

Hockey Talk: A Textured Description of Morality and Ethics in a Sporting Context

by

Patrick Bondy

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts

at

Dalhousie University
Halifax, Nova Scotia
April 2021

© Copyright by Patrick Bondy, 2021

Table of Contents

Abstract	iv
Acknowledgements	v
Chapter 1: Introduction - Shifting ice	1
Considering historical ‘change’: A sketch of hockey history	2
The Cherry incident	6
The study and research methods	10
My subjectivity in the rink	19
Chapter 2: Studying talk around sport, morality and ethics, and ethnicity and race	25
How to study talk in and around sport.....	26
Normative approach	26
Thick description approach	39
Textured description approach.....	26
Moving forward: an integrated approach to hockey talk.....	42
Chapter 3: Morality and ethics in hockey talk	44
Constancy.....	52
Progress.....	57
Keeping texture: Simultaneous moral trajectories	62
Conclusion	64
Chapter 4: Hockey talk about fighting and violence	65
Fighting and violence to carry on tradition and bond with others	66
Fighting in hockey as perennial.....	72
Fighting as a barrier to a better game	73
Conclusion	82
Chapter 5: Hockey talk about incidents which feature race	83
“ <i>Kick him out!</i> ”: An observed incident.....	83
Black perspectives	87
White perspectives.....	92
Textures of Whiteness: Subaltern White?.....	97
East Asian perspectives	99
Mixed-race and multiracial perspectives	102
Revisiting the “ <i>Kick him out!</i> ” incident	108

Chapter 6: Revisiting “<i>You people</i>” and the Cherry incident	112
A poor choice of words.....	113
An offensive speech act	116
Textures of a national incident	124
Chapter 7: Conclusion - Textured Insights, Normative Reflections from Hockey Talk ..	126
Bibliography	134
Appendix A: Consent form for minor-age hockey players.....	149
Appendix B: Consent form for parents/guardians of minor-age hockey players.....	153
Appendix C: Consent form for adult players.....	157
Appendix D: Consent form for adult fans (inclusive of parents)	160
Appendix E: Interview guide for hockey players.....	161
Appendix F: Interview guide for adult fans	165
Appendix G: Observation guide for structured observations at arenas	170
Appendix H: Promotional flyers to be put up at arenas	173
Appendix I: Table of games observed	175
Appendix J: Table of interview participants.....	181

Abstract

Across societies, morality and ethics manifest in many social arenas. Sports, and especially national sports such as ice hockey in Canada, are no exception. There is little consensus on the meaning of on- and off-ice actions, though, as hockey players, parents, fans, and others use multiple moral and ethical frameworks in ways that can conflict. Currently, disagreement exists particularly over the meaning of violent action, including fighting, and the meaning of action where a person's ethno-racial identity may be a factor at play. Drawing on ethnographic research collected during the 2018-19 and 2019-20 hockey seasons, including 80 interviews and 84 structured observations, this thesis describes hockey people's talk. It argues that hockey people rely on moral trajectories to structure their talk so that certain actions, inactions, speech, and silence become good and right things to do, or not do. The thesis argues that White identity in hockey is particularly heterogeneous, and that common disagreements about the meaning of action exist among all ethno-racial groups. Studies of ethno-racial subjectivity ought to take this into account. The findings in this thesis contribute to the fields of hockey and sports, morality and ethics, as well as ethno-racial identity and Whiteness Studies.

Acknowledgements

Thanks to the God the Creator, God of grace.

Thanks to God of my life, who has worked in my life, and who has used people powerfully in my life.

Thanks to my parents, for loving me, raising me, and giving me freedom to pursue my interests.

Thanks to my siblings, for being company to me. Thanks especially to my brother Terry, for pulling me out of a dark place and into light.

Thank you to early teachers – Mary Gliserman and Daniel Schwabauer, for giving me an early taste of writing. Thanks to Jessica Gliserman, for giving me an early taste of the social sciences.

Thanks to all who made my early days in Halifax and at Dalhousie positive. Thanks to Dr. Jerry White, to Danita and Jacobus Steyn, to Adventure By Bus which became Trips By Transit, and to the Deanery Project.

Thanks to Dr. Lindsay DuBois and Dr. Liesl Gambold for teaching introductory anthropology courses that introduced me to the discipline.

Thanks to all the roommates I ever had in Halifax – Isaac Berry, Ryan Perry, Brittany Harman, Emma Yeo, Bekah Smith, Corey Giles, Myriam Alexanian, Brandon Arsenault, Josiah Pittman, Paul Bendevis, Thomas Gadd, Johnny Richards, Josh Swain, and Sam Kamminga. Thanks for being a Godward community, holding the twin calling of loving one another and the wider world.

Thanks to neighbours – living alongside you was a great joy and privilege.

Thanks to all the SOSA faculty, for welcoming me and stimulating my interests in anthropology.

Thanks to Brian Howell, Dan Birtles, Stephen James, and everyone else I met at AAA Christian Anthropologists Network meetings. Even our sparse interactions have been an encouragement to me.

Thanks to Howard Ramos, for drawing me into the ‘Hockey Project’ team. Thanks to Lloyd Wong for allowing my participation in the project. It has been a remarkable opportunity. Thanks also to Martine Dennie for working alongside me in the project, encouraging me, and thinking about hockey in ways that have stimulated my own thinking.

Thanks to my MA committee, including Dr. Howard Ramos, Dr. Liesl Gambold, Dr. Martha Radice, and Dr. Laura Eramian for the first eight months. You were supportive, helpful, and made this work better than it would have been otherwise.

Thanks to everyone who participated in the ‘Hockey Project’. Your time and knowledge have been precious gifts. Thanks for the work you do to remember the past, to keep the game going, and to work for a better future.

Between finishing fieldwork and writing this Thesis, I moved to Ottawa. Thanks to my community here – Sarah MacDonald, Stephanie Moore, and Fey Oni. Thanks for keeping the Godward focus. Thanks also to Pat, Sean, Andre, and Tracy for keeping life humming in our building.

Thanks also to Calvary Baptist Church for their continued devotion in the past year. Thanks especially to Matt Rudd and his family, Kenny and Liz Wallace, Matt and Kim Okum, Hannah Gilman, and others for being community to Fey and I.

Thanks to Ryle Seminary for also persisting during COVID-19. Thanks to Dr. Byron Wheaton and Dr. Pierre Constant for their faithful teaching. Thanks to Matt Usherwood, Daniel Dixon, and others for being classmates.

Fey has my penultimate gratitude. As my Thesis wraps up, our life begins. You met a fool – poor hygiene included – and we both wanted more. Soon, God will marry us.

To Christ be the glory, the honour, and the power. Amen.

Chapter 1: Introduction – Shifting Ice

For most Canadians hockey is more than a game – it is something to talk about. Hockey talk is a constant hum not only in Canadian hockey arenas, but also in Tim Horton’s coffee shops, buses and shopping malls, and television and print media. Key events such as victory at the Olympics, misconduct allegations in professional hockey, or a young hockey player’s death can bring hockey talk to a fever pitch across Canada.

Whether at a constant hum or fever pitch, in hockey talk people express and evaluate actions, dispositions, and rules according to their views of how things ought to be. Hockey talk is populated with moral and ethical concepts. Ideas of honour, respect, submission to the collective, maintaining tradition, blazing a new path, celebrating a shared identity, or fostering diversity can shape a person’s hockey talk and make it legible. Hence there are multiple ways to relate meaning and action, multiple ways to narrate history, and multiple imagined or preferred futures within contemporary hockey talk. Hockey people can and in some cases do have conflicting moral or ethical stances toward a given topic in hockey and in broader society – violence and bureaucratic discipline, for example. Such conflicts between hockey people occur and are intensified because ‘the game’ is such an important marker of Canadian identity.

Hockey’s tight linkage to Canadian identity also means that conflicting moral visions of collective identity involving ethnicity, race, or nation show up in hockey talk. Ethnicity and race are tense discussion topics within contemporary North American society and talk about them in hockey and hockey arenas is no exception. Moreover, since ethno-racial identity is correlated with power and access to resources in society, people with different ethno-racial subjectivities may understand hockey and the operations of ethnicity and race within it differently. At a time when different and unequal experiences in Canada have led to incommensurable ideas of what is

and ought to happen, both in and beyond hockey in Canada, ethnographic descriptions that capture the variety of hockey talk are timely and important.

Considering historical change: A sketch of hockey history

Neither hockey talk nor the dimensions of it that interest me are static across time. Understanding past eras of hockey and hockey talk is a key first step to making sense of contemporary hockey talk. For my purposes, hockey in North America can be said to have passed through four phases over the last 200 years or so: emergence (1800 to 1870), consolidation (1870 to 1940), brutalization (1940 to 1990), and globalization (1990 to 2020). The focus here is on the moral and ethical content and ethno-racial boundaries and subjectivities present in each era.

The true origins of hockey in Canada are unknown and much-debated (McKegney 2018). The game was first played on naturally frozen lakes, ponds, rivers, and sea sides (Fosty and Fosty 2008). As a folk or popular sport at the time, the game did not have codified rules or bureaucratic structures (Gidén, Houda, and Martel 2020). The game did not have strong racialized boundaries around it either – evidence suggests hockey emerged in the intermingling of English, Irish, Mi'kmaq, and Black sporting activities in present-day Atlantic Canada (McKegney 2018; Fosty and Fosty 2008).

In an urbanizing and industrialising world, hockey quickly became more organized than the unstructured free play now referred to as “shinny”. The first formal game of ice hockey was played in Montreal in 1875 (Gidén, Houda, and Martel 2020). For the next six decades, formal hockey leagues arose and competed with one another for dominance. There was conflict over whether athletes ought to be paid or not (Wong 2005). By the end of the 1930s, the model of the

paid professional hockey player had won out, and the National Hockey League (NHL) consolidated power over the arena of competitive adult hockey (Wong 2005).

In terms of morality and ethics, there was a conflict in ideals between unpaid gentlemen hockey players and paid professional competitive hockey players (Wong 2005). Some players and hockey organizers felt the intrusion of money tainted the sport's purity, while others thought injecting cash into the game was essential for its growth and proper development (Wong 2005). Players, league organizers, and the wider public also disagreed about whether intentional body-checking and even incidental physical contact during the game were acceptable (McKee 2020). Here there were competing visions of how masculinity ought to be displayed on the ice. This moralized masculinity was also about national identity, though – hockey with physical contact represented an ethic of toughness that distinguished Canadians from their English and American neighbours (Robidoux 2002).

Hockey in Canada during this era had strong, tacit ethno-racial boundaries. Racial segregation laws pertaining to sport facilities were not widespread at this time in Canada, but did exist in some spaces, and racial discrimination and race-based treatment based on social norms rather than laws was commonplace in a variety of public spaces (Nzindukiyimana and O'Connor 2019). However, racial discrimination occurred more in hockey than many other public contexts because of the representative value the sport came to have for (White) Canadians. Major hockey leagues of the time, such as the National Hockey League (NHL), did not have ethno-racial diversity. A separate Coloured Hockey League (CHL) operated throughout the Maritime provinces from 1895 to 1925 (Fosty and Fosty 2008). The league was a significant achievement for the longstanding Canadian populations of African descent that lived in the Maritimes (Mensah 2010). The CHL was also important to so-called “mainstream” hockey history, as both

the slap shot and the butterfly position for goaltenders originated in this league (Fosty and Fosty 2008). These ethno-racial boundaries were reshaped by the Canadian demographics that followed World War II. Newcomers from Central, Eastern, and Southern European countries complicated older distinctions between White and Black (as well as Indigenous) populations in Canada.

At the same time as these demographic shifts took place, fans, players, and league organizers accepted norms that brutalized the game of hockey. In the consumer-society decades following World War II, there was a rise in the number of professional and semi-professional hockey leagues across North America. As a result, the number of people who could earn a living playing hockey grew. This gave less talented players a chance to play in the NHL – physicality supplanted skill. Teams like Boston’s “Big Bad Bruins” and the “Broad Street Bullies” of Philadelphia won Stanley Cups through a bit of skill and a lot of brute violence (Paul, Weinbach, and Robbins 2015). Goaltenders skating the length of the ice to fight each other, bench-clearing brawls, and even fights between players and fans occurred and are remembered – fondly, by some – from this era of hockey.

Honour, sacrifice, and submission to the collective were the moral touchstones of this brutalized form of hockey (Tjønndal 2016). The enforcer emerged as a distinct role in the game. This was someone who skated alongside star players to deter opponents from inflicting violence on those stars. Fans identified strongly with these hockey player-pugilists – Bob Probert and others like him – who sacrificed their bodies for their teams and cities to achieve victory (Paul, Weinbach, and Robbins 2015). What was good for the team was considered good.

The shifts in Canada’s population after World War II came to be reflected in its’ population of hockey players. Borje Salming, a Sami hockey player, was one of the first to join

the ranks of professional or semi-professional hockey players in Canada. Many Russians, central and southern Europeans, and other Scandinavians followed him. During this time period Willie O'Ree, a talented, African-descended hockey player from Fredericton, New Brunswick became the first Black NHL player. Animosity between ethno-racial groups and the deployment of discriminatory language against racialized minorities in hockey and other sports was commonplace during this time (Harris 2003). And while Canada's population shifted after World War II, it shifted at a similar scale again in the 1990s when it began to accept an increasing proportion of immigrants from the Middle East, the Caribbean, Africa, and East Asia (Kelley and Trebilcock 1998). Like before, these shifts complicated the landscape of ethno-racial relations in Canada.

Besides demographic change, economic globalization from the 1990s onward affected hockey in North America in profound ways. Gary Bettman, an American lawyer with previous experience at executive levels of the National Basketball Association (NBA), became the Commissioner of the NHL in 1993. He continues to hold that position in 2021. In that role he has aggressively expanded hockey to new markets through franchise expansion in US southern cities and exhibition games in mainland China. Such efforts have clearly been paying off for the league and team owners – Seattle \$650 million in 2018 to gain the rights to build an NHL team (Tzemis 2018). During this period NHL players increasingly came from suburban backgrounds, with access to specialized, high-cost training (Kaida and Kitchen 2020). Some say hockey faces a crisis of affordability that is estranging Canada's game from its people (Fitzgerald 2019).

During this period of globalization, the old moral framework of respect earned and honour proven through physical altercations came under scrutiny. Improved concussion science, an increasingly competitive talent pool of hockey players, and concerns about the sport's

branding have led to a reduction in on-ice violence (Wyshynski 2019). Other aspects of the old moral framework, such as submission to superiors and one's team, have been derided inside and outside hockey communities for allowing sexual and physical abuse to persist in the sport (Côté 2017; Kennedy 2011). The value of respect has been reconfigured in the context of minor hockey to minimize physical altercations and remove verbal ones from the game. Self-improvement, self-expression, and self-identification are emergent values in hockey and hockey talk (Ellison and Anderson 2018; Szto 2020).

Hockey's racialized boundaries have also weakened during the period of globalization, as greater numbers of non-White immigrants have come to Canada. A crop of second-generation Caribbean-Canadians – the three Subban brothers, Georges Laraque, and Joel Ward, among others – enjoyed lengthy careers in the NHL. Nazem Kadri, a Lebanese-Canadian and the NHL's first Muslim player, has also enjoyed a successful career, including a lengthy stint with the Toronto Maple Leafs. However, non-White minorities' engagement with hockey has not been without difficulty, as incidents of racist language continue to occur at both minor-league (Palmer 2018; CBC News 2019) and professional levels (CBC News 2020). Despite the individual success stories mentioned above, hockey continues to be and to be depicted as a sport overwhelmingly populated by White people. This is noteworthy because over 20% of the Canadian population is non-White and 20% are newcomers to Canada (Statistics Canada 2017). The disjuncture between hockey imagined as both White and Canadian on the one hand, and the reality of Canadian demographics on the other, are worth keeping in mind.

The Cherry incident

While a sketch of hockey history grounds this work and gives helpful context, discussing an example of high-profile hockey talk will clarify how present-day hockey talk operates. This example happened on *Hockey Night in Canada* (HNIC), a space where hockey talk has happened in Canada for the past eighty-plus years. First as radio and then as television, the sights and sounds of *HNIC* are seared into mainstream Canadian national identity. Since 1986, a hockey player-turned-coach-turned-commentator named Don Cherry, along with his on-air sidekick Ron MacLean, had been a key part of HNIC. Cherry was known for the colourful suits – and comments – he volunteered during his seven-minute segment, *Coach's Corner*. Through monologues and rousing conversations with his co-host Maclean, Cherry articulated an ethic of honour, respect, sacrifice, submission to the collective, and a(n ironic) preference for action over speech (Allain 2015). Cherry was known and derided by many for making brash on-air remarks about various Canadian social groups – Indigenous, European, and Francophone hockey players, women, and so-called “left-wing pinkos” (Elcombe 2010). Although broadcasting mostly during the globalization of hockey (1990-2020), the substance of Cherry’s talk was a holdover from its earlier period of brutalization (1940-1990) (Allain 2015; Elcombe 2010). As a result of this disjuncture, Cherry’s words sparked evaluative hockey talk about violence, morality, and ethno-racial inclusion.

On November 9, 2019, Cherry spoke words that ignited a firestorm of debate which dwarfed his previous comments and incidents. It started because, as part of Cherry’s ethic, he articulated great respect for Canada’s armed forces. He made his respect clear, every year, on the Saturday night closest to Remembrance Day. He extolled the virtues of Canada’s veterans and fallen soldiers, urging his fellow Canadians to remember them. On the 2019 edition of his

Remembrance Day broadcast, Cherry spoke candidly about changes he perceived in Canadians' relationship to their military before showing a pre-recorded clip of him visiting a cemetery. His off-the-cuff remarks focused on the decline he perceived in people wearing the red poppy – a fundraising staple for Canada's veterans based on World War I soldier John McCrae's poem, 'In Flanders' Fields'. In part, Cherry said this:

I live in Mississauga, nobody wears a...poppy, downtown Toronto, forget it!...you people love...ya love our way of life, you love our milk and honey, at least you could pay a couple of bucks for...poppies, or something like that! These [soldiers] paid for your way of life that you enjoy in Canada, these guys paid the...biggest price.

Don Cherry, November 9, 2019, on *Coach's Corner*

And MacLean gave his signature thumbs-up.

Soon after, outrage erupted. The volume of complaints against Cherry's talk exceeded the Canadian Broadcasting Standards Council's technical capacity (Bharti 2019). During a window of time during which apologies were possible, MacLean apologized and Cherry did not. Cherry lost his job and MacLean kept his. Alone and on-air, MacLean had this to say the following Saturday night:

Welcome to our first intermission, you know the story, the Coach's Corner is no more, and it's 34 years – look, we are all hurting, I have collapsed 100 times this week, if not more, we're all disappointed... [describes his mindset as 'the incident' took place] anyway [Cherry's talk] was done, and then you called us on [Cherry's words], which I thank you for, because that's the new world. You don't have a pulpit like Coach's Corner or the CBC News or The New York Times or The Guardian that just pronounces and that's it. Now, you have in real time social media, kind of a democracy happening, and so you caught it... I felt so bad, and I apologized immediately, and Don, you know Don...he made his choice, and I made mine...we have, like the country, to re-imagine ourselves, and there will be you know a possibility of this really bad, unexpected thing to do some good thing...

Ron MacLean, November 16, 2019, discussing the end of Coach's Corner on *Hockey Night in Canada*

Between Cherry's talk and MacLean's apology, there are multiple moral or ethical frameworks and they conflict with each other. For starters, Cherry and MacLean have very different moral renderings of time – for Cherry, the present is worse than the old, better days where more Canadians wore poppies and thus respected veterans. For MacLean, the only redeeming element of this experience is “*re-imagining ourselves*” and thus making the future a better place. Within these temporal, moral narratives, Cherry and MacLean focus their disappointment on different actions. Cherry is frustrated that new Canadians do not seem to wear poppies, while MacLean is disappointed in Cherry's words themselves. And in the end, Cherry and MacLean have different, even irreconcilable ideas about how to respond to this incident. As MacLean said, “[Cherry] made his choice and I made mine.”

Moreover, race and racialization are lurking in Cherry's words. People can plausibly locate Cherry's talk anywhere on a spectrum from not racist at all to entirely about race. On the one hand, Cherry is naming place-names and not ethno-racial people groups – and he has critically addressed ethno-racial groups before (Allain 2015). On the other hand, “*Mississauga*” and “*downtown Toronto*” are places with high numbers of visible minorities, some of the highest proportions in Canada. His words, therefore, may be singling out non-White Canadians for special criticism, which is offensive to some Canadians. I will pick up these themes during the in-depth exploration of the Cherry incident in chapter 6. Here, though, the point is simply to underscore the problem in contemporary Canadian hockey – a White sport cannot represent a non-White country for long. And for as long as some people think hockey does represent Canada, then there will be misunderstanding and conflict about hockey that will show up in talk.

To summarize, hockey in Canada is more than a sport, and as such generates evaluative talk. Different moral or ethical frameworks can structure this talk, and currently no one moral or

ethical framework dominates within hockey. This plurality is nowhere more visible than in matters of race and belonging to hockey, as well as to Canada. The disjuncture between hockey's privileged position in the Canadian imaginary, and the demographics of Canada and of hockey, signal the value of a description that can capture the experiences and thinking of hockey people with different ethno-racial subjectivities. Hence - the research questions that guide this thesis are:

1. How do hockey people talk about what is good or right, both in and beyond hockey?
2. What are the areas of moral or ethical disagreement about hockey among hockey people, and how do they talk about these areas where they disagree?
3. In what ways, if any, do people's ethnicized or racialized identities affect any of the above?

The first question is answered in chapters 3 and 4, the second question is answered in chapters 4, 5, and 6, and the third question is answered in chapters 5 and 6. Before any of this, it is important to provide the methodology for this research project, a word on my subjectivity in the research, and a review of existing literature pertaining to the above research questions.

The study and research methods

Having explained that my thesis is an exploration of hockey talk, with all of its disagreements and internal diversity, I can now explain the nature of the data it relies on. This thesis is written from ethnographic data collected during two hockey seasons – September 2018-June 2019 and September 2019-April 2020. This was both planned and serendipitous, as the first COVID-19 lockdown came in the spring of 2020 (NHL 2020). Serendipity is one word for the thread of un-planned and barely-planned actions that made this project what it is, and that thread begins at the start. My interest in researching hockey began in my third year of undergraduate

study. At that time, my long-term research interest was – and still is – the anthropology of Christianity. I wanted more time for those research interests to germinate, though, and I enjoyed hockey. After making a mock survey question in a class exercise about hockey, the course instructor told me he had a project about hockey and would need to hire a research assistant. In the end, he hired me.

That is how I ended up collecting the data for a Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC)-funded project, Hockey Arenas as Multicultural Spaces, grant file number 862-2017-0002. The “Arenas” project, with Dr. Lloyd Wong as the Principal Investigator and Dr. Howard Ramos as the co-investigator, used structured observations and semi-structured interviews to understand hockey’s demographics and the potential barriers – financial, cultural, or other – that prevent parts of the Canadian population from engaging the game. Besides this thesis I have produced my undergraduate thesis, two co-authored papers, and three conference papers from the project data. The two co-authored papers examine the nature of social forms and lived multiculturalism in Halifax minor hockey communities (Bondy and Ramos 2021) and the prominence of space in affecting social relations in hockey (Ramos and Bondy 2021). Neither those papers nor the other work addresses morality and ethics or – at least in any significant way – ethnicity, race and racialization in hockey talk. However, the project data has a lot of material on morality and ethics, as well as race and racialization. Therefore, this is an excellent set of data on which to base this master’s thesis. Moving from earlier work on multiculturalism and space to my present concerns about morality and ethics also reflects my intellectual trajectory toward research in the anthropology of Christianity.

As a research assistant for the Arenas project I not only used two research methods, but explored two field sites – Halifax, Nova Scotia and Toronto, Ontario. Having collected data from

two cities in two regions of Canada is another way this thesis keeps multiplicity within its view. Halifax and Toronto have different values and statuses as cities. Toronto in the past several decades has become a global, multicultural, highly competitive city (City of Toronto no date). Toronto is arguably the world's hockey capital – there is a massive ecosystem of private training, schooling adjusted for youth athletes, and of course the storied Maple Leafs. Halifax, meanwhile, is in Atlantic Canada, a region known for its' slower pace of life and emphasis on hospitable community (Grant and Kronstal 2011). These two cities also have different experiences in terms of race and racialization. As noted above, Halifax has had a long-standing African Nova-Scotian population with a rich hockey history (Fosty and Fosty 2008). At the same time, it has been slower to receive non-White immigrants since the overhaul of Canada's immigration system in the mid-twentieth century (Gosse et al. 2016). Toronto, meanwhile, has grown dramatically through immigration since the mid-twentieth century. The city received many immigrants from eastern and southern Europe in the twentieth century that altered the city's ethno-racial makeup substantially and generated some conflict along the way (City of Toronto no date). Today it is one of the most diverse cities in the world – just over half of the city identifies as a visible minority (Whalen 2017).

Three factors have led me to not consider this a comparative study of Halifax and Toronto, though. First, I conducted most of the Halifax research in the 2018-2019 hockey season and most of the Toronto research in the 2019-2020 season. The 2019-2020 season featured the Don Cherry incident, discussed earlier and at length in chapter 6. I was not able to conduct much research in Halifax around this incident. Not being able to compare responses to a single national incident would have left a comparative project hampered. Second, my supervisor Dr. Ramos conducted a greater share of the Toronto interviews than the Halifax interviews. We have

different interviewing styles, and a comparative study would risk conflating geographical differences with the differences between our interviewing styles. Third, several Halifax interviewees were from and grew up in the Greater Toronto Area, which blurs the line between Halifax and Toronto interviewees. Therefore this thesis is not a comparative study, though having data from two cities helps me have a more comprehensive view of hockey talk.

It is time to say more about the data of the Arenas project. I had access to observations of 83 events and to 80 interviews in Halifax and Toronto. 46 of the observations were of events in Halifax, and 37 of them were of events in Toronto. I conducted 35 of the Halifax observations on my own, co-conducted ten more with Dr. Ramos, and Dr. Ramos conducted one observation himself. In Toronto, I conducted 35 of the observations myself, while Dr. Ramos and I co-conducted two of them. Besides these observations, I had access to 80 interviews – 50 in Halifax and 30 in Toronto. I conducted 47 of the Halifax interviews and 22 of the Toronto interviews – Dr. Ramos conducted three and eight interviews, respectively. While I have more Halifax data than Toronto data, I have enough from both locales to make robust claims about these two cities.

The 84 events I observed were of five different kinds – mostly regular season, playoff, and tournament hockey games, as well as some hockey practices and learn-to-skate programs (see Appendix I). These games ranged in competition level from recreational to elite and ranged in age level from 11-12 year-olds to adult professionals. In this way, the dataset reflects a variety of age and competition levels. Although, as I will explore, talk of race was rarely explicit, I made sure to note when it rose to the surface of conversation. None of these notes contain identifying information, and hockey arenas are public spaces where my research could be reasonably expected, so informed consent was not required.

Overall the observations were long, cold, and slow – but certainly worthwhile. I made a point to stay for the entire hockey game, practice, or event, and sometimes stayed at a rink for multiple games. My observation periods, then, lasted between 90 minutes and six hours. They were cold – especially in older, poorly insulated arenas. Newer arenas, though, are much more temperature-controlled. Most arenas have warm and cold parts – I spent time in both. Time spent observing passed slowly – an hour of sitting alone under the heater could be punctuated by a mutual look. If I had three verbal interactions in a two-hour period, then the observation was busy. At a handful of points, though, the achingly slow tempo of observations was lit by a social matchstick. A tense exchange is the centerpiece of chapter 5, and I met the interviewee I call Tony by joining a brief scrum of angry parents at a Toronto arena.

Particularly in the first hockey season of fieldwork, I thought of myself as a wandering fool. What I have in mind here links to what others call ethnographic serendipity (Salazar & Rivoal 2013). Wandering fools, like the holy fools of Eastern Christianity (Ivanov 2006; Johnson 2014) and other traditions (Phan 2001), are those behaving in a foolish enough way that they are open to the grace and wisdom of God. In December 2018, during a warm spell in Toronto, I wore flip-flops to the hockey rink, hoping that would generate conversation. It did, actually – though with subsequent pains in my foot I learned that even fools need arch support. During the second season of fieldwork I felt more comfortable in and around rinks, and so thought of myself as a wandered fool. Fieldwork by that point was more socially active, too – I commonly saw interview participants at games, for example. Though I did not engage them in order to protect their privacy, just seeing familiar faces enlivened the observations for me. When they initiated conversation, I knew how to have hockey small-talk – a key social skill for anyone involved in hockey (Bondy and Ramos 2021).

I tried with my observations to get as kaleidoscopic a set of experiences as possible. Sitting far from the ice, at the first row, walking around the concourse; I aimed for as many angles as possible. Usually I sat close enough to some people in order to overhear at least exclamations, but there were exceptions. I often stuck around between games at a certain arena to understand the cycle of hockey families arriving early, chatting, watching the game, chatting more, and then leaving. I went to old rinks and new rinks, downtown rinks and suburban rinks. Except for Sundays, no time of day or day of the week was off-limits for me to go and be in hockey arenas.

While sitting down at observations, I nearly always had my observation sheets (see Appendix G) out and ready for note-taking. Social interaction across the arena – front-door security, line-ups, the concessions, the stands, the ice, the team benches, the penalty boxes, and more – was under my purview. My notes consist of demographic estimates – those were mostly for the Arenas project – and captures of conversation where people said certain actions were “right”, “wrong”, “good”, or “bad”. Players on the ice used this talk against each other, and people in the stands commented on the game and other issues inside and outside hockey in these ways. Aggressive play in particular – discussed in chapter 4 – drew out moralistic talk. Seeing people in hockey arenas talk in ways that involved morality or ethics also gave me a sense of how racialized identity may affect the moral and ethical views they express. These naturalistic observations helped me to understand what interview participants shared.

Via the Arenas project I had access to, as alluded to earlier, semi-structured interviews with 80 people: 17 parents, 36 players, 12 fans, and 15 key informants (see Appendices E and F for the interview guides, Appendix I for more detailed information on the interview participants). Project colleagues and I used a combination of recruitment methods to find interview

participants. In both Halifax and Toronto, I put up posters (see Appendix H) at hockey rinks. I did not seek to use snowball sampling, but if interview participants connected me with other eligible and interested people, then I did interview them. My own personal networks, as well as the networks of other research team members, were also helpful for finding interview participants.

Members of the Arenas research team, myself included, made particular effort to interview people with a variety of ethno-racial subjectivities. Studies of race and racialization in hockey frequently focus on particular ethno-racial groups, whether the group be White (Kalman-Lamb 2018), South Asian (Szto 2020), or Black (Harris 2003; Fosty and Fosty 2008). We interviewed people from several ethno-racial categories, which is a key reason this thesis can claim to describe hockey talk from the perspectives of multiple ethno-racial subjectivities. The categories are White and People of Colour (POC) – including Middle Eastern, East Asian, South Asian, and Black. A total of fifty-five interview participants identified as White. Thirty-nine of those were of Anglo-Celtic descent. Sixteen were White but had a range of different ethnic backgrounds, including Acadian, Dutch, Italian, and Portuguese. The remaining twenty-five participants were identified as POC. Within this category there are four subcategories – Middle Eastern, Black, East Asian, and South Asian. Ten interview participants were of Middle Eastern descent – they were from Israel, Lebanon, Syria, and Iran. However, the vast majority of these participants were young players and did not discuss ethno-racial subjectivity in their interviews. Therefore, I do not make claims about Middle Eastern subjectivities in hockey. Six participants were from China and identified as East Asian. Two interview participants identified as South Asian. Seven interview participants identified as Black, though we also conducted four informal, unrecorded short interviews with Black people at an event for Black hockey players in Halifax,

Nova Scotia. We followed up with one of those informal interview participants for a semi-structured interview.

Beyond these mutually exclusive ethno-racial categories, though, it is important to note the presence of mixed-race individuals in hockey. This is especially true for the purposes of producing a description that is accurate to the shifting ethno-racial demographics of hockey and Canada today. Mixed-race individuals were categorized as mixed-race and as whatever other ethno-racial identity they identified with or were identified as. Black mixed-race participants, for example (see Joseph-Salisbury 2020 for more on this category), were coded as both Black and mixed-race. Seven interview participants were mixed-race. Given the importance of the family unit in youth sports (see chapter 2), and the fact that much of the data for this thesis comes from youth hockey, mixed-race experiences here are not just individual, but familial. Therefore, in this thesis I repeatedly pay attention to the possibility that being a member of a multiracial family affects a participant's views. Fourteen people – including the seven mixed-race individuals already mentioned – were part of multiracial families.

Sixty-four of the interviews were with men and 16 were with women. While gender is certainly a dimension of hockey, talk included (Allain 2014), I do not focus on gender differences in this thesis for two reasons. First, I do not think I interviewed enough women to make strong claims about how hockey talk differs by gender. Second, during my data collection, race and racialization were much more topical than gender was, because of the incidents involving Don Cherry and others in the news. Existing literature makes plain that gender is present in hockey talk (Theberge 2003; MacDonald 2014), and I realize incorporating gender difference into my analysis would have added another layer of nuance to my research.

The participants ranged in age from 11 to 67 years old, and the interviews took between 10 and 90 minutes. For participants under 18, they and a parent or legal guardian signed written consent forms (see Appendices A and B). For participants over 18, we used a verbal consent process. In this thesis I will use either pseudonyms or general labels, such as “a recreational player in Toronto”, to protect participants’ identities. I transcribed all 80 interviews. The interviews focused on people’s experiences with hockey, perceptions of who plays hockey, and views on whether hockey is Canadian and what will happen to hockey in the future. Participants were offered a \$25 Tim Horton’s gift card to incentivize participation and express the research team’s gratitude.

Like with the observations, I adopted a stance of being a fool in the first season of fieldwork that I then modified in the second season. At the beginning of the research, interview participants needed to explain basic aspects of minor hockey to me. I did not understand differences between House (least competitive), Select, and Competitive hockey (most competitive), for example. Even with this base knowledge on minor hockey, I sometimes asked people questions I already knew the answers to. It was better for me to be the fool, and for the participant to be the knowledgeable one. Besides, even if I had tried to hide my lack of knowledge, people often asked me whether I had played hockey myself. Less sheepishly as the research went on, I told them I hadn’t. I was the fool. In the second season, having become more familiar with minor hockey and the game as a whole, I asked more follow-up questions to fill in gaps around the information I already had. Of course, even in the last interview I was learning, and so sought to practice the Biblical admonition to be “slow to speak” (James 1:19). Holding my tongue and allowing silence to probe the interviewee tended to bring good results.

I coded the event observation notes and interview transcripts together and followed a six-step process for coding and analysis. First, I wrote out my existing hunches about the data. This helped me remember them, and it reduced the potential for confirmation bias. My second step was to read all my notes and transcripts and write down potential codes to systematically analyse the data set. After reading through all my data, I had about 200 codes and a broad-strokes sense of the entire dataset. My third step, based on Step 2, was to revise my hunches into working arguments. My fourth step was to code the data in detail based on my working arguments. While coding, I whittled away unhelpful codes. I ended up with around 110 total codes, and 22 key codes. While coding the data, I began developing a basic outline of my thesis, which was my fifth step. My sixth step was to re-analyze parts of the data, in further depth where necessary. Taken as a whole, this six-step process fell somewhere between inductive and deductive approaches to data analysis.

My subjectivity, in hockey and in life

At this point it is worth diving a bit deeper into my ethnographic subjectivity, as good ethnographic work demands reflexivity. In terms of my experiences prior to the research, hockey was both *familiar* and *foreign* to me. It was familiar because I lived in Calgary, Alberta, from my birth to mid-2006. Canadian hockey fans will remember the underdog playoff run that Calgary's professional hockey team, the Flames, went on in the spring and early-summer of 2004. I was six years old then, and my father had secured a Calgary Flames flag that we clipped onto the drivers'-side window of our family van. My brother and I used our red goal horn to make long, blaring noises during games. We implored my mother to join the chorus of people honking at stoplights in a show of spontaneous support and euphoria over the Flames' success. Our – the

Flames' – captain at the time, Jarome Iginla, was my earliest hockey hero. It was not till much later in life that I realized “Iginla” was not a typical hockey name, or that Iginla was half-Nigerian and stood in a longer line of great Black hockey players (Harris 2003). As a kid I always felt an affinity with him because he seemed to be Christian like me – I only found out later that, in fact, he is (Hockey Ministries International 2018).

Hockey was foreign to me, though, because my family was never a hockey family. I played street hockey and mini-sticks hockey as a kid, but never minor hockey or ice hockey of any kind, for that matter. I skated often enough to know I could not skate, but never often enough to improve. Despite one of my brother's and my requests, my parents knew they did not want to be hockey parents. They did not want to spend thousands of dollars per year, ferrying their sons around weeknight and weekend. We downhill skied as a family instead. I was further distanced from hockey when we moved to Kansas City, Missouri, in the American Midwest, to join a spiritual community that was equal parts monastery and megachurch. My efforts to get locals to watch hockey or play mini-sticks went poorly, as they lacked hockey knowledge, skills, and perhaps above all, interest. I instead put my energy toward engaging the region's popular sports – NASCAR, baseball, and football.

Having experienced hockey as both familiar and foreign helped me in my fieldwork and in the subsequent production of a well-rounded, nuanced description of hockey talk. I was able to understand people when they described hockey as exciting, or fear-inducing, or expensive, or conducive to immoral behaviour, and even like a sacred canopy (Berger 1967) under which one's life has a moral orientation and structure. My past primed me to be a good anthropologist in and around hockey.

Hockey – this thesis is about more than hockey, and so I need to unpack my subjectivity in terms of more than just hockey. I have mentioned Christianity already – that my intellectual trajectory is toward the anthropology of Christianity, and that my family moved to the US for a monastery-megachurch mash-up. It is worth being more specific, though. Since sixteen I have been a committed Christian, and – as I understand myself – that is the primary identity and standpoint of my life (see Howell 2007 on Christian standpoint and commitment). During the years spent conducting fieldwork for this project, I puzzled over the relationship between anthropology and Christianity. I still do. Such reflexive pondering is essential in order to put other people’s lives on paper with integrity and humility. This is because the knowledge produced in this thesis is situated in myself, since I was the primary means of data collection (Haraway 1988; Howell 2007).

There is a paradox between Christianity as a powerful force in Western modernity, one that is translated even into supposedly secular concepts such as religion and the public-private distinction (Asad 1993), and the experiences of Christian academics and anthropologists in particular as feeling excluded or side-lined due to their faith (Priest 2001; Arnold 2006). I have lived this paradox in my own academic career – feeling nervous about saying anything that would let on my Christian subjectivity while hearing Christianity and Christians being depicted as those who can brazenly live insulated from difference or critique.

The fear that anthropology and Christianity are incommensurable commitments, or even that such persons holding both are automatically rejected by fellow anthropologists, is false and has never been true. Despite contrary arguments from Christian (Meneses et al. 2014) and secular – or at least religiously private – anthropologists (Stewart, 2001), Coleman’s published comment in Meneses et al.’s (2014) article is correct to point out the line of anthropologists who

were Christian are seminal figures in mainstream anthropology. Pivotal figures in the discipline such as Evans-Pritchard (Engelke 2002), Victor Turner (Engelke 2002), and Mary Douglas ([1966] 2002; see also Larson 2014) all practiced a Christian faith. More recent figures such as Kenelm Burridge (Jorgensen 2020) and the late Sonja Luehrmann, compared to a holy fool by one of her colleagues (Heo et al 2020), practiced Christian faith while occupying positions at mainstream Canadian universities. Besides these, anthropologists such as Brian Howell (2007) and Eloise Meneses (et al. 2014) contribute to anthropological theory and practice from their positions at confessional institutions.

Doing anthropology in a Christian subjectivity has attuned me to the matter of normativity. There are certainly other ways of getting to these reflections, the collision of feminism and anthropology being one of the most productive (Abu-Lughod 2015; Mahmood 2005). However an anthropologist gets to being reflexive about normativity, the point is that – to twist David Hume’s words – behind every “is” lies an “ought”. Description happens within a framework, worldview, or “culture”, and even then these structures overlap and are unevenly distributed in people’s lives. This is a basic insight of anthropology since the crisis of representation (Anzaldúa [1987] 2012; Rosaldo 1989; Clifford and Fisher [1985] 2010). I use the language of normativity here to connect these developments in anthropological theory with both my own normativity and that of the normative concerns I found in hockey and hockey arenas. Normativity is a running thread and foundation-piece in this thesis.

Of course ethnography is more than normative reflection – it demands fieldwork and a subsequent description of social life in the field. From the discipline’s inception, anthropologists have sought to describe social life in, to use Malinowski’s often-cited phrase, “the native point of view” (1961). Geertz altered this when, using language from the philosopher Gilbert Ryle

([1949] 1966), he called for anthropologists to undertake “thick” – as opposed to thin – “description” of the lives they encountered (1973). Thick descriptions explore the meaning of action, performance, and cultural symbols (1973; see also White 2007). Subsequent criticisms, which I am sympathetic to, allege that while Geertz describes the symbols and meaning animating cultural practices, he fails to attend to the processes and internal variation (Barth 1993, 2007; Clifford and Marcus [1985] 2010; Roseberry 1982; Sewell 1997) of life. Despite these criticisms, and the fact that some anthropologists deliberately consider their work to be “thin description” (Jackson 2013; Riles 2000, 2011), thick description’s place in the anthropological lexicon is cemented (Dan-Cohen 2019). Thick description being such a widely- and differently-used term makes it difficult – and it would repeat the Geertzian weaknesses which going beyond thick description ought to resolve – to make any positive claims about the enterprise of thick description.

In considering kinds of description, it is worth recalling the approach needed for this particular study. Hockey’s precarious position in Canada today, Canada’s changing demographics, the existence of conflicting moral-ethical frameworks within hockey, the ethno-racial diversity of research participants, the inclusion of data from distinct cities in the analysis, and my ethnographic subjectivity being involved in the research – whatever description I produce needs to be attentive to these factors.

I refer to such a description as a *textured* one.

A textured description calls attention to the internal variation and heterogeneity of social environments and groups. Over the course of this thesis I will develop and carry out such a description. Textured description relates to normativity and thick description in a sequential, dependent manner. As stated earlier, normativity – the reason, motivation, or *why* for any

research – is foundational. Thick description – I use the term here to refer to articulating the meanings people attach to action – proceeds from the scholar’s normative standpoint. Textured description builds on normativity and thick description, by considering internal variation within and lateral engagement between people and people groups in the research field. While some might do this textured work within a thick description, for clarity’s sake the two are separate in this ethnography of hockey people and their talk.

Chapter 2: Studying talk around sport, morality and ethics, and ethnicity and race

The introduction established that this thesis is an ethnography of hockey talk in Halifax and Toronto. Understanding this talk requires a grasp of the existing literature on sports, morality and ethics, and race and racialization. This chapter surveys literature on these topics from the disciplines of philosophy, history, sociology, and anthropology, as well as inter-disciplinary research areas such as Critical Whiteness Studies. The chapter establishes the value of studying talk in sport, examines the place of normative concerns in the literature, surveys relevant thick descriptions, and discusses the insights of work relevant for a textured description of hockey talk.

It is worth considering at the start why, if at all, it is worth studying the talk that happens in and around sport. Indeed, sports have only recently been considered a site of academic study at all (Brownell 1995; Coleman and Kohn 2007; Dyck 2012; McGarry 2010). At its simplest, talk in and around sports matters because through it people attach meaning to the actions and talk in sport. These dynamics are apparent across different scales of interaction. By practicing a sport, a person learns particular ways of being in and seeing the world, whether that is semi-professional North American hockey players (Robidoux 2001) or amateur boxers in inner-city Chicago (Wacquant 2006). Moreover, they carry the way of being learned in sport with them into the rest of their lives. Sports is always about more than the direct participants, though. Youth sports have grown tremendously in the past several decades, and despite scholars' slowness to study this phenomenon (Messner and Musto 2014), what research exists shows these activities are at least as meaningful for the parents as for the youth directly participating (Dyck 2012; Messner 2009). Professional and international sports, meanwhile, function as mediations of collectives that people find meaningful. This could be explicitly celebrated in terms of national identity (Archetti 1999), or in terms of soccer teams that implicitly represent religious

denominations (Webster 2020). And particular sports continue to be linked through discourse to certain ethno-racial groups (Besnier, Brownell, and Carter 2017). All this makes plain that people attach meaning to the talk and action that takes place in and around sport. The talk within sport, and the talk about and around sport, then, merits investigation as much as any other behaviour in which humans invest meaning.

How to study talk in and around sport

Knowing why to study the talk in and around sport, however, does not guarantee how to study such material. Indeed, there is no one approach, even within the call for texture I gave in the introduction. Here, my interests are more fundamental than a methodological discussion comparing interviews, archival research and the like. I focus instead on how scholars relate *meaning* and *action* within their work. Such a focus captures the social life of sport in its discursive or semiotic, as well as its corporal or embodied, dimensions. In doing so I set out the threefold sequence I developed in the introduction of textured description laid over thick description, which rests on a foundation of normative concerns.

Normative Concerns

Normative concerns – the *why* and the *ought* – are foundational to social life and to scholarship. Some scholarship is simply normative – the scholar here asserts the true meaning of a particular action. The most intuitive disciplinary location for this approach is philosophy. A philosopher, at least as classically understood, attempts to ascertain the true nature of reality – in part, what actions mean. Philosophers of sport, then, seek to understand what actions in and around sport mean. Simon (2010) addresses questions such as the place of violence in sport, the

use of performance-enhancing drugs, and other forms of cheating. Such actions are either right, wrong, or somewhere in between.

Talk counts as a kind of action, and philosophers of sport argue about the meaning of various kinds of talk that happen in and around sport. So-called “trash talking” or “chirping”, as it is known in hockey, is a controversial practice that consists of swearing at and directing threatening words towards one’s opponent or the game officials. Philosophers argue about whether these actions are acceptable or not (Dixon 2007; Feezell 2008; Simon 2010). In doing so, their arguments tend to be deontological, virtue ethics-based, or utilitarian. Deontological arguments rely on universal rules that ought to always be followed. Virtue ethics-based arguments decide right and wrong based on whether actions shape people in good or bad ways. Finally, utilitarian arguments decide right and wrong based on the consequences of the action. These arguments can be used simultaneously, as Lewinson and Palma (2012) do, to argue that one-on-one in-game fights between hockey players are morally wrong and therefore ought to be more strictly banned (see Zakhem 2015 for another philosophical argument but with a different conclusion).

I would be remiss, however, to indicate that philosophers are the only academics who have normativity in their work. Since the crisis of representation of the 1980s, anthropologists have laboured over questions of normativity in producing descriptions of other people and people groups. As discussed in the introduction, no anthropologist today can claim to produce value-free descriptions and expect to be taken seriously. Rather, a scholar’s own subjectivity is an important – though not overwhelming – part of their work. Among anthropologists of morality and ethics (see Laidlaw 2014 and Lambek 2015b for examples), there is an understanding that learning about how other people and people groups do morality and ethics can

help anthropologists and their own communities become better. Similarly, my own normative concerns and the morality and ethics encountered in hockey talk interact in a two-way movement, one that will develop throughout the thesis.

Normativity within description exists in more than topical considerations of morality and ethics. The cross-disciplinary work of race and ethnicity scholars is normative, or concerned with the true meaning of action. Race-based ill-treatment and inequities are seen by some as among the most pressing problems in the world today (Winant 2015). Within this framework, Whiteness studies seek to describe dynamics of racial privilege that lay at the heart of America's – and Canada's – racial hierarchy. DiAngelo (2011), a key figure in this literature, writes that her work does not intend to prove the existence of its study material, but rather simply describe it. Hence, her work asserts the meaning of action – that White people's actions, though mediated somewhat by social class, are about their will to remain ensconced atop a race-based hierarchy. Such a normative framework provides both an overarching story and grasp-able action points, many of which orbit around “micro-aggressions” – seemingly small conversational frictions that expose underlying power dynamics and personal insensitivities (Thurber and DiAngelo 2018). By intervening in microaggressions and clarifying the race-based nature of (North) American social institutions, these scholars reason society can make progress toward equitable race relations (see Victor and Seamster 2016 for more on racial progress). Likewise scholarship within Black studies (Gilroy 1993; Mensah 2010 for examples) is, even when descriptive, built on normative concerns about the flourishing of Black people. Hence Harris' (2003) volume on Black hockey players, even as it describes their experiences, asserts the normative, moral good of Black athletes achieving full inclusion in the game.

Besides philosophical reflection and its effect on description, normativity is also present in conceptual and methodological discussions. Here the argument is not about something out in the world, but rather a particular way of understanding what is in the world. As will be discussed below, anthropologists continue to disagree about what are the most fruitful concepts or theories for producing descriptions of morality and ethics within social life. Similarly, some criticize Whiteness studies and its presuppositions – they feel the approach gives race too central of a place in social problems (Wimmer 2015) and as a result fails to faithfully describe reality (Arnesen 2001).

Normativity is present in academic scholarship on sports, morality and ethics, and race, as well as many other social fields, in three ways. First, scholars can argue that certain actions in the world truly have certain meanings. Second, even for scholars devoted to describing how other people relate meaning and action, the scholar's normative concerns affect their description. Finally, scholars of description have normative positions about which concepts are more helpful for making sense of the world than others. Hence, normativity is present in any description, including this one.

Thick Descriptions

Rooted in Enlightenment-era normative concerns about producing knowledge of true reality, social scientific research seeks to describe social reality. Anthropology was born from a desire to describe the social reality of non-European peoples in particular. The most popular method of anthropological description, as noted in the introduction, was coined “thick description” by Clifford Geertz (1973), though anthropologists have been producing such descriptions at least since the early twentieth century (Gellner 1998). While thick description

today varies greatly in meaning and usage, for my purposes it is a description of how other people relate meaning and action.

Some sports scholarship can be considered descriptions of this variety. Azoy (2003) unpacks the meanings and social function of the Afghan sport buzkashi, for example. Hughes and Coakley's (1991) exploration of the "sport ethic", one part of which is an emphasis on personal sacrifice, is also an example. Colburn (1985), for another example, argues that violence in hockey games, and particularly one-on-one fist fights between hockey players, functions as a mechanism of social control. The participants in Colburn's study consider highly codified acts of violence to keep sneakier – and more dangerous – violent acts at bay. Bean (2016) and her colleagues, relying on interviews with minor hockey experts, elucidate the forms and causes of harassment and aggressive behaviour in hockey rinks. One reason offered is vicarious parenting, where hockey parents over-identify with the successes and failures of their hockey playing children.

Beyond sports, anthropologists of morality and ethics have studied the meaning of action in a variety of contexts. Emile Durkheim's ([1915] 1995) work on religion has had a monumental impact on this literature (see Howell 1997 for more) – hence his argument deserves brief exploration, even though Durkheim precedes the terminology of thick description and did not conduct fieldwork himself. Durkheim argued that religious objects and symbols were consolidations of the social group's power generated by their gathering together. These physical gatherings generated what he called "collective effervescence" (213, 216-220). An individual's experience of morality in this framework is the will of the group manifesting in oneself. Self-restraint and self-sacrifice are good behaviours within these social contexts (Zigon 2008). Durkheim continues to find appeal among some contemporary anthropologists – Robbins (2007),

for example, feels Durkheim serves as a corrective to an overestimation of human freedom and individuality.

Durkheim's thinking, though, has detractors. Given the importance of morality and ethics to hockey talk and hence to this thesis, it is worth exploring present-day evaluations of and alternatives to a Durkheimian approach. Some say his expansive definition of morality waters the concept down, limiting its' analytical value (Beldo 2014; Laidlaw, 2014; Dyring 2018). Moreover, his collectivist orientation and similarity to Kantian deontology leave little room for analysis of human freedom or the possibility of change in people's understandings of morality or ethics (Robbins 2007; Zigon 2008; Dyring 2018). Such an approach hampers an anthropologists' ability to describe drastic social change (Robbins 2007; for an ethnographic example see Robbins 2004).

The criticism that morality has too wide a definition is made against more than just Durkheimian approaches to morality and ethics, though. Zigon (2008) writes that Edel and Edel's (1968) early attempt to incite an anthropology of morality failed for the same reason. Zigon (2014) and Beldo (2014) fault the "ordinary ethics" approach put forward by Lambek (2015a; see also Sidnell, Meudec, and Lambek 2019) for the same reasons – that seeing ethics as a part of all human activity, as Lambek does, obfuscates morality, which makes it more difficult to effectively study. While Lambek finds this "ordinary ethics" approach helpful for understanding the religious and spiritual lives of the Madagascar residents he conducts fieldwork with (1993, 2015a), Beldo alleges such an approach fails to help him understand the Chicago-area atheists with whom he conducts fieldwork (2014). This is a clear example of scholars being normative about how to conduct description, and illustrates the consequences one's conceptual framework has on fieldwork, analysis, and description.

Two new approaches for describing morality and ethics in social life have emerged as a result of dissatisfaction with the Durkheimian approach. The first is to use virtue ethics to produce ethnographic descriptions of moral personhood. Earlier I noted how philosophers can use virtue ethics to make normative arguments of their own. Here, scholars trace the ways particular kinds of personhood are upheld as good, and people engage in particular regimes in order to become that better person (Faubion 2001). Mahmood (2005) explores how some Muslim women in Cairo eagerly participate in Islamic piety, and in doing so demonstrate agency and shape their personhood (for other ethnographic examples see Zigon 2010 and Hirschkind 2006). While not using virtue ethics specifically, studies of the role of moral exemplars in discourse and self-reflection (Humphreys 1997 for example) also fit under this approach. Relevant ethnographic descriptions show that moral personhoods tend to be aligned with particular religious (Mahmood 2005; Hirschkind 2006), ethnic (Humphrey 1997), or national (Archetti 1999) identities.

The second approach is existential or phenomenological – in this approach, the normative concern is to limit pre-conceived notions to an absolute minimum. Relying on philosophers such as Levinas and Heidegger, the focus is on people's direct, embodied experiences of the world (Mattingly and Throop 2018). Zigon (2014) alleges such an approach is necessary to make sense of the lives of anti-globalization activists at risk of losing the opportunity to be at home within their places of dwelling (Zigon, 2014). Culture is not a focus of this approach; the important point, rather, is connecting experiences of morality and ethics to human existence (Dyring 2018).

These thick descriptions of morality and ethics, whether in sport or elsewhere, seek to capture what certain actions mean to certain people. When these scholars are normative, it is primarily about what theories or concepts produce the best descriptions. Durkheimian

structuralism, virtue-ethics based approaches, and existential or phenomenological approaches have been the most popular. It is worth recalling how this fits into my overall theoretical approach – these kinds of thick description build on normative concerns. Any of the concepts and insights reviewed here could be useful in terms of unpacking the moral and ethical content of the hockey talk described in chapters 3 through 6 of this thesis.

While anthropologists have used Durkheimian social theory, virtue ethics, and phenomenology to produce thick descriptions of morality and ethics, they have also indirectly explored how people relate meaning and action through considerations of time and temporality. These concerns cut to the heart of anthropological theory. The discipline – as noted earlier – was born of a desire to understand non-European peoples, and came of age at a time when racist ideas of European superiority, such as those put forward by the 19th century social theorist Herbert Spencer, were appropriate and acceptable ways of understanding the world. As a result, anthropologists considered the people whom they studied to be outside of time and of history (Fabian 1983), and so therefore beyond change and its possibility (Robbins 2007).

Partly as a response to the critique put forward by Fabian (1983), an anthropology of cultural constructions of time has emerged (see Munn 1992; Gell 1992). Having noted at the outset of this study that people understand and evaluate hockey's history in Canada in multiple and conflicting ways, such studies are highly relevant. Munn, Gell, and others such as Bear (2014, 2016) explicitly orient themselves against the notion that “homogenous, empty time” (Benjamin 1969) has gained a hegemony over how people experience time. These studies, as well as those of collective memory and of “invented traditions” (Hobsbawm and Ranger 1983) more broadly (French 2012; May 2017) often end up describing how people think about the moral or ethical meaning of action. This is because human ways of telling time and narrating

their past are often teleological, meaning that they have an end-point, purpose, or destination. Rudiak-Gould (2014), in his work on Marshallese perceptions of climate change, refers to these teleological tellings of history as “trajectory narratives” (144), while Stewart (2016) refers to them as “historicities” (80). Either way, two of the most common trajectory narratives found are nostalgia and progress. Since hockey people may use nostalgia and progress in their talk, each is worth exploring a bit.

Nostalgia has been a powerful way for Western peoples to understand their world and history since the beginning of the modern era (Lems 2016). While the term was originally coined to describe Swiss soldiers’ sickness contracted from military service that drew them away from their homes (Lems 2016), its meaning has since morphed to include longing for any past that is seen as better (May 2017). Nostalgia is awakened via the senses – typically sight, but also smell (Waskul, Vannini, and Wilson 2015). In Allain’s (2015) analysis of *Coach’s Corner* episodes, mentioned earlier, she argues that Don Cherry’s use of nostalgia is a vital part of his language – through a rancorous and brash rhetorical style, Cherry embodies what the imagined viewer feels Canadian men could once be like. Mason, Duquette, and Scherer (2005) note the connections between community-level hockey, Canadian identity, and nostalgia.

While nostalgia longs for a better past, progress anticipates a better future. Progress is a dominant trope of Western societies. The idea is that improvement in all dimensions – moral, scientific, societal – proceeds with forward movement in time (Slaboch 2017). Sports have been caught up within moral progress narratives and used to discipline people into modern subjects (Brownell 1995). In contemporary times, diversity is seen as a key index of progress. Gender (Adams and Leavitt 2018) and race-based inclusion efforts are ways of measuring a better present against a morally inferior past and imagining better futures.

Scholars have also taken a thick description approach to describe lived social experiences of particular ethno-racial subjectivities. Du Bois' ([1903] 1996) classic work, *The Souls of Black Folk*, is a prime example of using description to bring to light the experiences of people with a particular ethno-racial subjectivity. Lorenz and Murray's (2014) research on media framing of professional Black hockey and basketball athletes is part of a wider literature describing Black Canadian experiences in different sporting contexts, including basketball (Abdel-Shehid 2005; Hartmann 2016; James 2005), swimming (Nzindukiyimana and O'Connor 2019), capoeira (Joseph 2012), and hockey (Abdel-Shehid 2000; Harris 2003; Fosty and Fosty 2008).

Critical Whiteness Studies, mentioned earlier for the highly normative stance of some of its authors (DiAngelo 2011; Thurber and DiAngelo 2018), has produced thick descriptions of White experiences. Goldstein and Hall (2017), for example, locate some of former US President Donald Trump's actions in a racism stemming from White supremacy, a logic that locates Whites at the top of human and civilizational achievement, or at least atop American society (see also Price 2018). In a different context, Slotkin (1981) probes the writings of former US President Theodore Roosevelt to show how important racialized thinking was to the moralized narrative he gave US history. And in terms of hockey, Allain's (2015) content analysis of Don Cherry *Coach's Corner* shows that, despite bombast and apparent contradictions, Cherry articulates a stable discourse that is responsive to the concerns of White, born-in-Canada Canadians with rural backgrounds or attachment to rural places.

The thick descriptions surveyed here are valuable insofar as they describe how people attach meaning to action. Spanning morality and ethics, change, time, ethnicity, race and racialization, these works provide concepts and insights for my purposes of describing hockey talk in Halifax and Toronto. However, as referred to in the introduction, they are not, on their

own, sufficient for the task that lay before me. Recalling hockey's precarious place in present-day Canada, demographic changes in Canadian society, having data from two distinct field sites, and having gathered hockey talk from multiple ethno-racial subjectivities, I need to factor in internal variation and lateral engagement – by which I mean people's encounters with and perceptions of each other – into my ethnographic approach. Hence the need for a textured description, recalling that it builds upon both thick description and normativity. In that spirit I survey literature across morality and ethics, ethnicity, sports, race and racialization that attends to internal variation and lateral engagement.

Textured Descriptions

Textured descriptions are the final unit in the three-part sequence of the ethnographic approach I am using in this study, the preceding parts being thick description and normative concerns. What I refer to as textured descriptions respond to the critiques of anthropology made by Fabian (1983), Robbins (2007), and others that anthropological description had been failing to situate those they wrote about within time and therefore able to change. Textured description is also sensitive to some of the fundamental insights made by postcolonial scholarship (Said 1978; Chakrabarty 2000). For example, in one piece that has received much attention among anthropologists and others, Gayatri Spivak (1988) provocatively asks whether the “subaltern” can speak. Taking the Indian practice of sati as her example, she shows how British administrators in colonial India superimposed their reading of female burnings, and Indian men had their own understandings of the practice too, such that the subaltern Indian women themselves were not heard. Postcolonial scholarship has prompted scholars across a range of disciplines to hear dominant, subdominant, and subaltern voices.

Sport is an ideal place in which to heed the calls of postcolonial scholarship by producing a textured description, because of the number and diversity of actors at play. For starters, all team sports involve two different teams competing against each other (Simon 2010). When the teams have different identities and histories attached to them, then they may understand actions, words and events differently (Allain 2019; Collings and Condon 1996; Robidoux 2004). Besides the two teams, there are different actors at play. Dyck (2012) underscores this in his study of youth sport in Canada by looking at players, parents of players, coaches, and other volunteers. I will discuss later how these actors are often of different ethno-racial subjectivities and what impact that has for producing textured descriptions.

In terms of analyses of morality and ethics, most of that work has taken a thick description approach as discussed before. Work by Laidlaw (2014), Lambek (1993, 2015a), Mahmood (2005), and many others describe the meaning of particular actions to particular people in particular times. There are other approaches, however. Goffmanian frame theory (1974) looks at how different actors in modern society, such as the state, news media, and activists seek to package events in terms of particular meanings. Boltanski and Thévenot (2006) put forward another model for understanding contested moralities. They set out six spheres or dimensions of social life – inspired, domestic, fame, civic, market, and industrial. Each of these has a moral structure within it – as a result, evaluative talk across spheres can easily be misunderstood and misinterpreted. They posit that “compromise objects” (279) exist, though, and that through these objects, subjects operating from within different moralities can effectively communicate with one another.

In contrast to descriptions of people’s morality and ethics, analyses of ethno-racial subjectivity frequently take a textured description approach. For example, Barth’s (1969)

constructivist model of ethno-racial identity focuses on boundary-making processes rather than fixed identities. Identity formation for Barth involves self-identification and other people's agreement or disagreement with that identity claim, which he refers to as "ascription" and "self-ascription" (13). People use physical markers of difference and adherence to shared morals to mark out their identity. People and people groups can make competing identity claims; such contests over meaning can lead to social change.

More recent scholarship has recaptured Barth's insights for contemporary audiences (Cohen 2000; Jenkins 2008). Brubaker (2006) goes further than Barth and argues ethno-racial groups tend to exist more as shifting so-called groupnesses than groups, and that the group label can be a discourse or frame, to use Goffmanian language mentioned earlier, that is not reflective of on-the-ground reality. Nagata (1974), for her part, underscores the moment-to-moment contingency of ethno-racial identity (see Okamura 1981 for a similar argument).

As alluded to earlier sport – and this is the main reason why scholars of ethno-racial identity in sport have produced textured descriptions – is often a place where multiple ethno-racial groups gather. Moreover, they often come under different circumstances and with their own worldviews. In colonial regimes, for example, sport was used by colonial administrators as a disciplining tool (MacAloon 2008). This did not produce uniform or necessarily ideal colonial subjects for European powers, though. Indigenous peoples, for example, had ambivalent experiences in sport even when it was being used as a tool of colonial discipline, as was the case with hockey in Canadian residential schools (McKegney and Philips 2018). In contemporary times, Indigenous and settler modes of playing hockey do not always align, leading to conflict (Collings and Condon 1996), the exclusion of Indigenous peoples (Robidoux 2004) and the formation or continuity of separate hockey spaces for Indigenous peoples (Robidoux 2006).

Multiple ethno-racial groups sharing sporting space happens more often than just between Indigenous peoples and settler colonial people and administrators. James (1963) documents how Black participation in British cricket in the colonial Caribbean disciplined them in White British norms, but also was the seed for their eventual independence. Hence in the same space different actions can have different meanings for actors of different ethno-racial subjectivities. Such differences persist in post-colonial contexts. For example, Hall (1978) and his Birmingham School colleagues argued that Black presence in Britain was interpreted by the White British majority as a threat to their existence, and so mainstream British media fixated on incidents of Black British men mugging other, White British people. In the Canadian context, Black identities are often shaped and constrained by the White majority, in terms of their participation in both mainstream society (Ari 2019; James 2010) and sport (Abdel-Shehid 2005; James 2010). By this I mean that Black identity in Canada is circumscribed to a significant but not total degree by White claims about Black identity.

Textured Critical Whiteness studies scholarship emphasizes the contingency and wobbliness of Whiteness across space and time along axes of class and ethnicity, often working in tandem. Anthropologists of race have explored how non-White immigrants to America, such as Jews, gradually came to be considered as White (Brodin 1998; for similar studies see Ignatiev 1995; Barrett and Roediger 1997). Garner's (2007) research further demonstrates the contingencies of Whiteness, in the Caribbean as well as in America. Bonilla-Silva (2018) traces how after the Civil Rights era, racism in the US has morphed into a more covert form, what he calls "colour-blind racism". Bonilla-Silva, Lewis, and Embrick (2004) analyze racialized storytelling, noting how White people's narrations of their lives denigrate minorities and naturalize racial hierarchy, even if speakers do not use explicitly racist language. The analysis is

textured, though – the authors report that about 15% of the research sample, disproportionately made up of working-class women, do not use the same racializing narratives as the other 85%. Race scholars in the Australian context (Hallinan and Krotee 1993) note how differences persist between how Anglo-Celtic and non-Anglo-Celtic Whites, including Greek, Serbian, and other ethnic groups, engage Australian identity through soccer.

Similar to the US and Australia, Whiteness in Canada is elastic and wobbly – Quebecers, for example, for most of the nineteenth century were presented as biologically inferior to Anglo-Saxon Whites (Scott 2016). Portuguese immigrants arriving in the mid- and late-twentieth century also experience ambivalent ethno-racial identification in Canada, while also having an internal hierarchy between migrants from the Azores islands and mainland Portugal (Da Silva et al. 2015). Other European, non-Anglo-Celtic peoples such as Greeks (Mina 2013), Italians (Sturino 2019), Eastern Europeans and Jews have also occupied shifting ethno-racial positions in Canada's social and demographic landscape. These various ethnic groups have not always had equal access to power and resources in Canadian society (Porter 1965; Ogmundson and McLaughlin 1992). Given the strength of the perception that hockey is by, for, and about White people (Kalman-Lamb 2018), it is important to keep this elasticity in mind.

Recent scholarship suggests Asian identities, at least in North American contexts, are best understood as existing in triangulation with White and Black identities. In such a context, Asians are ascribed the identity of model minority, against the White majority and Black non-model minority (Hartlep and Portfolio 2015). Hence in the world of sport, Asian athletes are seen as decent, but not spectacular – fanfare erupts and debatably racial language emerges when individuals, such as NBA player Jeremy Lin, break that mold (Kim 2014; McElroy 2014; Kalman-Lamb 2015). In terms of hockey in Canada, South Asians have engaged the game more

and hence have received more scholarly attention (Szto 2016) than their East Asian counterparts. Given that the Asian population in Canada is projected to continue growing rapidly (Morency, Malenfant, and MacIsaac 2017), racial triangulation is an important dynamic to keep in mind for studying how people of different ethno-racial subjectivities in hockey think and talk.

The literature on lived or everyday multiculturalism (Harris 2013; Wise and Velayutham 2009) is complementary to textured analyses of White, Black, and Asian subjectivities. Everyday multiculturalism literature probes the unstable relationship between meaning and action in ethno-racially diverse contexts such as commuting (Wilson 2011), working (Wise 2016), and recreating (Broerse and Spaaij 2019). Wilson's (2011) auto-ethnographic study teases out how bus passengers must make inferences about those around them, which can later prove false. A seemingly rude passenger, for example, could simply lack proficiency in English. Wise (2016) similarly suggests, partly using Goffmanian frame analysis, that coworkers often use humour and joking to make social connections. Yet a joke's perceived meaning is unpredictable and context-dependent, particularly when it pertains to race or ethnicity (Wise 2016).

It is false to think that the ethno-racial subjectivities surveyed here – White, Black, and Asian – only intermingle in terms of public space. The number of interracial unions and mixed-race children is growing in Canada (Milan, Maheux, and Chui 2010) and elsewhere (Aspinall and Song 2013). Mixed-race individuals, and especially Black mixed-race individuals, can face racism and rejection both from White majority individuals and from non-mixed members of the racial minority to which they could belong (Campion 2019; Joseph-Salisbury 2020). While mixed-race individuals signal for some members of society the final destination along a progress narrative toward racial harmony (Mahtani 2014), the evidence suggests otherwise. Canadian research demonstrates mixed-race individuals are ascribed an identity of “other” incongruous

with their self-ascribed “Canadian” identity, and hence have strategies to navigate conversations where racial micro-aggressions could occur (Mahtani 2002, 2014; Paragg 2015, 2017).

Moving forward: an integrated approach to hockey talk

So far, this chapter has been an overview of scholarly literature on sports and sport talk, morality and ethics, and ethno-racial subjectivity. I have underscored the presence of three distinct elements within this literature, which are (1) stating a normative position, (2) producing a thick description, and (3) producing a textured description. While they are distinct, these approaches are sequential. All scholarship involves normative positions, even if they are just conceptual or methodological ones. Producing a worthwhile thick description, then, depends first upon being reflexive and aware of one’s own normative standpoint. Textured descriptions, meanwhile, build upon thick ones, and therefore upon normativity as well.

Delineating these approaches alongside recalling the state of hockey in Canada discussed in the introduction demonstrates the importance of a textured description for this research. Hockey is seen as a White sport; hockey is seen by many Canadians as being representative of Canada; Canada is becoming less demographically White. The meaning of each of these terms – hockey, Canada, and White – is contested. The Don Cherry incident testifies to how talk about hockey, Canada, and ethno-racial subjectivity can inflame differences and disagreements. The meanings of hockey in Canada are under stress, and in taking a textured approach I strive to detect the fault lines.

With all this in mind, the outline for the rest of this thesis is as follows. In the next chapter, I address the question of how hockey people talk about good and right living in hockey, arguing they do so by adopting moral narratives which end up making certain action and talk

seem obviously good and right. In chapter 4, I use the vocabulary for morality and ethics developed in chapter 3 to explore how hockey people talk about violence and fighting. Chapter 5 investigates how hockey people talk about race and racialization in hockey. It does so primarily through analysis of talk about particular incidents on and off the ice where race may be a factor. This chapter also explores whether ethno-racial subjectivity correlates with different understandings of incidents. Chapter 6, the final chapter, looks at hockey people's talk about the Don Cherry incident described in the introduction. I end with by summarizing my arguments, considering their implications on hockey, morality and ethics, temporality, and race, before closing with normative reflections on living in a world of incidents.

Chapter 3: Moral trajectories in hockey talk

In the introduction and chapter 1 I explored the link between social, historical, and personal change and morality or ethics (Robbins 2007; Laidlaw 2014; Zigon 2014). Taking change, or the possibility of change, seriously is a key part of making sense of people's morality and ethics. There must be a possibility of something different in order to spark the need to think about what ought to be done. Hence change is an indispensable part of morality or ethics. And if change is necessary to morality or ethics, then so is temporality. Wherever there is change there is a time before change, the time during which change is occurring, and time after the change. Morality or ethics refers to evaluating the way in which things have changed, are changing, or will change. In this chapter I look at change, temporality, and morality and ethics in hockey people's talk, while also paying attention to the role of racial subjectivity in these matters. In doing so I rely on the language of moral trajectories, which refers to the moral arcs or storylines of nostalgia, constancy, and progress that hockey people give to change over time. My analyses of nostalgia and progress build on existing literature, while in talking about constancy I am describing an under-explored trajectory. By *moral trajectory* I have in mind what Rudiak-Gould (2014) calls trajectory narratives. I use the language of moral trajectory since my focus is on the moral or ethical shape of the trajectory.

I note as a starting point for analysis that hockey people talk about change a lot. In all, 56 (or 70% of) interview participants talked about change. It came up 153 times in the interviews – this means that, on average, change came up three separate times for each interview where “change” came up as a point of discussion. Some interview participants talked about how hockey changed people, for better or for worse. Others talked about how the game itself had changed; I commonly heard that hockey had become more bureaucratic, more diverse, more expensive, and

less violent. Independent of whatever specific change they had in mind, the hockey people I interviewed loved to talk about change.

“Change” came up in the hockey talk overheard during observation periods as well. I overheard talk about “change” in 19 (or around 20% of) observations. At a hockey practice for racialized youth in Halifax, one of the volunteer’s first words upon hearing my supervisor – who was also there – and I were researching the game was, “*Well, [hockey’s] changed so much.*” People noted change by comparing something current to something older – the object of comparison were often players, teams, or arenas.

Nostalgia was the least common moral trajectory that hockey people used. Only 14 (or a bit less than 20% of) interview participants aligned any of their talk with this moral trajectory.

Words from a male hockey parent in Halifax give a starting point to understanding nostalgia:

Patrick: Watching hockey in arenas, has that affected your sense of belonging in Canada...at all?

Participant: It’s kind of the quintessential, that’s what you do, you spend a lot of time in arenas and I love the arenas... I’ve been in some that are like old barns, right, the old-style arenas, and you get a sense of the whole history, kind of like when we were in England, we were in Scotland and went to some of the soccer stadiums and they just had so much history there. Right, some of the older clubs...you could see the wood and everything, you know all that history and culture of a place...And you go into the arenas here, whether [it’s] a barn in Lunenburg or somewhere, it’s like you see the whole history, uh, a lot of history, and that’s cool.

The participant establishes that old sporting arenas used to be made of wood, and presumably new ones are not. In the old wooden hockey “barn” or soccer stadium, the participant gained a sense of “*all that history and culture*” of a particular place. The participant here is implicitly contrasting old arenas, built in the past, to arenas built in the present which are not made of wood.

Another interview participant spoke similarly, but with stronger sentiment and more corporeal language. He said:

Jeff: There's nothing, and I say this all the time to my friends, and anyone who will listen – when you walk into the BMO Centre, when you walk into the RBC Centre, over in Dartmouth, all these new four, four-pad, four-plexes, all these new arenas that are popping up, they're so sterile now, they're gonna take a long time to really get that hockey feel, that smell, you know and I joke around with my friends [that] I don't drink, I don't do drugs, and I don't smoke, but there's nothing that brings hockey more to mind than the smell of sweat, the smell of rust, condensation on probably leaded paint in a hallway, smoke, beer, and urine...it sounds disgusting, but you can talk to anybody of my age [mid-40s] growing up...those are the smells we grew up with, and that's what those old arenas, they bring to the, and they don't they don't smell like that anymore because you're not allowed to do those things anymore but there is a feeling of those old barns, right, that we used to call them...Where they're cold, sometimes they're warm, but most of the time they're cold, and you can just feel the history when you walk in, a lot of them have banners up in the rafters, uh these new places don't, and for me that is, there's nothing better than walking into an old arena where you just feel like you're at home. Yeah there's a real tangible feel and taste, it's very sensual...

This interview participant contrasts past and present in a multi-sensory manner. The participant claims past hockey arenas smell like urine, sweat, cigarette smoke, and beer while new areas don't smell like anything. Past hockey arenas are usually cold, he says, while new arenas have no memorable temperature. Meanwhile, recall that in the literature review I noted that while nostalgia initially was a longing across space, eventually it more often referred to a longing across time (Lems 2016; May 2017). In longing for “old barns” to play and watch hockey in, Jeff and the earlier participant articulate longing for a distant space identified as being part of a different time. It is a matter of space and time, not just time. This contrasts with that of Mason, Duquette, and Scherer (2005), who argue nostalgia in Major Junior hockey is not about longing for a place, but rather longing for an experience. Jeff's emphasis on smell, though connects nostalgia for place and experience, and aligns well with the findings of Waskul, Vannini, and Wilson (2015).

The hockey people I interviewed who aligned their hockey talk with nostalgia mapped space and time onto each other. Rinks of the past are in places like “*Lunenburg*” – a small town about ninety minutes by car from Halifax – while present arenas are the corporately sponsored “*BMO Centre*” and “*RBC Centre*”, both located in the Halifax area. The past, here, is proximate – hockey people are nostalgic not about hockey of the 1920s, for example, but rather the hockey arenas they remember from childhood, and the hockey arenas they see when they leave the city. As a spatial-temporal location, rural hockey rinks stand in for the past – they are a mediation between past and present.

This urban-rural distinction manifests in the way Jeff and the earlier participant nostalgically refer to old rinks as “*barns*”. Barns, of course, are common structures on farms used to keep grains and livestock. While such language fits the macro-narrative of urban Westerners longing for an agrarian past, it also fits onto some interview participants’ lived experiences growing up in a rural locale and now living in the city. Such dynamics came up in an interview I had with a hockey parent named Christie at a suburban Tim Horton’s in Halifax. She described her engagements with hockey:

Christie: Pond hockey as a kid, we actually had a pond behind my house, the neighbourhood kids would come, and I had five siblings, and all their friends would come, so it was a really robust Canadiana back pond type of thing, and that would have happened throughout my childhood, when I was sixteen I joined a high school girls team, it was like a brand new team that they were trying to put together, so me and a bunch of high school students did for-that for two years, and then since having children I have enrolled them in minor hockey.

Patrick: Do you enjoy being in hockey arenas?

Christie: I prefer being a player, actively participating, no I do not enjoy hockey, in the sense of bringing my children to arenas...I actually begrudge it, but I do it because I feel it’s the right thing to do...I do believe it’s very Canadiana, and I want my kids to be able to play the sport, and that whole kind of romanticized idea of them showing up for pond hockey...

This parent went on to explain that she did not enjoy being a hockey parent, because she found it to require a lot of work and offer no social community in return. Ferrying her kids around the city and collecting “Facebook friends”, this parent longed for the hockey experience she had growing up.

The trajectory of nostalgia has a great moral weight attached to it. By tapping into nostalgia, hockey people are depicting the changes from past to present as sad, lamentable changes. Nostalgic talk is not excited about the present, or the future – rather, people feel the weight of what the present is not. This was clear in my interview with a Toronto-based male private hockey coach and scout named Tony:

Patrick: Yeah. Do you think hockey is Canadian?

Tony: There was a time when it was certainly, but that was in the professional side of it, it was the ‘hockey’s Canada’s game’ and Team Canada ruled in all the Olympics, and they still have the most players in the NHL, but, the US hockey program’s getting really good, everywhere in Europe’s getting really good, um, no, it’s not necessarily Canada’s game anymore, but yeah everyone from Canada still plays, um but it’s not just Canada’s game. But overall the kids are gonna be drawn more to hockey than, than other sports, it’s a matter of what they wanna follow and what they can afford to follow and uh, they’ll still be fans I think everyone’ll still be fans of hockey whether they play it or not but um it’s definitely a Canadian thing and what makes it Canadian is not rep hockey the pro hockey anything like that it’s the street hockey, and it’s the parties and watching the games on Saturday nights, it’s the backyard stuff it’s the fun in the dressing room with the boys, it’s that type of stuff that makes it Canadian.

As his words demonstrate, this man disdains the current hockey scene in Toronto where “rep hockey” and “pro hockey” are now dominant. The change from the past to the present is not value-neutral for him – it is bad. Change means the loss of innocence and joy, of “backyard” rinks and “Hockey Night in Canada”. These practices, and not competitiveness on the world stage, are what connect the game to Canadian identity for Tony, and the thought of losing that connection is sad to him. This is one example of how people aligning their hockey talk with

nostalgia feel sad about what changes have happened from the past to the present.

Nostalgia, then, configures change as happening between the past and the present. For hockey people, the temporality of nostalgia is such that the past is within living memory, though it can be more or less distant, depending on the person's age and life details. And when hockey people are nostalgic, they are sad about the changes they are describing. Now, all of this – trajectory, configuration of change, treatment of time, and personal assessment – are within the domain of morality and ethics. However, it does not get all the way to how a hockey person might talk about good or right living.

The next step, so to speak, is a person's measurement of their own agency to practice, and talk in line with, good or right living. This self-understanding of their agency may affect what moral or ethical response to the world they deem appropriate. For hockey people, there tends to be something they can say or do – they tend to see themselves as having some agency. If hockey people see themselves as being able to do anything in response to a reality which invokes nostalgia in them, they tend to either conduct themselves in line with the old, better world, or carve out spaces for themselves and those they care about that are like the old, better world. Either way, the kind of agency offered within a nostalgia trajectory leads to a stance of local activity and distance from the world and its systems. People aligning their hockey talk with nostalgia are likely to want to work directly with individuals and groups of individuals, rather than create programs or policies.

This is visible in the case of Tony, who existed in mainstream, competitive hockey spaces but conducted himself in line with the perceived old, better world. “*Respect(ing) the game*” was a key phrase for him, and he used it five times in the course of our interview. He framed the changes in hockey from past to present as producing a lack of respect toward the game from

young hockey players and their parents. As a coach, then, he sought to instill respect for the game into his players. As a scout, he looked for players who respected the game. By rewarding those who practiced respect for the game, he considered himself to be doing the right thing.

Jeff, a Halifax hockey parent mentioned earlier, took an even more active approach. Jeff waxed nostalgic with me at a Tim Horton's in one of Halifax's bedroom communities. His description of pond hockey speaks volumes:

Jeff: There's no greater feeling in my heart than watching kids play hockey on a frozen lake or a pond. If you get a chance to do that, that's what you- , that, I know rinks are kind of your focus, you get a chance to go watch kids play on a rink or a pond...we just had a bunch of our kids from our hockey team play on a pond last Sunday, and you build more in those two hours, sometimes it's three to five, it's ten hours who knows...You build more in those two hours of not having a structured practice or a structured game and you just let the kids play, you get more out of that than you could probably get in half a season of hockey. 'Cause you're truly having fun. You know.

For this man, participating in his kids' minor hockey team spending several unstructured hours playing pond-hockey is a right and good course of action. With that, talking about it and encouraging me to observe such action, even to make it part of my observation data, is also a good and right thing to do. It is a revival and a mediation of the better past where more kids were able to play freely outside for hours and hours.

I want to make the process that happens from aligning one's talk with a moral trajectory – an overarching direction to reality through time – to a hockey person being able to talk about good and right living crystal-clear. Trajectories entail configurations of change and treatments of time, and hockey people give moral evaluations of those historical trajectories. In the case of nostalgia, the change is between present and past, the past is within living memory and can be in the present, and the future is not significant. With a sense of how active or passive they can be in the world they perceive, hockey people adopt a particular stance toward the world. They can then

arrive at right and good ways of acting and speaking about their acts – moreover, with the earlier steps done, right and good action becomes obvious.

Before moving on to discuss other trajectories, it is worth exploring correlations between nostalgia and ethno-racial subjectivity. Previous literature has established a connection between nostalgia and White racialized identity (Allain 2015; Price 2018; Slotkin 1981). Hockey people did not align their talk with nostalgia equally when separated by racial subjectivity. Of the 14 interview participants who did use nostalgia in their talk, only 2 were POC. And while four of 14 total members of multiracial families aligned any of their talk with nostalgia, three of these four were White parents in multiracial families. This is not surprising – a past of exclusion, discrimination, and marginalization (Harris 2003; Fosty and Fosty 2008) leaves POC very little to want to be nostalgic about. Hockey’s past, especially in the brutalization (1940-1990) era that most easily comes to mind when people think about hockey history, is not a time they would reasonably long to be in or bring back.

Meanwhile, 12 of the 55 (or just a bit over 20% of) the White interview participants aligned any of their hockey talk with nostalgia. To probe deeper, separating White people of Anglo-Celtic and non-Anglo-Celtic origins is necessary. Of the 39 people of Anglo-Celtic origins, six (or 15% of those 39) aligned any of their talk with nostalgia. Each of these White Anglo-Celtic interview participants aligned their talk with nostalgia on one occasion each. Meanwhile six of 16 (or just a bit under 40% of those 16) White people of non-Anglo-Celtic origins used nostalgia in their talk, and they used it a total of 10 times. Of the three interview quotations used in the section above, Tony (Italian-background) and Christie (Acadian-background) White and of non-Anglo-Celtic origins. The difference between Anglo-Celtic White people and non-Anglo-Celtic White people appears here to be a significant difference within

White hockey people, one that I will return to in later chapters. For now, it is sufficient to note that White people of non-Anglo-Celtic ethnic backgrounds are significantly more likely to be nostalgic in their hockey talk than Anglo-Celtic Whites.

Constancy

The second moral trajectory I found hockey people using is what I call *constancy*. This frame was more popular than nostalgia – 26 (or just over 30% of) interview participants used this frame at one point in their words. Those 26 people aligned their talk with constancy 35 times.

As a starting example, I had this exchange with a hockey parent in Halifax:

Patrick: Would you say that hockey is Canadian?

Participant: Yeah.

Patrick: Yeah, how so?

Participant: Well let's just use Mooseheads for example, they've had sold-out rinks for longest time and every time I've gone to a game it's at least 10,000 people there, it's huge, basketball team, probably not even half of that, I just think we're, we're just hockey. (pause) It's hard to explain we just, we just grew up on it, everybody just loves hockey and supports hockey more than any other sport, I think that shows when you go to a Moosehead games versus basketball games, um and I- and just goin' to practice and just goin' to these games, it's a big turn-out, like everybody comes, they bring the family it's a good afternoon, I think we're definitely hockey.

Patrick: [So] hockey is Canadian because of its popularity in Canada, you would say?

Participant: Yeah, I mean I don't know too too too too much about hockey and the history of hockey, but ever since I've been a little girl, hockey's been in my family, um we're a Habs fan, don't kill me (I laugh), but yeah I grew up on hockey, I've watched hockey, I don't [follow] the stats and logistics of it, but all during school, I've always heard like 'we're hockey' you know so, yeah.

In this participant's view, the popularity of hockey simply has not changed in Canada.

Hockey in her view has drawn sell-out crowds in the past, present, and future. Whether across

space or time, a constancy trajectory is marked by the absence of change. Under a constancy trajectory there is no change, nor can there be. I noted earlier in the chapter that change over time is a fundamental part of people doing morality and ethics. Building upon that observation, for hockey people it seems that alignment with a constancy trajectory can limit the kind of moral or ethical work a hockey person can do.

The above quote about hockey attendance signals that in a constancy trajectory, time is not significant. This makes sense, since change is how time is noticeable, since there is a before-change, during-change, and after-change. Without change, time is not worth remarking upon.

When hockey people align their words with a constancy trajectory, they tend to adopt a stance of resignation toward the world. Out of a stance of resignation, hockey people aligning their words to a constancy trajectory can point out that problems in hockey are not unique to hockey. For example, Tony – referred to earlier – had this to say about problems of racism in hockey:

Patrick: Do people talk about ethnic discrimination or racism in hockey?

Tony: I'm sure it's out there, like everything else. Like everything else. In other sports it's happening, at the school [and] in the playground it's happening, in hockey it's happening, that's just how it is... my view on that is whether you're on the hockey ice, or you're in the playground, or soccer or basketball, if you're gonna say something like that, you learn that from somewhere or heard your parent say it, and you think it's okay to say it. 'Cause I have kids on my team who would never, never say something like that and it's because their parents would never say something like that. And it's the same way with the cheap shots and everything in hockey, if you have a kid who would go out there and take a cheap shot, it's for a reason. 'Cause I have kids who would never go out there and do it. And you have kids on teams that I work with where, you say something they'd talk back to you; kids today talking back to teachers, right? If a kid's talking back to a teacher he's probably talking back to his parents (laughs a bit), [and so] he would think it's okay to talk back to a coach... There's some kids who would never talk back to me 'cause they would never talk back to their parents. So that stuff, whether it's in hockey or not, might never go away, unfortunately... That's what I, that's what I attribute to respect the game, respect whoever you're playing against, respect your parents... it's a person thing, that's not a hockey thing.

To Tony, conversations around racism in hockey are faulty because their field of vision is too narrow. He sees racism, and any kind of disrespectful talk, as a “*person issue*” that can show up on an ice rink, or any number of places. Note the conspicuous lack of difference across time or space – in this view people are who they are, apart from context. Looking ahead into the future, this interview participant thinks problems of racism and disrespectful talk may “*never go away*”. This is an important consequence of a constancy trajectory – within it, there is little or no possibility of moral improvement. The present, past, and future all look the same.

The constancy trajectory may seem like it would be difficult to believe. Hockey people render constancy believable by recourse to material and biological facts. In this light the way things are is not a result of people’s choices, or social constructions, but are rather rooted in the physical – and therefore immovable – world. Later in my interview with Tony, I returned to the subject of racism in hockey. He had this to say:

Patrick: what do people say (during a hockey game) when they’re trying to get under somebody’s skin or you know

Tony: Oh it’s just kids and the thing is it’s...I told you about the game tonight, we played that team before, I can already tell you which kids on that team will say stuff, and I know who those kids’ parents are, because they’re the ones yellin’...the thing is our guys give it back too, like our guys are seventeen, testosterone, they’re gonna yap too, so sometimes our parents say ‘can you go warn the ref about these kids’ and you’re hesitant to go warn the ref; I’m not gonna go warn the ref and say ‘hey that team’s gonna start using slurs against my team!’ and then they start playing now my team’s saying stuff to their team, and I look like the idiot. You know what I mean? You gotta sort of wait till it happens, and hope that the ref hears something, hope that the league does something about it, but it happens all the time...It’s just, learn to deal with it, it’s like everywhere else though, not just at the hockey rink.

“*Testosterone*” and the players being “*seventeen years old*” function as key explanatory factors for this interview participant. The sense is that anywhere there are seventeen-year-old boys, with testosterone in their bodies, people will throw words at each other, and some of those

words will involve or be about race. Under a constancy framework, there is little, if anything, to be done about behaviour which can be considered problematic. The best one can do is “*deal with it*”, which within the constancy framework means learning to live with it. There is no room to imagine a future without besetting problems, because there is no room to imagine a future different from the past.

Talking in line with a constancy trajectory, then, cancels out change, which makes time insignificant. Rather, past, present, and future are essentially the same. Hockey people aligning themselves with this trajectory are resigned to it, as there is essentially nothing to be done. In line with this, they see themselves as passive when aligning their talk with this trajectory. They adopt a stance of relative resignation toward the world. Unlike nostalgia, where hockey people can talk about the old, better world to keep it alive in a way, or make spaces like the old world in the new, there are no such good or right pathways under a constancy trajectory. There is nothing which a hockey person needs to make present, since the present is the same as the past. The most a hockey person can feel incumbent upon them to do according to a constancy trajectory is keep doing what they are doing, or what those before them have done. Constancy’s foreclosure of moral or ethical action and speech was visible in the words of this man, a young adult who had played hockey growing up. We had the following exchange:

Patrick: People talk about making hockey more inclusive right now, do you think hockey can move that direction?

Participant: Mm. Well I’d like to think anything can move in that direction [but] I honestly couldn’t tell you what it would take, though...I was chatting with a group of friends last night about this kind of stuff actually, how perceptions of gender and race play into a personal narrative that drives the kind of actions that an individual takes, so it would probably require the deconstruction of expectations for hockey players, and then also like the personal deconstruction of individuals that feel marginalized by those communities, just for people to feel comfortable to come in because I know for a fact that especially in this day and age, probably a lot of people wouldn’t care if women or minorities played hockey but...there’s

something there that it's not really at the top of their list of priorities because I don't know maybe it's just not the atmosphere that they're looking for. So I mean I'm sure it could happen, but what it would take I have no idea.

This interview participant sees hockey's culture as so tightly bound, and the workload to change the environment of hockey to be welcoming so substantial, that it is very, very difficult for him to imagine hockey differently. Indeed – when the present is a constant given stretching into past and future, then it is near-impossible to imagine alternative futures. Such absences of imagination merit scholarly investigation, and have been understudied to date. As suggested by the literature review, scholars working under thick or textured description approaches write about nostalgia and progress, but not constancy. While the concept of “homogenous, empty time” put forward by philosopher Walter Benjamin (1940) has loomed large over anthropological investigations of temporality (see Munn 1992; Bear 2014, 2016), the constancy I heard some people align their hockey talk with is not the same as what Benjamin discussed. Benjamin's concept was about modern time, a time pliable to modern institutions such as the nation and capital (Bear 2014, 2016). Constancy, however, emphasises the non-piability of human behaviour within time.

Hockey people did not align their talk with constancy equally when separated by racial subjectivity. Three of 14 total multiracial family members (or a bit over 20%) aligned their talk with a constancy trajectory at any point. Of the 26 interview participants who did use constancy in their talk, only 4 (or about 15% of those 26) were POC. This is a bit surprising, given the continued persistence of race-based remarks being directed towards hockey players (Kalman-Lamb 2018; Harris 2003). It would seem reasonable for POC to see past, present, and future the same, at least as regards hockey. In this regard, the data may skew toward more optimistic minorities. I say this based on the comments of one Toronto hockey fan of Indian-Pakistani

heritage. Although he himself chose to think hockey can progress and move into a better future, he said many of his friends told him before I interviewed him, “*It’s not gonna change.*” I suspect POC who would align their words with a constancy trajectory are not the kind of people to participate in a research project that they would likely perceive as being aligned with progress.

Turning to alignment with constancy among White people, 22 (or 40% of the 55) White people did so at any point in the interview I had with them. Among those 22 White people, 13 were Anglo-Celtic White (or a bit less than 35% of all 39 Anglo-Celtic White participants). The 9 other White people who used constancy were of non-Anglo-Celtic origins (or 55% of all 16 non-Anglo-Celtic White participants). The difference between Anglo-Celtic and non-Anglo-Celtic White is only slightly closer for constancy than it was for nostalgia (a 20% difference in uses of constancy, versus a 25% difference for nostalgia). These figures suggest again that there are different ethno-racial subjectivities within the White population. I will give this topic greater attention later on, when I look at how hockey people talk about potentially racist incidents.

Progress

Among the three moral trajectories discussed here, hockey people aligned their talk with progress the most. In doing so hockey people articulated the sense that hockey had or has problems, but that those problems could be solved. In all, 31 (or almost 40% of all 80) interview participants aligned at least some of their talk with a progress trajectory. These 31 interview participants did so a total of 45 times during the interviews, meaning that, on average, about half of them aligned their words with this trajectory twice.

Progress is potentially the most intuitive moral trajectory to understand, at least among North American hockey people. As noted in the literature review, progress is a child of the

European Enlightenment and a key part of the modern Western imaginary (Slaboch 2017).

Temporal progression is supposed to be aligned with moral progression. We see this trajectory in part of an interview I had with a hockey fan and minor hockey coach, a man in Toronto. I had met him because we sat near each other at a semi-professional Toronto Marlies game. The Marlies game we met at was one where the Toronto District School Board brought thousands of students to the game during school hours. As a result, the crowd was younger and more ethno-racially diverse than a typical hockey game. He saw my foolishly conspicuous note-taking at the game, started chatting with me, and I later met him at his home hockey arena in Toronto. I asked him if events like the hockey game we'd met at would help to get kids of non-White ethno-racial backgrounds into hockey, at which point the following conversation took place:

Participant: Maybe, some, yeah. And they come from all over.

Patrick: Yeah.

Participant: Some of the kids, maybe some kids only come once a year that's it...I would say it's gonna get better, it's gonna just [involve] more people, but slowly.

Patrick: And, and you mentioned that that they will get better um, as, like if hockey gets more diverse, what kind of changes do you think that'll bring to the game, if it will change the game?

Participant: Mmm. Having more ethnic players in the game. Ah I think it should help, tremendously you know what they need that in sports...[in] hockey there's a few NHL guys that're Chinese but not that many. it's like every sport I guess it's just, like Natives, Chinese, Blacks, I think it'll get better, I think it's just right now it's just growing, it's growing a little bit.

In this quote, the interview participant aligns his talk about ethno-racial diversity in hockey with a progress trajectory. Such a trajectory configures change by positing change between past and present, and then between present and future. Both changes are of a similar kind, as the game becomes more diverse. There are two change-points, but one direction.

Since a progress trajectory demands change, it gives high visibility to past, present, and future. Unlike in the case of constancy, there are meaningful distinctions across time that render the past visibly different from the present, and the present visibly different from the future.

While time here can be bunched or stretched, like nostalgia, hockey people usually recall things within living memory – as happened with nostalgia – when discussing changes from the past to the future. For example, one player, fan and coach in Halifax named Dan said this about women and hockey:

Patrick: In the context of hockey, for you is [boys learning to respect boys], is that about boys as they age that around twelve, thirteen, fourteen they're learning to respect girls, or is that across time, like now compared to the mid-2000s or- or the 90s that young men and boys are learning to respect women?

Dan: I would say through the early 90s and I mean if a girl come out, or a female come out on the rink when I was playing, from my time it was, 'what does she think she's doin'?' Which is totally wrong, but that was unfortunately the attitude and the way that we viewed female participants in hockey at the time...my ex wife actually played for Junior Canada Games women's team and I had no idea, and this was back in '91, so this was a huge deal, and I didn't really appreciate it till I appreciated it, so I guess I'm a little bit ahead of the curve if you will, being exposed to that at such a young age.

The trajectory of progress gives structure and validation to Dan's story. Interestingly, the story involves bouncing between the past and the future. Progress trajectories often rely on this – something in the past or present will be a representation of the future. For this man, seeing his then-wife play highly competitive hockey in the early 1990s, a time when he feels women were not taken seriously as hockey players, placed him “*ahead of the curve*”.

Similarly, hockey people align themselves with a progress trajectory when discussing different styles of hockey. Hear this Halifax hockey fan named Luke talk about his favourite NHL team, the Toronto Maple Leafs:

Luke: (Hockey)'s just, again it's a beautiful sport, I'm excited w[ith] where it's moving both with some of the game innovations that we're making it a faster

game, while also trying to find better ways to protect players, and better ways to cut down on hitting, cut down on fighting. Um, it's one of the reasons why I love the Leafs so much right now that they're kinda pushing that, they're...trying to see where the game is going in saying 'if we keep going speed...skill,' I think look at what the...league has done in the last fifteen years, it's insane, like it's a different game pretty much, and it's so much fun, like a lot of the Leafs are just wicked fast, small guys...I think it's so much fun, so yeah. I'm excited where (hockey)'s going, I'm excited where it's moving, and I hope it continues to grow, and continues to change and adapt and become something that's more accessible.

Though as much in the present as any other hockey team, for this participant the Leafs are the future of hockey in the present. This, for the participant, is a good thing. “Cutting down” on “hitting” and “fighting” makes for, in his view, a better hockey than before.

The two previous quotations make plain that when hockey people align their words with a progress trajectory, they are saying the reality they perceive is good. Progress is progression from worse to better. Under progress, the present is better than the past and the future is better than the present.

In terms of perceived agency and stance toward the world, hockey people who align their talk with a moral trajectory of progress tend to see themselves as having an active role to play in making sure the future is indeed better than the present. They tend to see that better future as one requiring people's efforts in the present. For example, the Halifax player, fan, and coach named Dan whose words I engaged earlier had this to say about coaching mixed-gender minor hockey teams:

Dan: Now when I see a female I respect her for going out and playing with these guys that are gonna give her a hard time, trust me; they are not gonna soften the blow because that particular individual's a female. In this case, female hockey players are, in my opinion, in some instances better players than the boys out there, from a skill perspective, and also from a team player perspective. I think you're seeing the attitudes change when the girls are going into the corners with the guys and there's being a check thrown and the girl's comin' out and the guy isn't, it's a whole different game, it truly is. So, I don't know it's evolving, it's fluid, again we're limited [in Nova Scotia] by our population and by our participation, I think that's it. I have to be honest, it's I think in other associations

like uh [another minor hockey association in Halifax] for instance for has let's say on a team of eighteen, five of them are girls. And they're phenomenal, like I mean fantastic players I wouldn't wanna see them play on a female team because I think they're wasting their talent just limiting themselves to just a one gender team, I think they should go on out there and be all-inclusive and play the best hockey you can, and I'm glad that some female players decide to do that, so I encourage it, yeah I would; listen, for all the ya gotta go to separate change room, you've gotta you can't integrate with the boys during this time because of their age and stuff like that, I would take that on all day long if I could that inclusiveness on a team. A lot of coaches would '(sighs) hah no we gotta girl' because now it's different change-rooms I've gotta organize this – who cares? This is about the team. So, but not everybody gets that yet. It's coming but it's not everybody gets that yet. ... 'What's the skill of the female gonna be?' Well, who cares? Let's go find out she's made the team obviously, she's gone through the litmus test, now it's your turn bud (I laugh) ya know. Pony up, let's go.

Good and right living for this coach is supporting women and girls to play mixed-gender, competitive minor hockey and potentially beyond. The coach feels that he and other coaches ought to be willing – more than willing – to do the additional logistical work of having mixed-gender teams and not doubt players' ability based on their gender. We can see how, as noted in the literature review (Adams and Leavitt 2018), gender inclusion is linked to societal progress. As this coach is aligning his talk with a progress narrative, and takes gender inclusion to be an index of progress, he considers that being a gender-inclusive coach is a morally right thing to do. Note the factors that lie between a progress narrative and having a sense of what the right thing to do is. Time is significant because change is possible and desirable within a progress narrative, and people have some agency and a responsibility to use that agency. As hockey people who align their talk with progress see themselves as having some agency and responsibility to make the world better, they adopt a stance of positivity toward the present and hope or anticipation toward the future.

In contrast to the trajectories of nostalgia and constancy, hockey people aligned their talk with progress fairly equally in terms of racial subjectivity. Eleven (or about 45% of) POC

participants aligned their talk with a progress narrative at any point in their interview. Seven (or 50% of) members of multiracial families aligned any of their talk with progress. Twenty (or 35% of) White people aligned any of their talk with a progress narrative – 13 were of Anglo-Celtic origins (or 35% of all 39 of Anglo-Celtic origins), and seven were of non-Anglo-Celtic origin (or about 45% of all 16 of non-Anglo-Celtic origins).

Keeping texture: Simultaneous moral trajectories

I have examined three moral trajectories – nostalgia, constancy, and progress – in isolation thus far. In doing so I have outlined key characteristics of each trajectory and traced the points of connection between a moral trajectory and self-perceived right action. I would be remiss, however, in giving the impression that these trajectories are mutually exclusive. One of the chief advantages of the concept of moral trajectories is that it underscores the opposite – hockey people’s talk can be textured with multiple and sometimes conflicting moral trajectories. This can happen at different points of a hockey person’s talk, as was the case with Tony and Dan, mentioned above, who each aligned different parts of their talk with different trajectories. Sometimes, though, hockey people align talk with multiple trajectories at the same time. The most common combination of trajectories which hockey people use is constancy and progress. Eleven interview participants aligned their talk with both constancy and progress at the same time, and they each did so only once. As an example, when I asked a Halifax hockey parent whether changes in hockey that we had been discussing were positive or negative, he had this to say.

Participant: If you take the actual act of playing the game on the ice there’s always incidents have happened, and people are too rough, or somebody gets injured, because somebody hit them with a stick or something, my sense is that that’s always been part of it, and it will probably always continue, ‘cause it’s

human nature, things get out of hand and you lose your handle on things, when that does happen now parents get very upset. And not that they didn't used to [get upset], over [the] last couple years I've seen a couple incidents with my own kid, teams he's been on where there's been an altercation on the ice where it's as upsetting to parents and officials and teammates as it probably ever was, but now the repercussions that follow that event, there's a structure in place to correct it, to retrain the kid in this case to suspend him for a game, keep them accountable. There seems to be a little bit more structure that's able to respond to those incidents than perhaps there was in the past. So for example if there's a repeat offender, [someone] that's not playing well on the ice, there's a policy in place with the minor hockey association, there's a procedure that takes place, so for all the negative things that might happen on the ice there seems to be policies and procedures to help manage that.

Both constancy and progress are here. Injuries and being hit by sticks have “*always been a part*” of hockey, and “*will probably always continue*” – typical talk under a constancy trajectory. The participant accounts for these incidents, and angry responses to them, as examples of “*human nature*”. The implication here is that the response will not change. Even with these constant factors, though, there are changes. Parents are more upset over injuries, and minor hockey associations have greater disciplinary structures to prevent such actions from happening. “*Policies*” and “*procedures*” can curb the effects of “*human nature*” on ice.

Again, the trajectories of constancy and progress here have implications for people's moral and ethical thinking. In giving action a biological cause – in this case, “*human nature*” – the action is no longer the site of moral reflection. As a part of human nature, it simply happens. However, for this man where moral and ethical reflection does matter is in the “*structures*”, “*policies*” and “*procedures*” that minor hockey associations devise. Those are subject to change and can make a positive difference in people's lives, and so they demand careful reflection and intentional action.

Conclusion

This chapter deployed the concept of moral trajectory to examine change, temporality, and morality and ethics in hockey talk. I explored three moral trajectories, which were nostalgia, constancy, and progress. By aligning their talk with one or more trajectories, hockey people configure change and treat time in certain ways. By giving a moral evaluation to the sweep of history they consider true, and accounting for how passive or active they can or ought to be in the face of this history, they know how they ought to be, and what they ought to do. These factors – nature of change, treatment of time, moral evaluation of the trajectory, degree of personal agency, and stance toward the world – are the tissue connecting moral trajectories to perceived right action and talk. To answer my first research question which concerned how hockey people talk about good and right living hockey, they align their talk with a moral trajectory. Aligning talk with a moral trajectory shapes, but does not determine, a hockey person's moral or ethical talk. Speaking in multiple moral trajectories generates an even wider set of possible ways of talking about good and right living, which is important to keep in mind for the following chapters when I further explore the morality and ethics of hockey talk.

Chapter 4: Hockey talk about fighting and violence

The previous chapter introduced the notion that hockey people do morality and ethics by configuring time and change via alignment with moral trajectories. By evaluating their perceived reality and assuming a certain amount of agency and a stance toward the world, hockey people present their actions as being right and good in self-evident ways. Such an analysis is valuable insofar as it lays bare the particular means by which hockey people come to different conclusions about morality and ethics.

This chapter builds on that work by looking at hockey talk in relation to fighting and violence. As mentioned in the introduction, talk about violence in its many forms has long been a part of hockey, and the bounds of acceptable violence have ranged across time and space (McKee 2020). Hockey people talk about violence in the sport with relative ease – more ease than about race and racialization, certainly. Despite not focusing on fighting or violence in the interviews, 19 participants discussed fighting or violence in a way where moral or ethical content was manifest. I engage these interviews in the chapter, as well as select data from observation events. Such data, while meriting a chapter, is not large enough for me to reasonably correlate themes with ethno-racial groups. As a result, I do not engage with the ethno-racial subjectivity of interview participants in this chapter.

What my argument does engage with is how hockey people disagree about fighting and violence in hockey. In short, they align their talk with moral trajectories, and validate their views with evaluative references to history – mostly hockey history, but also general history. Hockey people perceived fighting and violence in hockey as being one of two things – they were 1) good activities that carried on tradition and brought honour and respect or they were 2) barriers to

better versions of hockey. I make these claims drawing from the words of 19 interview participants, as well as selected observation events.

Fighting and violence to carry on tradition and bond with others

It is a commonplace observation that some hockey people think positively of the game's violent aspects, including – and perhaps especially – fighting (Colburn 1985; Lewinson and Palma 2012; Zakhem 2015). I recall my own boyhood excitement over members of the Calgary Flames – Jarome Iginla, among others – fist-fighting an opponent on behalf of their teammates. Such a perception came up in one interview with a hockey fan Toronto in named Maxwell. In that interview, there was an impromptu meditation on fighting in the NHL the Toronto Maple Leafs in particular. I have reproduced it here:

Maxwell: You see everything else going on in the world, not just hockey, and just the way society is looking at things that have been accepted as norms, for long that aren't really right, and you never put hockey into that category when you think about it, it's legitimate, but it just feels weird because I still see it as a norm for hockey, like I still think there should be somebody that'll drop the gloves and go after somebody who throws a clean hit at your best player. And a lot of people think that's wrong. I still think that's part of the game.

Howard: Yeah...you know value judgments aside last time I checked, there were there was fights in the NHL like it's – it is part of the game.

Maxwell: Leafs had their first one of the year the other night.

Howard: Wow, it was the first of the year!

Maxwell: It was the first of the year.

Howard: My goodness, I can think of players like Wendel Clark where it would be like we're deep in the season it would be deep in the first period maybe of the first game.

Maxwell: Absolutely. And this- this wasn't even really a fight, it was more of a, they danced a little bit.

Howard: So what do you think about that in terms of the game and some of these changes, you think it's gonna it's changing the game in in a good way, or in a bad way, or?

Maxwell: Uh probably both. It speeds the game up, not just time wise, I mean just, the skill level is so much higher, but it's less traditional than it used to be. In terms of what we would call the traditions of hockey, right? Like what we just talked about with the fighting and stuff like that, when it happens now you get out of your seat because it's so uncommon. Is it twenty-eight I don't even know are we thirty games into the season about? And for a pro hockey team to have their first fighting major of the season that's unheard of, thirty games into the season.

Howard: Yeah certainly, I think, to me it's a pre-strike, post-strike change to the game, like where you see a lot of change in style and that kind of thing. And you lose the enforcer, in the way they used to be. And using the fights to like change the rhythm of game, that kind of thing's not done so much anymore.

Maxwell: Absolutely. I mean I think it was effective, but I also think it puts some of the more skill players in a really dangerous spot, because there isn't any policing on the ice anymore. You can't police a clean hit if you're a referee, and even if it's a clean hit, it's one of those things where, it's like unwritten rules, right? You don't go after Gretzky, you don't [go] after the best player on the team, right? Like you watch the Leaf games now and there's guys hackin' at Tavares and Marner and goin' after Matthews, and as big as Matthews is he doesn't, he doesn't play big. So, you're always worried as a fan anyways, that he's gonna get hurt every time he gets touched. And there's nobody out there to protect him.

First to note for understanding this exchange is that the participant is discussing fighting as a particular form of violence in hockey. Hockey talk about violence turns on a number of key thresholds (McKee 2020) – one-on-one in-game fistfights are one of these thresholds. The interview participant alleges at the end of his first text block that fighting in hockey is “*part of the game*”. The participant then goes on to state, in shock, that the Toronto Maple Leafs only had their first fighting major of the season on their thirtieth game, meaning they had twenty-nine games without one of their players daring to “*drop the gloves*” with an opposing player. The interviewer remarks jokingly that Wendel Clark, a former Maple Leafs captain who was willing to fight, would have gotten in one

by the first game of the season. When asked how he thinks about this change, the participant sees both positive and negative aspects. There is a progression from brute fighting to skill, but there is a loss of what he calls “*traditions*” of hockey. The tradition here is that star players have enforcers to fight opposing players on their behalf. It is worth noting here that such traditions are in fact invented (Hobsbawm and Ranger 1983); as discussed in the introduction, there were rival visions of violence in hockey in the first half of the twentieth century, and the enforcer type only reached its zenith in the brutalized era of approximately 1940-1990. Regardless, the participant ends by linking the erosion of this tradition to player safety concerns – the concern that a lack of willingness to fight make the Toronto Maple Leafs’ star players such as John Tavares, Mitch Marner, and Auston Matthews more vulnerable to sticks and slashes, and hence to injury.

In terms of moral or ethical content, both nostalgia and constancy trajectories are present in this participant’s talk. Fighting being “*part of the game*” smacks of constancy – it is not a descriptive fact, but rather a normative label derived from a moral trajectory. Clearly, if the Toronto Maple Leafs have gone twenty-nine games without a hockey fight, then it could be doubted whether fighting is “*part of the game*” or not. Hence there is a nostalgia component as well – nostalgia for a time when fighting was undoubtedly “*part of the game*”. Here, unlike in the instances discussed in chapter 2 and like the established literature on nostalgia, the participant longs simply for a time in the past (Lems 2016; May 2017).

Another interview participant's quotation sheds light on what a fight means from within this interplay of constancy and nostalgia. Toward the end of our interview, a man in Halifax named Braden who played minor hockey growing up said this about fighting:

Braden: For me, I appreciate the devotion I see in the players when they get in a fight, and when they protect their teammates by fighting someone else.

This states more pithily what Maxwell was also getting at – a hockey fight means that a man is willing to fight another man on behalf of his teammate or teammates. The social bonds entailed in such “*devotion*”, at least for Maxwell and Braden, are morally good. Hence while the physical altercation is between two players, the social interaction involves more than those two players. Hockey players fighting is good, then, not necessarily because of the fight with the opponent, but because of what it means for the players' relationships with their own teammates.

While noting that some consider hockey fights to be about more than the two fighters is not a complex point, it is missed by existing literature on fighting in hockey. Whether supportive (Zakhem 2015), critical (Lewinson and Palma 2012) or descriptive (Colburn 1985), the literature analyzes fights in terms of the two fighters. Such analyses fail to grasp the power of sacrifice and devotion to one another in some human moral systems. The power of sacrifice and devotion is caught, however, by Hughes and Coakley (1991) when they argue that a willingness to sacrifice oneself on behalf of one's teammates is a key element of the dominant ethical system in team sport. It is worth noting the Durkheimian ([1915] 1995) resonances of this emphasis on sacrifice, where sacrifice maintains a collectivity's cohesion. Watching – and cheering on – an act of sacrifice is its own kind of participation. People who find hockey fights to be morally good talk about them as being fundamentally about sacrifice and devotion.

The two participants quoted above were not the only ones I crossed in my research who felt this way. On New Years' Day, 2020, I went to an Oshawa Generals Ontario Hockey League

(OHL) game. Oshawa is a post-industrial small city that can increasingly be considered part of the Greater Toronto Area (GTA). My brother, uncle, and aunt's co-worker's husband – who also grew up in the same town as a friend from my church in Halifax – drove down together. By this point I considered myself a wandered fool, well-versed in hockey despite never having played myself. My uncle had played hockey as a kid, and the co-worker's husband – who I'll refer to as Mike – played A competitive hockey. On the way down, he talked about how his hockey coaches taught him to fight – how to use a fight to swing the momentum of a game. Mike referred to such fighting as “*tactful fighting*” – I'm not sure if he meant to say tactical, and I didn't ask. Perhaps the fighting he had in mind was both tactful and tactical. Despite having wandered around hockey for over a year, I still couldn't make out quite what Mike meant.

During that game, there was a fight. Oshawa was down 2-0, and from the face-off the Generals' Kyle MacLean – team captain, no less – fought Merrick Rippon of the opposing team. The fight greatly enthused the crowd. The Generals' post-game report captured the event like this (Oshawa Generals 2020):

Kyle MacLean and Merrick Rippon's gloves went flying and they threw down in an epic bout. Both sides held their own and got their licks in. They both went down at the end. MacLean was lauded by his teammates.

After the game, Mike pointed out that the Generals' captain engaged in a “*tactful*” fight. He was trying to alter the momentum of the game. The Generals' post-game report specifically noted how MacLean's teammates reacted positively to his fight. Whether on strategic or social grounds – and the two could be said to be linked – this fight was understood to be about much more than the two players fighting.

While Kyle MacLean is a hockey player whose name few would recognize, there are certain players that are household names in part because of their willingness to engage in

fistfights. See how Braden – the same one who earlier said he appreciated a fighter’s willingness to “*protect their teammates*” – described what he liked about his favourite hockey player, Tie Domi:

Braden: I liked watching his fights (laughs). I liked watching him wreck people. Yeah I still remember watching the NHL one night, like on the TV I can see his tooth flyin’ out while he’s pounding this guy. Yeah.

Tie Domi played for the Toronto Maple Leafs, and was an enforcer who broke penalty-minute records during his career (Domi 2015). Of Albanian descent, he was a late figure in the wave of brutalized hockey that was past its zenith when Domi was playing in the 1990s. Hockey people who approve of fighting uphold Domi and others, circulating their names as memorable and commendable people.

Note the implicit moral evaluation within this frame of violence and fighting. Fighting is not merely part of the game, but ought to be part of the game. A fight becomes an “*epic bout*”, where the fighter is “*lauded*” afterwards. Players like Tie Domi “*wreck*” and “*pound*” their opponents. There is an element of praise and enthusiasm for the violence and fighting described here. And such enthusiastic talk is precisely what constitutes right speech for people who speak within this frame. After all, the people I interviewed were not the ones fighting themselves, and nothing they said indicates they participated in fistfights to bond with those they loved. Rather, within this frame what is right is to commend hockey players for fighting, and espouse the virtues of hockey players who fought in their careers. Mike, Braden, and the Oshawa Generals’ game report takes a salutary stance toward these actions – the flip side of lamenting the passing away of the old, better world. Hence Mike spoke about the Generals’ captain’s sacrificial willingness and hockey intelligence in fighting an opponent at a critical time in the game. This makes sense, given the discussion in chapter 2 around the levels of perceived agency and stance

toward the world from within nostalgia and constancy trajectories. A constancy trajectory seems to afford hockey people little agency and a resigned stance toward the world, while a nostalgia trajectory affords speakers some agency and hence a more active stance. Agency within nostalgia is the ability to talk about the old, better world and potentially recreate those old, better spaces. Here, the level of agency is fairly muted – people are not talking about working to increase the level of fighting in hockey. Rather, they are talking about the old, better world and defending the vestiges of it they see.

Fighting in hockey as perennial

There is a twist on this first theme worth mentioning, where hockey people speak about fighting in a way that is neither praising nor condemning. Tony, the former play and current coach and scout in Toronto engaged earlier, had this to say about fighting in the Greater Toronto Hockey League (GTHL), the city's – and world's – largest competitive minor hockey league:

Patrick: Is fighting allowed in Midget in GTHL? Well 'allowed', whatever that means.

Tony: I mean, in in the last two or three years that I've worked with my team, I've seen it maybe once or twice, where if two guys are gonna drop the gloves and fight each other, you know I've got kids that are big boys on my team, we had it once a couple weeks ago where guys were starting to throw punches, and you expect the refs to get in and not let them do it but then you tell the refs over and the ref's sayin' 'I'm not gettin' in the middle of that' You know what I mean, a ref's not gonna go in the middle of two guys throwin' punches, the refs are makin' however much they're makin' a game, they're not gonna go and get in the middle and risk getting a punch in the face (laughs), so it does happen. When I was growing up playing if two guys wanted to fight it was okay the refs let you fight then they'll, once it's done it's done, and then you're done for the game, that was it. Umm, they're tryin' to get fighting to be less and less in the game, which fair enough but, it's gonna happen no matter what.

The participant feels fighting in hockey is inevitable – that it will happen, “*no matter what*”. This, despite the fact that the participant recognizes fighting in hockey, at least at the

Midget level, has decreased significantly since he played. One or two fights in the last two or three years is a small number. This tension between fighting being a given, and the perceived decrease in fights, is reconciled via alignment with a constancy trajectory. As in the previous section, constancy is part of this speech. The difference, though, is that there is no nostalgia in the frame. There are no traces of Tony lamenting the loss of the past world; rather, his tone is one of resignation. *Fighting's gonna happen, no matter what, and we'd be fools to think otherwise.*

As this frame is firmly within a constancy trajectory and makes use of neither nostalgia nor progress, it is fairly easy to understand given the material discussed in chapter 3. Within a constancy trajectory, there is no change over time and so time is not significant. Moreover, change is not even considered possible. People speaking within this frame tend to adopt a stance of resignation toward the world – they see themselves as not having personal agency to alter the world, and so right action or speech is to not over-estimate one's abilities, and try to live well within the world that is.

I want to underscore how this talk is separable from what participants may actually think. My own experience of identity, noted in the introduction, alerts me to the fact that hockey people who consider fighting a good tradition may use a more resigned tone when articulating their viewpoint among company whom they imagine think differently. It is important to keep in mind this situational dynamic to hockey talk.

Fighting as a barrier to a better game

By no means were the hockey people I talked to unanimous in their approving or resigned stance toward fighting and violence in hockey. Dan, a former player and current coach

whose words I engaged in the last chapter, was familiar with that frame and people who espoused it. However, he did not align his own talk with it. When I asked him an unplanned question about the high levels of violence and aggression I'd seen at men's University-level hockey games in Halifax, this conversation ensued:

Dan: I mean you don't make it to that level of playing because these guys are super skill players without having some type of aggression or competitiveness to your overall spirit, and I think the coaches know that and they use it to their advantage, and they are ruthless. They wanna win the [Atlantic University Sport] championship that's it, bar none. Takin' ya down, whether it's in skill or physically, so for them it's a toolbox, and some guys this is what they know, it's like if you train let's say a hunting dog to hunt, same rules apply to a hockey player. You train a hockey player to hit, they're gonna hit, so you're seeing some exceptional hockey players in fact they're way better than the QMHL in my opinion. University hockey's probably the best hockey if they would actually, I mean I watched the playoffs it can get pretty nasty, and I wish they could move away and start playing skilled hockey versus hit hockey, but it's old-school hockey, it really is.

Patrick: Hmm.

Participant: Umm I don't know, I guess the universities condone that level of ridiculousness, I mean there's a lot of stuff happened last year at the AUS level which listen I'm like, I think it's wonderful you guys can play hockey, I love watchin' you but why are you guys doin' this, like why is this drama happening at ice level? I think you get guys that are what twenty-three, twenty-four years old, full of testosterone, trying to make their mark in life, uh you put them all in an ice-rink, wait till ya see what happens. So when you have nothing else to lose, what I mean come on? Where are ya goin' you're not goin' to the NHL. We've already told ya no so anything's game right so. I'll be the league you know leading in penalty minutes guy, watch this! (laughs) You know what I mean so this is what it's all about for them, I think uh University really has to catch a grip on it but I don't think the coaches are, I think they're condoning behaviour I think they think it's (rubbing hands together) we're packin' the stands, watch this'

Patrick: Mmm.

Participant: And you know go back to ancient Rome you know we're watching the battles happen in the Forum you know it's like (laughs a bit) So anyways. Yeah it's a little barbaric for me, but there is some nice hockey goin' on outside of playoffs. Yep, I mean I enjoy the hits but not to the extent to where guys are getting' knocked out for five or six games, and then you're getting bench-clearing brawls, I mean this is, this is old-school, 1970s crap what are you guys doin'?' Get

a grip on it, so this is where the coaching and the associations have to get together and say 'come on' so I don't know, I don't condone that level, it's nice hockey when they're playing it and you're you know, when your penalty box is filled up with more players than your bench you got some problems right so you have to address them, so. I implore the AUS to go do something about that so you don't end up with the same crap that you did last year, 'cause there's a lot of people that love that hockey

Patrick: Hmm.

Participant: Not necessarily the, I mean there's a physicality aspect to it but it doesn't have to be as ridiculous as it is I mean there's guys out there getting hurt, maimed, playing university hockey, yeah it doesn't have to be that way.

It is worth noting the kind of violence this participant has in mind. He is not talking about one-on-one fights – which are punished with stiff penalties in the AUS – but rather about injury-causing hits and brawls, which are fights physically involving more than two players. Besides one-on-one fist-fights, body-checking and brawls are two other key thresholds around which conversation about violence in hockey has always turned (McKee 2020). The participant explicitly contrasts different styles of hockey – “*skilled hockey*” versus “*hit hockey*”. Hit hockey, for Dan, is “*old-school hockey*”.

While existing hockey literature has noted the typology of hockey styles in people's talk (Allain 2019), the moral and ethical aspects of this talk have not been investigated as much. Much of Dan's talk is aligned with a constancy trajectory. For this participant, the level of violence in University hockey does not come from nowhere and is not difficult to understand. It is a matter of excellent hockey players venting frustration about the impending close of their hockey careers through on-ice aggression and violence. Dan resorts to corporeal language when noting the “*testosterone*” coursing through these young men. By drawing an analogy to the Coliseum of Rome, he gives the impression that this is simply the way things are. This ay of talking presents time as hardly existing, for nothing seems to have changed in the past two

thousand years. Such time is unchanging but different from the “homogenous, empty time” that Benjamin (1940) discussed, for constant life in Dan’s words is not modern but pre-modern.

His words do not entirely align with a constancy trajectory, though. Even in distinguishing “*skilled hockey*” from “*hit hockey*” he is making the claim that there is a hockey without what he considers an egregious amount of hitting. Fighting is not necessarily, or does not always need to be, “*part of the game*” – here Dan’s words conflict with those of Mike, Braden and Maxwell in within the first frame. As such, and in keeping with the dynamics of a progress trajectory discussed in chapter 3, for Dan change is possible and time is visible. The participant views the level of violence in University hockey in the 2018-19 season as a blast from the past – as “*1970s crap*”. The participant is distinguishing between a time in the past where this action was common and seen as appropriate, to the present day where it is out of place. I note this is the same participant who talked earlier about gender-inclusive hockey as being representative of the future. This is a key part of talk from within both nostalgia and progress narratives – the meaning of certain actions is that they represent either the past or the future, which can be evaluated positively or negatively.

This temporal comparison is not always an element of the view that fighting is a barrier to a better version of hockey, though. Sometimes the comparison is between different sports. For example, I was discussing with a Toronto-based hockey fan what barriers might be preventing newcomers to Canada from engaging hockey and he had this to say about fighting in the NHL:

Participant: But one thing I know people who don't follow hockey maybe they are from other foreign countries, one thing they don't want to see is they don't want to see fighting. Umm, maybe they're not too familiar with the whole spectrum, they just focus on fighting a lot and say 'oh this is not a good, you know' 'other sports they don't allow fighting, why you guys allow fighting?' So, um, I think this is one of the reason why we, it's hard for us to promote the sport to other countries, compared to basketball and soccer, it's so popular around the world,

right? It generates so much business, right? So much money. I think this is one of the hurdles, if you ask me.

Patrick: Yeah.

Participant: Unless you are born here and really understand the game, right, because they don't think we really need to have an enforcer (laughs a bit) on the ice, and I don't know I'm kind of neutral, you know, I know many love to see fighting, but this could be one thing that you know drag[s] us from expanding the sport to the rest of the world, you know.

Patrick: Yeah. Interesting. And have you heard people tell you that here from other places?

Participant: Definitely. Many times.

Patrick: Hmm.

Participant: New immigrants, or people from other countries, if they're not born in Canada, right? If they're not Caucasian, they many of them have this opinion. They [would] rather stick with basketball, or soccer.

Like some of the other participants' words noted earlier, this participant zeroes in on in-game fist-fighting as a form of violence that distinguishes hockey from other sports. Hockey – the NHL, within the context of this conversation – is seen to “allow” fighting in a way that other professional leagues do not. The participant feels this impacts the sport's popularity in two ways – first it makes hockey more difficult to export to other countries, and it makes newcomers to Canada less likely to engage the sport. While the participant expresses sympathy for those who enjoy the “enforcer” in the game, in his view it is a “drag” preventing hockey from expanding.

The moral or ethical content of this statement is a shade ambiguous, and I do not mean to impose a meaning on it. The participant certainly feels fighting in hockey is a barrier – but a barrier to what? Clearly the participant feels it is a barrier to a more global hockey, but he himself does not state necessarily whether a more global hockey is a better

hockey. Regardless of his own opinion, the moral trajectory of progress often links to the diversification and growing popularity of that item (Adams and Leavitt 2018). As with gender inclusivity and progress, ethno-racial diversification of the game makes sense and is desirable from within a progress trajectory.

Not only fans of the game feel that fighting in hockey is a barrier to other styles of play. One former player and current parent, coach and minor hockey association executive named Mark had this to say about his association's system for dealing with bodychecking in minor hockey:

Patrick: What would you say is the average turnaround time from an incident to [knowing] if there's going to be a suspension.

Mark: Immediate. Oh yeah. And if it's something to do [with] violence you know on the game like fighting that stuff, it's th[e] day of. Right uh, [the player's] not actually allowed to continue playing; if they are the coach can then be reprimanded and be suspended as well.

Patrick: Oh-kay.

Mark: So like say for example there was a fighting in a higher-level obviously in [his daughter]'s group in PeeWee that doesn't happen too often, but at the Midget and Bantam level, if there was an incident like that; checking from behind, something where this is a game suspension and you're in a tournament, and the coach doesn't honour that and report it and take action immediately, then the coach will then be reprimanded and he'll be suspended as well.

Patrick: Okay.

Mark: Yeah, so they're pretty strict on that, there's a zero-tolerance for that type of foolishness. Which I think is a good thing, it's not a bad thing....there's no sweeping [these incidents] under the rug, there's no uh, you know Gestapo back-door type thing. It's very transparent right there was an incident, they don't always go into the individual's name, but they do say there was an incident at the level, and the division, and how it was handled and what the incident was, and that's reviewed every month.

Mark described bodychecking from behind and fights in minor hockey as “foolishness” which the association he was a part of rightly had “zero-tolerance” for.

Punitive action here was swift, proportionate, and escalated to the coach of the player responsible if the coach allowed their player to play in spite of a suspension. Elsewhere in my conversation with Mark, he framed his work in hockey as helping to ensure that his daughter received a “*fair shake*” out of her playing experience. He thought the process his minor hockey association had in place was “*awesome*”, and helped give all players as good a minor hockey experience as they could have. He clearly felt his work as a father, coach, and Board member was good work, and talking about it was good talk. He was helping make a good kind of hockey possible for his daughter and kids of her generation – a kind of hockey with as few fights and injury-causing hits as possible.

This example shows how people who align their talk with a progress narrative see themselves as having quite a bit of responsibility, and agency. A better world is possible, and yet does not come into being automatically. People must work to make the world better, and indeed they can. Such a moral trajectory animates Mark’s work as a parent, coach, and Board member.

As with the first frame, people who talk about violence and fighting in hockey as a barrier to a better game use particular hockey heroes as moral exemplars. Rather than hold up enforcers though, they hold up players who had successful NHL careers built, they claim, on skill and not violence. I saw this kind of discourse on a sheet set up for a high school hockey tournament in Toronto in early 2021. By this point I had been around hockey in Toronto long enough to recognize some names on the sheet and therefore comprehend the argument the tournament organizers were trying to make. They explained their ban on bodychecking, and tight rules on other kinds of physical contact, in the following way:

ADDITIONAL CLARIFICATION RE HOW NON CONTACT RULES WILL BE
INTERPRETED FOR HIGH SCHOOL HOCKEY

Coaches and players must understand that we now know far more about concussions than ever before. They can occur not just from contact to the head but also by severe jostling of the head and neck caused by body to body impact. The myth that Non Contact Hockey is somehow not “manly” must be put to rest. NHL Alumni such as Wendel Clark, Borje Salming, Adam Oates, Mike Modano and Shane Corson (to name but a few) have played (and continue to play) the highest level of Non Contact Hockey and certainly no one would accuse them of being “unmanly” hockey players. While it is a game that places a premium on safety, speed and skill, as evidenced by the rules below, there are still many instances in which smart and controlled body positioning and effective use of strength may still be used to gain a competitive advantage.

- 1. Body checking. Absolutely NOT ALLOWED.** Be especially aware that the defending player may NOT hit the offensive player by going in the opposite direction from that player. A Minor Penalty will be called for any body checking infraction. A Major penalty will be called in all cases where the action is flagrant and excessive, and in any case if a player is injured (which also means a Game Misconduct as well).
- 2. Angling a player towards the boards:** Players are entitled to the ice they occupy and to position themselves between the puck and their opponent without extending any part of the body (hip, leg or arm) or suddenly stopping to initiate contact. A defender has the right to steer or direct an opponent towards the boards, then close the gap (by body positioning, NOT by a hip check) that the opposing player is going wide to obtain. The objective here is to close the gap, NOT try to drill the opponent through the boards.
- 3. Battles: Players battling for position and/or puck possession using their strength and balance will not be penalized:** If any of these actions escalate into cross checking, forearm shoves, aggressive pushing or body checking, a penalty will be assessed.
- 4. Interference and “Mirroring”:** All players must be allowed to pursue the puck or gain position without being impeded in any manner. However, as players are entitled to the ice they occupy, they are allowed to position their bodies between the puck and their opponents without initiating body checking contact. For example, on a one on one rush, the defender is allowed to “mirror” the opposing player and not let the puck carrier by, until such time as the puck has been shot towards the net, passed, or chipped into the corner.

While much could be written about the complex typology of violence developed in the four listed points, the first paragraph interests me. The tournament organizers are attempting to convince everyone involved in the tournament to not commit or encourage acts of violence, including bodychecking. They do so by pointing out the fact that former NHL players play no-contact hockey. *If Wendel Clark, mentioned in an earlier interview, can play hockey without bodychecking, then anyone can.* Note, as well, what is not

emphasized here – Clark’s fights on behalf of his teammates. And note how this is by no means an exhaustive list – Tie Domi, for example, is not a listed player.

Another player on the sign’s list, Borje Salming, was mentioned in the introduction and deserves special mention. A Sami man who grew up in Sweden, Salming came to Canada as a young adult in the early 1970s and was one of the first professional hockey players to do so. He incited a wave of European players to North America – this was a key part of the transition from brutalized to globalized hockey. Some hockey people I interviewed framed their understanding of hockey’s progression away from violence in terms of the interplay between European and North American hockey players. When I asked a Halifax life-long player and fan of hockey whether the sport was Canadian, he had this to say:

Participant: (with little hesitation, but firmness) No. Um no it’s definitely US-Canada but um European hockey, I’ve always been interested in European hockey. Why? Uh ‘cause years ago I felt that they, they were, they were better at it than us. Um, the Russians, the Finns, you know uh the Swedes they were better skaters, and just all around better hockey, our hockey in North America, it’s changed now because now it’s European, used to be all about the brawn, you know the guy gettin’ into the fights and even the Mooseheads when I used to go to that it used to really annoy me all these fights they got into, so now you don’t really see that anymore, now it’s become a skilled game, which is I- what I’ve always thought was the best part of the game, so I for me, it’s more enjoyable to see a skilled hockey game than a game where a big fight broke out, I don’t care about the fighting, I think that’s, there are sometimes a place for it, but generally a lot of teams I’m finding now in the last five years don’t even have a tough guy on the team anymore. They can’t afford to have a twentieth guy be a low-skilled guy, tough guy, they need to have four very good lines, so I find the teams today are rolling four lines and their, the fourth line is pretty good.

Patrick: Interesting.

Participant: So that’s the way I play, you know.

While the existence of multiple national styles of play within Canadian hockey has already been ably discussed by Allain (2019), here I am interested in the moral and

ethical content of this participant's words. In his view, fighting is by no means inevitable, and does not need to be "*part of the game*". This is because a kind of hockey apart from fights is possible. Hockey in Canada has progressed by adopting higher-skill, lower-violence styles of play introduced by European newcomers. Hence this participant's stance toward hockey's future is one of hope and anticipation that skilled hockey will take hold in Canada. For him, in the present the right thing to do is play skilled hockey and talk about it.

Conclusion

In this chapter I have explored two contrasting frames hockey people use to talk about hockey and violence. One thinks of fighting and violence as a waning tradition that was good. By framing their talk with a combination of nostalgia and constancy, these hockey people position themselves as defending a tradition that cannot be entirely eradicated and has value for those who practice it. The other frame describes violence and fighting in hockey as a barrier to better versions of hockey. In this frame, fighting and violence can be rooted out of the game, doing so is desirable, and everyday people can help make that happen by playing "*skilled hockey*" and volunteering for their local minor hockey association. Both frames, through trajectories that configure change and time, and suggest moral evaluations of perceived history, which then shape perceived agency and stances toward the world, give hockey people foundations for what they perceive right action to be. This is true not just for acts of violence, but also for actions where racialization may be a factor in people's interpretations.

Chapter 5: Hockey Talk about incidents which may feature race

The preceding chapters have accomplished two important tasks. First, they explored hockey people's talk and second, they developed a vocabulary for the moral and ethical content of hockey people's talk. Hockey people align their talk with moral trajectories that configure change and time to make teleological stories of the world. Hockey people attach moral evaluation to these stories, perceive their level of agency, adopt a stance toward the world, and then seek to do what is right, based on the preceding stages.

This chapter builds on that work in two ways. First, it focuses primarily on how, in their talk, hockey people act in, narrate, and react to incidents that happen in the game. By *incidents*, I simply mean an action whose meaning is contestable. Second, it directly engages how hockey people's ethno-racial subjectivity affects their talk. To tailor this chapter toward answering that research question, my interest is specifically in incidents whose contested meanings are, to some degree, about race. I want to know both how hockey people talk about incidents that a person could think are race-based or racist, and how ethno-racial subjectivity affects that talk. Such material responds to a pressing problem in contemporary hockey, ethno-racial relations, and lays the groundwork for the next chapter, which analyses talk about the "*you people*" incident that ended Don Cherry's broadcasting career. Giving a thick description of a potentially racist incident will help clarify what I mean, and establish the chapter's key concerns that I will afterward explore in four ethno-racial subjectivities – Black, White, East Asian, and multiracial.

"Kick him out!": An observed incident

In late January 2019, I went to a Major Midget (14-16 year olds, highest competition level) hockey game in Halifax, Nova Scotia. The hometown Halifax team was playing against a

team from rural Nova Scotia. I had never attended a game at this age bracket and competition level before, so I was excited. The best Major Midget players are drafted by Major Junior teams like the Halifax Mooseheads, and the very best go from there to professional or semi-professional hockey careers, or at the very least to play University Varsity hockey.

That night I walked in the arena and had – like a fool – no idea where to place myself. Many people were standing – the number of people who stood for the duration of a hockey game always surprised me. I decided to stand too, and so picked a spot on the railing above the penalty boxes and between a White woman to the left and a White man to the right. That is the spot I had wandered to, and in retrospect it was the right place for me to be.

I quickly started chatting with the White woman to my left. She had three sons in hockey, and gave me some morsels of information about hockey life when she found out what I was researching. We chatted, in part, because the opening minutes of the game had been quiet – unusually so. I made a note on my large, printed observation sheet to capture that: *v. little yelling, no shouted profanities.*

That changed when an African Nova-Scotian player for the Halifax team received a two-minute penalty. As he was escorted to the penalty box, the White adult man to my right yelled, “*Kick him out!*” “*Kick him out!*” The Halifax player put his gloved hand to his ear, and cocked his head toward the man who had yelled. The man understood this to be a gesture directed at him. He responded verbally saying, “*Oh, tough guy?!’ What are you talkin’ about?*” as the Halifax player entered the penalty box, still turned toward the adult spectator on my right. My heart-rate rose as my attention glued to the words and gestures of these two men. “*Was I witnessing, or about to witness, a racist incident?*” I thought. Due to the arena design, we were about fifteen feet above and twenty feet back from the penalty box itself. This meant the Halifax

player and adult spectator could not physically interact, even if they wanted to. It also meant their words and gestures were loud enough that many other fans could see what was going on, or at least that *something* was going on.

The scorekeeper, sitting to the right of the penalty box, calmed down both the Halifax player and the adult spectator on my right to a point where they stopped communicating with each other. Moments later a fan sitting about thirty feet away to the left, who I estimated to be 12-18 year old Black or Black mixed-race youth stood up, turned, and shouted at the adult spectator on my right, “*You’re a joke! You’re a fucking joke!*” My notes indicate the adult spectator on my right said nothing in reply. The White woman with whom I had been chatting called this “*the real hockey.*”

About ten minutes passed.

Then, a Black man who I estimated to be 40-50 years old came to where I was on the railing, next to the adult spectator who had had the exchange with the Black player. The Black man pointed his finger directly in the adult spectator’s face and yelled: “*You yell at my son again I’ll beat the fucking shit out of you!*” The White adult spectator, myself, and the White woman next to me said nothing. A man standing next to him, though, said to the 40-50 year old Black man who had yelled, “*Calm down, it’s just a hockey game. It’s just a rink*”. The 40-50 year old Black man replied to him, “*I wasn’t fucking talkin’ to you!*” Turning back to the first adult spectator, who was smiling, he said at the same volume as his previous words, “*I’ll wipe that fucking smile right off your face! My son’s fifteen years old, how old are you?*” At that, the Black man turned around and left. The same 12-18 year old Black or mixed-race fan who’d spoken earlier yelled out once again, “*You’re a fucking joke!*” To this, the White woman on my left said hockey people “*keep it classy.*” My heart continuing to pound – I said nothing, hoping I would

be able to remember what had happened. Neither of us engaged either the White man to our right, or the Black man who had now left.

The rest of the second period passed without incident. During the intermission, as I sought to both listen to people's conversation and write down or remember what had already transpired, I saw the 50-60 year old White adult spectator talking with another White man. I caught the phrase "*racial slur*" in the midst of their conversation, but nothing more.

I went back to my position on the railing for the third period, with the same adult spectators on my right and left. I had spotted a few minutes earlier that the 40-50 year old Black man was watching the game down and to our left, at ice level. Then, the White adult spectator who was at my right said to the man on his right that he would "*be right back*." He had been gone about 15 minutes when I saw that he was talking with the 40-50 year old Black man. I went down to ice level as well, standing far enough away for them to have their conversation, but close enough to catch some words, and at least the general mood, of their conversation. They were laughing with each other, and talked for the rest of the third period. I heard the Black man say to the White man about six times in the course of their conversation, "*I'm glad you came down here and talked to me*." The game ended, and the 50-60 year old White adult spectator left the Black man at ice-level. The Black man then turned to me and asked, in a fairly cheery voice, "*Did you like the game?*" We got talking and I explained my research. I do not remember whether I asked him about what had transpired, or if he talked about it apart from my prodding. Either way, he said, "*For me it's just 'that's my kid', you know. Don't yell at my kid. He's fifteen, this guy's what, fifty. But you know what, he was a nice guy. That's how you meet people.*"

How might this incident be interpreted? While much has been written about the fraught nature of the anthropologist's interpretations, my interest here is in how hockey people would

interpret this incident. Was the White man who yelled “*Kick him out!*” racist? Was it a micro-aggression (Thurber and DiAngelo, 2018), or even a meso- or macro-aggression? Or, was the incident not even problematic? And what is the proper response – should governing bodies discipline the White man for his comments? Did the Black father over-react? Was the White woman on my left racist for not intervening in the situation? Was *I* racist for not intervening in the situation?

The rest of this chapter is a textured description of how hockey people of different ethno-racial subjectivities understand racist incidents such as this one. Such a description responds to my third research question, which asks how ethno-racial subjectivity correlates with the moral and ethical content of hockey people’s talk. In doing so I use the concept of a *racializable incident*, which refers to actions whose meanings are contested and can be argued to be about race. The concept contrasts with existing literature on race in hockey (Kalman-Lamb 2018; Szto 2020) where it is assumed within the analysis that incidents involving race are fundamentally about race. Adopting such a normative stance would distract from my goal of producing a textured description getting at the variety of interpretation of these incidents. Talking about racializability and racializable incidents leaves room for the way hockey people do or do not take these incidents to be about race.

Black perspectives

As noted in the introduction, seven of the semi-structured interviews were with Black people. I also have field notes from short interviews conducted with Black people at a hockey event in Halifax for Black and Black mixed-race individuals. Four of the seven semi-structured interview participants talked about racializable incidents. For the most part, they understood

these incidents to be about race. One Black minor hockey player I interviewed at a suburban Tim Horton's had experienced a player from an opposing team use a racial epithet against him during a game. When I asked him why he continued playing hockey despite having such an experience he replied, "*To just ignore those who doubt me and hate me.*" For this participant, an opposing player using a racial epithet against him was evidence that the player hated him, and presumably hated him because of his ascribed ethno-racial identity.

Existing literature makes it clear that that player's experience of an anti-Black racial slur being used against him is not isolated or unique, whether in hockey (Harris 2003) or in other sports (Nzindukiyimana and O'Connor 2019). In keeping with this literature, some Black hockey people understood incidents involving race-based language to be ubiquitous. One Black interview participant named Rob was a key informant who had grown up playing the game and was currently a parent and coach in minor hockey and in the tailored program for Black hockey players mentioned earlier. When asked about the frequency of incidents against Black hockey players, or POC in general, he said:

Rob: Well let me put it this way, I haven't met an adult hockey player of colour that ha[s]n't experienced it here in the Maritimes. Now uh with the younger players, uh some of whom uh I've had the privilege of either coaching or developing skill-sets with, a smaller percentage mention it to me, but uh there have been a couple, yes.

Howard: And I mean how does it come about it usually – chirping on the ice, uh, in terms of the play, or does it happen in other, other parts of the game too?

Rob: Um, for the most part the examples that I've personally experienced from hearing from players was chirping on the ice for the most part, um I've also heard parents share with me experiences while they sit in the stands and watch their child of colour on the ice. So um sometimes it's a, it impacts the entire family and not just the individual.

Howard: [When] Black kids are called racial slurs, how [do they react]?

Participant: [Of the] several incidents that I've personally been involved in with players that I coach, uh the individual on the receiving end of some of these comments are absolutely devastated. They're hurt, they often come to tears, they often don't want to come back again, and it hits at the heart of them and their enjoyment of the sport. So it's very, very challenging and uh, luckily with the incidents that I've been involved in I've been able to address it sensitively, restoratively and directly, and luckily we had three good results as a result of those three incidents but I don't think all coaches have the training to address situations like that in fact I know many don't. And that's perhaps one of the challenges.

This participant aligns his language with both constancy and progress. As noted at the end of chapter 3, this is the most common combination of trajectories that hockey people align their talk with. On the one hand, the participant considers racializable incidents to be widespread across his own generation – every Black adult hockey player he knows has experienced it. Kids in this Black hockey program mention experiencing racializable incidents too, though not all of them. Constancy accounts for the continuity, and progress accounts for the shift. A reduction in the number of racializable incidents is a metric of progress because, as noted earlier and in existing literature, inclusion across axes of difference can be taken to be a sign of moral improvement (Adams and Leavitt 2018). Recall the chain of items discussed earlier that bridge a trajectory to a perceived right course of action – configuring change and time, giving a moral evaluation, shaping a sense of agency, and adopting a stance toward one's world. I have previously asserted that in a progress trajectory, people see meaningful change as possible and good. That is true, but it is not all that aligning one's talk with a progress trajectory allows a person to do. Aligning his talk with progress gives Rob a place to stand from to condemn racializable incidents as being about race and problematically so. Since they are problematic, progress means dealing with these incidents and uprooting them from

hockey. Hence it is good that this participant as a coach is well-trained and willing to “*sensitively, restoratively, and directly*” deal with racializable incidents.

For Black people in hockey, racializable incidents are not just the more obvious incidents of people using race-based language against them. They also emerge in less detectable forms, such as during tryouts. At the Black hockey program mentioned earlier, my supervisor and I were welcomed by one of the organizers. In one of my first experiences of fieldwork research, as my supervisor demonstrated sociable hockey speaking and listening, the organizer told us of how he and his family once moved to a new city in Canada. His son tried out for minor hockey there – while his son’s skills were apparent in tryouts, he was told there “*wasn’t a place for him*” in their association. While no racist words were ever spoken, it seems the organizer at least felt race could have been a factor. This aligns with more recent literature which argues that in sports (Szto 2020) and elsewhere (Bonilla-Silva 2018), racism has become more covert but has by no means disappeared.

Not every racializable incident that Black people experienced was taken by them to be about race, though. I interviewed one Toronto-based Caribbean-Indian hockey player who identified as Black – he had played hockey as a kid, and in an ethno-racially diverse neighbourhood. When I asked him whether he’d ever experienced any expressions of racism, he shared the following story and interpretation of it:

Participant: The house league for which I played was very White, and I recall one instance we were all lined up for drills and we were wearing our face-masks and a[n] assistant coach was making his way through the line, asking each player, are you um I can’t remember the name of the girl, but are you let’s say it’s Jane, ‘Are you Jane’s sister?’, the person would respond ‘no’, he’d go to another person, look in his mask, ‘Are you Jane’s sister?’ ‘No’ ‘Are you Jane’s sister?’ ‘No’ then he’d get to me and he’d look at my mask ‘Are you- ope nope, guess not,’ (laughs a bit) but, yeah,

Patrick: And as a kid was that, did that have a- did that have an impact on you?

Participant: (With surprise in his voice) Surprisingly no, I was conscious of it, but um it didn't deter me from playing hockey, it didn't deter me from liking hockey, perhaps if I um, if I lived in a White neighbourhood, I don't know it might have, but I grew up in a context where all my male peers played hockey, regardless of ethno-racial affiliation, so for that reason, it didn't bother me that much.

This participant describes an incident where the intent of the assistant coach is open to a wide range of interpretation. While the participant could have reacted then or felt now that the coach's words about race or racist, he does not think so. He reasons that having exposure to a critical mass of non-White people playing hockey left him secure in feeling comfortable being a non-White hockey player, even in a house league and on a team that was "very White".

Within Black experiences of hockey, then, there is not a consensus on what words about race or incidents involving race mean. While a bit more than half of those interviewed had incidents that came to mind, and most of them thought these incidents were indeed incidents of racism, the last quotation indicates such views were not universal. Such findings – that some people think racist incidents happen, and some think they do not – is an established claim (see Szto 2020; Kalman-Lamb 2018). Whereas these scholars rush, as mentioned earlier, to a normative conclusion – that some informants see reality and some are blind to it – my analysis remains focused on the racializability of incidents. Such an approach gets at the textures of interpretation itself. Looking at Black perspectives alone, though, is insufficient. Existing literature (Ari 2019) indicates that Black identity has at least as much to do with White ascribed identities or meanings than Black self-ascribed identities or meanings, to refer back to the Barthian framework (1969) established earlier. Whether religious or ethno-racial, identity has at least as much to do with how others identify us as it does with how we identify ourselves.

White perspectives

As noted in the introduction, the data on which this thesis relies has interviews with 55 White people. Thirty-nine of those White people identified as being of Anglo-Celtic origin, and I will engage with those participants' words first. Of these 39 people, 12 (or just over 30% of) them discussed any racializable incidents, and there were 16 total references to racializable incidents.

Some White interview participants felt that racializable incidents were clearly about race. One participant named Paul shared a story of a racializable incident involving a Black teammate of his in a game that took place in central Ontario:

Paul: I had one friend of mine [when I was] playing Junior [and he] was Black , and we went to a small community, I think it was Elliot Lake or something like that, and there was verbal and there [was also] throwing banana peels or bananas at the bus which was just ridiculous and, I know it was upsetting for him, and I felt bad because he was, I think the only [Black] person, he was the only person on the team, on the ice for that matter, like between the two teams, and obviously our whole coaching staff everybody was White so I don't think anybody could really relate to what he was going through, and I remember him being very upset about it but kind of shut down by it, and um, yeah I don't even know what the aftermath was with that I think the team issued an apology on behalf of their fans, but it wasn't really anything, you know what I mean?

Patrick: Yeah.

Paul: And uh, that was the only incident of racism, I've, I've played with multiple, um, you know Black kids or whatever, and that was the only incident that I could think of, that came up, but it was pretty awful, and I know [it] had an effect on him. And I felt bad, I remember feeling bad in the moment 'cause, other than just kind of hearing him out and understanding his frustration, I couldn't do anything for him, and I feel like nobody really knew what to do, or nobody did anything, in terms of the coaching staff, or the team managers or the league, or anything, it kind of got swept under the rug, we weren't obviously a big program or anything like that where it gets any kind of media play, and it was a small town up in north Ontario, so just act like it didn't happen, but that's unfair to expect.

In this incident, spectators at a Junior A hockey game in a rural, central Ontario small town yelled race-based words at the Paul's Black teammate, and then threw bananas and banana peels at his team's bus. Such actions were upsetting both for the participant and for his Black teammate. These words, then, are not the kind of thing the participant feels can reasonably be expected to be shrugged off – rather, these words are genuinely hurtful. As with the earlier Black participant Rob, Paul takes a condemnatory stance toward the words and actions he saw. Such a stance is an interesting inversion of a nostalgia narrative that links rural places to better, past places. Here, the opposite happens – the rural is linked with the past, but the past is a worse place, a place where racist incidents happen. While this quotation itself is not directly aligned with progress, Paul aligned his talk with progress elsewhere in his interview.

It is also worth noting the emphasis Paul places upon his Black teammate's alone-ness. He felt that, since he, his other teammates, and the coaching staff was White, all they could do was listen to their Black teammate. The participant seemed to think this was not worth much – essentially he “*couldn't do anything for him.*” In terms of the linkage of items I have been working with, ethno-racial identity affects Paul's sense of agency around acting and talking rightly in response to racializable incidents, and therefore his stance toward them as well. He feels White people can do very little in response to racist incidents against Black people.

Not all White participants thought this way about race and racializable incidents, though. One White hockey player had this to say when I asked him about racializable incidents:

Patrick: Mm-hmm. Okay, interesting. And I remember a couple years ago in the news, there was a PeeWee tournament in [Halifax], and someone used [a racial epithet] against another player, is that surprising to you?

Participant: Depends on what level and on what stage of the tournament.

Patrick: Okay.

Participant: If it was the finals, and it's a competitive level, and these players are down, it doesn't overly surprise me. 'cause then they're mad, they wanna get it out, they're probably gonna say it, whereas if it's the first game, and it's low-level hockey, it's probably not gonna happen, because there's still recovery time from if the first game compared to the finals, I know Midget, Major Midget, the Macs, they were playing in Provincials, the final game, and they're playing against Cap-Cape Breton, they're down, Cape Breton was down by five, two minutes left and this guy decided he was mad, he just went up and started beating the living crap out of a kid just because he was mad, and I don't think that would happen in the start of the tournament, because there's still time to recover; this was high-stakes, they're mad, they're upset they're gonna lose, so they just wanted to get it out. And there wasn't much consequence from that because it was the end of the season, they're losing anyways.

The participant's answer suggests a view that racializable incidents are not about race.

His answer is not based on how racist he thinks hockey players are or are not, but rather he interrogates the incident's location in relation to the competition level and stage of the tournament. For him, using a racial epithet against an ethno-racial minority is not different from “*beating the living crap*” out of someone without a vendetta against that person. There is a significant spread, then, within how White people of Anglo-Celtic descent talk about race and racializable incidents.

Up to this point, I have distinguished between Anglo-Celtic and non-Anglo-Celtic White people. I probe that distinction in the rest of this section. Recall that just over 30% of Anglo-Celtic White participants talked about racializable incidents. In contrast, out of 16 non-Anglo-Celtic participants, only four (or 25% of) them talked about racializable incidents, and they each only referenced such incidents once in their interviews. Where other participants, whether White or Black, saw racializable incidents, non-Anglo-Celtic White people were less likely to. Recall, for example, how tryouts were a place where team selections had ambiguous meanings for some Black people that could involve race and racism. Contrast this with how one Toronto-based hockey player and coach of Danish descent named Jon talked about tryouts:

Jon: It's funny 'cause no one is ever frowned upon to come in and try the sport, ever. I've not seen that once, to me it's been the sport where, you wanna come out and try it, absolutely! Come out, right. Boy girl, whatever gender or uh purple I don't th- you could be Barney, right like come on out. That's always been, everybody that I've seen in the arena has always been like that in terms of opening and welcoming and especially when dealing with the kids, like it's just 'yeah, come on let's get 'em on the ice, let's get 'em on the ice', and you know if they like it they like it, if they don't, can't force 'em, like it's uh, you know, even though some parent might try but it's, no I've found that it's actually been a very open and inclusive environment.

For this participant, learn-to-play programs and minor hockey simply are not places where racializable incidents happen. The participant gives his argument a rhetorical flourish by suggesting that even Barney – a large, purple dinosaur from a children's television show – would be welcomed onto the ice. While such a flourish may seem inconsequential, usages of the colour purple emerged as a small but interesting finding during my analysis. Only four people used the word “purple” in any context in all eighty interviews. Each time, it was used the same way – to illustrate that hockey spaces can and do meaningfully include people across difference. This is similar to the kind of talk Bonilla-Silva (2018) describes as colour-blind racism. Interestingly, all four people who used “purple” this way were of White non-Anglo-Celtic background. Here are the three other quotations, with deployments of “purple” and their immediate surroundings in bold:

Jeff: [former teammates] go one way you go the other way, right? And that's not, hatred, it's not racially motivated or anything like that, it's about competition.

Patrick: Mm.

*Jeff: You wanna win, and the older you get, and you're playing AAA hockey or junior hockey, Junior A hockey, you wanna make sure they guy next to ya is there to win, and for me **I don't care if he's Black , green, purple, ...polka dots**, we're there to win together. (pause) Simple as that.*

Patrick: Yeah.

Jeff: It's really, for me it's that simple. –Halifax former player, current parent and fan, of Italian heritage

Participant: When Canada won gold, you know at the Olympics, at 5 o'clock in the morning here we were in a bar, and it was people from different walks of life, as the clock was counting down, everybody you know singing 'oh Canada' – it didn't matter, White blue purple pink, um European Asian, native Canadian, it didn't matter. Everybody showed that pride, and I'll tell ya – it was a great feeling. –Toronto key informant, 1st-generation immigrant from Portugal

*Maxwell: If the Leafs did what the Raptors [did, winning a championship], I think people would have [their] answer to the question [of whether] the Raptors were Canada's new team [or not]. [If the Leafs won a Stanley Cup] this city would shut down. **Whether you're Black , White, purple, brown, yet you know alien, human, it doesn't [matter],***

Howard: (laughs a bit)

Maxwell: This place would, it would be shut down. –Toronto hockey fan, of Italian heritage

Each of these quotations are instances where racializable incidents could arguably take place – players moving up competition brackets or not, and moments of franchise- or nation-based celebration. For these participants, though, such incidents did not happen, or at least were not worth talking about. In terms of personal agency, in these quotations no ethno-racial subjectivity helps or hurts forging a social bond. Whiteness, along with purple-ness, fades in contrast to the experiences hockey affords.

Non-Anglo-Celtic Whites do not uniformly deny the possibility of race-based treatment within hockey arenas, though. Jeff, for example, while never having witnessed it in his time as a hockey player and parent, was sympathetic to the idea of non-White people experiencing racist incidents in hockey arenas. He said:

Jeff: [That he has never felt unwelcome in a hockey arena] goes to the fact that I'm a White middle-aged Canadian. Yep. But I can tell you, and I would never pretend to speak on behalf of anyone of [a] different ethnicity or culture, but I can see they might feel it.

Patrick: Hmm.

Jeff: Absolutely. These people have dealt with you know, coming over here to Canada, I'm sure they've experienced some form of racism, and hockey is an old boys' culture still, right, it is an old White guys' culture still, and that is changing, you see a lot of cultural shifts going on today, especially the gender shifts, you see more women's hockey, girls' hockey, and that is fantastic, but I think um, I could still see people of colour having an issue walking into, to a hockey rink, I absolutely can see that.

Here, Jeff seems sympathetic to the idea that a fictitious “purple” person may, in fact, face difficulty in a hockey arena.

Textures of Whiteness: Subaltern White?

The findings given here suggest Anglo-Celtic White people, on the whole, think and talk differently about racializable incidents than non-Anglo-Celtic White people. Anglo-Celtics are more likely to talk about such incidents, and more likely to see them as being about race. Why might this be the case? Recalling that Anglo-Celtics have had more power and access to resources in Canada than other White ethnic groups (Porter, 1965; Ogmundson and McLaughlin, 1992), DiAngelo's (2011) approach to Whiteness is insufficient. Literature on Portuguese (Ari 2019; Jaffe 2015), Greek (Mina 2013) and Italian (Sturino 2019) experiences in Canada specifically show these people groups have been subjected, using DiAngelo's phrase, to “race-based stress” (54) in ways Anglo-Celtic Canadians have not. Reality here is the opposite of what DiAngelo's framework suggests – a segment of the Canadian population more insulated from

race-based stress is more likely to see racializable incidents, and is more likely to see them as being about race.

I suggest these differences between Anglo-Celtic White and non-Anglo-Celtic White stem from the fact that Anglo-Celtic ethno-racial identities have been stable over the past several generations, while non-Anglo-Celtic ones have not. Rather, since the mid-twentieth centuries Portuguese, Danish, Italian, and other non-Anglo-Celtic peoples have gone from being identified as inferior minority groups and occupying subordinate positions in society (Porter 1965) to becoming, though unevenly, part of the White majority (Ari 2019; Ogmundson and McLaughlin 1992; Sturino 2019). To use Barthian language, regardless of their self-ascribed identities, their ascribed identities in Canadian society have changed drastically. Hence, ethno-racial identities seem more transient and less real to them than such identities do to Anglo-Celtic White hockey people.

To capture this dynamic of a sub-section of White people with a history and current outlook different from Anglo-Celtic White people, I refer to non-Anglo-Celtic White peoples as “Subaltern Whites”. While such people have elsewhere been referred to as “in-between peoples” (Barrett and Roediger 1997), they are better thought of as both White and non-White than being in between the two. Again, the Barthian framework helps with this – ascription is a different process from self-ascription so there can be a disjuncture between identities. This is similar to the disjuncture noted in the introduction between the qualities ascribed to Christians in North America – ensconced in various kinds of privilege – and my experience as a Christian in the social sciences. Indeed, living such a disjuncture primed me to detect it amongst Subaltern White hockey people.

Subaltern Whites in hockey occupy this disjuncture and have a distinct way of talking about race and racializable incidents in hockey and hockey arenas. The language of Subaltern Whites intentionally – and perhaps a bit provocatively – is meant to evoke Spivak’s (1978) use of subaltern. This finding also points to the continued significance of ethnicity, which is important given that the focus of research Canadian ethno-racial relations has shifted toward race (Ramos 2010). The ethnic pasts of racially White hockey people matter.

East Asian Perspectives

As noted in the literature review, ethno-racial group relations are a matter of more than White and Black people. Hence looking at how (East) Asian hockey people talk about race and racializable incidents matters. The data for this project features interviews with six East Asian hockey people. Three of them discussed racializable incidents, and there were a total of four references to such incidents. One East Asian adult hockey player named Gao recalled racializable incidents from his days in minor hockey, saying:

Gao: There was definitely stuff said, but I would just say it’s [just] culture, background, I think they’re just not used to seeing a Chinese kid on their team. I was pretty good so I’d hear it from parents if I didn’t pass to their kid or something, and my Dad’s not there to say anything back – I remember one time, a parent actually came in and said, ‘you, you’re the biggest hog’, [and the] coach said to me ‘just score, you just win the game’ and when you’re 11 or 12 years old, and you can skate better than everyone or you can go around everyone, you can score 4, 5 goals a game and win the whole game, but you know that’s yeah, some people don’t like that. But, you can’t please everyone but then yeah on the ice they take, you know there’s been times where there’s racial remarks, and you understand like it’s bound to happen, it’ll happen everywhere. Um,

Howard: So, do you think it’s any different on the ice, or is it more like chirping?

Gao: It’s mostly chirping, but now you don’t hear it as much, I think people, especially in Toronto, you don’t hear it. Before it was actual racism but yeah, what are you gonna do, right, I mean [do you] react? That’s what they want you

to do and, I'm there to play hockey. If I'm better than you at hockey then that's what's making you mad, what can I do, right?

Howard: Do the coaches ever say anything if they heard things being said, or?

Gao: Oh if they hear it, they'll bring it up if they have to, but I don't remember any cases where anyone had to bring anything up, most of the time you know they're like uh 'go do math' where it's like 'yeah I know I'm probably better than you at school too, but it's like' 'is it really an offence?' How do I, you know even in school hockey or [if] I'm going to try-outs they [might think] '[Gao] is in Gifted and he also is better [than] me at hockey', like 'well, sorry there's nothing I can do, right?' like, you say 'go do math' I know what you mean, but what can I say, like, like it it it's you know like it's a, I don't know yeah, just leave it.

For this participant, race-based words against him in hockey were not about anti-Asian feeling or sentiment, but rather about people being envious of his talents. While people used “*culture*” and “*background*”, he did not take the meaning of the words to be as such. Regardless, the incidents this participant describes are an example of the “model minority” logic at work, where Asians are supposed to be decent but not spectacular (Kalman-Lamb 2015; Kim 2014). Despite being able to score five goals in a game, Gao was not heralded as a hero but rather derided by a teammate’s parent as being “*the biggest hog*” of the puck. Granted, other hockey parents talked about this being a source of minor hockey team conflict apart from race. Therein lay the rub of racializable incidents – action can be interpreted as being about race, or not.

The moral or ethical content of Gao’s talk is clearly aligned with constancy. *Such verbal insults as “go do math!” happen everywhere, not just hockey, and there is nothing to be done about them.* There is a bit of progress alignment in his talk too, though, as he feels race-based talk has decreased since he grew up playing hockey. “*Actual racism*” is contrasted against “*chirping*”. Note the difference between this way of thinking about race-based words and how Rob talked about race-based words against Black minor hockey players being “*devastating*”.

Clearly there are contested meanings to words and phrases in hockey arenas that have race-based content.

Meanings of racializable incidents were contestable in another dimension as well. One East Asian hockey coach and former player named Vernon described experiencing racializable incidents in his hockey-playing career, saying:

Vernon: When I was younger as a kid, I was on a team where there was just me and one other non-White and he was he was Vietnamese, and we went to play in a northern arena, north of Toronto. And they were just yellin' at us, I don't even know if they were yellin' at my parents or not, but I know that they were yelling at us and using a lot of profanity.

Patrick: Wow. And was that surprising to you, when it happened?

Vernon: No. I expected it, even in the Toronto area where we play[ed] I did get some of that too...just not as much, and it wasn't as dramatic as in the northern cities I guess like I don't know what it was with the northern cities compared to Toronto, I guess Toronto was more accustomed to having the odd ethnic child on the team, but when we went up north they just gave it to us. Telling us 'get out of the rink', 'this is not ping pong' or something, 'you dumb' and you know [they] used the words.

Patrick: Yeah. Hmm. And uh you said that your parents were in the arena as well did your parents normally go to your games as a kid?

Vernon: Uh my father drove me to every game. Every game, every practice. And he never mentioned anything, I guess if they sa[id] anything he would just ignore them, and he would teach me... 'if somebody says anything, it's just words' but there's times where it got past words, with the kids on the ice.

Patrick: Mm. Yeah like they'd be physically against you?

Vernon: Physically oh yeah they would try to hurt me. They would hit me on top of the skates with their skates, they would slash me, and they'd be more violent to me, they'd come up to me and start yelling at me and then start shovin' me, try and punch me....I just tried to defend myself. Um, luckily with the team that I had, a lot of the guys that were White, they would back me up, they helped me out, and we really treat[ed] each other as a family. Which is a good thing with hockey, if you're on that [team then] that's your family, no matter [if] you're Black, White, Asian, Indian [it] doesn't matter. That's how it is with hockey I guess – that team is your team, whoever it is.

Patrick: Hmm. That's really interesting, so even the guys who were on the other team who were shoving you, do you think [they would've defended you] if you were on their team?

Vernon: I think at first no, and then it would grow onto you. It's like meeting a new person, you don't know the person till you learn how that person is.

Like Paul, Vernon experienced more racializable incidents in rural Ontario than in Toronto. White opponents treated Vernon different than his teammates, using both race-based language and a disproportionate amount of violent, aggressive action toward him. This participant did not think of such action as being about race or consisting of racial prejudice, but rather a lack of previous contact and experience with non-White hockey players. In Vernon's view, if he played alongside these aggressive players, then they would "grow" in their understanding of him and would soon defend him during game play, like his teammates did.

Most interesting about this quotation, though, is how Vernon thinks about ethno-racial boundaries in hockey. For him, hockey teams are families, and that family bond overcomes any ethno-racial identity a person may have. Without using the language, this is similar to what Subaltern White people meant when deploying "purple", as discussed earlier. Contrast this view with that of Paul, who considered his Black teammate who experienced a racializable incident to be "alone" in his suffering. These are very different understandings of how much ethno-racial subjectivity counts in relation to how to react to a racializable incident. These understandings produce different ideas of personal agency, which in turn affect one's stance toward the world and perception of what the right things to do and say are.

Mixed-race and multiracial perspectives

As noted in the literature review, the number of multiracial families in Canada is growing (Milan, Maheux, and Chui 2010). The data I am engaging has interviews with 14 members of

multiracial families – two mixed-race adults, five White parents in multiracial families, and seven mixed-race youth hockey players. Seven of these 14 interview participants mentioned racializable incidents in their interviews, and there were a total of ten references to such incidents. I asked one Toronto-based mixed-race minor hockey player whether he was surprised about racializable incidents that had recently taken place in semi-professional and professional hockey. He responded:

Participant: I'm not surprised by it 'cause our generation's more accustomed to different races and ethnicities playing hockey, but I think, especially the older coaches, they're more used to the traditional preppy White kid playing hockey, and then when that clashes with this new diverse culture that we have playing hockey, then there's gonna be maybe some underlying racism that's pointed out. So I'm usually not surprised by it, especially when it's an older coach who might not be used to how things work nowadays.

For this participant, racializable incidents were indeed manifestations of “*racism*” and were a result of frictions between coaches with mentalities from the past and players who represent the future. This talk is aligned with a progress trajectory – as noted before, this trajectory frequently posits a diverse future against a homogenous past. Thinking about a progress trajectory and the parts that follow it, which chapter 3 established and chapter 4 fleshed out, is useful here as well. As in previous cases of talk aligned with progress, change and time are possible and significant between the past, the present, and the future. This hockey player anticipates and enjoys the future he describes and sees himself as playing an active part in it. Indeed, being a mixed-race hockey player, he is at home in the “*new diverse culture*” of hockey. Moreover, he is doing the right thing within the trajectory he has aligned his talk with, which is to participate in the world’s positive change. Continuing to play hockey despite the possibility of facing “*underlying racism*” is right action and talking about it is right talk. Hence racializable incidents for this player are about race, but they do not engulf or overwhelm his experience or

assessment of hockey. Racializable incidents within this trajectory are the result of the future and the past colliding in the present and will decrease as the new takes hold and old ways of being die out.

Different talk on the same topic came from my interview with a subaltern White hockey parent who was in a multiracial family, who I name Tim here. His child was playing hockey but was not yet old enough to play minor hockey, so my conversation with Tim was future-oriented. At one point he volunteered how his spouse, who was Black, felt about their son playing hockey. He said:

Tim: One of [his spouse's] hesitations to let him play hockey is 'cause of what he's gonna face, the racism and that. Uh you know I haven't faced it yet, but then again I miss a lot of things too, I don't face that on a daily basis, I don't know what it is ... I miss stuff, anyway that's uh um something that ... goes against inclusion, and it'll always

Patrick: Yeah, that's interesting and do you have a sense of where [your partner] gets stories [of] racism in hockey?

Tim: Um mostly from news and friends and that but you know her mother's [Caribbean] and her father's [West African], and she grew up in [Atlantic Canada], so when she moved here she was saying that this place is very, very racist and you know she has that experience, even if I don't see it I gotta be aware of that, it's gonna impact my son there's no doubt about it. It's something I'm trying to figure out.

For this interview participant, racializable incidents are a foregone conclusion about which there is “no doubt”. Halifax has racism in it, and its hockey arenas are no exception. Like the earlier mixed-race hockey player, though, playing hockey is still worth the risk of enduring racism. What is specifically interesting about this quotation, though, is the perceived impact of his Black spouse’s ethno-racial subjectivity on his own. It is obvious to him that his son will face racism in hockey not because of his experiences, or his views about society, but rather because of the testimony of his spouse.

Hence for him racism and racist actions, and hence racializable incidents, can be real, even if he does not see them.

Another White parent in a multiracial family was further along in parenting his son through minor hockey, and they had been a part of at least two racializable incidents. He told me about one of them in a suburban Halifax Tim Horton's, where we had this exchange:

Patrick: Yeah. Interesting. Do you think that hockey can help integrate newcomers into Canadian society?

Clyde: It can, it can. You gotta remember [hockey's] an expensive sport [and so] most Canadians that play it are White. All [of] the sudden you bring [in] a different culture, and he's a different colour, my son you know I remember some parent, god he was only eight or nine, some parent on the other end [saying] 'who's that n-word [on the ice]?' (pause) I was just happenin' to be close by and I just strolled down that side and said 'Hey, that [boy you called the] n-word is my son' and this woman beside him she was mad at him. I think she grossed him out, but you always gonna get a little bit of that, 'cause to some people it's not acceptable.

Recall that Rob noted in the context of Black families how racializable incidents could sometimes be directed at a player's parents or otherwise include a whole hockey family. In this story we see how these incidents can include White people being on the receiving end of a racializable incident through their membership in a multiracial family. In fact, this incident was likely made more possible because Clyde is White – it is unlikely the parent who initially spoke would have done so if there had been a Black man in proximity.

There are three other features of this incident to note. First, Clyde easily thinks of this incident from his personal experience. White parents not in multiracial families did not answer this conceptual question of whether hockey can integrate different kinds of people with such personal experiences of a racializable incident. Second, note how Clyde

aligns at least some of his talk with constancy. He feels he and his son will always have to face at least “*a little bit*” of other White people not finding a Black, or Black mixed-race, hockey player to be “*acceptable*”. He does not imagine a future where such incidents will no longer happen, and he does not seem to think there was a past without them either. Third, for Clyde participant this incident was about race. There was no attempt to explain the incident with other rationales – in his view, the speaker in the arena simply did not find Black or Black mixed-race hockey players, as noted before, “*acceptable*”.

Clyde talked about another racializable incident him and his son experienced. I quote our conversation at length:

Patrick: Is there anything more that you think I should really know about hockey, hockey arenas, based on your experiences and your experiences with [your son]?

Clyde: [In some minor hockey associations] you're in the in-crowd, or you're not. I remember one year I challenged [association executives], I think it was first year Peewee, [his son] didn't make competitive. There was eleven goalies, five teams, right? He gets cut. But I thought he did good in the first tryout, you know for goalies, and then he had two shutouts, another kid there he missed a game, and that goes against ya but he makes it. And I questioned that, they said 'he's where he should be'. Well, the House team was happy to have him because he shined, but what I said to [those responsible for team selection] is, 'Why did you knock the Black kid down? This guy missed this and this, and that goes against your rules that you set out, and he makes it, he doesn't. So please let me know that, so at least a week ...show me the documentation of how you scored [these two players]', and they never did to this day.

Patrick: Mmm

Clyde: So I said it's rigged why have the tryouts if you don't follow the rules. And if he did wrong, well let us know where so he can improve to make it for next time. That's why, uh you know that's the negative thing, it's it's clique, it's say it's status where you are

Patrick: And, and you feel then like for [his son's] case in that tryout because they didn't know [his son]there's just a 'wow, he doesn't look like a hockey player' or what- what do you think they're thinking about?

Clyde: Well I don't know what their thinking was 'cause I never got to see the results. And I threw it at them to make them uncomfortable, is it because he's Black that he doesn't make it, that the White kid makes it and he misses a practice, which goes against you[r rules], and he misses a game. How did you, and he wasn't any better than him like, how did you rate that? ...Never got a straight answer.

Patrick: Yep. And was this an in-person meeting?

Clyde: Yep, with the whole organization. How come you dropped the Black? With the director and everything. Then the next year 'wait is [my son] gonna play in goalie next year?' 'Cause they were short getting' short of goalies, 'cause kids as they move up, they wanna play out or you know they just change their mind. He's always stuck with it.

Note the forcefulness with which this parent understands and talks about race in this incident. Aware that association executives will not explicitly say whether race factored into their decision-making, the participant “*threw*” Whiteness and Blackness at the executives. “*The White kid makes it...how come you dropped the Black?*” For this parent, then, this racializable incident is about race. It is a matter of White people and Black people and how the two are treated differently in hockey and hockey arenas.

At that level, this talk is similar to that of Paul, the Anglo-Celtic White Toronto-based player looked at earlier. However, there is a key difference – Clyde sees himself as having responsibility and agency to intervene on behalf of his Black mixed-race son. Whereas for Paul there was a gap between him and his Black teammate he could not bridge, Clyde positions himself as actively advocating for his Black mixed-race son. This different understanding of his agency leads to a different stance and grasp of what the right thing to do is. For Clyde, he ought to be vigilant against racism and willing to stand up for his son by verbally challenging other parents and minor hockey association executives when it seems they are being racist.

The words of Tim and Clyde demonstrate a link between the experiences of sporting families and the textures of Whiteness. Research on youth sports (Dyck 2012; Messner 2009) and hockey in particular (Bean et al. 2016) has established how families, and not just kids, are deeply involved in youth sports, and parents can come to closely identify with their kids' sporting exploits. And it is also clear that mixed-race youth athletes exist, in most cases, in multiracial families. The words of Tim and Clyde show how being White parents of mixed-race kids in hockey greatly affects their ethno-racial subjectivity and experience with and of racializable incidents. Parenting mixed-race kids gives them a perspective that other White parents do not have. Hence, if class and ethnicity are textures of Whiteness, then in a sporting context being in a multiracial family is another texture, and one that demands further study.

Revisiting the “*Kick him out!*” incident

This chapter opened with a vignette of a racializable incident, where a White spectator yelled “*Kick him out!*” at a Black hockey player during the game's first period. A Black mixed-race spectator then hurled profanities at the White man, and the Black player's father confronted the White man in a tense verbal exchange. However, the White man approached the Black parent during the game's third period and the two talked the whole time, at multiple points laughing together. After the game I stood beside the Black player's father and he shared with me that he was frustrated the White parent would yell at his son, but that he appreciated the apology and subsequent conversation. The Black parent summarized the incident as “*how you meet people*”.

Exploring this incident and other, narrated incidents demonstrates that in hockey, as in other multicultural contexts (Wise 2016; Wilson 2011), the meaning of actions is textured, varying between people. In this study specifically, hockey people disagreed about (1) whether or not these incidents are about race and (2) how much White people can and should do in response to them. Whether hockey people understood these incidents to be about race was shaped by what moral trajectory they aligned their talk about these incidents with. Understanding racializable incidents via alignment with constancy renders them inevitable and nondescript – people make comments that cross the line; *it just happens*, a person might say. As in multicultural workplaces (Wise 2016), the proper response would be to bear with it and continue to play the game of hockey anyways. Contrastingly, understanding this incident via alignment with progress would make this incident regrettable and avoidable – therefore, it would be right to be frustrated by this incident. The right thing to do then would be to verbally challenge the man who had yelled “*Kick him out!*” and potentially report his words to league officials.

Interestingly, disagreement about how much agency White people have was not determined by alignment with one’s moral trajectory. Both Paul and Clyde, for example, aligned at least some of their talk with progress. Yet Paul said his Black teammate was “*alone*” in the aftermath of an incident which Paul understood to be racist, while Clyde thought him and other White people had a lot of power to comfort and support Black hockey players, including his Black mixed-race son. This demonstrates that a moral trajectory shapes but does not determine one’s morality and ethics. I will continue to trace this disagreement about agency in chapter 6 and the conclusion.

Responding to my third research question which asked if ethno-racial subjectivity would affect hockey people's moral and ethical talk, there were some correlations between viewpoint about these issues of racial meaning and White agency on the one hand and ethno-racial subjectivity on the other. Black, East Asian, mixed-race, and anyone in multiracial families would be most likely to say this incident was about race and that the man who yelled "*Kick him out!*" was racist, or at least racist in that moment. White, and particularly Subaltern White, people would be less likely to say the incident was about race and that the man had been racist. Moreover, Black, East Asian, and anyone in multiracial families would be most likely to think White people have significant agency and responsibility in combatting racism and engaging racializable incidents in hockey arenas. Contrastingly, White people who are not in multiracial families who believe racializable incidents are about race see themselves as being able to offer little comfort or support to non-White people on the receiving end of a racializable incident.

While the differences between these ethno-racial subjectivities are real, the similar differences among each ethno-racial subjectivity are no less noteworthy. Whether they were Black, East Asian, Anglo-Celtic White, or Subaltern White, people disagreed about whether racializable incidents were instances of racism or not. No ethno-racial subjectivity was a homogenous whole. This is an important corrective to contemporary discourse that reduces issues of race to White and POC perspectives. In terms of White ethno-racial subjectivities in particular, this chapter documents that Anglo-Celtic White, Subaltern White, and White people in multiracial families had different tendencies in terms of how people with those subjectivities understood racializable incidents. This flies

in the face of current discourse that refers to White people as a monolithic category (DiAngelo 2011). Using such coarse language does little to aid understanding of how ethno-racial subjectivity correlates with particular ways of understanding incidents in and beyond hockey where race may be a factor.

Chapter 6: Revisiting “*You People*” and the Cherry Incident

Chapter 3 developed a vocabulary to understand the moral and ethical content of hockey people’s talk. Chapter 4 deployed that vocabulary to understand hockey talk on the topics of fighting and violence. Chapter 5 kept that vocabulary in mind, where appropriate, but focused on how hockey people of different ethno-racial subjectivities understood racializable incidents in hockey. All the incidents featured in that chapter, though, happened on a small scale. In this chapter I build on the previous chapters and analyze hockey people’s talk about Don Cherry’s ill-fated “*you people*” rant in November 2019 that he ended up losing his job for.

Since the introduction described that incident in detail, here I only touch on it as necessary. A cornerstone of hockey player-turned-coach-turned-broadcaster Don Cherry’s on-air personality was a love of Canada’s armed forces (Allain 2015). As a result, he always celebrated Remembrance Day on *Coach’s Corner*, which aired between the first and second periods of the early game on the Saturday-night staple *Hockey Night in Canada (HNIC)*. On Remembrance Day, 2019, *Coach’s Corner* was supposed to end with a pre-recorded video of Cherry visiting a Canadian military cemetery. The episode ended according to plan, but before the video rolled Cherry said this:

I was talkin’ to a veteran, I said “I’m not gonna run the poppy thing anymore because what’s the sense – I live in Mississauga, nobody wears a...poppy, downtown Toronto, forget it! Downtown Toronto, nobody wears a poppy, and I’m not gonna” he says, “Wait a minute! How ‘bout runnin’ it for the people that buy them?” Now you go to the small cities and you know what he... you people love...ya love our way of life, you love our milk and honey, at least you could pay a couple of bucks for...poppies, or something like that! These guys paid for your way of life that you enjoy in Canada, these guys paid the p- the, the biggest price. Anyhow, I’m gonna run it again for you great people, and good Canadians that bought a poppy, I’m still gonna run it, anyhow. - Don Cherry, November 9, 2019, on Coach’s Corner

These are the words that generated the firestorm of moral and ethical talk that led to Don Cherry being fired from his job as commentator at *HNIC*. In keeping with my commitment to produce a textured description of hockey people's moral and ethical talk, my interest is not in the words themselves but in hockey people's evaluation of the words. This also serves to make a unique contribution to the literature on Don Cherry, which focuses on the broadcast itself and not people's engagements with it (Elcombe 2010; Allain 2015; Knowles 1995). The incident took place in November 2019, at which point I was a wandered fool. 80% of my Halifax interviews and less than 20% of interviews in Toronto were already complete. Hence, of the 80 total interviews, the Cherry incident came up in only 15. Because of the relatively small number of interviews, I do not attempt to correlate particular viewpoints with certain ethno-racial subjectivities in this chapter. Among the interview participants who did talk about the incident, two interpretations came up: some understood the racializable incident to be about Cherry's poor choice of words, and others understood the incident to be about Cherry's offensive talk.

A poor choice of words

Three interview participants expressed the view that Don Cherry did wrong only insofar as he chose his words poorly. For example, one mixed-race minor hockey player named Joseph said this when I asked him for his thoughts on Don Cherry's words and their aftermath:

Joseph: I think – I get what he was trying to say, but I think he just said it in the wrong type of words. Like he used the – [not the] right type of words.

Patrick: Yeah. Interesting. Now some people would say that Don Cherry is racist; do you agree with that, disagree?

Joseph: Well, I think he's a nice person, but I think he's maybe just a little racist, but not too much.

Patrick: Yeah, interesting. Were you surprised that he was fired?

Joseph: (With confidence) Yes.

Patrick: Yeah?

Joseph: Very.

For this participant, Cherry was trying to say something good or right, but he used “*the wrong type of words*”. It is not the meaning itself, then, that was problematic for Joseph, but only the kind of words Cherry used. Granted, it is not clear from this quotation what “*type*” of words it was that Cherry used. The participant considers Cherry to be “*a nice person*” and only “*a little bit racist*”, as opposed to being a racist full-stop. This distinguishing work is similar to how Gao distinguished between “*chirping*” and “*actual racism*” in chapter 5.

Vernon, the East Asian hockey coach and former player mentioned earlier, felt similarly to Joseph, but more strongly:

Vernon: I actually was watching that [broadcast where the incident happened]. I don't think [Cherry] meant it in a way to hurt other people, I think what happened was the news showed it and people who weren't even watching the show said 'oh, he said that – that's ridiculous!' and then he started getting onto the networks and 'you gotta fire him because he said this' I don't even think they saw the show, um, to be honest with you I think what he said he didn't mean it in a way they propose that he said it. He was just saying 'you people who come over, get a poppy, support the people who gave this country freedom'. You know so I think if Don Cherry was a lot younger, and he was just starting his career, I don't think they would have fired him, but I think because he's been around for such a long time they wanna try and maybe get a new face in there they're thinking 'let's get rid of him' just because of what he said and whatever people are saying.

In Vernon's view, Cherry was not even being, to use Joseph's phrase, “*a little bit racist*.” For this participant, the problem was not with Cherry's words per se, but with how other people – in his view – twisted the meaning of those words. Whereas Vernon saw Cherry's words as having been about encouraging national pride and support for the

nation's soldiers, people presented Cherry as speaking "*in a way to hurt other people.*" Granted, Vernon did not explicitly blame Cherry for a poor choice of words; however, there was an implication that had Cherry used words less vulnerable to alteration, he may have kept his job.

For one South Asian adult hockey player named Kamal, though, the sentiment that Cherry's fault was poor word choice was much more explicit. I met him for an interview at the eyewear shop he ran – we had this exchange about the Don Cherry incident:

Kamal: The whole thing with Don Cherry I'm not, I don't know what I think about it, I wasn't, I just, I don't think, people were saying 'that's not what he meant to say', or whatever, 'cause that's how he's always spoken, plus he's eighty-something, like he's old. Like I don't think he knows half the times what he's saying. So, I mean whatever, he had to go anyways...he should have retired a long time ago actually, but it is what it is about that. Um, but then, what was the other part of the question?

Patrick: I guess that's it. So for you, some people said 'oh that's not what Don Cherry meant' but you felt like that was just him being who he's always been?

Kamal: (laughs a bit) Yeah, I didn't take it personally, people say worse things [than] that, come on? Like, if you're looking for excuse to fire him, that's a different story (laughs a bit).

Patrick: Mm.

Kamal: But um, it wasn't that bad. And then, I don't know the fine line too which he was trying to get people to buy one of the poppies, that was the main thing, I guess, right? Um, so his message wasn't right, that's all. He just didn't use the right words, and now then in this day and age you have to, that's the thing. So obviously he's a much older school old-school person.

For this participant, the contemporary world is one where using "*the right words*" is of utmost importance. Cherry's failure to keep in-step with the world ended up costing his job. In this quotation, to draw in the vocabulary of morality and ethics used in previous chapters, an alignment with constancy shapes how he understands this

racializable incident. For Kamal, Cherry has always used “*old-school*” language to communicate what could be considered offensive – hence the past, present, and future have looked the same. As others have done, Kamal distinguishes between different levels of problematic talk – since people say “*worse things*” than Cherry’s “*you people*”, for this participant firing Cherry is not a proportionate response. Why fire Cherry now, he seems to wonder, when he was been talking this way for decades as part of his job?

Constancy filters through Kamal’s talk in the steps outlined already. His moral evaluation of this racializable incident is an ambivalent one – he says at the top of this quotation that he doesn’t know what he thinks about this incident. He feels little agency about responding to this incident and has a stance of resignation toward it. Any right action or talk, then, would be inaction or non-talk – not getting over-excited one way or the other.

An offensive speech act

In contrast to the above, five interview participants expressed the view that Don Cherry’s words were offensive, and that they were about race, and to at least some extent, racist. For example, I had this exchange about the Cherry incident with Luke, a Halifax-area adult hockey fan, mentioned earlier:

Patrick: Don Cherry getting fired, what do you think that means, if anything, in terms of this conversation around you know hockey versus basketball, hockey in Canada moving forward?

Luke: I hope it means that hockey learns and grows, I hope it means that hockey finds a way to become more accessible for people, because I genuinely do love hockey and I do think that there’s something beautiful about the hockey community that can be inviting for newcomers, can be something that is so exciting for people to be a part of, like it’s a wild sport, just twists and turns in ways that I don’t know if any other sport really does, like a single goal in hockey

can change a game. In football you have like seven points, um, basketball the scores can feel a bit like ridiculous, soccer if you get a goal that's exciting, right? Like, there's a certain level that hockey is just wicked exciting, and so I really hope hockey can start to look at itself and go 'okay, what are the parts of us that are creating systemic barriers to people? That people can't access it, and you're killing the sport if you try to keep, if we try to just keep going down the same path, what are the ways that we can actually look at it and change the Punjab broadcasts on CBC, wicked, I want more of that. I want more of how can we make this more accessible, how can we make this more exciting for people, how can we make this something that people can really grab hold of and say 'this is my thing too' um' yeah, I really hope that like with Don Cherry, with [other racializable incidents in professional hockey], that we can start saying 'some of this is absolutely appalling, and it's disgusting, and we need to learn, and we need to grow, and we need to honestly start cutting those things out and start finding ways to combat that and to take that down.'

For this participant, Cherry's words are part of a set of talk and action that is "appalling" and "disgusting" and deserves to be removed from the game. While much of the above quotation is not about the Cherry incident *per se*, it shows how alignment with a progress trajectory, and using diversity as an index of progress, helps this participant make sense of Cherry's words. "You people" becomes disgusting when progress is good, diversity measures progress, and diversity has to be actively fostered in order to happen. When those bigger blocks are in place, then words like "you people" are filth, dragging the present away from a better future and toward a worse past. "You people" for this participant performs the opposite function of *HNIC Punjabi*, which has done Punjabi-language hockey broadcasts alongside *HNIC* for over ten years to great success (Szto 2016). Again, such a broadcast comes signifies progress and the future because of the link between progress and diversity.

This is not the only way of expressing the idea that Cherry's words were offensive, though. Paul, whose words I engaged earlier, had this to say:

Patrick: What was your reaction to [the Don Cherry incident and other racializable incidents in professional hockey]?

Paul: Well I mean Cherry's notorious for crossing the line and being very Canadian-centric, to the point of like putting down everybody else, which is – like I've grown up with it, it's been so constant, to the point where you kind of tune it out and disregard it, but for people who are on the other side of that where they might feel like that's an attack on them, you don't tune it out, that's personal. And so it's really upsetting, so, from my standpoint I've always disregard[ed] it but that's 'cause I lived by Hockey Night in Canada, I grew up with all the Rock 'em Sock 'em tapes [of Don Cherry narrating violent hockey plays] like, Don Cherry was the guy, right? I also met him when I was younger, he had my team at the OHL when he owned the Mississauga IceDogs, we stayed in the box, I grew up kind of idolizing him in a sense, he'd be around the rink and that kind of thing. And it's only over time and this wasn't just like as it happened where I like clued in, like over time you start to realize like 'okay, you can't say this stuff' like, it's a little ridiculous, it's kind of inexcusable I guess. Um, I don't think it was the one incident, I think it was like the collection of [incidents], it was just getting old and tired and, offensive, but that's one of the things that doesn't help make families wanna participate in hockey.

Patrick: Yeah.

Paul: Where you have this old White guy who's calling out 'you people' kind of thing, and saying if you're not Canadian you're not good at hockey, or, you shouldn't be playing hockey, or you can't do it like the Canadians that kind of thing, it's not gonna help.

While there are elements of a progress trajectory in this talk, there is also quite a lot of constancy. I noted at the end of chapter 3 that constancy and progress was the most common combination of trajectories with which hockey people align their talk. Paul gives the impression that he used to think of Don Cherry as more of a constant presence in hockey, a figure who simply could not be otherwise. This is constancy talk – the past, present, and future are all the same. However, he more recently has come to believe that Cherry's way of being – including but not exclusive to the “you people” incident – is “kind of inexcusable I guess” and that a person “can't say” the kinds of things Cherry has said. Here, like Rob, and consistent with his own thinking on the racializable incident he observed that as discussed in chapter 5, adopting a progress trajectory gives Paul a place

from which to condemn talk as being unethical or immoral. And as with Luke, some of the moral impetus to condemn Cherry's talk comes from the perception that it will inhibit diversity in hockey.

Note as well how Paul imagines non-White people reacting to Cherry's words. He imagines they would and ought to take Cherry's words "*personally*" and that they would not be able to "*tune out*" Don Cherry as he, a White person, is able to do. Such a view makes sense within the Critical Whiteness studies-inspired framework on ethno-racial subjectivities put forward by DiAngelo (2011) and others, though as I noted in the previous chapter, such a framework is essentializing and problematic. Recall Kamal, a Toronto-area hockey player of South Asian descent, who explicitly stated he did not take Cherry's words personally.

Of course, Kamal does not represent POC, or even South Asians. I had an interview with another person of South Asian descent named Manny. He and his family were lifelong hockey fans, although his kids did not play minor hockey. Much of my interview with him was about the Don Cherry incident – here is part of our exchange:

Manny: Don Cherry, he never apologized. 'I said what I said'...Are we gonna put him in the Order of Canada? Are we gonna put Cherry in the Hockey Hall of Fame? They do that, that sends a message. It will.

Patrick: Yeah.

Manny: You know give it a year or two and 'ahh, he's old and this and that' okay. You know and it was interesting the debates some people said 'well he says 'you people'' all the time, but take it into context, he didn't just say 'you people' he said 'you people live in downtown Toronto, and in Mississauga'. So who's he talkin' about there? Because that's not people in Markham-Stouffville, or in Leamington or in Rosedale, or Forest Hills, is it?

Patrick: No.

Manny: Right? So, you know to Rogers' credit they got rid of him and they took a lot of heat, but I just find that there's been other times too when there's been racist, racism that's happened in hockey, and I've a couple times tweeted at people at Rogers, their on-air personalities, their exec producers, saying 'you guys should be discussing [this] on [Hockey Night in Canada], you guys should be bringing this up, because they are in leadership positions – and besides David Amber, who's responded once, but he's a Black guy, it can't all be on him! Where are the other guys, Elliot Friedman, MacLean, the other [on-air] guys, where are they? I don't hear them sayin' anything. I don't!...When [Don Cherry] made that statement, and it was interesting, it was White friends of mine who flagged it 'cause they found it offensive, and these aren't people who are bleeding-heart Liberals. They're not. They're ordinary Canadians, but they thought it was just offensive, I tweeted something out and I said 'look, [Cherry] should not be up for the Order of Canada', and then that tweet just went viral and media and other people wanted it, and I didn't wanna make it about me, because it was just around Remembrance Day, and I think it was important to think about the veterans; a group of us who were immigrants mostly, fundraised for the Calgary Veterans' Association Foodbank, just earlier that day before all this blew up, and we raised fifteen or twenty grand... I find it interesting [that] the Toronto Sun and Rebel Media all got behind Don Cherry and next thing you know he's on Fox News with Tucker Carlson, who I consider a White nationalist, and what does it tell us that Don Cherry said that Bobby Orr likes Tucker Carlson [who] supports this! For me like after that, I I won't honour Don Cherry...again.

Patrick: Mm.

Manny: I won't do it, 'cause this is what they really think of 'us',...[as well] I think the producers on air, I've talked to friends of mine who work in broadcasting [and] when you've got someone talking to you on a hot mic, or earpiece it's fast, right? So you've probably got a producer yelling at your ear like 'take it, wrap it up, wrap it up we gotta go to air' so maybe he, or they didn't say anything, but then what I understand was that broadcast which was live, there were two then repeats after that they didn't edit and the CBC or hock- you know Rogers-Sportsnet rather, CBC's not responsible here. Rogers Sportsnet ran it – um, what were the producers doin'?

Patrick: Mm.

Manny: Right? And it was only when it created a big shit storm that they moved, I think Rogers were in a difficult position, but I also think what happened was that from my understanding like even major uh advertisers like Scotiabank and Budweiser came down on them and said 'this ain't gonna work' right? Labatt's was like 'this is dumb,' he's out. From what I understand, they even gave [Cherry] a window to apologize and he refused. But they knew that – that's Don. He's not apologizing.

Patrick: Yeah.

Manny: That's what you're getting, you knew this when you took him on board...you know my question is quite frankly, besides David Amber, how many people of colour do you have working there? Not just on air, producers, editors, cameraman, you know uh other people. I mean they did do this thing with Hockey Night in Canada Punjabi which is, I don't know how it's doing, so there's opportunity there but unless people in the leadership of the game in my view [such as] broadcasters, and the media, make an attempt to make this a priority, I don't think it's gonna change much.

First, in this participant's view, Don Cherry's words were about race and were offensive – they were words all Canadians ought to see as offensive. While Cherry did not use words like “White”, “Black”, or “immigrant”, for this participant the fact that Cherry singled out “downtown Toronto” and “Mississauga” speaks volumes. The demographics of these locations meant Cherry was singling out newcomers to Canada and non-White people. This participant, who was a second-generation immigrant and a person of South Asian descent, felt that from Cherry's words he learned how Cherry thought of him and other people like him.

Race figured prominently not just in Manny's assessment of Cherry's words, but also in people's responses to it. Manny highlighted that “White” and “ordinary” “Canadians” found Cherry's words to be offensive and spoke up to that effect on social media. He called on White sports broadcasters to follow that lead and speak up about Cherry's words and similar racializable incidents. It is important to Manny that the burden for inciting change rested not solely on the shoulders of POC such as himself and hockey broadcasters of colour such as David Amber, a Black NHL alumni and on-air hockey analyst.

Some people who found Cherry's words to be offensive found it so not just for the words, but for their potential effect on the social climate of hockey arenas. After my interview with Manny, for example, he welcomed me into his home. I accepted, and chatted with him and his spouse. His spouse mentioned that their son had recently played hockey in a charity tournament.

Though he wasn't very good at skating, she said the kids were kind to him and the parents were nice as well. She added that she wasn't sure what the social climate would be like because the Don Cherry incident had just taken place. Thinking back to how diversity is an index of progress within that trajectory, the offensiveness of Don Cherry's words becomes clearer. For Manny, anything that makes hockey arenas less likely to be diverse and welcoming spaces would be wrong, and to have it come from *HNIC* adds insult to injury.

This dynamic of Cherry's words shifting the climate of hockey arenas was not merely potential, though. I interviewed one White, hijab-wearing hockey parent in a multiracial family. We had a lengthy conversation about the Don Cherry incident. It came up organically, when I asked her whether she had ever felt uncomfortable in a hockey arena. She replied, "Uhhh, yeah. Yeah. Yeah." And the following conversation ensued:

Jen: I stand out a little bit because [there's] not a lot of observant or visual Muslim women in competitive hockey. I actually had an incident where I was assaulted not too long ago, I didn't get hurt but definitely I reported it to the GTHL and to the police...

Patrick: Yeah

Jen: I had it on video, so. Especially when that Don Cherry thing was happening, a lot of White people couldn't see, because they've never experienced it, so they don't understand [how] detrimental his words were. So, you know, I love watching Don Cherry as an entertainer, he's a hockey commentator, right, and so that they then had to specifically target two cities with the highest population of immigrants, at least Mississauga's one of them, Toronto is for sure, when the discussion got brought up I said that there was definitely a racial undertone to what he was saying, there absolutely was, and people couldn't believe I said that. They were so mad because they didn't want him to get fired. They didn't want to lose him as an entertainer, but they couldn't acknowledge that what he was saying had a racial undertone. And I was like 'how can you not, I said go rewatch what he said', I mean I saw it live, but as he was saying it, I'm like 'are you serious?' and then as I watched the replays of it I was like 'Geez', ...you know? 'Cause as he said you know this is not anybody's land, this belongs to natives, it doesn't belong to White people,

Patrick: Yeah.

Jen: Like let's not even include the fact that many Indians and Africans and Natives were used in those wars to fight, with no rights whatsoever, I mean you wanna talk about just Canadian soldiers and then, White ones, fighting with rights? He doesn't know, I don't even think Don Cherry understands his racial undertone. Maybe he does, but he's too stubborn, you know? But...the fact that he doesn't ...[it] wasn't just 'you people', it was what he said after.

Patrick: Yeah, interesting, and you said you enjoyed Don Cherry as an entertainer?

Jen: (strongly, but with mixed or complicated emotions) I do, I like his energy, I grew up watching him so maybe it's more of a euphoric thing because I work Saturdays, I get off work at 7, ...and we watch hockey, 'cause I'm tired. And I've [s]een Don Cherry since as long as I can remember, right? I'm forty, I'm gonna be forty-two, so you know I've been watching him so I'm disappointed in him that he didn't wanna acknowledge his own perception, I'm disappointed in that. 'Cause people need to be aware, you know what I mean, White people don't understand their own White privilege...

In Jen's talk there are many of the same elements as were in Clyde's talk about the racializable incidents he and his son experienced. Clearly being a mother of mixed-race children and being in a multiracial family has significantly altered Jen's ethno-racial subjectivity. There is another layer to her experiences, though, and one not shared by previous participants – her (gendered) religious subjectivity. She noted that there are not many women wearing religious headgear in hockey arenas – which I can confirm from observations – and that in having dressed as she does, she lost her White privilege. This is yet another texture of Whiteness that ought not to be discounted in analysis.

Like Clyde and Manny, Jen considered the Don Cherry incident and people's responses to it to be about race. Again, Don Cherry choosing to single out the communities he did indicates that there was at least a “*racial undertone*” to his words. In Jen's view, his words were that of a White man singling out non-White people. Cherry's

words reflected a “*White privilege*” that was then reflected as well in how other hockey people talked about Cherry’s words.

Both Manny’s and Jen’s talk aligned with progress to a certain degree. As with Rob and Paul, from an alignment with progress, Manny and Jen were able to condemn Cherry’s words on moral grounds. They thought that such words were worth condemning and ought to be condemned from within this progress trajectory. Hence inducting Don Cherry into the Order of Canada or the Hockey Hall of Fame would be morally wrong – it would bring the worse past into the future, which is supposed to be better. Allowing fellow parents in a hockey arena to complain about Cherry’s firing, without pointing out how Cherry’s words were about race, would also be wrong. Both Manny and Jen saw themselves as having agency and responsibility to respond rightly here. Moreover, both thought that White people specifically have an agency and a responsibility to perceive this incident correctly and act against it in the right way. Personally adopting this active stance, a stance eager to bring the better future into the present, Manny was active both on social media and in volunteer work supporting veterans. Jen challenged people in conversation to rewatch Cherry’s words and see how they were, at least in part, about race.

Textures of a national incident

Drawing these words about the racializable incident that ended Don Cherry’s career together, it is fascinating to see people draw conclusions that are opposite to each other and yet obvious to each. *Don Cherry’s words had an element of racism – no, his words were obviously not racist.* Moreover, people’s claims about the relationship between ethno-racial subjectivity and understanding of Cherry’s words did not line up at all. POC such as Kamal and Vernon, for example, thought Cherry’s words were not that offensive and potentially not even about race.

Manny spoke as though a lack of POC in hockey broadcasting and media was partly to blame for such offensive words being aired on national television.

This contradicting body of material offers three lessons. First, among hockey people there are significant contests over the meaning of action. This is certainly true for racializable incidents – talk or action whose meaning could be racial. Findings from this chapter signal the importance of studying how people react to and engage with media discourse. The literature on Don Cherry (Allain 2015; Elcombe 2010; Knowles 1995) would benefit from more of this kind of study.

Second, and also in keeping with the previous chapter's finding that nostalgia was a less popular moral trajectory than either constancy or progress, the hockey people I spoke with did not align their talk about the Don Cherry incident with nostalgia. This is especially interesting given that nostalgia is said to be a cornerstone of Cherry's discourse (Allain 2015). In terms of moral trajectories, the friction I found was not between nostalgia and progress, but rather between constancy and progress.

Third and finally, a simplistic reading of ethno-racial subjectivity onto this situation is simply false, and therefore unhelpful for analysis or engagement. Not all non-White people were offended by Cherry's words, and not all White people were disappointed that Cherry was fired. Moreover, the very boundaries of Whiteness deserve critical thinking as White people in multiracial families, for example, interpret this and other racializable incidents differently.

Chapter 7: Conclusion - Textured Insights, Normative Reflections from Hockey

Talk

This thesis began with the simple observation that hockey in Canada is not just a game, but rather something to talk about. That hockey talk contains morality and ethics – evaluations of past, present, and possible realities. A brief tour of hockey history showed that the moral and ethical content of hockey talk is shaped by forces and powers in the world larger than just hockey. Applying that principle to the present, it seemed reasonable that hockey and hockey talk were in flux, due to Canada’s changing demographics and shifting consciousness around long-standing issues such as violence and race-based discrimination. My own multi-layered subjectivity toward hockey, the inclusion of data from both Halifax and Toronto, and the ethno-racial diversity of research participants all underscored the need for research questions and a methodology that would do justice to the material under consideration. *Flux, change, diversity* – I lingered over how to conduct this study. In the end a sequence of normative concerns, thick description, and textured description undergirded three research questions about (1) how hockey people do their talk, (2) what they disagree about, and (3) whether their conflicting viewpoints correlate with ethno-racial subjectivities.

I began to answer the first research question by noting that talk can be aligned with a moral trajectory. A trajectory is a purported shape of reality, a moralistic organization of change across time. Hockey people used the trajectories of nostalgia, constancy, and progress in their talk, ordered from least to most popular. A moral trajectory by its nature helps to configure both change and time. Hockey people aligned their talk with nostalgia to say that there was a change from the past to the present.

Having furnished a particular way of understanding change and time, a moral trajectory also guides a person toward a moral evaluation of reality. For example, hockey people might say that hockey arenas used to be more fun places to be than they are now – a negative change from past to present. With a certain self-perceived amount of agency, a person then has a stance toward the world. Continuing the example, the hockey people I spoke with who had this view of hockey arenas saw themselves as having enough agency to talk about life in old hockey rinks so the memories would last. They also understood themselves to have the agency to play and create (usually outdoor) space for hockey that retains elements of older, more-fun hockey.

While trajectory – which involves change, time, and moral evaluation – agency, stance, right talk, and action may feel obvious to particular hockey people, it is not obvious which trajectory they align their talk with on certain occasions. Reality is more textured than a model of three parallel moral or ethical tracks would suggest. Hockey people aligned their talk with multiple trajectories – constancy and progress was the most common simultaneous pairing, as it made for a measured optimism about, for example, the place of violence in hockey. Hockey people also aligned different parts of their talk with different trajectories – some hockey parents were nostalgic about their childhood experiences with the game, but still anticipated a better future for their children’s engagement with hockey.

Meanwhile, answering the second research question about hockey people’s disagreements led first to an analysis of talk about violent action, including aggressive body-checking, fights, and brawls in and around hockey. People reached evaluative talk and action regarding these violent acts using the elements identified above – trajectory,

agency, and stance – but their viewpoints differed. For some, violence was a proud tradition that was at risk of being lost. For others, it was perennial and inevitable, a feature of human, and masculine, nature. Violence was a barrier to progress for others, though, something that hockey could and should distance itself from. In each case, hockey people used hockey’s past to evaluate its’ present and depict its’ future.

Besides violence – and sometimes in conjunction with it – hockey people disagreed about the meaning of acts where racialization could play a part. I came to refer to these as racializable incidents. The paradigmatic example came from a game I observed, where a White hockey spectator yelled “*Kick him out!*” at a Black hockey player entering the penalty box. According to different hockey people there could be nothing racist about this incident, or it could be a fundamentally racist incident; the right response could be post-game, bureaucratic intervention, social intervention on behalf of the Black player, a combination, or a different response. Likewise, the words that got Don Cherry fired were understood by some as a poor choice of words and by others as an offensive speech act.

To address the third and final research question, different viewpoints did have soft correlations with ethno-racial subjectivities. Chapter 3 noted that White people, and particularly those of non-Anglo-Celtic origins, were most likely to align their talk with nostalgia as well as constancy. POC, White non-Anglo-Celtic, and members of multiracial families were the hockey people most likely to align their talk with progress. In terms of racializable incidents in particular, Black people were most likely to consider racializable incidents as racist incidents, and were mostly likely to see White people as having the responsibility to intervene in these incidents. White people of non-Anglo-

Celtic origins were least likely to comment on racializable incidents, and least likely to see them as being about race. However, no ethno-racial subjectivity had uniform viewpoints – differences between them must be understood, therefore, alongside the differences within them.

The “*Kick him out!*” incident, the Don Cherry incident, and others are poignant moments from my fieldwork. Such incidents are not confined to the past or to hockey, though - national and international racializable incidents have occurred since the conclusion of my fieldwork, including police brutality against Blacks (Clipperton 2020) and other POC (Nasser 2020) individuals as well as the use of the ‘n’ word on university campuses (Pfeffer 2020). These incidents demonstrate the persistent existence of racializable incidents in diverse and stressed populations without consensus on the meaning of actions. Therefore, I ask *what can we learn from hockey people, their talk, and my positioned engagement with them about living in a world of incidents, particularly racializable ones?*

First, individuals and collectives ought to use nostalgia, constancy, and progress to navigate a world with incidents. Like a three-cord rope (see Ecclesiastes 4:12), these trajectories can bear the weight of human hope and effort more than any trajectory in isolation. This is something Christianity does well. There is a nostalgic longing for Eden, an emphasis on the constancy of sin and brokenness in a fallen world, and an understanding that the world is progressing, however bumpily, toward a new Eden. As individuals and collectives, we need wisdom to align our talk with the right trajectory at the right time. Progress can cast vision, nostalgia can muster strength – constancy is perhaps less remarked-upon, but I think at least as important as the others.

On these grounds I would fault, for example, the NHL's recent anti-racism campaign. To give some background, after pausing for several months due to the pandemic, the NHL finished its playoffs from August to October 2020 (Morris 2020). During the summer of 2020, issues of racial injustice soared in public consciousness, first in the US and then elsewhere. Attempting to engage these issues and articulate a responsive message, the NHL put forward a tagline of "*End racism*" (Clipperton 2020). Such a slogan was all progress and no constancy or nostalgia.

While this may seem like the only option, it is not so. Price (2018) notes how nostalgia can be used for politically progressive purposes, if it is used to recapture past dreams of better futures. Nostalgia could be used to celebrate the Coloured Hockey League that operated in Atlantic Canada during the first several decades of the twentieth century, for example (Fosty and Fosty 2008). Moreover, alignment with a constancy frame is an important act of humility that would build long-term commitment to a better world over short-term, progress-oriented, energetic outbursts. August 2020 was not, after all, racial justice's first moment in hockey – the Coloured Hockey League faced racism in its day (Fosty and Fosty 2008) and Herb Carnegie faced racism when breaking into the NHL (Harris 2003). More recent players such as Jarome Iginla, PK Subban, Ryan Reaves, Akim Aliu and others stand within this line of Black hockey players – their struggles are multi-generational. Aligning some of our talk with constancy allows us to keep our heroes and our history in mind. Constancy here does not negate progress, but rather points out the persistency of problems. Humans at any scale do not outgrow the possibility of oppressing each other.

People and collectives in and beyond hockey can learn to use multiple trajectories to navigate a world of incidents not just from Christianity, mentioned earlier, but also from six interview participants. Tim, Mark, Jeff, Kamal, Jon, and Jen all aligned their talk with nostalgia, constancy, and progress at different points of their interview. Tim (Subaltern) and Jen (Anglo-Celtic), as a refresher, were White hockey parents in multiracial families. They talked nostalgically about their early hockey memories, talked within a constancy trajectory about the reality of racism, and talked within a progress trajectory in describing both desire and action for better hockey and a better world. Other individuals and organizations can learn from these two, as well as the other four, that nostalgia, constancy, and progress all capture parts of the world worth describing. Each has a role to play in helping us look backward at better times, appreciate that no incident is novel, and maintain hope that affairs can improve.

There is another lesson from these six interview participants. Tim and Jen's ethno-racial subjectivities were mentioned already – besides them Mark, Jeff, and Jon are Subaltern White while Kamal is a POC of South Asian origin. Hence a person's alignment with all three trajectories at different points of their talk cannot be inferred from their ethno-racial subjectivity. This builds upon a point made in chapter 5, where there were differences in viewpoint between and within ethno-racial subjectivities. Therefore, viewpoint cannot be inferred from ethno-racial subjectivity.

This simple point deserves emphasis because of the tendency to correlate viewpoint on an incident and ethno-racial subjectivity. Such notions – where homogenous White, or Black, or South Asian, or another ethno-racial group are said to think a certain way about a certain topic – are increasingly common discourses around

incidents. Such discourse inflames the incident itself, rather than diffuse it, let alone bring about restoration.

Rather than essentialize how members of an ethno-racial group think about incidents, it is better to receive a lesson both from the holy fools of ancient Christianity and from the literature on everyday multiculturalism (see especially Wilson 2011) – *humility*. By adopting a stance of humility, hockey – and other – people can resolve conflicting meanings of action, rather than inflame incidents. Like the Black parent and White spectator involved in the “*Kick him out!*” incident, earnest conversation between the parties involved can keep incidents from escalating. When incidents escalate anyways, as in the case of the Don Cherry incident, adopting a stance of humility allows us to see the texture of interpretation at play, find common ground, and learn from one another.

One lesson that hockey people – particularly White hockey people who are not in multiracial families – can learn from hockey people of other ethno-racial subjectivities is that *White hockey people have agency to act in regard to incidents*. This emerged as a nub of disagreement in chapter 5 – if a Black player on an all-White hockey team experiences a racializable incident, then is there anything White teammates can do for him? White people in multiracial families, as well as POC, seem far more likely to answer ‘yes’ than other White people. In wanting – I think – to respect the reality of ethno-racial difference, White hockey people may feel they are of no use to POC experiencing incidents in hockey. But White people have agency, and therefore responsibility, to re-shape hockey culture to address and respond to incidents. They may not have more agency than others in this regard, but they do not have less, either.

White hockey people – all hockey people – do shape how people within the game responds to incidents, racializable or otherwise. Therefore there is a responsibility to be shaping the game consciously and for the better. In this – and as my closing normative insight – my suggestion is to be radically inclusive. In the wake of incidents, calling people *in* to change is better than and at least ought to follow from calling people *out* to pay for their weaknesses and failings.

Such work is difficult, no doubt. Incidents are difficult, particularly because they so often seem inequitably difficult. One person's casual remark can be another's searing rejection. Regardless of whether we look back fondly on the past, or work meaningfully for a better future, or both, for as long as we humans are here, we are going to have to deal with weaknesses, failings, and mistakes. Sin, we might say. And for as long as there is sin, we are going to need to find grace in order for hockey, or anything else that is shared and good in this world, to continue.

Bibliography

- Abdel-Shehid, Gamal. 2000. "Writing Hockey Thru Race: Rethinking Black Hockey in Canada." In *Rude: Contemporary Black Canadian Cultural Criticism*, edited by Rinaldo Wilcott. London, Ontario: Insomniac Press.
- Abdel-Shehid, Gamal. 2005. *Who Da Man? Black Masculinities and Sporting Cultures*. Toronto, Ontario: Canadian Scholars' Press.
- Abu-Lughod, Lila. 2015. *Do Muslim Women Need Saving?* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Adams, Carly, and Stacey Leavitt. 2018. "'It's Just Girls' Hockey': Troubling Progress Narratives in Girls' and Women's Sport." *International Review for the Sociology of Sport* 53 (2):152–172.
- Allain, Kristi A. 2014. "What Happens in the Room Stays in the Room': Conducting Research with Young Men in the Canadian Hockey League." *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health* 6 (2): 205-219.
- —. 2015. "'A Good Canadian Boy': Crisis Masculinity, Canadian National Identity, and Nostalgic Longings in Don Cherry's Coach's Corner." *International Journal of Canadian Studies* 52: 107-132.
- —. 2019. "Hegemony Contests: Challenging the Notion of a Singular Canadian Hockey Nationalism." *American Review of Canadian Studies* 49 (4): 511–529.
- Anzaldúa, Gloria. 2012. *Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza*. Fourth Edition. San Francisco, California: Aunt Lute Books.
- Ari, Esra. 2019. "Centering the White Gaze: Identity Construction among Second-Generation Jamaicans and Portuguese." *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 51 (2): 61–86.
- Arnesen, Eric. 2001. "Whiteness and the Historians Imagination." *International Labor and Working-Class History* 60: 3–32.
- Arnold, Dean. 2006. "Why Are There So Few Christian Anthropologists? Reflections on the Tensions between Christianity and Anthropology". *Perspectives on Science and Christian Faith* 58 (4): 266-282.
- Archetti, Eduardo P. 1999. *Masculinities: Football, Polo, and the Tango in Argentina*. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Asad, Talal. 1993. *Genealogies of religion: Discipline and Reasons of Power in Christianity and Islam*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

- Aspinall, Peter and Miri Song. 2013. *Mixed Race Identities*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Azoy, Whitney. 2003. *Buzkashi: Game and Power in Afghanistan*. Second edition. Prospect Heights, Illinois: Waveland Press.
- Barrett, James R., and David Roediger. 1997. "Inbetween Peoples: Race, Nationality and the 'New Immigrant' Working Class." *Journal of American Ethnic History* 16 (3): 3–44.
- Barth, Frederick, ed. 1969. *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Culture Difference*. Long Grove, Illinois: Waveland Press.
- —. 1993. *Balinese Worlds*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- —. 2007. "Sixty Years in Anthropology." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 36 (1): 1-16.
- Bean, Corliss, Jeffery-Tosoni, Sarah, Baker, Joe, and Jessica Fraser-Thomas. 2016. "Negative Parental Behaviour in Canadian Youth Hockey: Expert Insiders' Perceptions and Recommendations." *PHEnex Journal = Revue PhénEPS*, 7 (3): 1-20.
- Bear, Laura. 2014. "Doubt, Conflict, Mediation: The Anthropology of Modern Time." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 20 (Supplement 1): 3–30.
- —. 2016. "Time as Technique." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 45 (1): 487–502.
- Beldo, Les. 2014. "The Unconditional 'Ought': A Theoretical Model for the Anthropology of Morality." *Anthropological Theory* 14 (3): 263–279.
- Benjamin, Walter. 1969. *Illuminations*. New York: Schocken Books.
- Berger, Peter L. 1967. *The Sacred Canopy: Elements of a Sociological Theory of Religion*. 1st edition. New York: Doubleday.
- Besnier, Niko, Brownell, Susa, and Thomas Carter. *The anthropology of sport: bodies, borders, biopolitics*. Berkeley, California: University of California Press.
- Bharti, Bianca. 2019. "Complaints about Don Cherry's 'you people' remark overwhelm broadcast standards body." *National Post*, November 11, 2019.
<https://nationalpost.com/news/canada/don-cherry-hnic-you-people-hockey-coachs-corner>
- Boltanski, Luc, and Thévenot, Laurent. 2006. *On Justification: Economies of Worth*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 2018. *Racism without Racists: Color-Blind Racism and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in America*. Fifth edition. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield.

- Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo, Lewis, Amanda, and David G Embrick. 2004. ““I Did Not Get That Job Because of a Black Man...”: The Story Lines and Testimonies of Color-Blind Racism.” *Sociological Forum* 19 (4): 555-581.
- Bondy, Patrick and Howard Ramos. Forthcoming. “Arenas of Solitude: Social Forms and Textures of Togetherness in Hockey.” *Journal of Canadian Studies*.
- Brodkin, Karen. 1998. *How Jews Became White Folks and What That Says about Race in America*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.
- Broerse, Jora and Ramón Spaaij. 2019. “Co-Ethnic in Private, Multicultural in Public: Group-Making Practices and Normative Multiculturalism in a Community Sports Club.” *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 40 (4): 417-433.
- Brownell, Susan. 1995. *Training the Body for China: Sports in the Moral Order of the People's Republic*. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press.
- Brubaker, Rogers. 2006. *Ethnicity without Groups*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Campion, Karis. 2019. ““You Think You're Black?” Exploring Black Mixed-Race Experiences of Black Rejection.” *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 42 (16): 196–213.
- CBC News. 2019. “Mi’kmaq hockey player returns to ice after racist taunts.” *CBC News*, December 15, 2019. <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/nova-scotia/logan-prosper-returns-to-the-ice-1.5397093>
- —. 2020. “Oilers’ AHLer Brandon Manning suspended 5 games for using racial slur.” *CBC News*, January 21, 2020. <https://www.cbc.ca/sports/hockey/nhl/brandon-manning-suspension-racial-slur-ahl-1.5435222>
- Chakrabarty, Dipesh. 2000. *Provincializing Europe Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- City of Toronto. No date. “The Modern Metropolis, from 1951”. City of Toronto. <https://www.toronto.ca/explore-enjoy/history-art-culture/museums/virtual-exhibits/history-of-toronto/the-modern-metropolis-from-1951/>
- Clipperton, Joshua. 2020. “NHL postpones remainder of weekday games in support of protests against police shootings.” *CBC News*, August 27, 2020. <https://www.cbc.ca/sports/hockey/nhl/nhl-season-bubble-1.5764228>
- Clifford, James, and George Marcus. *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. 25th Anniversary Edition. Berkeley, California: University of California Press.

- Cohen, Anthony. 2000. *Signifying identities: Anthropological perspectives on boundaries and contested values*. New York: Routledge.
- Colburn, Kenneth. 1985. "Honor, Ritual and Violence in Ice Hockey." *The Canadian Journal of Sociology / Cahiers Canadiens De Sociologie* 10 (2): 153–170.
- Collings, Peter, and Richard G. Condon. 1996. "Blood on the Ice: Status, Self-Esteem, and Ritual Injury among Inuit Hockey Players." *Human Organization* 55 (3): 253–262.
- Coleman, Simon, and Tamara Kohn. 2007. *The discipline of leisure: Embodying cultures of 'recreation'*. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Côté, Isabelle. 2017. "A Culture of Entitlement, Silence and Protection: The Case of the University of Ottawa's Men's Hockey Team." *Canadian Woman Studies* 32 (1/2): 99–110.
- Da Silva, Emanuel, Perrino, Sabera, Koven, Michèle, Jaffe, Alexandra, Vigoroux, Cécile B. 2015. "Humor (re)positioning ethnolinguistic ideologies: "You tink is funny?"" *Language in Society* 44 (2): 187-212.
- Dan-Cohen, Talia. 2019. "Writing Thin." *Anthropological Quarterly* 92 (3): 903-917.
- DiAngelo, Robin. 2011. "White Fragility". *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy* 3 (3): 54-70.
- Dixon, Nicholas. 2007. "Trash Talking, Respect for Opponents and Good Competition." *Sport, Ethics and Philosophy* 1 (1): 96–106.
- Domi, Tai. 2015. *Shift Work*. Toronto, Ontario: Simon & Schuster.
- Douglas, Mary. 2002. *Purity and Danger: An analysis of concept of pollution and taboo*. Routledge Classics. New York: Routledge.
- Du Bois, W. E. B. 1996. *The Souls of Black Folk*. New York: Modern Library.
- Durkheim, Emile. 1995. *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life*. Translated by Karen E Fields. New York: Free Press.
- Dyck, Noel. 2012. *Fields of Play: An Ethnography of Children's Sports*. Teaching Culture. North York, Ontario: University of Toronto Press.
- Dyring, Rasmus. 2018. "From Moral Facts to Human Finitude: On the Problem of Freedom in the Anthropology of Ethics." *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 8 (1-2): 223–235.
- Edel, May M, and Abraham Edel. 1968. *Anthropology and ethics; the quest for moral understanding*. Cleveland, Ohio: Case Western Reserve University Press.

- Elcombe, Tim. 2010. "The Moral Equivalent of 'Don Cherry.'" *Journal of Canadian Studies* 44 (2): 194–218.
- Ellison, Jenny, and Jennifer Anderson. 2018. *Hockey: Challenging Canada's Game, Au-delà Du Sport National*. Gatineau, Québec: University of Ottawa Press.
- Engelke, Matthew. 2002. "The Problem of Belief: Evans-Pritchard and Victor Turner on 'The Inner Life'." *Anthropology Today* 18 (6): 3-8.
- Fabian, Johannes. 1983. *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Object*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Fitzgerald, Sean. 2019. *Before the Lights Go Out: A Season Inside a Game on the Brink*. Toronto: McLellan and Stewart.
- Faubion, James D. 2001. "Toward an Anthropology of Ethics: Foucault and the Pedagogies of Autopoiesis." *Representations* 74 (1): 83–104.
- Feezell, Randolph. 2008. "Vulgarians of the World Unite: Sport, Dirty Language, and Ethics." *Journal of the Philosophy of Sport* 35 (1): 17–42.
- Fosty, George Robert, and Darril Fosty. 2008. *Black Ice: The Lost History of the Colored Hockey League of the Maritimes, 1895-1925*. New York: Stryker-Indigo Publishing.
- French, Briggittine M. 2012. "The Semiotics of Collective Memories." *Annual Review of Anthropology* vol. 41 (1): 337–353.
- Garner, Steve. 2007. "ATLANTIC CROSSING: Whiteness as a Transatlantic Experience." *Atlantic Studies: The French Atlantic* 4 (1): 117–132.
- Geertz, Clifford. 1973. *The Interpretation of Cultures Selected Essays*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gell, Alfred. *The Anthropology of Time: Cultural Constructions of Temporal Maps and Images*. Oxford: Berg Publishing, 1992.
- Gellner, Ernest. *Language and solitude: Wittgenstein, Malinowski, and the Habsburg dilemma*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Gidén, Carl, Houda, Patrick, and Jean-Patrice Martel. 2014. *On the Origin of Hockey*. Chambly, Québec: Hockey Origin Publishing.
- Gilroy, Paul. 1993. *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

- Goffman, Erving. 1974. *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Goldstein, Donna M., and Kira Hall. 2017. "Postelection Surrealism and Nostalgic Racism in the Hands of Donald Trump." *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 7 (1): 397–406.
- Gosse, Meghan, Howard Ramos, Martha Radice, Jill L. Grant, and Paul Pritchard. 2016. "What Affects Perceptions of Neighbourhood Change?" *Canadian Geographer / Le Géographe Canadien* 60 (4): 530-40.
- Grant, Jill and Karin Kronstal. 2011. "The Challenges of Integrating Newcomers: the Halifax Case." *Atlantic Metropolis Centre ~ Working Paper Series Centre.*
- Hall, Stuart. 1978. *Policing the Crisis: Mugging, the State, and Law and Order*. Basingstoke, UK: Macmillan Publishers.
- Hallinan, Christopher and March Krotee. 1993. "Conceptions of Nationalism and Citizenship Among Non-Anglo-Celtic Soccer Clubs in an Australian City." *Journal of sport and social issues* 17 (2): 125-133.
- Haraway, Donna. 1988. "Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privelege of Partial Perspective." *Feminist studies* 14 (3): 575-599.
- —. 2016. *Staying with the Trouble: Making Kin in the Chthulucene*. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press.
- Harris, Anita. 2013. *Young People and Everyday Multiculturalism*. New York: Routledge.
- Harris, Cecil. 2003. *Breaking the Ice: the Black Experience in Professional Hockey*. London, Ontario: Insomniac Press.
- Hartlep, Nicholas D and Bradley J Porfolio. 2015. *Killing the Model Minority Stereotype: Asian American Counterstories and Complicity*. Charlotte, North Carolina: Information Age Publishing.
- Hartmann, Douglas. 2016. *Midnight Basketball: Race, Sports, and Neoliberal Social Policy*. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press.
- Heo, Angie, Kormina, Jeanne, Rogers, Douglas, Keane, Webb, Naumescu, Vlad, Wanner, Catherine, Ghodsee, Kristen, and Shevzov, Vera. 2020. "Unfinished Conversations: A Tribute to Sonja Luehrmann (1975-2019)." *History and Anthropology* 31 (2): 165-196.
- Hirschkind, Charles. *The ethical soundscape: cassette sermons and Islamic counterpublics*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2006.

- Hobsbawm, Eric J, and Terence Ranger. 1983. *The Invention of tradition*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hockey Ministries International. 2018. "an interview with Jarome Iginla." *Hockey Ministries International*, May 14, 2018. <https://www.hockeyministries.org/home-ice/blog/an-interview-with-jarome-iginla/>
- Howell, Brian. 2007. "The repugnant cultural other speaks back: Christian identity as ethnographic standpoint." *Anthropological Theory* 7 (4): 371-391.
- Howell, Signe, ed. 1997. *The Ethnography of Moralities*. New York: Routledge.
- Hughes, Robert and Jay Coakley. 1991. "Positive Deviance among Athletes: the Implications of Overconformity to the Sport Ethic." *Sociology of sport journal* 8 (4): 307-325.
- Humphrey, Caroline. 1997. "Exemplars and rules: aspects of the discourse of moralities in Mongolia." In *The Ethnography of Moralities*, edited by Signe Howell, 25-48. New York: Routledge.
- Ignatiev, Noel. 1995. *How the Irish Became White*. New York: Routledge.
- Ivanov, Sergey A. 2006. *Holy Fools in Byzantium and Beyond*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jackson, John L. 2013. *Thin Description: Ethnography and the African Hebrew Israelites of Jerusalem*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- James, Carl. 2005. *Race in Play: Understanding the Socio-Cultural Worlds of Student Athletes*. Toronto, Ontario: Canadian Scholars' Press.
- —. 2010. *Seeing Ourselves: Exploring Race, Ethnicity and Culture*. Fourth edition. Toronto, Ontario: Thompson Educational Publishing.
- James, Cyril L. 1963. *Beyond a Boundary*. London: Hutchinson.
- Jenkins, Richard. 2008. *Rethinking ethnicity*. Second edition. Newbury Park, California: SAGE Publications.
- Johnson, Christopher DL. 2014. "Base, but Nevertheless Holy: Lessons in Liminality from Symeon the Holy Fool." *Studies in Religion* 43 (4): 592-612.
- Jorgensen, Dan. "Kenelm O. L. Burridge (1922-201)." *American Anthropologist* 122 (4): 984-987.
- Joseph, Janelle. 2012. "The Practice of Capoeira: Diasporic Black Culture in Canada." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 35 (6): 1078-1095.

- Joseph-Salisbury, Remi. 2020. *Black Mixed-Race Men: Transatlanticity, Hybridity and 'Post-Racial' Resilience*. Bradford, UK: Emerald Publishing Limited.
- Kaida, Lisa and Peter Kitchen. 2020. "It's cold and there's something to do: The changing geography of Canadian National Hockey League players' hometowns." *International Review for the Sociology of Sport* 55 (2): 209–228.
- Kalman-Lamb, Nathan. 2015. "Deconstructing Linsanity: Is Jeremy Lin a Model Minority Subject?" In *Killing the Model Minority Stereotype: Asian American Counterstories and Complicity*, edited by Hartlep, Nicholas D and Bradley Porfolio, 203-218. Charlotte, North Carolina: Information Age Publishing.
- —. 2018. "Whiteness and Hockey in Canada: Lessons from Semi-Structured Interviews with Retired Professional Players." In *Hockey: Challenging Canada's Game – Au-delà du sport national*, edited by Ellison, Jenny and Jennifer Anderson, 287-300. Gatineau, Québec: University of Ottawa Press.
- Kelley, Ninette, and Michael J Trebilcock. 1998. *The Making of the Mosaic*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Kennedy, Sheldon. 2011. *Why I Didn't Say Anything the Sheldon Kennedy Story*. London, ON: Insomniac Press.
- Kim, Christine. 2014. "The Smell of Communities to Come: Jeremy Lin and Post-Racial Desire." *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 35 (3): 310–327.
- Knowles, Richard. 1995. "Post-, 'Grapes,' Nuts and Flakes: 'Coach's Corner' as Post-Colonial Performance." *Modern Drama* 38 (1): 123–130.
- Laidlaw, James. 2014. *The Subject of Virtue: an Anthropology of Ethics and Freedom*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Lambek, Michael. 1993. *Knowledge and Practice in Mayotte: Local Discourses of Islam, Sorcery and Spirit Possession*. North York, Ontario: University of Toronto Press.
- —. 2015a. *The Ethical Condition: Essays on Action, Person, and Value*. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press.
- —. 2015b. "The Hermeneutics of Ethical Encounters." *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 5 (2): 227–250.
- Larson, Timothy. 2014. *The Slain God: Anthropologists and the Christian Faith*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lems, Annika. 2016. "Ambiguous Longings: Nostalgia as the Interplay among Self, Time and World." *Critique of Anthropology* 36 (4): 419–438.

- Lewinson, Ryan T, and Oscar E Palma. 2012. "The Morality of Fighting in Ice Hockey: Should It Be Banned?" *Journal of Sport & Social Issues* 36 (1): 106–112.
- Lorenz, Stacy L, and Rod Murray 2014. "'Goodbye to the Gangstas': The NBA Dress Code, Ray Emery, and the Policing of Blackness in Basketball and Hockey." *Journal of Sport & Social Issues* 38 (1): 23–50.
- McElroy, Kathleen. 2014. "Basket Case: Framing the Intersection of 'Linsanity' and Blackness." *The Howard journal of communications* 25 (4): 431-451.
- MacDonald, Cheryl. 2014. "Masculinity and Sport Revisited: A Review of Literature on Hegemonic Masculinity and Men's Ice Hockey in Canada." *Canadian Graduate Journal of Sociology and Criminology* 3 (1): 95-112.
- MacAloon, John J. 2008. *Muscular Christianity in Colonial and Post-colonial Worlds*. New York: Routledge.
- Mahmood, Saba. 2005. *Politics of piety the Islamic Revival and the Feminist Subject*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Mahtani, Minelle. 2002. "Interrogating the Hyphen-Nation: Canadian Multicultural Policy and 'Mixed Race' Identities." *Social Identities* 8 (1): 67–90.
- —. 2014. *Mixed Race Amnesia: Resisting the Romanticization of Multiraciality*. Vancouver, British Columbia: University of British Columbia Press.
- Malinowski, Bronislaw. 1961. *Argonauts of the Western Pacific: An Account of Native Enterprise and Adventure in the Archipelagoes of Melanesian New Guinea*. New York: Dutton.
- Mason, Daniel S, Duquette, Gregory H, and Jay Scherer. 2005. "Heritage, Sport Tourism and Canadian Junior Hockey: Nostalgia for Social Experience or Sport Place?" *Journal of Sport & Tourism: Heritage, Sport and Tourism*, 10 (4): 253–271.
- Mattingly, Cheryl, and Jason Throop. "The Anthropology of Ethics and Morality." *Annual review of anthropology* 47 (1): 475-492.
- May, Vanessa. 2017. "Belonging from Afar: Nostalgia, Time and Memory." *The Sociological Review* 65 (2): 401–415.
- McGarry, Karen. 2010. "Sport in Transition: Emerging Trends on Culture Change in the Anthropology of Sport." *Reviews in Anthropology*, 39 (3): 151-172.
- McKee, Taylor. 2020. "'Born of a Spirit That Knows No Conquering': Innovation, Contestation, and Representation in the PCHA, 1911-1924." PhD Dissertation. Western University.

- McKegney, Sam, and Trevor Philips. 2018. "Decolonizing the Hockey Novel: Ambivalence and Apotheosis in Richard Wagamese's Indian Horse." In *Hockey: Challenging Canada's Game – Au-delà Du Sport National*, edited by Ellison, Jenny and Anderson J. pp. 97-110. Gatineau, QC: University of Ottawa Press.
- Meneses, Eloise, Backues, Lindy, Bronkema, David, Flett, Eric, and Benjamin L Hartley. 2014. "Engaging the Religiously Committed Other: Anthropologists and Theologians in Dialogue." *Current Anthropology* 55 (1): 82-104.
- Mensah, Joseph. 2010. *Black Canadians: History, Experiences, Social Conditions*. 2nd edition. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.
- Messner, Michael A. 2009. *It's All for the Kids: Gender, Families, and Youth Sports*. Berkeley, California: University of California Press,.
- Messner, Michael and Michela Musto. 2014. "Where are the kids?" *Sociology of Sport Journal* 31: 102-122.
- Milan, Anne, Maheux, Helene, and Tina Chui. 2010. "A Portrait of Couples in Mixed Unions." *Canadian Social Trends* 89: 70–80.
- Mina, Noula. 2013. "Taming and Training Greek 'Peasant Girls' and the Gendered Politics of Whiteness in Postwar Canada: Canadian Bureaucrats and Immigrant Domestic, 1950s–1960s." *The Canadian Historical Review* 94 (4): 514–539.
- Morency, Jean-Dominique, Malenfant, Éric C, and Samuel MacIsaac. 2017. "Immigration and Diversity: Population Projections for Canada and its Regions, 2011 to 2036". *Statistics Canada*, January 25, 2017. <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/91-551-x/91-551-x2017001-eng.htm>
- Morris, Jim. 2020, October 19. "Like it or not, NHL could be forced to play next season in modified bubble." *CBC News*. Retrieved from: <https://www.cbc.ca/sports/hockey/nhl/nhl-season-bubble-1.5764228>
- Munn, Nancy D. 1992. "The Cultural Anthropology of Time: A Critical Essay." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 21: 93–123.
- Nagata, Judith A. 1974. "What Is a Malay? Situational Selection of Ethnic Identity in a Plural Society." *American Ethnologist* 1 (2): 331–350.
- Nasser, Shanifa. 2020. "Family of Ejaz Choudry demands firing of officer who fatally shot him during mental health crisis." *CBC News*, June 22, 2020. <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/toronto/ejaz-choudry-1.5622160>

- NHL. 2020. "NHL to pause season due to coronavirus". *NHL*, March 12, 2020.
<https://www.nhl.com/news/nhl-coronavirus-to-provide-update-on-concerns/c-316131734>
- Nzindukiyimana, Ornella, and Eileen O'Connor. 2019. "Let's (Not) Meet at the Pool: A Black Canadian Social History of Swimming (1900s-1960s)." *Loisir Et Société / Society and Leisure: Social Participation, Leisure and Active Aging / Participation Sociale, Loisir Et Vieillessement Actif* 42 (1): 137–164.
- Ogmundson, Richard and James McLaughlin. "Trends in the Ethnic Origins of Canadian Elites: the Decline of the BRITS?*" *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue Canadienne De Sociologie*, vol. 29, no. 2, 1992, pp. 227–242.
- Okamura, Jonathan. 1981. "Situational ethnicity." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 4 (4): 452-465.
- Oshawa Generals. 2020. "Gens Play Hard in Sold Out New Year's Game vs. 67s." January 1, 2020. <https://oshawagenerals.com/article/2020-01-01-ottawa-67s>
- Palmeter, Paul. 2018. "12-year old hockey player endures 6 years of racial slurs, latest tormentor suspended." *CBC News*, April 12, 2018.
- Paragg, Jillian. 2015. "'Canadian-First': Mixed Race Self-Identification and Canadian Belonging." *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 47 (2): 21–44.
- —. 2017. "'What are You?': Mixed Race Responses to the Gaze". *Ethnicities* 17 (3): 277-298.
- Paul, Rodney J, Weinbach, Andrew P, and Daniel Robbins. 2015. "Fighting, Winning, Promotions, and Attendance in the ECHL." *Sport, Business and Management: An International Journal* 5(2): 139–156.
- Pfeffer, Amanda. 2020. "Ottawa professor apologizes for using N-word, regrets growing controversy." *CBC News*, October 21, 2020.
<https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/ottawa/professor-apologizes-university-of-ottawa-1.5770946>
- Phan, Peter C. 2001. "The wisdom of holy fools in postmodernity". *Theological Studies (Baltimore)* 62 (4): 730-752.
- Porter, John A. 1965. *The Vertical Mosaic: an Analysis of Social Class and Power in Canada*. North York, Ontario: University of Toronto Press.
- Price, Bryan D. 2018. "Material Memory: The Politics of Nostalgia on the Eve of MAGA." *American Studies (Lawrence)* 57 (1): 103–115.
- Priest, Robert J. 2001. "Missionary Positions: Christian, Modernist, Postmodernist." *Current Anthropology* 42 (1): 29-68.

- Ramos, Howard. 2013. "From Ethnicity to Race in the Canadian Review of Sociology, 1964 to 2010." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue Canadienne De Sociologie* 50 (3): 337–356.
- Ramos, Howard and Patrick Bondy. Forthcoming. "From the Pond to the Jumbotron: Affordances of Hockey as a Multicultural and Social Space." *Canadian Ethnic Studies*.
- Ray, Victor, and Louise Seamster. 2016. "Rethinking Racial Progress: a Response to Wimmer." *Ethnic and Racial Studies: Ethnic and Racial Studies Review* 39 (8): 1361–1369.
- Riles, Annelise. 2000. *The Network inside out*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press.
- —. 2011. *Collateral knowledge: legal reasoning in the global financial markets*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Robbins, Joel. 2004. *Becoming Sinners: Christianity and Moral Torment in a Papua New Guinea Society*. Berkeley, California: University of California Press.
- —. 2007. "Between Reproduction and Freedom: Morality, Value, and Radical Cultural Change." *Ethnos* 72 (3):293–314.
- Robidoux, Michael A. 2001. *Men at Play: a Working Understanding of Professional Hockey*. Kingston, Ontario: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- —. 2002. "Imagining a Canadian Identity through Sport: A Historical Interpretation of Lacrosse and Hockey." *The Journal of American Folklore* 115 (456): 209-25.
- —. 2004. "Narratives of Race Relations in Southern Alberta: An Examination of Conflicting Sporting Practices." *Sociology of Sport Journal* 21: 287-301.
- —. 2006. "The Nonsense of Native American Sport Imagery: Reclaiming a Past That Never Was." *International Review for the Sociology of Sport* 41 (2): 201–219.
- Rosaldo, Renato. 1989. *Culture & truth: the remaking of social analysis*. Boston, Massachusetts: Beacon Press.
- Roseberry, William. 1982. "Balinese Cockfights and the Seduction of Anthropology." *Social Research* 49 (4): 1013-1028.
- Rudiak-Gould, Peter. 2014. "Progress, Decline, and the Public Uptake of Climate Science." *Public Understanding of Science* 23 (2): 142-56.
- Ryle, Gilbert. 1966. *The Concept of Mind*. London: Hutchinson.

- Sahlins, Marshall. 2006. "The Western Illusion of Human Nature*." *Michigan Quarterly Review* 45 (3): 454-483.
- Said, Edward. 1978. *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Salazar, Noel B, and Isabelle Rivoal. 2013. "Contemporary Ethnographic Practice and the Value of Serendipity." *Social Anthropology* 21 (2): 178–185.
- Scott, Corrie. 2016. "How French Canadians Became White Folks, or Doing Things with Race in Quebec†." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 39 (7): 1280–1297.
- Sewell, William H. 1997. "Geertz, Cultural Systems, and History: From Synchrony to Transformation." *Representations* 59: 35–55.
- Sidnell, Jack, Meudec, Marie, and Michael Lambek. 2019. "Ethical Immanence." *Anthropological Theory* 19 (3): 303–322.
- Simon, Robert L. 2010. *Fair Play: the Ethics of Sport*. 3rd edition. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 2010.
- Slaboch, Matthew W. 2017. *A Road to Nowhere: The Idea of Progress and Its Critics*. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Slotkin, Richard. 1981. "Nostalgia and Progress: Theodore Roosevelt's Myth of the Frontier." *American Quarterly* 33 (5): 608–637.
- Statistics Canada. 2017. *Focus on Geography Series, 2016 Census*. Statistics Canada (98-404-X2016001): <https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/as-sa/fogs-spg/Facts-can-eng.cfm?Lang=Eng&GK=CAN&GC=01&TOPIC=7>
- Stewart, Charles. 2001. "Secularism as an impediment to anthropological research." *Social Anthropology* 9 (3): 325-328.
- —. 2016. "Historicity and Anthropology." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 45 (1): 79–94.
- Sturino, Frank. 2019. "Italian Canadians". *The Canadian Encyclopedia*, May 23, 2019. <https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/italian-canadians>
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. 1988. "Can the Subaltern Speak?" In *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, edited by Lawrence Grossberg and Cary Belson, 271-313. Basingstoke, UK: Macmillan Education.
- Szto, Courtney. 2016. "#LOL at Multiculturalism: Reactions to Hockey Night in Canada Punjabi From the Twitterverse." *Sociology of Sport Journal* 33 (3): 208–218.

- Szto, Courtney. 2020. *Changing on the Fly: Hockey through the voices of South Asian Canadians*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Tjønndal, Anne. 2016. "NHL Heavyweights: Narratives of Violence and Masculinity in Ice Hockey." *Physical Culture and Sport: Studies and Research* 70: 55-68.
- Theberge, Nancy. 2003. "'No Fear Comes': Adolescent Girls, Ice Hockey, and the Embodiment of Gender." *Youth and Society* 34(4): 497–516.
- Thurber, Amie, and Robin DiAngelo. 2018. "Microaggressions: Intervening in Three Acts." *Journal of Ethnic & Cultural Diversity in Social Work: Microaggression and Social Work Education* 27 (1): 17–27.
- Tzemis, Stephen. 2018. "Seattle becomes NHL's 32nd team after league unanimously approves expansion bid." *CBC News*. December 4, 2018. <https://www.cbc.ca/sports/hockey/nhl/seattle-expansion-nhl-1.4929908>
- Wacquant, Loïc J. D. 2006. *Body & Soul: Notebooks of an Apprentice Boxer*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Walcott, Rinaldo. *Rude: Contemporary Black Canadian Cultural Criticism*. London, Ontario: Insomniac Press, 2000.
- Waskul, Dennis, Vannini, Philip, and Janelle Wilson. 2009. "The Aroma of Recollection: Olfaction, Nostalgia, and the Shaping of the Sensuous Self." *The Senses and Society* 4 (1): 5-22.
- Webster, John. 2020. *The religion of Orange politics: Protestantism and fraternity in contemporary Scotland*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press.
- Whalen, Julia. 2017. "Census 2016: More than half of Torontonians identify as visible minorities." *CBC News*, October 25, 2017. <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/toronto/census-visible-minorities-1.4371018>
- White, Ben. 2007. "Clifford Geertz: Singular Genius of Interpretive Anthropology." *Development and change* 38 (6): 1187-1208.
- Wise, Amanda and Selvaraj Velayutham. 2009. *Everyday Multiculturalism*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Wise, Amanda. 2016. "Convivial Labour and the 'Joking Relationship': Humour and Everyday Multiculturalism at Work." *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 37 (5): 481-500.
- Wyshynski, Greg. 2019. "'The New Normal': Why fighting in the NHL has dropped to historic lows." *ESPN*, July 30, 2019. https://www.espn.com/nhl/story/_/id/27283018/the-new-normal-why-fighting-nhl-dropped-historic-lows

- Wilson, Helen F. 2011. "Passing propinquities in the multicultural city: the everyday encounters of bus passengering." *Environment and Planning A* 43 (3): 634-649.
- Wimmer, Andreas. "Race-centrism: A Critique and a Research Agenda." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 38, no. 13 (2015): 2186-2205.
- Winant, Howard. 2015. "Race, Ethnicity and Social Science." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 38 (15): 2176-2185.
- Wong, John. 2005. *Lords of the Rinks: The Emergence of the National Hockey League, 1875-1936*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Zakheim, Abe. 2015. "The Virtues of a Good Fight: Assessing the Ethics of Fighting in the National Hockey League." *Sport, Ethics and Philosophy* 9 (1): 32-46.
- Zigon, Jarrett. 2008. *Morality: an Anthropological Perspective*. Oxford: Berg Publishers.
- —. 2010. *"HIV is God's Blessing": rehabilitating morality in neoliberal Russia*. Berkeley, California: University of California Press.
- —. 2014. "An Ethics of Dwelling and a Politics of World-Building: a Critical Response to Ordinary Ethics." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 20 (4):746-764.

Appendix A: Consent form for minor-age hockey players



CONSENT FORM FOR:

Name of Researcher, Faculty, Department, Telephone & Email:

Lloyd Wong
Department of Sociology
Faculty of Arts
University of Calgary
Phone: 403-220-6504
Email: lloyd.wong@ucalgary.ca

Howard Ramos
Department of Sociology and Social Anthropology
Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
Dalhousie University
Phone: 902-494-3130 or 902-494-6595
Email: howard.ramos@dal.ca

Title of Project:

Multicultural Common Spaces: A Study of Canadian Hockey Arenas and Social Integration

Sponsor:

Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council

This consent form, a copy of which has been given to you, is only part of the process of informed consent. If you want more details about something mentioned here, or information not included here, you should feel free to ask. Please take the time to read this carefully and to understand any accompanying information.

The University of Calgary Conjoint Faculties Research Ethics Board has approved this research study. Participation is completely voluntary and confidential. You are free to discontinue participation at any time during the study.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to find out your opinions and experiences, as a hockey player, about the game of hockey as it is played in hockey arenas in Canada. We want to find out if you think hockey

helps to promote Canadian identity and whether hockey helps to encourage the integration of different ethnic groups in Canada. If you want more details about something mentioned here, or information not included here, you should feel free to ask.

What Will I Be Asked To Do?

You will be asked to answer a few questions in a personal interview which will take approximately 45 minutes to one hour. The questions will be about your views of, and experiences in, playing in hockey games in arenas. An example of a question would be the following: Have you gained new friendships by playing hockey? With your permission we will audio-record the interview so that the interview can move along more quickly and we can get your words accurately.

You will be asked to answer questions about your views on hockey and social interaction in arenas as a part of an interview which will take approximately 45 minutes to one hour. With your permission we will audio-record the interview so that the interview.

Your participation is completely voluntary for this interview and you may decline to participate altogether and may also decline to participate in parts of the interview in that you do not have to answer all the questions. Further may withdraw from the interview at any time.

What Type of Personal Information Will Be Collected?

Should you agree to participate in the interview you will be asked to provide your gender, age, ethnicity, educational level, and level of the hockey league you are in, along with your opinions of, and experiences in, the game of hockey and hockey arenas..

Access to the audio-recording of your interview will be only available to members of the research study team. The recording will never be aired in public. Interviews will be transcribed and quotes will not be attributed to you. If a quote is used, a pseudonym will be assigned.

I grant permission to be audio-taped: Yes: ___ No: ___

The pseudonym I choose for myself is: _____

Are there Risks or Benefits if I Participate?

There are no foreseeable risks to participation in this study. To show our appreciation for your time spent in participating in the interview we will provide you with a small \$25 Tim Hortons or Starbucks gift card at the beginning of the interview.

What Happens to the Information I Provide?

No one except the members of the research team will be allowed to see or hear any of the answers to the recorded interview. Your identity will remain confidential for any presentations, reports, or publications. If there is any reference to information you provide then your confidentiality will be maintained by a pseudonym and by grouping your information with others. Your digitally recorded interview and its electronic transcription will be kept on computer hard drives, encrypted, and will be only accessible by members of the research team. Audio files will be stored for five years after publication on password protected computers and drives, at which time, it will be permanently erased. Anonymized transcripts will be kept for research purposes. If you choose to withdraw from the interview before it is completed then any information you have provided up to that point will be deleted. If you choose to withdraw from the research project after your interview then your interview information will also be withdrawn up to one month after your interview date.

Signatures

Your signature on this form indicates that 1) you understand to your satisfaction the information provided to you about your participation in this research project, and 2) you agree to participate in the research project.

In no way does this waive your legal rights nor release the investigators, sponsors, or involved institutions from their legal and professional responsibilities. You are free to withdraw from this research project at any time. You should feel free to ask for clarification or new information throughout your participation.

Participant's Name: (please print) _____

Participant's Signature: _____ Date: _____

Researcher's Name: (please print) _____

Researcher's Signature: _____ Date: _____

Questions/Concerns

If you have any further questions or want clarification regarding this research and/or your participation, please contact:

Dr. Lloyd Wong
Department of Sociology
Faculty of Arts
University of Calgary
Phone: 403-220-6504, Email: lloyd.wong@ucalgary.ca

Or

Dr. Howard Ramos
Department of Sociology and Social Anthropology
Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences

Dalhousie University

Phone: 902-494-3130 or 902-494-6595, Email howard.ramos@dal.ca

If you have any concerns about the way you've been treated as a participant, please contact the Research Ethics Analyst, Research Services Office, University of Calgary at (403) 220-6289/220-4283; email cfreb@ucalgary.ca. A copy of this consent form has been given to you to keep for your records and reference. The investigator has kept a copy of the consent for

Appendix B: Consent form for Parents/Guardians of Minor Age Hockey Players



CONSENT FORM FOR:

**Parent's or Guardian's of
Minor Age Hockey Players**

Lloyd Wong
Department of Sociology
Faculty of Arts
University of Calgary
Phone: 403-220-6504
Email: lloyd.wong@ucalgary.ca

Howard Ramos
Department of Sociology and Social Anthropology
Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
Dalhousie University
Phone: 902-494-3130 or 902-494-6595
Email: howard.ramos@dal.ca

Title of Project:

Multicultural Common Spaces: A Study of Canadian Hockey Arenas and Social Integration

Sponsor:

Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council

This consent form, a copy of which has been given to you, is only part of the process of informed consent. If you want more details about something mentioned here, or information not included here, you should feel free to ask. Please take the time to read this carefully and to understand any accompanying information.

The University of Calgary Conjoint Faculties Research Ethics Board and the Dalhousie University Research Ethics Board have approved this research study.

Your child's participation is completely voluntary and confidential. Your child is free to discontinue participation at any time during the study.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to find out your child's opinions and experiences, as a hockey player, about the game of hockey as it is played in hockey arenas in Canada. We want to find out if they think hockey helps to promote Canadian identity and whether hockey helps to encourage the social integration of

different ethnic groups in Canada. If you want more details about something mentioned here, or information not included here, you should feel free to ask.

What Will They Be Asked To Do?

In the interview she/he will be asked to answer a few questions which will take approximately 30 minutes to one hour. The questions will be about their views of, and experiences in, playing in hockey games in arenas. An example of a question would be the following: Have you gained new friendships by coming to the arena to play hockey? With your permission, and your daughter's/son's permission, we will audio-record the interview so that the interview can move along more quickly and get the words accurately.

Your child's permission is completely voluntary for this interview to take place. Your daughter/son may decline to participate altogether and may also decline to participate in parts of the interview in that she/he does not have to answer all the questions. Further she/he withdraw from the interview at any time.

What Type of Personal Information Will Be Collected?

Should you agree to have your daughter/son participate in the interview you should know that she/he will be asked to provide their gender, age, ethnicity, educational level, and level of the hockey league she/he is in, along with her/his opinions of, and experiences in, the game of hockey.

Access to the audio-recording of your daughter's/son's interview will be only available to members of the research study team. The recording will never be aired in public. Interviews will be transcribed and quotes will not be attributed to you. If a quote is used, a pseudonym will be assigned.

I grant permission for my daughter/son to be audio-taped:

Yes: ___ No: ___

The pseudonym I choose for her/him is: _____

Are there Risks or Benefits if She/He Participates?

There are no foreseeable risks for your daughter's/son's participation in this study. To show our appreciation for her/his time spent in participating in the interview we will provide her/him with a small \$25 Tim Hortons gift card at the beginning of the interview.

What Happens to the Information She/He Provides?

No one except the members of the research team will be allowed to see or hear any of the answers to the recorded interview. Her/His identity will remain confidential for any presentations, reports, or publications. If there is any reference to information provided by her/him then her/his confidentiality will be protected by a pseudonym and by grouping the information with others. Their digitally recorded interview and its electronic transcription will be kept on computer hard drives, encrypted, and will only be accessible by members of the research team. Audio files will be stored for five years after publication on password protected computers and drives, at which time, it will be permanently erased. Anonymized transcripts will be kept for research purposes. If you choose to withdraw from the interview before it is

completed then any information you have provided up to that point will be deleted. If you choose to withdraw from the research project after your interview then your interview information will be also withdrawn up to one month after your interview date.

Signatures

Your signature on this form indicates that 1) you understand to your satisfaction the information provided to you about your daughter's/son's participation in this research project, and 2) you agree to allow her/him to participate in the research project.

In no way does this waive your legal rights nor release the investigators, sponsors, or involved institutions from their legal and professional responsibilities. You are free to withdraw her/him from this research project at any time. You should feel free to ask for clarification or new information throughout their participation.

Parent's/Guardian's Name: (please print) _____

Parent's/Guardian's Signature: _____ Date: _____

Researcher's Name: (please print) _____

Researcher's Signature: _____ Date: _____

Questions/Concerns

If you have any further questions or want clarification regarding this research and/or your participation, please contact:

Dr. Lloyd Wong
Department of Sociology
Faculty of Arts
University of Calgary
Phone: 403-220-6504, Email: lloyd.wong@ucalgary.ca

Or

Dr. Howard Ramos
Department of Sociology and Social Anthropology
Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
Dalhousie University
Phone: 902-494-3130 or 902-494-6595, Email: howard.ramos@dal.ca

If you have any concerns about the way you've been treated as a participant, please contact the Research Ethics Analyst, Research Services Office, University of Calgary at (403) 220-6289/220-4283; email cfreb@ucalgary.ca or Research Ethics, Dalhousie Research Services, at (902) 494-3423; email ethics@dal.ca. A copy of this consent form has been given to you to keep for your records and reference. The investigator has kept a copy of the consent form.

Appendix C: Consent form for adult players



CONSENT FORM FOR:

Name of Researcher, Faculty, Department, Telephone & Email:

Lloyd Wong
Department of Sociology
Faculty of Arts
University of Calgary
Phone: 403-220-6504
Email: lloyd.wong@ucalgary.ca

Howard Ramos
Department of Sociology and Social Anthropology
Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
Dalhousie University
Phone: 902-494-3130 or 902-494-6595
Email: howard.amos@dal.ca

Title of Project:

Multicultural Common Spaces: A Study of Canadian Hockey Arenas and Social Integration

Sponsor:

Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council

This consent form, a copy of which has been given to you, is only part of the process of informed consent. If you want more details about something mentioned here, or information not included here, you should feel free to ask. Please take the time to read this carefully and to understand any accompanying information.

The University of Calgary Conjoint Faculties Research Ethics Board has approved this research study. Participation is completely voluntary and confidential. You are free to discontinue participation at any time during the study.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to find out your opinions and experiences, as a hockey player, about the game of hockey as it is played in hockey arenas in Canada. We want to find out if you think hockey helps to promote Canadian identity and whether hockey helps to encourage the integration of different ethnic groups in Canada.

What Will I Be Asked To Do?

You will be asked to answer a few questions in a personal interview which will take approximately 30 minutes to one hour. The questions will be about your views of, and experiences in, playing in hockey games in arenas. An example of a question would be the following: Have you gained new friendships by playing hockey? With your permission we will audio-record the interview so that the interview can move along more quickly and we can get your words accurately.

Your participation is completely voluntary for this interview and you may decline to participate altogether and may also decline to participate in parts of the interview in that you do not have to answer all the questions. Further may withdraw from the interview at any time.

What Type of Personal Information Will Be Collected?

Should you agree to participate in the interview you will be asked to provide your gender, age, ethnicity, educational level, and level of the hockey league you are in, along with your opinions of, and experiences in, the game of hockey.

Access to the audio-recording of your interview will be only available to members of the research study team. The recording will never be aired in public.

There are several options for you to consider if you decide to take part in this research. You can choose all, some, or none of them of the options provided below. Please review each of these options and choose Yes or No:"

- I grant permission to be audio-taped:* Yes: ___ No: ___
- I wish to remain anonymous:* Yes: ___ No: ___
- I wish to remain anonymous, but you may refer to me by a pseudonym:* Yes: ___ No: ___
- The pseudonym I choose for myself is:* _____
- You may quote me and use my name:* Yes: ___ No: ___

Are there Risks or Benefits if I Participate?

There are no foreseeable risks to participation in this study. To show our appreciation for your time spent in participating in the interview we will provide you with a small \$25 Tim Hortons or Starbucks gift card once the interview is completed.

What Happens to the Information I Provide?

No one except the members of the research team will be allowed to see or hear any of the answers to the recorded interview. Your identity will remain confidential for any presentations, reports, or publications. If there is any reference to information you provide then your confidentiality will be protected by a pseudonym and by grouping your information with others. Your digitally recorded interview and its electronic transcription will be kept on computer hard drives that are password protected and will only

be only accessible by members of the research team. These data will be stored for five years in the computers and drives, at which time, it will be permanently erased. If you choose to withdraw from the interview before it is completed then any information you have provided up to that point will be deleted.

Signatures

Your signature on this form indicates that 1) you understand to your satisfaction the information provided to you about your participation in this research project, and 2) you agree to participate in the research project.

In no way does this waive your legal rights nor release the investigators, sponsors, or involved institutions from their legal and professional responsibilities. You are free to withdraw from this research project at any time. You should feel free to ask for clarification or new information throughout your participation.

Participant's Name: (please print) _____

Participant's Signature: _____ Date: _____

Researcher's Name: (please print) _____

Researcher's Signature: _____ Date: _____

Questions/Concerns

If you have any further questions or want clarification regarding this research and/or your participation, please contact:

Dr. Lloyd Wong
Department of Sociology
Faculty of Arts
University of Calgary
Phone: 403-220-6504, Email: lloyd.wong@ucalgary.ca

Or

Dr. Howard Ramos
Department of Sociology and Social Anthropology
Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
Dalhousie University

Phone: 902-494-3130 or 902-494-6595, Email: howard.ramos@dal.ca

If you have any concerns about the way you've been treated as a participant, please contact the Research Ethics Analyst, Research Services Office, University of Calgary at (403) 220-6289/220-4283; email cfreb@ucalgary.ca or Research Ethics, Dalhousie Research Services, at (902) 494-3423; email ethics@dal.ca. A copy of this consent form has been given to you to keep for your records and reference. The investigator has kept a copy of the consent form.

Appendix D: Oral Consent Script for Adult Fans (Inclusive of Parents)

**ORAL CONSENT SCRIPT
FOR
PERSONAL INTERVIEWS WITH HOCKEY FANS**

STUDY TITLE:

Multicultural Common Spaces: A Study of Canadian Hockey Arenas and Social Integration

INVESTIGATORS:

Lloyd Wong (University of Calgary) & Howard Ramos (Dalhousie University)

FUNDER:

Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada

As you may know, I am a researcher from the University of Calgary (Dalhousie University). I am part of a research team that is conducting a study on the game of hockey as it is played and watched in hockey arenas in Canada. We are interested in finding out your opinions and experiences as a hockey fan. More specifically we want to find out if you think hockey helps to promote Canadian identity and whether hockey helps to encourage the integration of different ethnic groups in Canada. So, I would like to ask you some questions about that in an interview that will take about 45 – 60 minutes. With your permission I would like to also audio-record our conversation so that I can get your words accurately. If at any time during our talk you feel uncomfortable answering a question please let me know, and you don't have to answer it. If at any time you want to withdraw from the interview please tell me and I will erase the recording of our conversation. I will not reveal the content of our conversation beyond myself and the people on the research team. The people on the research are ones whom I trust to maintain your confidentiality.

Your identity or personal information will not be disclosed in any presentation, report or publication that may result from the study. Information you provide will be compiled as a whole with no individual responses tied to your name or any identifying information about you. If there is information directly used then you will be protected by a pseudonym. The audio recording taken during the interview will be stored in a secure location.

At the beginning of the interview I will provide you with a \$25 gift card that can be used at Tim Hortons (Starbucks) as a token of my appreciation of the time and effort you have provided.

Now I would like to ask you if you agree to participate in this interview. Do you agree to participate? (If yes) Do you allow me to audio-record our conversation?

Appendix E: Interview guide for hockey players

Semi-Structured Interview Schedule for Hockey Players

Section 1: Starter Questions

- 1) Which team do you play for? –and what league/level is that in?

- 2) What position do you play?

- 3) How long have you been playing hockey?

Section 2: On Hockey

- 4) Why do you play hockey? –why did you start playing hockey? How come? Any key people, whether personal or public, that influenced you?

- 5) What do you like about playing hockey? –what don't you like about playing (only as follow-up)?

- 6) Has it been difficult for you to play hockey because of the costs involved? (**costs such as equipment, league fees, team expenses, etc.**). If so then how have you overcome this? –(note difficulties of this if directed toward kid

Section 3: On Hockey Teams and Difference

- 7) What is the make-up of your team in terms of different cultures, races, or other aspects? –and how does this compare to past teams of yours? Is the makeup of your team pretty standard for your league? Do you see teams like yours at tournaments?
- 8) Is it important to you that there are other hockey players on your team or in your league who are the same ethnic/racial background as you? Why? –or why not? Is this something you’ve thought about before? Is this something your other players bring up? What about parents and coaches?

Section 4: Social Interaction on Hockey Teams

- 9) To what extent do you spend time with your teammates outside of practice and games? –what kinds of things do you do together? What proportion of the team comes on these kinds of things? How do you decide who comes?
- 10) Is any of this time spent with teammates who are of a different background than yours? (probe: cultural, racial, age, gender) –is this something you, or your teammates, think about? If so, how much?
- 11) Would you say that your participation in hockey has helped you understand teammates with different backgrounds than yours? –get to know? (Here can link back to Q 5-6; how does this compare to what you were hoping for out of hockey?)

12) **Have you ever felt not welcomed when playing hockey? If yes, please explain** –have you ever seen someone look or act unwelcome in an arena? Do you think it’s possible that this could happen sometimes? Why do you think someone might feel uncomfortable in an arena? Could you imagine a scenario where someone feels uncomfortable in a hockey arena?

13) **Would you consider some of your teammates as friends? If yes, are any of these friends a different ethnicity than yours? –or otherwise different (age, ethnicity)? Were these people friends before hockey and you’ve grown in friendship, or did you meet them through hockey?**

Section 5: Hockey and Canada

14) **Has playing hockey helped you identify yourself as a Canadian?** –what about hockey makes it so? Or if not, what would you make of other people claiming that playing hockey makes them identify as a Canadian? Is there a particular level of play at which you might identify as a Canadian because of playing hockey?)

15) **Has playing hockey helped give you a sense of belonging to Canada** –again, then, do you feel like you belong to Canada? What does give you that sense of belonging? Do you think hockey can give people a sense of belonging to Canada?

16) **Do you think playing hockey helps you to learn more about Canadian culture?** –Have you learned much about ‘hockey culture’ in your time playing? Can you talk about hockey culture and Canadian culture (are they similar, different, at odds, etc.)

- 17) a) Do you have a favourite hockey player? Who is this player? Why was she/he your favourite? (ask of younger players)
b) Who was your favourite hockey player when you played as a youngster? Why? (ask of older and adult players)

Section 6: Rapid-Fire Demographic Questions

- 1) What is your age?

- 2) What is your gender?

- 3) What is your ethnicity? (Make note of whether the interviewee is a racialized person.)

- 4) Are you an immigrant? If yes, when did you come to Canada and from where?

Notes

Appendix F: Interview Guide for Adult Fans

Semi-Structured Interview Schedule for Adult Hockey Fans

(inclusive of parents/guardians of minor age hockey players)

Section 1: Social interaction in Arenas

- 18) How long have you been a hockey fan? –how long have you been around hockey for? In what ways (playing shinny, watching on TV, playing (what level(s)?), going to games, watching family play?
- 19) How long have you been watching hockey in hockey arenas? –for how long have you been spending time in hockey arenas? When was the first time you went to a hockey arena? How much time do you spend in hockey arenas in an average week/month/yr?
- 20) Why do you like to watch hockey in arenas? –Do you like watching hockey in arenas? Why do you come to the arena? What do you enjoy about being in the arena? When you're in the arena, how much of the time do you spend watching hockey?
- 21) *When in hockey arenas, what kinds of people do you see?
(Probe: ethnicities, races, ages, genders)
- 22) To what extent do you spend time talking to other fans in the arena?
- 23) If you do spend time talking with other fans are any of these people of a different background to yours?

Section 2: Social interaction w/hockey people, but outside the arena

- 24) To what extent do you spend time with other fans outside of the arena? –are these people you met through hockey, or existing friendships? What kinds of things do you do with these people? Is hockey a family thing for you?
- 25) Is any of this time spent with fans (outside of the arena) who are of a different background than yours? (Probe: ethnicities, races, ages, genders)
- 26) Would you say that your participation in hockey arenas has helped you understand fans with different backgrounds than yours? (Probe: ethnicities, races, ages, genders) –understand=get to know
- 27) Have you ever felt not welcomed at a hockey arena? If yes, please explain.
- 28) Would you consider some of the other fans you interact with as friends? If yes, are any of these friends a different ethnicity than yours? –or different from you in some other way?

Section 3: hockey and Canadian identity

- 29) Has watching the game of hockey in arenas helped you identify yourself as a Canadian? –same results if watching hockey on TV? Or watching hockey where a Team Canada is playing? What about compared to other live sports?
- 30) Has watching the game of hockey in arenas helped give you a sense of belonging to Canada? –again, same results if watching hockey on TV? Or watching game where Team Canada is playing? Compared to other live sports, or other sports where Team Canada is playing?

Section 4: Hockey and Social Integration to Canada

- 31) *Do you think participating in hockey arenas helps you to learn more about Canadian culture? –possibly get to Canadian culture through hockey culture; ie., did you learn about hockey culture through time in hockey arenas? Do you think there’s a connection between hockey culture and Canadian culture? Does former lead to latter? Or are they quite different? What kinds of things must a person do in hockey arenas to learn about Canadian culture? Can you think of any specific examples where you learned about Canada, or how to do something in Canada, because of spending time in a hockey arena?
- 32) *Do you think watching the game of hockey helps to integrate newcomers (such as immigrants) into Canadian society? – if they don’t want to answer, put it this way: your coworker is an immigrant and young parent. She wants to put her children in a sport, and asks you if she should enrol her kids in hockey. What do you say to her? If you say yes, what reasons do you give to her for enrolling her kids in hockey, as opposed to some other sport? (Note tactic of creating fictional scenario, but where interviewee doesn’t have to imagine themselves to be in a new role)
- 33) Do you have any children who are playing hockey? If yes, then ask below:

Section 5: Kids and hockey

Note: questions 18-21 below could also be asked of fans in the arena who may have had children who played hockey. Then the questions would be in the past-tense.

Questions for hockey fans who are also parents of hockey players:

- 34) *Do you feel that there are barriers to playing organized hockey in Canada? If yes, what are they? **(Probe here to see if the monetary cost of playing hockey is seen as a barrier.)**
- 35) *Do you think playing hockey is an important experience for your children? If yes, why do you think playing hockey is important for your children? –perhaps in comparison to school? (How) did hockey affect kids’ academic and social lives at school?

36) *Do you think that playing hockey has helped your child(ren) fit into Canadian society? Probe: Is this a reason why you encouraged your child(ren) to play hockey? Further probe here about whether their expectations have been met.

37) Does watching your children play hockey make you feel more connected to the community you live in? yes/no Please explain.

Demographic questions (rapid fire, for organizing data, not to be used in any publications)

1) What is your age?

2) What is your gender?

3) What is your ethnicity? (Make note of whether the interviewee is a racialized person.)

4) Are you an immigrant? If yes, when did you come to Canada and from where?

Social Interaction
In Arenas

Social Interaction
Outside Arenas

hockey and
Canadian identity

Hockey and
Social Integration

Kids and Hockey

Rapid-fire Qs

Notes

Appendix G: Observation Guide for Hockey Arenas

Arenas Project Observation Guide

1. City: _____
2. Time of day: _____
3. Level of game: _____
4. Tier or house league: _____
5. Describe entrance and parking lot:

Is parking lot full –what proportion? Are there people outside the arena? Using 0 and then increments of 10, rounding up, how many people. What proportion appear to be from dominant population? Are there visible demographic differences of people at the outside of the entrance? Are there age differences? Are there gender differences? Report general proportions, not specific numbers.

6. Describe the lobby of the arena:

Are there people in the lobby? Using 0 and then increments of 10, rounding up, how many people. What proportion appear to be from dominant population? Are there visible demographic differences of people at the outside of the entrance? Are there age differences? Are there gender differences? Are people of different groups interacting? If so, how? Report general proportions, not specific numbers, report as yes or no rather than specific numbers.

7. Describe the stands of the arena:

Are there people in the stands? Using 0 and then increments of 10, rounding up, how many people. What proportion appear to be from dominant population? Are there visible demographic differences of people at the outside of the entrance? Are there age differences? Are there gender differences? Are people of different groups interacting? If so, how? Report general proportions, not specific numbers, report as yes or no rather than specific numbers.

8. Describe the teams playing:

What proportion of each team appears to be from dominant population? Are there visible demographic differences of players? Are people of different groups interacting? If so, how? Report general proportions, not specific numbers, report as yes or no rather than specific numbers.



PARTICIPANTS NEEDED FOR RESEARCH ON THE GAME OF HOCKEY and HOCKEY ARENAS

Are You:

- A minor hockey player 11 - 17 years old;
- A hockey player at the Juvenile, Junior, semi-professional or professional levels;
- An adult hockey fan.

If you are any of the above then you are invited to volunteer for this study where we want to find out your opinions and experiences, as a hockey player and/or a hockey fan, about the game of hockey as it is played in hockey arenas in Canada. We want to find out if you think hockey helps to promote Canadian identity and social integration.

You will be asked to participate in an interview that will take 45-60 minutes of your time. In appreciation of your time, you will receive a \$25 Tim Hortons gift card at the beginning of the interview. If you are interested in participating in this study, or for more information, please contact:

Patrick Bondy
Research Associate, Arenas Project
Department of Sociology and Social Anthropology
Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
Dalhousie University
Phone: 902-494-6957

Email: Patrick.Bondy@dal.ca

This research study has been reviewed and approved by the University of Calgary Conjoint Faculties Research Ethics Board and the Dalhousie Social Sciences and Humanities Research Ethics Board and is funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada

Appendix I: Table of games observed

Game#	Start Time/Date	League/Age Bracket	Level	Arena	Gender(s) Playing? 1_male, 2_female, 3_coed, 4_NA	Type of game? 1_regseason, 2_playoffs, 3_tournament, 4_exhibition- charity, 5_other
1	7pm, Date NA	University	Varsity	Halifax Forum	1_male	1_regseason
2	5pm, November 3, 2018	Bantam	Major	Dartmouth Sportsplex	1_male	1_regseason
3	7pm, November 3, 2018	Junior	Major	Scotiabank Centre	1_male	1_regseason
4	8:30pm, November 6, 2018	Bantam	B	Civic Arena	3_coed	1_regseason
5	7pm, November 9, 2018	Junior	Major	Scotiabank Centre	1_male	1_regseason
6	8pm, November 27, 2018	Peewee	B	Centennial Arena	3_coed	1_regseason
7	7:30pm, December 6, 2018	Bantam	A	Halifax Forum	4_NA	1_regseason
8	7pm, November 24, 2018	Junior	Major	Scotiabank Centre	1_male	1_regseason
9	7:30pm, November 27, 2018	Peewee	AAA	Halifax Forum	3_coed	1_regseason
10	5:15pm, December 6, 2018	Peewee	AAA	RBC Arena	3_coed	3_tournament
11	6:45pm, December 6, 2018	Peewee	AAA	RBC Arena	3_coed	3_tournament
12	7pm, January 9, 2019	Peewee	Major	Spryfield Lions Rink	3_coed	1_regseason
13	8pm, January 9, 2019	Bantam	B	Spryfield Lions Rink	4_NA	1_regseason

14	3pm, January 12, 2019	Midget	A	Centennial Arena	2_female	1_regseason
15	7:30pm, January 18, 2019	University	Varsity	Civic Arena	2_female	1_regseason
16	7pm, January 18, 2019	University	Varsity	Halifax Forum	1_male	1_regseason
17	7pm, January 19, 2019	Midget	A	Sackville Arena	1_male	1_regseason
18	7pm, January 19, 2019	Junior	Major	Scotiabank Centre	1_male	1_regseason
19	1:30pm, January 26, 2019	Ages 4-10	Rec	BMO Centre	3_coed	5_other
20	7:30pm, January 26, 2019	Midget	Major	Civic Arena	1_male	1_regseason
21	2019-02-02 19:00	University	Varsity	Halifax Forum	1_male	1_regseason
22	2019-02-04 19:30	Junior	B	Sackville Arena	1_male	1_regseason
23	2019-02-06	Midget	Major	Cole Harbour Place	1_male	1_regseason
24	2:30pm, February 9, 2019	PeeWee (+LearntoSkate)	C + NA	Forum/civic	3_coed	1_regeason; 5_other
25	9:00pm, february 9, 2019	All-ages amateur	.	Cole Harbour Place	3_coed	4_exhibition -charity
26	6:00pm, March 5, 2019	All-ages amateur	.	Spryfield Lions Rink	3_coed	4_exhibition -charity
27	8:30pm, March 8, 2019	Junior	C	Spryfield Lions Rink	1_male	2_playoffs
28	3pm, March 16, 2019	All-ages	.	BMO Centre	3_coed	4_exhibition -charity
29	5:45pm, March 31, 2019	Bantam	B	RBC Arena	3_coed	29
30	7pm, April 2, 2019	Junior	Major	Scotiabank Centre	1_male	30

31	7pm, April 24, 2018	Junior	Major	Scotiabank Centre	1_male	31
32	2pm, April 28, 2019	Junior	Major	Scotiabank Centre	1_male	32
33	4pm, May 11, 2019	Junior	Major	Scotiabank Centre	1_male	33
34	8pm, May 17, 2019	Junior	Major	Scotiabank Centre	1_male	34
35	4:30pm, May 18, 2019	Junior	Major	Scotiabank Centre	1_male	35
36	8pm, May 19, 2019	Junior	Major	Scotiabank Centre	1_male	36
37	8pm, May 20, 2019	Junior	Major	Scotiabank Centre	1_male	37
38	8pm, May 21, 2019	Junior	Major	Scotiabank Centre	1_male	38
39	8pm, May 22, 2019	Junior	Major	Scotiabank Centre	1_male	39
40	8pm, May 24, 2019	Junior	Major	Scotiabank Centre	1_male	40
41	8pm, May 26, 2019	Junior	Major	Scotiabank Centre	1_male	41
42	1:30pm, May 24, 2019	Amateur/Para-sport	All-Ages	Dartmouth Sportsplex	3_coed	42
43	7:00pm, September 27, 2019	Junior	Major	Scotiabank Centre	1_male	43
44	2020-01-11 13:00	Recreational	All Kids	Centennial Arena	3_coed	44
45	2020-01-17 19:00	University	Varsity	Dauphinee Centre	2_female	45
46	2020-01-20 13:15	Recreational	All Ages	Halifax Oval	3_coed	46

Table 1. List of games attended in Halifax.

Game#	Start Time/Date	League/Age Bracket	Level	Arena	Gender(s) Playing? 1_male, 2_female, 3_coed, 4_NA	Type of game? 1_regseason, 2_playoffs, 3_tournament, 4_exhibition-charity, 5_other
1	7pm, January 3, 2019	Adult	Rec	Moss Park Arena	1_male	1_regseason

2	7pm, January 4, 2019	Junior	A	Scarborough Gardens Arena	1_male	1_regseason
3	12:10pm, January 5, 2019	Peewee	AAA	Westwood Arena	1_male	1_regseason
4	3:50pm, January 5, 2019	Peewee	House	Don Montgomery Community Centre	4_NA	1_regseason
5	4:55pm, January 5, 2019	Peewee	House	Don Montgomery Community Centre	4_NA	1_regseason
6	6:10pm, January 7, 2019	Peewee	Minor	Scarborough Centennial East	4_NA	1_regseason
7	7:10pm, January 7, 2019	Peewee	A	Scarborough Centennial East	4_NA	1_regseason
8	8:25pm, January 7, 2019	Midget	A	Scarborough Centennial East	4_NA	1_regseason
9	7:25pm, February 19, 2019	Bantam (Minor)	A	Herb Carnegie Arena	4_NA	1_regseason
10	8:40pm, February 19, 2019	Junior	AAA	Herb Carnegie Arena	1_male	1_regseason
11	11am, february 20, 2019	AHL	.	Coca-Cola Coliseum	1_male	1_regseason
12	7:30pm, february 20, 2019	Bantam	House	Don Montgomery Community Centre	4_NA	1_regseason
13	2019-02-20 20:45	Midget Sr	House	Don Montgomery Community Centre	4_NA	1_regseason

14	9:15, February 21st, 2019	Midget	AA	Ted Reeve Arena	4_NA	1_regseason
15	7:30pm, february 22nd, 2019	Senior Competitive	Tier I	Scotiabank Pond	2_female	1_regseason
16	8:10pm, february 22nd, 2019	Minor Bantam	AA	Scotiabank Pond	4_NA	1_regseason
17	5:30pm, february 23rd, 2019	Midget	A	Chesswood Arena	4_NA	1_regseason
18	7:10pm, December 4, 2019	PeeWee		Ted Reeve Community Arena	4_NA	1_regseason
19	8:10pm, December 4, 2019	Bantam		Ted Reeve Community Arena	4_NA	1_regseason
20	7:10pm, December 6, 2019	Peewee	House	East York Memorial Arena	3_coed	1_regseason
21	2019-12-06 20:00	Peewee	House	East York Memorial Arena	3_coed	1_regseason
22	2019-12-07 19:15	ECHL	.	CAA Centre	1_male	1_regseason
23	2019-12-08 16:00	AHL	.	Coca-Cola Coliseum	1_male	1_regseason
24	2019-12-09 20:10	PeeWee	Select	Commander Park Arena	4_NA	1_regseason
25	2019-12-09 21:10	Midget Sr	Select	Commander Park Arena	4_NA	1_regseason
26	2019-12-10 19:30	Midget	.	Scotiabank Pond	1_male	5_other
27	2019-12-16 7:00	Junior	B	Dave Andreychuk Memorial Arena	1_male	1_regseason
28	2019-12-17	NHL	.	Scotiabank Arena	1_male	1_regseason
29	2019-12-18 7:30	Junior	A	St. Michael's College School Arena	1_male	1_regseason

30	2019-12-20 7:00	Junior	Major	Paramount Fine Foods Centre	1_male	1_regseason
31	2019-12-22 7:00	Minor Bantam	Select	Amesbury Arena	4_NA	1_regseason
32	2019-12-23 8:00	Bantam	Select	Amesbury Arena	4_NA	1_regseason
33	2020-01-01 2:00	Junior	Major	Tribute Communitie s Centre	1_male	1_regseason
34	2020-02-08 14:15	Bantam	?	Canlan Ice Sports - York	2_female	1_regseason
35	2020-02-08 19:15	University	Varsity	Canlan Ice Sports - York	1_male	1_regseason
36	2020-02-18 17:00	Rec, Youth	Rec, ?	Scarboroug h Village Community	4_NA, 4_NA	4_NA, 5_other
37	2020-02-19 19:15	University	Varsity	Mattamy Home Ice	1_male	2_playoffs

Table 2. List of games attended in Toronto.

Appendix J: Table of interview participants

Participant	Reward	Age	Gender	Ethnicity	Born in Canada?	Immigrated from?	Visible Minority?	Role	Date Interviewed
Hal-001	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	47	Female	POC – Middle Eastern ; mixed-race/multiracial	No	Turkey (via short time in US)	Yes	1_Parent	2018-10-18
Hal-002	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	40	Male	White – Anglo-Celtic	Yes	.	No	3_Fan	2018-10-23
Hal-003	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	58	Male	White – Anglo-Celtic	Yes	.	No	1_Parent, 3_Fan	2018-10-30
Hal-004	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	11	Male	POC – Middle Eastern	No	Israel	No(?)	2_Player	2018-10-30
Hal-005	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	13	Male	POC - Middle Eastern	No	Israel	No(?)	2_Player	2018-10-30
Hal-006	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	25	Male	White – Subaltern; French	No	France	No	3_Fan, 2_FormerPlayer	2018-11-05
Hal-007	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	16	Male	POC – Middle Eastern ; mixed-race/multiracial	Yes	.	Yes	2_Player	2018-11-05
Hal-008	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	44	Male	White – Subaltern ; half-Italian	Yes	.	No	1_Parent	2019-01-18
Hal-009	\$25 Tim Horton's	50	Female	White – Subalte	Yes	.	No	1_Parent	2019-01-19

	s Gift Card			rn; Quebec ois					
Hal-010	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	12	Male	White – Anglo-Celtic	Yes	.	No	2_Player	2019-01-22
Hal-011	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	50	Male	White – Anglo-Celtic	Yes	.	No	1_Parent	2019-01-22
Hal-012	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	44	Female	White – Subaltern; Acadian ; mxd-race/multiracial	Yes	.	No	1_Parent	2019-01-25
Hal-013	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	11	Female	POC – Black; mixed-race/multiracial	Yes	.	Yes	2_Player	2019-01-25
Hal-014	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	49	Male	White – Anglo-Celtic	Yes	.	No	1_Parent	2019-01-29
Hal-015	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	16	Male	White – Anglo-Celtic	Yes	.	No	2_Player	2019-02-05
Hal-016	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	67	Male	White – Anglo-Celtic	Yes	.	.	3_Fan	2019-02-05
Hal-017	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	28	Female	White – Anglo-Celtic	Yes	.	.	1_Parent	2019-02-08
Hal-018	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	58	Male	White – Subaltern; Scottish - Acadian	Yes	.	No	1_Parent	2019-02-12

Hal-019	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	22	Male	White – Anglo-Celtic	Yes	.	No	2_Playe r	2019-02-14
Hal-020	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	13	Male	White – Anglo-Celtic	No	UK	No	2_Playe r	2019-04-16
Hal-021	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	48	Female	White – Anglo-Celtic	No	UK	No	1_Pare nt	2019-04-16
Hal-022	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	47	Male	White – Anglo-Celtic	No	UK	No	1_Pare nt	2019-04-16
Hal-023	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	13	Male	POC – Black; mixed-race/multiracial	No	Barbados	Yes	2_Playe r	2019-04-27
Hal-024	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	59	Male	White – Anglo-Celtic; mixed-race/multiracial	Yes	.	No	1_Pare nt	2019-04-27
Hal-025	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	60	Male	White – Anglo-Celtic	Yes	.	No	2_Playe r	2019-05-27
Hal-026	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	NA	Female	White – Subal tern; Italian-Irish	Yes	.	No	4_KeyIn forman t	2019-06-14
Hal-027	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	50s	Male	POC – Black	Yes	.	Yes	4_KeyIn forman t	2019-06-19
Hal-028	\$0 (Did not accept gift card)	49	Male	White – Anglo-Celtic	Yes	.	No	4_KeyIn forman t	2019-07-04

Hal-029	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	26	Male	White – Anglo-Celtic	Yes	.	No	2_Playe r	2019-07-05
Hal-030	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	11	Female	White - Subal tern; half- Acadian White	Yes	.	No	2_Playe r	2019-07-10
Hal-031	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	45	Male	White – Anglo-Celtic	Yes	.	No	4_KeyIn forman t	2019-07-10
Hal-032	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	34	Male	White – Subal tern; Dutch	Yes	.	No	3_Fan	2019-07-12
Hal-033	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	39	Male	White – Anglo-Celtic	Yes	.	No	4_KeyIn forman t	2019-07-16
Hal-034	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	56	Male	White – Anglo-Celtic	Yes	.	No	3_Fan	2019-07-17
Hal-035	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	23	Male	White – Anglo-Celtic	Yes	.	No	2_Playe r	2019-07-23
Hal-036	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	20	Male	White – Anglo-Celtic	Yes (from Elite Prospects)	.	No	2_Playe r	2019-09-05
Hal-037	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	18	Male	POC – Middle-Eastern ; Lebanese	Yes (from Elite Prospects)	.	Yes	2_Playe r	2019-09-05
Hal-038	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	21	Male	White – Anglo-Celtic	Yes	.	No	2_Playe r	2019-09-18
Hal-039	\$25 Tim Horton's	38	Male	White – Anglo-Celtic	No	UK	No	4_KeyIn forman t	2019-10-17

	s Gift Card								
Hal-040	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	23	Male	White – Anglo-Celtic	Yes	.	No	2_Player	2019-11-01
Hal-041	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	11	Male	POC – Middle-Eastern ; Afghani	No	Iran	Yes	2_Player	2020-01-22
Hal-042	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	14	Male	POC – Middle-Eastern ; Afghani	No	Iran	Yes	2_Player	2020-01-22
Hal-043	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	13	Female	POC – Middle-Eastern ; Syrian	No	Syria	Yes	2_Player	2020-01-22
Hal-044	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	29	Male	White – Subaltein; Dutch	Yes	.	No	2_Player	2020-02-05
Hal-045	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	23	Male	White – Anglo-Celtic	Yes	.	No	2_Player	2020-02-22
Hal-046	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	23	Female	POC – East Asian; Chinese	No	Singapore	Yes	3_Fan	2020-02-25
Hal-047	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	30s	Male	White – Subaltein; Portuguese	Yes	.	No	2_Player	N/A
Hal-048	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	23	Male	White – Anglo-Celtic	Yes	.	No	2_Player	2020-02-27
Hal-049	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	24	Male	White – Subaltein; Dutch	Yes	.	No	3_Fan	2020-03-17

Hal-050	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	24	Male	White – Anglo-Celtic	Yes	.	No	2_Player	2020-03-20
---------	-----------------------------	----	------	----------------------	-----	---	----	----------	------------

Table 3. Table of interview participants in Halifax.

Participant	Reward	Age	Gender	Ethnicity	Born in Canada?	Immigrated from?	Visible Minority?	Role	Date Interviewed
TO-001	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	55	Male	POC – East Asian; Chinese	No	Hong Kong (present-day China)	Yes	3_Fan	02-21-2019
TO-002	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card (x2)	67, 86	Male, Male	White – Anglo-Celtic (x2)	Yes, yes	.	No, No	3_Fan, 3_Fan	02-21-2019
TO-003	. (Did not accept offered \$25 Tim Horton's gift card)	32	Male	White – Subaltern; Italian	Yes	.	No (?)	4_KeyInformant	02-23-2019
TO-004	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	50s	Male	White – Subaltern; Portuguese	NA	.	.	4_KeyInformant	04-11-2019
TO-005	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	13	Male	POC – Black; mixed-race/multiracial	Yes	.	Yes	2_Player	12-05-2019
TO-006	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	41	Female	White – Anglo-Celtic; mixed-race/multiracial	Yes	.	No	1_Parent	12-05-2019

TO-007	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	44	Male	POC – East Asian; Chinese	Yes	.	Yes	4_KeyInformant	12-09-2019
T00-08	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	47	Male	White – Anglo-Celtic	Yes	.	No	1_Parent	12-10-2019
T00-09	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	42	Male	POC – East Asian; Chinese	No	Hong Kong (present-day China)	Yes	3_Fan	12-11-2019
TO-010	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	35	Male	POC – South Asian; East Indian	No	India	Yes	2_Playerr	12-16-2019
TO-011	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	15	Male	POC; Middle Eastern ; mixed-race/multiracial; Jewish-Ethiopian	Yes	.	Yes	2_Playerr	12-16-2019
TO-012	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	11	Male	POC; Middle Eastern ; mixed-race/multiracial	Yes	.	Yes	2_Playerr	12-16-2019
TO-013	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	30	Male	White – Anglo-Celtic	Yes	.	No	4_KeyInformant	12-17-2019
TO-014	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	15	Male	POC – Black; mixed-race/multiracial	Yes	.	Yes	2_Playerr	12-20-2019

TO-015	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	48	Male	POC – Black; mixed-race/multiracial	Yes	.	Yes	3_Fan	12-23-2019
TO-016	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	?	Male	White – Subaltern; Danish	Yes	.	No	4_KeyInformant	12-04-2019
TO-017	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	?	Male	POC – East Asian; Chinese	No	China	Yes	2_Player	12-06-2019
TO-018	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	?	Female	White – Anglo-Celtic	?	?	?	4_KeyInformant	12-07-2019
TO-019	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	57	Male	White – Subaltern; Portuguese	No	Portugal	?Notsure	4_KeyInformant	12-08-2019
TO-020	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	mid-late30s	Female	POC – Black; mixed/multiracial	Yes (I think?)	.	Yes	4_KeyInformant	12-09-2019
TO-021	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	36	Male	White – Subaltern;	Yes	.	?Notsure	3_Fan	12-10-2019
TO-022	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	mid-40s	Female	White – Anglo-Celtic	No	America	?	1_Parent	12-10-2019
TO-023	\$0 (forgot to give him gift card, don't think it would have been approp	45	Male	POC – South Asian	Yes	.	Yes	4_KeyInformant	02-08-2020

	riate anyway s though)								
TO-024	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	49	Male	White – Anglo-Celtic	Yes	.	No	1_Parent	02-09-2020
TO-025	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	14	Male	White – Anglo-Celtic	Yes	.	No	2_Playe r	02-09-2020
TO-026	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	20	Female	White – Anglo-Celtic	Yes	.	No	3_Fan	02-09-2020
TO-027	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	52	Female	White – Anglo-Celtic	Yes	.	No	1_Parent	02-09-2020
TO-028	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	18	Male	White – Anglo-Celtic	Yes	.	No	2_Playe r	02-09-2020
TO-029	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	16	Male	White – Anglo-Celtic	Yes	.	No	2_Playe r	02-09-2020
TO-030	\$25 Tim Horton's Gift Card	58	Male	POC - East Asian; Chinese	Yes	.	Yes	3_Fan	02-18-2020

Table 4. Table of interview participants in Toronto.