

Community Mobilization around
Street Sex Work in Ottawa

Kristina Rohde

Thesis submitted to the
Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies
In partial fulfillment of the requirements
For the MA degree in Criminology

Department of Criminology
Faculty of Social Sciences
University of Ottawa

© Kristina Rohde, Ottawa, Canada, 2010

ABSTRACT

Community Mobilization around Street Sex Work in Ottawa

Kristina Rohde, M.A. Criminology Candidate, University of Ottawa

Key words: community mobilization, social movement, street sex work

Over the last three years the issue of street sex work has emerged as a contentious one in the Ottawa area. Many agencies in the community such as the police, social services and the municipal government each seek to deal with the matter. In considering this situation, I utilize Social Movement Theory to critically analyse a state-initiated social movement. This thesis presents the findings of a case study of the community group “Together for Vanier” in the east area of Ottawa. Drawing on documents produced by or about the group, observations at community meetings and interviews with key community players, the author argues that absent in Social Movement Theory is a consideration of silenced voices, rendering movements to appear more cohesive than they actually are. This paper suggests that “Together for Vanier” is not an authentic social movement, but rather a state generated one. The thesis concludes by utilizing ideas from Governmentality and Foucault to argue that “Together for Vanier” represents a form of governing at a distance and is thus a site of contestation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to thank my supervisor Chris Bruckert for her constant support during the completion of this paper. Chris was always there to listen and offer advice. Her insight provided me with different ways of looking at my project so that the evolution of my work continuously led to something more thought provoking. I appreciate her patience given the somewhat unfamiliar terrain my thesis sometimes entered. I would also like to thank Nancy Worsfold and the staff at Crime Prevention Ottawa for allowing me access to their records, meetings and always remaining welcoming to my research. I also extend a thank you to the *Together for Vanier* group for permitting me to observe their drugs and prostitution meetings and look into past meetings. And to my interview participants, thank you for your enthusiasm and enlightening perspectives. I also want to acknowledge Carolyn Gordon, for bringing that Ottawa Citizen article to my attention which ultimately sparked the idea for this thesis.

A special thank you goes out to my parents and family for their unwavering support and ability to believe in me. My time in Ottawa would not have been the same without the lasting friendship of Gabrielle, Johnny-Angel and Ashley. You ladies made the combination of never-ending schoolwork and -45 degree weather bearable. My support from the 'loo, Megan and Brian; you guys always provided an attentive ear and have the uncanny ability to dish out some of the best advice. And finally, without question I would like to acknowledge my grandfather; even though you did not see me reach my academic accomplishments, your dedication to the world of academe and spirited encouragement inspired me to never give up.

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

Abstract	i
Acknowledgement	ii
Table of Contents	iii
Introduction	1
Chapter #1: Literature Review	5
Residential Campaigns	5
Othering & Citizenship	8
Effective Policy?	11
Concluding Reflections on Community Action	12
Chapter #2: Theoretical Framework	13
Part #1: Social Movement Theory	14
Theoretical Foundations	14
Modern Developments	14
Concepts	16
Grievances	17
Mobilization	18
Political Opportunity	20
Resources	22
Framing	24
Part #2: Governmentality	26
Governing at a Distance	26
Responsibilization	27
Governing through “the Community”	28
Implications of Governing through the Community	28
Resistance	29
Final Consideration of the Theoretical Framework	30

Chapter #3: Discourses & Strategies	32
The Discourses	33
The Moralizing Discourse	33
Radical Feminist Discourse	36
Sex Worker Discourse	38
Social (dis)order Discourse	40
Contested Strategies (the options)	42
Abolition	43
Prohibition	44
Regulation	45
Non-intervention	46
Collaboration	47
Reflections on Discourses and Strategies	48
Chapter #4: Research Methodology	49
Methodological Reflections	49
The Case Study.....	50
Methods	52
Documentary Evidence	54
Participant Observation	55
Interviews	59
Data Analysis	61
Ethical Considerations	63
Limitations	64
Summary of the Methodological Approach	66
Chapter #5: Critical Analysis of a Social Movement	67
Genesis of a Social Movement	67
The Birth of ‘Together for Vanier’	67
Mobilizing the Community	69
Grievances	70
Key Arguments	72

Nuisance and Quality of Life	73
Nuisance Argument	73
Quality of Life Argument	75
Criminal Association	75
Drug Use Argument	75
“The Victim”	77
Sex Work as Victimization Argument	77
Victimization in Sex Work Argument	79
Attentive to Sex Worker Needs	81
Services Argument	81
Sensitivity Argument	82
Counter Argument	83
Mobilization Around the Sex Work ‘Problem’	84
Service-oriented Tactics	84
Criminal Justice Tactics	88
Social Integration & Community Building Tactics	94
Concluding Reflections on Conflicting Perspectives	96
Chapter #6: Analytic Themes	98
Image Control	98
Shift in Perception	99
Lack of Engagement with Conflict (and Resistance)	101
Exclusion of Voices	102
State Generated Movement	106
Governing at a Distance	109
Final Consideration of Critical Themes	111
Conclusion	112
References	116
Appendix A	134
Appendix B	137
Appendix C	144

Appendix D	147
Appendix E	149
Appendix F	152
Appendix G	155
Appendix H	156

INTRODUCTION

"What we need is more policing in our neighbourhoods to stop the drunk, high prostitutes and pimps that are fighting and passing out in our backyards" exclaimed Jeff Leiper, president of the Hintonburg Community Association (quoted in Fortier, August 26th, 2004). If news headlines are any indication, this is just what we are seeing in the city of Ottawa: "59 arrested in hooker sweeps" (Garrison, August 16th, 2007); "65 arrested in latest sweep" (McCann, December 17th, 2007); "Police arrest 14 sex workers on eve of hooker organizing" (McCann, February 15th, 2008); "Dozens arrested in police sweep" (Tong, May 5th, 2008); "'Zero-tolerance' crackdown nets 69 charges" (Tong, June 1st, 2008); "Prostitution sweep brings 77 charges" (CBC News Ottawa, September 18th, 2009); "Three weeks, three hooker sweeps" (Fagan, December 2nd, 2009). It would appear that the Ottawa police are dedicating increasing time and resources to the "problem" of street sex work.

The phenomenon of policing of street sex work is interesting however, what captivated me was the disjuncture between the two positions documented above. The differing opinions are just one part of a larger conversation comprised of competing discourses about sex work in Ottawa. For example, offering a divergent view, Jackie Joynt, an outreach worker with Elizabeth Fry points out: "continuous sweeps have never helped the problem and never will until we address the problem - why prostitutes are out there in the first place" (quoted Fortier, September 2nd, 2004). In other words, there is an established debate surrounding what exactly is "the issue"

with street sex work, and yet the practices are consistently punitive (Gibbs Van Brunschot, 2003, p. 223; House of Commons Canada, 2006, p. 29-34). Moreover, the community view is typically presented (particularly in the media) as one that focuses on the social disorder street prostitution causes (Brannigan & Fleishman, 1989, p. 134; Jeffrey, 2004, p. 84). However, it is acknowledged in the research that not only is the community not as unified as one would think, but that street sex work does not affect all Canadian communities in the same way and therefore a variety of practices have been employed to control the activity (Jeffrey, 2004, p. 85; House of Commons Canada, 2006, p. 34-35).

In the city of Ottawa, this issue has taken particular prominence as there is a longstanding conflict in some neighbourhoods over street sex work (Chapman et al., 2001; Ottawa Police Services, 2007). Recently, the media has highlighted the enactment of controversial law enforcement initiatives such as the Street Crime Unit of the Ottawa Police Services, which aims to deal with, “increasing concerns from the community about street level crime relating to drug dealing and prostitution in the Vanier, Centertown, Rideau Street and Market areas” (Ottawa Police Services, 2007). Also the “Community Safety Letters” which are mailed to people whose cars were seen in areas where street sex workers are known to operate to warn them that their vehicle was seen there and of the inherent dangers (Ottawa Police Services, 2007; CBC News, 2007). Similar initiatives have been seen across Canada in Toronto, Vancouver and Edmonton (CBC News, 2007; McCann, 2007).

All of this made me curious about “what was going on” in Ottawa. I was motivated to trace the mobilization process of one community group as they navigated around the issue of street sex work. The city of Ottawa provides a unique example with the group “Together for Vanier.” This community organization utilizes a multi-organizational approach working with

Crime Prevention Ottawa, Ottawa Police Services, and the Elizabeth Fry Society of Ottawa among others. This inspired my research into what the processes and practices were in Vanier's organizing around street sex work. The research question therefore centers around social mobilization. This also led to several secondary questions which guided and informed my investigation: what are the community perceptions (or discourses) regarding the problem and solutions to street sex work in Vanier? How does the Vanier community translate this position into action? What tools or tactics do they employ? How do the discourses and strategies serve to condition the subject matter; and finally, what are the implications of this pattern, particularly in light of power and governance?

In the first chapter, I set the stage by examining the literature on community organizing around street sex work. I examine how the 'other' status afforded to sex workers limits their citizenship in these communities and the implications this has. I also provide a brief critique of community policy and acknowledge successful alternatives. In the second chapter, I provide a brief overview of social movement theory including its origins and the contemporary developments, attending in particular to the key elements of the theory that will be employed in the analysis: grievances, mobilization, political opportunity, resources and framing. I also delineate a secondary theory utilizing concepts from Governmentality, specifically 'governing at a distance' and apply this to the community context. The third chapter provides a look into the conceptual discursive resources movement participants can invoke when forming a frame of understanding about sex work/workers (moralizing position, radical feminism, sex work and social (dis)order) as well as the objectives and affiliated strategies (abolition, prohibition, regulation, non-intervention and collaboration). Chapter four outlines the methodological procedures involved in this study, the triangulation of methods utilized (document analysis,

observation and interviews), ethical considerations and any limitations of the research. Next, chapter five utilizes this framework to provide a critical analysis of the social mobilization process of “Together for Vanier.” First, the genesis of the group is examined in order to provide background for an understanding of the grievances. The grievances suggest a number of arguments competing within Vanier in regards to street sex work. Similarly, the tactics for mobilization also indicate disparity in the position of the group. In the fifth chapter I present the critical reflections that elaborate on the ideas presented in the previous chapter with special attention to voices that are often subjected to exclusion and resistant discourses. This thesis finishes with a consideration of “Together for Vanier” as a *state-generated* social movement and the power and governance this presupposes: through governing at a distance a social movement can inspire self-governance in citizens. The thesis concludes with implications and a call for future research.

CHAPTER 1

LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter I will highlight some of the academic research on community mobilizing around the issue of street sex work.¹ In the introduction we saw how street sex work is positioned as a contentious issue in Ottawa; in the first section here I more generally describe some of the campaigns undertaken by residents in areas all over the Western world where the practice is considered a problem. I then look at the tendency of sex workers to be constructed as ‘others’ in these community initiatives and the subsequent implications this has on their denial of citizenship. I finish with a discussion on policy and practices, considering those which have been found to be deficient and those which have proven more successful at dealing with the street sex work issue.

RESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGNS

A large portion of the research on residential campaigns in neighbourhoods surrounding the issue of street sex work is from the United Kingdom. However, there is some research into some similar controversies in areas in Canada, particularly Vancouver. In general however, recently considerable attention has been focussed on residents’ campaigns to remove prostitution from ‘their’ streets through street patrols, pickets or similar initiatives (Hubbard, 1998a, p. 273;

¹ Note, though the terms ‘prostitution’ and ‘sex trade’ have been used in the literature, I will be utilizing the term ‘sex work’ throughout. This is the language employed by sex workers and their allies (Bruckert & Parent, 2006, p. 97-98).

Hubbard, 1998b, p. 56; Lowman, 2000, p. 1001; Hubbard & Sanders, 2003, p. 80-81; Sagar, 2004, p. 98-100; O'Neill & Campbell, 2006, p. 35; O'Neill et al., 2008, p. 78).

For example, in the Balsall Heath area of Birmingham England, there has been much community protest against prostitution documented where participants sought to exclude sex workers from the streets through a series of highly publicized pickets designed to displace the sex workers and their clients (Hubbard, 1998b, p. 56). This was done through a range of physical, legal and rhetorical actions (such as community picketing, street watch campaigns, residents' meetings, petitions) (Hubbard, 1998b, p. 61). These protests involved over 150 (mainly male) residents who patrolled the streets armed with placards and posters (Hubbard, 1998b, p. 64). They soon became organized pickets where groups were strategically located throughout the area in order to disrupt the work of street sex workers (Hubbard, 1998b, p. 64). This involved noting the car registration numbers of suspected kerb-crawlers (clients searching for sex workers) and handing them to the police, and occasionally pickets would attempt to 'shame' them out (Hubbard, 1998b, p. 64).

There were altercations between prostitutes and pickets as well (Hubbard, 1998b, p. 64). These easily turned into vigilantism and violence against street sex workers as vigilante groups used the guise of 'public nuisance' to scapegoat sex workers for causing social and economic problems in the area (Hubbard & Sanders, 2003, p. 81). However, the pickets did result in immediate decline of kerb-crawlers in the area, traffic and street sex work and thus the efforts became co-opted by the police as part of the government's experimental street watch campaign (Hubbard, 1998b, p. 64). The street watch programme is an extension of neighbourhood watch where the 'watchful neighbour' is encouraged to patrol the streets (Sagar, 2004, p. 98). It was

designed to be a 'quiet' patrol of the streets in areas where police manpower is insufficient, informing the police of suspected criminal activity (Sagar, 2004, p. 98).

In Grangetown, Wales, there were documented patrols as well where residents "walk the streets in the name of the community and claim to promote a 'sense of community'" (Sagar, 2004, p. 101). Sagar (2004) identifies the rhetoric used in the creation of the street watch scheme as the idea of shared community values, that there is a group responsibility for community safety (p. 101). However, she further highlights that the street watch campaign, rather than uniting the community, is actually divisive (Sagar, 2004, p. 102). There are a number of factors signifying a cause for concern: there is a potential for abuse, there is cause for displacement, there is a high risk for vigilantism, etc. (Sagar, 2004, p. 103, 106). Sagar (2004) cautions that when there is popular support behind an initiative, regardless of the tactics employed, the criminal actions of the community are often forgiven. She argues that it is likely the case that Street Watch members are not (nor are they likely) held accountable for vigilante acts against street sex workers (Sagar, 2004, p. 108).

Alternatively, in Vancouver there have been similar protests documented. Lowman (1986) notes that in the summer of 1976, local residents and business groups began applying pressure to the city council and the Police, lobbying for a 'clean-up-the-streets' campaign (Lowman, 1986, p. 8). Furthermore, the downtown eastside is a known stroll for prostitutes and when it moved into a gentrified residential neighbourhood, the first organized resistance to street prostitution came about (Lowman, 2000, p. 993-994). In 1981, the Concerned Residents of the West End (CROWE) formed and was the first Vancouver organization constructed specifically for the purpose of ridding a neighbourhood of street prostitution (Lowman, 2000, p. 1001). CROWE began the 'Shame the Johns' campaign in 1984, which encouraged the community to

mobilize against street sex work by “harassing johns, taking pictures of transactions, and reporting license plates” (Shearman, 2008, p. 10). Subsequently, from 1981 to 1985, municipal politicians, police and neighbourhood interest groups all pressed for a new law so that police could “sweep prostitution from the streets” leading to the enactment of the communicating law (Lowman, 2000, p. 1002).² However, these responses also resulted in vigilantism with the main result being displacement of the practice to other areas (Lowman, 2000, p. 1002).

Problems with these community responses to street sex work relate to the exclusionary nature of these campaigns. Decisions to enforce prostitution legislation are strongly influenced by public complaints, with those in more affluent positions able to effectively motivate change such as increased police surveillance and repression (Larsen, 1992, p. 187; Hubbard, 1998a, p. 272). Additionally, in general these protests rarely involve a representative cross-section of the community (O’Neill et al., 2008, p. 78). This is problematic given that these initiatives claim to speak on behalf of the ‘entire’ community and inevitably sex workers are a part of that community. The status of the sex worker in the community is deduced as a ‘non-member’ and we thus turn to further examine this next.

OTHERING & CITIZENSHIP

Conceiving of the sex work as an ‘other’ is really a separation of those deemed ‘needing to be governed’ versus those who need to be ‘protected’ in the community. Discourses that will later be examined later in chapter three work to conceptualize and support the ‘other’ status of sex workers and are regularly drawn from. In the residential campaigns we attended to in the last section, this is a common theme.

² The communicating law, or section 213 of Canadian Criminal Code (CCC) criminalizes communicating for the purposes of prostitution (Duchesne, 1997, p. 3).

There is a tendency for sex work to be depicted as ‘out of place’ in residential neighbourhoods (O’Neill, 2008, p. 74). According to Hubbard and Sanders (2003), this can be derived from a view that conceives of the city as a functional and ordered whole, and considers sex work as a disturbance to that “socio-spatial order” (p. 82). This conception can then inspire processes of boundary construction, purification and spatial exclusion (O’Neill, 2008, p. 73). For example, Hubbard (1999) identifies protests in Balsall Heath against sex work as NIMBYism (‘not in my backyard’ syndrome); related to the need to purify and order public spaces and exclude the ‘threatening others,’ (p. 152) and thus ‘manage risk’ (p. 155). The community is becoming increasingly regulated and those who do not conform to the ‘normal’ behaviours of community space (‘others’) are subjected to limitations (Hubbard, 1998a, p. 281).

By positioning sex workers as ‘others,’ they are perceived to be outside the definition of citizen. They are therefore not afforded citizenship in the community. As described by Procacci (2001) citizenship denotes a status; the status of a citizen, the ties to social community and their implications in terms of rights, loyalty and identity (Procacci, 2001, p. 343). Citizenship can thus “operate simultaneously as a force for both inclusion and exclusion” (Lister, 2001, p. 324). Within the context of street sex work, the workers are constructed as ‘others’ and not perceived to have the same ties to the community as other ‘normal’ residents. They are therefore excluded from citizenship by this very conception.

When we look practically at what this means in the context of sex workers in the community, their voices, along with those who may be more tolerant or adopting a pro-sex worker stance tend to be excluded within policy debates (Hubbard & Hall, 1998, p. 110; Outshoorn, 2004, p. 7; Jeffrey & MacDonald, 2006, p. 205; O’Neill et al., 2008, p. 78). The idea

that some sex workers may also be residents in the neighbourhoods where they work is hence discounted (Hubbard, 1998b, p. 56).

Instead, homeowners and residents, particularly those who are highly educated or articulate as well as residential associations, police and politicians are more likely to have their voices heard within policy (Jeffrey & MacDonald, 2006, p. 205; O'Neill et al., 2008, p. 82). These parties have been able to define the 'community' and *whom* the community is made safer *for* (Hubbard & Hall, 1998, p. 110; Sagar, 2005, p. 101). There is evidence that street sex work has not become an issue in some communities until middle class residents made it a priority (Larsen, 1992, p. 187; Hubbard, 1998a, p. 273; Lowman, 2000, p. 1002). The result has been a tendency for policy to generally reflect the interests of these groups, often to the detriment of the safety and human rights of sex workers (Jeffrey & MacDonald, 2006, p. 205).

For example, Jeffrey and MacDonald (2006) contend that because of their non-citizen status, community crime prevention initiatives designed to protect citizens do not extend police protection to sex workers (p. 130). They further argue that this is surprising given the potential for violence experienced by sex workers. Policies that might protect sex workers are instead focused on reconstructing the sex worker as one from whom the public should be protected (Jeffrey & MacDonald, 2006, p. 130).

The problem with the traditional conception of citizenship is that citizenship is presented as expressing a general will, a point of view that citizens hold in common that extends beyond their differences (Mouffe, 1992, p. 8). Mouffe (1992) instead proposes a "heterogeneous public" that provides mechanisms for the effective representation and recognition of the distinct voices and perspectives of those groups that are oppressed or disadvantaged (i.e. sex workers) (p. 380).

This would enable a broader definition to citizenship, one where sex workers and their supporters have their discourses heard.³

EFFECTIVE POLICY?

In general, residents' campaigns have been seen as limited in their effectiveness (O'Neill & Campbell, 2002, p. 53). Specifically, there was frustration with the lack of action by police; vigilantism was considered too risky, dangerous and time consuming; residents were unhappy with environmental cleanup; many felt as though their voices were not heard; and ultimately the actions were not successful, with sex workers only displaced elsewhere (Hubbard, 1998a, p. 284; O'Neill & Campbell, 2002, p. 53-55; Jeffrey & MacDonald, 2006, p. 204). O'Neill (2007) draws our attention to two barriers to an effective, inclusive and holistic strategy for prostitution reform in the UK specifically; the conception of the sex worker as an 'other,' and the shift in responses to sex work to intolerance and greater punitiveness in Western societies (O'Neill, 2007, p. 4).

However, there are a variety of experiences reported in areas of sex working, with different degrees of toleration suggesting that the co-existence of sex work and residential living is by no means impossible (O'Neill & Campbell, 2006, p. 55-56; O'Neill et al., 2008, p. 74). The literature indicates that the more collaborative type of solution is particularly effective in neighbourhoods affected by street sex work compared to the law and order type responses that have been noted as ineffective and frustrating for communities.

For example, O'Neill et al. (2008) argue for participatory action research (PAR) and community conferencing as a means of resolving conflicts and pacifying fears of 'others' (p. 73). These participatory methodologies are linked to restorative justice and include the working women's voices and respect for their experiences (O'Neill et al., 2008, p. 89). O'Neill et al.

³ Again, this will be examined in chapter three when we look at the various discourses.

(2008) credit these methods with helping to create safe spaces for issues to be raised and dialogues to take place within contentious communities (p. 89). In the UK, the process of PAR allowed residents to understand there were no straightforward solutions to removing sex work from public spaces, with a view emerging that it should instead be properly managed (O'Neill et al., 2008, p. 85). These authors also found co-existence (between residents and sex workers) to be greatest where responses to sex work had been developed between a range of partners and where alternatives to law enforcement were present (O'Neill et al., 2008, p. 82). This conception of a solution will be returned to in chapter three when we delineate the available options to communities and government when seeking to respond to the issue of street sex work.

CONCLUDING REFLECTIONS ON COMMUNITY ACTION

So where does this leave us now? Street sex work is obviously an issue around which communities all over are willing to mobilize. The mindset of some however, appears to be an obstruction to an effective solution to the problem. We will examine these perceptions (the discourses) to better understand the issues community members (among others) have with street sex work as well as the responses later in chapter three. For now we turn to consider the theoretical basis for such community action, looking at these residents' campaigns as social movements we thus utilize social movement theory.

CHAPTER 2

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This thesis draws on social movement theory as a conceptual framework to analyse the development of the community mobilization of ‘Together for Vanier’ in regards to street sex work. The former chapter has delineated the academic literature in terms of community organizing around street sex work. These approaches provide a descriptive account limited to a discussion from a policy angle, the legalities of the practice and consequences. On the other hand, Social Movement Theory allows for a greater in depth look. Considering these residential campaigns as social movements we can more fully examine the micro-processes that are taken for granted in existing approaches. In this chapter, I provide a brief overview of social movement theory including its origins and the contemporary developments, attending in particular to the key elements of the theory that will be employed in the analysis: grievances, mobilization, political opportunity, resources and framing. These will help in our understanding of what aspects comprise the making of a movement, and those which aid in their mobilization. In addition, since it was necessary to draw on concepts outside of social movement theory to interpret the findings, the governmentality concept of *government at a distance* and *resistance* will be discussed.

PART 1: SOCIAL MOVEMENT THEORY

Social movement theory (SMT) seeks to explain why social mobilization occurs, the form it takes, as well as the potential social, cultural, and political consequences (McCarthy & Zald, 1987, p. 149). Utilizing a blend of traditional theories and methodologies in an integrated and multi-dimensional framework, SMT seeks to account for the fluid and complex dynamics in which a movement operates (Maj, 2005, p. 1). It is argued that because SMT draws from a variety of processes and mechanisms, it affords a stronger explanatory value for understanding both the processes and outcomes of social movements (Maj, 2005, p. 1).

Theoretical Foundations

In this section the roots of Social Movement Theory will be developed. These will help us understand the basis of the theory, particularly the elements of the social world the theory highlights as being potentially problematic. The classical beginnings of SMT can be found in the work of Marx and Engels. Briefly, Marxist theory is concerned with the material conditions of people's lives and the struggle between the classes with opposing interests (Marx & Engels, [1848] 1997, p. 64). The result of this conflict is, according to Marx, the uprising of the proletariat class and the destroying of the capitalist system (Marx & Engels, [1848] 1997, p. 70). Another theoretical tradition from which SMT draws from is social constructionism. This theory sees social problems (the impetus for movements) as products of a process of collective definition (Blumer, 1971, p. 298). Social problems are thus considered as part of a *particular* group's social construction of reality (Bash, 1995, p. 52). According to Bash (1995), the understandings developed by groups that are differently situated in the social structure can vary substantially from one another, thus setting the stage for conflict over the definition of social problems (p. 52).

The final ‘classical theory’ that contributes to social movement theory is strain theory, which comes from the functionalist perspective that sees social institutions (such as family, education, religion) as contributing to the ‘normal’ operating of society. When something unusual happens that affects these institutions, strain or frustration results (Hackler, 2004, p. 314). This theory speaks to Durkheim’s attention to social integration and the consequences of “insufficient assimilation” in modern societies (Buechler, 2004, p.48). Durkheim argued that large-scale social change ensuing from an advanced division of social labour causes individual and collective disorder or anomie (Tilly, 1978, p. 18).⁴ Picking up on Durkheim’s conception of anomie, Merton used the term to more specifically denote a situation in which people’s goals were beyond their means (and they would result to illegitimate means to achieve their goals) (Hackler, 2004, p. 294).

The classical models described here envision social movements as a collective reaction to some form of unsettling system strain (McAdam, 1982a, p. 139). Such strain creates tensions which, when severe enough, trigger social insurgency (McAdam, 1982a, p. 139). There are a variety of reasons proposed for this strain. Other theorizing about strain includes the idea of “rise and drop,” which sees movements as likely to occur when a long period of socio-economic development is followed by a sharp reversal (Geschwender, 1968, p. 98).⁵ Alternatively, the rising expectations hypothesis argues that the experiencing of a period of economic growth leads to the expectation of, and desire for, further improvements. When these come too slowly,

⁴ *Anomie* in the Durkheimian tradition describes an absence of clear societal norms and values. Individuals lack a sense of social regulation and thus feel unguided in the choices they have to make (Hackler, 2004, p. 294).

⁵ The idea is the creation of a rising expectation in a previous period of the ability to satisfy needs – which leads to a later mental state of anxiety and frustration when the realistic state of anxiety and frustration when the realistic state of affairs does not meet those expectations (Geschwender, 1968, p, 98).

rebellion (or social movement formation) results (Geschwender, 1968, p. 98). Moreover, relative deprivation sees the emergence of social movements because of a growing gap between their expected level of need satisfaction (derived from the perception of that level experienced by a reference group) and their actual level of need satisfaction (Geschwender, 1968, p. 99).

Modern Developments

We now turn to contemporary developments of SMT: Resource Mobilization Theory and New Social Movement Theory. Resource Mobilization Theory (RMT) proposes that the formation of social movements is dependent upon the availability of resources and opportunities for collective action (Tilly, 1978, p. 99). RMT argues that access to capital (social, cultural, monetary or otherwise) for movement purposes is variable (Maj, 2005, p. 4). New Social Movement Theory (NSM) considers movements to be ‘new’ in comparison to the ‘old’ working class movements brought to light by Marxist theory (Canel, 1997, p. 1). The concern in New Social Movements is with culture; movements are conceived of as struggles for control over the production of meaning and the constitution of new collective identities (movement identities) (Canel, 1997, p. 1). In short, the theoretical roots of SMT are exceptionally diverse. In order to make sense of the process by which the Vanier community has mobilized around street sex work, I employ an integrated approach that draws on concepts that emerge from a range of theoretical traditions within Social Movement Theory. These are articulated below.

Concepts

In this next section, I clarify the concepts from Social Movement Theory used to critically analyse the mobilization of the community group ‘Together for Vanier.’ This discussion will specifically focus on grievances, mobilization, political opportunities, resources, and framing.

Grievances

The first concept is that of *grievances*, which are the basis of social movements and help to legitimize mobilization. According to SMT, a grievance develops in response to a social conflict. Oberschall (1973) argues that social conflict is the result of social stratification in society, specifically that relating to authority, privileges and one's social position (p. 33).⁶ Parties struggle over values, claims to status, power, and resources; where the ultimate goal is not only to gain the desired end, but also to neutralize, injure, or eliminate rivals (Coser, 1967, p. 232). Activists then work individually and collectively to create a framework of understanding that renders particular aspects of the social system as problematic (Oberschall, 1973, p. 32). In this process of advancing a perspective that perceives specific political, economic, and/or social aspects as immoral, wrong-headed, or intolerable; social movement thinkers create a *grievance* (Oberschall, 1973, p. 32).⁷ Moore (1963) cautions that social conflict and thus ones grievances and frustrations are interpreted and experienced through different beliefs about morality, justice, and social order (p. 18-19). In other words, the meanings people attach to objects or events are not intrinsic but are filtered through interpretive processes (McAdam & Snow, 1997, p. 233).⁸ I have provided here a basic sketch of what is meant by *grievance* and conflict in the social movement literature, which serves as a beginning to the understanding of social *mobilization* to which I now turn to.

⁶ As illustrated earlier in this chapter, the stratification of these aspects creates strain in those less fortunate.

⁷ It is important to note that each version of Social Movement Theory considers movement activity a response (or pre-empt) to a grievance as such; however, what these grievances are, is not the same in each case nor is the manner in which the mobilization is carried out.

⁸ The importance of the term *framing* can be seen here, which will be further explored later in the chapter.

Mobilization

Mobilization readily flows from grievances because conflict and change are intrinsically linked; during periods of change, groups seek to reform and revolutionize existing institutions or to defend the status quo (Moore, 1966, p. xvii). The action or change social movements seek is typically achieved through *mobilization*, the process by which a group goes from being a passive collection of individuals to an active entity in public life (Tilly, 1978, p. 69).

Klandermans and Tarrow (1988) explain that *mobilization* can be broken down into a series of stages. First is the formation of “mobilization potentials”; people who could in principle become participants (thus mobilized) in the social movement. This includes those who identify with the means and/or goals of the emerging collective (Klandermans & Oegema, 1986, p. 342-343; Klandermans & Tarrow, 1988, p.11).⁹ For example, those who believe in harm reduction principles would be good candidates for a movement to bring safe injection sites to a particular area. Second, according to Klandermans & Tarrow (1988) is the formation of recruitment networks (the linkages within and between formal and informal organizations and relationships) (p. 11). This could be an affiliation with the municipal government of the city in which the movement is operating or to a well-connected individual. The next stage involves the motivating individuals to participate. This entails presenting the issue in such a way that possible participants will perceive the benefits of involvement to outweigh the costs (Klandermans & Tarrow, 1988, p. 10-11). For example, if there was evidence in the media of a particular movement’s protest being criminalized, a potential participant might deem the activity as too costly. Whereas if members gained some type of benefit such as self-esteem or material gains

⁹ In ‘identifying’ with the movement, the goal is for the potentials to interpret grievances in the same manner (Klandermans & Tarrow, 1988, p. 10).

from joining, they might include themselves in the mobilization attempt. And finally, Klandermans & Tarrow (1988) stress the removal of barriers to participation, such as a negative stereotype of the social movement that was maybe proliferated in the media, would increase the probability that people who are inclined will eventually take part (p. 10-12).

Tilly (1978) offers his own typology of mobilization and argues that it can take one of three forms. In *defensive mobilization*, a threat from the outside induces the members of a group to pool their resources together to fight off the enemy (p. 73). For example, 9/11 served to bring North America and European nations together to fight a ‘common threat.’ However, with *offensive mobilization*, a group consolidates their assets in response to opportunities to realize its interests (p. 74). For example, emancipation (obtaining political rights and equality) opened the door for the women’s movement to flourish by giving women the right to participate in the political process. And finally, with *preparatory mobilization*, the group combines resources in anticipation of future opportunities and threats (p. 74). For instance, the environmental movement prepared for the future implications of climate change.

While typologies are conceptually useful, it is important to remain cognizant of the fact that the process of mobilization varies as populations are differently positioned socially, economically and politically. For example, those who are socially and economically disadvantaged or marginalized tend to begin defensively, while the rich and powerful begin offensively (Tilly, 1978, p. 75). This is linked to the fact that groups who are rich can mobilize a surplus without threatening their member’s amusements and obligations while the poor have more to lose in this context (Tilly, 1978, p. 75). For example, government agencies are in much better of a position to dedicate time and resources to organize around a cause while a small local group of people seeking to change the law on condominium expansion in their city have a far greater challenge.

Furthermore, dominant groups have access to more networks, can forestall claims from other groups before they become fully articulated, and are positioned to seize opportunities to make new assertions of their own (Tilly, 1978, p. 75). Minorities on the other hand, often find that the rich, the influential, and the state oppose and punish their collective organizing thereby rendering the mobilization process more costly for them (Tilly, 1978, p. 75).

Political Opportunity

Social Movement Theory also attends to *political opportunity*. No matter how motivated participants of a social movement may be their ability to realize their goals is undermined if the right opportunity for mobilization is not present. The Political Process Model within Social Movement Theory sees movements as developing in response to an ongoing process of interaction between movement groups and the larger socio-political environment in which they are located (McAdam, 1982, p. 175). The model stresses the *political*, because a social movement is perceived as a primarily *political* (rather than psychological)¹⁰ phenomenon (McAdam, 1982, p. 172).¹¹ McAdam et al. (1996) argue that *political opportunity*¹² is composed of three aspects: how inclusive or exclusive the leadership/government is towards opposition or

¹⁰ This is in contrast to the NSM perspective which views the individual cultural processes (such as framing, formation of collective identity, etc.) to be of paramount importance, or the RM theory which places the significance on the role of mobilization of resources. I am not stressing one paradigm over another, but merely integrating aspects from each to obtain a more comprehensive picture.

¹¹ Thus, the aspects defining institutionalized political processes are argued to be just as useful in accounting for social rebellion (McAdam, 1982, p. 173).

¹² Goodwin and Jasper (2003) point out that there are different ways for understanding opportunity. First, it can be conceived of as structural; large changes occur without much intervention by movements themselves (p. 258). It may also be seen as shorter term; during any conflict there will be moments when quick action can have a large effect (p. 258). And finally, opportunity may be understood to be permanent features of a country's political landscape which constrain the achievements of a social movement (for example, administrative structures, legal systems, or electoral rules) (p. 258)

challenge; the opportunities and constraints placed on a movement or group; and the internal changes within a movement or group, and how these developments impact the ability to mobilize, frame, and interact within its working environment (p. 10).

Building on this, Fireman and Gamson (1979) explored how opportunity comes about. They argue that one may *create* their own opportunities by establishing credibility and effectiveness in the eyes of the public and convincing potential participants that their proposed collective action is not only viable, but will produce the desired results (p. 30). Alternately, disarray in the target of collective action can also dramatically increase chances for successful group action. This could be either an external event such as war or an economic crisis which may render the target of action vulnerable; or internal conflict where the possibilities of effective counteraction are greatly reduced (Fireman and Gamson, 1979, p. 30). Finally, Fireman and Gamson (1979) note that opportunity may be increased by the actions of coalition partners and third-party supporters; when others plan actions or lend support to a social movement, new possibilities for collective action may become available through the aggregation of resources involved (Fireman and Gamson, 1979, p. 31).

Also important to the formation of *political opportunities* are the tactics of *repression* and *facilitation*. *Repression* is any action by another group which increases the potential cost (in terms of finances, time, staffing, etc.) of collective action (Tilly, 1978, p. 100). For example, a government can raise a group's mobilization costs by making communications difficult or inaccessible by freezing necessary resources (Tilly, 1978, p. 100). While *facilitation* is an action which lowers the group's cost of collective action (Tilly, 1978, p. 100). For example, pro-mobilization activities such as giving a group publicity or legalizing its membership (Tilly, 1978, p. 100). These activities can be carried out by outside agencies such as the government, the

media, or other organizations and have serious impacts on the success of a social movement (Tilly, 1978, p. 100). These are most important influencing institutions for the current investigation. Government repression is particularly important because governments specialize in the control of mobilization and collective action (Tilly, 1978, p. 101). The media are also important because of their structure and methods of operation (norms and practices) affect the opportunities and constraints under which movements operate (Kriesi, 2004, p. 86). Other organizations have similar impacts, but are also likely to have a stake in the issue; some even form a *counter-movement*, the mobilization of a movement in response to the social change advocated by an initial movement (Mottl, 1980, p. 408).

Resources

Resources are another important concept to SMT and are the tools available to the movement that facilitate collective action (Tilly, 1978, p. 157). A number of social movement thinkers have offered a typology of *resources*. Edwards and McCarthy (2004), drawing on the work of Snow (1979) and Cress and Snow (1996), offer an extensive categorization of resources. There are *moral resources*, such as legitimacy, solidarity support, sympathy and celebrity; which are all usually bestowed by another (p. 125). Then there are *cultural resources*, which are artefacts and educational products like conceptual tools and specialized knowledge (p. 125).¹³ Edwards and McCarthy (2004) also address *social-organizational resources*, breaking it down into three forms: infrastructures (i.e. public goods like postal service or sanitation); social networks; and organizations (p. 127). Next are *human resources* such as labour experience, skills, expertise and leadership (p. 127). And finally, is what Edwards and McCarthy (2004) refer

¹³ The tacit and strategic knowledge about how to accomplish certain tasks (Edwards & McCarthy, 2004, p. 126).

to as *material resources*; financial and physical capital such as monetary resources, property, office space, equipment or supplies (p. 128).

Not only are the resources themselves important in facilitating action, but so too is the manner in which they are attained. Edwards and McCarthy (2004) identify a number of resource access mechanisms. First is *aggregation*, where resources possessed by dispersed individuals get combined to form one larger resource to draw upon (p. 133). For example, social movements may compile and publicize lists of individuals and organizations that endorse their goals and actions (Edwards & McCarthy, 2004, p. 134). Second, is what they call *self-production*; where social movement organizations and movement leaders create or add value to resources (p. 134). For example, social movements create cultural products like collective action frames, tactical repertoires, literature, and organizational templates for enacting specific types of collective events or issue campaigns (Edwards & McCarthy, 2004, p. 134). Next, Edwards and McCarthy (2004) focus on *co-optation* and *appropriation*. *Co-optation* refers to borrowing of resources (with consent) from other social organizations that have already been aggregated, while *appropriation* refers to the covert exploitation of the previously aggregated resources of other groups (p. 134). Social movements often exploit relationships they have with existing forms of social organization that were not formed for explicit movement purposes (Edwards & McCarthy, 2004, p. 134). And finally, the authors identify *patronage*, or the bestowal of resources upon a social movement organization by an individual or organization that often specializes in benefaction (p. 135).

However, Edwards and McCarthy (2004) warn that the simple availability of resources is not sufficient; coordination and strategic effort is needed in order to transform available pools of individually-held resources into collective assets and thus utilize them for action (p. 116). It is

worth bearing in mind that, as is the case for the previous concepts discussed, resources also reflect the stratifications within society; middle-class groups are privileged in their access to resources and therefore social movements that resonate with the concerns of this population tends to flourish at the expense of the mobilization of the poor (Edwards & McCarthy, 2004, p. 117).¹⁴

Framing

Framing is concerned with how an issue is presented and perceived; a type of rhetorical device used to discursively persuade people to view the issue in a particular way. For example, the issue of substance abuse can be framed medically, through a criminal justice perspective or through the ideals of morality. This is particularly important in the current investigation which is seeking to understand how street sex work is constructed and conceived of as an ‘issue’ in the community group ‘Together for Vanier.’ *Framing* comes from the term *frame* borrowed from Goffman (1974) meaning a pattern of interpretation that allows individuals “to locate, perceive, identify, and label” happenings within their social environment. The capacity of a movement to transform the potential for mobilization into action depends on the movement’s ability to *frame* their issues in a way that resonates with potential participants (Snow et al., 1986, p. 211-212). *Frames* also function to organize experience and guide action by rendering events meaningful (Snow et al., 1986, p. 211-212). Efficiently framing aids in a social movement’s ability to generate support for collective action; casting doubt or critiquing the opposition at the same time also validating and legitimizing the goals or rationale of one’s own group (McAdam, McCarthy, & Zald, 1996, p. 5-6). For example, one political party will critique the other in a television

¹⁴ This is even the case despite efforts by agencies of the state, non-governmental organizations, and individuals to change prevailing patterns of resource stratification and redirect resources to channel assets into other social movements (Edwards & McCarthy, 2004, p. 117).

advertisement while also advocating for their own. A social movement may also use other agencies such as the government or media in their attempt to frame an issue in a particular way and present that frame to the public. By that same token, other agencies may also serve to influence the way a frame is formed or presented (McCarthy et al., 1996, p. 293).

Snow and Benford (1988) argue that there are three core tasks involved with *framing*. The first is a *diagnosis* of some event or aspect of social life as problematic and in need of alteration (i.e. a grievance) (p. 199). Second, is to propose a *solution* to the diagnosed problem that specifies what needs to be done (p. 199). And finally, a call to arms or *rationale* for engaging in ameliorative or corrective action (p. 199). Diagnosis and solution are geared toward achieving *consensus mobilization* (mobilizing a shared opinion), while the latter task concerns *action mobilization* (the motivational impetus for participation) (p. 199).

Another important factor to consider is how frames resonate with potential movement participants. Snow and Benford (1988) examine three core components that have a bearing on how people identify with frames: *empirical credibility* or the fit between framing and empirical events (p. 208). For example, does the research support the implementation of harm reduction strategies for the use of illicit substances? Next is *experiential commensurability*, whether the frame suggests solutions to troublesome situations that correspond with how they are subjectively experienced (Snow & Benford, 1988, p. 208).¹⁵ For instance, would spending time in jail represent a solution that we think would deter us from deviant activity? Finally, is *narrative fidelity*, which concerns how framings resonate with cultural narrations; for example aboriginal culture is integrative and supports re-integration as a strategy, suggesting it is

¹⁵ However, it is also very important to remain cognizant that an issue or situation could be viewed very differently by different people or groups.

therefore consistent with restorative justice practices, while western religions are more likely to support retributive justice initiatives (Snow & Benford, 1988, p. 210)? Cultural narrations are things such as the stories, myths, and folk tales that are part of one's cultural heritage and that thus function to inform events and experiences in the immediate present (Snow & Benford, 1988, p. 210). This section has summarized the key concepts of Social Movement Theory that will be drawn from when analysing the social movement 'Together for Vanier.' This theory is very useful as a framework/point of entry that delineates the process and mechanics of a group mobilization, but does not provide in depth analysis concerning the power relations at work. We will thus utilize concepts from a secondary theory; governmentality, which allows us to gain a more complex understanding of social movements by examining the contestations at work in the regulation of sex work.

PART 2: GOVERNMENTALITY

This section is not meant to be a comprehensive explanation of the theory of governmentality espoused by Michel Foucault, but rather I will briefly outline the thrust of his argument but instead primarily focus on the idea of *government at a distance*. The emergence of neoliberalism and decline of the welfare state brought with it less restraint on free-market policies, pro-corporatism, privatization, less state support of social services, the transfer of public services to private organizations, a reliance on 'expert knowledge'; and ultimately an emphasis on the idea of 'personal responsibility' (Rose, 1996, p. 328; Hannah-Moffat, 2000, p. 510; Bumiller, 2008, p. 7). Governmentality theorists explore what this transformation means; the decentred state brings our attention to circuits of rule and the conduct of conduct (Foucault, 1982, p. 789; Rose, 1996, p. 328).

Government at a Distance

Gullick (1936) describes *government* as “*exercised in a myriad of micro-locales, where authorities of all types exercise their powers over the conduct of others*” (p. xiv). *Government at a distance* then is the exercising of forms of power other than those directly of ‘the state’ that operate outside the political sphere and are removed from the process of governance by utilizing experts in distant sites to fulfil the will of the state (Rose, 1999, p. 49-50).

Furthermore, the concept of *translation* helps us understand the processes at work with *governing at a distance*. Fluid affiliations are formed between different parties where each has the self-serving interest of increasing their powers by ‘translating’ resources gained from the relationship in order to have them operate to their own benefit (Rose, 1999, p. 50). The potential for *governing at a distance* (or rule ‘at a distance’ as Rose refers to) is realized when one can transform the conduct of others so that it meets one’s own conditions in order that they self-govern according to those principles (Rose, 1999, p. 50). So it would seem that through the processes of translation, the governing authority is able to communicate and exercise its will without appearing to be directly involved, thus enabling ‘government at a distance.’

Responsibilization

Garland (1996) describes a technique of this new ‘government at a distance’ called ‘responsibilization.’ This technique acts on crime (sex work and other street crimes in this case) indirectly by inspiring citizen action through non-state agencies and organizations (p.452). Much like power is diffused under neo-liberalism, so too is the responsibility for crime prevention as the responsibility is transferred to those outside the state who can persuade citizens to act appropriately (Garland, 1996, p. 452). This will become clear in the next section when we look at the governance in the community context specifically.

Governing Through “The Community”

The community is becoming increasingly important in governance because some have argued that the “community” actually represents a new vehicle for the regulation of behaviour (Rose, 1996, p. 331).¹⁶ Rose (1996) explains that one’s community consist of networks of loyalty with which one identifies with, and “*government through community*” thus involves strategies for inventing and instrumentalizing these dimensions of commitment for the purposes of regulation, reform, or mobilization (p. 334). It would seem that one’s commitment to our “community” (whether it be our neighbourhood, church, or profession), has the capacity to dictate and regulate behaviour (in this case what is deemed ‘acceptable’ surrounding street sex work, what the solution should look like, and what steps we should take).

In this ‘government through community,’ Rose (1999) explains that there are ‘experts of community’ who serve to advise communities and individual citizens in terms of values and governance (p. 189). These authorities or ‘experts’ manage community projects from a distance through what Pavlich (1999) calls “devolution,” a decentralization of the community space while exerting its control over important structural decisions such as funding, protocols, evaluation and overseeing the entire process (p. 120).

Implications of Government through Community

The implications of such a conception of community, is that many government strategies operate on the assumption that a ‘community’ exists when such loyalties do not necessarily exist (Rose, 1996, p. 336). For example, Rose (1996) cites the example of urban renewal initiatives that aim to ‘empower’ citizens by defining those living in a particular neighbourhood as a

¹⁶ Rose (1996) sees the idea of “the social” of the previous welfare state giving way to “the community” as a new form of governing in the neoliberalist era (p. 331).

‘community’ and subsequently allocating ‘community groups’ who can “*claim to speak ‘in the name of community’*” (p. 336).

It is important to pay attention to the dangers associated with locating the governance of crime prevention strategies within the ‘community’ as spatially defined. Crawford (1995, 1996a) explains that community level government often creates ‘oligarchies,’ leading to undemocratic and unrepresentative networks (as cited in Pavlich, 1999, p. 124). As a result, those groups delineated as being ‘at-risk’ are frequently excluded (as cited in Pavlich, 1999, p. 124). Furthermore, Crawford (1996b) cautions that this process can lead to an ‘us versus’ them ethos where those groups deemed ‘at-risk’ come to be regarded as being ‘outside’ the community (as cited in Pavlich, 1999, p. 124).

And finally, there is a problem with utilizing a singular concept of community to conceptualize a varied and socially divided geographical area which as Pavlich (1999) warns, runs the danger of imposing the notion of ‘consensus’ of a constructed ‘common’ community grievance (p. 124). He further argues that the current power structure will dictate what ‘consensus’ is reached and will subsequently permit the predominate opinions to stifle those in minority positions coming from a lower social status (p. 124).

Resistance

A final concept we must consider in this discussion is the possibility of resistance in community governance. When we consider power and governance it is also important that we attend to *resistance*. Foucault (1982) argues that in order to understand power, we must look to where it is contested (p. 780). The contestations highlight that power is not something one possesses; it exists relationally (Foucault, 1982, p. 786). A ‘power relationship’ is based on two elements: an ‘other’ who is defined as an agent who acts; and the possibility of resistance

(Foucault, 1982, p. 789). Furthermore, power is contingent upon the assumption of freedom; there is no relationship of power without the means of escape or possible flight (Foucault, 1982, p. 790; 794). Thus every power relationship entails the potential of a “*strategy of struggle*” (p. 794). Most of the time, this power is conceived of as the political state which neglects individuals in favour of the interests of the common good of a class or group of citizens (Foucault, 1982, p. 782). These discussions sum up the ideas I will draw from when contemplating the findings presented in this paper in regards to the governmentality perspective. These considerations will add to the theoretical understandings of community group dynamics.

FINAL CONSIDERATION OF THE THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In this discussion of my theoretical framework I have provided an overview of the Social Movement Theory; examining its background in classical social theory, modern developments and conceptual aspects. I also highlighted the theory of governmentality, specifically governing at a distance and the implications this has in the community context. Together they provide the framework for a more nuanced understanding of the mobilization of the Ottawa community group “Together for Vanier” around street sex work. On the one hand, the SMT framework opens up a series of interrelated questions: how does the social movement create, view and interpret grievances about street sex work; how do grievances lead to mobilization, and how can we explain mobilization theoretically; what type of resources or opportunities does the social movement use in their mobilization activities; how does the social movement frame the issue and solution to street sex work; how do these frames resonate with the community at large; and finally, how do these observations provide us with an understanding of how the Vanier community group “Together for Vanier” perceives both the issue and the solution to street sex

work, and ultimately how they mobilize in response. On the other hand, the governmentality theoretical framework brings out attention to the role of power and regulation within communities in their perception of and response to the street sex work issue.

CHAPTER 3

DISCOURSES & STRATEGIES

Social Movement Theory and Governmentality are both useful as a theoretical framework but do not indicate what we need to attend to when examining community perceptions and organizing around the street sex work issue specifically. Therefore, in this chapter, I ground the current study in relation to the competing positions on street sex work, and more specifically to the various discourses and subsequent possible strategies. It is important to begin by defining what we mean by “discourse.” Discourses are languages, mindsets, or perceptions people employ when they speak of, think about or act on an issue (street sex work in this case) (Hall, 1996, p. 201). They influence the way people comprehend and make sense of the social world as they limit what can be experienced and the meaning (therefore what can be said and done) (Purvis & Hunt, 1993, p. 474; 485). This makes it possible to construct the topic in a *certain* way (Hall, 1996, p. 201). As this chapter contains more than one discourse, there are “alternative” discourses which represent another way of speaking about and perceiving the issue (Purvis & Hunt, 1993, p. 489). These different discourses and solutions (about street sex work here) are linked to a larger contestation over power and the results determine “truth,” thus what we recognize as knowledge (the meaning ascribed to the subject of street sex work (Hall, 1996, p. 201, 203).

Defined this way, it is easy to see how these discourses work with the concepts laid out in chapter 2 in Social Movement Theory. Predominantly, these discourses act as “resources” as they delineate the arguments from which movement participants can select and thus represent *conceptual resources* that have been *appropriated* from other groups and scholars who fashioned them as such. Furthermore, these discourses act as *frames* around the issue, specifying the *diagnosis* of what exactly is problematic with street sex work (thus it informs the ‘grievance’ as well), the associated *solution* (informing the strategy that would remedy the grievance as defined by that discourse) to the issue and the *rationale* as to why it is problematic and needs reform.

For the current study, it is necessary to consider the different discourses in light of the research focus: the formation of the community position around street sex work taken in the city of Ottawa. I begin with the moralizing discourse, move to the radical feminist discourse, turn to a consideration of the ‘sex worker’ discourse and then conclude with the social (dis)order discourse. It is important to note that these discourses represent ‘ideal types,’ rarely reflected as they are presented, and which often involve a blending of types or intersection in practice. I then finish with an examination of the strategies typically observed when considering the issue of sex work: abolition, prohibition, regulation, non-intervention and the (lesser acknowledged) collaboration. I propose that these strategies denote what type of practices should be utilized; thus, the community develops tactics with these strategic rationalities in mind.

THE DISCOURSES

The Moralizing Discourse

As indicated, the first of these discourses that I will examine is the moralizing view, frequently promoted by the religious right. It should be noted that radical feminist discourse is quite similar and also makes up the discursive landscape on street sex work from which

communities can draw; however this discourse will be explored in its own right later in this chapter.

I first highlight arguments promoted by this position and then offer a critique. This discourse takes issue with the immorality of sex work and argues that the normalizing of the buying and selling of sex has harmed traditional family values (Smith, 2006, p. 2; Weitzer, 2006, p. 34). From this perspective, sex workers are constructed as culpable by engaging in a practice that undermines the moral fabric of society (Shaver, 1994, p. 135; Weitzer, 2006, p. 34).

Subsequently, the moralizing discourse claims that sex work does not constitute a “victimless crime” (Smith, 2006, p. 2). From this perspective, the activity is inherently harmful because of the pervasiveness of violence to which it is linked and other social problems (such as drugs, mental illness, disease and other criminal activities) and how this affects (Weitzer, 2006, p. 34). Scholars such as Coulter (2007) argue that sex work is tied to substance abuse and mental illness (p. 9).¹ Thompson (2007a) goes further by suggesting that sex work is a kind of gateway crime for women’s entry into a range of other illicit activities (p. 16).² Also frequently cited in this discourse is the link between street sex work and the spread of sexually transmitted diseases such as HIV/AIDS (Concerned women for America, 2007, p.1).

Critiques of the moral discourse take issue with a number of these claims. In regards their issue with the immorality of sex work, critics have debated that this depends on one’s definition of morality; some see the activity as legitimate work (they are doing nothing wrong) (Brock, 1998, p. 13; House of Commons Canada, 2006, p. 31). Furthermore, sex workers argue that to

¹ Coulter (2007) suggests sex workers are “brainwashed” and those that are “survivors” of the industry suffer an array of mental conditions likened to those suffering from post traumatic stress disorder (p. 9-10).

² Thompson (2007a) also loosely proposes that prostitution can lead to the mass incarceration of women in general (p. 17).

suggest that sex without love or intimacy is immoral ignores the different definitions of morality (Bruckert et al., 2003, p. 4; House of Commons Canada, 2006, p. 31; Weitzer, 2006, p. 34).³

In response to claims that violence is inherent in the activity, Weitzer (2006) cites evidence that violence is not nearly as pervasive in prostitution as it is presented by proponents of the moralizing position (p. 34). Research indicates that not all customers are violent; a small percentage perpetuates violence against sex workers (Monto, 2004, p. 176-177; Jeffrey & MacDonald, 2006, p. 104; Weitzer, 2006, p. 34-35). Jeffrey & MacDonald (2006) found violence to be more of a by-product of poor working environments that stem from public attitudes that position sex workers as ‘disposable’ or as “non-people” (p. 85-88). Others speak of the way criminalization creates the conditions for these harms to materialize and flourish. Critics argue that the legal context is important and often ignored by the moralizing discourse (and radical feminism); many of the harms associated with sex work (such as the physical, emotional and verbal violence and abuse sex workers experience) can be attributed to its criminalized status (Weitzer, 2005, p. 214; Jeffrey & MacDonald, 2006, p. 175). Others point out that this serves to marginalize sex workers even more because it responsabilizes sex workers for their own victimization, makes sex work part of an illicit market, and ultimately alienates the sex worker from the protective service potential of the police (Satz, 1995, p. 416; Lowman, 2000, p. 1006-1007).

Other criticisms concern the argument that street sex work is intrinsically connected to issues such as a mental illness, disease or illicit substances. Some authors argue that these problems are just as prevalent in the wider society, but they may just be more visible among street sex workers (Jeffrey & MacDonald, 2006, p. 175, 192; Lewis & Shaver, 2006, p. 28-29). Jeffrey and

³ Arguably it also ignores the concept of casual sex between friends or strangers.

MacDonald (2006) also point out that the basis for these arguments is false (p. 177-178). For example, Jeffrey & MacDonald (2006) draw attention to the fact that rates of HIV/AIDS have either stabilized or are on the *decline* in many areas (p. 177). Furthermore, increases in STI's such as Chlamydia affect primarily youth, not the sex worker population discussed here (consenting adults) (Jeffrey & MacDonald, 2006, p. 178). Overall, these critics state that it is inappropriate to present the group of sex workers as problematic rather than faulting the wider social environment (Jeffrey & MacDonald, 2006, p. 179).

And finally, critics note a number of policy concerns implicit with the moralizing position. Shaver (1994) states that moralizing discourses have failed to adequately evaluate the nature of sex work and ultimately hinder our ability to develop appropriate policy (p. 123). One such barrier is the moral right's tendency to equate certain services for sex workers with condoning the activity. In other words, a benign measure such as providing social services to sex workers (food, counselling, etc.) would be unacceptable to those on the religious right (Lowman, 2000, p. 1008; Jeffrey & MacDonald, 2006, p. 224).

Provided an outline of moralizing discourses is important to the current study because this discourse is reflected in the arguments made by a number of key stakeholders in the community. I will now move on to do a similar outline of the other pivotal discourses in the street sex work debate.

Radical Feminism

The next discourse I will discuss is that of radical feminism. As noted, this position shares many similarities with the moralizing stance reviewed above and not surprisingly many of their key claims regarding street sex work overlap. However, unique to radical feminism is the

argument that considers street sex work in the context of gender and patriarchy; with sex work being the epitome of the domination of man over woman (Pateman, 1988, p. 50; Assister, 1989, p. 146; Dworkin, 1993, p. 4; MacKinnon, 1993, p. 24-25; Barry, 1995, p. 22; Scoular, 2004, p. 343). From this point of view, sex work represents a crime perpetuated by men against women that violates the woman's dignity and legitimates sexual access and sexual abuse (Romenesko & Miller, 1989, p. 110-111; Dworkin, 1993, p. 3-4; MacKinnon, 1993, p. 13, 24; Overs, 1994, p. 119). Some feminists also gone as far as to say all hetero-penetrative sex is rape; thus, even that between consenting adults (Brownmiller, 1975; Dworkin, 1993, p.3-4; MacKinnon, 1993, p. 13).

Radical feminists also argue that sex workers lack agency because the activity could not represent the 'choice' of a 'free' woman (MacKinnon, 1993, p. 21; Zurita, 2005, p. 1). They thus perceive the sex worker as a victim, as an exploited 'sex slave' in need of protection (Dworkin, 1993, p. 2; MacKinnon, 1993, p. 21; Overs, 1994, p. 119).⁴ Constructing the sex worker as a victim speaks to the association of sex work with slavery: the argument being that the activity involves the buying and selling of 'innocent' humans (Barry, 1995, p. 22-23). Similarly, proponents of the radical feminist discourse also see violence as omnipresent and inherent in street sex work; there is victimization 'within' sex work (Farley, 2004, p. 1094). And like the former moralizing discourse, radical feminists associate sex work with the spread of physical disease and mental disorder (Farley, 2004, p. 1097).

The critiques of this position tend to be very similar to those offered on the moralizing discourse: challenging the arguments that sex workers lack choice, the finding that violence is not as pervasive as presented, and that the discourse itself is providing barriers to effective

⁴ This all is compounded by the fact that it is an asymmetric service industry (women sell, men buy) (Shaver, 1994, p. 135).

policy. Therefore, these will not be presented again but it is important to note that not all sex workers see themselves as victims and many view themselves as workers with ‘agency’ (Bruckert et al., 2003, p. 4). There are however a number of criticisms uniquely made against the radical feminist discourse. Weitzer (2005) takes issue with what he sees as an essentialist perspective because of its sweeping claims applied across all historical time periods, all societies, and all types of sex work that denote what characteristics sex workers must possess (p. 211-212). Others disagree with the assertion that sex workers are victims who are reinforcing men’s right to sex. For example, Shaver (1994) argues that sex workers are the one group of women who disavow the male sex right by insisting on payment (p. 142), and Jeffrey and MacDonald (2006) see them as empowered with the potential to resist the boundaries of sex and gender (p. 11).

Sex Worker Discourse

The next position to be discussed is that of sex workers and their allies (who utilize their perspective as a point of departure). I will examine the key arguments proposed by this viewpoint as well as some of the criticisms of this position. This discourse emerged in response to sex workers mobilization in the late 1970’s, when sex workers in various countries began to organize, speak, and advocate for their *own* interests (Bruckert et al., 2003, p. 4; Bruckert & Parent, 2006, p. 95). Prostitutes’ rights organizations formed such as COYOTE (Call off your old tired ethics), ICPR (the International Committee for Prostitute’s Rights), SPOC (Sex Professionals of Canada), Maggie’s Toronto, Stella, Prostitutes of Ottawa/Gatineau Work Educate and Resist (POWER), and many others. The basis of these groups is the predominant assertion advocated by sex workers; that their activity should be considered legitimate work (Bruckert et al., 2003, p. 4).

The labour argument conceptualizes sex workers as women's work and discusses the experiences of other women in the workforce to demonstrate that sex work shares many of the same characteristics (Brock, 1998, p. 13; Nussbaum, 1998, p. 178-179). Sex workers claim that the relationship between a sex worker and a client is one of labour; the sex worker is engaging in a job and like other workers they develop strategies to deal with the challenges (Bruckert & Parent, 2006, p. 97-98). However, unlike the rest of the workforce, sex workers are denied the income, security and access to legal protections and remedies generally provided with employment (Brock, 1998, p. 23). Therefore, sex worker advocacy groups argue that the same human rights and civil liberties should be afforded to them including control over working conditions and access to social benefits (Brock, 1998, p. 22-23; O'Neill, 2001, p. 37).

Responding to other claims about sex work, sex workers do not see themselves as victims, but rather workers with 'agency' (Bruckert et al., 2003, p. 4). That women might consider sex work as an occupation should come as no surprise according to sex workers. Given the low pay, limited range of jobs open to women, and the prevalence of sexualized images of women as a commodity in current society, sex work may appear to be the most appealing option to make a financial living (Brock, 1998, p. 15). Others see sex workers as having the empowering potential for challenging and broadening the limitations of sex and gender (Jeffrey & MacDonald, 2006, p. 11). What sex workers perceive as the real 'problem' in sex work is the stigma accorded to them by moralistic stereotypes that reinforce criminal justice system responses. The criminal justice system in turn, penalizes sex work and *that* is what makes their profession dangerous (Bruckert et al., 2003, p. 4; House of Commons Canada, 2006, p. 31).

Since the previous discourses (moralizing and radical feminism) are essentially in opposition to the sex worker position, their arguments are to be considered critiques and will not

be revisited. However, some scholars such as Farley (2004) take issue with the notion that sex work is labour because she argues this tends to render its inherent harm invisible (p. 1089; 1095). To her, sex work does not contain the conditions that make consent achievable: physical safety, equal power with customers and real alternatives (Farley, 2003, p. 249). Farley (2004) further suggests it is not possible to protect the health and safety of someone whose ‘job’ means they may get raped (p. 1096).⁵ Furthermore, not all sex workers accept the labour argument of the sex worker discourse, some conceive of their entrance into the activity as “unwilling” the result of survival and need, not choice (Dalla, 2000, p. 345; Jeffrey & MacDonald, 2006, p. 47). It is therefore important to keep in mind that these discourses are ‘ideal types;’ in practice there is some degree of variation. Now that I have discussed the primary discourses surrounding the street sex work debate; I move to a consideration of the social (dis)order position.

Social (dis)order Discourse

This discourse is normally the one the media and public discourse attribute to the community. This is an ‘ideal type;’ not necessarily reflected in whole in practice. Rather, as evidenced by competing conversations within the community, there is much diversity in this position, according to personal interests and political ideology (Brock, 1998, p. 92; Gibbs Van Brunschot, 2003, p. 223).⁶ Notwithstanding, discourses that consider sex work a public ‘nuisance’ or as ‘social disorder’ (O’Neill et al., 2008, p. 78) will be presented in their own right while remaining attentive to its community association. Jeffrey (2004) argues that in recent years

⁵ Farley (2004) goes as far as to compare sex work activist groups to the unionizing of battered women (p. 1089).

⁶ Gibbs Van Brunschot (2003) notes that there is a myth that “there is now, or ever has been, a ‘community’ in the sense of like-minded individuals, living in urban areas, who share a common heritage, have similar values and norms, and share a common perception of social order” (p. 223). He explains that if there were a community even in the most abstract sense of the word, it is unlikely that Canadian legislation could embrace a position that simultaneously includes such diverse positions (Gibbs Van Brunschot, 2003, p. 223).

resident associations, the police, and politicians have increasingly constructed sex work as a public nuisance (p. 84).

The emergence of a collective community voice and political presence regarding sex work is quite recent; having formed in the 1970's spurred by the housing and renewal trend (Brock, 1998, p. 47; 101). Those in communities affected by street sex work typically problematize and rally around the visible problems associated with street sex work, citing evidence such as condoms and needles, increases in traffic, screaming and fighting, abusive behaviour and harassment by potential customers (Brannigan & Fleishman, 1989, p. 134; House of Commons Canada, 2006, p. 32-33).⁷

Proponents of the social (dis)order discourse argue that street sex work impairs the quality of life in the neighbourhood and obligates community members to alter their behaviour (for example, women will walk with their heads down and only in daylight to avoid being harassed by potential customers) (Brannigan & Fleishman, 1989, p. 134; House of Commons Canada, 2006, p. 32-33). Moreover, the social (dis)order discourse also conceptualizes sex work as linked to other criminal offences such as organized crime and the use of illicit substances (House of Commons Canada, 2006, p. 15, 25, 33). In short, the community seems unwilling to accept visible street sex work as part of the social landscape of the neighbourhood (Brannigan & Fleishman, 1989, p. 134).

In summation, this section has provided a description of the predominant discourses surrounding the issue of street sex work: the moralizing discourse, radical feminism, the sex worker discourse and that of social (dis)order. These discourses serve as knowledge and because

⁷ This is compounded by the fact that street sex work can take place at any time of day or night (Brannigan & Fleishman, 1989, p. 134).

knowledge is power, there is a certain power over those who are “known” (i.e. the sex workers) as they are subjected to it (Foucault, 1980, p. 201). Discourses thus ‘stereotype’ in this manner as the characteristics ascribed to the subject become the signs or evidence by which the subject is known (Hall, 1996, p. 215). For example, when we hear of “fighting in the streets,” “used condoms polluting the streets” or “strung out girls walking the streets” the general assumption is that this must be indicative of street sex work activity. The discourse produces knowledge that shapes perceptions and practices (Hall, 1996, p. 225). As we will see in the analysis, these discourses are drawn upon by community members. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, these discourses inform the type of mobilization effort that occurs. I now turn to address the strategies on which the community can base the development of their tactics.

CONTESTED STRATEGIES (THE OPTIONS)

In this section, I explore the criminal and social justice policy approaches to sex work. As discussed earlier when we spoke of Governmentality, Foucault described that under neoliberalism the state becomes decentred and power is diffused. When we look at the regulation of the street sex work, there is a pluralistic nature to the strategies of governance; there is a diffusion of the legal system where governance is dispersed over different branches of our legal system and it is not always obvious that the state is doing the governing. Each of the positions (abolition, prohibition, regulation, non-intervention and collaboration) can be conceived of as the objectives, while they are affiliated with operational strategies that will support these goals. For example a “license plate and letter strategy” targeting clients is used to meet the larger objective of prohibition. It is important to note that each draws on a form of law (criminal, administrative, labour or contract) in its conception of regulation. These approaches are *not* in conflict however,

but represent competing strategies to govern the practice of street sex work. We must consider the different strategies communities invoke to combat or respond to street sex work in their neighbourhood; because they inform what type of actions the group support.

Abolition

The first practice to be discussed is abolition of sex work through total or targeted criminalization of sex workers and their clients. This is typically the position of moralizing discourses and radical feminism. While both want to see the sex work industry abolished because of its harm, there is a distinction. Moralizing discourses argue that sex work is harmful because it undermines the moral fabric of society, and therefore sex workers are constructed as culpable; whereas radical feminism argues that sex work harms women and thus positions them as victims (Outshoorn, 2004, p. 8; Shaver, 2005, table 1; PEN, 2008). Not surprisingly, while both advocate abolition, radical feminists can be considered neo-abolitionists who endorse strategies that will not criminalize the sex workers (and thereby increase their victimization), but instead solely criminalize the clients (targeted criminalization) (Outshoorn, 2004, p. 8). In contrast, the moralizing discourse argues for the criminalization of all activities and *all* parties (total criminalization) (Outshoorn, 2004, p. 7; Shaver, 2005, table 1).

It is easy to see why this approach is favoured by feminists since it involves protecting the victimized sex worker and punishing the male exploiter (Shaver, 2005, table 1). The goal is to end the institution of sex work by ‘rescuing’ women from the activity and reintegrating them back into “lawful” society (Shaver, 2005, table 1; PEN, 2008). Abolition is demonstrated by such feminist organizations such as WHISPER (Women Hurt in Systems of Prostitution Engaged in Revolt) who oppose the legitimation of sex work, advocating against all forms of the sex

industry such as pornography, strip clubs, etc. (PEN, 2008). Currently abolition is endorsed by the United Nations as well as the United States government at the federal level, while neo-abolition is demonstrated in Sweden (Davis & Shaffer, 1994, ch. 3; Hughes, 2004, p.2). The ‘Swedish Model’ for example, advocates for the use of criminal sanctions when it comes to the clients, managers, and owners/operators but not sex workers because sex work represents a form of men’s violence against women (Shrage, 1996, p. 242; Shaver, 2005, table 1).

Prohibition

Another solution traditionally envisioned is that of prohibition through partial-criminalization. Proponents of this perspective recognize that sex work is unlikely to disappear so there is a need to regulate in order to minimize the harms. This solution utilizes criminal law by making aspects of sex work illegal through rendering all parties subject to penalties, including the sex worker (Outshoorn, 2004, p. 8). Criminalizing solutions involve the police or other criminal justice agencies, and include such initiatives such as community policing, sweeps⁸ or prostitution offender programs (John schools)⁹ (Gibbs Van Brunschot, 2001, p. 223).

For example, in Canada (a prohibitionist country) we have a legal framework that makes sex work impossible even though the exchange of sexual services for financial or other compensation it is not against the law; nor is being a sex worker a criminal status. To illustrate this further, in the Canadian Criminal Code (CCC) includes sections 210 which makes it illegal

⁸ The sweep, according to Chapman et al. (2001), is the use of officers who pose as prostitutes or johns in order to catch the customers or sex workers in the act of procuring, soliciting, or purchasing sexual services.

⁹ In Ottawa, the “John School” was set up in 1996 as an alternative to criminal charges for men who pick up prostitutes. The goal was to reduce the number of women on the street by diminishing the number of men who pick them up (Fortier, September 2, 2004, p. 1). What John School entails is a series of presentations about the legal, health and moral repercussions to the men’s actions from former sex workers, health professionals, and sometimes a member from the community association will hand out a bag of the needles and condoms found in the neighbourhood (Fortier, September 2, 2004, p. 1).

to be a.) an inmate or b.) the owner of a bawdy house; section 212 which prohibits the procuring and living off the avails of prostitution; and section 213 which criminalizes communicating for the purposes of prostitution. The implication of these laws are that it makes it illegal to work indoors (210), work in the protection of others (212), and to advertise or communicate (213) (Duchesne, 1997, p. 2-3; STAR, 2006, p.16). All of these things are criminalized, but what we focus on is the public nuisance of “sex work”; so that in effect, 98% of criminal code charges come from section 213 (Bruckert & Parent, forthcoming).

The prohibitionist strategy has been heavily critiqued. Research has shown the limited success of such an approach. For example, the Communicating Law (Bill C-49) which criminalized all public communication for the purposes of prostitution has been examined and considered a failure by many researchers (Fleischman, 1989, p. 118; Lowman, 1991, p. 324; Larsen, 1996, p. 42). Criminalizing efforts may just result in the activity getting displaced from one location to another and alienates the sex worker from the protective services of the police (Lowman, 2000, p. 1006-1007).

Regulation

Another strategy is that of regulation through the legalization of sex work. This involves state intervention through the use of administrative law to regulate sex workers and their activities (Outshoorn, 2004, p. 8; PEN, 2008). Proponents of this solution may see sex work as an inevitable activity between consenting adults (Shaver, 2005, table 1). Practices may include the licensing of prostitutes, compulsory medical examinations, zoning (confinement to certain areas) and the registration of bawdy houses through the criminal justice system (Shaver, 1985, p. 487; Outshoorn, 2004, p. 8). Currently, regulation is practiced in Nevada, U.S.A; the Netherlands; and some states in Germany and Australia (Shaver, 2005, table 1).

Based on the previous discussion on discourses, it is those adopting the moralizing discourses and radical feminism that would be opposed to such an initiative. For radical feminists, the fear is that by legalizing prostitution, another female job ‘ghetto’ would be created where women are coerced into stereotypical and inferior roles, and low-paying, low-status work (Shrage, 1996, p. 245). Regulation is also problematic for sex workers themselves. Legalization as practised rarely provides ideal working environments for prostitutes and often involves the intervention of the police in the approval of the licences, a factor which leads sex workers to think of themselves as criminals (Shaver, 1985, p. 497; van der Meulen, 2005, p. 11).¹⁰ Van der Meulen (2005) brings our attention to a common critical analogy made about regulation: “the state becomes the prostitute’s pimp” (p. 11).

Non-intervention

The next strategy to be examined is that of non-intervention or ‘normalization’ through decriminalization. This involves the repeal of all existing criminal laws on sex work (Van der Meulen, 2005, p. 11). Proponents of this system argue that individuals and activities can be regulated without using criminal law (Shaver, 1985, p. 498). Instead, the activity is regulated with a respect for labour rights and responsibilities by using: provincial labour standards legislation, occupational, health, and safety codes, zoning regulations, better business bureaus, landlord and tenant acts, unionization, professional associations, and human rights codes

¹⁰ Shaver (1985) also argues that the compulsory medical check-ups involved in legalization are inappropriate, because as she sees it, street sex workers already take the necessary precautions to protect themselves and the spread of disease in the practice is not as prevalent as one would be lead to believe (p. 497).

(Shaver, 2005, table 1).¹¹ Currently, non-intervention through decriminalization is seen in New South Wales, Australia and New Zealand (Shaver, 2005, table 1).

This strategy recognizes that criminalizing methods are harmful to sex workers and that sex work is not going to disappear (Chapman et al., 2001). Not surprisingly, this is the solution favoured by most sex workers and their allies as it holds the best potential to further workers' rights and secure their protection (Shrage, 1996, p. 241; Van der Meulen, 2005, p. 11). However, feminists are more hesitant about non-intervention through decriminalization because of their overall anxiety about sex work in general.

Collaboration

A final alternative strategy is worthy of mention. Working outside the parameters of any one of the above options, some communities in Canada have adopted a collaborative approach. For example, in the Strathcona community in Vancouver, Larsen (1996) notes that residents and street sex workers adopted a social work approach by negotiating compromise agreements stipulating where the sex workers could operate (p. 44). Though this tactic did not reduce the number of sex workers in the area, it did serve to minimize conflict (Larsen, 1996, p. 44). This was also demonstrated by Pitcher et al. (2006), who found that through the United Kingdom's ideas of community conferencing (bringing together all stakeholders who can make a difference to problems identified by communities, including sex workers), fewer community complaints are apparent (p. 29). This type of a solution appears to hold considerable promise to further the best interests of all parties in communities affected by street prostitution. However, since it operates

¹¹ However, their aim does include penalizing those abusing sex workers under the appropriate sections of the criminal code (e.g. kidnapping, physical assault, sexual assault, extortion, theft) and increasing the chances of women and men leaving the profession should they wish (Shaver, 1985, p. 498).

under the premise that street sex work is acceptable (sex workers are a legitimate group to collaborate with), it would not be accepted by those with strong moral or radical feminist beliefs.

I have now outlined the key strategies envisioned in regards to street sex work, as well as a less documented an alternative approach: abolition, prohibition, regulation, non-intervention and collaboration. The diversity of solutions allows us to see the frames of reference the community can draw from when seeking to respond to street sex work; these strategies inform tactics for mobilization.

REFLECTIONS ON DISCOURSES AND STRATEGIES

In this review I have examined two central focuses of the current study: the underlying discourses and the associated strategic solutions the community can choose to implement surrounding street sex work. These discourses and strategies aid in the explanatory value of the already delineated theoretical framework in that they inform what should be attended to specifically when we speak of street sex work in general. While Social Movement Theory, helps us see that the discourses and strategies are more than just suggested arguments and solutions; they have value in terms of the social movement process (i.e. forming a grievance, mobilizing a response). The evaluation has alluded to what is absent in the literature, an exploration of how the range of positions and related solutions in regards to street sex work figure into the formation and maintenance of the community position of the community group ‘Together for Vanier.’ In the next chapter I will describe in detail the methodology that resulted from such a framework of understanding.

CHAPTER 4

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In this next chapter, the study's methodological approach is explored. This project utilizes a qualitative research design to investigate the mobilization of the community group 'Together for Vanier' around street sex work. In this chapter the advantages of this approach are discussed. Subsequently, the subject of the research study is defined. The methods employed will then be explored, illustrating both why each represents a good choice and then explaining what each has entailed for this project. This includes documentary evidence, participant observation, interviews and data analysis procedures. The chapter concludes with a consideration of ethical concerns and a description of limitations to this research.

METHODOLOGICAL REFLECTIONS

As noted in the introduction, this study is concerned with social mobilization of one community group in Vanier, Ontario around street sex work. Qualitative methodology provides a useful framework to investigate this subject. Unlike quantitative research which is concerned with looking at patterns and predictability (while searching for causal connections and explanations), qualitative methodology is concerned with rendering visible the thickness of social meanings (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2006, p. 11; Berg, 2007, p.3). This approach allows us to

focus on humans' understandings and perceptions of others, as well as exploring how people structure and give significance to their lives (Berg, 2007, p. 8-9).

The qualitative approach draws on the symbolic interactionist perspective that is rooted in the work of Herbert Blumer (1969) who argued that human beings account for meaning in the following ways: it may be conferred on elements such as objects, people, situations or events by and through human interaction; meanings are thus social products (p. 5). Therefore, to comprehend behaviour, one must first understand the definitions, meanings and processes by which they have been created (Berg, 2007, p. 13).

THE CASE STUDY

Yin (2003; p. 1) states that in general, the case study is the best strategy when one wants to investigate “how” or “why” questions such as the ones that correspond to the research aims posed here. This type of research is useful for the current project because it concentrates on what is observed of the phenomena and pays close attention to the influence of the social, political, and other contexts (Stake, 2005, p. 454). This is particularly important in light of the theoretical framework of Social Movement Theory in that it denotes a concern with the consequences of these situations (McCarthy & Zald, 1987, p. 149).

There are a number of other benefits to utilizing a case study method. It can provide extremely rich, detailed, and in-depth information. It captures the nuances, patterns, and hidden aspects that other research methods may overlook (Berg, 2007, p. 283-284). In this particular case it was invaluable for the understanding of the “sense making” processes (Berg, 2007, p. 285). These are created and used by the individuals involved in the phenomenon, event, group, or organization under study; how people, groups, and organizations make sense of stimuli with

which they are confronted, how they frame what they see and hear, how they perceive and interpret this information, and how they go about solving problems and interacting with others (Berg, 2007, p. 285). This corresponds with one of the principal objectives of the current study; to understand the perceptions members of the community engage in when responding to street sex work. Furthermore, as Berg (2007) highlights, case studies have recently been particularly useful in the study of communities and the phenomena occurring within them such as conflicting groups and interests (p. 297).

Vanier and specifically the community group “Together for Vanier: Drugs and Prostitution Committee” was selected to serve as the subject of the case study. This community was employed as the case for a number of reasons. First, the ‘problem’ of street sex work in the community was evident. At the time of the groups formation and mobilizing various news and police reports documented the issue and the area had been the target of multiple police sweeps and the new street crime unit (Ottawa Police Services, September 7, 2007; November 19, 2007; March 2, 2009). Second, the community was in the process of consolidating its position through the organizing of ‘Together for Vanier.’ The development was therefore accessible within documents, but also in the recent memory of participants. Finally, it provided a particularly interesting case as the group was working collaboratively with other interest groups such as the Ottawa Police Services, the Vanier Community Service Centre, the Elizabeth Fry Society, the Vanier Resident Association, Ottawa Public Health, Wabano, Minwaashin Lodge and many others (Together for Vanier, April 23, 2008).

METHODS

This study used three different methods: documentary analysis (to contextualize the research), observation (to gain a firsthand experience of the mobilization) and interviews (to obtain further details, multiple subjective perspectives and account for any pertinent information missed by the other methods). These methods were selected based on a close consideration of the theory in regards to what I needed to find to examine the theoretical concepts. As I note in my examination of Social Movement Theory in chapter two, the theory seeks to understand *why* social mobilization occurs, the form it takes and the potential consequences. To understand “why,” I needed to gain an appreciation not only the official voice as to why the initiative started, but also the subjective firsthand experiences of those a part of it or who witnessed it as to why it began. The official ‘voice’ is evident in documents such as press releases and minutes but the subjective experiences are only able to be extracted through a method such as interviews.

Second, to understand the form the mobilization took, I needed evidence that would show the process of Together for Vanier and any projects or actions they undertook. Documents such as minutes from meetings and news articles highlighting their efforts clearly illustrate the projects, actions, and directions that would enable an understanding of the form of mobilization. Third, to understand the consequences, I needed to find out not only what was considered a success, but what was considered a failure. Documents such as minutes and news articles as well as interviews helped comprehend defined successes; however, failures (which are often subjective to any individual party) were understood by conducting interviews with diverse individuals.

Specifically looking at the concepts of Social Movement Theory, to understand *grievances* held by the group, I needed the official and subjective individual voices. The official

‘voice’ is evident in documents such as press releases and minutes but the subjective experiences are only able to be extracted through a method such as interviews. For *mobilization*, the processes and actions need to be examined. Examining documents such as minutes, observing meetings and getting the first hand recollection from interviewees allowed me to account for this. To understand *political opportunity*, I needed to comprehend what opportunities were presented to the group or which the group seized. Documents such as meeting minutes would provide some evidence of this. However, this method would not give us the complete picture, so the details that would be missed were addressed through interviews.

Next, *resources* would be delineated in detailed descriptions outlining who was a part of the initiative, what was involved in their actions, what aided the initiative in their efforts, etc. For the most part, meeting minutes provided these descriptive accounts and subjective understandings gained from a method such as interviews would account for any deficiencies. In order to understand *framing*, I needed to assess the arguments and perceptions that shaped the larger community perception and how actions and solutions came across. This was accomplished by examining how they were presented in documents such as minutes and press releases, how they were spoken about at meetings and through interviews to assess how officials and others perceived of projects and the rhetoric they felt was presented. The triangulation of methods that resulted from a consideration of Social Movement Theory in respect to Together for Vanier ultimately served to increase validity as the strengths of one approach can compensate for the weaknesses of another (Patton, 2002, p. 306).

Documentary Evidence

For case studies, the most important use of documents is to corroborate and augment evidence from other methods.¹ They should be seen as a way of contextualizing other data, such as that gathered from interviews as they often permit going beyond the perspectives of subjects in the field (Flick, 2006, p. 252). They may also provide information about many things that cannot be observed; for example they can reveal goals or decisions that might be otherwise unknown to the researcher (Patton, 2002, p. 293). Additionally, they impart important insight into how the organization or group chooses to manage its public representation and what their organizational agendas and priorities are (Noaks & Wincup, 2004, p. 109). Documents may also serve as a stimulus for paths of inquiry that can then be pursued through direct observation and interviewing (Patton, 2002, p. 294).²

The documents reviewed for this project have either been produced by “Together for Vanier” or have documented their mobilization efforts (for example, in the local newspaper). Documents included the annual community survey, meeting minutes from the Together for Vanier steering committee, meeting minutes from the Together for Vanier: Drugs and Prostitution committee, news articles, presentations, etc. They were selected from the time period of January 23rd, 2007 to April 29th, 2009. This time span was selected because it signifies the beginning of the group’s formation and then finishes with a turning point as the group has reached a sort of benchmark in terms of their objectives (most of their projects have come to fruition at this point and they subsequently go on a bit of a hiatus). All of the minutes within this

¹ As Yin (2003) details, if the documentary evidence is contradictory rather than corroboratory, you need to pursue the problem by inquiring further into the topic (p. 87).

² Hence, the logic in the current study of conducting of document analysis prior to interviews.

span were chosen for analysis. Presentations, flyers and news articles from this period were selected based on their applicability to the topic, specifically whether they referenced the groups structural mobilization or street sex work in general; for example, a news article documenting the results of their survey and community reactions was included, while one that referenced a park clean up was not (see appendix A for a comprehensive list of the documents analysed). In the current study, document analysis was conducted prior to interviewing in order to gain an appreciation for the issues and context and help generate interview questions and categories for analysis.

Observation

The second source of data comes from observation. The use of this method is strategic for a number of reasons. One advantage is its directness; it enables analysts to study behaviour in real time, as it occurs in the natural setting (Frankfort-Nachmias & Nachmias, 2001, p. 190). The researcher does not have to ask people about their own behaviour and the actions of others; he or she can simply watch them act or speak which prevents “contamination” or distortion of the data (Frankfort-Nachmias & Nachmias, 2001, p. 190). This ‘firsthand experience’ permits the investigator to capture the reality of the context and reduce the extent they are influenced by prior conceptions or stereotypes that might reduce their objectivity (Patton, 2002, p. 262).

The useful aspects of participant observation notwithstanding, there are difficulties with this method and many of these stem from the very presence of the researcher in the field. Specifically, the *Hawthorne effect* suggests that when subjects know they are part of a research study, they will alter their usual (routine) behaviour (Berg, 2007, p. 186-187).³ Another potential

³ This was of limited concern in this project as the observation was at community meetings where the purpose is to get issues out in the open, to discuss them and to come up with solutions.

problem are gatekeepers; these are people or groups who are in positions to grant or deny access to a research setting and thus may restrict the research (Berg, 2007, p. 185). If the gatekeeper disapproves of the project or the researcher, or is somehow bypassed, he or she may become an impediment to the research (Berg, 2007, p. 185).⁴ It is therefore imperative that relations with the community organization were kept positive and that the rights of the participants were respected.

A final difficulty is that not everything can be directly observed or experienced (Patton, 2002, p. 23). I observed things such as what the participants were saying (the conversation), what kind of people were there, how they looked, the way they came across (their demeanour), etc. However, I did not get to see any internal conflict that was there, subjective perceptions and thoughts of participants, events, conflicts or issues that were brought up at previous meetings that were not referenced for example. This would happen for a number of reasons: subjects may want to hide it or there was no particular opening at that meeting for it to be mentioned/come about, etc. This is a limitation of the observational method as it did not capture some of these internal aspects. Nonetheless, to some degree the interviews would have rectified this as interviewees were free to speak their minds on their feelings and perceptions (this however is limited by the amount of participants and their truthfulness/willingness to talk as I will touch on when discussing this method).

I gained entry into the field by meeting with the chair of the meetings and having her approach the steering committee to ensure there would be no objections to my research. I attended one meeting and one community forum (a meeting to highlight the results from their

⁴ These gatekeepers can have a large impact on the research: preventing access to the setting, documents or other resources among other obstacles. Gaining access may require some sort of mediation with these individuals, but once a gatekeeper sees the research in a favourable light, he or she may be willing to advocate for the researcher (Berg, 2007, p. 185).

survey and consult the community). A member of Crime Prevention Ottawa (the director of Together for Vanier) chaired the meetings and each meeting was approximately 2 hours in length.

Rather than getting involved as a member of the group, I took the role of an observer (Frankfort-Nachmias & Nachmias, 2001, p. 260). This entailed informing the group about the research and making connections with its members who subsequently served as both key informants and respondents (Frankfort-Nachmias & Nachmias, 2001, p. 260). This observation entails the systematic recording of events, behaviours, and objects in the social setting (the committee meeting) (Berg, 2007, p. 192). Observation was important to this study as I wanted to gauge collective perceptions expressed at community meeting spaces. As such, observation was conducted at two community meetings at which an observational record was kept. These were essentially field notes: detailed and concrete descriptions of what has been observed (Marshall & Rossman, 1999, p. 107).⁵ In this case, accurate field notes of what is viewed at the community meetings were taken. Four different types of notes were recorded as generated to ensure the creation of full and detailed field notes (Berg, 2007, p. 197-199). First, cryptic jottings were taken while still in the field and include brief statements, sketches, short notes, and odd and unusual terms or phrases heard that might serve as a memory trigger later when writing full notes (Berg, 2007, p. 198). Second, detailed descriptions were written once leaving the community meetings and include as much detail as memory permitted (how people appeared, what they said, what they did, etc.) (Berg, 2007, p. 198). The third type of notes were analytic notes, which are the ideas that occur as the full field notes are written (linkages between people in the study,

⁵ Every effort is made to be rigorous but it is recognized that it is difficult to remain completely non-judgemental.

theories that might serve to explain something happening in the field, or simply a judgemental observation) (Berg, 2007, p. 198-199). And finally, subjective reflections were noted, these are personal observations and comments about the feelings I may have as a researcher to a particular observation (Berg, 2007, p. 199). These allowed for as much of a comprehensive account as possible.

I took about five pages (front and back) of hand written notes during each meeting. These were primarily cryptic jottings or short notes of things that happened during the meetings. What issues were talked about, what were the important points said about each, what did community members from the audience have to say about the issues and very brief jottings of elements such as demeanour of community members, etc. When I returned home from these meetings I elaborated on the notes I had already taken by writing a more detailed description of certain elements. For example, if I was too busy noting a community member's comment and did not describe important things about his or her appearance, demeanour or if they belonged to some type of group that was not detailed already, I noted it here. I then reviewed the notes keeping in mind the literature on the topic, theory I was working with and what I had already discovered going through the documents. I noted any linkages, discrepancies or anything unusual in these analytic notes. And finally, I made comments in my notes relating to my subjective reflections; if I felt something was going on but did not have any solid proof I noted it here. For example, if I thought it was a bit odd the police were involved, if I thought it was strange they stressed neighbourhood watch when from what I learned in my crime prevention course was that the traditional model of neighbourhood watch is ineffective; these type of comments. Cohesively, I used all of these notes together when conducting my analysis as I analysed the notes and organized them into the categories to be delineated in the analysis section.

Interviews

The last type of data employed comes from structured yet flexible interviews. Marshall and Rossman (1999) note that they are a useful way to get large amounts of data quickly as immediate follow-up and clarification are possible (p. 108-110). Moreover, the interview is an especially effective method of collecting information when investigators are interested in understanding the perceptions of participants or learning how participants come to attach certain meanings to phenomena or events (Taylor & Bogdan, 1998, p. 98). Bearing in mind the objectives of the current study, this was particularly useful. Furthermore, using a structured interview with a series of areas to explore allowed for flexibility in the dialogue but at the same time provided direction with specific questions and themes to cover (Berg, 2007, p. 95).

Notwithstanding, there are also limitations to interviewing as a data collection method. Interviews involve personal interaction and cooperation is therefore essential. Interviewees may be unwilling or may be uncomfortable sharing all that the interviewer hopes to explore. Moreover, at times, the interviewees may have good reason not to be truthful (Marshall & Rossman, 1999, p. 110). This may happen for several reasons: interviewees may hold extreme views that they may want to conceal, they may just want their organization or the initiative itself to look good, or they may assume I am looking for something particular and give me what they perceive to be the “right” answer. This affected my research in that some of what I have utilized as interview evidence may not be true and might invalidate my findings. It was therefore recognized that the interview represents an imperfect research instrument. This underlies the importance of triangulation; with multiple information sources I was able to verify responses and account for the deficiencies in any particular method.

Interviewer bias can also be a problem. This is inadvertent behaviour on the part of the researcher that influences the participants. Researchers may unintentionally communicate their expectations regarding the participants' behaviours in various ways, such as showing tension or relief or by nodding when certain responses are made which may influence the respondents' answers (Frankfort-Nachmias & Nachmias, 2001, p. 219). In the present investigation, I took care to avoid such cues as much as possible, however it is also very important for the interviewee to feel as though the researcher is a trustworthy person and one they can open up to. Therefore there was a very fine balance in avoiding interview bias yet building rapport with the interviewees. I was consistent with nodding and encouraging responses with cues but I did not limit this to any one type of response. My mood, demeanour or behaviour did not change when the interviewee said something I did not agree with nor when they said something I had hoped to find.

These interviews were face-to-face, individual, tape-recorded interviews with four people involved with *Together for Vanier*. I interviewed observers, community members, and community leaders who serve as key informants. It is important to note the distinction between observers and community members here; observers are those parties present at meetings but are not residents of the community, while community members represent those attending meetings that are residents. Together they provide different perspectives and thus a more balanced view of the parties involved in the mobilization process.

The objective of the interviews was to 'fill-in-the-blanks' in the data left by the documents and observation. I utilized open-ended questions to allow for participants to take the lead in identifying key issues and concerns. An interview schedule was developed that covers specific questions that were to be asked, which were constructed to reflect the key themes

generated from the literature and document analysis (see appendix B for the full interview guide). The guide was slightly altered to tailor the questions based on which type of person I am interviewing, for example, a community leader would know extensively of all the opportunities and resources involved, while an observer would be lacking in this knowledge.

Data Analysis

In order to analyse the data, I used ‘content analysis.’ According to Berg (2001) content analysis is the effective summarization for rendering the information methodically comparable (p. 238). The merits of qualitative research for the current project have already been explored, and likewise for analysis, a qualitative technique stressing the “latent content” or “deep structural meaning” of the data collected has best served to deduce the cultural understandings and processes this project sought to uncover (Berg, 2001, p. 242).

The analysis was a multi-stage process. I first organized the data temporally. At that point I was positioned to code the data. In order to do so a coding grid was developed. This was a dialectic process drawing on both the theoretical framework and themes that emerged from the data. The documents previously listed in this chapter as well as the observational notes were organized in terms of the following 14 categories (see appendix C for a full outline of this coding scheme). *Rationale for Mobilization* recognizes that the group is involved in collective action, but this category was concerned with any reference made to why they are mobilizing. Second, *claims makers* are an inherent part of any movement; this category however is broken down into those *individual claims makers* and *group claims makers*. Individual claims makers are those singular people who are referred to in the documents or meetings, while group claims makers are those representing particular organizations.

The fourth category, *perceptions of street sex workers*, is concerned with how street sex workers are viewed by the community group. Related to this are the *issues with street sex work*, which identifies how members of the community group perceive of street sex workers. The community group's "issue" with street sex work needs to be introduced in the meetings, documents and to the public in a specific manner. The category of *framing of the issue* looks at the frame in which the issue was presented by individuals and the community group; what discourses were invoked in this regard. The seventh category, *opportunities*, recognizes that mobilization cannot just happen; opportunities need to present themselves (or be seized) in order for collective action to occur. Next are *resources*, these are integral to the mobilization process and this category sought to identify those used by the community group.

It is assumed that because the community group is opposed to the practice of street sex work in the community, they would aspire to come up with *proposed solutions*. Subsequently, *action is taken or will be taken*. This category held what actions or solutions have been taken or will be taken in the future by the community group in response to street sex work. Just as the issue of street sex work is presented in a particular manner, so too are the actions or solutions that the community group wishes to implement in response to the issue; the *framing of the solution/action*.

Based on the number and diversity of claims makers (individual and organizational) involved in the community group, not all interests are reflected in the formation of actions or solutions; this representation was coded in the category *interests reflected*. The final category, *results*, was concerned with what type of actions the community group has designated as "successes" to combat street sex work in the documents or meetings. An open ended category

was also included to accommodate any noteworthy comments that did fit into the other categories.

Data was grouped into these categories in a single table. Common themes and patterns were identified and quotes or sections of the information were extracted to illustrate the perceptions and processes involved. Data from the interview transcripts were examined line by line with these categories in mind, and then compared to the data gathered from the documents and observational notes, with special attention paid to inconsistencies and additional themes that emerged. Further themes for analysis were noted and served as the critical reflections we will consider in chapter five. This approach allowed a more complete picture to emerge, and helped to illustrate the mobilization around street sex work in Vanier.

ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

As with any research involving human subjects, there were a number of ethical concerns with this project. Accordingly, a number of steps were taken. The research project was approved by the Research Ethics Board at the University of Ottawa (see appendix D for the University Research Ethics Board approval). Second, informed consent was obtained from the subjects. In the interviews, I presented a written agreement which was signed by both myself and the subject (and organization if applicable), thereby obtaining their informed consent (see appendix E for consent forms for community members). Ethical consent for the observation was obtained in the written consent by the committee director (see appendix F for consent forms for committee director) and orally, by articulating my intentions at the outset to all committee participants and presenting an information letter (see appendix G for the information letter). These documents advised participants of the objectives of the research, potential risks, anonymity, confidentiality,

data conservation, and voluntary participation. Given that Vanier has a large number of Francophones, these forms were also offered in French (see appendix H for a translated version of these documents).

Risks and benefits were weighed as well. Participants were assured that every effort was taken in order to minimize any possible risks and were given a basic description of what the research entailed before giving permission to participate. Though the subjects were not paid for the interviews, I had no problem locating participants. The benefit subjects would gain was that their views would be heard within academic discourse. Though the community might have been wary of my intentions, I wanted to move beyond the construction of an “evil angry community member” interpretation and develop a research protocol that would allow me to bring to light the complexity of the Vanier community.

Anonymity and confidentiality may have also been a concern to the subjects involved. In order to reduce risks to individuals, no names were used in the thesis.⁶ Instead, pseudonyms were used in place of real names or identifying characteristics. For example, ‘community member #1’ or ‘observer #2.’ I also aimed to reduce bias in the research as much as possible by being rigorous and careful in my data collection and analysis. Based on all of the above measures that I have taken with this research, I feel that this project has been ethically responsible.

LIMITATIONS

In investigating the community mobilization around street sex work in Vanier, the overall method was a case study. With this type of research there is always the concern that the findings

⁶ All notes and any other record containing the subject’s names were kept under locked electronic access in my computer and a hard copy was kept under lock and key with my supervisor (both will be destroyed after a period of five years following the completion of the study).

will cannot be generalized beyond the case, to other communities within Ottawa or in Canada (Yin, 2003, p. 10). This study however, is not claiming to be generalizable and it is recognized that the findings are exclusive to the *Together for Vanier* group in Vanier, Ottawa.

Second, there is somewhat limited information that one can garner from the type of documents analysed (minutes, presentations and news articles). The data was confined to what the recorder has deemed essential. One would have to be present at all of these meetings to truly get a full and accurate picture of what was happening. This is one reason why triangulation was beneficial: to ‘fill in these blanks’ with other forms of data collection and ensure consistency.

Third, there were both a small number of meetings used for participant observation as well as a small interview sample. Again, triangulation was used to combat this threat to some extent. Moreover, it is important to note once again that this study was not seeking to be generalizable so a small sample was not a major issue. Concerning the interviews, this study was limited in the fact that I am a unilingual Anglophone and the Vanier community is comprised of a large number of Francophones. It was recognized that there is a portion of the population that is therefore unreachable by this study.⁷ Finally, in general, interviews deal with retrospective data, relying on events that happened in the past. Thereby, the interviewee’s recollection may not be accurate or they may leave out elements inadvertently (Frankfort-Nachmias & Nachmias, 2000, p. 190). Triangulation utilizing other data collection methods was employed to remedy this obstacle.

⁷ Notwithstanding, the group *Together for Vanier* is primarily an Anglophone group and the consent and information letters have been offered in both official languages.

SUMMARY OF THE METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

In review, this study triangulated sources (documents, participant observation and interviews) in order to provide a comprehensive account of Together for Vanier. Furthermore, by conducting a content analysis of themes, a nuanced investigation of the phenomena will be presented in the following chapters. At this point having outlined the above methodology, I will turn to the analysis of the key themes and patterns that arose from the data.

CHAPTER 5

A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF A SOCIAL MOVEMENT

In this chapter, the mobilization process of ‘Together for Vanier’ is critically analysed using Social Movement Theory. First, the genesis of ‘Together for Vanier’ will be considered, concentrating on the conception of the movement and its mobilization of the community. The group’s grievances will next be explored, delineating the arguments utilized by members and the discourses they represent. Furthermore, I account for the group’s tactics for mobilizing around the sex work ‘problem’ in a similar manner, with attention to the strategies they constitute. Throughout this chapter I draw attention to the elements identified in social movement theory: political opportunity (the wider social environment and how this affects the chances the group has to mobilize), resources (the range of provisions the movement has to draw from to aid in collective action) and framing (how an issue is presented and perceived).

GENESIS OF A SOCIAL MOVEMENT

The Birth of ‘Together for Vanier’

In January of 2007, *Crime Prevention Ottawa (CPO)* planned a meeting in Vanier and invited individuals they identified as ‘key’ community players: members from City council, Crime Prevention Ottawa, the South East Ottawa Community Health Centre (SEOCHC), the Ottawa Police Services, Vanier Community Service Centre (VCSC), Centre Richelieu Vanier, Focus Vanier and the Angolan Community attended the meeting and were interested in being

involved in the formation of the initiative.¹ They presented on the declining state of affairs in Vanier, particularly housing characteristics and crime rates (Portrait of Vanier in Data – presentation, January 23rd, 2007). Thus the mobilization can be perceived of as *offensive mobilization* because the community is afforded the opportunity to realize its interests of neighbourhood improvement (the opportunity *Crime Prevention Ottawa* presented) (Tilly, 1978, p. 73). An endorsement from participants at the meeting resulted in *Crime Prevention Ottawa* taking the lead in creating a community safety group; as one community leader recounts, “*the opportunity was okay, so do you want to do this? And then people said ‘yes’ and then it was okay, moving forward ...*” (community leader #1). This genesis is different from what is typically presented in classical Social Movement Theory (SMT), in which people come together in organic fashion. In ‘Together for Vanier,’ *Crime Prevention Ottawa* (an organization created by the state) took the lead in the formation of the movement.² According to Social Movement Theory, *Crime Prevention Ottawa* has *facilitated* the mobilization of the community by *creating* the opportunity for the movement to form thus rendering the local government as ‘*inclusive*’ to these mobilization efforts (Tilly, 1978, p. 100; Fireman & Gamson, 1979, p. 30; McAdam et al., 1996, p. 10).

Not surprisingly, in light of state financial and political backing, the group is well resourced and is politically well-positioned. For example, *Crime Prevention Ottawa* provides the *material resources* in the form of the monetary funds for the movement, consequently *self-producing* these assets (Press Release, January 24th, 2007). They maintain favourable

¹ Note that the researcher does not know the process in which they were selected for inclusion.

² *Crime Prevention Ottawa* is not a community organization; they are federally funded and operate out of the city of Ottawa and are an integrated into the municipal government.

relationships with community organizations, governments and the local media; which contributes to the *social-organizational resources* of the group as well as forming a pool of *human resources* from which they can draw (Together for Vanier Working Group on Drugs and Prostitution minutes, October 30th 2007; Together for Vanier Meeting minutes, January 17th, 2008; TFVWGDG minutes, January 23rd, 2008; TFV minutes, February 26th, 2008; TFV minutes, March 26th, 2008). Moreover, *cultural resources* are developed here as through these amicable relationships they are able to access the specialized knowledge, tools and skills of these other groups (Vanier Safety Meeting Minutes, January 23rd, 2007; TFVWGDG minutes, November 28th, 2007; TFVWGDG minutes, April 29th, 2009). These resources can be considered to be attained through *co-optation* (the allowed borrowing of resources others have aggregated), *patronage* (the bestowal of resources by an individual or group) and *aggregation* (the combination of dispersed resources into one) (Edwards & McCarthy, 2004, p. 133-135). Cohesively, because *Crime Prevention Ottawa* is a state-supported organization working for a cause with which ‘most’ Vanier residents can identify (for example, arguably sex workers who are residents would have a different position and approach); the *moral resources* of legitimacy, solidarity support and sympathy are easily met (Edwards & McCarthy, 2004, p. 125).

Mobilizing the Community

While the political and fiscal resources are significant, successful mobilization is contingent on the ‘message’ resonating with community members. In other words the issues must be *framed* in a manner that allows individuals to “locate, perceive, identify and label” happenings within their world (Goffman, 1974, p. 21) and to accept the *rationale* for engaging in

ameliorative or reformative action (Snow and Benford, 1988, p. 199).³ Identified by the community during the first meeting of the community group is a “*need to build a sense of pride and belonging in community*” (VSM minutes, January 23rd, 2007); “*to change the perception of the ‘Vanier Area’ in the media*” (VSM minutes, January 23rd, 2007); “*address concerns of community*” (VSM minutes, January 23rd, 2007); and to “*build up positives in Vanier (inventory the assets)*” (VSM minutes, January 23rd, 2007).

Publically, the message that emerged from that first meeting was that the initiative was “*to respond to Vanier residents' desire to safeguard their community against crime*” (Press Release, January 24th, 2007); “*to engage members of the community in addressing and resolving some of the challenges unique to the area*” (PR, January 24th, 2007); and to “*prevent public disorder and crime*” (PR, January 24th, 2007). The discrepancy between the public message and that which was articulated in the meeting minutes is notable. Officially, the initiative seems to be addressing the crime prevention and safety concerns by combating crime, public disorder and “challenges” unique to the Vanier area. Arguably this gives the *framing* of the movement *empirical credibility*; public nuisance is a central issue as we will see in the next section (Snow & Benford, 1988, p. 208). It would appear however that the *rationale* that resonates with the key community players of the initiative is that of the public image of Vanier, both to outsiders and those within the community.

³ The other two important aspects to be discussed later on are a *diagnosis* of some event or aspect of social life as problematic and in need of alteration (i.e. a grievance); a proposed *solution* to the diagnosed problem that specifies what needs to be done (i.e. a strategy for mobilization) (Snow and Benford, 1988, p. 199).

GRIEVANCES

Having explored how and why this particular movement came into being, it is important to examine the nuances of the group's grievances. We now turn to a consideration of some of the competing arguments advocated by members of the group concerning street sex work specifically. As indicated in chapter two, a *grievance* is an aspect(s) of the social environment that social actors find problematic (Oberschall, 1973, p. 32).⁴ In order to both mobilize the community and identify the key issues they wish to address, the newly named 'Together for Vanier' conducted a survey "*to investigate ways to strengthen our community*" (Vanier Community Survey - Draft #8, March 20th, 2007). Not surprisingly, street sex work is one of the 'problems' on which *Together for Vanier* sought to focus. In the results of this survey the community's issue with street sex work became apparent, with 73% of the respondents to the community survey defining it as an "*area for improvement*" (CFFUSSV – presentation, June 19th, 2007). It was also seen by the most number of respondents (259) as being the highest priority for Vanier, followed by drugs and beautification (CFFUSSV – presentation, June 19th, 2007).⁵

As an aside, it is important to note that the authors of the survey suggested 'problems' for residents asking "*Are the following situations a problem in your neighbourhood?*" (Vanier

⁴ Oberschall (1973) sees social conflict arising from the system of social stratification in society, specifically that relating to authority, privileges, social position and relationships (p. 33). Parties struggle over values, claims to status, power, and resources; where the ultimate goal is not only to gain the desired end, but also to neutralize, injure, or eliminate rivals (Coser, 1967, p. 232). Activists then work individually and collectively to create a framework of understanding that renders particular aspects of the social system as problematic (Oberschall, 1973, p. 32). In this process of advancing a perspective that perceives specific political, economic, and/or social relations as immoral, wrong-headed, or intolerable; social movement thinkers create a grievance (Oberschall, 1973, p. 32).

⁵ Thus the initiative formed distinct working groups to address each of these concerns (VSC minutes, June 27th, 2007).

Community Survey - Draft #8, March 20th, 2007). One concerned observer thought, “*it didn’t give a lot of room to be able to fully express what you think. It’s like you’re being guided to say ‘well this is a problem’.... it’s not really fair*” (Observer #1). This draws into question if the movement truly addresses the needs of the community and in turn obtains a complete picture of neighbourhood concerns.⁶

Other issues identified by the community are those that are typically associated with street sex work: “*people hanging around on the streets,*” drugs, harassment, poverty, etc. (CFFUSSV presentation, June 19th, 2007). The second survey conducted almost two years later reaffirms these concerns (CFFU2SSV presentation, February 12th, 2009).⁷ It is within this problematization of street sex work that particular arguments become evident.

Key Arguments:

Conflict is a large part of a social movement. It leads to the formation of *grievances* which provokes *mobilization* in the first place. However, this conflict is rarely agreed upon and is subject to different interpretations based on one’s understanding of the social world (McAdam & Snow, 1997, p. 233). It is important that we pay attention to this potential for diverse opinions because far too often we speak about the community as if it is unified in position. Conflict is also inherent *within* social movements. This becomes clear in the next section as we turn to an

⁶ The survey states that community members' participation in the survey will “*help us identify the priorities that require attention or improvement to our Vanier Community*” (Vanier Community Survey - Draft #8, March 20th, 2007). It is interesting that here *Crime Prevention Ottawa* is presenting itself as not espousing an agenda, but rather leaving it up to the community to tell them what they think are the issues.

⁷ “*75% (of respondents) strongly agree/agree*” that sex work was a problem in their neighbourhood (CFFU2SSV presentation, February 12th, 2009). However, the focus of the issue shifts from when the first survey was done in 2007 to when the second one was done in late 2008. For example, one member noted, “*people are noticing panhandling and homelessness, not drugs and prostitution*” and that this was a “*positive development*” (Devoy, February 27th, 2009). And another member pointed out that looking at the results of the second survey “*prostitution was not as big a worry as it had been in the past*” (Devoy, February 27th, 2009).

exploration of these different views. In the conversation surrounding the issue of street sex work in Vanier, several competing arguments emerge.

It is important to consider these key arguments in light of the discourses outlined in chapter one: moralizing, radical feminism, sex worker and social (dis)order. These arguments can be seen as *frames* in that they organize one's experience and direct action by rendering events meaningful in a selective way (Snow et al., 1986, p. 211-212). Likewise, because these arguments are part of larger *discourses*, they aid in the particular construction of a topic, governing the manner in which it can be meaningfully articulated and examined (Hall, 1997, p. 44). I begin with arguments related to nuisance and quality of life, move to a description of the perceived criminal associations, then reflect on the victim position and conclude this section with a consideration of those arguments seen as attentive to sex workers needs.

Nuisance and Quality of Life

Nuisance Argument:

As we saw in chapter one, research indicates that perceiving street sex work as a *nuisance* is widespread (Brannigan & Fleishman, 1989, p. 134; House of Commons Canada, 2006, p. 32-33; O'Neill et al., 2008, p. 78). A community member affirms:

[In Vanier] There's a huge number of people who have had it, are angry, are frustrated, are phoning the police at all opportunity, who want this gone, they don't care at this point whether it moves to another area or they legalize prostitution, they set it up in industrial parts, they don't care. They want it gone. (Community member #1)

In addition, the first meeting of the drugs and prostitution working group suggested that “*residents don't want them in the neighbourhood*” (TVWGDP minutes, October 30th, 2007). Residents of one particular building complained that they are “*tired of having garbage in front of their building, residents are scared to go out at night because of the loitering and noise and*

people hanging around at night” (TVWGDP minutes, October 30th, 2007). At the same meeting it was noted that residents “*should show them [sex workers] less respect*” (TVWGDP minutes, October 30th, 2007). A few community members spoke of having been attacked personally, verbally, and physically by sex workers (TFVWGDP observational notes, April 29th, 2009; Community member #1; Observer #2).

Also related to the nuisance conception of street sex workers in Vanier is that street sex work is considered “transient” (Sex Workers and John’s⁸ presentation, November 28th, 2008). During meetings it was noted that “*sex trade workers move from one place to another*” and that landlords should be “*checking tenants*” (TVWGDP minutes, October 30th, 2007).⁹ However, as one observer points out:

tenants, people, we have the right to be housed. Like if there’s a problem well we need to deal with it, you cannot just displace the people.... It’s like saying ‘ok, you’re HIV positive, well we don’t want you in my building.’ Well, you know. That’s not the answer. (Observer #1)¹⁰

Moreover the fact that street sex workers are stereotyped as being transient; suggests that the residents of Vanier do not consider street sex workers to be part of the community, but rather temporary interlopers. These sentiments are reiterated in *social (dis)order discourse*, which suggests is a very big problem with street sex work; in this light, the public nuisance concerns are tantamount (Brannigan & Fleishman, 1989, p. 134; Jeffrey, 2004, p. 84; House of Commons Canada, 2006, p. 32-33; O’Neill et al., 2008, p. 78).

⁸ Note that ‘John’ is a problematic term. Although this term is employed in literature, I will utilize the term ‘client’ or customer. This is the language utilized by sex workers and their allies (Jeffrey & MacDonald, 2006).

⁹ The implication here is that sex workers are not wanted.

¹⁰ Displacement as a strategy will be discussed in its own right when the discussion turns to strategies.

Quality of Life Argument:

The nuisance argument is particularly concerned with the ‘quality of life’ in the neighbourhood. Proponents would argue that the ‘quality’ is directly tied to the presence of sex work in the community (House of Commons Canada, 2006, p. 32-33; Brannigan & Fleishman, 1989, p. 134). This is very much the case in Vanier, as a community leader describes:

the stuff in Vanier is very quality of life driven. Like it's like 'I don't want to be scared when I'm standing waiting at the bus stop. I don't want to be scared when I need to buy some milk at the corner store. I don't want my kid to find needles when he's playing in the swings' – it's quality of life that's driving it there (Community leader #1).

It is notable that this definition of ‘quality of life’ and ‘improvement’ operates in the interests of some residents but would clearly disadvantage street sex workers who may also be residents and therefore community members. As described in chapter one, this is very common within this type of residential organizing, that sex workers are subject to a denial of citizenship (Hubbard & Hall, 1998, p. 110; Sagar, 2005, p. 101, Jeffrey & MacDonald, 2006, p. 130). This significance afforded to ‘quality of life’ here is also reminiscent of the *social (dis)order* position outlined in chapter one. Community members are often concerned about having to alter their behaviour due to concerns about sex work and the perceived associated illicit activities within the neighbourhood (Brannigan & Fleishman, 1989, p. 134; House of Commons Canada, 2006, p. 32-33).

Criminal Association

Drug Use Argument:

Another argument which emerged frequently in the research data is the perceived association of street sex work with criminal elements and the risks and dangers this implies. One of these arguments ties street sex work to drugs (or illicit substances). One participant

maintained that *"if you get a Drug Treatment Centre, the John's and pimps will be around because the clients are vulnerable people"* (TVWGDP minutes, October 30th, 2007). Another added that *"Sex Trade Workers will go where the drugs are"* (TVWGDP minutes, October 30th, 2007). The police support this argument when they assert *"if you clean up the drugs, you'll solve some of the Sex Trade Workers problems"* (TVWGDP minutes, October 30th, 2007). Further, one observer remarked *"I heard from one of the meetings that you know, if you see a prostitute, chances are she's never more than 3 or 4 blocks from somewhere where she can score drugs"* (Observer #2).

Speaking to a reporter, a police sergeant stated, *"we (the police) found that the girls are more addicted, there are no clean girls. There are no girls who are not hooked"* (quoted in Devoy, September 27th, 2007). This same sergeant adds that, the police had *"never before seen this animal-like behaviour. They've gone mad with whatever is in the crack ... it's making them more erratic. You cannot even hook them up with services or converse with them"* (quoted in Devoy, September 27th, 2007).

The linking of street sex work with illicit substances is not new. Both the moralizing discourse espoused by the religious right and the *social (dis)order discourse* consider street sex work to be directly related to substance abuse (Brannigan & Fleishman, 1989, p. 134; House of Commons Canada, 2006, p. 33-34; Coulter, 2007, p. 9). That said the broad generalization that all workers are involved in drugs and cannot be connected with services may be speculative. It is fairly ambitious for the police to declare that every single sex worker in Vanier is addicted to drugs. Moreover that they adopt this view when interacting with these workers and when trying to connect them with services is even more questionable. What about the sex workers who are not addicted yet are still treated as though they've "gone mad"? The most appropriate services

might not be referred and this type of stereotyping could only serve to alienate sex workers further. Moreover, is it not those addicted that are actually most in need of services? Additionally, it would seem that the public jumps all too quickly to attach the drug-user label to sex workers; a manner of reinforcing their 'other' status in the community.

"The Victim"

Sex work as Victimization Argument:

The suggestion that the sex worker is a victim is another argument espoused by members of *Together for Vanier*. Consistent with *radical feminist discourse*, these community members suggest that sex workers are forced or coerced since sex work is not conceptualized as a choice any freethinking person would make (Pateman, 1988, p. 50; Assister, 1989, p. 146; Dworkin, 1993, p. 4; MacKinnon, 1993, p. 21, 24-25; Barry, 1995, p. 22; Scoular, 2004, p. 343). In a news article highlighting the efforts of *Together for Vanier*, a police sergeant "*spoke to dispel some of the myths around the women involved in the trade.*" The sergeant elaborated by saying, "*it's not a job. It's not a choice. Nobody wants to grow up to be a prostitute. The people that we are seeing are not making good choices*" (quoted in Devoy, September 27th, 2007). It is interesting that the group sees this as a "myth to dispel" about street sex work and speaks to the reliance on the police discourse. Much of the academic literature actually argues that though there are some sex workers who do not freely enter into the practice, for the most part the myth is that sex workers are operating outside of questions of choice when in fact they consider themselves legitimate workers (Bruckert et al., 2004, p. 4; 2007; Brock, 1998, p. 13; Nussbaum, 1998, p. 178-179). A community leader alludes to this alternative understanding but at the same time dismisses it when they note, "*I'm not saying that every woman who works as a prostitute doesn't*

make a choice street level prostitution in Vanier (pause), there's no choice there"
(Community leader #1).

A community member offers an interesting take on this choice debate, *"most of them are doing what they want to do in a lot of ways ... they may not be wanting to hook, but they're wanting to do the drugs"* (Community member #1). This demonstrates a paradox with the illicit substance-sex work linkage. As the reader has already seen, the two are discursively linked, but this statement implies that illicit substances are responsible for sex work activities. It is also notable that drug use represents a choice, but sex work itself does not. Following this logic, what about sex workers who do not engage in drug use? In effect, there is an internal contestation at work. Following the logic, the drug user is a responsible neo-liberal subject; a choice maker who can learn to manage his or her problem (O'Malley, 1999, p. 201). O'Malley (1999) defines 'responsible users' as those who take into account the implications of their actions for the welfare of others (p. 206). And yet, in the current case, substance use and the other peripherals of sex work are defined as the real problem for many (TVWGDP minutes, October 30th, 2007; Community leader #1; community member #1). Furthermore, it is usually the 'traffickers' who are held responsible for the creation of illicit substance-related risks and thus are not afforded the same 'moral responsibility' as the users (O'Malley, 1999, p. 209). However, what is presented in the reasoning of this victimization argument is that illicit substances are responsible for sex work activities (another 'drug related risk'), where sex work is not afforded the same acceptance as a choice.¹¹

¹¹ O'Malley (1999) even notes that while the drug use is 'responsibilized,' it does not contain the punitive implications associated with other 'crimes' which overlap with illicit drug use. (p. 203-204).

The understanding that sex workers are victims also informs initiatives the group supports. The S.T.O.R.M. (Street Team Outreach Mobile) project from Minwaashin Lodge operating in Vanier clearly conceives of the sex workers they deal with as victims. During their presentation it was emphasized that sex workers were once children and continue to be “*precious*” (Observational notes, TFVWGDP, April 29th, 2009). An observer also notes similar concerns from community members, “*this is someone’s kid, and none of these girls wanted to grow up to be prostitutes*” (Observer #2). One resident remarked upon seeing “*teenage girls, strung out on drugs, in bad weather, prostituting themselves*” that “*it hurts, as a woman, to see, I’m just scared and I hurt*” (quoted in Devoy, September 27th, 2007).

Such sentiments suggest a broader motivation for participation in the group beyond the desire to eliminate sex work. It would appear that some residents wish to ‘save’ the sex workers from sex work. This is reminiscent of claims from the *radical feminist discourse* which to some extent associates sex work with slavery (Dworkin, 1993, p. 2; MacKinnon, 1993, p. 21; Overs, 1994, p. 119; Barry, 1995, p. 22-23). Furthermore, this also speaks to the *moralizing discourse* which argues sex work is a form of sex trafficking, exploiting women and children (Smith, 2006, p. 2; Thompson, 2007a, p. 17-18). These concerns are particularly paternalistic. The assumption here is that sex workers are unable to take care of themselves and it is therefore the responsibility of those community members to rescue the women. Thus despite the research described earlier in this section and in chapter three indicating sex workers consider themselves agents in their own right, this argument positions the community as being able to decide what is ‘best.’

Victimization in Sex Work Argument:

Another argument suggests there is an implicit victimization in the practice of sex work. For example, a worker from the S.T.O.R.M. project suggested that “*each women have their own*

story-most of them have criminal records, incarcerated, are victims of violence” (TFVWGDP minutes, April 29th, 2009). Furthermore, a joint presentation from *Crime Prevention Ottawa* and the *Ottawa Police Service* (OPS) link sex work to violence citing that “*1/3 (of john’s are) violent offenders*” (SWJACPRCCS presentation, November 28th, 2007). As discussed in chapter one, this statistic is inconsistent with the findings of academic researchers. Jeffrey and MacDonald (2006) note that the sex workers they spoke to indicated violence is “*not common among all clients*” (p. 104). It is a small percentage responsible for most of the violence against prostitutes (Monto, 2004, p. 176-177). Weitzer (2006) also confirms this and cites evidence that suggests those studies which do indicate pervasive violence are methodologically flawed (p. 34-35). Sex workers have a different understanding of violence; it is not so much a problem with their activity being inherently violent as this victim discourse may suggest; it is the stigma, attitudes and working conditions that are fostered through these problematic discourses (Jeffrey & MacDonald, 2006, p. 88).¹²

This argument that sex work invariably implies some degree of victimization is similar to several of the discourses discussed in chapter one. First, the *moralizing position* contends that sex work is harmful because of the pervasiveness of violence (Smith, 2006, p. 2; Weitzer, 2006, p. 35). Furthermore, the *moralizing discourse* argues that sex work is victimization because it leads to the women experiencing other problems such as substance abuse, mental and physical illness and ultimately their entry into other harmful illicit activities (Concerned Women for America, 2007, p. 1; Coulter, 2007, p. 9; Thompson, 2007a, p. 16). The implication here is that these other issues and activities will harm the community as a whole by compromising the moral

¹² Research indicates that sex work can be organized in such a way to minimize the violence and increase job satisfaction at the same time (Weitzer, 2006, p. 35). Weitzer (2006) draws our attention to The Netherlands whose sex workers experience a very small amount of violence (p. 35).

fabric of society. The *radical feminist discourse* is also concerned with violence within sex work and the further victimization of the women through mental and physical disease (Farley, 2004, p. 1094, 1097). Also because it represents male violence against (or victimization of) women (Pateman, 1988, p. 50; Assister, 1989, p. 146; Dworkin, 1993, p. 4; MacKinnon, 1993, p. 24-25; Barry, 1995, p. 22; Scoular, 2004, p. 343).

Attentive to Sex Worker Needs

Services Argument:

This argument focuses on the assertion that sex work should be approached as a service issue, one that can be solved by ensuring needs are met and adequate services are available (VSCM minutes, June 27th, 2007; TFV minutes, August 9th, 2007). A major discussion around street sex work centered on “*what can we do for them?*” and speaks to social responsibility (VSCM minutes, June 27th, 2007; TFV minutes, August 9th, 2007).

On the one hand, this argument can be perceived of as supporting the *sex worker discourse* which calls for the same human rights and civil liberties afforded to others including control over working conditions and access to social benefits (Brock, 1998, p. 22-23; O’Neill, 2001, p. 37). Keeping social welfare in mind and offering services is one step towards meeting these objectives. On the other hand, when considering services it would be important to bear in mind *which* type of services the group advocates. Those that would have the goal of helping sex workers leave the trade contradicts workers assertion of choice. Moreover, this supports one of the goals of the *moralizing* and *radical feminist discourses*; in that they aid in the sex workers’ exit from the industry (Shaver, 2005, table 1; Weitzer, 2006, p. 34; PEN, 2008).

Sensitivity Argument:

As much as there was an indication that the community takes issue with street sex work, there was also some evidence at this stage that at least some community members are willing to see things from a broader perspective. The message from the Elizabeth-Fry Society was that “*sex trade workers are your neighbours, they belong to the community like any other resident*” that there are “*specifics about their behaviour (i.e. crack) and it leads to a level of violence*” (TVWGDG minutes, October 30th, 2007). The Elizabeth Fry workers also suggested that “*they are sensitive about their needs*” and “*E. Fry is ready to work with community members*” (TVWGDG minutes, October 30th, 2007). It is unclear which ‘needs’ of sex workers are being considered. Presumably, in light of the attempts to eliminate the activity from the neighbourhood, it would be particularly difficult for organizations to advocate for sex worker rights. However, aiding in drug treatment or violence prevention would likely be received in a more favourable manner by residents whose focus is eliminating the activity from the neighbourhood.¹³

It is important to note that this is not consistent with the *sex worker discourse* as there is no acknowledgement of sex work as a form of legitimate work. As noted in the literature review, the main thrust of the *sex worker discourse* is that it should be considered as a viable occupation with rights and securities (though as I have indicated there are those who enter unwillingly into the practice and would ultimately have a different interpretation) (Brock, 1998, p.13, 22-23; Nussbaum, 1998, p. 178-179; O’Neill, 2001, p. 37; Bruckert et al., 2004, p. 4; 2007). The frame seen here though, can be regarded as more compassionate to street sex workers because it is

¹³ This is based on the acknowledgement that sex work is not just going to disappear. Residents with these attitudes described above faced with such a reality would be more open to offering services to help ‘get them off the streets’ rather than allowing them rights.

consistent with a broader and more empathetic perspective (for example, I think of them bringing attention to such things as socio-economic status) (VSCM minutes, June 27th, 2007). By being willing to adopt a more liberal outlook and a consideration of the sex workers themselves, members of the initiative demonstrate an openness to alternative frames. There are however some doubts; later developments demonstrate that this position remained marginal. Additionally, the concern for sex workers may be a repeat of the victimization argument.

Counter Argument:

A final argument can be conceptualized as being resistant to dominant frames in society about sex work. For example, one observer suggests:

When you don't understand something, you get fear out of it. Also because it's easier to target someone than to really question yourself, like your own perception.... people didn't understand, they fear what's different.
(Observer #1)

Building upon what this observer has brought to light, supporters propose this contention is not just out of concern with street sex worker rights or services, but with being critical of society's perception and problematization of the activity. This is similar to the arguments about the industry espoused by the *sex worker discourse*; that stigma derived from moral judgements creates challenges for sex workers. Furthermore, some sex workers identify as sex radicals who broaden the boundaries of sex and gender (Bruckert et al., 2003, p. 4; House of Commons Canada, 2006, p. 31; Jeffrey & MacDonald, 2006, p. 11). These ideas will be returned to when we consider resistance in the next chapter.

The arguments outlined in this chapter draw on the larger discourses delineated in chapter one in order to frame the activity of street sex work in Vanier in a particular way. This then informs their 'grievance'; why collective action is needed, the intentions of such activity and

ultimately what members of the community believe needs to be addressed through organizing. We now turn to consider how these translate into action; what tactics the movement employs in order to mobilize and address the grievances.

MOBILIZING AROUND THE SEX WORK ‘PROBLEM’

As noted in chapter two, *mobilization* is the process of a group becoming an active entity in public life (Tilly, 1978, p. 69). We have seen the discourses espoused by members of ‘Together for Vanier,’ now we will explore how movement participants plan to reach those objectives through various tactics. Throughout we remain cognizant of how these tactics comprise of and reflect the larger strategies outlined in chapter one (abolition, prohibition, regulation, non-intervention and collaboration).

Service-Oriented Tactics:

The first type of these strategies are those considered to be ‘service-oriented’ because of their attention to social, health or other services for street sex workers. Within ‘Together for Vanier,’ key projects consistent with this approach include the creation of an inventory of services and assets in the community (VSM minutes, March 30th, 2007). Related to this, Vanier Service Centre staff were to create a “*resource list for addiction treatment and sex trade workers from start to finish*” to distribute to residents in Vanier (TFV minutes, August 9th, 2007). The hope was that “*once the research was done on resources we can create a referral card for clients*” (TFV minutes, September 11th, 2007).

Other discussions held by the initiative concerning services for clients living “*high-risk lifestyles*” in Vanier involved “*getting information to be shared around,*” “*to have service providers meet and share what they do,*” with the goal of “*connecting information between*

people located in Vanier and clients living high risk lifestyles” and to have “*all Vanier Service Providers meet and become a more active community*” (TFV minutes, September 11th, 2007; TFV minutes, October 23rd, 2007). This type of approach resembles what we have referred to as the *collaboration* strategy in chapter one. Various stakeholders and service providers come together to create a more holistic and inclusionary solution (Larsen, 1996, p. 44; Pitcher et al., 2006, p. 29). This approach was evident as street sex workers were constructed as individuals. For example, members of the initiative asked “*what can we do for them?*” (VSCM minutes, June 27th, 2007). At the first working group meeting, an Elizabeth Fry Society of Ottawa worker mentioned a lack of resources for sex workers (TFVWGDGP minutes, October 30th, 2007). It was noted that a recently apprehended woman “*was ready to clean-up but there was no place to send her*” (TFVWGDGP minutes, October 30th, 2007). Thus this is the challenge *Together for Vanier* must negotiate. Many residents agree increasing services are needed to deal with the underlying issues of street sex workers, but most of the time these are unavailable.

Another tactic included members of the police and CPO giving a presentation titled: *Sex Workers and John's - A complex problem requiring a complex and comprehensive solution* (TFVWGDGP minutes, November 28th, 2007). The presentation recognized that “*strategies seeking to reduce the harms caused by and experienced by sex workers are more likely to work than those seeking to eliminate prostitution altogether*” but also that “*strategies focused exclusively on arresting sex workers are unlikely to be effective. Both sex workers' and John's' conduct must be addressed*” (November 28th, 2007). It further advocates that:

an effective strategy [is to] get sex workers off the streets and get them to stop their offensive behaviour, but also give them viable alternatives: either to get them out of prostitution altogether, or to operate in less-offensive locations, times or ways. (November 28th, 2007)

The fact that the presentation acknowledges it would be unrealistic to eliminate sex work altogether and that operating in less-offensive locations, times or ways would be a good solution is notable. This would certainly be appealing to residents who identify with the *social (dis)order discourse* which views sex work as a public nuisance (Brannigan & Fleishman, 1989, p. 134). This approach is consistent with the strategy of *regulation* as the state would regulate sex workers and their activities when having them operate in these ‘less-offensive’ ways (Outshoorn, 2004, p. 8; PEN, 2008). However, that the suggestion that getting workers out of prostitution altogether is considered an equally successful type of response is problematic as it relies on the strategy of *abolition* and the *radical feminist discourse* and therefore ignores the finding that many sex workers consider their activity a legitimate choice and a form of work (Brock, 1998, p. 13; Nussbaum, 1998, p. 178-179; Bruckert et al., 2004, p. 4).

Abolition is further illustrated when the individuals giving the presentation advocate for addressing the conduct of both workers and clients. Though it is not clear how this would be done, it is assumed that a pattern of services for sex workers and criminalizing measures for clients would be followed. As described in chapter one, this is exactly what we see in the *abolition* strategy espoused by *radical feminism* (Outshoorn, 2004, p. 8; Shaver, 2005, table 1).

Aspects of *prohibition* also manifest here when the presenters proclaim that it is unrealistic to eliminate sex work altogether but that the conduct of both parties must be “addressed” (Outshoorn, 2004, p. 8). This would seem to imply some degree of criminal law, thus representing the partial criminalization of *prohibition* described in chapter one (Outshoorn, 2004, p. 8; Shaver, 2005, table 1; STAR, 2006, p. 16). The influence of this strategy is further illustrated when the presenters advocate for reporting any “problems” to the police (SWJ: ACPRCCS presentation, November 28th, 2007). The presenters also introduced other less

criminalizing solutions as options; however, in the end the message was that of police reporting. This seems premature when community members and others have not yet had the opportunity to take in all the other alternatives offered. It would appear as though the *Ottawa Police Services* (OPS) is tacitly espousing their own agenda as they are the ones giving the presentation. Though a wide spectrum of options was presented, there is no evidence that the group fully considered the more ‘sex worker attentive’ alternatives which we will define later in this section.

Nonetheless, the discussions did result in a series of meetings with various service providers in the area and a partnership was formed between the Vanier Community Service Centre (CSC Vanier) and the Elizabeth Fry Society of Ottawa where (one day a week) street sex workers could receive counselling, support, resources and food (TFV minutes, March 26th, 2008; TFVWGDGP minutes, April 23rd, 2008; TFV minutes, October 16th, 2008). Minwaashin Lodge also received funding for S.T.O.R.M (Street Team Outreach Mobile); the project where a mobile van provides informal counselling, support, crisis intervention, referrals to Minwaashin Lodge and food (TFVWGDGP minutes, April 29th, 2009).¹⁴

While it appears as though these service-oriented tactics are less harmful to sex workers than the criminal justice responses to be discussed in the coming section, they are not without problems. For example, as mentioned in chapter one and elsewhere, the *sex worker discourse* regards sex workers as legitimate workers (I still acknowledge that there is those who enter sex work unwillingly however so this is *one* perspective of sex workers) (Brock, 1998, p. 13; Nussbaum, 1998, p. 178-179; Bruckert et al., 2004, p. 4). However, service responses such as the

¹⁴ Other efforts to collaborate with service providers involved: looking into “*supportive housing*,” lobbying for a drug addiction centre in Ottawa and having the police communicate with homeless shelters and resources (TFVWGDGP minutes, January 23rd, 2008; TFV minutes, February 26th, 2008; TFVWGDGP minutes, April 23rd, 2008).

S.T.O.R.M. program consider them as victims and have a goal of helping women leave the trade. According to the presentation a worker made, they help women in taking steps to question life choices and then make suggestions for “*alternatives*” (TFVWGDGP observational notes, April 29th, 2009). Though services would appear to be beneficial to street sex workers, there is no recognition of the legitimate choice of the worker. Thus efforts to help them may just serve to further alienate the sex workers.

Although strategies merge, it would seem that the majority of these service-oriented activities are supporting the *abolition* strategy. Those advocating for this tactic do not want to harm the sex workers through further criminalization but will work to mobilize against the institution of sex work itself by urging workers to leave the industry. As highlighted in chapter one, sex workers are conceived of as victims under this perspective and the goal is to end the practice of sex work altogether by ‘rescuing’ them (Shaver, 2005, table 1; PEN, 2008).

Criminal Justice Tactics:

The initiative concurrently invoked in conjunction with the service-oriented tactics, a criminal justice approach to deal with the issue of street sex work. T police set up a task force in Vanier with “*a total of 8 police officers added for Crack Houses*” and announced a “*Street Level Unit in (the) downtown area*” (TFV minutes, August 9th, 2007; TFVWGDGP minutes, October 30th, 2007). These actions have resulted in increased “*reassurance to residents,*” “*enhance(d) security,*” and ultimately “*more calls from Vanier area identifying hot spots*” (TFVWGDGP minutes, September 24th, 2008).¹⁵ Here one can see the tangible effect that criminal justice

¹⁵ Other criminal justice strategies are related to “problem” landlords and housing issues. Members of the initiative expressed that “*a landlord school would be a good idea for Vanier landlords*” because the area has “*a lot of absentee landlords*” (TFVWGDGP minutes, October 30th, 2007).

solutions may have on resident concerns. It would appear that community members are able to see immediate results to their problems thus leading the movement to be perceived as effective. Subsequently, more participants would be attracted to the movement itself as the solution has been *framed* in such a way that it resonates with the nuisance concerns of some community members (Snow et al., 1986, p. 211-212; Klandermans & Tarrow, 1988, p. 10-11).

Furthermore, members of the movement (strongly supported by the police) promoted the establishment of Vanier's first active Neighbourhood Watch (TFV minutes, September 11th, 2007). Vanier residents were given the message by the police and the initiative “*to call-in any problems they see*” (VSCM minutes, June 27th, 2007). To that end, the initiative developed an advertisement with information or “*tips*” for reporting on the priority issues (drugs, prostitution and beautification) the initiative identified (Together for Vanier: Reporting Tips, 2007). Specifically, it states that it is important to notify the police of “*suspicious activity such as men who might be “johns”, that is men using the prostitutes Try calling in the licence plate if you can see it without confronting him*” (TFV: RT, 2007).

The advertisement encourages the reporting of license plates but is ambiguous about the implications. What would happen as a result? In some minutes it is suggested that the police personally call these individuals and that there is a possibility for letters to go out (TFV minutes, October 23rd, 2007). One resident noted a concern with the potential “*incorrect suspicion of people,*” and wondered if the police would offer apologies? (TFVWGP observational notes, April 29th, 2009). The use of identification and letters is suggestive of the “community safety letters” the police in Ottawa have recently enacted. These letters will be mailed out to the residence of any driver who is stopped by police while talking to prostitutes in certain Ottawa neighbourhoods (CBC News, 2007). According to the Ottawa Police Services, the letter is

designed to send the message that their activity is not wanted in the concerned neighbourhood (CBC News, 2007). The letter warns of strong associations between street prostitution and drug use as well as health concerns such as HIV and hepatitis (CBC News, 2007). The initiative has wide support from residents in inner city neighbourhoods experiencing high levels of prostitution and drugs, but troubles many civil liberty advocates who argue for the importance of privacy and inappropriateness of police enforcing morals (CBC News, 2007). This program has troubled many civil liberty advocates who have argued for the importance of privacy and inappropriateness of police enforcing morals in various media outlets (Ottawa Police Services, October 2, 2007; CBC News, 2007; McCann, 2007).¹⁶ The clear tension between community members over this particular strategy suggests the presence of *resistance*. Resistance will be considered in its own right in the next chapter, but here I want to bring attention to the power relationship. The state (*Crime Prevention Ottawa* and *The Ottawa Police Services*) has envisioned this letter campaign as contributing to the ‘common good’ of the Vanier community. However, this appears to be at the expense of minority opinions which may be incompatible with that of the state and its represented government (Foucault, 1982, p. 782; O’Malley, 1996, p. 323). These minorities subsequently utilize the media as an outlet for resistance in the form of critical commentaries.

¹⁶ McCann (2007) also highlights a number of ill-conceived implications associated with the Ottawa “Community Safety Letter” legislation directed at punishing johns specifically: the effect of a blanket punishment for johns means that it will punish prostitutes as well, it takes away their business, makes them poorer, and increasing their marginalization due to stigma; taking a note from economics, a robust market is good for suppliers and a shrinking market is good for buyers, without many johns, the remaining johns out there can make more demands on the prostitutes who are at their mercy and therefore take just anyone home increasing their likelihood of experiencing violence; it infantilizes women as helpless non-actors in their own lives and conflates drug addiction with other reasons for entering the sex trade; in its application the letters erode Canadian values such as the presumption of innocence; and difficulties are noted for prostitutes who are LGBT (lesbian, gay, bi-sexual, and trans-gendered).

A more contentious project was the “*victim impact letters*” supported by the police.

Residents were asked:

to send e-mail/letter outlining how their lives have been affected by drug dealers in the Vanier Area.... words to the effect of how they were impacted emotionally, financially, perhaps physically (fear etc). The Crown Attorney is requesting the letters be included in the Crown Brief package for sentencing of the accused. This is a very important step in changing the drug sentences that have allowed street level crime to terrorize neighbourhoods (TFVW GDP minutes, January 23rd, 2008).

What is fascinating here is the suggestion that illicit substances are responsible for all street crime. While they likely do have a role, the larger socio-economic factors that make the social environment problematic for street sex workers in the first place (Brock, 1998, p. 15; Lowman, 2000, p. 1006-1008; Jeffrey & MacDonald, 2006, p. 37, 177) should also be included. Moreover, we see a similar logic to that delineated earlier in this chapter when discussing illicit substances and sex work in terms of choice. This tactic would seem to suggest that illicit substances are not just responsible for street sex work, but for all street crime as well. In this light, illicit substances become personified; however, it is assumed that by ‘drugs’ members of the initiative mean the traffickers, not users; which, as we have seen are conceived of as ‘responsible choice makers’ according to O’Malley (1999, p. 201). What about the street sex workers then? Given the argument that illicit substances are responsible for sex work, are sex workers not making choices as well? After all, it is not their practice that is argued to be responsible for the street crime. Furthermore, why are there not further tactics being used to target the illicit substances beyond the treatment centre mentioned? Arguably, this is tied to a lack of resources when it comes to such services.

Other participants had concerns over the legalities of this strategy. As observers at one meeting pointed out, “*first off, it’s [street sex work] not a crime,*” therefore how can these letters

be used in the sentencing of an individual who did not even commit a crime against particular community members (Observer #1)? Furthermore it was also observed that based on this earlier contentious discussion about the legalities of the strategy of using victim impact letters to convict people who did not commit a crime against the letter writers, an outreach worker did some research and came to the meeting explaining that he/she “*was told that this is not acceptable, it’s not admissible in court*” (Observer #1). The observer further told me that it was brushed off by the group. I do not know the exact reasons for this but it can be suggested that it was because it was inconsistent with the goals of the initiative – to decrease drugs and prostitution in Vanier. There was no evidence that members of the initiative followed up and confirmed the legality of the tactic.

Forwarding these letters to the MPP responsible for ‘*Safer Communities and Neighbourhoods Legislation*’ (SCAN) was also contested. According to members of the group, this legislation would “*make it easier on the Police to close down crack houses*” (TFVWGDG minutes, October 30th, 2007). According to one resident:

So the people never agreed beforehand to have their letters be used for that.... I got the official letter from them (local MPP) saying that pretty much stating ‘well thanks for your interest but most people that wrote the letters wrote it because they fear that crime, street crime, was costly for the communities and they wouldn’t mind that their letters were (used).’ Well they wouldn’t mind ... how would you know that? Did you ask them?

This would suggest the possibility that basic legal rights are going unchecked. Not only that, but critics have asserted this legislation is highly controversial as it implies that housing is not a human right (McCann, 2008).¹⁷

¹⁷ Again, we see the use of the media as a site of resistance.

One of the implications of this use of criminal justice responses is the displacement of street sex workers to other parts of the city; a tactic which some community leaders justify:

I would defend that, I think it's worth moving things around. Because if you move the problem around it takes less root in the neighbourhood, it causes less damage.... even though it's a little uh, it's not an entirely satisfactory solution ... (Community leader #1)

This argument contrasts with research that indicates displacement causes other problems such as the increase in the risk of violence for street sex workers (Kinnell, 1993, p. 11; Hubbard, 1998, p. 284; Lowman, 2000, p. 1007-1008; Gibbs Van Brunschot, 2004, p. 229). The logic however is consistent with the *regulation* strategy in that it recognizes that sex work is going to occur regardless; what is missing however, is an endorsement of actual licensed zones that would offer sex workers protection and security (Shaver, 1985, p. 487).

Similar to the previous section, there is an overlapping of the strategies seen in the tactics delineated here as well. For example, measures that specifically target the clients such as reporting of license plates and the reporting tips article can be conceived of as supporting the *abolition* strategy. These criminalize the clients while understanding the sex workers as victims (Outshoorn, 2004, p. 8; Shaver, 2005, table 1; PEN, 2008).

However, for the most part, the tactics described in this chapter represent the broader strategy of *prohibition* outlined in chapter one. Some residents may not want sex work as part of the community landscape, but it needs to be regulated in such a way to minimize the harms. The tactics evident here involve the use of the criminal law to render the practice of sex work partially illegal as the strategy of *prohibition* depicts (Gibbs Van Brunschot, 2001, p. 223;

STAR, 2006, p. 16). Arguably utilizing these tactics is just an extension of the current Canadian policy.¹⁸

Social Integration & Community Building Tactics:

There are also tactics employed that are not as clearly defined, particularly, those that aid (potentially inadvertently) in the social integration of *all* members of the neighbourhood and thereby aid in the development of a more inclusive community. These tactics are however presented and perceived of by the group as crime prevention measures.¹⁹ This means, whether or not the initiative is aware, some of its activities have implications beyond those intended.

The *Eyes on Vanier Walking Club* is one such project. It unites “*groups of walkers in Vanier*” with the aim to “*get to know your neighbours, give the group a chance to see illegal actions in the area ... to diminish crime activities in the area ... educate the residents as they walk.*” Ultimately it is presented as a “*soft approach to getting Vanier residents involved*” (TFVW GDP minutes, September 24th, 2008). Observer #1 speaks to the unintended consequences of this tactic:

I don't think they're a bad issue because if you flip that around, a walkabout, I see a walkabout as being to ensure the safety of sex trade workers, like how great would that be? So the idea itself is not bad, it's only as good or as bad as the people make it right? These people of course they have the vision that street sex workers are responsible for all the evils in the world. Well that's a threat for the community and for the sex trade workers the way I see it. But the idea itself, I think it could be very empowering and very good you know?
(Observer #1)

¹⁸ This is questionable though, because as illustrated in chapter three, research has indicated that this solution is particularly problematic and its success has therefore been quite limited (Fleischman, 1989, p. 118; Lowman, 1991, p. 324; Larsen, 1996, p. 42; Lowman, 2000, p. 1006-1007).

¹⁹ Note that this is more so the ‘Eyes on Vanier walking club’ rather than the ‘say Hi campaign.’ The say Hi campaign has the goal of social inclusion. However, when considering who is targeted for social inclusion the researcher doubts sex workers are the intended goal.

The tension between intent is interesting; though the goal may be social inclusion, given the assumed perspective adopted by most who participate, in practice, this campaign may be more criminalizing in nature.²⁰

Another strategy aimed at building up the conception of community, is the “Hi Campaign” which entailed the three components: “*Say Hi, Reporting, (and) Get Involved*” (TFV minutes, March 25th, 2009). The idea was that “*how people interact in public reflects on community safety*” (TFV minutes, March 25th, 2009). Advocates suggested this approach would humanize the sex workers and in time the sex workers would “*soften*” (TFVWGDGP observational notes, April 29th, 2009).²¹ This more inclusionary approach to street sex workers in Vanier proved to be contentious. During a meeting, one resident exclaimed that saying hi “*doesn’t work*” because for the street sex workers in the area, illicit substance dependence has already become prevalent. For them, it is therefore too late to engage in social integration as they threaten residents’ safety (TFVWGDGP observational notes, April 29th, 2009).²² Another community member added:

I took real offense to that. No, I’m not going to say hi. I’m not going to be mean, I’m not going to be aggressive, I’m not going to be rude but you know what? No. I say hi to the people in my neighbourhood that add something to my neighbourhood. And that doesn’t mean that they’re necessarily working people, um, it doesn’t mean that they are people that are covered head to toe

²⁰ Community members are walking around singling out those who are (or could be) involved in crime (note that prostitution is not considered illegal under the criminal code of Canada). It could be argued that this group is alienating sex workers further by considering them criminals and unwanted in the community, making them feel like social pariah.

²¹ The researcher assumes that by ‘soften’ the community members mean that street sex workers are perceived to be hardened criminals living on the streets and that they can ‘soften’ them by humanizing them through saying hello.

²² This is assumed to be based on previous encounters other residents have shared over their experiences being ‘nice’ to sex workers and not receiving the same respect back, but instead further animosity (Community member #1)

in tattoos, it doesn't even mean that they're people who do drugs! But they're doing it behind their door or yard, they're quiet, mellow about it, they're not bringing heat to our area. They're not yelling or screaming on the street, they're not you know throwing their crack pipe on the ground and smashing the glass. (Community member #1)

Efforts to become inclusive to street sex workers and integrate them into the neighbourhood are limited if the attitudes and perspectives of community members remain firmly entrenched in the *social (dis)order discourse*. The broader strategy to which these tactics relate is not clear. Loosely, it can be considered *collaboration* as it works to bring together multiple interests; though this is done in a paternalistic manner, and is therefore not as inclusionary as it may initially appear (Pitcher et al., 2006, p. 29). Here we see inclusion being utilized as a rhetorical device. Through invoking this *frame*, members are attracting more participants to the movement; those who may have been weary of criminal justice initiatives but would support this more liberal understanding to dealing with street sex work in Vanier (Snow et al., 1986, p. 211-212; Klandermans & Tarrow, 1988, p. 10-11).

CONCLUDING REFLECTIONS ON CONFLICTING PERSPECTIVES

The arguments and tactics outlined in this chapter represent conflicting perspectives, particularly between criminal justice and service oriented responses. The two types of tactics are often used simultaneously suggesting that some members of the initiative recognize that criminal justice measures alone cannot bring about long term effective change. At some point, those tactics must be used alongside services.

However, the criminal justice response does take precedence in many of the initiative's activities. Though a wide spectrum of options was presented at meetings, there is no evidence that the group really considered those alternatives more attentive to sex worker needs or those

that would give sex workers the right to work legitimately. This contestation between methods is likely because criminal justice responses can lead to more concrete and immediate change to the nuisance residents have associated with street sex work; in the meantime, these are favoured in comparison to service or social integration responses. It would appear as though *Together for Vanier* aims for service oriented solutions in the long term, yet adopts short term solutions that address resident's concerns.

In summation, this diversity of opinion means that the community is not as unified as it might appear to be concerning street sex work. The *consensus mobilization* sought through the *framing of grievances* and proposed solutions is clearly not met (although movement organizers might like to think so) (Snow & Benford, 1988, p. 199). The traditional way we may conceptualize of the "community" as those who share the same geographical space or neighbourhood is contrasted with a new way of thinking of the community as a collection of like minded individuals who share similar interests (Etzioni, 1997, p. 127; Rose, 1999, p. 172). These are not congruent however; just because you might live in a particular neighbourhood, does not mean you will share common interests or values. Therefore, when you try to create a movement that seeks to conflate these two models of community the result is disjointed and fragmented and we subsequently see the internal conflict and mixing of perspectives evident here. In this interplay between arguments and tactics key motives have emerged; we now turn to examine those patterns.

CHAPTER 6 **ANALYTIC THEMES**

In this chapter the critical reflections that build upon the previous chapter are presented. Several recurring themes were brought to light in the analysis of ‘Together for Vanier’s’ mobilization: image control, a shift in perception, lack of engagement with conflict (and resistance), exclusion of voices, the state generation of a movement and governing at a distance. Here I draw upon the theoretical framework and academic literature to examine each topic.

IMAGE CONTROL

The first of these is image control. From the beginning of the group’s *mobilization* street sex work is associated with a negative perception of the Vanier area. As one observer notes, “*you say Vanier and people instantly have this perception of two things unfortunately, the crime; specifically prostitution and drugs*” (Observer #2). This is important to the initiative and community they seek to involve because as one community leader expressed, “*part of the way that somebody feels about a community is how that community is reflected back at them*” (Community leader #1) – a sort of collective social identity (Goffman, 1959, p. 69).

Therefore, many of the efforts of the initiative are particularly image conscious. Drawing on their human resources, members have been motivated to write in to newspapers in response to false information printed about Vanier, and the initiative itself has assigned a spokesperson with a consistent message to the community (VSM minutes, February 6th, 2007; VSM minutes,

February 20th, 2007). Utilizing their contacts through *social-organizational resources*, *Together for Vanier* also commissioned a written report outlining their accomplishments which draws on the conceptual knowledge of research and writing skills provided by the *cultural resources* of the author (community leader #1). Furthermore, members insisted on a name with positive connotations (VSM minutes, February 6th, 2007; VSM minutes, February 20th, 2007). Recently the title “drugs and prostitution working group” was identified as too “*hard*” or “*heavy*” (TFVDPWG observational notes, April 29th, 2009) especially when members told people where they were going for their meeting, needing to stipulate “*we’re (the group) against it*” (Observer #2). This attention to public perception is not necessarily negative but merely suggests that the group is interested in attracting potential participants. Through portraying this positive perception of Vanier they are building up their *moral resources* through inspiring celebrity and support for their cause in the local community (Edwards & McCarthy, 2004, p. 125). This focuses on *action mobilization*, arousing the motivational incentive for participation in the movement (Snow & Benford, 1988, p. 199).

SHIFT IN PERCEPTION

Just as there are competing arguments evident within the movement, there is also a shift apparent in these positions. A community leader speaks to this, “*at the beginning the group ... many of the residents saw sex trade workers as the enemy and that shifted significantly(to) seeing the sex trade workers as victims*” (Community leader #1). There was a definitive shift in perception from anger about the situation to a ‘softening’ and labelling of street sex workers as victims. This is not a complete transformation however, because as a community member notes, “*They still don’t want them here, but there is a little bit more ‘ok, well we don’t want to see them*

just come back'.... We're not ready to let it continue in Vanier but ..." (Community member #1). This suggests an (ideologically inconsistent) amalgamation of nuisance concerns from the *social (dis)order discourse* with the victim claims made by *radical feminism* and the *moralizing discourses*.

One observer highlights an interesting implication of this shift, "*I understand people don't want to be like victimized and ... it's hard to show yourself when you know there's this perceived notion that you're a victim*" (Observer #1). One might assume that the victimization argument would make it easier for sex workers to advocate their position (most of the anger and resentment will dissipate with this discourse), however, it makes it difficult for a completely new set of reasons. Describing the sex worker as a 'victim' as *radical feminism* and the *moralizing discourse* would do is more than just assigning a label; the implications of this status signify a loss of their legitimate voice.

While it might seem as though the victim label appeared because of a real softening in the perspective of residents, one observer offers a different context, suggesting "*I think that that notion (of victimization) came afterwards ... that's because questions got raised, like you know? So it's easier when you put the victim label too. 'Well, they can't make their own decisions, na, na, na, we know best'*" (Observer #1). Seemingly by labelling them as "victims" the initiative is invoking the idea of "Parens patriae."¹ During interviews and observations, sex workers are frequently referred to as "*girls,*" not women, not individuals, but rather they are relegated to a childlike status (Observer #2; Community member #1; TFVDPWG observational notes, April 29th, 2009). The victim label appears to have denied sex worker legitimacy, therefore leaving the

¹ Meaning "parent of the country" and frequently used to refer to the promotion of the well-being of a child or young person (Reitsma-Street, 1989, p. 512).

Together for Vanier group to seemingly decide what is “best.” Through assigning a victim identity to sex workers, the initiative is discounting their experiential knowledge and in effect designated members of *Together for Vanier* as ‘experts.’ This idea will be returned to later in the chapter.

LACK OF ENGAGEMENT WITH CONFLICT (AND RESISTANCE)

In this next section, I document the limited attention afforded to conflict within the official discourse of the movement and draw awareness to the minority positions that make up these sites of contestation. In order to do so I will refer to the idea of *resistance* as put forward by Foucault (1982) as indicated in chapter two.

In ‘Together for Vanier’ the official discourse of the group does not recognize any real conflict other than the “*normal butting of heads*” (Community leader #1) seen in any type of group work. As a community leader noted:

None expressed to us. Other than through the survey, but we would put the survey out there to see what people think like the sex trade has a market you know? So, do the john's want it to stop? Guess not! You know, of course you're not going to get unanimity It [discordant views] hasn't been expressed in such a way that we have had to deal with them
(Community leader #1)

The only acknowledged conflict was “*multiple people wanting to take credit and that is a good problem to have*” (Community leader #1).

Notwithstanding, the data does suggest there was some degree of conflict and thus *resistance*. For example, the encouragement of the community to write victim impact letters concerning illicit substances or street sex work activity raised a lot of legal questions given that these letters would potentially be used in the sentencing of individuals who did not commit a crime against them. (Observer #1). Other conflict also erupted over the SCAN legislation, the

community association, the “say-hi” campaign, the proposed youth drug treatment facility and letter writing identification campaigns among others (TFVWGDP minutes, October 30th, 2007; TFVWGDP observational notes, April 29th, 2009; Observer #1; Community member #1).

Unlike the movement leadership, the resistance did not go unnoticed to observers, as one points out:

Well there certainly were questions being brought up right? You know, the victim impact letters, so to me that's a form of resistance. And the fact that there's people speaking on behalf sometimes of street sex workers, like outreach workers being there and saying like I said a couple of times too, 'this does not reflect, what you're saying does not reflect the reality of the sex workers we work with. At all.' (Observer # 1)

The group's failure to acknowledge *resistance* suggests the source of this contestation and its nature may be a factor as they do not share the same opinions and goals as the larger movement. As indicated by O'Malley (1996), the governing body will attempt to suppress those positions deemed incompatible with the program of rule (p. 317). It would appear as though the official discourse of the movement is ignoring the voice of these minorities in favour of what it has conceived of as the 'common good' of the Vanier community. Moreover, not only is conflict largely unacknowledged, other voices are absent and to this we now turn.

EXCLUSION OF VOICES

Speaking to the previously discussed discrepancy, the next pattern observed in the data is a silencing of voices and an affirmation of others. First and foremost, those involved in *Together for Vanier* differ from those in the larger population of the community of Vanier. A community leader defines those involved as people who are “*largely employed*” and are a “*bit more stable*” (Community leader #1). What is interesting is whose voices are missing.

One significant population which is unrepresented major absent voice among the group is the street sex workers themselves. An observer notes, “*street sex workers are not present at the table for one. That’s the biggest miss ever*” (Observer #1). The same observer details the concerns this poses:

that’s a problem because it’s like amongst white women we’re not going to speak about racism for black women you know? as two women we cannot speak about how it feels to be oppressed as a black woman. We can have ideas about that, we can know some coworkers, some friends, but you know (Observer #1)

This apprehension is warranted; the planning and actions directly affect the sex workers themselves. Consulting them and involving them in the process influences on the group’s ability to implement relevant initiatives that would have a positive impact on the *entire* community (street sex workers included).²

Despite these absent voices, a community leader defended the representation of the group stating, “*I’d say that different interests in the community are represented in different ways so... are there sex trade workers as a part of the committee? I don’t think so. Are there organizations who work with sex trade workers? Yes*” (Community leader #1). A community member offers a similar analysis:

We don’t have someone that represents the drug dealers. However we do have people who represent the crack pipe program and who are fighting to get an in-site in Ottawa, a safe injection site. Um, we don’t have prostitutes that show up at our meetings, however we’ve got way more groups that fight for the rights of prostitutes than we ever need showing up. Um, so are they represented? I guess in a round about way everyone is represented. We certainly have lots of renters, lots of tenants, homeowners, businesses ... I think we have about as complete representation as we can.
(Community member #1)

² Another group whose voice is notably absent is the First Nations and Inuit community (Observer #2; Community member #1).

Here in these contentions we have the validation of the expert and the negation of the experiential (and arguably authentic) voice.³ Drawing on the insights of Social Movement Theory, the street sex workers themselves would undoubtedly provide a significant improvement in the *cultural resources* (specialized knowledge and conceptual tools) of the movement in terms of the street sex worker issue (Edwards & McCarthy, 2004, p. 125). This frame lacks *experiential commensurability* in that a lot of what is proposed in the movement in terms of arguments and tactics is not consistent with what sex workers actually experience (Snow & Benford, 1988, p. 208-210).

Though there are those groups involved who work with street sex workers, the extent to which they truly represent the labour argument is limited. For example, the group claims to be inclusive of everyone but when it was asked whether they would be willing to work with sex worker activist groups, one observer notes, “*I think that would be welcomed. As long as it was along the lines of trying to get them out of that line of work.*” (Observer #2). In other words, a sex worker group is welcome; however, this is contingent on their ‘fitting’ with the discursive parameters adopted by ‘Together for Vanier.’ This would entail a fundamental reversal of the position of such a sex worker rights group. For example, in Ottawa, POWER (Prostitutes of Ottawa-Gatineau Work Educate and Resist) details in their mandate that: “*Sex work is honourable, valuable work worthy of celebration*” and further that “*the criminalization of sex workers, their partners, clients and families is unacceptable. The decriminalization of sex work is imperative*” (POWER, 2009). From what is illustrated in the data of ‘Together for Vanier,’ sex work is not regarded by the majority of the Vanier community as legitimate employment and

³ As Pavlich (1999) indicates, those groups deemed ‘at-risk’ are seldom included in the initiatives of local-level politics (p.124).

criminalizing measures were encouraged and utilized more so than *non-interventionist* (decriminalizing) strategies.

Not only were some voices absent, but others were allowed to dominate. This includes *Crime Prevention Ottawa* (and to a lesser extent their partner in the *Together for Vanier* initiative, the Vanier Community Service Centre) and the police.⁴ The police are given time to provide updates during every meeting, present on particular topics at meetings and facilitate discussions. Ultimately their participation is deemed essential (VSCM minutes, June 27th, 2007; TFVWGDG minutes, January 23rd, 2008; CFFU2SSV observational notes, February 12th, 2009; TFVWGDG observational notes, April 29th, 2009).

This integration of the police may reflect the significant amount of resources they provide to the group and thus that they *facilitate* mobilization (Tilly, 1978, p. 100). *Moral resources* such as the solidarity provided by the police are meaningful as they contribute to the legitimacy of the movement in the eyes of citizens since many of them trust the police (Edwards & McCarthy, 2004, p. 125). Further, ‘Together for Vanier’ is able to draw from the *cultural resources* of the police in terms of their specialized knowledge (for example, how they present crime statistics at each meeting and present on particular topics) (Edwards & McCarthy, 2004, p. 125). The police also provide *social-organizational resources* in that their social networks can be mobilized for movement purposes and human resources in their very presence in Vanier (Edwards & McCarthy, 2004, p. 127).⁵

⁴ Crime Prevention Ottawa leads the Together for Vanier meetings (particularly the drugs and prostitution working group). Their director chairs the meetings and delegates responsibilities, a member records minutes and they ultimately decide where funds go (VSCM minutes, February 20th, 2007; TFV minutes, August 9th, 2007).

⁵ *Crime Prevention Ottawa* does not have to worry about expending monetary resources when it comes to the police; they already represent a well funded organization (Edwards & McCarthy, 2004, p. 128).

While the criminalized nature of illicit substances and sex work justifies the police's presence at 'the table,' this does not explain the absence of service providers. Do they not warrant the same degree of attention given the complexity of the street sex work issue? Arguably the resources gained from their participation would be just as significant for 'Together for Vanier' in their mobilizing around street sex work, if not more given that they contain real *experiential commensurability* through a firsthand account of the issues targeted by the initiative (Snow & Benford, 1988, p. 208). This would suggest the elevated importance of the short term criminal justice solutions that would address *social (dis)order* concerns rather than affect real long term change.

STATE GENERATED MOVEMENT

The final pattern to emerge suggests that *Together for Vanier* does not represent an authentic social movement, but rather a state initiated social movement given its connection to a state organization (*Crime Prevention Ottawa*).⁶ There was no organic coming together of people; *Crime Prevention Ottawa* sought out participants and prompted the mobilization themselves, therefore, the opportunity was *created* (Fireman & Gamson, 1979, p. 30). As one observer describes:

I saw that group as being a grassroots group you know, just really like by and for citizens. And I realized that there was a lot of other interests at stake ... It's not really grass roots, it's crime prevention and the Ottawa police that is planning it and that are moving the issues forward, it's not the citizens themselves, if it was the citizens I think we would have a whole different approach about it. (Observer #1)

Another observer concurs, stating that:

⁶ Crime Prevention Ottawa operates out of the City of Ottawa, thus tying the organization and "Together for Vanier" to the municipal government.

Ideally, I think the people at Crime Prevention Ottawa would like to see it that way (being grassroots, citizen driven), but realistically, it had to start off ... originally... the police ... the seed was planted by Crime Prevention Ottawa and the Ottawa Police, with Crime Prevention Ottawa taking the lead. And then finding people with like minds in the community and hooking them up with other people. (Observer #2)

However, other community members feel as though it really was community driven. As one puts it:

There are a whole lot of people scattered around, frustrated, upset, angry, with what was going on in the community that they were seeing: drugs, prostitution, dealers, pimps, garbage ... no one person can do anything about that. Together for Vanier sort of facilitated getting all these people together. So all of a sudden it wasn't one person that was phoning the police, um, it was a group of people ... Crime Prevention Ottawa set up a meeting that gave a forum for people to get together. They didn't give anyone a handbook and say this is what you do to change your neighbourhood. They didn't even give us, you know the sort of directions, they opened up a forum that allowed people to talk. So what do 'you' think is going to work in Vanier, what can 'you' do to help or change this? (Community member #1)

The same community member defends the strong partnership with the police, stating, "... Inviting the police department to come in and talk to us was for 'what do we do when we see this?' Nobody directed this" (Community member #1). Another observer thought "it was almost necessary because when people were, from what we hear people were afraid to leave their homes ..." (Observer #2).

And as a community leader puts it, "I mean I, I'm just a resource right? And I'm not, I believe strongly that you lead by supporting in these kind of things because you don't ... but the community's got to own it" (Community leader #1). Even the police acknowledge that "it has to be community driven. It can't be the police telling them what to do" (quoted in Devoy, September 27th, 2007).

Thus, despite the criticisms, some really do feel as though ‘Together for Vanier’ was community driven or grass-roots; *Crime Prevention Ottawa* merely orchestrates the coming together of the parties. This is noteworthy because in the social movement literature, most community-level social organizing seeks autonomy from the state and its overreaching control, not state power (Midgeley, 1986, p. 4; Fisher & Kling, 1994, p. 10). Perhaps because ‘Together for Vanier’ does not represent the typical group in the community seeking to *mobilize* (e.g. civil rights, women’s, LGBT movements, etc.), the basis of its formation is not a perceived problem with over-reaching state power. Instead, in Vanier it did not appear that the community was able to come together and organize effectively without the help of a state organization. Crime Prevention Ottawa with a mandate to crime prevention and large partnership with the police would obviously utilize their resources and practices when called upon to help (or lead) a community. Any alternative resources or tactics others may bring to the table might get lost in this structure.

Furthermore, with the advent of an official community association for Vanier, others note that “*it’s becoming more of a community initiative, it’s becoming more community driven and I am noticing that there is the bandwagon effect.*” (Observer #2). *Crime Prevention Ottawa* is currently trying to plan an exit strategy in the next few years to leave the community, letting the community association take over and representing what they term “*an evolution towards community ownership*” (Community leader #1). Nevertheless, the direction, structure and perspective of the group are already set. Because *Crime Prevention Ottawa* organized and led the

initiative, they have left a lasting impact. Opportunities for discordant opinions or directions appeared limited.⁷

GOVERNING AT A DISTANCE

The fact that the group *Together for Vanier* represents a state initiated or generated social movement suggests it represents ‘government at a distance.’ In order to adequately consider this, we need to move beyond social movement theory to integrate concepts from Foucault’s theory of governmentality delineated in chapter two. When we consider *Together for Vanier* in light of governmentality and the changes engendered by neoliberalism, we can begin to see the governance practices implicit in the initiative. The social movement ‘Together for Vanier’ does not appear as direct state power. Instead, the state is governing indirectly through the group and *Crime Prevention Ottawa*, which is distanced from the state yet ultimately makes the funding decisions, leads the group and decides who gets to present at meetings, etc.

In turn, ‘Together for Vanier’ has the power to sway public perception about issues such as street sex work. *Crime Prevention Ottawa* and the influence they accord the *Ottawa Police Services*, come to be regarded as ‘expert discourses’ informing public opinion and the type of tactics *Together for Vanier* should endorse to ensure community safety.

At the community level, this authority has the capacity to govern individuals because citizens have a loyalty to their neighbourhood and the values and practices seen as contributing to the ‘common good’ (i.e. community safety as defined by the ‘experts’). The state has rendered

⁷ Discussions were led and moderated by members, surveys had pre-set options, the group seemingly had an agenda (VSCM minutes, May 31st 2007; CFFUTSSV presentation, June 19th, 2007; TFVWGDP, Nov 27th, 2007; TFVWGDP, January 23rd, 2008; TFV minutes, May 27th, 2008; TFV minutes, June 19th, 2008; CFFUT2SV presentation, February 12th, 2009; Observational Notes, February 12th, 2009; Community leader #1; Observer #1).

subjects governable here; individuals wishing to be ‘responsible’ citizens take it upon themselves to self-govern through following what is deemed the ‘expert knowledge.’

Street sex work, seen through the lens of experts (police) are associated with criminal elements and classified as activities or issues that threaten the safety and security of the neighbourhood; sex workers are thus marginalized. Moreover, because they do not necessarily subscribe to the same bonds of civility and self-responsibilization within the community, they are defined as being ‘risky,’ threatening and hyper-criminalized (Rose, 1996, p. 347). Therefore as we saw earlier in this chapter, their voices are discounted.

From a social movement perspective this is significant; not only do social movements have the capacity to govern individuals, they can do so beyond their borders and incite change within the wider community. They also define what is deemed ‘acceptable knowledge.’ In the case of ‘Together for Vanier,’ it is not readily apparent that the state is interfering, as *Together for Vanier* is still perceived by some as ‘community-driven.’⁸

Elaborating further on state governance from a distance, as described in chapter three, the strategies from which the initiative can select all represent some type of governance, using the law of the state in some manner. Perceived in this way, even when we may assume a solution to be inclusive to sex workers or to operate without state influence, in reality, they are all an extension of the state through some other type of behaviour being subject to a branch of our legal system.

This section has served to position the social movement of *Together for Vanier* within the broader socio-political context evident within neoliberalism and governmentality. The analysis

⁸ Which is interesting because this is exactly what we see in neo-liberalism; communities, individuals, subjects take it upon themselves to be responsible citizens and ‘self-govern.’

has highlighted the indication that perhaps the practice of ‘government at a distance’ is operating within the movement. This suggests far reaching consequences beyond what we see in classical social movements; a different type of movement, ‘state generated’ has the capability to govern an entire community.

FINAL CONSIDERATION OF CRITICAL THEMES

This chapter provided an overview of the themes brought to light through the critical analysis presented in the previous chapter. I have illustrated here that the arguments and tactics expressed in the previous chapter are not clear reflections of the larger discourses and strategies outlined in chapter one. The process observed in ‘Together for Vanier’ is more complicated than this; mobilizing around a shared outlook (*consensus mobilization*) can be incredibly challenging in a diverse community (Snow & Benford, 1988, p. 199). There is a continuous amalgamation and negotiation of these perspectives. Moreover, by advancing social movement theory beyond the traditional understanding and situating *Together for Vanier* within neoliberalism, I am able to integrate into Social Movement Theory theoretical concepts advanced by Foucault. This allows a more nuanced discussion by situating social movements within the broader context of governance and knowledge production.

CONCLUSION

This research set out to investigate the mobilization of one community group in Vanier as they organized around street sex work. Given the findings, I have provided a descriptive account of the efforts of “Together for Vanier” as they began their mobilization, negotiated their social environment and came up with practices for implementation.

We saw that the community is not as unified as its presentation of self would suggest. When we hear the news reports that ‘Vanier’ is doing something about street sex work, the assumption is always that ‘Vanier’ is a cohesive community. However, what this study suggests is that the group is made up of a variety of perceptions and positions and these are perpetually in a state of negotiation. Creating a social movement based on one’s geographical neighbourhood and including this diversity of opinion proves problematic and leads to fragmentation and subsequent conflict in perspectives.

We also saw that within the ‘official’ discourse of *Together for Vanier*, there is a silencing of voices and a simultaneous reliance on others. These perspectives are conflicting and messages from alternative positions (service-oriented and attentive to sex workers) may not resonate with residents whose preoccupation is the elimination of sex workers from the neighbourhood. It would appear that the Vanier community is not yet ready or willing to embrace a position attentive to sex workers or the strategy of non-intervention through

decriminalization.¹ Future research might investigate the conditions under which the sex ‘worker’ discourse can be integrated into community organizing. This would be a critical step in order to effectively interact and get information across to sex workers.

Given that street sex work is not an issue unique to Vanier or Ottawa, this study has repercussions for other cities and neighbourhoods across Canada. As we saw in the introduction, controversial policies utilizing license plates, letters and SCAN legislation and other tactics have been introduced all over the country (CBC News, 2007; McCann, 2007). The critical insight offered here can provide context for studying other communities mobilizing around street sex work or any other social issue.

Future research might address at a broader level the need for more adequate services, outreach and information for street sex workers noted by some in Vanier. Why is there such an abundance of resources and opportunities for criminal justice agencies but other services are left lacking (particularly in light of the research suggesting the ineffectiveness of criminalization)? Or one could consider the problematic aspects of these criminal justice strategies and why Canadians rely on them; concerning societal perceptions, does the Canadian public really think further criminalization is the answer and will work to remedy the issues neighbourhoods have with street sex work?

It would also be interesting to investigate the possibility that sex work itself is not the problem, but rather the peripheral activities such as illicit substances. The researcher wonders if sex work were allowed to operate free of the rest of these ‘issues’ would the practice really represent such a problem? Undoubtedly there would be opposition but it might represent

¹ It is assumed that this may also be because this strategy involves tactics that are very much on the policy level and therefore out of the reach of community governance.

progress in the debate. Realistically, if sex work is not going to disappear (and history suggests this is the case) and other efforts are problematic or require non-existent time or money; could Vanier (or other communities) not urge the federal government to repeal Criminal Code sections 210, 212 and 213? Or could they not go the way of the Netherlands and investigate a safer strategy of legalizing sex work in a particular area? This is in no way meant to be an ideal solution but rather something to reflect upon given the heavy social (dis)order discourse evidenced in Vanier. Furthermore, the researcher wonders that perhaps when the community becomes more accepting (if ever) of sex work as a viable occupation would organizations be able to truly start championing for sex worker rights within the community?

Another further avenue for research might focus on the lack of participation of the First Nations and Inuit communities in *Together for Vanier*. Their reluctance to partake in activities initiated by ‘Together for Vanier’ is something to be concerned about. How is their idea of community different from what is occurring in Vanier? Does the heavy influence of law enforcement have anything to do with it? What about their perception of “deviant” populations such as sex workers? Moreover, are there other cultures or populations showing similar reluctance in Vanier or in other communities?

Theoretically, the current case provides the opportunity to advance Social Movement Theory, conceiving of a new type of movement within neoliberalism. *Together for Vanier* represents a ‘state-generated’ social movement, given that the municipal government (operating via *Crime Prevention Ottawa*) prompted the movement and its mobilization. This suggests several implications concerning governance and raises the possibility that the state is *governing at a distance* through *Together for Vanier* and that this particular movement has the capacity to

create acceptable knowledges and govern a community through self-responsibilization. Further research might address this possibility in more depth and within other communities and contexts.

One final avenue for research this study has provoked is the questioning of the role of the expert; their function and reliance in community crime prevention initiatives warrants further consideration. This has particular prominence given its ability to render the ‘experiential’ knowledge of the sex workers irrelevant. Similarly, it would also be interesting for future research to investigate the denial of the status of ‘choice maker’ to the sex workers in terms of the theoretical context and observed reality.

As mentioned in chapter four, social movements typically do not seek out state power; instead they look for independence from overreaching state control (Midgeley, 1986, p. 4; Fisher & Kling, 1994, p. 10). Keeping this in mind, it will be fascinating to see in the near future how ‘Together for Vanier’ will function when the state withdraws itself from the initiative. Will the state’s influence prevail and continue to condition its discourses? Or will we see new key players emerge to change the direction? And what will this mean for the perceptions and solutions envisioned for street sex work? If *Together for Vanier* wishes to be truly inclusive of the Vanier community at large, minority and discordant opinions should not go disregarded. Finding a way to merge perspectives or at least a way to have them coexist reciprocally within the movement would serve to make Vanier a more cohesive community and ultimately one from which others can learn.

REFERENCES

- Aline (1987). Good Girls Go to Heaven, Bad Girls go Everywhere. In Delacosta, F. & Priscilla, A. (eds.) (1987). *Sex Work: Writings by Women in the Sex Industry* (131-134). Pittsburgh, PA: Cleis Press.
- Anderson, S.A. (2002). Prostitution and Sexual Autonomy: Making Sense of the Prohibition of Prostitution. In J. Spector (ed.) *Prostitution and Pornography: Philosophical Debate about the Sex Industry* (358-393). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Assiter, A. (1989). *Pornography, Feminism and the Individual*. London: Pluto Press.
- Banach, L. & Metzenrath, S. (2000). *Principles for Model Sex Industry Legislation*. Retrieved from http://www.bayswan.org/Resources_For_Prost_Law/Model_Prost_Laws/model-principles_swdecrim.pdf
- Barry, K. (1995). *The Prostitution of Sexuality*. New York: New York University Press.
- Bash, H.H. (1995). *Social Problems and Social Movements*. Atlantic Highlands, New Jersey: Humanities Press International, Inc.
- Bell, S.J. (2003). *Young Offenders and Juvenile Justice* (2nd ed.). Scarborough: Nelson.
- Berg, B. (2001). *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences* (4th ed.). Boston: Peason Education, Inc.
- Berg, B. (2007). *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences* (6th ed.). Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Blumer, H. (1969). Elementary Collective Groupings. In Buechler, S.M. & Cylke, F.K. (eds.) (1997). *Social Movements: Perspectives and Issues* (72-91). Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing Company.
- Blumer, H. (1969). *Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Blumer, H. (1971). Social Problems as Collective Behaviour. *Social Problems*, 18(3), 298-306.
- Bolland, John M, & McCallum, Debra M. (2002). Neighbouring and Community Mobilisation in High-Poverty Inner-City Neighbourhoods. *Urban Affairs Review*, 38(1), 42-69.

- Bosworth, M & Carrabine, E. (2001). Reassessing Resistance: Race, Gender and Sexuality in Prison. *Punishment & Society*, 3 (4), 501-515.
- Brannigan, A. & Fleishman, J. (1989). Juvenile Prostitution and Mental Health: Policing Delinquency or Treating Pathology? *Canadian Journal of Law & Society*, 4, 77-97.
- Brock, D. R. (1998). *Making Work, Making Trouble: Prostitution as a Social Problem*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Broom, L. (1959). Social Differentiation and Stratification. In Merton, R.K., Broom, L. & Cottrell, L.S. (eds.) (1959). *Sociology Today: Problems and Prospects* (429-441). New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Bruckert, C., Parent, C. & Robitaille, P. (2003). *Exotic Service/Exotic Dance Establishments: Types of Marginalized Labour*. Ottawa, ON: University of Ottawa.
- Bruckert, C. & Parent, C. (2006). The In-Call Sex Industry: Classed and Gendered Labour on the Margins. In Balfour, G. & Comack, E. (eds.) (2006). *Criminalizing Women: Gender and (In)justice in Neo-Liberal Times* (95-112). Black Point: Nova Scotia: Fernwood Publishing.
- Bruckert, C.; Parent, C. & Pouliot, D. (2006). *How to Respond to the Needs of Street Sex Workers in the Ottawa-Gatineau Region*. University of Ottawa & Centre espoir Sophie: Ottawa.
- Bruckert, C. & Parent, C. (forthcoming). Le travail du sexe comme métier. In Parent, C., Bruckert, C., Corriveau, P., Nengeh, M. & Toupin, L. (eds.) (forthcoming). *Mais oui c'est un travail!* Montreal, QC: Presses de l'Université du Québec. [English translation].
- Buechler, S.M. (1993). Beyond Resource Mobilization: Emerging Trends in Social Movement Theory. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 34(2), 217-235.
- Buechler, S.M. (1995). New Social Movement Theories. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 36(3), 441-464.
- Buechler, S.M. (2004). The Strange Career of Strain and Breakdown Theories of Collective Action. In Snow, D.A., Soule, S.A. & Kriesi, H. (eds.) (2004). *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements* (47-66). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Bumiller, K. (2008). *In an abusive state: How neoliberalism appropriated the feminist movement against sexual violence*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Canel, E. (1997). New Social Movement Theory and Resource Mobilization Theory: The Need for Integration. In Kaufman, M. & Dilla Alfonso, H. (eds.) (1997). *Community Power and Grassroots Democracy: The Transformation of Social Life* (189-221). Ottawa, ON: International Development Research Centre.

- CBC News Edmonton (July, 2007). Snitchline Working on Prostitute Stroll, Businesses Say. *CBC News Edmonton*. Retrieved from <http://www.cbc.ca/canada/edmonton/story/2007/07/11/police-john.html#skip>
- CBC News Ottawa (October 2007). Ottawa Sex Trade Customers, You've Got Mail. *CBC News Ottawa*. Retrieved from <http://www.cbc.ca/canada/ottawa/story/2007/10/02/ot-johns-071002.html?ref=rss>
- CBC News Ottawa (September 18th, 2009). Prostitution sweep brings 77 charges. *CBC News Ottawa*. Retrieved from <http://www.cbc.ca/canada/ottawa/story/2009/09/18/hooker-sweep.html>
- Chapman, C. D., Wilson, M., Sloan, N., Aries, R., Meredith, S. & Lalonde; edited by N. Temple (2001). *The Challenges of Policing in the Byward Market*. Ottawa: S.I.U. Production.
- Charmaz, K. (2004). Grounded Theory. In Hesse-Biber, S.N. & Leavy, P. (eds.) (2004). *Approaches to Qualitative Research: A Reader on Theory and Practice* (496-521). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Cohen, S. (1985). *Visions of Social Control: Crime, Punishment and Classification*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Collins, R. (1988). Conflict and Social Change. In Buechler, S.M. & Cylke, F.K. (eds.) (1997). *Social Movements: Perspectives and Issues* (6-35). Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing Company.
- Concerned Women for America (2007). *Keep the Anti-Prostitution Provision in PEPFAR*. Retrieved from <http://www.cwfa.org/articledisplay.asp?id=13683&department=BLI&categoryid=nation>
- CORP (Canadian Organization for the Rights of Prostitutes) (1987). An interview with Scott, V., Miller, P. & Hotchkiss, R. - Realistic Feminists. In Bell, L. (ed.) (1987). *Good Girls/Bad Girls: Feminists and Sex Trade Workers Face to Face* (204-217). Seattle, WA: The Seal Press.
- Coser, L. (1967). *Continuities in the Study of Social Conflict*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Coulter, L. (2007). Portrait of Exploitation: the Real Face of Prostitution. *PRISM Magazine*, Sept/Oct 2007, 9-13.
- Crawford, A. (1995). Appeals to Community and Crime Prevention. *Crime, Law and Social Change*, 22(2), 97-126.
- Crawford, A. (1996a). The Local Governance of Crime: Whither Accountability and Social Justice? Paper presented to the Australian and New Zealand Society of Criminology Conference, Wellington.
- Crawford, A. (1996b). The Spirit of Community: Rights, Responsibilities and the Communitarian Agenda. *The Journal of Law and Society*, 23(2), 247-262.

- Dahrendorf, R. (1959). *Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Society*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Dalla, R.L. (2000). Exposing the “Pretty Woman” Myth: A Qualitative Examination of the Lives of Female Streetwalking Prostitutes. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 37(4), 344-353.
- Dalla, R. L., Xia, Y. & Kennedy, H. (2003). You Just Give Them What They Want and Pray They Don’t Kill You. *Violence Against Women*, 9(11), 1367-1394.
- Davies, J.C. (1962). Toward a Theory of Revolution. *American Sociological Review*, 27, 5-18.
- Davis, S. & Shaffer, M. (1994). *Prostitution in Canada: The Invisible Menace or the Menace of Invisibility*. Retrieved from <http://www.walnet.org/csis/papers/sdavis.html>
- Devoy, D. (2007, September 27th). Lack of involvement decried at prostitution meeting. *The Now EMC*. Ottawa, ON.
- Devoy, D. (2008, February 7th). Vanier anti-crime initiatives take root. *The Now EMC*. Ottawa, ON.
- Devoy, D. (2009, February 27th). Residents taking note of Vanier improvements: poll. *The Now EMC*. Ottawa, ON.
- Dubois, E. & Gordon, L. (1983). Seeking Ecstasy on the Battlefield: Danger and Pleasure in Nineteenth-Century Sexual Thought. *Feminist Studies*, 9(1), 7-25.
- Duchesne, D. (1997). *Street Prostitution in Canada*. Retrieved from <http://dsp-psd.communication.gc.ca/Pilot/Statcan/85-002-XIE/0029785-002-XIE.pdf>
- Durkheim, E. (1951). *Suicide*. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.
- Dworkin, A. (1993). Prostitution and Male Supremacy. *Michigan Journal of Gender & Law*, 1, 1-12.
- Edwards, B. & McCarthy, J.D. (2004). Resources and Social Movement Mobilization. In Snow, D.A., Soule, S.A. & Kriesi, H. (eds.) (2004). *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements* (116-152). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Etzioni, A. (1968). *The Active Society*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Etzioni, A. (1997). *The New Golden Rule: Community and Morality in a Democratic Society*. London: Profile.
- Fagan, N. (December 2nd, 2009). Three weeks, three hooker sweeps. Capital Xtra. Retrieved from http://www.xtra.ca/public/Ottawa/Three_weeks_three_hooker_sweeps-7931.aspx
- Farley, M. (2003). Prostitution and the Invisibility of Harm. *Women and Therapy*. 26(3/4), 247-280.

- Farley, M. (2004). Bad for the Body, Bad for the Heart: Prostitution Harms Women Even if Legalized or Decriminalized. *Violence Against Women*, 10(10), 1087-1125.
- Fireman, B. & Gamson, W.A. (1979). Utilitarian Logic in the Resource Mobilization Perspective. In Zald, M.N. & McCarthy, J.D. (eds.) (1979). *The Dynamics of Social Movements: Resource Mobilization, Social Control, and Tactics* (8-44). Cambridge, MA: Winthrop Publishers, Inc.
- Fisher, R & Kling, J. (1994). Community Organization and New Social Movement Theory. *Journal of Progressive Human Services*, 5(2), 5-22.
- Fleischman, J. (1989). *Street Prostitution: Assessing the Impact of the Law: Synthesis Report*. Ottawa: Department of Justice Canada.
- Flick, U. (2006). *An Introduction to Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Fontana, A. & Frey, J.H. (2005). The Interview: From Neutral Stance to Political Involvement. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (eds.) (2005). *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research (3rd edition)* (p. 695-727). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Fortier, J. (2004, August 26th). Prostitution – Part One: On the Edge of Acceptable. *The Ottawa Xpress*. Retrieved from <http://www.ottawaxpress.ca/news/news.aspx?iIDArticle=3993>
- Fortier, J. (2004, September 2nd). Prostitution – Part Two: Putting Help on Hold. *The Ottawa Xpress*. Retrieved from <http://www.ottawaxpress.ca/news/news.aspx?iIDArticle=4047>
- Foucault, M. (1982). The Subject and Power. *Critical Inquiry*, 8(4), 777-795.
- Frankfort-Nachmias, C. & Nachmias D. (2000). *Research Methods in the Social Sciences (6th ed.)*. New York: Worth Publishers.
- Freeman, J. (1979). Resource Mobilization and Strategy: A Model for Analyzing Social Movement Organization Actions. In Zald, M.N. & McCarthy, J.D. (eds.) (1979). *The Dynamics of Social Movements: Resource Mobilization, Social Control, and Tactics* (167-189). Cambridge, MA: Winthrop Publishers, Inc.
- Gamson, W.A. (1987). Introduction. In Zald, M. & McCarthy, J.D. (eds.) (1987). *Social Movements in an Organizational Society*, New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.
- Gamson, W.A. (1992). The Social Psychology of Collective Action. In Buechler, S.M. & Cylke, F.K. (eds.) (1997). *Social Movements: Perspectives and Issues* (487-504). Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing Company.
- Gamson, W.A. (2004). Bystanders, Public Opinion, and the Media. In Snow, D.A., Soule, S.A. & Kriesi, H. (eds.) (2004). *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements* (242-261). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

- Gamson, W.A. & Meyer, D.S. (1996). Framing Political Opportunity. In McAdam, D., McCarthy, J.D. & Zald, M. N. (eds.) (1996). *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framings* (275-290). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Garland, D. (1996). The Limits of the Sovereign State: Strategies of Crime Control in Contemporary Society. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 36(4), 445-471.
- Garrison, L. (August 16th, 2007). 59 arrested in hooker sweeps. *Capital Xtra*. Retrieved from http://www.xtra.ca/public/viewstory.aspx?AFF_TYPE=2&STORY_ID=3446&PUB_TEMPLAT E_ID=1
- Geschwender, J.A. (1968). Explorations in the Theory of Social Movements and Revolutions. In Buechler, S.M. & Cylke, F.K. (eds.) (1997). *Social Movements: Perspectives and Issues*. Mountain View (97-107). CA: Mayfield Publishing Company.
- Gibbs Van Brunschot, E. (2003). Community Policing and 'John Schools.' *The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, 40(2), 215-232.
- Goffman, E. (1959). *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York, NY: Doubleday
- Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Goodwin, J. & Jasper, J.M. (eds.) (2003). *The Social Movements Reader: Cases and Concepts* (413-432). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Greene, J.M.; Ennett, S.T. & Ringwalt, C.L. (1999). Prevalence and Correlates of Survival Sex Among Runaway and Homeless Youth. *American Journal of Public Health*, 89(9), 1406-1409.
- Gullick, L. (1936). Introduction. In L. Harrison & E. Lane (eds.) (1936). *After Repeal: A Study of Liquor Control Legislation*. New York, NY: Harper.
- Hackler, J.C. (2004). Strain Theories. In Linden, R. (ed.) (2004). *Criminology: A Canadian Perspective*. Toronto, ON: Thomson Nelson.
- Hall, S. (1996). The West and the Rest: Discourse and Power. In S. Hall, D. Held, D. Hubert, K. Thompson (eds.) (1996). *Modernity: An Introduction to Modern Societies*. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Hall, S. (1997). The Work of Representation. In Hall, S. (ed.) (1997). *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*. London: Sage.
- Hall, T. & Hubbard, P. (1998) *The Entrepreneurial City*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Hannah-Moffat, K. (2000). Prisons that Empower: Neo-liberal Governance in Canadian Women's Prisons. *British Journal of Criminology*, 40, 510-531.

- Hesse-Biber, S.N. & Leavy, P. (2006). *The Practice of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hier, S. (2002). Raves, Risk and the Ecstasy Panic: A Case Study in the Subversive Nature of Moral Regulation. *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 27 (1), 33-57.
- House of Commons Canada. (2006, December). *The Challenge of Change: A Study of Canada's Criminal Prostitution Laws – Report of the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights – Report of the Subcommittee on Solicitation Laws*. Retrieved from <http://www2.parl.gc.ca/HousePublications/Publication.aspx?DocId=2599932&Language=E&Mode=1&Parl=39&Ses=1>
- Hubbard, P. (1998a). Community Action and the Displacement of Street Prostitution: Evidence from British Cities. *Geoforum*, 29(3), 269-286.
- Hubbard, P. (1998b). Sexuality, Immorality and the City: red-light districts and the marginalisation of female street prostitutes. *Gender, Place & Culture*, 5(1), 55-76.
- Hubbard, P. & Hall, T. (1998) 'Introduction,' in T. Hall and P. Hubbard (eds), *The Entrepreneurial City*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Hubbard, P. (1999) *Sex and the City: Geographies of Prostitution in the Urban West*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Hubbard, P. & Sanders, T. (2003). Making Space for Sex Work: Female Street Prostitution and the Production of Urban Space. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 27(1), 75-89.
- Hughes, D.M. (2004, May 31st). *Towards an Abolitionist Approach to Prostitution and Trafficking*. Retrieved from http://www.uri.edu/artsci/wms/hughes/abolitionist_approach_czechrep.pdf
- Hunt, A. (1997). Law, Politics and the Social Sciences. In Owen, D. (ed.) (1997). *Sociology After Postmodernism*. London: Sage.
- Hunt, S.A. & Benford, R.D. (2004). Collective Identity, Solidarity, and Commitment. In Snow, D.A., Soule, S.A. & Kriesi, H. (eds.) (2004). *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements* (433-458). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Jeffrey, L.A. (2004). Prostitution as Public Nuisance: Prostitution Policy in Canada. In Outshoorn, J. (ed.) (2004). *The Politics of Prostitution: Women's Movements, Democratic States and the Globalisation of Sex Commerce* (83-102). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Jeffrey, L. A. & MacDonald, G. (2006). *Sex Workers in the Maritimes Talk Back*. British Columbia: UBC Press.

Johnston, H., Larana, E. & Gusfield, J.R. (1997). Identities, Grievances, and New Social Movements. In Buechler, S.M. & Cylke, F.K. (eds.) (1997). *Social Movements: Perspectives and Issues* (274-295). Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing Company.

Kinnell, H. (1993). *Prostitutes exposure to rape: implications for HIV prevention and for legal reform*. Paper presented to the seventh Social Aspects of AIDS conference, London.

Klandermans, B. & Oegema, D. (1987). Potentials, Networks, Motivations, and Barriers: Steps towards Participation in Social Movements. In Buechler, S.M. & Cylke, F.K. (eds.) (1997). *Social Movements: Perspectives and Issues* (342-359). Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing Company.

Klandermans, B. & Tarrow, S. (1988). Mobilization into Social Movements: Synthesizing European and American Approaches. In Klandermans, B., Kriesi, H. & Tarrow, S. (eds.) (1988). *International Social Movement Research Volume 1: Comparing Social Movement Research Across Cultures* (1-38). Greenwich, CT: Jai Press Inc.

Klein, N. (2002). The Vision Thing: Were the DC and Seattle Protests Unfocused, or are the Critics Missing the Point? In Shepard, B. & Hayduk, R. (eds.) (2002). *From ACT UP to the WTO: Urban Protest and Community Building in the Era of Globalization* (265-273). New York, NY: Verso.

Kriesi, H. (2004). Political Context and Opportunity. In Snow, D.A., Soule, S.A. & Kriesi, H. (eds.) (2004). *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements* (67-90). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Larsen, E.N. (1992). The Politics of Prostitution Control: Interest Group Politics in Four Canadian Cities. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 16, p. 169-189.

Larsen, N.E. (1996). The Effects of Different Police Enforcement Policies on the Control of Prostitution. *Canadian Public Policy*, 22(1), 40-55.

Lewis, J. & Shaver, F. (2006). *Safety, Security and the Well-Being of Sex Workers: A Report Submitted to the House of Commons Subcommittee on Solicitation Laws (SSLR)*. Ontario: Sex Trade Advocacy Research (STAR).

Little, N. & Bruckert, C. (2007, December 14th). Little and Bruckert – Tough on Prostitution. *The Ottawa Citizen*. Retrieved from <http://www.canada.com/ottawacitizen/views/story.html?id=3984b99a-f7f1-492c-bfa5-742379bb4ef2&k=12117>

Lister, R. (2001). 'Gender and Citizenship' in K. Nash & A. Scott (eds.) (2001) *The Blackwell Companion to Political Sociology*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Lowman, J. (1986). Prostitution in Vancouver: Some Notes on the Genesis of a Social Problem. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, 28, 1-15.

Lowman, J. (1991). Punishing Prostitutes and their Customers: The Legacy of the Badgley Committee, the Fraser Committee and Bill C-49. In Samuelson, L. & Schissel, B. (eds.) (1991). *Criminal Justice Sentencing and Reform* (pp. 299-328). Toronto: Garamond Press.

Lowman, J. (2000). Violence and the Outlaw Status of (Street) Prostitution in Canada. *Violence Against Women*, 6(9), 987-1011.

MacKinnon, C.A. (1993). Prostitution and Civil Rights. *Michigan Journal of Gender & Law*, 1, 13-31.

Maj, J.C. (2005). The Explanatory Value of Social Movement Theory. *Strategic Insights*, 4(5) 1-9.

Marshall, C. & Rossman, G.B. (1999). *Designing Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Marx, G.T. (1997). External Efforts to Damage or Facilitate Social Movements: Some Patterns, Explanations, Outcomes, and Complications. In Buechler, S.M. & Cylke, F.K. (eds.) (1997). *Social Movements: Perspectives and Issues* (360-384). Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing Company.

Marx, K & Engels, F (1848). Bourgeois and Proletarians. In Buechler, S.M. & Cylke, F.K. (eds.) (1997). *Social Movements: Perspectives and Issues* (64-71). Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing Company.

McAdam, D. (1982a). The Classical Model of Social Movements Examined. In Buechler, S.M. & Cylke, F.K. (eds.) (1997). *Social Movements: Perspectives and Issues* (135-148). Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing Company.

McAdam, D. (1982b). The Political Proces Model. In Buechler, S.M. & Cylke, F.K. (eds.) (1997). *Social Movements: Perspectives and Issues* (172-192). Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing Company.

McAdam, D., McCarthy, J.D. & Zald, M.N. (1996). Introduction: Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Framing Processes – toward a synthetic, comparative perspective on social movements. In McAdam, D., McCarthy, J.D. & Zald, M.N. (eds.) (1996). *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framings* (1-20). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

McAdam, D. & Snow, D.A. (1997). *Social Movements: Readings on their Emergence, Mobilization, and Dynamics*. Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury.

McCann, M. (October 18th, 2007). Hookers need johns, City State/ Police should keep their paws out of all our drawers. *Capital Xtra*. Retrieved from http://www.xtra.ca/public/viewstory.aspx?AFF_TYPE=2&STORY_ID=3760&PUB_TEMPLAT E_ID=7

- McCann, M. (December 17th, 2007). 65 arrested in latest sweep. *Capital Xtra*. Retrieved from http://www.xtra.ca/public/Ottawa/65_arrested_in_latest_sweep-4067.aspx
- McCann, M. (February 15th, 2008). Police arrest 14 sex workers on eve of hooker organizing. *Capital Xtra*. Retrieved from http://www.xtra.ca/public/Ottawa/Police_arrest_14_sex_workers_on_eve_of_hooker_organizing-4343.aspx.
- McCann, M. (November 19th, 2008). Ontario entertains bill to oust hookers. *Capital Xtra*. Retrieved from http://www.xtra.ca/public/Ottawa/Ontario_entertains_bill_to_oust_hookers-5864.aspx
- McCarthy, J.D., Smith, J. & Zald, M.N. (1996). Accessing Public, Media, Electoral, and Governmental Agendas. In McAdam, D., McCarthy, J.D. & Zald, M.N. (eds.) (1996). *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framings* (291-311). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- McCarthy, J.D. & Zald, M.N. (1987). Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory. In Buechler, S.M. & Cylke, F.K. (eds.) (1997). *Social Movements: Perspectives and Issues* (149-172). Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing Company.
- Meaghan, D.E. (2001). Aids and Sex Workers: A Case for Patriarchy Interrupts. *Canadian Women Studies*, 21(2), 107-10.
- Meier, R.F. & Geis, G. (1997). *Victimless Crime? Prostitution, Drugs, Homosexuality and Abortion*. Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury Publishing Company.
- Melucci, A. (1985). The Symbolic Challenge of Contemporary Movements. *Social Research* 52(4), 789-816.
- Melucci, A. (1988). Getting Involved: Identity and Mobilization in Social Movements. In Klandermans, B., Kriesi, H. & Tarrow, S. (eds.) (1988). *International Social Movement Research Volume 1: Comparing Social Movement Research Across Cultures* (329-348). Greenwich, CT: Jai Press Inc.
- Midgley, J. (1986). *Community Participation, social development, and the state*, London: Methuen.
- Molotch, H. (1979). Media and Movements. In Zald, M.N. & McCarthy, J.D. (eds.) (1979). *The Dynamics of Social Movements: Resource Mobilization, Social Control, and Tactics* (71-93). Cambridge, MA: Winthrop Publishers, Inc.
- Monto, Martin A. (2004). Female Prostitution, Customers, and Violence. *Violence Against Women*, 10(2), 160-188.
- Moore, B. (1966). *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Moore, W.E. (1963). *Social Change*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

- Morris, A.D. & Staggenborg, S. (2004). Leadership in Social Movements. In Snow, D.A., Soule, S.A. & Kriesi, H. (eds.) (2004). *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements* (171-196). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Mottl, T. L. (1980). The Analysis of Countermovements. In Buechler, S.M. & Cylke, F.K. (eds.) (1997). *Social Movements: Perspectives and Issues* (408-423). Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing Company.
- Mouffe, C. (1992). 'Feminism, Citizenship and Radical Democratic Politics' in J. Butler and J.W. Scott (eds.) (1992) *Feminists Theorize the Political*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Noakes, L. & Wincup, E. (2004). *Criminological Research: Understanding Qualitative Methods*. London: Sage Publications.
- Nussbaum, M. (1998). Whether from Reason or Prejudice: Taking Money for Bodily Services. In J. Spector (ed.) (1998). *Prostitution and Pornography: Philosophical Debate about the Sex Industry* (175-208). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Oberschall, A. (1973). *Social Conflict and Social Movements*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- O'Malley, P. (1996). Indigenous Governance. *Economy and Society*, 25 (3), 310-326.
- O'Malley, P. (1999). Consuming Risks: Harm Minimization and the Government of 'Drug-users.' In R. Smandych (ed.) (1999). *Governable Places: Readings on Governmentality and Crime Control* (103-131). Surrey, UK: Ashgate Publishing, Ltd.
- O'Neill, M. (2001). *Prostitution & Feminism: Towards a Politics of Feeling*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers Inc.
- O'Neill, M. (2007). Community Safety, Rights and Recognition: towards a Coordinated Prostitution Strategy? *Community Safety Journal*, 6(1), 45-52.
- O'Neill, M. & Campbell, R. (2006). Street Sex Work and Local Communities: Creating Discursive Spaces for *Genuine* Consultation and Inclusion, in Campbell, R. & O'Neill, M. (eds.) (2006) *Sex Work Now*. Devon, UK: Willan Publishing.
- O'Neill, M., Campbell, R., Hubbard, P., Pitcher, J. & Scoular, J. (2008). Living with the Other: Street sex work, contingent communities and degrees of tolerance. *Crime Media Culture*, 4(1), 73-93.
- Ottawa Police Services. (2007, January 23rd). *Hintonburg Safety Partnership Presentation*. Presented at Vanier Safety Committee Meeting. Ottawa, ON.
- Ottawa Police Services. (2007, January 23rd). *Overview of Community Safety Partnerships Presentation*. Presented at Vanier Safety Committee Meeting. Ottawa, ON.

- Ottawa Police Services. (2007, September 7th). *Prostitution Sweep in Centretown and Vanier*. Retrieved from http://www.ottawapolice.ca/en/serving_ottawa/media_room/news.cfm?nr_id=4670
- Ottawa Police Services. (2007, October 2nd). *Community Safety Letters*. Retrieved from http://www.ottawapolice.ca/en/crime_prevention/safety-letters/index.cfm
- Ottawa Police Services. (2007, November 19th). *New Ottawa Police Unit gets tough with street crime*. Retrieved from http://www.ottawapolice.ca/en/serving_ottawa/media_room/news.cfm?nr_id=4878
- Ottawa Police Services. (2009, March 2nd). *Prostitution sweep results in 19 arrests*. Retrieved from http://www.ottawapolice.ca/en/serving_ottawa/media_room/news.cfm?nr_id=6177
- Ottawa Police Services. (2009, April 29th). *Information on 911-Communication Centre-Call Centre and Crime Stoppers Presentation*. Presented at Together for Vanier Drugs and Prostitution Working Group Meeting. Ottawa, ON.
- Outshoorn, J. (2004). Introduction: prostitution, women's movements and democratic politics. In Outshoorn, J. (ed.) (2004). *The Politics of Prostitution: Women's Movements, Democratic States and the Globalisation of Sex Commerce* (1-20). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Overs, C. (1994). Sex Work, HIV and the State. *Feminist Review*, 48, 110-121.
- Pateman, C. (1988). What's Wrong with Prostitution? In J. Spector (ed.) (1988). *Prostitution and Pornography: Philosophical Debate about the Sex Industry* (50-79). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Passy, F. (2003). Social Networks Matter. But How? In Diani, M & McAdam, D. (eds.) (2003). *Social Movements and Networks: Relational Approaches to Collective Action* (21-48). Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Patton, M.Q. (2002). *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods (3rd edition)*. California: Sage Publications.
- Pavlich, G. (1999). Preventing Crime: 'Social' versus 'Community' Governance in Aotearoa/New Zealand. In R. Smandych (ed.) (1999). *Governable Places: Readings on Governmentality and Crime Control* (103-131). Surrey, UK: Ashgate Publishing, Ltd.
- Pitch, T. (1995). *Limited Responsibilities: Social Movements and Criminal Justice*. London: Routledge.
- Pitcher, J., R. Campbell, P. Hubbard, M. O'Neill and J. Scoular (2006). *Living and Working in Areas of Street Sex Work: From Conflict to Coexistence*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Polletta, F. & Jasper, J.M. (2001). Collective Identity and Social Movements. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 27, 283-305.

- POWER. (2009). *POWER believes that...* Retrieved from <http://sites.google.com/site/powerottawa/>
- Procacci, G. (2001) 'Governmentality and Citizenship' in K. Nash & A. Scott (eds.) (2001) *The Blackwell Companion to Political Sociology*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Purvis, T. & Hunt, A. (1993). Discourse, ideology, discourse, ideology, discourse, ideology ... *British Journal of Sociology*, 44(3), 473-499.
- Prostitutes' Education Network (date unknown). *Prostitution Law Reform: Defining Terms*. Retrieved from <http://www.bayswan.org/defining.html>
- Rabinovitch, J. & S. Strega (2004). The PEERS Story: Effective Services Sidestep the Controversies. *Violence Against Women*, 10(2), 140-159.
- Renzetti, Claire M. and Curran, Daniel J. (2003). *Women, Men, and Society*. Pearson Education, Inc.: Boston, MA.
- Romenesko, K. & Miller, E.M. (1989). The Second Step in Double Jeopardy: Appropriating the Labour of Female Street Hustlers. *Crime & Delinquency*, 35, 109-135.
- Rose, N. (1993). Government, Authority and Expertise in Advanced Liberalism. *Economy and Society*, 22(3), 283-299.
- Rose, N. (1994). Expertise and the Government of Conduct. *Studies in Law, Politics, and Society*, 14, 359-397.
- Rose, N. (1996). The Death of the Social? Re-figuring the Territory of Government. *Economy and Society*, 25(3), 327-356.
- Rose, N. (1999). *Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Rosenstone, S.J. & Hansen, J.M (1992). *Mobilization, Participation, and Democracy in America*. New York, NY: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Rucht, D. (2004). Movement Allies, Adversaries, and Third Parties. In Snow, D.A., Soule, S.A. & Kriesi, H. (eds.) (2004). *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements* (197-216). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Sagar, T. (2004). Street Watch: Concept and Practice – Civilian Participation in Street Prostitution Control. *British Journal of Criminology*, 45(1), 98-112.
- Satz, D. (1995). Markets in Women's Sexual Labour. In J. Spector (ed.) *Prostitution and Pornography: Philosophical Debate about the Sex Industry* (394-418). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Saunders, T. (2005). *Sex Work: A Risky Business*. Devon, UK: Willan Publishing.

- Scoular, J. (2004). The 'Subject' of Prostitution: Interpreting the Discursive, Symbolic and Material Position of Sex/Work in Feminist Theory. *Feminist Theory*, 5(3), 343-355.
- Scoular, J. & O'Neill, M. (2007). Regulating Prostitution: Social Inclusion, Responsibilization and the Politics of Prostitution Reform. *British Journal of Criminology*, 47, 764-778.
- Shared Hope International (2006). *Annual Report 2006*. Retrieved from http://www.sharedhope.org/images/SHI_AnnlRpt_Complete.pdf
- Shaver, F. (1985). Prostitution: A critical analysis of three policy approaches. *Canadian Public Policy* 14(3), 493-503.
- Shaver, F. (1994). The Regulation of Prostitution: Avoiding the Morality Traps. *Canadian Journal of Law and Society*, 9(1), 123-145.
- Shaver, F. (2005, May 30th). *Recommendations for Sex Work Policy: An Integrated Approach: Presentation to the House of Commons Subcommittee on Solicitation Laws (SSLR) Roundtable, Ottawa*. Retrieved from <http://web2.uwindsor.ca/courses/sociology/maticka/star/presentations/sslr-presentation-text-may30.html>
- Shearman, M. (2008) *Street Prostitution and Public Sex in Vancouver's West End*. Retrieved from: https://wiki.sfu.ca/spring08/ws320d100/index.php/Street_Prostitution_and_Public_Sex_in_Vancouver%E2%80%99s_West_End
- Shrage, L. (1996). Prostitution and the Case for Decriminalization. In J. Spector (ed.) *Prostitution and Pornography: Philosophical Debate about the Sex Industry* (240-244). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Smyth, S. (2008, November 12th). Sex Work: An Experiential Perspective. *CRM 2308: Social and Criminal Policy*. Ottawa, ON: University of Ottawa.
- Snow, D.A. & Benford, R.D. (1988). Ideology, Frame Resonance, and Participant Mobilization. In Klandermans, B., Kriesi, H. & Tarrow, S. (eds.) (1988). *International Social Movement Research Volume 1: Comparing Social Movement Research Across Cultures* (197-217). Greenwich, CT: Jai Press Inc.
- Snow, D.A. & Benford, R.D. (1992). Master Frames and Cycles of Protest. In Buechler, S.M. & Cylke, F.K. (eds.) (1997). *Social Movements: Perspectives and Issues* (456-472). Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing Company.
- Snow, D.A. (2004). Framing Processes, Ideology, and Discursive Fields. In Snow, D.A., Soule, S.A. & Kriesi, H. (eds.) (2004). *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements* (380-412). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

- Snow, D.A., Rochford, F.B., Worden, S.K. & Benford, R.D. (1986). Frame Alignment Processes, Micromobilization and Movement Participation. In Buechler, S.M. & Cylke, F.K. (eds.) (1997). *Social Movements: Perspectives and Issues* (211-228). Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing Company.
- South East Ottawa Community Health Centre & Ottawa Police Services. (2007, January 23rd). *No Community Left Behind Presentation*. Presented at Vanier Safety Committee Meeting. Ottawa, ON.
- Stake, R.E. (2005). Qualitative Case Studies. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (eds.) (2005). *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research (3rd edition)* (pp 443-466). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications Inc.
- STAR (Sex Trade Advocacy Research) (2006). *Safety, Security and the Well-being of Sex Workers*. Retrieved from http://web2.uwindsor.ca/courses/sociology/maticka/star/pdfs/safety_and_security_report_final_version.pdf
- Taylor, V. & Whittier, N.E. (1992). Collective Identity in Social Movement Communities: Lesbian Feminist Mobilization. In Buechler, S.M. & Cylke, F.K. (eds.) (1997). *Social Movements: Perspectives and Issues* (505-523). Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing Company.
- Taylor, S., & Bogdan, R. (1998). *Introduction to Qualitative Research Methods (3rd ed.)*. New York: Wiley.
- Thompson, L.L. (2007a). Prostitution: Pathway to Incarceration for American Families. *PRISM Magazine*, Sept/Oct 2007, 15-17.
- Thompson, L.L. (2007b). Traffic Stopper: What does sex trafficking have to do with prostitution? *PRISM Magazine*, Sept/Oct 2007, 17-18.
- Tilly, C. (1978). *From Mobilization to Revolution*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Tilly, C. (1985). Models and Realities of Popular Collective Action. *Social Research*, 52(4), 717-747.
- Together for Vanier. (2007, January 23rd). *Vanier Safety Meeting Minutes*. Ottawa, ON.
- Together for Vanier. (2007, January 23rd). *Portrait of Vanier in Data Presentation*. Ottawa, ON.
- Together for Vanier. (2007, January 24th). *Press Release*. Ottawa, ON.
- Together for Vanier. (2007, February 6th). *Vanier Safety Committee Meeting Minutes*. Ottawa, ON.
- Together for Vanier. (2007, February 20th). *Vanier Safety Committee Meeting Minutes*. Ottawa, ON.

Together for Vanier. (2007, March 20th). *Vanier Community Safety Survey Draft #8*. Ottawa, ON.

Together for Vanier. (2007, March 30th). *Vanier Safety Committee Meeting Minutes*. Ottawa, ON.

Together for Vanier. (2007, April 23rd). *Vanier Safety Committee Meeting Minutes*. Ottawa, ON.

Together for Vanier. (2007, May 31st). *Vanier Safety Committee Meeting Minutes*. Ottawa, ON.

Together for Vanier. (2007, June 19th). *Community Forum and follow-up to the survey on strengthening Vanier Presentation*. Ottawa, ON.

Together for Vanier. (2007, June 27th). *Vanier Safety Committee Meeting Minutes*. Ottawa, ON.

Together for Vanier. (2007, August 9th). *Together for Vanier Minutes*. Ottawa, ON.

Together for Vanier. (2007, September 11th). *Together for Vanier Minutes*. Ottawa, ON.

Together for Vanier. (2007, September). *Together for Vanier Reporting Tips*. Ottawa, ON.

Together for Vanier. (2007, October 23rd). *Together for Vanier Minutes*. Ottawa, ON.

Together for Vanier. (2007, October 30th). *Together for Vanier Working Group on Drugs and Prostitution Minutes*. Ottawa, ON.

Together for Vanier. (2007, November 28th). *Together for Vanier Working Group on Drugs and Prostitution Minutes*. Ottawa, ON.

Together for Vanier. (2007, November 28th). *Sex Workers and John's- "A complex problem requiring a complex and comprehensive solution" Presentation*. Ottawa, ON.

Together for Vanier. (2008, January 17th). *Together for Vanier Minutes*. Ottawa, ON.

Together for Vanier. (2008, January 23rd). *Together for Vanier Working Group on Drugs and Prostitution Minutes*. Ottawa, ON.

Together for Vanier. (2008, February 26th). *Together for Vanier Meeting Minutes*. Ottawa, ON.

Together for Vanier. (2008, March 26th). *Together for Vanier Meeting Minutes*. Ottawa, ON.

Together for Vanier. (2008, April 23rd). *Together for Vanier Working Group on Drugs and Prostitution Minutes*. Ottawa, ON.

Together for Vanier. (2008, April 30th). *Together for Vanier Meeting Minutes*. Ottawa, ON.

Together for Vanier. (2008, May 27th). *Together for Vanier Meeting Minutes*. Ottawa, ON.

Together for Vanier. (2008, June 19th). *Together for Vanier Meeting Minutes*. Ottawa, ON.

Together for Vanier. (2008, September 18th). *Together for Vanier Meeting Minutes*. Ottawa, ON.

- Together for Vanier. (2008, September 24th). *Together for Vanier Working Group on Drugs and Prostitution Minutes*. Ottawa, ON.
- Together for Vanier. (2008, September 24th). *Helping Landlords Prevent Crime and Contribute To Building Safe Communities*. Ottawa, ON.
- Together for Vanier. (2008, September 24th). *Terms of Reference Draft*. Ottawa, ON.
- Together for Vanier. (2008, October 16th). *Together for Vanier Meeting Minutes*. Ottawa, ON.
- Together for Vanier. (2008, November 27th). *Together for Vanier Meeting Minutes*. Ottawa, ON.
- Together for Vanier. (2009, January 9th). *Together for Vanier Meeting Minutes*. Ottawa, ON.
- Together for Vanier. (2009, January 27th). *Together for Vanier Meeting Minutes*. Ottawa, ON.
- Together for Vanier. (2009, February 12th). *Community Forum and follow-up to the 2nd survey on Vanier Presentation*. Ottawa, ON.
- Together for Vanier. (2009, February 25th). *Together for Vanier Meeting Minutes*. Ottawa, ON.
- Together for Vanier. (2009, March 25th). *Together for Vanier Meeting Minutes*. Ottawa, ON.
- Together for Vanier. (2009, April 23rd). *Together for Vanier Meeting Minutes*. Ottawa, ON.
- Together for Vanier. (2009, April 29th). *Together for Vanier Working Group on Drugs and Prostitution Minutes*. Ottawa, ON.
- Tong, T. (May 5th, 2008). Dozens arrested in police sweep. *Metronews.ca Ottawa*. Retrieved from <http://www.metronews.ca/ottawa/local/article/49296>
- Touraine, A. (1985). An Introduction to the Study of Social Movements. *Social Research*, 52(4), 749-787.
- Unidentified. (2007, June 25th). *Together for Vanier: Community Contacts (e-mail correspondence)*. Ottawa, ON.
- Van der Meulen, E. (2005, October). Towards More Egalitarian Policies on Prostitution: What Canada can Learn from the International Community. Paper presented at the conference, *Imagining Public Policy to Meet Women's Economic Security Needs*, Vancouver, British Columbia. Paper retrieved from: <http://www.sfu.ca/esconference2005/presentations.htm>
- Weitzer, R. (2005). New Directions in Research on Prostitution. *Crime, Law & Social Change*, 4, 211-235.
- Weitzer, R. (2006). Moral Crusade Against Prostitution. *Society*, 43(3), 33-38.
- Williams, R.H. (2004). The Cultural Contexts of Collective Action: Constraints, Opportunities, and the Symbolic Life of Social Movements. In Snow, D.A., Soule, S.A. & Kriesi, H. (eds.)

(2004). *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements* (91-115). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Yin, R. (2003). *Case Study Research: Third Edition*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Young, T.R. (1999). Marxism and Social Movements: Theory and Practice for Social Justice. *Contemporary Sociology*, 28(3), 268-270.

Zald, M.N. (1996). Culture, Ideology, and Strategic Framing. In McAdam, D., McCarthy, J.D. & Zald, M.N. (eds.) (1996). *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framings* (261-274). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Zurita, B. (2005). *Prostitution is not a Profession*. Retrieved from <http://www.cwfa.org/articledisplay.asp?id=9691&department=BLI&categoryid=family>

APPENDIX A:

Documents analysed:

- 1.) Vanier Safety Meeting Minutes - January 23rd, 2007
- 2.) Portrait of Vanier in Data Presentation - January 23rd, 2007
- 3.) No Community Left Behind Presentation – January 23rd, 2007
- 4.) Hintonburg Safety Partnership Presentation – January 23rd, 2007
- 5.) Overview of Community Safety Partnerships Presentation – January 23rd, 2007
- 6.) Press Release – January 24th, 2007
- 7.) Vanier Safety Committee Meeting Minutes – February 6th, 2007
- 8.) Vanier Safety Committee Meeting Minutes – February 20th, 2007
- 9.) Vanier Community Survey Draft #8 – March 20th, 2007
- 10.) Vanier Safety Committee Meeting Minutes – March 30th, 2007
- 11.) Vanier Safety Committee Meeting Minutes – April 23rd, 2007
- 12.) Vanier Safety Committee Meeting Minutes – May 31st, 2007
- 13.) Community Forum and follow-up to the survey on strengthening Vanier Presentation – June 19th, 2007
- 14.) Together for Vanier: Community contacts E-mail correspondence – June 25th, 2007
- 15.) Crimes Prevention Ottawa E-mail correspondence – June 25th, 2007
- 16.) Vanier Safety Committee Meeting Minutes – June 27th, 2007
- 17.) Together for Vanier Minutes – August 9th, 2007
- 18.) Together for Vanier Minutes – September 11th, 2007
- 19.) Together for Vanier: Reporting Tips – 2007

- 20.) Devoy, D. "Lack of involvement decried at prostitution meeting" The Now EMC – September 27th, 2007
- 21.) Together for Vanier Minutes – October 23rd, 2007
- 22.) Together for Vanier Working Group on Drugs and Prostitution Minutes – October 30th, 2007
- 23.) Together for Vanier Working Group on Drugs and Prostitution Minutes – November 28th, 2007
- 24.) "Sex Workers and John's-"A complex problem requiring a complex and comprehensive solution" Presentation – November 28th, 2007
- 25.) Together for Vanier Minutes – January 17th, 2008
- 26.) Together for Vanier Working Group on Drugs and Prostitution Minutes – January 23rd, 2008
- 27.) Devoy, D. "Vanier anti-crime initiatives take root" The Now EMC – February 7th, 2008
- 28.) Together for Vanier Meeting Minutes – February 26th, 2008
- 29.) Together for Vanier Meeting Minutes – March 26th, 2008
- 30.) Together for Vanier Working Group on Drugs and Prostitution Minutes – April 23rd, 2008
- 31.) Together for Vanier Meeting Minutes – April 30th, 2008
- 32.) Together for Vanier Meeting Minutes – May 27th, 2008
- 33.) Together for Vanier Meeting Minutes – June 19th, 2008
- 34.) Together for Vanier Meeting Minutes – September 18th, 2008
- 35.) Together for Vanier Working Group on Drugs and Prostitution Minutes – September 24th, 2008
- 36.) Helping Landlords Prevent Crime and Contribute To Building Safe Communities (promotional poster for Landlord booklet) – September 24th, 2008
- 37.) Terms of Reference Draft – September 24th, 2008
- 38.) Together for Vanier Meeting Minutes – October 16th, 2008

- 39.) Together for Vanier Meeting Minutes – November 27th, 2008
- 40.) Together for Vanier Meeting Minutes – January 9th, 2009
- 41.) Together for Vanier Meeting Minutes – January 27th, 2009
- 42.) Community Forum and follow-up to the 2nd survey on Vanier Presentation – February 12th, 2009
- 43.) Together for Vanier Meeting Minutes – February 25th, 2009
- 44.) Devoy, D. "Residents taking note of Vanier improvements: poll" The Now EMC – February 27th, 2009
- 45.) Together for Vanier Meeting Minutes – March 25th, 2009
- 46.) Together for Vanier Meeting Minutes – April 23rd, 2009
- 47.) Together for Vanier Working Group on Drugs and Prostitution Minutes – April 29th, 2009
- 48.) Information on 911-Communication Centre-Call Centre and Crime Stoppers – April 29th, 2009

APPENDIX B:

Interview Guide – Community leader

I just wanted to start by saying thank you for taking the time to sit down and talk to me. As stated in the consent form, this interview should last approximately 45 to 60 minutes. This interview will be tape-recorded. Should you feel uncomfortable answering a question just say pass (or something) and we can move on.

1. Can you please begin by providing a brief description of your community?
 - a. What type of people are part of the community organization?
 - b. Would you say that all parts of the community are reflected? Why or why not?
2. How would you describe the “Together for Vanier” initiative? What about the drugs and prostitution committee?
 - a. What is the purpose or rationale for the initiative?
 - b. Has this remained consistent throughout the various developmental stages of the initiative? If not, why not?
3. What outlook on street prostitution does the initiative take?
 - a. What leads the group to take this view?
 - b. What about in your community?
 - c. Does the activity pose a threat in your community? Why or why not? And to who or what does this threat affect?
 - d. What aspects of street prostitution are perceived as being an issue?

- e. Have these perceptions remained consistent throughout the various developmental stages of the initiative? If not, why not?
4. Can you please describe for me how the “Together for Vanier” initiative came into being?
- a. What opportunities were presented or seized in order for the initiative to get off the ground?
 - b. What about during the subsequent development of the initiative?
 - c. Specifically what about with any other actions the initiative has sought to carry out?
5. What kinds of organizations or agencies are involved in the mobilization around street prostitution in your community?
- a. Does your organization work in collaboration with these organizations in the community?
 - b. What type of organization or agency specifically? Why these organizations?
 - c. In what capacity?
 - d. How did this collaboration come to happen?
 - e. Were they always involved from the beginning or how and when did they become involved?
 - f. Your initiative highlights a number of programs offered by other organizations (for example, numbers to call presentation by the Ottawa Police communications centre or the STORM program by Minwashin lodge); how did the group decide which programs to highlight? What purposes does this serve for your initiative?

6. Aside from the other organizations that the Together for Vanier initiative collaborates with, what other factors do you consider to be resources for the initiative (funding, support)?
 - a. Have these been consistent resources throughout the developmental stages of the initiative? If not, why not?
7. What does the initiative see as the ideal solution to street prostitution?
 - a. In the short term in your community? Why?
 - b. In the long term? Why?
 - c. Have these been consistent throughout the development of the initiative? If not, why not?
 - d. Which approach to street prostitution do you identify most with: criminalization? Decriminalization? Legalization? Or an alternative (if so, what would this be)? Why?
 - e. What sorts of resources should the community dedicate to such an effort (short or long term)?
 - i. What about the municipal/provincial/federal governments?
 - f. During the November 28th 2007 meeting Michael and Dana presented “sex workers and john’s: a complex problem requiring a complex and comprehensive solution – a lot of options were presented; what came out of this presentation? What course of action was actually undertaken or considered? Why?
 - g. Did the referral cards for people living high-risk lifestyles such as sex workers ever come into fruition?
8. What actions have been taken by the initiative toward this effort?

- a. How have these actions been implemented?
 - b. What is the desired result of these action(s)? What does the initiative hope it will accomplish?
 - c. What sources of funding were involved in these activities?
 - d. Do these actions have the support of the wider community?
 - e. Do you see any resistance to these efforts? By whom? Why do you think this is? What stages of the initiative did this resistance surface?
 - f. Are these discordant viewpoints considered by the initiative? How?
 - g. Have there been any other difficulties along the way? When? Describe.
 - h. What do these actions mean for the street prostitute?
 - i. In your opinion are all voices being heard?
9. Concerning other actions, why was the survey and an inventory of programs and assets decided on as the initial steps of the initiative?
- a. The working group on drugs and prostitution began with a number of “projects” (Seniors recruitment, supportive housing, lobbying for a drug addiction centre, problem property task force, neighbourhood watch promotion, landlord education, victim impact letters);
 - i. Where did these come from? Why were they considered important?
10. Have there been any successes with the action taken in the community in regards to street prostitution?
- a. What represents a success? (specific incidents that best characterize the successful implementation of action in the community in regards to street prostitution)?
When were these?
 - b. What organizations or key players were involved in these successful endeavours?

- c. What does a failure look like then?
 - d. Have these activities resulted in enhanced community leadership or increased involvement of residents? How? Describe.
11. And just one final question: I'm looking to fill in some of the blanks in the minutes and I'd like to get a well-rounded understanding of the initiative "Together for Vanier," besides the CSC Vanier and of course Crime Prevention Ottawa, who would you suggest I speak to?

Thank you very much for your time, if you have any further questions or concerns don't hesitate to contact me with the e-mail listed on the information form.

Interview Guide – Observers, Community Members

I just wanted to start by saying thank you for taking the time to sit down and talk to me. This interview should last approximately 30-45 minutes. This interview will be tape-recorded. Should you feel uncomfortable answering a question just say pass (or something) and we can move on.

I'm interested in getting a well-rounded view of the initiative (like not just interviewing those directly involved, but observers, those in the community, and those who might address and speak to any discord or conflict they observed).

Before I begin, did you have any questions for me?

So you're in regular attendance of the *Together for Vanier: Drugs and Prostitution Working Group's* meetings?

1. What purpose do you see the initiative “Together for Vanier” taking and why?
2. Do you see the group as being a true grassroots citizen driven group? Why or why not?
 - a. What would you call this type of group then?
 - b. Do you think it’s better the way it’s currently set up? Or would having a more citizen led group have been more beneficial? How?
3. What type of organizations did you see as being part of the initiative?
 - a. Were all parts of the community reflected? Why or why not?
 - b. Who was left out? And what does this mean?
4. Do you think the initiative is inclusive and welcoming to other community organizations working with them? Why or why not?
 - a. So, let’s say a prostitute’s rights group wanted to work with Together for Vanier; do you think the initiative would be open to working with them?
5. Was there any particular perception or outlook on street prostitution that you saw the initiative taking? (this doesn’t have to be an explicitly stated position, but can be implicit or inferred) How?
 - a. Was there a consensus on this? Why or why not?
 - b. If not, what was the alternate view?
 - c. Have these views been consistent from the beginning?
6. Why do you think street prostitution is perceived as such a threat in the Vanier community?
 - a. What aspects?
 - b. Who does it affect? (anyone else?)
 - c. What does it mean for Vanier on a community level?
7. What are your thoughts on the actions the group is taking in response to street prostitution?
 - a. Are these moving in the right direction? Why?
 - b. What if anything could be improved in your opinion?

- c. Do you think the appropriate sources being consulted before the implementation of action?
- 8. Do the actions of the initiative in your opinion have the support of the wider community? Why or why not?
- 9. In your observation, did you observe any sort of resistance to the efforts of the initiative?
 - a. By whom?
 - b. Why do you think this is?
 - c. Do you know if or was it evident that members of the initiative were taking these discordant viewpoints into consideration? How?
- 10. In your opinion are all voices being heard here? Why or why not?
 - a. If not, what needs to be done in your opinion?

Is there anything that you feel is important to add, things that you may have observed at the meetings that wouldn't necessarily get reflected in short official minutes?

Once again, thank you very much for your time. If you have any further questions or concerns don't hesitate to contact me with the e-mail listed on the information form.

APPENDIX C:

DATA COLLECTION CHART

Rationale for mobilization	It is already known that the group is involved in mobilization, but this category is concerned with any reference made to why they are mobilizing. What explanations are offered? How is it justified? Why community mobilization and not some other method?
Claims makers - individuals	Individual claims makers are those individuals who are referred to in the documents or meetings. Who are these key players? What organizations do these individuals represent? What is their standpoint on the issue of street sex work in general and in Ottawa specifically? How extensive is their influence in the documents or meetings? What type of influence do they have?
Claims makers - organizations	Organizational claims makers are those organizations who are referred to in the documents or meetings. Who are these organizations? Do they have an official position on street sex work? What is it? How extensive is their influence in the documents or meetings? What type of influence do they have?
Perceptions of street sex work	This category is concerned with how street sex workers are viewed by the community group. What beliefs about street sex workers are seen as being present in the documents or in the meetings? What language is used to describe them?
Issues with street sex work	This category identifies how members of the community group perceive of street sex work. What are the issues the group cohesively (or that individuals) have with street sex work? Why does this represent a problem?
Framing of issue(s)	The community group's "issue" with street sex work needs to be presented in the meetings, documents and to the public in a specific manner. This category will look at the framework in which the issue is espoused by the community group. How is the issue of street sex work presented in the documents or meetings? What frames are utilized? Where do these frames come from? What language is used? Is there evidence that the frame(s) resonate with the community? Why or why not? What discourses in regards to street sex work are these most in line with? How are sex workers described? What are some of the inferences made about street sex work? Whose interests (which claims maker) do these frames and grievances represent?

Opportunities for action - facilitation	Mobilization cannot just happen; this category recognizes this and is concerned with the opportunities that need to present themselves (or be seized) in order for mobilization or action to occur. Are any opportunities presented to the group for mobilization or action mentioned in the documents or meetings? Who do these opportunities come from? Why? Are these opportunities seized?
Repression of opportunities	Just like there are efforts to provide opportunities for the community group, there may also be efforts made to repress the mobilization or action of the movement. Is there any mention of efforts to repress the community group's actions? Who does this come from? Why? What is the response from members of the community group in regards to this repression? Do members of the community group anticipate repression to any of its mobilization or actions? Why or why not?
Resources	This category recognizes that resources are integral to the mobilization process and seeks to identify those used by the community group. What resources utilized are mentioned in the documents or observation? What type of resources are they (moral, cultural, social-organizational, human or material)? Where do they come from? How are they acquired? What purpose do they serve?
Solutions proposed	It is assumed that because the community group takes issue with street sex work, the group would aspire to come up with solutions. What solutions are mentioned or proposed in the documents or meetings? Are they in line with the grievances and framing of the issue presented? What contested practice in regards to street sex work is this most familiar to?
Actions taken/to be taken	This category is interested in what actions or solutions have been taken or will be taken in the future by the community group in response to street sex work. What actions are mentioned in the documents or the meetings that are to be taken or have already been carried out? What contested practice in regards to street sex work is this most familiar to?
Framing of action/solutions	Just like the issue of street sex work is presented in a particular manner, so too is the actions or solutions that the community group wishes to implement in response to the issue. What frames are used to substantiate proposed actions or solutions? Where do they come from? What language is used? Is there evidence of the frame(s)

	resonating with members of the community? Why or why not? Are they in line with the frames used to support the grievances?
Interests reflected	It is assumed that based on the number and diversity of claims makers (individual and organizational) involved in the community group, not all interests would be figured into (or be the most prominent) in the formation of actions or solutions. Which claims makers get reflected in the proposed action/solutions and the actions/solutions taken? Who is left out? Is their evidence of this being considered? If so, how?
Results	This category is concerned with what type of actions the community group has designated as “successes” to combat street sex work in the documents or meetings. What are these actions? Who is involved with them (which claims maker)? How are they defined as being a “success”?

APPENDIX D:



Université d'Ottawa
Service de subventions de recherche et déontologie

University of Ottawa
Research Grants and Ethics Services

October 16, 2008

Chris Bruckert
Department of Criminology
University of Ottawa
25 University Private, Room 206
K1N 6N5

Kristina Rohde
1016-170 Lees Avenue
Ottawa, ON K1S 5G5

Object: Community Mobilization around Street Prostitution in Ottawa (File #06-08-26)

Dear Professor Bruckert and Mrs. Rohde,

You will find enclosed the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Ethics Committee ethical clearance for the abovementioned study.

During the course of the study, any modifications to the protocol or forms may not be initiated without prior written approval from the REB. You must also promptly notify the REB of any adverse events that may occur.

This certificate of ethical clearance is **valid until October 15, 2009**. Please submit an annual status report to the Protocol Officer in October 2009 to either close the file or request a renewal of ethics approval. This document can be found at:

http://www.rges.uottawa.ca/ethics/application_dwn.asp.

A copy of this approval will be sent to research services, if necessary.

If you have any questions, you may contact the undersigned at the number (613) 562-5800 ext. 1783.

Sincerely yours,

Leslie-Anne Barber
Protocol Officer for Ethics in Research
For Peter Beyer, Chair of the Social Sciences and Humanities REB

550, rue Cumberland
Ottawa (Ontario) K1N 6N5 Canada

550 Cumberland Street
Ottawa, Ontario K1N 6N5 Canada

(613) 562-5841 • Téléc./Fax (613) 562-5338
<http://www.uottawa.ca/services/research/rge/index.html>



Université d'Ottawa

Service de subventions de recherche et déontologie

University of Ottawa

Research Grants and Ethics Services

SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HUMANITIES RESEARCH ETHICS BOARD

CERTIFICATE OF ETHICAL APPROVAL

This is to certify that the University of Ottawa Social Sciences and Humanities Research Ethics Committee has examined the application for ethical approval of the research project entitled **Community Mobilization around Street Prostitution in Ottawa (File #06-08-26)** submitted by Kristina Rohde and supervised by Chris Bruckert from the Department of Criminology of the University of Ottawa. The Board found that this research project met appropriate ethical standards as outlined in the Tri-Council Policy Statement and in the Procedures of the University of Ottawa Research Ethics Boards, and accordingly gave it a Category 1a (approval). This certification is valid one year from the date indicated below.

October 16, 2008

Leslie-Anne Barber Date

Protocol Officer for Ethics in Research
For Peter Beyer, Chair of the Social
Sciences and Humanities REB

550, rue Cumberland
Ottawa (Ontario) K1N 6N5 Canada

550 Cumberland Street
Ottawa, Ontario K1N 6N5 Canada

(613) 562-5841 • Téléc./Fax (613) 562-5338
<http://www.uottawa.ca/services/research/rge/index.html>

APPENDIX E:

CONSENT FORM FOR INTERVIEW

COMMUNITY MOBILIZATION AROUND STREET PROSTITUTION IN OTTAWA

Kristina Rohde
Dr. Christine Bruckert
Department of Criminology
University of Ottawa
25 University Street
Ottawa, ON, K1N 6N5
(613) 562-5800 (ext.) 1814

Invitation to participate: I am invited to participate in the aforementioned research study conducted by Kristina Rohde under the supervision of Dr. Christine Bruckert for the completion of a Master's Thesis.

Purpose of the study: This study has three related objectives. The first objective of this research is to describe and analyze the community perceptions regarding the problem and solutions to street prostitution in Ottawa. The second objective of this research is to describe the position the Ottawa community takes in regards to street prostitution and subsequently describe and analyze how they arrive at their position. And the third and final objective of this research is to describe and analyze how the Ottawa community translates their position into action: what tools and tactics they employ, and whether they call upon punitive or alternative responses. These objectives will be achieved by analyzing results of interviews conducted with members of Ottawa community groups, documents produced by or in conjunction with these groups, and observational accounts taken at community meetings.

Participation: My participation will consist essentially of one interview for duration of 45-60 minutes during which I will be required to answer open-ended questions based on my perceptions on the issue of street prostitution. I understand that this interview will be conducted at a time and place convenient for me.

Risks: I have received assurance from the researcher that every effort will be made to minimize any possible risks. My participation in this study will entail that I discuss my own thoughts and perceptions. I am not expected to feel any discomfort, however in the unlikely event that I do, information about counselling services in my area will be made available.

Benefits: As mentioned the objectives of this study concern the perceptions of community organizations in respect to street prostitution, the decision making involved in the formation of

positions, and the action and resource mobilization the community engages in. My participation in this research will create knowledge for researchers and communities on the unique thought processes involved in the community mobilization and those wishing to deal with the issue of street prostitution.

Confidentiality and Anonymity: I have received assurance from the researcher that the information I will share will remain strictly confidential. I acknowledge and understand that the researcher's supervisor will also have access to the data. I understand that the contents will be used only for the purposes of completion of a Master's Thesis and related publishing. My confidentiality will be protected as no one will know that I have participated in this research. I understand that only the researcher will conduct the interview and, only the researcher and supervisor will have access to the data. The data from the interview will be coded by number and my name will not appear in the interview. As well, this consent form will be kept separate from interview data (e.g. interview transcripts, tape-recordings, written notes). Furthermore, any discussion of client's names will not be discussed in the research. My anonymity will be protected in that my name or any information pertaining to my identity will not be disclosed in this research. I will be referred to by a pseudonym in the publishing of the results. For example, if I am quoted in the research, my real name will not be used.

Conservation of data: The data collected (e.g. interview transcripts, tape-recordings, written notes) will be kept in a secure manner. The data will be stored securely in the supervisor's office in which only the researcher and the supervisor will have access to. Also, any electronic data will be stored on the researcher's laptop protected by a password. This data will be conserved for 10 years after which it will be destroyed (shredded and deleted).

Voluntary Participation: I am under no obligation to participate and if I choose to participate, I can withdraw from the study at any time and/or refuse to answer any questions, without suffering any negative consequences. If I choose to withdraw, all data gathered until the time of withdrawal will be destroyed.

Acceptance: I, _____, agree to participate in the above mentioned research study conducted by Kristina Rohde of The Department of Criminology at the University of Ottawa, which research is under the supervision of Dr. Christine Bruckert.

If I have any questions about the study, I may contact the researcher or Dr. Christine Bruckert

If I have any questions regarding the ethical conduct of this study, I may contact the Protocol Officer for Ethics in Research, University of Ottawa, Tabaret Hall, 550 Cumberland Street, Room 159, Ottawa, ON K1N 6N5

Tel.: (613) 562-5841

Email: ethics@uottawa.ca

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

Participant's signature: _____

Date: _____

Researcher's signature: _____

Date: _____

APPENDIX F:

CONSENT FORM FOR INTERVIEW – COMMUNITY LEADER

COMMUNITY MOBILIZATION AROUND STREET PROSTITUTION IN OTTAWA

Kristina Rohde
Dr. Christine Bruckert
Department of Criminology
University of Ottawa
25 University Street
Ottawa, ON, K1N 6N5
(613) 562-5800 (ext.) 1814

Invitation to participate: I am invited to participate in the aforementioned research study conducted by Kristina Rohde under the supervision of Dr. Christine Bruckert for the completion of a Master's Thesis.

Purpose of the study: This study has three related objectives. The first objective of this research is to describe and analyze the community perceptions regarding the problem and solutions to street prostitution in Ottawa. The second objective of this research is to describe the position the Ottawa community takes in regards to street prostitution and subsequently describe and analyze how they arrive at their position. And the third and final objective of this research is to describe and analyze how the Ottawa community translates their position into action: what tools and tactics they employ, and whether they call upon punitive or alternative responses. These objectives will be achieved by analyzing results of interviews conducted with members of Ottawa community groups, documents produced by or in conjunction with these groups, and observational accounts taken at community meetings.

Participation: My participation will consist essentially of one interview for duration of 45-60 minutes during which I will be required to answer open-ended questions based on my perceptions on the issue of street prostitution. I understand that this interview will be conducted at a time and place convenient for me.

Risks: I have received assurance from the researcher that every effort will be made to minimize any possible risks. My participation in this study will entail that I discuss my own thoughts and perceptions. I am not expected to feel any discomfort, however in the unlikely event that I do, information about counselling services in my area will be made available.

Benefits: As mentioned the objectives of this study concern the perceptions of community organizations in respect to street prostitution, the decision making involved in the formation of

positions, and the action and resource mobilization the community engages in. My participation in this research will create knowledge for researchers and communities on the unique thought processes involved in the community mobilization and those wishing to deal with the issue of street prostitution.

Confidentiality and Anonymity: I have received assurance from the researcher that the information I will share will remain strictly confidential. I acknowledge and understand that the researcher's supervisor will also have access to the data. I understand that the contents will be used only for the purposes of completion of a Master's Thesis and related publishing. My confidentiality will be protected as no one will know that I have participated in this research. I understand that only the researcher will conduct the interview and, only the researcher and supervisor will have access to the data. The data from the interview will be coded by number and my name will not appear in the interview. As well, this consent form will be kept separate from interview data (e.g. interview transcripts, tape-recordings, written notes). Furthermore, any discussion of client's names will not be discussed in the research. My anonymity will be protected in that my name or any information pertaining to my identity will not be disclosed in this research. I will be referred to by a pseudonym in the publishing of the results. For example, if I am quoted in the research, my real name will not be used. However, I am aware that given the distinct nature of the situation in Ottawa, it is reasonable that one could surmise that the community group is "Together for Vanier" and subsequently, that I am the director of this organization.

Conservation of data: The data collected (e.g. interview transcripts, tape-recordings, written notes) will be kept in a secure manner. The data will be stored securely in the supervisor's office in which only the researcher and the supervisor will have access to. Also, any electronic data will be stored on the researcher's laptop protected by a password. This data will be conserved for 10 years after which it will be destroyed (shredded and deleted).

Voluntary Participation: I am under no obligation to participate and if I choose to participate, I can withdraw from the study at any time and/or refuse to answer any questions, without suffering any negative consequences. If I choose to withdraw, all data gathered until the time of withdrawal will be destroyed.

Acceptance: I, _____, agree to participate in the above mentioned research study conducted by Kristina Rohde of The Department of Criminology at the University of Ottawa, which research is under the supervision of Dr. Christine Bruckert.

If I have any questions about the study, I may contact the researcher or Dr. Christine Bruckert

If I have any questions regarding the ethical conduct of this study, I may contact the Protocol Officer for Ethics in Research, University of Ottawa, Tabaret Hall, 550 Cumberland Street, Room 159, Ottawa, ON K1N 6N5

Tel.: (613) 562-5841

Email: ethics@uottawa.ca

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

Participant's signature: _____

Date: _____

Researcher's signature: _____

Date: _____

APPENDIX G:

Information letter

Kristina Rohde : M.A. Candidate, Department of Criminology, University of Ottawa, under the supervision of Dr. Chris Bruckert

krohd055@uottawa.ca

Introduction: My name is Kristina Rohde and I am a Master's student at the Criminology department at the University of Ottawa. This letter is to inform you that I will be present and observing today's meeting of *Together for Vanier: Drugs and Prostitution Committee* for research purposes related to my Master's thesis.

Purpose of the study: This study has three related objectives. The first objective of this research is to describe and analyze the community perceptions regarding the problem and solutions to street prostitution in Ottawa. The second objective of this research is to describe the position the Ottawa community takes in regards to street prostitution and subsequently describe and analyze how they arrive at their position. And the third and final objective of this research is to describe and analyze how the Ottawa community translates their position into action: what tools and tactics they employ, and whether they call upon punitive or alternative responses. These objectives will be achieved by analyzing results of interviews conducted with members of Ottawa community groups, documents produced by or in conjunction with these groups, and observational accounts taken at community meetings.

Voluntary Participation: You are not under any obligation to participate in the study, however, should you wish to leave the observation, you may do so without suffering any negative consequences.

APPENDIX H:
FRENCH TRANSLATION OF FORMS

**FORMULAIRE DE CONSENTEMENT POUR ENTREVUE – MEMBRES DE LA
COMMUNAUTÉ**

**MOBILISATION DE LA COMMUNAUTÉ AUTOUR DE LA PROSTITUTION DE RUE
À OTTAWA**

Kristina Rohde
Dre Christine Bruckert
Département de criminologie
Université d'Ottawa
25, rue University
Ottawa (Ontario) K1N 6N5
(613) 562-5800 (poste 1814)

Invitation à participer: Je suis invité(e) à participer à l'étude mentionnée ci-dessus menée par Kristina Rohde sous la supervision de la Dre Christine Bruckert pour une thèse de maîtrise.

Objectif de l'étude: Cette étude comporte trois objectifs connexes. Le premier objectif de cette recherche est de décrire et d'analyser les perceptions de la communauté en ce qui a trait au problème de la prostitution de rue à Ottawa et à ses solutions. Le deuxième objectif est de décrire la position que la communauté d'Ottawa a prise vis-à-vis de la prostitution de rue et, par la suite, de décrire et d'analyser comment elle en est arrivée à cette position. Le troisième et dernier objectif est de décrire et d'analyser comment la communauté d'Ottawa a traduit sa position par des actions : quels outils et quelles tactiques elle emploie, et si elle a recours à des réponses punitives ou à d'autres options. Pour atteindre ces objectifs, on analysera les résultats des entrevues menées avec des membres de groupes de la communauté d'Ottawa, des documents préparés par ces groupes ou de concert avec eux, et les observations notées lors de réunions communautaires.

Participation: Ma participation prendra essentiellement la forme d'une entrevue d'une durée de 45 à 60 minutes durant laquelle j'aurai à répondre à des questions ouvertes fondées sur mes perceptions quant à la question de la prostitution de rue. Je comprends que cette entrevue aura lieu à un moment et dans un endroit qui me conviendront et que celle-ci sera enregistrée.

Risques: J'ai reçu l'assurance de la recherchiste que tous les efforts seraient faits afin de minimiser tous les risques potentiels. Ma participation dans cette étude signifie que j'aurai à discuter de mes propres idées et perceptions. Je ne devrais pas ressentir aucune gêne.

Avantages: Tel qu'indiqué, les objectifs de cette étude se rapportent aux perceptions des organismes communautaires quant à la prostitution de rue, au processus décisionnel dans la formation de positions, et aux actions et à la mobilisation de ressources entreprises par la communauté. Ma participation dans cette étude produira de nouvelles connaissances pour les recherchistes et les communautés sur le cheminement unique de la pensée entraînant la mobilisation communautaire et pour ceux qui aimeraient adresser la question de la prostitution de rue.

Confidentialité et anonymat: J'ai reçu l'assurance de la recherchiste que les renseignements que je vais partager demeureront strictement confidentiels. Je reconnais que la superviseure de la recherchiste aura aussi accès à ces données. Je comprends que le contenu ne sera utilisé que pour compléter une thèse de maîtrise et des ouvrages connexes. Mon anonymat sera protégé puisque personne ne saura que j'ai participé à cette recherche. Je comprends que seule la recherchiste effectuera l'entrevue et que seules la recherchiste et sa superviseure auront accès aux données. Un code numérique sera donné aux renseignements contenus dans l'entrevue et mon nom n'y apparaîtra pas. De plus, ce formulaire de consentement sera conservé séparément des données de l'entrevue (p. ex., copies de l'entrevue, enregistrements magnétiques, notes écrites). Aussi, les noms des clients qui pourraient avoir fait l'objet d'une discussion ne seront pas mentionnés dans l'étude. Mon anonymat sera protégé puisque ni mon nom, ni les renseignements se rapportant à mon identité ne seront divulgués dans cette étude. On utilisera un pseudonyme pour référer à moi dans la publication des résultats. Par exemple, si on cite mes paroles dans l'étude, on n'utilisera pas mon vrai nom.

Protection des données: Les données amassées (p. ex., copies de l'entrevue, enregistrements magnétiques, notes écrites) seront protégées de manière sûre. Les données seront conservées en sécurité dans le bureau de la superviseure auquel seules la recherchiste et la superviseure ont accès. De plus, toutes les données électroniques seront conservées sur l'ordinateur portable de la recherchiste et protégées par un mot de passe. Ces données seront conservées pour dix ans, après quoi elles seront détruites (déchiquetées et effacées).

Participation volontaire: Je ne suis aucunement tenu(e) de participer à cette étude et, si je décide de participer, je peux à tout moment cesser de le faire et/ou refuser de répondre à toute question, sans encourir de conséquences négatives. Si je décide de ne plus participer à cette étude, toutes les données amassées jusqu'au moment de mon retrait seront détruites.

Acceptation: Je, soussigné(e) _____, accepte de participer à l'étude mentionnée ci-dessus, menée par Kristina Rohde du Département de criminologie de l'Université d'Ottawa, dont la recherche est sous la supervision de la Dre Christine Bruckert.

Si j'ai des questions au sujet de cette étude, je peux contacter la recherchiste ou la Dre Christine Bruckert.

Si j'ai des questions concernant la déontologie en matière de conduite de cette recherche, je peux contacter le Chef du protocole pour ce qui a trait à la déontologie en matière de conduite de la recherche, Université d'Ottawa, Pavillon Tabaret, 550, rue Cumberland, Pièce 159, Ottawa (Ontario) K1N 6N5.

Tél.: (613) 562-5841

Courriel: ethics@uottawa.ca

Il y a deux copies du formulaire de consentement et l'une est ma copie personnelle.

Signature du participant: _____

Date: _____

Signature de la chercheuse: _____

Date: _____

INFORMATION LETTER:

Kristina Rohde : M.A. Candidate, Department of Criminology, University of Ottawa, under the supervision of Dr. Chris Bruckert
krohd055@uottawa.ca

Introduction: Mon nom est Kristina Rohde et je suis une étudiante à la maîtrise au Département de criminologie de l'Université d'Ottawa. Cette lettre est pour vous aviser que je serai présente à la réunion de *Ensemble pour Vanier : Comité sur la drogue et la prostitution* afin de l'observer à des fins de recherche pour ma thèse de maîtrise.

Objectif de l'étude: Cette étude comporte trois objectifs connexes. Le premier objectif de cette recherche est de décrire et d'analyser les perceptions de la communauté en ce qui a trait au problème de la prostitution de rue à Ottawa et à ses solutions. Le deuxième objectif est de décrire la position que la communauté d'Ottawa a prise vis-à-vis de la prostitution de rue et, par la suite, de décrire et d'analyser comment elle en est arrivée à cette position. Le troisième et dernier objectif est de décrire et d'analyser comment la communauté d'Ottawa a traduit sa position par des actions : quels outils et quelles tactiques elle emploie, et si elle a recours à des réponses punitives ou à d'autres options, etc. Pour atteindre ces objectifs, on analysera les

résultats des entrevues menées avec des membres de groupes de la communauté d'Ottawa, des documents préparés par ces groupes ou de concert avec eux, et les observations notées lors de réunions communautaires.

Participation volontaire: Vous n'êtes pas tenu(e) de participer à cette étude, toutefois, si vous désirez ne pas faire partie de cette observation, vous pouvez vous retirer sans encourir aucune conséquence négative.