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Why grouping?

• Use formal grouping positively
  – In SOTP/SOGP
  – To challenge each other
  – Evidence that more effective than challenging by non-sex offender

• But, suspicious of informal grouping
  – Dyads or rings of sex offenders
  – Concern in respect to supporting further offending
The Study

- Ethnographic study of the experiences of sex offenders living in a Probation Approved Premises (hostel): (21 months)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of data collected</th>
<th>Number of data collection points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observation in hostel (including informal interviews)</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews with residents (some repeated)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(21 sex offenders)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews with staff (some repeated)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9 RSO)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Study Setting

- Edge of small city
- Semi-rural location
- Set apart from residential & central business zone
- Curfew imposed
- Double –cover staff minimum
- ‘private’ & ‘public’ space
- Insular, secretive, isolated
My place as a researcher

• Access negotiations
  – formal and informal gatekeepers

• Role negotiations
  – Staff/ visitor/ spy/ researcher/ audience/ observer/ participator

• Trust, rapport & informed consent
What Residents & Staff Say About Groupings...

• The Main Groups:

“They talked about how there were two groups of offenders: the ‘others’ and the ‘sex offenders’. ” (R7 and R8 in interview, CSA)

However, in public..... ‘drug addicts’ and ‘others’
“R47 (convicted of multiple rapes against adult women) was upset because someone called him a ‘paedo’. He was sitting with R39, R26 and R49 (all CSAs) and said he was not interested in kids. Later when R51 (female, ‘other’) asked him what he was going to do tomorrow he said he was ‘going to sniff glue and then go to the park to watch the kiddies.’ R51 was shocked and said he shouldn’t say such things because of the other three there. R47 said he ‘didn’t give a fuck about them’ although he spends much of his time with them.” (field notes)
Categorised by Age

•

“S9 comments that the younger sex offenders especially see themselves as ‘white knights’ or ‘advocates for everyone else’ [residents]. They ‘have a certain cockiness over-confidence. This disappears with age, like a chrysalis and they turn into older sex offenders who are not so attention seeking, patient and take much longer [grooming] over their offences.”

(S9, PSO, observation notes)
Interaction of age and Offence Type

“That’s what makes it so hard for people like R6 (20 year old CSA), he’s in between groups. The drug addicts are about his age, they’re much younger really [than the sex offender group], but his offences are the other group. He doesn’t really fit in anywhere.”

(R7 in interview with R8, both CSA)
Limited movement only, with ‘others’ not moving between the two.

A solid line denotes additional membership of other groups. A dotted line denotes potential movement between groups. Arrows denote the direction of movement on dotted lines.
Distancing Techniques: Othering

• 1. Distancing from the group not a member of
  – Name calling: “R33 [violent offender] calls R1 [CSA] ‘nonce’ and ‘kiddie-fiddler’ to his face.”

• 2. Distancing from group a member of
  – Presentation as another offender

• 3. Reinforced by staff & hostel structure
  – “there’s lots of ‘nonce-calling’ going on. Even among staff.”
  – SOTP/SOGP
Functions of Grouping

• Support mechanism
  – Coping structures
  – Older offenders

• Supporting members’ resistance to offence work
  – Development, internalisation and normalisation of techniques of neutralisation
Sykes and Matza (1957)
Techniques of Neutralisation

1. Denial of responsibility
2. Denial of Injury
3. Denial of a Victim
4. Condemnation of the Condemners
5. Appeal to Higher Loyalties
Why are Neutralisations Important?

Offence

Pre-offence use of neutralisations

Post-offence use of neutralisations

Fantasy and offence planning

Offence
It’s not my fault

• “She was overly affectionate”
• “My girlfriend miscarried, that’s what prompted me”
• “She was having an affair”
• “She was a bad mother”
• “They were happy with it”
• “I’m being framed”
• “[...] everyone in the hostel is a criminal, and 99% of the population are too.”
“The thing is you listen to these men, they’ve been offending for years...what do you call it?...justifying it to themselves all this time. And they’re much more convincing than the psychologists [....] and they are there all the time.” (Child sex offender)
Challenging post-offence neutralisations → Group resistance of challenges. Normalisation of neutralisation → Development of pre-offence neutralisations
But…. Grouping Can Support Rehabilitation

- Challenging post-offence neutralisations
- Group challenges. Supportive of offence work
- Admission & acceptance of responsibility
What can be taken from this?

• The character of groups are influential on members
• Supportive – instrumental to coping in institutions
• If grouping were managed in residential settings it could be a powerful mechanism to support RSO and PO work
• If not, the negative effect of grouping needs to be acknowledged

• Note: structure of hostel life encourages informal sex offender grouping
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