



University of HUDDERSFIELD

University of Huddersfield Repository

Reeves, Carla

All together now! : Sex offender grouping and the normalisation of offending attitudes

Original Citation

Reeves, Carla (2010) All together now! : Sex offender grouping and the normalisation of offending attitudes. In: Sex offenders - punish, help, change or control, 29th April 2010, Newport centre for criminal and community justice. (Unpublished)

This version is available at <http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/id/eprint/13755/>

The University Repository is a digital collection of the research output of the University, available on Open Access. Copyright and Moral Rights for the items on this site are retained by the individual author and/or other copyright owners. Users may access full items free of charge; copies of full text items generally can be reproduced, displayed or performed and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided:

- The authors, title and full bibliographic details is credited in any copy;
- A hyperlink and/or URL is included for the original metadata page; and
- The content is not changed in any way.

For more information, including our policy and submission procedure, please contact the Repository Team at: E.mailbox@hud.ac.uk.

<http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/>

‘All Together Now!’

Sex Offender Grouping and the Normalisation of Offending Attitudes

Carla Reeves

University of Huddersfield

c.l.reeves@hud.ac.uk



The Study

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

Type of data collected	Number of data collection points
Observation in hostel (including informal interviews)	57
Interviews with residents	24
Interviews with Staff	17

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’

What Residents Say About Groupings...

- Categorized by Age:

“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)

What Staff Say About Groupings...

- 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)

What Residents Say About Groupings...


- Categorised by offence type:

“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.”

What Staff Say About Groupings...

- Categorised by offence type:

“The CSAs tend to be passive and compliant (at least in their presentation) whilst ASAs are more short tempered, aggressive and usually slightly younger. The ASAs resident at the moment are both immature, insecure and joke a lot. Anti-female comments are made in the form of jokes, for example, R47 often comments that women are fickle, nagging temptresses.”



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

- 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
 - “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?



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”

Admission Without Responsibility: A matter of interpretation?

“ He is one of those that doesn't think it is wrong, so he doesn't need to justify it to himself” (police officer in MAPPP)

Admission Without Responsibility: A matter of interpretation?

“ He is one of those that doesn't think it is wrong, so he doesn't need to justify it to himself” (police officer in MAPP)


- A technique of normalisation?

“[...] everyone in the hostel is a criminal, and 99% of the population are too.” (child sexual abuser)

The Power of Peers

“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)

Resisting Rehabilitation



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

References

- Auburn, T. and Lea, S. (2003). 'Doing Cognitive Distortions: A Discursive Psychology Analysis of Sex Offender Talk.' *British Journal of Social Psychology*. **42**; 281-298.
- Baldwin, K. and Roys, D. T. (1998). 'Factors Associated with Denial in a Sample of Alleged Adult Sex Offenders.' *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*. **10** (3): 211-226.
- Buunk, B. P. (1996). 'Affiliation, Attraction and Close Relationships.' In Hewstone, M., Stroebe, W. and Stephenson, G. M [ed] *Introduction to Social Psychology 2nd edition*. Blackwell, Oxford.
- Crawley, E. and Sparks, R. (2006). 'Is there Life After Imprisonment?: How elderly men talk about imprisonment and release?' *Criminology and Criminal Justice*. **6**; 63.
- Finkelhor D. (1984). *Child Sexual Abuse: New Theory and Research*. Free Press, New York.
- Gocke, B. (1991). *Tackling Denial in Sex Offenders*. Probation Monographs, Norwich.
- Haslam, S. A. and Reicher, S. (2006). 'Stressing the Group: Social Identity and the Unfolding Dynamics of Responses to Stress.' *Journal of Applied Psychology*. **91** (3): 1037-1052.
- Lea, S. and Auburn, T. (2001). 'The Social Construction of Rape in the Talk of a Convicted Rapist.' *Feminism and Psychology*. **11** (1): 11-33.