

Just Orientations: An Analysis of Membership Categorization During Response-Based
Conversations about Violence and Resistance

by

Jeffrey Galvin Smith
BMT, Capilano College, 2005

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in the Department of Educational Psychology and Leadership Studies

© Jeffrey Galvin Smith, 2011
University of Victoria

All rights reserved. This thesis may not be reproduced in whole or in part, by photocopy or other means, without the permission of the author.

Supervisory Committee

Just Orientations: An analysis of membership categorization during response-based
conversations about violence and resistance

by

Jeffrey Galvin Smith
BMT, Capilano College, 2005

Supervisory Committee

Dr. M. Honore France, (Educational Psychology and Leadership Studies)
Co-Supervisor

Dr. Vernoica Pacini-Ketchabaw, (School of Child and Youth Care)
Co-Supervisor

Dr. David de Rosenroll, (Educational Psychology and Leadership Studies)
Departmental Member

Abstract

Supervisory Committee

Dr. M. Honore France, (Educational Psychology and Leadership Studies)
Co-Supervisor

Dr. Vernoica Pacini-Ketchabaw, (School of Child and Youth Care)
Co-Supervisor

Dr. David de Rosenroll, (Educational Psychology and Leadership Studies)
Departmental Member

Violence is a social problem that therapists are called upon to address. This study focuses on how therapist Dr. Allan Wade and three female interviewees (who had been victims of violence) oriented to conversational devices, in particular those pertaining to membership categorization, during three response-based interviews. Response-based practice (RBP) is a therapeutic approach that operates on the premise that violence and oppression are unilateral acts that are always met with resistance. By incorporating a complex understanding of language and discourse, critical, postcolonial and feminist theory, and modern and postmodern therapeutic approaches, RBP offers an alternative to traditional psychological approaches. By using a variation of conversation analysis and ethnomethodology, and drawing upon the work of Deleuze, Guattari, and Foucault, I discuss how the participants oriented to particular conversational devices when accomplishing social tasks such as attributing perpetrator responsibility, acknowledging resistance, attending to negative social responses, and facilitating expressions of dignity.

Table of Contents

Supervisory Committee	ii
Abstract	iii
Table of Contents	iv
List of Tables	vii
Acknowledgements	viii
Chapter I – Introduction	1
Background to Study	1
Research Focus	2
Overview of the Thesis	6
Researcher Location	6
Chapter II – Theoretical Framework and Selected Literature	9
Epistemology	9
Developing What is Enveloped in a Sign	9
Substance, Content, Expression, and Form	12
Theoretical Framework	14
Response-Based Practice	14
Violence	18
Social Responses	19
Violence, Meaning-Making, and Structural Responses	20
Four Discursive Operations and Response-Based Tasks	22
Language	23

Politics of Representation	29
Language of Affects	30
Power	31
Resistance	35
Schizoanalysis	37
Summary of Chapter II	38
Chapter III – Methodology and Research Design	39
Research Aim	39
Context of the Study	39
Conversation Analysis Method	40
Conversation Analysis Devices	42
Turn taking	42
Sequence organization	43
Turn design	44
Lexical or word choice	45
Membership Categorization Devices	46
Procedure for Data Analysis	50
Summary of Chapter III	52
Chapter IV – Analysis	54
Response-Based Interview with Pamela	54
Response-Based Interview with Jane	61
Response-Based Interview with Kate	70
Summary of Chapter IV	75

Chapter V – Discussion	76
Power Asymmetries: The Pouvoir of Response-Based Practice	77
The Standardized Relational Pair (SRP) Perpetrator/Victim	81
Response-Based Orientations to the MCD Responding-To-Violence	87
Responding to a Language of Effects	90
Summary of Chapter V	93
Chapter VI – Conclusions	94
Review of the Findings	94
Limitations	94
Implications for Practice	95
Implications for Theory and Research	96
Researcher Experience	97
Conclusion	97
References	99
Footnotes	107

List of Tables

Table 1. Table of Standardized Relational Pair (SRP) Perpetrator/Victim	86
--	-----------

Acknowledgments

I would like to acknowledge the support of my thesis committee: Dr. Veronica Pacini-Ketchabaw, Dr. Honore France, and Dr. David de Rosenroll. I am also thankful to Dr. Cathy Richardson for the opportunity to join her hard working research team: Erica Briggs, Sonya Dhudwal, Lyndall Hewitt, and Cassidy Sheehan. Thanks to Dr. Allan Wade, for encouragement and feedback during analysis. Lots of love to Rose and Howard my loving parents and lifelong friends. Deep bow of appreciation to RM Meiten my dear teacher and dharma sister. Big squeeze to Breanna Lawrence for help with editing and other exciting encounters! Thanks to the Vancouver Island Narrative Collective (Becky, Dave, Jonny, and Megs) for being in solidarity with me over the past three years. Howl to Dr. Vikki Reynolds for the great discussions about theory, practice, ethics, and Life. Thanks again to Veronica and the rest of the Deleuze reading group for some untimely philosophical collisions and inevitable lines of flight. Also thanks to Dr. Tim Black for earlier revisions and dialogue. Lastly, not least, Joey, Jill, Maeve, PY, Brother Owl, the Wiss, the Galvins, the Smiths, and all my great buds who, as Vik says, “belong” me.

Chapter I - Introduction

Background to the Study

Violence is a social problem that therapists are called upon to address. Statistics Canada released a report in January 2011 entitled “Family Violence in Canada: A Statistical Profile” which highlighted that over 6% of 19 million Canadians, who had a current or former partner, were victims¹ of sexual or physical spousal assault. Only 22 % of the cases were reported to police. While both men and women reported being victimized, it was found that women were victims of more serious crimes including sexualized assault, beatings, strangling, and threats with a weapon. With increasing rates of spousal homicide, more women and men are experiencing violence and the resultant affects. In 2010 the Canadian Psychological Association (CPA) released a policy statement on violence against women recognizing that “violence against women is a serious issue in Canadian Society that must be addressed. Aboriginal, immigrant, and visible minority women are particularly vulnerable... Eradication of this prevalent social problem requires a multipronged, integrated approach with a focus on research, prevention, and remediation” (p.1). As counsellor researchers we are interested to know how are therapists are currently responding to this widespread social problem.

Violence research and specifically discourse analysis has shown that the manner in which professionals and government officials talk and write about violence can influence the ways that victims and perpetrators are treated (Coates & Wade, 2007). The Statistics Canada and CPA examples above are two brief demonstrations of how violence is represented in text. While the CPA statement recognized the “nature of violence against women” as “gender-based persecution” Statistics Canada continues to use mutualizing phrases like “family violence,” “spousal assault,” and “spousal homicide” in their report. Researchers Linda Coates and Allan

Wade argue that the use of such abstract terminology misrepresents victims and perpetrators of violence by obscuring the unilateral and intentional nature of violence. They have proposed a theory called “Four Discursive Operations” which outlines some of the ways that language is used to conceal violence, obfuscate perpetrators’ responsibility, conceal victims’ resistance, and blame and pathologize victims.

Research Focus

The modern conception of power in the social sciences changed when continental philosopher and historian Michel Foucault (2000) mapped how power interweaves itself within the history of human knowledge through practices that are linked with institutions, economic requirements, and the politics of social regulation (Gergen, 1991; Madigan, 2011; Rainbow, 1984; Rose, 2006; Wade, 1999; White & Epston, 1990). Anthropologist Paul Rabinow (1984) has argued that Foucault’s concepts of power and knowledge are interrelated and these concepts described how, in the domain of social life and the institutions that constitute cultural conduct, people exert power by acting in accord with knowledge, truth regimes, and dominant cultural discourses. When researching power in the human sciences, Foucault was not concerned with how an external power imposes itself upon science but rather the effects of power that are internal to certain scientific statements and knowledge. Nikolas Rose (2006) applies this understanding to the therapy profession, suggesting that psychology is not a negative instrument that manipulates, denies, or acts as a conduit for a power-full group that seeks to dominate a subordinate class. From this perspective, therapists are not in possession of power, but act as conduits for bodies of knowledge that have material effects upon other bodies. This understanding of power has been a catalyst for the development of poststructural therapeutic practices (Brown & Augusta-Scott, 2007; Guilfoyle, 2005; Hook, 2007; Madigan, 1996; Wade,

1999; White & Epston, 1990) and research methodologies, particularly in the fields of discourse analysis, critical discourse analysis, and Foucauldian discourse analysis.

While these interpretations of Foucault's work have had a major influence on researcher reflexivity and conceptualizations about the problem of power, politics, and ethics in therapeutic praxis, there have been some constructive critiques and alternative proposals based on conversation analysis (CA) and ethnomethodology (EM) (Wooffitt, 2005), as well as from Response-Based Practitioners. In his dissertation, "Resistance to Interpersonal Violence: Implications for the Practice of Therapy," researcher and Response-Based Practice co-founder Dr. Allan Wade (1999) articulated a concern about how some poststructural therapies have interpreted Foucault's early work, and these interpretations have shaped their understandings of violence and oppression. Wade posits that while Foucault acknowledged that power and resistance are relational in character, many scholars and practitioners tend to focus more on the operations of power and domination than resistance. This particular focus may have contributed to a binary that separates power and resistance, which can be seen in some practices of postmodern therapy, in which problems, or "problem stories" as they are referred to in narrative practice², are explored for their "effects" upon the subject. For example, narrative therapists Duvall and Beres (2007), when writing about the "effects" of sexualized assault, suggest that "... as a result of being sexually abused [victims] sometimes surrender to a pervasive cynicism, resulting in a pessimistic outlook on life" (p. 236). This view is problematic from a Response-Based perspective not only in its failure to account for the presence of ongoing resistance to violence, but the use of "effects-based" language (described in chapter 2) misrepresents the victim's responses as a "surrender to pervasive cynicism" (p. 236). These examples show how departures from dominant psychological paradigms do not guarantee freedom from what I call

psychological territorialization, which are psychological interpretations and/or appropriations of human experience, knowledge and understandings. Wade argues that the failure to account for responses to violence and/or the de-contextualization of responses as deficient or disordered, privileges ideology over action and psychological or intellectual description over locally contextualized understandings.

Psychological territorialization is informed by dominant institutional power and knowledge, often accompanied by discourses of evidence-based practice that are disseminated through mainstream training programs, workshops, journals, and popular media. Social psychologist Ken Gergen (2007) states: “When the science attempts to share its knowledge with the public, to influence policy issues, and to sell merchandise (such as psychological tests, books, educational programs), we confront significant issues of cultural concern” (p. 7). In their study of evidence-based discourse, Canadian Medical researchers Holmes, Murray, Perron, and Rail (2006) found that the evidence-based movement was exclusionary and normative with regards to scientific knowledge and Gergen has articulated that these exclusionary practices are a problem in the field of psychology as well.

Foucault’s preface to Deleuze and Guattari’s (2008) book “Anti-Oedipus” describes it as “an Introduction to the Non-Fascist Life” (p. xiil). He then goes on to list a number of principles that he considers integral to the art of “living counter to all forms of fascism” (p. xiil). One of the principles, to “...Withdraw allegiance from the old categories of the Negative... which Western thought has so long held as a form of power and an access to reality” (p. xiil), is of particular relevance to a critique of effects-based language. Not only is Wade (1999) critical of psychological practices that pay more attention to domination and its effects than to explorations of resistance, he asks why a practitioner would want to position their client as a subject of

negative effects in the first place. This concern is supported by the research of Brewin and Rose (2003), which showed that “negative social responses” are associated with an increase in the symptoms of “post-traumatic stress disorder.” Despite the fact that Deleuze and Guattari’s extensive analysis of psychoanalysis, modern linguistics, and psychiatry have been used to produce a large body of research in the areas of education (Amorim & Ryan, 2005; Gale, 2010; Hargreaves, 1996; Jackson & St. Pierre, 1997), ethnography (Roets, Roose, Claes, Verstraeten, & Vandekinderen, 2009; St. Pierre, 1999), nursing (Drummond, 2005; Holmes, Murray, Perron, & Rail, 2006; Holmes, Gastaldo, & Perron, 2007; Roberts, 2008), and organization studies (Manning, 1997), there is a paucity of contributions from the counselling psychology field. The collection of practice-based data and the application of analysis is no longer the sole domain of social researchers who arrive from the outside, but is an opportunity for practitioners to offer their own research contributions (Dausien, Hanses, Inowlocki, & Riemann, 2008). By creating assemblages between Response-Based Practice, conversation analysis, ethnomethodology, and the work of Deleuze, Guattari, and Foucault I hope to make a unique research contribution to the small but growing body of literature about Response-Based Practice.

Michel Foucault died of AIDS in 1984. Six months later Deleuze dedicated a book to his colleague and friend. In it he comments with admiration on the steadfastness of Foucault’s commitment to working through the highly publicized impasse in his analysis of power, in order to reach a new plateau. Foucault’s final plateau was dedicated to practices of care of the self and his final years were given to a celebration of joy: “...the joy of wanting to destroy whatever mutilates life” (Deleuze, 2006, p. 21). Inspired by this sentiment, in this thesis I describe how participants (Wade and three interviewees) orient to membership categorization and other linguistic devices in their interactions about violence and resistance. My research question is:

“How are membership categorization devices oriented to when attributing perpetrator responsibility, acknowledging resistance, and addressing negative social responses during response-based interviews?”

Overview of the Thesis

The present thesis focuses on the complex therapeutic problem of addressing violence as a contextual and political act by recognizing that resistance is ever-present and that people are always striving to maintain their dignity when talking about their experiences of violence and oppression. The site of analysis is that of Response-Based Practice (RBP) - a therapeutic practice that draws upon postcolonial theory, feminism, and modernist critiques of psychiatry (Coates, Todd, & Wade, 2000; Coates & Wade, 2007, 2003; Richardson & Wade, 2010, 2008; Todd & Wade, 1994; Wade, 1997, 1995, 1999). Co-founded by Dr. Allan Wade, Dr. Linda Coates, and Nick Todd, RBP focuses on the details of people’s responses to oppression and mistreatment. RBP privileges contextualized conversations about what people do to protect their lives, the lives of loved ones, and how they preserve dignity when faced with violence and oppression. Drawing upon conversation analysis and ethnomethodology, the purpose of this thesis was to describe how Wade and three interviewees oriented to conversational devices, with a particular focus on membership categorization devices (MCDs) and their accompanying apparatus’, during descriptions of violence and resistance.

Researcher Self Location

Living and working in the neighbourhoods of East Vancouver expanded my experience of poverty, desperation, and survival. My current work with socially, politically, and economically marginalized youth and adults in Victoria, has been informed by those earlier experiences. The despair expressed by my clients, friends and family in response to street life,

poverty, various state apparatuses (i.e. prisons, psychiatry, Ministry of Children and Families), and suicide have led me rethink the ethics and practicality of individualized and psychological technologies that fail to address social, political, spiritual, and economic contexts. As a music therapist and counselling graduate student who has been trained in traditional models of psychology, the shift to postmodern practices and principles of social justice has been a challenging yet rewarding endeavour. I have had the fortune of being in the company of other revolutionary thinkers, who share in this challenging work. My trainings in Response-Based Practice and narrative therapy have been instrumental in informing my commitment to acknowledging context, oppression, resistance and dignity (Wade, 1997,1999; Richardson, 2005; Madigan, 2011; White & Epston, 1990) on an ongoing basis. I co-founded a peer supervision group called the Vancouver Island Narrative Collective (VINC), comprised of fellow like-minded graduate students, with whom I engage in critical conversations about the structures of our traditional psychological training and our preferred ethics and practices. In addition we engage in peer supervision, facilitate training and guest lectures, and engage in consultations with community organizations.

My interest in RBP is related, in part, to Response-Based practitioners' collective resistance to dominant psychological representations and practices that privilege psychological abstraction over local descriptions of real events. My own observations, after over 10 years of experience working with people who respond daily to abject poverty, homelessness, racism, homo/transphobia, sexism, violence, and oppression, have led me to believe that dominant psychological knowledge fails to address people's actual experiences, and tends more often to misrepresent them as deficient. To offer an alternative, I have witnessed people being resourceful in their responses to the pathological system that we live against. I have heard

countless accounts of the negative social responses that victims of violence and oppression have received under the guise of psychology, psychiatry, and the law. I believe that when our dominant apolitical renderings fail to address the contextualized, structural and political nature of their experiences of violence and oppression we work against social justice. I appreciate the ways that Response-Based researchers document and respond to negative social responses and dominant power and knowledge while maintaining a focus on resistance and human dignity. It is my intention, by studying this practice, to become more proficient in these areas in my own work.

Chapter II – Theoretical Framework and Selected Literature

This chapter provides a review of the literature relevant to an analysis of accounts of violence and resistance during Response-Based interviews. First I introduce my epistemology, which is based on Brian Massumi's book "A User's Guide to Capitalism and Schizophrenia," and describe how Massumi's understanding of "woodworking" applies to the practice of research by using examples related to my methodology of conversation analysis (CA) and ethnomethodology (EM). I then provide a brief overview of RBP as the context of my research before addressing some of the problems that researchers have identified, and that Response-Based therapists attend to, regarding the way that professionals and other members of society respond to victims of violence and oppression. Finally, I draw the reader's attention to recent and classic scholarly knowledge in the social sciences about the problems of language, power, and political resistance as it relates to the institutionalization of therapy and research with victims of violence and oppression in the postmodern age of global capitalism.

Epistemology

Developing What is Enveloped in a Sign

In the present section I outline how Deleuze and Guattari's (1996) radical empiricism informed me while engaging with interactional data from my CA research. I draw upon an example provided by Massumi (1992), who explores the institutional practice of woodworking, to convey my conceptualization of how knowledge is selected and brought forward from multiple possibilities during research. Massumi describes the woodworker as an artisan who uses a skill plane to develop what is enveloped (the grain and qualities) in the wood. In doing so s/he interprets the *signs*, which are the enveloped qualities, such as the grain, that are already in the wood. Similarly when a conversation analyst applies a method to linguistic signs, such as a

sentence fragment, s/he does so in an attempt to describe how that social action was employed by participants to accomplish interactional work (i.e. to provide a positive social response to a victim of violence). Signs envelop a *potential*, meaning they have the capacity to be affected as when wood submits to the force of the plane, or when raw data is altered by a research method. For example, a social interaction consists of what was said and not said, physical gestures, private thoughts, body odours, feelings, eye contact, and so on. However, research analysis requires the application of a particular methodological force, which envelops multiplicity, for example by focusing on the conversational devices (as identified by conversational analysts and ethnomethodologists) that participants oriented to during a Response-Based interview. Signs have the capacity to affect. For example, in research signs are not determined by the method but rather inform it. In the woodworking profession the grain of wood affects the institutionalization of woodworking, which teaches one to follow the direction of the sign (grain). As you will see in chapter three, commonly observed interactional practices, such as a person responding to a previous utterance during a conversation, have informed the methodology of conversation analysis. Signs affect by releasing force, for example, the common conversational practice of persons responding to questions, has affected the field of conversation analysis and informed the CA device called “turn taking” (further discussed in chapter 3).

Massumi (1992) describes the sign as a contraction of time, as a future potential and symptom of the past. This means that the sign is a process that points forward. For woodworkers it is the grain that guides a planer carving a table. For conversation analysts it is the participant orientation to linguistic devices and unique sequence of interactions that guide analysis. The contraction of time also points backward, as in the evolution of a tree species and the historical and cultural practices of woodworking, or in the case of CA the historical and taken for granted

cultural practices of communication that inform social forms of interaction. Massumi (1992) argues that the concept of envelopment is not merely a metaphor, providing the wood grain, which has phylogenetic past as well as future qualities to be exploited, as evidence of the materiality of envelopment. An object of study is always a multiplicity and can be said to have as many meanings as there are forces to grasp it. The sign is not an identity, but rather an envelopment of difference and a narrowing of the multiplicity of ongoing action, transformation and diverse materiality. Massumi defines “meaning,” in radical empiricist terms, as the exploration of the infinity of processes, paths not taken, and forces that could have but did not seize upon what is enveloped in the sign. We make meaning of the woodworker as a subject by describing them as someone who brings a quality of wood to expression, or the conversation analyst as someone who seeks to explicate the theories and goals, either tacit or explicit, of participants engaged in an interaction (ten Have, 2000). While it appears that the woodworker and the researcher are subjects that possess the human qualities of will and intention, woodworking and research are not simply objective and autonomous practices. They can also be understood poststructurally as affected by the institutionalization of craftsmanship, methodology, and formalized knowledge. In addition the woodworker and the researcher create products that are partially determined by the cultural requirements of an audience (i.e. the woodworker builds a desk for a student to type a thesis, and the student responds to feedback from supervisors about what constitutes research).

The act of interpretation then is an application of force, which is the outcome of processes natural and historical, individual and institutional. This process is not determined, not just a product of forces behind the signs. For example research results are not just the result of analytic force applied to a phenomenon of interest, nor are they pure descriptions of the

phenomenon- but rather a meeting *between* forces. Massumi (1992) suggests that it is the process of force versus force and action upon action that results in the development of envelopment. The meaning that I make, as researcher, is a singularity of my encounter with lines of force (i.e. the raw data, the methodology, my relationship to RBP, my intuition, and so on), which is a complex of other forces (i.e. cultural understandings of violence and resistance, the institution of therapy, the Four Discursive Operations of RBP, the sequences that came before the current interaction of interest and the effect that the current interaction had on future sequences, the life experiences that each person brought to the interaction, the current mood of each participant, and so on). This appears to be, as a process with no unity and no end, a problem that could be analyzed infinitely in any direction. However, Massumi identifies a region of clarity called an *encounter* where, if we use the woodworking example, the tool meets wood, or in the case of CA, the method is applied to an interaction. Massumi suggests that the region of clarity is not a reification of the nature/culture duality, or a dichotomy of objective/subjective, matter/mind, raw material/production, but rather a conception of force as being both cultural and natural. Massumi's region of clarity maintains a duality in that, although signs are not passive, they are understood to be less active than the tool that develops them. Because the sign (i.e. an utterance about violence in the recorded interaction) is slower to act than the activity of interpretation, and its force is considered to be weaker than the application of method (i.e. the categorization of that interaction), it is overpowered in this encounter with the method and gives way to that interpretation (i.e. in the form of research results).

Substance, Content, Expression, and Form

Massumi's (1992) approach accounts for two materials of analytic interest: substance and form. Substance is an ontological concept that is connected to a theory of immanence, which

refers to a force that is immanent, or always within, the material world. This theory opposes transcendent theories that propose an external cause of life. For Massumi, after Deleuze, such an understanding of immanence obliges one to create action and results rather than establishing transcendent truths. Massumi suggests that substance has determinate forms on both sides of an encounter, such as the wood (and its signs) on one side and the woodworker and their tools on the other. Massumi describes an encounter as an event that encompasses two substance/form complexes that engage in a process in which one overpowers the other. In the case of CA, the “raw” data (a recorded encounter between two participants) exists on one side, and the researcher and methods (i.e. transcription format, analytic method, and so on) exist on the other. Form constitutes the raw materials and the objects they produce on both sides of the encounter, for example, conversations in which an initiating utterance by one participant produces a context to which the respondent is held accountable to address during their turn. The forces of one come to be captured and contained in the other. Massumi’s description of the encounter is a poststructural conception of power that allowed me to think of the knowledge as a hierarchy of forces that are expressed as complex phenomena with value of “content,” the overpowered (i.e. a multiplicity of interactional elements), on one side and value of “expression,” (i.e. the overpowering of those multiplicities as “conversational devices”), on the other. Content (i.e. an utterance) is not a sign, referent, or signified, but rather an expression that overpowered multiple forces (all that was left unsaid) that the sign (i.e. the methodological device used to define the utterance) then envelops. The formed substance of the expression envelops the content. In thesis-speak this process is referred to as results.

However envelopment is not simply a unidirectional process, and the difference between content and expression is functional, relative, and reversible. To explain, I return to Massumi’s

(1992) woodworking example. From the perspective of the dominant tool (the plane) the wood is the content. However, the wood is also an expression of the content (water, sun, and carbon dioxide) that it captures and contains to express its own genetic potential. While the woodworker with a tool is an agent of expression, her expression is informed by the content of the institution. Due to the fact that content and expression are reversible in action, an analysis of the power relation is necessary to determine which is which. Each power relation is a complex of power relations, and Massumi suggests that the strands of a web of power can be unwound and followed to trace the trajectory of force across entanglements with other forces. It is possible to follow the trajectory of a thing as it passes from one knot of forces to the next. While content and expression are mutually determining and have reciprocal presupposition, because neither one exists without the other, they are also always distinct in nature. Massumi's methodology is a model of struggle in which it is not always possible to know who/what has the upper hand (i.e. the content of a conversation, the methodology as expression of the content, the student or his institutional training, the research supervisor, and so on).

Theoretical Framework

Response-Based Practice

Allan Wade (1997) wrote a paper for the *Contemporary Family Therapy* journal in which he described the foundation of a therapeutic approach, now known as Response-Based Practice, which is "based on the observation that whenever people are badly treated, they resist" (p. 23). Acknowledgments of pre-existing ability in RBP are similar to the theoretical orientations of narrative and solution-focused therapies and, like narrative therapy Response-Based conversations are situated within a social justice framework. However by introducing the concept of "healthy resistance," which conveys that resistance to violence and oppression is a

“symptom of health and health inducing” (Wade, 1997, p. 24) RBP moves the idea of pre-existing ability in a new direction. The ontological position, that resistance is ever-present and health inducing, is supported by Wade’s (1999) microanalysis of how people, who are oppressed, attacked and violated, resist in complex and often misunderstood ways.

Wade and fellow violence researcher Linda Coates argue that resistance is often overlooked in North America because our cultural understanding is based upon the model of male-to-male combat, in which someone who fights back physically is thought to have resisted. This narrow definition fails to account for the complex, strategic, subversive, creative, and sometimes surprising forms of resistance that occur in response to violence and oppression. Another common and problematic misconception of resistance is based upon the psychoanalytic notion of the resistant client who, at the mercy of their unconscious psychological defenses defies the authoritative interpretation of the therapist, and is then held accountable for any lack of progress in therapy. These narrow and pathological conceptions of resistance are supplanted by Wade (1997) who, quotes from the 1990 Concise Oxford Dictionary, defines resistance as: “any effort to... withstand the action or effect of; repel.... stop the course of progress of; prevent from reaching, penetrating, etc... abstain from... strive against; try to impede; refuse to comply with... offer opposition” (p. 25). In addition to these mental and behavioural acts of self-preservation, Wade (2007) suggests that:

“Any attempt to imagine or establish a life based on respect and equality, on behalf of one’s self or others, including any effort to redress the harm caused by violence or other forms of oppression, represents a de facto form of resistance.” (p. 25)

Conversations about resistance can be thought of as Response-Based when they relate to people’s actual responses to violence and their contextual meanings, which can only be known in

consultation with the victim's own description. RBP engages clients (men and women, and children and adults who have been subjected to sexualized assault and abuse, humiliation, racism, exclusion based on disability, sexual preference, or beliefs, as well as people mistreated by professionals in institutions) in conversation to learn about the details of their own resistance. Close attention is given to the context that the violence occurred in, for example: women escaping violent partners, survivors of torture, First Nations people interned in the prison camps euphemistically referred to as residential schools, and victims of workplace harassment. Response-based counsellors use a series of questions to elicit accounts of resistance and responses to violence, which highlight the client's pre-existing competencies. The Calgary Women's Emergency Shelter published a handbook (2007) that provides examples of the kinds of questions that a therapist might ask a victim of abuse:

- How did you respond?
- What did your body language convey?
- What did you do then?
- What went through your mind?
- How did you feel?
- What is it like for you to think about your resistance to this abuse?
- Has your resistance ever been labelled as sick or dysfunctional by anyone?
- If so how?

This series of questions exemplifies how RBP can be used to centre client resistance, while de-centering psychological and pathologizing misrepresentations of people's responses to traumatic events, such as misconstruing a person's response to ongoing violence as clinical depression.

Wade (1997) describes two forms of resistance, spontaneous and strategic, which arise in response to violence and oppression. He provides a case study to exemplify how the qualities of spontaneous personal resistance are not always instructed or prescribed, but rather arise spontaneously in response to violence against oneself and others. Wade (2007) explains how one of his clients, whom he calls Joanne, resisted violence and other abuse in ways that were subtle, even disguised, so as not to increase the level of violence. The case study describes how, despite the ongoing danger, Joanne persisted in her opposition to the violence- even in the absence of immediate success (i.e. the cessation of further violence). Wade (1997) claims that resistance is “pervasive and everyday” (p. 29) and shows how Joanne strategized, not only in response to her father’s violence, but in her ongoing resistance (such as refusing to follow his orders) to the family authority and sense of entitlement that helped maintain his practices of control and domination.

In “Domination and the Arts of Resistance” James Scott (1990) explains how persons who engage in acts of violence also engage in efforts to suppress any perceived resistance to their authority. Wade (1997) provides the following examples from his practice: an employee who expresses dissent in response to mistreatment by a supervisor is fired; a woman who leaves her husband is stalked by him and beaten; a child who is sexually abused is told that they will be left alone by their loved one’s if they speak up; a disagreement between a patient and psychiatrist is interpreted as evidence of mental disorder. The ongoing threat of retaliation, in these examples, is why open forms of defiance are the least common forms of resistance (Scott). Subtler forms of resistance are more common and Wade suggests that tactics such as making shopping lists while being raped by an abusive partner, pretending to be crazy, and feigning agreement with a perpetrator are ways that victims conceal and protect their true thoughts and

intentions from perpetrators. Unfortunately the tactics used to resist severe acts of violence, such as “floating up behind the ear of a blue elephant” (Wade, 2007, p. 30), are often misrepresented by psychologists as the effects of “dissociation” or other disorder (Herman, 1997).

Violence

In RBP, violence is defined as a deliberate unilateral social act. Violence is social in that it occurs in specific interactions and involves at least two people; it is unilateral in that it requires actions by a perpetrator against the will of another person; and it is deliberate in that perpetrators take steps to conceal and suppress resistance (Coates & Wade, 2007; Richardson & Wade, 2008). RB practitioners use the terms “victim” and “perpetrator” contextually, and not as static identity markers, in order to be clear about the differences between unilateral acts of violence and acts of resistance. While open defiance to violence is not common for reasons described later, subtle forms are *always* realized (including the privacy of the persons thoughts) - even in the most life threatening circumstances. Acts of violence and how people respond are real events that occur in the material world and RBP take care when fitting words to deeds. They recognize that professional and personal accounts of violence influence the perception and treatment of victims and perpetrators and address three kinds of misrepresentation that has been linked to violence: strategic, in which perpetrators obscure their actions; tactical, in which victim’s preserve their safety by concealing their resistance; and inadvertent, such as when professionals use misleading terms to represent violence and responses (Coates & Wade, 2007; Richardson & Wade, 2010; Wade, 1999).

Social Responses

We know nothing about a body until we know what it can do, in other words, what its affects are, how they can or cannot enter into composition with other affects, with the affects of another body, either to destroy that body or to be destroyed by it, either to exchange actions and passions with it or to join with it in composing a more powerful body.

(Deleuze & Guattari, 1996, p. 257)

How people respond to violence is a central concern for RBP and the term “social responses” (Donalek, 2001) refers to how others react to victims who disclose violence. RBP differentiates between two kinds of social responses, each of which can be assessed as either positive or negative. *Personal* responses include those that are directed at the victim, for example, when a friend or professional criticizes the victim for making poor choices, or conversely when they reassure the victim that they are not to blame. *Systemic and contextual* responses influence what kinds of public resources and social services are made available to victims of violence. For example, decisions about service funding and program delivery are de facto responses to victims of violence, as are decisions that create poverty, isolation, homelessness and other conditions that limit options for personal safety.

While studies have shown that recovery from violence depends upon positive social responses (Andrews & Brewin, 1990; Andrews, Brewin & Rose, 2003; Fromuth, 1986) the majority of victims of sexualized assault, abuse, and wife-assault report receiving negative social responses from family, friends, and professionals (Andrews, et al., 2003). Research has shown that victims who receive negative social responses experience more intense and long-lasting distress, blame themselves for the abuse more than other victims, are more likely to receive a diagnosis of mental disorder, and are less likely to report further violence to authorities

(Andrews & Brewin, 1990; Andrews, et al., 2003; Fromuth, 1986). Response-Based interviewees have described how negative social responses are often more distressing than the violence itself (Wade, 1999).

Violence, Meaning-Making, and Structural Responses

While RBP offers a political therapeutic alternative to psychological practices that draw upon dominant power and knowledge, the Centre for Response-Based Practice is also a site of research. Coates and Wade (2004) engage in the analysis of documents that are produced by social institutions involved in the legal, psychological, medical, and political lives of victims and perpetrators of violence. For example, a study by Wade and Coates (2004) included an analysis of a judge's response to the sexualized assault of a woman. The article describes how the violent actions of an offender (who had forced his tongue into the victim's mouth) were reformulated by the judge as: "they [had] French kissed" (p. 501). I chose this example because it offers a clear illustration of how sexualized assault can be mutualized and eroticized at the highest levels of our social institutions.

Research that accounts for how abuses of institutional power contribute to trauma has helped me develop a more complex analysis of violence. This has been a useful frame of reference in my work with clients who have described similar negative social responses in institutional contexts (i.e. oppressive interactions with law enforcement officers, private security, therapists, social workers, and medical staff). As I became less inclined to look at problems from a dominant psychological perspective, I became more interested in people's responses to violence and oppression. The identification of institutional abuses of power presents the therapist with an ethical problem, to which RBP proposes some practical solutions. The fact that victims

of violence may receive negative social responses rather than support or justice (which Andrews, et al., 2003 have demonstrated, hinders recovery from trauma) must be addressed.

In response to this problem, Response-Based Practitioners elucidate the kinds of social responses that a client received. When responses are positive the therapist asks about what kind of difference they made, and when social responses are negative the client is asked about their own responses to those negative responses. Massumi's (1992) reflections on meaning are of value here. Massumi suggests "meaning" is a network of enveloped material processes, for example, when a series of violent acts and unexplored resistance is enveloped as a French kiss. The "sign," the French kiss, is not a representation of what happened, but an envelopment of difference based on the judge's personal thoughts about the event. By virtue of the judge's structural power, his interpretation becomes the dominant expression that envelops other content (i.e. she resisted, therefore it was not a kiss). The therapist committed to social justice would want to highlight the drastic difference between a shared kiss and a detailed account of a man forcing his tongue into a woman's closed mouth. RBP is committed to questioning such misrepresentations.

Therapists have an ethical responsibility to analyze the kinds of concepts that we develop in relation to the signs that our clients share with us, which requires a critical consideration of professional training and the effects that institutional power and knowledge have on our choices. Massumi (1992) suggests that interpretations are not the free will of a subject who then translates them into action, but rather that the subject is trained, through institutional knowledge, to apply particular concepts and interpretations. While Wade and Coates (2007) agree that individuals who work in specific institutions are held accountable to institutional power and therefore must link their actions to institutional ideologies, policies and objectives, they make a clear distinction

that people, not discourses, are accountable for their actions. They suggest that questions about the effects of power cannot be answered by examining ideology, policies, and objectives alone, but that one must analyze individuals' specific social and discursive actions in context. It is through the analysis of these actions that we are then able to talk about how abstract concepts, such as ideologies, policies and objectives, are interpreted and used to produce something in interaction.

Four Discursive Operations and Response-Based Tasks

In their research article, "Language and Violence: Analysis of four discursive operations," Coates and Wade (2007) summarize how violence is often concealed through four discursive operations:

1. Concealing violence
2. Obfuscating perpetrators' responsibility
3. Concealing victims' resistance
4. Blaming and pathologizing the victims

They contend that these operations "impede effective interventions through education, victim advocacy, reportage, law enforcement, criminal justice, child protection, and counselling with perpetrators and victims" (p. 521). Based on these findings they offer an alternative method for critical analysis, research, prevention, and intervention in cases of violence and oppression:

1. *Expose violence* by using language that conveys its unilateral nature and, wherever possible, by including accounts of victims' responses.
2. *Clarify offenders' responsibility* by avoiding language that portrays offenders as out-of-control and by highlighting the deliberate nature of violent acts, particularly offenders' strategic efforts to suppress victims' resistance.

3. *Elucidate and honour victims' responses and resistance* by enquiring about victims' responses to specific acts of violence and oppression, and elucidating the situational logic by which some responses become intelligible as forms of resistance.
4. *Contest the blaming and pathologizing of victims* by obtaining accounts of victims' prudent, determined, and creative resistance. While language is a tool of domination, it is no less a tool of resistance.

Language

Since the so-called “linguistic turn” in the twentieth century, language has taken a central role in the social sciences, which has had a major impact on research, theory, and practice within counselling and psychotherapy (McLoud, 2006). In the following subsections I explore language from two different perspectives. First I explore Deleuze and Guattari’s (1996) view of language as a cultural practice that is constrained and affected by words that tie the speaker to institutional forms of power and knowledge. The second orientation is informed by the ethnomethodological and conversation analytic view that language is a productive cultural resource that people draw upon in conversation to accomplish interactional goals.

Deleuze and Guattari (1996) view representational language as “... receiving, and transmitting order-words” (p. 76) and argue that social norms and cultural rules can be thought of as being regulated through “order words,” which are statements that are linked to particular social obligations. These cultural obligations define what can be recognized as normal speech, and are used to interpret and pathologize alternative subjectivities via dominant formulations. Deleuze and Guattari suggest that: “...the only possible definition of language is the set of all order-words, implicit presuppositions, or speech acts current in a given language at a given moment” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1996, p. 79). From this perspective, we cannot assign language a

neutral, non-linguistic point of departure because it “does not operate between something seen (or felt) and something said, but always goes from saying to saying” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1996, p. 76). This is a statement about representational language, and the order word, as an effect of power relations rather than a mirror of reality. While the speech act goes from saying to saying, our use of language is not disconnected from pre-discursive experiences in the world. When an event occurs that we feel compelled to talk about, the order-words that we use are commands that are linked to the *socius*, which is the social context that Deleuze and Guattari also refer to as “social machine.”

A brief aside on machines and further explication of their ontology, and Deleuze and Guattari’s (1996) strategic purpose, might be helpful here. The machine is a metaphor that is employed to describe the relatedness of everything, how each machine is connected to other different or similar machines. For example, people are machines that are connected to other machines (other people, policy manuals, institutions, buildings, bureaucracies, states, and so on), which form a social machine. It is not possible to discern an original social machine, nor can we determine which machine is driving which. The social machine is not deterministic however, and is connected to a second kind of machine, the “desiring-machine,” which is crucial to Deleuze and Guattari’s ontology. The introduction of the concept of “desiring-production” can be seen as a political and philosophical response to the Freudian unconscious, in which Deleuze and Guattari (2008) argue that rather than being at the mercy of psychoanalytic interpretations, desiring-machines, which are deviations of the Marxian factory model, are forces that increase productivity through connection, or what they term assemblage, with other desiring-machines. The machinic is not a totality (an enclosed and separate entity) and these productive machines work in-conjunction (i.e. and-and-and). The machinic system operates in terms of affect, which

is the capacity for one machine to affect and to be affected by other machines. Freud's mechanistic (not machinic) client (an enclosed and separate entity) fails to work due to a "lack" that requires expert intervention (i.e. the new priest) to retrieve some missing imaginary object. Desiring-machines and social-machines are always connected, or in assemblage. Desiring-production is the ontological force that drives the two kinds of machines (desiring-machines and social-machines) together, resulting in inextricable linkages. As my methodological focus will be on social interactions, I will expand upon the social machine as it relates to language before I move into a conversation analytic view.

The first side of the social machine is what Deleuze and Guattari (1996) call the "machinic assemblage of bodies," which is the site of cultural training and disciplining of bodies. These are the institutions, such as courts, political parties, corporations, and media conglomerates that oversee laws, norms, and the like. The second side is the "collective assemblage of enunciation," which are all of the order-words that are put into circulation and used in social interaction. These words are ordered in the way that they are collected into statements that commit one to other statements through rules of grammar, which are then connected to acts that must be carried out if we are to be read as congruent. Speech acts depend upon the machinic assemblage of bodies, or social context, in which they occur. Deleuze and Guattari argue that the most basic property of speech acts are the ways in which they conform to or break away from the order word. While the order word is a "redundant production," meaning that what we can say is always constrained by power, Deleuze and Guattari suggest that it can be reversed by a "password." They argue that because a password is inherent in every order word, there is always potential for the production of new meanings that make new actions possible. While order words are organized stoppages or limits, passwords are those discursive materials

that make space for passage into new territories. Deterritorialization is the process in which power is asserted (i.e. uttering a password) to take control away from an established territory of the machinic assemblage of bodies, such as the American Psychological Association.

In *Anti Oedipus*, Deleuze and Guattari (2008) discuss a psychic deterritorialization of the libido (which they consider to be Freud's greatest discovery) as a process of becoming, in which one's psychic energy, or libido, is free to connect with other machines/bodies to produce new machines that alter the social landscape. They suggest that this relational, machinic process is how the revolutionary potential of the unconscious becomes realized, and they describe Freud's introduction of the Oedipal complex as a fascist reterritorialization of the libido. Both volumes of *Anti-Oedipus* suggest that while Oedipus no longer appears to haunt the therapeutic landscape, there has actually been a proliferation of Oedipalization, not only in contemporary psychotherapy but across the entire socius. An example is the proliferation of mental illness diagnoses, from a handful in Freud's time to over four hundred diagnostic categories by the year 2000 (Gergen & Gergen, 2004). The diagnostic explosion of the 19th and 20th centuries has been accompanied by an increase in pharmaceutical interventions, resulting in capital gains for a corporate minority. This covert Oedipalization as diagnosis has been linked to the failure of health professionals to provide appropriate services. For example a recent study, of children who had experienced a traumatic event, found that doctors who failed to take environmental factors into account, for example violence and neglect, were more likely to misdiagnose children and failed to provide effective intervention (Burke, Hellman, Scott, Weems, & Carrion, 2011). Response-Based practitioners and Deleuze and Guattari share a common project: responding to dominant psychological territorializations of people's experiences. While Deleuze and Guattari (1996) call for a schizoanalytic response, which involves deterritorializations and

reterritorializations that are beyond the scope of this study, RBP can be seen as undertaking the task of “relative deterritorializations,” which are deterritorializations that are accompanied by reterritorializations that satisfy the institutional requirements of response-based practice (as outlined in previous sections). These tasks are accomplished through an engagement with language politics and the strategic use of words, which is similar to Deleuze and Guattari’s concept of a minor and major language. *Minor* language is contrasted with *major* language, not because they are two different languages, but because they constitute two different treatments, usages and/or functions of the same language. Minor language is linked to the minoritarian politics (which does not to infer a smaller population, but rather a population that has difficult political relations with those speakers of the major language and majoritarian politics). Deleuze and Guattari refer to minor language as that of the people, and major language as a language of dominant power and knowledge.

Deleuze and Guattari’s (1996) critique modern linguists, in particular the work of Suasserre and Chomsky, who developed a field of research in which language was isolated as a mental phenomenon as if it could be studied apart from culture. Deleuze and Guattari consider the linguistic tree and Chomsky’s hierarchy of formal language rules: “you will construct grammatically correct sentences, you will divide each statement into a noun phrase and a verb phrase” (p. 7), to be an example of arborescent theory. The *arborescent*, is a tree metaphor that describes the modern tendency to value a unitary and stable identity that is connected to a root, which is like the one true self, or core truth, that exists beneath the surface. The tracing of the arborescent is already complete, and objects of interest are inserted into its prefabricated reality—a reality that is spoken in a major language. This is a problem that has also been identified by conversation analysts (CA) and ethnomethodologists (EM). While CA argues against “bucket

theories” that represent people’s actions as the product of institutions, research has shown that people are not independent of the context in which interactions occur and there is an ongoing relationship between action and context (Heritage & Clayman, 2010).

While CA and EM researchers share in Deleuze and Guattari’s (1996) complaint against linguistic formalism and other cognitive modes that fail to recognize social context, they differ in how the social is understood. CA views human talk as a form of relational action that can be understood as meaningful when participants share the same procedures for designing and interpreting talk. CA research on mundane, or every day, conversation suggests that interaction is a creative process in which people draw from a repertoire of conversational materials to produce actions that are recognizable and purposeful in relation to the social context. The goal of CA is to understand the tacit social rules and ways that discourses and other conversational materials are used to perform the actions that occur between persons in interaction (Heritage & Clayman, 2010). Applied or institutional conversation analysis (ICA) has provided examples of how institutional conversations differ from ordinary talk in terms of their asymmetry (who is allotted certain rights, such as questioning authority, within the conversation). There are some similarities in the research findings of conversation analysts and the philosophical works of Deleuze and Guattari. They share a view that language is social action and not just a reflection of wider social structure. They also share a methodological interest in the particularities of a language that is in use, the systemic ways that it is used, and what it is used to do.

Politics of Representation

Representation fails to capture the affirmed world of difference. Representation has only a single center, a unique and receding perspective, and in consequence a false depth. It mediates everything, but mobilizes and moves nothing.

(Deleuze, 1994, p. 56)

The present study is an analysis of a therapeutic practice that arose, in part, as a response to a major language practice that Coates and Wade (2007) call the politics of representation. The present section will define this major language politic and describe how it has been addressed in the practice of RBP. Because language is an incorporeal that can have material effects upon corporeal bodies Coates and Wade have developed a method called the interactional and discursive view of violence and resistance in order to analyze the conditions that enable personalized violence. Coates and Wade (2007) describe five accounts of personalized violence, each from a perpetrator, psychiatrist, judge, government minister, and therapist. The results of their analysis, suggests a strong link between violence and representation. Representation, the idea that language is a neutral medium for representing reality, is problematized and reformulated by Wade and Coates as a “politics of representation” (p. 512). This stance acknowledges that language is not a neutral medium of exchange nor does it represent an objective reality. In their chapter “Postulates of Linguistics” Deleuze and Guattari (1996) weigh in on language politics by describing our induction into language as a means of teaching one to obey commands, which they consider the “semiotic coordinates possessing all of the dual foundations of grammar (masculine/feminine, singular/plural, noun-verb, subject of the statement-subject of enunciation, etc.)” (pp. 75-76). Representations spoken in a major language benefit a small but privileged demographic, which attempts to pathologize and regulate

difference by interpreting it through a dominant cultural lens. This is a strategy that continues to be used to justify practices of oppression, violence, and genocide.

Coates and Wade (2007) have linked representational practices and colonial discourses to historical and ongoing atrocities, such as the acts of violence and oppression against aboriginal people “on the basis of the presumed natural deficiencies of the aboriginals and the God given superiorities of Europeans” (p. 512). The next section provides a detailed description of a major language practice that Response-Based therapists attend to during RBP conversations.

A Language of Effects

*How might one find ways to escape the forces that produce these sad effects
and assert something more life giving?*

(Winslade, 2009, p. 337)

We live in an era of evidence-based practice, a time in which science and neutrality are given precedence over social analysis and critical thought. The language of effects is a majoritarian practice and effect of dominant power that positions a person as the site of psychological disorder. Wade (1999) has shown how the language of effects occurs when psychotherapists focus on diagnosis and treatment of “effects” and misinterpret responses to violence or oppressive social conditions as the effects of personal disorder, such as depression or PTSD. Research by Ridley (1999) found that therapists constructed victims as effected by abuse 89.9% of the time, while only discussing their responses to abuse 10.1% of the time. These findings suggest that when responses to violence are interpreted as effects, victims are more likely to be constructed as “passive, damaged, and deficient... in need of professional help” (Ridley 1999, in Wade, 1999, p. 322). I have drawn from some of the examples that Wade (1999) used to develop his theory to illustrate how a language of effects looks in practice:

cognitive modes that locate a person's problems internally, as "dysfunctional cognitions" or "negative and distorted beliefs about themselves" (Wade, 1999, p. 319). While traditional psychoanalytic modes, in which a person builds up unconscious defense mechanisms to family of origin problems that impair attachment and ego function rendering them more vulnerable to, and therefore responsible for their own victimization. And, in narrative therapy approaches, during externalizing conversations, the effects of a "problem story" upon a person's life are explored without necessarily accounting for resistance. An example, drawn from a therapeutic letter written by David Epston (1986/1989) the other co-founder of narrative therapy, includes the following: "... turned into a cinderella [SIC]... beaten into submission... chose a partner who would be your master... submitted to your exploitation without being fully aware of it" (in Wade, 1999, p. 310). This is a passage that draws upon knowledge of a client as passive and internally oppressed, without the capacity for resistance. Reading it came as a shock to me, and I was relieved to encounter the second section, in which Epston provides a radical departure arguing that his client was "...a prisoner of war... never broken" and then goes on to share his own perspective on her resistance to oppression and exploitation. Wade's investigations have helped me reflect on my own narrative practice and use of effects-based language.

Power

Power... is less a property than a strategy... it is exercised rather than possessed; it is not the "privilege," acquired or preserved, of the dominant class, but the overall effect of its strategic position.

(Foucault, 1977, p. 26)

In Deleuze and Guattari's (1996) seminal text "A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia" power, or "pouvoir," is "an instituted and reproducible relation of force, a

selective concretization of potential” (p. xvii). Foucault’s (1980) research on power and knowledge provides detailed descriptions about how the truth regimes constructed by social scientists in the eighteenth century produced a bulk of the knowledge about human beings in the human sciences, which continues to have relevance today. His extensive analysis of structural power informed his later writing about how knowledge, as another kind of power, is taken up and enacted by human beings, both in institutional settings and everyday life. The problem of the subject, i.e. the study of human beings, is related to knowledge and power because, for Foucault, Deleuze and Guattari, subjectivity is always embedded in cultural discourse. Through his analysis of the historical discourses and practices of objectification, Foucault proposed that human beings were produced as subjects in the nineteenth century. His work suggests that bodies are recruited as vehicles for power, regardless of social location, and that the self is shaped according to the cultural knowledges that inform three modes of objectification, which are inseparable from power (Brown, 2007; Foucault, 2000; Madigan, 2011; Mills, 1997). The first mode, called “dividing practices,” describes how discourses of science have been used to justify the exclusion of a person, or an aspect of that person, from participation in social life. The second mode of objectification is called “scientific classification,” and it is through this means that discourses of life, labour, and language are structured into disciplines that become universalized and naturalized. The third mode of objectification, called subjectification, describes the process of self-formation. This is the process in which people draw from a variety of discursive positions, operations upon their bodies, thoughts, and conducts to initiate a process of self understanding.

Foucault’s (1975) analysis of the industrial revolution led to his twin concepts “disciplinary technologies” and “docile bodies.” He argued that technologies such as observation

and surveillance, documentation of behaviour, and attempts to internalize, or inscribe certain truths upon the constituted subject, led to the production of docile bodies, which fostered greater productivity in disciplinary institutions such as the factory, hospital, school, and prison. Due to his interest in how these modern technologies informed psychiatry and psychology, as domains of power and knowledge, Foucault's research has a particular historical relevance to this study. His analysis of how truths about psychological states, such as madness/mental illness, are constructed and circulated, bear resemblance to RB research findings about professional responses to violence.

While power is not a monolithic feature of therapeutic practice, in which the therapist has power over the client, there are clear asymmetries in the conversational modes that occur in the institution of therapy. Wang (1996) speaks of this mode of power as "social power" (p. 531) and describes how in institutional settings the distribution of power has already been established before verbal interaction occurs. This is exemplified by research that focuses upon the distribution of conversational resources in therapy, such as the allocation of questioning authority, which in-turn influences the allocation of turn-taking (McGee, Del Vento, & Bavelas, 2005; Wang, 2006). CA research has demonstrated *how* power may be distributed and oriented to asymmetrically among social formations such as gender, ethnic and racial groups, age-grade groups, and professional relations. These distributions of power are of particular relevance for empirical studies of institutional identities in which the relationship between whom the parties are (i.e. their affiliation to social structures such client and therapist) seem to be oriented to by the parties themselves (Schegloff, 1992, 1998). For example, McGee and colleagues studied how therapists, by virtue of their institutional identity, are accorded the institutional position of asking the questions during interaction. This position "constrains the recipient to answer within a

framework of presuppositions set by the question” (McGee et al., 2005, p. 371) and requires the answerer to acquiesce, to some extent, to the perspective presupposed by the question. The unequal distribution of questioning authority ensures that the therapist has greater control over both local and global topics, which are linked to particular forms of institutional power and knowledge.

Wooffitt (2005) argues that power can be thought of as “a set of structured but variable potentials, not a static feature of unchanging relationships between well-defined social groups” (p. 199). McGee and colleagues (2005) support this argument and describe the process as an event in which “the questioner’s perspective both penetrates the answerer’s world and is enveloped by it” (p. 377). While therapeutic questions or comments typically contain overt or covert presuppositions, the client’s answers contribute information (albeit within the constraints imposed by the question) that the therapist does not have. In this way questions and other utterances are a structural resource that can be used in interaction to influence the next turn. Because power is embedded in the relationships between social agents and social structures, and oriented to the institutional goals preceding the interaction, any analysis of power would need to focus on the complexity of interaction. This should include how power is taken up and used to resist domination. The institutionalization of helping and accompanying asymmetries in power between therapist client provides opportunities to establish safety and restore dignity by avoiding the kind of unsolicited advice giving that is endemic to what amounts to an “unspoken code” in the helping professions, which Wade (1995) has called “The Colonial Code of Relations:”

1. I am proficient
2. You are deficient, therefore I have the right to
3. Fix you, diagnose you, change you, intern you
4. For your own good.

Cathy Richardson's (2009) Islands of Safety model can be thought of as a response to this colonial code. In her Response-Based work with Indigenous families, Richardson focuses on the knowledges that women and Indigenous peoples have about human dignity and resistance. She does this by inviting family members to share what they actually already do in response to mistreatment. These conversations are based on the view that "human beings are spirited, agentive beings who sometimes choose to use violence and who invariably seek to preserve their own and others' dignity- on physical, spiritual, emotional and social levels" (Richardson, 2009, p. 1). Richardson refers to this practice as "safety counselling" (p. 6) because it draws upon traditional Indigenous and family knowledge to make safety plans, re-structure relational styles around non-violence, and to promote overall safety in families.

Resistance

If there was no resistance, there would be no power relations. Because it would just be a matter of obedience. You have to use power relations to refer to the situation where you're not doing what you want. So resistance comes first, and resistance remains superior to the forces of the process; power relations are obliged to change with resistance. So I think that resistance is the main word, the key word, in this dynamic.

(Foucault, 1997, p. 167)

Wade (1999) declares that Foucault's re-definition of power in terms of discourse, which arguably has been his greatest influence upon methodology and practice in the social sciences, is equalled in importance by his re-definition of resistance. Foucault (2000) argues that it is only through the investigation of resistance as an attempt to dissociate power relations that we can come to understand power relations and that resistance occurs at the point where power relations

are formed. Wade (1999) identifies two kinds of resistance in Foucault's work, one in which resistance occurs at the point of power, and a second kind that occurs "at a temporal and physical distance from the points where power is exercised" (p. 198). The first kind of resistance is largely an unmediated "response" to a complex event, while the second kind is a more reflective and "strategic counteraction" to the operations of power (Wade).

Michel de Certeau (1984) analyzed how individuals living in industrialized societies, whom he called "consumers," resist subjection to the disciplinary technologies that are concealed within acceptable social practices. de Certeau (1984) was interested in the strategic oppositional practices that occurred within activities of daily life and he sought to study in detail the "procedures and ruses" that "compose the network of an antidiscipline" (p. xv), as movements toward freedom. Complex and taken for granted actions (which are diverse combinations of actions that are improvised in relation to context) are then coded as more or less acceptable at certain points of the interaction and are dependent upon the social positions occupied by the more and less privileged. Strategies and tactics are afforded in relation to social position, which of course is related to what kinds of power and knowledge are accessible. de Certeau argues that while the socio-economically privileged are afforded time and security to devise and implement strategies and tactics, the oppressed must improvise under surprising conditions over which they have little control. Due to this uncertainty, de Certeau suggests that the act itself is its own best explanation. While the act itself is perhaps its own best explanation Scott (1990) reminds us that, in contexts that require immediate responses to violence and oppression, there are private acts of resistance that professionals and people connected to the State and its institutions, may not have direct access to. Richardson (2005) has written about covert acts of resistance by Indigenous and Metis people who draw upon personal experience, history, and political intelligence to preserve

their safety and dignity. Richardson's Medicine Wheel of Responses (2005) identifies how people preserve dignity, promote safety, make political statements, and resist mistreatment in covert ways that are often overlooked, misunderstood, or misrepresented by professionals. While not an exhaustive list, Richardson describes how people display knowledge about how to live well by resisting threats to their lives and dignity in the following ways: by passing and not speaking, by telling stories rather than answering questions, by adjusting their physical appearance, by leaving the vicinity, by thinking private thoughts, by praying, by laughing, and by leaving their body.

Schizoanalysis

It is this operation of capture that needs to be understood if an effective cure is to be carried out, one that actually extinguishes the cause of particular symptoms.

That psychoanalysis goes about this in the wrong way is obvious... from the fact that the peculiarly pernicious effect of so-called psychoanalytic cure is that it preserves the very thing that it is supposed to get rid of:

it causes repudiated beliefs to survive and unbelievers to believe, by creating a private territory for them.

(Buchanan, 2008, p. 118)

Schizoanalysis is a revolutionary practice that does not involve taking power, but rather is an analysis of how we can know and change our relationship to power and the exercise of force (Buchanan, 2008). This is particularly important when working with people who, after being subjected to violence and oppression, receive negative social responses from the professionals they consult for support. Deleuze and Guattari's (2008) target was to root out Oedipus and its oppressive psychoanalytic machinery, not merely be analyzing it but by destroying it to avoid

turning Oedipus into another idea with a new name. Buchannan (2008) states: “Destruction is essentially a practical matter of undoing the complex set of illusions [i.e., territories in Deleuze and Guattari’s terms] by means of which we give structure and purpose to our lives” (p. 117).

While conversation analysis and ethnomethodology allow for a detailed focus on the how, what, and why of interaction (as I will explain in chapter 3), Deleuze and Guattari’s schizoanalysis allows for a broader historical and analytical understanding of psychological oppression and revolutionary responses to it.

Summary of Chapter II

This chapter began with an overview of my epistemology, which is informed by Massumi’s theories of substance, content, expression, and form, and how I apply this understanding to conversation analysis and ethnomethodology. I then reviewed the history, purpose, and research relating to RBP. Next I reviewed recent and classic scholarly literature that attends to the problems of language, power, subjectivity, in relation to the institutionalization of therapy and social science research from the nineteenth to twenty-first centuries. Finally, I reviewed movements of political resistance and discussed how those movements are being applied psychoanalytically, as well as in contexts where people resist violence and oppression.

Chapter III – Methodology and Research Design

...questions about how professionals, elected officials, and other authorities exercise their social power cannot be answered by examining the institution's ideology, policies, or objectives. It is only through analysis of individuals' specific social and discursive actions that we can see how power is used...

(Coates & Wade, 2007, p.4)

In the following chapter I articulate my research aim and provide a description of my methodology, which is heavily influenced by the empirical traditions of conversation analysis and ethnomethodology. Then, I provide an overview of CA and describe how I analyzed the conversational devices that participants oriented to when accomplishing the response-based tasks of exposing violence, clarifying perpetrator responsibility, elucidating and honoring victims' responses and resistance, and contesting the blaming and pathologizing of victims (Coates & Wade, 2007).

Research Aim

The aim for this study was to examine how participants oriented to conversational devices, with a particular focus on membership categorization devices (MCDs) and their ancillary devices, and to analyze the kind of work that such categories were used to accomplish in a Response-Based context.

Context of the Study

The purpose of this study was to analyze RBP using conversational analytic tools (described below). As a research assistant for Dr. Cathy Richardson, I had ethics approval to use the data and transcripts from a study entitled "A Videotape Analysis of Social Responses to People Who Have Experienced Violence." I selected three interviews to use for my thesis study.

The participants included Dr. Allan Wade, who was the interviewer/therapist, Pamela who at the time (over 10 years ago) was consulting with Allan about her experiences of violence, Jane who was a therapist being interviewed in Sweden, and Kate who was also a therapist being interviewed in Sweden. Each participant was interviewed about her responses to violence. Note that pseudonyms are used in place of participant's names to respect confidentiality.

Conversation Analysis Method

Conversation analysis can... offer an account of the operation of power which captures the complexity and sophistication of actual conduct; and one which resonates with the lived reality of the people whose activities we study.

(Wooffitt, 2005, p. 210).

Conversation analysis (Heritage & Clayman, 2010; Liddicoat, 2007; ten Have, 2000; Wooffitt, 2005;) is an analytical method developed by Harry Stacks and Emanuel Schegloff, who were influenced by Harold Garfinkel's ethnomethodology and Irving Goffman's studies of interaction order to analyze methods of human communication in context. The focus of CA is on the details of an interaction in an attempt to get "a clear picture of CA's core phenomenon... the in situ organization of conduct" (ten Have, 2000, p. 28), which is an analysis of how conversations inform, while simultaneously being informed by, the social context in which they occur. As an empirical discipline, CA provides an account of what speakers *do* in these contexts, as opposed to what they say they do (as in narrative inquiry) or what researchers theorize that people do (as in discourse analysis).

The analytic goal of CA is to explicate the "theories-in-use" of participants. These theories in use are the analytic conclusions about which theories and goals (either tacit or explicitly oriented to by participants) informed particular interactions. Conclusions about what

appears to inform these “lived orders” (ten Have, 2000, p.32) are based upon a close analysis of interaction as it relates to two social contexts: the *external context* comprised of social categories, relationships, and institutional/cultural settings, and the *internal context*, which is created locally and co-constructed in the “here and now” through talk (ten Have, 2000).

Utterances and the social actions that they embody are what Drew and Heritage (1998) call “doubly contextual,” being both “context shaped” and “context renewing” (p. 18). Action and talk are context renewing in that every current utterance forms an immediate context for the next action in a sequence. The interactional context is continually being developed with each successive action and each current action can function to maintain, adjust, or alter any broader sense of context, participant orientation, and future action. As context is dynamic, it is always viewed in relation to its local production and potential for transformation (Drew & Heritage).

From a CA framework, conversation and interactional order are produced orderliness, which are the creative and relational act of constructing order from discursive and interactional materials, such as phrases, turn-taking, symbols, and non-verbal gestures, that are available to the parties in situ. CA views order as a repeatable and recurrent algorithm, for which the research task is the mapping, description, and analysis of what ordered repetition is employed to do in interaction. Repetition in conversation is repetition with a difference however, intended to do something, for example, when a speaker produces a repeat with “question intonation,” which employs the raising of vocal pitch at the end of a sentence (Sindell, 2009). Studies in which CA is employed describe, in microanalytic detail, some of the ways that people manage social situations, in overt or tacit ways, to produce order and accomplish tasks during regular conversation. The analysis of institutional conversations, sometimes called applied conversation analysis or institutional conversation analysis, has shown how institutional parameters limit and

shape how people manage social situations within institutional settings. In other words applied CA has shown that, while people's actions are not products of institutions they are also not independent of the contexts in which they occur. Relationship between action and context are seen as reflexive (Heritage & Clayman, 2010).

Conversation Analysis Devices

I drew from four devices of talk that have been proposed by conversation analysts (Drew & Heritage, 1998; Sacks, 1972; Schegloff, 2006; ten Have, 2000; Wooffitt, 2005) as being common to most everyday and institutional interactions. These devices include turn-taking, sequence organization, turn design, and lexical or word choice. In order to analyze how processes of subjectification contributed to interactions I drew upon Sacks' analysis of how membership categorization devices (MCD) are used to accomplish interactional work.

Turn taking. A core concept of CA, turn-taking, is the idea that conversation adheres to the rule that one person speaks at a time while speaker change occurs with minimal gap and minimal overlap (ten Have, 2000). Turn-taking procedures are typically grouped according to normative action, for example, pre-allocation of turn-taking (i.e. courtrooms, news interviews), mediated turn-allocation procedures (i.e. business meetings), and systems that involve both processes (i.e. therapeutic interviews). Turns, or the transfer of speakership, occur at the end of a "turn constructional unit" (TCU, ten Have, 2000, p.111), which is a clause, phrase, or lexical construction that is used to perform an action in interaction. An example of a TCU is "how are you doing?" The TCU is analyzed as an adequate unit, a tool that is useful for participants to produce some kind of action. Analytical questions a researcher might ask about a TCU is "Why that now?" and "What is it doing?" For example, is it proposing, requesting, accepting, or showing surprise? (ten Have, 2000). CA research has identified three ways that speaker change

appears to be organized: the next speaker can be selected by the previous one (i.e. have you been here before?), a speaker can self-select (such as when two or more people are asked a question and someone self-selects to respond first), or the present speaker can continue speaking (the speaker continues their turn, either continuing with the present TCU or producing a new one).

Sequence organization. Sequence refers to the experience that “one thing can lead to another” (Ten Have, 2000, p. 112) and sequence organization is a way that conversationalists manage the activities and tasks that are central to interaction. CA studies have shown that the identity positions that individuals are positioned within, and held accountable to, are constructed in sequence. For example the way that men and women *do* gender in interactional routines, and what these doings of gender seek to accomplish in relation to the gendered order of social life, has been explicated by CA studies. To analyze sequence organization in an institutional context (i.e. therapy) is to describe the establishment, maintenance, and alterations of local and social/institutional roles related to categories such as gender, age, sexual orientation, and marital status. Sequential analysis focuses on TCU “units of discourse” and “structures of social action” (Drew & Heritage, 1998, p. 17), which are performed by people in interaction (i.e. Person 1: “What did you do next?” Person 2: “Ran out the door”). Drew and Heritage (1998) claim that, because action is organized around “intersubjectivity” and “moral accountability” (p. 17), utterances should be analyzed as an interactive product of what was produced at previous turns. Utterances are considered to be purposeful productions, which are constructed by conversationalists in relation to what came before, while at the same time creating a context for the next utterance.

The basic logic of question-answer sequences is a central feature of therapeutic practice, in which a therapist asks a question about a state of affairs relative to the client, positioning

themselves as unknowing (K-) and the client as knowing (K+). The expectation being that the response will be informative. An analysis of a third-turn, which is part of what is called a three-turn sequence, can provide evidence about whether a response has been informative. For example, CA research suggests that a response may be interpreted as informative if (K-) uses the utterance “oh” to illustrate the dissemination of new information. The analysis of discourse and social action is an interdependent phenomenon and is a way of integrating the “illocutionary” dimension (the content of a current utterance) with the “perlocutionary” (those utterances that came before), for example when a reply (illocutionary) is provided in response to a greeting (perlocutionary). To succeed with this task requires a focus on units larger than individual sentences or words (Drew & Heritage, 1998), moving CA beyond discourse and narrative analysis.

Turn design. Sequences are made up of turns, which are influenced by the institutional context and actions that they seek to achieve. The social context must be analyzed to understand the kinds of turns that are available during an interaction, which inform the two distinct elements of turn design: the action that the talk is designated to perform and the means that are chosen to perform that action (Wooffitt, 2005). Each turn informs the next action, which is selected to accomplish an activity. The task of the researcher is to analyze what an action might have been meant to accomplish. Analysis of turn design in relation to sequence allows for a detailed analysis of action as either seeking to accomplish a similar activity or pursue a different activity. This then allows for an analysis of how this difference is oriented to. For example, while there may be agreement about something being talked about in interaction, participants may have completely different goals, and hence fashion their turns in alternative ways. Conversely different speakers may employ different designs to achieve a similar broad goal. Typically the

choices in turn design can be traced to the details of a turn's components to speculate about the interactional goal. CA interprets a speaker's selection of their formulation as motivated and chosen for a particular purpose. The syntactic, lexical, and other aspects selected by a speaker are a part of a turn's design (Drew & Heritage, 1998), which embodies an action selection and allows one to speculate on how actions are accomplished through the strategic use of words.

Lexical or word choice. The words that participants choose are significant indicators of how they orient to the institutional context of their talk. Several studies have documented how “lay” and “technical” vocabularies appear to designate specialized knowledge and institutional identities in formal and informal institutional settings (Drew & Heritage, 1998). Turn designs are punctuated by words that convey how a subject orients to an experience that they are describing, and has consequences for the plan of action that relates to those circumstances. While word choice may or may not conform to the use of technical jargon, descriptive terms are almost always, if not always, context sensitive, tending toward institutional roles, membership affiliations, and identities that are relevant to the institutional setting. For example, when speakers use the self-referring “we” they invoke a membership category over the “I” of personal identity. The invoking of a membership category is a rich site for analysis, in which a researcher would seek to understand what institutional tasks this invocation sought to achieve (see membership categorization devices section). Temporal references are another way in which word choice informs context, for example there is a difference between biographical time, describing time in reference to a biographical event, and calendar time, which is a quantitative measure in days or weeks. For example CA research suggests that biographical time appears in less formal “conversational” formulations, while calendar time features frequently in “institutional” settings.

Membership Categorization Devices

My primary analytic focus was on how membership categorization devices (MCDs) were oriented to during sequences that related to accounts of violence, resistance, and social responses. MCDs are interactional practices that are used by people in conversation to refer to themselves and others. The research focus is on conversationalists' "categories-in-use" (Sacks, 1972), and is based upon the categorical rules (cultural norms) that people draw from to accomplish interactional goals. The focus is on "culture-in-action" (Sacks), which is the local management of speakers' categorizations of themselves and others. Sacks argued that we make links between categories based upon an "explanatory apparatus", which are practical categorizations that allow for the MCD to occur. These categorizations form the ongoing taken for granted knowledge about the "facts" of social life such as gender identities. Stokoe and Benwell (2006) suggest that a nuanced understanding of membership order can be achieved through the examination of people's social and moral categorization practices, or the "doing" of categorization. The research task is to analyze the hearings and understandings that an apparatus gets and to describe the practices that produced such an understanding. In other words, the MCD relies on tacit participant knowledge about which categories relate to which other categories (which include members), actions (category-bound activities), and characteristics (behaviors that are deemed "natural"). For example Sacks referred to his data in which a child said: "The baby cried. The mommy picked it up" to argue that the MCD of "family" allows for the categories "baby" and "mommy" to be collected together. Some categories are considered "duplicatively organized" and treated as a unit, for example, mommy and baby go together as part of a family or, as Silverman (2001) has shown, "defender" and "striker" go together as part of a sports team. Categories are accompanied by category-bound activities, predicates, or rights and obligations"

(Stokoe, 2004). For example, standardized relational pairs (SRPs) refer to the fact that categories can sit together in paired relationships such as “mommy” and “baby” and that each are inference rich and have associated duties and obligations (Stokoe, 2003). It is important to note that categories are not social facts ready to be linked to conversational patterns, but rather are only to be considered empirically within the context that is constructed by the conversationalists. West and Zimmerman (2002) argue that people engage in activities and are held accountable for their performance in terms of authenticity, moral adequacy, and appropriateness in relation to others in the category, and add that “membership assessment” may occur if one does not live up to normative expectations of that category. The doing of membership requires vigilance, and participant activity is “accountable” to a particular category. A study by West and Fenstermaker (2002) found that “explicit self- and other-categorizations render persons answerable to normative conceptions that legitimate social inequalities” (p. 164). They showed how normativity is displayed and how assessments function to reproduce, naturalize, and legitimate the “essential distinctiveness of categorical identities and the institutional arrangements they support” (p. 541).

Schegloff (2006) has identified two parts that compose a MCD: first, there is one or more collection(s) of categories and, second, there are rules of application. Categories include men, women, Catholics, guitarists, merchants, murderers, revolutionaries, skaters, etc. The category of persons is not a simple aggregate of categories but is typically organized into “collections” of categories. A collection is a set of categories that go together, such as Muslim, Buddhist, Jew, Wiccan, Protestant... or Mexican, Canadian, Indian, Vietnamese... These categories are empirical in relation to the context that they occur, whereas the category: male, female, and ironworker is not considered empirically correct because “iron worker” is not a member of the

gender category. A collection is “inference rich” in that it relates to the explanatory apparatus/knowledge that members have about society.

MCDs can be thought of as arborescent systems (Deleuze & Guattari, 1996) of common sense knowledge that people have about cultural norms. For example someone assumed to be a member of the category “wife” is a presumed representative of that category and therefore what is known about wives, such as they are often presumed to be heterosexual, is presumed to be true about them (Tanio, 2002). The term “knowledge” connotes the working status of knowledge as a discursive currency that is oriented to by the members engaged in interaction to accomplish relevant tasks. Knowledge might be oriented to by all of the parties or it may be resisted or neutralized by Sacks’ (1972) concept of “modifiers.” For example a question about one’s age may be responded to with a chronological answer as well as a modifier, such as “but I look younger.” There are also overrides to modifiers, which can be used to re-invoke the category-based knowledge, such as “it’s the number that counts,” which re-asserts category-based knowledge over the attempted modification. Protection against the subversion of knowledge refers to the fact that common sense knowledge is organized in reference to membership categories and if a presumed member of a category deviates from what is known about that category, the common sense knowledge is not revised. Instead the person is viewed as an exception, different, or defective in relation to the category. This is problematic for the person in question who may subscribe to knowledge about the category and try to change, reinforcing the common sense knowledge, or alternatively may not change and experience despair. Obvious members of a category that are engaged in activities out of keeping with the category can alternatively be thought as imitating that behavior rather than doing it, and in this sense modifiers are also resources to protect category-based common-sense knowledge against subversion.

Category-bound activities are those activities or actions that are characteristic of a category's member. It is important to note that category membership can be alluded to without explicitly naming the category, and merely by mentioning a person's doing of an action that is category bound. The doing of such an activity can introduce the relevance of the category, which has as its locus the MCD that is connected to other categories and ways of understanding other members and categories in that scene. The connection between category and activity is not restricted to a member's description of an action, but can be inferred through the doing of an action that is analyzable by the recipient as an invocation of a category. Collections of categories are not only taxonomies of categories, but are devices through which common sense operates as a cultural norm. A MCD may have alternative collections of categories, such as the use of numbers (1-year old, 35 year old, etc) or qualitative categories such as infant, adult, or others such as younger, older. Hester and Eglin (1997) have broken the categorization system down in the following way:

Any collection of membership categories, (containing at least a category) which may be applied to some population (containing at least a member) so as to provide, by use of some rules of application, for the pairing of at least a population member and a categorization device member. A device is then a collection plus rules of application. (p. 4)

The rules of application include an economy rule and a consistency rule. The economy rule requires that a single category term from any MCD will provide adequate reference. More can be, and often are, used, but in principle one term is adequate. The consistency rule holds that if several persons are being categorized and the first person categorized is referred to a category from an MCD collection, then that category or other categories from the same MCD collection may be used to categorize subsequent persons. This optional social practice provides an activity

with the relevance of other categories, for example at music school people often introduce themselves in relation to their major instrument. If someone deviates from that norm, and say self-identifies as a surfer, this can prompt an inquiry into what occasioned that categorization (always in relation to the initial category- which has either been introduced by mention of a category term, or by the doing of a category-bound activity). The analytic question is: why that now?

Sacks' (1972) hearer/seer maxims posit that when a recipient is presented with an action that is connected to some category from some collection, and the speaker is viewed as a member of that category, then that is how the recipient will view that person. The hearer's maxim includes the cultural instructions for hearing a category term used by a speaker (i.e. if the activity and the categorized person have already been formulated by another). The viewer's maxim applies to the perception of an action itself (as opposed to the hearer's maxim which is used to perceive an already articulated characterization of action or category). When a viewer witnesses a category-bound activity being done by a member of that category, they use this as relevant to the identification of the doer. For example, Sacks described the "*omni-relevance*" of the categorization device therapist/patient in group therapy by analyzing how closing as a feature in the structure of therapy sessions, is specified by the therapist. The description of the activity is treated as non-problematic, i.e. ending a therapy session, and the categorization of the actors is the analytic problem, i.e. the type of person who ends a therapy session (as a category-bound activity).

Procedure for Data Analysis

Ten Have (2000) suggests that when researchers choose to study cases intensely rather than viewing a large collection, they are better able to adhere to theoretical sensitivity (the ability

to see things with an analytic eye). Using CA and EM tools, which ensured a strict analysis of relevant Response-Based interactions, I engaged in a detailed exploration of response-based interviews. My procedure for data analysis included the following steps:

Step 1: Soaking in the data. I began my analysis by “soaking” in the data, which occurred through repeated viewings of the RB interviews, as well as repeated readings of the transcript.

Step 2: Identify accounts of resistance to violence and/or negative social responses. I focused on turns that included what I identified (see chapter 2) as accounts of resistance (i.e. a victim describing the actions of a perpetrator and the therapist asking about how they responded).

Step 3: Identify sequences. I identified the interactions leading up to the phenomena of interest, as well as the interactions leading away. In other words, I was guided by the interactions themselves (a CA method) in making my decisions about what constituted a complete sequence.

Step 4: Preliminary analysis. I then removed sequences of interest from the transcript and asked the questions: “Why that now? What is it doing?” I formulated answers based on how participants were responding to what came before (perlocutionary interactions), and how they were producing what came next (illocutionary interactions). In this section, I referred to CA research literature on conversation devices (Ten Have, 2000; Drew & Heritage, 1998; Wooffitt, 2005; Sacks, 1972; and Schegloff, 2006).

Step 5: Identify categories-in-use. I then identified those turns in which participants oriented to categories and MCD devices, and selected two turns per interview for further analysis

Step 6: Analyze Categories-in-use. I analyzed the categories-in-use by participants, adhering to the rules of categorization (Sacks, 1972; Schegloff, 2006), to determine what kinds of interactional work they appeared to accomplish.

Step 7: Member Checking. I sent my analyzed sequences to Dr. Allan Wade for feedback as a form of member checking to avoid the problem of over-interpretation or misinterpretation.

Summary of Chapter III

The quote by Coates and Wade that opened this chapter articulates the need for a more complex analysis of power that is grounded in actual conduct, by observing what people do/say and how they respond to one another in interaction. The CA focus upon activity (interactional accomplishments that occur in particular social activities) is what distinguishes it from neighboring disciplines, which tend to be more polarized, either focusing upon culture and social identity on one pole, or linguistic variables (such as syntax and word selection) on the other (Wooffitt, 2005). As an empirical discipline, CA views all talk-in-interaction as a social process that is self-generating, thereby drawing upon both poles. By adhering to the conversation analytic requirement, that utterances or discourses should be analyzed as interactionally generated, I have provided detailed accounts to substantiate any conclusions about the design of utterances and their use in the performance of sequentially relevant actions. My analytical formulation (description of the interaction and analysis of the tacit organizing principles, i.e. MCDs) of the Response-Based tasks that I observed in the data were grounded in the observable interactions themselves (audio recordings and transcripts of response-based interviews). I then used a specimen approach (Ten Have, 2000) to describe the order, i.e. the conversational devices and MCDs that the therapist and interviewees appeared to orient to when accomplishing

response-based work. Finally, in order to assess the accuracy of my observations of response-based tasks I had Dr. Allan Wade review my analysis and provide feedback.

Chapter IV –Analysis

The following chapter illustrates the conversation analytic and ethnomethodologically informed results of two sequences per interview from three response-based interviews with victims of violence. I relied on audio recordings and transcripts to analyze sequences that best exemplified how members oriented to membership categorization devices when clarifying violence, attributing perpetrator responsibility, exploring acts of resistance, and challenging negative social responses. While the focus is upon how conversation was organized by the participants, and the kinds of devices that they oriented to accomplish interactional work, non-verbal elements that would be important to traditional CA (i.e. length of pauses between statements, changes in vocal pitch, speaker overlap, and so on) were not observed.

In this chapter I discuss the analysis of the audio recordings and accompanying transcriptions. At the beginning of each new interview section I provide a brief description of the participant and a general summary of the interview to provide context. Where appropriate I further contextualize each sequence by summarizing the interactions that preceded it. This chapter includes a detailed analysis of two sequences drawn from each interview totalling six sequences.

Response-Based Interview with Pamela

During the interview with Pamela, she and Wade explore how she responded to men who took advantage of their intimate partner status to perpetrate violence against her. Wade and Pamela engage in descriptions of unilateral violence and detailed analyses of the tactics employed by the perpetrators, as well as exploring Pamela's strategic responses to these threats to her life and dignity. The participants also talked about the kinds of social responses Pamela received from friends, family, and professionals. Sequence 1 is an analysis of how Wade uses

Response-Based Practice to deconstruct dominant psychological discourses about victims of violence. The sequence shows how Wade responded to the negative social responses (i.e. victim blaming and misrepresentation of identity) that Pamela received from professionals, and how conversational devices allowed for a dignified account of Pamela's feelings and actions to emerge. Sequence 2 is an analysis of a five-turn interaction in which Pamela describes how she responded to an assault perpetrated by an intimate partner.

Sequence 1

1. P: Yeah, no and also. Our view, well, or my view of myself. Then- coz sometimes I feel like I'm crazy or that I'm unstable because I do- I change. Just, yesterday morning I woke up, I was so joyful and happy and-
2. A: Yeah.
3. P: And by the close of the day yesterday I was- you know- sad and um. Confused. Overwhelmed.
4. A: And had good reason for being both those.
5. P: I guess, yes.
6. A: Yeah.
7. P: Ok, yeah. Coz sometime I do wonder that coz I don't stay the same.
8. A: Well, yeah, sometimes people of course demand that you do be consistent. Right?
9. P: Yes.
10. A: They would sort of- If you seemed to them to be inconsistent they would say that something the matter with you.
11. P: Yeah.
12. A: Whereas invariably you find or at least I think I find in talking with people that if people feel really differently from one time to another or behave really differently there is something really going on in the circumstances. Right?
13. P: That helps too for judgments or anything like that coz I really don't like judging people. But I find I will stay away. I mean, we make subconscious judgments I guess. But then- I'll just stay away.
14. A: Yeah. Absolutely. There are a lot of situations where staying away is a darn good idea.
15. P: Yeah.

Sequence one follows an interaction (not included) in which Wade challenged the notion of stable and genetic personality traits and the existence of a naturalized and static identity. Pamela's response shifted the subject matter from her son, and the psychological discourses that have been used to naturalize parts of his identity as Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder and

Attention Deficit Disorder to herself, constituting a new turn (and introducing the present sequence) that accomplished new interactional work. Pamela's first turn in this sequence: "Yeah, no and also. Our view, well, or my view of myself. Then- coz sometimes I feel like I'm crazy or that I'm unstable because I do change" is an example of "membership assessment," which West and Zimmerman (2002) have shown occurs when a member does not live up to normative expectations. Pamela's experience of "change" contravenes the category "stable," which is inference rich and protected against induction (Schlegoff, 2006). Because inference rich knowledge is not typically revised, Pamela can be seen as a defective member of the category "stable." She provides an example during her first turn by describing feeling "joyful and happy" upon awakening, and then feeling sad, confused, and overwhelmed by the end of the day. Wade draws upon his institutional position as therapist, and exploits the institutional asymmetry that has been shown to occur in turn-taking allocation between therapist/client (Wang, 2006), to interrupt Pamela's turn and make an assertion: "And had good reason for being both those." This contextualizes and de-individualizes the experience of "change," and the lexical phrase: "good reason" can be viewed as a de-pathologizing device that modifies the category stable. Pamela confirms this modification. Her next turn (turn 7): "Coz sometime I do wonder that coz I don't stay the same" draws upon Wade's perlocutionary modification of "change." This curiosity about change allows for an inquiry into alternative categories to "crazy" and "unstable." It appears that Wade's "good reason" was employed as a positive social response and an acknowledgement of Pamela's resistance to a yet undetermined context that "good reason" was used in response to.

In his next turn Wade contextualizes the categories crazy and unstable by attributing them to a new category: "they," who can be seen as morally accountable: "They would sort of -

if you seemed to them to be inconsistent they would say that something the matter with you.” Members of this collection are paired with the category-bound activity of the Four Discursive Operations (Coates and Wade, 2007). Wade’s presumption, that the categories crazy and unstable were produced by members of the category “they,” is then confirmed by Pamela: “Yeah,” completing an adjacency pair. Wade’s next turn: “Whereas invariably you find or at least I think I find in talking with people that if people feel really differently from one time to another or behave really differently there is something really going on... in the circumstances” is interesting in that it exhibits two instances of repair, in which he changes “you find” to “I find” and repairs “invariably” with “at least I think.” Wade’s repair is called a verbal hedge, which is used to reduce certainty, make a statement less assertive and avoid universalizing knowledge. Admunson, Stewart and Valentine (1993) have argued that colonization occurs when therapists apply expert knowledge and certainty over the account of the client and Wade’s verbal hedge can be thought of as the first part of a two-part decolonizing practice that is exhibited in this turn. After his repair Wade draws upon the category therapist, and the category-bound activity of “talking to people” to introduce a new category, “people,” whom he cites as his source of knowledge about how people’s feelings and actions change in relationship to their environmental circumstances. The practice of drawing upon client knowledge, also referred to as “insider knowledge” (Madigan, 2011; Madigan & Epston, 1995), is an example of the kind of decolonizing therapy (using power to “empower” and acknowledge the circumstances related to people’s problems- abuse, poverty, injustice, and inequity, rather than to assert psychological certainty) advocated by Admunson, and colleagues.

Pamela’s next TCU is a multi-unit turn, which in CA is treated as a personal achievement that seeks to accomplish a particular outcome. The first fragment: “That helps too for judgments

or anything like that coz I really don't like judging people" is followed directly by a second unit: "But I find I will stay away. I mean we make subconscious judgments I guess. But then - I'll just stay away." Pamela organizes her second unit of talk by drawing upon two devices. The first device is called a "rush through," which is a speeding up of talk before the completion of the first turn allowing a speaker to take a second turn in a row. CA views this as a methodological achievement, and a potentially rich site of analysis (Schegloff, 1987). Pamela's second unit of talk uses the disjunctive marker "but" twice in relation to a category-bound activity, "stay away." This disjunctive topic shift, which is a method used by Pamela to move into a new aspect of the same topic, appears to relate the action "stay away" to a problematic category "judgment." This can be seen as an "override" (Schegloff, 2007) that is applied to Wade's "good reason" modification of the category-bound activity "stable." Wade responds to "stay away" as a "Really darn good idea," contesting the override and possible victim-blaming discursive operation that occurs by partitioning "stay away" as a category-bound activity with "judgment" (recall from chapter three that partitioning occurs when different MCDs have properties specific to a particular context, and are used to partition the different categories as identical), which Pamela identified as a problematic category and/or action in her statement: "I really don't like judging people." Wade's modification implicitly acknowledges the context that precedes "stay away" as what is problematic, and in fact makes a statement that "a lot of situations" are problematic and worth staying away from. This presupposition would infer that a lot of "stay away" is necessary, modifying "stay away" as a category-bound activity that is unproblematic and related to a new category-bound activity and MCD: responding-to-violence (Coates and Wade, 2007; Reynolds, 2010; Richardson, 2005, 2009; Scott, 1990; Wade, 1999, 1997). In this sequence Wade has already attended to two response-based tasks: "elucidate and honour victims'

responses and resistance” and “contest the blaming and pathologizing of victims” (Coates and Wade, 2007) without having named the “situations” that precipitated the MCD responding-to-violence.

Sequence 2

1. A: ...Prior to knowing him, had you - How had you been treated by people in your life, um, up until that point? Um.
2. P: Well, I had - I just met with while I was breaking off a relationship with like a normal guy, he was apprenticing to be a plumber. And, uh, he and I really fought. His name was Fred. Um, back and forth.
3. A: Alright.
4. P: I could remember one time, he uh, I was in his pickup truck. And he was banging my head against the window and I can remember taking my shoe off and trying to hit him back. And uh.
5. A: Fred was banging your head against the window?

The present sequence followed Pamela’s description (from a previous sequence that was not included in my analysis) of her relationship with a high-level member of a biker gang. She explained that, while he was a “violent man,” he was not violent toward her, and that in fact she was called to the bar to calm him when others “Couldn’t control this man.” Wade’s first turn exemplifies the basic question-answer logic of the institution of therapy, in which Wade asks a question about a state of affairs relative to Pamela, positioning himself as unknowing (K-) and Pamela as knowing (K+). Wade’s (K-) turn is also the first utterance in a “paired action sequence” (Wooffitt, 2005), in which the speaker issues the first part of a question-answer: “...Prior to knowing him, had you- How had you been treated by people in your life, um, up until that point? Um.” Pamela replies with a story: “Well, I had - I just met with while I was breaking off a relationship with like a normal guy, he was apprenticing to be a plumber. And, uh, he and I really fought. His name was Fred. Um, back and forth” - this is a multi-turn unit that accomplishes several interactional tasks. Schegloff’s (2007) summary of CA research indicates that most reference to persons is not done to accomplish identity work. For example, the

category “normal guy,” used to describe the boyfriend prior to Fred in Pamela’s previous turn, can be viewed as a category that accomplishes interactional work.

Drawing upon Oh’s (2007) research on overt reference forms, references such as “normal guy” are not typically used to assert identity but are more often used to accomplish responsibility attribution and disagreement, we can analyze “normal guy” as a category that is used to establish normalcy, which is then compared to “Fred.” Wade uses the lexical device “ok,” to return the turn back to Pamela who follows with an account of a problematic interaction with Fred: “I could remember one time, he uh, I was in his pickup truck. And he was banging my head against the window and I can remember taking my shoe off and trying to hit him back. And uh.” This TCU appears to accomplish what Sacks (1972) called the “I was just doing x when y formulation.” Sacks’ research shows that people who have extraordinary experiences tend to report them in routine and predictable ways, and that the doing of “being ordinary” is a device that speakers use to position themselves as normal and socially competent in relation to abnormal circumstances. The first fragment, which can be thought of as an x formulation: “I could remember one time, he uh, I was in his pickup truck,” establishes the actors in a normal social environment. Her next turn however refers to an unusual experience, y , in which Fred assaults Pamela: “And he was banging my head against the window”, who resists: “...and I can remember taking my shoe off and trying to hit him back.” Wade uses his next turn to name the perpetrator and focus on his unilateral violence: “Fred was banging your head against the window?” which is a category-bound activity that orients to the category perpetrator. It also places Fred in the subject position, and Pamela in the object position to highlight his actions first, and his sole responsibility for the violence (Wade, April 18, 2011, personal communication). As researcher, by establishing the category “perpetrator” to refer to a collection of people (i.e. people who were identified during

response-based interviews) who engaged in a category-bound activity (i.e. unilateral acts of violence against women and children), I will be following the “consistency rule” (Schegloff, 2007). This rule operates on the premise that when several persons are being categorized and the first to be categorized is referred to by some category from a collection, then that category or other categories from the same collection can be used to categorize subsequent persons.

Response-Based Interview with Jane

Jane’s interview focuses primarily on recollections of her childhood experiences (roughly five decades ago) with a teacher who perpetrated violence against her and other students who were singled out as problem students. The interview deconstructs the discourse of intelligence as a tactic (i.e. form of victim blaming) of the perpetrator, and explores how Jane’s school performance was related to how she was treated by the teacher. For example, after moving to a new school in which she was not being assaulted and insulted by the teacher, her grades improved.

Sequence 1

1. A: Even at the time, do you remember noticing that she was doing the same thing to other children?
2. J: Yeah.
3. A: So when you saw that happening to other children, how did you respond to that?
4. J: I don’t really remember.
5. A: Okay.
6. J: But when you ask me now, I feel like, relief, about that. It was not only me—
7. A: Mm-hmm.
8. J: -it is quite a -- a kind of relief because maybe it was not only me who was wrong, or dumb, or—
9. A: Mm-hmm. Yeah. It wasn’t about you, it was about the teacher, hm?
10. J: Yeah.
11. A: Yeah.
12. J: But...
13. A: You got hurt.
14. J: Yeah.
15. A: Yeah.
16. J: But somewhere I wasn’t sure about that.

17. A: Mm-hmm, and you thought that maybe it was you.
18. J: Yeah. Stupid, you know?
19. A: What's stupid about that? You were little.
20. J: I was not clever.
21. A: In school.
22. J: Mm-hmm.
23. A: Okay. Yeah. You had a hard time in school?
24. J: Mm-hmm.
25. A: Even after that?
26. J: Yeah, next year, about the same, but the teacher was not so mean, and after that, it got better and better.
27. A: What got better and better?
28. J: We moved from Normandy to Brittany and the school was very different and it was much better for me, and I had some very nice teachers, and it made me to be more friends with the school system.
29. A: Mm-hmm. So, you had nicer teachers.
30. J: Mm-hmm.
31. A: And you felt better about being in school.
32. J: Yeah.
33. A: You didn't hate it so much.
34. J: No.
35. A: Okay.
36. J: Yeah.
37. A: What happened with your learning?
38. J: Oh, it improved.
39. A: Yeah, right.
40. J: I was at that time in Brittany ... I was one of the best students. It was a huge difference compared to the start.
41. A: Yeah. It looks like you are really smart when you are treated respectfully, eh?
42. J: Yeah.

In the present sequence the participants orient to a previous category teacher, which is duplicatively organized with the category children, in the MCD classroom. Wade uses his first turn in this sequence to ask a closed question about whether Jane recalled other victims of this teacher's abuse, to which Jane responds in the affirmative. Wade's next question, which is used to explore the details of Jane's response to the teacher's abuse of the school children, receives the response: "I don't really remember." Allan says: "Okay," passing the turn back to Jane, who adds: "But when you ask me now, I feel like, relief, about that. It was not only me." While Wade's question about resistance was not answered it had an affect of "relief" and his next turn:

“Mm-hmm” returns it to Jane again who adds the categories, “wrong” and “dumb,” to the collection children: “-it is quite a -- a kind of relief because maybe it was not only me who was wrong, or dumb, or.” These problematic identity categories can be seen, from a response-based perspective, as a orienting to a discourse of victim blaming, and Wade’s next turn is a self-selection and interruption that occurs at a transition relevant place - a victim blaming discourse: “Mm-hmm. Yeah. It wasn’t about you, it was about the teacher, hm?” This turn accomplishes a few different pieces of interactional work. First, Wade orients overtly to the category teacher, drawing upon inference rich knowledge about what a presumed representative of that category does (i.e. teach children) and does not do (i.e. abuse children), in order to attribute responsibility to her, which is also an orientation to the category perpetrator. While he appears to ignore the categories wrong/dumb from a discursive perspective (as he does not overtly take them up), he actually orients to those discourses in his response by addressing victim blaming and attributing perpetrator responsibility: “It wasn’t about you, it was about the teacher.”

10. J: Yeah.

11. A: Yeah.

12. J: But...

13. A: You got hurt.

In turn 10 Jane appears to complete an adjacency pair by agreeing with Wade’s previous turn, and his next turn “Yeah” returns the turn to Jane who’s “But...” can be viewed as a disjunctive marker that Wade interrupts to self-select and orients to the MCD violence, completing Jane’s phrase with “You got hurt”, to which Jane agrees “yeah” and Allan’s “yeah” in line 15 returns the turn to Jane:

16. J: But somewhere I wasn’t sure about that.

17. A: Mm-hmm, and you thought that maybe it was you.

18. J: Yeah. Stupid, you know?

Jane reintroduces doubt with the disjunctive marker “But...” followed by a topic shift

“...somewhere I wasn’t sure about that,” which can be seen as a refusal to orient to the category perpetrator that Wade oriented to in turn 9. Wade draws upon his knowledge of victim blaming in his reflection: “Mm-hmm, and you thought that maybe it was you,” which Jane completes: “Yeah. Stupid, you know?” The word “stupid” can be seen as an addition to the collection of children who are “wrong” and “dumb,” and Wade uses his next turn: “What’s stupid about that? You were little” as an attempt to modify the knowledge about this collection. Jane’s next turn: “I was not clever” is an override that is applied to Wade’s modifier, and another addition to the category children. Wade’s next turn: “In school” is a modification of Jane’s utterance “I was not clever,” which orients to inference rich knowledge about the category-bound activities (i.e. being clever) of children in a school context. It also serves to avoid the totalizing subjectification of a child: “I” that was “not clever.”

The difficulties that Wade experienced in modifying the collection “wrong,” “dumb,” and “stupid” of the MCD “children” can be explained in relation to the concept of “protected against induction” (Schegloff, 2007). When categories are protected against induction it means that when a member of the category, for example “children,” contravenes what is “known” about members of that category, i.e. the category bound activity of being “clever” at school, the knowledge about the category is not revised. In other words something is seen to be wrong with the member, i.e. “stupid,” and not with the category, “child,” which has been normatively associated with the category-bound activity of “being clever” at school. To relate this concept to the present analysis is a statement about the power of discourses of intellectual evaluation that are oriented to by members in school contexts, in which “stupid” is heretofore seen as an exceptionality or defective attribute of a member of the category “child.” In his next turn Wade modifies “not clever” with “Okay. Yeah. You had a hard time in school?” which is a more

ambiguous statement that leaves room for alternative explanations about why a child might have a “hard time.”

Wade uses his next turn to ask a follow-up question that places the school context within a broader historical framework: “Even after that?” This question can be seen as a modification of the category child who is “not clever... in school” and is used to elicit an historical account, which may offer an alternative, or what is known as the “absent but implicit” (White, 1995), account related to the category child. The “absent but implicit” is a narrative concept that White used to describe alternative stories that exist outside of the “problem saturated story,” which positions the author, or “client,” as the site of the problem. The way that the discourse “not clever” has been protected against induction in the present sequence could be viewed as a problem saturated story. However, the way that Jane orients to the category teacher in her response to Wade’s question: “Yeah, next year, about the same, but the teacher was not so mean, and after that, it got better and better,” not only draws upon the absent but implicit “It got better and better,” but is achieved by drawing a correlation between the actions of the teacher, “not so mean” and the quality of Jane’s experience “better and better.” Jane’s turn produces a new category, “mean,” which can be added to the collection “teacher” and orients to the category perpetrator. Wade’s next question “What got better and better?” is used to explore the details of Jane’s experience, to which she replies: “We moved from Normandy to Brittany and the school was very different and it was much better for me, and I had some very nice teachers, and it made me to be more friends with the school system.” Jane adds the category “very nice” to the collection “teacher” and adds that “very nice” teachers improved her relationship with the “school system.” Wade uses his next turn to ask another question: “What happened with your learning?” which presupposes that there is a correlation between how children are treated and

their experience of learning. He achieves this by orienting to the category teacher and the category-bound activity of being “very nice,” while also orienting to the category child and the category-bound activity of being “more friends with the school system.” Jane affirms the presupposition: “Oh, it improved” and, in her next turn discloses: “I was at that time in Brittany ... I was one of the best students. It was a huge difference compared to the start.” Wade’s final statement: “Yeah. It looks like you are really smart when you are treated respectfully, eh?” reflects the new category “smart” by orienting to the new category “very nice teacher” and the category-bound activity of treating children respectfully.

Sequence 2

1. A: So, what do you think bothers you more, this idea that you might not be smart, or this idea – or, how you were treated?
2. J: Mmm...
3. A: In other words, if you were treated respectfully –
4. J: Yeah?
5. A: -could you live with the idea that you weren’t the smartest person in the world?
6. J: Yeah. Right. You picked up something important.
7. A: Mm-hmm?
8. J: Yeah. What you said...very good distinction.
9. A: Why, what do you mean? What’s good about it?
10. J: No, because, I really think that. I believe that people are different, and it’s okay.
11. A: Yeah.
12. J: But what she did with me-
13. A: Mm-hmm.
14. J: -it was not ok.
15. A: Yeah. It should not be – happen. And it happens every day in schools.
16. J: Yeah. It does.
17. A: It does. That is part of what bothers you, isn’t it?
18. J: Yeah.
19. A: It happens still. Right. Yeah. Sorry, I interrupted.
20. J: No, no.
21. A: Carry on.
22. J: So I like your -- the distinction you do... what part of what happened, and this part, how I was treated.
23. A: Mm-hmm. Yeah, because I have had experiences with teachers that have been abusive. You know? Not the same as yours. But one of the things I think I’ve witnessed is that sometimes, the students that the teachers pick on, are the most defiant. The most troublesome. They don’t go along with everything. Students who...make it apparent that

they don't like the teacher...you know, they give an attitude like, I don't care... Who are you?... mess around with their homework, don't take the teachers seriously.

24. J: Mmm.

25. A: Yeah, yeah. And sometimes, they're nicer to students who just go along. Do everything they're supposed to do. And that's good for those students, you know, that's the way they handle the situation. But they're not – you know – they're the good students. They're not so likely to get – you know, they're not defiant, they're not making trouble, they're not showing that they are unhappy, they're not showing that they don't like the teacher, they're not refusing to do the homework in the right way, and that's -- you were doing all those types of things.

26. J: Yeah.

27. A: Hey?

28. J: And I, what I realize now, I was proud...Proud?

29. A: Yeah.

30. J: And uh, yeah, it was my way to say to her that maybe I am little, and I can't do or say anything to convince you that I could be better, but I am proud.

Wade initiates sequence two with a closed question that requires Jane to identify the source of her feeling: “bothered,” and he asks her to clarify whether she is more bothered by “This idea that you might not be smart” or “How you were treated.” While Jane considers the question, Wade self-selects to take another turn and reframes the question, this time infused with a presupposition that being “bothered” is related to mistreatment and violence rather than concerns about personal intelligence:

3. A: In other words, if you were treated respectfully –

4. J: Yeah?

5. A: -could you live with the idea that you weren't the smartest person in the world?

Jane responds: “Yeah. Right. You picked up something important,” and in her following turn: “No, because, I really think that. I believe that people are different, and it's okay.” This can be analyzed discursively as a political statement about Jane's values in relation to human rights, diversity and dignity. She then connects this statement to her own experience by orienting to the standardized relational pair SRP victim/perpetrator: “But what she did with me... it was not ok.” Stokoe (2003) calls categories that go together standardized relational pairs (SRPs), and her research draws attention to the fact that categories that sit together in paired relationships, such

as “mommy” and “baby”, are inference rich and have associated duties and obligations. Jane’s statement is supported by earlier accounts of violence and oppression (“She treat me like shit” “...word like, are you stupid,” “Insults,” “She would hit me in my head,” “I had long hair, and she would...”), which are category-bound activities belonging to the category perpetrator. Wade uses his next turn to share his own view about the politics of violence and oppression in schools: “Yeah. It should not be – happen. And it happens every day in schools” and his next utterance includes a presupposition about Jane’s ethics: “... That is part of what bothers you, isn’t it?” which Jane affirms and then picks back up on Wade’s utterances in turn 1 and 5, which is also a continuation of her previous turns that orient to the category victim: “So I like your - the distinction you do... what part of what happened, and this part, how I was treated.”

Wade’s next two TCU’s, which were used to accomplish a series of Response-Based tasks, includes statements about his own experiences, observations, and political understanding of classroom conduct. His first turn is used to describe the category-bound activities of victims who resist oppression and the status quo of classroom normativity. He identifies himself as an insider who has had experiences with abusive teachers and lists a number of category-bound activities (some of which are reflections of Jane’s own acts of resistance that were discussed in a sequence that has not been included in this analysis) that are attributed to a new category: “students,” which can be added to the collection children, who resist in the following ways: “... most defiant. The most troublesome. They don’t go along with everything. Students who...make it apparent that they don’t like the teacher...you know, they give an attitude like, ‘I don’t care... Who are you?’ ... Mess around with their homework, don’t take the teachers seriously.” Jane returns the turn to Wade, who accomplishes two interactional tasks in his next turn. First he adds the following category-bound activity: “They’re [teachers] *nicer* to students who just go along”

to the category perpetrator, and adds the category-bound activity “students who just go along” to the collection student. He then adds “good students” to the collection “student” and identifies a number of category-bound activities: “Not defiant, they’re not making trouble, they’re not showing that they are unhappy, they’re not showing that they don’t like the teacher, they’re not refusing to do the homework in the right way...” The collections “good students” on one hand and “most defiant” on the other can be seen to constitute student as a team-type MCD (Schegloff, 2007).

Team-type MCDs are categories (i.e. student) in some category collections (i.e. “good” and “most defiant”) in some MCD (i.e. class). Wade finishes this TCU by adding Jane to the category “most defiant,” and links her actions to the category-bound activities of that collection: “You were doing all those types of things,” which Jane agrees with: “Yeah” and Wade’s next utterance: “Hey?” is read as a request for elaboration. Jane uses her turn to add pride, as a descriptor of her connection to team most defiant: “And I, what I realize now, I was proud...Proud?” In the final turn of the sequence Jane aligns herself with the category-bound activities of resistance that are associated with the category “most defiant:” “It was my way to say to her that maybe I am little, and I can’t do or say anything to convince you that I could be better, but I am proud.” The statement “I can’t do or say anything to convince you I could be better” orients to the category perpetrator and the category-bound activity of “be better,” which still presumes deficiency. While school-based discourses of deficiency are inference rich and protected against induction, Jane modifies her actions as resistance: “It was my way to *say* to her...” and overrides “convince you” with “I am proud,” which orients to the MCD responding-to-violence. Pride is a lexical marker that constitutes the category “most defiant” as inference rich and oriented to the category-bound activity of resistance.

Response-Based Interview with Kate

Kate's interview is based on her acts of resistance to an assault perpetrated by a man at a dance club as well as an exploration of the kinds of social responses that she received afterward, and what she did in response. In sequence 1 the participants talk about her responses to the negative social responses of a psychologist, while sequence 2 is an analysis of her responses to a friend's negative social responses.

Sequence 1

1. K: And uh this therapist, with the best intent I'm sure she was uh using this psychodrama inspired thing where she asked me to pretend I was a big and strong animal, like a lion or something, and how if I had been a lion at the time what would I have done to this guy.
2. A: Right...
3. K: Uh and that was, I hate those kinds of metaphors...
4. A: Ok...
5. K: So I just wouldn't do it. I said sorry
6. A: Oh really, you wouldn't do it?
7. K: No,
8. A: Ok
9. K: This is not helpful to me. And when you were talking about how people actually make resistance, do things, resist, uh there were lots of things I did, I even hit the guy.
10. A: Hmmm...
11. K: And she didn't use that (laughs).
12. A: Hmm really she had an assumption-
13. It was right in front of her!
14. A: Right.
15. K: And she still needed to make something up to pretend I had been strong when I actually had been really strong.
16. A: Mmmhmm.
17. K: And so that was a really good example.
18. A: mmhmm, so you had some idea that you have to make up something about if you were strong when you were really strong.
19. K: Uh huh.
20. A: And so never noticed this somehow.
21. K: Yeah.
22. A: Can you say a little bit about the events that you are talking about, uh the assault...is it OK to start there?

In the following sequence Kate describes a meeting that she had with a therapist whom she saw as part of her own training as a psychologist. What she is referring to in this sequence is

the negative social response that she received from this therapist after disclosing that she had been the victim of assault. In her first turn of the sequence she prefaces her description of the therapist's actions with the phrase: "With the best intent I'm sure," which is a lexical device that renders what will follow to be problematic. She then describes the category-bound activity of psychodrama: "She asked me to pretend I was a big and strong animal, like a lion or something, and how if I had been a lion at the time what would I have done to this guy." Wade then selects Kate to take another turn and she overtly orients to these category-bound activities as dis-preferred: "I hate those kinds of metaphors." After Wade selects her to speak again, she describes her response as a category-bound activity of resistance: "So I just wouldn't do it" which Wade responds to with a same polarity question (SPQ): "Oh really, you wouldn't do it?" The SPQ is a lexical device that is often used to convey affiliation with the knowledge that has been shared, and to invite elaboration of the topic (Heinemann, 2008). Kate affirms Wade's SPQ with "No" and then, in her following turn, accomplishes three interactional tasks. First, she extends her complaint against the category-bound activities of the collection "therapist": "This is not helpful to me", which contravenes inference rich knowledge about therapy as a helping profession. In the second segment Kate repeats something that Wade said in a previous interaction (not included) about resistance to violence: "how people actually make resistance, do things, resist" and links this knowledge to her own personal experience of resisting violence: "there were lots of things I did, I even hit the guy". Finally, she holds her former therapist accountable by performing a membership assessment: "and she didn't use that" followed by "It was right in front of her" and finally: "And she still needed to make something up to pretend I had been strong when I actually had been really strong". Allan then orients to the category-bound activity of "make something up" (which belongs to the category: unhelpful therapist) to

reflect Kate's complaint that the therapist failed to acknowledge that: "you [Kate] were really strong". Wade then states "And so [the therapist] never noticed this somehow", in which "somehow" orients to Kate's membership assessment of the therapist. These statements can be said to adhere to the "hearer's maxim" (Schegloff, 2007), which are instructions for orienting to categories (i.e. the category unhelpful therapist) and the activities (i.e. attributing responsibility, doing membership assessment) that were used by Kate. I've included Wade's next turn, which begins a new sequence because, by naming "the assault" and focusing on the details of what happened, it can be seen as a direct response to what was complainable about the category-bound activities of psychodrama in the previous sequence: "metaphors", "she didn't use that" (re: her acts of resistance to the violence) "needed to make something up" and "pretend."

Sequence 2

1. K: And I woke up the next morning, and I saw my face in the mirror, and uh it wasn't until then that this occurred to me, is this a crime?
2. A: Mmmhmm.
3. K: I can report this....to the police. And uh, I can get him in some trouble. And uh, I felt very clever (laughs), to realize this. And so I went to knock on her door, and she was awake already and cleaning up in her room, and so I said, 'look, I am going to report him to the police'. And she said, 'what for, what do you mean?' And I said, 'Well, *look* at me, He *hit* me. My face. He hit me'. (Laughs) And she said, 'well what do you expect, you hit him first'.
4. A: Oh...
5. K: Yeah that was too, very very strange, so, and uh,...
6. A: So she also hit him first.
7. K: Yeah...
8. A: But of course...
9. K: Yeah but I guess she slapped him and uh maybe she would report him to the police if he had hit her back, I don't know.
10. A: So the fact that he had been grabbing you, and grabbing her...
11. K: Mmmm....
12. A: Was a fact that was somehow, that wasn't considered an assault or . . . ?
13. K: No.
14. A: That was somehow just left out of the picture.
15. K: It's just normal...I guess.
16. A: It's just normal. Ok. Alright, yeah. Huh. So, how did you respond to that, when she said that, when she kind of said that to you?
17. K: I was a bit confused.

18. A: Yeah.

19. K: And I thought, uh, she might be right, but I might be right, and she might not be such a good friend.

20. A: Yeah.

21. K: So I thought I'll just leave her to it, and I'll go phone the police.

22. A: You did anyway?

23. K: Yeah.

The present sequence describes how Kate responded to the negative social responses of a former friend after she was assaulted. In her first turn she describes seeing the physical effects of violence on her face in the mirror, and orients to the SRP perpetrator/victim by asking: "Is this a crime?" In her second turn she describes a category-bound activity of responding to violence: "...report this....to the police." Kate describes her surprise at her friend's response to her plan: "what for, what do you mean?" and "...well what do you expect, you hit him first", which adds Kate to the category perpetrator who is seen to be doing the category-bound activity of "hit him first."

In the next few turns Wade reflects on Kate's earlier report (from a different sequence in the transcript) that her friend hit him first, before Kate did. Kate states: "maybe she would report him to the police if he had hit her back," and by doing so removes her friend from the category victim. In the next turn, Wade responds to this modification by re-orienting to the SRP perpetrator/victim, both by describing unilateral acts of sexualized assault: "grabbing you, and grabbing her," which are the category-bound activities of the category perpetrator, as well as adding "you" (Kate) and "her" (friend) to the collection: victim. Wade then asks a question: "Was a fact that was somehow, that wasn't considered an assault or?" This question can be viewed as protected against induction in the sense that both Wade and Kate orient to inference-rich knowledge that an act of "grabbing" without consent is a category-bound activity of the category perpetrator. Wade then adds: "That was somehow just left out of the picture."

Turns 10-16 are critiques of the normalization of sexualized assault, and both speakers orient to inference rich knowledge about the four discursive operations: concealing violence, obfuscating perpetrators' responsibility, concealing victims' resistance, blaming and pathologizing the victims. First Kate says: "It's just normal...I guess," and then Wade responds with sarcasm in the first part of a two-turn unit: "It's just normal. Ok. Alright, yeah. Huh." This sequence can be analyzed as adhering to Sacks' "hearer's maxim," which refers to the instructions for a recipient (i.e. Wade) to hear and understand a category term (i.e. friend) or category-bound activity (i.e. victim blaming) that was used by a speaker (i.e. Kate). For example, Wade followed the hearer's maxim in his understanding of Kate's mentions of her friend, who Kate asserted had questioned her plan to attribute perpetrator responsibility: "What for, what do you mean?" and blame the victim: "Well what do you expect, you hit him first," as category-bound activities of victim-blaming. Rather than continuing with the dialogue based on the hearer's maxim, Wade orients to the "viewer's maxim" to self-select and take a second turn that accomplishes new interactional work. The viewer's maxim is an instruction for a participant (i.e. Wade) perceiving an action (i.e. resisting negative social responses) being done by a member of a category (i.e. Kate, in the collection victim). Wade draws upon the viewer's maxim to construct a response-based question: "So, how did you respond to that, when she said that, when she kind of said that to you?" which reorients the conversation to the hearer's maxim (i.e. the category "friend" who engaged in the category-bound activity of blaming the victim/Kate). Kate responds: "I was a bit confused," and Wade returns the turn, which Kate uses to elaborate on her confusion: "And I thought, uh, she might be right, but I might be right, and she might not be such a good friend." The last segment "she might not be such a good friend", is a membership assessment that orients to the category: "friend," and establishes a new category "not such a good

friend” in the collection “friend.” Kate then orients to the MCD responding-to-violence and describes a category-bound activity that she does in response to the negative social response: “So I thought I’ll just leave her to it, and I’ll go phone the police.” The lexical device: “Leave her to it,” is an act of resistance to the category-bound activity of victim-blaming, which belongs to the category “not such a good friend.” Wade uses his next turn to ask a same polarity question: “You did anyway?” highlighting the act of resistance, which Kate affirms: “Yeah” completing the sequence.

Summary of Chapter IV

In this chapter I presented my findings in relation to conversational devices that have been identified by researchers in the fields of conversation analysis and ethnomethodology, and described the interactional work that these devices were used to accomplish in these response-based interview contexts. Finally, I ensured the validity of my findings by adhering to CA principles and research as well as having Dr. Wade read each sequence to validate my analyses in relation to the response-based contexts.

Chapter V – Discussion

In the following chapter I discuss how my findings support membership categorization research (Sacks, 1972; Schegloff, 2007; Stokoe, 2003, 2006, 2010; West & Fenstermaker, 2002) that shows how most references to persons are not done to accomplish identity work but rather are used to accomplish social tasks. The present discussion is focused on how references to persons and category-bound activities were used to make inferences about violence and resistance. Generally, I found that categorical references were used by each of the participants to attribute responsibility and to assess aspects of self and other against inference rich cultural and scientific (i.e. in terms of psychological stability and intelligence) norms about violence and responses. My findings are supported by the analytic work of Foucault, Deleuze, Guattari and scholars who have extended their ideas in relation to power, language, social conduct and the subject of psychology.

In the first section, I discuss how Wade oriented to the institutionally relevant category ‘therapist’ and the associated social power to produce categorical references that constrained the four discursive operations and accomplished response-based work, such as exposing violence, clarifying perpetrator responsibility, elucidating and honoring victims’ responses and resistance, and contesting the blaming and pathologizing of victims. Second, I discuss how the participants oriented to the standardized relational pair (SRP) perpetrator/victim to clarify who was doing what to whom during conversations about violence, resistance, and social responses. Third I look at the membership categorization device ‘responding-to-violence’ and provide examples of how participants oriented to that device to accomplish response-based work, as well as how it features in Wade’s responses to a language of effects.

Power Asymmetries: the Pouvoir of Response-Based Practice

My analysis offers a contribution to research on asymmetries in the conversational modes that occur in the institution of therapy (Bartesaghi, 2009; Dhudwal & Sheehan, 2011; McGee, Del Vento, & Bavelas, 2005; Sacks, 1972; Wang, 2006), which is necessarily an institutional analysis of power. Massumi's (1992) concepts of form and content that I addressed in my epistemology section resurface here: Language is a form of expression (i.e. that which is said) that does not exist outside of forms of content (i.e. the multiplicities of what could have been said but were constrained by inference rich knowledge). Each side has substance that informs the other. Forms of expression and forms of content battle back and forth to reach an end called ideology, which survives based on the frequency of its use in social contexts. Massumi (1992) suggests that power relates to the form of expression and the form of content and considers the form of content to be a productive network of forces. This force is boundless potential that takes the uniqueness of an event to its limit, while power exists in relation to forms of expression, which delimit and distribute the potential of content. While force drives the productivity of forms of content, power delimits and distributes it as a form of expression. The present section will describe how Wade and the interviewees oriented to the duplicatively organized MCD therapist/client in ways that allowed for Wade to constrain the expression of content (i.e. language of effects) and distribute forms of expression agreeable to the ethics of response-based practice. How these forms of expression were achieved is the focus of the present analysis, which is supported by the findings of institutional conversational analysis that show how interaction is shaped by the concerns of the institution (ten Have, 2000; Heritage & Clayman, 2010).

Sacks (in Schegloff, 2007) showed how asymmetries in power allow for the “omni

relevance” of the category device therapist/patient. He went on to show how this device applies to certain category-based practices in which the therapist saying it and/or doing it carries special import. Wang’s (1996) theory of “social power” (p. 531) describes how in institutional settings the distribution of power has already been established before verbal interaction occurs. And Schegloff (1992) showed how distributions of power are of particular relevance for empirical studies of institutional identities in which the relationship between the parties, i.e. their affiliation to social structures such client and therapist, seem to be oriented to by the parties themselves. My findings show at least two ways that all three interviews were constrained by social power in the participants’ orientation to the MCD therapist/client. First, there were asymmetries in the allocation of turn-taking rights, in which Wade can be seen to self-select in order to achieve a second order of asymmetry: the pursuit of response-based tasks, and second was Wade’s explicit orientation to the category therapist in order to privilege the voices of people who resisted violence and spoke out against oppression.

In their study of questions as a therapeutic resource, McGee, Del Vento, and Bavelas (2005) showed how the distribution of conversational resources, such as the allocation of questioning authority, in-turn influences the allocation of turn-taking. Turns 10-13 in sequence 1 of Wade’s interview with Jane provide an example of how conversational resources were allocated to Wade, as an effect of social power, to accomplish response-based tasks:

- 10. J: Yeah.
- 11. A: Yeah.
- 12. J: But
- 13. A: You got hurt

Notice how, when Jane introduces doubt with the lexical device: “But” at turn 12, Wade interrupts and self-selects to complete Jane’s phrase with: “You got hurt”, which re-orientes the conversation to the category victim and exposes violence. This turn also initiates the response-

based task of contesting the blaming and pathologizing of victims as Wade, using the viewer's maxim, saw Jane to be doing in her orientation to the categories wrong and dumb in turn 8. If we look back at how Wade had initially responded to turn 8, we see that he drew upon the MCD therapist/client to change topic and contest a victim blaming discourse: "me [Jane] who was wrong, or dumb", by using the category teacher to re-orient the conversation to the category perpetrator: "Mm-hmm. Yeah. It wasn't about you, it was about the teacher, hm?". Wade's use of the category teacher to orient to the category perpetrator adheres to the "economy rule" (Schegloff, 2008), which states that while more can be used, a single category term from any MCD can do adequate reference.

We see Wade make a similar self-selection in turn 4 of sequence 1 in Pamela's interview:

16. P: Yeah, no and also. Our view, well, or my view of myself. Then- coz sometimes I feel like I'm crazy or that I'm unstable because I do- I change. Just, yesterday morning I woke up, I was so joyful and happy and-
17. A: Yeah.
18. P: And by the close of the day yesterday I was- you know- sad and um. Confused. Overwhelmed.
19. A: And had good reason for being both those.

Wade uses his social power and the allocation of conversational resources to contextualize and de-individualize the experience of "change". He uses the lexical phrase: "good reason" as a de-pathologizing device that modifies the category "stable", which was identified in an earlier sequence as an inference rich category and therefore protected against induction. The modification, "Good reason" draws upon inference-rich knowledge about the category "they", who sought to territorialize Pamela's experience as an effect of psychological power and failed to address the problem of violence. Mills (1997) writes that the inseparability of power and knowledge is reflected when someone argues for one form of knowledge over another and that, if we view all of the knowledge that exists as the result of a struggle for power, what we constitute

as knowledge can be thought of as the product of the subjugation of other objects. Wade's use of social power to self-select and perform a partial schizoanalysis, by attributing perpetrator responsibility and acknowledge acts of resistance, can be seen as an act that subjugates the dominant knowledge. This is confirmed in turn 8, when Wade identifies a "they" who demand consistency and view inconsistency as a sign of having "something the matter with you". I will address this particular de-psychologizing task of Wade's response-based work in greater detail in a later section.

A third example comes from sequence 2 of Wade's interview with Kate:

3. K: I can report this....to the police. And uh, I can get him in some trouble. And uh, I felt very clever (laughs), to realize this. And so I went to knock on her door, and she was awake already and cleaning up in her room, and so I said, 'look, I am going to report him to the police'. And she said, 'what for, what do you mean?' And I said, 'Well, *look* at me, He *hit* me. My face. He hit me'. (Laughs) And she said, 'well what do you expect, you hit him first'.

4. A: Oh...

5. K: Yeah that was too, very very strange, so, and uh,...

6. A: So she also hit him first.

7. K: Yeah...

8. A: But of course...

9. K: Yeah but I guess she slapped him and uh maybe she would report him to the police if he had hit her back, I don't know.

Wade uses the asymmetrical allocation of interactional resources to interrupt Kate's 5th turn in the sequence: "So she also hit him first", and achieve the response-based task of contesting victim blaming, in which Kate's friend had added Kate to the category perpetrator and failed to acknowledge that her actions followed a sexualized assault. Kate completes the turn by orienting to the category victim: "maybe she would report him to the police if he had hit her back". It is important to remember that the hitting that Kate and her friend engaged in was a response to sexualized assaults that had been perpetrated by the man being hit.

The final example differs from the others in that Wade draws explicitly upon the category therapist, and the category-bound activity of "talking to people" to introduce a new category

“people”, whom he cites as his source of knowledge about how people’s feelings and actions change in relationship to their environmental circumstances:

14. A: They would sort of- If you seemed to them to be inconsistent they would say that something the matter with you.

15. P: Yeah.

16. A: Whereas invariably you find or at least I think I find in talking with people that if people feel really differently from one time to another or behave really differently there is something really going on in the circumstances. Right?

17. P: That helps too for judgments or anything like that coz I really don’t like judging people. But I find I will stay away. I mean, we make subconscious judgments I guess. But then- I’ll just stay away.

18. A: Yeah. Absolutely. There are a lot of situations where staying away is a darn good idea.

Line 14 is an example of an schizoanalytic practice that interrogates the major language practices done by the category “they” by drawing upon client knowledge, known in the narrative therapy community as “insider knowledge” (Madigan & Epston, 1995; Madigan, 2011) to value people’s responses to difficult circumstances. Wade uses the MCD therapist to join in the politics of minorities and can be seen as subverting the MCD therapist/client, in the spirit of narrative therapy, by trading on the omni-relevance and social power of the category-based privileges of therapist to empower the politics of the minority (in this case people who responded to violence).

The Standardized Relational Pair (SRP) Perpetrator/Victim

Stokoe (2010) draws upon the research of Lee (1984) and Wowk (1984), who found that when people talk about violence they orient to inference-rich knowledge about violence as a problem related to gender, sexuality and culture. For example, Wowk found that male perpetrators of violence against women blamed the victim. Acts of blaming were based on inference-rich knowledge about sexuality and related cultural norms about the ‘kind of girl’ that is a victim of violence. Lee, Wowk, and Stokoe have shown that male/female and perpetrator/victim can be duplicatively organized as standardized relational pairs (SRP). In the

three interviews that I analyzed, when conversations about violence involved men and women, men were identified as the perpetrators. The sole female perpetrator was a teacher who assaulted another female Jane, who was a child at the time. In all of the conversations, it was women who were the victims of violence. Therapist and violence researcher Tod Augusta-Scott (2007) argues against the use of the terms “perpetrator” and “victim”, suggesting that they promote one-dimensional identities that contribute to gender essentialism. However, to view the SRP perpetrator/victim as essentialist is to engage in a representational view of language that fails to account for the interactional work that such words are used to accomplish in their social context, as language-in-use. To engage in the censure of words is to constrain the creative, political, liberatory, and minor use of inference-rich social knowledge to change the social conditions to which such terminology refers. Because of its relevance to the problem that Augusta-Scott raises I include a section from Wade’s interview with Pamela that was not included in my analysis:

19. P: He was dating a girlfriend of mine. And he would, from time to time, hurt her. And he would come and talk to me about it.
20. A: How would he hurt her?
21. P: One time he hit her with a pool stick.
22. A: Oh. So, this is a violent guy.
23. P: Yeah he was.
24. A: To her.
25. P: And to the police.
26. A: And to the police.

In turn 21 Pamela describes a category-bound activity: “One time he hit her with a pool stick” to which Wade responded: “Oh. So, this is a violent guy,” completing an adjacency pair. Note that Wade’s response began with the utterance “Oh,” which is a device CA has identified as illustrating the dissemination of new information (Drew & Heritage, 1998), in this case Pamela’s provision of an explanatory apparatus that Wade used to add “He-who-hit-her-with-a-pool-stick” to the category perpetrator. Pamela’s response confirms the adjacency pair, “Yeah he was” and

provides evidence that the category was correct. However, Wade then adds another turn to this sequence: “To her,” which accomplishes two pieces of interactional work. First it orients to the category victim and completes the SRP perpetrator/victim, and second, “to her” also specifies the category “violent guy” in relation to a particular person (who belongs to the category victim) and context (i.e. a unilateral act of violence) to avoid the problem of identity essentialism. Pamela then completes the sequence: “And to the police,” which adds police to category “victim” and further contextualizes the violence.

Another example of Wade’s orientation to the SRP perpetrator/victim comes from sequence 2, when Pamela describes her relationship with an abusive partner:

2. P: Well, I had- I just met with while I was breaking off a relationship with like a normal guy, he was apprenticing to be a plumber. And, uh, he and I really fought. His name was Fred. Um, back and forth.
3. A: Alright.
4. P: I could remember one time, he uh, I was in his pick up truck. And he was banging my head against the window and I can remember taking my shoe off and trying to hit him back. And uh.
5. A: Fred was banging your head against the window?

“...he and I really fought... Um back and forth” is a discursive operation that mutualizes and envelops the details of what happened. In her next turn she recalls: “I could remember one time, he uh, I was in his pick up truck. And he was banging my head against the window and I can remember taking my shoe off and trying to hit him back. And uh.” Wade orients to the category-bound activity violence and reflects the fragment: “Fred was banging your head against the window?” which accomplishes response-based work by adding Fred, to the collection perpetrator and Pamela to the collection victim. By orienting to the category-bound activity violence: “Fred was banging your head against the window” rather than the category-bound activity of resistance: “taking my shoe off and trying to hit him back” Wade is clarifying

perpetrator responsibility and the details of the assault, as well as challenging the mutualizing expression “back and forth.” My findings connect to Stokoe’s (2010) research findings that show how denial accounts such as “I’m not gonna hit a lady” presuppose a culture in which men “hit” women frequently enough for such actions to be common knowledge. Pamela draws upon this knowledge by orienting to the category “normal guy” to describe an ex-boyfriend (who is not added to the category perpetrator), prior to talking about a later boyfriend Fred, whom she adds to the category perpetrator. Oh’s (2007) research on overt reference forms, shows that references such as “normal guy” are not typically used to assert identity but are more often used to accomplish responsibility attribution and disagreement. We can therefore analyze “normal guy” as a category that is used to establish moral accountability and disagreement with men who commit acts of violence.

A third example comes from the interview with Jane when Wade initiates sequence 2 with a closed question that requires her to identify the source of feeling “bothered.” He asks her to clarify whether she is more bothered by “this idea that you might not be smart” or “how you were treated.” While Jane considers the question, Wade self-selects to take another turn and reframes the question, this time infused with a presupposition that being “bothered” is related to mistreatment and violence rather than concerns about personal intelligence:

6. A: In other words, if you were treated respectfully –
7. J: Yeah?
8. A: -could you live with the idea that you weren’t the smartest person in the world?

Jane responds: “Yeah. Right. You picked up something important”, and then in her following turn: “No, because, I really think that. I believe that people are different, and it’s okay.” This can be analyzed discursively as a political statement about Jane’s values in relation to human rights, diversity and dignity and she connects this statement to her own experience by

orienting to the standardized relational pair SRP victim/perpetrator: “But what she did with me... it was not ok.” Jane’s statement is also supported by earlier accounts of violence and oppression (“She treat me like shit”, “...word like, are you stupid, or?”, “insults”, “she would hit me in my head”, “I had long hair, and she would...”) which are category-bound activities belonging to the category perpetrator. Wade can be seen to juxtapose the inference-rich knowledge (predicates, rights and obligations) that people have about membership categories against the SRP perpetrator/victim. For example, from the same interview, Wade orients to the category teacher, drawing upon inference rich knowledge about what a presumed representative of that category does (i.e. teach children) and does not do (i.e. abuse children), in order to attribute responsibility to her: “Mm-hmm. Yeah. It wasn’t about you, it was about the teacher, hm?” which adds “teacher” to the collection perpetrator.

My final example comes from the second sequence of Kate’s interview, in which she describes seeing the physical evidence of violence on her face in the mirror, and orients to the SRP perpetrator/victim that had been occasioned earlier in the interview by asking: “Is this a crime?” In her second turn she describes a category-bound activity of responding to the violence: “...report this...to the police.” However, when she shares her plan with a friend, the friend adds Kate to the category perpetrator with the fragment: “...you hit him first.” Wade responds to this account of the friend’s negative social response by re-orienting to the SRP perpetrator/victim and the MCD responding-to-violence to clarify the difference between the male perpetrator’s violence “grabbing” and the victims (Kate and her friend’s) responses: “hit him.” This offers a clear distinction between violence and resistance and shows how responsibility is attributed sequentially: he grabbed (violence), they hit (response).

In this section we have seen how Wade's orientation to the SRP perpetrator/victim is used to identify, in detail, the category-bound activities associated with their duplicatively organized membership categories. The table below provides a list of examples from the interviews. The grey left column includes the sequence number, the turn number and the members involved in the interaction (it is assumed that Wade is involved in each interaction). The clear left column contains the text fragment from the transcript. The grey right column includes the category, reference to persons, or object in the case of Pamela's shoe, which were used to attribute an activity to a character. The clear right column is used to acknowledge the response-based tasks of exposing violence, clarifying offenders' responsibility or acknowledging resistance, and the arrow represents the direction of the action.

Table 1.

Table of Standardized Relational Pair (SRP) Perpetrator/Victim

Sequence/turn/member	Category, or object
Text fragment from transcript	Category-bound activity
INTERVIEW WITH PATRICA	
1. (Sequence 1, turn 4) Pamela <i>he was banging my head</i> against the window	He → My Head Violence
2. (Sequence 1, turn 4) Pamela taking my shoe off and trying to <i>hit him back</i>	My Shoe ← → Him Resistance
3. (Sequence 1, turn 5) Wade <i>Fred was banging your head</i> against the window?	Fred → Your Head Perpetrator responsibility
INTERVIEW WITH JANE	
4. (Sequence 1, turn 1) Wade (and Jane) ...do you remember noticing that <i>she</i> was doing the same thing to other <i>children</i> ?	She → Children Perpetrator responsibility
5. (sequence 1, turn 9) Wade (and Jane) It wasn't about <i>you</i> , it was about the <i>teacher</i> , hm?	Teacher → You Perpetrator responsibility

6. (sequence 2, turn 12 and 14) Jane what <i>she</i> did with <i>me</i> ... it was not ok.	She → me Perpetrator responsibility
7. (sequence 2, turn 23) Wade (and Jane) <i>I</i> have had experiences with <i>teachers</i> that have been abusive	Teachers → Me Violence
8. (sequence 2, turn 23) Wade (and Jane) the students that the teachers pick on, are the most defiant. The most troublesome. They don't go along with everything	Teachers ↔ Students Perpetrator responsibility and resistance

INTERVIEW WITH KATE

9. (sequence 2, turn 3) Kate <i>He</i> hit <i>me</i>	He → me Violence
10. (Sequence 2, turn 10) Wade and Kate he had been grabbing you, and grabbing her...	He → You, her Violence

Response-Based Orientations to the MCD Responding-To-Violence

The MCD ‘responding-to-violence’ is informed by the idea that where there is violence, resistance is ever present (even when overlooked or undetectable). This is articulated in the following quote from the Honoring Resistance Handbook (2007): “Perpetrators do not believe that victims will be passive. Therefore, perpetrators think about how the victims will resist their abuse and make plans to try to stop this resistance” (p.25). In sequence 1, Wade and Pamela engage in a conversation that orients to the MCD responding-to-violence without explicitly naming violence, for example, in turn 12 Wade says: “Whereas invariably you find or at least I think I find in talking with people that if people feel really differently from one time to another or behave really differently there is something really going on in the circumstances.” Wade’s description of people who “feel” and “behave” differently in relation to their environment is an orientation to the MCD responding-to-violence. Richardson (2005) has written about Metis people’s responses to racism, violence, and oppression. She documents the sadness and despair felt by Metis people as an emotional response to injustice and a political protest against

violations of human dignity. These acts of feeling and behaving differently, as responses to violence and oppression, can be seen as a minoritarian politic that undermines the majoritarian view of emotions as internal processes that become disordered and require regulation.

In addition to my conversation analytic findings, I draw upon the concept of subjectification to unpack the final example, which includes self-categorizations made by Wade, who shares with Jane, his own experiences, observations, and political understanding of teachers who attempt to overpower student resistance. He follows these self-categorizations with categorizations of other students, as well as categorizations of Jane by talking about her own category-bound activities. His first turn is used to describe the category-bound activities of students who resist oppression and the status quo of classroom normativity. He identifies himself as an insider to resistance and someone who has had experiences with abusive teachers. He then lists a number of category-bound activities (some of which are reflections of Jane's own acts of resistance that were discussed in a sequence that has not been included in this analysis) that can be attributed to a new category: "students", which can be added to the collection children, who have been said to resist in the following ways: "... most defiant. The most troublesome. They don't go along with everything. Students who...make it apparent that they don't like the teacher...you know, they give an attitude like, 'I don't care... Who are you?' ... Mess around with their homework, don't take the teachers seriously." These acts can also be seen as subjectifications of resistance, which are conducts that arose in response to the dividing practices and scientific classifications that occurred in relation to the MCD classroom. Jane returns the turn to Wade, who accomplishes two interactional tasks in his next turn. First he adds the following category-bound activity, as a comment about dividing practices: "They're *nicer* to students who just go along," to the category teacher, and adds the category-bound activity

“students who just go along” to the collection student. He then adds “good students” to the collection “student” and identifies a number of category-bound activities: “Not defiant, they’re not making trouble, they’re not showing that they are unhappy, they’re not showing that they don’t like the teacher, they’re not refusing to do the homework in the right way...” The collections “good students” on one hand and “most defiant” on the other can be seen to constitute ‘student’ as a team-type MCD (Schegloff, 2007). Team-type MCDs are categories (i.e. “good” and “most defiant”) in some category collection (i.e. student) in some MCD (i.e. class). Wade finishes his turn by adding Jane to the category “most defiant,” and links her actions to the category-bound activities of that collection: “You were doing all those types of things,” which Jane agrees with: “Yeah” and Wade’s next utterance: “Hey?” is read as a request for elaboration. Jane uses her turn to add pride, to the category most defiant: “And I, what I realize now, I was proud...Proud?” In this final turn of the sequence Jane aligns herself with the category-bound activities of resistance that are associated with the category “most defiant:” “It was my way to say to her that maybe I am little, and I can’t do or say anything to convince you that I could be better, but I am proud.” The statement “I can’t do or say anything to convince you I could be better” orients to the category teacher, which is duplicatively organized with perpetrator, and the category-bound activity of “be better,” which still presumes deficiency. Because school-based discourses of deficiency are inference rich and protected against induction, Jane modifies her actions as resistance: “It was my way to *say* to her...” and overrides “Convince you” with “I am proud,” which orients to the MCD responding-to-violence. This can be seen as a subjectification of resistance and dignity, in which pride is a lexical marker that constitutes the category “most defiant” as inference rich and belonging to the category-bound activity of resistance.

Responding to a Language of Effects

Manuel Delanda (2010) argues that the ability for language to represent all other objects including itself, and translate each object into an abstract system of signs, is what gives “language-based theories, their imperialist pretensions” (p. 34). Delanda traces this pretension back to the linguistic turn and the rejection of materialism. His view does not refer to language as a whole, but more specifically to language that is used as a form of representation. In his book “Essays Critical and Clinical” Deleuze (1998) asks: “By what means can one ward off linguistic power?” (p. xlvi) and then describes a process in which “victors” attempt to impose their language on the “vanquished,” who in-turn exploit the extensible and reversible functions of linguistic power to engage in active political struggles and microstruggles. My findings show how Wade’s engagement with a politics of representation and his resistance to a language of effects can be seen as a methodology akin to Deleuze’s reversal of linguistic power. I begin by discussing how a language of effects becomes inference rich knowledge, and provide an example from Jane interview to show how major languages that are protected against induction are difficult to modify. I then provide a second example from sequence 1 of Pamela’s interview to show how Wade attends to the language of effects, first by engaging in interactions about the linguistic origins of effects-based discourses about their lives, and then by understanding their experiences in a relational context, which includes an elucidation of her responses to danger and oppression.

While my analysis indicates the presence of dominant psychological discourses and accounts for their effects, for example those occurrences of membership assessment that orient to victim blaming discourses, I also found that resistance to those discourses was ever-present.

Instances of membership assessment can be analyzed in relation to Foucault's modes of objectification of the modern subject. For example, on the side of dominant power, Wade's failed first attempt: "What's stupid about that? You were little", to modify Jane's additions of "wrong" and "dumb" to the collection "child" shows how difficult it is to modify inference-rich scientific knowledge. Jane's override "I was not clever" re-orientates to scientific knowledge, as does Wade's modification: "in school." Drawing upon Massumi's (1992) analysis of power, the conversation remains territorialized by scientific knowledge, and knowledge about intelligence remains protected from induction. This problem allows for a Foucauldian category-bound activity: dividing practices, which are the exclusionary practices against Jane and others who are seen as a threat to the community (i.e. bad student) because they differ from an established norm (i.e. clever). For example, when Jane's description of herself as a member of the category "children" contravened what is "known" about members of that category, i.e. that they engage in the category bound activity of being "clever" at school, the knowledge about the category was not revised. Instead a new membership "stupid" was added to the collection "child." The normativity of "being clever" is a powerful scientific classification from which discourses of normal/abnormal achieve their truth status and come to be applied to members. Wade responds to Joce's statement: "it is quite a -- a kind of relief because maybe it was not only me who was wrong, or dumb, or" by orienting to the MCD therapist/client and interrupting with: "Mm-hmm. Yeah. It wasn't about you, it was about the teacher, hm?" In this statement, it appears that Wade ignored the categories wrong/dumb from a discursive perspective, as he does not overtly take them up. However, he actually orients to that discourse as a language of effects, and his partial schizoanalysis addresses victim blaming and attributes perpetrator responsibility: "It wasn't about you, it was about the teacher." By returning the focus to the details of oppression and

responses and avoiding the metaphysical traps set by the major language practices of psychology and education, RBP can be seen as structural variation of Deleuze and Guattari's (2008) materialist psychiatry.

In turns 1 and 3: "Sometimes I feel like I'm crazy or that I'm unstable because I do- I change. Just, yesterday morning I woke up, I was so joyful and happy and... by the close of the day yesterday I was- you know- sad and um. Confused. Overwhelmed" Pamela engages in membership assessment, which West and Zimmerman (2002) have shown occurs when a member does not live up to normative social expectations. For example, Pamela's experience of "change" contravenes the category "stable," which is an order-word that is inference rich and protected against induction. Again, the problem of inference-rich knowledge that is spoken in a major language (i.e. the language of disorder) by referencing a scientific authority such as psychology (Hook, 2007) is an example scientific classification. Because scientific knowledge is often delocalized and deterritorialized it is difficult to locate the source of its power, and therefore not easily revised, for example, when Pamela refers to herself as a defective member of the category "stable," which is an order word that is duplicatively organized with unstable. As I outlined in a previous section Wade draws upon the asymmetry, the *pouvoir*, of response-based practice to orient to the MCD responding-to-violence and modifies the scientific classification of Pamela's feelings and responses: "And had good reason for being both those." This contextualization and de-individualization of the experience of "change" and the lexical phrase "good reason" can be viewed as a password, which, as I described in chapter 2, is inherent in every order word. The password accomplishes a deterritorialization and reterritorialization of the category "stable," which in turn 7, Pamela draws upon to "wonder" about "change." This "wonder" can be seen as a further deterritorialization, an opening-up of discursive space. Wade

then draws upon inference rich knowledge about scientific classification to accomplish the next interactional task of mapping the origin of the categories crazy and unstable. Wade attributes these scientific classifications to the category “they” who can be seen as morally accountable and paired with the category-bound activity of the four discursive operations (Coates & Wade, 2007): “They would sort of- if you seemed to them to be inconsistent they would say that something the matter with you.” This presumption is confirmed by Pamela: “Yeah” and constitutes a new category “they-who-perform-discursive-operations” in the collection therapist. This task is a partial schizoanalysis that relates to one of Deleuze and Guattari’s (2008) targets: “The poor technicians of desire- psychoanalysts and semiologists of every sign and symptom- who would subjugate the multiplicity of desire to the twofold law of structure and lack” (p. xii).

Summary of Chapter V

This chapter has shown how participants oriented to categorization devices when accomplishing interactional work with people who resisted violence. I brought together CA, EM, and the analytical work of Deleuze, Guattari, and Foucault to discuss my findings. I discussed how Wade oriented to the MCD therapist/client and drew upon the asymmetry in power to accomplish response-based work. Then I wrote about how the SRP perpetrator/victim was used to attribute responsibility and account for resistance. I then described the participants orientations to the MCD Responding to Violence. Finally, I described how Wade responded to a language of effects.

Chapter VI – Conclusions

In this final chapter, I provide a brief review of the findings. Following this is a discussion of the limitations of the study. I then discuss of the implications for practice, theory, and research. Finally, I note my experiences as researcher and conclude.

Review of the Findings

My analysis of response-based practice supports other CA analyses of institutional interaction (Heritage & Clayman, 2010). For example, I found that RB interviews involve a reduction in the range of interactional practices by the participants (i.e. the power asymmetry related to the MCD therapist/client), restrictions in the contexts of deployment (i.e. psychological inferences, discourses of normal/abnormal intelligence and other forms of victim blaming were constrained), and often required a specialized re-specification of the interactional relevance of the practices that remain (i.e. psychological inferences were oriented to in relation to the four discursive operations, and responses were explored). I also showed how Wade responded to the language of effects as an institutional force that shapes the semiotic coordinates of psychotherapy (Deleuze & Guattari, 1996), which are beliefs that influence mainstream thinking about the causes and effects of violence and, in turn, influences the lives of people who are victims of violence. In this thesis I described how membership categorizations were used to accomplish response-based tasks that overlap with the social analyses and liberatory projects of Deleuze, Guattari, and Foucault.

Limitations

Even though the results of this study are not intended to be generalized beyond Wade and the interviewees use of membership categories during these particular Response-Based interviews, these findings could have implications for other politically engaged therapeutic

practices, such as narrative therapy and discursive psychology. Moreover, a limitation of the study might include the fact that the interviews were with three Caucasian women, two of them therapists, and were conducted by a white male with a PhD presents limitations. The findings are less applicable to youth victims of violence, or to people who identify as male, LGTB, queer, Aboriginal, or as a visible minority. The gender, race, socio-economic status, and sexual orientation of the interviewer may also have influenced some of the participant's responses. More interviews with a broader socio-demographic representation would have contributed to a more diverse analysis of response-based tasks and categorization use.

A limitation of this study was related to my lack of knowledge about CA and EM, and the steep learning curve required to understand the theoretical underpinning and applications. As the traditional CA transcription method requires specialized training, I resolved to do a variation, which was a more appropriate undertaking for an MA thesis. Due to this I did not attend to length of pauses, transcription of vocal pitches, measure of overlapping dialogue, other mouth sounds, in-breath/out-breath and so on. Because CA research is traditionally limited to audio content and transcription analysis my study might have been enriched by observing video content and a microanalysis of body language.

Implications for Practice

Lincoln (1998) writes that the goal of social science is not merely to accumulate neutral knowledge as a contribution to literature, but that it should be assembled for praxis, action, and the amelioration of some social predicament. The findings of my study have implications for how membership categories can be used strategically with victims of violence. My findings may also be informative to practitioners who are concerned about linguistic determinism, the idea that words like perpetrator are essentialist. What I found to be important is *how* words are used and

not *what* words are used- this is the difference between minoritarian and majoritarian languages. Finally, these findings could have implications for practitioners who have yet to identify their own political and ethical relationship to violence and language as a politics of representation. This could be particularly helpful to those who orient to discourses of neutrality and/or science.

Implications for Theory and Research

My study shows that CA and EM can be used to study how subjectifications are accomplished interactionally through reference to persons and membership categorizations. These implications open up research possibilities for further study in the area of counselling with people who have resisted violence. Deleuzian philosopher Buchannan (2008) suggests that revolutionary change comes from creating new social and philosophical conditions for changing ideas and attitudes and I have shown how two different analytical frameworks, such as CA/EM and Deleuze, Guattari, Foucault, can be used in assembled to make a unique research contribution to a complex and important topic. After doing some formal training in CA and EM, I would like to study the differences and similarities of membership categorization orientations between response-based practitioners and narrative therapists working with victims of violence. I would also like to draw further comparisons to dominant mainstream approaches. A second interest includes further exploration of the assemblages between CA /EM and Deleuze, Guattari, and Foucault. Rosi Bradotti (1994) proposes practices of “dis-identification,” which is a letting go of representational thought about self and self-location, in order to attend to the temporary landscapes that form in the spaces between bodies. These proposals are new opportunities to study subjectification as an exterior process and, as a music therapist, I am interested in exploring the potential of these analytic frameworks to study the sonic territories that are created

in hospitals, music therapy studios, and public spaces by people responding to violence and oppression.

Researcher Experience

When Michel Foucault and Gilles Deleuze were interviewed together about the problem of power (Bouchard, 1972) Deleuze suggested that projects directed against power offer opportunities for people to struggle on their own terrain, in relation to their own interests, objectives and methods. He concluded that it is during this struggle that a revolutionary process begins. This study was an attempt to analyze the complexity of struggles against power, which, in the process, led to my own struggle... My motivation to continue was a commitment to ethics, which I view as an ongoing relational process of becoming-ethical in every moment. The importance of this process for researcher/practitioners is summarized by activist, educator, clinical supervisor and solidarity-team member Vikki Reynolds (2010) who writes: "Action is followed by reflection, which informs actions which are more *just*, which rolls into further reflection, and so it continues." (p.19) As a counsellor and music therapist working from response-based and narrative therapy orientations, the research process has helped me reflect more critically on my own interactions with people who resist violence and oppression.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to explore of how membership categorization devices were oriented to by participants while engaged in response-based tasks, and to analyze what kind of interactional work the devices were employed to accomplish. To do so I analyzed audio recordings and transcripts of three response-based interviews, and applied a variation of conversation analysis and ethnomethodology. My results confirmed past studies, which show that most reference to persons are not used to establish identity but rather to accomplish social

and/or institutional goals. It is my hope that this study will provide a deeper understanding about how our use of reference to persons is tied to larger ethical, moral, and political beliefs about violence, resistance, and highlight the importance of language as an important resource for counselling professionals who work with victims of violence.

References

- Amorim, A. C. & Ryan, C. (2005). Deleuze, action research and rhizomatic growth. *Educational Action Research*, 13(4), 581-594.
- Andrews, B., & Brewin C. R. (1990). Attributions of blame for marital violence: A study of antecedents and consequences. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 52, 757-767.
- Andrews, B., Brewin, C. R., & Rose, S. (2003). Gender, social support, and PTSD in victims of violent crime. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, 16(4), 421-427.
- Augusta-Scott, T. (2007). Challenging essentialist anti-oppressive discourse: Uniting against racism and sexism. In C. Brown & T. Augusta-Scott (Eds.), *Narrative therapy: Making meaning, making lives* (pp. 211-228). Sage: CA.
- Bartesaghi, M. (2009). Conversation and psychotherapy: How questioning reveals institutional answers. *Discourse Studies*, 11(2), 153-177
- Benwell, B., & Stokoe, E. (2006). *Discourse and Identity*. Edinburgh University Press: Edinburgh.
- Besley, A. (2002). Foucault and the turn to narrative therapy. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling*, 30(2), 125-143.
- Bouchard, D. (1972). *Intellectuals & power: A conversation between Michel Foucault and Gilles Deleuze*. Retrieved from <http://libcom.org/library/intellectuals-power-a-conversation-between-michel-foucault-and-gilles-deleuze>.
- Braidotti, R. (1994). *Nomadic Subjects*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Brown, (2007). Discipline and desire: Regulated the body/self. In C. Brown & T. Augusta-Scott (Eds.), *Narrative therapy: Making meaning, making lives* (pp. 105-132). Sage: CA
- Buchanan, I. (2008). *Deleuze and Guattari's Anti Oedipus*. New York: Continuum

International Publishing Group.

Burke, N., Hellman, J., Scott, B., Weems, C., & Carrion, V. (2011). The impact of adverse childhood experiences on an urban paediatric population. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 35(6), 408-413.

Calgary Women's Emergency Shelter (2007). *Honoring Resistance Handbook: How women resist abuse in intimate relationships*. Calgary Alberta: Wade, A., Todd, N., Coates, L., Weaver, J. Ogden, C., and Craik, L.

Coates, L., & Wade, A. (2007). Language and violence: Analysis of Four Discursive Operations. *Journal of Family Violence*. 22(7), 511-522.

Coates, L., & Wade, A. (2003). Telling it like it isn't: How psychological constructs obscure responsibility for sexual assault. *Discourse and Society*, 15(5), 499-526.

Fromuth, M. (1986). The relationship of childhood sexual abuse with later psychological and sexual adjustment in a sample of college women. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 10(1), 5-15.

Dausien, B., Hanses, A., Inowlocki, L., & Riemann, G. (2008). The analysis of professional practice, the self-reflection of practitioners, and their way of doing things: Resources of biography analysis and other interpretative approaches. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 9(1), article 61. Retrieved from <http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/viewArticle/312>.

Delanda, M. (2010). *Deleuze: history and science*. New York: Atropos Press.

Deleuze, G. (1994). *Difference and repetition*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Deleuze, G. (1998). *Essays critical and clinical*. New York: Verso.

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (2008). *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and schizophrenia*. Trans. R. Hurley, M. Seem, & H. Lane. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1996). *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia*. Trans. B. Massumi, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Drummond J. (2005). The rhizome and the tree: A response to Holmes and Gastaldo. *Nursing Philosophy*, 6, 255–266.
- Dhudwal, S., & Sheehan, C. (2011). *A content analysis of Response-Based Practice*. Unpublished Master's project, University of Victoria, Victoria, Canada.
- Foucault, M. (1975). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. New York: Random House.
- Foucault, M. (1997). The Ethics of the Concern for the Self as a Practice of Freedom. In P. Rabinow (Ed). *Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth. Essential Works of Foucault 1954–1984, Vol. 1*. New York: The New Press.
- Foucault, M. (2000). The Subject and Power. In J. Faubion & P. Rabinow (Eds), *Power: Essential works of Foucault* (pp.326-348). New York: The New Press.
- Fromuth, M. (1986). The relationship of childhood sexual abuse with later psychological and sexual adjustment in a sample of college women. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 10, 5-15.
- Gale, K. (2010). An inquiry into the ethical nature of a Deleuzian creative educational practice. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 16(5), 303-309.
- Gergen, K. (1991). *The saturated self*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gergen, K. (2007). *The self: Colonization in psychology and society*. Retrieved from <http://www.swarthmore.edu/x20607.xml>
- Gergen, M., & Gergen, K. (2004). *Social constructionism: Entering the dialogue*. Chagrin Falls, OH: Taos Institute Publications.
- Guilfoyle, M. (2005). From therapeutic power to resistance? Therapy and cultural hegemony. *Theory & Psychology*, 15(1), 101-124.

- Hargreaves, A. (1996). Revisiting voice. *Educational Researcher*, 25(1), 12–19.
- Heinemann, T. (2008). Questions of Accountability: Yes–no interrogatives that are unanswerable, *Discourse Studies*, 10(55), 55-71.
- Herman, J. (1997). *Trauma and recovery*. New York: Basic Books.
- Holmes, D., Murray, S., Perron, A. & Rail, G. (2006). Deconstructing the evidence-based discourse in health sciences: Truth, power, and fascism. *International Journal of Evidence-Based Health Care*, 4, 180–186.
- Holmes, D., Gastaldo, D., & Perron, A. (2007). Paranoid investments in nursing: A schizoanalysis of the evidence-based discourse. *Nursing Philosophy*, 8, 85–91.
- Hook, D. (2007). *Foucault, psychology, and the analytics of power*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Jackson, A. Y. (2003). Rhizovocality. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 16(5), 693–710.
- Lee, J. (1984). Innocent victims and evil-doers. *Women's Studies International Forum* 7(1), 69–73.
- Madigan, S., & Epston, D. (1995) From spy-chiatric gaze to communities of concern: From professional monologue to dialogue. In S. Friedman (Ed.), *The reflecting team in action* (pp. 257-276). New York: Guilford Publications
- Manning, P. (1997). Organizations as sense-making contexts. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 14, 139–150.
- Massumi, B. (1992). *A user's guide to capitalism and schizophrenia*. Cambridge: MIT.
- Mills, S. (1997). *Discourse*. New York: Routledge.
- Rabinow, P. (1984). *The Foucault reader*. New York: Pantheon.

- Reynolds, V. (2010). *Doing justice as a path to sustainability in community work*. Retrieved from <http://www.taosinstitute.net/Websites/taos/Images/PhDProgramsCompletedDissertations/ReynoldsPhDDissertationFeb2210.pdf>.
- Richardson, C. (2005). Metis identity creation and tactical responses to oppression and racism. *Variations Journal*, 2, 56–71.
- Richardson, C. (2009). *Islands of safety and the social geography of human dignity: A child and mother safety planning initiative for cases of paternal violence in child welfare*. Federation of Community Social Services of BC, Research to Practice Network.
- Richardson, C., & Wade, A. (2009). Taking resistance seriously: A Response-Based approach to social work in cases of violence against Indigenous women. In J. Carriere & S. Strega (Eds.), *Walking this path together* (pp. 204-211). Winnipeg: Fernwood Publishing.
- Richardson, C., & Wade, A. (2010). Islands of safety: Restoring dignity in violence-prevention work with Indigenous families. *First Peoples Child and Family Review*, 5(1), 137–155.
- Roberts, M. (2008). Capitalism and schizophrenia: A critical introduction to Deleuze and Guattari's *Anti-Oedipus*. *Nursing Philosophy*, 8, 114–127.
- Roets, G., Roose, R., Claes, L., Verstraeten, M., & Vandekinderen C. (2009). The Pointer Sisters: Creating cartographies of the present. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 38(6), 734-753.
- Rose, N. (2006). Power and subjectivity: critical history and psychology. In C. Graumann & K. Gergen (Eds.), *Historical Dimensions of Psychological Discourse* (pp.103-124). New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Sacks, H. (1972). An initial investigation of the usability of conversational data for doing Sociology. In D. N. Sudnow (Ed.), *Studies in Social Interaction* (pp.31-74). Free Press, New York.
- Schegloff, E. (2007). A Tutorial on Membership Categorization. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39, 462–482.
- Schegloff, E. (1987). Recycled turn beginnings: A precise repair mechanism in conversation's turn-taking organization. In G. Button and J. Lee (Eds.), *Talk and Social Organization* (pp. 70-85). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Scott, J. (1990). *Domination and the arts of resistance: Hidden transcripts*. New Haven: Yale University.
- Sindell, J. (2009). *Conversation analysis: Comparative perspectives*. Cambridge University Press, New York.
- Skott-Myhre, H. (2009). *Youth and subculture as creative force: Creating new spaces for radical youth work*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- St. Pierre, E. A. (1997). Methodology in the fold and the irruption of transgressive data. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 10(2), 175–189.
- St. Pierre, E. A. (1999). The work of response in ethnography. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 28(3), 266–287.
- Stokoe, E. (2003). Doing gender, doing categorization: Recent developments in language and gender research. *International Sociolinguistics*, 2(1). Retrieved from: http://www.crisaps.org/newsletter/backissue/stokoe_back.pdf.
- Stokoe, E. (2004). Gender and discourse, gender and categorization: Current developments in language and gender research, *Qualitative Research in Psychology* 1(2), 107-29.

- Stokoe, E. (2010). 'I'm not gonna hit a lady': Conversation analysis, membership categorization and men's denials of violence towards women. *Discourse & Society, 21*(1), 59-82.
- Stokoe, E. (2006). On ethnomethodology, feminism, and the analysis of categorical reference to gender in talk-in-interaction. *Sociological Review, 54*, 467-94.
- Stokoe, E. H. & Weatherall, A. (2002). Gender, language, conversation analysis and feminism. *Discourse and Society, 13*(6), 707–713.
- Todd, N. & Wade, A. (1994). Domination, deficiency and psychotherapy. *Calgary Participator, Fall*, 37-46.
- Wade, A. (1999). Resistance to interpersonal violence: Implications for the practice of therapy. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Victoria, British Columbia, Canada.
- Wade, A. (1995). Resistance knowledges: therapy with Aboriginal persons who have been subjected to violence. In P. H. Stephenson, S. J. Elliott, L. T. Foster, & J. Harris (Eds.), *A Persistent Spirit: Towards Understanding Aboriginal Health in B.C.* (pp. 167-206). Vancouver: University of British Columbia.
- Wade, A. (2007). Despair, resistance, hope: Response-Based therapy with victims of Violence. In C. Flaskas, I. McCarthy, & J. Sheehan (Eds.), *Hope and despair in narrative and family therapy: Adversity, forgiveness and reconciliation* (pp. 63-74). New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.
- Wade, A. (1997). Small acts of living: Everyday resistance to violence and other forms of oppression. *Journal of Contemporary Family Therapy, 19*, 23–40.
- West, C., & Fenstermaker, S. (2002). Accountability and affirmative action: The

- accomplishment of gender, race and class in a University of California Board of Regents meeting. In S. Fenstermaker & C. West (Eds.), In S. Fenstermaker & C. West, (Eds.), *Doing gender, doing difference: Inequality, power, and institutional Change* (pp. 537-563). New York: Routledge.
- West, C., & Zimmerman, D.H. (2002). Doing gender. In S. Fenstermaker & C. West, (Eds.), *Doing gender, doing difference: Inequality, power, and institutional Change* (pp. 125-151). New York: Routledge.
- White, M. (1995). *Re-authoring lives: Interviews and essays*. Adelaide: Dulwich Centre Publications.
- White, M. & Epston, D. (1990). *Narrative means to therapeutic ends*. New York: Norton Publications.
- Winslade, J. (2009). Tracing lines of flight: Implications of the work of Gilles Deleuze for narrative practice. *Family Process*, 48(3), 332–346.
- Wooffitt, R (2005). *Conversation analysis and discourse analysis: A comparative and critical introduction*. California: Sage Publications.
- Wowk, M. T. (1984). Blame Allocation, Sex and Gender in a Murder Interrogation, *Women's Studies International Forum*, 7, 75–82.

Footnotes

¹ It is important to note that the terms “victim” and “perpetrator” are not identity markers of disempowered subjects, but rather are used to contextualize the unilateral nature of violence as an intentional act that seeks to overpower.

² As a narratively informed therapist I am not only interested in alternatives to dominant psychological ideas, but in critiques of narrative discourses and praxis as well.