

CoSA-Ottawa's volunteers' subjective experiences with 'sex offenders:'
Taming the monstrous

Marci Beitner

A thesis submitted to the
Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies
in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the MA degree in Criminology

Supervisor: Dr. David Joubert
Department of Criminology
Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies

University of Ottawa

© Marci Beitner, Ottawa, Canada 2015

Table of Contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
ABSTRACT.....	v
INTRODUCTION	vii
What is CoSA-Ottawa?.....	viii
Rationale for my Study	xiii
Criminological Significance and Contribution.....	xiv
Outline	xv
CHAPTER 1: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	1
The Historical Dehumanization of the ‘Sex Offender’—The Monster	1
‘Sex Offenders’ as Folk Devils	6
The Media and the Folk Devil from Within.....	8
Canada’s Management of People Convicted of Sexual Offences.....	9
Current Conservative Agenda	12
CoSA’s Funding Crisis.....	14
Established Research on CoSA	15
Evaluation of CoSA’s Effectiveness.....	16
Impacts of Circle Programs	19
Experiences of Core Members and Volunteers.....	23
Contribution to the Literature	26
CHAPTER 2: CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK.....	29
Power as Relational.....	29
Power as Guiding Behaviour.....	33
Disciplinary Power	36
Power and the Carceral System	39
Biopower.....	41
Power and Governance.....	42
Neoliberalism and Governance	44
The Subject and Subjectification	46
Power, Governmentality, and Risk.....	48
Power and Rehabilitation Narratives.....	51
Critique of Foucault’s Formulations on Power and Governmentality	55
Overview of Theoretical Concepts.....	57
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY	59
Positioning: Epistemology, Ontology, and Voice.....	59
Reflexivity.....	63
Definitions of Terms and Concepts.....	63
Research Design.....	66
General Characteristics of the Study Population	66
Interview Locations	67
Sampling Design and Procedures	68
Information-Collection Procedures and Instruments	68
Transcription Notes.....	68
Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis	69
Evaluative Criteria	72
Strengths and Limitations of IPA	73
Reflections and Ethical Concerns	74

Justifying the Method	75
CHAPTER 4: THE HUMANIZATION OF THE MONSTROUS	79
Distancing from the Public’s Perceptions	81
Stigma from the Media	86
Personifying the Core Member	99
Humanizing the ‘Sex Offender’ through Power and Governmentality	102
CHAPTER 5: THE REINTEGRATION AND RE-SOCIALIZATION THROUGH A HELPING RELATIONSHIP	105
Agent of Help	105
Agent of Risk Prevention	110
Agent of Protection	115
Agent of Companionship/Friendship	118
Relationships of Power and Re-socialization Through Governmentality	121
CHAPTER 6: OVERALL IMPACTS AS A COSA-OTTAWA VOLUNTEER	125
Motivation for Involvement	125
Personal Impacts	128
Understanding Volunteers’ Impacts through Power and Governmentality	132
DISCUSSION	136
CONCLUSION	146
Limitations	148
Contributions to the Field	149
Directions for Future Research	151
REFERENCES	152
APPENDIX	167
1. Appendices	167
1a Interview Guide.....	167
1b Demographic Information Questionnaire	168
1c Recruitment Texts (Emails)	169
1d Consent Form.....	170
1e Ethics Approval Notice	172
1f Sample of IPA Tables	172
1g Sample of Master Theme Table.....	207

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my family and friends for their endless love and encouragement, especially my dad, mom, and Lani. Also, towards the end of this process I had a few friends in particular who kept me going and gave me tangible assistance, which I greatly appreciate, and thank you Michelle Speyer for doing the final edit of my manuscript. I also could not have written this thesis without the constant guidance and support from my supervisor Dr. David Joubert. Similarly, I would like to thank my evaluators, Dr. Christine Gervais and Dr. Justin Piché, whose comments and recommendations have greatly contributed to my thesis. In addition, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize CoSA-Ottawa's coordinators Susan Love and Adina Ilea, for granting permission to conduct my research within the organization, as well as for assisting with my recruitment process. Lastly, I would like to acknowledge my six wonderful participants, without whom my study would not have been possible. Thank you to everyone who supported me along the way throughout this challenging academic process.

ABSTRACT

People convicted of sexual offences are arguably one of the most marginalized criminal offender groups because both the general population and offender populations tend to have hardened views of these individuals (Spencer, 2009; Wilson & Prinzo, 2001). Circles of Support and Accountability Ottawa (CoSA-Ottawa) is an organization that helps people convicted of sexual offences reintegrate into society by challenging traditional forms of community reintegration. CoSA-Ottawa was founded on the principles of restorative justice, which are exemplified in their mottos “no more victims” and “no one is disposable.” The organization relies on the commitment and contribution of volunteers to assist with the reintegration process. While there have been various studies on CoSA from different perspectives (Duwe, 2012; Fox, 2014; Wilson, Picheca, and Prinzo, 2007; Wilson & Prinzo, 2001), there have been few studies directly focusing on CoSA-Ottawa volunteers through a critical lens.

This study examines the subjective experiences of CoSA-Ottawa volunteers who work with people labeled as ‘sex offenders.’ The research was conducted using semi-structured interviews with six participants. Each interview transcript was transcribed and analyzed using interpretative phenomenological analysis. The master themes that developed through this study include: the humanization of the monstrous, the reintegration and re-socialization through a helping relationship, and overall impacts of these relationships on CoSA-Ottawa volunteers. Using a governmentality and power conceptual framework, this thesis demonstrates how the relationships between the core members and volunteers are transformative and act as an extension of the carceral

system. Further, this thesis illustrates that the supportive function of these relationships is explicit, while their governing function is implicit.

INTRODUCTION

This Master's thesis explores the subjective experiences and perceptions of volunteers who work with people labeled as 'sex offenders,' as well as how the volunteers make sense of their role working with this marginalized population. My interest in studying this topic stems from a personal desire to challenge my own preconceived judgments about 'sex offenders.'

This research explicitly examines volunteers who participate in the organization Circles of Support and Accountability-Ottawa. It explores the narratives of how volunteers relate to people identified as 'sex offenders' in order to work directly with them on a personal level. In addition, this thesis examines how volunteers explain and express their role and relationship with persons branded as a 'sex offenders.' It also illustrates the challenges and obstacles that volunteers face when working with this population within the community. The goal of this research is to understand and explore volunteers' perceptions and experiences while working with people identified as 'sex offenders' because there is a lack of research on this topic specific to the volunteer population.

The major research question for this study asks: *How do volunteers experience working with people labeled as 'sex offenders' through CoSA-Ottawa?*

Additional research questions addressed throughout the study include:

1. *How do volunteers describe the subjective components associated with working with this population?*
2. *How do volunteers describe their relationships and roles with their core members?*

3. *What are some of the perceived obstacles and limitations that volunteers experience working with persons identified as 'sex offenders' through CoSA-Ottawa?*
4. *What is the subjective relevance assigned by volunteers to changes in their perceptions of this population?*
5. *How are concepts of power and governmentality manifested through participants' narratives?*

What is CoSA-Ottawa?

Circles of Support and Accountability Ottawa (CoSA-Ottawa) is a community-based initiative founded on the principles of restorative justice (CoSA-Ottawa, 2012). Restorative justice as defined by Howard Zehr (2001) in the training manual *Circles of Support and Accountability: A Guide to Training Potential Volunteers*, is

- *A redefinition of roles in the Criminal Justice System, placing the victims of crime at the center;*
- *Best used with serious crime, such as interventions with federal parolees;*
- *Appropriate for minor crimes, but often even more so for serious crime where the needs of victims are similar and in greater need of being addressed;*
- *An attempt to address the needs and causes of crime. In so doing, this approach brings to bear two fundamental principles:*
- ***Harm:*** *Restorative Justice addresses the harm caused by crime by addressing victim's needs, and by holding the offender accountable in terms of the harm done;*
- ***Engagement:*** *Restorative Justice engages victims, offenders and the community in the process of addressing the harms done by crime (as cited in Correctional Service of Canada, 2002, p. 7-8).*

Accordingly, CoSA takes into consideration the needs and concerns of all parties, including the victim, the offender, and the community (Correctional Service of Canada, 2002). However, while CoSA does not seek to directly reconcile the harms caused to victims, they allow for the offender to resolve the harms they have caused by being

accountable to the community through a successful non-offending re-integrative process (Cesaroni, 2001).

The CoSA initiative works with people convicted of sexual offences that have been deemed high needs and high-risk to reoffend (CoSA-Ottawa, 2012; Hannem & Petrunik, 2007). They must also have served their federal time of imprisonment until the final day of their sentence, and may be on a Long Term Supervision Order (CoSA-Ottawa, 2012; Hannem & Petrunik, 2007). CoSA's objective is to support people labelled as high-risk 'sex offenders:' they minimize their risk of reoffending, help individuals develop a healthy and pro-social lifestyle, and assist their successful reintegration into society (CoSA-Ottawa, 2012; Hannem & Petrunik, 2007). These individuals, known as core members, participate in CoSA's program on a voluntary basis; it is not a judicially mandated program (Hannem & Petrunik, 2007). Nonetheless, in order to participate in the program, individuals must sign a consent form agreeing to share his or her Correctional Service of Canada file with CoSA (CoSA-Ottawa, 2012).

The program is designed to provide a network of support around the core member. Each core member works with three to five community volunteers who have been screened and trained; the volunteers form the core member's inner circle (CoSA-Ottawa, 2012). CoSA also works closely with carceral system professionals like the police, probation officers, parole officers, and psychologists, who together form the outer circle of the core member's support network. The CoSA coordinator is in charge of facilitating the flow of information between these inner and outer circles. The current study focuses on the inner circle only. Hereafter, all discussions of the circles relate to the volunteers involved in the core member's inner circle of support.

The entire circle meets regularly, generally on a weekly basis, to discuss a diverse range of matters, including the offender's problems and progress (Hannem, 2011). In addition to the weekly group meetings, the circle breaks into individual meetings between each volunteer and the core member (Hannem, 2011). These one-on-one meetings offer opportunities for the volunteer to further develop their rapport with the core member. Drewery (2008) notes that the established circles in Canada last for about a year; about half of them will continue into a second year, and half of those will continue into a third year. The volunteers must commit to participating in CoSA's program for a minimum of one year, while the core member reintegrates into society (CoSA-Ottawa, 2012). CoSA provides its core members with a consistent network of emotional support, while also challenging the behaviour and attitudes that may have been associated with their criminalized behaviour (CoSA-Ottawa, 2012).

The CoSA program was established a few decades ago, when one particular individual was released back into his community and was met with hostility and violence from residents. He was unwanted—an outsider, with no place to go. In 1994 in Hamilton, Ontario a man who was designated as a high-risk, mentally delayed, repeat child sexual abuser was released back into the community after he finished serving his prison sentence (Hannem & Petrunik, 2004; Wilson et al., 2007). The community was outraged by his return. They showed extreme hostility toward the offender by protesting and picketing at his home, as well as by relaying angry phone calls to his house (Wilson et al., 2007). This explicit community action prompted high levels of media attention, political intervention, and 24-hour police surveillance (Wilson et al., 2007). In response to the offender's appeals for assistance, a Mennonite pastor agreed to gather a group of congregants

around him to offer support (Wilson & Prinzo, 2001). He also asked a concerned member of the community who was involved with Neighborhood Watch to join the group, and it was her role to reassure the community that their initiative would lead to greater overall community safety (Correctional Service of Canada, 2002). The Mennonite pastor, his congregants, and the other community volunteers were also able to provide him with a framework to assume accountability for his wrongful actions (Wilson & Prinzo, 2001). Once the community began to understand that the group was monitoring the offender closely, some of the community member's concerns were appeased (Correctional Service of Canada, 2002). Fortunately, this individual did not reoffend (Correctional Service of Canada, 2002).

The faith group that originally established CoSA created the support group as a response to a problem caused by the government's implementation of more restrictive legislation, which affected people convicted of sexual offences who were federally incarcerated. The legislation affirmed that all people identified as 'sex offenders' were to be imprisoned until the final date of their sentence (Correctional Service of Canada, 2002). The results of this legislation meant that these offenders would not have access to any formal forms of support or monitoring following their release, as well as throughout their attempts to reintegrate back into society (Correctional Service of Canada, 2002).

A few months following the response and creation of the first Circle of Support, a similar situation occurred in a small town outside of Toronto, Ontario (Duwe, 2012; Hannem & Petrunik, 2004). A community chaplain from the Correctional Service of Canada became aware of the successes of the first Circle of Support established in Hamilton (Duwe, 2012). Based on his knowledge, he formed another Circle of Support

around another person labeled a high-risk ‘sex offender’ who was being released from prison (Duwe, 2012). Subsequently, at the request of the Correctional Service of Canada, the Mennonite Central Committee of Ontario agreed to conduct a pilot project, which was named the Community Reintegration Project (Cesaroni, 2001; Duwe, 2012; Hannem & Petrunik, 2004; Wilson et al., 2007). The pilot project was developed in order to examine whether the Circles of Support could be implemented more broadly, since they had positively affected the reintegration of two high-risk ‘sex offenders’ (Duwe, 2012). Additionally, the project would evaluate whether Circles of Support would have an impact on the recidivism rate of people who had committed sexual offences (Duwe, 2012). After the reported success of the pilot project, the program was later renamed Circles of Support and Accountability and implemented throughout Canada.

The fundamental philosophy behind CoSA is to ensure that there will be “no more victims” and to reaffirm that “no one is disposable” (CoSA-Ottawa, 2012). Accordingly, the mission of CoSA today is to reduce the risk of future sexual offences by providing released individuals with support and assistance during their reintegration process (Correctional Service of Canada, 2002; Duwe, 2012). While CoSA began as a humanitarian initiative providing salvation and support to persons labeled as ‘sex offenders,’ it is now overseen by the Correctional Service of Canada (CSC), which imposes its own agenda. For example, the CSC’s article *Circles of Support and Accountability: Quick Facts* (2010) highlights the fact that CoSA volunteers are supported by professionals including treatment providers, psychologists, probation officers and parole officers. In doing so, they emphasize the first half of the CoSA motto “no more victims” as the more important objective of CoSA.

Correctional Service of Canada has financially supported Canada-wide CoSA programs so it is understandable that CoSA must be accountable to CSC's agenda. However, more recent news has suggested that CoSA-Ottawa and other Canada-wide CoSA programs are at a risk of disappearing because their federal funding has not been renewed (CoSA-Ottawa, 2012). The implications of CoSA's financial crisis will be further discussed later on in this paper.

The general expectation of CoSA is that the Circle meets less and less until the core member has established his own pro-social contacts and coping mechanisms, with the overall goal of the individual being able to live a crime-free independent life (Drewery, 2008). CoSA-Ottawa's mission and mandate is to:

- *Support the Core Member's community integration by facilitating his practical needs (i.e. access to medical services, social assistance, seeking employment/affordable housing, etc.) and by providing a consistent network of emotional support;*
- *Develop constructive and pro-social strategies and solutions to everyday problems and concerns;*
- *Challenge the Core Member's behaviours and attitudes that may be associated with his offending cycle.*
- *Celebrate successes (CoSA-Ottawa, 2012).*

Overall, CoSA-Ottawa believes in protecting society through the development of productive and helpful relationships between core members and volunteers.

Rationale for my Study

Volunteers are an important element in most non-for profit organizations. In spite of this there are far fewer studies on the volunteers than on the organizations' target groups for intervention. Volunteers at CoSA-Ottawa have an important role to play since they form the inner circle of support for the core member and do not have access to the practices used by the penal system in order to govern people identified as 'sex offenders.'

However, frequently volunteers develop trust-based relationships with their core member, which can have profound effects on both individuals. These relationships may serve as an alternative to the formal mechanisms of social control typically used in a carceral setting. In this context, this study documents the ways in which volunteers may be implicitly subjectified as agents of social control, through the creation and fostering of a significant relationship with the core member. In addition, this study explores volunteers' accounts of changes in their perceptions of people labeled as 'sex offender,' the influence to which they attribute these changes in perception, as well as the personal benefits to themselves resulting from their involvement in CoSA-Ottawa.

Criminological Significance and Contribution

This project is relevant for the purpose of expanding the current knowledge on the community's influence in managing criminalized individuals. As mentioned previously, this research aims to advance a specific form of knowledge with a focus on the volunteers who work with people labeled as 'sex offenders' in the community. In addition, this study makes use of interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA) in order to develop insights into the experiences of volunteers who work with a highly marginalized population. This form of analysis, first introduced in the field of health psychology by Jonathan Smith (1996) is rarely used within criminological scholarship. In using IPA as a heuristic tool, this study illustrates its relevance for criminological research.

As previously discussed, this research explores how CoSA-Ottawa volunteers challenge dominant representations of people labeled as 'sex offenders.' Through this study, I demonstrate the humanization process involved in reintegrating people labeled as 'sex offenders' and the factors that shape the volunteers' practices. Furthermore, in

examining the volunteers' narratives I conceptualize their roles as various agents of governance. Lastly, since the volunteers of CoSA-Ottawa are integral to the organization's practices, I highlight the positive and negative impacts of their work. My study expands the knowledge surrounding a relevant issue that influences both public opinion and political policies. In addition, it presents an understanding of how a community organization in Ottawa uses volunteers to manage people who are labeled as 'sex offenders' following their term of imprisonment. The volunteers' accounts shed light on how they understand their role, how they relate to their core member, and what guides their practice.

Outline

In Chapter 1: Review of the Literature, I explore how people identified as 'sex offenders' have been connected to the idea of the 'monster' in order to contextualize the title of my thesis. I discuss the concept of the monster as it has developed in history and literature. Then I describe how people labeled as 'sex offenders' have become the folk devils within our society, through an examination of the media's portrayal of this population as well as a discussion on the impact of the recent legislative policies under the Conservative federal government. Lastly, publications that have studied CoSA and similar organizations are reviewed in order to ground my study.

In Chapter 2: Conceptual Framework, I conceptualize power and governmentality, explaining these concepts and their relevance for my study. Some of the other concepts related to my analytical frameworks that I explore here include: disciplinary power, bio-power, subjectification, and risk. Subsequently I note several critiques of the Foucauldian framework and suggest how my study can overcome these

critiques. Lastly, I provide a brief overview of the concepts that will be highlighted throughout my analysis.

In Chapter 3: Methodology, I describe my positioning as a researcher, operationalize certain concepts, as well as outline my research design. In this section I explain interpretative phenomenological analysis and its relevance to a power and governmentality framework in order to justify my research choices.

The analysis portion of my thesis is presented in chapters 4, 5, and 6 based on the three master themes that have materialized through the use of interpretative phenomenological analysis on my transcripts. The master themes are: humanization of the monstrous, the reintegration and re-socialization through a helping relationship, and the overall impacts of these relationships on CoSA-Ottawa volunteers. Throughout these master themes, secondary themes have emerged which are substantiated by verbatim quotations and subsequently analyzed through a power and governmentality framework.

In the Discussion chapter, I summarize the overall findings of my study. In addition, contributions by Turnbull and Hannah-Moffat (2009) lend to the overall understanding of how the trust-based relationship between the volunteer and core member is more productive for re-socializing core members in society. Finally, in the Conclusion chapter, I summarize my study, reflect upon the limitations of my research, discuss several contributions of my study, and propose ideas for future research.

CHAPTER 1: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

In this chapter I first introduce a discussion regarding the historical significance of the term monster and I then discuss how persons identified as ‘sex offenders’ are often labeled as monsters by our society. In this discussion, I present the idea that people classified as ‘sex offenders’ have become the folk devils in our society and propose that this perception is perpetuated through the media. There follows, a segment regarding how Canada manages people who have committed sexual offences, highlighting a discussion of the current Conservative agenda. Lastly, I present relevant research on CoSA and similar organizations in order to ground the current study within the established discourse.

The Historical Dehumanization of the ‘Sex Offender’—The Monster

Monsters are omnipresent in our lives as they appear throughout religious scriptures, mythologies, fairy tales, modern stories, and movies. The monster is a metaphor used to describe and associate negative feelings toward a designated character. A monster is frightening; we are disturbed by and terrified of monsters. In our society, we give the monster label to both fictional characters and real people. It is a common term that people currently use to refer to people who commit sexual offences, especially if their sexual offences are against children (Thomas, 2005; Spencer, 2009). McGuickin and Brown (2001) suggest that sexual offences, particularly against children significantly affect communities because of the vulnerability of the victims. Thomas (2005) argues that the pedophile symbolizes a popular representation of hate within today’s society. Simon (1998) suggests that “sex offenders are our modern-day monsters” (p. 456).

Furthermore, the stigma and characterization of these types of offenders as monstrous, demonic, or animalistic is not exclusive to western society, but exists in many cultures around the world (Mancini, & Mears, 2013; Marshall, 1996; Pickett, Spencer, 2009; Thomas, 2005). For example, according to Marshall (1996), people in Scotland commonly brand people who commit sexual offences as beasts. People regarded as 'sex offenders' are generally depicted as monstrous because of certain stereotypical assumptions about them found within public discourse. These assumptions include 1. that the individual committing the sexual offence is usually a stranger to the victim(s); 2. that they commit their offence because of inherent personal evil, deviant sexual desires, and are motivated by self-interests; 3. that most of these offenders cannot be rehabilitated (Pickett et al., 2013; Spencer, 2009). These assumptions about the stereotypical 'sex offender' perpetuate society's hostility toward those who commit sexual offences (Pickett et al., 2013). In addition, despite the variety in the behaviours that constitute sexual offences, anyone labeled a 'sex offender' is subjected to this stigma (Pickett et al., 2013; Spencer, 2009). It has been argued that there are no minor sexual offences (Pickett et al., 2013).

These metaphors, which are used to designate people who commit sexual offences as less-than-human characters -or monstrous-characters play several roles. First, they are a way for people in society to create an us and them dichotomy (Douard & Schultz, 2013; Thomas, 2005). In other words, the metaphors offer a way for us to differentiate ourselves from the people who commit such violent acts. Second, in using these metaphors we dehumanize these individuals in order to reject them as human beings, hence justifying the denial of their rights and freedoms through restrictive sanctions and

punishments (Douard & Schultz, 2013; Lynch & Kaplan, 2009; Spencer, 2009). Pickett et al. (2013) found that the public is generally accepting of governments implementing harsh punishments rather than rehabilitation for those who commit sexual offences, as well as repressive forms of surveillance and segregation upon their release from prison. In addition, research has found that individuals who are classified as ‘sex offenders’ are more harshly punished compared to most other types of offenders (Garland, 2008; Matravers, 2003; Pickett et al., 2013; Wilson & Prinzo, 2001). Subsequently, the question remains: how did those who commit sexual offences come to be defined as monstrous?

Douard and Schultz (2013) explain that monsters are a cultural product created within dominant political, religious, economic, and social discourses. The first accounts of the human monster are typically found within Aristotle’s biological work, as well as in works written by his classical and medieval followers (Park & Daston, 1981). The second historical narrative of monsters was associated with biological anomalies such as abnormal births. This idea of the monster was understood as the “portents and punishments throughout history, [which are] both fascinating and frightening” representations of nature’s power to shape humans (Douard & Schultz, 2013, p. 3). Unlike the monstrous births, which exposed visible abnormalities on the newborn, the abnormality of the ‘sex offender’ is internal; it leaves no physical marking on the individual. Thus, the individual who commits sexual violence is demonized and hated due to his (or less often, her) invisibility, which provokes the uneasy feeling of not being able to see who is and who is not a sexual predator (Thomas, 2005).

Those who commit sexual offences are framed as monsters because there is a fear of their presumed violent nature. Reactions to sex offences are very emotional, and have

incited demonstrations of anger in communities; these demonstrations have been found to increase if the victim is a child (McGuickin & Brown, 2001; Thomas, 2005). Douard and Schultz (2013) explain that the aggressive and vicious nature of this wrongful act insinuates a lack of control over the individual's sexuality, as well as a lack of empathy for their victims. Accordingly, they are treated like creatures lacking the ability to empathize with the pain they cause others; this results in people labeled as 'sex offenders' being seen as inhuman and needing to be segregated from others. Contrary to the stereotypical 'sex offender' image of the dark figure lurking in the bush, persons who commit sexual harm represent a heterogeneous population (Douard & Schultz, 2013; Thomas, 2005; Williams-Taylor, 2012). Douard and Schultz (2013) explain that the image of the 'sex offender' represents a metaphorical monster because 'sex offenders' look like the rest of us but possess a dangerous internal quality.

These authors also draw a parallel between other metaphorical monsters, such as those depicted during the Salem witch trials of the seventeenth century and the 'sex offenders' of today (Douard & Schultz, 2013). In the seventeenth century in the small village of Salem, Massachusetts, a group of girls would habitually gather to listen to West Indian Negress Tituba tell stories of the supernatural (Detweiler, 1975). In the spring, a few of the girls began acting strangely; the doctors could not explain their behaviour, and concluded that the girls were suffering from the presence of evil spirits (Detweiler, 1975). As a result, these girls and others were accused of conducting witchcraft and the trials began (Detweiler, 1975; Douard & Schultz, 2013). The various individuals being accused were portrayed as dangerous monsters that lurked within the community (Douard & Schultz, 2013). The objective of witch-hunting was to discover the enemy who was

otherwise unrecognizable within the community: the monster among us (Douard & Schultz, 2013).

Similar to the witches of Salem, persons labeled as ‘sex offenders’ are otherwise undiscoverable prior to their accusation. Another similarity between the Salem witches and ‘sex offenders’ is that they both presented or currently present a danger to the vulnerable child (Douard & Schultz, 2013). Today, we see children as being vulnerable and in need of protection (Thomas, 2005), so any offences against them are deemed particularly vicious and violent. Even though the women accused of being witches were genuinely innocent, and people who commit sexual offences can be legally convicted for their wrongful behaviour, the portrayal of the metaphorical monster is similar in both the witches of the past and the ‘sex offenders’ of the present.

In addition, through past and current exclusionary practices Dale Spencer (2009) argues that people labeled as ‘sex offenders’ can be constituted using Giorgio Agamben’s concept of the *homo sacer*, (bare life) which is life that is “deemed impure, dirty or accursed” (p. 224). It is also “life without form and value, stripped of political and legal rights accorded to the normal citizen” (Spencer, 2009, p. 220). Once persons identified as ‘sex offenders’ have served their sentence of imprisonment they return to the community but Spencer argues that they are physically in the community but not *of* the community. This means that the *homo sacer* does not have the same rights, freedoms, and protections guaranteed to other citizens on the basis of their humanity. In this way, a process of othering occurs whereby the individual is seen as dangerous and inhuman even as a monster, and so society distances itself by constructing a dichotomy between the ‘sex offender’ and normal community members (Spencer, 2009).

'Sex Offenders' as Folk Devils

Society accepts retributive punishments as a way to relieve fears of the sex offender-based panic (Pickett et al., 2013) by making people categorized as 'sex offenders' scapegoats (Douard & Schultz, 2013). Although most perpetrators of sexual violence are family members or acquaintances of their victims, much of the panic around them stems from the common idea that they are predatory violent creatures who are lurking in the bushes waiting for a moment to snatch children and then brutally attack them (Hannem & Petrunik, 2004; Lancaster, 2011; Thomas, 2005). Stanley Cohen's (2004) concept of moral panic can provide an explanation for why people who commit sexual offences are increasingly viewed as monsters. According to Cohen (2004), a moral panic is "a condition, episode, person or group of persons [that] emerge[s] to become defined as a threat to societal values and interests; its nature is presented in a stylized and stereotypical fashion by the mass media" (p. 1). The characters associated with these moral panics are known as folk devils whose deviance is amplified along with the terror and fear that they cause.

Garland (2008) suggests that a panic is a "sudden and excessive feeling of alarm or fear, usually affecting a body of persons, and leading to extravagant or injudicious efforts to secure safety" (p. 10). One of the current moral panics taking place in our society targets 'sex offenders' as folk devils, as they are believed to be terrorizing innocent people, especially children (Harrison, 2010; Thomas, 2005; Williams-Taylor, 2012). Spencer (2009) suggests that the term 'sex offender' has been considered interchangeable and synonymous with the term pedophile. Asma (2009), as quoted in Douard and Schultz (2013), claims that an individual is "demonized...by people who

stand to benefit from the derogatory labeling. Monsters are ‘constructed’ and serve as scapegoats for expedient political agendas” (p. 52). The ‘tough on crime’ narrative drives Canada’s current political administration and public opinion supports the government when it proposes legislation that is more punitive toward those who commit sexual offences.

Garland (2008) argues that our current terror and fears of child sexual predators is associated with an “unconscious guilt about negligent parenting and widespread ambivalence about the sexualization of modern culture” (p. 15). During the 1960s there was a rise in divorce rates and a trend that saw women increasingly joining the workforce (Lancaster, 2011). This breakdown in the nuclear family resulted in a lack of supervision for children in the home (Lancaster, 2011). Lancaster (2011) contends that today the world is seen as a dark and scary place where constant adult supervision is necessary. Presently, childhood is conceptualized as a time of vulnerability in need of protection, although in the past children took on adult roles earlier in their lives.

The innocent child narrative ethically distinguishes the child from the adult, creating an idea that children live in a happy, magical, fantasy-like world, while the adult world is filled with hardship, danger, and strife (Giroux, 1998). Consequently, there is a need to protect the child from the harshness of the adult world. Giroux (1998) argues that the threat to childhood innocence lies not in the sexual predators imagined in our moral consciousness, but rather results from the practices of sexualization, commodification, and commercialization of children ingrained in our culture.

The Media and the Folk Devil from Within

The media is known to intensify the momentum and spread of current sex offender-based moral panics. The media vastly contributes to the othering of individuals who commit sexual offences, and results in them being constructed as folk devils within society (Hudson, 2005; Thomas, 2005). Various news reports and tabloids portray these individuals based on stereotypical images, and use vulgar and emotion-laden language in order to shock the public rather than educate them (Hudson, 2005; Thomas, 2005). Accordingly, people in society are fascinated by accounts of sexual crimes; to put it bluntly, sex sells (Dowler, 2006; Kemshall & Wood, 2007; Thomas, 2005).

Cohen (2004) reports that the mass media plays an influential role in maintaining and perpetuating moral panics. The media disproportionately and deceptively heightens the public's perception of the nature and extent of violent sexual criminalized harms (Hudson, 2005; Pickett et al., 2013; Williams-Taylor, 2012). It increasingly gives coverage to the most atypical or unusual stranger-perpetrated cases of sexual harm that make the offences seem more common (Hudson, 2005; Thomas, 2005). However, evidence suggests that the majority of victims know their perpetrator (Hudson, 2005; McGuickin & Brown, 2001; Thomas, 2005). Nonetheless, the media gives coverage to the stories that will sell papers and make headlines, which works because our society is both disturbed and fascinated by violence (Fowler, 1991).

Several academics agree that a disproportionate amount of the news media's attention and coverage is based upon criminalized sexual violence (Chadee & Ditton, 2005; Dowler, 2006; Soothill, 1991; Soothill, Walby, & Bagguley, 1990). Furthermore, literature suggests that the news media's coverage of sexual offences is highly

sensationalized (Comartin, Kernsmith, & Kernsmith, 2009; Dowler, 2006; Pickett et al., 2013). According to Banks (2005), the media creates an irrational fear in the viewer by portraying crime news in a highly dramatized way. Thus, this misconception misrepresents the threat of violent harm, avoiding discussion of the real sexual threats within society. Consequently, the mass media's distortion of reality impacts people's fear of violence (McGuickin & Brown, 2001; Williams-Taylor, 2012). Therefore, the public becomes irrational about the risk posed by the image of 'sex offenders,' while falling prey to negative media influence (Kemshall & Wood, 2007). The mass media's emotionally charged headlines about perpetrators of sexual violence extend the public's fear regarding the existence of sexual predators within their community. Since these offenders do not remain imprisoned for the rest of their lives (Williams-Taylor, 2012), these fears have led to communities violently demonstrating their apprehensiveness regarding the return of those who commit sexual offences following their sentences, and several cases of vigilantism have occurred (McGuickin & Brown, 2001; Spencer, 2009; Thomas, 2005).

Canada's Management of People Convicted of Sexual Offences

According to a research forum produced by the Correctional Service of Canada, the courts have been giving out lengthier sentences to people who commit sexual offences, thus prolonging the time leading to their return to the community (Williams, 1996). In Canada, typically, most offenders who are refused parole are then released under mandatory supervision after serving two-thirds of their sentence (statutory release) for the purpose of ensuring the monitoring of offenders after they re-enter the community (Hannem & Petrunik, 2004). However, in 1986 Bill C-67 (*An Act to amend the Parole*

Act and the Penitentiary Act) passed, which implemented an automatic day parole review, or a one sixth review, and new detention provisions (Corbeil, Faure, & Lemaire, 1991). While the automatic day parole review was already in practice legislators felt it was necessary for the National Parole Board to be legally required to review inmates' cases before their parole eligibility date in order for them to be identified sooner and released earlier (Corbeil et al., 1991). This was important because the latter half of the Act concerning the detention provisions sustained the over-population of prisons, which was already a problem (Corbeil et al., 1991). Prior to the Bill, inmates had a right to be released into their community under mandatory supervision; however detention was created because of the public's concern, and consequently abolished that right (Corbeil et al., 1991). The detention provision was established in order to "provide a legal basis for controlling the automatic release of potentially dangerous inmates" (Corbeil et al., 1991, p. 135). This legislation granted the National Parole Board the authority to deny both parole and statutory release of certain offenders they deemed to pose a high enough risk; such offenders were not let out until the final date of their sentence (Corbeil et al., 1991; Hannem & Petrunik, 2004; Hannem & Petrunik, 2007). This change in legislation resulted in an inadvertent hole within the carceral system: now individuals labeled high-risk 'sex offenders' were being released into their communities without any resources, services, or (most importantly) supervision (Hannem, 2011; Hannem & Petrunik, 2004).

In 1988, Joseph Fredericks, who was labeled a serial predator and ex-psychiatric patient, killed an eleven-year-old boy named Christopher Stephenson (Hannem & Petrunik, 2004; Hannem & Petrunik, 2007). Fredericks was on mandatory supervision at the time of the violent offence; however, his parole supervisors were unaware that he had

moved and that he had breached his condition of not being in contact with children (Hannem & Petrunik, 2004). In the early 1990s, succeeding many high-profile child sexual assaults cases, several states implemented sex offender registries, including Washington's Community Protection Act and New Jersey's Megan's Law (Hannem & Petrunik, 2004; McGuickin & Brown, 2001; Simon, 1998; Thomas, 2005; Williams-Taylor, 2012). Following the Christopher Stephenson tragedy, Canada followed the United States by implementing the first sex offender registry in Ontario (Hannem & Petrunik, 2004; Hannem & Petrunik, 2007). Christopher's Law came into effect in 2001 (Hannem & Petrunik, 2004; Hannem & Petrunik, 2007).

In 1992, Bill C-36 (*An Act to Amend the Criminal Code: Serious Time for the Most Serious Crime Act*) was passed, which restricted anyone labeled as a high-risk sexual and violent offender from being eligible for early parole and unescorted absences (Hannem & Petrunik, 2004; Hannem & Petrunik, 2007). The legislation also made it compulsory for the Correctional Service of Canada to provide police with an information package concerning any offender designated high-risk nearing his or her release date (Hannem & Petrunik, 2004; Hannem & Petrunik, 2007). Bill C-126 (*An Act to Amend the Criminal Code and the Young Offenders Act*) was subsequently passed in 1993, allowing judges to apply probation orders restricting this criminalized population from being in places frequented by children, including schools, parks, and shopping malls (Hannem & Petrunik, 2004; Hannem & Petrunik, 2007). Additionally, in 2003, the Canadian federal government enacted legislation that resulted in the creation of a national level sex offender registry (Hannem & Petrunik, 2007).

There is a general understanding that most people who commit sexual offences are eventually released back into the community following their sentence. The popular public fantasy that society should ‘lock them up and throw away the key’ only pertains to a small portion of the entire criminalized population in Canada. However, over the last decade more punitive, restrictive, and intrusive measures have been implemented by the state as a result of the recurring sex offender-based moral panics (Garland, 2008; Williams-Taylor, 2012). Consequently, upon their release these individuals have fewer options for assistance and are met with more apprehensiveness from community members when reintegrating back into society. As was discussed, individuals who are categorized as ‘sex offenders’ are constructed as folk devils and enemies within our society. This could be an important reason explaining the lack of resources available for this criminalized population. Nonetheless, the Circles of Support and Accountability-Ottawa program aims to fill this resource gap.

Current Conservative Agenda

The current Conservative government under the leadership of Steven Harper has positioned itself as punitive through a tough on crime approach since 2006 (Piché, 2015; Webster & Doob, 2015). Webster and Doob (2015) present a shift in how preceding federal administrations have managed the crime problem; first they explain that prior to 2006 the policy elite understood that crime was socially determined, and the offenders were seen as socially disadvantaged people in need of rehabilitation and reintegration. However, this belief changed following the rise of the Conservative government, which considers crime to be individually determined through the rational choices of the offenders. Therefore, the government’s sentencing objectives include deterrence,

denunciation, and incapacitation. Piché (2015) suggests that various punitive policies under the Conservative government continue to increase the number of imprisoned, criminalized people. Some of this government's strategies include: limiting the use of conditional sentences in the community, introducing more mandatory minimum sentences, and reducing the use of community supervision (Piché, 2015). Webster and Doob (2015) state that the Conservative exclusionary framework uses a moral justification to use more punitive sanctions to protect us the law-abiding citizens from them the dangerous 'sex offenders,' who are assumed to be incapable of change.

This agenda has attracted a lot of criticism, since statistics show that the crime rate has been on a decline for the past 20 years, including a drop in violent crimes (Mallea, 2010; Sullivan, 2014, October 9; Webster & Doob, 2015). Nonetheless the Conservatives continue to pursue this agenda using the ideology that longer and harsher prison sentences will lead to safer communities and less criminalized harm (Webster & Doob, 2015); however this ideology has been discredited by many academics (Mallea, 2011). Though many scholars have disagreed with this solution, the tough on crime policy is highly attractive to voters even though it costs taxpayers billions of dollars (Bronskill, 2013, October 18; Mallea, 2010; Sullivan, 2014, October 9).

Language plays an important role in the way policies are framed by the Conservative government to produce fear in the public (Bronskill, 2013, October 18; Mallea, 2010). For example, Bill-C-26, the *Tougher Penalties for Child Predators Act* was tabled in February 2014; if passed, it will create a mandatory minimum sentence for persons who commit sexually violent acts against children, and will increase their maximum term of imprisonment (Webster & Doob, 2015). The title alone highlights

sensationalized notions about the people who will be targeted by this Bill. The Bill includes policies that increase mandatory minimum and maximum penalties, eliminate judicial discretion by mandating sentences to be served consecutively, and launch a publicly accessible offender database (Bill C-26, 2013-2014; Spratt, 2014, February 27). According to Mallea (2010), the Conservative crime agenda has been costing billions and is more likely to produce less public safety rather than more. In addition, various community programs and agencies that serve to prevent criminalized harms cannot function properly because of present underfunding (Mallea, 2010).

CoSA's Funding Crisis

CoSA has recently received media attention due to federal funding cuts to its program. This has led to a financial crisis for various CoSA affiliates around the country, including CoSA-Ottawa. CoSA-Ottawa is in dire need of long-term funding because their funding from the Correctional Service of Canada expired at the end of March 2015 (McCracken, 2014, September 25). Another source of funding that has also recently expired came from Public Safety Canada's National Crime Prevention Centre, while they researched the effectiveness of CoSA (McCracken, 2014, September 25). Their results demonstrated that CoSA presents a successful and cost effective program for reducing recidivism and victimization (Harris, 2015, March 2; McCracken, 2014, September 25; Sullivan, 2015, March 4). Nonetheless, the Public Safety research project was completed and their funding for CoSA was terminated.

Sullivan (2015, March 4) has advised that if CoSA loses its funding, the program may be forced to shut down, stating, "private fundraising is a dead end (imagine trying to get people to open their wallets for sex offenders)." Susan Love, program coordinator of

CoSA-Ottawa, comments that since there is widespread stigma against those who commit sexual offences, federal funding (though minimal) gave the program credibility, which helped them leverage funding from other sources (Harris, 2015, March 2).

The funds from both CSC and NCPC have allowed CoSA sites to operate at capacity – including: renting office space and hiring at least one full time and one part time staff who oversee Circle operations effectively and safely, conduct volunteer training, and most importantly, maximize the number of ‘core members’ we work with (CoSA-Ottawa, 2012).

Fortunately, following vigorous advocacy efforts and campaigns from CoSA sites and supporters, the Correctional Service of Canada has reversed their decision and has now drafted a renewal contract for providing financial support to CoSA (CoSA-Ottawa, 2012). However, the funding from the National Crime Prevention Centre’s five-year research project provided 80% of CoSA-Ottawa’s backing and will not continue since the project has been completed (CoSA-Ottawa, 2012). As a result, CoSA-Ottawa remains in need of financial support.

Established Research on CoSA

Circles of Support and Accountability (CoSA) is a fairly recent initiative, which has been in practice for less than twenty-five years. This research examines the experiences of volunteers, whereas other studies like those conducted by Wilson, Picheca, and Prinzo (2007), and Wilson and Prinzo (2001) have evaluated whether CoSA was an effective program for reducing recidivism of people who had committed sexual offences. In addition to these Canada-based studies, some academics in other countries have evaluated other similar pilot projects that were developed based on the Canadian model (Bates, Macrae, Williams, & Webb, 2012; Duwe, 2012; Fox, 2014). Similar to my objectives, there have been some previous studies that have included or solely focused on the volunteers of Circles of Support and Accountability (Cesaroni, 2001; Drewery, 2008;

Fox, 2014; Murphy, Fedoroff, & Gray, 2010; Wilson, Picheca, & Prinzo, 2007).

Summarizing these previous studies allows me to ground my work in the current literature on CoSA.

Evaluation of CoSA's Effectiveness

Wilson, Picheca, and Prinzo (2007) measured the effectiveness of the program based off of narratives provided by all of the stakeholders of CoSA. By contrast, Wilson and Prinzo's (2001) study focused specifically on the effectiveness of CoSA, which was determined by whether there was a reduction in offenders' recidivism rates. Bates, Macrae, Williams, and Webb's (2012) study examined how the United Kingdom's Hampshire and Thames Valley Circles have met the needs of their core members, as well as how this program has influenced the reduction of their core members' risk to reoffend. Conversely, the current study analyzes the experiences of volunteers in CoSA, and their perceptions of how their notions of 'sex offenders' are shaped throughout their involvement. There is a limited foundation of data that centers on the volunteers within CoSA. Most of the studies to date have examined the impacts of CoSA on the 'sex offenders,' the core members. This research will contribute to filling the gap present in the literature on CoSA's volunteers.

Wilson and Prinzo (2001) conducted a study looking at the recidivism rates of 30 federally sentenced men classified as 'sex offenders.' Society in general has a hardened view of this criminalized population, particularly when they reoffend. Wilson and Prinzo used several actuarial tools, including the RRASOR, SORAG, and STATIC-99 in order to assess projected and actual rates of recidivism among the individuals who participated in CoSA. Based on their study's results, involvement in CoSA had an impact on the sample's positive reentry into society. From these findings, they concluded that the

program was successful.

In addition to their major findings, Wilson and Prinzo (2001) argued that the community must take a greater stake in ensuring its own safety. Involvement in CoSA allowed community members to have an influential role in the risk management of recently released individuals labeled as ‘sex offenders.’ This program allowed for community members to become educated, aware, and to have a role in maintaining the safety of their community. They believed that education could lead to a more secure society, claiming, “an informed community is a safer community” (p. 15). Wilson and Prinzo also argued that the CoSA program is a good way to introduce and involve the community in their own risk management, with the overall goal of increasing public safety.

Bates, Macrae, Williams, and Webb (2012) conducted a study on the United Kingdom’s Hampshire and Thames Valley’s CoSA. CoSA was first introduced in the United Kingdom in 2002 after the United Kingdom Home Office agreed to fund several CoSA pilot projects, all which have been based on the Canadian CoSA model. Unlike the Canadian model, the Hampshire and Thames Valley’s CoSA program was created using a top-down approach, whereby the government explicitly created and controlled its implementation. Bates, Saunders, and Wilson (2007) conducted the original follow-up study of the Thames Valley CoSA pilot project, and Bates et al.’s (2012) study was developed based upon the previous study. The previous study used the first 16 circles that were set up in the Thames Valley in order to examine rates of sexual reconviction, recall to prison and parole, and evidence of other problematic behaviours. The authors concluded that although over half of the sampled core members demonstrated

problematic behaviours or returned to custody, the program was successful because of several other positive outcomes (Bates et al., 2012).

Bates et al.'s (2012) follow-up study examined in more detail how the first sixty circles met the needs of the core members involved over an eight-year period, and evaluated how the circles contributed to the reduction of recidivism rates. The researchers reviewed the core members' case files in order to identify demographic, outcome information, and the criminogenic factors specific to each core member, which were addressed through the circles. Some of their findings suggested that for 70% of the total number of circles, the core members' emotional well-being had improved. Evidence showed that over half of the core members had presented pro-social attitudes and behaviours, such as being involved in treatment programs, seeking employment or education. In addition, almost half of the core members had developed age appropriate relationships, and had also improved their connections with their families. Overall, Bates et al. found that three-quarters of the circles examined had favorable outcomes, meeting some or all of their goals. Based on their study, they concluded that the core members involved in the Hampshire and Thames Valley CoSA demonstrated positive progress.

Similar to the United Kingdom's pilot project, in 2008 the Minnesota Department of Corrections developed a Minnesota CoSA pilot project, also based on the Canadian CoSA model (Duwe, 2012). Likewise, Minnesota's CoSA also differed from the Canadian model because it was created and implemented through governmental means and process. As well, their volunteers were predominantly students (Duwe, 2012). Thus, CoSA's inception and recruitment efforts in Minnesota were more systematic (Duwe, 2012). In addition, the Minnesota CoSA project admitted only Level 2 persons classified

as ‘sex offenders’ into their program. Level 2 offenders displayed a moderate public risk. As such, certain members within their community were to be notified about their release from prison, including their victims, witnesses to the crime, law enforcement agencies, anyone identified by the prosecutor, schools, daycare centers, and other places where potential victims of the offender could be found (Duwe, 2012).

Duwe (2012) used a randomized experimental design to evaluate whether the program had reduced recidivism rates by looking at the outcomes of 62 participants randomly assigned to a circle or a control group. In addition, his study examined whether the Minnesota CoSA was cost-effective for the state through a cost-benefit analysis. The outcomes of Duwe’s study revealed that Minnesota’s program is one of the most cost-effective programs for adult offenders. Moreover, even with his small sample size (total $N = 62$; CoSA = 31 & control group = 31) the results from a Cox regression model suggested that CoSA significantly reduced three out of the five recidivism measures examined. These outcomes have been similar to the findings reported by the Canadian studies. Thus, Duwe was able to demonstrate the effectiveness of CoSA’s program in Minnesota. He further argued that based on his study, CoSA can be adapted for the diverse needs of the United States.

Impacts of Circle Programs

Wilson, Picheca, and Prinzo (2007) conducted a study on the South-Central Ontario pilot project formally known as the Community Reintegration Program, (now known as CoSA). They surveyed the stakeholders of the program as well as the community in order to examine how the program had impacted each of them. The stakeholders within the Community Reintegration Program included participants labeled as ‘sex offenders,’ community volunteers, affiliated professionals, and members from the general

community. Results from their surveys indicated that 83% of individuals labeled as ‘sex offenders’ became involved with CoSA due to the fact that they did not have any other forms of social support. Additionally, over half of them revealed that they were motivated to join CoSA because of the community’s overwhelmingly negative reaction to their release. Wilson et al. found that almost all of the individuals who were identified as ‘sex offenders’ and participated in this study felt gratitude, anxiety, or relief that help was available to them.

Similar to the current study, Wilson et al. (2007) surveyed a sample of community volunteers involved with CoSA. They asked the circle volunteers why they became volunteers, and their initial and current thoughts on being involved in the program. Over half of the volunteers were made aware of CoSA through family, friends, or from other people participating in the program. Almost all of the volunteers reported that they felt the circle was at least moderately helpful to the core members. In addition to these findings, some of the volunteers stated they assumed that the presence of CoSA would lead to a community’s increased sense of safety, and furthermore, that communities would be less fearful about these criminalized individuals’ risk to reoffend. Wilson et al.’s study examined volunteers’ experiences at a more surface level, since their goal was to examine all stakeholders. However, the present research goes more in-depth to look at the personal experiences and exclusive perspectives of the volunteers involved with CoSA-Ottawa.

The CoSA community volunteers interviewed for the study above represented a small portion of the general community. Therefore, Wilson et al. (2007) gave surveys to 77 random members of the community in order to gather the opinions of the general

public. Overall, the results of the surveys indicated a positive reaction to the implementation of CoSA. Knowing that the pilot project existed in their area, over half of the respondents reported that they were pleased that those who committed sexual violence were receiving extra support, and were relieved that these offenders were getting help. Since this project aimed to help persons who were labeled as ‘sex offenders’ and generally negatively viewed by society, there were some negative reactions to the implementation of the CoSA pilot project. As such, 14% of the respondents in the community relayed that they were skeptical that the program would reduce criminalized offences. In addition, a few community members conveyed “negative feelings, such as anger, that these offenders were getting extra support (8%) and irritation that people would want to help these offenders (3%)” (p. 12).

Similar to Wilson and Prinzo’s study (2001), Wilson et al. (2007) argued that empowering communities encourages their involvement in effective risk management of released individuals deemed as ‘sex offenders.’ The outcomes of their study indicated that as a result of involvement with CoSA, community volunteers perceived an increase in their public safety (Wilson et al., 2007). Wilson et al. (2007) noted that “the former Commissioner of the Correctional Service of Canada frequently spoke of her wish to see ‘Circles’ in place for all or most offenders coming out of federal institutions” (p. 12-13). Wilson et al. (2007) concluded that CoSA is an excellent example of how the community can take initiative in managing its own risk. Finally, they state that their hope is to have “the community learn that risk management is something within their grasp” (Wilson et al., 2007, p. 14). Their research provides an extensive look at how each stakeholder involved in CoSA perceives the program. Conversely, the purpose of the current study is

to focus primarily on the volunteers who are involved in CoSA-Ottawa.

Murphy, Fedoroff, and Gray (2010) recently conducted a study on Ottawa's CoSA program. Their results have yet to be published; however the authors have provided me with their poster presentation, which summarizes their research. Murphy et al.'s study examined the effects CoSA had on the program's core members and volunteers. Their primary goal was to "measure the effect of participation in CoSA on self-reported psychological well-being of CoSA members." Their secondary goal was to identify "components of the program that contribute to changes in well being, and identification of approaches to enhance the positive impact of the program" (Murphy et al., 2010). They used General Health Questionnaires as an outcome measure. It was given to 10 core members and 29 volunteers. Overall, their results indicated that the majority of core members and volunteers surveyed reported positive impacts regarding their involvement with CoSA-Ottawa; specifically, they felt that their experiences were fulfilling and led to feelings of belonging and self-worth.

One short article by Drewery (2008) presented an overview of David Wilson's research on CoSA. His research described the viewpoints of volunteers. Wilson took a similar approach to this current study's objectives; he, too, concentrated on the volunteers within CoSA, exploring their motivations and presenting some quotes from his participants. Some of the themes presented in Drewery's article showed that volunteers are motivated to work with this highly criminalized population in order to give back to the community; because they see all people as valuable individuals; and to challenge their core member's attitudes and behaviour with the goal of making the community safer. Others have mentioned the impact which being a part of a circle has had on them. One

particular individual, who disclosed that she was a victim of sexual abuse in her past, found it as a form of healing and came to understand that people who commit sexual offences are human, as well as acknowledging that being a part of the circle may have reduced the core member's risk to reoffend. As she states, "to me, as a survivor, that is the greatest reward I can imagine—that other little girls are spared" (p. 19).

Experiences of Core Members and Volunteers

Research conducted by Cesaroni (2001) explored the experiences of both core members and volunteers involved in the Mennonite Central Committee's Community Reintegration Project, the original form of CoSA. She used open-ended surveys to understand how core members felt about reintegrating into the community following their term of imprisonment, and how their involvement with circles impacted this process. In addition, Cesaroni interviewed volunteers in order to explore their general perceptions of the process, and their perceptions of 'sex offenders.' Parts of Cesaroni's study reflect aspects of the current study, as both studies look at general perceptions and experiences of CoSA volunteers.

After exploring her data, Cesaroni (2001) found that most core members joined the Community Reintegration Project as a form of self-protection. Some of the core members reported that they were motivated to join the program because they needed a sanctuary from the media and anticipated police harassment. Other core members reportedly joined due to the fact that they had no other forms of social support, or because they saw the program as a last resort for help. In addition, they also reported their feelings about the impact of circles on their process of returning to the community. Over half of the core members sampled admitted that circles prevented them from re-offending, and a few of them divulged that they would have returned to drugs, alcohol, or other criminal

behaviour had the program not existed. Also, the majority of respondents felt that the Community Reintegration Project assisted them with practical matters, with emotional issues, or both.

The Mennonite Central Committee designed the Community Reintegration Project as a faith-based initiative, in keeping with the underlying Judeo-Christian theological belief “in compassion and forgiveness where harsh judgment might otherwise rule” (Strange, 1996 as cited in Cesaroni, 2001, p. 91). Accordingly, most of the volunteers of the Community Reintegration Project had reported to have some tie to the faith community; some of the volunteers were chaplains, ministers, reverends, or deacons. However, not all of the volunteers represented were part of the faith-based community (Cesaroni, 2001).

Cesaroni (2001) found that about half of the volunteers reported that prior to their involvement in the program, they had felt empathy and understanding about the challenges faced by people who are labeled as ‘sex offenders,’ whereas some volunteers (35.6%) disclosed that they had negative feelings or were fearful of this population. Within her volunteer sample, the most surprising outcome for Cesaroni was the overlap between volunteers and victims. However, although victims were represented within the volunteer group, the program was not intended to act as a reciprocal healing initiative. Nonetheless, the “presence of victims ke[pt] the Circle attune[d] to accountability issues” (p. 93). Other findings suggested that circle volunteers felt that the program allowed for core members to contribute to the community, and that it broke down fears and helped educate the community. However, some of the volunteers believed that the Community Reintegration Project did not impact the community because the community at large

remained unaware of its existence. Nevertheless, most of the volunteers felt that the program was able to help the core members with practical matters, emotional issues, or both, which is similar to the reports of the volunteers in this study. Cesaroni's study of the Community Reintegration Program helps to establish preliminary research examining the experiences of both core members and the volunteers within circles.

New Zealand is another country that has adopted the Canadian CoSA approach in order to deal with people classified as 'sex offenders' that are released into the community. A study conducted by Fox (2014) explored the issues related to the reintegration process of this criminalized population in New Zealand. She conducted open-ended semi-structured interviews with various parties involved in the reintegration process. Her sample included various correctional staff, prisoners including recently released offenders (some of whom were involved with CoSA), volunteers, and restorative justice providers. Correctional officials have acknowledged the challenges that recently released offenders experience, mainly due to the lack of available support. Fox argues that individuals who are categorized as 'sex offenders' lack social ties to supportive people, and thus CoSA fills that gap in these offenders' lives by providing them with a network of unprejudiced support.

Some of Fox's (2014) findings indicated that New Zealand's CoSA program differs from the Canadian model in that it allows for volunteers to become more immersed in the core members' lives. For example, she found that some of the volunteers let the core members live with them for a period of time in order to provide them with the feeling of belonging to a family. Other findings suggested that the relationships between volunteers and core members are comparable across different contexts. The relationship between the

two parties is founded on trust and honesty; one of the volunteers in Fox's study tells her what he says to his core member:

I will respect you for who you are, for all your past and all you've done. In different ways I could be over that side of the fence just as much as you. But I am not going to stand for any falsehood. We gotta be totally honest with each other. And we'll build that relationship . . . but I am not gonna judge you for the past (p. 249).

Contribution to the Literature

This study can make considerable contributions to the literature. In general, there is an overall deficiency of studies conducted on volunteers who are involved in community programs involving criminalized populations. More specifically, there is a lack of research on how the volunteers perceive and experience their work with those who are deemed 'sex offenders.' Höing, Bogaerts, and Vogelvang (2014) believe that "research on the effects of volunteering in CoSA is still scarce [and] small scale" (p. 12). In order to understand the background of CoSA-Ottawa I have drawn on information developed through various studies on CoSA and on other CoSA-based programs.

Since there is limited research on this topic, the current study will contribute to expanding the understanding of CoSA and its volunteers. In addition, the current study takes a different approach from previous research on the topic. As mentioned, most of the previous studies evaluated CoSA in terms of its effects on the core members. These studies primarily used quantitative methods; however, of the studies that used qualitative methods, very few of them highlighted the importance of the impacts on volunteers. The current study uses semi-structured interviews with participating volunteers to explore various topics related to criminalized sexual harm and to their core members in order to answer the major research question: *How do volunteers experience working with people labeled as 'sex offenders' through CoSA-Ottawa?*

Furthermore, this study has generated original data through interview sessions conducted with several volunteer participants. This original data will contribute to the production of new knowledge on this topic. Other questions that the current study answers include:

1. *How do volunteers describe the subjective components associated with working with people deemed 'sex offenders?'*
2. *How do volunteers describe their relationships and roles with their core members?*
3. *What are some of the perceived obstacles and limitations that volunteers experience working with persons identified as 'sex offenders' through CoSA-Ottawa?*
4. *What is the subjective relevance assigned by volunteers to changes in their perceptions of this population?*
5. *How are concepts of power and governmentality manifested through participants' narratives?*

Contrary to other studies, the current research takes a critical perspective of CoSA-Ottawa. In doing so it investigates the implications of CoSA-Ottawa's connection to the state. I use a power and governmentality conceptual framework in order to critically analyze the subjective experiences of CoSA-Ottawa's volunteers. I interpret how the dynamics of power and governmentality are manifested within the lived experiences of the participants.

Very few studies to date have examined the volunteers within CoSA's Ottawa chapter. Ottawa is the capital of Canada, and the place where policies and procedures related to sex offending are discussed and turned into legislation. The context in which CoSA takes place could have possible implications for the kinds of narratives described

by the volunteers. In addition, this is a Canada-based study and most of the newer studies being published on CoSA examine circle programs developing around the world.

Therefore, this study is relevant for expanding Canada-based research.

Furthermore, my study not only focuses on the effects of volunteers rather than the core members, but I also use interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA) in order to analyze the interview transcripts. IPA is a method that emphasizes an in-depth understanding of the lived experiences of the participants. This method is underutilized within the field of criminology and this study demonstrates how this analytical technique is accessible to researchers while producing new knowledge on the volunteers of CoSA-Ottawa.

CHAPTER 2: CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

My study provides an exploration of CoSA-Ottawa's volunteers' experiences working with those who are branded as 'sex offenders' from a power and governmentality standpoint. In this chapter, the prominent works of Michel Foucault and others' ideas examining power and governmentality are used in order to create a relevant framework for critically examining the subjective experiences of CoSA-Ottawa volunteers in the context of working with their core members. Foucault's work and concepts are used in this study because his theories directly relate to the concepts that will be explored throughout this research. In this light, the current study aims to contribute valuable knowledge by demonstrating how concepts of power and governmentality are embedded within CoSA-Ottawa's volunteers' subjective experiences.

Power as Relational

Foucault says, "the problem of power is complicated" (1989, p. 185). It is complex because power is not a tangible thing, its existence is not always obvious (Barker, 1998), and the meaning of power varies from place to place and in different times. For example, under the theory of sovereignty, power is understood as a thing to be held and possessed by a monarchy (Foucault, 1980). However, as will be further explained, Foucault's (1980) understanding of power is more abstract; it does not have ownership but rather circulates through action. For the purpose of grounding this study, I borrowed mainly from Foucault's (1980, 1989, 1997) conceptions of power, while using other sources to further develop his ideas (Burchell Gordon, & Miller, 1991; Dean, 2013; Newburn, 2007; Powell, 2013; Rose, 1996). Foucault (1980, 1989) recognizes power as

being interpersonal, meaning that it exists through and within relationships. These relationships are known to exist between individuals, groups, or within oneself. Foucault (1980) suggests that we consider questions such as how is power exercised; what does it consist of; and what mechanisms does it use? Understanding Foucault's concept of power is important for this study because it provides the groundwork for his later focus on the analysis of government and governmentality (Powell, 2013), which will be subsequently explained.

Newburn (2007) suggests that power relations have the ability to order, manage, facilitate, constrain, and oppress individuals or groups. Using Foucault's ideas, power is theorized as relational, which makes it relevant to the examination of power dynamics existing between the CoSA volunteers and their designated core members. This research focuses on the microphysics of power, that is the interaction of power and power relations within dividing practices and tactics in various contexts (Powell, 2013). For example, power dynamics exist between a doctor and a patient, a prison guard and a prisoner, and a teacher and a student (Powell, 2013). Using these examples, power dynamics can be applied to the relationship between the volunteer and the core member in CoSA circles.

Traditionally, power has been understood through a more restrictive lens, in terms of prompting violence and domination (Feder, 2011; Taylor, C., 2011). Conversely, Foucault (1999) contends that power is not repressive but productive. Foucauldian power "is employed and exercised through net-like organizations" (Foucault, 1980, p. 98) including cultures, institutions, and individuals (Feder, 2011). Power is not seen as being either positive or negative, but rather creative (Feder, 2011; McGushin, 2011; O'Malley,

2009). Foucault suggests that modern power takes on two forms in which one form can be termed biopower, a technology for managing populations, and the other form disciplinary power, a technology for managing individuals. These forms of power can be contrasted with pre-modern power, also known as sovereign power, which signified the sovereign ruler having absolute control of his territory and his people (Foucault, 1980; Taylor, C., 2011). Classical sovereign power theories asserted that the sovereign had the ability to take life or let live (Taylor, C., 2011). Death was the ultimate expression of sovereign power; in contrast, modern power, including disciplinary power and biopower, are focused on controlling the living (Taylor, C., 2011). Simply stated, modern forms of power are a set of actions upon other actions (Dean, 2013). Hence, to be living is to simultaneously exercise power while also being subjected to it (O'Malley, 2009). Foucault (1980) further states, "the individual which power has constituted is at the same time its vehicle" (p. 98).

Gordon cites Foucault's essay *The Subject and Power* (1982) where he interprets Foucault's conception thus:

Power is only power (rather than physical force or violence) when addressed to individuals who are free to act in one way or another. Power is defined as actions on others actions: that is presupposes rather than annuls their capacity as agents; it acts upon, and through, an open set of practical and ethical possibilities. Hence, although power is an omnipresent dimension in human relations, power in society is never a fixed and closed regime, but rather an endless and open strategic game (Burchell, Gordon, & Miller, 1991, p. 5).

Here Gordon explains that power is only understood as such when in any given situation an individual is not bound by tangible or intangible constraints. Subjects must be free in order to allow for the existence of the exercise of power (May, 2011; Murray Li, 2007).

As Foucault suggests, the individual must have agency, meaning that the individual must

assume responsibility for his or her own thoughts, behaviours, and actions. Accordingly, the individual will have various possibilities in his or her own actions. In any given situation, the individual can decide to react in various ways, and as a result of the individual's actions, the situation is transformed, along with the relationship. Power is not a dominating or violent force but one that guides actions. It is intrinsic in our daily lives and helps shape us into docile beings (May, 2011). Lastly, Foucault believes that power is not permanent, but shifts between different relations through diverse interactions. He rejects the idea that any particular group or class holds a monopoly on power (Powell, 2013); rather, individuals are assigned different positions in society, which give them specific capacities or limitations in the exercise of power (Feder, 2011). Foucault believes that power circulates through social networks and is subsequently exercised through the relationships and interactions between free individuals (May, 2011; Powell, 2013).

Based on my understanding of power, I have created a simple example of an interaction between a teacher and a student to further clarify this concept. A teacher in a classroom tells a student who is being noisy and running around the classroom to sit down and be quiet. Yes, the teacher has the authority over the student because of her role; however, she does not hold power over the student. Additionally, the teacher will not use domination or violence in order to control her student. Both the teacher and the student in this interaction will exercise power through their subsequent behaviour. The student is not bound by any restraints; as well, he has the control of his own thoughts, behaviours, and actions. Hence, he has the agency and the free choice of several possible reactions to this specific situation. A sample of possible reactions to this situation include the following: the student can choose to obey the teacher's command, stop running and sit

down quietly and as a result, the teacher will be pleased, or he can reject her rule and continue running around the classroom while being noisy, and then the teacher may be angry. The student may then obey part of her order by sitting down but continuing to be noisy, so the teacher may be slightly less pleased, or he can choose to punch another student in the arm, and so the teacher may become very angry. All of these possible choices will elicit different responses from the teacher, thus the relationship between the teacher and the student will be transformed depending on which possible action the student chooses, as well as how the teacher chooses to respond to the student's behaviour. Likewise, every subsequent interaction will produce various further possibilities for actions between both the teacher and the student.

This idea of power is important for my study because both CoSA volunteers and core members enter into a relationship freely. It is important to note that the organizational structure of CoSA-Ottawa already creates an unequal dynamic between the volunteers and the core members. This suggests that they are already designated certain roles; yet as the preceding example explained, the roles of the individuals do not fully determine how power is exercised because one individual does not hold a power over the other. Nonetheless, power between both the volunteer and the core member will be actualized within their various experiences working with one another.

Power as Guiding Behaviour

Foucault presents the exercise of power as a “conduct of conduct” and as “the management of possibilities” (Dean, 2013; Murray Li, 2007; Newburn, 2007; Rose, 1996). It is a form of activity that aims to shape, guide, or affect the behaviour of an individual or group of individuals (Burchell et al., 1991). Dean (2013) further explores

this notion by breaking down the word conduct, as it holds a double meaning. In one sense, conduct means to lead, while in another sense it refers to an individual's behaviour (Dean, 2013). From there he concludes that the exercise of power constitutes a way to lead or control behaviour (Dean, 2013). Although the term control sounds restrictive and dominating, Foucault distinctly states that power is a game of freedom, meaning that power can only be exercised on free subjects as long as they are free. When Foucault uses the term free he means that these individuals or groups have the option to react to a situation with various types of behaviours (Dean, 2013). Furthermore, Foucault believes that freedom fundamentally relates to our capability to create ourselves within the parameters of a particular historical situation; thus, who we become changes with our practices within society (Barker, 1998; May, 2011). In this case, Foucault's understanding of freedom is historical and political rather than a metaphysical idea (May, 2011).

To further clarify Foucault's analysis of power, the following excerpt is taken from an interview transcript of Foucault talking with an interviewer. Here, Foucault explains how power is exercised between free individuals when the relationships of these individuals is unbalanced, and thus illustrates that power is dynamic:

What does it mean to exercise power? It does not mean picking up this tape recorder and throwing it on the ground. I have the capacity to do so...[b]ut I would not be exercising power if I did that. However, if I take this tape recorder and throw it on the ground-in order to make you mad or so that you can't repeat what I've said, or to put pressure on you so that you'll behave in such and such a way, or to intimidate you-Good, what I've done, by shaping your behaviour through certain means, that is power...[I]f...that is to say, I'm not forcing you at all and I'm leaving you completely free-that's when I begin to exercise power. It's clear that power should not be defined as a constraining act of violence that represses individuals, forcing them to do something or preventing them from doing some other thing. But it takes place when there is a relation

between two free subjects, and this relation is unbalanced, so that one can act upon the other, and the other is acted upon, or allows himself to be acted upon (Foucault, 1980g as cited in Taylor, D., 2011, p. 5).

Through his example with the interviewer, Foucault expresses, in more simple terms, that power exists within a relationship between free individuals. In doing so, Foucault differentiates between when power is exercised and when power ceases to exist.

From his explanation, we can understand that the act of throwing the tape recorder to the ground is not a form of power; however when there is an intention behind the act, which could be in order to produce a reaction or type of behaviour from the interviewer, power begins to exist within this specific instance and relationship. Thus, the interviewer can respond to Foucault's action in a number of ways. For example, the interviewer can get angry and stop the interview, remain calm and allow Foucault to finish the interview without the use of his tape recorder, etc. Dianna Taylor (2011) notes that the point of this example is to illustrate that even though the relationship between Foucault and the interviewer is not equal, the interviewer is free to respond in several possible ways, with the idea that his response could potentially influence Foucault's actions. She further explains that the interviewer does not exist under a state of domination where no response to Foucault's actions is possible (Taylor, D., 2011). This implies that the interviewer is a free individual with the capacity and ability to respond to Foucault's actions in several potential ways. Moreover, remaining aligned with the formulations of both O'Malley (2009) and Foucault (1982), power is assumed to be omnipresent, and exists universally throughout our lives. Since power is found everywhere, it is my goal to examine how power manifests within the narratives of CoSA-Ottawa's volunteers' experiences.

Disciplinary Power

Discipline is a type of power (Foucault, 1997). Its primary function is to control or guide the behaviour of individuals (Hoffman, 2011). Foucault (1997) explains that discipline “fixes, arrests, and regulates movements, clears confusion, [and] organizes individuals who may be wandering around in unpredictable ways” (p. 208). Discipline has been historically connected to the eighteenth century, when there were large demographic changes that resulted in increased transient populations (Foucault, 1997). Within these unstructured populations some individuals were identified as unproductive and were viewed as a political problem during the rise of the modern state (Powell, 2013). These unproductive people were divided into categories of the mad, the poor, and the delinquent (who consequently, were institutionalized in places like asylums, hospitals, prisons and schools) in order to be disciplined (Powell, 2013). Power was used to reorganize these populations.

Disciplinary power works through and on the bodies of individuals. It further constitutes individuals using specific techniques with an understanding that individuals represent both the objects and instruments of the exercise of power (Hoffman, 2011; O'Malley, 1992). Disciplinary power targets the body with the objective of making the body docile; Foucault (1979) suggests that the “more obedient as it becomes [the] more useful” the individual will be. This power does not exercise physical force, nor does it cause the body pain. Rather, it is subtle and uses less directly coercive techniques to control the behaviours of individuals. Less physically invasive techniques of discipline include supervision and surveillance, which may be performed through the confined spaces of prisons, asylums, and schools (Castel, 1991; Murray Li, 2007).

Disciplinary power is perpetuated through techniques of hierarchical observation, normalizing judgment, and examination (Heyes, 2011; Hoffman, 2011). Hierarchical observation is when a single gaze is used to make subjects constantly observable, constituting them as objects of knowledge (Heyes, 2011). Space and architecture play a pivotal role in exercising hierarchical observation because spaces are created in order to make individuals visible. The overall aim of visibility is to influence and structure the behaviour of the individuals under this watch, which is exemplified in Bentham's Panopticon. Creating spaces of visibility is necessary for observation, though this will not be continuous unless a hierarchical network is implemented allowing the knowledge produced through observation to come from the top and descend to the bottom (Hoffman, 2011). However, Foucault (1979) posits that the observational gaze may function in a multi-directional way:

Although surveillance rests on individuals, its functioning is that of a network of relations from top to bottom, but also to a certain extent, from bottom to top and laterally. The power in the hierarchized surveillance of the disciplines is not possessed as a thing, or transferred as a property; it functions like a piece of machinery (Foucault, 1977b, p. 176-177).

Foucault explains that powers of observation exist for those within positions of authority who are looking down upon their objects of knowledge, while those individuals have the ability to observe from below. As explained above, power is not a thing that can be kept or given away; it exists within the intent of our actions. Power is fluid and produced through every interaction.

Disciplinary power is also enacted through the technique of normalizing judgment, which is implemented through systems that have the ability to micromanage the behaviour within various areas of social life (Heyes, 2011). Hence, the systems create

experts in various fields that position people to have authority in determining normal versus abnormal behaviour. These authorities are often found within the institutions upon which Foucault focuses his attention. Within the prison, the guards invoke normalizing judgment; within hospitals, the psychiatrists and doctors constitute what is normal, and thus, what is abnormal (Barker, 1998). Furthermore, in this context, norms are used to split individual differences into normal and abnormal categories. Accordingly, Foucault (1979) suggests that norms establish what is constituted as normal, and this figure of the normal acts as a guiding force in coercing the figure of the abnormal. He further believes that the carceral network, with its various systems and institutions, is the greatest example in modern society of normalizing power (Heyes, 2011). Since normalizing judgment allows those within these institutions to measure all people based on a standard, of norms, then if an individual does not measure up they will be further controlled through disciplinary techniques.

The practice of the examination combines the technologies of hierarchical observation with normalizing judgment to produce a normalizing gaze, which is used in order to disseminate disciplinary power (Heyes, 2011; Hoffman, 2011). This gaze “manifests the subjection of those who are perceived as objects and the objectification of those who are subjected” (Foucault, 1977b, p. 184-185). Observation of these individuals allows authorities to gather knowledge about them, so the individual and their behaviour becomes a field of study. Disciplinary knowledge is produced through the exercise of disciplinary power (Hoffman, 2011). Disciplinary power first objectifies the individual through observation, and then the examination of these individuals converts them into subjects (Hoffman, 2011). These processes aim to gather personal information, such as

medical records, student records, and criminal records, in order to create a case file (Hoffman, 2011). This type of administrative writing describes the individual as an object of inquiry, writing about their progress, or lack thereof, as well as comparing them to the rest of the population (Hoffman, 2011). A consolidation of the various documents transforms the individual into a case who is no longer defined by personal characteristics but by general or categorized details.

Power and the Carceral System

Foucault considers Jeremy Bentham's design of the 'Panopticon' to represent the perfect expression of disciplinary power (Hoffman, 2011). Foucault discusses the Panopticon within his own works, including *Discipline and Punish* (1977) and *Security, Territory, Population—Lectures at the College de France* (1997-1998). In the eighteenth century, Bentham created the Panopticon, as an architectural design for the ideal prison (McKinlay & Starkey, 1998). The theory behind this structure was that the prisoners could not see the guards in their tower and therefore would never know when they were being watched. The Panopticon represents a mechanism for subjection, but also for self-subjection, because its structure caused prisoners to be aware of their constant visibility, compelling them to control their own behaviour (Hoffman, 2011). Therefore, the individual is both the object and subject of disciplinary power in the Panopticon; the prisoner is observed but also aware of his own behaviour (Feder, 2011). The overall goal of the prison design was to cause inmates to internalize the habit of self-surveillance.

Some believe that the Panopticon was designed with a "humane, efficient, punitive form of moral rehabilitation" in mind, compared to formally popular cruel forms of punishment (McKinlay & Starkey, 1998, p. 3). However, for Bentham, the idea of the

Panopticon was more than just a prison design; he claimed that it encompassed a set of principles that could establish practices in all forms of social governance, not just within the institution of the prison (McKinlay & Starkey, 1998). Several intellectuals, including Foucault, view the Panopticon equally as an architectural structure of a prison as well as an ideology, known as *panopticism* (Semple, 1993). For Foucault (1977), the Panopticon creates a technology of discipline through its control of the body and of space, assimilating both power and knowledge.

Foucault asserts that the power within institutions extends through the carceral continuum to people's homes and workplaces (McLaughlin et al., 2003). The carceral encompasses institutions of supervision or constraint that use discreet surveillance and insistent coercion in order to apply punishments according to quality and quantity (Foucault, 1977). Here, Foucault references two forms of discipline: first, the discipline exercised within a closed institution like a prison, located on the edge of society, where power is applied within the institution as a mechanism to correct behaviour (Barker, 1998). Foucault calls this form of discipline the discipline blockade, because it is applied within a closed environment and has direct influence on the bodies of the inmates (Barker, 1998). Second, Foucault refers to the disciplinary technology termed *panopticism*, which functions more broadly because it uses more discreet methods of surveillance and coercion throughout society (Barker, 1998; Castel, 1991). As Feder (2011) states, the objective of *panopticism* is for individuals to "internalize the gaze of authorities" (p. 58). It is the movement from discipline within the total institution to discipline through *panopticism* that leads to the establishment of a disciplinary society (Barker, 1998). It is important to explore the notions of disciplinary power and

technologies because they are closely reflected in the emergence of governmentality (Barker, 1998).

Biopower

Disciplinary power concentrates its control on the bodies of individuals through subtle coercive techniques. By contrast, biopower works on populations through broad systems of information control and management. It is a form of power that is exercised over individuals, as they are living beings within a population (Burchell et al., 1991).

Biopower is:

working to incite, reinforce, control, monitor, optimize, and organize the forces under it: a power bent on generating forces, making them grow, and ordering them rather than one dedicated to impeding them, making them submit, or destroying them (Foucault, 1990, p. 136).

Biopower is similar to disciplinary power because its purpose is to control, observe, and order apparatuses beneath it, but it differs in that biopower has a macro focus on broader systems in society. Nonetheless, individuals within society are affected by biopower because they internalize its norms and control their behaviour accordingly (Taylor, C., 2011). As discussed above, disciplinary power predominantly functions through institutions targeting the body of individuals, whereas biopower is exercised primarily through the state and assumes an internalization of its power (Garland, 1997; Taylor, C., 2011).

The association between science and government allowed for the discovery and recording of problems specific to populations through statistics (Foucault, 1977). These statistics enabled specific societal phenomena to be observed and quantified, such as the idea that populations had their own regularities through frequencies such as birth and death rates (Foucault, 1977; O'Malley, 2009), and rates of recidivism. Statistics

contribute to how people shape themselves and self-govern their conception of who they are in order to fit with the norm that is statistically produced (Garland, 1997). Through statistics we can classify people into various groups in order to manage them such as high-rate offenders (Garland, 1997).

Biopower is less directly relevant for this study because the focus of this research concentrates on individuals' accounts of their behaviour. Nonetheless, biopower is relevant for understanding the overall aims of CoSA-Ottawa as an organization that seeks to influence specific populations.

Power and Governance

Foucault's analysis of power not only offers insight into the relational aspect of the power, but also provides an understanding of government and governing (Powell, 2013). As discussed above, power is the conduct of conduct; it is exercised in order to lead and control the behaviour of individuals and groups, and is connected to the concepts of government and governing. Unlike discipline, which aims to reform individuals through supervision, governments intend to educate entire populations about their desires, goals, and beliefs (Murray Li, 2007). To govern individuals is to influence and align their actions and behaviours with a particular end by constraining and facilitating their potential of actions (Burchell, 1991).

The purpose of government is to ensure the "welfare of the population, the improvement of its condition, the increase of its wealth, longevity, [and] health" (Foucault, 1991, p. 100). The population is divided into subgroups such as gender and age, in order to target them for interventions (Murray Li, 2007). Improving the population requires governmental rationality or governmentality, which is a way of thinking that

conveys that the processes of government is the “right manner of disposing things” not to lead to the “common good [...] but to an end which is ‘convenient’ for each of the things that are to be governed” (Foucault, 1977, p. 95). This type of thinking together with the techniques forms the “institutions, procedures, analyses and reflections, the calculations and tactics” for which governmental interventions are developed and performed (Foucault, 1991, p. 102).

Foucault stresses that we should not understand government as a single source being called the state, but rather as a multiplicity of apparatuses that influence our lives (Hunt & Wickhman, 1994; Murray Li, 2007; O’Malley, Weir, & Shearing, 1997). His work recognizes government as a decentralized practice (O’Malley, 2009; O’Malley et al., 1997). For Foucault (1982) the application of government does not remain as a fixed state but is an active and changing practice. These authorities aim to lead and guide the behaviour of individuals in order to control the outcomes. Some of the authorities that are influential in governance include the family, the church, the school, the prison, and the state (Newburn, 2007).

Foucault (1977-1978) in his *Security, Territory and Population* course summary defines government as an “activity that undertakes to conduct individuals throughout their lives by placing them under authority of a guide responsible for what they do and for what happens to them” (p. 471). Furthermore, it concerns the action of “structur[ing] the possible field of action of others” (Foucault, 1982, p. 790). For him, government does not only refer to the state’s apparatus, but also to the mechanisms used by various authorities to control the behaviour of others. These authorities use knowledge and social practices to shape individuals’ behaviours (Burchell et al., 1991; Newburn, 2007).

Various authors have suggested that analyzing governmentality will answer the following questions: who can govern, what is government, and who or what can be governed? (Burchell et al., 1991; O'Malley et al., 1997; Murray Li, 2007; Rose & Miller, 1990; Rose et al., 2009). These questions require a different analytical lens than ones based on examining the sociological and historical basis of governmentality (O'Malley, 2009; O'Malley et al., 1997). Nevertheless, the historical and sociological examination of governmentality aims to develop a genealogy of the rationalities of this practice (O'Malley et al., 1997). Thus, it is necessary to explore some of these historical rationalities, including neoliberalism.

Neoliberalism and Governance

Neoliberalism is an ideology of government that relates to how subjects govern and are governed. The term neoliberalism suggests that it is a restoration of classical liberalism (O'Malley, 2009; Thorsen & Lie, 2006). Liberalism was founded on the principles of freedom and democracy (Thorsen & Lie, 2006.). According to Rose et al. (2009) there is a need for human behaviour to be controlled in the interest of both society and the state. However, under classical liberalism, it is understood that the state should have a minimal role in regulating its citizens. Still, a belief exists that it is necessary for the state to have control over certain matters like the military and law enforcement (Garland, 1997; Thorsen & Lie, 2006). Therefore, under the liberal ideology it is believed that citizens within society should be ordered through the rule of law and democratic governance (Plant, 2010; Thorsen & Lie, 2006).

The belief underlying neoliberal government recognizes that citizens are responsible for governing themselves (O'Malley, 2009). This philosophy emphasizes the

government of the self by the self in order to develop a society in which members are self-regulating (Powell, 2013). O'Malley (1996) claims that neoliberal social policies promote what he calls *prudentialism*, which is when individuals and organizations that are separate from the state become responsible for themselves and self-sufficient, and can protect themselves and others (Garland, 1997; Newburn, 2007). The subjectivities of citizens are flexible, dynamic, and reflexive, while persons labeled as 'sex offenders' are not constituted the same way (Spencer, 2009). Their generated subjectivity is rigid, static, biologically different, and thus both irredeemable and intolerable (Spencer, 2009). People who are identified as 'sex offenders' are seen as an exception to the neoliberal idea of lesser state control (Spencer, 2009). Thus, as was discussed in the previous chapter, severe measures of state control are exercised upon these individuals.

In addition, neoliberal techniques highlight individuals' responsibility in managing their own risk (Simon, 1997). As such, these citizens are in favor of privatized risk management in order to maximize their individual autonomy (Campbell, 2010). Nonetheless, Foucault cautions that this idea of autonomy is illusory because it exists within a system of governance (Campbell, 2010). Campbell (2010) further explains that the neoliberal system of governance implicitly limits actual free choice to its citizens by restricting them to a specific set of possibilities; and as a result, the individual has no real power to influence their outcomes.

The political concept of neoliberalism is relevant for this research because even though the core members of CoSA have completed their sanctioned sentences and are considered free, various explicit laws and policies such as sex offender registries restrict their freedom of possible actions. Being within the system of government, these

individuals must become productive members of society in order to be accepted and reintegrated. Furthermore, the volunteers themselves are working within a system of governance under the umbrella of CoSA's organization; therefore, their potential actions are limited by existing organizational norms, rules, practices, and procedures. Likewise, the concept of governmentality is relevant for the purpose of analyzing CoSA's practices and procedures of government. As an organization, CoSA has specific rules, regulations, and procedures regarding how it manages the behaviour of both its core members and its volunteers. The organization itself is a governing body that limits the actions of its members.

The Subject and Subjectification

The concept of governmentality presumes the existence of a power relationship between a governing agent and a subject. As previously stated, the understanding of power has shifted from a traditional idea of coercive and dominating forms of control to more subtle, calculated technologies of subjectification (Foucault, 1997). Foucault defines subjectivity as the relationship of our self to our self, which is formed through various practices; it is not who we are, but rather, something we do (McGushin, 2011). As McGushin (2011) explains, "the self is a continuous becoming, not a fixed being" (p. 141). This concept of subjectivity was briefly mentioned above and will be explored further through the works of Foucault (1997) and others (Cruikshank, 1993; Garland, 1997; McGushin, 2011; Powell, 2013; Rose, 1989; Rose et al., 2009; Taylor, D., 2011).

Subjectification is an activity that occurs through a context of constraint (Taylor, D., 2011). The individual is constituted into a governable subject through forms of power and knowledge (Powell, 2013). We are able to establish ourselves as subjects through

practices of self, which include writing, exercise, and truth telling (Taylor, D., 2011). However, we are constrained in our ability to constitute ourselves by the institutions that shape our practices, including the schools, courts, hospitals, state security mechanisms, and more general norms and values within society (Taylor, D., 2011). Thus, the same institutions and norms that exist in society simultaneously enable and constrain our ability to establish ourselves (Taylor, D., 2011). McGushin's (2011) simple explanation of how one expresses oneself illustrates this relationship: expressing oneself requires both the self *doing* the expressing and the self *being* expressed.

Cruikshank (1993) explores the ideas of self-esteem and subjectivity, which are ultimately linked to the ideas of governmentality. Cruikshank argues that self-esteem is not a personal concept; however, it can be understood as a “social relationship and political obligation” (1993, p. 328). Self-esteem is a social construct. She explains that the self-esteem movement promises to produce technologies of subjectivity that will solve social problems such as criminalized harms by initiating a revolution, not based on external forces but on the internal forces within ourselves, and revitalize the way we govern the self (Cruikshank, 1993).

For Rose (1996), governmentality is a psychologized exercise of modern political authority, which is linked to the knowledge behind subjectification. Self-subjectification is the way in which an individual transforms himself or herself into a social subject while using various technologies of the self (Powell, 2013). Technologies of the self are ways “human beings come to understand and act upon themselves within certain regimes of authority and knowledge,” which are directed at self-improvement (Rose et al., 2009, p. 11). Powell (2013) suggests that individuals use various processes of reflexivity where

they “speak truth about [their] self, gain self-knowledge in an ethical self-formation [and produce] self-managing individuals” (p. 35).

According to Foucault (1988), the purpose for using these technologies of the self is to enable the individual to affect their own “bodies, souls, thoughts, conduct, and way of being, so as to transform themselves in order to attain a certain state of happiness, purity, wisdom, perfection, or immortality” (p. 18). Powell (2013) further indicates that individuals use various technologies of the self so that they can become subjects who are then able to socially function in society; additionally, these technologies also allow them to analyze these effects. The concept of technologies of the self is an important notion to consider alongside the ideas of governmentality and subjectification.

Power, Governmentality, and Risk

O’Malley (2009) found that several of Foucault’s colleagues including Ewald, Defert, and Castel, examine risk as an emerging analytical framework. These authors understand risk as a technology of government (O’Malley, 2009; Rose et al., 2009). Understanding risk as a technology of government means that it is not an inherently natural phenomenon; however, in their view, it is a statistical and probabilistic technique used to make plausible predictions (O’Malley, 2009; Rose et al., 2009). As Ewald (1991) claims, “nothing is a risk in itself; there is no risk in reality” (p. 199). Rose et al. (2009) also believe that risk is not real; rather, it is a particular way of thinking about and dealing with a situation. In their understanding, it is a probability of harm (Rose et al., 2009). Nonetheless, anything can be viewed as a risk depending on how one interprets a situation.

Colloquially, risk is a synonym for danger or hazard, which is used in order to designate an event as a threat (Ewald, 1991). However, risk in relation to criminality and crime emerged from the economically-driven discourse that developed from insurance companies within the private sector (Garland, 1997). Moreover, the terms risk and risk taking are by-products of insurance sales techniques (Burchell et al., 1991; Ewald, 1991; Garland, 1997; Maurutto & Hannah-Moffat, 2006). Insurance regimes use risk as a specific way to consider negatively perceived events that can happen to a group of people, values, or capitals, rather than as a way to label something as dangerous (Ewald, 1991). Insurance is a social practice for the taming of chance, which is defined as ensuring compensation for the effects of plausible events (Ewald, 1991; Garland, 1997). Insurance exemplifies Foucault's concept of an apparatus of security because it provides a safety net for the occurrence of unpredictable events within the social and economic spheres (Garland, 1997). Moreover, insurance shapes people's lives, health, and security, while also imposing self-governance on individuals (Garland, 1997).

Interestingly, the economic rationale of risk prompted the stereotypical image of the rational criminal, and as a result we began to govern these imagined individuals through risk management (Garland, 1997). Like Ewald, Castel also focuses, to an extent, on the implications of risk in relation to how we are to be governed; however, his attention is on risk in psychiatry (O'Malley, 2009). For Castel (1991), risk is differentiated from dangerousness, because proof of danger can only be diagnosed after the fact, whereas risk is merely the uncertainty of danger.

Crime is understood as a governable risk; it is measurable, thus preventable (Hannah-Moffat, 2005). Risk is treated similarly to disciplinary power because it

constitutes the subject through information rather than personal accounts, and it, too, produces knowledge. Technologies of risk categorize people through similar applications such as criminal records and actuarial risk assessments (Garland, 1997). Walklate (1999) notes that actuarial risk assessments provide statistically reliable information about groups of people, or types of behaviour; however she argues that they are largely unable to predict individual behaviour. Despite their lack of predictive validity, penal agencies continue to use these tools in order to inform various decisions (Maurutto & Hannah-Moffat, 2006; Walklate, 1999). In relation to governmentality, the increasing use of risk frameworks creates new subjects and redefines relationships, hence creating new techniques of self-governance, and new techniques to govern others (O'Malley, 2009).

The understanding of risk frameworks varies depending on the political context of the time. Under liberalism, risk was associated with social or collective models of management, such as social insurance (O'Malley, 2009). However, the emergence of neoliberalism shifted the ideal of collective management to the responsibility of individuals (O'Malley, 2009; Simon, 1997). Hannah-Moffat (2005) states that offenders are encouraged to become responsible for their offending, and issues related to their offending. This shift led to new forms of self-governance, which reached such areas as crime prevention (Newburn, 2007; O'Malley, 2009). The state encourages people to become responsible for themselves, becoming directly accountable and involved in their own crime prevention, risk prevention, and loss prevention (Garland, 1997; Hannem, 2011; Newburn, 2007; O'Malley, 2009; Simon, 1997). Therefore, individuals increasingly become responsible for minimizing their own risk of victimization and harm.

People are no longer dependent on penal agencies to protect them from criminalized harm and victimization under neoliberalism; they now take the responsibility upon themselves (Garland, 1997; Hannem, 2011). The risk framework created a new form of subjectification, which is the responsabilized and crime-preventing subject known as *homo prudens* (Garland, 1997). This idea of the responsabilized individual not only relates to the offenders themselves, but to potential victims, and other members of the community. Thus, this narrative is relevant for examining how CoSA-Ottawa and its volunteers have been implemented to manage offenders who have completed their sentence and are reintegrating into society.

Power and Rehabilitation Narratives

Power manifests in all types of relationships, including through penal practices such as rehabilitation. The objective of CoSA-Ottawa is to reintegrate persons identified as ‘sex offenders’ back into the community with the help of volunteers. Re-integrative programs fall under the umbrella of the rehabilitation narrative, thus it is important to explore the various perspectives of rehabilitation in order to later situate CoSA-Ottawa among them. There has always been an interconnection between the goals of punishment and reform throughout modern penology discourse (Lucken, 1998; Robinson, 2008). Robinson (2008) discusses three specific penal narratives, including: utilitarian, managerial, and expressive, which she says demonstrate how rehabilitation has continued to exist through its own restoration.

Historically, rehabilitation efforts for offenders were justified through welfare and instrumentally-based arguments, also known as the utilitarian narrative (Robinson, 2008). During the twentieth century, rehabilitation and reform policies were ideal because

individuals' deviation was thought to be the cause of crime (Simon, 1998). Rehabilitation objectives aimed to normalize the deviant individual (Feeley & Simon, 1992; Lucken, 1998). In this case the offender's treatment was not only implemented for the benefit of the individual, but also for the good and welfare of society (Robinson, 2008). In the 1980s, rehabilitation was seen as a right of the offender; however, by the 1990s this rationale was discredited (Robinson, 2008). The political discourse of the 1990s assured society that offenders' needs should not be placed above victims' or potential victims' needs (Robinson, 2008).

Rehabilitative programs of the mid-1990s saw another way to make an impact on recidivism, which was through experimental interventions focusing on cognitive behavioural methods (Robinson, 2008). These new programs gained wide acceptance because they reproduced utilitarian rationale while de-emphasizing welfare reasoning (Robinson, 2008). Thus, rehabilitation of offenders was implemented to promote the greatest level of safety for the greatest number of people (Robinson, 2008). The community and victims became the beneficiaries of rehabilitation, rather than the offender. This aligns with the distinction made in penal practices between criminogenic needs versus non-criminogenic (formally welfare) needs (Hannah-Moffat, 2005; Maurutto & Hannah-Moffat, 2006; Robinson, 2008). Interventions solely focused on the risks and needs that related to the individual's criminality and disregarded his other needs because they were not connected to his risk of reoffending. Utilitarian rehabilitative narratives were aligned with carceral system decisions, such as the release of offenders on parole or probation, which focused primarily on the concerns for the community's

safety (Robinson, 2008; Simon, 1998). With the emergence of neoliberalism, risk discourse replaced the welfare narrative (Hannah-Moffat, 2005).

Managerial rehabilitation developed after there was a shift from the optimistic view of rehabilitation to one that perceives crime as a risk or social fact that requires defensive action from both individuals and the community (Robinson, 2008; Simon, 1998). This context led to the support for managerial objectives and actuarial techniques (Robinson, 2008). Feeley and Simon (1992) argue that the change in penal language depicts a shift from old clinical, individualized, and treatment-based disciplinary penalty to the new penology of actuarial justice, risk management, and control-based techniques (Lucken, 1998; Maurutto & Hannah-Moffat, 2006; Robison, 2008).

Some have argued that Feeley and Simon's account of the new penology describes it as anti-rehabilitative (Lucken, 1998), because their narrative focuses on the penal system's basic tasks of identifying, classifying, and managing high-risk populations rather than normalizing or treating individuals (Feeley & Simon, 1992; Hannah-Moffat, 2005; Lucken, 1998; Simon, 1998). Feeley and Simon (1992) claim that the objective of the new penology is to manage populations and control crime, compared with the transformative and rehabilitative objectives present in the old penology. The prison is seen as a suitable institution for keeping dangerous offenders away from the vulnerable public for some time (Feeley & Simon, 1992; Simon, 1998). Walklate (1999) suggests that the idea of the dangerous offender generally means an offender who has committed or has the potential to commit violence.

Garland (2001) argues that current penal practices emphasize punitive, risk, and expressive approaches. Expressive rehabilitation, through its techniques, focuses on

communicating the moral wrong of criminalized harm to the offender as well as to the community (Robinson, 2008). It follows Durkheim's belief that punishment is a mechanism used to affirm moral values (Robinson, 2008). The idea of re-moralizing and responsabilizing the offender is relevant within this view of rehabilitation and penology (Robinson, 2008). Restorative justice initiatives and practices are highlighted within the expressive rehabilitative narrative, because its aim is to instill morality in order to guide future actions (Robinson, 2008). Restorative justice acknowledges that criminalized wrongdoings harm the victim and the community, to repair this harm, their needs must be addressed and the offender must take actions to become accountable, right the wrongs, and become responsible for correcting his behaviour for the future (Hannem, 2011). This is relevant to explore within my thesis because CoSA-Ottawa was founded on principles of restorative justice.

Empey (1967), as mentioned in Cohen (1979), argues that we are currently in a third wave of corrections going from "Revenge to Restraint (in the first part of the nineteenth century), [...] Restraint to Reformation (from the late nineteenth to the early twentieth century) and now from Reformation to Re-integration" (p. 356). Empey proposes that the current wave of corrections presents the community as the final stage of rehabilitation in which the offender must return back to the community and become reintegrated. The community agencies, rather than formal governmental institutions, exert greater influence on and become more involved with and responsible for the management of the offender's daily prevention, treatment, and re-socialization (Cohen, 1979). Consequently, there are very few community programs to help people who are labeled as 'sex offenders' to reintegrate back into the community; fortunately, CoSA-Ottawa exists

to fill this need. The role of the volunteers as part of the therapeutic relationship is further explored in the analysis section of this study.

Critique of Foucault's Formulations on Power and Governmentality

Foucault's work on power and governmentality is the primary conceptual framework for my study; therefore, it is important to outline the various criticisms of his work in order to remain critically-conscious in highlighting the contributions to this research. Michel Foucault was a French philosopher who greatly influenced British criminology (Newburn, 2007; Powell, 2013). He believed that we could come to understand whole societies through the reconstruction of certain techniques of power or power/knowledge in order to observe, shape, and control the behaviour of individuals who are diversely positioned throughout society (Burchell et al., 1991). Foucault used the methods of historical accounts and genealogy in his studies.

Many have critiqued Foucault's studies of power and subjectivity. For example, Murray Li (2007) questions Foucault from an empirical basis: What actions does power evoke and how? What are the conditions of power? What are its effects? Fraser (1989), as referred to in Heyes (2011), claims that Foucault's ideas of subjectivity and power lack the assumption of human agency. Therefore, they also lack the capacity to resist the effects of disciplinary power as he describes it (Heyes, 2011). Many others agree with these authors who state that Foucault's representation of the individual as a subject fails to describe human beings as having the capacity to exercise neither agency nor freewill (Burchell et al., 1991; Garland, 1997; O'Malley et al., 1997; Powell, 2013).

Foucault's governmentality work has been widely criticized by other theorists as well. Some have argued that governmentality theory proposes rigid models of

government systematically integrated, while having rationalizations that are always changing (Rose et al., 2009). Others have criticized governmentality work for failing to recognize postcolonial perspectives on racial and gender inequality, as well as completely disregarding feminist counter-discourse (O'Malley et al., 1997). Critiques of governmentality include that it presents a blueprint for government, advising how to live rather than examining how we are living (O'Malley, 2009). Lastly, O'Malley (2009) argues that Foucault's discussion of the subjects of government (either individuals or groups) presents an assumption that these individuals are passive and will automatically adopt the practices presented to them.

Garland (1997) and others challenge some of the terms associated with governmentality and regard them as neologisms, or historical terms, or conventional words used in unusual contexts. Foucault's unconventional use of certain terms can lead to confusion in interpreting his work. This confusion is evident through his use of the word government to mean different things at different points during his career. Furthermore, Foucault does not always distinguish between the various meanings of a single concept; rather, he assumes the reader recognizes the differences. I fully agree with Garland's criticism of Foucault's ambiguous use of his concepts and terms.

In order to overcome the critiques outlined above, I have made explicit how each concept is used throughout my study. In addition, I define the concepts throughout my analysis in order to remain coherent in how they are being used. Furthermore, below I have provided an overview and explanations of the specific ideas developed through the conceptual framework that are explicitly relevant for my study.

Overview of Theoretical Concepts

The Foucauldian framework encompassing concepts of power and governmentality is used in my study to examine how these and related ideas are manifested within the experiences of volunteers who work with people identified as ‘sex offenders.’ By way of a conclusion to this chapter, I emphasize here the Foucauldian concepts that are most relevant to my analysis.

Power is a relational concept that shapes behaviour in order to influence possible outcomes. Power is understood as a process that is both creative and productive (Feder, 2011; Foucault, 1999; O’Malley, 2009; McGushin, 2011). It transforms individuals into docile beings and functions through relationships, including that of CoSA’s core members and volunteers (May, 2011). Foucauldian power assumes the presence of resistance, which produces information and changes practices (Barker, 1998).

Disciplinary power is a subtle technology that is exercised in order to shape the behaviour of individuals and transforms these individuals into objects of knowledge (Hoffman, 2011; O’Malley, 1992). Individuals are constituted into both objects and subjects through further processes of hierarchical observation and normalizing judgment (Hoffman, 2011; Heyes, 2011).

Governmentality is another form of power that also guides behaviour through relationships (Burchell et al., 1991). It is a lens to use in order to explore the ways in which we govern the behaviours of others and ourselves (O’Malley, 2009).

Governmentality is a decentralized and dynamic activity, which aims to lead and guide the behaviour of individuals in order to influence outcomes (Foucault, 1982; Foucault, 1997; O’Malley, 2009; O’Malley et al., 1997).

Although governmentality is understood as a process, it remains important to examine a political ideology that has affected the practices of governmentality. Neoliberalism is a dominant perspective that discusses the responsabilization of citizens and claims to produce individuals that are self-governing (O'Malley, 2009; Powell, 2013). As mentioned previously, people labeled as 'sex offenders' are excluded from this ideal. Their risk of becoming dangerous again is constantly monitored through various formal mechanisms as well as informal systems of governance such as CoSA-Ottawa.

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

In this chapter I first situate my position as the researcher in my study and include a reflection on why I chose this topic. Following this, I operationalize the terms sex offender and volunteer in order to provide a framework used throughout this study. Subsequently, I present my research design outlining the details of how this qualitative study was conducted. Then I explain what and how interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA) was used in order to analyze my interview transcripts. Following this section, I discuss the evaluative criteria used in my research in order to ensure its authenticity and summarize the strengths and limitations of IPA. I reflect upon the ethical considerations inherent in my study involving human participants, and finally provide a justification for my research choices.

Positioning: Epistemology, Ontology, and Voice

When considering our epistemological positioning we must ask ourselves the following: what do we as social science researchers assume about the nature of knowledge? Accordingly, Guba and Lincoln (1994) suggest that we ask ourselves: “what kind of relationship do I have with the knowledge that can be known?” (p. 108). I assume the co-existence of multiple realities, and believe that through my interactions with participants I produce new multiple knowledges. My position is most consistent with a constructivist paradigm with a critical lens. Guba and Lincoln (1994) understand constructivism as a subjective assumption whereby knowledge is produced through the interactions between the researcher and his or her participants. As a constructivist, I adopt the position that the knowledge that I generate is inherently biased and subjective because I am producing it through purposeful study.

The constructivist paradigm has been interchangeably called the interpretative paradigm because of its focus on qualitative methodologies involving hermeneutics. Hermeneutics recognize that meaning is not expressed or reflected through a text. Rather, it is language that produces the meaning of a text (Packer, 2011b). Hermeneutics is thus the art of interpretation (Packer, 2011b); it is mediation between developing an understanding through the text while interpreting it. Therefore, my use of a qualitative hermeneutics-based methodology of interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA) fits within the constructivist paradigm.

In their article, Guba and Lincoln (1994) describe the various attributes of each paradigm. I use their conceptualizations in order to understand the constructivist paradigm. They state that relativism is the ontological stance most consistent with the constructivist paradigm. As such, I assume that my study's results have produced multiple realities and not one single truth. This ontological stance offers the production of various knowledges and is open to the subjective nature of participants' experiences. Subsequently, the multiple realities created through this study are in themselves social constructions. According to Guba and Lincoln these multiple realities are malleable and subject to change over time and space.

As mentioned above, the general research question guiding this study is: *How do volunteers experience working with persons labeled as 'sex offenders' through CoSA-Ottawa?* It examines the various subjective accounts of CoSA-Ottawa's volunteers. Accordingly, each individual's account is considered its own significant reality. Guba and Lincoln state that "understanding and reconstruction of the constructions that people (including the inquirer) initially hold" is the goal of research within a constructivist

paradigm (p. 113). Thus, this project aims to understand how those who work closely with criminalized individuals on a voluntary basis express their subjective experiences of this practice and their relationships.

My background developed through my studies of criminology at the University of Ottawa and has shaped my critical lens. I also use Guba and Lincoln (1994) in order to understand the critical paradigm. According to them, the critical paradigm understands reality to be malleable and impressionable, and the ontology of this paradigm is historical realism, which understands that reality is shaped by structures of domination. Historical realism is consistent with Foucault's conceptions of power and governmentality as described within the study's heuristic framework. Accordingly, the epistemology of the critical paradigm is transactional and subjectivist, which means that there is an interactive linkage between the researcher and the participants. Therefore, I understand that knowledge is produced during my interview process. Similar to the constructivist paradigm, the critical paradigm acknowledges the researcher's influence on the production of knowledge. Additionally, this paradigm emphasizes the use of dialectical methodologies, which aligns with the method of semi-structured interviewing used in this study.

Moreover, in order to remain coherent when combining the constructivist and critical lenses I adopt Heiner's (2002) critical constructivist paradigm. Heiner (2002) affirms that these two paradigms can be united because of the functions that powerful structures employ within the processes of constructing realities. His ideas are consistent with the notions of power and governmentality as previously discussed. Furthermore, as formerly examined, power is productive (Foucault, 1999) and creative while it also

constrains the freedom of possibilities. Structures within society have the ability to influence implicitly and explicitly our behaviour, such as mechanisms of discipline or more broadly the technologies within *panopticism*.

The purpose of this research is to facilitate a production of knowledge that has been created through the accounts of participants. Grbich (2004) labels this epistemological posture as the “author as behind-the-scene facilitator of others’ voices” (p. 74-75). In using such an analytical framework, the themes that emerge out of the interview transcripts are supported through verbatim quotations. It is necessary for me to provide the reader with the entirety of the quotations that I have selected because although not all of the account presented is explicitly relevant to the themes, it is relevant for IPA in order to remain ideographic and portray the individuality of each participant in the way that they express their experiences. Furthermore, Smith and Osborn (2004) note that verbatim quotes represent and acknowledge the presence of participants’ voices in a final paper. However, my voice will not be entirely behind-the-scenes because I, as the researcher, interpret the transcripts in a particular way (Smith & Osborn, 2004). This positioning of voice is consistent with the critical paradigm, since Guba and Lincoln (1994) assert that the researcher possesses the intellectual tools enabling her to understand the participants’ realities.

I adopt a critical constructivist epistemological stance, understanding that there are multiple realities, and various truths, which ultimately are socially constructed. I also assume that power is embedded in the creation of knowledge, and various structures of society influence this creation. My voice as a researcher will be behind-the-scenes in some instances, such as in the presentation of the verbatim quotes; however, I primarily

play an active and interpretive role in my study and within the production of new knowledge.

Reflexivity

In conducting this research I am mindful of my preconceived notions toward ‘sex offenders.’ My interest in this topic and my own preconceived notions were sparked by a single experience of childhood victimization. When I was thirteen years old I was the victim of cyber sexual harassment by someone unknown to me. My victimization at the time was emotionally traumatizing, as I was a young female adolescent. I reported the case to the police but nothing came of it, and then as time went on it was forgotten about. However, this memory resurfaced during the final year of my undergraduate degree in a human sexual behaviours class. During one of our classes we watched a documentary about individuals who use the Internet to lure and groom their child victims. After watching this documentary, I did not realize how much it had affected me until I broke down to my professor. With the emotional support of my professor and my sister, I was able to move past this, by acknowledging my experience and its effect on me. Consequently, when I was applying for the Master’s program in criminology, I knew that I was curious about the topic of sex offending and this is why I picked this topic for my Master’s thesis. Nonetheless, I am reflexive about how my preconceived notions influence this research. In completing my study, I have been able to expand my understanding of sex offending while taking on a more open-minded approach to this topic.

Definitions of Terms and Concepts

‘Sex Offender’

It is important for me to operationalize the concept of the ‘sex offender’ for the

purpose of this study. Since I assume a critical constructivist position, I am aware that the idea of the ‘sex offender’ is a social construct. As was mentioned in the literature review, the mass media has contributed to disseminating negative and stereotypical portrayals of people labeled as ‘sex offenders.’ Correspondingly, the government and politicians have, to a lesser extent, promoted this same view of these individuals to the public (Harrison, 2010). In the 1970s the Criminal Code of Canada formally classified sexual offences as crimes of violence (Wilson & Prinzo, 2001). Matravers (2003) indicates that ‘sex offenders’ are widely viewed as abnormal and “present an intolerable risk to society” (p. 9). According to the glossary within *Circles of Support & Accountability: A guide to Training Potential Volunteers: Training manual* (Correctional Service of Canada, 2002), a ‘sex offender’ is defined as:

An offender whose primary offence leading to incarceration is a sexual offence. In the context of the ‘Circles’ program a person is considered to be a sexual offender if a sexual offence constitutes at least one of the charges and the sexual offence is the reason for the detention.

The ‘sex offender’ is represented as an other, an outsider, different than the rest of society. Thus, they are someone who is in the community but not *of* it (Spencer, 2009). According to CoSA-Ottawa (2012), those who are suitable for their program and core members include the following:

*[A person who] has been convicted of a sexual offence and admits to committing a sexual offence in the past; will be held to Warrant Expiry Date (or within months of WED) and may be released on a Long Term Supervision Order; has been assessed as posing a high-risk to re-offend sexually; has high needs (i.e. has little or no support in the community, low functioning); agrees to share his/her CSC file with CoSA-Ottawa by signing a consent form; displays genuine commitment to turn his/her life around by **voluntarily** entering into a supportive relationship with his/her volunteers and agreeing to: 1) Honor the terms of his/her covenant (an agreement between the Core Member and his/her volunteers) by communicating openly with the volunteers in order to identify offence*

triggers and to avoid lapses and re-offences; 2) Participate in counseling or other community-based programs as recommended, such as relapse prevention, anger management, AA/NA (where applicable); 3) Communicate openly and honestly with his/her professional network, including, but not limited to, therapists and parole officers and allows communication between CoSA and his/her professionals by signing a Consent Form, and 4) Commits to being involved for 1 year.

For this study, I adopt a broad definition of a ‘sex offender’ encompassing the legal definition, Correctional Service of Canada’s definition, and CoSA-Ottawa’s definition.

Volunteer

A volunteer is someone who devotes their own time to serving the needs of others without receiving financial compensation for their work. “The volunteers in the circles are people from the community who give their time to provide friendship, emotional support, and accountability to the core member” (Correctional Service of Canada, 2002). Volunteers at CoSA-Ottawa must be mature, committed, and responsible individuals (CoSA-Ottawa, 2012). Prospective volunteers must be at least 21 years old. CoSA-Ottawa (2012) requires that potential volunteers participate in and complete volunteer training. They also must complete a screening process that includes an interview, two character references, and a police background check. In addition, the prospective volunteer must commit to CoSA-Ottawa for at least one year (CoSA-Ottawa, 2012). The volunteers are expected to commit their time for two hours per week, attend one circle meeting each week, meet with their core member on a one-on-one basis once a week, and be available for phone calls or emails from their core member (CoSA-Ottawa, 2012). The core member and three to five trained and screened community volunteers form the Circle of Support and Accountability (CoSA-Ottawa, 2012).

Research Design

The current study uses a qualitative methodological approach, as it is well-suited to studying the meaning of phenomena in real-world settings (Labuschagne, 2003). Onwuegbuzie and Leech (2005) claim that all data is basically qualitative as it attempts to reproduce individuals' raw experiences. Additionally, Sommers (1997) advises that researchers should choose a method that suits their individual goals and allows them to tell the story they wish to share. Hence, I have chosen to use a qualitative methodology because I aspire to share a rich and in-depth description of volunteers' subjective experiences. Subsequently, I only had access to a small sample; therefore, qualitative methods enable me to examine data using an approach that focuses on the depth and detail of the phenomenon (Englander, 2012; Hycner, 1985; Labuschagne, 2003; Roulston, 2011).

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with current CoSA-Ottawa volunteers. The interviews were held as a single session, which ranged from around 35-90 minutes in length. The interview method is appropriate for this research because my objective is to develop an analysis of volunteers' experiences with people categorized as 'sex offenders,' as well as how they express these experiences. The semi-structured interview style allowed the participants to guide the dialogue in their own direction (Barbour, 2008; Englander, 2012; Roulston, 2011). Additionally, Smith (1996) asserts that semi-structured interviews are used to explore how participants respond to a certain topic comprehensively. Hence, this study used a comprehensive approach in order to explore this phenomenon.

General Characteristics of the Study Population

Human participants were utilized as the data source for this study. The participants

were recruited through CoSA-Ottawa. The participants' ages ranged from 24 to 60. There were four female and two male participants. Since this research examines volunteers' experiences, the participation of CoSA-Ottawa volunteers was required. The research sample included six current volunteers all who have completed training and have been involved in at least one circle with a core member. Most of the participants had been involved with CoSA-Ottawa for between one to three years, participating in one or two circles, although one participant had ten years of experience and had participated in six circles. This research sample was specifically targeted because it was important to recruit participants who had the lived experience of the phenomenon being explored (Englander, 2012; May, 2002). CoSA-Ottawa volunteers were chosen as the sample population because they directly work with this criminalized population and have experiential knowledge of this phenomenon.

The purpose of this sampling approach allows for a comparison of the narratives of the individual volunteers' experiences. In addition, this study's aim is to explore how the volunteers express their individual understanding of the practices and relationships with core members. I have been cautious as to how I have interpreted the participants' voices when transcribing and analyzing the dialogue, and of how I represent them in the final text (McCotter, 2011). The use of verbatim quotations allows readers to be critical of how I interpret the various accounts.

Interview Locations

Five out of the six participants were interviewed in reserved rooms within the Faculty of Social Sciences building; the rentals were prearranged with the assistance of the University of Ottawa's Criminology department. One of the participants requested that his interview take place at his workplace, so I accommodated his request. All of the

interview appointments were made at the convenience of each participant and scheduled accordingly.

Sampling Design and Procedures

The current study used purposive sampling, as the objective of this study requires a specific population who has experience with CoSA-Ottawa, plus experience working with people convicted of sexual offences. Susan Love, the coordinator of CoSA-Ottawa, and Adina Ilea emailed my recruitment text to their network of volunteers (see appendix 1c). Subsequently, the willing participants contacted me directly via email to set up prospective interview dates.

Information-Collection Procedures and Instruments

The interviews were recorded using a Livescribe Smartpen. A Smartpen is a digital pen that records audio information, while simultaneously enabling the individual to take written notes. I had experience with and access to this technology so its use was suitable for its purpose. The process of recording the interview sessions enabled me to ensure the authenticity of my participants' accounts when I later transcribed each session.

Transcription Notes

The volunteers who participated in this study henceforth are referred to as Participant 1, Participant 2, etc. I, the interviewer, refer to myself as the Researcher. In addition, pauses in the participants' responses have been indicated by an ellipsis "...". Omission of unnecessary material has been marked by three dashes "---". In order to remain engaged with my participants during the interviews, I uttered noises such as "yeah," "mhm," and "okay," these have mostly been excluded from this analysis. Lastly, all descriptive notes such as expressions or non-verbal cues have been documented within brackets, for example (chuckles).

Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis

My study uses interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA) in order to analyze each individual interview transcript. Considering the qualitative nature of this approach, as well as this study's objective to examine the subjective experiences of volunteers, IPA presents as an appropriate method to use. The theoretical foundations of this method include symbolic interactionism and phenomenology (Smith, 1996). Symbolic interactionism claims that social scientists must place importance on the meanings that individuals assign to certain events, while also acknowledging their own role in creating the meanings through subjective interpretations (Smith, 1996).

IPA is a specific form of phenomenological inquiry, which Packer (2011a) describes as a type of descriptive approach to understanding the human experience. Englander (2012) suggests that in order to conduct phenomenological research we must "understand a phenomenon from the point of view of the lived experience" in order to discover its meaning (p. 16). In Schostak's (2006) work, Husserl's idea of phenomenology is described as having the ability to reduce the world into a phenomenon that can be accessed through consciousness. Smith (1996) expands on Husserl's philosophy, asserting that it focuses on the individual's personal perceptions of an event. Recording how participants express their lived experiences enables access to their conscious understanding of the phenomenon (Schostak, 2006). Focusing on these experiences, researchers can analyze these accounts in order to attempt to understand "why things happen the way that they do" (Schostak, 2006, p. 79).

IPA is fundamentally connected to the practices of hermeneutics and likewise is a version of phenomenology (Finlay, 2011; Smith & Osborn, 2008; Winder & Gough,

2010). This method develops themes through the analysis of accounts. Jonathan Smith introduced IPA in 1996 when he wrote a paper arguing for a research method that examined the subjective experiences of participants (Finlay, 2011; Smith, 1996). IPA is mainly used in counseling psychology, occupational therapy, and physiotherapy research. Winder and Gough (2010) used IPA to analyze the accounts of individuals convicted of Internet-based sexual offences. Their work left a strong impression on me, and I was convinced that IPA could be more broadly applied within criminological research.

IPA utilizes the researcher's ability to interpret participants' accounts. Interpretation is important because the ontological assumptions of IPA presume that it is impossible to directly access participants' experiences (Finlay, 2011). The process of interpretation incorporates the researcher's views as well as the interactions between the researcher and the participants (Finlay, 2011). This analytical method focuses on the individual and how they make sense of their own experiences (Finlay, 2011; Smith & Osborn, 2008). Furthermore, it examines how participants explain and make sense of their personal and social worlds by focusing on the analysis of their subjective experiences (Smith, 2011; Winder & Gough, 2010).

IPA requires the researcher to interpret participants' personal accounts while actively using conceptual and psychological language to generate deeper insight into the participants' meaning-making processes as they reflect upon their perceptions and experiences (Winder & Gough, 2010). Smith and Osborn (2008) conclude that IPA requires a two-way process of interpretation; they describe that while "the participants are trying to make sense of their world; the researcher is trying to make sense of the participants trying to make sense of their world" (p. 53). The researcher gathers multiple

accounts from participants and then proposes a general description of the phenomenon (Finlay, 2011). In the current study, my interest is in analyzing how CoSA-Ottawa volunteers explain and make sense of their subjective experiences working with people identified as ‘sex offenders.’

In a way that is consistent with IPA, I have engaged in one interview transcript at a time. Initially, I read the first transcript in an inductive systematic way in order to find themes (Smith & Osborn, 2004) (see appendix 1f). However, according to Eatough, Smith, and Shaw (2008), IPA requires that the researcher move between both inductive and deductive processes. Subsequently, connections are constructed between the themes that have emerged from the transcript in order to create subordinate themes (Smith & Osborn, 2004) (see appendix 1f). Following this, the same procedure is conducted for each succeeding interview transcript. Upon completion of gathering the themes from each individual transcript, I discovered various patterns between cases, and in doing so produced master themes (Eatough et al., 2008; Smith, 2011; Smith & Osborn, 2004).

Initially, these master themes are presented in a table format, with concrete examples to support each theme (Smith & Osborn, 2004) (see appendix 1g). Afterwards, these themes (within the table) are translated into narrative accounts, which introduce the topic and each succeeding subordinate theme (Smith & Osborn, 2004). These themes are described in detail and reinforced through verbatim quotations from the participants’ accounts (Smith & Osborn, 2004). According to Labuschagne (2003), acquiring direct quotations from participants can reveal their “level of emotion, their thoughts, their experiences, [and] their basic perceptions” (p. 102). The following are seven steps that Finlay (2011) proposes for conducting IPA:

Step 1 Reading and re-reading – immersing oneself in the original data.

Step 2 Initial noting – free association and exploring semantic content (e.g. by writing notes in the margin).

Step 3 Developing emergent themes – focus on chunks of transcript and analysis of notes made into themes.

Step 4 Searching for connections across emergent themes – abstracting and integrating themes.

Step 5 Moving to the next case – trying to bracket previous themes and keep open-minded in order to do justice to the individuality of each new case.

Step 6 Looking for patterns across cases – findings patterns of shared higher order qualities across cases, noting idiosyncratic instances.

Step 7 Taking interpretations to deeper levels – deepening the analysis by utilizing metaphors and temporal referents, and by importing other theories as a lens through which to view the analysis (p. 142).

Evaluative Criteria

Qualitative research is evaluated by assessing its credibility, believability, and authenticity (Golafshani, 2003; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Lincoln and Guba (1985) emphasize that evaluating the trustworthiness of a study is very important. In order to evaluate the truthfulness of a study, they suggest establishing its credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). In order to ensure the credibility and dependability of my analysis, my supervisor analyzed two out of the six transcripts and we discussed our findings. Likewise, to ensure the reliability and transferability of my study, I have included details about my research decisions, processes, as well as my interview question guide, which is found in appendix 1a (Chenail, 1995).

In addition, reflexivity can minimize the effect of a researcher's bias on their study by making themselves and the readers aware of their research choices and influences; Palys and Atchison (2008), among others, emphasize the importance of being a reflective researcher. I have demonstrated my reflexivity by situating myself as a critical constructivist researcher and outlining my assumptions and research choices, as

well as by sharing my personal experience with this topic. Moreover, Ortlipp (2008) suggests that researchers should keep a self-reflective journal, which will help them to analyze their own assumptions and research choices. Accordingly, I kept a self-reflective journal to become aware of the issues that I have faced and the decisions that I made while conducting the study.

Strengths and Limitations of IPA

IPA requires the researcher to use a small sample size through purposive sampling (Smith & Osborn, 2008). The unrepresentative and small sample size needed for this method may be considered a limitation of IPA. Consequently, the lack of size and representation of the sample will prevent me from being able to generalize my results onto larger populations (Smith & Osborn, 2004; Smith & Osborn, 2008). Hence, after gathering my sample, I have created a boundary around the generalizable claims that they are able to make (Smith & Osborn, 2004).

In contrast to the limitation outlined above regarding the small sample size, the strength of this method is that the research produces detailed and in-depth narratives (Larkin et al., 2006; Smith & Osborn, 2004; Smith & Osborn, 2008). The interview method and the subsequent analytical technique have enabled me to generate novel ideas. Smith and Osborn (2004) suggest that these original ideas are often very valuable as they develop without a prompt and could provide insight into the importance that a participant places on their subsequent account. They also claim that the semi-structured interview is the best method to use when a researcher collects material and then uses IPA to analyze it (Smith & Osborn, 2004). Furthermore, other academics suggest that IPA is beneficial for researchers because it is an accessible, flexible method of analysis (Eatough et al., 2008; Larkin et al., 2006).

Reflections and Ethical Concerns

My study directly relates to ethical issues since I worked with human participants using semi-structured interviews. Israel (2004) suggests that often a process of negotiation takes place when people allow a researcher to investigate them. I offered my participants the assertion that the information they provided would only be used for this research purpose and that their personal information would remain private and confidential (Israel, 2004). Accordingly Palys, Ted, and Lowman (2000) suggest that ensuring confidentiality enables the researcher to develop a rapport with their participants and gives them an opportunity to develop trust. Furthermore, Mander (2010) advises that when researching the lived experiences of people a researcher must be empathetic. His claims were specific to researching vulnerable individuals, and even though my participants were not vulnerable, the topic of this research deals with a social issue that can have an emotional effect on people. Thus it was important for me to conduct my research and analysis with personal accountability and empathy (Mander, 2010).

Moreover, Haggerty (2004) highlights consent as an integral ethical consideration when conducting studies involving human participants. I have guaranteed that my participants have been informed of the potential risks of their involvement (though these were minimal). The signed consent forms represent a contract of confidentiality between my participants and I; it also signifies their willingness to partake in my study (see appendix 1d). Nonetheless, at the start of the interview I ensured each participant that they “may refuse to answer any question or withdraw from the study at any point without consequence” (see appendix 1a).

In addition, I was prepared to provide participants with a list of contacts should

they need further assistance after participating in my study. Hence, when the volunteers consented to participate in this study they provided informed consent. I have completed the procedural ethics as discussed by Guillemin and Gillam (2004), which included completing an ethics application. The University of Ottawa's Office of Research Ethics and Integrity granted full approval of my study on April 18th, 2013 (see appendix 1e).

I have demonstrated respect by actively listening to my participants during the interviews, and acknowledging and thanking them in this final paper. Furthermore, Guillemin and Gillam (2004) suggest that it is possible for researchers to be faced with ethical dilemmas in practice. While conducting the interviews one ethical issue arose in which one of the participants divulged that he was a victim of abuse. Nevertheless, he confirmed that he was able to continue with the interview and was also informed that should he need additional support I had prepared materials and contacts for all participants.

Furthermore, my project relates to broader ethical question of how to live a good life. My study examines the balance and struggle between the ideas of care versus control for this criminalized population. It looks at how the volunteers help their core member, but this help is both a struggle between being supportive and governing the individual to protect society. This dilemma is explicitly highlighted in CoSA-Ottawa's mottos "no more victims" and "no one is disposable" and through my study I examine how the participants navigate this issue.

Justifying the Method

The interview method is an appropriate choice for my study since my objective is to examine the subjective experiences of volunteers. In order to gather this information, it

was necessary to ask participants questions related to their experiences through a semi-structured interview style. The interviews were semi-structured to allow for the participants to guide the interview while emphasizing information that is most important to them. In addition, the interview was a suitable choice since I only had access to a small sample population through CoSA-Ottawa. Moreover, scholars who utilize IPA suggest that a small sample size of about 5-10 participants with the semi-structured interview method is most appropriate for this form of analysis (Smith & Osborn, 2004; Smith, 2004). IPA allows the researcher who only has access to a small sample to conduct a thorough and in-depth analysis of their subject matter.

Interpretative phenomenological analysis is a method that examines a person's lived experiences. The objective of my research is to understand the subjective experiences of volunteers who directly work with persons labeled as 'sex offenders.' Within IPA there is a heavy focus on exploring the subjective experiences of the participants. Therefore, I have chosen to use a form of analysis that directly coincides with my research objectives. It is an analytical technique that emphasizes the researcher's understanding of the individual cases before trying to make sense of patterns or commonalities and differences across participants. Furthermore, IPA finds the meaning within each case and then generates themes from this meaning.

Through this method, it is understood that the interpretation of participants' experiences is dyadic, meaning that while participants are trying to make sense of their experiences, the researcher is simultaneously attempting to understand the participants' expression of their experiences (Smith, 2004). This process of interpretation incorporates the researcher's views as well as her interactions produced between herself and her

participants (Finlay, 2011). While interpreting the text the researcher imposes conceptual language in order to explore the deeper meaning behind participants' accounts (Winder & Gough, 2010). Smith (2004) suggests that IPA closely reflects the text; however, he acknowledges the influence of the researcher's position while reading and interpreting the text. He also states that through IPA other levels of interpretation are accessible to the researcher, including using more "specific theoretical accounts" and "systematic formal theoretical connections" (Smith, 2004, p. 46). However, in order to remain consistent with IPA guidelines, I have opted to present the data-driven descriptions and analyses prior to identifying the theoretical connections throughout the analysis chapters. Thus, I have chosen to examine how the main concepts of power and governmentality are manifested within participants' narratives. It will be evident in the following chapters that I am not examining explicit power dynamics; however, through IPA I am able to access the volunteers' experiences of these dynamics.

The use of a power and governmentality conceptual framework coincides with IPA for several reasons. First, power is not a tangible thing, but it occurs within every interaction. It is circular, experiential, and relational. Thus it is necessary for me to use an analytical technique that examines this relationship through the subjective experiences of my participants. In my study I am not looking directly at power; I am analyzing the experiences of power from one perspective, that of the volunteers. In using IPA I am able to access the subtleties of power and governmentality that are embedded within the practices occurring through the relationships between the volunteers and the core members. While power and governmentality are abstract concepts that are not directly observable, IPA enables me to uncover the manifestation of these ideas within the

volunteers' explanations of their involvements. In my study I explore the subjective understandings of this dynamic relationship, which inherently is instilled with power that serves the ultimate function of governmentality. IPA allows me as a researcher to access and examine the participants' lived experiences of power and governmentality within the context of their relationships with their core members.

CHAPTER 4: THE HUMANIZATION OF THE MONSTROUS

In the following three chapters I present my analysis, which is organized and divided into three master themes that have emerged through the participants' accounts. Chapter 4 explores the humanization of the monstrous, chapter 5 examines the reintegration and re-socialization through a helping relationship and the final master theme described in chapter 6 discusses the overall impacts as a CoSA-Ottawa volunteer. Within each analysis chapter I introduce each master theme, describing its relevance to my study while referencing significant literature. In the introduction I briefly mention the name of each subordinate theme that will be discussed throughout the chapter. Then I describe the secondary themes again referencing applicable literature.

The format of the analysis is as follows: first, I use a short statement to introduce the quotation and then the verbatim quotation is presented. Subsequently each quote is described and analyzed with the information gathered using IPA. Interpretative phenomenological analysis is a data-driven methodology and though it uses both inductive and deductive approaches, the analysis of each quote closely reflects the text (Eatough et al., 2008; Smith, 2004). In using IPA I am interpreting the ways in which my participants are expressing their lived experiences; this technique allows me as a researcher to apply theoretical concepts while analyzing each verbatim quotation (Eatough et al., 2008). Subsequently each master theme chapter is summarized with a more general analysis examining how concepts of power and governmentality are manifested in the participants' accounts of their experiences.

In this chapter I present my first master theme, the humanization of the monstrous. Participants were asked to generally describe their views of people identified

as ‘sex offenders’ at the onset of the interviews. In their responses throughout the interviews and at different moments during the sessions the participants provided anecdotes recognizing this group as human beings. The participants expressed various ways in which they felt it was important to generally humanize people labeled as ‘sex offenders’ or their core members. This theme is especially relevant because as discussed in the literature review, these individuals are highly vilified, demonized, and regarded by many as monsters due to the perceived violent nature of their offences (Marshall, 1996; Spencer, 2009; Thomas, 2005). People categorized as ‘sex offenders’ are considered to be the worst of the worst kind of criminal (Garland, 2008; Matravers, 2003; Wilson & Prinzo, 2001). This assumption begs the question: how do some people volunteer to work with this type of criminal population?

This major theme is entitled humanization of the monstrous because it reflects how participants collectively opposed the commonly held negative views of persons identified as ‘sex offenders.’ However, the pattern exemplified throughout the transcripts illustrates how and in what ways the volunteers regard them as human beings. There are various ways in which the participants tended to humanize these individuals. Some expressed a willingness to distance or even reject socially constructed views of people labeled as ‘sex offenders’ as being monsters. Participants were also observed to personify people characterized as ‘sex offenders’ through their implicit and explicit choices of language when talking about this population or their individual core member.

The process of humanization varied between the participants. Several participants discussed assumptions of misconceptions or misrepresentations within the mass media’s depiction of this population. Likewise, some described their view as going against the

more general view of people identified as ‘sex offenders’ throughout society. Other participants emphasized the dichotomy between the act and the actor; here, they distinguished between a person’s actions, behaviours, offences, or harms and who a person truly is. Additionally, participants expressed their positive regard for their specific core member, explicitly representing the criminalized individual that they worked with as a person.

Distancing from the Public’s Perceptions

The literature suggests that the public perceives people regarded as ‘sex offenders’ as dehumanized creatures such as the monster (Mancini, & Mears, 2013; Marshall, 1996; Pickett, Spencer, 2009; Thomas, 2005). This perception is maintained by the persistence of certain commonly held assumptions, including the assumption that the ‘sex offender’ is a stranger to the victim(s) who is driven to commit his offences because of an inherent evil, deviant sexual desires, or motivated by self-interest; lastly, there is a pervasive assumption that these individuals cannot change (Pickett et al., 2013; Spencer, 2009). The public has been found to be in favour of harsher punishments as opposed to rehabilitative efforts (Pickett et al., 2013).

Some of the participants portrayed through their own narratives their individual understanding of how society perceives people categorized as ‘sex offenders.’ This is an important subordinate theme since it introduces the idea that volunteers differ from the general public since collectively they do not see persons identified as ‘sex offenders’ as monsters incapable of change. This overall idea of self-distancing was present in the transcripts and emerged throughout the participants’ narratives while discussing their various experiences working with their core members. One participant expressed that her

inherent personal bias allowed her to reject the presumed stigma that society holds, whereas another participant judged that her background in the field of criminology was the reason for her opposing view.

In the following quote, Participant 2 describes her understanding of the public's perceptions of 'sex offenders':

And then we need education that treatment does work.---That people can change because you know that whole thing once a sex offender always a sex offender I think is really ingrained in the public's mind---a lot of people still think that you know once you sexually offended that you can't change because they see it as a sickness or something that's---that you're born with...But I think there needs to be more education about um...that intervention can be effective and that people can change and not reoffend (Participant 2).

In this statement Participant 2 refers to her understanding of society's assumptions, which closely relates to the ideas found in the literature mentioned above, specifically, with regards to the common belief that sexually offensive behaviour is inherent and that individual offenders are unable to transform themselves (Pickett et al., 2013; Spencer, 2009). However, Participant 2 explicitly presents her approval of rehabilitation and asserts the need for educating the public with her understanding that treatments can be effective and people can be rehabilitated. Nonetheless, throughout the interview she presents as skeptical as to the effectiveness of the treatment that is currently available to this population. There is a slight discrepancy in Participant 2's presented opinions, since she alleges to believe that treatment works and the public should be educated about the efficacy of rehabilitation, but contradicts herself by recognizing that the current treatment is not entirely effective. Participant 2 makes reference to the need for proactive and preventative treatment but her idea to prioritize rehabilitation differs from the agenda of the current Conservative government.

In the above account, Participant 2 is observed to be distancing herself from the way that she had explained the public's perceptions of people identified as 'sex offenders.' In distancing herself she played the role of the expert compared to the uneducated public. Further, she placed a high importance on education in order to inform the public about its misconceptions. However, she did not specify what kind of education would be necessary or how this education would be disseminated. Her proposed solution of education seems to be more of an abstract ideal than a concrete plan.

When asked if her perceptions towards people labeled as 'sex offenders' have changed since joining CoSA-Ottawa, Participant 5 expresses that she has never been prejudiced and further discusses her assumptions of the most common attitudes in society:

I've always been pretty nonjudgmental open-minded about that kind of thing, that's why went into social services...it was the right field for me so---my teacher always used to ask---name a population you could not work with---everybody said sex offenders, you know...that was one thing that always came up, and you know...mine were different, mine were stuff like terminal illness or working with children or something like that. But I've always had an interest in criminal justice---As for sex offenders it's just a reality of the job so I mean you know those are the type... those are the people that most of society doesn't want out (Participant 5).

This statement illustrates how Participant 5 differentiates herself from the popular belief that 'sex offenders' should stay locked up. Her understanding of the public's perception is consistent with the literature, which states that the majority of the public is in favor of Steven Harper's tough on crime agenda leading to more punitive sanctions for persons labeled as 'sex offenders' (Mallea, 2010). More specifically, she distinguishes herself by describing herself as being nonjudgmental and open-minded compared to the general population. Like Participant 2, Participant 5 also distances herself from the general public

and goes further in separating herself completely. She seeks to position herself as more suitable for this type of work compared to others in the field.

Moreover, Participant 5 is perceived to have described her willingness to work with ‘sex offenders’ as anomalous in her field of study. She explains that when her teacher asked the social services students which population they could not work with, she singled herself out in stating that she had no issues working with the ‘sex offender’ population compared to the rest of her classmates. In addition, she mentions her interest in criminal justice. However, the field of criminology is broad and Participant 5 did not specify how this interest has shaped her. Nonetheless, her interest in criminal justice corresponds to other participants’ interests, in particular Participant 1, Participant 2, Participant 4, and Participant 6, who informed me that they had studied criminology. This coincidence will be further explored through the excerpt below.

In the following account, Participant 4 explains the reason for her contrasting view from society:

I mean I do have a background in criminology, so my idea of sex offenders is probably a lot different than the general public---I mean as criminologists we get pegged as these bleeding hearts who just take everyone in, and crime doesn't really exist and blah...blah...blah...I don't believe that...I think that there's some really crappy people out there that do really crappy things to one another---Well my idea of I guess sex offenders in general, just that there's a lot of ideas that circulate (chuckle) in society about them, that they are probably the most hated group of offenders---um...yeah and just that there's a lot of misconceptions, this idea that the majority of sex offenders are the stranger in the bush that is going to jump out at you (Participant 4).

In the statement above Participant 4 recognizes that her academic studies within the field of criminology have influenced her understanding of ‘sex offenders.’ This connection with the academic field of criminology raises some pertinent issues. First, Participant 4 expresses the feeling that her status as a criminologist causes other people to trivialize

and stereotype her as highly emotional and having an outlandish rejection of the existence of crime. In using the phrase “blah, blah, blah,” this nonsensical language and her tone convey the idea that she is actively dismissing conventional viewpoints and situating herself outside the norm. It further insinuates an argument that she has heard over and over again from others when discussing her viewpoints. Participant 4 explicitly clarifies her position in a later statement, calling her work with this criminalized population a personal “crusade [to] pull down all those barriers and blah...blah...blah.” Again, this statement reflects Participant 4’s understanding of existing socially constructed obstacles preventing people identified as ‘sex offenders’ from living successfully in society, which corresponds to Spencer’s (2009) discussion explaining the implications of viewing persons labeled as a ‘sex offender’ as a *homo sacer*.

Subsequently, Participant 4 uses vague language when referring to “crappy people” doing “crappy things.” This statement suggests an awareness of the conventional stereotypes of the socially constructed ideas of ‘criminal’ and ‘crime;’ however her ambiguous semantics convey her willingness to only partially acknowledge the commonly understood bad aspects of criminalized harm and human conflict. Furthermore, she states that ‘sex offenders’ are the most hated type of criminal group, and Spencer (2009) suggests that even other criminalized individuals demonstrate hate and violence against them. Participant 4 further alludes to her belief that there are various misconceptions about people labeled as ‘sex offenders,’ including the stranger in the bush idea that has spread throughout society and is consistent with findings in the literature (Hannem & Petrunik, 2004; Lancaster, 2011; Pickett et al., 2013; Thomas, 2005). This leads to the subsequent subordinate theme: the idea that the media widely broadcasts the

stigmatization of people categorized as ‘sex offenders.’ Participants bring up the idea that the media plays a significant role in the distribution of stigma exposing persons labeled as ‘sex offenders.’

Stigma from the Media

As was explored within the literature review, the mass media contributes to the amplification of the negative image of people identified as ‘sex offenders’ and perpetuates the panic around them (Banks, 2005; Chadee & Ditton, 2005; Comartin et al., 2009; Dowler, 2006; Garland, 2008; Hudson, 2005; Soothill, 1991; Soothill et al., 1990; Thomas, 2005; Williams-Taylor, 2012). It has been argued that the ‘sex offender’ concept and persons labeled as ‘sex offenders’ have been constructed as folk devils within our society (Hudson, 2005; Thomas, 2005). It has been found that the media, rather than educating the public, use reporting techniques to shock the public (Hudson, 2005; Thomas, 2005). For example, they present stereotypical images and use vulgar, emotionally-laden language in their stories (Hudson, 2005; Thomas, 2005).

Various researchers have found evidence indicating that the media sensationalizes crime stories by using a general tactic whereby they focus on the most atypical and violent cases (Hudson, 2005; Thomas, 2005). Consequently, this leads the public to believe that they and their children are directly at risk from these individuals (Hudson, 2005; Thomas, 2005). Acknowledging and being aware of the mass media’s influence on the representation of people identified as ‘sex offenders’ is a common theme observable across the participants in this study. Some participants show an explicit rejection of the media’s portrayal of ‘sex offenders’ through their own narratives. Others convey that their previous conceptions of persons labeled as ‘sex offenders’ came from the media,

and these individuals stated that education and exposure to this criminalized population influenced their current views.

During the interviews, participants were asked about their general perceptions of persons identified as ‘sex offenders.’ Without a prompt from me, most of the participants discussed the media’s involvement in circulating ideas about the ‘sex offender.’ The following quote presents Participant 1 describing how the media has portrayed these individuals:

Um...well I think just like cause...uh...I think people in the media tend to...uh to paint them all with the same brush where it's like you know the they can never change it's...you know it's...part of their biology or you know they... um...or th...either that or they chose to...to do this cause they're...they're evil people they're monsters (Participant 1).

In the quote above, Participant 1 acknowledges the media’s influence on how the image of the ‘sex offender’ is socially constructed. She states that the media has presented these criminalized individuals as a homogenous population. Moreover, she indicates the media is at fault for having depicted them as biologically different from other people, and in doing so, presenting the argument that since it is a part of their biological make up they are unable to change their offending behaviour. In addition, her statement reflects the idea that sex offending as portrayed in the media has been depicted as a choice, and is only chosen by “evil” people. Her view is consistent with existing research that argues that the media portrays persons labeled as ‘sex offenders’ as biologically different, vilified individuals, evil, or even as monsters (Pickett et al., 2013; Spencer 2009).

Furthermore, in Participant 1’s description of ‘sex offenders’ there was noticeable hesitation in her voice and she re-started speaking in some instances. This could suggest that she was trying to monitor what she was going to say in response to how she views this population. Participant 1 perhaps felt nervous about how I would interpret her views

and wanted to think and formulate her ideas before expressing them. In addition, Participant 1 used the metaphor of painting, possibly to emphasize the artistic and permanent strategies used by the media to illustrate people identified as ‘sex offenders’ as a certain kind of character or monster.

In the next quote, Participant 2 similarly references the media’s portrayal of people labeled as ‘sex offenders’ when asked about her general perceptions of them.

Without being probed, the participant brings up the media:

Um...well I think they're...it's a very heterogeneous group. So I, I think sometimes in society and in the media they are portrayed as one type of person you know the 'sex offender.' But um...there it's a very um...diverse groups of people right? Cause sexual offending is like sexual offences are there is a variety of them (Participant 2).

In this statement, Participant 2, much like Participant 1 in the previous quotation suggests that the media portrays this population as a homogeneous group. In her view, the media depicts ‘sex offenders’ as being true to the stereotyped image of the typical sex offender, which is similar to what is described by academics (Hudson, 2005; Thomas, 2005; Spencer 2009). However, she was quick to dismiss this misconception and then asserts that ‘sex offenders’ are unique and have distinct characteristics. Participant 2’s understanding of this population fits with the discourse, which states that people labeled as ‘sex offenders’ represent a diverse population (Douard & Schultz, 2013; Spencer, 2009; Thomas, 2005; Williams-Taylor, 2012).

Additionally, her expression indicates that she holds the view that sexual offences vary in nature and motivation. Participant 2 also discusses that, like the behaviour itself, the actors committing these offences can also be diverse. Pickett et al. (2013) state that despite the variability of behaviours classified as sexual offending, anyone deemed a ‘sex offender’ is subjected to stigma. Participant 2’s statement invokes the idea that when the

term sex offender is heard a media-generated image is produced of who they are and what they did; however, Participant 2 proposes that this image is too simplistic and that these individuals and offences are actually diverse. The literature suggests that the image of the typical 'sex offender' has been changing over time; for example, during the welfare period the 'sex offender' was represented as the "dirty old man," in the 1980s there was a shift in language to the "rapist," then in the 1990s it returned to the "dirty old man." Today we have a conflated idea that the 'sex offender' and the 'pedophile' are synonymous labels for this type of violence (Spencer, 2009, p. 225).

In the transcripts, Participant 4 discusses how she sees people regarded as 'sex offenders' as not an other but believes that "the problematic (chuckle) mentality that people have toward sex offenders [has been] creating this whole problem...this whole divide...and I think that once you can get past that, you start to look at it differently" (Participant 4). The preceding statement illustrates Participant 4's explicit rejection of current views towards people identified as 'sex offenders.' Furthermore, a chuckle in the midst of explaining her ideas is interpreted as her conveying a possible disdain or frustration towards normative conceptions of this population. Throughout the transcripts Participant 4 was observed to chuckle a lot and at various random moments, such as after stating that sex offences are a crime. In this case, Participant 4 discusses her understanding of the social construction of sexual crimes and simplifies the legal system by stating that "we just codify in a criminal code...someone decides and puts down on paper what we as society decide is legal and what we decide is illegal" and in a further statement suggests that these decisions are highly influenced "for whatever reason, whether it be social norms and social pressures." The preceding quotation further

exemplifies her frustration towards conceptions of crime being constructed through normative social practices.

In addition, following the quote above, I asked Participant 4 to provide her view on what could be done to address this problem. The statement below presents her discussion of the media's function in stigmatizing people labeled as 'sex offenders:'

The media is absolutely disastrous in the way that they report on these things---but I mean if it bleeds, it leads, whatever...--- somewhere along the way our social subconscious was tapped into to ha...paint this entire population as being terrifying, so now that that has been done it's just continuing to feed this misconception that we have. I mean what is that stupid newspaper the Sun is it?---I have to like not look at the headlines half the time because there's literally uh...someone's face plastered on the front of it with the words monster pedophile written across, you go on Facebook now social media is making the whole thing even worse.--- "Sex offender" like on my own Facebook like on my own friends... "Sex offender released into the community" you know protest in rise aware of this face (exaggerated) in your community. And they'll post this stuff on Facebook its so social media has actually made everything worse so I would just bring that to a crashing halt (Participant 4).

Here, Participant 4 explicitly disagrees with the media's treatment and reporting of criminalized sexual harms. Her overt disagreement is exemplified when she states, "the media is absolutely disastrous." To further illustrate her point, Participant 4 uses the cliché "if it bleeds, it leads" as a way to describe her belief in the lack of moral integrity in news stories. Her standpoint is consistent with the literature that suggests that the media sensationalizes stories in order to sell their reports (Dowler, 2006; Kemshall & Wood, 2007; Thomas, 2005). She discusses her belief that the media has been able to "tap into our social subconscious," making the assumption that the public is unable to form their own opinions of people labeled as 'sex offenders' without the influence of the media, which has led to them being stereotyped and feared. Participant 4, like Participant 1, uses a painting metaphor in her account. Similarly, Participant 4 appears to have

created an image in the reader's mind of a blank canvas being covered by one colour, thereby losing its individuality and uniqueness.

Additionally, in her narrative she describes an example where she specifically targets *The Sun* newspaper for the way that it dramatizes sex offender-based reports of criminalized violence. Moreover, Participant 4 appears to feel so strongly against how these harms are reported that she claims to abandon this form of news source on occasion. Likewise, she declares that social media exacerbates the stigmatization of people identified as 'sex offenders' and further aggravates the moral panic. Participant 4 emphasizes that her "own friends" have posted stories about 'sex offenders' and their negative views towards them. She strongly emphasized her "own friends" in this statement in order to highlight her concern for her friends being deceived by the media's representation of people identified as 'sex offenders.' Participant 4's emotional language suggests a primarily anger-driven response to the media and its influence.

Participant 3 also refers to the media when asked about his general views of people regarded as 'sex offenders:'

So that, I guess that was kind of my uh sort of my initial perception um...like when I was growing up. Like when I was uh young like I'm talking preteen years uh...the Clifford Olson trial---that kind of left a big impression in terms of you know seeing someone as a sexual predator---murderer, you know that was there's a lot of media for that---and then in the early 90s uh the the Paul Bernardo and Karla Homolka thing, that was pretty big---yeah, so those were sort of I guess some of the...I guess the touchstones at least in Canada that I---that I was aware of you know who are big sex offenders who are big kind of monsters that we want locked away type thing---I'd say it it tended to be sort of the the stereotype of like a uh Clifford Olson or Paul Bernardo type like someone like a a very sensationalistic view of someone who abducted strangers and did bad things to them---um...it was only later on as a you know University student doing---my own kind of reading and learning about things that I learned that most sex offences take place within families that usually uh victims and perpetrators know each other, you know that that sort of opened

opened my mind up a little bit---uh so yeah I'd say as a kid like I say that they're stereotypes almost like one-dimensional characters--- And then like through CoSA I'd say like I've really learned a lot in terms of the you know the the the perpetrator victim cycle---where that's coming from so I'd say I have a much more uh...sympathetic view---like I don't I try not to paint them and that one-dimensional (Participant 3).

In this excerpt, Participant 3 talks about his exposure to “big” criminalized sexual harm cases. He states these cases have had an influence on his social perceptions of people categorized as ‘sex offenders.’ These cases in the media have constructed the offenders as monsters. He refers to the high profile Clifford Olson case initially influencing his view of the ‘sex offender’ as a “sexual predator...murderer.” He alludes to another high profile case, involving Paul Bernardo and Karla Homolka, which also shaped his past perceptions. Participant 3 explains that these two cases were “big” “touchstone” cases in Canada, whose perpetrators were all portrayed by the media as “monsters” in need of indefinite imprisonment. Participant 3 reveals that the media’s sensationalized reporting of these cases highly influenced his past perceptions of people identified as ‘sex offenders.’

Later in the interview, Participant 3 was asked to clarify his recollection of how he remembers perceiving persons categorized as ‘sex offenders’ prior to joining CoSA-Ottawa. He refers back to the high profile cases mentioned above and insists on society having a certain stereotypical view of ‘sex offenders.’ This is consistent with scholars who suggest that society holds stereotypical assumptions about people labeled as ‘sex offenders’ (Hudson, 2005; Pickett et al., 2013; Spencer, 2009; Thomas, 2005). He suggests that society developed the belief that ‘sex offenders’ typically commit their offences against strangers and this assumption is prevalent within the academic discourse (Hudson, 2005; Pickett et al., 2013; Spencer, 2009; Thomas, 2005). Despite Participant 3

recognizing these assumptions, he further distances himself by attributing his knowledge of sexual harm and the people who commit these acts to his prior university education, self-learning, and participation in CoSA-Ottawa. Participant 3 explains that he no longer sees people labeled as ‘sex offenders’ with a narrow-minded view but has become more open-minded to the uniqueness of individuals and adopts a sympathetic view toward them. Participant 3, like Participants 1 and 4, also uses a painting metaphor. In his account this metaphor is as a way to emphasize that his perception of people labeled as ‘sex offenders’ has changed over time. He further highlights that he now sees them as distinctive individuals, not as stereotypes.

Another way in which the volunteers distanced themselves from socially constructed ideas of ‘sex offenders’ was when they explicitly or implicitly differentiated between the act and the actor. They tended to suggest that while they did not agree with the behaviour they did not see the individual as a bad person. This was contrary to how society has predominantly viewed people deemed as ‘sex offenders.’ People who have committed sexual offences have been labeled in society as ‘sex offenders,’ and most often these labels have become their master status. Howard Becker’s (1963) concept of master status has been described as “a set of characteristics that over-determines identity and overshadows all the other aspects of an individual’s character” (p. 72). These labels have been known to follow individuals throughout their life, starting from when they are accused of a sexual offence through their time in prison, continuing upon their release and during their reintegration process. However, the participants separated *what offenders did* from *who offenders are*. In some instances participants referred to their criminalized harms or offences as mistakes. Many volunteers emphasized the importance for offenders

to be able to move on from their pasts during their reintegration process. In addition, a few participants introduced the idea that sex offending was similar to a substance addiction. The ways in which the participants distinguished between the offence and the offender varied.

Participant 2 responds as follows when asked her thoughts about the words ‘sex offender’ or ‘sex offending:’

Well, I think in general we have to stay away from the label.---cause it sort of...it takes over the status of the individual right? So I prefer to use you know “person who has sexually offended” so that the behaviour is not them. So when I hear that, like the term sex offender I immediately kinda have a problem with that and just think it’s a person who has sexually offended (Participant 2).

In this passage Participant 2 swiftly rejects the label: ‘sex offender.’ She describes her assumption that the ‘sex offender’ label becomes the individual’s overall identity as his master status. As was cited above, Becker’s (1963) master status describes how one characteristic of a person such as them being convicted of a sexual offence thus being labeled a ‘sex offender’ can dominate the person’s life, which further reduces the other diverse roles that make the person an individual. In the account above she emphasizes the phrase “person who has sexually offended” to describe her belief that a person’s behaviour does not define who they are. Participant 2 humanizes the individual when she foremost identifies him as a person above his harmful behaviour. In rejecting the label of ‘sex offender’ she explicitly separates the individual from the offence committed.

The following statement illustrates Participant 1’s response regarding her understanding and views of this harmful behaviour:

I don’t agree with it I don’t think it’s anything that is good in anyway necessarily but um...uh in saying that I guess I don’t think that all sex offenders should be vilified in the same way. Um...cause there’s um I guess different reasoning’s behind why they do what they do or why they

made this one mistake---it's not like it sounds like I'm like condoning their behaviour (chuckle) which I'm not.---um...but just like accepting as you know you have done this terrible thing but you know you're still a person and you know how could we move past this so this doesn't happen again (Participant 1).

In this excerpt, Participant 1 explains clearly that while she does not condone the action of sexual offending she does not believe that all of the people identified as 'sex offenders' should be demonized in the same way. Participant 1 alludes to her understanding that there are diverse reasons behind sexual offending. Using the term "reasons" removes some accountability from the offender, and having called the offence "a mistake" might be understood as a way for Participant 1 to disassociate the violent action from the individual, thus seeing him as a human being. In addition, she describes a sexual offence as "a mistake" which deemphasizes the notion of a single behaviour somehow having the ability to define who a person is or how they ought to be treated by others. This idea relates to her wanting to look beyond the label of his actions and further resisting seeing him as the 'sex offender' and more as a person who can change. She perhaps felt differently towards repeat sexual offenders, though, as was evident when she was quoted later on in the interview stating, "I feel like there's...there's probably few people that um...do need to be I don't know, excluded from society...that sounds terrible" (Participant 1). She expresses that even though overall she believes that people can change, there remain exceptions to this idea and therefore there are some people who remain a true danger to society.

In the extended quote above, Participant 1 stresses that she does not accept offending behaviour, but feels that it is necessary to accept the behaviour in a certain way in order to move past it and ensure that it is not repeated. Furthermore, Participant 1 underlines her perception that these people have the ability to change, which is a belief

distinct from our society's widely held assumptions (Pickett et al., 2013; Spencer, 2009). She highlights that in doing so she acknowledged the individual has remained a person regardless of his actions.

Participant 6 responds as follows when asked how he feels his involvement has contributed to the lives of his core members: "What I feel some of them have gained is respect for themselves...the realization that there is a difference between the offence and the offender" (Participant 6). Participant 6 stated that he had been involved in CoSA for over ten years and had participated in six circles. Compared to other participants interviewed, he had developed varied experiences with multiple core members. He describes his overall belief as to the difference between the offence and the offender and hopes that the core members will come to this realization through participation in the CoSA-Ottawa program. He highlights the importance of this process, emphasizing that it is necessary for his core members to become self-aware of their own humanity.

Participant 4 discusses her views towards 'sex offenders' while emphasizing her humanistic view of people:

I do recognize that some people like I said do really crappy things for inexplicable reasons, but the grand majority of them I would say it's their humanity that actually makes them who they are (Participant 4).

In the preceding quotation, Participant 4 acknowledges that individuals may behave badly for reasons that cannot be explained. Again, she appears to be distancing herself from conventional understandings of criminalized harms by using vague language such as "crappy things" while also suggesting there are reasons for this behaviour. Regardless of her having recognized the behaviour, Participant 4 suggests, "it's their humanity...that makes them who they are." In this quotation it is clear that her beliefs differ from those of the general public, in which people labeled as 'sex offenders' are seen as inhuman and

different from the normal man (Spencer, 2009). These ideas lead to a process of othering, which generates a dichotomy of us versus them (Spencer, 2009). However, in her statement humanity is understood as an inherent characteristic of all individuals regardless of their behaviour. A human being is defined by their intrinsic humanity rather than by their behaviour. In this way, “humanity” suggests a connection of all people within humankind who share the potential for being good or bad, but emphasizes that even those who committed criminalized harms still have the potential to be good. In this quotation Participant 4, like most of her peers, openly distinguishes the person from their behaviour and also relies on the idea of common humanity to bridge the gap between us and them.

Similarly, Participant 5 also emphasizes her humanistic view in her response to her understanding of ‘sex offenders.’ In the following excerpt she highlights that even prior to joining CoSA-Ottawa she has always viewed everyone (including persons identified as ‘sex offenders’) as deserving of being treated like a human being:

What do I think about people who commit crimes? I mean you know I work with them so obviously I don't have I don't condone what they've done but I also don't have a problem with them as human beings.---I've always lived with the belief that like everyone deserves to be treated as a human being regardless of what they've done. Even though I know the crime that they've done and I don't condone it to me that doesn't mean that they should be um...treated worse than somebody who say robs a bank or kills somebody but for some people someone who kills someone is a lot better than a sex offender but I mean it's a crime either way so, I don't see them really any differently than anybody else (Participant 5).

Participant 5 begins by overtly describing her general denunciation of criminalized behaviour. Nonetheless, she does not distinguish people who commit criminalized sexual harms from those who commit other criminalized offences of comparable severity and consequently generalizes the initial question. Participant 5 displays her belief that all

criminals, regardless of the type of wrongdoing that they commit, should be regarded as “human beings.” Her response emphasizes that all individuals who commit criminalized offences are the same. In her example, Participant 5 refers to bank “robbers, murderers, and sex offenders” as being equal, and all deserving of being humanized. However, she also notes that other people in society might feel as though this type of criminalized group were worse than murderers, and she personally rejects this view.

Differentiating between the act and the actor is a common theme throughout participants’ narratives. Unlike the description of the media’s view of this criminalized population, the participants in their accounts display more willingness to see these individuals as people who committed terrible offences rather than strictly and reductively as monsters. This observation is similar to results from Drewery’s (2008) sample of volunteers, who express a willingness to work with people identified as ‘sex offenders’ through CoSA out of a need to humanize this population. The participants present this idea of humanizing people who are labeled as ‘sex offenders’ in a way that makes it evident that they are subconsciously rationalizing their work, since this population is highly stigmatized in our society.

Moreover, contrary to the media’s portrayal of this criminalized population as being homogeneous, the participants generally recognize that persons who commit sexual offences are fundamentally different from one another. This understanding is consistent with the literature, which suggests that this criminalized group represents a heterogeneous population (Douard & Schultz, 2013; Thomas, 2005; Williams-Taylor, 2012). Nevertheless, most participants focus their attention on those who commit sexual violence against children. Some use the term ‘sex offender’ as if it were synonymous

with the term pedophile. This relates to how society views criminalized sexual harm against children to be more violent and repulsive than other types of criminalized sexual harm (Harrison, 2010; Thomas, 2005; Williams-Taylor, 2012). In addition, as discussed before, today the term ‘sex offender’ is interchangeable with the term pedophile (Spencer, 2009). As discussed throughout the literature review, children have been typically seen as vulnerable and in need of protection (Lancaster, 2011; Thomas, 2005). Although some of the participants in their discussions focused on the perpetrators of sexual offences against children, they continued to acknowledge other types of sexual offences.

Personifying the Core Member

Through the interviews, participants emphasized the importance of characterizing their specific core member in terms of the core member’s potential or redeeming individual characteristics. Participants construct them as ‘in-disposable’ persons.

When asked how she views ‘sex offenders’ as a result of her direct involvement with her core member, Participant 1 replies: “They’re not totally inhuman either like the guy that I work...that I’m with now, like you know he’s a funny guy...he has a lot of potential to contribute productively to society” (Participant 1). Participant 1 expresses her belief that ‘sex offenders’ are “not totally inhuman.” Here, her emphasis on “totally” hints that she had some initial negative perception, meaning that she is ambivalent about whether to view the entire population of ‘sex offender’ as part of humankind. However, she effortlessly describes her core member as having positive personality traits and expresses feeling like he has potential to contribute productively to society. In this phrase, the terms “potential” and “productively” are value-based statements, which

suggest that in order to be treated as a human being one must have the ability to contribute in a positive way to society.

Participant 2 explains specific characteristics common to the core member population at CoSA-Ottawa:

Participant 2: *My core member is one person, right?---so um...we can't like say you know core members slash sex offenders I guess as if it was the same---because, they're they're very they're a certain type of person right? um...*

Researcher: *because they volunteer to...?*

Participant 2: *well yeah they volunteered, um...in general core members tend to be a bit older*

Researcher: *mhm*

Participant 2: *they voluntarily, you know well first they've been identified and convicted right?---so that in itself it just there's lots of people who sexually offended who are not caught.*

Participant 2 acknowledges that core members are unique individuals and is cautious about making generalizations of the entire 'sex offender' population. She recognizes the boundaries of her perceptions since her experiences have been with distinctive core members. Participant 2 insinuates that core members are a specific kind of individual. She clarifies her remark by having referred to the distinctive characteristics of core members, including that they are usually older and have been convicted of a sexual offence. In addition, she also suggests that there are many individuals who have sexually offended who have not been caught, which means that they never end up going through the same formal and informal processes, including CoSA.

Below, Participant 5 discusses the specific positive characteristics she feels her core member possessed:

In my case my core member does, and he's doing really well. You know he's, he's going to school, he is seeing Dr. Fedoroff; he's seeing every doctor he has to; he's seeing you know every program; he's going through every program that he can find that will help him. You know and he wants

to go back to college and he wants to do all sorts of things and there's lots of guys who want to do that (Participant 5).

Participant 5 expresses her admiration for her core member stating that from her perspective he was doing “really well.” She further explains this value-based statement referencing the various activities that he is involved in, including attending school, meeting with Dr. Fedoroff (Director of the Sexual Behaviours Clinic at the Royal Ottawa Mental Health Centre), seeing his medical doctor, and participating in every program that could help him.

Participant 5 distinguishes between the programs that were mandated versus the ones she assumed he felt would have been “helpful.” The term “helpful” was ambiguous and in this context it might mean in order to prevent his recidivism, or for the pursuit of a life outside prison. Nonetheless, she appears to measure her core member’s success through his willingness to participate in various organizations and institutions that may help him in terms of allowing access to an alternative social place.

Within Participant 6’s discussion, he argues that CoSA-Ottawa has increasingly become bureaucratized, though he states that even with his opposition to the way things have been changing within the organization, he remains involved because he wants to help core members. “That all of this is done for them, and to anyway help them realize that they are cared for. They’re considered human, they are not a throwaway” (Participant 6). In this small statement Participant 6 articulates that CoSA-Ottawa was designed for the benefit of the core member. He feels that it was created as a way for the core member to understand that there are people who care for him and consider him a human being despite how society feels towards him. Participant 6 claims that core members are not

“throwaway[s],” a term that perhaps relates most closely to the second phrase of CoSA-Ottawa’s philosophy, “no one is disposable.”

The majority of the participants discuss humanizing their core members that they work with directly. As previously discussed, the media tends to dehumanize people identified as ‘sex offenders,’ which perpetuates disproportionate reactions to these individuals observed in society. People labeled as ‘sex offenders’ have been used as scapegoats in order to advance various political agendas in favor of implementing more retributive forms of punishment (Douard & Schultz, 2013; Pickett et al., 2013). This humanization process links with the volunteers having created diverse relationships with their core members.

Humanizing the ‘Sex Offender’ through Power and Governmentality

The practice of humanization can be described through Foucault’s concept of power since it can be understood as a creative process (Feder, 2011; O’Malley, 2009; McGushin, 2011). In this sense, the participants were able to generate a new perspective on people regarded as ‘sex offenders.’ This process occurred in a number of ways; for example the participants distanced themselves from society’s and the media’s constructs of this criminalized and highly stigmatized population. Through this distancing they were able to produce an opposing perception of these individuals.

Furthermore, Foucault’s (1999) conception of power as productive is made evident when the participants in their accounts personified their core members and described their potential in terms of becoming productive members of society. One participant appears to measure her core member’s productivity in terms of his attendance and participation in various programs and institutions. This relates to the idea that power

is intrinsic within the day-to-day life of the core member and the volunteers, which helps to shape the core member into a docile being (May, 2011). The core member becomes obedient toward the volunteers who are showing that they care for his well-being by celebrating his successes. The successes are defined as ways in which the core member becomes reintegrated in society and participates in programs that are considered helpful in preventing his recidivism. This is exemplified when Participant 5 lists the ways that her core member is proving to make an effort to become re-socialized.

Overall, the process of humanization can be understood as a form of resistance, which as Foucault claims can produce knowledge and transform practices (Barker, 1998). The resistance stems from the ways in which participants distanced themselves from commonly held views of people identified as ‘sex offenders.’ Through their narratives they have produced a new identity and new image of this population.

According to Murray Li (2007), government aims to educate the population about its desires, goals, and beliefs. Murray Li’s explanation of government closely reflects Participant 6’s statement indicating that he and CoSA-Ottawa’s overall purpose was to make the core member realize that he was a human being and not a “throwaway.” Here, Participant 6 positions himself to educate the core member about his own humanity. Power is exercised through the relationship of the volunteer and the core member; however, this study only produces the subjective experiences representing the outcome of implicit power.

The general humanization practices exemplified through the accounts of the participants closely reflect the concepts of hierarchical observation and normalizing judgment (Hoffman, 2011; Heyes, 2011). The participants construct the core members as

objects of knowledge but do so without access to formal mechanisms such as assessments or case files. However, they use their relationship with the core member to learn about him with the fundamental goal of shaping his behaviour and shifting his attitudes from anti-social to pro-social. The overall idea of re-socialization will be further explored in the following chapter.

CHAPTER 5: THE REINTEGRATION AND RE-SOCIALIZATION THROUGH A HELPING RELATIONSHIP

The reintegration and re-socialization through a helping relationship is the second master theme that materialized from the transcripts. This theme illustrates how the volunteers express and explain their roles and relationships while working with their core members. In their interviews, participants describe what they did with their core members. I have interpreted their explanations as them taking on different roles through their involvement with their core members. Underlying all of these roles and relationships is the idea of the volunteer helping the core member. This help took place in various ways; participants typically described situations in which they assisted their core member in attending to his specific practical needs or emotional needs. There were several patterns and roles demonstrated throughout the transcripts. These are identified as the agent of help, the agent of risk prevention, the agent of protection, and the agent of companionship/friendship. These concepts emerged both through the data as well as through my interpretation of the participant's narratives. These conceptualizations of the various roles that I have interpreted through the data connect to the ideas of power and governmentality through the subjective experiences of this relationship. These conceptual associations are discussed further through the participants' accounts.

Agent of Help

The agent of help was a consistent theme across the various interview transcripts. At one point or another participants all mentioned the idea of helping their core member. Some described helping their core member with various physical or practical needs, such as finding housing, job, or doctor. Also, they explained helping their core members deal

with more abstract or emotional needs, such as navigating through the norms and expectations of society. The agent of help is a broad theme that encompasses several roles that appear throughout accounts of the participants.

In the following quotation, Participant 1 indicates that she, along with her fellow volunteers, has been helpful to her core member:

So I think in that sense we were helpful cause I think it was just kinda like okay well you're free out of prison you know go reintegrate now like they wouldn't have been helpful at all. Um, so like we've we've kinda stepped up with help helping set appointments um, one of our volunteers helped him get set up with a doctor cause he is having a lot of health issues now. So, he's got that kinda squared away, we're helping set up stuff with uh with John Howard---to get him like a job and um you know he's got a place right now he's not super happy with his apartment so we're all kind of banding together to find uh a cheapish apartment for him in the next couple months (Participant 1).

In this context, help refers to when she assisted her core member attend to his practical needs (CoSA-Ottawa, 2012). Above, she describes her general understanding of the process her core member went through after being released from prison and returned to the community with no support or help. Fox (2014) suggests that these criminalized individuals return to the community where they lack social bonds, so she demonstrates how CoSA acts as a network of nonjudgmental support. Accordingly, CoSA-Ottawa offered support and through the creation of a circle around him he was able to receive assistance with various tasks. Participant 1 uses the term “banding together” to explain how she and her fellow volunteers worked together to help out their core member. Her statement reflects the presumption that her circle is successfully functioning as a team, and thus able to attend to their core member’s various needs.

She said that the circle assisted with setting up appointments in order to attend to her core member’s medical needs, which Participant 1 implied were quite serious. They

also connected him with the John Howard Society, a community organization that works with individuals who have been in contact with the law. She, too, states that as a team the volunteers worked together to help find the core member a job and more suitable housing. From her statement, it is evident that the interconnection between formal institutions and community organizations is perceived as necessary for the reintegration of offenders.

In his account, Participant 6 explains that he was willing to provide help to his core members only if they wanted it:

That I'm there to help them, and there to do what I can uh...that it is up to them, that I'm not going to go out of my way if they don't, and that they are quite free to lie to me and use whatever they have learned in their multiple programs they are only harming themselves, because they aren't harming me one damn bit. I'm going to go on with my life. I'll also tell them I'm going to call a spade a spade. Um...That again that...I'm...I'm willing to help them provided they want to help, that I can provide, certain things I cannot provide. And there are other Circle members for that. Uh... Basically it's up to them, if you want to avail yourself of what I can offer, great (Participant 6).

As previously described, Participant 6 has more experience in CoSA-Ottawa than the other participants; because of this history, his narratives stand out compared to other accounts. In particular, he is more explicit when discussing negative attributes of his core members. Participant 6 appears to be more restrained compared to other participants who seem more idealistic in terms of discussing their core member's potential to change pro-socially. This is evident in the above statement where he describes that core members may lie or use information gained from programs as tactics of manipulation. Moreover, Participant 6 seems to convey the impression that their actions had no consequence for him, and distances himself from the core members.

Despite Participant 6's seemingly detached viewpoint, he did confirm that his involvement in CoSA-Ottawa was to help the core members in any way he could. However, without going into specifics, Participant 6 acknowledges his own personal limitations about the help that he is able to provide to his core members. He mentions that he relies on his fellow circle members for attending to the core members' other needs. Murphy et al., (2010) stated that volunteers expressed feeling supported by other circle volunteers as a positive impact of their work. Participant 6's account evokes the implication of an embedded shared responsibility within circle dynamics. In his case, it seems as though Participant 6 is not oblivious to the potential emotional impacts of the experience, but rather feels that sharing the responsibility with other volunteers may allow him to diffuse potential blame or other unpleasant emotions in cases where problems arise.

Furthermore, Participant 6 implies that the onus for seeking help from him is always on his core members. In this quotation it is evident that Participant 6 has enforced clear boundaries between him and his core members throughout his years of involvement; however, he did not specify what kinds of help he was willing to deliver and what kinds he was not. By placing the onus on the core member for seeking Participant 6's help, he encourages the core member to become accountable for his own reintegration process and further attempts to responsabilize him. In this way the term *homo prudens* can demonstrate that in placing the duty on his core member to seek his support Participant 6 is shaping the core member's behaviour toward becoming a self-governing subject responsible for his own pro-social reintegration (Garland, 1997).

The next excerpt portrays Participant 5's response when asked how being involved in CoSA has impacted her life:

I'm here to help you but also you know I have work, I have my personal life, I have all these things in my life that I have to balance in addition to balancing this relationship we have---so why don't we make better use of it instead of just doing you know whatever. Which at the beginning we try to make a priority of more of the important things like you know if they need to get their health card, or their ID. When they first come out we try to make a habit of let's get all these important things lined up, let's get you you know signed up with Dr. Fedoroff, let's get down to the police station so you can register, let's get all these things done instead of like k let's just go to the movies or something like that (Participant 5).

In this passage, Participant 5 expresses that she is “here to help,” though despite her presumed willingness, she highlights the importance of letting her core member know that her role with him must be balanced amongst the many other roles she takes on in her life. Participant 5 suggests that her time is precious and her core member should acknowledge this as a condition for their relationship to develop. Murphy et al., (2010) found that difficulty scheduling meeting times was a negative impact that volunteers had described. Participant 5 describes what she and her core member did upon his release from prison during the initial weeks of their relationship. She explains that they did “important” things such as getting a health card, setting up appointments, and registering with the police. Participant 5 conveys that these responsibilities are a more important priority in their relationship than spending their time on social activities. In this way, it can be understood that Participant 5 is imposing her own agenda onto her core member and thus shaping his behaviour.

Participants commonly refer to their work as helping the core member. Existing literature suggests that volunteers within various CoSA-based programs felt the circles were helpful for this population (Cesaroni, 2001; Wilson et al., 2007). The help

participants provide is a function of the needs of the core member, as well as how the participant views their own capacity to help him. Most of the participants describe helping their core member by meeting his practical needs, including helping them obtain identification, scheduling appointments, as well as finding a job or housing.

Agent of Risk Prevention

The term risk and risk-based narratives stand as a subordinate theme within this analysis, as they were discussed extensively by some of the participants. Risk is understood by Castel (1991) as the uncertainty of danger; it is explicitly related to the conventional notions of ‘crime’ and ‘criminality’ (Garland, 1997). Risk has implications for how individuals are to be governed (Hannah-Moffat, 2005; O’Malley, 2009). Certain participants describe being aware and diligent, noticing changes in their core member’s behaviour or demeanor. Particular participants express a belief that their core member would not reoffend against a victim; however, at the same time, core members are perceived as remaining susceptible to breaking their restrictions. They emphasize that one of their roles is to help core members deal with and overcome stressful and difficult situations in order to prevent them from reoffending or getting into other kinds of trouble.

In the subsequent quotation, Participant 1 describes a situation where her core member disclosed to her that some of his money was stolen from him:

He said he had some money stolen from him so we were talking a bit about that and um...some of the challenges that he’s going to be facing um...in the coming weeks. Cause he doesn’t have as much money as he thought he was going to. Um...what else? He was also super pissed and wanted to like go after the guy that he’s pretty sure stole his money so that was uh...that was a bit of uh a challenge. Just to be like okay well you know, obviously you’re really angry I would be really angry too. You know let’s let’s take a step back do you really think confrontation is the best way to handle this situation, um...you know the money is already

gone, you probably will not get it back if you get into a fight with him
(Participant 1).

Participant 1, in her discussion, did not provide specific details as to how the money was stolen, but instead reviews how the conversation between her and her core member played out. First, she explains that they discussed the situation, referring to the challenges that he will most likely face because of his lack of funds. She notes that he was very angry, and admitted to her that he wanted to “go after” the person who he believed had stolen his money. She contends that dealing with this particular situation was a challenge for her. Participant 1 recalls having empathy towards her core member, stating that she too would be upset if someone had stolen her money. However, she insists that her core member think before he acts. In addition, she recalls telling him that the fact of the situation was that the money was probably already gone and he would be unlikely to get it back even if he fought with the individual who had stolen it. Participant 1’s agenda, in this case, seems to have been to prevent her core member from committing further criminal activity, which could have been the result if he got into a fight.

Participant 4 in this next statement discusses her role as being attentive to the changes in her core member’s behaviour:

But as long as I do what I do, and when I notice I mean it’s not to sound not diligent about things when I notice, and as a group when we notice things changing, when there’s high tense high stress times in his life then we address all those things. Risk factors that we’ve identified as a group like not necessarily what’s reflected in all the reports that get made up about them (Participant 4).

In this excerpt, Participant 4 refers to her position as part of a team of other volunteers within the circle who together observe the changes or times of high stress and then address those situations. Further, she notes that her role is to focus on the risk factors that they as a circle had identified and not the ones based on the formal reports created about

the core member by various institutions. Some academics have argued that the carceral system relies heavily on the use of actuarial risk assessments to guide practices despite their lack predictive validity (Maurutto & Hannah-Moffat, 2006; Walklate, 1999).

In her account, Participant 4 implicitly communicates the need for self-agency due to the tension between recognizing the risk posed by the core member and the necessity of their relationship. The way in which Participant 4 described the reports as documents “that get made up about them” indicates her skepticism about the carceral system and its practices. This is also clear when she insinuates that the risk factors determined by the circle are more accurate than the ones in the formal reports.

Participant 3, like Participant 4 above, maintains the importance of being aware of variations in his core member’s conduct:

Yeah, that being said though we do we do like whenever I meet him we do have that sort of check in at the beginning in terms of how things are going what’s been going on that sort of thing. Um...You know just look for any any changes in um...the person’s demeanor or you know just anything---if there’s any if there’s anything that is causing like a tingling you know in the back of our necks---so usually, you know something (Participant 3).

Participant 3 discusses the routine of doing a “check-in” with his core member, where he describes asking his core member on a regular basis how he is doing, and what has been going on with him since they last saw each other. Participant 3 says that it is the responsibility of him and his fellow circle volunteers to notice changes in their core member’s character. He further claims to rely on his intuition to tell when something might be wrong with his core member. His instinct is presumably based on his connection with the core member on a relational level. He states that he knows his core member well enough that he can tell if something is different or wrong, and he seems to take on a lot of responsibility to prevent any issues himself. He contends that on most

occasions he and other volunteers need to remain aware of changes in their core member in order to foresee potential issues.

Participant 6 states that none of the core members he had worked with through his involvement with CoSA-Ottawa have reoffended:

None of the people that I worked with reoffended, which is a reflection not of me but of CoSA. I think the recidivism rate is 35, 45% or less, no less twenty something 24, 26% that is nothing compared to the average (Participant 6).

He suggests that this result is not a reflection of him or his work, but a reflection of the overall ability of CoSA-Ottawa to help these individuals reintegrate into the community. Furthermore, he estimates that the recidivism rate of core members who are involved with CoSA-Ottawa is low, especially compared to the recidivism rates of people convicted of sexual offending who were not with CoSA-Ottawa. His assumption is consistent with findings in the literature, which indicate the effectiveness of CoSA programs in reducing the recidivism rates of its core members (Bates et al., 2012; Duwe, 2012; Wilson & Prinzo, 2001). In his statement, Participant 6 highlights the significance of the recidivism rates of core members through CoSA-Ottawa. In addition, he stresses that he alone cannot fulfill the practices of prevention, but insists that the organization itself through its various practices and procedures have influenced the reduction of reoffending. He uses these statistics as an objective way to appeal to the effectiveness of CoSA-Ottawa.

Lastly, in the following narrative, Participant 4 presents the idea of self-management:

First you have to it's like any other type of addiction or any type other type of behaviour you have to recognize that the behaviour is problematic, you have to identify, you know, what your risks are, what your triggers are, and find a way to manage---So it's I I think it has it's more to do with

self-management. Learning yourself, learning what's problematic and what's not for you.---And just learning to live with it, the same way as you would if you had an a drug addiction or an addiction to alcohol
(Participant 4).

Participant 4, while associating sex offending with substance addictions, illustrates the steps she understands to be necessary in dealing with any type of problematic behaviour. As she suggests, the first step is recognizing that the behaviour is problematic, then identifying the risks and triggers, and, lastly, finding a way to manage it. Participant 4 presents self-management as the ideal way to manage sex offending behaviour and substance addiction. Her statement demonstrates the concept of *homo prudens* where she illustrates the need for these criminalized individuals to become responsabilized and self-governing in order to manage their own risk to reoffend (Garland, 1997; Newburn, 2007; O'Malley, 2009).

Throughout the transcripts, participants explicitly mention or allude to the concept of risk. Risk, in this case, refers to the possibility of a core member recommitting a sexual offence, committing other criminal offences more broadly, or breaking restrictions or conditions. In this sense risk is conceptualized through Castel's (1991) notion of uncertainty linked to the concept of dangerousness. Again, this dangerousness can be exemplified throughout the past behaviour of the core members who have previously committed sexual violence that is considered highly damaging to victims. In addition, CoSA-Ottawa's mandate requires that circles be created around 'sex offenders' who have been assessed as high risk. Based on previous literature there is an understanding that these assessments of the core members have primarily been actuarial in nature (Castel, 1991; Garland, 1997; O'Malley, 2009). One of the participants critiqued these assessments, suggesting that she and her co-volunteers are more aware of their core

member's risk factors than the formal reports submitted. Regardless of whether the volunteers agreed with it or not, their core member throughout his term within the carceral system had been categorized and constituted through various technologies of risk (Garland, 1997). The participants express a need to be conscientious and attentive to their core members' behaviour in order to prevent them from getting into further trouble.

Agent of Protection

Circumstances are introduced in the interviews in which the participants present themselves as taking on the role of a guardian. The protection presented through participants' accounts relates to both physical and emotional harm. One participant advises that she made herself available to her core member in order to help him deal with a highly stressful situation where she believed that without her help he could have harmed himself. The other form of emotional protection developed through some of the transcripts is the specific ways in which some of the participants proposed that their core member wanted to feel a sense of normalcy. They express their beliefs that their core members want to be normal and be treated like a regular person. As such, participants describe their role in the form as a protective function.

This quotation illustrates how Participant 2 deals with a risky situation that arose with her core member:

And there's actually been one time when I specifically like changed my whole plans for the day because I felt like he needed to have a meeting with me because I actually felt like he was at risk of not offending by any means but at risk of getting really depressed or giving up or something like that (Participant 2).

Participant 2 describes how on one occasion she had to change her entire plan in order to be available for her core member who she thought was at risk of becoming depressed or "giving up," which could refer to him hurting himself. Participant 2 identifies the role of

being a protector for her core member when she describes the situation where her presence was needed in order to guard him from the dangers within himself. She underlines the idea that she is not worried about whether he would reoffend or harm another person, but instead feels it would be more likely that he would harm himself had she not been available, illustrating another form of potential risk (Castel, 1991).

In the next excerpt Participant 5 explains her first one-on-one encounter with her core member:

I more asked about um...where he'd been incarcerated as opposed to what he's done. Just so that when we we did a separate meeting where he kinda told us everything so, I decided to leave that more when were not in a public area, but everything else was more like what is if he have siblings if they had kids and that kind of stuff. More like regular things aside from the prison record but you know we try to keep a low tone when we talk at Time Horton's so nobody else can hear what we're saying (Participant 5).

Here she presents their conversation as being restricted due to them being in a public location. Participant 5 explains that she had avoided talking about his actual offence because of their public setting, suggesting a need to protect him. However, they discussed where he had been incarcerated and his experiences within the system. Participant 5 also suggests that they mainly talked about their families, describing such topics as “regular things.” In addition, she explains that they spoke in a low tone since they were in a public place and she did not want others to hear their conversation. In doing this, Participant 5 assumes a protective role, as she wants to prevent her core member from potentially feeling publicly shamed, insulted, or embarrassed. This is relevant since there are known cases recorded where community members have demonstrated apprehensiveness and vigilantism towards people deemed as a ‘sex offenders’ in the community (McGuickin & Brown, 2001; Thomas, 2005).

Participant 4, in the next quotation, explains that as a designated ‘sex offender,’ her core member was subjected to the ‘sex offender’ label, which had detrimental effects:

And how much the barriers and the restrictions and the labels and the everything else, keep him from feeling normal---and I think that we contribute to making him feel normal as it sounds really patronizing but you know what I’m trying to get at (Participant 4).

Due to the nature of his offence, the core member was subject to various social and legal barriers and restrictions. As she suggests, these limitations prevent her core member from feeling “normal.” Spencer’s (2009) use of the concept *homo sacer* can illuminate the ways people labeled as ‘sex offenders’ can be constructed through social and legal restrictions as having lives lacking the values and rights guaranteed to a normal citizen. Normal in this sense means being a member of society without being subjected to undue stigma. Participant 4 expresses that her presence and CoSA-Ottawa provides a way for her core member to develop or retrieve a sense of place in society.

Similarly, Participant 5 explains that she and the other volunteers support the core member, accompany him to various places, and treat him like a regular person: “I mean we’re just there to support him and take him places and go and have fun just treat him like a regular person which is all he really wants is for people to see him as a regular person” (Participant 5). Participant 5 insinuates that the core member wants to be treated like everyone else. Her usage of the term “regular person” brings up the idea of normalcy; both concepts refer to the idea of having freedom from formal and social limitations. It further relates to the idea that people labeled as ‘sex offenders’ are seen as an other, suggesting that even though the core member is physically *in* the community, he is not *of* the community (Spencer, 2009). In addition, in her description, the phrase “take him places” suggests an idea of dependency. In viewing the core member as dependent

on the volunteers, participants propose that restrictions reduce the core member's autonomy to the point where he needs someone in charge of him, such as the volunteer, to derive even his basic enjoyment of life.

Agent of Companionship/Friendship

In the following excerpts, participants illustrate different points where their role as a volunteer is to provide companionship or even a form of friendship. In these statements the participants distance themselves from being a part of the system (in this case, the penal system). In addition, participants express developing trusting relationships with their core members. Some participants convey a strong connection, while others describe more of a distant relationship, possibly even lacking genuine emotional connectedness.

Participant 6, in this statement, describes his relationship with his core member:

Whereas with us there is trust, they know what they tell us stays within the circle. Uh... We will not go running to their uh...uh...parole officer or probation officer and say you know Bobby here said this and this---there are no notes, no records nothing---With a big exception of breaches, you breach sorry you are accountable, we are not to cover up. And they know this upfront (Participant 6).

Participant 6 explains that his relationship with his core member is built on trust; this was a similar finding in Fox's (2014) study also exploring volunteers' accounts. Participant 6 indicates that he does not report his core member for minor issues or slip ups during his reintegration. In the interview, Participant 6 recalls incidents where his core members went out for "a beer," going against their condition to abstain from alcohol. However, he expresses that they usually not only admit their misdemeanors to the circle but also show remorse. He affirms that CoSA-Ottawa is able to mediate the situation, preventing the "slip-up" from turning into an indictable offence. His account demonstrates how the

relationship between the core member and volunteer extends beyond strictly surveillance but also incorporates the concept of care.

He portrays the relationship as informal: the core member is free to discuss his feelings without being concerned about the volunteers taking notes and creating a file about him. However, Participant 6 unambiguously specifies that he never puts himself in a position to cover up any breaches that his core members might have made, which was something he had expressed at the start of their interaction. Thus, there are clear limitations within this relationship, since it occurs within the context of CoSA-Ottawa, where volunteers must adhere to boundaries and legal obligations.

Participant 2 defines her role as a volunteer by differentiating herself from the roles of people within the carceral system who also work with her core member:

Um...cause it's very different than when they have a psychologist or counselor or the guys at the halfway house. Maybe those guys actually share probably a lot more about their personal lives, but we're not professionals we're supposed to be sort of friends. Not friends to the point that you do everything that you would do with a friend but friendly. Right?---um...So CoSA volunteers are his friends, you know. They're people there for him to call whenever he has a problem (Participant 2).

Participant 2 explicitly differentiates between her role as a volunteer and the role of the professional. She understands that she does not assume a professional role as a volunteer, and adopts a more friend-like role. Participant 2 does not, however, specify that her role is not to be “friends” where you can do everything with each other, but a friendship involving definite and firm boundaries. As an example, she describes the ability of the core member to call her or other volunteers if he has an issue. This differs from the extent of the relationship described by some of the volunteers in Fox’s (2014) study who reported that they allowed their core member to live with them in order to provide a family atmosphere.

Similar to Participant 2's statement, Participant 4 also differentiates her role from that of people within the penal system:

I'm not his parole officer so it's become an art to develop what I would qualify as being a friendship as well as kind of like a pseudo-professional relationship because I'm not his professional---So I...I find that I...I envision CoSA volunteers kinda being this special little in between group where we're pseudo-system people in the sense that we know everything about his offences, we know everything about his background, his risk factors, everything that he's done, but yet we also get the social thing. Him and his PO don't you know go to the movies or go bowling together which is what we did last week--- I'm not a parole officer, if my...if my core member reoffends that has close to no effect on me (chuckle). You know what I mean, it would bother me because I've...I've known him---I've spent a year with him, but that has no implications for me. If you're a parole officer and someone under your watch reoffends especially a sex offender in the community that evil of all evil. I mean that's your ass that's responsible for that (Participant 4).

In this explanation Participant 4 expresses that her relationship with her core member is a “friendship” but also “pseudo-professional.” She explicitly remarks that she was “not his professional” alluding to the various responsibilities and functions specific to the role of the professional. However, Participant 4 defines her relationship as one in which she knows about her core member's criminal background and risk factors, but unlike professionals within the system, their relationship involves a less regulated social dimension where the activities do not always involve an explicit reintegrative component but include normative enjoyable activities. For instance, she provides the example of her being able to go bowling with her core member.

Participant 4 in the quote above further conveys a struggle between needing to protect herself from disappointment or frustration associated with potential re-offence, and acknowledging the emotional significance of the relationship. As this quote suggests, “if my core member reoffends that has close to no effect on me (chuckle)---it would bother me because I've...I've known him.” She communicates a need to protect herself

from this potential internal struggle and perhaps the chuckle here was an expression of self-reassurance.

Finally, Participant 3 describes the various social activities he and his core member have done together:

I guess what I call social activities whether it's playing cards, Scrabble or going to movie or whatever. And that's pleasant I mean that's always nice. So in other words we're not always focused on recovery or reintegration it's more just kind of more relaxed which I think is ultimately the the objective. We want this guy to be able to have friends but not always having to think about you know recovery or to think about uh...what he's done in the past (Participant 3).

Similarly to the rest of the participants, Participant 3 primarily recalls the social aspect of his role. He provides examples of what he and his core member do together, specifying that their time has not always focused on recovery or reintegration. Rather it is more centered on creating a friendship through which the core member will develop ways to reintegrate.

Relationships of Power and Re-socialization Through Governmentality

Participants produce transformative relationships with their core members. This examination of the relationship is an example of the microphysics of power, particularly the interaction of power and power relations (Powell, 2013). While the relationship is noted to be beneficial to the core member himself, it also acts as a mechanism through which power and governmentality are exercised: “this relation is unbalanced, so that one can act upon the other, and the other is acted upon, or allows himself to be acted upon” (Foucault, 1980g as cited in Taylor, D., 2011, p. 5). Due to the nature of their work and position in the organization, volunteers have more authority than core members. Thus, through their training and clear criminal record check they have the ability to exercise normalizing judgment, and the ability to determine what is normal versus abnormal, or

what are pro-social versus antisocial behaviours and attitudes (Heyes, 2011). Foucault suggests that the figure of the normal is used to manipulate the figure of the abnormal (Hoffman, 2011). In this case, the volunteers and non-offending members of society are considered normal, while persons identified as ‘sex offenders,’ including core members, are abnormal.

Participants 4 and 5 recall their core members implying that they want to be treated as a “normal” or “regular person.” The core members communicating this desire to volunteers suggests that the core members believe volunteers have the ability to exercise normalizing judgment and can influence the way the core member sees himself as well as how others will view him. Normalizing judgment also allows volunteers to measure core members based on the norm, and if they do not measure up then volunteers may strongly influence the core member’s possible choices using disciplinary technologies.

Drawing on Foucault’s conception of power as involving the conduct of conduct and as the management of possibilities (Dean, 2013; Murray Li, 2007; Newburn, 2007; Rose, 1996), the volunteers can be seen as positioned strategically to guide the behaviour of core members. There is a fundamental intention to shape, guide, or affect the behaviour of the core member in these relationships (Burchell et al., 1991). For example, in one of Participant 1’s narratives, she describes a discussion that she had with her core member, where he told her about an incident in which some money was stolen from him. In this account she expresses having attempted to shift her core member’s thinking away from a violent reaction towards a pro-social non-action. Participant 1 governed the core member in order to influence and align his actions and behaviour toward a desirable end

and toward a more pro-social lifestyle, primarily using their emotional connection and trust-based relationship since other means of discipline were not available or would have been counter-productive in that context (Burchell, 1991).

The object of disciplinary power is to transform the individual into a docile body. Foucault (1977b) suggests that the more obedient a person is the more useful they will become. Participants did not express wanting the core member to become docile; instead, they aimed to shape his behaviour and attitude to fit with pro-social ways of life. The concept of governmentality is exhibited in the way participants suggest encouraging their core member to become a productive member of society. Attending treatment programs and finding a job was said to achieve a quality of productivity.

Disciplinary power is subtle and exercises less directly coercive technologies, which is demonstrated within systems of surveillance and supervision (Castel, 1991; Murray Li, 2007). Based on the participants' narratives, volunteers use various disciplinary techniques. Surveillance and supervision are demonstrated through participants' direct interaction with the core member, but are also exemplified in the "check-ins" as described by Participant 3. The check-ins provided the volunteers with an opportunity to become aware of changes or risky behaviour in the core member.

The overall practice of one-on-one and circle meetings conceptually reflects such principles behind the disciplinary technology of the timetable (Heyes, 2011; Hoffman, 2011). In this case space is not used like it is within the institution; instead, the time spent with core members symbolizes the space. Although the core member's day is not regimented as it is in the prison environment, their time is organized through the circle and the volunteers in an abstract way. The circle is meant to surround the core member so

that he is meeting with a volunteer almost everyday. In this sense, the disciplinary power inherent in the circle is able to micro-manage the core member's behaviour within various areas of his social life (Heyes, 2011).

The idea of responsabilizing citizens, a fundamental notion behind the political ideology of neoliberalism, is evident through some of the participants' accounts. First, the concept reflects how Participant 4 articulates her belief in making the core member aware of his problematic behaviour and risk factors in order to learn how to self-manage. A further example is when Participant 6 informs me that he places the onus on the core member to seek out his help rather than waiting on his core member. In both cases, the idea of responsabilizing the core member is presented through the practices within CoSA-Ottawa and participants' narratives.

This general goal of re-socializing the monstrous appears to be better accomplished through subjectively meaningful relationships rather than through formal and direct constraint. One participant says that she believes that CoSA-Ottawa volunteers are "pseudo-system people." As the literature suggests, CoSA-Ottawa as a program is structurally a part of the carceral system because they are financially tied to the state government. However, within the narratives, participants tend to subjectively distance and detach themselves from the system. This begs two questions: first how can one work both in and out of the system at the same time? Second, how does this inconsistency affect the volunteer's agenda and work?

CHAPTER 6: OVERALL IMPACTS AS A COSA-OTTAWA VOLUNTEER

Motivation for Involvement

Participants were asked how they became involved in CoSA, what their motivations were for joining, and why they continue to be a part of the program. Some of the participants related their motivation to chance, as it happened to be the organization that called them back first, or because the topic was of interest to them. Moreover, contrary to the initial development of Circles of Support and Accountability as a faith-based organization (Cesaroni, 2001; Duwe, 2012; Hannem & Petrunik, 2004; Wilson et al., 2007), as well as previous studies citing volunteers' connection to faith (Cesaroni, 2001), none of the participants interviewed in this study made any mention of faith. Instead, they cited their personal interests and their educational background as contributing factors for their involvement. As for the reasons for participating in CoSA-Ottawa, some stated that it was their way to give back to the community. Others noted it was a way to make a direct difference in a person's life, or to help prevent further offences. Certain volunteers even stated that it was because this group is so stigmatized that they thought: if they did not help them, then who would?

In this statement, Participant 6 describes his involvement with CoSA-Ottawa as being a positive experience:

*So...so that was an opportunity of being able to assist others.
Um...And...and it's end up being really a very...very good experience.
Uh...Because of a key factor which is accountability. The support is there but so is the accountability. So again, you asked prior how do I think or feel or see sex offenders, well they...they do need care and they do need attention and they need to be accountable.---So, it...it has been a very interesting---And its a way of giving back to the community in uh...in a what I think is a positive way (Participant 6).*

Participant 6 describes his participation with CoSA-Ottawa as a way to help others, noting that it has been a very positive experience for him. He highlights the notion of accountability as an important factor, making sure that the core members were held accountable for their actions while also receiving support from the volunteers. Participant 6 was the only participant who explicitly mentions accountability as a motivation for his involvement. He suggests CoSA-Ottawa is important in that it provides these criminalized individuals with a form of accountability.

Participant 6 also expresses that his involvement is his way of giving back to the community. Similarly, Participant 3 expresses his will to give back to the community as he states he has “a wanting to volunteer, wanting to give back to the community” (Participant 3). Both participants’ accounts specify a desire to contribute to the well-being of their community, which is consistent with findings in previous studies that explore volunteers’ motivations (Drewery, 2008; Murphy et al., 2010; Wilson et al., 2007).

In the following quotation Participant 1 illustrates her reasons for working with people identified as ‘sex offenders’ and becoming involved with CoSA-Ottawa:

I guess I kinda got interested in...in this group in particular just because I know...I recognize that like I said earlier sex offenders are so vilified and that the people willing to work with them and help them reintegrate and that kinda stuff is...would be a lot smaller than---less vilified (chuckle) crimes---(chuckle) um...so I guess I thought that would be important as well cause I was like I mean I’m...I’m obviously bothered by---what they’ve done but...I don’t know maybe some people wouldn’t be able to deal with it and I was like I felt like I could. I could deal with it so I thought it would be important to...to help out (Participant 1).

In this statement, Participant 1 recognizes that ‘sex offenders’ are a highly stigmatized population and believes that there are less people who would want to work with this group compared to other criminal groups that are perceived less negatively. She notes

that even though she was uncomfortable with sex offending behaviour, she demonstrates the personal capacity to overcome her discomfort in order to help these individuals.

Participant 1 recognizes that working with a stigmatized population can be emotionally demanding. She acknowledges the emotional impact of this work, and suggests struggling with the idea of being troubled by the behaviour and the drive of wanting to help such an ostracized population. She describes being able to “deal” with this population; in this sense “deal” neither indicates acceptance nor rejection of the individual. However, the term suggests that Participant 1 is able to independently approach her work regardless of her concern for his past sexual offences. Furthermore Participant 1 seems to impose a sense of obligation on herself since she expresses the feeling of being one of very few people willing to help this highly stigmatized population.

Likewise, Participant 5 explains her understanding that there has been a lack of people willing to help out this population and states that she decided to work directly with people identified as ‘sex offenders’ “[b]ecause I knew nobody else would” (Participant 5). Both participants illustrate a common theme presented in the construct of the ‘sex offender.’ ‘Sex offenders’ have been constructed as monsters and undeserving of help (Thomas, 2005). However, the participants show an open-mindedness and tend to humanize the offenders. The participants’ interest in the topic, their will to make a difference in their community, their desire to see offenders held accountable, as well as a their sense of obligation are reasons why the volunteers decided to work with people labeled as ‘sex offenders’ through CoSA-Ottawa.

Personal Impacts

Participants were asked how their involvement with CoSA-Ottawa has impacted their own lives. Their responses were mainly positive and referred to their opportunities for self-reflection, self-satisfaction, development of relationships with other volunteers, and pride in seeing their core member succeed. Many of the participants in this study also describe professional impacts, including having expanded their professional networks, learning and understanding more about the carceral system, experience working directly with this population, and developing communication skills. There are also negative impacts exemplified within participants' accounts such as frustration or disappointment caused by the core members' behaviour or lack of commitment. One participant feels her involvement with CoSA led to a heightened awareness of sexual offending while being out in public. However, overall the participants express feeling well-supported by the organization through continual training opportunities, social opportunities, and direct communication with the CoSA-Ottawa staff.

In the following statement Participant 6 expresses a sense of self-satisfaction from his involvement with CoSA-Ottawa:

A sense of self-satisfaction and that um...I recognize I am giving back to society, this society many of the things it has given me. Um...I'm not as strong believer in citizenship and in the way the state proclaims it. So this is my way of doing citizenship. The little bit that I do might help prevent an offence and because of the way the system operates tons of money in the long run and wastes lives both victim and offender. So I'm getting out a sense I'm getting out of it a sense of having contributed in albeit a tiny tiny way, but a very honest way (Participant 6).

Participant 6 states that his involvement has been a way for him to give back to society.

Murphy et al., (2010) suggest a similar finding in their study that indicates volunteers reported to have felt like they were giving back and making a difference in their

community. Furthermore, he calls his participation as his way of “doing citizenship” in a way that was helping to prevent further offences. He conveys his disapproval of the way our current system operates for both offenders and victims and emphasizes his work with CoSA-Ottawa as being his honest way of giving back, which is ultimately satisfying for him.

In this next statement, Participant 2 illustrates her heightened awareness of issues relating to sexual offending while she was out in public:

Yes so it does...I mean I have seen things like interactions between adults and children on the bus like I think three times where I was like oh this isn't right. You know? But I mean I couldn't really, well one time it was like an older kind of older man like in his 60s talking to a girl who's probably like 13 or 14 and obviously he didn't choose to turn left and talk to the 50-year-old woman next to him. He chose to turn right and talk to the 13-year-old girl next to him and that made me feel very uncomfortable. And um...I didn't really know what to do. Obviously she was uncomfortable with the whole thing but um...but also interactions between like adult men and younger girls---But it definitely yeah it's...it's I kind of get sad sometimes when I see like kids or younger people cause I think about that kind of stuff. So it makes you more aware of the fact that this is going on (Participant 2).

The preceding situation presents Participant 2's description of her having an increased awareness of issues relating to abuse and sexual offending. This could be interpreted as a negative impact of her involvement with CoSA-Ottawa because she explains feelings of distress and sadness related to these particular issues. This context may also hint at a form of burnout in which the volunteer is seen to carry the burden of her work (and thoughts) with her through her everyday life. Yet, on a more positive note, as exemplified in this excerpt, Participant 2 implied that she had become more aware and attentive to victims' (or potential victims') safety. This can highlight how contrary to public criticism, some people who work with offenders are also supportive of victims.

Another negative personal impact is demonstrated through Participant 3's account

where he describes feeling frustrated with the failure of his first core member. However, he concludes by conveying the reasons for a more positive impact of his participation:

You do put a whole lot of emotional investment---uh...so not just your time and effort but there's some you know there's a...a at least for me there was a desire to see this person succeed---and it was kind of frustrating you know over the two months when the person just wasn't getting it and was you know kind of making the same mistakes that were probably going to lead him back to an institutionalized setting---yeah, there was a bit of uh... a mourning there and I think others in the group felt that as well. On the flip side when the person is working in the program and are doing well--- there is kind of a pride that's sort of like yeah I'm helping with that (Participant 3).

In the above statement Participant 3 articulates the idea that he has an emotional investment in the relationship built with his core member and describes his frustration and sadness when his core member does not follow through with the program. Participant 3's explanation is comparable to the findings in other studies that have shown volunteers reporting periods of increased tension or stress when their core member is dishonest or is "shutting out" the volunteers' support (Murphy et al., 2010). However, in the interview, he states that he had since gotten a new core member who has been more open and positive, leading Participant 3 to feeling a sense of pride that he has contributed to the success of his new core member.

Participant 5 in this quote displays a concrete example where her experience has led to personal growth:

I would have felt like oh maybe he thinks I'm kind of rejecting him in a way by doing that and so it's been an opportunity for me to realize that it's okay to say no. I've always had a problem saying no, I've gotten better at it over the past few years but uh... I think it's always hard to say no to someone and to feel like maybe you're disappointing them. But at the same time you come to realize that sometimes saying no might be the best thing for them (Participant 5).

In this excerpt Participant 5 describes how through her experience she has come to learn

how to refuse certain requests or demands put upon her by her core member. She expresses that prior to this learning, declining anything led her to feelings of dissatisfaction and frustration. Personal growth is noted as a common positive impact conveyed by volunteers (Murphy et al., 2010; Höing, Bogaerts, & Vogelvang, 2014). In addition, Participant 5 discusses her feeling that rejecting someone's demands has the potential for straining the relationship. However, she says that in some circumstances this refusal may be beneficial to the core member. Here, Participant 5 suggests that she, as a volunteer, knows what is most helpful for the core member. She implies that she has been emotionally challenged by the need to balance the relationship with her core member and her need to guide his behaviour.

In this excerpt Participant 2 describes a personal impact of her involvement:

It's made me like understand the system more.---And also what some people are going through.---And personally I mean I thought I was a bit less of a people person and I thought that I would have a difficult time building a rapport with him and I realized maybe I lack some sort of like thing that other people have that makes them get along with people. But I sort of overcame that---by putting in the time.---showing that I cared in other ways (Participant 2).

Here Participant 2 explicitly notes that her involvement with CoSA-Ottawa has enabled her to gain a more in-depth understanding of the penal system through her association with her core member, thus suggesting a form of empathy through her experience. In addition, she plainly expresses her personal belief that she lacks social skills and would have difficulty creating a social connection with her core member. However, she states that she has been able to create a significant relationship with her core member through showing her commitment to him. Again, her statement is comparable to those found in other studies reporting personal growth as a benefit of volunteers' involvement with CoSA (Murphy et al., 2010; Höing et al., 2014). In this context, Participant 2 highlights

the importance of displaying her devotion through her availability.

Lastly, this narrative displays Participant 4's reasons for her positive regard for her involvement with CoSA-Ottawa:

On a positive note like I just really like all the experiences that I've gained from it. It's not often I mean...I don't want to over stretch it and say like "I've walked a mile in his shoes" cause I haven't. But it's given me some really really interesting opportunities of reflection that I would've never otherwise had. I've gotten really interesting perspectives not what it's like to walk in his shoes but what it might be like, to walk in his shoes...reflections that I would've never thought of before and you know when you talk about restrictions and labels like I guess those are mostly the big things that I've thought about or reflected on. And just you know from my own personal growth reflecting on wow what is that like, like when you're not talking about the offence and the past and the background, when you're not talking and thinking about that but when you're talking about who you are as a person today and what your life is like today on a daily basis and offers some really really interesting moments of reflection. So for my own personal growth that's been really great (Participant 4).

In the above account Participant 4 discusses her enjoyment of the experiences that she has gained through her involvement with CoSA-Ottawa. She indicates that her work has enabled her to be reflective and gain greater understanding of issues that people convicted of sexual violence have when reintegrating into society. She suggests that she has developed her capacity for empathy. Participant 4 even suggests that this opportunity has led to positive personal growth. These findings parallel those of Höing et al. (2014) whose study showed that personal growth in terms of increased self-esteem and self-reflection were widely reported as positive impacts of involvement in CoSA.

Understanding Volunteers' Impacts through Power and Governmentality

Dianna Taylor (2011) discusses how norms and values in society help to shape practices. The idea behind being a productive person and contributing to society has appeared to shape some participants' motivations for volunteering with CoSA-Ottawa.

For example, Participants 3 and 6 recognized the idea of “giving back,” and Participant 6 presented the idea that his involvement was his honest way of “doing citizenship.” Both Participants 3 and 6 demonstrate in their narrative that they feel good about contributing to the management of risk in their community. The terms “doing citizenship” and “giving back” imply a connection with the idea of responsabilization because it shows how the volunteers understand their influence in contributing to the well-being of their community. The notion of responsabilization can be used to understand that while criminalized individuals are shaped into self-governing individuals in control of their own risk, community members are also encouraged to take accountability for their community’s risk management (Garland, 1997; Hannem, 2011; Newburn, 2007; O’Malley, 2009; Simon, 1997). Wilson and Prinzo (2001) contend that an informed community is a safer community.

Furthermore, Cruikshank’s (1993) understanding of self-esteem not as a personal concept but one that is conceptualized as a “social relationship and political obligation” (1993, p. 328) offers an explanation for the motivations identified by some participants. This is closely related to Participant 6 stating that it was his way of “doing citizenship.” This idea of self-esteem relates to government in the way that volunteering is seen as virtuous and the fact that the volunteers receive internal rewards perpetuates the idea behind CoSA to use volunteers to guide the behaviour of its core members. This program is seen as cost-effective and further encourages community members to be involved in the management of this population while lessening the burden to the state.

Technologies of the self provide a link between practices of everyday life and developing ideas of wellness (O’Malley et al., 1997). In this context, volunteer work as a

practice is connected to wellness in that it provides participants with a good feeling that they are contributing to the lives of others. This is overtly reproduced in Participant 6's statement "I think I'm a better human being for being with CoSA and---it's the core members that have helped me be a better human being. Of course and the hope is that I'm helping them in a small way to be better." Participant 6 suggests that his human condition is positively affected through his involvement with CoSA-Ottawa and its core members. He suggests that the relationship is reciprocal; the volunteer not only influences the core member but the core member also impacts the lives of the volunteers. His example further illustrates how power is relational and circular. Overall, participants describe a positive feeling as a result of being a part of an organization that helps people.

Likewise, Foucault's relationship of the self-to-self is defined as not who we are but what we do (McGushin, 2011). This relationship is exercised through technologies of the self such as self-reflection and introspection. Participant 5 reflects on her personal realization of learning to refuse to meet certain demands without it leading to feelings of regret. Participant 2 conveys the ways in which she has experienced empathy and has been able to create a rapport with her core member by demonstrating her commitment. Finally, Participant 4 describes gaining introspection and opportunities for self-reflection and personal growth.

CoSA-Ottawa volunteers appear to be an essential part of the circles program; this study demonstrates that the core members are guided toward pro-social attitudes and behaviours through their dynamic relationships with CoSA-Ottawa volunteers. In this chapter the participants have discussed ways that their involvement has both positively and negatively impacted their lives. The positive impacts include gaining introspection

and a sense of self-satisfaction for contributing to the community in a positive way. As this chapter has shown, the internal validation obtained through this relationship maintains the volunteers' altruistic work while implicitly perpetuating the practices of government and responsabilization inherent in CoSA-Ottawa's mission.

DISCUSSION

The subjective experiences of CoSA-Ottawa volunteers were explored using semi-structured interviews and interpretative phenomenological analysis. The analysis above demonstrates the manifestation of several master and secondary themes. In the first master theme, humanization of the monstrous, participants describe their perceptions of people labeled as ‘sex offenders.’ These volunteers either compare their current views with their past perceptions (prior to joining CoSA-Ottawa) or contrast their views from those of the public. In addition, most participants identify the media as having an influence in either their perceptions of ‘sex offenders’ or an impact on the dissemination of stigma and stereotypes of them. In doing this research I attempted to remain neutral so as not to bias the prompting of these recollections as expressed by the participants. Another manner in which participants are observed humanizing their core member is when they differentiate between the offence(s) that their core member had committed versus the person they genuinely are. Further, some participants describe individual attributes of their core member in order to present him as a changed and pro-social person.

The importance that is assigned by participants to changes in their perceptions of people labeled as ‘sex offenders’ is evident in the following participant’s statement: “the problematic (chuckle) mentality that people have toward sex offenders is...is creating this whole problem...this whole divide...and I think that once you can get past that, you start to look at it differently” (Participant 4). She suggests that the problem is due to the divide that the public, media, and politicians maintain between us and them. With this divide and perception of persons identified as ‘sex offenders’ they, even after completing

their sentence, continue to be seen as a problem in society (Spencer, 2009). Fundamentally, the 'sex offender' is seen as someone who does not deserve help, but primarily warrants restrictive measures in order to protect the community (Spencer, 2009). This is exemplified in the way Correctional Service of Canada (2010) defines the overall intention of CoSA as to ensure "no more victims" while essentially overshadowing the message that "no one is disposable." This suggests that although what the core member did is considered morally wrong, the fact is that most offenders are eventually released from prison. Therefore, more support is necessary for these criminalized individuals in order to prevent more victims and guide them towards becoming pro-social members of society. CoSA-Ottawa is an organization that can offer the required support; as this study has shown, this organization facilitates the creation of significant relationships between volunteers that are both supportive and emphasize accountability.

The reintegration and re-socialization through a helping relationship is the second master theme that materializes from the transcripts. In this master theme, I interpret the portrayal of several types of roles and forms of relationships that the participants are observed to take on. The agent of help theme encompasses the idea that the function of help precludes all of their other roles. Essentially, all of the participants at one point in time are seen mentioning this concept as the overall agenda of their work with this population. Participant 5 expresses that "I can't change what they've done, I can only help them not go back to what they've done." Other roles that evolve out of this research include: the agent of risk prevention, the agent of protection, and the agent of companionship/friendship. Participants express taking on the responsibility to monitor

changes in their core member's behaviour and demeanor in order to prevent future problems (whether criminalized or not). In addition, participants explain instances when their core member was in need of protection from either internal sources of harm, such as self-defeating and self-harming thoughts, or external sources, such as public scrutiny and shame. Lastly, a common theme is that participants portray their relationships with their core members as a form of friendship, thereby distancing themselves from the penal system.

The final master theme is the overall impacts as a CoSA-Ottawa volunteer. This theme explores how participants describe the impacts and effects of their work within CoSA-Ottawa. The first subordinate theme examines the reasons and motivations that participants suggest for joining the organization. Some of the reasons include: giving back to the community, making a difference in a person's life, having an interest in the topic of sex offending, wanting to contribute to the prevention of further victims, and having the thought that since very few people are willing to work with such a stigmatized population then they are needed. The last secondary theme explores the personal and professional impacts of the participants' work. Most participants described positive feelings towards their experience, which are due to gaining attributes such as professional skills, expanding their professional network, introspection, and pride. However, some participants disclosed various challenges that relate to the nature of their work and described more emotionally difficult personal impacts. Nonetheless, participants asserted feeling well supported by the coordinators of CoSA-Ottawa, and were thus able to overcome the challenges present in their work.

I argue that regardless of the ways in which volunteers humanize their core members and create relationships with them, the purpose of CoSA, whether intentional or not, is that it acts as an extension of the carceral system. Thus, the volunteers act as agents within or perhaps beside the system. One participant perceived the role of the volunteers as being “pseudo-system people” (Participant 4). In her statement she alluded to the fact that in their volunteer position they have knowledge of their core member’s offences and criminal history but also maintain a social relationship that goes beyond the boundaries of a professional relationship. The volunteers remain extensions of the carceral system because they govern their core member through establishing a significant relationship. I borrow some ideas from the scholarship of Turnbull and Hannah-Moffat (2009) where they argue that parole conditions (specific to women) act as mechanisms of targeted governance, which integrate the exercise of both repressive and productive power. The authors maintain that these conditions prepare women for freedom while mobilizing techniques of self-governance and surveillance that promote normalized behaviour. Unlike Turnbull and Hannah-Moffat’s research, which studied parole decisions (explicitly connected to the carceral system), the current research adapts their claims in order to argue that CoSA-Ottawa and the volunteers extend the carceral gaze towards people labeled as ‘sex offenders’ in the community.

The volunteers of CoSA-Ottawa do not have access to the practices used by the penal system to govern this population. Therefore, volunteers manage the core members through a relationship that serves as an expansion of the formal mechanisms of social control. Presumably, CoSA-Ottawa volunteers are expected to facilitate the successful reintegration of core members by providing support while constantly being attentive to

potential forms of risk. For example, Participant 2 stated that “if they don’t have us um...they’re at risk maybe of getting depressed and depression can lead to maybe them you know using substances and maybe that later on would lead to offending.”

Nonetheless, the volunteers are also used as a “means of creating accountable and thus governable and obedient citizens” out of their core member (Bosworth, 2006 as cited in Turnbull & Hannah-Moffat, 2009, p. 533). Participant 1 insisted that her core member is “a funny guy...and he has a lot of potential to contribute productively to society.” The relationship that has been developed between the core member and the volunteer acts as a regulatory technique which functions as a means of both assistance and surveillance (Turnbull & Hannah-Moffat, 2009). In the following narrative, Participant 5 discusses how she guided her core member toward the steps that she believes were important for his reintegration.

At the beginning we try to make a priority of more of the important things like you know if they need to get their health card, or their ID. When they first come out we try to make a habit of let’s get all these important things lined up, let’s get you...you know signed up with Dr. Fedoroff, let’s get down to the police station so you can register, let’s get all these things done instead of like k let’s just go to the movies or something like that (Participant 5).

In another case, Participant 2 suggested that her core member “has made progress it’s just at his own pace. It’s not as fast as I think he’s capable of---but at the same time, you know he’s not offending, he’s not drinking, he is not doing drugs, he’s not hurting anybody.” Here Participant 2 imposes conventional ideas of progress onto her core member but also displays acceptance of her core member’s growth. This excerpt presents the balance between government and care, in the way that she suggested that she had imposed her ideas of pro-social progress but is aware that she does not have control over her core member’s life and highlights his successes.

The extensive interview process and criminal record check suggests that selected volunteers are responsible citizens. The selective process intends to ensure that volunteers are in the best position to help core members become reintegrated and re-socialized. CoSA volunteers are understood as ideal citizens because of their pro-social lifestyles, which are evident in their involvement with systems of work, family, and the community (Turnbull and Hannah-Moffat, 2009). Many of the participants reported to be employed or in school and discussed having other ties to the community. Since volunteers can be seen as ideal citizens, they are seen as best suited to shaping the core member in his image. This is not to say that volunteers are active governing agents on behalf of the system; however, their position as a volunteer at CoSA-Ottawa acts as an informal system of management, which is implicitly produced through their relationships with the core members. In the following quotation Participant 1 suggests that since core members most likely do not trust the penal system it is beneficial for them to receive support from community members during their reintegration. She states that

probably all of these guys don't trust the police they don't trust um anyone from the penal system.---So to have them working with them to reintegrate wouldn't really be successful I don't think. Um...so it makes it worth...and so I think it works out well with them being in the background if we need them but to actually reintegrate into...to be more productive members of society it helps to...to mingle with members of society rather than---just like the police (Participant 1).

In the above account Participant 1 describes that within CoSA-Ottawa she is both a volunteer and a part of the community; therefore this position situates her in a better place to shape the core member's behaviour. Furthermore, she references the concept of trust that as demonstrated through the analysis, is an element inherent in the relationship between the volunteer and the core member. As I have argued above, this relationship serves as the vehicle for the exercise of both power and governmentality.

This research describes some ways in which power exists within the institution of CoSA-Ottawa and is experienced through the relationships between its volunteers and core members. These relationships are not restrictive in nature; rather, they are built on the concept of help and trust. In this quotation Participant 2 expresses her thoughts about her relationship, stating: “I think that it’s just being there and actually showing up to all of the meetings and showing up and doing the one-on-ones. I think the...that’s a sort of like rapport but also trust, right?” In addition, Participant 6 states that his core members are “recognizing [that] you’re here for me, you are here because you want to be, you’re treating me with respect and I can trust you.” Turnbull and Hannah-Moffat’s (2009) analysis proposes that reintegration involves a process of developing “trust and demonstrating reform by making pro-social choices—the necessary steps to becoming a responsible, self-sufficient citizen” (p. 538). Similarly, as the current study demonstrates, a relationship of trust is important because volunteers celebrate when their core members make pro-social choices, such as attending school, finding employment, and seeking treatment. The volunteers embody a form of creative power because their goal is to govern core members through the core members’ freedom of choices and ambitions to successfully reintegrate back into the community (Turnbull & Hannah-Moffat, 2009). This idea is demonstrated through Participant 3 classifying his relationship with his second core member as successful:

The second guy, it's like the guy was very proactive uh...and he is...he's doing it you know...so he's not just talking the talk he's walking the walk, and it...it's a good feeling like it's um...it creates a virtuous cycle where you're like I trust this guy more, you know we don't have to just do the sort of the heavy kind of behaviour check almost like parent-child thing it's more it becomes more of a relationship of equals (Participant 3).

However, if this trust is broken, the core member is at risk of losing a person of support and further risks re-incarceration (Hannem & Petrunik, 2007). This idea is exemplified through Participant 4's quote where she stated, "so we've come to learn---that he does realize that he's the one who's going to get sent back to jail if something happens, not us." These relationships function as a form of normalizing judgment through which the volunteer is able to frame the choices, behaviours, and attitudes of the core member in an ideal direction. The current research lends credence to the notion that these relationships exist in order to lead the core member to more pro-social and non-criminal behaviours and attitudes.

Neoliberal ideology is relevant for the current research because CoSA-Ottawa is an organization that promotes the protection of the public in their motto "no more victims." It is suggested that the fundamental objective of CoSA-Ottawa is to responsabilize its core members so that they become responsible for managing their sexual offending and anti-social behaviour and attitudes. Drewery (2008) further suggests that the expectation of CoSA is that of a temporary support system that will eventually lead to an independent crime-free life for the core member. Accordingly, through CoSA the core member will have established pro-social contacts, attitudes, behaviours, and coping strategies.

Similar to the way in which Turnbull and Hannah-Moffat (2009) explain parole narratives, CoSA provides its core members with structure and supervision through weekly circle meetings as well as (almost daily) one-on-one meetings with volunteers. Participant 2 explains that her position was not very time consuming, describing that

it's like a circle meeting every week and then another one hour to two hour meeting some other time and then some phone calls. But what

happens with CoSA also with a core member is that he can seem stable for a while and then something will happen like a little crisis and then it will be more intense.

Eventually as described by Drewery (2008), the frequency of the circles is intended to gradually decrease, allowing for the core member to gain more independence and the capacity to self-manage. Again, the overt purpose of CoSA is to support core members through their reintegration back to society while it subtly transforms core members into self-governing individuals through their relationships with volunteers.

The relationships that volunteers have with their core members take place within a context of governance. These relationships are not open-ended because they serve a transformative purpose. The relationship serves to guide and lead the core member's conduct in a more pro-social mode. There are also boundaries, limitations, and restrictions put in place between volunteers and core members. Even when volunteers and core members go out for coffee together the interaction remains under an overall system of control and surveillance. Despite volunteers deliberately presenting themselves as equal to or on the same level as their core member, when critically analyzing the relationship, it is evident that the governance role is covert. However, governance is more overt in some situations, such as when volunteers are required to challenge their core member on instances of antisocial behaviour or attitude.

CoSA's use of volunteers emphasizes that governance occurs through altruistic mechanisms. This is seen as more effective than formal carceral system strategies because the relationship is the mechanism through which these individuals are governed. In this relationship, the governing agenda is implicit and the supportive relationship is explicit; thus, core members are more willing to open up to volunteers who are assumed to be separate from the system that had originally punished them. Participant 2 shared

that “he’s [her core member] told me that you know CoSA is really important to him and he doesn’t plan on stopping work with CoSA. Um...yeah because we’re not part of the system in that sense.” In this context, volunteers are seen as amplifying the reach of the carceral system under the guise of their role to help the core members through emotional support and practical support. This relationship benefits the government through the enhancement of surveillance of people convicted of sexual offending who have completed their state-sanctioned term of imprisonment.

The system perpetuates this program as volunteers continue to participate because they gain frontline experience working with marginalized and criminalized populations. Volunteers also develop a sense of pride for helping the core member, a sense of self-satisfaction for positively contributing to their community, introspection, as well as other positive effects. Rose et al. (2009) explain that the subject (in this case the volunteers) continue their altruistic work, while facilitating the government’s own objective: additional supervision and means of governance of people identified as ‘sex offenders;’ conversely, the volunteers are under the impression that they are working and fulfilling themselves, “rather than being merely obedient and... obliged to be free in specific ways” (p. 11). As other studies suggest, the CoSA program also benefits the government since it has been found to be cost-effective through its reliance on volunteers (Duwe, 2012). The extension of the carceral system is subtle because core members are expected to “internalize the gaze of authorities” (Feder, 2011, p. 58), which in this case occurs through volunteers subjecting core members to forms of normalizing judgment. The success of this internalization is evident in the current study while examining the subjective experiences the participants have shared.

CONCLUSION

The aim of this research was to examine the subjective experiences of volunteers who work directly with people labeled as ‘sex offenders.’ In order to access the subjective experiences of such a population, I conducted six semi-structured interviews with current CoSA-Ottawa volunteers. The transcripts were analyzed using interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA). This analytical technique utilized my ability to interpret the participants’ accounts while they were making sense of their lived experiences.

In order to ground this study, it was important for me to first explore the concept of the ‘sex offender’ and its criminological and sociological significance. In my literature review, I established how the ‘sex offender’ has been historically dehumanized, how society presents these individuals as folk devils and how the media perpetuates this stigma. It was also essential to describe how the Canadian government has dealt with sex offending as a social issue and how it continues to deal with it. Furthermore, I provided an overview of current research on CoSA, as well as similar organizations.

In using a power and governmentality conceptual framework, I was able to interpret the subjective experiences of my participants. Power exists through relationships; it is both creative and productive (Feder, 2011; Foucault, 1999; McGushin, 2011; O’Malley, 2009). Power is an activity that aims to guide and shape the behaviour of individuals (Burchell et al., 1991). Governmentality is a form of power that is applied in order to influence conduct. Government influences and aligns an individual’s behaviour to a certain end through limiting their potential actions (Burchell, 1991).

Throughout my study, I found that the participants humanized the ‘sex offender’ through various means. One way this was accomplished was by distancing themselves from the public’s perceptions of this population. This disassociation was also seen in the ways the participants described the media’s influence in perpetuating misconceptions and stigma about people labeled as ‘sex offenders.’ Participants were also observed to humanize their specific core member who they worked directly with, stating the personal attributes and presumed potential he possessed. This humanization process demonstrated the creative aspect of power. In distancing themselves away from the media and the public’s views, participants engaged in new ways of thinking about this population.

The relationship between the core member and the volunteer was seen as dynamic and serving various functions. I have interpreted that the volunteers assumed different roles within their position. The fundamental purpose of their position was understood through the concept of help. Other roles included preventing risk, acting as protection, as well as providing companionship/friendship. These relationships have been understood as transformative and serve as a mechanism through which the volunteer is able to shape and guide their core member’s behaviour and attitudes in a pro-social way.

The impact of the participants’ volunteer work was explored in order to present how this work has affected them. The volunteers appear to be an essential aspect of CoSA-Ottawa: based on the findings of this study, the volunteers play a direct role in shaping the behavior and attitude of the core members. Participants expressed several reasons for joining CoSA-Ottawa, including chance, interest in the subject, the opportunity coinciding with their educational background, as well as viewing the ‘sex offender’ population as highly stigmatized and feeling that they were filling a void.

Overall, participants discussed positive impacts of their work, such as gaining a sense of pride, increasing their self-satisfaction, and becoming more reflective. However, there were some negative experiences shared, such as feeling frustrated with the core member's lack of commitment or progress. Nonetheless, their volunteer work is ultimately seen as altruistic.

Lastly, through this study I have argued that the relationship between the core member and the volunteer is a mechanism extending formal social control onto this criminalized population. This transformative relationship, as expressed by the participants, is founded on the notions of help and trust. In this relationship, the supportive and caring function is obvious while the governing function is embedded and subtle. While the relationship is beneficial to the core member, it implicitly serves as a mode of normalizing judgment through which the volunteer guides the core member's attitudes and actions in a pro-social direction.

Limitations

While conducting my study I have discovered various limitations inherent in my research choices. In using a power and governmentality framework, I was limited in the ways these conceptual lenses were able to substantiate some of the themes I sought to explore. For instance, even though I discussed that forms of creative power are manifested in the humanization process, the framework does not provide a specific explanation of this phenomenon. However, in my research I used power and governmentality not as theories but as conceptual lenses to interpret the subjective experiences of my participants.

In relation to the analytical method, I found that interpretative phenomenological analysis does not provide the researcher with tools to create interpretations based on non-verbal cues, such as interference in thoughts (for example laughter, stutters, and long pauses). In addition, it does not offer tools for understanding the presence of emotions that were observable during the interactions with my participants. Additionally, I found that IPA does not allow the researcher to directly interpret different degrees of language, such as when participants used vague language. These moments were significant, but since IPA does not have a designed manner for analyzing them I relied on empathy to interpret them.

Contributions to the Field

From an academic standpoint, the association between my topic, conceptual framework, and the methodology used in this study are relatively original in the field of criminology. My unique research design produced significant knowledge that illustrates the experiences of CoSA-Ottawa volunteers. While most of the studies on community organizations targeting criminalized populations evaluate their effectiveness in terms of recidivism rates (Bates et al., 2012; Duwe, 2012; Wilson & Prinzo, 2001), my study uses a qualitative approach to explore the volunteers' perceptions using a critical power and governmentality conceptual lens. Through my study I have reproduced the narratives of my participants, which can be used as a source of information for future studies on this topic.

Another contribution is that my study demonstrates the way in which a sample of volunteers subjectively experience working with people labeled as 'sex offenders.' This is important because the volunteers play a significant role within CoSA and it is

important to look at their perspectives to learn about both the positive and negative impacts of their work. Through this study I present the ways in which participants involved in CoSA-Ottawa challenge popular representations of people who have been identified as 'sex offenders' and further illuminate the process of humanization.

Using interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA) I not only described the accounts of the participants but I also interpreted them in order to understand their subjective experiences. IPA is strongly accepted within other fields of research that examine the subjective experiences of individuals and some authors in the field of criminology have adopted this technique, but it is still recent and can be explored further.

CoSA has been in the news lately for its funding crisis but it remains an organization that lacks public support. This research can spread awareness about the ways in which this population is being managed and about the benefits of such an organization. In addition, it can lead to wider discussions that explore the ways in which this population is treated and the effects of that treatment.

An interesting contribution from this study is that one participant suggested she had become more aware and attentive to victims' (and potential victims') safety. Additionally, one participant informed me that while she volunteers with offenders, her paid work is with victims of crime. This highlights that contrary to public criticism, people who work with offenders are also supportive of victims. Overall, my study produced new knowledge about the subjective experiences of volunteers who directly work with persons labeled as 'sex offenders.'

Directions for Future Research

This study examined the subjective experiences of CoSA-Ottawa volunteers. Future research could compare the narratives of volunteers throughout various CoSA sites, including models developed around the world. Would volunteers from different parts of the world having different political contexts differ in their views of ‘sex offenders?’ Additionally, as was previously mentioned, some other CoSA organizations have been created with a top-down approach; it would be interesting to investigate whether the narratives of those volunteers differ from those who work in a more grassroots approach developed in the Canadian model.

Other possible topics for future research include examining the various circles and the dynamics within each circle. Do some volunteers take on a greater leadership role while others in the circle are more passive? How do circle dynamics affect the core member’s reintegration?

Future research could also further examine both the core members’ and volunteers’ narratives in order to shed light on how they express their understanding of their relationships with one another. It would be interesting to look at how the core members assume the volunteers see them. Additionally, it would be fascinating to investigate core members’ understanding of the roles that volunteers play in implicitly governing them toward leading a pro-social lifestyle. It is important for research to continue on the topic of sex offending and on the individuals who work with this population in order to better understand the complexities associated with supportive endeavours among marginalized and criminalized populations.

REFERENCES

- Barker, P. (1998). *Michel Foucault: an introduction*. Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press.
- Bates, A., Macrae, R., Williams, D., & Webb, C. (2012). Ever-increasing circles: A descriptive study of Hampshire and Thames Valley Circles of Support and Accountability 2002-09. *Journal of Sexual Aggression: An international, interdisciplinary forum for research, theory and practice*, 18(3): 355-373.
- Becker, H. (1963). *Outsiders: Studies in sociology of deviance*. Free Press.
- Bill C-26: *Tougher Penalties for Child Predators Act*. (2013-2014). 1st Reading, February 26, 2014, 41st Parliament, 2nd Session, 2013-2014. House of Commons of Canada. Retrieved July 20, 2015 from <http://www.parl.gc.ca/HousePublications/Publication.aspx?Language=E&Mode=1&DocId=6443981&File=4>
- Bronskill, J. (2013, October 18). Feds hope to throw away key for ‘most heinous’ offenders. *iPolitics*. Retrieved from <http://ipolitics.ca/2013/10/18/feds-hope-to-throw-away-key-for-most-heinous-offenders/>
- Burchell, G. (1991). Peculiar interests: civil society and governing ‘the system of natural liberty.’ In G. Burchell, C. Gordon, & P. Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality: With two lectures by and an interview with Michel Foucault*. Chicago, USA: The University of Chicago Press.
- Burchell, G., Gordon, C. & Miller, P. (1991). *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality: With two lectures by and an interview with Michel Foucault*. Chicago, USA: The University of Chicago Press.

- Campbell, E. (2010). The emotional life of governmental power. *Foucault Studies*, 9:35-53.
- Castel, R. (1991). From dangerous to risk. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon, & P. Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality: With two lectures by and an interview with Michel Foucault*. Chicago, USA: The University of Chicago Press.
- Cesaroni, C. (2001). Releasing sex offenders into the community through “Circles of Support”-A means of reintegrating the worst of the worst. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 34(2): 85-98.
- Chadee, D. & Ditton, J. (2005). Fear of crime and the media: assessing the lack of relationship. *Crime, Media, Culture*. 1(3): 322-332.
- Chenail, R. J. (1995). Presenting Qualitative Data. *The Qualitative Report* [On-line serial], 2(3).
- Cohen, S. (1979). The Punitive city: notes on the dispersal of social control. *Contemporary Crises*, 3(4): 339-363.
- Cohen, S. (2004). *Folk Devils and Moral Panics* (3ed) London: Routledge.
- Coleman, R. & Sim, J. (2000). 'You'll never walk alone': CCTV surveillance, order and neo-liberal rule in liverpool city. *British Journal of Sociology*, 51(4): 623-639.
- Comartin, E., Kernsmith, P. & Kernsmith, R. (2009). Sanctions for sex offenders: Fear and public policy. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*. 48(7): 605-619.
- Corbeil, C. R., Faure, D. S., & Lemaire, D. (1991). The evaluation of Bill C-67, An act to amend the parole act and the penitentiary act. *The Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation*, 6(1):131-156.
- Correctional Service of Canada (2002). *Circles of Support and Accountability: A Guide*

- to Training Potential Volunteers*, Training Manual, Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Correctional Service of Canada (2010). Circles of Support and Accountability: Quick facts. <http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/publications/092/005007-3006-eng.pdf>
- CoSA-Ottawa. (2012). Retrieved from <http://www.CoSA-ottawa.ca>
- Cruikshank, B. (1993). Revolutions within: self-government and self-esteem. *Economy and Society*, (22) 3:327-344.
- Dean, M. (2013). *The signature of power*. Los Angeles, USA: SAGE Publications.
- Detweiler, R. (1975). Shifting perspectives on the Salem Witches. *The History Teacher*, 8(4): 596-610.
- Douard, J. & Schultz, P. D. (2013). *Monstrous Crimes and the Failure of Forensic Psychiatry*. Springer.
- Dowler, K. (2006). Sex, lies, and videotape: the presentation of sex crime in local television news. *Journal of Criminal Justice*. 34: 383-392.
- Drewery, H. (2008). The people behind Circles of Support. *Criminal Justice Matters*, 52(1): 18-19.
- Duwe, G. (2012). Can Circles of Support and Accountability (COA) Work in the United States? Preliminary results from a randomized experiment in Minnesota. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 25(2): 143-165.
- Eatough, V., Smith, J.A., & Shaw, R.L. (2008). Women, anger and aggression: an interpretative phenomenological analysis. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 23(12): 1767-1799.
- Englander, M. (2012). The interview: Data collection in descriptive phenomenological

- human science research. *Journal of Phenomenological Psychology*, 43: 13-35.
- Ewald, F. (1991). Insurance and Risk. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon, & P. Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality: With two lectures by and an interview with Michel Foucault*. Chicago, USA: The University of Chicago Press.
- Feder, K. E. (2011). *Power/knowledge*. In D. Taylor (Ed.), *Michel Foucault: Key concepts*. Durham, UK: Acumen Publishing Limited.
- Feeley, M. M. & Simon, J. (1992) The new penology: Notes on the emerging strategy of corrections and its implications. *Criminology*, 30(4): 449-474.
- Finlay, L. (2011). *Phenomenology for Therapists: Researching the Lived World* (1st Ed): John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Foucault, M. (1977-1978). Security, territory, population: Lectures at the Collège de France 1977-1978. Ed. Michel Senellart, translated by Graham Burchell. Palgrave MacMillan.
- Foucault, M. (1977). Governmentality. In McLaughlin, E., Muncie, J. & Hughes, G. (Eds.), *Criminological Perspectives 2nd Ed*. London, UK: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Foucault, M. (1977). The carceral. In McLaughlin, E. & Muncie, J. (Eds.), *Criminological Perspectives 3rd Ed*. London, UK: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Foucault, M. (1977b). *Discipline and punish: The birth of prisons*. Vintage Books.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977*. Pantheon.
- Foucault, M. (1982). The subject and power. *Critical Inquiry*, 8(4): 777-795. The University of Chicago Press.

- Foucault, M. (1988). Technologies of the Self. In *Technologies of the Self: A Seminar with Michel Foucault*, ed. Luther H. Martin, Huck Gutman, and Patrick H. Hutton, 16–49. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Foucault, M. (1989). *Foucault Live: 1989 Interviews (1966-1984)* J. Johnston (Trans.), S. Lotringer (Ed.). New York, USA: Semiotext(e).
- Foucault, M. (1990). *The history of sexuality volume 1: An introduction*. (Translated by, R. Hurley), New York: Vintage Books.
- Foucault, M. (1991). Governmentality. In *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*. Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon and Peter Miller, eds. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Foucault, M. (1997). Panopticism. *Discipline and Punish*. Reprinted in Neal Leach, ed. *Rethinking Architecture*. London/New York: Routledge. [1958, trans. 1969]
- Foucault, M. (1999). *Abnormal: Lectures at the Collège de France 1974-1975*. Ed. Valerio Marchetti & Antonella Salomoni, translated by Graham Burchell. New York: Picador.
- Fowler, R. (1991). *Language in the News: Discourse and Ideology in the Press*. New York: Routledge.
- Fox, K. (2014). Restoring the social: offender reintegration in a risky world. *International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice*, 38(3): 235-256.
- Garland, D. (1997). ‘Governmentality’ and the problem of crime: Foucault, criminology, sociology. *Theoretical Criminology*, 1(2):173-214.
- Garland, D. (2001). *The culture of control: Crime and social order in contemporary society*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

- Garland, D. (2008). On the concept of moral panic. *Crime, Media, Culture*, 4(1): 9-30.
- Giroux, A. H. (1998). Nymphet fantasies: Child beauty pageants and the politics of innocence. *Social Text* 16(4): 31-53.
- Golafshani, N. (2003). Understanding Reliability and Validity in Qualitative Research. *The Qualitative Report* [On-line serial], 8(4): 597-607.
- Grbich, C. (2004). The Position of the Researcher. C. Grbich *New Approaches in Social Research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications p. 67-79.
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research, In N.K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (p. 105-117). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Guillemin, M., & Gillam, L. (2004). Ethics, Reflexivity, and “Ethically Important Moments” in Research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 10(2): 261-280.
- Haggerty, K. D. (2004). Ethics Creep: Governing Social Science Research in the Name of Ethics. *Qualitative Sociology*, 27(4): 391-414.
- Hannah-Moffat, K. (2005). Criminogenic needs and the transformative risk subject. *Punishment & Society*, 7(1): 29-51.
- Hannem, S. (2011). Experiences in reconciling risk management and restorative justice: How Circles of Support and Accountability work restoratively in the risk society. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 57(3): 269-288.
- Hannem, S. & Petrunik, M. (2004). Canada’s Circles of Support and Accountability: A community justice initiative for high-risk sex offenders. *Corrections Today*, 66(7): 98-101.

- Hannem, S. & Petrunik, M. (2007). Circles of Support and Accountability: A community justice initiative for the reintegration of high-risk sex offenders. *Contemporary Justice Review*, 10(2): 153-171.
- Harris, K. (2015, March 2). Sex crime prevention program cut by Ottawa: Government evaluation of Circles of Support and Accountability found it boosts public safety, saves money. *CBC News*. Retrieved from <http://www.cbc.ca/m/news/politics/sex-crime-prevention-program-cut-by-ottawa-1.2979196>
- Harrison, K. (2010). *Managing high-risk sex offenders in the community: Risk management, treatment and social responsibility*. Portland, OR: Willan Publishing.
- Heiner, R. (2002). *Social problems: An introduction to critical constructionism*. New York: Oxford University Press
- Heyes, J. C. (2011). *Subjectivity and power*. In D. Taylor (Ed.), *Michel Foucault: Key concepts*. Durham, UK: Acumen Publishing Limited.
- Hoffman, M. (2011). *Disciplinary power*. In D. Taylor (Ed.), *Michel Foucault: Key concepts*. Durham, UK: Acumen Publishing Limited.
- Höing, M., Bogaerts, S., & Vogelvang, B. (2014). Helping sex offenders to desist offending: The gains and drains for CoSA volunteers-A review of the literature. *Sexual Abuse*, 1-39.
- Hudson, K. (2005). *Offending Identities: Sex offenders's perspectives on their treatment and management*. Uffculme, UK: Willan Publishing.
- Hunt, A. & Wickham, G. (1994). In Vogel, E. M. (Ed.) *Crime, inequality and the state*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

- Hycner, R. (1985). Some guidelines for the phenomenological analysis of interview data. *Human Studies*, 8: 279-303.
- Israel, M. (2004). Strictly Confidential?: Integrity and the Disclosure of Criminological and Socio-Legal Research. *British Journal of Criminology*, 44(5): 715-740.
- Kemshall, H., & Wood, J. (2007). Beyond public protection: An examination of community protection and public health approaches to high-risk offenders. *Criminology & Criminal Justice*. 7(3): 203-222.
- Labuschagne, A. (2003). Qualitative Research - Airy Fairy or Fundamental? *The Qualitative Report* [On-line serial], 8(1): 100-103.
- Lacombe, D. (2008). Consumed with sex: The treatment of sex offenders in risk society. *British Journal of Criminology*, 48:55-74.
- Lancaster, N. R. (2011). *Sex Panic*. Berkeley, California; London: University of California Press.
- Larkin, M., Watts, S., & Clifton, E. (2006). Giving voice and making sense in interpretative phenomenological analysis, *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2): 102-120.
- Lincoln, YS. & Guba, EG. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications. <http://www.qualres.org/HomeLinc-3684.html>
- Lucken, K. (1998). Contemporary penal trends: Modern or postmodern? *The British Journal of Criminology*, 38(1): 106-123.
- Lynch, A. & Kaplan, S. (2009). Treatment program for sexual offenders and those at risk of offending sexually: a program proposal. *Cornwall Community Hospital Assault and Sexual Abuse Program*.

- Mallea P. (2010). The fear factor: Steven Harper's "Touch on Crime" agenda. *Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives* 1-58.
- Mander, H. (2010). 'Words from the heart': Researching people's stories. *Journal of Human Rights Practice*, 2(2): 252-270.
- Marshall, L. W. (1996). The sexual offender: Monster, victim, or everyman? *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 8(4): 317-335.
- Matravers, A. (2003). *Sex offenders in the community: Managing and reducing the risk*. Portland, OR: Willian Publishing.
- Maurutto, P. & Hannah-Moffat, K. (2006). Assembling risk and the restructuring of penal control. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 46(3): 438-454.
- May, T. (2002). *Qualitative Research in Action*. London: Sage Publications.
- May, T. (2011). *Foucault's conception of freedom*. In D. Taylor (Ed.), *Michel Foucault: Key concepts*. Durham, UK: Acumen Publishing Limited.
- McCotter, S. S. (2001). The Journey of a Beginning Researcher. *The Qualitative Report*, 6(2): 1-22.
- McCracken, E. (2014, September 25). Sex offender supports on a shoestring. Public safety vs. the politics of payback. *Ottawa Community News*. Retrieved from <http://www.ottawacommunitynews.com/news-story/4882113-sex-offender-supports-on-a-shoestring/?send=false>
- McGuickin, K. G. & Brown, J. (2001). Managing risk from sex offenders living in communities: Comparing police, press and public perceptions. *Risk Management*, 3(1): 47-60.
- McGushin, E. (2011). *Foucault's theory and practice of subjectivity*. In D. Taylor (Ed.),

- Michel Foucault: Key concepts*. Durham, UK: Acumen Publishing Limited.
- McKinlay, A. & Starkey, K. (Eds.) (1998). Foucault, Management and Organization Theory. London, UK: Sage Publications Ltd.
- McKinlay, A., Carter C., & Pezet, E. (2013). Governmentality, power and organization. *Management & Organizational History*, 7(1)3-15. Sage Publications.
- McLaughlin, E., Muncie, J., & Hughes, G. (2003). Crime control II: Discipline and governmentality: Introduction. In *Criminological Perspectives 2nd Ed.* (p. 413-414). London, UK: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Murphy, L., Fedoroff, P., & Gray, J. (2010). An examination of the impact of Circles of Support and Accountability on the program's Core Members and volunteers. *University of Ottawa Institute of Mental Health Research, Royal Ottawa Mental Health Centre*. (Poster presentation) Ottawa, ON.
- Murray Li, T. (2007). Governmentality. *Anthropologica*, 49:275-294.
- Newburn, T. (2007). Late modernity, governmentality and risk. In *Criminology* (p.318-338). Portland, Oregon: Willan Publishing.
- O'Malley, P. (1992). Risk, power and crime prevention. In McLaughlin, E. & Muncie, J. (Eds.), *Criminological Perspectives 3rd Ed.* (p. 524-530). London, UK: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- O'Malley, P. (2009). Governmentality and Risk: *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*. 9(98): 1-19.
- O'Malley, P., Weir, L. Shearing, C. (1997) Governmentality, criticism, politics. *Economy and Society*, 26(4): 501-517.
- Onwuegbuzie, A. J. & Leech, N. L. (2005). On becoming a pragmatic researcher: The

- importance of combining quantitative and qualitative research methodologies. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 8(5): 375-387.
- Ortlipp, M. (2008). Keeping and Using Reflective Journals in the Qualitative Research Process. *The Qualitative Report*, 13(4): 695-705.
- Packer, M. (2011a). Dualism and constitution: The social construction of reality. In *The Science of Qualitative Research*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Packer, M. (2011b). Hermeneutics and the project for Human Sciences. In *The Science of Qualitative Research*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Palys, T. & Atchison, C. (2008). "Chapter 5." In *Research Decisions*. Toronto: Thomson Nelson. Available: VC
- Palys, T. & Lowman, J. (2000). Protecting Research Confidentiality: Towards a Research Participant Shield Law. *Canadian Journal of Law and Society*, 21(1): 163-185.
- Park, K. & Daston, J. L. (1981). Unnatural conceptions: The study of monsters in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century France and England. *Past & Present*, 92:20-54.
- Piché, J. (2015). Playing the "Treasury Card" to contest prison expansion: Lessons from a public criminology campaign. *Social Justice*, 41(3): 145-167.
- Pickett, T. J., Mancini, C., & Mears, P. D. (2013). Vulnerable victims, monstrous offenders, and unmanageable risk: Explaining public opinion on the social control of sex crime. *Criminology*, 51(3): 729-759.
- Plant, R. (2010). *The Neo-liberal State*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Powell, L. J. (2013). *Understanding Foucault-for beginners*. New York, USA: Nova Science Publishers Inc.

- Robinson, G. (2008). Late-modern rehabilitation. *Punishment & Society*, 10(4):429-445.
- Rose N., O'Malley P., & Valverde M. (2009). Governmentality: *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*. 2: 83-104.
- Rose, N. (1996). Power and subjectivity: Critical history and psychology, *Historical Dimensions of Psychological Discourse*. Ed. Carl F. Graumann and Kenneth J. Gergen. 1st ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996. pp. 103-124. *Cambridge Books Online*. Web. 29 October 2014.
- Roulston, K. (2011). *Reflective Interviewing: A guide to theory and practice*. Georgia, US: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Schostak, J. (2006). *Interviewing and Representation in Qualitative Research*. New York: Open University Press.
- Semple, J. (1993). *Bentham's Prison: A study of the Panopticon Penitentiary*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press Inc.
- Simon, J. (1997). Governing through crime. In McLaughlin, E. & Muncie, J. (Eds.), *Criminological Perspectives 3rd Ed*. London, UK: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Simon, J. (1998). Managing the monstrous: Sex offenders and the new penology. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 4(1/2): 452-467.
- Smith, J (2011): Evaluating the contribution of interpretative phenomenological analysis. *Health Psychology Review*, 5(1): 9-27.
- Smith, J. (1996). Beyond the divide between cognition and discourse: Using interpretative phenomenological analysis in health psychology, *Psychology & Health*, 11(2): 261-271.
- Smith, J. & Osborn, M. (2004). "Interpretative phenomenological analysis." In *Doing*

- Social Psychology Research*, Edited by: Breakwell, G. 229–254. United Kingdom: The British Psychology Society and Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Smith, J. & Osborn, M. (2008). “Interpretative phenomenological analysis.” In *Qualitative Psychology: A practical guide to research methods*, (2nd Ed) Edited by: Smith, J. 50-80. London: Sage Publishing Ltd.
- Sommers, R. C. (1997). The quilting bee: A research metaphor. *The Qualitative Report* [On-line serial], 3(4): 1-4.
- Soothill, K. (1991). The changing face of rape? *British Journal of Criminology*. 31(4): 383-392.
- Soothill, K., Walby, S. & Bagguley, P. (1990). Judges, the media and rape. *Journal of Law and Society*. 17(2): 211-233.
- Spencer, D. (2009). Sex offenders as homo sacer. *Punishment & Society*, 11(2): 219-240.
- Spratt, M. (2014, February 27). Bill C-26-Protecting children and disregarding evidence. Michael Spratt. Retrieved from <http://www.michaelspratt.com/law-blog/2014/2/27/bill-c-26-protecting-children-and-disregarding-evidence>
- Sullivan, S. (2014, October 4). Harper’s tough-on-crime moment has passed him by. *iPolitics*. Retrieved from <http://ipolitics.ca/2014/10/09/harpers-tough-on-crime-moment-has-passed-him-by/>
- Sullivan, S. (2015, March 4). Public safety vs. the politics of payback. *iPolitics*. Retrieved from <http://www.ipolitics.ca/2015/03/04/in-harpers-world-payback-trumps-public-safety/>
- Taylor, C. (2011). *Biopower*. In D. Taylor (Ed.), *Michel Foucault: Key concepts*. Durham, UK: Acumen Publishing Limited.

- Taylor, D. (2011). *Michel Foucault: Key concepts*. Durham, UK: Acumen Publishing Limited.
- Thomas, T. (2005). *Sex Crime: Sex offending and society*. Uffculme, UK: Willan Publishing.
- Thorsen, D. E. and Lie, A. (2006). "What is Neoliberalism?" University of Oslo
<http://www.statsvitenskap.uio.no/ISVprosjektet/neoliberalism.pdf>
- Turnbull, S. & Hannah-Moffat, K. (2009). Under these conditions: Gender, parole and the governance of reintegration. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 49(4): 532-551.
- Walkate, S. (1999). Is it possible to assess risk? *Risk Management*, 1(4): 45-53.
- Webster, C. M. & Doob, A. N. (2015). US punitiveness 'Canadian style'? Cultural values and Canadian punishment policy. *Punishment & Society*, 17(3): 299-321.
- Williams-Taylor, L. (2012). *Increased surveillance of sex offenders: impacts on recidivism*. United States of America: LFB Scholarly Publishing.
- Williams, S. (1996). A national strategy for managing sex offenders. *Forum on Correctional Research*. 8(2).
- Wilson, R. J., Picheca, J. E. & Prinzo, M. (2007). Evaluating the effectiveness of professionally-facilitated volunteerism in the community-based management of high-risk sexual offenders: Part one – Effects on participants and stakeholders. *The Howard Journal*, 46(3): 289-302.
- Wilson, R. J., & Prinzo, M. (2001). Circles of support: A restorative justice initiative. *Journal of Psychology of Human Sexuality*.
- Winder, B. & Gough, B. (2010). "I never touched anybody—that's my defence": A

qualitative analysis of internet sex offender accounts. *Journal of Sexual Aggression*, 16(2): 125-141.

APPENDIX

1. *Appendices*

1a Interview Guide

Interview Guide

PR (Primary researcher): Hello (name of participant), I am Marci, and I am a Master's student in the department of Criminology at the University of Ottawa. I am the primary researcher of this study and will be conducting this interview session. As you have completed the consent form you are aware that this session will be audio recorded. Nonetheless, you may refuse to answer any question or withdraw from the study at any point without consequence. Before we begin I would like to thank you for participating in my study.

PR: First can you please fill out this anonymous demographic information questionnaire; it will provide me with a general understanding of your demographics. However, identifying information will not be included in the final write-up of my research. Now, we will begin the interview session. I am interested in understanding your perceptions of sex offenders and whether you have changed your viewpoints throughout your involvement with CoSA-Ottawa.

1. As I previously mentioned I am interested in the topic of working with sex offenders
 - First I'd like to talk about how you see sex offending in general; what are your views towards sex offending?
 - How do you find that sex offending differs from other consensual sexual behaviours?
2. Now I would like to talk about how you see sex offenders themselves?
 - Can you remember, how you thought about sex offenders prior to volunteering with CoSA-Ottawa?
 - How do you perceive sex offenders now?
 - Some people believe that sex offenders are very different than other people others do not. Where do you find yourself in that statement?
3. How did you get involved in working with sex offenders, and becoming a volunteer with CoSA-Ottawa?
 - Can you remember why you decided that you wanted to work with this specific population?
4. How did CoSA-Ottawa prepare you for working with sex offenders?
 - What kind of training and education did they provide you with?
5. How have you found your experience has been working with a Core Member?
 - How do you interact with Core Members?
 - Can you describe what a typical interaction with a Core Member involves?
 - Do you feel you are being yourself or assuming a role in order to serve a purpose?
6. Some people believe that it is important that the penal system be involved in managing sex offenders, others do not.
 - What are your opinions towards this statement?
 - Do you think that sex offenders can be rehabilitated in the community, through programs such as CoSA-Ottawa?
7. What kind of rehabilitation are you in favor of for sex offenders?
 - Community based or penal system based or other?

8. What do you think you contribute to the lives of the Core Members you work with?
 - What is the contribution that being apart of CoSA-Ottawa has on your life?
9. Do you feel that your involvement in CoSA-Ottawa has had any negative or positive effects on any aspects of your life?
 - Has your involvement with sex offenders affected your own relationships (with family, partners, friends)?
10. Lastly, do you think your perception towards sex offenders has changed since you began your involvement as a volunteer with CoSA-Ottawa?
 - What do you think were contributing factors that influenced a change in your perceptions towards sex offenders?

PR: Thank you for participating in my study, I appreciate your contribution. If you have any questions or concerns you may contact my supervisor Dr. David Joubert or myself, and our contact information is on your copy of the consent form.

1b Demographic Information Questionnaire

Demographic Information Questionnaire

Age:

Sex:

Marital status:

Amount of time of participation in CoSA-Ottawa:

Number of circles participated in:

1c Recruitment Texts (Emails)May 2nd, 2013

Hello CoSA-Ottawa Volunteers,

My name is Marci Beitner and I am Master's student in the Criminology Department at the University of Ottawa. Dr. David Joubert is supervising my research project. I am conducting a study on how CoSA-Ottawa volunteers perceive sex offenders.

The purpose of my study is to examine how volunteers who work with sex offenders perceive them. My research objective is to examine how CoSA educates its volunteers about sex offenders, and whether the education and involvement has influenced volunteers' perceptions.

Participation in this study is minimal; it will consist of a single 2-hour interview session, which will be audio recorded. Participation in this study is voluntary and will have no effect on your involvement with CoSA-Ottawa. Furthermore, confidentiality and anonymity of participants will be ensured.

If you choose to participate, you can contact me at [REDACTED] and we will set up an interview session at your convenience. The interviews will take place at the University of Ottawa in a private room in the Social Sciences Building or other arrangements can be made.

Looking forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Marci Beitner
Primary Researcher
[REDACTED]

June 17th, 2013

Hello,

I am writing to you in regards to your interest in participating in my study where I will be conducting interviews with CoSA-Ottawa volunteers.

I wanted to inform you that I have been delayed in conducting my interviews this month so I have planned to conduct them in mid-July. I will contact you again next month to schedule the interview at your convenience. Thank you again for your interest in participating in my study.

If you have any questions or concerns do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Marci Beitner
[REDACTED]
Primary Researcher
University of Ottawa Master's student

1d Consent Form

Consent Form

Title of the study: CoSA-Ottawa's volunteers' perspectives: 'Sex offenders' inherently evil or capable of reform?

Principal Investigator(s) (Supervisor(s)): Marci Beitner
Principal Investigator
Master's Student
Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies,
Criminology
[REDACTED]

Dr. David Joubert
Supervisor
Social Science, Criminology
University of Ottawa
Ottawa, ON
[REDACTED]

Invitation to Participate: I am invited to participate in the abovementioned research study conducted by Marci Beitner, supervised by Dr. David Joubert.

Purpose of the Study: The purpose of the study is to examine how volunteers who work at Circles of Support and Accountability (CoSA) in Ottawa perceive sex offenders. My research objective is to examine how CoSA educates its volunteers about sex offenders.

Participation: My participation will consist essentially of attending one 2-hour semi-structured interview session during which I will be asked questions related to my experience and views of working with sex offenders. The interview sessions have been scheduled to be held at the University of Ottawa, and will take place at my convenience in the summer. **The interview session will be audio recorded and by consenting to participate in this study, I consent to the audio recording of my interview session with the primary researcher.**

Risks: My participation in this study will entail that *I volunteer my experience and perceptions*, and this may cause me to feel emotional discomfort. I have received assurance from the researcher that every effort will be made to minimize these risks (*Participation in this study is voluntary. Participants may refuse to answer any question if they so choose. Participants may withdraw from the study at anytime without consequence.*).

Benefits: My participation in this study will be beneficial because my experiences will be acknowledged and recognized by the academic community. I will be able to share my own opinions in a non-judgmental environment with the primary researcher. Society will benefit from this research, as it will provide a new knowledge about how certain individuals perceive sex offenders. This research will attempt to examine whether participants' perceptions of sex offenders has changed throughout their involvement with CoSA-Ottawa. Furthermore, it will examine whether society on a larger scale can change its punitive views through forms of education and awareness, which will promote collective risk management.

Confidentiality and anonymity: I have received assurance from the researcher that the information I will share will remain strictly confidential. I understand that the contents will be used only for the purpose of publishing a thesis and that my confidentiality will be protected. The researcher has ensured that the identity of participants will be safeguarded through the use of pseudonyms. Only the primary researcher and her supervisor will have access to these pseudonyms.

Anonymity will be protected in the following manner: the researcher will not publish any identifying information; instead the use of pseudonyms will be in place to protect the identity of participants. Furthermore, any form of identifying information will be removed or altered to protect participants' identity.

Conservation of data: The data collected, both hard copies and electronic data including tape recordings of interviews, transcripts, and notes, will be kept in a secure manner. All data (paper and electronic) will be stored in Dr. David Joubert's office in locked cabinet at the University of Ottawa for 5 years. All electronic data will be stored on primary researcher's password protected laptop that only she has access to.

Voluntary Participation: I am under no obligation to participate and if I choose to participate, I can withdraw from the study at any time and/or refuse to answer any questions, without suffering any negative consequences. Participation or withdrawal of participation will have no effect on my involvement in CoSA-Ottawa. If I choose to withdraw, all data gathered until the time of withdrawal will be disposed of (shredding paper documents and securely deleting electronic files).

Acceptance: I, *(Name of participant)*, agree to participate in the above research study conducted by Marci Beitner of the Criminology Department, Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies, University of Ottawa, which research is under the supervision of Dr. David Joubert.

If I have any questions about the study, I may contact the researcher or her supervisor.

If I have any questions regarding the ethical conduct of this study, I may contact the Protocol Officer for Ethics in Research, [REDACTED]

Tel.: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

There are two copies of the consent form, one of which is mine to keep.

Participant's signature: *(Signature)*

Date: *(Date)*

Researcher's signature: *(Signature)*

Date: *(Date)*

1e Ethics Approval Notice

File Number: 03-13-13

Date (mm/dd/yyyy): 04/18/2013



Université d'Ottawa **University of Ottawa**
 Bureau d'éthique et d'intégrité de la recherche Office of Research Ethics and Integrity

Ethics Approval Notice Social Science and Humanities REB

Principal Investigator / Supervisor / Co-investigator(s) / Student(s)

<u>First Name</u>	<u>Last Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>	<u>Role</u>
David	Joubert	Social Sciences / Criminology	Supervisor
Marci	Beitner	Social Sciences / Criminology	Student Researcher

File Number: 03-13-13

Type of Project: Master's Thesis

Title: CoSA Ottawa's volunteers' perspectives: 'Sex offenders' inherently evil of capable of reform?

Approval Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Expiry Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Approval Type
04/18/2013	04/17/2014	Ia

(Ia: Approval, Ib: Approval for initial stage only)

Special Conditions / Comments:
 N/A

1f Sample of IPA Tables

IPA-P1 Themes

Initial List of Themes-A (simplistic & chronological)	Clustering List of Themes-B (theoretical/concept based & chronological)
Condemning sex offending behavior	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Condemning sex offending behavior • Rationalization of sex-offending behavior <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Parallels between alcohol/drug addictions ○ Paraphilia's → sexual gratification to violence ○ Pedophilia → sexual attraction to children ○ Factors leading to sex offending • Media
Rationalize sex-offending behavior	
Media's representation	
Ability to change	
Choice	
Excuse or reason for offending	
Determinism	
Definition of crime	
Victim's choice	
Victim ignored/refused	
Victim's → trauma/impact	
Parallels between alcohol/drug addictions	
Previous perception	

Sexual gratification from violence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Representation
Attraction to children	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Free will vs Determinism <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Choice ○ Parallels between alcohol/drug addictions
Human being/people/person	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CM's accountability/responsibility for actions
Labeling theory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social construction of crime <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Definition
CoSA's practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Victim <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Impact ○ Type
Neutralizing reactions to CM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perception of sex offender <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Human being/people/person ○ Image/characteristics ○ Exceptions to the "humanistic view" of sex offenders ○ Change of perceptions
Criminal Justice System's influence/viewpoint	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Labeling theory <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Stigma
Judgments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organizational practices <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ CoSA → training, process, procedure,
Image/characteristics of sex offender	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Criminal Justice System <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Penal system, ○ Prison, ○ PO's/police, ○ Restriction/conditions
Comparing different crimes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volunteer's role <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ "Help" ○ Impose social norms ○ Time commitment ○ Accountability ○ Responsibility to report?
"help" "helping"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recidivism/reoffending
Voluntary work-not obligated to stay	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relationship between CM and volunteer <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Trust ○ Friendship
Extending the reach of commitment to after hours	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Abolitionism
Social norms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Prison
Restrictions/conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CM's victimization
Volunteer's role	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Institutionalization
Sensitive towards CM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reaction from others
Reoffending/recidivism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety
Accountability (CM & volunteer)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Friendship
Responsibility (CM & volunteer)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change of perceptions
Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Factors leading to sex offending
Relationship between CM and volunteer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reintegration
Role of penal system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevention
Abolitionist	
Exceptions to the "humanistic view" of sex offenders	
Unproductive state of prison as management	
Management	
Victimization	
Institutionalization	
Prison environment	
Time commitment	
Reactions from others	
Safety	
Friendship	
Change of perceptions	
Factors leading to sex offending	
Reintegration	
Prevention	

IPA-P2 Themes

Initial List of Themes-A (simplistic & chronological)	Secondary List of Themes-B (theoretical/concept based & chronological)
Labeling theory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Labeling theory <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Master status-Becker ○ Reject the term “sex offender” ○ Differentiate individual from behavior ○ Stigma ○ Us vs them ○ Criminal status • Definition of sex offender <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Consent→age, intoxication • Image/characteristic of sex offender <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Heterogeneous group ○ Human being/people/person ○ Sexual offending viewed as sickness not able to cure • Sex offending “it is the worst of the crimes out there” • Organizational practice <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ CoSA practice→training ○ Circle meeting held in private location ○ One-on-ones ○ CoSA separate from the system • Expectation v.s. reality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Regular people • Volunteers’ role <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Time commitment ○ Frequency meeting with CM ○ One-on-ones ○ Pro-active interventions (see signs of trouble/change) ○ Active listening ○ Cycle of CoSA involvement in CM’s life→stable, crisis, stable... “help” • Participant’s feelings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ New experience ○ New relationships to form ○ New = scary/intimidating
Master status-Becker	
Reject the term “sex offender”	
Differentiate individual from behavior	
Definition of sex offender	
Consent→age, intoxication	
Image/characteristics of sex offender→heterogeneous group	
Dark figure of crime	
CoSA practice	
Expectation versus reality	
Regular people	
Us versus them	
New experience, relationship	
Criminal status	
Time commitment	
Frequency seeing CM	
New=scary/intimidating	
Training	
Circle meeting in private location	
One-on-ones	
LTSO	
Restrictions/conditions	
Rapport	
Trust	
Pro-active interventions (see signs of trouble/change)	
Care	
Active listening	
Balancing the relationship as volunteer→not burden CM with volunteer’s issues	
Type of relationship between volunteer and CM	
Friends?	
Being a stable presence in CM’s life	
Human being/people/person	
Rely on other organizational members (volunteers, coordinator)	
Reflexive	
Imposing own values/social norms	
Rationalizing CM behavior	
Accountability (CM)	
Responsibility (CM)	
System is reactive in providing intervention	
Prison programming	

Treatment→Dr. Federoff Sexual Behaviors Clinic at ROH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Rely on other organizational members (volunteers, coordinator) ○ Reflexive ○ Imposing own values/social norms ○ Dynamics of circle ○ CoSA motto “no one is disposable” ○ Heightened awareness of stranger interaction ○ More aware of child abuse • Criminal Justice System <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ LTSA/A10 ○ Restrictions/conditions ○ Reactive in providing interventions ○ Prison programming • Relationship between CM and volunteer <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Trust ○ Rapport ○ Care ○ Balancing the relationship as volunteer→not burden CM with volunteer’s issues ○ Friends? ○ Being a stable presence in CM’s life ○ CM becomes a part of volunteer’s life ○ Affect CM has on volunteer→grounding • Rationalizing CM behavior • Management <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reactive ○ Prison ○ Treatment→Dr. Federoff ○ Treatment→CBT • CM’s responsibility/accountability for actions • What is needed for society to deal with sex offenders: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Need education ○ Need proactive services for sex offenders/deviants (before offend) ○ Need education on signs of child abuse→public, and system
Professional disclosure to call authorities when CM admits thoughts to harm children etc. (psychologists/psychiatrists)	
Need for education	
Need for proactive services for sex offenders/deviants	
Prison treatment→CBT	
Stigma	
Shame→admitting sexually deviant thoughts	
What is normal?	
Victim’s voice	
Recidivism rate→sex offenders low r. rate	
Prevention	
Need education on signs of child abuse→public, and system	
Need intervention	
Educate public on the notion that treatment works, idea that people can change	
Sexual offending viewed as sickness not able to cure	
Education about effectiveness of intervention	
Media as an outlet	
CoSA’s importance to CM success	
CoSA separate from the system	
CM isolated/excluded from former informal social groups (family, friends)	
CM duty to report to PO	
Volunteers as CM’s friends	
Volunteer experiential learning	
A10	
Half way houses	
Reaction of others about involvement with CoSA	
Change of perceptions	
CM = an individual	
CM = certain type of person	
Voluntary nature of joining CoSA as sex offender	
Dark figure of crime→those that aren’t caught	
SO’s demonized in the media	
Sex offending “it is the worst of the crimes out there”	
Dynamics of circle	
Reaction to if one leaves CM	
Cycle of CoSA involvement in CM’s life→stable, crisis, stable...	
CM becomes a part of volunteer’s life	
Affect CM has on volunteer→grounding	
CM = potential risk to public/self	

IPA-P3 Themes

Initial List of Themes-A (simplistic & chronological)	Secondary List of Themes-B (theoretical/concept based & chronological)
Previous perception→repulsion, anger	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perceptions of sex offenders <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Medias influence ○ News media ○ Society deems bad ○ Balanced view of sex offender ○ Bad people exist ○ Problem for society ○ Perceptions of sex offenders→shaped by media e.g. Clifford Olsen, Paul Bernardo & Karla Hamolka ○ Big kind of sex offender=big kind of monster ○ Prior perception=stereotypical ○ Change of perceptions=more sympathetic view ○ Open minded ○ At CoSA events→assumptions of who was CM vs volunteer “tattoos... had the look” ○ See sex offenders as damaged goods • Contact offences against children <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Visceral aversion • Determinism <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Cause of sex offending ○ Remove responsibility→ probably came from crappy background, wasn't taught life skills • Choice • Prevention • Management <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Lock them up ○ CM→learn re-parenting→self, volunteer, professional, or other
Media's influence	
News media	
Society deems bad	
Contact offences against children	
Determinism	
Cause of sex offending?	
Choice	
Balanced view of sex offender	
Bad people exist	
Sex offenders=problem for society	
Prevention	
Perceptions of sex offenders→shaped by media e.g. Clifford Olsen, Paul Bernardo & Karla Hamolka	
Big kind of sex offender = big kind of monster	
Management→ Lock them up	
Contact offence against children = visceral aversion	
Participant's childhood victimization by an authority (not sexual)	
Personal history = predisposition to aversion of sex offenders	
CoSA practice	
Screening process→any time you don't wish to work with?	
Types of sex offenders	
Definition	
No consent	
Perpetrator + Victim (2 different roles)	
Violation	
Non-contact offences fall under definition too	
Spectrum of sexual offences	
Children do not have the knowledge/awareness of consent	
Prior perception→stereotype	
Vague wording/language→ “bad things to them”, “bad stuff”	
Learnt real prevalence of sex offending in university	
Image/characteristic of sex offender →1 dimensional character based on stereotypes	
Perpetrator victim cycle	
Change of perceptions→more sympathetic view	

Open minded	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • P3's history of childhood victimization by an authority (not sexual) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Predisposed to aversion of sex offenders • Organizational practice <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Screening process ○ Group aspect ○ Training, in depth ○ Staff present and available ○ Supportive staff ○ Exit interview • Types of sex offenders <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Spectrum of sexual offences → full penetration or not • Definition of sex offence <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No consent ○ Violation ○ Perpetrator + victim (2 roles) ○ Non-contact offences ○ Children do not have the knowledge/awareness of consent • Vague wording/language <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ "bad things to them" ○ "bad stuff" ○ "he's done in the past" • Real sex offence crime rate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Learned in university • Image/characteristics of sex offender <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 1 dimensional character based on stereotypes • Perpetrator victim cycle • Victim <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Psychological trauma • Volunteer's role <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Leave personal feelings aside (judgments) ○ Make sure CM does not reoffend ○ Reintegrate CM back into society ○ Time commitment ○ Be social with CM ○ Not always focused on recovery/reintegration
Spectrum of sex offending e.g. full penetration or not	
Victim → psychological trauma	
Role as volunteer → leave personal feelings aside	
Role as volunteer → make sure CM does not reoffend	
Role as volunteer → reintegrate CM into society	
"Help" "helping"	
Group aspect	
CM were not deemed parole ready, so negative associations with that	
Hesitant to work with sex offenders	
CoSA practice → training, in depth,	
Nervous meeting CM2 based on experience of CM1	
CoSA practice → staff present and available	
CM1 had incorrect perception that CoSA was mandatory	
Time commitment	
Effort working with CM	
Desire to see CM succeed	
Emotional affect on participant of CM1 leaving CoSA and circle	
Institutionalization effects	
Sense of pride from helping CM	
Results of CM	
Reaction of others about involvement with CoSA	
Participant's family informally asks about CM	
Sexual victimization of participants wife → she supports his CoSA involvement	
Understanding the need to break the victim perpetrator cycle	
Give back to the community	
Positive impact on life	
CoSA cliental dealing with mental health, and addictions	
Assumptions of who is CM → tattoos, "had that look"	
Affect of involvement on participant's kids → use tv as teachable moments	
Real crime rate versus crime shown on tv	
Society = relatively civil and safe	
Recidivism/reoffending	
Supportive CoSA coordinator, and staff	
Frustration felt when CM1 slacked off (miss meetings)	
Frustration felt when CM1 was unresponsive	

CoSA practice exit interview	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Check in with CM ○ Look for changes in demeanor or behavior ○ Advocate on behalf of CM ○ Be the CM's peer group ○ Teach CM to be reflexive importance of learning why CM acted/said etc. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Help" • CM <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Finish their time ○ Not deemed parole ready ○ CM1 had incorrect perception that CoSA was mandatory ○ Institutionalization effects ○ Results of CM? ○ CM2 difficulties initially but pulled through ○ CM individuals → needs can be high or low ○ CM1 high needs=necessities ○ Manipulative-learn in prison, eager to please ○ CM1 blatantly using CoSA ○ Difference between CM;s behavior within CoSA and system/halfway house/professionals ○ CoSA changed CM view of system staff → authority figures → potential helpers • Participant's feelings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Hesitant to work with sex offenders ○ Nervous to meet CM2 because of experience with CM1 ○ Desire to see CM succeed (how do you measure that?) ○ Emotional affect on participant of CM1 leaving the circle ○ Sense of pride from helping CM ○ Give back to the community ○ Positive impact on his life
CM2 difficulties at the start → pulled through	
CM individual → needs high/low	
CM1 high needs → needed necessities	
Relationship between CM1 and volunteer → parent & child	
Relationship between CM2 and volunteer → relationship of equals (no one is superior to other)	
Role: be social with CM	
Not always focused on recovery/reintegration	
Vague language "he's done in the past"	
Role: check in	
Role: look for changes in behavior/demeanor → risk	
Manipulative-learn in prison, eager to please	
CM1 blatantly using CoSA	
Difference between CM behavior with CoSA, and system/halfway house/professionals	
Risk → triggers	
Infractions	
Disconnection between privileges being in CoSA allowed to go to meetings even under formal punishment	
Risk → cycle of infractions	
Volunteers ideas are welcomed in CoSA-even going against the system/professionals	
Role: advocate on behalf of CM	
Secure environment-focused on treatment	
Balance risk of society with whether there is hope of redemption for offender	
Most sex offences=not stranger, usually from within a family	
Generational sex offending	
Sex of sexual offending	
Treatment: anger management, emotional intelligence, cognitive behavioral therapy	
Underlying → Mental illness	
Underlying → Addictions	
Federal institutions have better programs	
Prevention focused	
Role: be an peer group	
Negative influences → peer groups (mother was an enabler)	
Risk management	
CoSA changed CM view of system staff → authority figures → potential helpers	
Role: teaching CM to be reflexive importance of learning why CM acted/said etc.	

IPA-P4 Themes

Initial List of Themes-A (simplistic & chronological)	Secondary List of Themes-B (theoretical/concept based & chronological)
Physical cues: laugh=discomfort?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Physical cues <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Laugh=discomfort? ○ Rapport: hesitant to speak about CM-things specific to him that made creating a rapport easy ○ Visibly uncomfortable when talking about predicting how she would feel if CM reoffended • Perception of sex offending <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Context specific* ○ Spectrum of sexual offending→pedophiles, to assault on adult victims • Definition of sex offending <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Fact that it's a crime-obvious answer ○ Legal definition ○ Legal definition, but apprehensive about agreeing with it • Social constructionism <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Codify laws→ society decides ○ Social norms ○ Pressure to create the law ○ Sex/sexuality is taboo in our society • Perceptions of sex offenders <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ More critical coming from a criminology background/education ○ Most hated group of offenders ○ Paul Bernardo's of the world=extreme cases ○ SO not distinctly more scary than other criminals who commit serious offences ○ Focuses on pedophiles ○ Differentiates between CM versus other sex offenders
Sex offending as context specific	
Spectrum of sexual offending: pedophiles to assault on adult victims	
Fact that it's a crime-obvious answer	
Legal definition	
Codify society decides	
Social norms	
Pressure to create the law	
Criminology background/education-more critical	
Distinctive types of sex offenders→pedophiles a special category	
CoSA practice: initial interview, determining the comfort of volunteers	
CM=mostly men charged with pedophilic offences	
CM=mostly pedophilic men	
Most hated group of offenders	
Misconceptions in society: sensationalized ideas of sex offenders in society	
Media's influence on perceptions→crime dramas	
Previous perception: dehumanized	
Previous perception: scary	
Previous perception: lack control	
Previous perception: uncontrollable	
Sex/sexuality is taboo in our society	
Previous perception: lack self control→deterministic	
Paul Bernardo's of the world-extreme cases	

Scared by some cases in the media	<p>who recidivate and go in and out of prison</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “Who you would picture as a typical sex offender. Or a typical sex offender that had offences for pedophilia” ○ Acknowledges that there is a “typical” idea of what a SO/pedophile looks like ○ Preconceived notion of typical pedophile: old man, developmentally challenged ○ Choice of their actions (reoffending) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants perceptions influenced by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ CJS ○ CoSA ○ Media • Types of sex offenders <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Pedophiles a special category ○ Mostly male ○ Female sex offenders are rare • CoSA Practice <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Initial interview- determining the comfort of volunteers ○ Voluntary program for CMs ○ Matching CM with volunteers that have similar interests, common personalities, characteristics etc ○ Weekly meeting at a church ○ Training to be aware of common conditions and restrictions of SO • General CM in CoSA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mostly men charged with pedophilic offences ○ Mostly pedophilic men • Misconceptions in society’s perceptions
Sex offenders are not distinctly more scary than other criminals who commit serious offences	
Lack of control: idea of sex offenders being uncontrolled→deterministic in his offences	
Sex offender characteristics: mostly men	
Female sex offenders are rare	
Dehumanize: “beast”, “evil”, uncontrollable, lack control of their sexuality	
Sexuality is difficult to control for everyone? Or just sex offenders?	
Previous perception: lack control of sexual desires	
Participant’s perceptions influenced by CJS, CoSA,	
CM offended against children, but P4 does not say he is a pedophile works around it saying “technically” he offended against people under 16 years of age	
Seems to be uncomfortable with the fact that they are children, being non-chalant about the term “children or whatever”	
Human perspective	
Focusing on pedophiles	
Dr. Federoff-ROH	
CM involved with Dr. Federoff	
Parallels made between addictions (drugs/alcohol) and sex offending	
Management: can be managed	
Cannot cure sexual tendencies	
CoSA similar to AA	
CoSA volunteer similar to AA sponsor	
Management: penal system should not manage sex offenders	
Sex offending minimized: as to being any other “problematic behavior”	
Legal definition-but apprehensive for agreeing with it	
Parallels with addictions	
Penal system doesn’t help anyone	
Differentiates between CM versus other sex offenders who recidivate and go in and out of prison	
Parallel with addiction: recognize behavior as problematic	
Parallel with addiction: identify risks, triggers, and a way to manage it	
Management: self-manage→learn self	
Management: learning to live with it	
Parallel with addictions: learning to live with	

addiction	
CoSA isn't perfect CM have reoffended	
CM voluntarily involved in CoSA	
CoSA should not be the backbone of CJS-?	
Criminologists stigmatized as having "bleeding hearts"	
Vague language-> People do bad things	
Not in favor of getting rid of CJS	
Role: not a part of the system	
Relationship between volunteer and CM: separating own accountability from CM's	
Relationship between volunteer and CM: if CM reoffends only bother participant on superficial level	
Role: not CoSA responsibility if CM reoffends it's the responsibility of the system-PO	
Role: volunteer not a part of the system or accountable for CM actions	
Against jail confinement	
Reintegration needs community link	
Some parts of the CJS are necessary for management	
Prison isn't good for anything	
Avoids using the word "crime"	
Vague language: "crappy things"	
Humanizing sex offenders → in order to coexist	
Other's reaction to CoSA involvement → secondary stigma/courtesy stigma	
Stigma	
Humanize CM → in order to have other's empathize	
Harm reduction	
Crime prevention	
Relationship between CM and volunteer → care about CM see past their criminal history	
Vague language: "what they did"	
Role: "genuinely caring"?	
Prevention: community ties essential to preventing reoffending	
CoSA=community tie	
Management: self manage within the community	
Stigma: primary → internalize the stigma → see themselves as "monster/disgusting"	
Sex offenders will reoffend whether they are involved in CoSA or not-why? Implications → "no more victims"	
P4 thinks that other's views towards sex offenders creates the problem-how?/what is the problem in her mind	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Sensationalized ideas of sex offenders in society • Perception of fear: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ SO are the most highly monitored and restricted group of people that get released into the community ○ Shouldn't be scared of them, someone always knows where they are... (but do they? Working in PPO we didn't always know where the sex offender was, he just came in for appointments and told us what he has been up to, where he is living, but nothing too restrictive from a probation standpoint... Parole may have more influence and control over parolees ○ She was not scared, thought maybe she should have been more scared because of peers and social pressures ○ No heightened awareness of stranger interactions • Media's influence on perceptions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Crime dramas ○ P4 scared by some cases presented in the media ○ Problematic how they report sexual offences ○ Motto: if it bleeds it leads ○ Portrays this entire population SO as "terrifying" → perpetuates misconceptions that we (society) have of SO ○ Influences our perceptions of SO ○ Social media-making the problem/divide even worse → sharing and reposting sensational stories with a mass public • Previous perception of sex

Problem=the divide “us versus them” what are the implications of this divide?	<p>offenders before criminological education</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Dehumanized, scary, lacked self control → deterministic, uncontrollable ○ Dehumanized: beast, evil, ○ Lacks control of sexual desires <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants feelings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Criminologists stigmatized as having bleeding hearts ○ Involved through a roommate ○ CoSA was available first → similar to P3 needed volunteers ○ Interest in RJ ○ Likes to go against the norm, took on CoSA’s message like it was her “crusade” • Involvement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Enjoyed the experience, “great”, good relationship with her CM ○ CM has contributed to why she is having a good experience with CoSA ○ Would continue with CoSA following her year commitment ○ Development of skills: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Being present with someone ▪ Refining communication skills ▪ “Being okay with hearing the answer” not reacting to certain responses ▪ Counseling skills ▪ Networking ○ Professional development: learning about the system “black and white” for someone on restrictions ○ Learning experience
Media=problematic in how they report sexual offences	
Vague language → not using the word crime calling it a “thing”	
Media motto: “if it bleeds it leads”	
Media=portrays this entire population (SO) as “terrifying → perpetuates the misconception that “we” (society) has of SO	
Media=influences our perceptions of SO	
Media/social media (Facebook) making the “problem”/divide worse → sharing sensational news over social media	
P4 stop social media	
Bring back humanity into the CJS-did it ever have humanity? In the past we treated mental illness like circus animals	
Bring back humanity into the communities where the “guys” move to, or back to	
Involved through a roommate	
CoSA was available first → similar to P3 it was available because they needed volunteers	
Interest in RJ	
CoSA says they are RJ however P4 doesn’t see the connection within CoSA	
Involvement → awareness about CoSA through criminology program, roommate, and looking for something to occupy time	
Strong belief in the work of CoSA	
Likes going against the norm, and took on CoSA’s message like it was her “crusade”	
Enjoyed the experience, “great” good relationship with CM	
CM has really contributed to why she is having a good experience with CoSA	
Would continue after year commitment with CoSA	
Development of skills: being present with someone	
Relationship/role → friendship and a pseudo-professional relationship friendship “I’m not his professional” –don’t these roles conflict, friendship?	
Relationship → develop a relationship where you can have “tough” “serious” conversations in a public place (out for coffee)	
Development of skills: refining communication skills	
Development of skills: “being okay with hearing the answer” not reacting to certain responses from the CM, portray less shock	

Development of skills: counseling skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ P4 wasn't affected by her involvement with CoSA, people in her life are aware of her criminological interests, done things "like this" before ○ Contribution: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Given opportunities to self reflect ▪ Developed interesting perspective and reflections about restrictions and labels ○ Able to emotionally and psychologically do this type of work <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CM <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Offended against children ○ P4 does not use the term pedophile ○ Involved with Dr. Federoff ○ Younger than the usual CM in CoSA ○ Open and honest from the start ○ Because he didn't look like a typical pedophile it was easier to trust him, look at him like a friend ○ CM is aware of his own conditions/restrictions ○ Done parole on LTSO ○ Errs on the side of caution ○ Cautious from the start, knows that he is the one who takes accountability and is punished for his own mistakes • Vague language <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ P4 does not say he is a pedophile works around it saying "technically" he offended against people under 16 years of age ○ Seems to be uncomfortable with the fact that they are children, being non-chalant
Development of networks → professionals in the field, police, parole officers	
Rapport: hesitant to speak about → things specific to him that made creating a rapport with him "easy"	
CM: younger than the usual CM in CoSA/ "who you would picture as a typical sex offender. Or a typical sex offender that had offences for pedophilia"	
(society's) perception of typical SO/pedophile	
Acknowledges that there is a "typical" idea of what a SO/pedophile looks like	
Vague language: "would get involved in something like this"	
Relationship: "they set us up nicely"-quite a bit younger than most CM	
CoSA practice: matching CM with volunteers that have similar interests, common personalities, characteristics	
Relationship: developed a "kind of a friendship relationship" easily → had things in common	
CoSA practice: initial interview, and matching process	
Trust: believes there is trust between CM and her	
CoSA is voluntary so most SO come in with an openness	
CM was open and honest from the start	
Expectation vs reality: typical pedophile → not what she expected	
Physical appearance: because he didn't look like a typical pedophile it was easier to trust him, look at him like a friend	
Preconceived notion of a typical pedophile: old man, developmental challenges	
CoSA practice: weekly meetings at a church	
Do "fun" social things together as a group with other circle volunteers	
Regular one-on-one interactions: coffee, walks, book stores	
CoSA practice: match volunteers and CM based on common interests	
Management: "we were all very aware of his conditions" /restrictions	
CoSA practice: training to be aware of common conditions and restrictions	
Management: CM is aware of his own conditions/restrictions	
Management: factor in conditions when making plans with CM	

Management: restricted from malls, parks→taking the long way around	<p>about the term “children or whatever”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “People do bad things” ○ Avoids using the word “crime”→says “crappy things” ○ “What they did” ○ “Thing” ○ “Would get involved in something like this” ○ Avoids saying crime/offence/sexual assault “ who have had really awful things happen to them” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Human perspective? Whether it can be cured from a criminological perspective ○ Humanizing sex offenders→in order to coexist ○ Humanize CM in order to elicit others to empathize with them • Treatment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Dr. Federoff at the Royal Ottawa Hospital Sexual Behaviors clinic ○ Cannot cure sexual tendencies ○ She believes that SO can stop reoffending • Parallels made between addictions (drug/alcohol) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ignoring the debate of whether it can be cured ○ Can be managed ○ CoSA similar to AA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ CoSA volunteer like a sponsor ○ Recognize the behavior as problematic ○ Identify risks, triggers, and a way to manage it • Management <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Penal system should not manage sex offenders ○ Self management-learn self
Management: parole→then Long Term Supervision Order (ltso), most SO given LTSOs	
Management: CM is done parole, on LTSO	
Management: Gatineau Park now considered a park→prevented CoSA from holding their yearly event there	
Management: “park” conceptualized as a place with play structures, near a school→not Gatineau park	
Who decides what is considered a park? Why did this change all of a sudden?	
Professional development: empathizing with CM seeing what life is like day to day	
Management/professional development: learning the restrictions CM has and it’s intense	
Professional development: learn about the system “black and white” for someone on restrictions	
Perception of fear: SO are the most highly monitored and restricted group of people that get released into the community	
Perception of fear: shouldn’t be scared of them, someone always knows where they are... (but do they? Working in PPO we didn’t always know where the sex offender was, he just came in for appointments and told us what he has been up to, where he is living, but nothing too restrictive from a probation standpoint... Parole may have more influence and control over parolees	
Professional development: a learning experience, networking	
Management: PO decides on the grey issues, final decision of what CM can and cannot do (e.g. skating on the canal)	
Management: have to be aware of the conditions, when trying to reintegrate CM	
Management: self management→CM role to ask PO where he can and cannot go (restrictions)	
Trust: trust that CM tells you the true answer from PO	
Uncomfortable when talking about predicting how she would feel if CM reoffended	
Relationship: from the start she had a disconnect from her CM and his choices, if he gets caught she doesn’t feel that she would have any responsibility/accountability for her CM’s actions	
Management: breaking a LTSO is indictable offence→minimum 2 years in jail/prison	
Relationship: P4 disconnects completely from CM	

choices/actions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Learn to live with it ○ Reintegration needs community link ○ Self-manage within the community ○ “we were all very aware of his condition”/restrictions ○ CM is aware of his own conditions/restrictions ○ Factor in conditions when making plans with CM ○ Restricted from malls, parks→taking the long way around ○ Parole→then Lon Term Supervision Order (most SO given LTSOs) ○ Gatineau Park now considered a park→prevented CoSA from holding their yearly event there (who decides what is considered a restricted park?, why did this all of sudden change) ○ “park” conceptualized as a place with play structures, near a school not Gatineau park ○ PO decides on the grey issues, final decision of what CM can and cannot do (eg skating on the canal) ○ Have to be aware of the conditions when trying to reintegrate CM ○ Self management→CM role to ask PO where he can and cannot go (restrictions) ○ Breaking a LTSO is indictable offence→min 2 years in jail/prison ○ Notive/awareness of changes to CM behavior ○ Risk management→aware of CM personal risk factors not the ones from formal reports ○ Diligent/ but not there to
Relationship: P4 takes no “culpability” or responsibility/accountability if CM reoffends→but she cannot predict how she would feel	
Management: notice/awareness of changes to behavior	
Management/risk→ CM personal risk factors not the ones from formal reports	
Management/role: diligent/ but not there to prevent reoffending, CM choice to reoffend or not	
Choice: CM’s decision to reoffend	
Voluntary program for CM	
Relationship/trust: have to trust CM if they don’t want to tell PO what they are doing than that’s a “gamble” they are taking	
CM errs on the side of caution	
CM cautious from the start, knows that he is the one who takes accountability and is punished for his own mistakes	
CoSA practice: training-“okay”, good in terms of logistics, role playing→is different on the job	
P4 background in criminology	
CoSA practice: training-learn on the job, learn by doing, cannot prepare you for working directly with cliental-every situation that arises will be different	
CoSA practice: training- P4 is skeptical of how role playing prepares one for on the job interaction	
CoSA practice: training-good with follow up trainings, and events, strong emphasis on continued learning	
CoSA practice: training-coordinator and staff always involved and available	
CoSA practice: P4 felt follow up trainings were more useful than the initial→build on skills developed in the field	
Perception of fear: P4 not scared, thought maybe she should have been, because of peers/social pressures	
Rehabilitation-P4 believes that SO can stop reoffending	
Relationship: support system	
Role: basic positive link in the community	
Stigma: labeling theory→labeled SO/pedophile, criminal, label follows you throughout life	
Labeling theory: master status→ people see the label first, very isolating	
Relationship: support, social, positive interaction	
Relationship→CoSA volunteers are probably the only people in his life who have met him since his	

release from the institution that know everything about him	<p>prevent reoffending, CM choose to reoffend or not</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The one stop fix doesn't exist (the issue is context specific) • Sex offending minimized <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ As to being any other "problematic behavior" • Views towards the CJS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The penal system doesn't help anyone ○ Not in favor of abolishing the entire CJS ○ She is against jail confinement ○ Some parts of the CJS are necessary for management (which parts?) ○ Prison isn't good for anything • Views towards CoSA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ CoSA isn't perfect CMs have reoffended ○ CoSA is not adequate to be the backbone/foundation of the CJS ○ =Community tie ○ Doesn't see the proposed RJ within CoSA ○ Strong belief in CoSA's work ○ CoSA is voluntary so most SO come in with an openness ○ Training: was "okay", good in terms of logistics, role playing → is different on the job ○ Training: cannot prepare you for working directly with cliental-every situation that arises will be different ○ Training: skeptical of how the role playing activity prepared the volunteers ○ Training: good with follow up training, and events, strong emphasis on continued learning
Shame: of the past, not wanting to tell people history, starting a new life	
Perceptions: double life	
Labeling theory: master status, stigma, shame	
Not easy making friends	
Perception: labeling, double life: CJS life → PO, halfway house staff/Co-workers, new friends	
Role/relationship: CoSA volunteers are like "pseudo-system" people- in between the system and new life, CoSA knows everything about CM background, risk factors, but also play a social role (PO doesn't go to movies or bowling with CM)	
Relationship: Easy for new people who do not know CM past to like him, but its "something else" for P4 to say she likes CM and supports CM and everything he's done	
Relationship: "I'm supporting you and I know everything that you've done"? Is that the right word... because I don't think you support his offence(s)	
Role/perceptions: introducing him as a "friend" and he feels a sense of "normalcy"	
Role: "Normal" barriers and restrictions prevent him from feeling "normal" I think he means free- because he's out in the community but still constrained by the system, contribute to making him feel "normal"	
role/stigma: introduce to others as friend not client, which allows for a sense of normalcy that CM likes	
Involvement: P4 wasn't affected by her involvement with CoSA, people in her life are aware of her criminological interests, done things "like this" before	
Reaction of others: no judgment → friends in criminology so they do not judge → but some criminology students aren't as critical	
Reaction of others: intimate relationships at first there's "back lash" but P4 can debate and convince him otherwise	
Reaction of others: intimate relationship → secondary stigma: "guy stuff"-ego?	
Reaction of others: secondary stigma: perception that the guy will attack when meeting for coffee	
Reaction of others-secondary stigma: "guy" feels protective	
Reaction of others: secondary stigma → from coworkers-Comment 230	

Contribution: given opportunities to self reflect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Training: coordinator and staff always involved and available ○ Training: follow ups were more useful than the initial training->build on skills developed in the field • Volunteer's role explained <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Not a part of the system ○ Not CoSA's responsibility if CM reoffends it's the responsibility of the system-PO ○ Volunteer not a part of the system or accountable for CM actions ○ "Genuinely caring" ○ Ability to have tough conversations in public places, and "being okay with hearing the answer" not reacting to certain responses from CM-portray less shock ○ Hide judgments/feelings ○ Rapport-things specific to him that made creating a rapport easy ○ Do "fun" social things together as a group with other circle volunteers ○ Regular one-on-one interactions: coffee, walks, book stores ○ Aware of his restrictions and conditions ○ Diligent/ but not there to prevent reoffending, CM choose to reoffend or not ○ Support system ○ Basic positive link in the community ○ Social support/positive interaction ○ CoSA volunteers are like "pseudo-system" people- in between the system and new life, CoSA knows everything about CM background, risk factors, but also play a social role
Contribution: developed interesting perspectives, and reflections about restrictions and labels	
No heightened awareness of stranger interactions	
Victim: Never been a victim of a sexual offence	
Victimization: never been a victim, so this is why she feels she can do this work	
Vague language: avoids saying crime/offence/sexual assault " who have had really awful things happen to them"	
Involved: able to emotionally and psychologically do this type of work	
Us v.s. them	
Stigma: Secondary stigma, idea that since P4 works with this population everyone should	
P4 works with victims too	
Victimization: victims can do this work too, personal choice	
Change in perceptions: perceptions have become more nuanced	
Aware that CM in CoSA have reoffended	
Management: The one stop fix doesn't exist (the issue is context specific)	

	<p>(PO doesn't go to movies or bowling with CM)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ "Normal" barriers and restrictions prevent him from feeling "normal" I think he means free- because he's out in the community but still constrained by the system, contribute to making him feel "normal" ○ introduce to others as friend not client, which allows for a sense of normalcy that CM likes • Relationship between volunteer and CM <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Separating own accountability from CM's ○ If CM reoffends it would only bother her on a superficial level? ○ Care about CM see past their criminal history ○ Friendship and a pseudo-professional relationship friendship → "I'm not his professional" ○ Develop a relationship where you are able to have the "tough" serious conversations out in public ○ "they set us up nicely" ○ developed a "kind of friendship relationship" easily, commonalities ○ believes that trust exists between her and CM ○ Because he didn't look like a typical pedophile it was easier to trust him, look at him like a friend ○ Trust: trust that CM tells you the true answer from his PO ○ From the start she had a disconnect from her CM and his choices, if he gets caught she doesn't feel that she would have any responsibility/accountability
--	---

	<p>y for her CM's actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ She disconnects completely from CM choices and actions ○ Takes no "culpability" or responsibility/accountability if CM reoffends → but she cannot predict how she will feel ○ Trust: have to trust CM if they don't want to tell PO what they are doing than that's a "gamble" they are taking ○ CoSA volunteers are probably the only people in his life who have met him since his release from the institution that know everything about him ○ CoSA volunteers are like "pseudo-system" people- in between the system and new life, CoSA knows everything about CM background, risk factors, but also play a social role (PO doesn't go to movies or bowling with CM) ○ Easy for new people who do not know CM past to like him, but its "something else" for P4 to say she likes CM and supports CM and everything he's done ○ "I'm supporting you and I know everything that you've done"? Is that the right word... because I don't think you support his offence(s) ○ Introducing him as a "friend" and he feels a sense of "normalcy" <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other's reaction to participants involvement with Cosa <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Stigma ○ Secondary stigma ○ Courtesy stigma ○ No judgment → friends in criminology so they do not
--	--

	<p>judge→but some criminology students aren't as critical</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Intimate relationships at first there's "back lash" but P4 can debate and convince him otherwise ○ Secondary stigma: perception that the guy will attack when meeting for coffee ○ Secondary stigma: "guy" feels protective ○ Secondary stigma→from coworkers-Comment 230 ○ Secondary stigma, idea that since P4 works with this population everyone should <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harm reduction • Prevention <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Community ties=essential for preventing reoffending ○ CoSA=community tie • Labeling theory/Stigma <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary stigma→internalize stigma→see themselves as "monsters/disgusting" ○ Labeled SO/pedophile, criminal label follows you throughout life ○ Master status→people see the label first=very isolating ○ Shame→of the past, not wanting to tell people criminal history, starting a new life ○ Double life→not easy to make friends ○ Double life: CJS life=PO, halfway house staff/ other life:coworkers, new firends • Reoffending* <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ SO will reoffend whether they are involved in CoSA or not ○ Takes no "culpability" or responsibility/accountability if CM reoffends→but she
--	--

	<p>cannot predict how she will feel</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Diligent/ but not there to prevent reoffending, CM choose to reoffend or not ○ Aware that CM in CoSA have reoffended <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Problem <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The divide “us versus them” ○ Double life ○ Not easy to make friends • Idealized solution <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Stop social media ○ Bring back humanity within the CJS (did it have any before?) ○ Bring back the humanity of the communities the guys come from, and go back to • Setting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Coffee shops • Expectation vs reality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Typical pedophile→not what she expected • Victim <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Never been a victim of sexual offence→so this is why she feel she can do this work ○ She works with victims too • Change in perceptions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Perception have become more nuanced
--	---

IPA-P5 Themes

Initial List of Themes-A (simplistic & chronological)	Secondary List of Themes-B (theoretical/concept based & chronological)
Definition: Legal definition-CCC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Physical cues <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ laughter-“something illegal”-because they are criminals is that what she thinks? • Definition of sex offending <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Legal definition ○ Legal definition of consent • Determinism
Focus on sex offences against children	
Perception: Disconnecting the actor from the act-offender from offence	
Perception: Sees them as human beings	
Determinism: background (excuse?)	
Attraction to children	
Fixated on the fact that when I say SO she only means pedophiles	

Legal definition of consent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Background (excuse?) • Perceptions of sex offenders <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Disconnecting the actor from the act-offender from offence ○ Sees them as human beings ○ No change in perceptions ○ SO as human being, everyone as human being ○ Don't condone behavior but feel they should be treated like other criminals ○ Non-judgmental, open-minded ○ CM are just "normal people" ○ Still people not different ○ As people not different, just their crime is different ○ P5 sees beyond his file, and can only "help" him not reoffend-how? ○ found that some people since they were mothers could not work with SOs • Participants perceptions influenced by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ P5-social services at Algonquin ○ P5-interest in the criminal justice • Types of sex offenders <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Fixates on sexual offences against children, acknowledges there are different levels of sexual offences • CoSA Practice <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Training:-6 step training, 3 sessions, 2 training <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Guest speakers from the Men's project discuss background, victimization and offences ▪ Exposing to possible matters seen in CM files ▪ Cannot be fully
Perceptions: No change in perceptions	
P5-social services at Algonquin	
General perception: most students did not want to work with SO population	
P5-interest in the criminal justice	
Perception: SO as human being, everyone as human being	
General perceptions: some believe that a murderer is "better" than a sex offender	
Perception: don't condone behavior but feel they should be treated like other criminals	
Perception: non-judgmental, open-minded	
Involvement: since no one else would	
General perception: most people don't want SO around	
General perception: most people don't know that by aw they are eventually released into the community	
Management: there need to be services available to sex offenders for when they want to make a change	
CoSA practice: training-6 step training, 3 sessions, 2 training Guest speakers from the Men's project discuss background, victimization and offences	
CoSA practice: exposing to possible matters seen in CM files	
CoSA practice: cannot be fully ready, everyone's file/story is different	
CoSA practice: training prepares you to work with people generally	
P5 experience working frontline	
Views of CoSA: cannot fully be prepared through training	
CM1: didn't work out, he was unrealistic about his expectations of CoSA	
CM2: "ideal" client extensive criminal history starting from youth records	
CoSA CM: most have long criminal histories	
CM2: enthusiastic takes on all opportunities-Dr. Federoff	
Treatment: Dr. Federoff ROH	
CM2: issues at the beginning he's doing fine since CM2 enjoys involvement with CoSA	
CoSA practice: circle meeting, paperwork, one on ones	
CoSA practice: given file after meeting CM	
P5-first one-on-one ended being 3 hours (usually 1)	

Relationship: CM2 opened up right away on the first one-on-one	<p>ready, everyone's file/story is different</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Training prepares you to work with people generally ○ Circle meeting, paperwork, one on ones ○ Given file after meeting CM ○ voluntary program for CMs-not everyone wants to be involved with CoSA=CM1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General CM in CoSA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Most have long criminal histories ○ For some CoSA is all they have-isolated, due to restrictions, lack of family/friends, new city ○ CM all men, volunteers mostly women • Society's perceptions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Most students did not want to work with SO population ○ Some believe that a murderer is "better" than a sex offender ○ most people don't want SO around ○ Most people don't know that by law they are eventually released into the community ○ Other criminal groups dislike SOs so they are segregated for their own safety • Perception of fear: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ "Working with men safety is always an issue"-why? ○ 90-95% clients committed some sort of offence-JHS (don't like all have a record?) ○ JHS→rely on staff to warn P5 about clients that she should be cautious around ○ Rely on staff at halfway
Role/setting: coffee, shopping, museums	
Management: has to verify with PO whether he can do certain things, like leave the province-Gatineau Park	
Relationship: accepting of volunteers unavailability-get sick, miss a one-on-one	
Involvement/role: time commitment	
Relationship: upfront about scheduling time for CM2	
Stigma: CM2 hesitant at first but then opened up	
CM2: avoided talking about his actual offence and more about his experience within the cjs	
Stigma/setting: CM2 didn't want to talk about his offence in a public area	
Stigma/setting: keep a low time in Tims, avoid public from overhearing what they are saying	
CM2: very open, transparent about his history	
Relationship: CM2 open, rapport development wasn't hard	
Fixated on me saying SO and her interpreting it as only pedophiles	
Management: CJS less restrictive than public opinion	
Management: long term "dangerous offender diagnosis"	
Perception: CM are just "normal people"	
Management/CM2: self-management→asked for a heavier sentence so he could go to prison (federal) to access more programs	
Management: self-management→P5 believes SO should decide their sentence, have choice in the matter	
CM: social control/norms, Dr. Federoff, going to school	
Programming: Provincial system needs more programs for SOs	
Programming: skill building: anger management, parenting class	
Management: not everyone has to go to jail, other options: conditional sentence, TAP, probations	
CoSA CM: for some CoSA is all they have-isolated, due to restrictions, lack of family/friends, new city	
Service: psychiatrists and doctors	
Stigma: programs are needed because they are shunned by most	
Involvement: contribution: "doesn't have to be stuck inside all the time, living in residential	

facility with rules” CoSA-allows him to leave because he may be required to have a chaperone	<p>house to tell Susan (CoSA coordinator) to inform P5 about CM for reasons to be cautious</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants feelings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ P5 experience working frontline • Involvement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Involved with SO since no one else would ○ P5-first one-on-one ended being 3 hours (usually 1) ○ Contribution to CM life: “doesn’t have to be stuck inside all the time, living in residential facility with rules” CoSA-allows him to leave because he may be required to have a chaperone ○ Contribution to own life: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Wanting to make a positive change sees that she is “helping” CM2 make positive changes in his life ▪ Gained experience ▪ Developed knowledge about CJS ▪ Learn about how the CJS affects people and learn about individuals experience in it ▪ Self reflection personally and professionally ▪ Learn to say no, stick up for self and not be manipulated ▪ Learn about self, self reflection ○ Challenges-time/scheduling→working with the whole circle of volunteers to plan, time commitment
Management: restrictive living conditions	
Role: support anytime, company	
Role: nonjudgmental people in his life	
CM2 has family supports, but volunteers add to that circle of support	
CJS-case worker, PO do their job-they do not judge the SO either	
Role: support-take CM places, have fun together, treat him like a “regular” person, which is what he wants	
Involvement: wanting to make a positive change sees that she is “helping” CM2 make positive changes in his life	
Involvement: contribution-gained experience	
Involvement: developed knowledge about CJS	
Involvement: learn about how the CJS affects people and learn about individuals experience in it	
Involvement: contribution-self reflection personally and professionally	
Role: “helping”	
Role: “helping”-do things that may not be productive, but want to seem “compliant”-?	
Involvement: learn to say no, stick up for self and not be manipulated	
Physical cues-laughter-“something illegal”-because they are criminals is that what she thinks?	
Role: it’s a limited role cannot always be there for the CM-there is a limit	
Informal social control-P5 imposing her views as to what is better use of CM’s time	
Role: accompanying CM to get necessities after being release from an institution: get IDs, OHIP card, sign up with Dr. Federoff	
Involvement: learn about self, self reflection	
Involvement: challenges-time/scheduling→working with the whole circle of volunteers to plan, time commitment	
CM2-challenges at the beginning	
Role: do not have control over him, his PO and case manager hold the control over him	
Role: had to wait out the issues, wasn’t present for the “issue” so could not be apart of the solution/resolution	
Vague language: “issue”	
Other’s reaction: CM2 asked what her family and friends thought of her involvement	
Others reaction: secondary stigma-intimate partner	

asked if P5 was ever scared or worried that CM would fall in love with her	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Thinks she's less sensitive because she doesn't have children ○ Feels comfortable working with SOs "right in the middle"-sses why some people can't work with them, but doesn't have a personal problem with them
CoSA dynamics: CM all men, volunteers mostly women	
Perception of fear: "working with men safety is always an issue"-why?	
Perception of fear: 90-95% clients committed some sort of offence-JHS (don't like all have a record?)	
Perception of fear: JHS → rely on staff to warn P5 about clients that she should be cautious around	
Perception of fear: rely on staff at halfway house to tell Susan (CoSA coordinator) to inform P5 about CM for reasons to be cautious	
Others reaction: courtesy stigma-people question how P5 can work with SOs	
Perception: still people not different	
Perception: fixates on sexual offences against children, acknowledges there are different levels of sexual offences	
Other's reaction: hides her involvement from parents and brother-conservative views	
Perception: as people not different, just their crime is different	
General perception: other criminal groups dislike SOs so they are segregated for their own safety	
Perception: not different	
Perception: P5 sees beyond his file, and can only "help" him not reoffend-how?	
Perception: found that some people since they were mothers could not work with SOs	
Involvement: thinks she's less sensitive because she doesn't have children	
Involvement: feels comfortable working with SOs "right in the middle"-sses why some people can't work with them, but doesn't have a personal problem with them	
Program: need more	
Need more volunteers	
CoSA practice: voluntary program for CMs-not everyone wants to be involved with CoSA=CM1	
CM2: wanted to change (himself-school) not to go back to prison-(doesn't mention that he doesn't want to hurt others)	
Lack of knowledge: SO don't always know about the services, people don't always tell them.... P5 thinks maybe some believe they don't deserve the services	

	<p>against children</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Fixated on the fact that when I say SO she only means pedophiles ○ Fixated on me saying SO and her interpreting it as only pedophiles <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volunteer's role explained <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Time commitment ○ Support anytime, company ○ Nonjudgmental people in his life ○ Support-take CM places, have fun together, treat him like a "regular" person, which is what he wants ○ "Helping" ○ "Helping"-do things that may not be productive, but want to seem "compliant"-? ○ It's a limited role cannot always be there for the CM-there is a limit ○ Informal social control-P5 imposing her views as to what is better use of CM's time ○ Accompanying CM to get necessities after being release from an institution: get IDs, OHIP card, sign up with Dr. Federoff ○ Do not have control over him, his PO and case manager hold the control over him ○ Had to wait out the issues, wasn't present for the "issue" so could not be apart of the solution/resolution • Relationship between volunteer and CM <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ CM2 opened up right away on the first one-on-one ○ Upfront about scheduling time for CM2 ○ CM2 open, rapport development wasn't hard
--	--

IPA-P6 Themes

Initial List of Themes-A (simplistic & chronological)	Secondary List of Themes-B (theoretical/concept based & chronological)
Power:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ SO powerless? Power, lack of knowledge of their harm to others, discrepancy between thinking they are helping but causing harm in their offences ○ Power: metaphor, past UofO left centered view • Determinism <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Learn the root cause ○ See it as an illness • Perception of sex offending <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “Sex offenders most definitely (exaggerated) but they are a product of this society we've built.” ○ Sees offending as a sickness, offenders need to be hospitalized ○ Sees it as an illness ○ medicalizing it and learning that it can be treated ○ Female sex offenders getting sentenced is rare • Definition of sex offending <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Want to influence and have power over others ○ Focus on children as the victims ○ Consensual relationship: implies consenting adults ○ SO's offending against a child (minor) ○ Lack of consent ○ Victim is a child (a minor) ○ Offence against pregnant women=rare ○ Difference=consent and age • Social constructionism <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Social constructionism of crime→power (haves and have-nots, who creates the laws) ○ “Sex offenders most definitely (exaggerated) but they are a product of this society we've built.” • Determinism <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ coming from broken homes, being
Power: SO powerless? Power, lack of knowledge of their harm to others, discrepancy between thinking they are helping but causing harm in their offences	
Definition of sex offending: want to influence and have power over others	
Focus on children as the victims	
Perception: pity sees them as “sad cases”	
Perception: lost after being released from many years in jail	
Perception: ostracized by informal groups family & society,	
Perception: ostracized by formal groups: police, parole services	
Consensual relationship: implies consenting adults	
Definition of sex offence: SO's offending against a child (minor)	
CoSA practice: doesn't deal with victims of rape-if they are consenting age (so not SO's offending against adults?)	
Definition of sex offence: lack of consent	
Definition of sex offence: victim is a child (a minor)	
Victim: hard to imagine the offences against children	
Victim: psychological trauma of child sexual abuse	
Vague wording: “event” vs offence, crime	
Definition of sex offence: offence against pregnant women=rare	
Definition: difference=consent and age	
Social constructionism of crime→power (haves and have-nots, who creates the laws)	
Stigma: of sex offenders	
Views of the CJS: CJS stigmatizes and ostracizes SO's who need treatment, psychiatric and medical care	
Perception: “Sex offenders most definitely (exaggerated) but they are a product of this society we've built.”	
Cycle of sexual violence:	
Determinism/cause: coming from broken	

homes, being victimized themselves	victimized themselves
Cause: sometimes living on the streets	○ sometimes living on the streets
Perception: "I never thought they were despicable throwaways"-because of learning how behaviors are criminalized	• Perceptions of sex offenders
Perception: did not have a negative view towards them	○ Pity them, sees them as "sad cases"
Management: not necessarily criminalization	○ Lost after being released from many years in jail
Labeling theory	○ Ostracized by informal groups family & society,
Management: not in favor of incarceration	○ Ostracized by formal groups: police, parole services
Influenced by: mentors: Bob Gausher and Michael Petrunik	○ "I never thought they were despicable throwaways"-because of learning how behaviors are criminalized
Perceptions: developed through upbringing and background	○ Did not have a negative view towards them
Views: skeptical of those in power, corporations	○ SO mostly uneducated/ high school drop outs
Power: metaphor, past UofO left centered view	○ Need care, need attention also need to take accountability
View of CJS: criminalization targets the individual	○ Exceptions to the abolitionist view, the extreme cases-Bernardo's: "Except as Bob used to say about 4-6% of the population, you know the Bernardo's of the world and and you have these are people that are beyond redemption. There is very very few but there are some."
View of CJS: criminalization (general) harrases people, and gives a false sense that the system is working	○ Ostracized population within prisons
View of CJS: incarcerate SOs giving the public a false sense of security	○ Disconnects the act from the actor
Management: against incarceration for hospitalization	○ Part of the human race, and so are deserving of support, help
Perception: sees offenders as sick, need to be hospitalized	○ Even after a breach "you're not despicable you're not scum"
Perception: SO mostly uneducated/ high school drop outs	○ "um... and help others understand that hey you know these are not pariahs. These are not social scum. these are people that just got a pretty rotten deal to start with."
Cause: ?	• Participants perceptions influenced by:
Influenced by: Michael Petrunik who was a Professor at UofO and was involved with CoSA	○ Mentors: Bob Gausher and Michael Petrunik
Involvement: end up being a "really a very very good experience"	○ Developed through upbringing and background
Involvement: experience has been good because sees CM being accountable	○ Michael Petrunik who was a Professor at UofO and was involved with CoSA
Perception of SOs: need care, need attention also need to take accountability	○ Bob used to say always keeping in mind he used to tell us that after you graduate your job is to eliminate the
Management: response→not jail for a long time but not letting them get away with the offence-something in the middle	
Management: accountability is crucial	
Involvement: through Michael Petrunik	
Perception of SO: sees it as an illness	
Perception of SO: medicalizing it and learning that it can be treated	

Perception of CM: “very touching stories”	<p>need for criminology</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CoSA Practice <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Doesn’t deal with victims of rape-if they are consenting age (so not SO’s offending against adults?) ○ They need volunteers, they always will need volunteers-will there always be a lack due to the nature of the population ○ “And the idea of course is if they didn't need volunteers then CoSA didn't need to exist.” ○ “Label, box, classify, catalog” the CM not like in the past (actuarial tools?) ○ Do not tell on CM, there are no notes or recordings taken during the meetings ○ Controls their own program but when it comes to breaches they aren’t going to cover up for the CM, they will be told on and dealt with “They determine what's going to happen and how it's going to happen. With a big exception of breaches, you breach sorry you are accountable, we are not to cover up. And they know this upfront.” ○ Sometimes circle meetings happen without the CM to figure out how to solve issues • General CM in CoSA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Most CM: had psychological or psychiatric problems • Society’s perceptions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Society sees them as worthless and threw them away • Participants feelings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Not afraid to get fired ○ Vocal about his opinion of CoSA to the staff-not going to get fired as a volunteer ○ Abolitionist stance- P6 doesn’t believe in incarceration “Jail doesn't help anyone.” ○ Abolitionist: “I guess the main one is locking people up we know doesn't help, and sex offenders are no different.” • Involvement
Treatment: Dr. Federoff at ROH-learning about pedophilias and other philiias	
Involvement: contribution interesting experience, feels he is giving back to the community in a positive way	
CoSA practice: they need volunteers, they always will need volunteers-will there always be a lack due to the nature of the population	
Involvement: still has time to give	
Involvement/impact: you always get more from volunteering than what you put into it	
Involvement: contribution- positive experience: learning, meeting new people	
Relationship: “I am needed, and I need them”	
Relationship: “So it’s quite a symbiotic relationship”	
Perception of SO: “And the idea of course is if they didn't need volunteers then CoSA didn't need to exist.”	
Influenced by: Bob used to say always keeping in mind he used to tell us that after you graduate your job is to eliminate the need for criminology	
Views of CoSA: “So yes, the idea of yeah we should not have Circles of Support, cause we shouldn't have offenders. but we do, so Circles does uh... does an incredible job”	
Involvement: fell into the opportunity, through the influence of Michael Petrunik	
Involvement: experience varies depending on each CM	
Most CM (until recently): were “needy”- they needed a lot of things	
CM newest: not needy	
Role for needy CMs: escort them to meetings due to restrictions, after being released need credit card, bank account, drivers license, doctor, finding living arrangements → day to day needs	
Role for newest CM: doesn’t need any of those things, lives in a halfway house, he’s resourceful and his needs are different	
Involvement: contribution-introspection	

Involvement: realizes personal inadequacies, but due to introspection it's still a positive experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ End up being a “really a very very good experience” ○ Experience has been good because sees CM being accountable ○ Contribution: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Interesting experience, feels he is giving back to the community in a positive way ▪ You always get more from volunteering than what you put into it ▪ Positive experience: learning, meeting new people ▪ Introspection ▪ Realizes personal inadequacies, but due to introspection it's still a positive experience ▪ Self satisfaction, and recognizing that he is giving back to society ▪ Does not believe in state's citizenship, for him his was of doing citizenship-little bit that may prevent an offence ▪ Having contributed in a tiny tiny way, but an honest way ▪ Learning, games with CMs ▪ Introspection ▪ “I think I'm a better human being for being with CoSA and they and its the core members have help me be a better human being.” (wow strong statement) ○ Fell into the opportunity, through the influence of Michael Petrunik ○ Context of P6 involvement with CoSA-lapse of time away for 4 years and back for 2 years now ○ • CM <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “Very touching stories” ○ Most CM (until recently) were “needy”-they needed a lot of things ○ CM newest: not needy ○ Gained respect for themselves, realizing there is a difference
Role: individualize and adapt to each different CM and their unique needs	
Role: CM don't know what their needs are due to a lack of education, long-term incarceration being used to the system → institutionalization → causes of recidivism	
Management: institutionalization → leading to recidivism	
Management: institutionalization → easier on the inside than on the outside	
Role: imposing what volunteers/CoSA see as the CM's needs	
P6: always questioning-CM's actions, his own actions, CoSA' actions, and the system	
Involvement: Context of P6 involvement with CoSA-lapse of time away for 4 years and back for 2 years now	
View of CoSA past: smaller organization	
View of CoSA now: bigger, more bureaucratized, more paperwork → justification for everything to obtain (government) grants and funding	
View of CoSA now: not as separate from the system as P6 would like	
View of CoSA now: skeptical of conversations within and reports that are produced	
Role: vocal about his opinion of CoSA to the staff-not going to get fired as a volunteer	
Involvement: not afraid to get fired	
CoSA practice: “label, box, classify, catalog” the CM not like in the past (actuarial tools?)	
View of CJS/general: increase of the medicalization of deviance-DSM	
View of CJS: cannot prove DSM diagnosis-not exact	
View of CoSA: doesn't believe in using this classification system based on the DSM, and as volunteers should not lend no credence to these items	
View of CoSA: very against the classification system in place	

View of CoSA: changed CoSA needs to be more accountable because of the funding	
Role: "help[ing]" the CM	
Role: help them realize that they are cared for, considered human and not throwaways	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ between the act and the actor ○ Within the first year CM's have slip-ups and close calls thus realizing what they have to lose ○ Feel guilty for breaches ○ Through recover→ "he says 'look I always lived my life on the wrong side of the tracks, and I believe that this was okay. I am now starting to see that your side of the tracks is perhaps better.' That is a huge revelation."
View of CoSA now: bureaucratized→against that	
Relationship: skeptical of having a rapport with CMs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Use manipulation with the system because their files are never confidential-the system people have access: doctors, parole officers
Relationship: skeptical of having a rapport: CM manipulation e.g. learn in jail programs, lingo, how to act	
Relationship: "They learn the catchphrases, and learn what to say, they pick up on how to act because of course they want to get out and doing well in programs is a way of getting out. So then they learn what to say and how to behave. Sometimes that is apparent uh... the name dropping, the always positive attitude, nothing is ever wrong, everything is wonderful with the world but it is and it cannot be"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vague language <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ "event" vs offence, crime • Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ P6: always questioning-CM's actions, his own actions, CoSA' actions, and the system • Treatment/Programming <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Dr. Federoff at ROH-learning about pedophilias and other philias ○ Programming: Provide real programs for them to take inside the institution→ranging from basic education to psychiatric/psychological needs ○ Need to have programs in prisons-help them address their life long challenges
Role: help: "That I'm there to help them, and there to do what I can uh..."	
Relationship: "I'm not going to go out of my way if they don't, and that they are quite free to lie to me and use whatever they have learned in their multiple programs they are only harming themselves, because they aren't harming me one damn bit."	
Role/relationship: "That again that I'm I'm willing to help them provided they want to help, that I can provide, certain things I cannot provide. And there are other Circle members for that. uh... Basically it's up to them, if you want to avail yourself of what I can offer, great. uh... don't think you're going to get it by lying and cheating because you won't. if you tell me everything is great and it isn't well it's your problem not mine. I I'm there if you tell me what your problems are or what challenges you might be facing today or yesterday."	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Not necessarily criminalization ○ Not in favor of incarceration ○ Against incarceration for hospitalization ○ Response→not jail for a long time but not letting them get away with the offence-something in the middle ○ Accountability is crucial ○ Institutionalization→leading to recidivism ○ institutionalization→easier on the inside than on the outside ○ look at external forces/needs to be addressed→ lack of education, broken homes, children ○ evaluate the effects of prison on the
Relationship: choose to take his advice or not but if not then be upfront to discuss	

<p>it→open up for conversation: “they don't have to follow whatever advice I give them, if they don't think it's appropriate. I would prefer that they tell me up front that they don't think it's appropriate and how cause then and why because then we can discuss it, but conversely they are just willing to say yeah yeah that's great that's great and then do something else well it's to their detriment and not mine.”</p>	<p>person and their family</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ better intervention than prison? ○ Incarceration is not the right response for SO ○ Risk management: through files, use their files against them ○ Institutionalized people-reoffend (not sexually) to get back into the system cannot handle the outside <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Views towards the CJS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ CJS stigmatizes and ostracizes SO's who need treatment, psychiatric and medical care ○ Skeptical of those in power, corporations ○ Criminalization targets the individual ○ Criminalization (general) harrases people, and gives a false sense that the system is working ○ Incarcerate SOs giving the public a false sense of security ○ Increase of the medicalization of deviance-DSM ○ Cannot prove DSM diagnosis-not exact ○ Against incarceration, against the system ○ Should be harsher on white collar criminals→like many politicians and CEO's should be in jail forever, but we don't do that ○ View prison as a breeding ground for better criminals ○ Skeptical of the system for SO and as a whole ○ Abolitionist stance “The I guess the the bottom line from my perspective is incarceration doesn't work for anything and therefore it doesn't work for sex offenders.” ○ Lack of confidentiality leads to manipulation • Views towards CoSA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “So yes, the idea of yeah we should not have Circles of Support, cause we shouldn't have offenders. but we do, so Circles does uh... does an incredible job” ○ View of CoSA past: smaller
<p>Boundaries: Us vs them: disconnecting himself from the CM “You know I am not on an LTSO, I am not (mumble) sword thank God. it's not hanging over my head not nodded and criminal sense.”</p>	
<p>Relationship: “working relationship”/ “honest relationships”→ “I would say there's, yeah working relationships, I don't think it has gone beyond that in my case. um... Mind you I've always had a honest relationships, open, I think fruitful.”</p>	
<p>Recidivism: CoSA's CM's rate</p>	
<p>View of CJS: against incarceration, against the system</p>	
<p>SO: female sex offenders getting sentenced is rare</p>	
<p>Management: look at external forces/needs to be addressed→ lack of education, broken homes, children,</p>	
<p>Management: evaluate the effects of prison on the person and their family</p>	
<p>Management: better intervention than prison?</p>	
<p>Most CM: had psychological or psychiatric problems</p>	
<p>View of CJS: abolitionist stance- P6 doesn't believe in incarceration “Jail doesn't help anyone.”</p>	
<p>Perception of SO: exceptions to the abolitionist view, the extreme cases- Bernardo's: “Except as Bob used to say about 4-6% of the population, you know the Bernardo's of the world and and you have these are people that are beyond redemption. There is very very few but there are some.”</p>	
<p>View of CJS: should be harsher on white collar criminals→like many politicians and CEO's should be in jail forever, but we don't do that</p>	

Management: incarceration is not the right response for SO	<p>organization</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ View of CoSA now: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Bigger, more bureaucratized, more paperwork → justification for everything to obtain (government) grants and funding ▪ Not as separate from the system as P6 would like ▪ Skeptical of conversations within and reports that are produced ▪ Doesn't believe in using this classification system based on the DSM, and as volunteers should not lend no credence to these items ▪ Very against the classification system in place ▪ Changed CoSA needs to be more accountable because of the funding ▪ Bureaucratized → against that ○ Recidivism rate shows that CMs get a lot out of the program <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volunteer's role explained <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Role for needy CMs: escort them to meetings due to restrictions, after being released need credit card, bank account, drivers license, doctor, finding living arrangements → day to day needs ○ Role for newest CM: doesn't need any of those things, lives in a halfway house, he's resourceful and his needs are different ○ Individualize and adapt to each different CM and their unique needs ○ CM don't know what their needs are due to a lack of education, long-term incarceration being used to the system → institutionalization → causes of recidivism ○ Imposing what volunteers/CoSA see as the CM's needs ○ Vocal about his opinion of CoSA to the staff-not going to get fired as a
Prevention: incarceration is does not provide general deterrence, it will provide specific deterrence for a limited period of time	
Management/Programs: provide real programs for them to take inside the institution → ranging from basic education to psychiatric/psychological needs	
View of CJS: abolitionist: "I guess the main one is locking people up we know doesn't help, and sex offenders are no different."	
View of CJS: view prison as a breeding ground for better criminals	
Perception of SO: ostracized population within prisons	
Programming: need to have programs in prisons-help them address their life long challenges	
View of the CJS: skeptical of the system for SO and as a whole	
Solution: move away from copying the US and look towards the Nordic nations, how are they dealing with SO?	
Solution: programs in prison that responsabilize and make them accountable	
RJ: Native Justice rituals	
View of CJS: abolitionist stance "The I guess the the bottom line from my perspective is incarceration doesn't work for anything and therefore it doesn't work for sex offenders."	
CM: gained respect for themselves, realizing there is a difference between the act and the actor	
Perception of SO: disconnects the act from the actor	
Perception of SO: part of the human race, and so are deserving of support, help	
Relationship: if trust is broken it hurts the CM more than it would for the volunteer	
CM: within the first year CM's have slip-d close calls thus realizing what they have	
Role: because of CoSA these slip-ups do not become punishable-buffer between the system?	
Reoffending: terms of breaches-"go[ing]	

for a beer. Well it's a breach"	
CM: feel guilty for breaches	
Relationship: CM provided (small) gifts for each of his volunteers	
Relationship: "The little things that mean a lot. That they are recognizing you're here for me, you are here because you want to be, you're treating me with respect and I can trust you. If you you say you'll be there you'll be there. If you say you won't, you won't."	
General view of SO: society sees them as worthless and threw them away	
Role: help through the recovery	
CM: through recover → "he says 'look I always lived my life on the wrong side of the tracks, and I believe that this was okay. I am now starting to see that your side of the tracks is perhaps better.' That is a huge revelation."	
Relationship: will not tell on them "And also very important they know we will not whistle blow. They know we won't stab them in the back, which of course is (chuckle) is the ongoing complaint about Circle treatment."	
CM: use manipulation with the system because their files are never confidential-the system people have access: doctors, parole officers	
Management: lack of confidentiality leads to manipulation	
Relationship: "You know if you're going to come in here and just tell me what I want to hear, I said you can do it with me but don't do it with your shrink, because he's a professional he is there to help you. And he said no he isn't. And I said well why not? And so this person said well because these files are open to the system."	
Risk management: through files, use their files against them	
Relationship: there is trust, will not tell on them → to parole/or probation officer	
CoSA practice: do not tell on CM, there are no notes or recordings taken during the meetings	
Relationship: trust: "so, so yeah they they recognize over time. There is trust and	<p>volunteer</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ "Help[ing]" the CM ○ Help them realize that they are cared for, considered human and not throwaways ○ Help: "That I'm there to help them, and there to do what I can uh..." ○ Because of CoSA these slip-ups do not become punishable-buffer between the system? ○ Help through the recovery ○ Will whistle blow for more breaches, first CMs get one chance ○ Treat people like people ○ Sometime using more forceful expressions of concern is necessary ○ Sometimes side with the professionals, play devils advocate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relationship between volunteer and CM <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ "I am needed, and I need them" ○ "So it's quite a symbiotic relationship" ○ Skeptical of having a rapport with CMs ○ Skeptical of having a rapport: CM manipulation e.g. learn in jail programs, lingo, how to act ○ "They learn the catchphrases, and learn what to say, they pick up on how to act because of course they want to get out and doing well in programs is a way of getting out. So then they learn what to say and how to behave. Sometimes that is apparent uh... the name dropping, the always positive attitude, nothing is ever wrong, everything is wonderful with the world but it is and it cannot be" ○ "I'm not going to go out of my way if they don't, and that they are quite free to lie to me and use whatever they have learned in their multiple programs they are only harming themselves, because they aren't harming me one damn bit." ○ "That again that I'm I'm willing to help them provided they want to help, that I can provide, certain things I cannot provide. And there

when there have been this little slip-ups or or minor breaches we normally tend to be on their side, or certainly I have been on their side.”	<p>are other Circle members for that. uh... Basically it's up to them, if you want to avail yourself of what I can offer, great. uh... don't think you're going to get it by lying and cheating because you won't. if you tell me everything is great and it isn't well it's your problem not mine. I'm there if you tell me what your problems are or what challenges you might be facing today or yesterday.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Choose to take his advice or not but if not then be upfront to discuss it → open up for conversation: “they don't have to follow whatever advice I give them, if they don't think it's appropriate. I would prefer that they tell me up front that they don't think it's appropriate and how cause then and why because then we can discuss it, but conversely they are just willing to say yeah yeah that's great that's great and then do something else well it's to their detriment and not mine.” ○ Boundaries: disconnecting himself from the CM “You know I am not on an LTSO, I am not (mumble) sword thank God. it's not hanging over my head not nodded and criminal sense.” ○ “Working relationship”/ “honest relationships” → “I would say there's, yeah working relationships, I don't think it has gone beyond that in my case. um... Mind you I've always had a honest relationships, open, I think fruitful.” ○ If trust is broken it hurts the CM more than it would for the volunteer ○ CM provided (small) gifts for each of his volunteers ○ The little things that mean a lot. That they are recognizing you're here for me, you are here because you want to be, you're treating me with respect and I can trust you. If you you say you'll be there you'll be there. If you say you won't, you won't.”
Perception: even after a breach “you're not despicable you're not scum”	
Role: will whistle blow for more breaches, first CMs get one chance	
View of CoSA: recidivism rate shows that CMs get a lot out of the program	
CoSA practice: controls their own program but when it comes to breaches they aren't going to cover up for the CM, they will be told on and dealt with “They determine what's going to happen and how it's going to happen. With a big exception of breaches, you breach sorry you are accountable, we are not to cover up. And they know this upfront.”	
CoSA practice: sometimes circle meetings happen without the CM to figure out how to solve issues	
Role: treat people like people	
Role: sometime using more forceful expressions of concern is necessary	
Relationship: trust	
Relationship: someone cares for the CM because “for no reason other than you're a human being”	
Role: sometimes side with the professionals, play devils advocate	
Involvement: contribution-self satisfaction, and recognizing that he is giving back to society	
Involvement: contribution-does not believe in state's citizenship, for him his was of doing citizenship-little bit that may prevent an offence	
Involvement: contribution-having contributed in a tinu tiny way, but an honest way	
Involvement: contribution-learning, games with CMs	
Involvement: contribution-introspection	
Involvement: “I think I'm a better human being for being with CoSA and they and its the core members have help me be a better human being.” (wow strong statement)	
Management: institutionalized people-	

reoffend (not sexually) to get back into the system cannot handle the outside	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Will not tell on them “And also very important they know we will not whistle blow. They know we won't stab them in the back, which of course is (chuckle) is the ongoing complaint about Circle treatment.” ○ “You know if you're going to come in here and just tell me what I want to hear, I said you can do it with me but don't do it with your shrink, because he's a professional he is there to help you. And he said no he isn't. And I said well why not? And so this person said well because these files are open to the system.” ○ There is trust, will not tell on them → to parole/or probation officer ○ Trust ○ Someone cares for the CM because “for no reason other than you're a human being”
Involvement: keeps CoSA private from others (other than partner)	
Others reaction: his partner is aware, and has joined some of the group outings	
Other's reaction: sister → had long talks about it, she hasn't accepted it but at least understands what it is all about	
Deterministic view: learn the root causes	
Perception of SO: “um... and help others understand that hey you know these are not pariahs. These are not social scum. these are people that just got a pretty rotten deal to start with.”	
Us vs them: a fine line, homeless analogy	
Change in perceptions: yes there has a change but not solely because of involvement with CoSA also with U of O, people in CoSA, non-academic experience	

1g Sample of Master Theme Table

Master Theme Table ‘Humanization of the Monstrous’	
PARTICIPANT 1:	Sub-themes
1: (Pause) Uh um... well obviously it's not a good thing...haha (laughter) um... (pause) yah... uh... like obviously like I don't agree with it I don't think it's... it's anything that is good in anyway necessarily but um... uh in saying that I guess I don't think that all sex offenders should be vilified in the same way... um cause there's um I guess different reasoning's behind why they do what they do or why they made this one mistake um or why they chose to (mumbled word-“versus”) making a mistake...	Condemning sex offender behavior Sex offenders as unique Rationalizing the behavior
1: well I think just like cause uh I think people in the media tend to...uh to paint them all with the same brush where its like you know the they can never change its... you know its... part of their biology or you know they... um or th... either that or they chose to to do this cause they're they're evil people they're monsters	Media's representation
1: okay well yes you made a mistake or yah you've really made this really terrible choice but you know how can we move on so that that doesn't happen again	ACT AND ACTOR
1: um... my assumption was always just, well... um... they're attracted to the violence or that's how they get... they... get sexual satisfaction is through violence or through... um... like in the case of people that engage in sex with children it's that's who they're attracted to and that's why they do it. So... I guess how it's changed is that there's other reasons why people would do that...	Previous perception → sexual gratification of violence, attracted to children
1: ... but uh... they're not totally inhuman either like the guy that I work... that I'm with now like you know he's a funny guy he... and he has a lot of potential to contribute productively to society...	Human/core member
PARTICIPANT 2:	Sub-themes
2: Well, I think in general we have to stay away from the label. R: okay 2: um... yeah cause it sort of it takes over the status of the individual right? So I prefer to use you know "person who has sexually offended" so that if the behavior is not them. So when I hear that, like the term sex offender I immediately kinda have a problem with that and just think it's a person who has sexually offended.	Rejects the label
#00:02:39-1# 2: um... well I think they're it's a very heterogeneous group. So I I think sometimes in society and in the media they are portrayed as one type of person you know the sex offender. But um... there it's a very um... diverse groups of people right? cause sexual offending is like sexual offences are there is a variety of them. Right? And we only know about the people who have been caught, pretty much right? And convicted and participated in research and stuff. I mean we can know about the ones who haven't been caught maybe from victim surveys and from victims themselves	Heterogenous group MEDIA
2: ... From people abusing children to you know date rape situations, they're very different people.	Variety/types of sex offenders/offences
2: (pause) I think I imagined them to be more intimidating or scarier than what I found the core members to be.	Previous perception
#00:04:44-9# 2: um... and then when you meet them they're different. So I remember like my first Christmas party with CoSA a few years ago... I mean I was intimidated by the core members and peop you know cause they're just like people so they're new people right?	People/Sex offender/Core members

<p>2: ... I don't think anybody wants to be doing this in a sense if they could not #00:20:08-9# R: mhm #00:20:08-9# 2: if they could be normal. so to say they would be right?</p>	<p>Determinism No free will Treatment</p>
<p>#00:20:58-3# 2: although sex offenders have a very low recidivism rate once they're identified and treated so</p>	<p>Low recidivism rate</p>
<p>#00:30:08-6# 2: and my core member is one person, right? #00:30:10-7# R: right #00:30:11-6# 2: so um... we can't like say you know core members slash sex offenders i guess as if it was the same #00:30:15-0# R: mhm #00:30:15-0# 2: because, they're they're very they're a certain type of person right? um... #00:30:21-3# R: because they volunteer to...? #00:30:22-7# 2: well yeah they volunteered, um... in general core members tend to be a bit older #00:30:32-6# R: mhm #00:30:35-6# 2: they voluntarily, you know well first they've been identified and convicted right? #00:30:35-5# R: mhm #00:30:35-5# 2: so that in itself it just there's lots of people who sexually offended who are not caught.</p>	<p>Personification CM versus sex offender CM = very specific type of person</p>
<p>#00:31:20-9# 2: Than whatever you've read that's that goes for anybody right like not. and especially so a group of people who are so stigmatized and demonized in the media. right? #00:31:32-4# R: mhm #00:31:32-4# 2: that's probably the worst of the yeah it is the worst of the crimes out there</p>	<p>Media: stigma demonizing Worst crime</p>

<p>PARTICIPANT 3:</p>	<p>Sub-themes</p>
<p>#00:00:52-6# 3: i think like i...i would generally feel repulsion uh... probably anger... uh... if i heard about some sort of sex offence like if its reported in the media it's usually something you know lured enough uh something very you know that society would deem pretty bad. um... Especially like contact offences against children. #00:01:11-2# R: mhm #00:01:11-2# 3: uh that would usually kind of like you know really make me angry. but on the other hand I also you know I have a little bit of insight in terms of of understanding that most sex offenders don't just wake up one day and say okay I'm going to be a sex offender, there's usually you know a long chain of events that led them to make those choices. So I kind of I guess I sort of had a little bit of a you could maybe say it's kind of a balanced view? #00:01:41-0# R: okay #00:01:41-0# 3: In terms of like I I knew that it wasn't just you know out of the blue that these things were happening, but there were also some really bad people out there. #00:01:52-7# R: mhm #00:01:55-8# 3: who you know and it was a problem for society, like how do you you know basically get these people to stop reoffending #00:02:01-2# R: yeah #00:02:01-2# 3: so that, I guess that was kind of my uh sort of my initial perception um... like when I was growing up. Like when I was uh young like I'm talking preteen years uh the Clifford Olson trial #00:02:18-0# R: okay #00:02:18-0# 3: that, that left a. That kind of left a big impression in terms of you know seeing someone as a sexual predator, #00:02:25-6# R: mhm</p>	<p>Society deems SO bad Contact offences against children Range of type of SO Not a decision Chain of events Cause Bad people exist (exceptions) Problem for society Prevent recidivism Notorious: Clifford Olsen, Paul Bernardo, Karla Hamolka Touchstones in Canadian criminal history “big sex offenders who are big kind of monsters” we want them locked away</p>

<p>#00:02:25-6# 3: murderer, you know that was there's a lot of media for that #00:02:31-4# R: mhm #00:02:35-1# 3: and then in the early 90s uh the the Paul Bernardo and Karla Hamolka thing, that was pretty big. #00:02:40-7# R: mhm #00:02:40-7# 3: yeah, so those were sort of i guess some of the I guess the touchstones at least in Canada that I #00:02:46-7# R: mhm #00:02:46-7# 3: that i was aware of you know who are big sex offenders who are big kind of monsters that we want locked away type thing</p>	
<p>#00:03:04-4# 3: um... I I guess for me like the any sort of contact offense against children the reason why that's kind of uh uh like uh it's almost like a visceral uh aversion</p>	<p>abuse in the past... why he is uncomfortable about that</p>
<p>#00:06:15-3# 3: um... can you just um... tell me more about how he see sex offenders like prior to CoSA #00:06:22-9# 3: I'd say it it tended to be sort of the the stereotype of like a uh Clifford Olson or Paul Bernardo type like someone like a a very sensationalistic view of someone who abducted strangers and did bad things to them #00:06:39-0# R: mhm #00:06:39-0# 3: um... it was only later on as a you know University student doing re like doing my own kind of reading and learning about things that I learned that most sex offences take place within families that usually uh victims and perpetrators know each other, you know that that sort of opened opened my mind up a little bit #00:07:02-8# R: okay #00:07:02-8# 3: uh so yeah I'd say as a kid like I say that they're stereotypes almost like one-dimensional characters. #00:07:12-1# R: mhm #00:07:12-1# 3: um... And then like through CoSA I'd say like I've really learned a lot in terms of the you know the the the perpetrator victim cycle #00:07:25-0# R: mhm #00:07:25-0# 3: where where that's coming from so I'd say I have a much more uh sympathetic view #00:07:30-3# R: okay #00:07:30-3# 3: like I don't I try not to paint them and that one-dimensional #00:07:34-6# R: mhm #00:07:34-6# 3: view, I tried to go in with an open mind.</p>	<p>Prior perception: stereotype, Clifford Olsen, Paul Bernardo Sensationalistic-stranger danger 1 dimensional characters Taught through university→abuse happens within families CoSA learned→victim perpetrator cycle More sympathetic view now Open minded</p>

PARTICIPANT 4:	Sub-themes
<p>#00:02:43-4# 4: (deep breath) mmm... No I mean I do have a background in criminology so, my idea sex offenders is probably a lot different than the general public.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education plays a factor
<p>#00:03:43-8# 4: That end up being members of CoSA. So I guess my idea was the question what was my idea of CoSA members or what was my idea of sex offenders in general? #00:03:52-3# R: Sex offenders. #00:03:52-3# 4: well my idea of I guess sex offenders in general just that there's a lot of ideas that circulate (chuckle) in society about them, that they are probably the most hated group of offenders.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General ideas that they are most hated
<p>#00:04:08-3# 4: um... yeah and just that there's a lot of misconceptions, this idea that the majority of sex offenders are the stranger in the bush that is going to jump out at you and blah blah blah, like a lot of things that when you do study criminology you know #00:04:23-9# R: mhm</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Misrepresentation of Sex offenders

#00:04:23-9# 4: are not true.	
#00:06:27-5# 4: that men are... you know uncontrollable beasts who can't control their sexuality and who it's just this... evil inside of them that you know they can't let go of. And whether you're talking about someone who you know sexually assaulted someone their own age, the same sex, opposite sex, when whether you're talking about pedophiles #00:06:47-5# R: mhm #00:06:47-5# 4: whatever range you're talking about just this idea that your sexuality is so difficult to control #00:06:54-8# R: mhm #00:06:54-8# 4: I guess that would be one of my on my old perceptions... or my old perceptions #00:06:59-8# R: okay #00:06:59-8# 4: of sex offenders is not being able to control	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> old perceptions
#00:07:58-6# 4: um... like most other CoSA members, and from a hum from a human perspective I mean this idea that because my background is in criminology I've been involved in these debates of can you cure it? How do you treat it?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criminology background.... This human perspective...
#00:08:41-9# 4: but, I do think still think that it's an interesting debate, and from my work with my core member in CoSA, I think that I draw I personally draw a lot of parallels and when I talk to people about the work I do with CoSA i i do draw a lot of parallels with like drug addiction, or alcohol. Like never mind this idea can you be cured can you not. #00:09:02-9# R: mhm #00:09:03-3# 4: If it is an idea of management, I think that it can be managed, like for me personally I guess I don't think you can cure being a s... sex offender like I don't think or not being a sex offender but I don't think you can cure your sexual tendencies. I think it's about management. #00:09:23-2# R: okay #00:09:23-2# 4: The same as it would be like like CoSA I can I consider CoSA being similar to like being a member of AA.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parallel between AA
#00:14:20-1# 4: I do recognize that some people like I said do really crappy things for inexplicable reasons, but the grand majority of them I would say it's their humanity that actually makes them who they are and I think is it's important to recognize that people are human just like you and I, just like your parents and your siblings and everyone else. And it's the first step of being able to coexist with sex offenders is recognizing them as human.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Humanize
P4: ...the the best way that I can (chuckle) describe it to someone I always ask put yourself in a position where you're living in a community and you have absolutely nothing (exaggerated). You're human being were social beings and you have absolutely nothing you're not accountable to anyone most of the people you care about have blocked you out of your life, you have huge restrictions on your liberty you can't even go to half of the city because of different restrictions that you have, and people look at you like you essentially have a stamp saying that you're evil and disgusting. Put yourself in that position now you're living in a community what are you going to do?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Humanize, empathize
#00:16:30-6# 4: my position is saying that I am probably one of the only people who actually genuinely cares about this person and can see past what they did.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Humanize, see past the act and actor
PARTICIPANT 5:	Sub-themes
#00:01:08-1# 5: um... what do I think about people who commit crimes? I mean you know I work with them so obviously I don't have I don't condone what they've done but I also don't have a problem with them as human beings.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Humanize
#00:02:36-2# 5: yeah I uh... I studied social services at Algonquin and uh... my	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the field of social

<p>teacher you know my teacher always used to ask you know students when it came to placement you know name a population you could also work with. And everybody at least everybody said sex offenders, you know that was one thing that always came up and you know mine were different mine were stuff like terminal illness or working with children or something like that, but I've always been had an interest in criminal justice. so for me it was either I can do it or I can't but I have to go in and knowing that there's a possibility that I may meet sex offenders and not know they're sex offenders. you know I won't know unless somebody tells me. that's the reality, knowing that I would have to deal with in regardless of if I specifically worked with them or not, or chose to work with them.</p>	<p>services, no issue with working with sex offenders</p>
<p>#00:03:31-3# 5: I've always lived with the belief that like everyone deserves to be treated as a human being regardless of what they've done. even though I know the crime that they've done and I don't condone it to me that doesn't mean that they should be um... treated worse than somebody who say robs a bank or kills somebody but for some people someone who kills someone is a lot better than a sex offender but I mean it's a crime either way so, I don't see them really any differently than anybody else.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Humanize
<p>#00:04:05-6# 5: nope, pretty been I've always been pretty nonjudgmental open-minded about that kind of thing, that's why went into social services it was the right field for me so #00:04:13-0# R: mhm okay um... and what made you decide you wanted to work with sex offenders as a particular group? #00:04:22-3# 5: Because I knew nobody else would, I mean yes we have we have volunteers you know obviously there's a decent amount of people who um... who are willing to do it but compared to the population of people living in the city it's an extremely small fraction of people. You know in my studies you know nobody else wanted to work in social justice or anything, everyone wanted to work with women or teens or the elderly or anything like that, nobody wanted to go into criminal justice so I knew generally speaking that that was a field that needed more people because nobody else wanted to go. And as for sex offenders it's just a reality of the job so I mean you know those are the type those are the people that most of society doesn't want out. And a lot of people don't realize that for the most part by law they have to come out. And so there need to be services for them when they come out, when they're ready, when they actually wanna make a change, when they want to use the services available to them, they need to be there and there have to be people that are gonna run it so I decided that I wanted to go into that work.</p>	<p>Theme: volunteer because nobody else would Theme: society's perception-most people don't want sex offenders around Theme: society's perception-most people don't know that by law they are eventually released into the community</p>
<p>P5... : i was put in that circle in April and he's like the type of client we all hope to end up with, you know he's uh...he's um... he has pretty extensive uh... history starting from like uh... being a youth. #00:08:25-9# R: mhm #00:08:26-9# 5: um... so, his history was a lot longer, than the first guy, the first guy only had a history that was maybe about 4 years, which is very rare compared to i guess most of the people CoSA ends up with i guess as core members. um... he's like super awesome like every opportunity he has to go to school or doing any kind of programming you know working with Dr. Federoff, anything that comes his way, anything he learnt about that might be of interest, he's willing to do and try anything, to help him stay on the straight and narrow to keep him from going back. you know super enthusiastic wants to you know go all over the city, go to museums and learn different things, wants to see everything try everything, so he's uh... super super compliant. i mean at the beginning there was a couple of incidences with um... like he had some like i guess anger control issues a little bit that kind of um... lead to a negative result for him, but you know so the first month was kind of like oh has it kinda is it going to kinda be like the first guy but then after those incidences past</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ideal core member

everything was fine, and he's been doing great ever since like May so, we're all very happy.	
P5:... in my case my core member does, and he's doing really well. You know he's he's going to school, he is seeing Dr. Federoff, he's seeing every doctor he has to, he's seeing you know every program, he's going through every program that he can find that will help him. You know and he wants to go back to college and he wants to to all sorts of things and there's lots of guys who want to do that.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Core member specific
P5:...And not even necessarily just sex offenders anybody who's been released, you know it can help anyone. but I mean they're the ones who are shunned a lot more than anybody else	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public perceptions
#00:28:34-4# 5:The only people that don't actually know about my volunteer work are my parents, and my brother uh... because they have very conservative conservative mindset. Things like even things as simple as like homosexuality is very like inappropriate for them, so I don't think they'd really understand why I would work with sex offenders and I really... (pause) don't feel like I should have to defend it.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distancing self from social perspective of sex offenders

PARTICIPANT 6:	Sub-themes
#00:01:39-8# 6: I believe in the poss... and I know now because of my exposure to them that sex offenders are mostly people that have been uh... abuse themselves, that are powerless, that lack any social graces by and large, and that in some but not cases strong strongly believe that they're not harming an individual for life because they're actually helping them and giving them uh... love, care and attention. In some cases it strictly a power... so I see them as such individuals who in some cases uh... want uh... to influence and to have power over others. Unfortunately its children, and it's something that can be dealt with so how do I see them? Well I see them as pretty sad cases. um... That find themselves after usually many years in jail quite lost and uh... ostracized by their families, definitely by society, police services, parole services, and all of the other circle services.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Theme: power • SO- powerless? Power, lack of knowledge of their harm to others, discrepancy between thinking they are helping but causing harm • Theme: pity "sad cases" • Theme: ostracized by informal groups (family/society) • Theme: ostracized by formal groups: police, parole
#00:06:28-1# 6: Which of course sex offences would fall part of it, what you become part of it um... and and this of course uh... is to one, two of my mentors from from here who really opened my eyes to the fact that um... what we tend to call crimes are really rules or norms set up by the haves in detriment of the have-nots. I'm sure you have heard of this before, uh... trust me that's the way it is, and unfortunately we have a system that does nothing but stigmatize and ostracize people that offend, many of the people that offend need treatment, psychiatric and medical. uh... Sex offenders most definitely (exaggerated) but they are a product of this society we've built. um... Again because of the links with CoSA you learn or I've learned that the things I was taught were actually correct. because people come mostly from broken homes, they've been offended against themselves uh... sometimes most sometimes not very often but sometimes they lived in the streets, so anyway my perception of sex offenders specifically. let me put it this way I never thought they were despicable throwaways. uh... because once I learned how the system works and what behaviours we've criminalized uh... you realize that many of them are... many of these behaviours require other forms of attention other other than criminalization. So I I I did not have a negative view, I have a few I suppose in retrospect that yes, this is something to be addressed we you know	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Humanize • Theme: social construction of crime • Theme: crime and power • Theme: stigma • Theme: system negative (stigma, ostracize) offenders • Theme: what does this mean? "product of the society that we've built"? • Theme: cycle of sexual victimization/violence • Theme: Offenders

<p>we don't want to perpetuate um... this social scars so to speak. But of course, you know labelling, and incarcerating is not the way to do it. But that's what we do, for a variety of reasons of which we are aware.</p>	<p>from broken homes, living on the streets</p>
<p>P6:... so again, you asked prior how do I think or feel or see sex offenders, well they they do need care and they do need attention and they need to be accountable. You can't just forget about it that would be the other silly extreme. One extreme is jailing them for 10 years without any support, and the other one is oh well you know it happens.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sex offender
<p>#00:30:11-3# 6: maybe it's just uh... an ill of the times and an something that happens. But overall no I I'm again it is accountability and they do help the core member and this is something that you know I try to keep in mind all the time, which and often times not easy cause you're dealing with people. #00:30:32-0# R: mhm #00:30:33-7# 6: That all of this is done for them, and to anyway help them realize that they are cared for they're considered human, they are not throwaway.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Theme: help→CoSA “helps: the CM] • Theme: CM as human, “not a throwaway”
<p>P6:... Definitely locking them up and throwing away the key is useless, but this applies to anything within the system.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not useful
<p>P6:... um... see I I don't believe in incarceration to start with so this is a big problem. Jail doesn't help anyone. Except as Bob used to say about 4-6% of the population, you know the Bernardo's of the world and and you have these are people that are beyond redemption. there is very very few but there are some. uh... many of our politicians should be there, heads of corporations, those should be in jail and the key thrown away. You know the exiles of the world, and we don't do that</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exceptions
<p>P6:... with sex offenders my understanding is that they're quite ostracized in jails and they don't even get that</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ostracized within jails
<p>P6:... #00:51:47-1# 6: okay, well I don't know what they get out of it, I can tell you what they say they get out of it. #00:51:51-4# R: okay #00:51:51-4# 6: uh... You know again I'm I'm what I feel some of them have gained is respect for themselves, the realization that there is a difference between the offence and the offender. The idea that people will help them, and will be friendly towards them and supportive simply because they're members of the human race and nothing else and they are deserving.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Humanize
<p>P6:... You know that the development of relationships, the development of trust, and that you trust this person, trust is a big one uh... that someone cares for them, uh... for no particular reason other than you're a human being.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Human being
<p>#01:15:31-0# 6: um... and help others understand that hey you know these are not pariahs. These are not social scum. these are people that just got a pretty rotten deal to start with.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Humanize
<p>#01:17:34-3# 6: Yes, but it's not... yes my perceptions have changed, but it's not only (exaggerated) through my involvement with CoSA. See anything that deals with events we criminalize there is a pre-Ottawa and post Ottawa U, so I would say that that it has not only been CoSA. CoSA has had a major impact but the change from the Roman ignorance position to a less ignorant (chuckle) position that I have now has happened over many many years. And and I think the people that I met here um... had a much greater impact. now CoSA and my work with them provided the nonacademic type of experience but uh... the questioning of our ways started here. The challenging of of why we think the way we think, and why we act as we do began here. as Bob used to say the lonely road started here. uh... what was he talking about uh... the academic life, is a very lonely road.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact of criminology U of O