CO-CREATING ETHICAL UNDERSTANDINGS THROUGH OUTSIDER WITNESSING

MARK MULLKOFF

PRACTICE BASED RESEARCH PAPER

GRADUATE PROGRAM IN SOCIAL WORK

YORK UNIVERSITY

TORONTO, ONTARIO

APRIL 2020

Abstract

This research project seeks to examine ethical dilemmas faced by practitioners who work with men who have used intimate partner violence (IPV). The study is informed by a Foucauldian conception of power. The research explores how the workers' reflections on power and ethics give them insight into the journeys towards accountability that their clients undertake. Methodologically, the study adopts narrative inquiry combined with outsider witnessing methods, which allow an audience of participants to listen to one participant be interviewed about an ethical dilemma, and explore what things resonated with them in the story; what accounted for this resonance within the life or practice of the witness; what these things indicate about the values, ethics, or politics of the storyteller; and where the witness has been transported as a result of hearing the story. Findings indicated that this process contributes to a relational understanding of ethics through soliciting shared experiences, feelings, and values; by causing participants to reflect on past experiences differently; and by descriptions of values, ethics, and power as active and relational processes. Insight into the clients' pursuits of accountability arose through reflections on the experiences of clients, the process of change, and an understanding of shared navigations of power relations with clients. The study recommends that those working with men in IPV intervention consider building a regular practice connecting with others doing similar work in order to co-create shared ethics and mutual support around the pursuit of those ethics.

Acknowledgments

This is very important to me – I am not the sole author of this paper; it was a community effort:

Dr. Chris Chapman – thank you for your encouragement last year to pursue this work further, for your consultation on this project, and for inspiring me with your writing, your politics, your pedagogy, and your care. Dr. Daniel Kikulwe – thank you for your guidance and support on this journey, for reading and editing all of the iterations of my work, and for balancing support for my ideas with support for me finishing. SOWK 5450 Section R – for inspiring me with your ideas, reassuring me with your struggles, for providing me with feedback and encouragement.

Mom, Dad, and Dan – for raising me with values that extend outside the well-being of our individual family and prioritize the well-being of the most marginalized, and also for your emotional and financial support that has enabled me to pursue this degree (and thus this project). Hannah, Kate, and Jura – for providing me with the support and space to pursue this project, and for our co-learning about what it means to be in relationships that value respect and equality.

Mary and Wanda – for taking a chance on me, helping me hone my analysis of the criminal justice system, and showing me that you believe in me. S.K. and L.D. – for bringing into focus for me the experience of survivors. Amy – for helping us through this and for showing me how to ask great narrative questions.

SJ – for all of our Propeller sessions and giving me thorough feedback. Sasha – for taking a sincere interest in my work and sharing your wisdom around presenting it. Orla – for working alongside me pre-COVID and post- and talking through my ideas with me. Ninotchka – for our work sessions and emotional support.

Melissa, Henny, Sophie, and Ben – for your time, wisdom, and sincere engagement. You are absolutely co-authors of this work, even if academic conventions don't allow me to put your names on the cover page. All people harmed by interpersonal violence, state violence, and all other forms of domination and coercion – I hope this experience helps me work to resist these sources of harm.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction

Research Topic

Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) intervention is a site of intersecting and conflicting relations of power. Men's abuse of their partners and the discourse that supports it is a prime vehicle of patriarchy (hooks, 2004) and thus intervening to address this problem is a form of resistance to patriarchy. However, due to the colonial violence (often carried out by social workers) of breaking up Black and Indigenous communities and family structures (Baskin, 2006; Conwill, 2010) and the colonial violence of the criminal justice system, which disproportionately targets these communities (Salole & Abdul, 2015), there is great risk of this violence extending to the therapeutic relationship. Furthermore, regardless of the background of the men, coercive and dominating practices are not only less likely to elicit reflection and accountability from men but also model the very dynamics of an abusive relationship (Augusta-Scott, 2003, 2007, 2009; Jenkins, 2009). There are calls for therapists to take on a "parallel journey," wherein they seek to be accountable to their clients (and those they have harmed) while their clients seek to be accountable to those who they have harmed (Jenkins, 2009, p. xiii).

Social workers are encouraged to consider how their social position (race, gender, class, professional status, etc.) impacts their goals of effective and empowering work with marginalized people through a practice called reflexivity (Badwall, 2016). Poststructuralist critical social work scholars have identified epistemological and racist pitfalls of the practice (Badwall, 2016; Brown, 2012; Heron, 2005) and it has also been critiqued for not having theoretically appropriate models which formalize the practice (Ruch, 2009). I am interpreting Jenkins' call for a parallel journey as an appeal for a theoretically specific reflexivity practice for critical IPV practitioners. This research examines a model for this practice that is rooted in the

theoretical background of narrative therapy by asking therapists who do this work to reflect on an ethical dilemma they have had to navigate in their work with men who have used IPV. Using the narrative therapy technique outsider witnessing (White, 2000; 2007), the study participants were interviewed about these experiences in front of one another, and then were guided in a reflection on what they heard in the interviewee's stories in terms of what resonated with them, and where it took them. This study was guided by the following two research questions:

1. How does using outsider witnessing as a reflexive practice contribute to a relational understanding of ethics?

2. How does reflecting on issues of power and ethics in their own practice inform workers' understandings of their clients' journeys towards accountability?

Justification and Significance of the Research

I have pursued social work as a career out of a desire to resist oppressive social formations and the powers that have shaped these and maintain them. Critical social work studies have identified many ways in which the social work field itself has shaped these formations and maintains them (Badwall, 2016; Chapman, Hoque, & Utting, 2013; Rossiter, 2001; Thobani, 2007). With its roots in Foucauldian power analysis, critical social work scholarship analyzes the powers I sought to resist as amorphous, dispersed, conflicting, and constantly being created through the discourse and practices of all of us – social workers certainly not excluded (Chambon, 1999). So, rather than looking without to locate the sources of power I seek to resist, I am more interested in looking within practices of social work to critically examine how these contribute to oppressive power relations.

Because of the intersection of many of these multidirectional streams of power in IPV intervention, I believe it is an ideal site to study ethical intervention practices and to understand

resistance to dominant power practices. There is also a unique opportunity for therapists doing this work to view their journey towards ethical practice as parallel to their clients' journeys towards ethical relationships (Jenkins, 2009). This allows for an identification between clients and workers in how difficult it is to understand their participation in oppression, understand how to address it, and how to be accountable for it. I believe there is much workers can learn from their clients for their own journey and much that workers can learn from their own journey which may assist them in supporting their clients' journeys.

I am also interested in this topic from a prison abolitionist standpoint, both from the perspective of the intervention with men who have used abuse as well as the ethical journeys of the therapists doing the intervening. For the abolition movement to advance, alternatives to incarceration and punishment must be imagined, developed, and promoted (Ben-Moshe, 2014). It is utterly important from my perspective, that the alternatives do not resemble that which is being overturned nor have the same impacts – that they are indeed alternatives and not simply newly-clothed forms of punishment. Clinical interventions with men who have used abuse have the potential to be either the former or the latter, and without scrutiny, are likely to follow in the footsteps of dominant carceral practices (Jenkins, 2009). Departing from a culture of incarceration also requires imagining, developing, and promoting alternative ways of understanding ethical conduct outside of rules and laws. I see the parallel journey of therapists working with men who have used abuse as a fitting site for developing a relational, rather than statutory, understanding of ethics; an ethics which is continuously co-created in an effort to be accountable to the complex ways that oppression can be produced through this work.

Chapter 2: Theoretical Framework

Introduction

In this chapter I will outline the theoretical framework I am using to guide my research. I will briefly explain the Foucauldian analysis of power through social work scholarship and argue why this is suitable for the project. I will also introduce the concept of relational ethics through the work of Chapman, Hoque, and Utting (2013), White (2002), and Llewellyn (2011), and show how this follows from Foucauldian power analysis. This is followed by a brief summary.

Foucauldian Power Analysis

This project is grounded in a Foucauldian analysis of power and ethics as demonstrated by critical social work scholars (Badwall, 2016; Chambon, 1999; Chapman, Hoque, & Utting, 2013; Heron, 2005; Pease, 2002; Rossiter, 2001; Thobani, 2007; White, 2002). This conception of power is beyond the conventional understanding as simply something wielded over powerless subjects by an oppressive ruling force, but is rather framed as a phenomenon which "reaches into the very grain of individuals, touches their bodies and inserts itself into their actions and attitudes, their discourses, learning processes, and everyday lives" (Chambon, 1999, p. 58). White (2002) explained power as something "that recruits people's active participation in the fashioning of their own lives, their relationships, and their identities, according to the constructed norms of culture – we are both a consequence of this power, and a vehicle for it." (p. 36). Because the fashioning of lives, relationships, and the construction of identity are all characteristics of therapeutic conversations, a Foucauldian analysis is relevant to exploring how power operates in therapeutic relationships.

A limitation of this theory of power is that it can appear to blame people for their own oppression by ignoring those who wield great power. However, Pease (2002) pointed out that

this analysis does not deny that there are larger forces of power at play, but that it is more "concerned with the ways in which these global manifestations of power are influenced by decentralized and localized forms of power" (p. 139). He argued that, if power does not operate in a consolidated and unified manner, then resistance need not and should not attempt to address it in such a manner. Resistance can and should attempt to "undermine institutional power where it reveals itself in ideology under the mask of humanism" (p. 140) – such as in social service delivery like IPV intervention.

While this analysis views power as carried out by individuals through their everyday lives, power also shapes these individuals in a process called subjectivity. The self is not fixed or essential but is fluid and relational: "Individuals take up or identify with particular subject positions structured through relations of power and made available through different discourses" (Heron, 2005, p. 347). Through their dominance over others, these discourses become the knowledge that is taken for granted as truth. For example, dominant discourse around professional social work shapes power relations between social workers and clients (Badwall, 2016; Rossiter, 2001) and shapes what is possible for clients (Heron, 2005). This is a key focus of this study: dominant discourse around problems such as IPV shapes who clients are and what is possible for them (Augusta-Scott, 1999, 2003, 2007, 2009; Cain, 2011; Jenkins, 2009). Other power relations and ways of being are possible but are subjugated by this dominant knowledge.

This fluid and relational conception of self means that power operates through a complex web of subject positions and discourses. Badwall (2016) highlighted that this not only shapes what is possible for clients, but also for workers. According to her analysis, critical social work discourse constructs a dichotomy of powerful worker/powerless client. While on one hand this discursively forecloses the possibility of empowerment for clients, it also erases the ways that

power operates to produce and facilitate domination of the client over the worker. Her research explores this in through the ways racialized social workers can be positioned to their white clients who use racist language and violence, however one could extend this to male-identified clients and female-identified workers, straight or cisgender clients and LGBTQI2S+ workers, etc. A Foucauldian conception of power allows us to appreciate and analyze these complexities by not viewing individuals as embodying simple, fixed subject positions but rather ones that intersect and oscillate as they are reproduced through different discourses.

Pease (2002) argued if power is channeled through discourse and its subjectification of individuals, then resistance takes the form of not complying with dominant discourse and knowledge; empowerment of clients takes the form of making room for and amplifying subjugated discourse and knowledge. His argument is resonant with the theoretical basis for Jenkins' (2009) narrative therapy-inspired invitational practice: If the pursuit of ending IPV is taken up through complicity with the dominant discourses which reproduce the status quo power relations that support IPV in the first place, then it is likely short-sighted and ineffectual. If the intervention seeks to transform these power relations, it must be carried in ways that resist dominant power relations and attempt to empower clients to shape themselves in alignment with their own ethical strivings. Badwall's (2016) analysis is an indication that these power relations are never not present due to our embodiment of multiple subject positions. This creates a joint ethical pursuit on the part of therapist and client to resist harm and domination.

Relational Ethics

As Foucault's sense of power is produced through discourse and practices, accordingly "ethical knowledges and skills are collaboratively developed through conversation, partnership, and community, rather than primarily through individual self-reflection or consulting rules and

codes" (Chapman, Hoque, & Utting, 2013, p. 26). This is a crucial theoretical underpinning of the present research project. If power relations are being constantly created through complex and conflicting discourses, no professional ethical code or book of rules could adequately address how to navigate these power dynamics. Rather, we as professionals must create and engage in practices which support this collaborative development of what it means to do our work ethically. White (2002) noted that this is not without challenges, but that "these challenges take us to another version of ethics, a version of ethics that is not passively received but one that is the outcome of our activity" (p. 69).

Related to this Foucauldian sense of ethics as a relational process is Llewelyn's (2011) "relational conception of justice…[which] sees the centrality of relationships not as that which is useful for the individual or simply as part of their lived experience but, rather, as essential to the very imagining or understanding of the individual" (pp. 100-101). Similarly to how the Foucauldian subject is constructed through its relations, Llewelyn (2011) views the individual as socially constructed. Contrary to the statutory nature of the criminal justice system, she argued that justice "cannot be met by standard and formulaic answers but, rather, must take into account what is needed in a particular context to achieve just relationships between and among the parties involved" (Llewelyn, 2011, p. 98). Since individuals are socially constructed rather than fixed, static beings, what a just relationship needs depends on the social positioning of the individuals involved and the power relations that arise from this relationship. While the reflexive method I am proposing does not involve the clients or their partners (who might have been harmed in the ethical dilemmas), it is rooted in a situational, relational conception of just action which hopefully leads to consideration of the uniqueness of each situation reflected on.

Summary

In this section, I have outlined the theoretical framework of this research through a Foucauldian conception of power, as demonstrated by critical social work scholars. Since this power operates through dispersed, localized practices more so than centralized, global structures, resistance to these operations of power can take place at the local level. However, just as power is carried out by individuals, individuals themselves are shaped by power relations through dominant discourses. This shaping, or subjectification, is concealed through appeals to fixed, naturalized, and essentialized qualities of individuals. Subjectification does not produce individuals with fixed identities, but rather creates ever-shifting identities and power relations as they intersect with different discourses. Resistance then can take the form of challenging dominant discourses, unveiling the ways they constitute individuals, and making room for subjugated discourses.

This is important in the traditional individually-focused approach to talk therapy, where discourses around professional expertise and pathology can construct people with fixed, problem-saturated identities which disempower and discourage change. In therapy with men who have used abusive behaviour against their partners, there is also the added risk of a therapist modeling the domination they seek to address, asserting their knowledge over a client's. These risks are complicated by the potential for clients to embody subject positions which can produce forms of dominance over workers who are female-identified, racialized, LGBTQ2S+, etc. Accordingly, an approach to power and ethics informed by a Foucauldian power analysis must be a situated, relational process rather than one that appeals to statutory bodies, rules, or laws.

Chapter 3: Literature Review

Introduction

My research intends to find out how the use of outsider witnessing used as a critically reflexive ethical practice can contribute to a relational understanding of ethics; and, specifically, when this is practiced with those who work with men who have used abusive behaviour, how this practice may inform their understanding of their clients' processes of accountability. This literature review will situate my research in the historic development of intimate partner violence (IPV) interventions, with a focus on the development of critical, politicized understandings of the phenomenon through the contributions of systems theory, the Duluth model, transformative and restorative justice, and narrative therapy/invitational practice. I will focus on Jenkins' (2009) invitational practice and its emphasis on therapists' "parallel, political journey" as a preferred practice model for understanding IPV intervention in a critical social work context. I end by briefly looking at Jenkins' (2009) and Dowse's (2017) engagement with outsider witnessing or audiencing as a tool for critical reflexivity with IPV workers.

Development of Critical IPV Intervention

Given the theoretical framework of this project, a historicized and politicized understanding of the development of IPV intervention is crucial for tracing how power has operated on, and through, these practices. The framing of the issue at different points in time by different intervention practices highlights what discourses had dominance at that time, whose voice(s) and perspective(s) were centered in the analyses that informed the practices, how power was conceived of, and how subjects were formed through these discourses and analyses. While this genealogy could warrant an entire research project on its own, the following section will provide a brief (and almost certainly incomplete) history of IPV intervention in the past decades.

Therapeutic: Systems Theory

In the 1980s and prior, dominant therapeutic approaches to addressing men's violence against their female partners were apolitical and the problem was viewed as simple relationship dysfunction (Augusta-Scott, 1999, pp. 3-4; Jenkins, 2009, p. 147). This practice largely followed the framework of systems theory, which understands people's behaviour in the context of their relationships and surrounding social order. This practice, however, is criticized for not problematizing that social order (Payne, 2014, p. 135). By not zooming out and looking at the gendered power imbalance in our society these therapies "at best ignored the asymmetrical and gendered power arrangements of battering (*sic*) relationship(s) or at worst endangered battered (*sic*) women and colluded with abusive men" (Augusta-Scott, 1999, pp. 3-4). These past therapeutic approaches were also critiqued for pathologizing men for their use of abuse, which also serves to individualize an issue that is systemic (Augusta-Scott, 2009, p. 115). These apolitical understandings of IPV concealed the ways that power operates through relationships to reproduce broader societal discourses like male dominance or patriarchy.

Educational: Duluth Model

Feminist critique of the existing therapeutic practices in the 1980s and the organizing of the battered women's movement led to a new model becoming the dominant practice for working with men who use abusive behaviour against their partners (Langer, 2017, p. 108) - the Duluth model created by Pence and Paymar (1993). This model importantly politicized the issue of interpersonal violence and made connections to the social issues of power and gender. The practice emphasizes that men use abuse against their partners in order to establish power and control and that addressing this must be at the core of intervention. It puts full focus on the man taking responsibility for his violent behaviour, and in response to past alleged therapeutic

collusion with men, reframes the intervention as "education" rather than "therapy" (Augusta-Scott, 2009, p. 115). The character of this education can involve heated confrontation (Augusta-Scott, 1999, p. 1) to challenge men's justification, minimizing, and denying of their abuse as control tactics (p. 15).

The Duluth model also collaborates with law enforcement to attempt to ensure the safety of women who have experienced partner abuse and to mandate their partners to attend intervention services (Langer, 2017, p. 108). Prior to the impacts of the feminist activism via the battered women's movement, IPV was not taken seriously compared with other crimes. Hall (2001) recalled that "although the issue was about the safety and protection of women, the police did not regard 'domestics' as 'real' police work" (para. 6). The establishment of the Duluth model as the norm in IPV intervention has led to policies increasing police involvement in cases of domestic violence including mandatory arrest, charge, and prosecution (Augusta-Scott, Goodmark, and Pennell, 2017; Augusta-Scott, Harrison, and Singer, 2017; Durazo, 2006). In Ontario, Partner Assault Response (PAR) programs, which are based on the Duluth Model, are funded by the Ministry of the Attorney General and are the dominant court-mandated response to domestic violence (Department of Justice, 2018, September 14).

Intersectional: Restorative Justice & Transformative Justice

The battered women's movement and the Duluth model made progress in politicizing the issue of interpersonal violence by getting the issue recognized as serious enough to be enforced with the same commitment as other crimes. While this does represent an achievement in that women's safety is being valued on par with other criminal matters, the issue has been problematized by women of color (CARA, 2006; Critical Resistance and Incite! Women of Color Against Violence, 2006; Durazo, 2006;), Indigenous communities and scholars (Baskin,

2006); justice system reformists (Augusta-Scott, Goodmark, and Pennell, 2017; Augusta-Scott, Harrison, and Singer, 2017), and prison abolitionists (Chrysalis Collective, 2011; Jashnani, Maccani, and Greig, 2011; Withers, 2014) for taking for granted that increased criminalization represents a victory. Advocates of restorative and transformative justice are critical of the ability of the criminal justice system (CJS) to address harm without causing increased harm.

From an intersectional feminist perspective, the survivor-centered intentions of increased involvement of the CJS have had some unfortunate and ironic impacts on the rights and agency of survivors, particularly those who are racialized. Critical Resistance and INCITE! (2006) pointed out how undocumented women who have sought protection from the criminal justice system have been deported. They also brought up how mandatory arrest laws have led to the arrests of women who called the police on their partners (p. 223). Augusta-Scott, Goodmark, Pennell (2017) noted how women who had changed their minds about going through the CJS were jailed for refusing to testify and prosecuted for perjury (p. 179). Durazo (2006) discussed how people of color are reported by doctors to child protective services more often than white people, which is troubling in light of mandatory medical examinations that sometimes accompany rape reporting (p. 187). These medical examinations themselves are also experienced as harmful by survivors as they invoke penetration, objectification, and a loss of control - all characteristic of the abuse they experienced in the first place.

Even when the system does not lead to arrest, deportation, or dehumanizing medical examination, survivors are still decentered by the process. The wants and needs of survivors are not considered under mandatory arrest laws, nor when charges are laid without their consent - further reproductions of the coercion and control inherent in the initial abuse (Durazo, 2006, p. 181). These policies were “designed to support women who wanted charges laid against their

partners but would not do it on their own because they were afraid their partners might want to retaliate" (Augusta-Scott, Harrison, and Singer, 2017, p. 160). While the intention of this might be noble, the execution is a paternalistic practice that constructs people who have experienced harm as "helpless, passive victims" (p. 161) who have uniform wants and needs. In fact, many people actually want to stay with their partners, and just want the abuse to stop (Augusta-Scott, Harrison, & Singer, 2017). Augusta-Scott, Goodmark, & Pennell (2017) refer to no-contact orders assigned in these circumstances as "defacto divorces" (p. 179).

Finally, increased policing disproportionately impacts Black and Indigenous men due to the effects of historic and ongoing colonialism on family structures, as well as the systemic racism of the criminal justice system. Baskin (2006) connected higher rates of domestic violence in Indigenous communities with the systematic dismantling of family structures through the removal of children who were placed in residential schools and exposed to various traumas. Conwill (2010) made a similar case for members of the Black diaspora whose traditional family structures were severed by slavery and have been challenged and disrupted ever since by neoliberal policies, racist policing, and resulting social harm. Salole & Abdul (2015) outlined how Black and Indigenous men are disproportionately targeted by the criminal justice system from a young age into adulthood. As a result, increased involvement of this system is more complicated than perhaps was considered by the initial efforts of the battered women's movement. Baskin (2006) and Conwill (2010) both argue for culturally specific services for these communities, designed by and run by these communities. I support this goal and also recognize that there will likely always be Black, Indigenous, and other men of colour accessing mainstream services, and these services need to actively avoid perpetuating colonial harm.

Conversational: Narrative Therapy/Invitational Practice

Jenkins (1990; 2009) proposed and developed the invitational practice model as a response to the Duluth model and its many critiques, including those raised by the transformative and restorative justice movements. This model is informed by narrative therapy and post-structuralist principles that challenge pathology, including a conception of problems as external to clients (Augusta-Scott, 2007; White, 2007) and a conception of identity as fluid and becoming, rather than fixed (Jenkins, 2009; White, 2007). While both rooted in feminist principles and with a shared interest in politicizing the issue of interpersonal violence, invitational practice responds to the ways in which the Duluth model may reenact the dominant masculinity it critiques. Jenkins (2009) described violence as "concerned with promoting conformity and sameness through imposing one's own ideas and preferences through judgement, intolerance, and the suppression of difference" (p. 3). This is not meant to equate physical violence with the imposition of ideas, but it does draw out parallels between the harm that can arise from the gendered power imbalance in heterosexual relationships and "the toxic effects of the imbalance of power that is inherent in the therapeutic relationship" (White, 2011, p. 54).

To this end, invitational practice is also informed by narrative therapy's collaborative relationship between client and therapist (Augusta-Scott, 2007; Monk and Gehart, 2003). Chapman, Hoque, and Utting (2013) noted that both narrative and invitational practice tend to turn away from the term "therapy", in favor of "conversations" (p. 26). While the Duluth model moved from "therapy" to "education", the subsequent reframing attempts to challenge the authoritative stance of both traditional therapy as well as that of the education model. The purpose of this is not only concerned with modelling respectful and tolerant dialogue, but because invitational practitioners find that it is more effective at inviting responsibility from

men. Augusta-Scott (2007) reflected that after ceasing to use oppositional confrontation in his practice, he saw his clients become more likely to be critical of themselves, not less: "As a result of feeling safe and respected, men are often able to face the behaviours they are ashamed of and feel most vulnerable discussing for the first time" (pp. 63-64).

Jenkins (2009) proposed his invitational practice as a "parallel, political journey" in which the therapist seeks to be accountable to the client, the people they have harmed, and their community, while supporting the client to do the same. By "political," Jenkins refers to the power relations at play (Queensland Centre for Domestic and Family Violence Research, November 26, 2017) between men and those they have abused, as well as between therapists and those who they counsel. In this section, I will outline some of the aspects of these parallel journeys through four themes.

Colonialism. In his analysis of dominant IPV intervention practice, Jenkins (2009) pointedly uses the term "colonisation" (p. 14) to describe the 'confrontation, correction, and education" (p. 14) involved. He clarifies that he is not using the term to equate the coercive character of this practice with the "devastation wrought upon Indigenous communities by the invasion of western colonizing forces" (p. 14), however he does draw parallels between the past and ongoing practices of those afforded privilege by colonization. He pointed out that these practices are usually carried out with "'noble' aims and the conviction of good intention, with a sense of 'right' and higher moral ground" (p. 14), and without care or notice of the harmful effects on those disadvantaged by these power relations. This is a risk no matter who the man is or in what ways he is positioned in social hierarchies, as there is a power imbalance in the therapy room (White, 2011), however this is of particular concern when a white therapist is working with Indigenous and Black clients, or anyone else marginalized by colonial practices.

Resistance. One of the principles of the "parallel, political journey" is in legitimating the ethic of protest (Jenkins, 2009, p. 16). Dominant approaches such as those following the Duluth model might view a man discussing his own experience of abuse as a tool the man is using to avoid responsibility (Augusta-Scott, 2007, p. 53). These approaches endorse meeting this so-called resistance with confrontation and challenge, so as to not allow the client to minimize or deny their abuse (Augusta-Scott, 2003, p. 22). Jenkins (2009) asserted that "to attempt to suppress or pathologize the ethic and practice of protest against injustice is unfair and unhelpful and constitutes a form of colonisation or oppression in intervention practice" (p. 17-8). Such suppression not only mimics the domination present in colonial power relations, but also present in abusive intimate relationships. It is done with noble aims, as the worker wants the man to focus on accountability for his behaviour rather than pointing elsewhere, however it models and thus tacitly endorses the use of dominance in relationships to pursue desired ends.

Jenkins (2009) instead actively promotes resistance in the therapy room, identifying it as a skill that enables men to resist dominant discourse around masculinity and, in turn, abusive behaviours and attitudes. "Creative forms of resistance tend to be discovered and actualized in relationships characterized by fairness and respect of difference…" (p. 25), rather than those of domination and submission. A man may be resisting in ways which appear to the therapist to be supporting his own domination over partners or children however to address this through the same exercise of power is to endorse such domination by example. Invitational practice would rather strive to legitimize protest early on in the therapy as a way of anticipating resistance and normalizing it. This might be done though asking the client to discuss potential feelings of injustice or responsibility overload, that is when a more is expected of a client than has been afforded to him in his own life (p. 51). Jenkins asserted that this does not generally result in

blaming stories or defensiveness but rather that these generally arise from attempts to suppress protest. Encouraging resistance allows the client to work through their behaviours and attitudes in a patient way where the growth comes from them rather than being imposed.

The spirit behind his promotion of the ethic of protest is in the value of fairness (pp. 16-17). This value is fleshed out as a respect for the client's ongoing process of navigating their complicity and resistance with power relations, which promote individualism, violence, and coercion, just as the therapist has compassion for their own challenging navigation of the same power relations. One aspect of practicing fairness is by not promoting "unjust expectations, particularly those that might require the man to demonstrate forms of consideration that we are not prepared to afford him" (p. 17). Jenkins is clear that to ensure this ethic is practiced requires "ongoing critique and scrutiny of our actions," so that therapists are avoiding complicity with dominant power relations. At the same time, it also requires an openness to seeing and understanding the ways in which the men they work with are resisting these power relations.

Reaching Out Towards the World of the Other. Jenkins (2009) refers to this openness to understanding the ethical strivings of men who have used abuse as "reaching out towards the world of the other" (p. 24). When addressing the potential for acts of "colonization" in this work, he asserted that "those with membership of privileged groups often feel entitled to impose their interests and cultural practices upon those who are less privileged and less advantaged" (p. 14). Reaching out towards the world of the other is the intentional disruption of this entitlement, displacing oneself from the position of knowing, and having an openness to another way of understanding. In this suspension of having authority over knowing, the therapist makes room to see men's ethical preferences and the ways in which they are already resisting dominant power relations in favor of these preferred ways of living.

Elsewhere, Jenkins proposed "a passionate interest in otherness as the antithesis of violence" (Queensland Centre for Domestic and Family Violence Research, 2017, November 23). Curiosity and openness are important for mitigating the effects of the power imbalance in the therapy room, and true to the other principles of the parallel, and political journey. They are also characteristic of intimate relationships that are free from violence and coercion. Valuing difference rather than suppressing it and suspending one's own experience in order to understand the experience of the other are fundamental qualities of caring relationships (Jenkins, 2009, p. 25). By modelling these values in practice and being accountable to the men they work with, therapists can assist them to reach out towards the world of those they have harmed in order to understand this harm and take meaningful accountability for it.

Reflexivity: Outsider Witnessing and Audiencing with IPV Workers

In addition to the four aforementioned themes, Jenkins (2009) also proposed a related method of reflexivity and accountability to the women who may be impacted by the men IPV counsellors work with. While not quite following the exact structure of outsider witnessing, there are clear parallels. He proposed listening circles composed of people who work with men who have used IPV and people who work with women who have experienced IPV. In these circles, the counsellors who work with men can reflect on a specific aspect of the experience of the women or children impacted by the abuse, to imagine what it might be like, and to express this to an audience (or listening circle) of the counsellors who work with survivors of this type of abuse. Then the men can form a listening circle (or audience) to hear the counsellors who work with survivors reflect back what they heard (p. 99). In these circles, "ethics and strivings which both groups may hold in common can be named and honoured" (p. 98), which would allow for a process where individuals hold themselves and each other accountable in their practice.

Dowse (2017) discussed how she uses outsider witnessing as a technique in her groups with men who have used abuse. Her method also does not follow the structure precisely, as one man sits in the "hot seat" and the other group members respond to "what resonated from the contributions the person in the hot seat made [over the course of the group]? What was made possible by their attendance in the program?" (p. 8). Dowse herself takes the "hot seat" so that members can share the same with her. In her use of outsider witnessing she could be affirmed in what she is doing right, however the structure does not leave room for critical analysis of ways in which she might have caused harm or fallen short of her ethical strivings as a practitioner.

Situating My Research within IPV Intervention History

I would argue that the critiques of dominant IPV practices revolve around power, knowledge, and subject formation. While the purpose of the intervention is to resist the power of discourses that support patriarchy and male dominance, the Foucauldian conception of power as amorphous, dispersed, conflicting, and constantly being created through the discourse and practices of all of us (Chambon, 1999) complicates the idea that this task can be taken on simply without reproducing harmful power relations. Given that many of the harms outlined in the above analyses were facilitated by well-intentioned feminist practices which sought to resist oppressive power relations, it is clear that strategies or frameworks are necessary to reflect on how power operates through our IPV intervention practices if we are to avoid reproducing harm.

Summary

In this review, I have provided context for my research by outlining the development and politicization of IPV intervention, which painted the ethical landscape that IPV therapists navigate. I gave particular focus to Jenkins' (2009) invitational model and its "parallel, political journey" given its emphasis on ethics and accountability for both client and therapist. In my

research, I hope to use outsider witnessing as a critical reflexive tool for therapists working with men who use abuse in order to better understand how we co-create ethical understandings and navigate ethical dilemmas.

Chapter 4: Methodology

Introduction

In this section I will outline and justify my use of narrative therapy as a research methodology, focusing on the links of this research with narrative therapy's poststructuralist, Foucauldian roots. I will explain this project's use of outsider witnessing as a data generation, how the concept of co-research is emphasized in my methods, and how centering the participants led to questions about demographic information. There is a discussion of some of the ethical considerations that arise from doing this research from my own positionality as a white, cis-male, raised in an upper-middle class household, as well as other ethical considerations in conducting interviews with the participants. Finally, I will explain in detail how the recruitment and data generation process played out as the process overlapped with the beginning of a global pandemic.

Narrative Therapy as Methodology

Citing a therapeutic approach as a methodology might seem unconventional, however there is a tradition of using narrative therapy in research (Bergen, 2016; Cain, 2011; Chapman, 2010; 2011; Chapman, Hoque, & Utting, 2013; Crocket et al., 2009; Davis & Crocket, 2010; O'Neill, 2004; Redstone, 2004; Speedy, 2004). Narrative therapy itself, and specifically outsider witnessing, was influenced heavily by the critical cultural anthropology research methods associated with Clifford Geertz, Renato Rosaldo, Edward Bruner, Victor Turner, and Barbara Meyerhoff (Dulwich Centre Publications, 2004; White, 2000). Narrative therapy is also epistemologically rooted in the poststructuralist understanding of the self as a fluid and relational concept and in the Foucauldian analysis of power as producing subjects through discourse (Besley, 2002; Brown, 2007; White, 2002; 2007). Narrative therapy as a research methodology

is limited insofar as it is not generalizable and is ill-equipped to back practices as "evidence-based," in the strict sense of the term (Speedy, 2004). Its usefulness, however, lies in its capacity for producing a "thick or rich description" (White, 2000, p. 5) of a specific, localized story and situating it in the social, historical, and political.

Outsider Witnessing as Data Generation

I chose to use outsider witnessing as the primary method from within this methodology. This process involves a person telling a story to a small audience who are then guided through questions about what they heard (White, 2000; 2007). Chapman (2010) and Chapman, Hoque, and Utting (2013) used this process in an ethics class as a tool for students to reflect on their navigations of power relations. Students were asked to talk about an ethical dilemma in which they were positioned on top of a social hierarchy and the audience was the other classmates. In this research project, I asked workers to reflect on an ethical dilemma that they had to navigate in their therapeutic work and the audiences were the other interviewees. I had a number of prepared questions (see **Appendix A**) about this experience that asked about what ethics or values were at stake, how they recognized the situation as an ethical dilemma, how others supported them through the dilemma, and how this experience impacted them, and so on. Borrowing from Chapman's (2010) outsider witnessing questions, which are rooted in White's (2003) questions, I asked the audience members about what resonated with them as they listened; what those resonances suggest about what is important to the storyteller and what they indicate about the storyteller's values, politics, or practice; what in the audience member's life accounted for why that resonated with them; and how they have been transformed having heard this story. I concluded the interviews with a question about how this process has impacted the workers' understandings of how their clients navigate their ethical strivings or processes of accountability.

My goal was that producing this rich, thick description of how specific workers navigated localized examples of power relations and how other workers engage with these stories would allow for a greater understanding of ethics as a relational process. If it is through discourse that power is operationalized, it is through discourse that power must be deconstructed. In Chapman, Hoque, and Utting (2013), Chapman found that their students' "initial reflexivity problematize[d] past actions, but toward open-ended scrutiny, uncertainty, and moral complexity, largely enabled by others' reflections and provocations" (p. 27). I expected that using this practice with workers would yield similarly rich results. My hope was that, if this method did result in a nuanced and detailed discussion of the navigation of ethical strivings, the final question reflecting on their clients' experiences would allow them to make connections they may not have made before their descriptions of these ethical dilemmas were thickened by the outsider witnessing process.

Co-Research as Analysis

Narrative therapists have been described as sociopolitical activists (Monk & Gehart, 2003) and the emancipatory aims of the therapy are explicit (White, 2007). To this end, narrative therapy research ought to seek collaboration with its participants rather than simply extracting data from them. David Epston, a founding narrative therapist, sought to bring ideas from his critical cultural anthropology background into the therapy realm wherein clients and therapists would "co-research problems and the alternative knowledges that are developed to address them" (Dulwich Centre Publications, 2004, p. 2). With the evolution of narrative therapy as a research methodology, this co-research ethic has been taken up by narrative researchers (Bergen, 2016; Cain, 2011; Chapman, 2010; 2011; Chapman, Hoque, and Utting, 2013; Crocket et al., 2009; Davis & Crocket, 2010; O'Neill, 2004; Redstone, 2004; Speedy,

2004) and those using other emancipatory methodologies (Haritaworn, 2015; Moussa, 2013). The common factor in these approaches is the steps taken to de-center the researcher and to make room for the knowledge of the research participants.

I attempted to carry on this tradition in my work through both the data generation, as well as the analysis. Rather than begin the interviews with a series of questions, I prompted the participants to tell stories about navigating an ethical in whatever form they decided. My follow up questions drew from narrative therapy-style inquiry (White, 2007) in that they sought to thicken the descriptions of the ethical strivings and knowledges of the participants and connect them with the histories of those ethics and understandings. The outsider witnessing questions are structured to maintain a focus on the story and its impact on the audience, as White (2007) suggested. Following related scholarship (Chapman, 2011; Chapman, Hoque, and Utting, 2013; Davis and Crocket, 2010), the outsider witnessing also served as a co-research method of analysis. The reflection done by the audience became a form of on-the-spot analysis of ethics as a relational process. Further, I engaged in the practice of member-checking by sending a transcript to each participant of their own interview to ensure that they felt as though their intentions were fairly expressed before reporting the results. While this introduced the limitation that participants may have decided to self-censor if they regret how they came off, I believe that this is consistent with the ethic of centering the participants. Moreover, the edits that were submitted were in the interest of clarity and protecting anonymity.

In addition to this on-the-spot analysis, the above studies (Chapman, 2011; Chapman, Hoque, and Utting, 2013; Davis and Crocket, 2010) also included scholarly analysis, however in the spirit of co-research, they did not use it to subjugate or contest the participant's words. The participant's words rather lent credibility to the theoretical work being cited. I followed this by

coding the interviews and sorting these codes into themes by what comes up most frequently in relation to my research questions. I compiled these codes based off of the outsider witnessing portions of the interviews as well as the responses to the final question (reflecting on clients' journeys of accountability). I did multiple rounds of coding, so as to make sure that if a participant's words inspired a code in a later section, I would make sure to look for examples of that code in previous sections. I chose to derive my themes from these sections as this is where the co-creation of ethics was most likely to take place as audience members reflected back what they heard and connected it to their own experiences, values, and strivings. These two sections also pertained directly to my research questions. I did not code directly from the interviews for the first research question, as it is concerned with outsider witnessing; I did code them for the second research question, however in the spirit of co-research, only looked for examples of codes derived from the outsider witnessing conversations. I then put these themes and examples from interviews into conversation with the scholarship that informed my research as outlined in the literature review.

Demographics and Positionality

Given that the research is focused closely on subject positioning and its relationship to the constructions of identity and operations of power, I decided that in my role as researcher, it did not seem appropriate to give clients a list of demographic information to fill out. Unilaterally deciding what categories are relevant to the analysis and which ones people should be asked to identify through would not be squarely unethical, however I do see benefit in co-creating this aspect of the work with the participants. I first asked participants how they would choose to identify considering what we were discussing and then shared the categories the other

participants had offered in case they wanted to alter their response, while clarifying that they may choose not to provide any information they did not feel comfortable providing.

A critique of this practice (and indeed of the overall reflexivity practice as rightly highlighted in Badwall (2016)) might be that it leaves room for dominant identity categories that are shared by all participants (and the researcher) to be ignored, thus erased from the discourse. While all research is necessarily an incomplete picture, it is worth discussing how or why certain angles of analysis are in/excluded. In retrospect, this may have been an unnecessary and time-consuming step, however I found it to be an opportunity to reflect on the ethics of research (information extraction vs. co-creation; ongoing and active consent) as well as on the categories of analysis that might be relevant to myself and different participants. Ultimately, I believe these are ethical decisions and were worth considering in this project.

The participants include Henny, who identified as a white European/Canadian woman in her late 60s, working in social work field for over 25 years. Another participant, Melissa identified as a white Canadian woman in her late 30's and is a registered psychotherapist who has been in the field for 5 years. Sophie (a chosen pseudonym) identified as a white Canadian woman in her 30's currently working in Social Policy. Ben identified as a white, cis-gendered, heterosexual man, a settler on Turtle Island, in his mid-30's. Ben has been involved in Partner Assault Response programming for the past five years.

Ethical Considerations: Positionality, Politics, Biases, and Risks to Participants

I am coming into this research shaped by dominant discourses around white settler supremacy, patriarchy, neo-liberalism, and professionalism. I was raised as a cis-gender male by white upper-middle class professional parents on stolen Indigenous land, which was settled in part via the stolen labor of enslaved Black people. Embodying this position, I have had all the

benefits that have come from the oppression of women, Black, Indigenous, and lower income communities (not mentioning, of course, the numerous other communities whose oppression has contributed to my access to power and privilege). I have pursued this work, as well as this research, in hopes of figuring out how to critically unpack this positionality (Heron, 2005). I am, however, cognizant of this social work's role in exalting this positionality (Thobani, 2007) and in supporting the oppression associated with it (Badwall, 2016).

In light of this, my research is highly politicized. My political position is, hopefully, very clear: there are positionalities (many of which I embody) which greatly benefit from dominant discourses; I believe fully in resisting these discourses and the power relations they support in pursuit of a more just and equitable society. That said, my perspective and understanding of the world is shaped by these positionalities and it is inevitable that they lead to me reinforcing dominant discourses to the detriment of marginalized people regularly, and likely will in this research. In fact, that inevitability is precisely what this project is about. It is my hope that this project will contribute to helping those on top of hierarchies, such as myself, to navigate the world more ethically and cause less harm to those whose oppression supports my exaltation (Thobani, 2007).

The considerations around my positionalities have (particularly through a conversation with Dr. Chris Chapman) helped me view myself as being on my own parallel journey as a researcher. As I considered what research questions to pursue and with whom, my initial interest was in interviewing men who had acknowledged having used abusive behaviour in relationships and had embarked on a journey of accountability about what enabled this understanding. The ethical questions and implications of doing that research felt like too much for me to take on (something I recognized, in large part, thanks to my supervisor Dr. Daniel Kikulwe) as the

potential for harm of publishing a one-sided account which was not survivor-centered was present, as well as the potential to cause harm to the men themselves. Instead, I chose to interview workers, however even this brought up a lot of dilemmas. How do I design research based in the values of co-creation with the limitations of time and resources that I have? How do I practice co-creation without asking too much of my participants? How do I frame my questions and analysis in a way that challenges the power relations that I benefit from at the expense of those who they marginalize? How do I present findings in a way that honours the participants, the stories told to me, that honours the men these stories involve, that honours those harmed by these men?

I am not sure to what extent I navigated these concerns successfully, and doubt that there is in fact a singular successful navigation to be achieved, however I am extremely thankful to the people who have helped me work through the concerns. I acknowledge the inevitable imperfection and incompleteness of academic work in this context which is time-limited, resource-limited, and was completed in the midst of a global pandemic. I also acknowledge and expect that there may be many areas where my research design, questions, and analysis likely fall short in being accountable to my values, ethics, and politics. That said, I do believe that embarking on this journey has helped me engage more closely with those things through a process of co-creation with the participants.

The risks to participants included the discomfort associated with reflecting on challenging experiences, sharing potentially vulnerable experiences with peers, and exposing oneself and their past decisions to the judgement and scrutiny of other professionals or readers. Participants were advised that participation is completely voluntary and that they may choose to decline to answer any questions or withdraw from the study at any time. If they chose to

withdraw, their data would be immediately destroyed wherever possible. If I noticed that someone was presenting as uncomfortable, I planned to stop interviewing and use my counselling skills to discuss their discomfort and whether they would like to continue or not. As the outsider witnessing portion involved the participants engaging with the story of another, I was careful to point out that the purpose was not to elicit criticism or judgement and that if I noticed these things taking place, I would redirect the respondent to a reflective stance. I also made clear that the participant whose story was being reflected upon could choose to stop the outsider witnessing at any time. I took steps to briefly debrief with participants after the interviews and also had on-hand referrals to Family Services Toronto Walk-in Clinic in case a participant wished to further debrief any discomfort with a therapist. Each participant signed an agreement that they would keep confidential any information they heard during the interviews, however their following this agreement cannot be guaranteed. I gave each participant the option of choosing a pseudonym to be used during the interviews and in the reporting of the results. This research proceeded only after being approved by York's Ethics Board.

Details of Recruitment and Data Generation Process

My recruitment strategy was to reach out through my networks and through "cold-calling" (via email) individuals and agencies who work with men who have used abusive behaviour. Through these modes of contact, I briefly explained what my research was about, provided a recruitment letter (see **Appendix B**), and asked the person I was contacting to distribute it to anyone they knew who might be interested in participating. This included the following participation criteria: people who work with men who have used abusive behaviour against their partners who have done this work for at least one year in the last five years, and who could attend an in-person interview in Toronto. I chose this criteria as I wanted people who

had had a wider range of experience doing this work, who had showed some intention and commitment to it, and who have had time to reflect on their role, rather than someone who had just begun or who tried it briefly and changed roles. I also wanted someone whose experience was somewhat recent so that they would be more likely to recall, in detail, an ethical dilemma they navigated.

The "cold-calling" consisted of contacting all of the agencies in Toronto that I could find who operate Partner Assault Response (PAR) groups; individuals who listed on their Linkedin pages having facilitated PAR groups; individuals therapists whose websites or Psychology Today profiles made reference to working with domestic violence or masculinity issues; and clinics, collectives, and other organizations of therapists whose websites mentioned working with those issues. My networks included professional and personal contacts working in therapy and anti-violence work, professors, and my placement supervisors.

I anticipated the interview and outsider witnessing process would take four hours for three participants. My plan was that if I recruited five to seven participants, I would arrange for groups of three to four to do this process separately so that no one was being asked to contribute more than four hours of their time. As the recruitment criteria was relatively narrow, I was not able to recruit this sample size. Four people contacted me with interest in participating in the research. Given the smaller sample size and the logistics of scheduling people to interview at the same time, the plan was slightly altered. I scheduled the participants to meet with me in pairs for in-person interviews and outsider witnessing. The first meeting took place in the office of one participant and took about two and half hours. The second interview was originally scheduled to take place in the home of one of the two participants on March 15, 2020, however on March 11 the World Health Organization declared that COVID-19 was officially a pandemic. In days

following this declaration many institutions took measures to mitigate and contain the virus, including the province of Ontario closing all publicly-funded schools for two weeks following March break (which began on March 16) and York University suspending all in-person classes and non-essential meetings. After consulting with the participants, we agreed to meet remotely via Skype, which took just under two hours. The participants signed consent forms and uploaded scanned or digitally photographed copies, in lieu of being able to hand them to me in person.

The meetings were recorded on my phone and computer and were transcribed by myself with the assistance of the Otter Ai transcription tool. This tool converts audio into text and allows one to listen back and edit the text. These finished transcripts were emailed in password protected documents to the participants for them to read over and ensure that their intended meaning was conveyed in what was captured. As some participants consented to waive their anonymity in the final report during the initial meeting, this was also a check and balance to ensure that this consent was given after they were aware what content could be included in the report.

Summary

This research project is primarily about ethics and accountability and it is of great importance to me that these are not just the focus of the content, but of the execution as well. This work draws on Jenkins' (2009) idea of workers being on a parallel political journey with the men they work with. As a researcher, I also aim to be accountable to the people I interviewed and to the people impacted by IPV and IPV interventions. In this section, I outlined the ways that I have tried to build an ethic of co-creation into my research design which I hope portrays the relationship between researcher and participants as one of collaboration. I have also outlined

the ways in which narrative therapy research is a suitable methodology to draw from to achieve these goals and made connections with my Foucauldian theoretical framework.

Chapter 4: Findings

Introduction

In this section, I will report on the themes that pertain to my research questions which I drew from the conversations I had with my participants. I will present these alongside my analysis and the theory that has grounded this research. The introduction of theory into the reporting is not intended to overshadow or subjugate the meaning participants and I co-created in our conversations, but rather to show how these concepts are brought into being through the actions and interactions of workers and the men they work alongside. Further, these theoretical works informed the design of this research and the questions I asked and thus are arguably already part of the co-creation between myself and the participants. This section is structured by the two research questions, brief introductions of the themes and sub-themes for each, and then more detailed reporting by way of direct quotes and analysis, followed by a conclusion.

How Outsider Witnessing Contributes to a Relational Understanding of Ethics

The first theme is how outsider witnessing contributed to a relational understanding of ethics through drawing out shared experiences, feelings, and ethics between participants and links to question one of the research study, focusing on how outsider witnessing as a reflexive practice contributes to a relational understanding of ethics. Sub-themes include how naming values and putting things into words allowed participants to consider that which they share; conversations about experiences led to highlighting the importance of certain values; and how the naming of shared values and the identification of their importance led to a sense of connection.

The second theme centres on how ethics is a relational process by outsider witnessing causing one to reflect on their past experiences differently. The related sub-themes included

recognizing constraints to acting in accordance with one's ethics; re-analyzing one's past experiences; and gaining perspective from others' experiences.

The final theme is comprised of reflections from the outsider witnessing exercises which specifically described values, ethics, and power as active and relational processes. This key theme also had sub-themes such as a recognition of values being enacted in practice; the non-statutory nature of ethics; and power as situated and relational. I will report in detail on these themes and sub-themes.

Shared Experiences, Feelings, and Ethics

Since outsider witnessing asks audience members what resonated with them as they listened to a story, what in their own life accounts for this resonance, and what these things say about the values or ethics of the storyteller (White, 2007), it is perhaps not surprising that there were frequent discussions of shared experiences, feelings, and ethics in the interviews. Reflecting on Henny's interview, Melissa related to her experiences:

> …being in the room with men, when you want to give them space to share and reflect and do their own processing about their experiences; and also, being able to manage when they become sucked into generalizations or speaking negatively of women. I really resonated with that as well, something I experienced a lot of.

Melissa's discussions of some of the core ideas and values in her work resonated with Henny too, who explained "that really is what brings me to the work, as well, is that whole idea of men being damaged by that masculinity- and women, both."

The influence of Ben's politics accounted for the shared ethical grappling he identified with in Sophie's story: "So, as a prison abolitionist myself, who feels very conflicted about many of the, sort of, coercive aspects of the program I work for, I felt like Sophie and I were on the

same page, like she got it." Sophie recalled experiencing some of the same struggles as Ben had in their respective roles as PAR facilitators, noting "that conflict, like you mentioned, having the Victim Intake Worker or the Victim Contact Partner asking you to get updated contact information- that's something I've wrestled with for a long time- like, whose role is what?" Their having grappled with similar issues suggested that there may be shared values or ethics behind their dilemmas.

Naming Values & Putting Things into Words. In addition to participants resonating with the experiences or values discussed, the relational nature of ethics arose through witnessing and reflecting back the naming of values. Henny noted:

> [Melissa was] being very explicit about the values that she held, you know, I thought "Yeah, those are [pause] very much values that I hold as well." So, to have them articulated was helpful because I'm not always that great at articulating [laughs] some of those things.

This not only allowed Henny to put a name to values that she resonated with, but also reminded Melissa:

> I can articulate the values I have, because I've had experiences with supervisors or with training that's helped me do that… maybe you don't think very often about, like, "Can I articulate my values?" But when you're asked the right question, you know, you can get back to that really easily.

The exchange around these experiences, facilitated by the nature of the outsider witnessing questions, allowed shared experiences to be named as shared values or ethics. Carey and Russell (2003) noted that if one can "articulate their principles of living and what it is they are standing for in life, the more likely it is they will know what future steps they can take in order to act in

accordance with these commitments" (p. 65). This step towards strengthening commitments to ethics by naming them was enabled through the outsider witnessing questions' focus on resonant values.

Highlighting the Importance of Certain Values. In some cases, the stories or witnessing accounts not only brought forth shared values and named them, but also highlighted or reminded participants of the importance of certain values. Sophie reflected on an aspect of Ben's story and what it says about what he might value, saying

> I think that's so important because that's when [pause] facilitators stop talking *with* clients and start talking *to* them and I think the program fails at that point. So, that acknowledgement that someone is human and has their own rights within this program is really important.

Reflecting on where she is now that she wouldn't be otherwise, having witnessed Melissa's interview, Henny shared

> I think just validating some of those ideas around [pause] you know the importance of those values, for one thing, and the [pause] the importance of [pause] how change happens and not giving up on people. … the other thought that it leaves me with is the importance of hope. She talked about hope being in the room too, and that kind of helped balance how she would work with the group, if there was enough hope in the room. And that's just so important in terms of working with clients, individually or in groups, the whole idea of hope.

In turn, listening to Henny's witnessing account of her own story reminded Melissa of values that she had articulated, that seemed to be re-emphasized through outsider witnessing:

> I think it's nice to be reminded to something you said yourself, to remind yourself about not fixing people, and that change takes time. Because I think we need that reminder constantly when sessions feel hard, or you feel like you've been meeting with someone for a long time and nothing seems to have shifted. It's always good to remember that.

Extrapolating from Carey and Russell's (2003) point about naming values strengthening our commitments to them, it seems there might also be a strengthening of our values when they are reflected back to us.

Connection. Through the recognition of shared experiences, the naming of values, and the highlighting of the importance of certain values, a sense of connection arose between people who had never met before but have worked in the same field with similar ethical strivings. Responding to where witnessing Sophie's story had taken him, Ben expressed that "I feel connected, I feel an affinity, you know, not just for Sophie, but knowing that there's someone at the government, who's thinking these critical questions…". This not only indicated connection, but also suggested a relief that these shared values were being considered in different parts of the field. Sophie answered the same question also with an expression of connection (and an implication of relief), saying "I kind of felt [laughs] that there weren't as many people like that in the PAR program doing similar things and having similar values. And [pause] so, I'm truly [pause] just so happy that Ben is out there."

This sense of connection is not just a feel-good aspect of the story of this research (although it is also that) but is built into the very theoretical basis of outsider witnessing practices. White (2007) explained how he based these practices off Barbara Meyerhoff's "re-membering" which "evokes the image of a person's life and identity as an association or a club" (p. 136) and "contributes to the development of a 'multivoiced' sense of identity" (p. 137). This

sense of identity resists the conception of the self as a fixed entity, enabling people to revise membership of their club (p. 138). When the membership in this club of life is built around a shared commitment to mutually identified ethics, re-membering strengthens those commitments towards future action and can allow re-consideration of past actions.

Causing One to Reflect on Their Past Experiences Differently

Another theme that came up in the outsider witnessing process was how hearing others' stories or hearing one's own story reflected back to them caused the participants to think differently about things that they had experienced. When explaining what had resonated with her in Henny's story, Melissa shared that "it just made me think about my own sort of [pause] reflections around ethical dilemmas that I've experienced." Sometimes this led to the witnesses telling stories about their lives, such as when Henny was giving her account of Melissa's story and said:

> So, it's kind of left me thinking about that whole area of power and, and how the men see, you know, when you're the only woman in the room and all of that. [pause] And so I was reflecting on that and [pause] I was in a bit of a different position.

These conversations enabled a co-authoring of shared ethical strivings and produced a sense of connection around these ethics as expressed in the first theme. However, uncovering operations of power through ethical dilemmas also requires examining the constraints one experiences in pursuing these ethical strivings. Brown (2007) highlighted that within a Foucauldian and narrative therapy analysis of power, "people can both have power and be constrained by power."

Recognizing Constraints to Acting in Accordance with One's Ethics. Henny's reflections brought her back to different times when she facilitated groups with male cofacilitators. One was during her student placement and "there was a difference in power

because I was a student and he was the main facilitator who'd done this for many years [pause] and I think it affected the work;" the others were groups she had been running for many years and "it did not work very well when I had cofacilitators who were really not on the same page in terms of the narrative approach, and were threatened by my power in the group." In both cases there were constraints to running the groups effectively due to multiple and conflicting operations of power. Henny's witnessing of Melissa's discussions about the impacts of male-female facilitator relationships on participants caused her to reflect on these constraints.

In his interview, Ben had named constraints he had experienced to acting in accordance with certain values, however Sophie's outsider witnessing account produced other possible constraints through her shared experiences:

> And I really relate [pause] to so much of it, like [pause] wanting to let stuff slide sometimes, be it because the client has put in the good work, or because [pause] you're facilitating alone or with a new facilitator that day, or [pause] there's been a lot of times where you have, like, 30 guys in a group and you're like, "I just," [laughs] "just don't want to have the hard talk tonight," because there's so many of those hard talks in those groups, and you never really know where they're gonna go. And [pause] it can be a real blessing to have a positive relationship with your client, and have that kind of be a positive thing for the group, and then to have to kind of potentially sour it because of [pause] what is one of these bureaucratic rules…

After hearing this perspective on his story in Sophie's re-telling, Ben expressed:

> [I felt] relieved, too, because, I am bringing a story of what I still remember as [pause] a lapse in judgment. But to have it framed as [pause], you know, with empathy toward the tough situation that the systems and structures put us into…

Sophie's re-telling did not cause him to dismiss his initial analysis of the story as having involved a lapse of judgement, however it did thicken the story by proposing that there were additional constraints operating in the dilemma. Brown (2007) noted that "we can achieve a thicker description through the view that power can be both constraining and productive, through noticing powerlessness and power in people's stories without totalizing them to either subject position" (p. 18). If we are "recruited as vehicles to power" (p. 17), having a thickened story allows us to be clearer about which flows of power we want to transport.

Re-analyzing One's Past Experiences. In addition to identifying constraints Ben had not considered previously, Sophie's account of his story also caused him to re-analyze aspects of the dilemma. Ben's story involved a client making a disclosure of starting to date a new partner on his last day, to which Ben had to decide how to respond. It was clear from Ben's reflection that he had not the considered the "perspective that, you know, guys wouldn't open up to you unless they felt comfortable with you" until Sophie had shared that with him. Again, this did not replace his previous analysis, but did provide an alternate storyline to the disclosure. This ethical dilemma, while frustrating, may have been an outcome of him acting in accordance with other ethical strivings around building positive relationships with the men in his groups.

This exchange is a great example of the concept of the "absent but implicit" that White (2003, p. 31) formulated out of the work of poststructuralist Jacques Derrida. Pertaining to how we make sense of the world and ourselves through how we describe our experiences, the concept posits that "all such descriptions are relational" (p. 30), in that they are compared and contrasted with other experiences. "A singular description of experience can be considered to be the visible side of a double description. It is that which is on the other side of singular descriptions of experiences of living" (p. 30) which can be referred to as the absent but implicit. Ben described

the dilemma as a lapse of judgement, which I read as a challenging choice between competing values. However, what Sophie drew out what was absent from his account, but implied – that the very context of the dilemma spoke to him having successfully enacted a value he holds in his work.

While Sophie's account of his story caused Ben to his re-analyze his experience, Henny's responses to outsider witnessing questions about Melissa's experiences caused her to re-analyze her own experiences. When considering the values that were named in Melissa's interview, Henny recalled that after she returned from retirement, she was frustrated with a client and talked to her supervisor about transferring the client to another therapist:

> [This memory] resonated with [the value of] not taking things personally. Because I think what happens for me too in those situations is I feel like I can't be effective, "This isn't going anywhere" and "what's going on here?" and [pause] so the value of not giving up and not taking it personally and looking at "Okay, what might be going on with this person?"

Reconnecting with this value allowed her to reconsider how she may have been going about their work together. These examples both display how an understanding of what values or ethics are present – if overlooked – in one's practice is supported by outsider witnessing.

Gaining Perspective from Others' Experiences. In some cases these insights about what values or ethics are present in one's practice came about through hearing about the different experiences other participants have had. Regarding witnessing Henny's interview, Melissa observed that "it's really nice to be able to connect with other people who are doing similar work, and who've done it longer and have had different experiences." This sentiment was also shared

by Ben who, after learning about the specifics of how men are pressed through the dubious referral process in court, reflected:

> I think what resonated immediately was Sophie's analysis of: this is a program to teach [pause] awareness of how men, in particular, wield tactics of power and control. And, here we are, the portal into this program, being the gatekeeper wielding the coercive controlling power of the state over the material conditions of someone's life that really - I mean, I've thought critically about these programs before and [pause] I haven't [pause] pointed it- I haven't come upon the irony there.

This tension between the values that the PAR program seeks to instill in men and the ways in which the court process does not reflect those values was revealed through Ben and Sophie's exchange. Their having connected over shared values facilitated Ben achieving greater insight into how these values are at play in the structure of PAR via Sophie's experiences.

Values, Ethics, and Power as Active and Relational Processes

The outsider witnessing process drew out how values, ethics, and power are not static or abstract, but are rather processes – they come to be through interactions, dialogue, and institutional practices. As with the example of the court process, there is a difference between a program stating it holds a value and its processes reflecting that value in its practices.

Recognition of Values Being Enacted in Practice. Melissa recognized the process Henny went through of shifting from exclusively working with women who had experienced abuse to working with men who had engaged in abusive behaviour as being reflective of values she strives for:

> …anyone who's able to examine how they think about things and open themselves up to thinking in new ways…and especially in this kind of work where that dichotomy exists in

> the industry itself, that being able to sort of dip your toes in both sides of things [pause] yeah, I think that definitely demonstrates those words that she shared - acceptance and, and compassion.

Henny also recognized Melissa and her cofacilitator enacting values in the ways they managed men speaking to her disrespectfully in groups, saying "it sounded like what it showed was really important was respect, which is what they were also trying to teach the men about relationships and the importance of respect and equality in relationship." Respect and equality came to be in their group through the conduct of Melissa and her cofacilitator, rather than simply being appealed to as a rule that should be followed.

Non-Statutory Nature of Ethics. One of the premises of this research is that the pursuit of ethics cannot be accomplished through appeals to laws, rules, or codes of conduct, as these are static, abstract, and detached concepts. Ethics as a relational process is a dynamic activity that is situated in particular interactions between subjects constructed through multiple and conflicting power relations. This was captured in Sophie's witnessing of Ben's story, where she said

> I appreciate that you're thinking about those things while you're interpreting [pause] and maybe applying some of the rules. I really wanted to commend you on not coming down on one of your clients for the drink before work. I know that that's a challenge and- just, Mark, for context, like, that is something that could send somebody back to court right then and would result in a Failure To Comply and a new set of charges.

While there are distinct rules that dictate what Ben was expected to do in this situation, Ben's ethical navigation took into consideration numerous other factors. From his interview it was clear that he was considering the work the client had done up to that point and how seriously he had taken the group, what his perceived level of intoxication was and how it would impact the

group, and how close he was to finishing the mandated number of sessions. Sophie pointed out how he also likely considered the weight of the outcome of acting in accordance with the program rules and legal statutes, and how in this case, by Ben and Sophie's co-created understanding of ethics, it would have been unethical to report him for this.

Power as Situated and Relational. Sophie also drew out how power is something that is not static, abstract, or something that one possesses, but is a complex process that comes into being through relations. In her outsider witnessing account, she shared:

> [Ben has an] understanding of the complexity of familial violence. And [pause] as a feminist, I understand that these conversations mostly revolve around [pause] gender-based violence and male violence against women. But I see that there is also [pause] an understanding of how police systems interact with men and racialized men and men of different economic backgrounds…

Their co-analysis here is highlighting how different streams of power intersect in IPV interventions as the discourses that support male dominance are juxtaposed with the discourses that support that domination of racialized and low-income men by the state. An account of power relations which states simply that men have power is complicated by the streams of power supported by capitalism and white supremacy discourses in the context of the criminal justice system.

Henny's reflections on Melissa's story about the way she and her cofacilitator navigated masculinity discourses with the men in the group led her to comment on her own experiences which elucidated how power is situated and relational. In her role as more experienced in relation to her cofacilitator, as well as her role as the professional in front of a room of "clients," the power Henny has access to was noticeable:

> I'm sure the men saw me as more powerful, especially when these men who I was cofacilitating with were not on the same page, where [pause] I could feel it, I'm sure the man could feel it. Like, just in little things that they would say or- you could tell we weren't working well together.

Despite working in a context that is specifically focused on men being influenced by misogynistic and discourses and exercising domination over women, Henny could sense that men who had engaged with these exercises of power viewed her as having more access to power than her male cofacilitator. These reflections about the complex, situated, and relational nature of power and ethics provided a context where the participants could voice insights into their client's experiences of navigating towards accountability.

How Reflecting on Power and Ethics Informs Understandings of Clients' Journeys

In addressing the second research question on how reflecting on issues of power and ethics inform the worker's practices and understandings of their clients' journey towards accountability, three themes emerged. The first theme presented is how reflecting on issues of power and ethics facilitated participants reaching out towards the world of the other. This came up in various ways including in the sub-theme of the impacts of socialization on men's use of violence.

The second theme included reflections on the nuances and details of the process of change that men experience on their journeys. Sub-themes related to this were discussions that identified the importance of positive relationships between workers and clients in enabling change; illustrations of the constraining effects of responsibility overload on this change; and ways in which participants clarified that accountability happens via men, not workers.

The third theme focuses on the ways in which reflecting on ethics and power brought forth a recognition of participants' parallel journeys with their clients. That is, they are situated amongst the same dominant discourses and power relations that the men are, which, amongst other things, can result in reproducing behaviour that the intervention is attempting to address. I will report in detail on these themes and sub-themes in the following pages.

Reaching Out Towards the World of the Other

Jenkins (2009) explains this idea as involving "an active interest in understanding, respecting, and appreciating the experiences of others and informs the motivations to cease violence and make restitution for harm done" (p. xiii). This is something that is encouraged in men seeking to take accountability, and which serves as a key part of the parallel journey workers take alongside them. Ben discussed enacting this:

> So many clients that I deal with in my PAR program come in and they're like, "I want to tell my story. I haven't told my story to anybody. I did this thing. I didn't think it was a big deal" or "I was afraid for my life and I called the police because I thought that the police would help me and then I was arrested and then here I am, and nobody's listened to me yet. So, I want you to hear my story."

Sophie echoed this by observing:

> From the perspective of anyone going through a court situation, you notice very quickly that someone is not able to provide their side of the story, their opinion of what happened, [pause] how they think they've been treated by police, how they think they've been treated by the courts. And so because of that, when they go through this process, everything very quickly becomes distilled into "you are wrong, and everyone else is right, and now sign this paper confirming that."

Henny, referring to ideas she learned from Tod Augusta-Scott, showed how reaching out towards the world of the man can enable them to reach out towards the world of their partner:

> Because they would say, the woman was abusive - "and how if you're experiencing that, what do you think it's like for the woman to experience that from you?" So, you could kind of listen to that, but also bring it back to the guy.

Melissa found that having run a PAR group for women enabled her to ask:

> If I've learned to see women as both victims and perpetrators, then why would I not give the same respect to men? That as I sit with them in the room, that their story isn't just that they are monsters who perpetrate violence against women. If I can see women as having that complex history of experiencing and perpetrating abuse, how can I not also do that for men?

Henny's experience of being interviewed about navigating an ethical dilemma caused her to consider the challenges of this, which she connected to the experiences of men in her groups

> It kind of made me think, actually, [pause] about how hard it is to reflect on things. That it's really not that easy to do. And like for a lot of the men… they're not often socialized to even do that private reflection. And part of what … we were doing in the group- because we, in the Choosing to Change group would ask a lot of questions. And we actually, almost, are teaching them to reflect on things. And so, by the end of the group, for a lot of them, they were much more able to reflect on things, more than at the beginning of the group. So, going through this experience kind of reminded me that it's not that easy to reflect on things.

Being asked to reflect on past actions and the impacts they might have had on others is not an easy task. This experience enabled Henny to reach out towards the mens' experiences, and to

appreciate that their challenges in reflecting are not innate deficits or acts of denial, but rather impacts of their socialization.

The Impacts of Socialization. Reaching out towards the world of the other allows for more complex relations of power to be articulated, in particular how men who use abuse were exposed to the ideas that they chose to use in their domination over women. Melissa reflected:

> I've heard very upsetting stories from some men [who had] stepfathers who have been extremely abusive to [them as] young boys. And they come into the group and in some ways, they have no idea what a healthy relationship looks like. They have no idea how to build a safe, intimate partnership. And they've gotten themselves in the mess of this cycle of abuse of power and control. And the dilemma I face is that, in many ways, it's not their fault.

While Melissa's point was not that the men are not responsible for using abuse, she was highlighting how, by reaching out to understand their experience, a more nuanced history of how they came to adopt these ethics or values is depicted. Henny recalled:

> We would actually get the men to do a drawing of an experience that they had as children, where they witnessed violence, or they experienced violence. And then they would share their story with the men in the group. We would post the drawings up on the wall and they would share their stories with the other men. And for a lot of these men, they've never shared those stories, certainly not with other men.

Henny's group's focus on these nuanced histories allowed for the men to engage with how they came to use abuse, which the facilitators understood as a part of the process of change.

Process of Change

All of the participants talked about insight they have into the ways in which people make changes in their lives and how to best facilitate that. These insights arose from discussions of ethical dilemmas around the role of the workers, such as Ben's discussion of his approach:

> If we try and do a more transactional approach to learning, we never move beyond the initial sort of, "I'm mandated to be here so, I will just show up and attend." The people that [pause] actually come back to the program when they finish because they've gained so much from it, and because they use it as an accountability measure are the ones that my co facilitator and I [pause] feel an affinity for - or where there's mutual affinity.

Sophie, reflecting on the coercive aspects of the program, wondered:

> If a program like this dropped the [pause] upfront accountability, …were more open to hearing the story of the individual first, and then working from there to say, okay, "You don't think you did anything wrong, but you're here because you think you really want to be a good dad. What does a good dad look like to you? What does a good dad do to their partner?"

Melissa's grappling with the multi-directional and relational flows of power between her as a facilitator and the men as mandated clients vs. her as a woman and them as men, led to articulating a process of change. Regarding naming disrespect from the men, she said:

> When I do speak up like that [pause] 80% of the time, at the end of the group, that man will come to me and apologize. And that's the moment, I think, where I get that perspective back. I can see like, "you knew I was upset, you knew that you sort of transgressed in our conversation, and you were able to be accountable to me," which is exactly the thing that we're trying to teach them to do.

Elsewhere in her interview, Melissa highlighted how these conversations where she can name respect and be heard by the men are facilitated by the rapport they build with one another.

Positive Relationships Between Workers and Clients. The role of worker-client relationships in facilitating change was noted in several places in the interviews. Ben expressed in his interview that "I believe I'm effective as a facilitator when I can create that affinity, you know, the model of education that we use in PAR is all about [pause] establishing affinity between facilitator and client." Through hearing Sophie's outsider witnessing account of his story, Ben later was able to recognize that even in his ethical dilemma, this ethic was reflected in "the perspective that, you know, guys wouldn't open up to you unless they felt comfortable with you." Sophie's interview revolved around how the coercive aspects of the PAR program's court mandate work against this ethic. In a particularly disturbing story, she discussed how a person who was not out to the public that their roommate was a romantic partner had to sign an acknowledgement form stating that they had used abuse against their partner (the "roommate") in order to avoid more punitive measures:

> And so even if there was an opportunity, a small window to have that conversation about accountability, you've basically broken any trust between you and a potential client. Because you're basically already saying, like, "look, we're going to skip all the stuff where you're concerned about being outed, about your community finding out about all these things, and what I need you to tell me in 10 minutes is how this happened, what you did to contribute to it, and then sign this paper, and I need to feel like it was genuine." And it just sets off in motion for me, the worst type of [pause] therapeutic alliance you can have, right? Like you have really, really broken something for that person.

What Sophie is suggesting is that the person with whom the program hopes to engage about showing respect and having concern for the impact their actions have on others, is shown that this program will not extend that to them.

Responsibility Overload. This concept is articulated by Jenkins (2009) who wrote that "the context for responsibility overload exists when we expect something of the man which we (and most likely, others) have not attempted to provide him with" (p. 32). Melissa described a man who appeared to have experienced this:

> [This man] had PTSD, grew up in foster care, had lived on the streets, went through cancer, survived, and yet is obsessed with being in control, and is completely misogynistic, and blames all of his experiences for the reasons why he was abusive. So, if we were to talk about [pause] you know, respect: "how do you show respect how you demonstrate respect?" He's like, "No one's ever showed me respect. So, why should I ever show them respect?"

While workers cannot change the man's past experiences, they can recognize this as a constraint to his process of change and consider how their actions will enable or further constrain the man's process of taking accountability.

Accountability Via Men Not Workers. This consideration of the process of change is rooted in the understanding that change happens through the men themselves, not through workers. Burk (2011) wrote that it is a mistake to view accountability as an "external process rather than an internal skill" (p. 266). This may appear to stray from the relational conception of ethics in which this research is grounded, however I believe it highlights that accountability is not something that can be imposed on others. Accountability is socially co-created and that co-creation necessarily involves the active participation of the men themselves. Henny noted:

> I'm not there to fix clients. And I don't know what their change will look like for themselves. It may look very different than what [pause] I'm thinking they should do. Really a lot of what [pause] I provide for clients, I feel, is a safe place for them to grow in whatever way they want to grow.

Her participation in the co-creation is apparent in that she is helping to provide a space for growth and encouraging it, however that growth is not solely up to her. Ben reflected in his outsider witnessing account that he and Sophie also share this ethic:

> [Sophie's intention is to] address the root causes of domestic violence and treating them not just in a superficial way, in a punitive way, but towards actually creating a society that is, you know, where men enter into equitable relationships because they know how to and they want to, not because they're trying to behave according to the way that they think their facilitators of the PAR program should.

The navigating that these workers described in their interviews to achieve this balance of non-coercively and respectfully inviting the men they work with to a place where they are choosing this way of relating to and treating their partners is what Jenkins (2009) referred to as the parallel, political journey.

Parallel Journeys

The parallel journey recognizes that the workers are situated amongst the same discourses and power relations that facilitate and justify abuse; are subject to the same constraints that challenge men to successfully navigate their ethical strivings; and that their processes of being accountable to those harmed by the abuse and those who have caused the abuse mirror one another (Jenkins, 2009). Ben spoke to an aspect of this parallel journey - the shared

accountability to the people who have been, or could be, harmed by abuse – which arose in his dilemma:

> It shone a light on [pause] the kind of fraughtness of relationship-building between facilitators and clients. [pause] I have always known that I'm tempted to collude, ever since I did my training however many years ago. And that [pause] I [pause] constantly need to be conscious of how [pause] my power [pause] influences my relationships to my clients, and that I use that responsibly in a way that balances [pause] my respect for their human dignity with [pause] the values and goals of the program and accountability to the victim and the people [pause] inside of the lives of my clients.

Reflecting on power, in this case, brought up for Ben how accountability to the partners of the men can conflict with the value of positive relationships between workers and the men (which is itself valued for how it increases the effectiveness of the intervention for men, thus accountability to their partners).

Melissa identified how her interactions with the men in the group, whether building rapport or responding to disrespectful comments, are built around shared values:

> I think fundamentally I believe all human beings have value, and they have a right to experience healthy relationships and [pause] so that means that when I remind them to be respectful I'm valuing myself, and my experience in the group. I'm also valuing their experiences when I validate them. And that comes back to my ethics around the value of people.

She named that the constraining force in this is also shared:

> Much of what happens in those moments of disrespect is masculinity at play in the room, and so, if I can hold on to the idea that this harms men just as much as it harms women [pause] then it maintains space for us to connect.

Sophie also spoke to shared constraints in these parallel journeys in her comments about how some of the program rules are a hindrance to men's journeys through their invasiveness, however facilitators cannot be public about the ways they bend these rules due to some of the same factors. She quipped "Yeah, it's the surveillance of the clients and then the surveillance of the facilitators [laughs]."

Reproducing Behaviour. As these journeys parallel one another through shared ethical strivings and constraints, it was observed in the interviews how crucial it is that facilitators enact those strived-for values and ethics in how the program is run. Melissa considered:

> when I think about some of those examples I shared, that, I think the clients in the room were also learning by seeing- kinda like what Henny was saying, like having them see two facilitators support each other or disagree - that witnessing that also helps the witnesser reflect on how they feel about it.

Ben resonated with how this came up in Sophie's practice, particularly in

> her focus on like, okay, if we're trying to do a program where the goal is to move men away [from] reenacting the abusive patterns in their relationships, then treating someone like a human and giving that sort of validating invitation to tell their story and say, "Hey, I see you. Let's talk, let's have an actual dialogue."

These reflections draw out how the ways in which workers and program structures reproduce the values, ethics, and ways of behaving. If the journeys clients and workers are on are parallel, this

is a reminder of the importance of reproducing those values, ethics, and behaviours which promote safety, agency, and respect.

Summary

Jenkins (2009) wrote that "the concept of taking responsibility entails an ongoing journey or investment based upon our own ethical strivings, rather than external moral codes or standards" (p. 27). The roadmap for such a journey is not one that can be drawn up by oneself, however. Chapman, Hoque, and Utting (2013) noted that "in ethical practice, 'we cannot dispense with the other' (Foucault, 2006, p. 398); we cannot do this work alone." The findings presented above highlight how outsider witnessing contributes to this relational understanding of ethics through its emphasis on co-creation of ethical analysis and strivings. The findings demonstrated that the framing of this work as a parallel journey with men seeking to address their use of abusive behaviour is also one of ethical co-creation. The quote "If you have come here to help me, you are wasting our time. But if you have come because your liberation is bound up with mine, then let us work together (Aboriginal activists group, Queensland, 1970s)" (Morley, Macfarlane, and Ablett, 2014, p. 9) is a beautiful summary of this parallel journey. That Lilla Watson, to whom the quote is often attributed, rejected the sole attribution because she was "not comfortable being credited for something that had been born of a collective process" (p. 9) only further ties together the ethics of the parallel journey and co-creation.

Chapter 6: Discussion

Introduction

In this chapter, I will discuss the themes that arose in the findings and the ways in which they interact with related scholarship. I begin with a brief summary of the intentions of research and its place in the academic conversation. I then explore the linkages between the three main themes associated with the first research question around outsider witnessing producing a relational understanding of ethics. Through White's (2007) club of life metaphor and Stillman's (2006) goal of giving people a new place to stand, I discuss what the outsider witnessing enabled for the research participants. I then turn to the three main themes that arose from the research question about reflecting on the journeys of the participants' clients, continuing to draw from Stillman's (2006) work, as well as Foucauldian subject positioning, to illustrate Jenkins' (2009) parallel journey. I conclude with some tentative recommendations based on the findings.

Discussion

No one is outside of power relations, and there is the potential for harm in all social work interventions no matter how well intentioned (Heron, 2004; Rossiter, 2001), so if one enters into work to assist men on becoming ethical, this ought to be undertaken as a parallel journey so as not to produce more harm through intervention (Jenkins, 2009). The critiques of past and current intervention approaches have brought out how harm arises from complex power relations due to competing, and contradictory discourses (Augusta-Scott, 1999; Cain, 2011). This Foucauldian reading of power suggests that ethics is not a statutory, objective, or individualizable activity - to appreciate these power relations one must pursue a relational sense of ethics (Chapman, Hoque, and Utting, 2013). The practice of reflecting on how one's social position affects their work is already established as a goal in social work (Ruch, 2009), however, if one accepts a Foucauldian

conception of power, reflexivity practices must be structured in a way to facilitate this understanding of power.

I wanted to find out if outsider witnessing would support this goal of an epistemologically appropriate reflexive practice. I also wanted to find out how reflecting on power and ethics in one's practice could assist those who work with men with histories of violence to understand their clients' journeys better in order to be more effective in this work, with the ultimate goal of reducing coercion and violence used in relationships - be they personal or professional.

Outsider witnessing provided a context wherein participants' shared values could be recognized and named, and thus reinforced (Carey and Russell, 2003). As these values did not always coincide with dominant discourses around IPV intervention practice, criminal justice, feminism, etc., they can be viewed as subjugated knowledge. According to Pease (2002), the amplification of such knowledge is considered a form of resistance to dominant power relations through Foucault's conception of power. Tying this in with White's (2007) club of life metaphor, outsider witnessing thus allowed for the development of a club of resistance to dominant power relations. While simply acknowledging shared values does not lead to critical reflexivity, it is a crucial step towards it. As Chapman, Hoque, and Utting (2013) articulated it, "reflecting upon one's own ethical dilemmas and transgressions can facilitate subsequent ethical navigation but sustaining such reflection and transformation requires the support of others with resonant commitments" (p. 25). While these participants may not stay in touch, these encounters with others with resonant commitments can still contribute to their respective clubs of life.

Further, these encounters did result in critical reflexivity as participants used these shared values as "a new place to stand" (Stillman, 2006, p. 34) (or at least a newly reinforced one) in

order to move to reassessments of their past experiences. Establishing these values and recognizing them in one another's experiences and actions, perhaps, allowed for a jumping off point into more self-critical discussions. In Stillman's (2006) article, he looked at how when work with boys who have used sexual abuse focuses solely on the abuse "there is no distance or space open to move into other ways the boys have been seen or could see themselves differently in the world" (p. 35). While certainly not equating or comparing abuse with anything the participants discussed self-critically, I do see a parallel between Stillman's approach and that of using outsider witnessing to discuss ethical dilemmas. He starts his work with these boys in a place that establishes their preferred ways of being or ethical strivings before moving into reflecting on past actions that were not in line with those things. The outsider witnessing questions that elicited the naming of values similarly establishes preferred ways of being. After re-establishing her value of not giving up on people, Henny was able to look back at how she had departed from her preferred way of working with clients when she was discussing transferring a client she had become frustrated with. Outsider witnessing, in this regard, is well suited to critical reflexivity, as it focuses directly on shared values and ethical strivings which gives people a place to stand and reflect.

These shared values and how they result in the reassessment of participants' past experiences laid the groundwork for understandings of ethics and power as relational and contextual. "Individuals take up or identify with particular subject positions structured through relations of power and made available through different discourses," (Heron, 2005, p. 347) which are the various and conflicting knowledges available to make sense of the world. The participants co-created a set of shared values that may conflict with dominant discourse through their club of resistance. By doing so they were able to position themselves based on their

localized discourses rather than, say, those based on the rules of a government funded program. The reassessment by Ben, for example, uncovered how he would have been arguably acting unethically according to his localized set of ethics had he followed through with the program rules about reporting someone for coming to the group after consuming alcohol. Ethics defined as purely statutory would not be sufficient to arrive at this conclusion. Outsider witnessing facilitated a non-statutory and relational understanding of ethics which allowed for participants to co-create subjugated, localized understandings of ethical conduct through which to reflect on their dilemmas.

This localized and contextually-specific conception of ethics is also crucial to understanding the processes by which men who have used violence in relationships journey towards accountability. As Jenkins (2009) warned, "those with membership of privileged groups often feel entitled to impose their interests and cultural practices upon those who are less privileged and less advantaged" (p. 14). While IPV practitioners can stand firmly on their ethical ground that violence against intimate partners, and especially men's violence against women, is uniformly harmful, they still must seek to understand the nuance and strivings of each man they work with in order to give them a place to stand (Stillman, 2006). As the practitioners' own ethical dilemmas could not be simply understood through manuals or laws, the interventions on IPV cannot be simply plucked from a manual and applied indiscriminately. I believe that the process of reflecting on these dilemmas, and particularly doing so with the validation and reinforcement of outsider witnessing, facilitated an understanding of their clients' journeys of accountability. The participants achieved this through reaching out towards the world of the other, reflecting on how people make changes in their lives, and through identifying aspects of their clients' journeys as paralleling some of their own.

Jenkins has postulated “a passionate interest in otherness as the antithesis of violence” (Queensland Centre for Domestic and Family Violence Research, 2017, November 23), in that it involves an openness to difference rather than a coercive effort to enforce sameness. Melissa’s efforts at reaching out towards the world of the other, for example, allowed her to see how many of the men she worked with had experienced abuse by caregivers in their lives and were not given examples of caring relationships. This highlighted how “individuals take up or identify with particular subject positions structured through relations of power” (Heron, 2005, p. 347), as she could view them as people who had been hurt as well as people who have hurt others. Their capacity to be harmed or to harm was greatly impacted by the social positioning they took up in these relationships. To flatten their life experiences as being a pursuit of power and control would be to subjugate their experiences of abuse in the service of a dominant understanding of men who abuse.

This openness to the experiences of the other also enabled an exploration and understanding of how these men can change. Melissa alluded to what Jenkins (2009) refers to as responsibility overload by pointing to how insufficient an educational approach to intervention can be in the above scenarios. Trying to tell a man who had never been shown respect that he needs to show others respect is asking him to do something no one has been prepared to do for him. Henny highlighted how the openness to men’s experiences of abuse can be a way of modelling for them what they are being asked to do – “if you're experiencing that, what do you think it's like for the woman to experience that from you?" In addition to modelling, reaching into the world of the men also positions them differently. Telling men who have been hurt themselves that they need to own up to the harm they have caused discursively positions them to

defend themselves; showing them that you are open to positionalities they have had where they did not benefit from abuse gives them a new place to stand (Stillman, 2006).

Finally, we can also see how the act of reaching out towards the world of the other can uncover the ways in which the journeys of clients and the journeys of workers to act ethically and to take accountability are often parallel. Sophie's explorations of the experience of men being hastily constructed as subjects suitable to fit into a PAR group through the court process mirrored the coerciveness that the program attempts to address in the men's past actions. In some ways, this supported the idea that the workers have to examine themselves and their practices to avoid harm in their relationships with clients. In other ways, it brought out how institutional practices were similarly constraining for both the men and the workers. Melissa also reflected on how dominant masculinity discourses acted on her as well as the men in some conversations, bringing to light the ethic that she and Henny shared, that masculinity is harmful to both men and women. This framing of them being mutually harmed by the same dominant discourse (despite men also benefitting from it) allowed the workers and men to position themselves alongside one another rather than in opposition.

I believe the findings presented do indicate that outsider witnessing as a reflexive practice is supportive of the goal of analyzing ethics as a relational process in line with a Foucauldian understanding of power, and that reflecting on power and ethics does offer IPV workers insight into their client's processes of accountability, at least in the specific context of these two meetings with these four participants and myself. There was indication, though, that these participants likely already do think and speak about issues of power and ethics in a relational way and consider themselves in some way on an ethical journey parallel with their clients. Melissa and Henny both referenced their work as being influenced by Tod Augusta-Scott, whose

writing and work is very much inspired by Alan Jenkins, as well as both using narrative therapy in their respective practices. Sophie and Ben mentioned having prison abolitionist leanings and traced some of their understandings of power relations to having read Foucault.

Thus, it is unclear how much this way of speaking about power and ethics in practice came from outsider witnessing and how much came from these shared influences. That said, I believe that the outsider witnessing practice was epistemologically appropriate to support these conversations, even if they did not arise specifically from the practice itself. Research with participants who are unfamiliar with these concepts could provide interesting insight into its potential for drawing out a relational sense of ethics from those who may be less likely to frame things this way on their own.

Summary

I have made a case in this research against relying on manualized, statutory, or prescriptive means to navigate the ethical territory of complex webs of power relations, so I am hesitant to offer concrete recommendations from these findings that may be interpreted in this way. I would however recommend a Foucauldian power analysis as a framework for a critical reflexive practice for those working with men who have used abusive behaviour, or truly any work that seeks to assist people in taking accountability for harm caused. I would also recommend that outsider witnessing can be a useful tool in pursuing reflexivity through this framework. Multiple participants spoke of how meaningful it was to connect with others doing the same work about the practical and ethical challenges involved, and how this type of activity seems to be missing from their work. Sophie jokingly suggested “we should start a facilitator support group,” however given that the findings suggested real ethical and reflexive consequences to building a club of life around those who resist dominant discourse, I think this

deserves consideration. I would recommend, based on this, that those working with men in IPV intervention consider building a regular practice connecting with others doing similar work in order to co-create shared ethics and mutual support around the pursuit of those ethics.

Chapter 7: Conclusion

This research has built off the work of Chapman, Hoque, and Utting (2013), White (2007), and others to explore the ways in which outsider witnessing can be used to foster a relational sense of power and ethics. The research found that outsider witnessing contributes to a relational conception of ethics by drawing out, naming, and highlighting the importance of shared experiences, feelings, which led to a sense of connection via what White (2007) might refer to as a club of life. These reflections also showed ethics as a relational process by the stories and their re-tellings causing participants to reflect on their past experiences differently, re-analyzing them based on perspective they gained from others' experiences, and recognizing constraints they had to acting in accordance with their ethics. They also specifically described values, ethics, and power as active and relational processes by recognizing values being enacted in practice, showing the showing how these ethics did not rely on or appeal to rules or laws, and how they were in the context of a power that is situated and relational.

This research also explored the ways in which reflecting on power and ethics can give insight to workers on the journeys of accountability that men who have used abusive behaviour are undertaking with their support. The findings indicated that this takes place through workers "reaching out towards the world of the other" (Jenkins, 2009, p. xiii), including exercising an openness to the impacts of socialization on men's use of violence. Workers also reflected on the ways in which change takes place, highlighting the importance of positive relationships between workers and clients in enabling change, illustrating of the constraining effects of "responsibility overload" (Jenkins, 2009, p. 32) on this change, clarifying how accountability for abuse is taken up by the men, not the workers. Finally, the findings animated Jenkins' (2009) concept of the parallel journeys between workers and their clients, in that they are situated amongst the same

dominant discourses and power relations that the men are, which, amongst other things, can result in them and the institutional practices they participate in reproducing behaviour that their interventions attempt to address.

This project has also been an exercise in pursuing research using narrative therapy not only as a source of methods, but as a research methodology itself. This involved taking the concept of co-research (Dulwich Centre Publications, 2004) and co-creation of knowledge very seriously. My interview questions were based in narrative inquiry and the narrative practice of outsider witnessing was both a tool and a central focus of a research question. My intention (which I believe I did justice to) was to not simply engage on a superficial level with these practices, but to attempt to sew them into the threads of all aspects of the research. This included traditional qualitative research approaches such as member-checking, but also included coding and presenting findings in a way that highlighted participants' analysis, considerations about agency and the socially constructed nature of identity in how I collected demographic information, and in viewing my role in research design and question-posing as an act of co-creation rather than imagining an objective truth that I was uncovering in the participants' words.

It is my hope that this research, at the very least, provided a space for the participants to reflect on their work through their respective positionalities and to better understand their ethical strivings and those of their clients. I truly believe that everyone involved in this project has a sincere desire to reduce the harm associated with dominant discourses of masculinity, specifically men's use of violence against their intimate partners. It also seems apparent to me that the participants are thoughtful and reflective about how the pursuit of this goal can lead to other forms of domination and have all made efforts to mitigate and avoid reproducing these harms. If this research has exceeded my expectations, it will carry on a tradition that sees all of

these struggles against domination as connected and continually co-created both by those who are oppressed by these streams of power, as well as those who benefit from them. May we recognize our liberation as bound up in one another's and work together.

Limitations and Further Research

As with all research, there were limitations in this work that suggest other possible areas of research. I have considered that everyone involved is white, including myself, which reminded me of Badwall's (2016) critiques of the limitations of reflexivity in a field that takes its whiteness for granted. Issues of how race (and class) operated in ethical dilemmas were certainly raised by participants, and I am not suggesting that those who did not bring them up were remiss not to. However, it does remind me that whiteness (and class status, settler status, maleness, etc.) can hide from me the ways in which I have caused harm to others; as that is the case, these positionalities can also prevent outsider witnessing about ethical dilemmas from being effective at surfacing these kind of harms for those who share them. It is not that outsider witnessing hides them, but rather that it may allow them to go unrecognized and unaddressed if not brought up by the participants. Further research might look at how these processes might differ if, say, the conversations were between white and Black participants, or settler and Indigenous participants.

Another gap is that this approach does not directly include the voices of the people who were harmed by the abuse, whose safety and autonomy is of central concern to the research; nor the men themselves, whose process of change and agency is also central to the work. This is another example of the limitations one's positionality puts on their having full access to the harm they may potentially cause. I have not thought through how these voices could be brought in more closely, nor fully explored the ethical implications of doing so. There are serious ethical

questions involved in asking survivors of IPV to do the labour of assisting in IPV intervention (Newman, 2007), for example. This might be another area future research could look into. Jenkins' (2009) listening circles between those who work with men and those who work with survivors could inform this research, as well as Dowse's (2017) putting herself in the "hot seat" (p. 8) in front of the men for whom she facilitates IPV groups.

Finally, in the discussion section, I reflected on how the outsider witnessing method was sufficient to support the goal of analyzing ethics as a relational process in line with a Foucauldian understanding of power. However, because the participants involved were familiar with some of the theories underlying this understanding of power and ethics, the research could not draw any conclusions about whether it would cause others unfamiliar with these concepts to speak about power and ethics in this way. Due to the small sample size and the specific people involved, I would suggest that further research should be undertaken to better understand how this tool works.

References

Augusta-Scott, T. (1999). *Reinventing the wheel: Finding new stories for men who batter.* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Dalhousie University.

Augusta-Scott, T. (2003). Dichotomies in the power and control story: Exploring multiple stories about men who choose abuse in intimate relationships. In *Responding to violence: Collection of papers on working with violence and abuse* (pp. 204-223). Retrieved from: *http://relationshipanarchy.com/wp-content/uploads/augusta-scott-comp-zine-imposed_singlepage.pdf*

Augusta-Scott, T. (2007). Conversations with men about women's violence: Ending men's violence by challenging gender essentialism. In C. Brown & T. Augusta-Scott (Eds.), *Narrative therapy: Making meaning, making lives* (pp. 197-210). Retrieved from: http://relationshipanarchy.com/wp-content/uploads/augusta-scott-comp-zine-imposed_singlepage.pdf

Augusta-Scott, T. (2009). Narrative therapy: Addressing masculinity in conversations with men who perpetrate violence. In P. Lehman & C. Simmons (Eds.), *Strengths-based batterer intervention: A new paradigm in ending family violence* (pp. 113-136). Springer Publishing Company.

Augusta-Scott, T., Goodmark, L. & Pennell, J. (2017). Restorative justice, domestic violence and the law: A panel discussion. In T. Augusta-Scott, K. Scott, & L. Tutty (Eds.), *Innovations in interventions to address intimate partner violence: Research and practice* (pp. 174-190). Routledge Press.

Augusta-Scott, T., Harrison, P. & Singer, V. (2017). Creating safety, respect, and equality for women: Lessons from the intimate partner violence and restorative justice movements. In

T. Augusta-Scott, K. Scott, & L. Tutty (Eds.), *Innovations in interventions to address intimate partner violence: Research and practice* (pp. 156-173). Routledge Press.

Badwall, H. K. (2016). Critical reflexivity and moral regulation. *Journal of Progressive Human Services,* 27 (1), 1-20. https://doi.org/10.1080/10428232.2016.1108169

Baskin, C. (2006). Systemic oppression, violence, and healing in Aboriginal families and communities. In R. Alaggia & C. Vine (Eds.), *Cruel but not unusual: Violence in Canadian families* (p. 15–48). Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

Bergen, H. (2016). *Teen moms talk back: Young mothers strategizing supportive communities.* [Unpublished master's thesis]. York University.

Besley, A.C. (2002). Foucault and the turn to narrative therapy. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling,* 30 (2), pp. 125-143. https://doi.org/10.1080/03069880220128010

Brown, C. (2007). Situating knowledge and power in the therapeutic alliance. In *Narrative therapy: Making meaning, making lives* (pp. 197-210). Sage Publications.

Brown, C. (2012). Anti-oppression through a postmodern lens: Dismantling the master's tools. *Critical Social Work,* 13 (1), 34-65. https://doi.org/10.22329/csw.v13i1.5848

Burk, C. (2011). Think. Rethink. Accountable communities. In C. Chen, J. Dulani, & L. Lakshmi Piepzna-Samarasinha (Eds.), *The revolution starts at home: Confronting intimate violence in activist communities* (pp. 355-374). AK Press.

Cain, T. (2011). *Connecting discourse, policy, and practice: Practitioners' perceptions of the influence of dominant discourses and stories surrounding women who experience abuse by their intimate male partners.* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Dalhousie University.

Carey, M. & Russell, S. (2003). Re-authoring: Some answers to commonly asked questions. *International Journal of Narrative Therapy & Community Work*, 2003 (3), 60-71. https://search.informit.com.au/documentSummary;dn=652291092639962;res=IELFSC

Chambon, A.S. (1999). Foucault's approach: Making the familiar visible. In A.S. Chambon, A. Irving, L. Epstein (Eds.) *Reading Foucault for Social Work.* Columbia University Press.

Chapman, C. (2010). *Using our everyday ethical transgressions as starting points for social justice education.* Paper presented at the 29th National Conference of the Canadian Association for the Study of Adult Education (CASAE). http://www.casae-aceea.ca/~casae/sites/casae/archives/cnf2010/OnlineProceedings-2010/Individual-Papers/Chapman.pdf

Chapman, C. (2011). Resonance, intersectionality, and reflexivity in critical pedagogy (and research methodology). *Social Work Education, 30* (7), 723–744. https://doi.org/10.1080/02615479.2010.520120

Chapman, C., Hoque, N., & Utting, L. (2013) Fostering a personal-is-political ethics: Reflexive conversations in social work education. *Intersectionalities: A Global Journal of Social Work Analysis, Research, Polity, and Practice,* 2 (27), 24-50. https://journals.library.mun.ca/ojs/index.php/IJ/article/view/394

Chrysalis Collective. (2011). Beautiful, difficult, powerful: Ending sexual assault through transformative justice. In C. Chen, J. Dulani, & L. Lakshmi Piepzna-Samarasinha (Eds.), *The revolution starts at home: Confronting intimate violence in activist communities* (pp. 258-279). AK Press.

Communities Against Rape and Abuse (CARA): Bierria, A., Carrillo, O., Colbert, E., Ibarra, X., Kigvamasud'Vashti, T., & Maulana, S. (2006). Taking risks: Implementing grassroots

community accountability strategies. In INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence (Eds.), *The Color of Violence: The INCITE! Anthology* (pp. 250-266). Duke University Press.

Conwill, W. L. (2010). Domestic violence among the black poor: Intersectionality and social justice. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling*, 32 (1), 31–45. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10447-009-9087-z

Critical Resistance and Incite! Women of Color Against Violence. (2006). Gender violence and the prison-industrial complex. In INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence (Eds.), *The Color of Violence: The INCITE! Anthology* (pp. 223-226). Durham: Duke University Press.

Crocket, K., Pentecost, M., Cresswell, R., Paice, C., Tollestrup, D., de Vries, M., & Wolfe, R. (2009). Informing supervision practice through research: A narrative inquiry. *Counselling and Psychotherapy Research*, 9 (2), 101-107. https://doi.org/10.1080/14733140802688936

Davis, E., & Crocket, K. (2010). What does it mean to be a man? Effects of outsider witnessing practices. *New Zealand Journal of Counselling*, 30 (1), 15-33. http://www.nzac.org.nz/new_zealand_journal_of_counselling.cfm

Department of Justice, & Research and Statistics Division. (2018, September 14). *Programming responses for intimate partner violence.* Retrieved March 6, 2020, from https://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/rp-pr/jr/ipv-vpi/p10.html

Dowse, K. (2017). Thwarting shame: Feminist engagement in group work with men recruited to patriarchal dominance in relationship. *International Journal of Narrative Therapy & Community Work*, 2017 (1), 1-10. https://search.informit.com.au/documentSummary;dn=768645774103202;res=IELHEA

Dulwich Centre Publications (Ed.). (2004). Narrative therapy and research. *International Journal of Narrative Therapy and Community Work*, 2004 (2), 1–8. https://www.dulwichcentre.com.au/narrative-therapy-and-research.pdf

Durazo, A. C. R. (2006). Medical Violence Against People of Color and the Medicalization of Domestic Violence. In INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence (Eds.), *The Color of Violence: The INCITE! Anthology* (pp. 179-187). Duke University Press.

Hall, R. (2001). Pitfalls and challenges in work with men who use violence against their partners. In Pease, B., & Camilleri, P. J (Eds.) *Working with men in the human services* (pp. 122-133). Retrieved from: https://www.pratiquesnarratives.com/-Pitfallsandchallengesinworkwithmen.html

Haritaworn, J. (2015). *Queer lovers and hateful others.* Pluto Press.

Heron, B. (2004). Gender and exceptionality in North-South interventions: Reflecting on relations. *Journal of Gender Studies,* 13 (2), 117-127. https://doi.org/10.1080/0958923042000217837

Heron, B. (2005). Self-reflection in critical social work practice: Subjectivity and possibilities of resistance. *Journal of Reflective Practice,* 6 (3), 341-351. https://doi.org/10.1080/14623940500220095

hooks, b. (2004). *The will to change: Men, masculinity, and love.* Atria Books.

Jashnani, G., Maccani, RJ, & Greig, A. (2011). What does it feel like when change finally comes? In C. Chen, J. Dulani, & L. Lakshmi Piepzna-Samarasinha (Eds.), *The revolution starts at home: Confronting intimate violence in activist communities* (pp. 217-236). South End Press.

Jenkins, A. (1990). *Invitations to responsibility: The therapeutic engagement of men who are violent and abuse.* Dulwich Centre Publications.

Jenkins, A. (2009). *Becoming ethical: A parallel, political journey with men who have abused.* Russell House Publishing.

Langer, R. (2017). A continuum of services for men who abuse: Developing a small-city coordinated community response model. In T. Augusta-Scott, K. Scott, & L. Tutty (Eds.), *Innovations in interventions to address intimate partner violence: Research and practice* (pp. 108-121). Routledge Press.

Llewellyn, J. J. (2011). Restorative justice: Thinking relationally about justice. In J. Downie & J.J. Llewellyn (Eds.), *Being relational: Reflections on relational theory and health law,* (pp. 89-108). UBC Press.

Monk, G., & Gehart, D. R. (2003). Sociopolitical activist or conversational partner? Distinguishing the position of the therapist in narrative and collaborative therapies. *Family Process*, 42 (1), 19-30. DOI: 10.1111/j.1545-5300.2003.00019.x

Morley, C., Macfarlane, S., & Ablett, P. (2014). *Engaging with social work: A critical introduction.* Cambridge University Press.

Moussa, G. (2011). *Narrative (sub)versions: How queer palestinian womyn 'queer' palestinian identity.* [Unpublished master's thesis]. University of Ottawa.

Newman, D. (2007). Audience as accountability?: Dilemmas in the use of outsider-witness practices in supporting men's anti-violence projects. *International Journal of Narrative Therapy & Community Work*, 2007 (4) 63-69. https://search.informit.com.au/documentSummary;dn=059781239600460;res=IELIAC

O'Neill, M. (2004). Researching 'suicidal thoughts' and archiving young people's insider-knowledges. *International Journal of Narrative Therapy and Community Work,* 2004 (3), 38-40. https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/95b3/b87144bf4eb7c7eac6a5963acd4861eca776.pdf

Payne, M. (2014). Systems and ecological perspectives. In *Modern social work theory, 4th Edition* (pp. 184-197). Lyceum Books, Inc.

Pease, B. (2002). Rethinking empowerment: A postmodern reappraisal for emancipatory practice. *British Journal of Social Work,* 32 (2), 135-147. https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/32.2.135

Pence, E. & Paymar M. (1993). *Education groups for men who batter: The Duluth model.* Springer Publication Company

Queensland Centre for Domestic and Family Violence Research. (November 26, 2017). *Working with fathers in family violence - Generativity in practice.* [video file]. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rz89LROcI7E

Redstone, A. (2004). Researching people's experience of narrative therapy: Acknowledging the contribution of the 'client' to what works in counselling conversations. *International Journal of Narrative Therapy and Community Work,* 2004 (2), 1-6. https://search.informit.com.au/documentSummary;dn=243465070263796;res=IELHEA

Rossiter, Amy (2001). Innocence lost and suspicion found: Do we educate for or against social work? *Critical Social Work,* 2 (1). https://gateway.library.qut.edu.au/login?qurl=http%3A%2F%2Fwww1.uwindsor.ca%2Fcriticalsocialwork%2Finnocence-lost-and-suspicion-found-do-we-educate-for-or-against-social-work

Ruch, G. (2009). Identifying ‘the critical’ in a relationship-based model of reflection. *European Journal of Social Work,* 12 (3), 349–362. https://doi.org/10.1080/13691450902930761

Salole, A. T., Abdulle, Z. (2015). Quick to punish: An examination of the school to prison pipeline for marginalized youth. *Canadian Review of Social Policy/ Revue Canadienne de Politique Sociale,* 72/73, 124-168. https://crsp.journals.yorku.ca/index.php/crsp/article/view/38162

Speedy, J. (2004). Living a more peopled life: Definitional ceremony as inquiry into psychotheraapy 'outcomes'. *International Journal of Narrative Therapy & Community Work,* 2004 (3) 43-53. https://dulwichcentre.com.au/living-a-more-peopled-life-speedy.pdf

Stillman, J. (2006). Working with adolescents who have committed sexual abuse: Establishing a new place to stand. *International Journal of Narrative Therapy & Community Work*, 2006 (1) 32-38. https://search-informit-com-au.ezproxy.library.yorku.ca/documentSummary;dn=197180769658427;res=IELHEA

Thobani, S. (2007). *Exalted subjects: Studies in the making of race and nation in Canada*. University of Toronto Press.

White, M. (2000). Reflecting-team work as definitional ceremony revisited. In *Reflections on narrative practice: Essays and interview*s. Retrieved from http://www.narrativetherapylibrary.com/media/downloadable/files/links/R/O/RONP4White_2.pdf

White, M. (2002). Addressing personal failure. *International Journal of Narrative Therapy and Community Work,* 2002 (3), 33-76 https://search.informit.com.au/documentSummary;dn=661570312326546;res=IELFSC

White, M. (2003). Narrative practice and community assignments. *The International Journal of Narrative Therapy and Community Work*, 2003 (2), 17-55. https://search.informit.com.au/documentSummary;dn=631981153968524;res=IELHEA

White, M. (2007). *Maps of narrative practice*. W.W. Norton.

White, M. (2011). The responsibilities: Working with men who have perpetrated violence. In *Narrative practice: Continuing the conversations*. W.W. Norton.

Withers, A. (2014). Sexual assault and attempts at collective justice. In *Transformative justice and/as harm*. Rebuild Printing.

Appendix A

Interview question guidelines

Describe a scenario in your work where you had to navigate an ethical dilemma.

a. What values or ethics of yours were at stake this dilemma?
b. How did you know that there was an ethical concern at hand?
c. Did your training in working with this population inform your values and ethics in this situation? How so?
d. If not, where did this knowledge/understanding come from?
   OR if so, did anything or anyone else inform your knowledge/understanding of these values and ethics?
e. What constraints or challenges were there in acting in accordance with these ethics?
   OR- What were you up against in acting in accordance with your values?
f. What did it take to be able to overcome those constraints or challenges?
   OR - If you wish you had acted differently, what would it have taken to stand up to those constraints?
g. Did anyone support you in this process? How?
h. How might have you handled the situation differently if it weren't for that person/those people?
i. Did this experience impact your understanding of how power operates? How so?
j. Did this experience impact your understanding of your values or ethical strivings? How so?
k. Did this experience impact you in any other ways?

The outsider witnessing process is not meant to elicit criticism or judgement of the interviewee, but rather to reflect back to them the parts of their story that the listeners connected with, to reflect back their ethical strivings, and to explore the impacts of sharing our ethical strivings with others.

If the researcher notices that the responses are taking the form of criticisms, I will redirect the respondent to a reflective rather than judgmental stance. The interviewee may choose to stop the outsider witnessing process at any time if it is causing them discomfort.

Questions for the Outsider Witnessing:

1. As you were listening to participant x, did any words, phrases, or stories resonate for you?

2. What did those particular words, phrases, or stories suggest to you about what's important to participant x? What image did they give you about what they value in their politics, practice, or life?

3. What do you think it is about *your own life* or *your clients' lives* that might account for why you were drawn to that particular word, phrase, or story?

4. Where are you now, as a result of witnessing participant x's account, that you wouldn't be now, if you had done something different during this time?

Final question after outsider witnessing process:

> Did this experience impact your understanding of how your clients navigate their own ethical strivings or processes of accountability? How so?

Appendix B

Recruitment letter

To Whom It May Concern,

I am a student in the Master's of Social Work program at York University. I am conducting research as part of this degree and am writing to find out if you would be interested in participating in the research.

This research will explore understandings of ethics and power through formal interviews with people (therapists, counsellors, group facilitators, etc.) who work with men who have used abusive behaviour against their partners. The goal is to explore how helping professionals understand their values and ethics through reflection with others on past actions.

The research will consist of interviews in the presence of other participants who will be interviewed on what they have heard. This process will produce the participants' shared analysis of ethical dilemmas faced in the field which will be further explored by the principal investigator in his Practice-Based Research Paper.

You will be asked to reflect on an ethical dilemma that arose in your work. You will have an audience of 2-3 other participants listen to your story of understanding and navigating the ethical dilemma. The audience will then reflect back what they heard in your story and how this resonates with their own experience. You will take turns being an audience to the other participants' stories through the same process.

The data collection will be comprised of these verbal interviews which would take place in one meeting.

This would require 4 hours of participants' time.

No inducements will be offered for participation.

Thank you for your consideration and please do not hesitate to contact me for more information.

Regards,

Mark Mullkoff
MSW Candidate, York University
markmullkoff@gmail.com
647-852-3133

Appendix C

Informed Consent Form

research ethics | YORK UNIVERSITÉ UNIVERSITY

Office of Research Ethics
York University

Kaneff Tower, Fifth Floor -- 4700 Keele Street,
Toronto, Ontario, Canada, M3J 1P3

ore@yorku.ca
research.info.yorku.ca

Study Name: Co-Creating Ethical Understandings Through Outsider Witnessing

Researcher name: Mark Mullkoff, Master's of Social Work Program, Graduate Studies, York University. Principal Investigator. Markmullkoff@gmail.com

Purpose of the Research:

- This research will explore understandings of ethics and power through formal interviews with therapists who work with men who have used abusive behaviour against their partners. The goal is to explore how social workers and therapists understand their values and ethics through reflection with others on past actions.
- The research will consist of interviews in the presence of other participants who will be interviewed on what they have heard. This process will produce the participants' shared analysis of ethical dilemmas faced in the field which will be further explored by the principal investigator in his Practice-Based Research Paper.

What You Will Be Asked to Do in the Research:

- You will be asked to reflect on an ethical dilemma that arose in your work. You will have an audience of 2-3 other participants (ie. other therapists also being interviewed for the research) listen to your story of understanding and navigating the ethical dilemma. The audience will then reflect back what they heard in your story and how this resonates with their own experience. You will take turns being an audience to the other participants' stories through the same process.
- The data collection will be comprised of these verbal interviews which would take place in one meeting and will be audio recorded and later transcribed.
- The investigator will conduct a short debrief with each participant to assess any possible discomforts that arose during the interviews.
- This would require 4 hours of participants' time.
- No inducements will be offered for participation.

Risks and Discomforts: The risks may include the discomfort associated with reflecting on challenging experiences, sharing potentially vulnerable experiences with peers, and exposing ones self and their past decisions to the judgement and scrutiny of other professionals. The outsider witnessing process is not meant to elicit criticism or judgement of the interviewee, but rather to reflect back to them the parts of their story that the listeners connected with, to reflect back their ethical strivings, and to explore the impacts of sharing our ethical strivings with others. If the researcher notices that the responses are taking the form of criticisms, I will redirect the respondent to a reflective rather than judgmental stance. The interviewee may choose to stop the outsider witnessing process at any time if it is causing them discomfort. The investigator will take steps to individually debrief with participants after the interviews and will also have referrals on hand for Toronto Family Services Walk-in Clinic in case a participant wishes to further debrief any discomfort with a therapist. Each participant will sign an agreement that they will keep confidential any information they hear during the interviews, however this cannot be guaranteed by the investigator. The investigator will give each participant the option of choosing to use a pseudonym to use during the interviews to protect their identity from the other participants, as well as to use in the reporting of the results. The researcher will also obscure any identifying

information in the reporting of the results. The final transcripts will be provided to each participant to assist them in making an informed decision around the use of a pseudonym.

Benefits of the Research and Benefits to You: This research will benefit you by giving you a chance to increase your understanding of ethical practice and will allow you to experiment with a tool for critical reflexivity that may be of use to you professionally. Given that your clients are engaged in self-reflection and accountability processes, which are also aspects of this reflexive practice, this research may give you additional insight that may be helpful to you supporting your clients. This research will benefit me in the same ways, and additionally will contribute to my education and training as a social worker and therapist.

Voluntary Participation and Withdrawal: Your participation in the study is completely voluntary and you may choose to stop participating at any time. Your decision not to volunteer, to stop participating, or to refuse to answer particular questions will not influence the nature of the ongoing relationship you may have with the researchers or study staff, or the nature of your relationship with York University either now, or in the future.

In the event you withdraw from the study, all associated data collected will be immediately destroyed wherever possible. Should you wish to withdraw after the study, you will have the option to also withdraw your data up until the analysis is complete.

Confidentiality:

Unless you choose otherwise, no identifying information will be associated with the collected data. All information you supply during the research will be held in confidence and unless you specifically indicate your consent, your name will not appear in any report or publication of the research. The data collection involves 3-4 participants in a group setting; therefore the researcher cannot ensure complete confidentiality. However all participants will be asked to sign a confidentiality agreement to not disclose any information outside of the interviews. Interviews will be documented through audio recordings (on principal investigator's phone and laptop) which will be transcribed by him or through a professional transcription service. Name and confidentiality policy of transcription service is available upon request. The transcribed text will be stored on the principal investigator's laptop. Name of participants will not be attached to audio files or text files of interviews but will be assigned numeric codes that will be documented separately and securely stored. If any hand-written notes are taken they will be photographed and shredded and stored in the same manner as the other electronic documents.

Questions About the Research? If you have questions about the research in general or about your role in the study, please feel free to contact me at markmullkoff@gmail.com or my supervisor, Daniel Kikulwe at kikulwe@yorku.ca and/or 416-736-2100 ext. 22963. You may also contact the Program in Social Work at gradsowk@yorku.ca and/or 416-736-2100 ext. 55226.

This research has received ethics review and approval by the Delegated Ethics Review Committee, which is delegated authority to review research ethics protocols by the Human Participants Review Sub-Committee, York University's Ethics Review Board, and conforms to the standards of the Canadian Tri-Council Research Ethics guidelines. If you have any questions about this process, or about your rights as a participant in the study, please contact the Sr. Manager & Policy Advisor for the Office of Research Ethics, 5th Floor, Kaneff Tower, York University (telephone 416-736-5914 or e-mail ore@yorku.ca).

Legal Rights and Signatures:

I, _____, consent to participate in Co-Creating Ethical Understandings Through Outsider Witnessing conducted by Mark Mullkoff. I have understood the nature of this project and wish to

participate. I am not waiving any of my legal rights by signing this form. My signature below indicates my consent.

Signature _____ **Date** _____
Participant

Signature _____ **Date** _____
Principal Investigator

Additional consent (where applicable)

1. **Audio recording**

☐ I consent to the audio-recording of my interview(s).

Signature _____ **Date** _____
Participant Name:

2. **Consent to waive anonymity.**

I, _____, consent to the use of my name in the publications arising from this research.

Signature _____ **Date** _____
Participant Name:

YORK UNIVERSITÉ UNIVERSITY

Office of Research Ethics
York University

Kaneff Tower, Fifth Floor -- 4700 Keele Street,
Toronto, Ontario, Canada, M3J 1P3

ore@yorku.ca
research.info.yorku.ca

MRP PROTOCOL:
RESEARCH INVOLVING HUMAN PARTICIPANTS

INSTRUCTIONS:

A. Who should complete this Protocol Form?

This form should be completed by Graduate Students conducting research involving human participants for the purposes of a Major Research Paper (MRP).Research activities generally include- – but are not limited to - experiments, interviews, surveys, focus groups and participant observation. Copies of approved protocols should be kept on file by the student researcher for a period of 2 years.

B. Who Should NOT complete this form?

1. **Graduate or Undergraduate Students conducting research for a course in which everyone in the class is conducting the same research should NOT complete this form**:

   For courses in which all students are conducting the same/similar studies, Course Instructors only should complete the:
   Generic Protocol: Course Related Research Involving Human Participants

   Please consult your Course Instructor for further information.

2. **Graduate or Undergraduate students conducting individual projects as part of a course assignment should NOT complete this form:**

   For courses in which graduate or undergraduate students are completing individualized research studies as part of a course assignment; or for the purposes of an undergraduate theses or individual projects, students should complete the:
   Individualized Protocol – Course Related Research Involving Human Participants

3. **Students conducting research that must be reviewed by the HPRC should NOT complete this form.** To determine whether **your research must be reviewed by the HPRC,** please answer the following questions:

   a. **Is your research funded?** ☒ N ☐ Y
   (Funded research refers to stand alone research funding and excludes student awards such as bursaries and scholarships.)

   b. **Is your research more than minimal risk?** ☒ N ☐ Y
   (What is minimal risk research? If potential participants can reasonably be expected to regard the probability and magnitude of possible harms implied by participation in the research to be no greater than those encountered by the participant in those aspects of his or her everyday life that relate to the research then the research can be regarded as within the range of minimal risk)

   c. **Does your research involve Aboriginal/Indigenous/Indigenous Peoples?**
   ☒ N ☐ Y

The following questions may assist in determining whether your research involves Aboriginal/Indigenous/Indigenous peoples:

(i) Will the research be conducted on Aboriginal/Indigenous land (Canada; international) for which permission and/or approval from an authority (such as a band council, First Nations Research Ethics Board etc.) may be required?	☒ N	☐ Y
(ii) Will recruitment criteria include Aboriginal/Indigenous identity as either a factor for the entire study or for a subgroup of the study?	☒ N	☐ Y
(iii) Will the research seek input from participants regarding an Aboriginal/Indigenous peoples' cultural heritage, artefacts, or traditional knowledge?	☒ N	☐ Y
(iv) Will research in which Aboriginal/Indigenous identity or membership in an Aboriginal/Indigenous community be used as a variable for the purpose of analysis of the research data?	☒ N	☐ Y
(v) Will interpretation of research** results refer to Aboriginal/Indigenous communities, peoples, language, history or culture?	☒ N	☐ Y

*(**NOTE:** "Research" does not include literary criticism and/or history (excluding oral history) and/or primarily textual activities). If you have answered **'Yes' to any of the above noted questions**, then your research involves Aboriginal/Indigenous/indigenous peoples and must be reviewed and approved by the HPRC.*

d.	**Does your research involve Clinical Trial(s)?**	☒ N	☐ Y
e.	**Does your research involve Animals?**	☒ N	☐ Y
f.	**Does your research involve Biological Agents?**	☒ N	☐ Y
g.	**Does your research involve Invasive procedures?**	☒ N	☐ Y
h.	**Does your research involve collection of human bodily fluids?**	☒ N	☐ Y
i.	**Does your research involved radioactive material?**	☒ N	☐ Y

NOTE: If you have answered "**yes**" to any of the questions noted above, **then this is NOT the correct form.** You are required to complete the HPRC protocol form and submit to the HPRC for review. Please contact the Office of Research Ethics (ore@yorku.ca) or 416-736-2100 ext 55201 for further assistance.

C. Does this research require any other approvals?

Research involving another institution (such as a school, university, business, government agency) may require additional ethics review and approval or permissions if using institutional resources (such as internal listservs, or conducting interviews on the premises of the institution).

a) Does the research involve another institution or site? ***If Yes:*** Specify the institution(s)/site(s):	☒ N	☐ Y
b) Do any of the institution(s)/site(s) require administrative permission?	☒ N	☐ Y
c) Has any other REB cleared this project? ***If Yes**, please submit the original application and provide a copy of the clearance letter.*	☒ N	☐ Y

NOTE: If the research is to be conducted at a site requiring ethics approval or administrative permission, please include all draft informed consent forms/administrative permission requests. It is the responsibility of the researcher to determine what other means of clearance are required, and to obtain clearance prior to starting the project.

D. Who do I contact and where do I submit the MRP Protocol - Research Involving Human Participants?

To find the appropriate contact within your Department, Graduate Program and/or

Faculty/School/College to submit the protocol, Researchers (Course Instructors or Students) must consult the "Chart of Contacts – Delegated Ethics Review Committees".

Faculty and students conducting course-related research requiring ethics review in any of the units not listed in the chart should contact the Office of Research Ethics (ore@yorku.ca) or 55201 for further information.

E. How long will the review process take?

The average time to process minimal risk protocols is approximately twenty working days from the date of receipt by the Delegated Research Ethics Review Committee.

NOTE: INCOMPLETE OR ILLEGIBLE PROTOCOLS WILL BE RETURNED TO THE RESEARCHER, WHICH WILL DELAY THE ETHICS REVIEW PROCESS.

F. Research Ethics Guidelines:

Researchers are encouraged to review the various Research Ethics Guidelines to address any research specific questions they may have. Please visit the Research Ethics website to review **Research Ethics Guidelines** that may be relevant to your research.

MRP PROTOCOL FORM:

PART A – COURSE INFORMATION

Student Name:	Mark Mullkoff		
Student Number:	216139891		
Program:	2 Year Full-Time Master's of Social Work Program		
Email:	markmullkoff@gmail.com		
Phone Number:	647-852-3133		
Faculty Advisor	Daniel Kikulwe		
Email:	kikulwe@yorku.ca		
Office:	Ross Building South, Room 815		
Phone Number:	416-736-2100 ext. 22963		
Title of Research Project*:	Co-Creating Ethical Understandings Through Outsider Witnessing		
Start date:	January 1, 2020	**End Date:**	December 31, 2020
PRIVACY: Personal information in connection with this form is collected under the authority of The York University Act, 1965 and will be used for educational, administrative and statistical purposes. If you have any questions about the collection, use and disclosure of personal information by York University, please contact: Office of Research Ethics, Kaneff Tower, Fifth Floor, 416 736 5201			

PART B – EDUCATIONAL ELEMENT

In order to conduct research involving human participants, you are required to:

- Familiarize yourself with York University's "Senate Policy Research Involving Human Participants" as well as the basic principles by which ethical research involving human participants is conducted. (E.g. lecture, case study, test etc.).
- Review the "Student Researcher Responsibility Document"
- Complete the TCPS 2 Tutorial – Course on Research Ethics (CORE)

Please confirm the following:

☒ I have reviewed and am familiar with the "Senate Policy Research Involving Human Participants"
☒ I have reviewed and am familiar with the "Student Researchers Responsibility" Document"
☒ I have completed the TCPS tutorial. TCPS Tutorial Certificate is attached

PART C - PROTOCOL DOCUMENT CHECKLIST

Please attach the following items, if applicable, to the ***MRP Protocol: Research Involving Human Participants*** application.
NOTE: Please ensure ALL fields in this application are filled out. For sections that apply please mark with an "x"; for sections that do **not** apply, please mark as "n/a".

Incomplete forms will not be accepted for review.

1. **ALL protocol forms must have the following documents attached:**
   a) An informed consent form (or multiple consent forms and/or assent forms if relevant)
   b) Certificate of completion of the CORE (TCPS) ethics tutorial

2. **Consent documents (check all that are applicable):**

x	Written Informed Consent form
n/a	Substitute Consent form (Parental/Guardian consent) — required if your research participants are under 16 years of age or without capacity to consent.
n/a	Assent Form — required if your research involves substitute consent
n/a	Verbal Consent Script — required if you plan to seek verbal consent for any of the research participants
n/a	On–line Consent Script — required if participants are asked to consent online
x	Consent for Audio/Visual/ Taping Form — required if you plan to use audio recording or photographs of participants. This may be included in the regular consent form as an additional check box.

3. **External permissions and approvals (if applicable):**

n/a	Decisions Needed From Other REB Boards — required if your research requires ethics approval from an institution other than York University
n/a	External REB approval required – certificate attached
n/a	External institutional permission required – documentation provided
n/a	Internal institutional permission/approval required (e.g., OIPA) – documentation provided
n/a	Medical Directive
n/a	Research Agreement(s) – append all copies
n/a	Data Use Agreements (for use in secondary data analysis)

4. **Test Instruments (if applicable):**

n/a	Questionnaires and Test Instruments
x	Draft interview questions, focus group questions

5. **Recruitment (if applicable):**

x	Recruitment Materials: Posters, Letters, Participant Pool Advertisement, etc.

6. **Debriefing (if applicable):**

n/a	Debriefing Letter – required if your research involves deception (see section 10, Informed Consent form for details)
n/a	Debriefing Consent Document – required following administration of debriefing statement (if your research involves deception)

7. **OTHER (if applicable):**

n/a	Reviewed: Clinical Trial Research Guidelines
n/a	Provenance of Anonymous data
n/a	Research Team Member Confidentiality Agreement
n/a	Participant Images Informed Consent Addendum

PART D – RESEARCH INFORMATION

1. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

In layperson's terms, please provide a general and brief description of the research (e.g., hypotheses, goals and objectives, etc.).

This research will explore understandings of ethics and power through individual interviews with therapists who work with men who have used abusive behaviour against their partners and through a narrative therapy method called outsider witnessing. Outsider witnessing involves a person telling a story (in this case their initial interview) to an "audience" (in this case, the other interviewees) who then answer questions about what they heard with the initial interviewee now acting as the "audience". The primary goal is to find out how social workers understand values and ethics through reflection with others on past actions.

2. PARTICIPANTS

a.) **State who the participant(s) will be:** *Describe the participants that will be recruited and about whom personal information will be collected (i.e., numbers, age, special characteristics, etc.). Describe the size of the group from which participants will be recruited and the estimated number needed for the research (minimum/maximum). Where active recruitment is required, please describe inclusion and exclusion criteria. Where the research involves extraction or collection of personal information, please describe from whom the information will be obtained and what it will include (include permission letters).*

The participants will be therapists/counsellors/workers who work specifically with men who have used abusive behaviour against their partners or children (or have in the last five years), who work in the Toronto area, and who have been doing this work for at least one year (or did the work for at least one year, if in a new position). The group I am drawing from (based on the above inclusion criteria) could number in the dozens, but I am aiming to interview 5-7 participants. The reason for this number is because of the time involved in the outsider witnessing process and the extra data that will be generated by the reflections of participants on one another's stories.

b.) Please indicate if this study will be using a participant pool ☒ N ☐ Y

If 'Yes', please indicate which pool(s):

- ☐ URPP
- ☐ Schulich Marketing pool
- ☐ School of Administrative Studies participant pool
- ☐ KURE
- ☐ Glendon Participant Pool
- ☐ Other:

3. RECRUITMENT

a) How will participants be recruited (e.g., snowball technique, random sampling, previously known to interviewer, telephone solicitation, etc.)? I plan to recruit through a therapist I have had contact with through professional networks and hope that this will initiate the use of the snowball technique. I will ask this individual to pass a recruitment letter to those who meet the criteria and might be interested. If this does not generate enough participants, I will do telephone solicitation by calling agencies and asking their administrative staff to share my recruitment letter with therapists that run programming for men who have used abusive behavior against partners. Interested potential participants will contact me.

b) Will you be using any advertisements, flyers, posters, email scripts, social media postings, etc. for recruitment purpose?

☒ N

☐ Y - ***If 'Yes,'*** *please attach a copy of each with your application.*

4. INDUCEMENTS:

a) Will you be offering inducements to participate (e.g., money, gift certificates, academic credit, etc.)?

☒ N
☐ Y - ***If 'Yes,'*** *please check all that apply:*
- ☐ Financial
- ☐ In-kind
- ☐ Draw
- ☐ Participant Pool Bonus Points
- ☐ Other:

b) If compensation is provided, please provide the source of funding for the compensation/incentive:

n/a

5. METHODS:

a) Please indicate all the research methods that apply:

☐ Action Research	☐ Ethnography
☐ Observation	☐ Survey
☐ Documentary/Filmmaking	☐ Focus Group
☐ Experimental Lab Study	☒ Interview
☐ Oral/Life History	☐ Human Tissues
☐ Experimental Behavioural Study	☐ Online Research

☒ Other: Outsider witnessing, a narrative therapy research method: Participants will be asked to reflect on an ethical dilemma that arose in their work. They will have an audience of 2-3 other participants listen to their story of understanding and navigating the ethical dilemma. The audience will then reflect back what they heard in the story and how this resonates with their own experience. They will take turns being an audience to the other participants' stories through the same process.

b) Do any of the methods involve:

Audio Recording	☐ N	☒ Y
Still Recording	☒ N	☐ Y
Video Recording	☒ N	☐ Y

NOTE: *Explicit consent is required to use these methods of recording. Please see Section 10, "Informed Consent" for details.*

i) If you are using recordings, please account for how they will be safely stored, eventually destroyed or archived, and how, if used in research dissemination, confidentiality will be maintained: Interviews will be documented through audio recordings (on principal investigator's password-protected phone and laptop) which will be transcribed by him or through a professional transcription service. The transcribed text will be stored on the principal investigator's password-protected laptop in a password-protected file. Name of participants will not be attached to audio files or text files of interviews but will be assigned numeric codes that will be documented separately and securely stored in a password-protected document. If any hand-written notes are taken they will be photographed and shredded and stored in the same manner as the other electronic documents. Participants may decide what pseudonym is used in reporting the results.

c) What will be required of the participant(s). *Clearly specify in a step-by-step outline exactly what the participant(s) will be asked to do in each methodology. A separate outline is required for each methodology. Include the settings, types of information to be involved, and how data will be analyzed. Include details about identifying participants, recruitment, procedures participants will undertake, etc. Include copies of study instruments. Please also include the*

estimated time commitment required of participants for each method.
• Participants will be recruited by phone or email by the principal investigator.
• Participants will be advised that participation is completely voluntary and that they may choose to decline to answer any questions or withdraw from the study at any time. If they choose to withdraw, their data will be immediately destroyed wherever possible.
• Interview: Participants will be asked to reflect on an ethical dilemma that arose in their work. The interview guide is attached to this application, but questions will include asking about what values or ethics were involved in the dilemma, how they understood the dilemma, what challenges they faced, and what supports they had in navigating it.
• Outsider Witnessing: They will have an audience of the other 2-3 participants listen to their story of understanding and navigating the ethical dilemma (if goal of 5-7 participants are recruited, they will be separated into two smaller groups). The audience will then reflect back on what they heard, what resonated from their own lives, and how hearing this has impacted them. For exact questions see the interview guide that is attached to this application. They will take turns being an audience to the other participant's stories through the same process.
• The purpose of the outsider witnessing is not to judge or be critical of the interviewee which is represented in the questions and will be made explicit before the interviews begin. In the event that a participant's outsider witnessing reflections becomes critical of the interviewee the researcher will redirect them to focus on reflection and description rather than critique. Interviewees will be informed they may stop the outsider witnessing process at any time if it causes them discomfort. If any of the above occurs, the researcher will debrief with the interviewee.
• The data collection will be comprised of these verbal interviews which will take place in one meeting in a private office space.
• The investigator will conduct a short debrief with each participant to assess any possible discomforts that arose during the interviews.
• This meeting will require 4 hours of participants' time.
• One component of data analysis will be done by participants via the second step of interviewing, where they reflect on one anothers' stories. This is consistent with the collaborative research (or co-research) tradition of narrative therapy research. Data will also be coded by theme and analyzed through scholarship around reflexivity practices and intimate partner violence intervention, not for the purpose of critiquing what participants have said, but for exploring the connections between theory and practice and how these two realms inform one another.

d) What is the experience of the researcher/research team with this kind of research?
Please provide a description of the individual team members' experience with the proposed methods, participant population, etc.
I have worked for seven years in roles that support people who have been incarcerated and am familiar with the challenges that workers face in navigating the tension between supporting clients to seek accountability while also holding a position of power over these clients and themselves seeking to be accountable to their clients. These roles have involved many formal and informal processes of reflexivity, and through this I have developed skills and sensibilities around how to support my colleagues and myself in this type of reflection. I have not specifically used outsider witnessing in these settings, but have had trainining in narrative therapy practices through my Masters of Social Work program.

6. RISK:

Please indicate potential risks that the participants as individuals or as part of an identifiable group or community might experience by being part of this research project **(NOTE:** *Checking 'Minimal' indicates that the risk associated with the method meets the definition of minimal risk as set out in the TCPS-2)*:
☐ **No known/anticipated risks**
☒ **Y – *If 'Yes,'* please complete the following:**

a) Physical risks (including any bodily contact; administration of any	☒ N	☐ Y

substance)?		
b) Psychological/emotional risks (feeling uncomfortable, embarrassed, anxious, upset)?	☐ N	☒ Y
c) Social risks (including possible loss of status, privacy and/or reputation)?	☒ N	☐ Y
d) Data security (i.e., risk to participant from data exposure)?	☒ N	☐ Y
e) Tied to deception involved in the study? (See DEBRIEFING section below)	☒ N	☐ Y
f) OTHER:		

Please describe how each of the potential risks described above will be managed and/or minimized: While these risks may be present in the study, these risks are also present in the everyday work that these professional perform, given that reflexivity is an encouraged and expected part of clinical and social work practice. The risks involved include the discomfort associated with reflecting on challenging experiences, sharing potentially vulnerable experiences with peers, and exposing ones self and their past decisions to the judgement and scrutiny of other professionals. The outsider witnessing process is not meant to elicit criticism or judgement of the interviewee, but rather to reflect back to them the parts of their story that the listeners connected with, to reflect back their ethical strivings, and to explore the impacts of sharing our ethical strivings with others. If the researcher notices that the responses are taking the form of criticisms, I will redirect the respondent to a reflective rather than judgmental stance. The interviewee may choose to stop the outsider witnessing process at any time if it is causing them discomfort. Participants will be advised that participation is completely voluntary and that they may choose to decline to answer any questions or withdraw from the study at any time. If they choose to withdraw, their data will be immediately destroyed wherever possible. If the investigator notices that someone is presenting as uncomfortable, I will stop interviewing and use my counselling skills to discuss their discomfort and whether they would like to continue or not. The investigator will take steps to debrief with participants after the interviews and will also have referrals to Family Services Toronto - Walk-in Clinic on hand in case a participant wishes to further debrief any discomfort with a therapist. Each participant will be asked that they will keep confidential any information they hear during the interviews, however this cannot be guaranteed by the investigator. The investigator will give each participant the option of choosing the pseudonym used in the reporting of the results and will obscure any identifying information. The final transcripts will be provided to each participant to assist them in making an informed decision around the use of a pseudonym as well as confirming they are comfortable with the results being reported.

7. BENEFITS

What, if any, are the benefits to the participants? **Or, ☐ No benefits**

a) Discuss any potential direct benefits to the participants from their involvement in the project; these might include education about research methods, useful knowledge gained about self, etc.
This research will benefit participants by giving them a chance to increase their understanding of ethical practice and will allow them to experiment with a tool for critical reflexivity that may be of use to them professionally. Given that their clients are engaged in self-reflection and accountability processes, which are also aspects of this reflexive practice, this research may give them additional insight that may be helpful to them in supporting their clients.

b) Comment on the (potential) benefits to the scientific/scholarly community or society that would justify involvement of participants in this study.
This research will contribute to knowledge around critical reflexive practices, the uses of (or potential limitations of) of outsider witnessing as a reflexive tool, and the ways in which we understand ethics and power through dialogue with others and shared reflection on action.

8. SECONDARY ANALYSIS OF DATA:

NOTE: Secondary Data Analysis is described as the analysis of data collected for a purpose other than that for which it was originally collected in order to pursue a research interest which is distinct from that of the original work. Researchers are advised to review the "**Secondary Data Analysis Guidelines**" for further information on requirements related to use of secondary data for research purposes.

a.) Are you conducting secondary data analysis?
☒ **N – *If 'No,'* please go to Question 9**
☐ **Y**

If 'Yes,' please answer the following questions:

i) Are you using **Anonymous Data**? (data which never included personal identifiers)
☐ N
☐ Y - ***If 'Yes,'*** please provide a description of the provenance of the data set:

NOTE: *Research that relies **solely** on secondary analysis of anonymous data is exempt from ethics review.*

ii) Are you using **Anonymized data**? (Data which has been stripped of personal identifiers; no potential for data linkage.)
☐ N
☐ Y - ***If 'Yes,'*** please provide a description of the provenance of the data set:

iii) Are you using **Identifiable data**?
☐ N
☐ Y - ***If 'Yes,'*** please provide a description of the provenance of the data set:

b.) If you are conducting secondary analysis using IDENTIFIABLE DATA, please address the following:

i) Do you plan to link this identifiable data to other data sets?
☐ N
☐ Y - ***If 'Yes,'*** please describe:

ii) What type of identifiable data from this data set are you planning to access and use?
☐ Student records (please specify in the space below)
☐ Health records/clinic/office files (please specify in the space below):

☐ Other personal records. Please specify:

iii) What personally identifiable data (e.g., name, student number, telephone number, date of birth, etc.) from this data set do you plan on using in your research? Also, please explain why you need to collect this identifiable data and justify why each item is required to conduct your research.

iv) Describe the details of any agreement you have, or will have, in place with the owner of this data to allow you to use these data for your research. ***(You must submit a copy of any data use/access agreements.)***

v) When participants first contributed their data to this data set, were there any known preferences expressed by participants at that time about how their information would be used in the future?
☐ N

☐ Y - ***If 'Yes,'*** please explain:

vi) How will you obtain consent from the participants whose identifiable data you will be accessing? Please explain:

NOTE: *Consent of participants is required for research involving secondary analysis of data that includes personal identifiers. Waiver of consent may only be considered if researchers meet the additional criteria. Please consult the* ***Secondary Data Analysis guidelines*** *for further information.*

vii) If you do ***not*** intend to seek consent of participants for use of identifiable data for secondary analysis, please provide a rationale as to why:

9. CONFLICT OF INTEREST:

a) Is there a possibility of an apparent, actual or potential conflict of interest on the part of researchers, the University or sponsors? (e.g. commercialization of research findings; self-funded research)
☒ N
☐ Y - ***If 'Yes,'*** *please elaborate and outline how the potential or real conflict of interest will be addressed*:

b) Do any members of the research team have multiple roles with potential participants (such as researcher and therapist, researcher and teacher, student/supervisor, etc.)
☒ N
☐ Y - ***If 'Yes,'*** please review **Research Involving Investigators' Students**

i) Describe the nature of the multiple roles between researcher(s) and any participants:

ii) Describe how the potential conflict of interest that will emerge as a result of the dual roles will be minimized or managed:

c) Are there any restrictions regarding access to or disclosure of information/results/data at any point during the study including completion that the funder/sponsor has placed on the researchers? (These include controls placed by sponsors, funding sources, advisory or steering committees.) ***If 'Yes,'*** please describe: No

10. INFORMED CONSENT

a) Is there a relationship between participants and either of the following:

Person obtaining consent:	☒ N	☐ Y
Investigator(s):	☒ N	☐ Y

If 'Yes,' *what steps will be taken to avoid the perception of undue influence in obtaining free and informed consent:*

b) Ongoing consent is required if the research occurs over multiple occasions or over an extended period of time. Does the research occur over multiple occasions and/or over an extended period of time?
☒ N
☐ Y

If 'Yes,' please describe the process of how you intend to obtain ongoing consent:

c) Is substitute consent involved (e.g., children, youths under 16, those without capacity to consent)?

☒ N
☐ Y

If 'Yes,' please elaborate on how consent and assent will be obtained (an assent form/ script must also be provided):

d) Is Deception involved? Specifically, do you intend to withhold any information from and/or intentionally mislead the research participants?

☒ N – Please go to Question E
☐ Y

If 'Yes:'

i) Please provide a description of the nature of the deception and whether it is full or partial:

Please provide a rationale as to why deception (in whole or part) is required:

ii) Please append a copy of the debriefing statement.

The debriefing statement needs to explain three elements:

(i) Why the experiment was developed and why the deception was necessary.

(ii) What the current research says about the topic, which includes providing two references (text, article, on-line reference) that the participants can reasonably access and understand (if you have an academic and non-academic population, you may need to provide more than one version of the debriefing statement or make sure that the references can be accessed by the least educated of the population).

(iii) Any additional resources that would be useful for the participant. Resources need to be appropriate and accessible for the participants. For example, if you are conducting a study on parenting, you could include community resources for parenting classes or recommendations for parenting guides. (Source: Univ. Virginia, IRB).

Researchers must re-obtain consent from the participants once the debriefing statement has been provided. Participants shall be provided with and sign the **"Debriefing Consent Form."**

iii) If a debriefing statement will not be provided to the participants, please provide a rationale as to why a statement will not be provided:

iv) For studies that are not deceptive, briefly describe the process and nature of any immediate post-study information that will be provided to participants and the rationale for providing this information (e.g., counseling or trauma resources, information links, etc.):

e) How will informed consent be obtained? (Please check all that are applicable):

☒ Informed Consent Form (please attach draft version) (and assent form if relevant)

☐ Verbally* (please attach draft approximation of what participants will be verbally told)

☐ Online Consent Form** (please attach draft version)

If informed consent is being obtained verbally, please provide a rationale regarding why a written informed consent form is not being used:

****If online consent is being obtained, please indicate the website where the questionnaire/ survey will be hosted:***

11. DATA SECURITY:

Privacy refers to an individual's right to be free from intrusion or interference by others. It is a fundamental right in a free and democratic society. The ethical duty of confidentiality refers to the obligation of an individual or organization to safeguard entrusted information. Security refers to measures used to protect information. It includes physical, administrative and technical safeguards.

For a fuller description of researcher obligations surrounding confidentiality, privacy and data security issues, please consult the **Data Security Guidelines for Research Involving Human Participants.**

In light of the above, please address the following questions:

a) **Will the data be treated as confidential?** ☐ N ☒ Y
If 'No,' please provide a rationale as to why not:

b) **Will the participant(s) be anonymous?** ☒ N ☐ Y
If 'No,' please provide a rationale: I will be interviewing them directly so their identities will be known to me. Due to the outsider witnessing, their identities will be known to one another, however all participants will be asked to respect confidentiality and not disclose any information outside of the interviews. The information gathered will be reported under a pseudonym of their choosing and if they choose, that pseudonym could be used during interviews to protect their identity from other participants. The rationale is that I could not conduct this type of interview anonymously and I would not be able to research my question without doing this type of interview.

c) **Describe the procedures to be used to ensure anonymity/confidentiality of participants or informants (where applicable) -or- the confidentiality of data during the conduct of research and dissemination of results.**
Participants will be asked to sign an agreement to keep confidential anything they hear in the group interviews. I will keep all voice recordings on my password-protected phone and laptop and backed up on encrypted, password-protected flash drives. Interview recordings will be transcribed by myself or through a professional transcription service with a publicly stated confidentiality policy available to participants upon request. The transcribed text will be stored on my laptop. I will photograph any handwritten notes, store them in the same manner, and shred the physical notes. I will keep participant names separate from any voice recordings or photographs of notes by using numeric identity codes, and document these codes and securely store them in a password protected document.

d) **Explain how written records, video/audio recordings, artefacts, and questionnaires will be secured, how long they will be retained, and provide details of their final disposal or storage. Describe the standard data security procedures for your discipline and provide a justification if you intend to store your data for a longer period of time. If the data may have archival value, discuss this and whether participants will be informed of this possibility during the consent process.**
Audio files, text files, and any other documents including participant information will be stored on

password-protected devices (phone and laptop) with back-up copies on encrypted and password-protected flash drives. Data will be saved for five years (per social work research standards) after the report is due (April 30, 2025) on encrypted and password-protected flash drives and then deleted.

e) **Please describe how you plan to store hard copy data, i.e., consent forms and other written records.**
- ☒ Locked filing cabinet
- ☐ Other:

f) **Please describe how you plan to store electronic data (such as video/audio recordings and document files)**
- ☒ Encrypted and/or password-protected USB keys, laptops and/or other portable electronic data devices
- ☐ Secure Server
- ☐ Other:

g) **Please describe how you plan to store other formats of data (if applicable):**
n/a

h) **If you plan to destroy research data:**
a. Please provide a firm date by which the data will be destroyed:
April 30, 2025
b. Provide details of their final disposal:
i. for hard copy data (e.g., cross-cut shredder, etc.):
cross cut shredder
ii. for electronic data (e.g., deletion and overwriting of drives; destruction of drives; etc.):
Deletion of files and formatting of drives

i) **If you plan to retain data indefinitely, please provide a justification (e.g., data use for future research):**
n/a

j) **Describe any limitations to protecting the confidentiality of participants whether due to the law, the methods used, the nature of the sample population, or other reasons (e.g., duty to report).**
The standard limitations of confidentiality will apply to these interviews. I have a duty to report if someone informs me that they have harmed or neglected a child, plan to hurt themselves or others, or tells me they have committed a serious crime. I will outline these limitations to participants prior to interviewing.

k) **Identify all parties who will have access to the data.**
- ☒ Primary Investigator/student
- ☐ Supervisor
- ☐ Other (please specify):

l) **Uses of the data: Please describe all forms of output that are anticipated to result from this research (e.g., presentations, written papers, placing data in an archive, creative works, documentary films, etc.). Describe how any potentially identifying information will be handled in each form of output.**
I plan to use this data exclusively for the completion of my Practice-Based Research Paper which will be stored on file in the York School of Social Work office. No identifying information will be included in this final report unless a participant explicitly consents to waive their anonymity.

m) **Subsequent use of data: Will the data potentially be used for other purposes in the future (e.g., teaching, future analysis, publishing of dataset, archiving in an institutional repository, etc.)?**
☒ N ☐ Y

*If **'No,'** the data will be solely used for the purposes describe in this application and will not be used for other purposes in the future.*

*If **'Yes,'** participants must be informed of this possibility during the consent process. Subsequent use of the data for new purposes may require additional review by the REB.*

n) **Please describe how the data will be prepared to make it suitable for future use (e.g., anonymization, storage, archiving, etc.). Please describe what future uses might occur (e.g., use within the PIs research group, transmission to other researchers, publication of the dataset, etc.). Please identify any known repositories to which data may be submitted. (The REB recognizes that all potential future uses cannot be anticipated; but does expect that data will be prepared in a manner for future uses that respects the conditions under which the data were originally collected).**
n/a

STUDENT RESEARCHER DECLARATION

I have reviewed and am familiar with the guidelines and principles detailed by the HPRC, the Delegated Ethics Review – Student Researcher Responsibilities Information Sheet and with the ***Senate Policy on Research Involving Human Participants***, and affirm that, to the best of my knowledge this research conforms thereto.

I hereby certify that the course-based research involving human participants is unfunded and minimal risk research, does not involve Aboriginal/Indigenous/Indigenous Peoples or Clinical Trials and that all information on this form and all statements in the attached documentation are correct and complete. I affirm that I am aware of my responsibilities as a researcher as it speaks to the conduct of research involving human participants and as outlined in ***Senate Policy on Research Involving Human Participants***. I am aware that all human participants in the research must have signed a written consent form or have provided oral consent for their participation in the research. I am aware that the approved protocol and signed consent forms have to be retained for two years following the completion of the research.

I hereby undertake to notify the Delegated Ethics Review Committee to which I am submitting this protocol in the event that I make any changes to the **approved *MRP Protocol – Research Involving Human Participants.*** I am aware that a further ethics review may be required as a result of such changes and that research shall be suspended pending clarification and/or resolution. I will also notify the Delegated Ethics Review Committee if any unforeseen risks not specified in the research proposal appear. In such a case, the study will be suspended pending clarification.

WM

Signature, Student Researcher

1/22/2020
Date

Feedback

Grade	Approved
Graded on	Tuesday, 28 January 2020, 12:59 PM
Graded by	Maurice Kwong-Lai Poon
Feedback files	Mark Mullkoff Ethics Application Feedback.docx19 December 2019, 11:48 PM

Feedback

Grade	Approved
Graded on	Monday, 6 January 2020, 8:52 PM
Graded by	Luann M Good Gingrich

Feedback comments

- This is a creative and important study. Most of my recommendations have to do with your recruitment process.
- Please...