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Abstract

This thesis is a study of a contemporary space at the University of Toronto: The Goldring Centre for High Performance Sport (GCHPS). The motto for the GCHPS was “Pursue (your) Greatness”. I explored the ways in which greatness may be connected to the research and practices of the exercise sciences, sports medicine, and athletics. I drew on the theoretical insights of Lefebvre (1991), and scholars of space and sport (e.g., Pronger, 2001; Atkinson, 2009; van Ingen, 2003; Fusco, 2005). I explain the Centre’s ties to the University’s institutional vision for academic and athletic excellence, as well as the provincial and federal government’s investment in sport. I argue that this production is tied to legacies of classism, whiteness, and scientific knowledge/power, and is neglectful of the interests of the broader university community. I conclude by suggesting that scholars must be critical of the socio-cultural and political aspects of spaces and disciplines.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

As a Master’s student in the Faculty of Kinesiology and Physical Education (FKPE), I am invited to participate in the relatively elite and exclusive space(s) of the GCHPS. On the fourth floor of the building, I study in the Sports Physical activity and Cultural Environments (SPaCE) lab, where our interests lie in critically analyzing power relations within physical cultures and spaces of sport. As I walk through the Centre’s halls, I acknowledge the expansive new building, the bare, white walls that surround me, and the natural sunlight that shines through the windows. On the second and third floors, in the Fitness Centre, I take in the clear view of Varsity Stadium, through the immense windows that comprise the Centre’s front walls. In the fitness centre, I see red-shirted staff, recreational users, and high performance sport athletes, but mostly I see structured, ordered, separate levels of space: four tiers that hold high performance (and recreational) fitness equipment that is designed for specific, purposeful, athletic training. On the main floor, I am greeted with an open view of the Centre’s sunken gymnasium, where shiny, wooden floors; folded, navy seats; and bright lights surround female athletes who train on the court.

When I am in this space, I am also continually reminded of the ways in which the knowledge produced through and by the exercise sciences and their associated technologies is applied to active, moving, human bodies. For instance, I often see and hear stories about the ongoing inquiries of kinesiology that are conducted in the labs when I interact with other graduate students. In Biomechanics studies, research may involve force plates and physics calculations, analysis of joint angles and meticulous measurements of range of motion. In the Physiology labs, cardiovascular systems may be evaluated, perhaps tested and monitored during a maximal, three-minute exertion on a bike. In the Motor Control and Learning Lab, a robot and various computer technologies are meticulously worked on and studied by graduate students.
Lastly, in the Sports Medicine Clinic, therapies and treatments for the injured and healing take place. When I pass through the clinic waiting room, I stop to stare at various tensor bands and devices for treating injuries, and I notice how they are locked in a prestigious glass case display, seemingly too valuable for the everyday touch. I begin to wonder how all these diverse practices might be implicated in shaping dreams, desires, and rationalized visions of “greatness.”

As I navigate my way through the building, I am reminded of my place of privilege, as well as the privilege of others, who are welcomed to engage in this modern, exclusive, affluent space that has been recently produced on our campus. I realize that in this Centre, members of the University community, and others, are engaging in enjoyable experiences of spectating and participating in sport. I also acknowledge the importance of scientific research, as I see the possible ways in which these pursuits often benefit individuals, our society, and a collective state of wellness. Yet, as Merrifield (2000) suggests, academic space is tied to contemporary, capitalist spatial practices:

> For we scholars and intellectuals who operate in the academy now find our own space and lives increasingly under assault from the same commodification Lefebvre tried to demystify years ago. Our space – our academic space, in our department, on paper – is itself becoming (has become?) yet another abstract space of capitalism, and we ourselves are the perpetrators, are the formulators of new kinds of representations that are inexorably tied to relations of production and to the ‘order’ they impose. (p.181)

Accordingly, I have imagined this space in a different way that extends beyond the dominant discourses and material practices of prosperity, strength and sovereignty through the sports sciences, sports medicine and elite sport. As graduate student of the University of Toronto, I am encouraged to engage in critical research that questions the assumptions of esteemed institutionalized and societal beliefs. The University of Toronto’s Mission and Purpose states:
Within the unique university context, the most crucial of all human rights are the rights of freedom of speech, academic freedom, and freedom of research. And we affirm that these rights are meaningless unless they entail the right to raise deeply disturbing questions and provocative challenges to the cherished beliefs of society at large and of the university itself. It is this human right to radical, critical teaching and research with which the University has a duty above all to be concerned; for there is no one else, no other institution and no other office, in our modern liberal democracy, which is the custodian of this most precious and vulnerable right of the liberated human spirit. (http://www.utoronto.ca/about-uoft/mission-and-purpose)

This mission provokes me to engage in critical thinking that may pose discomforths for those whose research and practice are deeply-rooted in particular normalized beliefs and values. Critical research is part of the rights, and the responsibilities, of democracy; critical research questions and exposes the “most previous and vulnerable right of the liberated human spirit.”

I have sought then to use my academic freedom and my driven curiosity to pay attention to what often might be neglected or unnoticed in a seemingly utopian high performance sport centre. I challenged myself to think critically about a space that I was asked to celebrate, and I wanted to deconstruct the possible relations of power embedded in notions of greatness, both within the University and in kinesiology, that operate in the GCHPS. I sought to elucidate the discursive and spatial practices in this Centre and ultimately, I asked: Who and what do ideologies of “greatness” serve, and at what cost?

In the next section, I provide background information on the Centre’s production and opening. Namely, I include a factual account of the perceived need for high performance sport infrastructure in Ontario (and on the University of Toronto’s campus). I also state the sources of funding and describe some of the Centre’s opening events and promotional activities.
The Making of Goldring

Discussions regarding the construction of a high performance sport facility in Ontario have been ongoing for over 15 years. In the early 2000s, the development of new sporting infrastructure in Ontario was perceived to be necessary for raising healthier children, Ontarian athletes, and Canadian Olympians (Wallace, 2003). An article in *The Globe and Mail*, entitled “To score big, Ontario athletes need new facilities,” states: “A modern Toronto centre providing scientifically informed training is desperately needed by those at the top of their game now. And young kids need a chance to watch them train and dream of the future” (Campbell, 2007, p.A12).

The Goldring Centre for High Performance Sport is a newly developed sporting complex located on the University of Toronto’s St. George campus and is a new flagship facility for the Faculty of Kinesiology and Physical Education (FKPE). The construction of the Goldring Centre for High Performance Sport has received attention from local newspapers and from the Faculty of Kinesiology and Physical Education’s seasonal magazine *Pursuit*. The $58 million Goldring Centre was funded in part by the Province of Ontario’s Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities, as well as by three Toronto families, including the family of the late University of Toronto graduate Warren Goldring after whom the Centre is named (Smith, 2014). In 2006, Warren Goldring donated $11 million to the campaign to raise money for a high performance sport centre on the university campus. Donations were also made by the late Gordon Stollery and Ron Kimel, a University of Toronto alumnus and former Varsity athlete, and his family. In 2011, the Ontario’s Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities invested $22.5 million for the development of the Centre. Additional donations were made by Accenture Inc., Alex Chiu Annual Golf Tournament, C.A. Delaney Capital Management Ltd., EllisDon Corporation, and the Davenport family (Shim, 2014).
Throughout its planning, construction and opening, The Goldring Centre for High Performance Sports was discursively and materially represented as a valuable and necessary space for the University of Toronto’s Varsity Blues athletes, researchers and members of the Faculty of Kinesiology and Physical Education, and the broader university community. During its construction, University of Toronto administration supported this space, and suggested that it would be beneficial for the university community. For instance, on January 31, 2012, after the Groundbreaking Ceremony (marking the beginning of the building of the Centre) a message from the University of Toronto’s Office of the President stated: “The ground breaking ceremony for the Goldring Centre for High Performance Sport, held on January 31, marked the final phase of the Varsity Centre complex. The Goldring Centre will enhance the student experience by providing much needed additional physical activity programming space for the University of Toronto community.” The 300 guests attending this event listened to speeches from Dean Ira Jacobs, U of T President Meric Gertler, Judy and Blake Goldring, and the Minister of Tourism, Culture and Sport, the Honorable Michael (MPP) Coteau (Ryeland, Oct. 2014).

Similar discourses prevailed during the Goldring Centre’s official opening ceremony on October 27th, 2014. Speeches were given by a student athlete, members of the Goldring Family and Dean Jacobs. In these speeches, the Centre was linked to raising the next generation of Canadian Olympians, promoting student health and fostering student pride. In addition, the University’s flickr page (an image-based social media account) notes:

members of the community celebrated the official opening of the Goldring Centre for High Performance Sport. The multi-storey complex will fill a critical gap in Ontario’s high performance sport infrastructure. It will create a ‘sport institute’ environment like no other in the province, fostering synergies between sport science research and teaching, sport medicine, athlete training, coaching and world-class competition. (https://www.flickr.com/photos/71041967@N02/15656827171/)

A few days after this opening event, an additional gathering, a Donor Celebration, was held (Shim, 2014). Guests were handed a map and invited to tour the five floors of the Centre, prior
to gathering for the announcement of the three newest donations from the Cardiac Health Foundation of Canada, Kylemore Communities, and the Harbord Street Business Improvement Area. The Cardiac Health Foundation of Canada secured a $325,000 donation for a research lab named in honor of a cardiac health researcher, the Dr. Terry Kavanagh Heart Health Lab (Ryeland, Dec, 2014). This was one of two labs labeled on the Goldring map, as well as the Iovate/Muscletech Metabolism and Sports Science Lab sponsored by a nutritional supplement company. In addition to their efforts to organize the donor celebration event, Kylemore communities announced a $100,000 sponsorship for the Kylemore Communities Conference Room on the second floor. In all, the total donated funds for this Centre were over $31 million (Ryeland, Dec. 2014).

After the Centre’s opening, the Goldring Centre was celebrated and the University of Toronto community members were invited to participate in this space (Appendix A). Around FKPE and on campus, the Centre’s new motto was on display - “Pursue Greatness”. The promotional material distributed and displayed around campus during the Centre’s development and opening months described the space as a “Dream Realized” (Appendix B), a space that “enhances student experience.” Additional promotional material invites all to “pursue (your) greatness, discover, learn, compete, get fit, have fun” (University of Toronto, 2014). In April 2015, The Faculty of KPE website stated:

Although the name of this new facility is the Goldring Centre for High Performance Sport, the building has been designed to welcome anyone from the university and local community who is interested in physical activity and sport - from students, faculty and staff looking for a great place to work out, to intercollegiate, intramural and international-level student-athletes coming to train, practice and compete. (http://physical.utoronto.ca/FacilitiesAndMemberships/goldring-centre-for-high-performance-sport.aspx)

In May 2015, the Centre nearing the end of its first academic year of operation was a “Design Excellence Award” recipient at the 2015 Ontario Association of Architects (OAA) Celebration of Excellence Awards (http://www.oaa.on.ca/news%20--%20events/news/ detail/OAA-
announces-winner-of-inaugural-Lieutenant-Governor’s-Award,-awards-spotlight-designs-that-shape-cities-and-strengthen-communities/1503). Today, it remains populated by some of the university’s Varsity Blues athletes (e.g., members of the female and male volleyball, basketball and ice hockey teams), some of FKPE’s professors, researchers and graduate students, a variety of sports medicine practitioners and patients, and other student/university community members pursuing recreational fitness.

In the following chapter, I provide a review of the literature on spaces of sport, critical scholarship on research and practice within institutions of higher education, and the conception of excellence (and greatness) within academia and high performance athletics. Next, I detail the theoretical framework that is used in this critical study of a space of sport and scholarship. In chapter 3, I explain the methodological approach that is taken to this qualitative inquiry. Chapters 4, 5 and 6 are my analysis chapters, wherein I elaborate on the production of a high performance sport and research space, and I describe the three moments of Goldring’s space. I pay particular attention to the details of the Centre’s building plans, the ongoing spatial practices and the lived experience that enable or resist the dominant discourses and conception for this space. I highlight their social, political, economic and technological contexts in order to theorize a response to my research question, who and what do ideologies of “greatness” serve, and at what cost? In Chapter 7, I conclude that the production of this space is tied to the political and financial interests of the elite stakeholders (e.g., the university administrators, provincial and national government, high performance athletes, corporate funders). In sum, I problematize the pursuit of greatness within sport science research and practice, as well as the pursuit of excellence (in academics and athletics) within an institution of higher education. Future research might explore the lived experiences of those who are part of the university community who do/do not participate in this space (e.g., in high performance or recreational athletics, or in the sports sciences).
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The following is a review of the literature pertaining to spatial analyses and geographies of sport in physical cultural studies. Specifically, I review literature on spaces of sport on North American University campuses, Canadian National- Multi Sport Centres (NSCs), and the corporatization and commercialization of Canadian institutions of high education, and within Departments of Kinesiology, as well as a critical analysis of sport at the University of Toronto in particular. Finally, and importantly, I also review literature pertaining to the institutionalization of whiteness, which would have an important role to play in my analysis of the Goldring Centre for High performance Sport.

Spatial Analysis in Physical Cultural Studies

It has been theorized that spaces and places act to govern and regulate individuals and communities (Dean, 1999; Crang & Thrift, 2000). In their discussion of space, place and culture, Gupta and Ferguson (1992) suggest that spaces are tied to sociopolitical histories; as such, spaces are not neutral. The authors note:

> by always foregrounding the spatial distribution of hierarchical power relations, we can better understand the processes whereby a space achieves a distinctive identity as a place … the identity of a place emerges by the intersection of its specific involvement in a system of hierarchically organized spaces with its cultural construction as a community or locality. (p.36)

The International Committee for the Sociology of Sport released a special issue of *The International Review for the Sociology of Sport* focused on Sport and Space in 1993. Puig and Ingham (1993), the editors of the edition acknowledge:

> Those who practice sport, plan or work in it, are hardly ever conscious of the social nature of the spaces where the sporting activities take place. There is a general
tendency to regard them as being subject to considerations of a practical character only, that is, they should provide the ideal technical conditions to make possible the correct execution of the sporting activity and ensure the well-being and comfort of those who practice it. (p.101)

They recognized that complex social relationships exist within spaces of sport, and emphasized the need to study the form and production of space, as well as the “cultural codes of the collectives who live in this space, their interests and their position in power relationships” (p.102). The issue’s introduction poses thought-provoking questions such as “What relationship exists between spatial segregation and the exercise of power in a specific society? What are the socio-historical circumstances in which space is produced?” (p.102) These inquiries suggest the vast potentialities of spatial formations including their ties to (re)producing relationships of power and collective identities, as well as the social, cultural and historical contexts of space(s) of sport.

The work of John Bale (e.g., 1993; 1994) was fundamental to the developing of studies pertaining to the geography of sport and space that emerged in the early 2000s. In *Sport, Space and the City*, Bale (1993) examines space, environment and architecture of modern football stadiums. He argues that in modern sport landscapes, specialized roles and spatial order territorialize and categorize space. In his analysis, he draws from Foucault (1979) and theorizes that sporting landscapes are mechanisms of social control, as they permit the unobtrusive surveillance of individuals. He also suggests that athletes are easily identifiable and surveyed by power structures who acquire knowledge and power over their actions and bodies. Thus, Bale (1993) critiques the spaces of achievement-based spectacle, and states that they mirror the inequities of the surrounding society and foster a misleading sense of community:
The achievement space of sport mirrors that of society... But as in other modern landscapes they will make people feel less like persons and more like things (Gregory 1989:370). These landscapes of spectacle will attract the discriminating consumer rather than the committed fan... The super clubs will provide spectacles which may symbolize community – but they will only symbolize it. At this level at least, and in David Harvey’s words, ‘place and community’ will have given way to ‘space and capital. (Harvey, 1989 as cited in Bale, 1993, p.179)

Bale suggests that although a sense of community identification may occur through a collective spirit and pride for local teams, discrimination is implicated in these landscapes, for instance, through the distancing of social class.

In Landscapes of Modern Sport Bale (1994) asserts that modern sporting environments reflect dominant cultural ideologies (i.e. of achievement, nationalism and patriarchy). As such, political and economic histories, as well as aesthetic qualities, orient and shape the observer and participant perception. He further suggests that in achievement sport, the natural bodies of athletes are exploited and monitored in pursuit of performance and spectacle (Rail, 1991, p. 748-9, in Bale, 1994).

After the 1993 special issue of the International Review for the Sociology of Sport, there was a period when there was no sustained, specific focus on space in sociology of sport until the study of geographies of sport and space resurfaced in the early 2000s. van Ingen (2003) advocates for the study of the geography of space, and calls for the unpacking of the interrelations between space, race, gender, and sexuality in sport. She argues:

By drawing on theorists such as Henri Lefebvre, sport sociologists can begin to explore the social production of space, place the body at the centre of inquiry and explore the ways in which socially constructed differences are materialized in social space (p.207).

van Ingen suggests that a post-modern spatial approach to spaces in sport can help to identify how socially constructed differences are produced, and may be managed, concealed or neglected.

In Sites of Sport: Space, Place, Experience, Vertinsky and Bale (2004) highlight the relations (e.g., of class, gender, consumption and performance) within contemporary sites of
sport (e.g., the locker room) and physical culture (e.g., mountains and beaches). The editors make the distinction between space and place, and feature a selection of essays that profile the ways in which diverse landscapes of sport and physical activity are both celebrated and contested. For instance, Thomson (2004) analyzes primary school playgrounds, and argues that these spaces are extensions of the institution’s prescriptive, rigid, and controlled classrooms. Accordingly, she argues that they constrain to the spontaneity of child’s play and sense of autonomy. Vertinsky (2004) studies the relations between space, place and gender in the construction of a Canadian university gymnasium, in addition to Park (2004) and Fusco (2004), whose chapters pertain to research on spaces of sport within university campuses. This critical scholarship is detailed in the following section.

Fusco (2005) calls for further engagement with spatial ethnographies in sport and physical activity, and asserts that they:

> can help us trace different kinds of genealogies of the self in and on sports landscapes, which may help us better understand how the construction of subjectivities and the built environments of sport are interlocked. (Fusco, 2005, p.24-25)

Fusco (2005) also advocates that “paying attention to the geography of sport means being vigilant about how the sociocultural organization of space produces and embodies constructions of race, gender, sexuality, class, ability and nationhood. … [F]undamentally, (sport) spaces are not places for everyone” (p.305). In addition, Fusco’s (2006) theorizes the interconnections between whiteness and the built landscapes of sport. Other scholars (e.g., Silk & Andrews, 2006) contribute to the growing literature on space, neoliberalism and the reproduction of citizenship.

After van Ingen’s (2003) article, scholars in the field of physical cultural studies continued to explore the social production of space and the importance of the body in space through (i.e., Lefebvre’s work). For instance, Atkinson (2009) connects Lefebvre’s (1991) theorization of the social-cultural dynamics of city spaces, wherein physical spaces and
architecture inflict and order social relations and movement:

Roads, buildings, parks, schools, even rivers and trees in the city are managed as social space (or rather as market commodities) with market capitalist codes, uses, and relations in mind. (p.175)

Atkinson suggests that parkour (also known as free running) explores “how one’s body is shaped by the political geography of a late modern city” (p.170). He states:

Parkour is a physical cultural disruption of the taken-for-grantedness of corporatized and denaturalized urban zones and is intended to transform it into a collective scapeland1. (p.192)

In addition, Friedman and van Ingen (2011) advocate that for Lefebvre (1991), the body is integral to social space, as space is produced in relation to the body. The authors write that even though landscapes of sport are entrenched with active bodies, the body is absent in much of the research on sporting spaces. Thus, the authors call for Lefebvrian spatial analyses in PCS that “can become a fertile ground for geographic inquiry that critically analyzes space, power/resistance and bodies” (p.91). They assert that spatial analysis is a powerful theoretical tool that can further the understandings of geography and the body, including the embodied understandings of race, gender, and sexuality. Importantly, they state:

Whether in the embodied identities of gender, race, ethnicity, or sexuality or in the various spatial scales analyzed within cultural geography, the failure of PCS to locate the body within space would be a missed opportunity to create more fully developed analyses of the various forces operating within dominant power relations. (p.95)

The authors advocate that the unpacking of inequitable and unjust social relations is critical in any field of study, and cite Lefebvre (1991):

1 “Scapeland are, for Lyotard (1989), physical spaces that produce an emancipating experiential awareness of impermanence, emptiness, unconscious remainder, and presence. A scapeland is characterized by the absence of direction and destination provided by cultural scripts or modes of thinking and understanding, such as technocapitalist ways of mapping and defining urban infrastructures or physical cultural practices within them. A scapeland is raw, open, primitive, and decolonized space.” (Atkinson, 2009, p. 192)
any revolutionary ‘project’ today, whether utopian or realistic, must, if it is to avoid hopeless banality, make the reappropriation of the body, in association with the reappropriation of space, into a non-negotiable part of its agenda. (Lefebvre, 1991, as cited in Friedman & van Ingen, 2011, p. 99)

Friedman and van Ingen (2011) also suggest “Paying attention to what and who is included in particular spaces at particular times should not divert our critical attention away from who is excluded from social space and the broader social forces that have produced those patterns” (p.94).

In sum, the works of these critical scholars in the area of physical culture of studies and geographies of sport (e.g., van Ingen, 2003; Fusco, 2004, 2006; Atkinson, 2009; Friedman & van Ingen, 2011) call for the further inquiries in physical cultural studies that explore socio-cultural power relations through the lens of Lefebvre’s (1991) spatial theory. In the following section, I will detail the study of spaces of sport that pertain specifically to North American university campuses.

**Spaces of Sport on North American University campuses**

The spatial dynamics and practices of competitive sport and the spaces that are associated with them on North American university campuses have also received attention from academics. Notably, Park (2004), Vertinsky (2004) and Fusco (2004, 2005) theorize dominant relations of power, as well as structural and ideological inequities embedded within sporting facilities on university campuses. In her interrogation of high performance sport in post-secondary North American institutions, Park (2004) examines the development of the University of California’s Harmon Gymnasium. She writes that within gymnasia on college campuses, bodies are constrained and disciplined through prescribed exercise programmes, intense training, and methodological evaluation. Park (2004) suggests, “Here values that coalesce in, construct and reinforce our conceptions of power, weakness, masculinity, femininity, and much more are, quite literally, ‘acted out’” (p.178). In other words, she advocates that dominant societal values are
constructed and consolidated in these settings. Yet,

[w]hen questions are asked about such things as their centrality or marginality (both physical and conceptual); their architectural style, their size, floor plans and functionality; who uses what portions of the facility and under what conditions; which modality dominates … and where in the hierarchical value structures of an institution do programmes whose focus is the exercising body stand, it becomes evident that realities are more complex. (p.178)

Likewise, Vertinsky (2004), in her analysis on the War Memorial Gymnasium on the University of British Columbia’s campus, discusses the French modernist architect, Le Corbusier, in her theorization of the logical gendered messages embedded within the shape and architectural practices of modern gymnasia on North American campuses. She notes that Le Corbusier believed that forms shape space, and in effect, space shape social relations. Le Corbusier advocated that inherent within the machine-like nature of gymnasiums should be representations of masculine activity and power (for instance, upright windows can symbolize masculinity as they permit domination of the visible, and a territorial sense of security). She states:

Upon observing the widespread gothic style of gymnasium architecture on North American campuses, he determined that such spaces could never be considered appropriate for athletic development in high education. They were, he said ‘caged, chlorotic and spiritless – not in any way helpful in building supermen’ (Le Corbusier, 1925). In his eyes, every modernist project was a gymnasium of sorts where the modern body wasregulated in measured spaces, with light, air and space arranged for training, ordering and recreations. Not everyone, however, was granted equal access to the symbolic realm of modernism and its ordered and functional spaces, and, as we shall see, the female body soon became estranged from the spaces of the War Memorial Gymnasium. (p.18)

Fusco’s (2004) critical rethinking of locker rooms also continues the specific analysis of spaces on a university campus. She draws from critical spatial theory to analyze the ways in which specific subjectivities are engendered within the architecture and practices of locker room spaces. She suggests that these are complex spaces where dominant ideologies are produced and reproduced, and in effect, enable and constrain subjectivities. Additionally, Fusco (2005) historicizes and contextualizes sport spaces within discourses of whiteness. She theorizes that
architecturally, modern landscapes of sports spaces may be racialized landscapes. For instance, she draws from sports geographers, including Bale, and writes:

> it might be suggested that the rational, straight-lined, and quantified landscapes of modern sports inevitably support(ed) the production and performance of white(ned) hegemonic masculinities. Furthermore, these new sports environments, in conjunction with popularized myths of landscapes, sustained the historical continuity of white, Western, racial homogeneity. (Bale, 1994; Rutherford, 1997, as cited in Fusco, 2005, p.285).

She discusses the architectural preference for white surfaces, and writes “the white surfaces of buildings, like white skin and white clothing, came to signal and represent visible signs of propriety, cleanliness, purification, and order” (p.287). Notably, in her interview with the architect of a locker room sport centre, Fusco (2005) reports that the architect emphasized aspects of commodity, legibility and visibility, which, as Lokko (2000) suggests, are connected to notions of whiteness and purity.

There have been other studies in sport sociology that have looked at locker room spaces (e.g., Bruce, 1998; Clarke, 2000; Fusco, 1998; Griffin, 1998; Pronger, 1990; Theberge, 1995), as well as those that have made connections to power relations of gender and sexuality (e.g., Atkinson, 2011). Still, Fusco’s (2005) work on whiteness in locker room spaces, in addition to the literature on institutionalized whiteness (e.g., Macalpine & Marsh, 2005; Macdonald, 2009) and whiteness within university departments of kinesiology and physical education (e.g., Douglas and Halas, 2013) were salient to my thinking of the production of this Centre and colonialist legacies. I will return to this discussion later in this review of literature in the section on ‘Institutionalized Whiteness’. Suffice to say, many of these university and college sports spaces are designated spaces for recreational athletes however as many universities and colleges have intercollegiate representative teams they can also be sites for high performance training. I now turn to a brief analysis of high performance sport and sport centres, as the name of the GCHPS directs attention towards this class of training and performance.
High Performance Sport Centres and the Status of High Performance Athletes in Canada

Fusco (2009) explores the political, economic, historical, spatial and discursive fields connected to the establishment of Canadian National-Multi Sport Centres (NSCs). She critically analyzes the National Sport Centres Position Paper that was issued in 1998 by Sport Canada and its partnering agencies, the Canadian Olympic Association and the Coaching Association of Canada. Using Lefebvre’s (1991) spatial triad, as well as Foucauldian (1977) theories of surveillance, she critically analyzes the discursive and material representations of NSCs, and urges scholars to pay attention to the interrelations between the political management of bodies and spaces. Ultimately, she questions the objectives of these governing agencies and suggests: “the ideological commitment to the development of NSCs was not only embedded in discourses of performance, excellence, discipline and nationhood but also in discourses of space and the surveillance of bodies.” (p.2)

In her investigation, Fusco (2009) uses the NSCs mission statement, policy interventions and media releases to critically analyze the objectives of major stakeholders in their efforts to professionalize Canadian high performance athletes arguing that:

while NSC spaces were committed to providing funding, medical care, competitive experiences, and state-of-the-art environments to facilitate athletes development in their respective sports, NSC policy interventions and subsequent spaces can also be read as mechanisms of spatialization and subjectivation that, in effect, enable the government’s subordination of Canadian athletes’ bodies to the pursuit of excellence. (p.2)

Importantly, Fusco calls for further critical investigation of high performance sport spaces that extends beyond the study of sport management and athletic success.

Scholars should be concerned by the interactions among the state conceptions of spaces and expertise of expertise and performance, the disciplining of the athlete’s body, and the particular forms of expression of state panoptics in producing sports policy should continue to concern sport scholars. (p.2)
Critical studies on high performance sport carried out by Shogan (1999), Beamish and Ritchie (2006), and Baker, Safai and Fraser-Thomas (2015) collectively question the ethics of the ‘high performance’ sporting pursuit. Shogan (1999) reflects upon her own coaching experiences within University-level sport and argues that there are harmful effects of the ‘disciplinary technologies’ of athletic training. She argues that disciplinary powers are inflicted upon athletes by sports scientists, as their knowledge and claims of “truth” are legitimized and applied by coaches. Shogan suggests that coaches use “the subject matter of high performance sport and translate this information into ever more exacting technologies of docility to produce ever more disciplined athletes” (Shogan, 1999, p.39). Shogan also states that high performance athletes learn that training with intensity is best and, while they may be unaware of when they are being watched by their trainers and coaches, they learn to self-police during training as they combine these values of docility and correct training into their training practices.

Similarly, in Fastest, Highest, Strongest, Beamish and Ritchie (2006) critique the dynamics of contemporary world-class high performance sport. The authors suggest:

This study’s most important findings concern the ways in which larger political and social events shaped the decisions and actions of those who laid the foundations for the contemporary world of high-performance sport. Idealism, ideology, war, conquest, the pursuit of geo-political power, wealth, personal interest, and the dominating influence of technical rationality all combined to constitute the world in which athletes today make their decisions. (p.5)

The authors state that high performance athletes are driven to perfect their bodies in order to perform beyond their perceived limits. Comparable to Shogan (1999), they note that in modern high performance sport, intensive sport systems apply carefully directed experimental research and high performance technologies to athletic training. They athletic body is pushed to excel beyond human limits, which perhaps poses issues (e.g., the use of performance enhancement supplements, over-training, manipulating research) that require further ethical consideration. Furthermore, they assert that problematic socio-historical political approaches to sport are
repeated in the contemporary high performance sport model.

Baker, Safai and Fraser-Thomas (2015) question if high performance ‘is a healthy pursuit’, and suggest several consequences (e.g., for an individual’s physical and psychological health, as well for society) of pursuing excellence in and through elite-level sport. While athletic excellence and elite sporting pursuits are critiqued by scholars (Shogan, 1999; Beamish & Ritchie, 2006; Baker, Safai & Fraser-Thomas, 2015), they continue to be supported through campaigns and infrastructural initiatives within Canadian institutions including universities. There is a rich history of critical studies of Canadian high performance sport and federal initiatives for sport performance. Beamish (1990) highlights the findings of a 1986-1987 survey of Canadian national team athletes. The survey data indicates that upper SES group status was a primary facet of the national team athletes. While the federal governments’ intentions and proposed initiatives to surmount a barrier to sport participation, lower SES, began in 1970, Beamish advocates:

The data in this study clearly indicate that athletes from Canada’s national team are significantly overrepresented among the upper SES groups and significantly underrepresented among the lower SES groups, no matter what indicators of SES are used. (p. 1)

Additionally, Ekos Research Associates Inc. (1992) conducted a study on behalf of the Government of Canada, Fitness and Amateur Sport to provide insight into the lives of Canadian high performance athletes. They recognized the predominance of sport science research relating to the psychology and physiology of Canadian high performance athlete, and the absence of detailed analyses of the socioeconomic, demographic and cultural profile of athletes and their experiences. The researchers highlighted the absence of attention given to organizational, social, economic, demographic and cultural factors that influence Canadian high performance athletes:

The preoccupation has been with the training systems, support services and psychological factors which contribute to successful performance, rather than with the social status, economic and occupational status, living conditions, etc. of athletes, and with the ways in which they integrate the demands of sport into their lives. (p.2)
A key theme that was identified in the data included “the opportunity to pursue and celebrate excellence” (p.283), which was attributed to positive experiences, enjoyment of physical activity, and self-growth as opposed to material rewards (for instance, some athletes were critical of their available financial support). A second theme that emerged from the data was the high performance athlete’s “obsession with excellence and achievements” (p.283) for instance, by valuing sport above other aspects and responsibilities of their lives.

A notable finding was that most high performance athletes came from families of high socioeconomic status:

First, the generally high socioeconomic status of athletes is remarkable. High performance athletes are generally well-educated and come from economically comfortable families, much more so than the average Canadian youth. They tend to reflect a lot of the values, attitudes and lifestyles of their parents and of the social milieu in which they were raised. (p.286)

However, there was also an identifiable socioeconomic segmentation in this community, and within the “socioeconomically disadvantaged segment within the high performance sport community; the views of these athletes differ from those of the majority group who come from upper or upper-middle socioeconomic backgrounds” (p.286). The segmentation analysis demonstrated that among the lower socioeconomic group, economic factors influenced their lives to a greater extent (e.g. greater economic sacrifices). The lower socioeconomic group also were less satisfied with their careers than their counterparts. Generally, high performance athletes were more likely to be educated (than their same-age counterparts) and they were more likely to be involved with both sport and academics, many at the graduate studies university level. The majority of athletes were reported to receive support from friends and family; and were committed to their sport and motivated by self-development, the pursuit of excellence, enjoyment of physical activity, and national pride.

Successive governments at the federal and provincial level are also focused on the pursuit of high performance sport and the promotion of excellence. For instance, federal programs (e.g.,
Own the Podium- 2010 and Road to Excellence) were initiated in 2003 after Vancouver was chosen to host the 2010 Winter Olympic Games (Harvey & Thibault, 2013). After the 2010 Games, there continued to be ongoing federal support for Olympic-level athletes and new sporting infrastructure. Sport Canada’s 2012 “Collaboration” Policy profiles the federal governments support for high performance athletes and the sport system. This collaborative effort calls for the participation of other sectors, including provincial and territorial governments and education systems (https://sirc.ca/sites/default/files/content/docs/pdf/csp2012_en.pdf). As I will explain in the analysis chapters, the federal and provincial financial support for high performance athletics is imperative to my reading of the production and maintenance of the GCHPS.

“Greatness” and High Performance Sport

While the Centre was intended to be a space for high performance sport, in its opening months it was also promoted to be a space of greatness; where all in the university community were invited to “Pursue Greatness”. The literature on greatness in sport was limited, however an article titled “Redefining Greatness”, written by the athletic director and a coach at Brandon University, Manitoba, explains how to achieve excellence in elite sport performance (De Fazio, 2008). De Fazio writes:

We live in an era where training an elite athlete or developing a championship team requires more than simply talented, hard working players and coaches. The gap between being very good and being great is much narrower now and this calls for a professional approach to identify and develop performance at the elite level. (p.50)

He conceptualizes five facets of success (i.e., greatness): biomechanics (e.g., positioning and technical feedback and guidance); cognition (e.g., attitude, work ethic, desire, intellectual capacity); physiology (e.g., genetics and strength and conditioning); sport specific skills (e.g., related to an expert coaching) and intangibles (e.g., parental support and specialized environments such as sport schools). He asserts that success is tied to the science of sport, as
findings in this field “can elevate an athlete beyond their genetic makeup” (p.51).

Additionally, a three-part book titled *The Complexity of Greatness, Beyond Talent or Practice* (Kaufman, 2013) outlines the origins of greatness, the various perspectives on elite-level achievement and the attainment of greatness in specific domains, including mathematics, music and elite sport performance. In “Creating Champions: The Development of Expertise in Sport”, Ford, Hodges & Williams (2013) synonymize greatness with expertise and suggest that elite-level expertise involves both the genetic (e.g., height and muscle fibre type) as well as environmental elements (e.g., sport training in the early years). The authors advocate:

> We argue that practitioners and researchers should concentrate on creating optimal environments across the age continuum in order to “create champions” in sport. Such an environment would allow for childhood experiences that do not explicitly focus on performance improvement or adult-orientated competition within the primary sport and adolescent/adult experiences that do. (p.3)

The authors assert that it is difficult to draw conclusions on the genetic contributors to expert performance, however it appears as though optimal environments that allow for long-term practice and competition are valuable contributors to expert performance.

During the Centre’s opening month, the university community was encouraged to pursue greatness by exploring the new fitness facility, supporting the university’s varsity athletics program and learning about the FKPE’s research and sport medicine clinic. These will be discussed at length in a further chapter. I will now turn to the critical scholarship on the dynamics of research and practice within North American institutions of higher education.

**The Corporate University and Academic Capitalism**

Giroux’s (1999, 2003, 2009, 2010) critique of the hierarchies of power and dynamics of social relations within colleges and universities suggests that although the mission of higher education is to inform and foster critical thinking skills, the dimensions of profit control the research and practices of these settings. As such, expressions of the corporate world allow for
the placement of students into the ongoing, systematic, unjust social order.

Giroux (2010) raises critical questions pertaining to institutions of higher education, namely, the absence of critical pedagogy and democratic learning and the presence of a competitive, market-driven, corporate-based, neoliberal model of teaching and learning. The author uses Agamben’s (1998) concept *bare pedagogy*, which is a political and social practice that mirrors the economic neo-Darwinism of neoliberalism. It places an emphasis on winning at all costs, a ruthless competitiveness, hedonism, the cult of individualism, and a subject largely constructed within a market-driven rationality that abstracts economics and markets from ethical considerations. Within this pedagogy, compassion is a weakness, and moral responsibility is scorned because it places human needs over market considerations. Bare pedagogy strips education of its public values, critical contents, and civic responsibilities as part of its broader goal of creating new subjects wedded to the logic of privatization, efficiency, flexibility, the accumulation of capital, and the destruction of the social state (p.185).

Giroux (2010) critiques the commercialization and militarization of pedagogy in American universities, but also discusses the “worldwide crisis in higher education” (p.186) wherein neoliberalism, corporate investments and market culture permeate the academic realm and leave little space for democratic practices. He argues:

It is more and more apparent that the university in America has become a social institution that not only fails to address inequality in society but also contributes to a growing division between social classes. Instead of being a space of critical dialogue, analysis, and interpretation, the American university is very often defined as a space of consumption, where ideas are validated in instrumental terms and valued for their success in attracting outside funding while developing stronger ties to corporate powers. (p.187)

Giroux advocates for pedagogy that considers how power is institutionalized and educates students on the economic, political, educational and social conditions of higher education. Furthermore, he asserts that education must allow students to think critically and hold authoritative figures politically and morally accountable.

Specifically within Canada, the Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives (CCPA) (2008) suggests:
Corporatization converts universities from public-serving institutions into knowledge businesses; that is, it changes the university from a publicly accessible resource for social development that benefits a diversity of groups in a wide variety of ways into an institution that produces products and services for specific markets and paying clients. (https://www.policyalternatives.ca/publications/monitor/openbusiness#sthash.gL4EwAU2.dpuf)

Brownlee’s (2014) doctorate dissertation critiques the trend towards the corporatization of Canadian Universities. Brownlee connects the corporatization of universities to academic capitalism, and explains: “Under corporatization, the public interest – once defined as shielding public entities from the market – is assumed to be enhanced by embracing commercial activities” (p.71). Brownlee writes that the shift towards the corporatization of Canadian institutions of higher education occurred in the middle of the 1980s (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997, as cited in Brownlee, 2014). These market-driven changes were quite directly linked to the government’s declining funds for post-secondary education:

From the late 1970s to the early 1990s, Liberal and Conservative governments reduced the monetary commitment to post-secondary education through repeated amendments to this funding formula; the billions of dollars cut by the Conservatives under Prime Minister Mulroney was especially noteworthy. Overall, between 1983-84 and 1994-95 the federal contribution to post-secondary education was reduced by nearly $13.5 billion. (Tudiver, 1999, as cited in Brownlee, 2014, p. 92)

In order to compensate, tuition fees and the involvement of private sponsorship rose. The possible stimuli that may contribute to this active shift towards academic capitalism in modern Canadian universities are both internal and external factors. Internal influences are individuals within the university (e.g., professors and administrative professional) who are interested in pursuing external market interests. Some scholars suggest these interests are tied to the generalized vision of excellence within the contemporary university’s purpose and objectives:

the university’s role in modern society is no longer clearly defined; they have lost sight of any clear mission beyond a general commitment to “excellence” and are operating in a policy vacuum that is easily exploited by outside interests (e.g. Aronoqitz 2000; Readings, 1996). (Brownlee, 2014, p.77)

Notably, Crocker and Usher (2006) surveyed Canadian university vice-presidents on the
philosophy and procedures of “innovation” at their university, a concept “defined as the competition for external dollars, knowledge transfer and the promotion of commercial research opportunities” (as cited in Brownlee, 2014, p.80) The researchers found that the vast majority of participants viewed the prime contributors to their positive innovation environments as internal to their university. Additionally, Brownlee suggests, “to fully appreciate the entrepreneurial culture, academic capitalism has become part of a new set of values within the university context” (p.81). This corporate nature of universities and academic capitalism permeates diverse fields of study including kinesiology and physical education.

**Corporatization within Faculties of Kinesiology: Moving towards ‘McKinesiology’?**

Specifically, in the sociology of sport, Andrews (2008) writes on the institutional logic in contemporary Departments of Kinesiology in American universities. Andrews suggests that the scientific quest to produce rationalized, objective-oriented, quantitative research is tied to our modern, liberal, capitalist society:

> The rational productivity ethos of liberal capitalist society finds its epistemic corroboration in the positivist objectivism that underpins the scientific method, as conventionally understood. Both are constituents, and simultaneously constitutors, of a particular understanding of modernity, centered around linear evolutionary assumptions pertaining to the inevitable progress of human civilization through the advancement of empirically grounded—often a euphemism for quantitatively driven and objectively reasoned—science. (p.48)

Andrews (2008) suggests that there is a hierarchy of knowledge in the domain of kinesiology, and although the field claims to be interdisciplinary, quantitative, predictive, positivist modes of understanding are privileged, while qualitative, post positivist and interpretive inquiries are undermined. Andrews, Silk, Francombe & Bush (2013) outline Ritzer’s (1998, 2004) concept of McDonaldization that (metaphorically) encompasses principles that are profit-driven and based on efficiency, calculability, control and predictability. This structure justifies the production and delivery of products and services in an institution. Notably, Ritzer’s discussion of McDonalization stems from Weber’s (1958) iron cage of capitalism,
wherein individuals are constrained by bureaucratized organizations that are purposeful, rule-based and productive. Specifically, Andrews et al. (2013) argue that, “The McDonaldizing rational productivity ethos of liberal capitalist society has seemingly found its epistemic corroboration in the positivist objectivism that underpins the scientific method” (p.240). The authors assert:

Our central thesis is that the lean and mean kinesiology presently operating within the (corporatized) academic jungle precludes the development of the field as a comprehensive and integrated approach to the study of human movement. (p.335) The authors theorize that the modern departments of McKinesiology wherein “natural bio-scientific dimensions of kinesiology” (p.343) dominate and are rationalized within “the institutional (overt and covert) promotion” (p.343) of the productive and efficient research and teaching practices.

This critical scholarship is pertinent to my study of the Goldring Centre because it is evident that the competitive model of research and practice in institutions of higher education that is outlined above includes Departments/Faculties of Kinesiology (i.e., the sport sciences). Thus, these critiques are inextricably linked to the research practices and research initiatives that take place within the FKPE and within the University of Toronto at large.

**Sporting Space at the University of Toronto**

Despite the controversy regarding the sport for all ideology used to promote and support the funding for the Varsity Centre Complex renewal, high performance sport is now firmly entrenched at U of T. Lenskyj (2004) examines the referendum that occurred in 2001 regarding the implementation of student fees for shared funding of the Varsity Centre. She highlights that most of the high-profile stadium and levy supporters were staff and students of the Faculty of Physical and Health Education (renamed the Faculty of Kinesiology and Physical Education in 2011), and Varsity team members. She challenges the campaigners who supported shared-student funding for the renewal of the University of Toronto’s Varsity Centre. She also raises
issues of equity, including the notion that the renewal targeted benefitees would be the ice hockey teams (i.e., high-profile ice rink sport) and the male football team (i.e., high-profile field sport), even though the development of the Varsity Centre was promoted to contribute to recreational and intramural sport, and to the entire student population. Accordingly, she critiques this shared-funding model and argues that the campaign supporting the student fee exemplifies the patriarchal nature of university sport, and the flawed recurrent practices of high-level university administration:

Academic freedom also encompasses the right to challenge the cherished beliefs underpinning university sport programs and departments of physical education and the right to question the privileged place accorded by the male-dominated competitive sport model in the university and broader society. (p.380)

This important critique by Lenskyj (2004) is specifically of interest to me because the Goldring Centre is part of the Varsity Centre complex (I will detail the Varsity Centre complex, and the renewal project for this complex, in Chapter 4). This study questions the high-performance priorities of stakeholders, including those involved with the University’s Varsity Sport program and the Faculty of Kinesiology and Physical Education, and it is evident that Lenskyj’s concern for inequitable practices occurred early on in this development.

**Institutionalized Whiteness and Whiteness in sport**

Critical race theorists, such as Ahmed (2007), explain that embodying whiteness extends beyond skin colour, and that institutions, such as universities, can take on ‘white’ qualities. Ahmed (2007) identifies the way in which whiteness is material and notes that it may serve as an orientation that influences which bodies are able to act in space. She explains that whiteness is reproduced through decisions, the organization of space, and the recruitment of subjects. A “body-at-home” is one that can inhabit whiteness, and is thus able to attain certain capacities, techniques and habits.

Whiteness is embedded within unmarked and un-named cultural practices (Dyer, 1997).
Macalpine and Marsh (2005) studied whiteness and power in organizations by holding discussion groups with health care professionals and health/social care managers. The researchers found that whiteness silenced, perhaps because it is normalized and as an ethnicity, or due to fear, embarrassment and/or resistance. As a result, the dominance of whiteness within organizations is concealed, as are the inequitable power and race relations that persist within high status jobs.


whiteness is reinforced through a series of discursive techniques that includes the power not to be named, ‘exnomination’\(^2\) and ‘naturalization’, where only whiteness can make sense of an issue. (p.89)

Long and Hylton (2002) hope to make whiteness visible and open for discussion. They explain that whiteness in sport is problematically tied to personal identity, structural privilege, access and power.

The histories of sport and race (as well as its intersections with gender, sexuality and ability) have been studied extensively by Canadian scholars (see Joseph, Darnell & Nakamura, 2012). For instance, Darnell (2007) discusses the (re)confirmation of whiteness in development through sport organizations and concludes:

Through sport and development, Whiteness is (re)confirmed as an intelligible and recognizable subject position, one characterized as benevolent, rational and expert. This position is intelligible in opposition to bodies of colour, recognized as marginalized and unsophisticated, yet simultaneously and continuously grateful for the boons of development. (p.374)

\(^2\) “Barthes’ term for the phenomenon whereby the bourgeoisie hides its name (and identity) by not referring to itself as such in order to naturalize bourgeois ideology and maintain its hegemony, representing itself, for instance, as the nation”(http://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/acref/9780199568758.001.0001/acref-9780199568758-e-910).
As noted earlier, Fusco’s (2005) studying of the locker rooms historicizes and contextualizes sport spaces and discourses of whiteness. She theorizes whiteness as a historical legacy, and suggests that modern sports spaces may be racialized landscapes. While critical studies of whiteness in sport have surfaced in more recent years, there remains a call for discussion of whiteness in sport and leisure settings (MacDonald, 2009).

With respect to university curricula, Douglas and Halas (2013) elucidate the absence of racial diversity in both the curricula content, and in the demographics of Canadian Faculties of Kinesiology and Physical Education. The authors argue that the hegemony of whiteness must be addressed:

Some of the costs of racism include a lack of cooperation and collaboration and the absence of integrity in relationships among faculty and between students and faculty; the assertion of unmarked values, knowledge, subjects and identities that affirm and maintain white Western racial dominance; the rationalization of hostility via disciplinary emphases that scientize and objectify bodies through the persistence of racialized/engendered stereotypes about physical ability and potential. (p.457)

Areas of study in the sports sciences, such as sport psychology have also been tied to whiteness. For instance, Butryn (2009) suggests:

by not understanding how whiteness relates to the sport and the sport psychology, the field might be complicity in the perpetuation of white privilege, and perhaps, racism through the collective silence of the field. (p.328)

Whiteness is a concept that cannot be neglected in the study of a high performance sport space that is complexly linked to a Faculty of Kinesiology and Physical Education. As such, it is an concept that has guided my study of the production of the Goldring Centre.

Conclusion

This review of literature outlined relevant themes that pertain to high performance spaces of sport, whiteness and the privileging of the scientific method within institutions of higher education. In this study, I engage in a case study of a high performance sport space on the University of Toronto’s downtown campus, wherein there is research and practice in the sports
sciences, as well as recreational and high performance athletics. I aim to explore the ways in
which these themes and others emanating from the data may be relevant to a high performance
sport centre. Moreover, I aim to unpack their architectural, procedural and lived contexts. In
addition to extending the literature of space/place and physical cultural studies, this study intends
to hold the ‘pursuit of greatness’ to account for an era when broader social, political, economic,
and technological contexts on domination are bearing down on people and spaces.
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In my study of the Goldring Centre for High Performance Sport, I paid critical attention to the ways in which spatial practices may control social relations, and/or (re)produce dominant ideologies that permeate academic circles and societies. I attain theoretical insight from Lefebvre (1991) and intended to apply his three moments of space (i.e., the imagined/conceived, the perceived/spatial practices and the lived) to my analysis of the Goldring Centre. I gained additional theoretical insight from Andrews (2008) and Andrews, Fracombe & Bush (2013), who critically analyze the domain of kinesiology. Furthermore, Pronger’s (2002) theorizations of the modern technologies of fitness are highly relevant to my study of this academic, high performance sporting space.

In The Production of Space (1991), Lefebvre theorizes that space is actively produced, it is historically, politically and strategically shaped. He asserts that “space is never empty: it always embodies a meaning” (p.154). Lefebvre argues that dominant power relations, including those that pertain to bodies in space, can be studied through inquiries of the representations of spaces. He writes: “Ideologies dictate the locations of particular activities…. But ideologies do not produce space: rather, they are in space, and of it” (p.210). According to Merrifield (2000), Lefebvre seeks to “expose and decode space” and “demystify capitalist social space by tracing out its inner dynamics and generative moments in all their various guises and obfuscations” (Merrifield, 2000, p.171).

In Space, State, World (2009), selected essays of Lefebvre, he reiterates that space is a material production; a social product; a political network of accumulation; “a modernized mode of capitalist production” (Lefebvre, 2009, p.187). Lefebvre’s analyses of specific spaces include but are not limited to buildings, monuments and local markets. His study of space extends to cities, such as the dimensions of urban planning that involve material, financial and spatiotemporal dynamics. He theorizes that the networks of communication and exchange
within a city are tied to capital, and to the (re)development of power relations; thus, spatial productions are associated to dynamics of consumption, exploitation and domination.

Lefebvre unpacks the politics of space, notably, its infusion of social relations, and asserts that urban spaces have political functions and allow for capitalist development:

space participates in the production of goods, things, and commodities; it consumes productively; but at the same time it is totally covered by exploitation and domination. Having completely ceased to be a “neutral,” passive, and empty milieu, space becomes a social and political instrument. In whose service? To what end? Who uses it and why? This is the central question. The answer: it becomes a site [lieu] and a context for the reproduction of the (social) relations of production, and primarily for the (social) relations of capitalist production. (Lefebvre, 2009, p.202)

Thus, intertwined within the ‘social and political instrument’ of space, there are social relations and perpetuations of capitalist expansion, and in effect, local, national, and transnational spaces are not neutral, passive grounds.

Lefebvre (1991) theorizes that there are three moments involved in the production of space. Lefebvre’s spatial triad will serve as the theoretical framework for this thesis. Each of the three chapters in this study will describe and apply a moment of the triad to the production of the Goldring Centre for High Performance Sport on the University of Toronto’s downtown campus. This application will be followed by a description of how this framework has helped to understand, and perhaps respond to Lefebvre’s central question on space: “In whose service? To what end? Who uses it and why?” (Lefebvre, 2009. p.202).

The first moment of Lefebvre’s triad is the imagined space (also known as the conceived space and representations of space), which involves the plans and designs that were envisioned by architects and planners, and accordingly, their dominant ideologies are embedded within this planning process. The next moment of the triad is the spatial practices (also known as the perceived space, and the spatial representations), which involves the realization of a materialized space, as well as the common sense perceptions that generate competencies within it. In this moment of the triad, users of space begin to comprehend how to move, engage and conduct
themselves in actualized space. As elite groups have contributed to the construction of spaces, spatial representations are embedded with knowledge and power. Finally, the third moment of space is the *lived space*, which involves the possibilities for the everyday experience. This moment is known for its creative potential, as it embraces the alternative realities that may either enable or resist the envisioned practices and implications. Lived space is where ideas, dreams and desires (that may be otherwise suppressed) are able to prosper. While this study separates and analyzes the three moments separately, I will attend to the ways in which the emergent data and themes overlaps with one another. Lefebvre asserts that an understanding of spatial production must not be confined to a directional order, as all of these moments are intertwined with and influential on one another (Lefebvre, 1991).

Among others, the works of Giroux (e.g., Giroux, 2010), Andrews (e.g., Andrews, 2008; Andrews, Silk, Francombe & Bush, 2013) and Pronger (2002) contributed to the analytical framework I used in this study. For instance, Giroux (2010) analyzes research and practice in institutions of higher education, and Andrews (2008) and Pronger (2002) make clear connections between the political, technological and socio-cultural contexts of research and practice in kinesiology. Thus, in addition to Lefebvre’s (1991) framework, the work of these scholars were helpful in this analysis as they consider specific dynamics of higher education, and within kinesiology that Lefebvre does not specify. In addition, critical race scholars (e.g., Douglas & Halas, 2013; Long & Hylton, 2002) and critical geography scholars (e.g., Longhurst, 2001) take into account aspects of social and political life that are useful in this analysis. These academics take into account aspects of contemporary social and political life that are context specific and complement Lefebvre’s spatial triad framework. In the next chapter, I describe the methodological approach that I used in the analysis of the spatial production of the GCHPS.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

I used qualitative research methods in order to explore the social, economic, technological and political relations involved in Lefebvre’s (1991) three moments of space as they pertained to the production of the Goldring Centre. Smith’s (2006) institutional ethnography was the methodological approach to this inquiry, which deploys a combination of observational, textual, discursive and interview-based data. The aim of this methodological approach is to “explore particular corners or stands within a specific institutional complex, in ways that make visible their points of connection with other sites and courses of actions” (DeVault & McCoy, 2006, p.17). Institutional ethnography involves studying the connections between local constructs (e.g., visibilities and social relations of everyday life), as well as the translocal processes of administration and governance (e.g., the social relations that are not specific to a local context as they overlap into broader areas of society). An institutional ethnographic approach suggests that the local practices within the institution (e.g., the University of Toronto and the Faculty of Kinesiology and Physical Education) involve complex linkages between the local and translocal (e.g., beyond the local place and time) relations. These linkages are termed “the ruling relations” (Smith, 2006, p.79), and Smith theorizes that ruling relations (e.g. within an institution) involve social, economic, and political constructs that coordinate in multifaceted ways, and serve to attain and maintain structure and control. Institutional ethnography seeks to unpack the ways in which the ruling structures of domination form and operate:

They are those forms that we know as bureaucracy, administration, management, professional organization, and the media. They include also the complex of discourses, scientific, technical, and cultural, that intersect, interpenetrate, and coordinate the multiple sites of ruling (Smith, as cited in DeVault & McCoy, 2006, p.17)
In effect, institutional ethnography studies the occurrences, practices and actions of multiple sites of action and provides a detailed description of the organizational processes that take place in everyday relations. In my study, I paid attention to the ways in which governing bodies coordinated together to support representations of space, the spatial representations, and the everyday social relations within this institution. I intended to use this approach to study the connection between the local ruling relations (e.g., University and Faculty administration) and the broader political (e.g., Government of Ontario) and economic parties (e.g., private donors and sponsorships) that served to produce and actively support the operations of this space.

In order to explore Lefebvre’s (1991) moment of imagined space, and to comprehend the structures of power (i.e., elite administrators and researchers, private donors), and social and political organizations (i.e., provincial and national governing sport bodies, Province of Ontario), after University of Toronto ERO’s ethical approval I contacted, arranged and conducted semi-structured interviews with nine individuals who contributed to the planning, realization and research of the Goldring Centre. I recruited members of the Faculty of Kinesiology and Physical Education, including administrators involved in the Faculty’s Co-Curricular Program (e.g., Varsity Sport and athletic programming). As I used a combination of qualitative methods for data collection only a relatively small sample size for interviews was conducted.

Interviewees were contacted by email and an information letter and informed consent form were attached to this initial email. The individuals I contacted for interviews are not normally regarded as vulnerable populations and many have already spoken publicly about the GCHPS. To that end, I also used publicly available interviews, media articles and podcasts of opening ceremonies, special events etc. to collect data about peoples’ relations to the GCHPS. The participants who agreed to take part in an interview signed the informed consent form.
The participants seemed willing to share information about their involvement with the Centre. Two of the participants were very helpful, and offered assistance beyond the scheduled interview time (e.g., encouraged me to contact them if I had any other questions). I received one rejection for an interview. Another individual I contacted for an interview responded initially but did not respond to the follow up emails.

To maintain confidentiality, participants are not referred to directly in my research and will not be referred to in any other subsequent written or oral reports. Interview participants are identified by number (e.g., Participant 1, Participant 2, etc.) All transcripts were anonymized and identifying information is not used in this document. In addition, non-identifiable descriptors refer to interview participants throughout the text (e.g., a key contributor; a stakeholder). Given the participants role in the Goldring Centre for High Performance Sport, there is some potential that participant’s responses may identify their relationship to the Centre. However, by signing the consent form (Appendix B), participants acknowledged that they are choosing to participate in the study despite the possibility that their relationship to the Centre may be identifiable.

The hard copies of the anonymized transcripts are stored in a locked filing cabinet in the SPaCE lab in the Goldring Centre for High Performance Sports, The SPaCE lab is a key-locked room on the fourth floor of the GCHPS. The hallway leading to the research lab is only accessible with a security fob that permits entry and exit to the fourth floor. Thus, there are three levels of security for the stored data.

The interviews were audio-recorded and the audio document was saved on a password protected phone and subsequently transferred to a password protected computer. Interviews were transcribed and coded for emergent themes (e.g., imagined space, spatial practice, lived space). The interview data was particularly helpful to attain insights into the vision for and operations of
this Centre that may not have been accessible otherwise. An interview guide detailing the questions can be found in Appendix C.

In most cases, participants had diverse connections to the production of the Centre and were specifically involved with particular facets of its planning and/or operations. Thus, I began the interviews with general questions (e.g., “Tell me about your relationship to the GCHPS”) and from there stemmed a conversation about the particular areas of expertise or elements of planning/involvement that the participant was/is involved with. In a few cases, participants had similar relationships to the Centre, and articulated very similar ideas/responses to questions in the interview guide. It was due to these similarities, as well as emergent themes in the text/document analysis, that sub-themes emerged in the interview data.

As I interviewed some of the key contributors to the planning process, one of the interviewees provided me with access to many of the planning documents that were put together by the Centre’s planning committee. These documents include the FKPE’s Project Planning Reports, as well as proposal documents that were created to attain the support of public (e.g., provincial and federal government and sport governing bodies) and private (e.g., wealthy elite) donors (See Appendix D).

**Discourse Analysis**

In addition, the dominant discourses that circulate in this Centre (e.g., high performance, greatness) and within the institution at large (e.g., academic and athletic excellence) are analyzed to explore the Centre’s spatial practices. Notably, Harvey and Sparks (1991) write: “Relations of power can coalesce strategically around certain discourses, activities, and institutions without an apparent author of their tactic” (p.167). A useful principle for me stemmed from poststructuralist theory:

Meanings do not exist prior to their articulation in language and language is not an abstract system, but is always socially and historically located in discourses. Discourses represent political interests and in consequence are constantly vying for
status and power. (Weedon, 1996, p.41)

Atkinson (2012) explains that discourse analysis involves a combination of interpretive techniques, or approaches to studying representations of a subject. He explains that discourse analysis studies “how the language of the texts illustrates something about established power relationships between people in a society” (p.49). Hall (1997) further explains:

[Discourse] governs the way that a topic can be meaningfully talked about and reasoned about. It also influences how ideas are put into practice and used to regulate the conduct of others. Just as a discourse ‘rules in’ certain ways of talking about a topic, defining an acceptable and intelligible way to walk, write or conduct oneself, so also, by definition, it ‘rules out,’ limits and restricts other ways of talking, of conducting ourselves in relation to the topic or constructing knowledge about it. (p.44)

I utilized a variety of sources in the discourse analysis. Sources included the University of Toronto’s and the Faculty of KPE’s promotional material and publications (e.g., Pursuit magazine), which are available to the public (e.g., posted online or distributed in hard copies at special events). I also searched within the Faculty Council meetings minutes (e.g., 2010 onwards) that are accessible to the public and found on the Faculty’s website. In addition, I went through some of news articles and videos that were issued on behalf of the Faculty and University (e.g., on their official social media accounts), and by student groups on campus (e.g., The Varsity student newspaper).

Atkinson (2012) writes, “Discourse analysis is therefore a mode of performing inquiry into how stories about the world are told, disseminated, interpreted and reproduced in a society, and the effects of such storytelling on people.” (p.49) I learned about the Faculty of KPE’s story (e.g., featured research) by transcribing and analyzing the Faculty’s annual symposium events (e.g., “How Far Can We Push Ourselves?” in 2014 and “From Good to Gold” in 2015). I also transcribed some of the speeches that occurred during the Centre’s celebratory events held during its official opening and those held after its opening (e.g., “Donor Celebration”, “From Good to
Gold”, “Doors Open Toronto”). This textual and special event data was coded for relevant themes (e.g., imagined space, spatial practice, lived space). I paid particular attention to the discourses of ‘greatness’, ‘high performance’ and ‘excellence’ as they pertained to the production of the Centre, and this approach to data analysis was particularly helpful to explore how these constructs are explained, reasoned and justified by the University’s administration, FKPE professoriate, and private donors.

**Observational Data**

While discourse is part of this analysis, non-verbal material signs, such as lighting, painting and architecture also contribute to the spatial practice and lived experiences in the GCHPS. According to Lefebvre, these non-verbal dynamics are the *mise en scène*:

> Non-verbal sets are thus characterized by a spatiality which is in fact irreducible to the mental realm. There is a spatiality which is in fact irreducible to the mental realm …. To underestimate, ignore and diminish space amounts to the overestimation of texts, written matter, and writing systems, along with the readable and the visible, to the point of assigning to these a monopoly on intelligibility. (p.62)

Lefebvre (2009) argues that understanding space “must begin with the lived and the body that is, from a space occupied by an organic, living, and thinking being (p.229). Similarly, Smith (2006) insists that the embodied is foundational to institutional ethnography. In order to bring some embodiment to the research, I actively participated in this space (e.g., SPaCE lab and fitness centre) and sought opportunities to learn about the other academic research and high performance sporting practices that occur in the neighboring research labs. I attended events held in the Centre (e.g., Varsity basketball and volleyball games, and high performance sport events). I took field notes on what I observed and on the discourses that serve to enable or resist the dominant ideologies embedded within the space. I recorded dates, times, observations and insights in journals that I kept locked at my desk in the SPaCE lab. This observational data focused on the space and practices of the Goldring Centre, and not on specific individuals within in.
Visual Methodologies

Visual methodologies (e.g., photography/photographs, screenshots) are also used in this study. Rose (2012) explains that visual representations surround people in modern Western society and they are now a means of representation (e.g., meanings) of the world and for life. Similarly, Pink (2001) encourages the use of visual methods in qualitative, ethnographic research. She explains

The same photographic image may have a variety of (perhaps conflicting) meanings invested in it at different stages of ethnographic research and representation, as it is viewed by different eyes and audiences in diverse temporal historical, spatial, and cultural contexts. (p. 51)

Many of the participants talked specifically about the imagined architectural features and design elements that have now materialized and are visible from the Goldring Centre’s exterior and/or interior. Thus, photographs can represent the architecture and modern technologies that are used in the field of kinesiology for research and practice, as well as in sports medicine, and high performance sports training. Some of the photographs are of the relatively exclusive areas in the Centre (e.g., the 4th floor labs and the sports medicine clinic). A lab-mate helped me to photograph these images and our status as graduate students in the Faculty of FKPE granted us access to these spaces (e.g., we asked a clinic staff for permission to take photographs of the sports medicine clinic; we asked a graduate student to take photographs of the MuscleTech lab; we obtained the key to the Bod Pod room from the front desk etc.)

In addition to photographs, I include screenshots from publically available online sources (e.g., video of the live data from the FKPE’s Good to Gold event that is now accessible to the public online). Other images included in this document are promotional images released by the FKPE (e.g., for Good to Gold). Beyond images, these visuals are representations of the architectural, socio-cultural and technological facets of the Centre’s production and they are contextualized within Lefebvre’s (1991) three moments of space.
Themes

Smith’s (2006) methodology of institutional ethnography helped me to explore the 3 moments of the Goldring space in a way that find the possible connections between ideas, people and their objectives, as well as how these social relations “organize or coordinate what actually happens” (Campbell, in Smith, 2006, p. 98). Lefebvre’s (1991) three moments of space were the main themes that guided the analysis. There are intersections between in the three moments of space, as Lefebvre asserts that the moments of space are interlaced and influential on one another (Lefebvre, 1991). Still, I made the decision to place information under these three themes by considering factors such as the verb tense that participants used (e.g., past or present tense); the chronological dates/time periods of documents (e.g., planning documents, websites), and the social dynamic/context of the (e.g., expressions enabling/support for or resisting the production of the Centre).

Data pertaining to dates prior to October 2014 (Goldring’s official opening) fell under the theme of GCHPS’s imagined space. Interview participants often referred to dynamics of the Centre’s imagined space, when they provided insight on the particular conceptions and plans for the building of the Centre. If they were referred to in the past tense (for example “the architects… wanted” (Participant 7); “the intent was” (Participant 3); “the desire was” (Participant 2)) they also fell under the moment of imagined space.

Data falling under the theme of spatial practices involved any texts/publically available documents accessed online that involved events, activities, daily operations that occur(ed) in the Centre. These involve celebratory events that took place prior to the Centre’s opening, as well as those that happened after the Centre officially opened in October 2014. Spatial practices are representative of the “everyday realities” (Lefebvre, 1991, as cited in Merrifield, 2000, p.175), and include the observable competencies that emerge in the materialized space. Accordingly, interview data, quotes from speeches, and online materials were themed under the spatial
practices if the participant/speaker/text used the present tense. For example, “we want to make sure that they see” (Participant 6); “It represents a new paradigm” (Blake Goldring, Opening Ceremony speech). Moreover, spatial practices encompass the common sense perceptions, as well as the social dynamics through which the Centre’s practices occur and operate. Thus, data was themed under spatial practice if it involved the ways in which people work together within the Centre (e.g., “we create mathematical models of the human body, it’s just beautiful” (Dr. Tyson Beach at “From Good to Gold”), “there’s programming in there for everyone” (Participant 8). Lastly, photographs that fell under this theme involved the observable technologies for fitness training, research devices, and sports medicine that are implicated in the routine practices of the Centre.

In the theme of the lived space, I decided to include data from various dates/time periods (e.g., prior to GCHPS opening, and during its construction). Lefebvre (1991) argues that in the moment of lived space, there are expressions of emotion (e.g., positive or negative). Thus data afforded attention in Lefebvre’s moment of lived space if it involved dynamics of emotions or expression that enabled or resisted Goldring’s production and practices. For instance, I decided that particular acts of resistance (e.g., from the university’s undergraduate student union, and from writers in the university’s student newspaper) that occurred early on in the Goldring planning stages were evidence of the lived experiences. Lived space data includes the language used by individuals who are quoted in publically available articles/texts or speeches.

Interview data was coded under the theme of lived space if participants expressed strong emotion, support, or opinion on the GCHPS. For instance, “I’ve been delighted to be here, it’s been wonderful, I like a lot of the aspects (Participant 2); “I am heartened by what I see” (Participant 4); “One of the favourite things I get to do…” (Participant 6); “it’s so great” (Participant 8).
My theoretical orientation guided my attention towards particular sub-themes as they emerged in the data. Within the three analysis chapters/themes, sub-themes were identified that were specific to a particular moment of space. For instance, within the theme of imagined space, I noticed the repetition of words in the FKPE’s planning documents (e.g., academic and athletic excellence) and I found commonalities in the dynamics of the envisioned architecture that were expressed by interview participants (e.g., light and bright). Within the theme of spatial practices, I noticed that there were common discourses and practices that circulated within the FKPE (e.g., “fundraising campaign”, “greatness”, “high performance”) as well as specifically within the Centre (e.g., “technology”, “MuscleTech/Iovate”).

My participation in the Centre afforded me the opportunity to communicate with individuals who work in the Centre and who have insights on particular spatial practices (e.g., within the Sports Medecine Clinic, and within the research labs). In many cases, sub-themes emerged if there were commonalities between observational discourses and practices, and those that surfaced in the interview data and in publically available information (e.g., on the FKPE website).

**Overarching questions**

In this contemporary landscape of sport, I intended to unpack the broader social, political, economic and technological contexts in which it is situated. In addition, I intended to explore the relations of power, and their possible connections to regulating research pursuits and active bodies. In sum, the aim of this physical cultural inquiry was to critically investigate the following three questions: 1) How was the Goldring Centre imagined and how is it experienced? 2) What power relations are evident and enabled? 3) Who and what do ideologies of “greatness” serve, and at what cost? In the next three chapters, I unpack the three moments of the Goldring space (i.e. the imagined; the perceived and the lived). Each analysis chapter begins with an introduction that overviews the moment of space that is of focus, based on Lefebvre’s (1991)
spatial triad. The chapters are further divided into sections that are specific to the data collected (e.g. interviews, planning and implementation documents). Each of these sections are analyzed through the lens of spatial theory, as well as through critical scholarship in the domains of higher education (e.g., Giroux, 2010), kinesiology/physical cultural studies (e.g., Andrews, 2008; Pronger, 2002), critical geography studies (e.g., Longhurst, 2011) and race/whiteness studies (e.g., Douglas & Halas, 2013).
CHAPTER 4

THE IMAGINED CENTRE FOR HIGH PERFORMANCE SPORT

Introduction

The imagined space (also referred to as the representations of space or the conceived space) is the first moment of space in Lefebvre’s triad. According to Lefebvre (1991), representations of space “are tied to the relations of production and to the ‘order’ which those relations impose, and hence to knowledge, to signs, to codes” (p.33). This moment involves the various facets of objective planning of a space or urban centre (e.g., blueprints, building codes, signs). These plans are conceived by technocrats, engineers, architects and executives, and while dynamics of the structural and physical appearances are envisioned, their rationalized ideologies are embedded within spatial design. Accordingly, designers impose order and structure on the space that will enable and/or constrain who and what is included in a particular space and where they will be located (Lefebvre, 1991).

Lefebvre (1991) argues that space is inscribed by the past, as are the connections between networks of local, national and international centres of accumulation and power. As such, he calls for the study of history of space, for the recollection of “the society managed and dominated by the bourgeoisie (p.187). A spatial approach to the study of sport spaces questions:

In what way do those who practice or plan urban development influence sport space?

This question embraces all those analyses that deal with the thinking – the representations of space according to Lefebvre – of those who conceive and realize sport spaces. … We are talking about people with real opportunities to intervene in the territory and project their aspirations onto it. (Puig & Ingham 1993, p.104)

As the imagined space of Goldring Centre was on land that is on the University of Toronto’s St. George Campus, a study of this production needed to ask: Who requested this
space; and who was involved with its material and spatial planning? What were the financial and political networks that enabled this production?

The following chapter is divided into two parts. In Part 1: The Vision of Academic and Athletic Excellence, I explore the productive forces that served to imagine, finance, support and plan for the spatial production of the Goldring Centre for High Performance Sport. In Part 2, I explore the architectural plans and intended design of the Faculty’s planning committee and the Centre’s architects. Overall, this chapter seeks to elucidate: How was the Goldring Centre conceived, and who projected their imaginations upon it?

PART 1: THE VISION OF ACADEMIC AND ATHLETIC EXCELLENCE

A Centralized Vision of Excellence

While the initial plans for a new sports space on campus were conceptualized by the Faculty of KPE, the imagined space of the Goldring Centre’s would not have been realized without the support of the University of Toronto’s administration, the federal and provincial governments, the advocacy of Canadian governing sport bodies, and the financial contributions from private donors. The infrastructure project would be part of the University institution, and thus, was subject to approval by the University administration and Governing Council. Accordingly, the capital project would need to fulfill the University’s vision and objectives, particularly those that are articulated in Towards 2030: Planning for a Third Century of Excellence at the University of Toronto (Naylor, 2007). This document was initiated and released by the University of Toronto’s President David Naylor (2005-2013), and it highlights the University’s institutional short and long term plans and objectives, namely, the call for
research-intensiveness, scholarly excellence and a positive reputation at a provincial, federal and global level.

After meeting over 100 times with the University’s faculty, students, staff, alumni, and governors, five Task Force reports were issued in response to President Naylor’s initial document. A subsequent report entitled *Towards 2030: A Third Century of Excellence at the University of Toronto: Synthesis Report* (Naylor, 2008a) was released which contains the conclusions and recommendations from the Task Forces, as well as some of Naylor’s own thoughts and visions. The University’s Governing Council strongly supported the Synthesis Report as well as the summarized “Long Term Planning Framework” (Naylor, 2008b).

In these documents, the heads of departments and divisions were asked and expected to define and communicate the benefits and opportunities they offer and utilize both for recruiting student prospects and for strengthening the student experience. Moreover, the Framework (Naylor, 2008b) asserts, “the University will ask that, within any division, all programs be excellent and that most be nationally pre-eminent and internationally competitive” (p.7). The regular evaluations of programs, departments and faculties would verify:

whether they are competing on an international level, whether other institutions in Ontario or the Toronto region are covering the same ground effectively, and whether these academic initiatives are essential to the core mission of the University. If they are not, and if they do not generate sufficient revenues to cover their costs, consideration should be given to discontinuing them (Naylor, 2008a, p.56)

Across the university’s three campuses (Downtown, UTM and UTSc), the St. George campus was suggested to be particularly meaningful because its “comparative advantages flow from history, location, alumni base, scholarly profile, disciplinary range and graduate/professional program intensity, as well as the associated long-term development of specialized infrastructure and facilities” (Naylor, 2008a, p.18). Importantly, increasing the
development of specialized facilities on the downtown campus was perceived to be connected to the consolidation of campus’ assets.

There were hopes to increase graduate student and professional education enrollment to meet the University’s objective to pursue teaching and research excellence. The University aspired to be the largest provider of second-entry professional and graduate programs, and to increase graduate enrollment to 35% by the year 2030. Naylor (2008a) writes:

> our institution can best serve society by sustaining – even augmenting – its research-intensiveness, and by undertaking to expand the relative and absolute numbers of students enrolled in graduate and professional programs. (p.10)

The Synthesis Report (Naylor, 2008a) highlights the need to invest strategically in capital projects, and to consider the institutional priorities. One of the University’s goals was to enhance ‘the student experience’, a factor that was linked to campus-wide infrastructure, interior and exterior environments, and the availability of co-curricular space (e.g., academic study space, recreational and athletics facilities). The 2030 objectives were also tied to the provision of sporting competition, international spirit and culture:

Hosting local, national and international sporting competitions on campus is a great way for the University to give back to its surrounding community. Furthermore, the impact of athletics and recreation on the University community is substantial. … The Task Force on Institutional Organization urged exploration of ways to create a stronger international spirit and culture in our student body and Varsity athletics is certainly helpful in that regard. Our Varsity athletes are also role models for student engagement outside of the classroom. (Naylor, 2008a, p.47)

While the initial imagining and planning of a Centre for High Performance Sport commenced in the early 2000s, as part of the four-phase Varsity Centre Project, an official project planning report for the Varsity Centre project was accepted by the University’s Governing Council in 2005. The Varsity Centre project as a whole totaled an estimated $56 million dollars, and the majority of this spending was planned for Phase 3 (the construction of a new athletic facility) and phase 4 (the renovation of Varsity arena). Initially, the new facility
was initially to be located on the south end of Varsity Stadium, and it was referred to as ‘the South Building.’ The developers would build two floors on top of the Varsity Centre Pavilion, and the project was intended to have some offices for the Faculty of KPE, as well as some additional strength training facilities for students and Varsity athletes (FKPE, 2007).

The University’s President David Naylor encouraged the pursuit of capital funding, via private benefaction, government grants and other outside sources. The FKPE’s Advancement and Alumni Affairs office (responsible for advertising, advancement financial/alumni fundraising) was directly involved with the pursuit of funding, and strived to attract the attention of prospective donors. The office engaged in strategic planning. This involved changing the new facility’s name to ‘the Centre for High Performance Sport’.

**Selling the Dream: A High Performance Space of Sport**

I said to [the Dean] I can’t sell South Building we need to change the name. He said okay we’re going to call it the Wellness Centre and I said I can’t sell Wellness Centre, it sounds like a spa. He said fine then were going to call it the Centre for Physical Activity and Health. That lasted about 6 weeks. I said [Dean] I can’t sell that either. He said what would you call it? [I said] How about we call it the Centre for High Performance Sport. He said “well that’s fine, we’ll call it that.”

(Participant 5)

A key contributor to the initial funding plans Participant 5 commented: “My business is to develop the dream, and sell the dream to people who want to support that.” The funding process involves presenting “a donor a prospect with an opportunity” (Participant 5), and a critical component of framing this project as one worth funding was changing the name for the project.

---

3 Phase 1 (the renewal of the track and field stadium) and Phase 2 (involved the construction of the Dome and the Varsity Centre entrance pavilion) of the project were nearing completion by 2007, and totaled $2 million.

4 Provincial and federal funding, philanthropic support, and private partnerships, and funding opportunities from industry-sponsored research were essential to the development of all major infrastructure projects on campus. The University strongly supported these funding pursuits to avoid recurrent instances of debt caused by prior capital developments (Towards 2030 Framework)
Three weeks after the change in name to the Centre for High Performance Sport an $11 million donation was made by the late Warren Goldring and his family (Participant 5). This was the greatest individual gift given to a Canadian university for athletics (Blackburn-Evans, 2007).

Within about 3 weeks of that time, of calling it the Centre for High Performance Sport, we had an 11 million dollar lead gift. Because the donor said “yes, helping Canada, helping university students, helping Canada, helping Olympic sports, this is wonderful, I’ll give you my money. (Participant 5)

In addition, Participant 3 explained that the donors were presented with an opportunity to fund a Centre for the study of sport for all ages that would be inclusive to the sport-training model ‘Playground to Podium’:

So the donors came forwards, Warren Goldring, which is why the building is named the Goldring Centre, and the way they kind of presented this goal of building this building was to serve community, the whole community, from playground to podium, that’s the phrase that’s frequently used, with a kind of Centre for the study of sport, like they had in other parts of Canada and the US. There’s one in Calgary, there’s one in Montreal, but there’s nothing that serves the people in Ontario. (Participant 3)

In a public lecture, the former dean of the Faculty of KPE mentioned that the late Warren Goldring was given the choice between “The Goldring Centre for Healthy Active Living” and “The Goldring Centre for High Performance Sport”. Warren Golding favored the latter and as a result, this was the agreed upon name for the facility. Participant 5 commented

The particular donor was aged 80 in 2006, he died in 2008. He was looking to make his lifetime gift. It’s all timing. Now if I asked him for a bunch of money, to name the South Building, he wouldn’t have given us a dime. He would have realized it doesn’t have anything in it. It has a few offices, a little bit of strength training. The existing Pavillion doesn’t have much in it, and that building cost 10 million dollars. You have to provide something that shows the donor that their gift will make a substantial impact on society. So everyone that is associated with that building has said “wow, this is a fabulous building”.

When the plan for the new high performance sport centre was presented to the University of Toronto’s President David Naylor, he recognized the possibility of allocating 100 Devonshire Place, also known as Site 12, to the redevelopment of the Faculty of KPE’s athletic
infrastructure. Site 12 was the last large space for development on the University’s St George
Campus and was fittingly located across from Varsity Stadium (and the Varsity Pavilion where
the proposed additions were to be). While there were other promises for Site 12, the President
realized that the larger site of land would allow for offices, a training facility, and a new facility
for basketball and volleyball:

the President said to us, David Naylor, at the time, “you don’t have a basketball
facility anywhere on campus. Benson building was built in 1958, you don’t have a
basketball facility. If you can get the money together quickly, I will give you Site
12”, which is the existing site where the Goldring Centre is. (Participant 5)

Still, the Faculty of KPE would need to seek further funding to be granted this site. The
Advancement and Alumni Affairs office “literally had 6 weeks to go and find a donor”
(Participant 5). They found a donor for $10 million to name the Kimmel Family Field House,
and the President granted the Faculty Site 12 (KPE, 2007, p.3).

The prospect of a larger facility was desirable for the Faculty, who envisioned the ways in
which they would be able to enhance their teaching, research and athletic programs, in addition
to providing spaces for physical activity and recreation for students. It was suggested to be
Canada’s first integrated summer sports institute that would connect “the high performance
enterprise to Canada’s strongest health sciences network, which includes ten affiliated hospitals
aligned with the six health science faculties at the University of Toronto” (Source, 2007, p.3).

One stakeholder suggested:

there were lots of good reasons to go ahead, but this had appeal to the donors, to say
it’s kind of like a research centre, it’s this intensive you know, uh, integration,
you’re going to put people together who can look at the provision of sport from all
different kinds of angles, and early on it was assumed that the sport medicine clinic
would be a part of that, that there would be sport researchers, there would be
sporting organizations who might rent space, or collaborate with people who occupy
or work out in the building, and then our own sport programs. (Participant 3)

Another contributor to the planning of this space suggested:

the labelling of it as a high performance sport Centre, I’d say, was partly labeling, it
was a selling device, it was ... what were people going to get excited about, and I know the faculty had tried earlier with projects to label things with the wellness and health side of it and it didn’t have much traction. (Participant 2)

The excitement for the realization of a high performance sport space on campus grew, particularly among the stakeholders. For instance, in 2007, Blake Goldring, the son of the late Warren Goldring was quoted in the Faculty’s Pursuit magazine:

Our goal is to help create a world-class facility that will attract top rate researchers and athletes, and ideally foster new Olympians … These are the things that really motivate and excite us. … The University of Toronto is a world-class institution … We are delighted to contribute to a project that will enhance the experience of students attending this university in the years ahead. (Blackburn-Evans, 2007, p.14)

The Interim Report of the Project Planning Committee (FPHE, 2007) articulates the numerous ties between the project, the Faculty’s mission and objectives and University-wide objectives. It details elements of the site conditions, funding, and “the goals and aspirations of the widely representative membership of the Project Committee” (p.3). For instance, it explains that new athletic facilities would allow the university to host national (and other competitive) championships in field and ice sports and beyond, as per Naylor’s (2008a) request. The Report elucidates that the new capital project will allow for the enrichment of academic spaces, and thus will favor the Faculty’s pursuit of excellence in research, teaching and graduate education. Importantly,

The project will also enable the University to realize the Governing Council objective ‘to provide opportunity for athletes in a few carefully selected sports to pursue world standards of performance and to provide for empirical research into the requirements of excellence in these sports. (FPHE, 2007, p.4)

It would enhance Varsity sport experiences and performances, as the new training facility would be equipped to suit specialized sporting needs. The 2007 report emphasizes that new infrastructure will enhance the University’s “beyond the classroom” (p.4) image. An interview participant commented:

I’m not sure if you’re aware of what the conditions were like at the Athletic Centre
for the Varsity teams. In terms of team rooms or lack thereof, so, there were no team rooms. And visiting teams when they came to play against us were changing in 304, the meeting room up in the third floor of the Benson building. So not great for the visiting teams, not great for U of T’s image. I mean not that image is everything, but I mean, but certainly below what other schools would have, like everyone has a visiting team room and we had nothing. (Participant 7)

**Responding to the Need for Student Space for Athletics and Recreation**

The development was intended to provide more recreation and sport space, and help to move closer to the requirement that is outlined by Provincial Space Standards and the Council of Ontario Universities (COA). The shortage of space on the U of T’s St. George campus included, but was not limited to, physical activity and recreational space. Every three years the Council of Ontario Universities (COU) conducts a review of the physical facilities on University campuses. The COU Guidelines are used to evaluate the quantity of space available, in square footage, for use on the University campus. In 2007, the St. George Campus had 75% of the co-curricular athletic space recommended by the COA for student enrolment (FPHE, 2007, p.4). In 2011, the University was only providing 61% of the COU standard of athletic space per student enrolled, however, with the construction of the High Performance Sport Centre, the campus would meet 73% of the COU standard (FPHE, 2011). A prime contributor to the development of this space confirmed:

> it wasn’t meant to be just a centre for high performance athletes, it was always meant to be a recreation and sport centre for the student body, first and foremost because although we have a big facility here, it is very very heavily used, and the facilities that we have, this building is from 1979, the Clara Benson half of it, from 1956 or 1959 or something like that and in the interim the student body has doubled, and in order to try to get the students in, who again provide many of the funds to operate this, couldn’t get in here if they wanted to because it is just oversubscribed. (Participant 3)

As a result, the Project was endorsed to allow for the Faculty to better serve the needs of the entire student body, and to allow users to “build an optimal lifestyle which promotes learning beyond the classroom experience and to build a foundation for health and fitness for the future” (FPHE, 2007, p.4).
Equity, inclusion and accessibility were envisioned for the new Centre. The Centre was planned to be highly accessible and to operate year-round, and it was imagined that it would expand and enrich the Faculty’s diversity programmes “based on its established policies of gender equity, universal accessibility, ethno-cultural inclusion and sexual diversity” (FPHE, 2007, p.5). Integrating barrier-free accessibility and abiding by the University’s accessibility guidelines within the design of the space were suggested to ensure that the “entire facility is accessible to all” (p.19).

The Centre for High Performance Sport will be student-centred, educational in focus and inclusive in design. It will provide for equity, diversity, community outreach and a sense of welcome in its spaces, services and programmes. (FPHE, 2007, p.19)

The provision of an inclusive student space with opportunities for physical activity continued in the later planning documents. For instance, the 2011 planning states:

There is a pent-up demand from students annually for access to fitness facilities, recreational sport and intramural teams that exceeds the University’s ability to accommodate them for one reason only…lack of space. The construction of the Goldring Centre will provide additional facilities to help accommodate demand and substantially increase the opportunities for students to engage in physical activity and fitness programs on their campus. (FPHE, 2011, p.7)

The University’s administration continually supported the development of this capital project. For instance, at a Faculty Council Meeting in January 2011:

Ira Jacobs [the current FKPE Dean] spoke about a meeting concerning the Goldring Centre for High Performance Sports that he attended earlier in the day, which had been positive. He was anticipating that more formal levels of approval would be sought and received in the normal cycles of governance, to ensure that the site is reconfirmed and that formal approval to move forward with building will be approved. The leadership of the University remains committed to ensuring that this happens. (FPHE Faculty Council Meeting Minutes, Jan., 2011)

In April 2011, the allocation of Site 12 to the Goldring Centre was officially approved by the university’s Governing Council and this marked the beginning of the official planning and construction phase for the Centre. The FKPE’s Assistant Dean of Co-curricular Physical Activity and Sport explained:
we can now proceed with our planning on the presumption that fundraising targets will be achieved. It looks like construction will be able to begin within the next twelve months, and preparation work is currently underway. A project planning committee will be formally assembled by the University shortly, so some members of Faculty Council may be asked to join this. (FKPE Faculty Council Meeting Minutes, April, 2011)

**Space of the Best and Brightest**

The planning documents for the Varsity Centre facilities aimed to demonstrate the Faculty’s commitment to an enriched academic program, as well as “attract the best and brightest undergraduate and graduate students to U of T and help the University to recruit outstanding faculty members” (FPHE, 2009a, p.12). *Varsity Centre: A Case for Support* (FKPE, 2009a) suggests that as a result of the University’s investment in and production of this new facility, the top national and international students would be interested in attending U of T: “Those who aspire to be the best will attend U of T because they understand the University’s commitment to excellence” (FPHE, 2009a, p.13). Furthermore, the production of the Goldring Centre would provide for the dissemination of knowledge within the faculty and among its students, but also nationally and internationally through a larger ‘Sport Science Program’ that would operate in the new facility:

The Sport Science Program will create an exciting, interdisciplinary approach to the study of athletic performance and training. Leading researchers in motor learning, bio-engineering, psychology, sociology, nutrition, physiology, sports medicine and biochemistry will come together to investigate athletic performance, new approaches to training, and the health of athletes. (FPHE, 2009a, p.13)

By implementing the best processes for knowledge exchange among researchers, clinicians, coaches and athletes, the sports science programs will benefit athletes who are training for intercollegiate, national, international and Olympic competitions. Advanced assessments will assist athletes as they continue to develop and hone their skills, and will provide invaluable feedback to coaches and sport governing bodies. (FPHE, 2009a, p.13)

The benefits of a Sports Science program suggestively extended to society at large, as the document states “The new knowledge that is created will promote best practice in athletic training, foster a healthier society, and contribute to economic productivity” (FPHE, 2009, p.13).
In 2011, the FPHE planned to increase undergraduate and graduate student enrollment by 20%, respectively, over the upcoming 5 years. The Goldring Centre’s 2011 planning document states: “The Faculty plans to revamp its graduate program to attract the best national and international students, establish research chairs, new research centres and become recognized as Canada’s academic leader in the promotion of physical activity, health & wellness, and healthy high performance sport” (FPHE, 2011, p.2). This Centre was argued to be a vital component for the success of these programs and “these strategic goals are not possible without the additional program and research space that the GCHPS will provide (FKPE, 2011, p.2). Moreover, it states:

The importance of the Faculty’s mission has never been more urgent given what is now known about personal health and well-being, the benefits of healthy active living and the costs of physical inactivity to personal health and the country’s health care system. (FKPE, 2011, p.7)

**High Performance Sport in Ontario and Canada**

Importantly, in 2006, the Canadian Olympic Committee released the Road to Excellence Business Plan that identified a gap in the infrastructure for summer sports in particular urban areas across the nation:

Toronto, specifically, was singled out as a priority, based on the region’s population and concentration of identified athletes and the surprising lack of facilities to service their specific needs. Presently, many Ontario athletes relocate to other parts of the country of the world to obtain the necessary training facilities and support. The complete absence of a high performance centre in Toronto has created a huge gap in the national strategy. (FPHE, 2009, p.2)

The project was envisioned to facilitate the pursuit of excellence amongst coaches and scientists in high performance sport, and enable “the University to contribute significantly to the revitalization of high performance sport in Ontario and Canada.” (FPHE, 2007, p.4) The Faculty of KPE sought partnerships with the Governments of Canada and Ontario, in hopes of obtaining capital investment for the Centre, including a $30 million investment from the Government of Canada’s “Building Canada fund, Major Infrastructure Component.” The Building Canada
infrastructure initiative fund was created to provide support to the Canadian sport system including internationally competitive Canadian athletes and coaches. The Centre held an estimated $23 million (39.6%) in private donations, and a funding proposal, “Building Canada’s Sport Infrastructure: A proposal to create the Goldring Centre for High Performance Sport” (FPHE, 2009b) requests $15 million (25.9%) from the government of Canada and $15 million (25.9%) from the Ontario government. The proposal highlights:

Helping to complete the final phase of the Varsity Centre project offers another great opportunity to make a bold statement about the government’s commitment to supporting Canada’s finest athletes, to fostering academic and athletic excellence, and to showcasing Canadian talent on the world stage - all in a way that strengthens the health and well-being of Canadian communities. (FPHE, 2009b, p.9)

The proposal indicates that governmental funding and support would maximize the funds thus far, and help to secure prospective funding from private contributors. It explains that the Varsity Centre project fulfills several of the government’s Building Canada infrastructural objectives, including “opportunities for sport activities that improve the health of Canadians and strengthen Canadian communities” and encouraging “the development of Canadian athletes and/or hosting of amateur athletic events” (p.4). Furthermore, the High Performance Sports Centre was suggested to be a critical step towards renewing Ontario’s sport infrastructure, as Ontario was the only region in the country that did not have a “facilities-based national training centre” (p.3).

Additional prospective impacts of this Centre are specified in the 2009 funding proposal, namely, the continued development of future athletes, trainers, coaches, and sports medicine physicians who “will build on the University’s strong track record of success at the highest levels of international sport” (p.6) and the training of national team athletes during the summer months “who are preparing to qualify for national teams competing at the summer Olympic, Paralympic, Commonwealth, Pan American, World University and other games” (p.6). The

---

5 The remaining $5 million (8.6%) was anticipated to come from the private sector. “The University is confident of raising another $5 million from private sources, even in this uncertain economic climate” (p.2)
Centre was also suggested to encourage involvement at every level of sport (e.g., through the Junior Blues U of T programs, Camp U of T, and connections with elementary schools) and in doing so, “will strengthen the University’s capacity to conduct community outreach and encourage a culture of sport among all citizens, particularly children and youth” (p.7). Moreover, the Centre was proposed to provide additional support for the Canadian economy, through sport tourism and the tourism expenditures that are related to high performance sport, through the regular hosting of local, provincial and national events, and their associations to expenditures on accommodation and ticket revenue for attendees. It would also benefit the local economy with respect to construction employment (FPHE, 2009b).

In order to strengthen this proposal, the Faculty of KPE sought the support and endorsement from Provincial and National sport governing bodies. In May of 2009, individualized letters in support of the funding for the Goldring Centre for High Performance Sport were sent to Canada’s Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities. The majority of the letters were written on behalf of the Executive Directors of provincial and national sport governing bodies, including the Executive director of Ontario Volleyball, the Executive Director of Ontario Basketball, the Chief Executive Officer of the Coaching Association of Canada, the CEO/National Coach of Swimming Canada, the Chief Executive Officer of Athletics Canada, the Executive Director of Field Hockey Canada, the Executive Director of Own the Podium and the Director of the National Coaching Institute Ontario. The letters demonstrated the very strong support for the government’s funding of a high performance sporting centre on the University of Toronto’s downtown campus. They highlight the need for high performance sport infrastructure:

This is a critical opportunity for the Government of Canada to show its support for our country’s top athletes and coaches by financially backing this infrastructure initiative through its “Building Canada” fund. (Director, National Coaching Institute)
We do not have the facilities needed in Canada to produce world class athletes … together we can make Canada’s sport system a better place for our athletes. (Executive Director, Field Hockey Canada)

This Centre will have a major impact on the training and performances of Ontario Athletes, and the Canadian sport system as a whole. The type of infrastructure it will provide is vitally important if Canada wants to excel in future Olympic and Paralympic Games … This essentially will allow our athletes to compete on a level playing field with the rest of the world. (Executive Director, Own the Podium)

Furthermore, the opportunities to connect the university and high performance sport were recognized. Accordingly, the letters indicated that this facility was “critical”, “vital” and “long overdue.”

It will be a win-win situation for all, with the ultimate goal to produce world leaders. … This infrastructure is exactly what is needed for Canada to retake its proper place in the world of sport … This project is a critical component in assisting our athletes to be able to compete with the very best in the world. (CEO/National Coach, Swimming Canada)

The Centre will, in fact, benefit the country as a whole … the CAC urges the Government of Canada, through your department, to contribute to the Centre for high Performance. Doing so will signal the government’s support for many of this nation’s finest athletes and coaches and will enable a most worthwhile project to forge ahead. (Chief Executive Officer, Coaching Association of Canada)

It is only when all the stakeholders work together that we can produce a true synergy and training environment for our high performance athletes. (Executive Director, Ontario Basketball)

The 2009 Building Canada proposal strategically integrates a variety of supportive statements found in the letters sent on behalf of various Canadian sporting organizations. It promised strength within development, preparation and engagement, and sport and physical activity programming in Ontario, and in Canada at large:

Drawing on this extraordinary cluster of talent and expertise, the Varsity Centre will have a broad impact on Canadian society. It will significantly strengthen Canada’s capacity for research and innovation, knowledge translation and leadership development related to sport and physical activity. It will help prepare the next generation of athletes, coaches, teachers and sports scientists, engaging in community outreach, and providing Ontario schools and groups with access to facilities and programs. (FPHE, 2009b, p.3)
In the attempt to update institutional capital priorities, and address “the on-going need for strategic capital investments across the system” (p.1), the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities requested that postsecondary institutions to complete a Postsecondary Institution Capital Project template that addresses project-based information (e.g., description, cost, impact on space inventory and institutional mission) and institution-based information (e.g., institution profile). In their application, the Faculty articulates how the Goldring Centre project aligns with the systemic academic and capital plans. For example, the document states: “The downtown Toronto St. George campus is space limited, and today our approach to capital development is focused on intensification. A development site for the Centre has been identified at 100 Devonshire Place, which maximizes unused space and provides strategic linkages with Varsity Centre (FPHE, 2011b, p.3). It also profiles the economic and social impacts of a high profile new facility, and its associated possible events that will have a direct positive impact on the City of Toronto and the GTA. Furthermore, the application suggests: “Athletes who train and compete will inspire individuals to become more active, and raise goals for personal achievement” (FKPE, 2011b, p.15).

Analysis

The critical analysis of the production of space acquires a practical interest, implying the study and the understanding of the role of (private and public) construction as a decreasingly subsidiary branch of industry- the understanding of “responsible” institutions and the relations between “agents.” (Lefebvre, 2009, p.203)

An analysis of the imagined space of the Goldring Centre emphasizes the intentions and the interests of the agents involved. It also pays attention to the connections amongst them, particularly with respect to their objectives and priorities. Importantly, Lefebvre (1991) argues that while buildings are separated by their architectural enclosures, they are intertwined with and connected to social divisions, productive forces and state power. For this reason, this study must consider the following:
Though a product to be used, to be consumed, it is also a means of production; networks of exchange and flows of raw materials and energy fashion space and are determined by it. Thus this means of production, produced as such, cannot be separated either from the productive forces, including technology and knowledge, or from the social divisions of labour which shapes it, or from the state and the superstructures of society. (Lefebvre, 1991, p.85)

The envisioned plans for the GCHPS on the University’s campus cannot be separated from those who asserted their interests in the production, nor from the efforts of the various stakeholders who supported its development. The Goldring Centre aspired to fulfill the priorities of the University’s President, the University’s Governing Council, the Faculty of KPE’s administration, the provincial and federal governments, and Canadian sport governing bodies.

As the last site available on the University’s campus, there were practical, financial, and political implications for the use and development of an infrastructural project on this site (i.e., Site 12). As Lefebvre (1991) asserts:

The act of creation, is, in fact a process. For it to occur, it is necessary (and this necessity is precisely what has to be explained) for the society’s practical capabilities and sovereign powers to have at their disposal special places: religious and political sites. (p.34)

The ‘sovereign power’ who had the site of land at his disposal was the University’s President David Naylor. His title afforded him the possibility of imposing his particular institutional vision and objectives on the material development of this site.

President Naylor played a central role in the University’s objectives in the Towards 2030 documents (Naylor, 2008a, 2008b), namely, the aspirations for higher standards of excellence in research and the growth in graduate education and professional learning programs. Naylor aspired to enhance the student experience and co-curricular programming, and to develop a positive reputation at a provincial, national and global level.

Still, the institutionalized values and priorities for this site of development, and for excellence as a world-class facility, were not innocent in terms of social exclusion and inequity. As Amsler and Bolsmann (2012) suggest, world-class university institutions are affiliated with
social exclusionary practices. They argue that the institutionalized pursuit of global recognition is problematic, as there are:

politico-ideological technologies of valuation and hierarchisation that operate according to a principal logic of inclusion and exclusion. In so far as they have ‘taken the form of rites of institution which inscribe hierarchized social identities in the objectivity of social existence’, they may thus be regarded as symbolically violent practices. (Wacquant, 1993, as cited in Amsler & Bolsmann, 2012, p.284)

The authors suggest that the quest for attainment of a world-class institution is also the quest for institutional power and national supremacy. This hierarchy devalues alternative objectives of higher education, namely the fostering of gradual democratic social changes.

The planning documents suggest that the Centre will help the Faculty of KPE contribute to the University of Toronto’s pursuit of excellence and world-class standing. However, the institutional desire to attract the ‘best and brightest’ graduate students, to recruit and train high performance athletes, and to pursue high performance sport research is also tied to exclusionary practices and perhaps, the discredit and negligence of the ‘non-excellent’ (e.g., individuals who are not ‘high-performance’ athletes, or part of academia). When the Faculty’s, province and nations high performance initiatives are placed at the forefront (and tied to this spatial development) other causes for support that involve equity, inclusion and social justice are backgrounded. The Centre’s proposals claimed to include and welcome the everyday student, however, the vision was particularly supportive of those who are athletically, politically, economically, and academically valuable for the University, for our province and for our nation. Moreover, this production was valuable for the recruitment of the best and brightest subjects who would be able to fulfill the University’s academic and athletic objectives. This is evident in the lack of support for a ‘Centre for Wellness’ that did not entice or excite the private donors, the University’s President, or the Building Canada infrastructural initiative. A critical study of this infrastructural project must not neglect the concern that utopic discourses of excellence are tied to elitist ideals that include and prioritize high performance athletes, sports science research and
graduate education, while excluding and depreciating equitable ‘low performance’ wellness initiatives and alternatives. As critical scholars suggest, “universities operate in the shadow and service of power, and function to preserve class privilege and protect and legitimate the social order” (Brownlee, 2014, p.45).

Lefebvre (1991) emphasizes that space, including the moment of the imagined space, involves social relationships, property relationships and the forces of production:

Is space a social relationship? Certainly- but one which is inherent to property relationships (especially the ownership of the earth, of land) and also closely bound up with the forces of production (which impose a form on that earth or land); here we see the polyvalence of social space, its ‘reality’ at once formal and material. (Lefebvre, 1991, p.85)

While the administration within the Faculty of KPE, particularly the Planning and Implementation Committee\(^6\) were central in shaping the vision and design for this space, the intentions for this Centre attended to the priorities of broader social forces. For instance, the national and provincial sport governing bodies who argued that a new high performance sport centre would facilitate sports, health and the economy in Ontario and Canada were important stakeholders. Moreover, as fundraising and attaining the support of prospective donors was a central component to this project, the ongoing communication and strategizing of the Faculty’s administrators and the Advancement and Alumni Affairs office was central in the planning and the funding of this infrastructural project. Without the contributions of these strategic planners (e.g., suggestion to change the Centre’s name) the private donors and the provincial and federal government may not have been willing to fund and support the materialization of the infrastructure.

---

\(^6\) All capital development projects on the University’s campus involves a Planning and Implementation Committee (Participant 7).
In the next section, I detail the architectural vision and design of the capital development, and explain how the structure enabled the stakeholders’ strategic political research and high performance sport goals.
PART 2: THE ENVISIONED ARCHITECTURE AND DESIGN

This section details the imagined spaces of the Goldring Centre. It will pay particular attention to the early renderings of the Centre, the scope and size of particular spaces, and the architectural design. In the analysis, I theorize the ways in which the representations of space are tied to power relations. Namely, I detail elements of design (e.g., territorialized and segmented spaces) that are implicated in social hierarchies and practices of in/exclusion.

Spatial Planning and Architectural Features

Patkau Architects and MacLennan Jaunkalns Miller Architects created the early renderings of the Goldring space. The Faculty’s administrators selected these architects for the project because they met the requests the Faculty articulated in relation to the structure’s features and design. These architects presented a unique and appealing building feature wherein the Field House (e.g., basketball and volleyball court and 2000 seat stadium) would be located below ground level (i.e., below grade) (Participant 3). Participant 3 explained that these architects were the only ones who decided to put the Field House below ground, and this unique design feature was appealing to the Faculty.

The details of the building’s interior design involved regular meetings between Faculty administration and Goldring’s Planning and Implementation Committee. These individuals worked closely with the architects to conceptualize the space. Participant 7 explains that “there were weekly meetings where you would have the contractor, the architects … every little niche had their own sort of specialties”. Members of the Committee7 were also looked to for provision-specific input in their respective areas of expertise (e.g., in the research space, details of location of technology and type of flooring) (Participant 4).

7 There were 17 members on the committee including the Dean of the Faculty, the Assistant Dean of Co-curricular Physical Activity and Sport, the Acting Assistant Vice President of Campus and Facilities Planning, and student representatives (FPHE, 2011).
The Committee was also the prime contributor to the development of the facility’s Space Plan. The Space Plan includes the square footage that is allotted for designated spaces in the building, such as the Strength and Conditioning Centre, the basketball and volleyball courts, and the change rooms. Notably, the Space Plan and the initial imaginings for the Centre began in the early 2000s:

when we went forward in 2011 for governance approval, it was still what we call the space plan, this is your new space and this is how we plan to fill it, it’s called a space plan, that space plan had been developed way back in 2003, 4, 5, updated in 07, updated in 10 went for approval in 2011, I think it was 11 and then we kicked off the process that ended up with this Goldring building. (Participant 3)

The weekly meetings with the architects and the Committee also involved the revisions of Room Data Sheets:

I’m sure you’ve heard about the room data sheets, our bible for many months and months, and those data sheets actually started back in 2007, as we went through the project we kept updating and changing them because things change so much in terms of facility development. (Participant 4)

The Room Data Sheets detail the size of the rooms in nasms (i.e., net assignable square metres). Four primary areas were conceptualized for this project and were of upmost importance during the design and architectural planning. The largest space in the Centre (4790 nasms) was assigned to the below-grade Field House that includes a standard size basketball and volleyball court and a 2,000 seat stadium. Additional spaces designated for Varsity sport were included in the various sports facilities rooms, such as change rooms. Private change rooms were planned for each of the University’s male and female volleyball and basketball teams. These rooms would account for 264 nasms. Moreover, 180 nasms were assigned to the visiting team change rooms. Additional high performance sport spaces included assignable change rooms for competitions at Varsity Stadium and taping rooms (FPHE, 2007).

The next largest area, the Strength and Conditioning Centre (SCC), would be 1,100 nasms and intended to provide all users with “training opportunities to enhance the necessary fitness
components of cardio, strength, endurance, flexibility and body composition, to build an optimal lifestyle which promotes learning beyond the classroom experience and to build a foundation for health and fitness for the future” (FPHE, 2007, p. 4). One exercise studio, 200 nasms in size, would hold instructor-led fitness and dance classes. The SCC would include a specialized high performance strength and conditioning centre with “a dedicated heavy lifting facility for Varsity and high performance athletes” (FPHE, 2007). The architects envisioned a tiered-design that would serve to separate designated areas in the conditioning space.

In terms of the tiers there, the architects put that feature in for a couple reasons, one its works out really well, in that we can have separate activities going on, and then the top floor if we need to section it off for team training, students always have access to equipment. So you don’t just have to be on a varsity team, but if a varsity team has an area reserved, you can still always come in and do something and I think that was part of it. (Participant 7)

An additional motive for the separate tiers was to provide all of the participants in the space with a view of Varsity Centre field, as the architects’ plans included a large window that would serve as the wall for the front of the SCC. Figure 1 demonstrates the separate levels/ the tiers that would separate the spaces of the SCC, as well as the designated areas for specialized training.

![Figure 1](http://urbantoronto.ca/database/projects/u-t-goldring-centre-high-performance-sport#)
The tiers in the SCC were also imagined to serve a conceptual purpose. The architects envisioned the tiers to be a feature of the Centre that would create a sense of connectedness between the Goldring Centre and Varsity Stadium. The tiers are oriented towards the stadium’s field and would be designed to mirror the stadium stands. Participant 7 explained:

the architects also with the tiered, tiers on the second to the third floor, wanted to mimic the varsity stadium stands on the other side so it looked like it was one sort of unit even though they’re two different facilities, but they wanted to sort of connect those two. (Participant 7)

Moreover, Participant 3 highlighted that the conceptual intent was to create a ‘bowl effect’:

The intent was that the Goldring Centre is the final phase of the Varsity Centre project, and so it goes the stands, go down, then the field, the street, and then, that’s why we have the tiered Strength and Conditioning Centre it looks kind of like the stands, so it makes this bowl effect. (Participant 3)

Figure 2 shows an early rendering of the infrastructural project, and the intended connection between the Centre and Varsity Field.

*Figure 2. (http://www10.aeccafe.com/blogs/arch-showcase/files/2011/06/goldring_02.jpg)*
An additional space that was accounted for in the architectural plans was for the Faculty’s David L. MacIntosh Sport Medicine Clinic (629.6 nasms; FPHE, 2011a). At the time, the Clinic was identified as “one of the busiest” (2009a, p.7) in the Greater Toronto Area, and connected athletes with “globally renowned specialists and the latest in diagnostic, treatment, rehabilitation and injury prevention programs” (2009a). The new relocated clinic space would be larger and intended to better serve the student population:

Demand for the clinic’s services is high with about 23,000 client services annually, but the resources and collaborative opportunities that it require to operate at its full potential are lacking. The new clinic space will be twice as large as its current space in the basement of the Athletic Centre, and more easily accessible to students and clients. (FPHE, 2011a, p.7)

The Faculty also planned to enhance curricular content, for instance by expanding programming opportunities for teaching and learning though student placements. In addition, the larger Clinic was suggested to strengthen the Faculty’s connections with the University’s Faculties of Health Sciences, and with the University’s affiliated teaching hospitals in Toronto (FPHE, 2011a).

A final space included in the plan was the Sports Science and Assessment area. This academic space (909 nasms) would include professorial offices, research labs, and graduate student space (FPHE, 2007). When asked who would be in the space, and how this was decided, Participant 2 mentioned:

because it was going to be the Goldring high performance centre, if you’re going to locate up here, at least some fraction, 10% of your research should have a connection with sport and that side of things, although probably more emphasis on the sport than on the high performance … if your research … some portion of your research has to do with sport and high performance, then “come on up”, and that was essentially it, then you’re invited to come up, not everybody did that, had that connection anyway. (Participant 2)

Light and Bright

The architects envisioned the colour scheme as well as many of the components of the Centre’s interior and exterior design. A vision for the Centre was that it would be light and
bright. The majority of the SCC and the fourth floor of the Centre was planned to be painted in a very light colour and the flooring was intended to be dark. This was thought to help to keep attention directed to the floor:

the official color, what do they call it, café noir, but they liked it … they wanted to go with the café noir and there up against the walls, which a lot of the time want to keep it light and bright, but what they wanted to do, was they said they want all the attention to be focused on the floor, and the action going on the gym floor, and it makes sense, because most of the time whether you’re playing or sports therapy, you’re watching what’s going on the floor, whether it’s an athletic event or not, and they just wanted nothing else to distract you from that. (Participant 7)

In accordance with principles of designing light and bright spaces an abundance of windows, to allow for the infiltration of daylight, were envisioned. This design was thought to be representative of an attractive aesthetic - features of a pleasurable workout space:

Now the design of the Goldring Centre, and the architect got this clearly, was to get away from that workout space, as something that this building represents, you know concrete walls, utilitarian, kind of going, ‘I’m going to come in here and work out’, not because it is going to be pleasurable necessarily but because it is something I have to do. (Participant 3)

Accordingly, windows would form the front of the Centre, allowing natural light to shine through during the day. In addition to windows on the exterior of the building, the architects envisioned the interior to have transparent features (e.g., clear glass walls) that would contribute to the open and lofty concept. Participant 3 commented that the large amount of glass, for instance, forming the walls in the meeting rooms on the second and third floors, “was very much behind the whole, loftiness of the building”. The only exception to the glass panels on the Centre’s interior would be the doors to the professorial offices. Participant 3 commented: “the windows in the offices were meant to be transparent, people didn’t feel comfortable with that.”

Light in all aspects of the building was a central element of the architectural planning. For example, the presence and absence of light was important for practical reasons in the research spaces:
An important consideration in how the space was designed was to have sunlight, a lot of students had been in labs in buildings and they would check on their phones to see what the weather was like. The desire was to provide that light for as much as we could, the laboratory spaces, in some cases it kind of doesn’t matter, in some cases like the motor control lab, they actually wanted the ability to cut out light. (Participant 2)

Daylight was also suggested to be important for the sports medicine clinic, as its current location was in the basement of the Athletic Centre, and had no access to windows or daylight, and had “been in the dark for so long.” (Participant 3) Figure 3 shows the imagined daytime appearance of the Centre, including the infiltration of light to the SCC, and the Centre’s white-painted interior.

![Figure 3](http://urbantoronto.ca/database/projects/u-t-goldring-centre-high-performance-sport)

While the daytime light was an important feature in the planning of the facility, the architects also conceptualized a vision for artificial light that would emanate from the Centre at night. The night-time vision was that the artificial lights within the Centre would emanate outwards (e.g., through the large front glass wall). A coiled, café noir coloured ‘veil’ would cover part of the exterior of the Centre. In effect, the design feature would create a “lantern effect”. Participant 7 explains this architectural and stylistic feature:

the veil that’s over it, this coil-y … there’s some of it over here… but it’s on the front of the building as well, so the architects vision of that was that, it really doesn’t have any structural reason for it, it was architectural, but what they wanted, their vision was that at night, with the lights on in the building it would look like a lantern. The light flowing through all the holes in it. You can kind of see it hanging off the side, it comes down part of the front window. So if you’re here at night and
you’re across the street you can see the sort of lantern vision of it. (Participant 7)

Figure 4 shows the ‘veil’ effect. The coil comes part-way down the Centre’s exterior and is visible from the inside. (Note: this photo was captured from the second floor of the Centre, thus it was taken after the Centre was realized).

**Figure 4**

Figure 5 demonstrates the intended “lantern vision” of the Centre at night. Note that this photo was captured after the Centre was realized. (http://physical.utoronto.ca/FacilitiesAndMemberships/goldring-centre-for-high-performance-sport/facility-descriptions)
The large window that covers the front wall was also imagined as an opportunity for the people passing by the Centre to see inwards. This wall would be visible from Devonshire Road, which intersects with Bloor Street (a main thoroughfare in Toronto). The use of transparent glass panes was tied to the envisioned transparency (e.g., people inside can see outside, people outside can see inside) and was thought to be inviting. Participant 3 explained:

If you’re going to engage people in physical activity who many not have done it before, you need to make it appealing, and you entice them in … you engage them in imagining themselves on the other side of the glass so when they’re walking by or cycling by, they can look in and find it intriguing, they can imagine themselves trying that machine out, or sitting in a seat watching a game, so that was very much behind the whole, the loftiness of the building, the large amount of glass, the transparencies inside too, the walls of the meeting room.

As Participant 3 mentioned, the abundance of windows along the front of the building would also permit individuals on the outside of the building to view the Field House inside of the Centre. The windows and below grade court would allow onlookers who approached the front of
the building an opportunity to “imagine themselves sitting in a seat and watching a game” (Participant 3). Figure 6 shows the imagined below-grade Field House space and the windows at ground level that would allow for the external community to see the Centre’s court space. It also shows the Mezzanine lounge that would surround the Field House. This lounge would offer spaces for the sponsorships through the Seat Sale campaign (Participant 6), as well as an ideal space for cameras and filming (Participant 8).

Figure 6 (http://urbantoronto.ca/database/projects/u-t-goldring-centre-high-performance-sport#)

Participant 3 explained an additional feature of the transparent exterior design involved the comprehending of the Faculty’s work. The intent was that the increased visibility would allow for onlookers to better understand the Faculty of Kinesiology and Physical Education. It would also support the efforts of members in the Faculty who aim to promote physical activity: you know we want people to be able to understand the full range of what kinesiology represents, it’s not just this, and it’s not just that, so being able to look into the building gives people the understanding that “yeah, we do research in lots of different domains, we teach in lots of different aspects of sport and exercise, the mechanics of, psychological benefits and challenges of”, etcetera, etcetera. Most people don’t think about kinesiology and physical education, that it has that sort of multi-disciplinary instead of staring at a block wall they have a nice airy space. (Participant 3)
Analysis

the space of scientist, planners, urbanists, technocratic subdividers and social engineers as of a certain type of artist with a scientific bent – all of whom identify what is lived and what is perceived with what is conceived. (Lefebvre, 1991, p.38)

Several envisioned architectural and design features are worthy of analysis as they are implicated in the social relations (and the power relations) of Goldring Centre’s production. Firstly, the envisioned tier-based design of the Goldring Centre’s Strength and Conditioning Centre was intended to foster a sense of connection between the Centre and Varsity Centre’s field and stadium stands. However, as Lefebvre (1991) suggests, the unity and cohesion involved in urban spatial planning are not innocent, they are tied to impositions of domination. He argues that cohesion:

characterizes a double imposition of force: first in order to maintain a coherence and, later, in the shape of reductionism, in the shape of the strategy of homogenization and the fetishization of cohesiveness in and through reductions of all kinds. (Lefebvre, 1991, p.411)

Accordingly, a Lefebvrian analysis of this vision for the sporting landscape is also an infliction of power and spatial hegemony. The connected entirety of the Varsity sport complex fosters a unified space of sport, but also a unified space of domination, wherein order is imposed upon its spectators and participants. Lefebvre (1991) explains that spatial hegemony exists at both the micro level (e.g., the organization of surfaces, such as those found within a store) and at the macro level (e.g., “the ordering of ‘flows’ within nations” [p.412]). Accordingly, the tiered conception that mirrors the stadium stands is also tied to an impending ordered ‘flow’ of the high performance sport complex. This vision imposes a sort of spatial organization, wherein bodies (and attention) would be oriented towards the terrain of competition (e.g., the Varsity Centre
field). As a result, all of the SCC’s users would also become spectators, as their positioning encourages (perhaps obliges) them to look outwards onto the Varsity Stadium field. The users would be positioned in symbolic stadium stands, and attend to the cohesive, homogenous space of “greatness” that they will witness and engage.

The tier-based plan for the Strength and Conditioning Centre was also perceived to serve a practical purpose. As Participant 7 mentioned the architects conceptualized a design that would allow for the separation and reservation of specialized training areas, such as the heavy lifting facility that the Faculty requested in the planning document (FPHE, 2007). Moreover, Participant 7 highlighted that the Varsity teams would be able to reserve space on the top tier of the Centre for team training sessions. There was administrative support for the segmentation of space. This would not deter access to the facility for other users who would have access to the lower tiers. Specifically, Participant 7 stated:

there was some thought and even to this day I think that when people see it as the Goldring Centre for high performance sport, that the general arts student can’t come over and work out and that’s not the case at all, so, I think they [the architects] wanted to make sure they did that.

A reserved space would not only facilitate a social distinction for Varsity competitive athletes but actively provoke this division through the placement of boundaries. Moreover, at varsity sport games or at special events, the wealthy elite donors and other insiders (e.g., FKPE administrators) would have the option to be secluded, and to sit in the seats that would overlook the Field House space from the Mezzanine lounge, meanwhile, the remaining spectators would not have this opportunity. This speaks to Lefebvre’s (1991) fundamental question, who has the right to space?

Another facet of the architectural planning involved the presence (or the necessitated absence) of light. The desire for a well-lit work-space and/or a dark lab space was
articulated by the interview participants, and these preferences had practical justifications. Still, the architectural details of these lighting features are noteworthy, as Lefebvre (1991) argues:

A further necessity is that space – natural and social, practical and symbolic – should come into being inhabited by a (signifying and signified) higher ‘reality’. By Light, for instance- the light of sun, moon or stars as opposed to the shadows, the night, and hence death; light identified with the True, with life, and hence with thought and knowledge and, ultimately, by virtue of mediations not immediately apparent, with established authority. (p.34)

During the day, the multitude of windows would allow for the day’s [L]ight to penetrate the Centre, yet in the evening the [L]ight from within the Centre would shine out to the city. The lantern effect mentioned by Participant 7 communicates the message that while the Centre may be closed for the evening, its presence would not fade in the darkness of the night. This eminence of [L]ight may serve the purpose of a night-light: it shines in darkness to ease fears of the unknown, to comfort anxieties and to guide the vulnerable. The night-light of this Centre appears as a beacon of strength, communicating the importance of the discipline of Kinesiology and high performance sport for the University of Toronto. In sum, Goldring’s night-light would be symbolic of the Centre, and the University’s aspired pursuit of excellence within the quests for strength through sport, fitness and knowledge.

The architects planned for windows on the building’s exterior and intended to have transparent panes of glass as opposed to the opaque walls within the Centre. These design features are also tied to dynamics of luminosity, continuity and visibility. They are similar to Lefebvre’s (1991) “illusion of transparency” (p.28), which communicates the message that spaces are innocent:

The illusion of transparency goes hand in hand with a view of space as innocent, as free of traps or secret places. Anything hidden or dissimilated – and hence dangerous – is antagonistic to transparency, under whose reign everything can be taken in by a single glance from that mental eye which illuminates whatever it contemplates. (p.28)

He explains that spaces are deemed comprehensible “either by piercing it with a ray or by
converting it, after certain precautions have been taken, from a murky to a luminous state” (p.28). Through the illusion of transparency, “an encrypted reality becomes readily decipherable” (p.28). Moreover,

space appears as luminous, as intelligible, as giving action free rein. What happens in space lends a miraculous quality to thought, which becomes incarnate by means of a design (in both senses of the word). The design serves as a mediator - itself of great fidelity – between mental activities (invention) and social activity (realization); and it is deployed in space. (Lefebvre, 1991, p.28)

The physical structures that would allow for the transparency of the Goldring Centre would convey the illusion that there is nothing to question about these practices and activities. There is nothing hidden, silenced or left unknown. The onlooker on the Centre’s exterior would see the Centre’s practices, and on the interior, participants would see into the activities deployed in this space, for instance, in the exercise studio, in the SCC and in the meeting rooms. Lefebvre argues, this illusion serves “to be a transcendental illusion: a trap, operating on the basis of its own quasi-magical power” (p.29). In the Goldring Centre, the ‘trap’ of this illusion lies in the possibility that the “greatness” of this infrastructure will be unquestioned by the onlooker and the participant. The open and observable space would support the image of social continuity, and protect the forces of its production:

Thus space emerges consecrated - yet at the same time protected from the forces of good and evil; it retains the aspect of those forces which facilitates social continuity, but bears no trace of their other, dangerous side. (p.34)

Within this conception of visibility and transparency lies the assumption that the Centre’s users would want to be visible. There is an assumption that in this enlightened space, people (e.g., athletes, students, staff, coaches, trainers, and academics) would want to be seen, and be part of its visibilities. The danger in this assumption lies in the possibilities for discomfort, dis-ease, and exclusion of those who would prefer to engage in spaces where they are not displayed, where they can be ‘invisible’ to the surveilling eye. Vertinsky (2004) mentions that Le Corbusier
advocated for upright windows to symbolize masculinity as they permit domination of the visible, and a territorial sense of security. Especially, in spaces of exercise, fitness and sport that are entrenched with the moving body, there may be people who desire the comfort of a private (or an intuitive and perceived private) space. For instance, Leary (1992) outlines self-presentational processes, “the processes by which people monitor and control how they are perceived by other people” (Schlenker, 1980 in Leary, 1992, p.339) in exercise and sport. Leary suggests that they range from worrying about appearance (e.g., being perceived as being athletically incompetent), to engaging strenuous, physical exertion perhaps to make an impression on others or to attain a particular athletic performance. Importantly, visibility and appearance concerns may influence an individual’s choice of physical activity, as well as the actual decision to participate in exercise and sport. Accordingly, Lefebvre (1991) explains that some spaces:

are made with the visible in mind: the visibility of people and things, of spaces and of whatever is contained by them. The predominance of visualization (more important than ‘spectacularization’, which is in any case subsumed by it) serves to conceal repetitiveness. People look, and take sight, take seeing, for life itself. We build on the basis of papers and plans. We buy on the basis of images. Sight and seeing, which in the Western tradition once epitomized intelligibility, have turned into a trap: the means whereby, in social space, diversity may be simulated and a travesty of enlightenment and intelligibility ensconced under the sign of transparency. (pp. 75-76)

While the visibility of Goldring’s interior would expose the contents and diversity of its space, it asserts particular social and spatial practices of homogeneity. The visible would be engaged in an illuminated space of performance and research, while they conform to the order, structure and discipline of visible spaces (e.g., segmented tiers, exercise studio, field house).

There would be one exception to the envisioned visibility and transparency of the Centre. Translucent glass panes that would separate the fourth floor hallway and the professorial offices would not be transparent, because as Participant 3 mentioned, members of the professoriate were opposed to the idea of transparent glass panes. Perhaps this speaks to the need for privacy,
and/or on the danger of the onlooker gazing into their space of knowledge. This hidden, private space would be “antagonistic to transparency, under whose reign everything can be taken in by a single glance from that mental eye which illuminates whatever it contemplates” (p. 28). While translucent panes of glass would still allow for the eminence of light within these spaces, their details would be protected. The activities, meetings and research within these spaces would not be subject to the risk of a trespassing eye. In sum, these rooms of “greatness” would not be socially continuous: they would need to be separate, private, and protected. This inquiry into the planning of the Goldring space helped me to see the complex realities that exist within institutional gym spaces. As Park (2004) writes:

> when questions are asked about such things as their centrality or marginality (both physical and conceptual); their architectural style, their size, floor plans and functionality; who uses what portions of the facility and under what conditions; which modality dominates … and where in the hierarchical value structures of an institution do programmes whose focus is the exercising body stand, it becomes evident that realities are more complex. (p.178)

In this chapter, I described the spaces that were conceptualized by the architects, as well as the FKPE’s Planning and Implementation Committee. In my analysis of this planning stage, I suggest that while certain features of the Centre’s design (e.g., the tiers, large front windows and high office doors) are suggested to have practical purposes and be architecturally appealing, they are also implicated in the manifestation of a segmented, visible and imposing space for the sport sciences and academic intellect, wealthy elite, and elite level competitive performance on the University’s campus. In this imagined space for academic research, athletic training and therapy, the FKPE and the University as a whole, esteemed to shine (both figuratively and literally) amongst its counterparts. Perhaps, the administrative desire for excellence in academics and athletics casted a shadow on the pressing needs of the student body (e.g., those who do would not envision themselves on the other side of the glass), and the broader university community. As I will discuss in Chapter 7, there were several acts of resistance amongst the student body
(e.g., from the University of Toronto Student Union (UTSU) and from the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students (APUS)). These students (amongst others, such as writers in the student newspaper) believe that the university administration might better serve their campus by prioritizing alternative spatial developments such as a Student Commons building. Despite these efforts that called for equity and justice, the substantial financial investment on behalf of the federal and provincial government, as well as the philanthropic (and legacy) interests of the wealthy elite donors spearheaded the commencement of this infrastructural development.

In the next chapter, I detail Lefebvre’s second moment of space, and suggest that there are particular conceptions of “greatness” that materialize in discourse, sport, research and practice in the GCHPS.
CHAPTER 5

SPATIAL PRACTICES OF GREATNESS

Introduction

In Lefebvre’s spatial triad, the spatial practices, also known as perceived space, are the second moment of space. This moment involves a materialized structure and its physical (e.g., architectural) dynamics. Spatial practices also include the competencies that develop within a space, such as the ways of movement that facilitate a cohesive and organized environment. In addition, spatial practices include (but are not limited to) the common sense perceptions that form among the users of a given spatial formation. Merrifield explains:

spatial practices structure everyday reality and broader social and urban reality, and include routes, and networks, and patterns of interaction that link and set places aside for work, play and leisure. Such practices embrace both production and reproduction, conception and execution, the conceived and the lived, and somehow ensure societal cohesion, continuity and what Lefebvre calls “spatial competence.” (Lefebvre, 1991, as cited in Merrifield, 2000, p.175)

Social relations are the substance of spatial practices. Lefebvre states that spatial (and social) relations are “part of a practical relation” (p.18). Thus, the objective of the study of the production of space is to underline the “contents – i.e. the social (spatial) practices inherent to the forms under consideration” (p.18). In this chapter, I examine the spatial and social relations of the Goldring Centre, and explore the competencies and common sense perceptions that emerge in the materialized space. These practices include: ceremonies and celebrations, discourses and dreams, specializations and sponsorships, technologies and ‘truths’.

In the analysis, I question the spatial practices that order and regulate Goldring’s participants, academic and athletic programs, and sport medicine practices. Specifically, in this analysis, I question how spatial practices are implicated in the governance of bodies in this space, and also work to reproduce social relations of power. I also argue that spatial practices discursively and materially communicate a particular vision of “greatness”, excellence and
success. The analysis makes connections between Andrew’s (2008, 2013) conception of ‘McKinesiology’, Giroux’s critique of corporatization in higher education, and Pronger’s (2002) assertion that salvation is found in and through the modern technologies of fitness. In sum, this chapter seeks to explain: What power relations are evident and enabled?

PART 1: FUNDRAISING FOR AND CELEBRATIONS OF GREATNESS

Fundraising for the Goldring Centre and the Varsity Centre was ongoing for the past 10 years. Part of the University’s and the FKPE’s financial strategy was to recognize the individual parties who contributed to the Founding Benefactor Campaign, the Goldring Centre Campaign, and the Seat Sale Campaign (Participant 6). The Faculty’s Alumni and Advancement team were involved with fundraising for the Goldring Centre’s campaign to achieve the campaign goals, as well as working with campaign volunteers and organizing celebratory events (Participant 6). Involving the donors in the Centre’s opening was suggested to be important:

I think from a donor perspective that they just want to feel involved, so we just make an effort to include them in whatever is going on, and try to make the most of it. Also for donors, they invested in this project, we want to make sure that they see that it was worth it. So I think that the more we do the better. And just show that it is a good facility and it is being used and it’s being valued by students and the community and anyone who can take advantage of it. (Participant 6)

The first of the celebratory events occurred in May 2012 prior to the Centre’s opening\(^8\) and it marked the beginning of the events that would engage Goldring’s supporters and

\(^8\) The “Goldring Gala” was held at the Royal Conservatory of Music on Bloor Street (University of Toronto, 2012) was part of the Founding Benefactor Campaign (Participant 6). It included a cocktail reception, a silent auction, and an opportunity to meet a selection of Canadian high performance athletes including student Olympians (University of Toronto, 2012).
prospective donors. The event celebrated all donors, particularly those who made a minimum $200 donation. Individuals who made donations above $1000 would eventually have their name displayed on the Founding Benefactor Wall in the Centre (Participant 6).

The official Opening Ceremony for the building was on October 27, 2014. This event was attended by “300 members and friends of the U of T community” (http://www.president.utoronto.ca/opening-of-the-goldring-centre-for-high-performance-sport) including the University’s President Meric Gertler, a select few of various student representatives (e.g., FKPE graduate student, FKPE undergraduate student, intramural and Varsity sport), some Faculty members, donors and their families (e.g., Goldring, Kimel and Stollery families). Speeches were given on behalf of key stakeholders including Judy Goldring (the Chair of the University’s Governing Council, the daughter of the late Warren Goldring), Blake Goldring, The Honourable Michael Coteau (Ontario’s Minister of Tourism, Culture and Sport), Ira Jacobs (the FKPE’s Dean), and Michael Wilson (The Honourable Chancellor of the University) (http://www.president.utoronto.ca/opening-of-the-goldring-centre-for-high-performance-sport). In his speech, Blake Goldring stated:

What you see before you today is more than just a beautiful new building. It represents a new paradigm - a true Sports Institute where researchers, graduate students and sport medicine experts connect with athletes, coaches and sport organizations to create a rich environment for training, studying teaching and team-building. The impact of the work that will be carried out in this state-of-the art Sport Institute will be deep and widespread. The things we learn here about health, training, exercise and conditioning will inform our efforts everywhere and produce many astounding athletic feats. And, as new research informs public policy and personal performance, it will come to benefit many thousands.

Blake Goldring also spoke of his father who:

believed in the "strong body, strong mind" philosophy. He believed that great students and great faculty deserve great facilities. He was seized by the vision of David Naylor and Bruce Kidd to assist in the creation of a world-class facility which would nurture future Olympians, and impact on the health and fitness of all of us through its research and teaching. As a family, we are delighted to contribute to projects that enhance the student experience. We are proud to participate actively in the life of the University. For three generations,
beginning with our grandfather and great uncle, we have enjoyed the special benefits of a University of Toronto education.

On November 6 2014, a subsequent Donor Celebration event expressed gratitude and honor for the donors who together provided $31 million for the Centre’s construction. Donors were diplomatically recognized and welcomed into the Centre. In their speeches, Dean Ira Jacobs and other stakeholders articulated their gratitude, eagerness and high hopes for its research and practices. Participant 6 explained that the Donor Celebration marked the beginning of the Seat
Sale campaign:

The donor celebration … was an opportunity to launch our seat sale fundraiser … we also invited a wider range of donors ‘cause one of the ideas that we had, rather than for most buildings you just do one official opening, so that was the one where we had government, and chancellor and chair and president, the official regalia kind of thing, which is great and you have to do it, but we saw an opportunity to hold more events, and be able to include more people because there are obviously way more stakeholders than just the sort of 400 people we could involve in that event. (Participant 6)

An article in the University’s student newspaper, The Varsity, titled “Cost for Goldring Centre event raises eyebrows” explains that the donor event might cost up to $40,000 as it included gifts to thank guests and the Centre’s donors. In the article, the director of public relations and communications for the FKPE justifies the spending and addresses the need to thank the contributors, as well as to entice additional funds. At the time there was still $4.5 million left to fundraise for the Centre’s development (Shim, 2014). Participant 6 spoke about the importance of this gesture:

Especially because a lot of those people are sort of our nearest and dearest who’ve been involved and supporting for a really long time, so this is kind of their opportunity to be part of the next phase. (Participant 6)

In the 2030 documents, the University’s President endorses the gift-giving strategy:
there is a major push to grow our endowment and a change in our fund-raising campaign strategy to include more annual gifts and expendable donations. I endorse these recommendations wholeheartedly … The University’s debt to its thousands of benefactors is incalculable. If our alumni and friends receive a fair accounting of the institution’s needs, I believe they will continue to support the University of Toronto generously. (Towards 2030, Synthesis Report, p.60)

Subsequently, after the Centre’s opening, its architectural design was celebrated for both its engineering expertise and construction. For instance, the design was a winner in the 2015 Toronto Urban Designs Award. The Jury Report for this award states,

The main elements of this building (a large field house and workout facilities) are physically bulky and could have easily been closed off from the street. Instead, the architects found a way to lessen their bulk by dropping the field house partly below ground and making each large space transparent to the street. The jury applauds the elegance of this solution and also the fine detail in the public realm around the building, from the materials of the emergency exit stairs to the pedestrian routes that slice through the building at ground level. (http://urbantoronto.ca/news/2015/09/winners-announced-2015-toronto-urban-design-awards)

In addition, the Centre received the Blackwell 2015 Canadian Consulting Engineering Award for the detailing and complexity of its construction. The award recognized the strategic placement of the below-grade field house that allowed for the maximization of the site size and space restrictions and was suggested to be a successful contributor “to the quality and coherence of the university as a whole” (http://www.acec.ca/files/mediarelease/2015Awards/ACEC_CCE_Awards2015_PressRelease_National_Backgrounder_Final.pdf). It was also recognized in the realm of sports and athletics by Athletic Business⁹ in their Facilities of Merit 2015 (http://www.athleticbusiness.com/project-1145.html). Their review of the Goldring Centre project states:

The core of the program is a pair of very large rooms: the field house and the strength and conditioning center. Due to site restrictions, the field house was too large to fit within the permissible zoning envelope, requiring the courts to be placed below grade.

---

⁹ Athletic Business is available online, and is suggested to be “a resource for athletic, fitness, and recreational professionals” (http://www.athleticbusiness.com/project-1145.html).
To preserve the clear span required for the field house, the strength and conditioning center and upper floors are suspended above using 180-foot-long trusses. In overcoming the challenges posed by a constrained urban infill site, the project was rewarded with a singular public expression on the street: a heroic steel frame vaulting over a cavernous excavation. (http://www.athleticbusiness.com/project-1145.html#lightbox[gallery]/5/)

Judges described this project as “Innovative use of a tight site. Well-planned, nicely stated. Very Toronto” and an “Amazing project top to bottom. A true modern design” (http://www.athleticbusiness.com/project-1145.html#lightbox[gallery]/5/).

Celebrations of the opening of this space targeted the University community on October 7, 2014. While the Alumni and Advancement Affairs office was not involved with this event, they did help to “spread the word” among alumni (Participant 6). The tagline for the event was “Pursue (your) greatness: Sneak Peek”. It was a three-hour, free event that encouraged the University community to explore the new development. Attendees were encouraged to Tweet¹⁰ about their Goldring Centre experience by using the hashtag #DiscoverGoldring (http://www.physical.utoronto.ca/Event/2014/09/12/goldring-centre-sneak-peek). In addition to displaying and celebrating the sport as a space of high performance, Participant 8 also spoke of it as an event facility (both for sport and celebrations) for the university at large:

Essentially, Goldring is an event facility, so, I’m in it extensively, we use it a lot to run our programs, run our games, and then run events with external partners. A lot of times though they’re tied to intercollegiate events, but sometimes we run them with partners of high performance groups, that come in and use the facility to kind of showcase it, you know it helps with our branding it links to the community, and the sport community in particular. (Participant 8)

I think you know our physical activity unit is doing a great job to showcase how it can be use for greatness and for recreation use as well, there’s programming in there for everyone, it’s not just for elite athletes and high performance athletes, although when they come in and use it and we’ve had a lot of external professional athletes and when they come in and use this place they love it too, and there is both sides of the gamut. (Participant 8)

¹⁰Twitter is a form of social media. Accounts are created free of cost and provide individuals with the opportunity to “communicate and stay connected through the exchange of quick, frequent messages. People post Tweets, which may contain photos, videos, links and up to 140 characters of text.” https://support.twitter.com/articles/13920#)
Participant 8 suggested that the showcasing of this infrastructure was important for attracting the attention of different rental groups, as well as for exposing the University of Toronto ‘brand’ and enhancing the University’s athletic reputation. Participant 8 suggests that “this is the athletic side” and people are “taking notice of our space”:

so we can showcase the facility as best we can, ‘cause when you showcase it, like when we hosted the NBA event, I’ve had two more people come in with requests for rental space. And so it opens up that whole world and people are like “I didn’t know this was here”, “this is great” and you know, “how do we get in”, “I need it for this, I need it for that” and so I mean that helps it exposes the brand it helps the university and the wonders that they’re doing in a different realm, ‘cause everybody knows how academically sound and wonderful they are with the programs that are offered, and the Nobel prize people that I see about every week, but this is the athletic side, where the athletic world is kind of sped up and they’re taking notice of our space, so that’s good. (Participant 8)

Thus, showcasing the space was suggested to be a contributor to the recognition and importance of Varsity sport, and the FKPE within the University as a whole.

Participant 4 suggested that the perceived space met the expectations for the imagined space:

I do lots of tours of the centre for outside people, I always say that quite often when you do a project like this, it doesn’t match the vision that you had in the first place, but this does, and that’s why I think we were very successful, and it took a lot of people being very vigilant in every part of the process, but it really did meet our expectations.

Moreover, Participant 4 articulated that the Centre generates excitements because it is ‘cutting-edge’, modern, and reflects the ‘new time’:

I think that the facility here, it’s just, it’s reflective of the time we live in. Right. So the AC when it was opened was reflective cutting edge of the time it was open, and now Goldring is reflective of the new time and where we are now.
Participant 8 suggested that the space is now widely used for holding of diverse events for the University community, and was seen as a valuable event space for the University:

[the University administrators] hosted a few events, they’ve been to several events, and they seem to be more engaged in using this space because it is so beautiful, like it’s a great venue to show off to central, I mean … they’re finding ways to use it differently, we hosting conferences in there, were hosting a panel and a movie …the presidents reception is now hosted in that space, it’s a beautiful space, and the facilities team is great in terms of accommodating different ways to utilize it and so we can show off its greatness and use it for all to see and all to use.

Figure 7 shows the set-up of the Field House as a celebratory event space, such as for the Faculty’s annual ‘hall of fame’ ceremony (June 5, 2016).

Figure 7 Overlooked Architectural Features of the Materialized Space

Many of the architectural and design features of this space were praised in the celebratory speeches and as noted above, were aspired to benefit all and foster prosperous
states of health for the broad student population. Still, some of the design features were neglected by the stakeholders who celebrated of this space (e.g., at the opening events) as well as by the agencies who recognized the spatial production with designs of excellence and engineering awards (e.g., Toronto Urban Design Award, Blackwell Engineering Award). For example, modern, urban spaces of excellence, contain structural features that cater mostly to able-bodied users and elite funders above others (both symbolically and literally). Space and disability critical scholars assert oppression of the ‘disabled’ are both structural and systemic. For example, Purcell (2014), writes that “The able-bodied privilege of spaces and learning forms becomes apparent in their social construction” (p.203) and that “able-bodied privilege is one that assumes the “able body” as the normal body in social spaces” (p.203). Despite intentions in Goldring’s planning stages to make the Centre fully accessible there are several facets of the materialized centre that are not accessible for all. For instance, access to the 2nd and 3rd tiers (Figure 8) are only accessible by staircase. Thus, these two tiers that hold a number of strength-building and cardiovascular training equipment are not easily accessible for individuals in wheelchairs, or individuals whose mobility is limited (e.g., due to injury).
This feature, alongside other features in the 4th floor Clinic space (e.g., doors that did not have sensor/automatic openers) was mentioned by an individual who works in the Clinic. The individual commented that the national wheelchair basketball team (a team he has worked with) would have difficulty training in the SCC as well as with navigation in the Centre. For instance, the effort required to turn the knob and pull the door open of non-accessible/automatic doors (both of which would require shifting their positioning in their wheelchair) would likely pose difficulties and discomfort (Personal Communication, April 20, 2016).

An additional architectural feature that poses inconvenience for the Centre’s users involves the design of the sport medicine clinic’s treatment rooms. Each of the treatment rooms are equipped with a skylight, and thus do not permit for the complete blocking out of daylight (as shown in Figure 9). This feature was suggested to be impractical for patients who are suffering from concussions and need to be in dark spaces during their recovery period (Personal Communication, April 20, 2016).

*Figure 9 shows the skylight (square on ceiling closest to side wall) that enables the infiltration of light in the clinic’s treatment rooms.*
Additionally, the once envisioned glass wall is now material (Figure 10). Large glass panes allow for the Goldring’s interior from the street and sidewalk. As mentioned in the previous chapter, the imagined visibility of the SCC, as well as the tier-based structure and design, may not attract ‘all’ of the student population, particularly those who prefer to remain in private workout spaces (e.g., for cultural or religious reasons), where visibility is minimized and privatized spaces and programs for movement are available and offered (e.g., a Women-only hour).

![Figure 10](image)

An additional materialized feature that separates social spaces (e.g., for spectating sport) is the Field House. A segmented Mezzanine level surrounds the upper-most level of the Field House (see Figure 7 above), and allows access to camera and filming crews, as well as the Centre’s donors, and other elite members who contributed to the funding and sponsorship of the Centre (through purchase of a seat). As the Faculty’s website states:

Donors who contribute $1,000 or more will have their names displayed on the back of a Gold Status seat on the mezzanine floor in the Goldring Centre, overlooking the impressive 2,000-seat Kimel Family Field House that has raised basketball and volleyball competition to new heights. Don’t miss your chance to snag one of the best seats in the house. Donors who contribute $2,000 will be upgraded to a named courtside seat! (http://www.physical.utoronto.ca/AlumniAndGiving/Giving/GoldringCampaign/seat-sale)
Figure 11 shows the Mezzanine level seats ‘for sale’ and spectatorship. (http://www.physical.utoronto.ca/AlumniAndGiving/Giving/GoldringCampaign/seat-sale)

Analysis and Implications

Lefebvre (1991) supports Marxist philosophy of the unmasking of things in order to unveil the intricacies of social relations. He writes,

When no heed is paid to the relations that inhere in social facts, knowledge misses its target; our understanding is reduced to a confirmation of the undefined and indefinable multiplicity of things, and gets lost in classifications, descriptions and segmentations. (Lefebvre, 1991, p.81)

With the space was opened, there was now the need to take up space, to access/belong within the structure of its dominance, to unpack the visibilities, classifications and descriptions, and to tell the story of what and who is invested and present in this space. Lefebvre writes,

Every group of places and objects has a centre. … The Centre may be perceived from every side, and reached from every angle of approach; … it is occupied by Divinity, Wisdom and Power, which by manifesting themselves show any impression of void to be illusory. (Lefebvre, 1991, p. 154)

Lefebvre suggests that so often, the “modern state promotes and imposes itself as the stable centre” (p.23), and he draws from the work of Hegel, Marx and Nietzsche when he explains that historically, the centering of power was connected to technical and strategic rationalizations, and the neutralizing of acts of resistance. Divinity’s presence in the Goldring Centre are the funders (and the fundraisers), as well as the other elite invited guests (e.g., the professors, the Dean, the
and provincial representative, the University’s chancellor). Speeches at the celebratory events, as well as the other material representations of the elite stakeholders in the Centre (e.g., Founding Benefactor wall, Mezzanine seats, highly visible signage), prioritize their presence, praise and honor.

Furthermore, while investments in the Centre were tied to acts of benevolence, they are also connected to the dispensing of inherited (and accumulated) wealth, and thus, are also tied to a family legacy. The Founding Benefactor wall, the names - the Kimel Family Field House and the Gordon Stollery Atrium - are mounted for the Centre’s users to see, and remind people of the support that wealthy elites are intricately connected to the Centre, the Faculty and the institution. As Participant 5 mentioned, the late Warren Goldring was aged 80 at the time of his donation, and he was “looking to make his lifetime gift”.

Gupta and Ferguson (2002) advocate that spatial hierarchies are produced by the centralized power of the state, whereby spatial practices are influenced by the state’s authority and actions, and “help to secure their legitimacy, to naturalize their authority, and to represent themselves as superior to, and encompassing of, other institutions and centres of power” (p.982). The authors also suggest:

an analysis of the imaginary of the state must include not only explicit discursive representations of the state, but also implicit, unmarked, signifying practices. These mundane practices often slip below the threshold of discursivity but profoundly alter how bodies are oriented, how lives are lived, and how subjects are formed. (p.984)

These discursive and material orientations of the state involve envisioning the creative ways in which authority and power communicate choices, aspirations and desirable lifestyles to members of the university community and to the broader society (e.g., through fundraising, at the opening events and celebrations). The implicit spatial practices impose spatial hierarchies (e.g., in the Mezzanine lounge and the tiers of the SCC) that are overlooked and neglected in the celebration of this space.
While the Centre was recognized for its architectural, “modern” design, and unique engineering, these awards are neglectful of the particularities within the Centre that support the separation and distinction of social class and (dis)ability (amongst others). Moreover, if the structural and institutional privileging of particular high performance sporting bodies is the space of ‘modernity’ and reflective of the ‘new time’, there is some work that needs to be done regarding the inequitable distribution of space, power and access within an institution of higher education. The GCHPS is a space of visibility, wherein the able-bodied high performance athlete, sports scientist, and wealthy elite exert power and privilege, and importantly, this spatial production raises concern regarding the perpetuation of systemic privilege and the particular orientations of greatness that resultantly manifest.

In the following section, I move beyond the rhetoric of greatness and legacy in the celebratory events and speeches, to detail the actual high performance sport technologies and research practices that thrive within the Goldring space.
PART 2: GREATNESS IN AND THROUGH THE SPORT SCIENCES

FKPE Symposiums on Research, Technology and High Performance

The Faculty’s symposium in May 2015 was titled “From Good to Gold”. It was held in the Goldring Centre Field House and was hosted by Tom Harrington, a CBC television investigative consumer show host and sports correspondent for CBC. Figure 12 shows an online advertisement for the event, explained to be “An interactive symposium demonstrating how sport science, research + technology at U of T intersect to bring out the best in High Performance athletes” (http://www.physical.utoronto.ca/Event/2015/04/07/from-good-to-gold).

Figure 12

At the start of the event, the host explained that the night was “all about exploring how cutting-edge scientific study and technology can help to prepare an athlete, teams of athletes and their coaches, so that they can achieve outstanding performances.” He announced that the presenters, four professors in the FKPE would demonstrate “a very intriguing sampling of the range of potential scientific perspectives that a high performance athletes and their coaches have available to them, and need to consider, to get them from being good, to winning a gold medal.” As the event continued, athletes, and sport and research technologies were showcased while these expert speakers analyzed the ways in which specific technological advances were allowing for improvements in athletic training and sport performance. A connection between technology
and research was made by all presenters; for example, one a full-time faculty member with FKPE stated, “I wanted to share with you just how technology has enabled us to do things differently, and so much better.” He asked one of the athletes to demonstrate the non-invasive “mobile lab” that allows for the tracking of physiological changes in his body in response to exercise (e.g., heart rate, oxygen consumption, breathing frequency). He demonstrated non-invasive mobile technology “like Darth Vader”, which provides the physiologist, the coach, and the athlete with insights into the body’s functions, such as levels of oxygen consumption, muscle activity, heart rate and blood flow. As the audience watched the live data that shows the changing numbers on the screen (e.g., Figure 13 is a screen shot of the live data projected to the audience) the faculty member stated that it is “fun for a physiologist to do this.” Notably, he continued to explain that measuring the flux in breathing/ventilation rate provides “insight on how hard the athlete is working and how stressed they are.

![Figure 13](image.png)

The faculty member continued:

you can take them from situations like this if you’re coaching, if you’re working, and then demand a little bit more, and see if we can actually really push the system, and
really push the limits of what humans are capable of … so guys, if you don’t mind could you do like a bunch of suicides, do you mind, for a minute, just like really hammering, really beating yourselves up a little bit.

The audience was encouraged to watch the athletes push ‘their systems’ and to watch the numbers on the screen change. He explained that based on these numbers, the exercising athlete was in “a lot of discomfort, a lot of pain”. He persuaded the audience to “look at the data, he’s breathing 38 times per minute.” He concluded by suggesting that the “mobile lab” assists “Canadian athletes to win internationally” but also extends to helping children with chronic diseases, including cancer and cardiac disease, as these tracking systems can be utilized in treatment interventions.

Next, another professor demonstrated a cell phone application used to gather data on team’s emotions. She suggested:

We’re interested in using a technology that we can deliver to athletes so that they can record their emotions, their performance and their emotion regulation on a daily basis leading up to competition so that we can try to track fluctuations in emotion and in social interactions so that we can try to optimize athletes’ performance on game day.

She stated that this technology is useful for monitoring stress, coping and emotion in sport, as it asks an athlete to respond to questions about their emotions, and uses these responses over time to understand how social interactions and emotions might influence athlete and team performance. Figure 14 shows an example of data collection that was projected to the audience.
This professor stated that through the “cutting-edge open-source mobile app they can launch surveys [and capture emotion] anytime they want,” partnered “with psychology to capitalize on this research.” The fact that this technology is readily available and easily accessible was one of the suggested strengths of data collection. The ultimate goal is to use this emotion and teamwork data on days of competition, to try to enhance the likelihood of “optimal” performance. At the end of her presentation, the host pointed out that this individual and team emotion and performance research has “applications to other places” such as the police force and the military.

The final presenter of the night was another professor in the disciplinary stream of biomechanics, which he described as an intersection between biology, physics and engineering science. Essentially, he stated that his research would “look at the human body as a mechanical system.” He continued to explain that the goal of this research is to “be more objective”:

what we’re doing is research to try to marry our most sophisticated laboratory based equipment, with more field based and validate them and test their reliability and how well they work in the field so that we can monitor things and be more objective on a daily basis.

Rosie McLennan, a Canadian Olympic athlete, was the star of this demonstration. He explained:
Rosie is covered head to toe in reflective markers and we use an optoelectronic motion sensing devices, send lights out, burn images on the sensors of the camera we’re able to quantify, measure the position of those markers within submillimeter accuracy.

McLennan stood on a ground force platform that was able to measure the magnitude of force she applied to the ground on a series of vertical jumps and the crowd was encouraged to applaud the magnitude of her jumps. He explained the relevance of this data for his research:

this is what really excites me, now it’s really hard to get you excited about it because it’s a lot of computer programming, but what we do, what we do so uniquely, different than other people … we take all of this data, we synthesize them and we create mathematical models of the human body, it’s just beautiful.

Moreover, he elaborated that the mathematical model of the human body can be used to make individualized training interventions:

when we have that information we can literally give customized individualized intervention, so training, we can monitor the training, and really look at the athlete themselves … right in computer code, creating mathematical models, it’s amazing.

Figure 15 shows the presentation slide that was projected to the audience:

![Create Mathematical Model of Body](image-url)
One of the concluding statements made in this presentation elucidated that while the biomechanists are “behind the scene” and “invisible,” their mechanical insights are essential for perfecting the high performance athlete’s “raw materials”:

as bio mechanists, with our friends at the Canadian Sport Institute, … we work behind the scenes. We don’t coach the trampoline skills, we don’t coach the other tactical and technical pieces. Our goal is to … send Rosie to coach Ross [Rosie’s coach] with just perfect raw materials, make her as strong, as reactive, as resilient as possible, based on all of our mechanical indices, so that when he is able to give her a cue, when he is able to coach her, she can do it, and she can train, she can keep training, to keep her healthy. That’s what we do in our lab, we’re behind the scene, we’re invisible, just working our tails off, to try to keep our athletes performing at the highest level but also to keep them as healthy as we can.

Notably, during the entire event, the audience was encouraged to use interactive social media to share their comments and questions via Twitter by tweeting #FromGoodToGold.

The Faculty of KPE’s pursuit of high performance research was also showcased at the annual symposium in 2013 titled “Extreme Environments, How Far Can We Push Ourselves.” At this event, the Dean talked about his high performance research and explained that it does not concern treating or preventing chronic disease or injury. Rather, it has applications for military operational scenarios. He explained that he studies “sometimes very healthy” individuals, and researches how they might be able to improve performance through, for instance, minimizing or delaying the onset and effects of fatigue. Moreover, he listed some examples of his research and its ties to the military: ‘time to exhaustion’ at high altitudes (as they are measured in a high altitude chamber), the influence of protective clothing and the increases in body temperature during various work-rest breaks (in tanks set at high temperatures), and testing the dexterity of snipers in extreme conditions. He stated that the findings of this kind of research have “since been commercialized”. Lastly, he explained the value in conducting “anti-g training maneuver tests” that control for particular environmental conditions and strive to minimize the likelihood
that a member of the military will lose their life in real situations. The loss of an invaluable life is also tied to the loss of the $1-2 million that the government invests in their training, as well as the $30 to $50 million cost of the military jet. He suggested “that is why organizations like the department of national defense devote so much of our tax dollars in order to support individuals that we ask to do these things.”

The costly technologized devices that are used in research in biomechanics (e.g., force plates and reflective light trackers that measure corporeal movement), motor control (e.g., robotics and computer programming), and physiology (e.g., testing of athletes in extreme, high-altitude environmental conditions) are justified through discourses that reinforce the applicability of these findings for the health and wellness of a broader spectrum of individuals and literally for protecting the nation. For example, in addition to the connections made at the FKPE Good to Gold symposium, the Human Physiology Research Unit (part of the FKPE) webpage states, “The outcome of these studies will be used to guide therapeutic interventions, as well as training and physical activity recommendations for people across the human spectrum”. When asked about the vision of greatness in research, Participant 2 commented:

I guess in some ways it fits with the broader U of T conception that we want to be world leaders, and I think that that’s one aspect of what pursuing greatness means, is that we would like to be leading in the research that we’re doing.

Technologies in the SCC and in sport medicine

Novel exercise and body composition technologies are also part of the Centre’s spatial practices. Training technologies in the SCC include versa-climbers (Figure 15), and “weight training equipment [that] uses pneumatic resistance instead of more traditional weight stacks”; as well, “the centre is wired to support wearable accelerometers” (p://physical.utoronto.ca/FacilitiesAndMemberships/goldring-centre-for-high-performance-sport/facility-descriptions/strength-conditioning-centre).
New equipment includes 15 Keiser\textsuperscript{11} Power Racks\textsuperscript{12} located on tiers 3 and 4, and 3 Keiser Functional Trainers\textsuperscript{13} located on the 2\textsuperscript{nd} and 1\textsuperscript{st} tier. Other contents of the SCC include ellipticals, treadmills, 2 rowing machines, 1 stationary bike, an arm ergometer, free weights, a multi-station weight trainer, stretching mats, medicine balls, and a specialized turf surface floor space that “allows users to train on a more forgiving surface while doing movements such as plyometrics, small accelerations, agility drills, and running drills” (http://physical.utoronto.ca/FacilitiesAndMemberships/goldring-centre-for-high-performance-sport/facility-descriptions/strength-conditioning-centre).
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\caption{New equipment includes 15 Keiser Power Racks located on tiers 3 and 4, and 3 Keiser Functional Trainers located on the 2\textsuperscript{nd} and 1\textsuperscript{st} tier. Other contents of the SCC include ellipticals, treadmills, 2 rowing machines, 1 stationary bike, an arm ergometer, free weights, a multi-station weight trainer, stretching mats, medicine balls, and a specialized turf surface floor space that “allows users to train on a more forgiving surface while doing movements such as plyometrics, small accelerations, agility drills, and running drills” (http://physical.utoronto.ca/FacilitiesAndMemberships/goldring-centre-for-high-performance-sport/facility-descriptions/strength-conditioning-centre).}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{11} Keiser is a manufacturer specializing in high performance training equipment that can be used by elite athletes and by recreational users. (https://www.keiser.com/)

\textsuperscript{12} Keiser Power Racks allow “for a wide spectrum of training, enhancing power and stability for the athlete”. Professional sports teams often use them. They look similar to the traditional squat racks found in gyms, however, may also utilize air resistance to be used alone or in combination with free weights. (https://www.keiser.com/fitness-equipment/strength-training/power-rack)

\textsuperscript{13} Keiser Functional Trainers use air resistance which allows for groups (e.g., professional athletes, the military) to “train at the speed they perform their jobs in the real world”, as movement is not slowed down by gravity. (https://www.keiser.com/fitness-equipment/functional-training)
New exercise technologies are also found inside a specialized ‘Speed and Power Centre’, wherein:

Force plates in the floor are connected to computers and provide users with analytics with respect to the force they exert while weight training. (http://physical.utoronto.ca/FacilitiesAndMemberships/goldring-centre-for-high-performance-sport/facility-descriptions/speed-power-centre)

Users can also book sessions with a fitness consultant, and this may include a session with the ‘BOD POD’ (Figure 19 and Figure 20). The BOD POD is found on the 3rd floor in the “Fitness Consultation” room (Figure 16).

**Figure 16 shows the room where the BOD POD is located.**

**Figure 17, a poster that is on the BOD POD room door.**
The Faculty’s personal training and nutrition webpage explains:

The BOD POD Gold Standard Body Composition Tracking System is an Air Displacement Plethysmograph, which uses whole-body densitometry to determine body composition (fat and fat-free mass) in adults. The BOD POD’s precision, accuracy and reliability have been validated through many independent research studies with various subject populations and in the field by leading universities, sports teams, fitness clubs, military organizations and fitness centers. (http://physical.utoronto.ca/FitnessAndRecreation/Registered_Programs/Program_Descriptions/Personal_Training_and_Nutrition.aspx)

A session with the BOD POD ranges from $53-77 (e.g., $53 for student vs. $77 for non-members) and takes 20 minutes or less (http://physical.utoronto.ca/FitnessAndRecreation/Registered_Programs/Program_Descriptions/Personal_Training_and_Nutrition.aspx).

*Figure 18, a scale used in the BOD POD tracking system.*

*Figure 19, the BOD POD.*
Novel technologies permeate the new Sports Medicine Clinic as well. For instance, patients can train with an anti-gravity treadmill (Figure 21). With this machine, the athlete is secured inside a black casing and is able to run without putting pressure or strain on their body.
This machine was estimated to cost somewhere between $50,000 and $70,000, yet a sport medicine staff mentioned that there are others that are more costly than this one. (Personal communication, June 5) In addition, the clinic has a separate room (visible in Figure 21) as there are transparent glass panes separating this room from the larger clinic area) that holds two tubs filled with water (stained by a green disinfectant). These tubs (Figure 22) are for “hot/warm bath treatment”. (Personal Communication, April 20)

![Figure 22](image)

The clinic’s treatment space also has new patient treatment “tables”, a treadmill, 6 new stationary bikes (Figure 23), and new laptops for the sports therapists and practitioners. (Personal Communication, April 20)
An additional room (Figure 25) is for surgeries and specialized treatments by a physician.

(Personal Communication, April 20) When this photo was taken, sterilized surgical tools
were drying on the countertop beside the patient table. The removal of stitches and casts are some of the practices that take place here (Personal Communication, June 5, 2016).

Figure 25

Analysis

In the 2013 and 2015 symposium events, high performance research and high performance sport were used to capture attention, and to generate excitement among their audiences. The technologies implicated in sports science research were praised for the prospective ‘successes’ they might bring in sport, training and ‘health.’ There are modern sport technologies within the SCC and on the fourth floor of the Goldring Centre, for instance, within the research labs, and the Sports Medicine Clinic. In the Goldring space, the modern technologies of sports science research direct ‘high performance’ body and research desires (e.g., for change, for results, for progress). In a Lefebvrian analysis, they form part of the Centre’s abstract space, that “has a very real social existence” and “gains objective expression in different buildings, places, activities and modes of social intercourse over and through space” (Merrifield, 2000, p.176).
Merrifield (2000) explains Lefebvre’s abstract space, which includes valuing quantity (e.g., money), homogeneity (e.g., formality) and repression (e.g., through conceived space and force). Moreover, he argues:

its underlying dynamic is conditioned by a logic which has no real interest in qualitative difference. Its ultimate arbiter is none other than value. Value, money, … and exchange value… Thus value dictates underwrite conceived space. … Hence abstract space isn’t just the repressive economic and political space of the bourgeoisie; it’s also, Lefebvre suggests, a repressive male space which finds its representation in the ‘phallic erectility’ of towers and skyscrapers, symbols of force, of male fertility and of masculine violence…abstract space is formal, homogeneous and quantitative, it erases all differences that originate in the body. (Merrifield, 2000, p. 176)

The quantification of bodies through measurements and values, as well as the financial dynamics of research, technology and showcasing of the Goldring space, reveal it as an objective expression of abstract space.

While bodies are subject to the architectural design, boundaries and barriers of this space, they also abide by the intricate ‘energies’ (e.g., technologies and prescriptions) that are found within its walls. The Faculty’s symposiums showcase the high performance sport science research and their technologies, and connect them to ‘outstanding research’ practices and training for successful results. These studies are representative of a larger group of studies originating in Goldring’s research labs that study the body systematically, for instance, by tracking the mechanics of the body (e.g., heart rate, blood pressure, lung capacity) during training. It is the changing and flux of these numerical values serves as a basis for the body’s analysis in the labs of Goldring.

These research practices are directly tied to Pronger’s (2002) theorization of the modern, technological project of the sport sciences, whereby salvation is found through the description, inscription and prescription of exercise and fitness. However, this scientific approach to the body involves a hegemonic power system that is easily overlooked, almost invisible:
the almost invisible hand of this power, leads to little chance of rebellion.

The ‘positive’ (productive rather than repressive) nature of this fascism makes it attractive to the subject and requires little more than the promise of success within its system to get people participating wholeheartedly. (p.111)

Pronger (2002) suggests that the modern technologies of fitness are connected to sociocultural, political and historical networks of power and domination. In the pursuit of knowledge and fitness, active bodies are made valuable, useful, purposeful, and are promised success, liberation and longevity. Pronger notes: “Functional capacities (aerobic capacity, strength, flexibility, youthfulness, slenderness, muscularity, and so on), coded for their capital use-value, can purchase salvation” (p.202). He suggests that the technology of physical fitness:

promises that the more productively the body is trained, the more thoroughly it is called to account for itself, and the more able-bodied it becomes, the more it will increase its power to purchase modern sovereign self-hood. (p.189)

Pronger advocates that salvation is found through the productive expenditure of the body, and freedom (e.g., from loss, failure, disease, weakness) is promised through the production of knowledge (e.g., scientific texts, discourse and research). Salvation and freedom make the pursuit of fitness and excellence in sport performance desirable, and accordingly, the technologized approach to fitness directs human desire and gives the body purpose and meaning. Still, modern desire is managed and exists within the realm of production and consumption (i.e., accumulation) of physical fitness.

Pronger’s conception of the modern technologies of fitness, and the project of the exercise sciences, are evident in the Faculty’s research displays. For instance, at “From Good to Gold” the biomechanist is depicted as “invisible,” yet the promises of his research and its implications are central to the achievement of athletic success (e.g., Rosie winning a gold medal). He emphasized that in his lab they “create mathematical models of the human body”, create “customized individualized intervention”, and look at athletes “in computer code”. He also affiliated this mathematical model of the body as “amazing” and “beautiful.” Importantly, I
attain insight from Rose (2012) who details Haraway’s (1991) critique of the visual technologies that are used in science and asserts that they are problematically tied to a hierarchy between those who “claim to see with universal relevance and those who are seen and categorized in a particular way” (Rose, 2012, p. 9). Moreover, these scholars argue that these technologies are thus embedded with power relations including legacies of capitalism, colonialism, and patriarchy.

Moreover, Pronger (2002) argues that the producers of knowledge effectively maintain a rhetoric of innocence, as they communicate the notion that technologies of fitness are beneficial for all, and neglect to acknowledge, or even notice, the power they exert. While Goldring’s high performance research is rationalized through discourses that are strategically integrated into special events and showcases, it could be argued that they are implicated in (re)producing the economic and political strength of particular scientific practices, and privileging particular ways of knowing and understanding the body and movement. In effect, the dimensions of profitability (e.g., politically and economically) for some individuals (e.g., high performance athletes, academic researchers) are underemphasized beneath powerful discourses of health that are directed to all. This connects to the planning documents in which the university’s and nation’s aspirations to recruit and to foster successful, winning, high performance athletes who will represent the university and/or nation are clearly articulated. Thus, this research advances the economic and political status of the Faculty of KPE, the University of Toronto, and the Canadian state.

Moreover, while various dynamics of the body (e.g., those displayed at “Good to Gold” including heart rate, breathing, exertion, sentiment and mood are measurable, they cannot reveal the coordinated, whole, rhythm and flow of the body in space and time. Lefebvre (1991) reminds us that:

The body’s inventiveness needs no demonstration, for the body itself reveals it, and
deployed it in space. Rhythms in all their multiplicity interpenetrate one another. In the body and around it, as on the surface of a body of water, or within the mass of a liquid, rhythms are forever crossing and recrossing, superimposing themselves upon each other, always bound to space. (p.205)

The measurements of scientific inquiries are fragments of the body that are reduced to highly specialized purposes that pertain to exercise and sport. However, these values are not able to comprehend these complex interactions of the body such as the organs, (their) ‘spaces’ and relationships beyond their physical responses:

An organ has a rhythm, but the rhythm does not have, nor is it, an organ; rather it is an interaction. A rhythm invests places, but is not itself a place; it is not a thing, nor an aggregation of things, nor yet a simple flow. It embodies its own law, its own regularity, which it derives from space- from its own space – and from a relationship between space and time. Every rhythm possesses and occupies a spatio-temporal reality which is known by our science and mastered so far as its physical aspect (wave motion) is concerned, but which is misapprehended from the point of view of living beings, organisms, bodies and social practices. (p.206)

Furthermore, Lefebvre (1991) argues:

The repetitions and redundancies of rhythms, their symmetries and asymmetries, interact in ways that cannot be reduced to the discrete and fixed determinants of analytic thought. Only if this is clearly grasped can the polyrhythmic body be understood and appropriated. (p.205-206)

Lefebvre asserts that the rhythms of spaces, including their social relations and the rhythms of the body, are perhaps more complex than the natural rhythms of the body. He writes: “What we live are rhythms – rhythms experienced subjectively” (p.206). While these rhythms can be imagined, “the laws of nature and the laws governing our bodies tend to overlap with each other – and perhaps too with the laws of social reality” (p.206). These processes encompass a spatial-temporal reality, yet “How exactly the laws of space and its dualities (symmetries/ asymmetries, demarcation/orientation, etc.) chime with the laws of rhythmic movement (regularity, diffusion, interpenetration) is a question to which we do not as yet have the answer” (p.207).
Notably, Deleuze and Guatteri (1980) theorize a body without organs (BwO). They explain that a BwO opposes the organic composition and positioning of its organs; it is a body that stands alone and is open to the passages, opportunities and intensities that lie within it. They encourage:

- a movement of generalized deterritorialization in which each person takes and makes what she or he can, according to tastes she or he will have succeeded in abstracting from a Self [Moi], according to a politics or strategy successfully abstracted from a given formation, according to a given procedure abstracted from its origin. (p.157)

The authors also discuss the construction of a plane of consistency, wherein multiple types of bodies without organs (i.e., political, scientific, artistic) exist and are inherently diverse. Sports scientists must consider that a body that is not measured, quantified, timed or understood as an encoded entity is a body that is liberated from the examiners eye. As Deleuze and Guatteri suggest, it is within a BwO that we are open to the fluidities and intensities of the body. Moreover, as Lefebvre (1991) asserts, the body and its rhythms are subjectively experienced, and thus, we must let individuals be free to flow in spaced and in time.

A final point of interest for analysis in the 2013 symposium was the connection between high performance research and the military (in Canada as well as in other places of the world). Giroux (2010) argues that scholars and students must acknowledge that university education is tied to political investments, as well as encourage critical questioning and democratic engagement among students in order to question justice, power and citizenship. Giroux (2008) discusses American institutions of higher education and their affiliations with defense, primarily military technologies, objectives and purposes. He argues that university research should not focus on and engage with the technical, instrumental or economic constructs of the military. Rather, ethical relations, democratic thinking and alternative strategies for war and initiatives for peace must be pursued, especially in spaces of higher education. Academia must encounter and unpack the significant challenges that pertain to the
myriad of global problems that produce needless human suffering, obscene forms of inequality, ongoing exploitation of marginalized groups, rapidly expanding masses of disposable human beings, increasing forms of social exclusions and new forms of authorization. (Giroux, 2007, as cited in Brownlee, 2014, p. 13)

Accordingly, the ways in which these research aspirations and objectives are reasoned and rationalized (e.g., they are advocated to be beneficial to the well-being of everyday citizens, and for the success of athletes) must be questioned. Extreme performance research endeavors within institutions that are tied to the military and the nation’s financial priorities, must also be challenged, while support for alternatives for fostering peace, democracy and equality must be sought.

The events highlighting high performance sport research are funded by corporate sponsors and commercial sponsorships are also visibly part of the competitive sport events held in the Centre, such as the Varsity Blues games. The following section will speak to the business of sponsorships for spatial productions in the Centre, and will continue to explore the production (possibly the dominance) of quantitative, objective-oriented, rationalized, scientific research and its relation to profitability.
PART 3: THE BUSINESS OF VARSITY SPORT AND SPORT RESEARCH

The Business of Sponsorships

While the Goldring Centre was funded by large private donations, its spatial practices are supported by company sponsorships. Participant 5 stated that it is not common for companies to give out large donations, as “they like to do sponsorships.” Participant 5 continued to explain:

Companies, generally, that want to do sponsorships are a business transaction. They’re saying “I will give you money, what are you giving me in return?” And what do you think they want in return? … The biggest thing they want is access to students, they want to be able to tell the students what their products and services are in the hopes that students would purchase them. They’re not looking for adults, they’re looking specifically for students. Now what kind of events are we going to run, that would interest a company? They want an event not that holds 200 people, but an event that holds 2000 people many times a year. (Participant 5)

Participant 5 continues that companies will determine the value of their investment based on the number of people at events:

A sponsorship becomes a business transaction. And so if we can’t provide them with access to those students … Think of it this way, if you come into a basketball game and they pay us $10 thousand dollars and we hand out a voucher to every student that attends, so that they can go to that company and get 10 percent off or 15 percent off some kind of a service, then the company can say “okay, how many people brought in that voucher, that tells me how much value this is”, and that will tell you whether they want to do business with you next year. Unless there’s a large number of people there, there’s not much of a business transaction there, so it’s harder to get sponsorships. (Participant 5)

As a venue that can provide access to University students, the Goldring Centre is attractive to sponsors. Sponsorships are highly visible at the Varsity Blues games and in other special events that are held in the Centre. A variety of logos, brands and advertisements line the court side and are displayed on the Field House video board. For instance, at the Varsity Blues games, I saw advertisements for Pizza Pizza and the Duke of York, lined up along the court side and displayed on the fascia (a band of LED screen) on the wall of the Field House. High performance events at the Centre included two NBA All-Star Challenges. The first NBA sponsored event was held on November 28, and was titled “Bell NBA All-Star Challenge
presented by Air Miles.” (https://www.events.utoronto.ca/?action=singleView&eventid=12095)

The University’s events page stated:

For the first time in the history of the NBA, the All-Star game is being played outside of the US. The NBA, with partners, Bell, BMO, Air Miles and Samsung are going across the country to celebrate this monumental year for Canadian Basketball. Leading the way is the Bell NBA All-Star Challenge, presented by Air Miles, which is making a stop here, at the Goldring Centre for High Performance Sport, and in conjunction with our women’s basketball game on Nov. 28. (https://www.events.utoronto.ca/?action=singleView&eventid=12095)

In the afternoon, a ‘pre-qualifying tournament’ was held that featured a panel of judges (including former Toronto Raptor, Morris Peterson) scoring community member competitors. In the evening game, Morris Peterson, the Raptors Dance Pak and the Raptor’s mascot provided entertainment.

The second NBA event was on February 6 and was also titled, the “Bell NBA All Star Challenge, presented by Air Miles”. In the afternoon “students, staff, and friends can show off their best 3-pointers, skills or slam dunk” and in the evening, the Varsity men’s women’s basketball games took place and featured performances by the Raptors Dance Pack, as well as the former NBA star Isiah Thomas. The NBA and its partners also offered prizes and giveaways to spectators. In addition, the afternoon’s community finalists took part in a competition at halftime during the men’s basketball game. (https://www.events.utoronto.ca/index.php?action=singleView&eventid=12224) Figure 25 shows the advertising of the event on the Varsity Blues website.

One day prior to the February 6th event, I entered the Centre and saw Bell/Air Miles promoters holding signs and approaching students who were passing through the main entrance (likely going up the stairs to the SCC). The promoters were encouraging students (including me) to come down to the Field House, and have their picture taken while they were ‘taking flight’ (jumping on a trampoline set up below the basketball net). The corporate presence within the university’s sport and academic space was strikingly obvious. The industry was specifically targeting the students, who were encouraged to sign up for Air Miles in order to participate and receive prizes.

The new technologies in the Field House were perceived to generate excitement among spectators, as Participant 8 explained: “there’s a video board, cameras and filming,” “we’re doing replays and having interaction you know, crowd reaction.” Participant 8 continued to explain

the sound system, well, yea, everything in that building, in that space, the field house space, is amazing, so the video score board, is huge, there’s what we call the fascia, or the LED board along the side so the score board is facing the north side and the fascia is facing the south side, and it’s a ribbon, an LED ribbon, so we can do numerous things with that as well to enhance uh sponsor commitments and or just the in-game stuff. And then, you know, the microphones, the AEV, the cameras and the set-up with the cameras, and everything that they can hook up and do, and how we webcast and how we broadcast up there so it’s neat, it’s great.

Spatial practices in the Centre also involve the advertising and promoting of the University of
Toronto ‘brand’ and the selling of Varsity Blues sports products. Participant 8 explained that the ‘T leaf’ is the University’s athletic brand, and they try to place this brand in “highly visible places”:

the T leaf brand is our, you know, athletic brand, so we call it a T Leaf because it’s a T and a leaf, the athletic T, so that is, that basically is, our brand, I mean that is our logo… it’s a mark that’s approved by the university… it is one of the very few centrally approved university brands, and it’s the athletic brand, … it’s a way to identify us and our student athletes and our program, so we use that and we try to put that highly, in highly visible places, so that they know that there’s an association with the T leaf.

Figure 26 shows an example of the T leaf, as it is displayed on the Centre’s court, and figure 27 shows the T leaf display on a transparent glass pane on the 4th floor of the building:

![Figure 26](http://www.birnie.com/goldring-centre-for-performance-sports/)
The events in the Centre entail dynamics of production. For instance, at the Varsity Blues games, Participant 8 explained, “when gates open at 5 we’re pretty much running the show inside the building”:

we also have to promote it, we need to get bums in seats, we have to set up concessions, we have to set up ticketing, we need to ensure readiness, we work with our facility team to ensure that its ready, ready to go, it’s looking pretty, we do all the branding on the score board, and on the fascia, so all the kind of... and then all of the in games pieces that you see, so any of the videos that go up, unless their movie trailers, are videos that we’ve produced, all of the fascia signage, is all us, that we’ve help design, we work with our IT department to implement that. (Participant 8)

This larger space involves a set-up that was different than the Varsity Blues games that were hosted in the Athletic Centre: “this is just sort of a bigger scope, and we really do want to push the boundaries” (Participant 8).

Spaces for sponsorships (and their associated promotional displays) are also enabled through the organization of space in the Field House; for instance, there are retractable stands that surround the Field House court. This ability to move the stands is particularly important at large events, as Participant 8 stated, “for the CIS championships we had all of them [the stands] out except for one, because we had a tent for one of the sponsors there.” Moreover, Participant 8 mentioned:
Being able to pull parts of them [the stands] back allows us with an opportunity for partners who come in and wanna have tents and booth set up. We can afford that space to them.

The Industry of the Sport Sciences

Corporatization and commercialization do not solely influence the high performance event space. For example, a research lab on the fourth floor of the Centre is sponsored by Iovate Health Sciences International Inc. Figure 28 shows the lab’s signage, and figure 29 shows part of the training/testing facility in the Iovate/Muscletech Metabolism and Sports Science Lab.

![Figure 28](image)

![Figure 29](image)

At the 2014 Faculty Council meeting, the Dean explained that the company was “a
Canadian company in the sports nutrition and natural health product business” (Faculty Council Minutes, January 2014, p.4). He stated that the company provided a very significant donation; thus, in return, the sport nutrition lab in the Goldring Centre would be named in their honour and titled the “Iovate/MuscleTech Metabolism and Sports Science Lab.”

The Iovate Health Sciences website states that the company is part of the “fitness and active nutrition industry.” It explains that the company is “committed to higher standards” and believes that “superior science delivers superior results.” It is affiliated with research sponsorships at the University of Toronto, the University of Tampa and McMaster University that allow them to attain industry-related leads. (http://www.iovate.com/) Participant 5 stated the amount of money that the Iovate company provided “A $450,000 gift to name the lab, $10 thousand a year in sponsorship for a number of years and $1.5 million worth of research money.”

Figure 30 demonstrates the MuscleTech brand, as it appears on the lab coats that are used by graduate students and other researchers in the sport science lab.
Figure 31 shows the meticulous procedural sampling in the lab.

Figure 32 shows 1 of the 3 large freezers, as well another piece of “expensive equipment” (Personal Communication, June 4, 2016).

In an online promotional video, the company asserts its connection to the University in that was filmed on the fourth floor of the Goldring Centre. The video includes a representative from the Iovate/MuscleTech company who states “For 20 years MuscleTech clinically advanced formulas have helped athletes achieve elite level results through improved muscle growth, strength, endurance, recovery, energy and focus” and who identifies the company’s objective for
collaborating with the University of Toronto:

MuscleTech and the University of Toronto have entered into a multi-million dollar partnership with the sole purpose of developing, researching and assessing novel nutritional strategies and ingredients with the potential to help athletes reach new previously unattainable heights.

The Dean of the Faculty, one professor and 3 of his graduate students appear in a dramatization of an athlete engaging in a fitness test on a stationary bike. Figure 33 shows the Iovate/MuscleTec lab space and the dramatization that is featured in the video.

![Figure 33](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zRE_Fi3D8NQ)

The video also features an ‘athlete’ using Goldring’s force plate technologies, as well as training with the University’s head coach in strength and conditioning. Moreover, Figure 34 shows the MuscleTech trainer standing on the first tier of the SCC.
The Dean also appears in the video, and he advocates:

What this partnership will now provide us with is a wonderful platform to actually be able to connect quite directly with those who use those supplements. Here we have one of the premier knowledge generating institutions in North America. And on the other hand the partnership with Iovate represents the partnership with an industry leader.

The Dean continues to explain that the partnership will help the Faculty to connect with the users of the company’s muscle enhancement supplements. He explains that some of these users are the University’s athletes:

We have one of the largest high performance sports programs of any university in North America. 1000 athletes who represent the university, they are extremely thirsty for new knowledge about nutrition, nutritional strategies, and how that can be used to enhance their performances as student athletes, as well as enhance their health. (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zRE_Fi3D8NQ)

As a graduate student in the Goldring Centre, I am often reminded of some of the research that is conducted in the MuscleTech Metabolism and Sport Science Lab. For instance, in the Goldring kitchen there is a scale that is used to meticulously weigh the quantity (i.e., grams) of food or fluid that is carefully portioned for research participants (Figures 35 and 36). The scale is also used to weigh the food that is left over in a research participant’s dish. In the kitchen’s sitting room, I have also seen research participants eating or talking about the study they are participating in. I saw a young male (in high school) sitting at the table consuming a bowl of meat and rice that a research assistant had prepared for him. The lab’s nutrition and training studies also entice children (and/or their parents) to engage in exercise and dietary intake programs. (Personal Communication, April 8)
Notably, partnerships with the private sector were supported in Naylor’s *Towards 2030*:

> The Task Force also recommended that the University continue to explore where and how partnerships with the private sector can advance our academic mission without compromising core values and principles. (Naylor, 2008a, p.65)

The commercialization of investigator-initiated research was not commented on, but was seen as a way to generate revenue:

> Although the Task Force did not comment on commercialization of investigator-initiated research, this often-misunderstood area of activity has promise both as a source of revenues and as a way to put ideas to work in the service of society. (Naylor, 2008a, p.65)

The only other research space that is sponsored in the Centre is The Dr. Terry Kavanaugh Heart Health Lab. Participant 5 explains:

> The Dr. Terry Kavanaugh Heart Health Lab, well that’s named after a pioneer in Canada who started cardiac rehabilitation in Canada and we got a whole bunch of people together in his honor to raise the money for that, it was a foundation that wanted to do that in his honor, we also have 4 graduate fellowships in his name, the Dr. Terry Kavanagh Fellowships, I went and got a $150 thousand dollar donation and the University was matching that, $300 thousand, $15 thousand a year to be spread out over scholarships. (Participant 5)

Participant 2 mentioned that “Some of the things that are here are very here, they have been funded through very competitive processes like the CFI, Canadian Foundation for Innovation”,


and further stated “there is actually less new technology here than we would like to have.”

Analysis

certain spaces produced by capitalist promoters are so laden with signs – signs of well-being, happiness, style, art, riches, power, prosperity, and so on – that not only is their primary meaning (that of profitability) effaced but meaning disappears altogether. (Lefebvre, 1991, p.160)

This analysis will speak to the dynamics of the Centre’s spatial practices as they pertain to intended meaning of profitability, particular for the Centre’s Varsity Sport corporate sponsors and the Iovate/MuscleTech corporation. The prestige of the University’s state-of-the-art Goldring Centre attracts the profit-driven research in the health and fitness industry. Moreover, Participant 5 explains that corporate sponsorships for the Varsity Blues program, and for the research lab, are business transactions. FKPE and the University supported the corporate sponsorship of the Iovate/MuscleTech Sport Metabolism and Sport Science lab. For instance, in Towards 2030, the University encouraged private sector partnerships that “did not compromise the core values and principles”, as the commercialization of investigator-initiated research was recognized for its potential for income. Nevertheless, the Iovate/MuscleTech sponsorship is tied to the reputation of the company and the marketing of MuscleTech products. I question the financial priorities of this company, as well as the Faculty’s avid support for the production of training supplements (e.g., protein powder and pre-workout caffeine supplements [Personal Communication]). In these studies, participants are subject to the quantification of food and fluid intake and rigid exercise regimes. While these are variables of an objective research study, the support for this research as high-quality science may raise some concerns. Not only are research subjects (especially the youth participants) exposed to disciplined, technological, culture of fitness and training, the dynamics of profitability for the Iovate/MuscleTech company are suppressed behind discourses of ‘better science’ and ‘better results.’
Andrews (2008) argues that in Kinesiology, quantified and objectified ways of understanding the moving body are supported economically through research grants and funding. Thus, there are aspects of profitability for both funders and researchers that are associated to research. In effect,

A pervasive grant culture within the McUniversity has thus skewed the epistemological hierarchy, such that research areas are valued for their funding potential and records, more than their intellectual impact and relevance. (p.341)

Andrews is critical of the fact that corporate interests are able to support and facilitate the pursuit of particular research inquiries, even though these governing agencies may know little about the scientific research method and practice. Moreover, Andrews writes:

The actions of public and private funding bodies have made it apparent that the nearer one approaches the “gold standard” of randomized experimental design, the more one is likely to receive funding for doing “objective and good science,” and the larger that funding is likely to be. (Lather, 2006, as cited in Andrews, 2008, p. 49)

Interestingly, in addition to the featuring of a professor, the Dean, and graduate students, the spaces of the Goldring Centre (e.g., the SCC and the Iovate/MuscleTech Lab) appear in parts of the company’s promotional video. The lab (and these people) is connected to productions of space, knowledge, science and truth. Thus, this video uses the University and these people to enhance the reputation of the MuscleTech product, as well as the company’s product sales.

In addition, Andrews, Silk, Francombe & Bush (2013) argue that the privileging of particular inquiries of active bodies is supported in universities form a ‘McKinesiology’, wherein quantitative, profit-driven, objectively reasoned research is rationalized and deemed logical. The authors outline that kinesiology is far from an interdisciplinary, socially just, democratic field, as some research practices, solidify the ‘truths’ of scientific knowledge and conceal/deny alternatives for the purposes of profit:

The contemporary university is, if nothing else, a pragmatic environment and has responded to this corporate and “governmental manipulation of science” by reinforcing the primacy of “high-quality science.” (Lather, 2006 as cited in Andrews, 2008, p.50)
Andrews (2008) evaluates the domain of kinesiology and argues that kinesiology is (misleadingly) described as “a comprehensive and integrated approach” to studying human movement. Andrews (2008) suggests kinesiology has an “epistemological hierarchy (privileging particular ways of knowing over others)” (p.48).

In the same way that the Faculty’s research is connected to corporate world, so are the Varsity Blues programming and events. Participant 8 expressed the desires to have the T leaf visible and dominant in the Centre, as well as to “push-the boundaries”, “to provide some entertainment, and kind of lure them [students] in.” This logic speaks to Ritzer’s theory of McDonalidization, wherein speed, efficiency, and production are valued above their counterparts (Ritzer 1998, 2004 as cited in Andrews et al., 2013). Moreover, the technological facets of the Goldring Centre (e.g., the video board and the fascia in the Field house) are tied to generating excitement and to enticing spectatorship, yet they are also tied to a business transaction, the Faculty’s ability to attract audiences, and to the promotion of the University brand. As Lefebvre (1991) writes:

Things and products that are measured, that is to say reduced to the common measure of money, do not speak the truth about themselves. On the contrary, it is in their nature as things and products to conceal that truth. Not that they do not speak at all: they use their own language, the language of things and products, to tout the satisfaction they can supply and the needs they can meet; they use it too to lie, to dissimulate not only the amount of social labour that they contain, not only the productive labour that they embody, but also the social relationships of exploitation and domination on which they are founded. (Lefebvre, 1991, p.81)

Conclusion

This chapter detailed the spatial practices of the Goldring Centre’s operations, including those involved in the Faculty of KPE’s research pursuits, Varsity athletics program and sport medicine clinic. The showcasing and celebrating of these spatial practices are often tied to the Faculty’s advancements and contributions to refining athletic bodies through training, monitoring, supplements and therapy. In addition, the technological advancements that permeate
many of these domains are directly linked to the glorification and support of the Goldring space.

As noted, some academics are concerned about the prioritization of commercialized and corporate-funded research in institutions of higher education. While there were suggested implications for the treatment of children with chronic disease, many of Goldring’s high performance research pursuits are geared towards the successes (e.g., performance improvements) of individual or teams of athletes. As these competitors will go on to represent the nation at international events, they are also intricately tied to the reputation, strength and prosperity of the Canadian state.

I extend Pronger’s (2002) concern for the developing fitness technologies to a concern for the commercialization of research as it is sold and used by high performance athletes and other groups (e.g., those who face extreme environmental conditions, such as military personnel). The Faculty’s high performance research have a variety of applications at a local (e.g., for the University) and national level (e.g., international partners). Thus, the University’s avid support for high performance research pursuits are also telling of the institutions financial priorities, political objectives and worldwide reputation. Furthermore, the investment on the behalf of the Iovate/MuscleTech company and the corporate sponsors for the Varsity athletics program must not go unquestioned. The company’s website and promotional videos advertise their products and affiliate their brand with ‘scientifically-based’ research. Jackson, Andrews and Scherer (2005) detail the politics of advertisements in sport as they pertain to power relations, cultural representations and commodities. The authors advocate that they shape the contemporary dynamics of identity and social order in society. They continue to assert that advertising in sport reflects the nature of capitalism and suppresses the political, economic and social agendas of the producers. I am led to believe that MuscleTech’s investment in the University of Toronto’s sport science research stems from their corporate objective. In their advertising, the MuscleTech/Iovate company associate the validity of their product with the
Faculty of KPE’s scholarship. Moreover, the university’s name and the research of the “sports sciences” permeates the company’s promotional videos and the branding of their product. As Jackson, Andrews and Scherer (2005) suggest, the alternative economic and social agendas of producers must not be overlooked or go unquestioned. I argue that the sponsorship if reflective of a company who is attempting to enhance their reputation and the value of their products through their association with “scientifically-based research” at a reputable university. It is likely that the MuscleTech/Iovate lab sponsorship is also tied to the company’s desire to increase their product sales, particularly amongst university students, varsity student athletes and members of the Canadian high performance sport community.

Lastly, the GCHPS is tied to the business (e.g., the selling of tickets) for Varsity sport and high performance athletics. For instance, the walls and the court space are occupied by the university’s T leaf symbol, and the space(s) within the Centre are sold through rentals. This production is thus tied to the Faculty’s priorities for paying off the Centre’s construction debt and maintenance fees, and for generating income through ticket sales in order to fund the Varsity athletics program.

The next chapter will elucidate Goldring’s lived space, and describing the emotions, thoughts and actions that enable or resist the production and practices of the Goldring space.
CHAPTER 6
THE CENTRE’S LIVED SPACE

Introduction

Lefebvre’s third moment of space is the lived space, also known as space of representation. In this moment, the social dynamics of space and subjective spatial experiences are revealed. Lefebvre (1991) explains that lived space “is essentially qualitative, fluid and dynamic” (p.42), and it elucidates feelings, emotions and thoughts. According to Lefebvre, nothing and no one can capitalize on lived space. He advocates, “Although suppressed by the abstract space of capitalist societies, it remains in art, literature and fantasy” (Shields, 2011, p.281). Merrifield (2000) explains:

Lived space is an elusive space, so elusive in fact that thought and conception usually seek to appropriate and dominate it. Lived space is the experiential realm that conceived and ordered space will try to intervene in, rationalize, and ultimately usurp. On the whole, architects, planners, developers and others, are, willy-nilly, active in this very pursuit. (p.174)

In order to explore the Centre’s lived space, I reflected on the impressions and the perceptions of the Goldring space that I had heard and observed over the duration of this study. I also examined the complications of this space (e.g., technological and financial) that participants explained regarding the Centres practices and maintenance. Further, I sought to explore the complicities and resistances that resisted the Centre’s development and/or routine practices, such as student groups and users.

In this chapter I elaborate and particularize: Who and what do ideologies of greatness serve? Is there an (unintentional), silent, evacuation of certain bodies and development of others? Who/what is oriented to be ‘at home’ in the Centre, and who/what is not?
PART 1: INSIDERS DELIGHT AND STUDENT RESISTANCE

Insiders delight

The Centre was positively perceived and supported by all of the interview participants. The participants talked about their own feelings and experiences, and spoke about some of the positive responses they have heard from users of the space, such as student athletes, graduate students and staff. Participant 7 suggested:

I think at the end of the day, I think most people are happy I think the people who have their offices here, the faculty, and the coaches I know are happy, and the student athletes are happy…I think as much as the athletes were happy, I think the grad students too, and I really had little to do with the academic side, I’ve got to know the faculty a whole lot better, that’s been nice for me. (Participant 7)

Participant 2 expressed ‘delight’ for the Centre, and highlighted the value of the integrated research and practice space:

I’ve been delighted to be here, it’s been wonderful, I like a lot of the aspects. I like having the common research area that a lot of the research places open onto, I think it does help provide sort of a natural exchange, so the physical proximity of people doing different kind of research, is quite valuable. Among the researchers that’s a good thing. I think our connection with the Sports Medicine clinic is strengthening, and I think that will continue to grow. The physical connection plays into that. (Participant 2)

In addition, Participant 2 enjoyed the SCC space, “I really enjoy working out there, it’s a great space to do it in.”

Participant 4 was very supportive of all aspects of the Goldring Centre and stated: “it’s such an important building for the whole student body, everybody on the campus.” The participant explained: “I am heartened by what I see in the Strength and Conditioning Centre” and perceived there to be a wide representation of high performance and recreational users using the SCC:

I think is really nice, is that everyone’s on the floor, everyone’s in the Strength and Conditioning Centre. We have Varsity Athletes training beside recreational users, it’s really a nice vibe I think, it’s very U of T, I like that, because we are so diverse and we’re very big on equity so I think that’s really great.
Participant 4 added that many of the students who participate in the facility are very committed to their training pursuits and are fond of the ‘high performance mandate’:

we try to say that high performance means different things to different people and it applies to everybody, because you must know this, I know this too we have recreational athletes who use this facility that are completely committed to their health and well-being and they want the best equipment, they want to be able to get access to it, they want to be able to be in a vibe where there’s lots of other people with shared common goals about being fit, being active and being healthy, and so to me that’s how they illustrate the high performance mandate for themselves.

Participant 4 also explained the exercise and fitness programming, including the pick-up basketball program hours that are held in the Field House:

I see all the programs that we have, I see all of the access students have, I see all of the students enjoying the fitness facilities, I see you know people, all of these people show up to play open rec basketball downstairs, it’s crazy like they love it, right and I think they love it because it’s also where the Varsity Team plays, and so it’s kind of cool that you walk in as a student and you watch a Varsity game, and then you come back two days later and you’re shooting hoops with your friends on the same floor that both of the teams play. It’s kind of cool that way I think.

In addition to the users who “love it”, Participant 4 highlighted: “From a personal perspective I work out in the Strength and Conditioning Centre 5 times a week, the facilities are very nice and the windows are nice, I really love the facility.”

Participant 8 described the Centre as “beautiful”, “grandiose”, and having a “wow factor” and continued:

there’s still an influx of people who’ve never seen and they come in and watch one of our games and they’re just kind of awed and amazed by the space, and you know what a beautiful space it is. And I think it’s very deceiving from the outside, you don’t know that it goes three floors underground, right, so people come in and they’re like ‘there’s a whole gym in here?’”, like ”where is it”? And then they look down and to me when I do a tour I give people tours and I kind of show them an above ground view, so you’re looking down into the space, from the main level, the atrium area, but then I take them down, and that’s the wow factor, when you actually walk into the space and look up, and it’s very grandiose, and its, its, look and its feel and perception from the ground level.

The Centre’s ‘wow factor’ was particularly noticeable when showcasing the space to people who had never seen it before. Similarly, Participant 6 said, “It’s a jaw dropper, people are
impressed”, and explained:

One of the favourite things I get to do is bring someone new into the Centre. Every time they walk in they’re like [opens mouth] shocked, about what’s in there because you wouldn’t really know from the street. How far down it goes, how big the field house is, the scale of the strength and conditioning centre. So everyone is always very impressed when we take them through.

Moreover, Participant 8 suggested that: “we have the, the greatest facility across this country”:

So for us in intercollegiate across the country I really would have to say that we have the, the greatest facility across this country, so when people come and visit here from out of province or even from in province and they come for the first time, you always get those looks, it’s so great. (Participant 8)

**User numbers at the Varsity Blues games and the SCC**

The attendance at Varsity games in the new 2000-seat stadium is not yet attracting an overwhelming number of spectators. Participant 4 stated that FKPE’s goal is “between 12 and 14 hundred is what we’re looking for”. Yet, they continued by stating: “we hit that target about 45-50% of the time. So not bad” (Participant 4). Participant 4 stated that the number of people using the Centre has increased since it has opened: “I think that every month it gets stronger, that we’re attracting everyone, is what I’d say.” They continued:

In the beginning there weren’t a lot of people around and slowly as we had more events and more communication, it increased and increased, I can see now that there are lots of different people from different places, not just faculty, it’s not just kin students.

Participant 8 articulated the continual struggle to attract bigger audiences and to “bring them into your space”:

it’s a beautiful facility that we have on campus, and giving the opportunity for people to come in and see, you know, and take in one of our events and see what we do, and see how amazing, as an affordable alternative to the higher kind of entertainment dollar pricing that’s out there, yes, were not professional but we do have some high caliber events going on and what that looks like, so it’s how do you, how do you, reach those audiences, and bring them into your space, that’s my project, that’s my vison, is getting people in. (Participant 8)

Participant 1 suggested that the organizers are “constantly trying to let people know you can do
programs there as well.” They elaborated:

I would say Goldring is a hidden gem, and you know, the University of Toronto is a uniquely large campus, and so it is a challenge to raise awareness um, amongst people who might not come anywhere near that part of campus, so I think long term the faculty needs to get creative about how do we reach people at all corners of the university to encourage them to come in and try the building out.

I was able to access the student pass scanned summary report (GR), also referred to as the “card swipe data,” for 2014 and 2015 years. The data indicated the total number of users, as well as the total number of user visits per year. The figures also indicate female and male users. However, there is no distinction between Varsity Blues athletes in the data\(^\text{14}\). During Goldring’s opening months (October 2014 to December 1\(^{\text{st}}\) 2014) the Centre had a total of 5, 851 individual users, who contributed to a total of 25, 113 individual visits. During January 1\(^{\text{st}}\) 2015 to December 1\(^{\text{st}}\) 2015 (Goldring’s first full year in operation), 16, 399 individual users and 181, 763 individual visits were recorded at Goldring. Of these visits, 107,152 were male and 74,421 were female.

Participant 2 suggested, “the idea’s caught on and people are using it, whereas during the first 9-12 months it was underutilized.” Participant 4 stated that the goal is to keep seeing increases in Goldring’s popularity among the student body:

I think that as we go along, the Centre will become even more important on the campus, I think cultural changes for U of T take a long time, and we have 85,000 students, and I think we forget that, the number of people that we have on the campus, and then when you add faculty and staff. We’re trying really hard to connect with those students around physical activity and sport and were seeing increases and I think the goal is to keep seeing the increases, because we are very reliant on student fees I mean we don’t get central funding for our programs, it’s all through the ancillary fee . . . and I’m very big on making sure that students feel like this is theirs, this is part of what they paid for and it’s a part of what they have access to and so I do challenge my staff to always be student focused first and to really find ways to engage people who may not normally come to something.

\(^\text{14}\) Student users are further categorized into enrolled full-time or part-time, and specifies if their studies are within the Faculty of Kinesiology and Physical Education (BKPE), the Department of Exercise Sciences (EXS), or if they are based within the larger scope of the University of Toronto St. George (UTSG), University of Toronto Mississauga (UTM), University of Toronto Scarborough (UTS) campuses.
Student Resistance?

Despite administrative perceptions and desires for the increasing, broad-based student use and avid student support, not all students were supportive of the Centre’s planning or of its practices. The first documented act of student resistance occurred in the planning stages of this Centre. In 2006, the north end of Site 12 was also declared the proposed location for the new Student Commons building, part of the University of Toronto’s Undergraduate Student Union (UTSU). The UTSU had been lobbying for a space for students since the 1960s, as the student union reported:

Students need a space that they can call their own to build community on campus, engage in student life, support one another and build school spirit. The University of Toronto has always received low scores with respect to student satisfaction with the sense of community on campus, school spirit and community engagement. (http://studentcommons.ca/about/)

The new Student Commons building was proposed to hold common areas for students to study, eateries, and offices for student services. It was projected to engage commuter students who do not report positive campus experiences and the desire to stay around before, after and between classes. The initial plan was to have a co-location of the Student Commons on the north end of the site and the Goldring Centre on the south end of the site. This was outlined in the Interim Project Planning Report (2007):

It is anticipated that a second building, possibly the Student Commons (for which a Project Planning Committee is underway) will be constructed north of the Centre, abutting the Centre on its south side and the historic Admissions Building on its north side. The Centre and adjoining building can share entrances, circulation and common space, and food and beverage services. (FPHE, 2007, p.9)

As the new athletics facility also aspired to provide space for students to engage in physical activity and recreational programs, during these initial planning stages, the Goldring Centre’s Project Planning Committee attempted to find commonalities between their new infrastructural project and the new Student Commons proposition. For example, a key contributor in this planning stated:
it was originally going to be combined building with the student commons. So for
many years, we were talking about how to find commonalities in the sort of sport and
recreation ideas and the student commons. (Participant 3)

A proposal for a new Student Commons building was underway at this time, and the Project
Planning Committee for the new building requested 3300 nasms of land for their development
(Governing Council Notes, May 2007). A memorandum dated April 9, 2007, was sent from the
Dean of FKPE to the Chair of the Project Planning Committee for the Student Commons that
outlined the intended synergies of the new Centre for High Performance Sport with the Student
Commons. It suggested that the developing Varsity Centre (Varsity Stadium, Varsity Arena, and
the Centre for High Performance Sport) would have expected participant uses of more than one
million participant uses per year. The new High Performance Sport Centre would help to meet
the student demand for co-curricular athletics and recreation spaces and equipment. It also
highlighted that the new strength and conditioning centre would double the space and equipment
offered for strength training and fitness on the University’s downtown campus. It stated that the
Sports Medicine clinic space that will provide treatment and therapy to all students and
members, both recreational and Varsity athletes, and suggested, “The new centre will be
designed and programmed to attract people from diverse backgrounds to participate in a healthy
lifestyle program.” Moreover, it reads:

The Varsity fitness centre will be welcoming and integrative space for all people.
Participants will have access to training opportunities to enhance the necessary
fitness components of cardio, strength, endurance, flexibility and body composition,
building an optimal lifestyle which promotes learning beyond the classroom
experiences and builds a foundation for health and fitness for the future. (p.2)

Lastly, the memorandum states: “For all of the above reasons, we see the new Centre for High
Performance Sport and the entire Varsity Centre as vibrant focal points of student life.”

Despite the intention to work with the student government and to make connections with
the Student Commons, the request was not accepted by the student government at the time, and
was thus rejected by the Student Commons Planning Committee:
That became rather fraught, because there were enough internal politics with the student government, about the student commons, and then to layer on some of the leadership towards the athletic and recreation side, was very…unfriendly, shall we say towards the university activity, did not appeal to them….. and for a whole bunch of other protocol reasons that collapsed. (Participant 3)

The development of this new Student Commons does not appear to be a priority for University administration, as the Student Commons has yet to receive Governing Council approval, despite an operating agreement with the University in place since 2013 (http://studentcommons.ca/about/).

A second stage of student resistance occurred when the construction of the Centre for High Performance Sport (and the proposed Student Commons) was set to begin. At this time, the office for the Association of Part-Time Undergraduate Students (APUS) office (located across from the Varsity Centre) was vacated and the Association was relocated for the second time that year. A unanimous vote from the University’s Governing Council led to the relocation of this office, and the representatives for APUS were not pleased with this relocation as it was their second of the year. An article in The Varsity (the University’s student newspaper) quotes a director of the Association’s response to the relocation and the new developments on the Site 12: “It is an elitist project that marginalizes part-time students on this campus”, and the representative also stated, “It has no place for part-time students, many of whom are far too busy to take full advantage of this facility” (http://thevarsity.ca/2007/07/16/apus-out-again/).

More recent acts of resistance on behalf of the student body occurred after the Centre had opened. In January 2014, an article in The Varsity titled “U of T’s building plans: Massive construction on U of T’s St. George campus will negatively affect student experience” student writer Forsyth-Sells states:

the construction of the new Goldring Centre also seems to harbour external motivations that do not concern the experience of most students. Described by Dean Ira Jacobs as a “new paradigm for Toronto and Ontario,” it seems the administration failed to consider the university as a campus unto itself. This project is funded
largely by the Goldring family, hence the namesake, the Goldring Institute for High Performance Sport. This new monstrous building eclipses half of Woodsworth Residence, dramatically affecting the visual airspace that unique residence once possessed. (http://thevarsity.ca/2014/01/13/u-of-ts-building-plans/)

Moreover, Forsyth-Sells argues “This project is also concerning as it prioritizes the national perception of the university as a sports institute as opposed to considering the campus as a whole experience.” She continues to suggest that private donations must be “considered critically as it pertains to the function they serve for the greater student body” as the priorities for sport also involves the neglect of other University needs such as student experience, and the effects of closures and construction on student and campus life (http://thevarsity.ca/2014/01/13/u-of-ts-building-plans/).

A May 2015 issue of The Varsity featured an article titled “Glancing back at Goldring: U of T’s newest athletic facility may not be reaching much of the student population.” The article explains:

Even with all its acclamations, however, the Goldring Centre still faces some criticism from the student body. Many claim that there aren’t enough resources for “non-varsities,” that the field house is usually booked by teams during peak hours, and that information about times when the field house will be inaccessible is not made clearly available. Moreover, even with its $22.5 million investment by the province of Ontario, varsity teams have not received a significantly greater crowd at their games. (http://thevarsity.ca/2015/03/16/glancing-back-at-goldring/)

It also featured some student responses to the equipment in the Centre, and questioned the University’s investment in the large allotment of space that is segmented for research, instead for increasing the size for students and activity:

Additionally, many students criticize the poor selection of equipment and lack of certain equipment in the facility. Many believe that basic equipment for strength-building is missing. Others have met U of T’s investment with criticism regarding its benefits for students. Much of the building is devoted to research, which benefits a small number of students who are conducting and engaging with the research, but it takes up room for the broader student population. (http://thevarsity.ca/2015/03/16/glancing-back-at-goldring/)

Beth Ali, the University’s director of intercollegiate and high performance sport, is quoted: “We
want the Blues to be a catalyst for campus pride.” The author concluded that: “selling school spirit to over 40,000 students will unquestionably be an uphill battle. Until that happens, the success of Goldring to the broader student population remains unclear” (http://thevarsity.ca/2015/03/16/glancing-back-at-goldring/).

As I mentioned in Chapter 1, the original name envisioned name for the Centre was ‘the Wellness Centre,’ however this proposed title was quickly changed as the Advancement and Alumni Affairs office (responsible for recruiting donors and sponsors) strongly advised administration to use the name of the Centre to entice and attract prospective funders. However, there is a student-run Wellness Centre on the University’s downtown campus, which is actually a room where martial arts and boxing are practiced. In the March 2016 issue of The Varsity, Kikulis profiles the Wellness Centre in an article titled “Fighting for relevance: U of T’s combat sports club finds their place on campus.” The Wellness Centre is very familiar with “struggling for space” as the martial arts and combat sports clubs have a history of being relocated and facing spatial constrictions. The article explains that the boxing club experienced a long-standing pattern of finding and using a space on campus (e.g. in Kelly Library) but eventually being relocated when the room was in need by the University. The boxing club merged with the student-run Taijutsu club, who were also familiar with the experiences of relocation. The club managed to clear out “the junk” of the most recent space that was allocated to them by the facilities department of St. Michael’s College. Now called the Wellness Centre, the martial arts club was open to sharing their space with the boxing club when the student leaders approached them.

The Wellness Centre has grown substantially and has began to provide lessons for students interested in learning about Taijutsu, martial arts, self-defense, MMA and yoga:

With almost 600 members on the group’s Facebook page, 150 club members, and a waitlist of 130 students, the boxing club had to be creative in the scheduling of
classes. Kuse explains how they fit in seven sessions a week, but only being able to offer nine spots per session still does not accommodate all of the boxing club’s members. (http://thevarsity.ca/2016/03/28/fighting-for-relevance/)

While this community is growing, the leader of the Wellness Centre, Pulwer, expressed the constant “threat of eviction” from the space as “history has proven — that the threat of eviction from the space still looms large”. The student leader states: “[W]e still live under this threat of disappearing, […] we’re trying to make sure that you know the space is thought of as a wellness studio centre, so it’s constantly in people’s mind.” Despite the fear of losing their place on campus, the Wellness Centre is passionate about continuing to “help students relieve stress” and to have fun.

**Resistances and Juxtapositions on the Inside**

My participation in this Centre (4-5 days per week, including evenings and weekends) afforded me the opportunity to observe some of the lived realities of this space. I had the opportunity to converse with people in this space (e.g., SCC staff, graduate students, caretakers) and to observe the daily interactions that occur on the fourth floor, in the field house, and in the lobby (e.g., the Gordon Stollery Atrium). In this section I explain some of the non-dominant, alternative, modes of resistance that I observed in the Goldring space.

Firstly, two of the nine labs on the 4th floor, the “Sport, Physical activity and Cultural Environments” (SPaCE) laboratory and the “Media and Motion Collaboratory” engage in research that (as far as I know) is entirely qualitative and often involves the critical questioning of dominance and power relations. They are thus alternative to the quantitative, objective, rationalized research that occurs in most of the other laboratory spaces. Secondly, another observation of resistance occurred on a Sunday afternoon when I walked into the Centre to go to the game and noticed that a coach was standing in front of me at the turnstiles. He was with his wife and their two children. He said to the staff, “We’re just going to my office”, and as they entered the staff scanned my student card and allowed for my free entry. I noticed that the coach
and his family proceeded to go directly down the stairs (in the opposite direction of the coach’s office) to the Field House. Soon after, we were both seated in the Field House seats watching the game. In the interviews, Participant 4 and Participant 8 suggested that the low turn-out at Varsity games is likely due to the number of events and activities that go on in Toronto, and not to the prices of tickets. Yet, a coach who avoids paying for his family to spectate may suggest otherwise.

A third point of observation, is not an act of resistance but demonstrates the juxtaposition between the people I saw in the Centre (e.g., on the 4th floor) during the day, and those in the Centre during the evening. On Saturday and Sunday nights, I was one of the few people on the fourth floor of the Centre. Sometimes, the only people I saw were three middle-aged women and one middle-aged man, who are employed by a private cleaning company. When they come in to change the garbage, or vacuum the carpet, we exchange smiles and I say hello and thank you, yet when I try to communicate with them, their broken English surfaces. Their first language is Spanish, and I know this because when the halls are quiet and empty, I can hear them speaking Spanish to one another, as well as on their cell phones, and I can also hear the Spanish music that it is playing (loudly) from a speaker on their cleaning cart.

One evening when I was in the kitchen preparing a cup of tea, I asked the woman cleaning the kitchen area if she likes working here, and she said “yes”. As I go along with my routine and they with theirs, I am reminded again of the privileges of working in a ‘clean’ space. I am reminded of the privileges of working in a space that will be tidied for me. I think about the contrast (e.g., in social class, ethnicity, language) between the professoriate and researchers in the 4th floor offices during the day, and the night shift workers who clean them during the evening.
Analysis

While participants (e.g., administrators and stakeholders) articulated their strong support and for the Centre (in both the imagined phase and spatial practices), and perceived that it was used and enjoyed by many, I attain insight from Park (2004) who states:

[w]hen questions are asked about such things as their centrality or marginality (both physical and conceptual); their architectural style, their size, floor plans and functionality; who uses what portions of the facility and under what conditions; which modality dominates … and where in the hierarchical value structures of an institution do programmes whose focus is the exercising body stand, it becomes evident that realities are more complex. (p.178)

Park (2004) continues to discuss the complexities of gymnasium spaces and advocates that dominant societal values are constructed and consolidated in these settings. Participant 4 perceived that “it was built for them [students] that was the intent” and articulated “they [students] do see it as their space” (Participant 4). However, while administrators and other elite contributors (e.g., donors, professoriate) expressed emotions of delight during the imagined phase of the Centre, its production did not go unquestioned by some of the university’s student body. For instance, there was a lack of support from student leaders of the UTSU and APUS, who refused to support the allotment of land on campus and the new development.

Interestingly, Participant 4 mentioned, “We have a problem here in that we don’t have enough space for physical activity and sport for the number of students that we have”, yet, I argue that an expansive 2000 seat stadium does not provide physical activity and recreational spaces for the student population. The logic behind the allotment of space in the Centre is seemingly based in strategically planning for the Faculty’s vision of greatness, and the University’s vision of excellence, which involve world-class reputation in academics and athletics, state-of-the-art facilities, as well as economic growth through sponsorships and rental spaces.

University of Toronto scholar Lenskyj (2004) asserts that the patriarchal nature of the
university sport system prevails, as does the flawed recurrent practices of high-level university administration. Lenskyj suggests that in the early phases of the Varsity Centre project, it was promoted to contribute to Varsity, recreational and intramural sport and thus was suggested to benefit the entire student population. However, she argues that its prime benefiters would be the ice hockey teams (i.e., a high-profile ice rink sport) and the male football team (i.e., a high-profile field sport). Similarly, now that the GCHPS is in its second year of operation, it seems as though the high-profile objectives of the university administration do not primarily suit the interests of the broad student body and university community. Rather, the Centre’s space caters to the interests of those involved in athlete training, fitness testing and sports medicine, and is particularly useful for Varsity Blues athletes and for individuals or groups who pay fees for SCC memberships, clinic services, and rental spaces.

There is an ongoing effort amongst the FKPE’s staff and administration to bring the student body into the Centre and to communicate information about the activities in the GCHPS, including instructor-led fitness programming, a SCC, Varsity Blues basketball and volleyball games, and student/community access to a sport medicine clinic (as long as the injury is sport related (Participant 4). Still, Participant 1 stated it is a “constant challenge to spread the word”. Even though there was an increase in participant numbers in the Centre in comparison to its first year of operation (e.g., I think that every month it gets stronger” (Participant 4); “certainly it seems a whole lot busier here” (Participant 7), in terms of the GCHPS as a spectator space, the attendance numbers remain relatively low. Participant 4 stated that the target ticket sales goal (just over half of the stadiums size) is only met 45% of the time. Thus, at the majority of the Varsity Blues games, there are roughly 500 seats filled and nearly 1500 that are empty.
Thus, despite the FKPE’s intent and efforts to attract a broader audience from the community (e.g., “how do you, how do you, reach those audiences, and bring them into your space, that’s my project, that’s my vision, is getting people in” (Participant 8)) it has not occurred as of yet. As Varsity Blues games used to be held in a gym space that could hold 800 people (Participant 8); this raises the question of whether the expansive spectator space for Varsity Sport is needed, and whether this space might have better served the student population in other ways. For instance, the plans for this space might have better served the student population if they allotted open-spaces, such as rooms for recreational fitness classes (e.g., another 200 nasms exercise studio), rooms for student groups and clubs and an area for students to sit, work and eat (e.g., ideal for commuter students who have long breaks between classes). This actual presence of student space may also have led to less resistance from student groups, such as the APUS, the UTSU and from student journalists in The Varsity as these are the kinds of spaces that students lobbied for in their public statements and articles.

In the Varsity’s “Fighting for Relevance” article, it is evident that there are students who are interested in organizing and directing their own movement programs and physical activities. Moreover, they are interested in being responsible for their own space that is not entrenched with the competitive, high performance, fitness label and its associated technologies. Student engagement in abandoned/spare rooms on campus exemplifies that their alternative vision of activity and wellness does require a modern, visible, world-class space capital project.

Student leaders (e.g., in the UTSU, APUS and writers for the Varsity) are critical of the university’s infrastructural and financial priorities regarding the allotment of the campus space. For instance, upon the university’s Governing Council approval for the development of GCHPS, the UTSU representatives demonstrated frustration, as they had been fighting for the Governing Council’s approval for a new Student Commons for over 7 years (http://studentcommons.ca/about/).
The resistance towards the highly regulated, neoliberal, capitalist space of the Goldring Centre is comparable to Atkinson’s (2009) writing on parkour practitioners (i.e., traceurs) who resist urban spaces and seek movement experiences that demonstrate “intensely political athleticism” (p.192), wherein they “seek to disrupt the urban space through which capitalist pouvoir\(^\text{15}\) is deployed” (p.192). Importantly, spaces and sport is a critical vehicle for acts of resistance. As Atkinson suggests “sport may be tapped as a vehicle for experiencing alternative forms of poetic and aesthetic spiritualism in late modern life. (p.192). Perhaps there are other students and groups on campus who would like to move and to realize wellness in non-dominant (e.g., high performance) and non-spatially dominated ways.

Importantly, these acts of resistance discussed above do not stand alone. Individuals who are afforded spaces within the Centre, such as researchers in the Centre’s SPaCE laboratory (Prof. Caroline Fusco and graduate students under her supervision) and the Media and Motion Collaboratory (Prof. Margaret McNeill and graduate students under her supervision) are likely engaged in research that is substantially different in content when compared to the objective, quantitative, sometimes corporate funded and industry-based research in sports sciences. For instance, perhaps my presence and my research in GCHPS is a critical act of resistance that surfaces the vulnerabilities and weaknesses of a seemingly utopic, “great” space by placing its architectural, socio-cultural, historical, political, economic and technological backdrops at the forefront. These labs are part of the field of Physical Cultural Studies (PCS). Andrews (2008) conceptualizes PCS research as that which:

- locates and analyzes within the broader social, political, economic, and technological contexts in which they are situated. More specifically, PCS is dedicated to the contextually based understanding of the corporeal practices, discourses, and subjectivities through which active bodies become organized, represented, and experienced in relation to the operations of social power. PCS thus identifies the role played by physical culture in reproducing, and sometimes challenging, particular class, ethnic, gender, ability, generational, national, racial, and/or sexual norms and differences. (pp.54-55)

\(^{15}\) Pronger’s (2002) conceptualization of pouvoir, as cultural and political power (see footnote 19, p.166).
Importantly, “PCS is thus political in the sense of identifying and analyzing—and thereby seeking to intervene into—the operation and experience of power and power relations” (Andrews, 2008, p.58).

Apart from these research labs there are other members of the GCHPS community who demonstrate opposition to the routine practices of the sport space. For example, the VarsityBlues coach and his family who entered the Centre and did not pay to watch the Sunday afternoon game. In addition, as a student I see that some of the Centre’s users are not willing to abide by the routine practice of purchasing a day pass or a facility membership. On occasion, I see a student help a friend who is not a member of the Centre enter the building to hang out or to work-out in the SCC facility (Participant observation, Feb. 21 and March 30). With these acts of resistance in mind, I attain insight from Lefebvre (1991) who theorizes:

The bourgeoisie and the capitalist system thus experience great difficulty in mastering what is at once their product and the tool of their mastery, namely space. They find themselves unable to reduce practice (the practicosensory realm, the body, social-spatial practice) to their abstract space, and hence new, spatial, contradictions arise and make themselves felt. Might not the spatial chaos engendered by capitalism, despite the power and rationality of the state, turn out to be the system’s Achilles’ heel? (Lefebvre, 1991, p.63)

Perhaps, a part of the Centre’s Achilles’ heel; one of the weakness within the Centre’s proposed strengths, is the resistance that is enacted on behalf of the student community, and by individuals who are afforded spaces within the Centre.

The vision of greatness involves the inclusions of normalized, valuable, privileged bodies, as well as the neglect and exclusion of others. The next section will explore the insider’s perceptions of greatness and high performance, and argues that the Centre is not a ‘home’ (e.g., welcoming) for all.
PART 2: PERCEPTIONS OF TAGLINES AND BODIES AT HOME

Perceptions of Greatness and High Performance

The tagline for the Centre, “Pursue Greatness”, was a production of the FKPE’s communication team and involved the approval of the Faculty’s administration (Participant 1). While “Pursue Greatness” was on the distributed materials and gifts at the Donor Celebration, FKPE used the tagline “Pursue (your) Greatness” for the Sneak Peek and the Opening Ceremony Event. Participant 1 explained:

the reason we went with the concept of Pursue (your) Greatness, for the Sneak Peak and the launch event, was because we were trying to emphasize that greatness is different for everyone, it’s about just setting your own personal goals, and raising the bar on your own personal physical activity and sport endeavors, so the idea was to pursue your greatness, and to really emphasize that it’s not about pursuing greatness, because some people would think that pursing greatness is getting on the podium and so we called it Pursue (your) Greatness to try to make that clearer to the student body. (Participant 1)

The Centre’s motto was part of an effort to communicate the message that the Centre was not a space for a singular notion of greatness, but for one that might be realized in a multitude of ways within the Centre.

our goal was to take the fact that the building has a name that was very inaccessible to students, …[and to] to communicate that even though it was called ‘for high performance sport’, it’s a facility that is open to all students at the university to participate in physical activity and sport. (Participant 1)

The slogan “Get Fit. Have Fun. Learn. Compete. Discover” also appeared at the Sneak Peak event. Participant 1 explained that this was “because the building offers so much” with respect to co-curricular activities (e.g., Varsity Sport), and curricular activities (e.g., research labs and offices), suggesting:

we always have a challenge in the faculty of communicating to people our dual mission, and so when we were trying to get people to come to the building for the sneak peak, we started talking about the fact that it’s just very difficult in full in proper prose to talk about all of the different uses of the building, in an effort to boil down the essence of the building. (Participant 1)
“Get Fit. Have Fun. Learn. Compete. Discover” was also thought to be more encompassing of the broad uses for the Centre which expands to literally all the audiences that our faculty serves. Students who pay ancillary fees. Community members who buy gym memberships. Researchers. Teachers. Anyone. Donors, Partners, Iovate has a lab there. We wanted it to reflect something for the many audiences. (Participant 1)

Participant 1 also explained that prior to the use of these taglines on promotional materials and opening events, there were meetings that occurred with:

the Deans’ group to specifically talk to them about the concept of Pursue (your) Greatness and to literally confirm with them the words Learn. Compete. Get fit. Have Fun. Discover. Because for everyone words mean different things, so the Deans’ group was a part of it as well in term of the tagline being broadly relevant to everyone.

Participant 4 explained their thoughts regarding the conception of greatness and its connections to high performance:

I think it’s [greatness] very strongly connected to the whole statement about high performance, it was a campaign, right, as part of the opening for the Goldring Centre and I think it was to say, you know whatever your greatness is, here is a place you can do it. I think it also reflected the nature of the building. It’s a spectator space, it’s an activity space, it’s a training space, and it’s a research space, and it’s a sport medicine space, and so all of those things play an important part in whatever you want to do in terms of your own individual goals and I think that’s what pursue greatness was. I think it’s connected to the question of the name, and the ability to attract a broad based participant group I think that every month it gets stronger, that we’re attracting everyone, is what I’d say. (Participant 4)

Participant 4 also suggested, “even though the [high performance] title [of the Centre] can be misleading… it is for everyone.” Participant 6 commented that greatness was an individual pursuit, and that in the Centre, “anyone can go there and pursue their version of greatness” and continued:

the idea of the Centre is that anyone can go there and achieve their own greatness, so one that that we’re always trying to stress especially in the Dean’s messaging about it is that yes it is a high performance Centre but it’s not only for high performance athletes, that anyone can go there and reach whatever your greatness is in that context, that’s the message.
Participant 2 explained that high performance involved attempting to attain a level of performance that is a “stretch” for the individual:

I think its high performance in the life of the people that are pursuing it I guess. So if you’re a student athlete, you’re not going to be paid $10 million dollars to do it, but you can be performing at a high level for a university student athlete. If you are somebody with a disability that’s working out, then you can be high performance in that setting as well. I think it is … trying to reach a level of performance that you think is a stretch. To me that’s more what it’s about.

Participant 2 also mentioned that the concept of “healthy high performance” was relevant to the imagined space, as well as the continual development of the research that occurs within it:

The other tagline that we’ve used is “healthy high performance”, and I think that is one of the things that we thought around this development and this centre, is health from both a physical, emotional, social points of view, because it is possible to pursue high performance to your own detriment over the longer time. And that’s not what we want to see, we want to figure out ways that are going to continue to support the individual. (Participant 2)

Participant 4 explained that the University’s goal is to communicate the message that high performance is for everyone “and so it’s our challenge to help people understand that high performance is what you make it and it’s for everybody, and not just for elite athletes”.

Similarly, Participant 8 suggested that high performance, and being great are not elitist concepts:

your high performance is not my high performance, but it’s how you are great at what you do and the opportunity to advance and be great in whatever you choose to be doing, whether its yoga whether its Zumba, whether it’s you know research, there was an opportunity for greatness across all platforms. …I don’t think it’s an elitist, it’s not trying to be elitist, it’s really just like you can be great and were going to give you this great place where you can be great at whatever it is you choose to do, that’s the general consensus feeling that I pulled from it and knowing what Mr. Goldring and the Goldring family really envisioned for this project.

**We All Bleed Blue and “If you can play, you can play.”**

“We All Bleed Blue” is used as a motto for the Varsity Blues sport program, and I often saw these words in a video during half time at the Varsity games. The LED screen also says “We All Bleed Blue”, thought by Participant 8 to encourage everyone to be part of the University’s team:

because of the diversity on the campus too, not everybody is as athletically inclined as we are, so we have to take ourselves out of that box and really promote, a
different kind of event to them, it’s not just basketball, it’s not just a basketball game cuz not everybody cares that it’s just a basketball game so what else are we doing in and around that to include them. (Participant 8)

A second motto of the Varsity Blues athletics program is “If you can play, you can play.” This motto is part of the Faculty’s Athlete Ally campaign, an effort to resist the discrimination based on gender and sexuality, as well as raise awareness for homophobia in sport. The article quotes the Athletic Director:

The Athlete Ally campaign is one that is important to all students at the University of Toronto… Diversity and respect are cornerstones of the Varsity Blues program. We won't tolerate an environment that erodes our ability to excel in sport and represent the University with pride. (http://varsityblues.ca/news/2014/4/1/GEN_0401143726.asp)

At the Varsity Blues volleyball and basketball games I sat in the Goldring Centre’s Field House stands and during the game’s breaks (e.g., half time) I saw the video produced by the Faculty that features a selection of Varsity Blues coaches and student athletes. They are dressed in their Varsity sport uniforms and advocate for the campaign, stating “If you can play, you can play.”

**Bodies “at home”**

In the 2013 issue of the Faculty of KPE’s *Pursuit* magazine we met “Who’s who in high performance” and were introduced to the people who would “bring the Goldring Centre to life”. Figure 37 shoes an image that was displayed in the issue.
In her speech at the Opening Ceremony, a Varsity Blues athlete stated: “It [Goldring] truly IS my home now, and home to so many other students like the ones sitting either side of me today.”

Similarly, a video post on October 7 2014 by U of T Varsity Blues shows the Varsity basketball and volleyball players entering their official team change rooms for the first time and shows the student athletes expressing their joy and excitement. In the video, a student suggests “we’re excited to make this our home court” (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=akKtmAhb8k8).

Moreover, in the winter semester of 2016 I was invited to a FKPE fourth year undergraduate class to speak about my research on the GCHPS. At the beginning of my presentation, I asked if any of the students had been to the Goldring Centre. A student raised his hand and explained: “I’m on the volleyball team, so Goldring is basically my home”. (Personal Communication, Feb. 25, 2016)

The notion that high performance athletes have a new “home” in this Centre was also taken up by the external university community (e.g., in the media). For instance, an article called
“High Performance Athletes Get a New Home at the Goldring Centre” profiles the Centre’s technology, design, and services and suggests that the Centre is relevant for the University community, PanAm Games and the Province of Ontario. (http://urbantoronto.ca/news/2014/10/high-performance-athletes-get-new-home-goldring-centre)

**Analysis**

Lefebvre’s dynamic of lived space involves “local forms of knowing, that are geographically and historically contingent and which are the result of socially specific practices” (Stewart, 1995, as cited in van Ingen, 2003, p.204). Lived space also “forms, informs and facilitates the deviations, diversity and individuality that are a fundamental aspect of any social encounter” (Watkins, 2005, p.213).

There was a progressive change in the Centre’s motto of “Pursue Greatness” at the Donor Celebration, to “Pursue (your) Greatness” and “Get Fit. Have Fun. Learn. Compete. Discover” for student-centred and community events. These changes took place in order to appeal to particular audiences, such as donors or students. Participants did not restrict the vision of greatness to the elite of high performance sport, and they suggested that this vision was individualized and included everyone who engaged in the new space. For instance, Participant 8 suggested, “were going to give you this great place where you can be great at whatever it is you choose to do.” Importantly, Participant 8 also suggested that what “Mr. Goldring and the Goldring family really envisioned for this project” was that it would not be an “elitist” space, yet one that would be open and welcoming for all. Still, there was concern that the high performance title would deter students from the Centre (e.g., Participant 1, Participant 4, Participant 7, Participant 8), yet there was also the desire to attract all students to the new sport space (e.g., Participant 1, Participant 7, Participant 8), and to encourage them to support Varsity Blues athletics (e.g., Participant 4, Participant 8).
As Lefebvre (1991) writes:

A body so conceived, as produced and as the production of space, is immediately subject to the determinants of that space … the spatial body’s material character derives from space, from the energy that is deployed and put to use there. (Lefebvre, 1991, p. 195)

Consequently, enclosed within the Centre’s practice is an imposed particular culture of greatness; an imposed set of visions, choices, and selectivity upon its members. The pursuit of greatness is prescribed within the spatial ordering, the sport sciences, and the Varsity Blues program, and effectively, participants are not given much choice to be creative in their activity pursuits and to discover alternatives for physical culture at all.

Moreover, Participant 2 high performance sport is not inherently a healthy pursuit, nor is it desirable for all. As Chapter 2 highlights, the Centre’s spatial practices of commodification and quantification have political and economic ties. The administrative decision and desire to attract and to recruit the broad student community (e.g., through promotional materials, special events, etc.) may also be an attempt to minimize conflicts and confrontations from the U of T student community.

Although spatial practices and the messages of greatness are individualized and suggested to be for all, I am compelled to question if they are representative of a diverse range of cultures, of the socially, politically and historically marginalized subjects, their lives, and their bodies?

As Grosz notes:

a corporeal “universal” has in fact functioned as a veiled representation and projection of a masculine which takes itself as the unquestioned norm, the ideal representative without any idea of the violence that this representational positioning does to its others—women, the “disabled”, cultural and racial minorities, different classes, homosexuals – who are reduced to the role of modifications or variations of the (implicitly white, male, youthful, heterosexual, middle-class) human body. (p.189)

The Faculty embraces diversity and broad student audiences, however, they appear to be invited in ways that homogenize them with the objectives of the Faculty’s high performance program
and, one might argue, neoliberal agenda (i.e., where one is responsible for one’s own health), and within their particular space and vision of greatness. Lefebvre asserts

capitalist and neo-capitalist space is a space of quantification and growing homogeneity, a commodified space where all the elements are exchangeable and thus, interchangeable; a police space in which the state tolerates no resistance and no obstacles. Economic space and political space thus converge toward the elimination of all differences. (Lefebvre, 2009, p.192)

The 2013 Pursuit magazine image, though not ill-intentioned I imagine, is starkly white coloured and depicts only white representatives of ‘high performance sport' (and the representatives of this Centre). This presence of white bodies may be overlooked, normalized, ‘invisible’ within the high performance sport culture. As Macalpine and Marsh (2005) state, “The taken-for-grantedness of whiteness reflects the normalizing of whiteness so that it simply is not seen as an ethnicity, it is invisible” (p.442). Douglas and Halas (2011) assert the predominance of whiteness as it pertains to curricular content in Kinesiology (e.g., absence or lack of content related to race, ethnicity and whiteness). Moreover, they highlight the white demographic of professoriate within Canadian Departments of Kinesiology and Physical Education. The authors argue:

white students and staff experience their faculties as spaces of affirmation, familiarity and belonging as Western, European, classed, able-bodied and heterosexist ways of knowing and being are affirmed and normalized…. For the profession of physical education, this racialized cultural climate establishes implicit and explicit criteria for membership; it is clear that some are more welcome than others.

Continuing, they suggest:

the continuing white composition of faculties of physical education contributes to the reproduction of cultures of whiteness that affirm and naturalize white racial dominance in their embodied, gendered, classed and (hetero)sexualized forms. (p.471)

Importantly attention must be paid to institutionalized whiteness as there are “important consequences for life, opportunity, and psychic security” (MacDonald, 2005, as cited in MacDonald, 2009, p.9).
I am led to question whether the vision of an individualized high performance pursuit of greatness is tied to the unified embodiment of whiteness within the Faculty that is now targeting the University community at large. Bosse (2007) argues that whiteness is not only performed by white bodies. It is established through political organizations, academia and the corporate world. As ‘We all Bleed Blue’ and ‘If you can play, you can play’ are reiterated and enabled by the organizers in the Goldring Centre, I analyzed the ways in which they might be tied to legacies of political statements, as well as to historical, social and cultural dynamics of sport and kinesiology.

The slogan “We All Bleed Blue” asserts that all are part of the university community, and all are invited to support the Varsity Blues teams. There is an understanding that collectively, “we all” identify with this community and show support for the University’s athletes. While Participant 4 and Participant 8 articulated the desire to generate Varsity Blues campus wide-pride, the history of the term ‘blue blood’ must not be neglected. The term blue blood is discussed by scholars, such as Longhurst (2001) and Foucault (1978) who explain its relations to cultural and political hierarchies among people within social classes and from particular geographical origins. Foucault (1978) describes “the blue blood of the nobles” (p. 126) in the 18th century, that was tied to class consciousness and to the continuation of the royal blood line. More recently, the term ‘blue blood’ is defined as:

That which flows in the veins of old and aristocratic families . . . who claimed never to have been contaminated by Moorish, Jewish, or other foreign admixture; the expression probably originated in the blueness of the veins of the fair complexion as compared with those of dark skin. (Compact Oxford English Dictionary, 1991, as cited in Longhurst, 2001, p.10)

Longhurst (2001) explained that there are connections between the modern material displays of blue blood and the history of the term. For instance, the author explains the use of blue blood appears (as opposed to red blood) in the advertisements for menstruation products to assert the
pure, unpolluted, clean image of the product. The author advocates that there are continued relationships between blood, history, place, politics and identity.

Ahmed (2007) explains that whiteness is reproduced through decisions, the organization of space, and recruitment of subjects, and suggests that a “body-at-home” is one that can inhabit whiteness, and is thus able to attain certain capacities, techniques and habits. She identifies the way in which ‘whiteness’ is material, and notes that it may serve as an orientation that influences which bodies are able to act in space. Those who embody whiteness are included and privileged, as white values and orientations are normalized. Moreover, as Macdonald (2009) writes:

In contrast to a heterogeneous population with competing needs, dominant conflations of white with model citizenship allows white interests to be presented as ideals, which benefit the entire nation. (p.13)

The notion of white, model citizenship can be linked to the “If you can play, you can play” campaign. Campaigns supporting equal opportunities, respect and diversity are critiqued by scholars such as Macalpine and Marsh (2005) who assert:

Each assumes that a level playing field can be created, enabling people to enter and progress within organizations according to merit. They do not therefore take into account of the embedding of gender and ethnicity within organization structures and cultures. (p.436)

Moreover, the notion that equal opportunities exists for all holds individuals accountable for their behavior, however:

The language of equality, sameness and prejudice additionally suggests that if racism/discrimination/inequality exists at all, it is a matter of biased individual attitudes and personal behavior. (MacDonald, 2009, p.11)

While this campaign resists discrimination in sport based on sexuality or gender, it also silences the systemic privileges that enable Varsity sport participation (e.g., education, social class, ability, access to transportation, training and coaching). It is also tied to the problematic notion that equal opportunities exist within the world of university sport, and thus an individual’s participation in Varsity sport is due to the fact that they ‘can play’.
Through auto-ethnographic narratives, Butryn (2009) examines whiteness and privilege in his field of sport psychology; and critiques a previous paper he published that neglects the conflicts of privilege, race and identity. Butryn (2009) writes that while academics in kinesiology and higher education at large are becoming more comfortable with expressing acceptance of sexuality, if a sport sociology scholar raises issues of race and white privilege are silenced and raise discomfort. He argues, “Homophobia we can address … same with gender… But race makes some PhD’s squirm” (p.333). Butryn asserts:

My point here is that, by not understanding how whiteness relates to the sport and the sport psychology, the field might be complicit in the perpetuation of white privilege, and perhaps, racism through the collective silence of the field. (p.328)

PART 3: THE DIFFICULTIES OF SPATIAL MASTERY

Facing the Financial Maintenance of the Centre

The priority of the Faculty, with respect to fundraising is, as Participant 5 mentioned, “to finish paying off the building” (Participant 5). After having official possession of the Goldring Centre for High Performance Sport for a full year, a representative from the funds committee at the Faculty Council meeting explained that there was still a deficit of $4 million for the Centre which will remain the main concern for attracting funding, before other funding initiatives for academic programs and scholarships are introduced (Faculty Council Minutes, October 2015). This was reiterated by Participant 5:

We still have 3.8 million left to raise, to meet our target of 58 million, the budget for the building was 58 million and we were to raise all 58 million of it, so we are 3.8 million dollars short of that. And if you can appreciate the larger the amount of the donation the longer the number of years of pledge payments spreading that out. It’s not unusual for a donor to say look I’ll give you $100 000 dollars but I’ll give $20,000 a year for 5 years. It’s not likely that someone writes you a check for $100,000dollars. So in that sense, we’re about $6 million dollars short on the pledges coming in and we’re 3.8 million dollars short on raising for the capital, so therefore our top priority is to raise the rest of that. (Participant 5)

There remains a continued search for sponsorship and continued funding for this Centre. For
instance, at the Faculty Council meeting in January 2014, the Dean encouraged the sharing of ideas for donations and contributions, particularly about those who might be interested in naming opportunities (e.g., the Strength and Conditioning Facility and labs in the research wing).

Participant 5 continued to explain:

at the moment we have to pay a mortgage and paying that off…as soon as that’s paid off, then we’ll take a look at what other things, in other words, if we wanted pieces of equipment for instance in any of the labs or in any of the rooms, if someone says well I need a piece of equipment here and that is $20,000 dollars or that’s $50,000 dollars we can do one of several things we can look for a donor for $20,000 or $50,000, or look for a donor at a million dollars and buy a number of pieces of equipment.

Participant 2 mentioned that: “my concern is that the usual thing happened, that the budget limited things and that we’re already full” and also suggested “there is actually less new technology here than we would like to have”. Similarly, Participant 5 mentioned “Everybody wants the money now. And I’m saying excuse me why do you want the money now when you’re paying a mortgage” (Participant 5).

The need to fund all of the aspects in this space is not only apparent, it is pressing onto the practices of sport medicine practitioners (Personal Communication, April 20) and is evident in the ongoing showcasing of the space to external organizations. For instance, Participant 8 suggested that “us promoting the building, and getting people inside” was important, to increase rental opportunities that will contribute towards maintenance of the Centre, promoting the Varsity Sport ‘T leaf’ brand, and enhancing the University’s reputation. Participant 5 explained, “what we’re trying to do is maximize our non-academic year time, so the April to August” as there would be fewer students in comparison to the fall and winter academic semesters. Despite the need to generate revenue, Participant 5 highlights the purpose of the Centre’s construction, and the importance of the student body in the University:

it is for students, at the same token you know were trying to raise the profile, you know were trying to, quite frankly the rental income is good for us, if we can rent to someone whose got a high profile, it helps everything, so there’s a bit of a snowball
effect. … we’ve got to keep a balance in mind. I mean if we wanted we could rent the place out all the time (laugh), but that’s not why it was built. I think people will have to always have to remember that we’re sitting on the grounds of U of T, and for all of us the input is, if there’s no students, there’s no jobs, I mean, it’s our bread and butter.

The pressure to contribute to the Faculty’s mortgage is also affecting the Sport Medicine Clinic. While the primary focus is to see students, particularly Varsity Athletes, there is some pressure on the athletic therapists to treat private clientele. After a $60 registration fee, students receive services from the clinic as part of their student memberships. However, the income from private clientele might help to fund the Centre and to sustain the Clinic practices (Personal Communication, April 21, 2016).

**Maintaining the Technological Features of the Space**

There are also particular technological practices that enable (or hinder) the body and its spatial orientations. For instance, there is a ‘fob’ system that permits and/or restricts access to particular areas and floors within the Centre. Participant 7 mentioned on the fourth floor, “you know that anyone who’s coming in has a fob” and also explained how the fob system changed the operation of this building, in comparison to the other Varsity sports facilities:

> I mean there certainly is a different way of doing business, like fob access … so there’s no keys anymore. You know in some ways it’s good in some ways it’s a little more work, because we have to, if we want to close early, then we have to make a phone call to ask the police to lock the doors for us because they lock automatically, we don’t lock doors anymore.

Participant 7 did support this new technology in the Centre, despite some of the ‘glitches’:

> the flip side is, is that if the system goes down, and it doesn’t unlock, then you’ve got some issues, fortunately that doesn’t happen very often but there’s a few glitches with that.

Participant 7 also mentioned that with this technology, there is also risk of it breaking down and causing inconveniences that cannot be tended to without specialized technicians (e.g., elevator repairs):
So for a while the elevators weren’t working well or not everyone had a fob I think as well, so people could get sort of locked in no man’s land, so that was one of the opening learning curves we had.

As a graduate student in this space, I am continually reminded of the importance of my fob, as on weekends and after 7 pm weekdays, the 4th floor hallway doors lock automatically. I also see the ‘dysfunction’ that occurs when the elevators break down, which has occurred several times over the course of the year. Participant 2 mentioned “The clinic loves the new space, they hate the fact that the elevators kept breaking down, that’s a major problem with your dealing with people with mobility issues.” Another user of this space mentioned that they heard Goldring staff member’s comment: “It wouldn’t be Goldring if it wasn’t breaking down” (Personal Communication, May, 2016).

Analysis

Now that the Goldring Centre is in operation, the ongoing use of spaces, technologies and their maintenance, as well as the Centre’s finances (including the Centre’s mortgage) remain a concern for administrators in the Faculty. A main concern for the space is that “we’ve used it all up” (Participant 2) and that “the budget is limited” (Participant 2). The ongoing need to fundraise and pay the mortgage hinders the ability to purchase new technologies and equipment, particularly in the non-sponsored labs. Moreover, administrators strive to hold a high profile in hopes of renting the Field House to high performance sport governing bodies. Sports medicine clinicians are also encouraged to treat private clientele. As Lefebvre (1991) asserts:

the space thus produced also serves as a tool of thought and of action; that in addition to being a means of production it is also a means of control, and hence of domination, of power; yet that, as such, it escapes in part from those who would make use of it. The social and political (state) forces which engendered this space now seek, but fail, to master it completely; the very agency that has forced spatial reality towards a sort of uncontrollable autonomy now strives to run it into the ground, then shackle and enslave it. (Lefebvre, 1991, p.26)
Conclusion

Scholars in the field of Kinesiology and Physical Education must now realize the explicit hierarchies of knowledge, identity, ability, and class that are ‘hidden in plain view’, and privilege because:

a culture of whiteness [that] involves both the lack of comprehension and the denial of a ‘non-white’ reality is perhaps the most public or observable illustration of the operation of white power and privilege. (Wise, 2005; Henry & Tator, 2007b as cited in Douglas and Halas, 2013, p.456)

As suggested by Douglas and Halas (2013): “we call upon our colleagues within physical education to make inclusion more than an illusion” (p.472). This will involve the continual disruption of discourses of equal opportunities in high performance sport, as well as the disruption of the discourses that assert the high performance sport is beneficial ‘for all’. It will also involve the critical questioning of the ways in which the architectural design of a high performance sport Centre perpetuates the systemic privileging of the wealthy and the elite, and (re)produce the(ir) particular vision of greatness.

Butryn (2009) explains Gill’s (2007) consideration that integration of (our) separate fields (sociocultural, physiology, biomechanics, motor control) is critical. Moreover, he writes:

I see Gill’s notion of “integration as inclusion and social justice” as a vital characteristic and practice of a sport psychology [and kinesiology] that seeks to confront whiteness. Gill argues that “all have a right to physical activity as a public health and social justice issue, and it is our professional responsibility in kinesiology to secure that right. (p.283)

Participant 4 suggested that the Goldring Centre had a slow start in terms of participation, because “cultural changes take a long time”. Lefebvre theorizes:

A transformation of society presupposes the possession and collective management of space by a permanent intervention of “interested parties” … This is an orientation. Nothing more and nothing less. But it does point out a meaning. Namely, something is perceived, a direction is conceived, a living movement makes its way toward the horizon. But it is nothing that yet resembles a system. (Lefebvre, 2009, p.195)
As such, the administrators, the professoriate, the students, athletes, and the advocates for ‘greatness’ are the parties who are implicated in this orientation. Importantly, the significant cost-benefit ratios should not be left unquestioned, undervalued or understudied.

In these analysis chapters, I demonstrated that there are three intricately connected moments of space that have underpinned and continue to support the production of the GCHPS. In sum, I suggest that the production of a high performance sport space is tied to political and economical legacies of classism, scientific knowledge/power and White supremacy in North American institutions of higher education in societies at large.
CHAPTER 7
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Lefebvre (1991) asserts that space is inherently social and is dominated by abstraction. This account of the Goldring Centre for High performance Sport exposes the dangers of an elite and possibly exclusionary space, and it argues that the FKPE and the University administration must not neglect the ways in which the Centre’s spatial production is connected to the reproduction of social relations. While the university’s aspirations for academic and athletic excellence are suggested to materialize within this Centre, I have demonstrated that the architectural imaginations, as well as the material and discursive practices of this space serve to divide and hierarchize the knowledge and technologies of the sport sciences subjects and its subjects (e.g., high performance and recreational athletes).

My thesis theorizes a particular pursuit of greatness that is tied to the privileging of particular identities (e.g., of sporting ability and academic discipline), as well as the corporate-sponsorships and commercialization of scientific ‘truths’, and processes of normalization that reproduce whiteness. The pursuit of greatness, and the production of this Centre, exemplifies the institutions (and academia’s) highly selective financial, economic, political and social priorities.

Andrews (2008) writes that the broader political, economic and technological networks that contribute to the social context and forms of physical culture (e.g., practices, discourses, subjectivities) must continue to be studied. As a graduate student who studied and worked in the GCHPS, I realize that qualitative researchers might “sit on the fringes of research, but remember that it is on the fringes where the greatest advances are often made” (Morse, 2006, p.90).

Pronger (2002) advocates that we need a theory of the modern body, and I would add space, that is open to the body’s (and space’s) potential that technologies of fitness and the exercise sciences exclude. This way forward means developing a sensitivity to the ways in which modernity is aggressive with bodies, (as well as with spaces). One must respects alterity,
as Pronger suggests:

Exploration of alterity is intended to open thinking about the body in ways that might transcend modern, Western, technological and phallogocentric conceptions and practices of the body. (p.78)

In addition to recognizing, and valuing the alternative visions of health and wellness that remain invisible from the field of the exercise sciences in the GCHPS, the way forward recognizes that there are a multitude of boundaries (e.g., oppressions) that are imposed upon the University community, and that are reproduced through architecture (e.g., visibility and SCC tiers), and technological practices of this space. Those on the ‘inside’ must be open to alternatives that involve questioning the practices of the ‘productive’ and objective scientific disciplines of anatomy, physiology, motor control and biomechanics. As mentioned in Chapter 6, Lefebvre’s (1991) conception of territorial, capitalist abstract space is radically different from the freedom, flow and creativity of the differential. In contrast to the abstract spaces produced by the purposeful, measurable practices of scientific inquiry, Lefebvre (1991) theorizes the alternative that is differential space:

a space which doesn’t look superficially different, but is different, different to its very core… it celebrates… both bodily and experiential… True differential space is a burden. It cannot, must not, be allowed to flourish by the powers that be. It places unacceptable demands on accumulation and growth. (p.176)

Lefebvre’s conception of differential space is non-directional, non-uniform, non-systematic, unpredictable, and opposes abstract space. Rather, the research in Goldring’s abstract space enables and supports projections of hierarchy and competition, objectiveness and progress. Still, the potentialities of the body and space must not be neglected, as they move and flourish in differential space. Thus, alternative modes of inquiries that resist the scientific ways of knowing and claiming of truth are of upmost value (even if, and especially because it does not entail direct economic returns). Differential space in this Centre would involve experiences that are not tied to self-attainment. Future research might allow for possibilities of ‘becoming’ through various
discovery-based, qualitative pursuits.

Pronger (2002) writes of the practice of absence and presence, in which “freedom [is attained] through the enlightened attainment of absence” (p.86). Differential space respects and embodies the Buddhist philosophy (and way of life) that is free from aggression. Pronger advocates: “Emptiness, I argue is a compassionate and sacred gift that is the very source of the puissance\(^\text{16}\) of being free” (p.78). Differential space in this Centre would not attempt to homogenize its users towards a centralized vision of ‘fitness’. It would afford a variety of student groups spaces where they may feel ‘at home’.

Similarly, Atkinson (2009) connects Pronger’s notion of puissance to the active, moving body in his discussion of urban Parkour (or free running). Parkour practitioners (i.e. traceurs) consider:

a sense of being through free movement, what Pronger (2002) calls ‘puissance’ and what Buddhists call mindlessness,’ liberates one from fears of personal failure and social impotence (trappings of the will) and creates an enduring feeling of ecstasy. (p.191)

They believe that physical and emotional learnings from Parkour are applicable for the “bettering” (p.173) of the social world. Traceurs seek to deconstruct the ways in which spaces (e.g., their urban environment) are inextricably tied physical movement. Atkinson explains:

Important to them is that one will never experience flow in free running unless one first uses the practice to understand, deconstruct, and critique the confining and pathological nature of his or her own urban environments. In other words, people must first strive to understand how they, and their bodies, are contextualized and physically ordered as resources within urban space before they are free to become. (p. 191)

---

\(^{16}\) Puissance, as described by Pronger (2002) is infinite and essential to all beings. It is “the power of coming to presence, the productive power of realization” (Pronger, 2002, p.67). However, puissance is also acted upon and necessary for the cultural and political power (i.e. pouvoir). Thus, while puissance is a mode of liberation and the essence of being free, it is also harnessed as a means of control and governance.
The process of deconstructing the everyday spaces of high performance sport, kinesiology and athletic therapy would benefit, and perhaps liberate, those who are involved in them and immersed in their associated teachings, if they choose to know. Moreover, thinking critically about the physical and social ordering of a modern space of sport and how it came to be may have physical, emotional, and social value for both those who participate within them and for those who do not.

Upon completion of this study, I reflect on the Smith (2006) who writes that institutional ethnography “is not a matter of discovering the everyday world as such, but of looking out beyond the everyday to discover how it came to happen as it does” (p.3). In my initial exposure to this Centre, the observable dynamics of the research and practices within the FKPE, high performance sport, recreational athletics and the study of the production of this infrastructure helped me to consider the various discourses and practices that pertained to the Centre over different points of time (e.g., during its initial imagination, spatial organization and ongoing operation). Further analysis of this space might interrogate the normalized discursive and technological practices within the Centre that circulate on a daily basis, and might also seek opportunities for the critical analysis of intercollegiate high performance athletics, the commercial pursuits of the sports sciences, as well the quest for excellence (as opposed to equity) in scholarship and athletics at the University of Toronto.

In my research, I was often intrigued by the various student perceptions (e.g., like or dislike of the Centre’s SCC), as well as various perceptions of visibility and belonging (e.g., within in the SCC). This dynamic of lived space (and architectural design) merits further attention and scholarship. Smith (2006) encourages “talking with people” (p.22) both informally and spontaneously, as well as in individual and group interviews. Now that the Centre is nearing its second year of operation (October 2016), open-ended informal and formal inquiries of the lived experience of the Centre’s users may shed light on the connections between landscapes of
sport and physical cultural studies, as well as the applications of spatial theory to the analysis of major infrastructural developments on post-secondary campuses.

Oftentimes before I began a participant interview, I explained to them that this thesis was about ‘telling the story of the Goldring Centre’. I realize that there are alternative ways of telling the GCHPS story. However, I argue that if the University of Toronto, and institutions of higher education at large, are to better serve all of society we must consider that the institutional priority for excellence is connected to a histories of inequities. In order to address systemic injustices, research, practice and pedagogy must question why and how high performance sport and its research is rationalized and deemed valuable. Moreover, university scholars and communities must support infrastructural projects that service the requests and the holistic wellness of a student body, a community, and a society.
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Project Title: The production of a space of greatness: A critical institutional ethnography

Investigator: Rachel Scarcello (MSc Candidate, Faculty of Kinesiology and Physical Education, University of Toronto)

Supervisor: Caroline Fusco (Associate Professor, Faculty of Kinesiology and Physical Education, University of Toronto)

Research Procedures:

You are invited to participate in this study called “Imagining and Producing a Space of greatness: A critical institutional ethnography” because you were a key contributor to the development of the GCHPS and you were associated with the conception, design and/or production of this space. Your participation will consist of an interview that will take approximately 60-90 minutes. You may refuse to answer any questions and you may stop the interview at any time without any consequences. The interview would be done in person at a date, time and place that is convenient to you.

Confidentiality:

For confidentiality reasons, you will be given a pseudonym. Any personal information linked to your identity will be kept confidential throughout the study and in subsequent presentations/publications based on the study. Given your role in the Goldring Centre for High Performance Sport, there is some potential that your responses may identify your relationship to the Centre. However, all transcripts will be anonymized and your name or other identifying information (e.g., your position at the university, your firm) will not be used in any presentation or published materials. By signing the consent form, you have acknowledged this is a possibility and are choosing to participate in the study despite this potential.

With your consent, interviews will be audio-recorded and transcribed. Any personal information linked to your identity will be kept confidential by having transcripts anonymized, coded and password protected. A master list of names will be kept in a separate password protected file and will not be linked in any way to participants’ transcripts. All data generated from the interview, including hand-written notes, recordings, and transcriptions will be kept in a secure location for the duration of the study (a locked filing cabinet in my office in the Faculty of Kinesiology and Physical Education at the University of Toronto). Recorded information shared during the interview will only be accessible to the primary researcher, Rachel Scarcello and (anonymized) themes will be shared with my supervisor, Dr. Caroline Fusco. Notes and ‘clean’ electronic
I understand this research project is not likely to produce any psychological stress or discomfort or social risk. The research involves no physical risk or deception. Participants should experience no risk greater than can be expected in the regular procedures of their daily activities. Participants who are interviewed for this project will benefit by sharing and broadening knowledge about the social, political, economic and technological dimensions of the GCHPS and may gain an extended understanding of how space(s) and place(s) and high performance athletics and research are interrelated.

Voluntary Participation and Early Withdrawal:

Participation in this study is voluntary and participants have the right to refuse to answer a question in the interview. Participants are free to withdraw their interview data from the study at any time and without prejudice or explanation. Participants who withdraw their interview data will be informed that all transcripts and audio recordings of their interview will be destroyed. Participants may withdraw from the study by contacting the researcher at rachel.scarcello@mail.utoronto.ca. After the manuscript is drafted (April 1st, 2016) the data cannot be removed from the study. The data collection is scheduled for completion by June 2016 and further contact outside a scheduled interview time would be for clarification purposes only. If participants have any questions or concerns about their rights as a research participant they can contact University of Toronto’s Office of Research Ethics- ethics.review@utoronto.ca or 416-946-3273.

Informed Consent:

I, ___________________________ (please print your name) agree to take part in the study examining the vision, the production and the current activities of the Goldring Centre for High Performance Sport (GCHPS). As a volunteer in this study, I acknowledge that the information letter details the interview process and handling of research data. I also acknowledge that any questions I have asked have been answered satisfactorily, and that if I have any concerns or questions arising subsequent to the interview process, they can be addressed by contacting the researcher.

I understand what this study involves and agree to participate:

_____________________________ (Signature)    _____________________________ (Date)

In addition, I grant permission to the researcher to record my interview:

_____________________________ YES (signature required)    ____ NO (check)
In addition, I grant permission to the researcher to use data from my interview for:
- Research Publications
- Teaching and demonstrations at professional meetings

______________________________ YES (signature required)  ____ NO (check)

I, the undersigned, have, to the best of my ability, fully explained the nature of this study to the participant. I believe that the person whose signature appears above understands the implications and voluntary nature of their participation in the research procedures.

______________________________
Researcher’s signature  Location  Date
APPENDIX C: INTERVIEW GUIDE

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this interview. I will turn the tape recording device on now.

Part A: Imagining Goldring: Conceived Space

1) Can you tell me about your relationship to the Goldring Centre for High Performance Sport?
2) Why did you want to be involved in the conception and production of Goldring?
3) How did you get involved in imagining Goldring?
4) What were your initial thoughts about the project? Did they change? Why?
5) What was your vision for this Centre?
   a. How important was the conception of such a space to you?
   b. What do you think of the name of the Centre? Is it important to you? (Why? Why not?)
   c. In what ways did your vision for Goldring align with or differ from other stakeholders?
6) Can you specify some of the ways that you were involved with the planning and design of this space?
7) What kinds of input did you have about the production of the Goldring space?
   a. What was and remains important to you about this space?
   b. What kinds of concerns/debates/feedback occurred about Goldring?

Part B: Development and realization: Spatial Practices

The Goldring Centre has been represented as a valuable and necessary space for the University of Toronto, the FKPE and its Varsity Blues athletes, its researchers, its sports medicine, and the broader University of Toronto faculty and student community. During the Centre’s development and opening months, the promotional material distributed and displayed around campus stated the motto for the Centre: “Pursue Greatness”.

8) Where did the idea about pursuing greatness as a motto/tag line come from?
   a. Do you think that it is a good motto/tag line for this space? (Why? Why not?)
   b. Was there consensus/debate around this idea of the “Pursuit of Greatness”?
   c. What does greatness mean to you with respect to Goldring?
9) Do you think that greatness is/will be materialized in this space? If yes, how? Part C: Day-to-day: Lived Space

10) In what ways are you involved in the Goldring space presently?
   a. Do you attend events and/or take part in the organization/management of that space?

11) Can you tell me what you know about the high performance sport/ sports science research/ sports medicine practices that take place in Goldring?
   a. What, if any, is your role in these practices and what is your vision for them in the future?

12) Can you tell me something about how you see this space being used by individuals, the university and the community?
   a. Do you think everyone benefits from Goldring or do you have any concerns about how it is used or what people think about it?
   b. What might you say to someone who is apprehensive or critical of Goldring?

13) What kinds of events, athletics, recreation and partnerships do you think should be supported by Goldring? (Why?)

14) There are many new technologies in the Goldring gyms, sports medicine clinic and labs. In what way do you envision these as related to the motto of “pursuit of greatness”?

15) I have asked you a lot of questions, is there anything you would like to add about your vision and thoughts about Goldring?

Thank you for taking part in this interview. It is greatly appreciated. I will turn the tape recording device off now.
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