From Policy to Practice: Sexual Violence Prevention and Response in Nova Scotia

By

Alison Armstrong

A thesis submitted in conformity with the requirements for the
degree of Bachelor of Arts, Honours with Subsidiary
Department of Anthropology
St. Francis Xavier University

April 20 2018

Table of Contents

Abstract

Sexual violence has become a topic of increasing public interest in Nova Scotia over the past five years. This thesis explores the effects of provincial policies regarding sexual violence from 2012-2017, on a feminist, community-based organization (the Centre) that provides services to survivors. The thesis is a case study based on four in-depth, semi-structured interviews with people affiliated with the Centre and a review of relevant, publicly-available documents produced by the Centre and the Nova Scotia government. It argues that organizations, like the Centre, both work with, and resist the government and its policies. Theoretically the thesis engages the concepts of governmentality to explain how organizations work as agents of the government (Foucualt 1991), and an analysis of how government policies are more rhetorical than practical in guiding frontline work (Mosse 2005). The research shows how the Centre's work was affected by successive provincial governments calling upon community-based organizations to develop and deliver prevention and response services and programs for survivors of sexual violence, while struggling with inadequate and unsustainable funding. The Centre resisted pressures from the government using their community-based model, by networking, and through sharing of expertise. The case study shows how the Centre aims to effectively help its community, while operating within the limitations imposed by the provincial government. The result is an organization that acts as an agent of the government while simultaneously resisting these pressures and staying resilient by continuing its work using a feminist, community-based model.

Acknowledgments

This project was only possible thanks to the Centre and the remarkable women that work there. Thank you all for welcoming me into your space and sharing your knowledge, passion, and experiences with me. Thank you especially to those women who I interviewed, for your enthusiastic responses and engagement in this research.

I am indebted to Dr. Clare Fawcett and Dr. Nancy Forestell for your time, care, and the expertise you shared with me throughout this process. You have both been invaluable mentors, and I would not be where I am today without your guidance. I am also grateful to Dr. Rachel Hurst for your thoughtful comments and encouragement as my Second Reader.

Finally, whether in Antigonish, across the country, or overseas, I am bursting with gratitude for my family and friends. Your unwavering support, optimism, intelligence, love, feminisms, and humour have gotten me here. Thank you.

This research was funded in-part by the Irving Research Mentorship Awards program, through StFX University's McKenna Centre for Leadership. Their trust in this work is sincerely appreciated. Thank you to the StFX Department of Anthropology and the StFX Research Ethics Board for approving and supporting this project.

Chapter 1: Introduction

> It was shocking at first…so many women have disclosed some kind of experience of sexualized violence… it almost seemed like there was this common denominator among so many women, [that] they had had this kind of experience in their lives at some point. (Grace)

> You cannot be a woman in this world over the age of.. let's be generous, [let's] say 15, without having experienced some form of sexualized violence. That means that it is being perpetrated at a huge level. And we have to get to the place where we take up the call of 'no more.' And that has to involve all of us. And we need to be able to say that clearly. We need to have those very clear statements from everybody, across our communities. (Kelly)

Sexual violence is pervasive in our communities. If you have been lucky enough to escape it yourself, you no doubt have a close friend or family member who has been intimately affected by this violence. The struggle to change this context is being fought every day by organizations supporting survivors and trying to navigate our political systems while upholding their feminist values. These organizations exemplify resilience and strength in their ability to both work within and resist the neoliberal and patriarchal structures that allow this violence to happen and make it so difficult to interrupt.

As Canadians, our governments — federal, provincial, and municipal — are expected to assess community priorities and provide services to meet our needs; however, this support is lacking in a number of areas. My honours thesis project will investigate one of the topics that feminist activists often point out as lacking the government's attention: sexual violence. While state officials acknowledge and address this as an issue, community members and activists are often unsatisfied with the type and amount of attention politicians and bureaucrats give sexual violence, especially considering the pervasiveness of the problem. They are concerned, furthermore, that governments may not always be using expert knowledge or survivor-centred practices. In my thesis, I will explore provincial government policies that address sexual violence

in Nova Scotia, and provide an analysis of how these policies impact the work of community-based organizations.

Rehtaeh Parsons' death and the public and government reactions that ensued are a critical point of departure for my research. In November of 2011 Rehtaeh Parsons, a fifteen-year-old high school student in the Halifax area of Nova Scotia, was sexually assaulted at a party (Segal 2015, iii). Unbeknownst to her, a photo was taken of the assault. Days later it was circulated around her high school which led to prolonged instances of bullying and cyberbullying (Segal 2015, iii). Parsons suffered from suicidal thoughts and the trauma of the bullying and assault for over a year and moved schools multiple times (Pepler and Milton 2013, 5-7). The police investigated the case but made no arrests due to 'insufficient evidence' (Segal 2015, 19). On April 4, 2013, Parsons attempted to take her own life, and two days later she died in hospital (Rehtaeh Parsons Society 2014). After her death, the case was reopened and two people were charged with the creation and distribution of child pornography (Rehtaeh Parsons Society 2014).

Rehtaeh Parsons' case is significant in Nova Scotia because it drew attention to the need for stronger policies and support services to address sexual violence and cyberbullying. Following her death and before any charges had been laid, the Justice Minister at the time, Ross Landry of the New Democratic Party (NDP), stated that he supported the RCMP's decision to not lay charges (DuBreuil 2013). Immediate backlash followed this statement as thousands of people turned to Facebook, Twitter, and an online petition, to say that they believed the justice system had failed Rehtaeh and her family (DuBreuil 2013). That evening, Landry issued a press release stating there would be a review of the case and he planned to meet with Parsons' mother the following day (DuBreuil 2013). In autumn of that year, a provincial election was held and both NDP and Liberal campaigns put noticeable focus on their intended sexual violence policies

(The Canadian Press 2013). The Liberals would go on to win the election with a promise of $6 million to be spent on a sexual violence strategy and a commitment to fund frontline work (The Canadian Press 2013). This marked the first time that the topic of sexual violence in Nova Scotia provoked significant public attention and a government response.

The case of Rehtaeh Parsons acts as a historical point of departure from which to examine how provincial policies on sexual violence have been implemented in response to how the government has perceived the needs of communities in Nova Scotia. This need is understood based on research done by the provincial government, in response to the public outrage that followed Parsons' death. In Nova Scotia, community-based organizations have been called upon by successive provincial governments to develop and provide services for victims of sexual violence. While work on sexual violence in Nova Scotia has been ongoing for many years, my thesis will only consider sexual violence policies and the work of community-based organizations in Nova Scotia over the past five years, from April 2012 to August 2017. To gain an in-depth understanding of how organizations are affected by shifting government policies, I am focusing on one organization, a women's resource centre in North-Eastern Nova Scotia, which I refer to as "the Centre."

The Centre is an organization based on principles of feminism and social justice. Their mission statement asserts that their work is based on the goal of working with women in the community towards a more equitable and just society. They are situated in a semi-rural, medium-sized town in North-Eastern Nova Scotia. The town is also home to a university with an undergraduate population of about 4000 students of whom 63% identify as female and 37% as male, impacting the demographic of those in need of sexual violence services (MacDonald 2015). The Centre further services the surrounding rural area, covering a population of just under

20,000 people.[1] The Centre provides an ideal case study for my research since, throughout its history, it has adapted to shifts in state policies, actively lobbied for change, and engaged in ongoing feminist advocacy, all while meeting the needs of the community. The Centre has been addressing the complex and wide range of issues facing women and adolescent girls for the past 35 years. Currently the Centre provides a number of services including, but not limited to, a Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner program, therapeutic counselling, organized support groups, as well as projects for sexual assault prevention in association with the local university and First Nations communities. The Centre works with and helps to implement the policies and objectives of the government that address sexual violence.

The Centre is an excellent case study for this research because of the wide variety of ongoing projects and services it provides; however, differences between the Centre and other organizations in Nova Scotia that do similar work must be noted. The Centre is unique in its size and scope of work. With a staff of over 15 women, the Centre is much larger than other rural women's organizations in Nova Scotia. Additionally, with a focus not only on direct services but also on ongoing projects for social change, the Centre puts forward a strong agenda of feminist activism and ensures work is not just in reaction to problems that women are facing, but also preventative. Further, the Centre was the first rural women's centre in Nova Scotia to implement a Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner Program, and to run a women's only clinic with a holistic approach to health. The location within a town that has a significant university student population also impacts the demands on the Centre, and therefore the work that they do.

The current provincial strategy against sexual violence, *Breaking the Silence*, was implemented by the Liberal government and relies on community members and organizations to

[1] Statistics Canada, 2016. Not cited in order to keep anonymity of community.

help form and implement the services and programs developed to stop sexual violence from occurring and to support victims and survivors. *Breaking the Silence* splits the province into nine "community support networks" (Province of Nova Scotia 2015). Its aim is to understand community needs and then improve in three categories: "services and supports," "education and prevention," and "approach and accountability" (Province of Nova Scotia 2015). Over a two-year period, *Breaking the Silence* hoped to "have the coordination, supports, and policies required to address sexual violence" in place in Nova Scotia (Province of Nova Scotia 2015, 2). As part of this strategy, "Prevention Innovation Grants" have been provided to a variety of organizations and individuals to engage in research and develop programs that help complete the prevention aspect of the strategy (Province of Nova Scotia 2016, 16). Yet front-line work being done to assist those who are victims of sexual violence is still being provided by community organizations and sexual assault centres, and a consistent funding framework for these organizations is still in the process of being developed (Province of Nova Scotia 2016, 15).

Based on Foucault's (1991) concept of governmentality and Mosse's (2005) ideas regarding the relation between policy and practice, my thesis analyzes how state policies impact a community-based organization. I begin with the question: "How have the Nova Scotia provincial government's policies and priorities, following the death of Rehtaeh Parsons, affected the kind of work that a feminist community-based organization does around sexual violence?" In answering this question, my thesis argues that organizations both work with and show resilience by resisting the government and its policies. This conclusion is ascertained because following Foucault (1991), organizations work as agents of the government, and as suggested by Mosse (2005), policies are more rhetorical than practical in their ability to guide frontline work.

Resilience is shown by the Centre's ability to challenge these power structures. My thesis considers power relations and distribution within the provincial government and the organization to demonstrate that the Centre's work is affected by (a) successive provincial governments calling upon community-based organizations to develop and deliver prevention and response services and programs for survivors of sexual violence, and (b) inadequate and unsustainable funding. I will further assert that, (c) the Centre is resisting these pressures and staying resilient in their feminist values through their community-based model, networking, and the sharing of their expertise.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

The aim of this project is to understand provincial policies that address sexual violence in Nova Scotia, and the impacts that result from the implementation of and changes in these policies. This literature review will provide an overview of extant scholarly work that has been done on this topic. To begin, I will discuss how I am framing sexual violence within my research. Following this, I will discuss anthropological and ethnographic work that has been done on front-line organizations that address sexual violence. I will then define neoliberalism as it will be used in this project and discuss the impacts of neoliberalism on women and community-based organizations, as well as their efforts of resistance. This literature review works to situate my own research in previous studies and knowledge regarding the practices of community-based organizations doing work around sexual violence.

2.1 Sexual Violence

Sexual violence has long been prevalent and pervasive in North America, and governments have implemented a variety of policies that work to prevent sexual violence and provide services to victims and survivors. Literature on the topic of sexual violence policy is varied; for this Honours thesis I will be studying sexual violence as "any violence, physical or psychological, carried out through sexual means or by targeting sexuality" (Barnes and Chau 2014, 1). I will be focusing specifically on sexual violence in the developed world, and mainly in North America.[2]

[2] Much scholarly work has been done on sexual violence that falls outside of this definition and the context that I am using to frame this project. There is, for example, an extensive literature on rape as a weapon of war (Buss 2009, Farwell 2004, Kirby 2012); however, I will not be working with this literature for my study. There has also been a substantial amount of work done on the topic of sexual violence within universities (Adelman et al. 2012, Branch et al. 2013, Lichty et al. 2008). While much of this work

Ethnographic research has shown that institutional processes dealing with sexual violence are context-specific (Wies and Haldane 2011). The context changes because of cultural differences, as well as the goals and priorities of the organization that is providing the service (Wies and Haldane 2011). It follows that no single policy or program will work for all organizations that address sexual violence, as they must adapt to the needs of their community while also working within the limitations of any external demands of funders. In addition, many service providers that work with victims of sexual violence have their roots in feminist activism, and therefore their advocacy work and goals of social change impact the front-line work that they do (Wies 2008, 222). Over the past few decades, funding for sexual violence work has been limited while demands for these services have increased. Feminist and activist organizations, therefore, have struggled to shift how they structure their work to meet the demands of donors, including the government, with limited budgets and growing demand for their services (Wies 2008, 222).

2.2 Neoliberalism and its Effects

This increase in demand for services, with restricted funding and support, is understood to be part of the shift to a neoliberal governance strategy. A neoliberal model of government deregulates the economy, privatizes previously state-owned enterprises and services, and limits state interventions (Jessop 2002, 454). The state is understood to be responsible for upholding an institutional framework which allows individuals to economically progress by their own means (Harvey 2008, 2). Within my thesis, neoliberal governance is recognized as impacting not only

on university campuses does address an aspect of sexual violence within North America, the institutional context of this work is a complexity that I will not be dealing with in my project, and therefore I will not be addressing this literature.

the economy but also citizens and organizations through practices such as budget cuts and privatization that regulate the behaviour of individuals and non-governmental organizations (Knight and Rodgers 2012, 268). This acknowledgement is important for my project as it recognizes that a neoliberal governance strategy impacts the priorities of a government when they are creating policies, and the effects of these policies are felt by and create limitations for community-based organizations.

Neoliberalism has been discussed as a scientific way to organize a state, with the priorities of the government being focused on the economy. Neoliberal strategies rely on scientific analyses of the market to understand what is happening and treats all parts of the state as an equation to be solved (Oksala 2013, 48). The state turns its citizens into bureaucratized, disciplined, and gendered subjects that can be controlled (Brodie 1996, 12). Notably, everything is identified as an economic issue, including what would traditionally be considered social, cultural, and political problems; Oksala (2013, 49) suggests that policies for change become morally and politically neutral and decisions become based on economic results. This is problematic for feminist issues and movements as autonomy is removed and radical politics become meaningless apart from their economic value (Oksala 2013, 50).

It should be noted that the impacts of neoliberalism are felt differently depending on the context in which this governance strategy is implemented. Neoliberalism has spread globally with states that have successfully implemented this strategy forcing this form of governance on other states, creating a global economy that is highly interconnected (Harvey 2008, 87). Developing countries, where neoliberalism has been forced onto their state structure, have felt more negative impacts including debt crises, economic turmoil, and political instability, while developed countries have stayed relatively immune to these consequences (Harvey 2008, 88, 96).

This difference in impacts resulting from neoliberalism is important to note, as the context of this study implies consequences that are specific to the location and politics of Nova Scotia. The ways in which neoliberal governance impacts the development of policy and its translation into practice will be discussed in Chapter 3, and is the basis of the theoretical framework used to analyze my research.

2.3 Neoliberalism and Feminism

There is a significant amount of literature that uses a feminist analysis to understand neoliberalism. Neoliberalism has negative consequences for women as individuals as well as feminist organizations; I will begin by discussing the former. Negative effects of neoliberalism are disproportionately felt by women. Historically, unpaid care work has fallen onto women, and with an enhanced focus on the individual and economic success, women are marginalized (Ready 2016, 5). Neoliberal governments have removed funding and political focus from social services, instead prioritizing employment, believing this will allow individuals to care for themselves (Ready 2016, 7). The result of this is that women are forced to find employment while receiving fewer services. Furthermore, care work continues to fall on the backs of women, forcing many to work both a paid and an unpaid job. In other instances, women are forced to choose employment over reproduction and caregiving, turning middle-class women into human capital (Rottenberg 2017). For feminist issues such as sexual violence, neoliberal governments have reframed the conversation to be an issue of the individual, therefore making invisible the systemic and gendered nature of the problem and framing individuals as responsible for their own victimization (Ready 2016, 33). Application of a feminist lens to neoliberalism can also illustrate how organizations providing services to women have been implicated and impacted in

the shift to neoliberal governance strategies, as the issues they are addressing are reframed and the government puts less emphasis on assisting in their efforts.

Over the past four decades both Canadian and American governments have adopted neoliberal strategies (Harvey 2008, 2-3). One result of these neoliberal regulations has been an increased pressure to adapt the structures of organizations and the attitudes of workers to fit contemporary expectations of professionalism (Wies 2009, 466). This has included adoption of a code of ethical guidelines and adaptation to legislation dealing with sexual violence (Wies 2009, 469). Many front-line workers find professionalization helpful as it sets up formal boundaries and allows service providers to remove themselves from emotional and traumatic situations (Wies 2008, 227). However, professionalization has also resulted in a division of power between service providers and victims of sexual violence, and has, therefore, worked against the original feminist and activist goals of empowering women and equalizing power (Wies 2008, 226). Further, services are often professionalized so the organization can secure funding. To access funds, therefore, organizations spend time setting up 'professional' structures within their organization rather than focusing on developing and providing services (Wies 2008, 228). These changes to organizational structure both benefit and harm the work being done. This is an example of how external powers can guide and limit the work done in this field.

Within a neoliberal context, another pressure for organizations has been access to funding. With governments pulling or changing funding frameworks as services become private rather than public, organizations providing direct services need to find new sources of money to continue doing their work. In a neoliberal context, state funding may become tied to certain expectations, consequently impacting what services can be provided or advocacy work can be done by feminist organizations (Ready 2016, 27). A study on Canadian women's organizations

found that neoliberal governments have forced organizations to put aside their advocacy work and feminist ideals (Ready 2016, 33). A general lack of funding has also meant that many organizations have had to prioritize direct services over prevention work, limiting their ability to address systemic gendered inequalities, which is inherent to the feminist goals of their organizations (Ready 2016, 89). In difficult times, organizations have had to dip into savings and simply work to allow the organization to survive (Ready 2016, 87, 99). These questions of funding also mean there is less stability within these organizations. Not always being sustainable means a possible lack of services for those in need, as well as job instability for those employed in the field.

2.4 Resisting Neoliberalism

While there are many external pressures to change the provision of sexual violence services, organizations have also implemented a variety of techniques to continue to do their work in a way that still meets their priorities. Neoliberal governance with minimal funding and policy frameworks that are more political in nature than helpful for front-line work have been particularly limiting for the activist work of sexual violence service providers (Beres et al. 2009, 137). Efforts such as the creation of anti-violence coalitions, which have streamlined the services of many organizations, have overcome some of these difficulties (Wies 2011, 68). Further resistance to external limitations can be seen when front-line service providers are asked about their organizations, and they state that their mandate is still primarily feminist and they aim to uphold their activist work (Beres et al. 2009, 152). Rodgers and Knight (2011, 579) note that women's organizations in Canada are "carving out spaces for survival" as they adapt to the increasingly repressive neoliberal context in this nation. While the women's movement and

activism for social change are in some ways becoming less visible, this movement is not fading away completely and feminist organizations are working together to adapt to this new political and economic landscape (Rodgers and Knight 2011, 579).

My study will build on research that examines how organizations have adapted to neoliberal policies. I will do this through an investigation of a community-based organization — the Centre — and the strategies it employs to meet the needs of their community. The research will examine how government policies have placed limitations on organizations, and how this impacts the work of the Centre. I am therefore investigating how political intention is worked into state policies, and how community-based organizations are limited by, work with, and resist these policies to develop effective practices and provide needed services on the ground.

Chapter 3: Theoretical Framework

My research is framed using a theoretical perspective based on the work of David Mosse (2005) and Michel Foucault (1991). These two scholars both address power and its effects as it is disseminated and used to control a group of people. Specifically, I will be using the work of Mosse (2005) to frame my understanding of the development of government policy, the multi-faceted purposes of these policies, and the impacts that these varying purposes have once the policies are implemented in work at the community level. I am using Foucault (1991) to frame my research within a neoliberal context and to understand how work at the Centre both aligns with government objectives, and resists them.

3.1 Mosse: Creation and Implementation of Policy

The translation of policy to practice has been discussed in the field of international development by David Mosse (2005). Mosse focuses on development agencies and on-the-ground organizations which put their policies into practice. His framework can be applied to my research project because Mosse analyses how bureaucratic policy and hands-on practice are connected, and is therefore applicable to understanding government policies and their impacts on community-based organizations. Mosse (2005, 14) sees policy as a way to maintain political support and to legitimize certain practices. Policy, therefore, tends to focus more on creating and maintaining relationships and systems of power than guiding front-line work (Mosse 2005, 16). Other scholars have also commented on this, making note of how discourses of power are covertly used within policy, often making them less helpful on the ground and more useful in maintaining the political interests of those in power (Apthorpe 1996, 22). A discourse analysis can be used to show how policy in the field of development tends to be framed as apolitical and

uses language that shows compassion, yet the actual results are politically focused (Apthorpe 1996, 22). My study will apply this framework to sexual violence policies by investigating how provincial government policies have called upon community-based organizations to develop and deliver prevention and response services and programs to address sexual violence, without providing them with adequate or sustainable funding. I will be doing this through a simple discourse analysis, focusing only on the political actions and priorities as discussed in provincial policies. The effects of these policies will be examined through the case study of the Centre.

My research makes the assumption that government policies are not created with the specific needs of every citizen in mind, rather policies are intended to be overarching. In this context, it becomes the job of community-based organizations to develop projects that both meet the needs of their community and fall within the parameters of the government's policies.

3.2 Foucault: Governmentality

In addition to Mosse, I am using Foucualt's (1991) writing on governmentality to frame my analysis and explain systems of power within a neoliberal context. Governmentality recognizes the management of goods, individuals, and wealth as inherent to political practice: this is referred to as the art of government (Foucault 1991, 92). Understanding government in this way suggests that those governing assume the role of safeguarding their population and accepting responsibility for the welfare of their citizens (Foucault 1991, 94). Foucault (1991, 100) notes that improving the wellbeing of the population becomes the goal of the government. In this framework, government is about "employing tactics rather than laws" to manage and arrange a population to meet certain ends (Foucault 1991, 95). Power is therefore less about keeping control and more about managing assets. Embedded in governmentality is the

interconnectedness of the population and the state, with the needs of the population being the goals of the government, and the wellbeing of the population being in the hands of the government (Foucault 1991, 100). This interconnectedness of the state and the population results in citizens becoming agents of the government as they begin to self-manage to fit into the role designated to them by the government (Harriman 2016). This theory of governmentality is being applied to my research as a way of understanding the interconnectedness of the state and its citizens, and what the role of policy is in this connection. The intention of policies is understood to be the management of one's citizens, and they are implemented in reaction to the perceived needs of their population. Government must therefore surveil and keep statistics on their citizens. Governmentality also explains how deeply a population is impacted by these policies, as citizens become reliant on the government for their wellbeing.

Due to my research being based in modern-day Nova Scotia, I will be using governmentality as an analytical tool to understand what is happening in our current neoliberal context. The theory of governmentality asserts that power is not just about control but also about knowledge, and therefore power is not held by only one group but is constantly moving between people (Macleod and Durrheim 2002, 44). Therefore, an understanding of power must consider power relations as well as the connection between power and knowledge (Macleod and Durrheim 2002, 44). Within a neoliberal context, it follows that a shift of services from public to private is not a rolling-back of the state, but rather a transfer of power to non-state entities (Ferguson and Gupta 2002, 989). This distribution of power means that the state both sits above and encompasses the communities that it governs, and this sharing of power is reinforced through neoliberal strategies, resulting in the tying together of localities and overarching governments (Ferguson and Gupta 2002, 982). Ferguson and Gupta (2002, 983) suggest that this

contact zone and redistribution of power between the state and communities is often done through civil society, and in the case of my project this contact zone is the Centre. These relationships between the state and organizations are embedded in neoliberal structures (Ready 2016, 25). As a result, as power is distributed to meet the needs of a population, this power becomes not just regulatory but also as productive (Ferguson and Gupta 2002, 989).

Governmentality is a well theorized concept for understanding the functioning of a government and the structures of neoliberalism; however, there are also critiques. Foucault acknowledges resistance as part of power; power is not always repressive but can be expressed as resistance and therefore be liberatory (Macleod and Durrheim 2002, 55). Alliances can form around these points of resistance, and this both results in new concentrations of power and in the perpetual disorder of power (Macleod and Durrheim 2002, 55). The critique of this is the omnipresence of power and impossibility of emancipation politics (Macleod and Durrheim 2002, 54). If power is everywhere, then essentially it is nowhere, and any resistance will only result in the shifting of power and therefore the creation of new oppressions (Macleod and Durrheim 2002, 54, 55). Keeping these critiques in mind, my research will specifically look at how power is used and distributed through policies impacting the work of community-based organizations, and therefore within the framework of governmentality I will be focusing on the connection between policy and practice, and what roles governments and organizations carry out in this connection. I will also consider the relationships between governments and organizations, and the potential for resistance within a neoliberal context.

In my investigation of the relationship between policy and practice, I will be looking at how the Centre both works with and resists policy changes. Governmentality, as an analytical

tool, makes assumptions about how neoliberalism works and what the relationship between the government and organizations like the Centre is. Working under the assumptions of governmentality, one would expect to see the Centre keeping statistics, compiling regular reports, focusing on service delivery, and working to empower women as individuals. On the other hand, assumptions of governmentality would not expect to see employees engaging in work outside of their job description, involved in advocacy, networking with other organizations, or educating clients on justice or tools for resistance. In my research I will be exploring some of these ways that the Centre is resisting neoliberalism and how governmentality is not always an effective framework to understand community-based or feminist work. Mosse (2005) augments this discussion by explaining ways that policy and practice do not always align because policies are more about maintaining the government's power, and less about what is happening on the ground and the goals of those doing the work. Mosse (2005) is also of value as I am investigating the consequences of neoliberalism and policy development for community-based organizations, and therefore need to use a theory that allows me not only to see how policy and practice work together, but also when there is a disconnect.

My study uses the theoretical frameworks outlined above to structure the analysis of my findings. I will be using Foucault's (1991) theory of governmentality to understand government intentions and distribution of power within a neoliberal context, and how the Centre acts as an agent of the government. I will be using Mosse's (2005) understanding of policy as a guide to interpret how changes in the governing political party, shifts in policy, and patterns of neoliberal governance have inhibited community-based organizations from implementing programs that help those affected by sexual violence.

Chapter 4: Methodology

My research looks at the translation of policy into frontline practice, and therefore my research needed to explore information regarding the provincial government as well as the Centre, and then consider how the two impact one another. I chose to complete this investigation based on two sources of information: document review and formal semi-structured interviews. This approach allowed me to understand from different perspectives how the Centre has been affected by the provincial government's shifting policies and priorities on the topic of sexual violence. I further used these methodologies to look at how the Centre has effectively put into place sexual violence prevention programs that meet the needs of the community while also complying with the demands of the government.

I had access to the Centre and its resources through a three-month internship in the summer of 2017. This internship was funded by an Irving Mentorship grant to complete work related to this study, and therefore inherently tied to my gathering of research. During the internship, I engaged in research on the historical trajectory of sexual violence policies in the province of Nova Scotia in relation to publicized events of sexual violence such as the death of Rehtaeh Parsons. The focus of this investigation was on provincial government strategies and university policies. The research consisted of a review and analysis of publicly-available documents and literature both collected by Centre staff and available on the internet, and one email survey sent to the Sexual Violence Service Network of Nova Scotia. The internship also involved assisting with a pro-social bystander intervention project and helping with other work related to sexual violence education and community projects that are on-going at the Centre.

I did not use participant observation as a methodology in this research project because of concerns about confidentiality in a place – the Centre – where both employees and clients expect

privacy. Working at the Centre for several months, nevertheless, inevitably informed my study as I met and got to know Centre employees as well as individuals who come to the Centre for a variety of services. My everyday work therefore gave me a better idea of who to interview formally and what questions I should ask my participants. To ensure that I kept my personal observations as an intern separate from my thesis research, I kept a journal in which I recorded notes – my observations, thoughts and reactions – for personal use only. These were not field notes. The goal of this journal was to generate ideas for my research, make note of possible interview questions, and identify possible key informants. None of my personal journal notes were used in the writing of this thesis. Furthermore, these notes were not shown to other researchers, people at the Centre, or my academic advisors. This was not a deceptive research project and all employees at the Centre were made aware, through personal communication, of my reasoning for being there when my position commenced. I also openly discussed my research and how it was related to my work at the Centre throughout the internship, therefore ensuring that Centre employees were aware of my intentions and knew I would be returning after my summer position to complete interviews. In October 2017, I was hired part-time at the Centre as a Project Assistant. The job includes engagement in a pro-social bystander project, facilitating education workshops in local schools, and sitting on project advisory committees. This position is unrelated to my research; however, my continued presence at the Centre and interactions with staff certainly influenced and informed my analysis.

4.1 Document Review

My first source of information is publicly-available literature and documents from the Nova Scotian government and the Centre. These documents were used to help me understand

policies, processes, and programs that relate to sexual violence and how they have changed in the past five years. I only reviewed policies up to and including the summer of 2017. This documentation was used to gain an understanding of the recent history of policy development around sexual violence in Nova Scotia. This review of literature considers the policy trajectory on this topic since the death of Rehtaeh Parsons in 2013, hence the five-year timeline[3]. I focused on changes to provincial government policies and aimed to investigate the reasoning for these changes. I paid particular attention to policy responses to the case of Rehtaeh Parsons, as well as the change in government from NDP to Liberal. This review was centred around the sexual violence strategies developed by the NDP and Liberal provincial governments.

Documents from the Centre provided information on how the organization has been impacted by changes in government policy, including changes to funding and any restrictions that came with this. These documents also shed light on how the Centre has pushed forward their own agenda in terms of educating their community and networking with like-minded organizations. Literature from the Centre further describes the services they provide regarding sexual violence and helped me understand how and why these programs were implemented. This review focused on the Centre's annual reports. I accessed provincial government documents online, and digital copies of the Centre's documents and literature were obtained with assistance from the Executive Director of the Centre. All documents used are publicly available.

[3] The earliest documents reviewed from the Centre were from the 2012-2013 fiscal year, to see if there was change before and after Parsons' death. The five-year timeline is therefore from April 2012 to August 2017.

4.2 Interviews

Semi-structured, open-ended interviews with key informants at the Centre were my second source of information and were used to build on what was learnt through the document review and to fill gaps in information. The interviews provided insight into the implications of provincial policies on the practical work of community-based organizations. Specifically, I used the interviews to gain a community-centred perspective on the Rehtaeh Parsons case and to understand how the government's response to the case and continuing changes in policies have affected work at the Centre. I also asked participants to expand on ways that they believe the Centre and their personal work has gone beyond specific government objectives and towards aims of social justice. This provided some insight into the ways that the Centre is resisting the neoliberal structures and processes that are recognized through the analytical framework of governmentality. The development of interview questions and identification of key informants was aided by the notes in my analytical journal, and the interviews were a way to formally record and gain deeper understanding of what I experienced at the Centre as an intern.

I identified key informants at the Centre based on their knowledge of the topic and experience in the field. Once I had identified these individuals, I directly approached them, explained my research, and verbally asked whether they would like to participate in an interview. Following this, I emailed each participant an "Invitation to Participate" (Appendix I). Interviews were scheduled based on the availability of participants and all but one interview occurred at the Centre. The interview not done in the organization's space was scheduled elsewhere at the request of the participant. Before each interview began, I verbally highlighted key points of the "Invitation to Participate" and re-explained the project; following this all participants and I signed the "Invitation to Participate" as well as a "Consent Form" (Appendix II).

Four, hour-long interviews were completed to inform this research. All interviews were conducted by me and recorded on my phone. Interviews were based on questions from an interview guide (Appendix III) that I used to direct the conversations; however, no interviews covered all the questions and most conversations moved beyond what was on the guide, rather they tended to focus on the expertise and interest of the participant and their interpretation of what was relevant to my research. In an effort to have conversations focused on the interests and knowledge of participants and for the conversations to flow naturally, interviewees did not receive the questions in advance. There was one exception to this as a participant reached out specifically asking to see the questions prior to the interview, a request I complied with. One interview was followed-up by email communication to clarify my understandings. I transcribed all interviews and, as was the choice of all participants, pseudonyms are used and job titles are not noted in this research. The original recordings of the interviews as well as the key identifying which participants are ascribed to which pseudonyms is kept in a locked computer file that only I, the primary researcher, have access to. These practices to maintain confidentiality of participants are essential in ensuring my project is as ethical as can be, and that is meets the parameters outlined in my Research Ethics Board application.

Chapter 5: Analysis

In Chapter 1 of this thesis I outlined a framework through which I would ask questions about the information I collected while doing research. While analyzing the interviews I completed with Centre staff and during my review of documents, both from the provincial government and the Centre, I wanted to answer the question "how have the Nova Scotia provincial government's policies and priorities, following the death of Rehtaeh Parsons, affected the kind of work that a feminist community-based organization does around sexual violence?" In answering this question, I looked for themes that arose from my research. This included an investigation of (a) whether successive provincial governments have called upon community-based organizations to develop and deliver prevention and response services and programs for survivors of sexual violence; (b) whether these organizations believe they have been provided with adequate or sustainable funding for these programs, and how this funding has impacted the work that is done; and (c) the impact these shifts in policy have had on front-line practice, and how the Centre has adapted.

This chapter will outline my findings, grouped by the themes above. Section 5.1 will explore how and why provincial governments have called upon the Centre to provide certain services, and what the implications of this have been for the organization. Section 5.2 will consider funding structures and their effects on work at the Centre. This will include a discussion of targeted funding and the implications that finances have on the capacity of the Centre and their ability to address community needs. Finally, Section 5.3 will explore the impacts on front-line work that result from changes in provincial policies. I will note the balancing of government and community demands, engagement in the development of new programs, the benefits of a community-based model, and networking. Each section will begin by outlining the theory used

to frame that discussion. Section 5.1 uses Mosse's (2005) understanding of policy as more rhetorical than practical, while sections 5.2 and 5.3 use Foucault's (1991) discussion of governmentality as a way to situate this work in a neoliberal context and recognize the power dynamics between the state and its citizens.

5.1 Government Demands

This section explores Nova Scotia's provincial strategies for responding to and preventing sexual violence. Two strategies have been released since Rehtaeh Parsons' death, one from the NDP and the other from the Liberal government; the strategy shift was directly tied to the political shift. I will examine how the two governments called upon the Centre to provide services following Rehtaeh Parsons' death, I will also explore the involvement of the government in these services. The focus of this section is on policy development, I will therefore be considering the rhetoric of the strategies and what this suggests about the purpose of these policies. I will first discuss the NDP's Action Plan, and then the Liberal's *Breaking the Silence* strategy by comparing and contrasting it with what was done by the NDP government. The implications of these policies will be further discussed in sections 5.2 and 5.3.

After Parsons' death, the provincial government responded to public outcry by quickly developing and pushing through policies. Within a month, a cyber-safety act had been put in place, the first in Canada. Soon after, however, it became apparent that this rapid action may not have paid off as the act was struck down less than two years later by the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia under claims that it was too broad and "[infringed on] charter-protected rights" (Ruskin 2015). While not quite as rapid, but still in immediate response, the NDP's Action Team released a progress report in August of 2013 with 13 actions to address sexual violence and bullying in

the province (Province of Nova Scotia 2013). A few months later, in the autumn of 2013, a provincial election resulted in the Liberal party coming to power. They did not use the NDP's strategy, but rather began their own research process and would release their strategy, *Breaking the Silence,* in June of 2015 (Province of Nova Scotia 2015). This section on government demands considers both of these strategies and how they called upon, or did not call upon, community-based organizations to address sexual violence. This discussion is framed by the work of Mosse (2005) and his view that policies function to maintain political relationships, rather than guide front-line work, and are therefore more rhetorical than practical.

The NDP strategy was released in the form of a "Progress Report and Transition Plan" in August 2013 (Province of Nova Scotia 2013). This plan was put together by an Action Team comprised of government officials representing a variety of sectors and departments (Province of Nova Scotia 2013, 1). The purpose of the Action Team was to make recommendations of long-term actions and system-wide improvements to address underlying social issues that led to the death of Rehtaeh Parsons, including sexual violence (Province of Nova Scotia 2013, 1). The report recognized sexual violence as rooted in social beliefs and relationships, and therefore the strategy applied a prevention approach aimed at fostering supportive and respectful relationships, particularly among youth (Province of Nova Scotia 2013, 2).

The report includes lists of challenges to implementing this strategy. One challenge is noted as,

> Some community-based organizations have some distrust of government and frequently report underfunding. There can be significant tension among such organizations, stemming from disagreements on practice models and competition for resources. (Province of Nova Scotia 2013, 11)

Interestingly, while the NDP government makes this explicit effort to depict community organizations as a potential obstacle when addressing sexual violence in our province, they do not mention the decades of work already done by these organizations, nor did they include experts from this field on their Action Team. Further, by noting community organizations' reports of underfunding as a sign of "distrust" of the government, the Action Team was not acknowledging that this lack of funding could be a reality for many organizations. By having an Action Team only comprised of government officials, the strategy was able to maintain political authority, potentially resulting in an echo-chamber that legitimized the practices they already had in place. This is not to ignore the fact that this team did meet with a variety of community members and experts, but to acknowledge that those voices were not always at the table, or at least not the most influential tables. Centre employee Kelly expressed her frustration:

> If you're not prioritizing the expertise of the organizations who are doing the work, who are doing the research, who are talking to the people in the most intimate ways and who are seeing this issue and know clearly how we have to move forward as a province, then it's a problem.

Further, only two of the actions in the NDP's progress report note engagement with community-based organizations. Action Six notes the Department of Health and Wellness will be leading "demonstration projects on support services for victims of sexual violence" and, following this, a hired "community development expert" will engage with the Department to develop a funding framework for community-based sexual violence services (Province of Nova Scotia 2013, 12). Action Ten further discusses funding for community organizations doing work related to sexual violence, noting that a shift to centralized and coordinated funding will hopefully result in more accountable, consistent, transparent, and efficient work from these organizations (Province of Nova Scotia 2013, 13). This shift aligns with the ideals of neoliberal governmentality. It is noteworthy that the only actions that mention community-based work

focus on their funding, rather than considering the services they are already providing and taking into consideration their impact in the greater scheme of sexual violence response and prevention work that needs to be done. Considering Mosse's (2005, 16) notion that policy maintains systems of power rather than guiding frontline work, this discussion of funding without explicit dialogue about what the work will look like keeps the focus on government action rather than community work; these two actions provide no practical information for those working on the ground. Moreover, an Action Team comprised of only government employees means power can be maintained within one group of bureaucrats.

The NDP Action Plan was focused solely on government action. The voices of community-based organizations already immersed in this work were secondary in the creation of this strategy. Further, the plan only discussed working with community-based organizations through funding frameworks; it was silent about direct services and gave no practical direction for how community-based organizations could do their work on the ground. This strategy therefore aligns with Mosse's (2005) discussion as policy as rhetoric to maintain power rather than guide work.

When the NDP lost the election in 2013, the Action Team and work being done was put aside as the Liberals began developing their own strategy. In June of 2015, a year and a half later, the Liberal provincial government released their strategy to address sexual violence in Nova Scotia: *Breaking the Silence* (Province of Nova Scotia 2015). The proposed actions took a "people-centred" approach; it worked to be inclusive, culturally competent, and trauma informed; and was explicit in noting cooperation between government, communities, and victims in the development of the strategy (Province of Nova Scotia 2015, 3). While the NDP took a

preventative approach and focused on the actions of government officials, the Liberal strategy emphasizes services that respond to survivor needs and relies heavily on community members and organizations to help form and implement services and programs related to sexual violence. Examples include the fact that prevention work is being done through a fund where individuals and organizations apply for grants to implement their own projects, therefore the focus of prevention is on community rather than government action (Province of Nova Scotia, 8). The strategy also splits the province into nine Community Support Networks, each of which is supposed to coordinate the services in place in their communities; again, a community rather than government focus (Province of Nova Scotia, 6). Similar to the NDP strategy, *Breaking the Silence* notes setting up a funding framework for sexual assault centres as an important action; however, it is noteworthy that relative to other actions, the least number of steps towards completion have been taken on this one, as outlined in the progress reports and strategy updates (Province of Nova Scotia 2016; 2017). In short, while the Liberal strategy addresses community-based organizations and their role in this work, there is a lack of accountability on the part of the government as they place much of the work to be done in the hands of these organizations, and while providing some funding to do this, it is not yet set up in a sustainable way.

It is important to consider the rhetoric used in the actions outlined by the strategy. Many of the actions involve general, but important, tasks such as "[reviewing] current policies" and procedures related to sexual violence within a certain department (Province of Nova Scotia 2015, 8). While such reviews are fundamental to this work, progress updates on actions such as this do not explain what has been found or if change is being made. By not explicitly stating how these actions are being undertaken, the government is able to appease many people who may otherwise have differing opinions, and they also retain the ability to adapt exactly what these actions may

look like. Citizens fearful of a lack of action will see policy revision as a step forward, yet the vagueness of this statement allows those who are reviewing the policy to determine the process and what, if any, change will come out of this and how extensive the revision will be. While these effects of vague language are not necessarily problematic, they do make the government less accountable and reduce expectations. This is an example of policy being used to maintain relationships and political support, rather than guide work on the ground. Further, emphasis on action that has already taken place instead of that which still must happen, appeases the public and limits the accountability of those implementing the strategy. An example of this are the Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner programs that the strategy is implementing, yet already through a significant portion of their funding, the programs are not yet up and running (Province of Nova Scotia 2017, 9, 17; Jillian). This inaction is not discussed in the progress reports. Nevertheless, it was brought up in my interviews. The lack of explicit discussion around action, and silence when there is inaction, puts the government in a positive light for the work they are doing to support victims and survivors, even when much of this work has not been followed through with.

This rhetoric used by the Liberal government has been used to make it look like they are doing substantial work around sexual violence, when in fact change is happening slowly and much of the work is being carried out by community-based organizations. Mosse (2005) discusses how policies are used to legitimize and maintain the power of those who are developing the policies, and that this results in documents that are not practical or useful for work on the ground. *Breaking the Silence* has been widely promoted throughout the province, leading to public recognition that the government is doing something about sexual violence in their communities, but how truthful is this? The compassionate language used suggests to citizens that their government is caring for and protecting them. Yet, a deeper analysis of the

strategy shows that much of the work is in fact not being done by the provincial government, but rather they are providing funding for other individuals and organizations to both develop and implement programming, such as through Prevention Innovation Grants[4]. This is not a problem, in fact it is best that these community experts are central to these supports and programs, but credit should be given. As Kelly notes, "I think one of the problems has been…the lack of recognition and the unwillingness to recognize…the expertise that sits in the province." Moreover, the caring rhetoric used in this strategy meets political ends by making citizens feel cared for and therefore appreciative of their government – perhaps will even vote them back into power – but for the front-line and community-based organizations that are working directly with victims and survivors, the provincial government is not providing a substantial or sustained framework to support them. Kelly comments on the priorities of government officials:

> The people in those departments also want to end sexualized violence. We're all in alignment around that. Then it comes down to the various restrictions of their mandates, the programs under which they need to work, the multiple priorities that they have in front of them. The political will that there is within Nova Scotia around what's going to get me elected and what's not going to get me elected.

These results of policies that are more talk than action will be further discussed in sections 5.2 and 5.3; evidence from Centre staff and documents which outline their reaction to these changes in provincial strategies will be discussed, shedding light on how community-based organizations are impacted by these policies.

[4] Prevention Innovation Grants are part of the *Breaking the Silence* strategy. They provide funds to individuals and organizations who develop initiatives to prevent sexual violence in the province. See Province of Nova Scotia 2015.

5.2 Funding Limitations

Work at the Centre, as with any organization, is in large part shaped by funds. Centre employees provide direct services; they engage in larger, systems-change, projects; they work in collaboration with other organizations; and they participate in a variety of types of community work. These programs and projects are funded in various ways by different entities, through sustained funding, short-term grants, and donations. This section considers these various sources and structures of funding. To begin, I will note how the entities that fund Centre work have changed in tandem with changes in provincial policies. I will then explore some of the limitations that come with certain funding structures, specifically grants. Following this I will discuss what a lack of funding means for work at the Centre. I will conclude with a discussion of the trauma therapy program as an example to highlight the implications of these funding structures. This analysis will be framed by Foucault's (1991) theory of governmentality, which will be used as an analytical tool to explore the implications of neoliberalism on community-based work.

Governmentality recognizes that governments use a variety of tactics to control the actions of their population (Foucault 1991, 95). In this analysis, I explore funding as one of these tactics as it places limitations on what work can be done at the Centre. The power that is held by the funding entity is not just regulatory but also productive (Ferguson and Gupta 2002, 989); the government is able to influence certain results and actions based on their funding decisions. Additionally, what is funded or not funded by government entities impacts the projects and work being done at the Centre, making the Centre an agent of the government and undertaking some of their work. This role as agent, or intermediary, that is necessary in a neoliberal state is discussed by Harriman (2016), and Ferguson and Gupta (2002, 983). While the Centre is

certainly impacted by government funding, resistance and resilience are also evident, as Centre staff push beyond the bounds of their role as agent. Finally, governmentality and neoliberalism are used to frame this analysis through acknowledgement that funding ties the Centre to the provincial government; the state both sits above and encompasses the communities that it governs, by sharing power with local entities (the Centre), resulting in a reinforcement of neoliberal structures that make the state, citizens, and civil society all reliant on one another (Ferguson and Gupta 2002, 982).

To contextualize a discussion of the implications of funding, one must first understand where this money is coming from. The Centre has 'core funding,' which is sustained funding from a number of government entities, that supports their direct-services work: individual support counselling, crisis intervention, sharing of information, referrals, as well as individual advocacy and accompaniment (Annual Report 2013, 5). This core funding came from the Nova Scotia Department of Community Services as well as Guysborough Antigonish Strait Health Authority from 2013to 2015 and capacity was met by augmenting with community donations;[5] the Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner (SANE) program was funded by the Nova Scotia Department of Health and Wellness (Annual Report 2013; 2014; 2015). In 2016 and 2017 core funding still came from the NS Department of Community Services, but shifted from the local to the provincial Health Authority; the SANE program funding also started coming from the NS Health Authority; community donations were still needed to fill gaps (Annual Report 2016; 2017). This shift in funding is noted to draw attention to the number of and also varying entities that the Centre is working with at any given time.

[5] Throughout this section the dates used will be referring to fiscal years.

In addition to direct services with core funding, a number of projects run out of the Centre that rely on grant funding. Grant funding must be applied for and only lasts a set period of time, most often for a period of six months to three years. Grants come from government entities as well as a variety of corporations. The Healthy Relationships for Youth (HRY) program is a primary example of what grant funding can look like: a survey of the Annual Reports from 2013 to 2017 show various funders that shift every year. Some of the funders for HRY over the years include the Canadian Women's Foundation, Nova Scotia Department of Justice Lighthouses' Program, Telus, Rural Communities Foundation, Greenshield, and more. HRY is an example of a program that has been able to sustain over the years by continually applying for grants from different organizations, but none of their funding is guaranteed to continue. Other projects out of the Centre do not last more than a short period of time due to their grant funding, such as *Responding to and Preventing Sexual Violence – Laketown*[6], which was funded in 2015 and 2016, after which the project ended (Annual Report 2015; 2016). Also important to note is the Specialized Therapeutic Counselling for Survivors of Sexual Violence Trauma program[7] that began at the Centre in fiscal 2014 on a grant, and has since become sustainably funded (more on this later).

Significant work is required when one's funding comes from so many places. Not only is time and energy required to seek-out this funding, particularly when thinking about grants that need to be continually re-applied to, but there is also effort in maintaining relationships. As one Centre employee, Jillian, notes, "it takes a lot of time and energy to manage the multitude of relationships when your funding comes from multiple places." This focus on relationship building helps establish ties between funding entities and the Centre. As Ferguson and Gupta

[6] Name of community has been changed to keep anonymity.
[7] This is the name of the program at its inception, it has since changed.

(2002, 982) discuss, this allows the funding entity, in this case provincial government departments as well as some corporations, to both sit above and encompass the communities they are governing over. While this sharing of power and tying of entities is seen at the Centre, this is evidently a system that does not work perfectly as it is taking time and energy away from work at the Centre.

Some Centre staff noted the difficulty in maintaining these relationships as there is a disconnect between Centre and funder understandings of what needs to happen. Stephanie notes that her main form of communication with funders is through reports that she submits to them; Stephanie works mostly on grant-funded projects. She says that "other than questions around those reports, [and a] check in here or there" there is not much communication, which she was happy about. When asked if there are any conflicts with the funders regarding the projects, their relationship, and the reports, she noted jargon as a point of tension:

> You know sometimes it's just about the wording. So just the way they word something we could call it something else and it's essentially the same thing, you know, or the other way around…some of the staff at Status of Women Canada that I've connected with over the years through the projects have suggested…things but it was clear that they didn't really have experience in community development stuff. So it was just, for me to understand that and then to kind of figure out what they were really asking and to frame it, frame what we were doing in another way so it made sense, you know…you need to be strategic in that way to figure out what…was the issue that we were not meeting, but how do we explain what we were already doing in a way that ticked the box…for them basically.

Kelly expressed a similar sentiment when discussing programs that have funding coming from multiple people, and needing to show that they are meeting the variety of demands from the different funding entities:

> It's not that we change the program every time to meet the funding need, we might talk about it in a bit of a different way, like focus on particular aspects of the program that might meet the need.

Foucault (1991, 95) discusses governmentality as a series of tactics, not laws, that allow the government to control the actions of their citizens. While the rhetoric used in the reports that Centre staff are writing to their funders may make it appear that this control is in full force, interviews with these same staff members provide testimonies of their work not truly being controlled by funder demands and limitations. Phrases used such as "ticking the box" are evidence that Centre staff are "strategic" and maneuver how they discuss their work so as to appease funding entities, while still resisting these tactics of control and completing work the way they see as best for the community (Stephanie).

While rhetoric has been one way that the Centre has been able to resist the control that funders have over their work, some demands, such as those that came out of the *Breaking the Silence* strategy, alter and limit their work in more substantial ways. When discussing changes to her position and what she experienced at the Centre in regards to *Breaking the Silence*, Jillian notes the total shift in work that was required to both assist in developing the strategy and then putting it into place:

> I think it would be really naive to not acknowledge the resources that were required and committed, but I do think that those were considered very meaningful and important investments and I don't think anyone would have done it differently…I think it would be really interesting to try and quantify how much of our existing budgets were kind of shifted to engage in that work, just as a measure, just as a curiosity for myself of like, you know, governments like to talk in dollars and cents and if we could say "this is how much of our existing funding we use to support your work," that would probably be a clearer way of demonstrating the level of resources and commitment that was pulled into this work.

Following this, Jillian was explicit in saying that this work is extremely important, and her comment was not to say that she did not want to be part of it. The sentiment was that she wished to acknowledge the amount of additional work the Centre was asked to do in order to make

Breaking the Silence a success, and that one must keep in mind the implications of this additional work on a Centre that is already working at full capacity. Also noteworthy, is that a lot of this support and development work that the Centre was called on for by the government in their strategy and new program development was not coming with any extra pay. For example, Jillian recalls the Centre helping support the development of the new SANE program in the province:

> There was no funding available to the partnering organizations to support that work, in like the nitty gritty development stages, right. So what it took was a lot of time, time away from [other] work commitments.

This work without additional pay meant that staff had to take time away from other projects to focus on assisting the government in developing new provincial programming. This is an overt example of the Centre becoming an agent of the government, as the time and energy of staff is being used at the direct benefit of the state, for no additional cost.

Government reliance on community-based organizations for service provision and program development is of great benefit to the state. Centre employees are professionals, many with or working towards masters and post-graduate degrees (Stephanie, email communication, 2018). Working out of a community-based organization means their compensation for providing services is significantly less than if they were to be working for a government program (Jillian). The resources accorded to the Centre are well below those for state services, this means that the provincial government is able to have these needed supports provided to their citizens for a lower price (Stephanie, email communication, 2018). Moreover, there is irony to the neoliberal structure in which the government limits their support of community-based organizations both financially and through lack of recognition of their expertise, yet they benefit greatly from the cheap labour of the professional women working in these organizations. The strength of these

women and organizations to provide extensive services with this limited support is explored in section 5.3.

Another point of interest is that of grant funding. If a project is grant funded it most often means it is short term and significant time needs to be put into searching and applying for this funding. While sustainability of programs and projects is arguably always a good thing, it is particularly important when this work is around sexual violence. For example, when the Centre first got specialized sexual violence trauma therapists, they were funded through a grant and on bridge funding (Annual Report 2014; 2015). This work that supports survivors of sexual violence does not work in a short-term framework; survivors need ongoing support from individuals they can trust, and the reality of programs based on grant funding is that they do not meet these needs.

Further, grant funding often comes in relatively small amounts. Most entities providing these grants are allocating grants to a large number of different people or organizations. *Breaking the Silence*'s 'Prevention Innovation Grants' are an example of this. As Kelly notes, in the long term these small grants cannot make deep change. Commenting on the funding provided through *Breaking the Silence* she says:

> It's ended up in some ways through the sexual violence strategy, and I don't really even think particularly it's a strategy, of a scattering of funding in little bits and pieces to, I guess, I'm not sure the rationale behind it, thinking that maybe you have to scatter funding and try to address small pockets of need. I'm sure some really good things have come out of it. But what we haven't done is we haven't really put in place the staffing for one thing…We've not strengthened the capacity of the organizations who are working in issues of sexualized violence to address sexualized violence, sufficiently, at all, even close.

Grant funding also has the implication that if there are not substantial outcomes to share with the funders proving the success of the project, then funding may not continue. Jillian shares

the following about the new SANE programs in the province and her fear that funding will be cut if there is nothing to show:

> I do feel some frustration…I've felt like those programs should have been live by now, it's taken a long time. We're almost through their first year of funding and they've only been committed three years of funding. So, I have some concerns…that with the next change of government…if political will were to shift and change, like what that could mean…if we don't have some measurable outcomes to share with government after the first year of funding. Ya, that's a concern of mine.

The need for Sexual Assault Nurse Examiners in the province is not something that will go away. To think that this is a program that will be discontinued if "measurable outcomes" are not present, would be a great deficit to the province. In framing this analysis I noted how power was not only regulatory but also productive, this is an example of that. Through targeting funding and requiring certain outcomes, the government is able to achieve certain results, and if the action they see is not to their liking they have the ability to pull that funding. In this way, the funding for the new SANE program is productive as it ensures certain outcomes.

While grant funding comes with its own set of limitations, the overall lack of funds at the Centre was one of the greatest challenges noted in all the interviews and annual reports. Each of the annual reports I reviewed had a statement along the lines of "the workload of [the Centre] remains substantial. To meet the demand for direct service, requests to participate in community development endeavours and the need for increased fundraising, [the Centre's] direct services and project staff worked many hours of unpaid overtime" (Annual report 2014, 167). The 2016 and 2017 Annual Reports note that some programs were booking appointments two to four weeks in advance: evidence of the great demand for services from the Centre, but how limited their capacity is. All annual reports also noted the need to fundraise to cover costs associated with programs and services. The unsustainability of grant funding is also tied to this problem as

projects supplement Centre costs such as rent, resulting in the whole organization being somewhat reliant on inconsistent funding (Stephanie, email communication, 2018).

The reality of the Centre being a community-based organization with limited funds also means that many employees are not being paid competitive wages. The 2016 Annual Report (62) notes that the Centre "is not able to pay staff salaries comparable to those working in public and for-profit sectors." Speaking about the SANE program, Jillian explains that to choose to work based out of a community organization means "you have to be okay with…giving up your union seniority, you have to be okay with not having a stepped wage increase, like all your other nursing colleagues." This is a real problem for the Centre in attracting employees; the 2016 Annual Report (54) noted how uncertainty "around ongoing program funding and long-term sustainability made it difficult to attract and retain specialized counselling therapists."

One way that the Centre adapts to this lack of funding is to spend time fundraising. However, this once again limits the capacity of Centre staff as they must spend time raising funds rather than doing the work they are there to do. Kelly comments that "fundraising is not a small part of what we need to do, so we're always kind of trying to patch together our funding in some ways to keep our programs going." Later in her interview, Kelly comments on this again and how illogical it is that employees are spending work hours looking for ways to continue to fund their work rather than doing the actual work. Commenting specifically on youth work she explains:

> You know the fact that we have to run around all the time to be able to try and do work with youth who are crying out for spaces to be able to talk about what's going on in their lives, is, you know it's just, it's just so counterproductive in some way.

Considering the many sources of funding and the work involved in accessing this money shows the resilience of the Centre in their ability to continue to provide extensive services.

Particularly in the cases of working unpaid overtime and time spent fundraising and applying for grants, we see the work of Centre staff expanding far beyond their job descriptions to having their labour support the under-resourced foundations of the Centre. This exemplifies the Centre's ability to maximize services with limited resources. Again, this shows great resistance to the neoliberal state which lacks support for community-based organizations, yet through these constraining forces, Centre staff are able to grow, flourish, and continue to expand their organization. It cannot be forgotten that the state benefits greatly from this growth and maximization of resources which means citizens are being served at low cost to the government. As will be explored in section 5.3, it is in part the feminist values of the Centre that allow for this resistance, resilience, and growth.

As explored at the beginning of this section, governmentality asserts that states distribute power in such ways that organizations become agents of the state, carrying out the work of serving citizens for them (Harriman 2016; Ferguson and Gupta 2002, 983). Further, this sharing of power and continuity of work means the state and Centre become tied together as the power of the government encompasses the organization and the two become reliant on one another (Ferguson and Gupta 2002, 982). The findings show this to be true as services provided are directly determined by what funding is available. However, there is also resistance as staff expand beyond their job descriptions and the Centre continues to grow despite limited funding. This is a paradox, as Centre staff must work within neoliberal structures to be able to push the borders of their organization and resist these same structures that are limiting their work. This exemplifies the possibility of agency and resistance to Foucault's understanding of an omnipresent power, a critique of governmentality (Macleod and Durrheim 2002, 54, 55).

To bring this analysis on funding to a close, I will share an example from the Centre that demonstrates many of the limitations I have discussed. This example is of the Specialized Therapeutic Counselling for Survivors of Sexual Violence Trauma program. The trauma therapy program was first started at the Centre soon after Rehtaeh Parsons' death. As Grace notes,

> It was post-[Parsons' death] that we were able to have, and I think it was just a grant as opposed to core funding, but for a trauma therapist, a feminist therapist you know to work with women who specifically have experienced sexualized violence.

This comment from Grace is an example of how shifts in funding were recognized as one of the tangible responses from the government after Parsons' death. This funding, for the trauma therapy program, came in the form of a grant, and also as bridge funding. Kelly explains:

> They put in bridge funding, and that really enabled us to have a second therapist. So that was a big thing. Now, it was bridge funding that it sounded as though it was going to be a bridge to somewhere, like maybe bonding funding, which it was not, but nonetheless it allowed us to have a second therapist which is a really important model for sexual assault centres.

Impacts of changes to this grant and bridge funding are noted in the 2016 Annual Report. A 23% cut in funding for the therapy program resulted in therapist hours being dropped to four days a week, and a support group had to be cancelled (Annual Report 2016, 49). The project funding for the program was known to be ending in March 2016 and staff changes part way through the year furthered fears of sustainability of the program and how that would impact the effectiveness of the service for survivors of sexual violence (Annual Report 2016, 49). This lack of sustainability in mind, therapists had to shift the focus of their work to "making short-term realistic plans with women, ensuring they were resourced both internally and externally," rather than delving into a healing process that may be interrupted, which could potentially cause further harm (Annual Report 2016, 54). This problem was cyclical as the uncertainty of the program made it increasingly difficult to attract and retain therapists for this specialized position, making

the future of the program even more uncertain (Annual Report 2016, 54). In sum, the problems were securing ongoing funding, which led to difficulty in filling the positions, thus impacting the effectiveness of the program for survivors. The 2016 Annual Report (61) noted "feelings of anxiety, fear, and anger related to the injustice and unfairness of government's approach to sexualized violence," resulting from the lack of secured funding being applied to the program.

The Centre reacted quickly and applied pressure to funders. The 2016 fiscal year saw significant time and effort put into meeting with government officials and "making [their] case for funding [the] two therapist positions to the government, primarily to the Department of Health and Wellness" (Annual Report 2016, 56). In that fiscal year, they got permission to apply some of the SANE funds to the therapy program, but no promises of sustained funding were confirmed (Annual Report 2016, 56). In the next fiscal year, the Centre partnered with a sexual assault centre in Halifax to call for "adequate funding and program sustainability" (Annual Report 2017, 37). Presently, the Centre does have sustained funding for the specialized therapy program. Speaking to past problems they had with the program Kelly notes, "it allowed us then to make the case that we need to have sustained funding for a second therapist and that kind of became a three year, you know, three year advocacy initiative until we did have ongoing funding."

This case of the Specialized Therapeutic Counselling for Survivors of Sexual Violence Trauma program at the Centre outlines a number of the negative implications on work at the Centre that result from funding. The program began with grant and bridge funding, both which came with an expiration date. To begin, this made it difficult for the Centre to attract employees to fill these positions. The precariousness of the program also meant a more challenging healing experience for survivors as they were not guaranteed to finish the therapy program and they did

not know if they would be able to continue on with the same therapist. When working in the area of sexual violence and trauma, this uncertainty is particularly problematic. We also see a lack of transparency from the government in Kelly's comment that "it was bridge funding that it sounded as though it was going to be a bridge to somewhere…which it was not." Finally, this example demonstrates resistance and resilience from Centre employees. This funding framework was recognized as a problem almost immediately, and led to a three year advocacy initiative until they were able to achieve the result of sustained funding.

Our neoliberal society is structured around money. This analysis on funding was not to say whether this structure is good or bad, but to outline the implications that come with the funding frameworks that the Centre must work within. The Centre must manoeuvre their work to align their rhetoric to match that of their funders. They must also spend significant time and energy maintaining relationships, as well as looking for new funders and writing grant applications. Projects funded by grants are often short term; this means prevention work is not sustained and therefore less likely to make an impact, and response work becomes less effective as survivors of sexual violence cannot access the consistent support that they need. Limited and precarious funding also means that the Centre has difficulties attracting and retaining specialists, and cannot provide competitive wages. While these effects and limitations of funding frameworks are enforced by funding entities such as the provincial government, we also see resistance from Centre staff. Staff members are actively choosing lower wages in return for engagement in community-based work and the "rich and awesome environment" this provides (Jillian). We see staff members doing the work the way they see as most beneficial to the community, while being careful with their rhetoric to ensure that funders are in agreement with

what they are doing. Continuously, staff members are working unpaid overtime and engaging in more than their program descriptions require; Kelly comments: "so what we tend to do, is we…meet those parameters[8], honour that, do that in the best possible way, and then do more." Centre staff are also engaging in advocacy work and have made substantial steps forward, turning the trauma therapy program from grant-based to sustained funding.

I will end with a comment from Kelly, as she explains her perspective on the government's role in funding and supporting this work:

> The role for government to play is in you know, pulling together those who are the experts in the field, or those who have been doing the work, and then enabling us to do that work in a more thorough, concerted way. And supporting that 100%, and that needs to be through adequate, stabilized funding for therapists, ongoing funding for doing the violence prevention work.

5.3 The Centre's Adaptation

The interviews completed and documents reviewed repeatedly showed the Centre's ability to adapt to both government demands and perceived community need. Shifts in policy have resulted in changes in programs and services at the Centre, but as this analysis will outline, much of this change has come with resistance and resilience as Centre staff continually advocate to work in ways that they believe will best benefit their community. This section provides specific examples of how shifts in government and their policies have impacted work at the Centre, I will explore how evolving community demands for services have influenced Centre programs, I will discuss the power of a community-based model, and I will consider networking as a site of tension as well as great power as it allows the Centre to do the work they perceive as most beneficial to the community.

[8] 'Parameters' refers to expectations and requirements from funders.

This analysis is situated in the changes that occurred after Rehtaeh Parsons' death. Parsons' death resulted in the first large-scale public outcry around sexual violence in Nova Scotia, and this attention put pressure on the government to make change. Her case brought awareness to the need for stronger policies and support services to address sexual violence and cyberbullying. This recognition not only meant that more cases would become public, but also that there would be an expectation that survivors would be supported and action would be taken. As Stephanie notes, Parsons' death meant that sexual violence could no longer be ignored:

> I mean…after Rehtaeh Parsons they had to do something. They were obviously… [committing] time and [committing] money to doing things after Rehtaeh Parsons…I think it's important for them, they wanted, they want to stay elected, they feel like it's an issue that their constituents care about, so to highlight that they are doing things. I'm sure many people do care, you know, but it's also like, you can't not do anything at that point.

Other Centre employees expressed a similar sentiment, noting that it was not just government, but community members and organizations started to realize that they too had to do something. Jillian comments on changes she saw after Parsons' death:

> The demands definitely increased. Demands for education increased, not just for health care providers, demands for professional development opportunities increased, the demand for school-based presentations increased.

Public awareness and acknowledgment was one of the biggest shifts seen after Parsons' death. This resulted in a number of significant changes to service delivery and supports in the province, most notably the implementation of the NDP Action Plan and *Breaking the Silence* that were discussed in section 5.1. Other major events that interviewees noted as having influence on the discussions and work happening around sexual violence in the province included the

Dalhousie Dentistry case[9] and Saint Mary's University rape chant[10]. I am noting these events because they reiterate that shifts in how sexual violence is understood, and therefore addressed, come from interactions between communities and larger powers such as post-secondary institutions or the government. Public reaction and pressure is what has made the provincial government take action on sexual violence, and then this power is shifted back down to the community level; it is the Centre that is called upon to develop and deliver these programs and services that citizens have asked for.

Recognition of these interconnected relationships and also the balancing of power between citizens, the Centre, and the provincial government is being framed in this analysis through Foucualt's (1991) discussion of governmentality, which is being used to explore the impacts of neoliberalism on the Centre. Fundamental to Foucault's (1991, 92, 94) theory of governmentality is the understanding that the state takes responsibility for the welfare of their citizens; their role is to manage people, goods, and wealth in order to safeguard the population. Foucault (1991, 100) also details the interconnectedness of the population with the government: citizen needs become government goals, and the government controls the wellbeing of their citizens; this structure eventually becomes engrained in society, resulting in citizens self-managing and unwittingly acting in accordance with and perpetuating this power structure. Part of this interconnectedness has already been highlighted through recognizing that public outcry is what led to government action after Parsons' death. A result of this interconnectedness is that

[9] On December 6, 2014 a poll was created on a private Facebook group comprised of fourth year, male dentistry students at Dalhousie University, asking who, out of their female classmates, they would like to "hate fuck" and "sport fuck." December 6 is also the anniversary of the École Polytechnique massacre and Canada's National Day of Remembrance and Action on Violence Against Women. See Task Force on Misogyny, Sexism and Homophobia in Dalhousie University Faculty of Dentistry, 2015.

[10] In September of 2013 a video of Saint Mary's University students chanting about underage sex without consent during an orientation week activity was posted to Instagram. This video caught immediate national and international attention. See Saint Mary's University President's Council, 2013.

citizens and their organizations (i.e. the Centre) become agents of the state as they begin to self-manage and fill the roles designated to them by the government (Harriman 2016). Further, this model means that power gets distributed among civil society as agents are working for the goals of the state, allowing the government to both sit above and encompass the communities that it is governing over (Ferguson and Gupta 2002, 982). Power, therefore, is both used and distributed by the government to manage their population and ensure their wellbeing.

Changes in political power have resulted in a number of shifts in policy and therefore work at the Centre. In Nova Scotia, the transition from a NDP to Liberal government meant a new strategy to address sexual violence. Section 5.1 described how this change resulted in greater community involvement and organizations being called upon to develop and deliver services. I have also previously reflected on how this change resulted in the Specialized Therapeutic Counselling for Survivors of Sexual Violence Trauma program at the Centre. To add to this discussion, I will comment on what voices were listened to when these changes were happening.

The interviews and annual reports all acknowledge the Centre's involvement in developing *Breaking the Silence.* There is, however, also a shared sentiment that their voices were not heard to the extent that they wished they were, and there is disappointment with how the Liberal government approached the research process used to develop the strategy. Jillian expresses this communal frustration and also excitement in taking part in this work:

> I think that individuals and communities, and community groups that were involved in this work for decades have been waiting so long for some opportunity to create both community awareness and community building, around like making this an important issue for people and leaders, that people willingly engaged in this work, like it wasn't like a "oh gosh, now we have to do this" right, "thanks," it was like, "finally, let's do it," like "let's get going." There was [sic.] tons of energy around, and I was also very

> energized by it. So you do these things totally willingly, and want to engage, and wanting your voice to be a part because it's unfair to assume that clients and survivors are going to just *snaps fingers* disclose to government to kind of to get that perspective across, right. So very much wanting to be at all of the tables that we were invited to and very much demanding to be invited to certain tables if we felt that we could bring that particular voice.

Also speaking to engaging with government work, Kelly notes her disappointment in how different voices have been prioritized in the processes of developing and implementing programs around sexual violence:

> One of the problems has been…the lack of recognition and the unwillingness to recognize for whatever reasons the expertise that sits in the province through organizations such as sexual assault centres, women's centres, etcetera…Part of the way that government wants to move forward is by, you know, "we're going to talk to the people." Well that's all well and good to talk to the people, however if you're not prioritizing the expertise of the organizations who are doing the work, who are doing the research, who are talking to the people in the most intimate ways, and who are seeing this issue and know clearly how we have to move forward as a province, then it's a problem.

This disconnect between government entities reaching out to hear from their citizens, while not listening to the voices that have been doing this work for so long, shows a fault in the neoliberal state. The Nova Scotian government is attempting to hear from their citizens so that they can then address their needs, but by not recognizing other actors (i.e. the Centre) and the knowledge that they hold, the state is not fully understanding the needs of their population and also not hearing expertise on how it should be addressed.

In her interview, Stephanie discussed another way in which advocates for women's rights and community-based work were not being heard. She notes that federal funding through Status of Women Canada had strict regulations under the Conservative government led by Stephen

Harper.[11] Projects that were funded by Status of Women, under this government, were not allowed to participate in any political advocacy. Stephanie notes, "there have been other organizations or other people funded by them that have felt that they weren't able to do any advocacy work…that was under Harper times." She followed up by explaining that the change to a Liberal federal government led by Justin Trudeau[12] has resulted in a change to this regulation, and "now we're allowed to." She explains that they are now directly asked for any demands they have from the federal government:

> The Status of Women Canada minister, she at this meeting said, "if you have asks for me, send them to me" so this group kind of talked about those asks at the meeting…I think being a part of this network and having the ear of the minister might be interesting.

While this comment is about the federal rather than provincial government, this is a marked example of how a shift in political power directly impacts the work that can be done at the Centre. This specific example also shows the implications on the social justice and advocacy work done at the Centre, rather than direct services. Initiatives such as requesting to be part of the development of new programs, budget asks, and ensuring expertise is heard as often as possible exemplifies the proactive efforts of Centre staff in seeking to shift the neoliberal structures that are causing problems for women in the community and limiting the possibilities of work at the Centre.

Another way the Centre has adapted over the years is by shifting their work to align with the ever-evolving demands of the community. When asked what roles the Centre plays in the

[11] Stephen Harper was the Prime Minister of Canada from 2006 to 2015, he was the leader of the Conservative Party of Canada.
[12] Justin Trudeau assumed the office of Prime Minister in 2015 and is the leader of the Liberal Party of Canada.

community, all interviewees noted the double mandate of direct services and social action; these mandates were described as separate pieces of work, yet they influenced one another. Feedback from women accessing direct services at the Centre is what influences the direction of the organization's social justice action and activism. It is recognized that the multi-faceted issues that women face are systemic problems that must be addressed; unless these larger problems can be taken up, the need for direct services will never diminish. We see here the Centre's work as aligning with the greater feminist movement, acting beyond the needs of individual women. In this way, social action work at the Centre happens on a grander scale and is more preventative, while the direct services are in reaction to issues in women's daily lives. Kelly explains:

> Service delivery work has always informed our social action work. So that our social action is informed by the stories of women who come in the door, and we have always taken the position that individual women need support, the issues that impact one woman have the potential to impact all of us and in many ways do impact all of us. So the need to change the conditions that under from which the various issues arise has been very much a part of our mandate.

This double mandate and the Centre's approach to social action as being informed by the needs of women who are accessing their services has allowed Centre staff to see gaps in services and also try to address them. This approach further allows staff members to recognize when and how community demands for services are changing. Stephanie shared her opinion on the importance of the Centre being able to adapt to community need, while still being committed to a feminist set of values:

> It's an organization with people who are willing to learn and change as well…To know that survivors are not only women in the community seeking support, [and] to provide services [to] others…It's not a shift in ideals but it's a shift, it's a change in responding to what's needed and I think that's really important. You know, still [holding] feminist ideals. I think the beliefs and values have been consistent, but [with] changes in who is seeking support and offering these really important services.

An example of shifting service demand in the community is the use of the Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner (SANE) phone line. The SANE line is open 24 hours a day, seven days a week. The purpose of the phone is for victims of sexual assault to be in contact with a nurse who can assist them immediately following an assault, and to do a medical examination if the victim so chooses. Increasingly in the past years, however, this phone is being used for a wider variety of reasons. Jillian noted calls ranging from people looking for an abortion, survivors in crisis that want someone to talk to, and people looking for advice on how to support someone who had disclosed to them. Jillian also noted community members and organizations reaching out to the SANE office for support and resources:

> [Another] thing that's increased in the last five years is people using [the] service as a consultation…So, "I've heard this disclosure I just want to make sure I'm doing the right thing." …It's not uncommon to get a call that says…"I've heard this disclosure, I just want to make sure [that I] know about all the available services and supports." And that extended to like public health nurses working in high schools, cops in other jurisdictions.

This example of a broadened use of the SANE phone line shows the great variety of ways that the Centre provides services to the community, adapting according to what people need at any given time. Part of what the Centre does is provide their community with a space for people to be comfortable, welcomed, and safe. Women "come to use the space just as a place to kind of put their feet up, have a cup of coffee, jump on the computer, visit, like a social kind of," reflects Grace. The Centre seeks to create a space that is supportive and caring for women; this aligns with their commitment to the feminist values of being a space for community rather than hierarchy (Annual Report 2017, 44, 146). An important aspect of the Centre being a place where women are comfortable being themselves is that the Centre approaches women and the issues they are facing by listening to and working alongside them to address any problems. Stephanie explains:

> It's more meeting people at where they're at in terms of their knowledge of issues…I think people come and seek that kind of education from [the Centre] because the way we do that is not necessarily about like stating the laws like other…folks might do in terms of their education, but it's really like having a conversation about what people are experiencing in their own lives, how they define what healthy is, what violence is…We help facilitate the spaces where that conversation can happen…I think we're often called to do that because we're outside of maybe institutional powers and people feel safer in having those conversations in a women's centre facilitated kind of space. To be able to voice concerns and be critical and ya, share honestly what they're experiencing.

Not only has the Centre become a place to air individual concerns, but it is also a space where concerns about the community as a whole have been brought:

> If there are issues in the community that need to be raised, that need to be challenged, that need to be worked on, I think [the Centre] is one of the first places that people share these concerns for some action. (Stephanie)

These comments from interviewees provide insight into the Centre's role in the community as a place where people seek help, and also change. In considering Foucault's (1991) discussion of the distribution of power, it is interesting to note that the Centre has become a place where citizens are sharing their needs and seeking help. Governmentality asserts that it is the role of the state to safeguard the population and address their needs. It appears that community members will go to the Centre to share these needs, yet as described earlier, when Centre staff bring this information to government entities, they feel that they are not listened to. Here again, we see a fault in the processes of the neoliberal state and its ability to appropriately control and care for its population. We also see a contradiction in that the neoliberal state puts restrictions on the Centre, but this results in limiting the potential to serve citizens and understand their needs, indicating a weakness in the system. While the Centre is acting as an agent of the state, as described in Section 5.2, it is also acting as a site of resistance against neoliberal governance, as women bring their issues to the organization and staff members engage in social action work.

Moreover, while the Centre is functioning within a neoliberal structure, it is also able to resist from within; resistance is fuelled by and in support of serving women in the community and a commitment to the feminist framework in which they conduct work.

There are numerous oversights in the decisions of the provincial government, as the Centre and its knowledge as a community-based organization are not always being listened to. The many advantages of a community-based model to doing work around sexual violence were noted by all interviewees. As previously mentioned, the Centre is a community space where women are welcomed and feel safe to air concerns and discuss issues in their lives (Grace). The Centre also facilitates a space for non-intimidating education by emphasizing discussion and learning from one another rather than providing facts (Stephanie). The importance of having a centralized space for services was also noted by interviewees. Jillian explains the value in being able to make a referral to someone you know:

> You'll see a much higher uptake in referral options, you know people consenting to referrals when I can say "you know, so-and-so is just right down the hall from me, I know exactly how they work, I know their approach, and [what] you can expect," means so much more than "oh, in your community I know that there's this, this, this, and this and I don't mind connecting you with those services" but I don't really speak to them in the same way.

Grace expressed a similar sentiment of the benefits of having all these services in one place, noting the enrichment of Centre services when the trauma therapy program began:

> Prior to having a trauma-informed therapist that could work with victims of sexualized violence…when someone would disclose that that was part of their life experience…there was no one to say "hey, I know the perfect person that you can meet with."

Overall, a community-based approached was recognized as an essential factor in the work the Centre is doing to address sexual violence.

Two main themes about the benefits of this community-based approach arose. First, the importance of a holistic healing that allows survivors of sexual violence to address the many interconnected issues they are dealing with in one space was seen as extremely beneficial to their healing process. Second, as a community space, the Centre is a site where concerns can be shared, heard, and worked on, making the Centre a place where citizens go to have needs met, knowing they will be addressed within the local context. Essential to both of these benefits is that the people accessing services in regards to sexual violence are being addressed as individuals with their own intersecting needs. Feminist principles also augment these benefits as Centre staff have an intersectional understanding of the issues that women are facing and the organization is less hierarchical than one would expect in a neoliberal system, resulting in empowerment of the women they are serving (Annual Report 2017, 44). Stephanie notes how elemental feminism is in framing the work they do as the staff policy manual has "so much written in it about a feminist philosophy of working with women." While a community approach is fundamental to work at the Centre, it also comes with challenges. Jillian reflects:

> I just want to say that as opposed to "all this was really hard," but, it's really hard, but it's all for a really good purpose, and…[it's] better to have the community-based organizations doing this work because we're so close to the population, than to have this kind of prescribed approach that we know doesn't work for all people.

The importance of noting the benefits of the community-based approach and the assets of the Centre is to acknowledge their flexibility in how they work and their ability to address the needs of the community, while also balancing the demands of the government. The Centre strikes a careful balance between working within neoliberal structures and meeting the demands of funders, while also resisting these restrictions and staying true to their feminist values.

Community work means engaging with a wide variety of individuals; one of the groups that the Centre has focused on over the years is youth. Youth work at the Centre takes the form

of education and prevention of violence, and this is done through facilitated discussions. A facilitation approach means that youth get to air their concerns and lead the conversation, it also means that youth are seen as holders of knowledge and the Centre plays the role of creating the space for them to share this knowledge with one another. Grace noted that youth work was one of the places where interest and questions around sexual violence shifted in response to Parsons' death. In sessions with young girls, Centre staff heard new questions arise and girls wanting to explore the issue and learn more about how to stay safe; they were seeing in their own lives some of the same bullying behaviours that were being discussed in Parsons' case. Grace reflects:

> I do remember the girls mentioning not only Rehtaeh Parsons but Amanda Todd[13] as well…it was something that they were hearing about…they wanted to talk about it…so we certainly, you know, would shift what we were doing to allow for those conversations.

Kelly reiterates this point, noting the conversations she heard among youth following Parsons' death:

> We saw more young people talking about it. It was an opportunity to talk about shaming, it was an opportunity to talk about slut shaming…with the work we were doing among youth there was a lot of conversations around how they were feeling about that and what they were seeing and what young women were seeing…that was certainly a change here.

These new and changing conversations from youth based on the news and actions from the province helped guide work at the Centre, as seen by Grace's note of shifting programming to allow for these conversations. While youth work is not a focus of this analysis, it is important to note as it highlights the adaptability of Centre programs and also the prevention-based work that is being done.

[13] Amanda Todd was a British Columbian teenager who committed suicide as a result of extensive cyber-bullying and online sexual violence. See Lau 2012.

As a feminist, community-based organization, the Centre not only works with and according to community demands, they also spend significant time collaborating with other organizations. A neoliberal state, as understood by governmentality, has a population that is so interconnected with the government that people and organizations (i.e. the Centre) become agents of the state and begin to self-manage according to state demands (Harriman 2016). In this next section, however, I will argue that there is resistance from the Centre to this interconnectedness and organizations-as-agents of the state, and that this can be seen through their extensive networking efforts.

Federally, provincially, and regionally, the Centre is part of numerous networks. Some examples of provincial networks include Women's Centres Connect, a network of all women's centres in Nova Scotia; the Nova Scotia Poverty Network; the Nova Scotian Trafficking Elimination Project; Nova Scotia Association of Community Health Centres; and more (Kelly). There are also short-term collaboration efforts for advocacy such as partnering with other organizations in the province providing sexual assault services and making recommendations to the Department of Health and Wellness for "adequate funding and program sustainability" (Annual Report 2017, 37). We see further collaboration at the federal level in association with Status of Women Canada, in the creation of asks for the next budget (Stephanie). This collaboration that focuses on advocacy has the clear purpose of altering government actions. Such advocacy is an example of how the Centre is not working as an agent of the state, and in fact working actively against it. While this role of agent is not met, Foucault's understanding of the interconnectedness of the state and citizens is still clearly at play as the Centre must work with the government, even if they are asking for change, in order to complete the work they want to be able to do. There is some inconsistency with the theory of governmentality as the Centre

effectively resists and portrays agency by taking part in these advocacy initiatives. We see here how power works in many directions and is productive, as the state is able to shape the possibilities of the Centre, and the Centre also impacts the actions of the state.

The Centre not only inserts themselves into positions to ask for change, but staff are also requested to sit at a variety of tables to develop new programs and to discuss issues of sexual violence, as has been discussed earlier. Jillian noted the time and effort put in by many Centre staff "in trying to frame or at least have opportunity to have our voice be part of…program expansion." Jillian also commented on the frustration she felt when not invited to the table to share expertise from the Centre:

> It was initially disappointing that that working group, the government working group, actually went out of province first before contacting the local [organizations] to get insight into different program options.

As noted at the beginning of this section in discussion around the development of *Breaking the Silence*, it is extremely frustrating for Centre staff to not have their expertise be heard, as they lose their influence and power if they are not able to share their knowledge. This is a flaw of the state as not seeking out expertise means they are unable to gather crucial information about their citizens. By not listening to experts in the field, the state is unable to effectively understand the problems that their population is facing and therefore cannot safeguard them, as is their role in a neoliberal structure.

The role of the Centre as an independent establishment in the community has also been important to their networking efforts. Kelly shared that because they are community-based and not tied to other organizations or institutions, she feels this has allowed them to "bring together key stake holders" that want to "move things forward." Stephanie also shared this sentiment noting the Centre as a place where people are not afraid to raise issues, making the Centre one of

the first places that people come to discuss community problems and potential action. The independence of the Centre and ability to be a safe space to air concerns is a further benefit of the organization being community-based.

Networking at the Centre is not only about advocacy, but also about organizations that are working in similar fields supporting one another. Jillian discusses this collaboration and support since Parsons' death and as recognition of sexual violence as a problem has been heightened:

> Relationships have been strengthened, new relationships have been formed, and there are more people at the community table now than when we started and I think that that's a measure of more organizations…recognizing that "hey, there's a need, we should meet it, let's work together on this." And I think that that's really meaningful,…recognizing that we provide a lot of support to other organizations as well, and that the more organizations that are existing in our communities [that] are having similar conversions, the better I feel about finding places that are supportive and trauma-informed, that meet the needs of the individual.

Collaboration and networking have been important aspects of the Centre's ability to move their work forward. This has allowed the Centre to advocate to the government for changes in funding and action; they have been able to help develop new programming, although not without its challenges; and they have been able to support other organizations doing or wanting to do work in this field. The result of this has been more and stronger services for those experiencing sexual violence and neoliberal structures being called into question.

This section has provided only a sampling of ways in which the Centre has adapted to fulfill policy and funding demands, while also meeting the needs of the women walking through their doors. Centre staff work hard to have their voices heard and share their expertise early on, in the hopes of proactively influencing policy and program development according to how they

see need in the community; however, this sharing of knowledge is not always successful and sometimes staff do not get the opportunity to share at all. Interviewees repeatedly noted the many benefits to working in a feminist, community-based organization: a holistic approach, ability to adapt to community and individual needs, and social action that can be informed by direct services. The community-based approach is also preferred by those accessing services as we see higher referral uptake, increased use of the Centre from year to year, and women coming to the Centre to air personal and community issues. The Centre facilitates conversations with women on the topics they want to discuss, rather than lecturing or teaching them, and women continue to return to the Centre for the welcoming and safe space that it is; this limited hierarchy between staff and those they serve is part of their feminist model. Finally, networking is an important way, both locally and nationally, that the Centre pushes their agenda forward and is able to support other organizations that are fulfilling survivor needs. The Centre is a multi-faceted, constantly adapting, and community-centred space which continues to work, despite all obstacles, to meet community needs and support survivors of sexual violence.

Chapter 6: Discussion and Conclusion

In her interview, Kelly posed some questions regarding responses to sexual violence: "what do we want to have happen in this province? Who can make that happen? And then how do we empower that to happen?" My research has shed light on how the Centre is reacting to these questions and what actions they are taking. This chapter will reiterate some of my findings as well as consider how my research fits into the previous literature that has been written on this topic. I will conclude with some final thoughts regarding the future of sexual violence response and prevention in Nova Scotia, and the roles of policy as well as local organizations in creating safe and supportive communities.

In answering the question, "how have the Nova Scotia provincial government's policies and priorities, following the death of Rehtaeh Parsons, affected the kind of work that a feminist community-based organization does around sexual violence?," I chose to focus in three areas: (a) government demands, (b) funding limitations, and (c) Centre adaptation. This allowed me to begin with a consideration of what the provincial government was asking for from community-based organizations, and how they were asking for it. It then allowed me to explore what the impacts of this were on the Centre and how they were adapting to meet these demands, while still completing the work they wanted to do in the way they perceived as best for their community. I argued that organizations both work with and resist the government and its policies because following Foucault (1991), organizations work as agents of the government, and as suggested by Mosse (2005), policies are more rhetorical than practical in their ability to guide frontline work. As a result, the Centre must work within the restrictions imposed by the state and its neoliberal structure; however, through their feminist ideals and resilience as an organization,

they continue to push forward their own agenda and effectively support women in their community.

I found the NDP and Liberal Nova Scotian governments to have different strategies for addressing sexual violence, yet there were a number of similarities. I focused on the Liberal's *Breaking the Silence* strategy as this is what is currently in place in the province. This strategy calls upon community-based organizations to help develop and then deliver services to survivors of sexual violence. Support for this work comes mostly in the form of funding, yet this funding does not have a sustainable framework. The rhetoric used in the policy frames the government as compassionate, doing extensive work, and making great strides towards preventing and responding to sexual violence in the province. This is the case to some extent, but there are also many faults in the work and projects that have not been followed through with. While an important step forward, *Breaking the Silence* does more to legitimize and maintain the power of those who wrote it, than it does to guide front-line work.

In my analysis of funding, I discussed how fundamental money is to determining what work can be done at the Centre, and also the many ways that Centre staff are working around these constraints. Core funding (versus grant funding) as well as a lack of funding were points of interest. Centre staff work hard to maintain relationships with many funding entities and also spend significant time looking and applying for funding. The discourse around program aims and activities is important as it can be shifted in ways that demonstrate to different funders that Centre programs are meeting stipulations. Short-term grants and a lack of funding both have led to a series of challenges for the Centre including employee retention, the ability to provide competitive salaries, and sustainability of programs. These challenges are particularly notable as they can result in the instability of services, and when working with individuals who are in crisis

and experiencing trauma, this instability can be extremely harmful. My research illustrated Centre staff working unpaid overtime, doing more than their programs required, and advocating to the government in efforts to combat these challenges.

The final section of my analysis considered ways in which work at the Centre has adapted to the many demands and challenges they are faced with, in ways that allow them to continue their work as they see as most beneficial to their community. Sharing knowledge and expertise at a variety of government and community tables was one way this was done: Centre staff noted having to fight to have their voice always heard, and this fight was something they actively engaged in. The Centre's status as a community-based organization was continuously noted as crucial to the services they provide, and the structure of their work. Benefits of this community-based model include a holistic approach to service provision, the ability to adapt to individual and community needs, as well as having direct services inform social action work. I also explored how networking was used by Centre staff as a way to advocate for systems-change, to influence policy and program development, and to assist and collaborate in local action and services that are supporting women in the community.

My research was consistent with much of what was found in the literature discussed in Chapter 2. My literature review began by noting how responses to sexual violence are context specific; context matters both in regards to geographic location as well as the organization that is providing services (Wies and Haldane 2011). This notion is supported by the extensive comments from interviewees regarding the importance of a community-based model. We also see this in the social action component of work at the Centre which is determined by the needs of

women walking through the doors, which means that what is being addressed is specific to Nova Scotia and the semi-rural context in which they live.

A significant section of my literature review considered the effects of neoliberalism on organizations. First, the literature noted a shift towards professionalism in women's centre contexts, resulting in a division of power as well as increased boundaries between those accessing services and those providing them (Wies 2008, 227; 2009, 466). My research did not reveal much information in this regard, neither supporting nor denying the claim. The scope of my project was limited to the last five years, and changes in professionalization within this time frame did not arise out of the interviews or document review. However, most employees at the Centre do have post-graduate degrees and the detailed statistics being kept suggest a professional work environment (Stephanie, email communication, 2018; Annual Report 2017, 8). Keeping statistics also aligns with assumptions of governmentality and surveillance of a population. While there is alignment with neoliberal structures, I would add that the sense of community at the Centre is in part a result of limited hierarchical interactions, and this aligns with the feminist values of the Centre. Therefore, professionalization is evident; however, by working within a feminist framework, this professionalism is not necessarily noticed by the women accessing services nor do they experience it as a form of control, as staff are not presenting themselves as in positions of authority.

Literature also noted that organizations were increasingly finding that expectations were tied to funding, and there was need to adapt to funder demands (Wies 2008, 228; Ready 2016, 27). Section 5.2 of my analysis went into depth on this topic, providing supporting evidence that this is an effect of neoliberalism that has resulted in significant change to how the Centre functions. Past studies have further illustrated how a neoliberal state results in a focus on service

delivery rather than advocacy in women's organizations (Ready 2016, 89). While my research did not explicitly address this, I did find some evidence of an increased focus on service delivery. Interviewees discussed the advocacy work they did as being additional to their usual work commitments and without supplementary pay. The scope of my research did not provide for a long enough time frame to show how advocacy work may have decreased, but it being discussed as unpaid and additional work does suggest that it is getting harder to prioritize, especially with the lack of funding. What my research did reveal, was a number of grant-funded projects running out of the Centre which are social-change and advocacy based. Many of these programs focus on developing policies that are community-driven. This is an example that contradicts the literature, as these advocacy focused projects were government funded (Annual Report 2013; 2014; 2015; 2016; 2017). Finally, the literature showed neoliberalism to result in decreased funding, leading to unstable programs and jobs (Ready 2016, 87, 99). This is unquestionably supported by what we see at the Centre, particularly with the case of the Specialized Therapeutic Counselling for Survivors of Sexual Violence Trauma program. Additionally, Jillian noted the difficulty in retaining professionals in positions at the Centre, for example nurses with the SANE program, as the community-based model cannot match government salaries, regular wage increases, or benefits. The fact that these positions are filled regardless of their disparate compensation exemplifies the strength of the Centre and their ability to stay resilient regardless of the neoliberal context. This does, however, also suggest a fragility to work at the Centre as these important services are being provided by under-compensated employees.

Another section of my literature review considered how women's organizations have resisted effects of neoliberalism. Tactics discussed included anti-violence coalitions, streamlined services, and maintaining feminist discourse when discussing their work (Wies 2011, 68; Beres

et al. 2009, 152). My research revealed evidence of all these forms of resistance. Significant focus at the Centre is on networking, collaborating, and doing so to build a support system between organizations as well as for advocacy purposes. Through *Breaking the Silence* we in fact see some evidence of the government working to streamline services as they implemented Community Support Networks. Centre staff, however, are heavily involved in supporting the work of this network and leading action that they take, suggesting it is the communities and not the state that are undertaking this work (Annual Report 2017, 34). All interviewees also discussed their work as feminist and noted the Centre to be structured as a feminist organization. This shows not only resistance to neoliberalism, but also resilience of Centre staff and their ability to maintain their feminist principles. It is perhaps their commitment to feminist values that give Centre staff the resilience and strength to continue resisting the neoliberal structures that they must work within.

Moving beyond the literature review, I will comment on my research and what I expected to find using the theoretical framework that I did. At the end of Chapter 3 I discussed the usefulness of Mosse and Foucualt in framing my project and what I expected to see at the Centre, considering both of their theories as well as my understanding of neoliberalism. I proposed that I would find the Centre keeping statistics, compiling regular reports, focusing on service delivery, and working to enable women as individuals. I found all of this to be true. One finding that does not fully align with my expectations is that the Centre is deeply and continually involved in advocacy work rather than only focusing on service delivery and meeting job descriptions. Furthermore, I discovered that in addition to direct services, the government also funds some of these social action projects. My expectation, based on previous literature, was that the Centre would be pushed by the government to primarily provide services aimed at helping women as

individuals rather than as members of a community. The was however was also challenged by my findings. While many of the services at the Centre provide one-on-one assistance to women, the Centre also offers a number of support groups, the focus on holistic healing is often about community and not just the individual, and much of the social change work happening at the Centre is about systemic change rather than individual rights and development.

In Chapter 3 I also put forward suggestions as to what I would not find at the Centre under assumptions of governmentality and neoliberalism. I suggested that I would not see employees engaging in work outside their job description, involved in advocacy, networking with other organizations, or educating clients on justice and tools for resistance. In contrast to my expectations, I found Centre staff participating in all of these activities. While these actions may not be the predominant work happening at the Centre, staff are certainly participating in these efforts. Actions that fit these descriptions were discussed in detail in Section 5.3. I will add that it is not only through educating women individually but also through community programming and events, as well as through advocacy work, that the Centre acts and provides women with tools to act in resistance to the systems that have created the issues that women are facing today. In this way, the Centre must adapt to and function within a neoliberal state, however, they also actively resist these systems from within and commit to their core values of feminism, to serve women in their community, and fight for a more equitable future.

This brings us back to my research goal; a consideration of how the Nova Scotia provincial government's policies and priorities, following the death of Rehtaeh Parsons, affected the kind of work that a feminist community-based organization does around sexual violence. I will reiterate that all conclusions provided are limited by the scope of my project, and all

findings are specific to my case study of the Centre. First, the Nova Scotia government has affected community-based organizations working on the topic of sexual violence by calling on them to develop and deliver services. This has been done through provincial strategies and through funding that comes with certain demands. This downloading of work is consistent with the structure of a neoliberal state. The process through which this happens, however, is not simple, and the Centre does not blindly follow through with government requests. The Centre manages funding to fit their own needs through careful use of rhetoric, the management of relationships, applications for further funding, advocacy for improved funding frameworks, and working unpaid overtime. Beyond funding, Centre staff adapt their work and stay committed to their feminist principles through sharing their knowledge and expertise, demanding to be part of the development of policies and programs, working within a strongly-rooted community-based organization, shifting programming to meet community demands, and networking with a variety of other organizations. Consequently, the Nova Scotian provincial government certainly affects the kind of work that a feminist, community-based organization does regarding sexual violence, but those same community-based organizations tirelessly resist demands they see as not beneficial to their communities, are resilient in their dedication to the feminist movement, and fight to work for a future free of sexual violence, a future developed based on the needs of the people living in their communities.

I will end with some comments from interviewees. Change is happening and resistance is clear, but not enough has been done and there is still far to go. We must support local organizations and their resilience, and trust in the knowledge that our communities hold.

Until there's not one more disclosure of sexualized violence in our university, in our community, in our schools, in our…First Nations communities, in our wherever in this, until there's not one more disclosure we haven't done the work. We haven't done it, we need to do it. (Kelly)

[An article was sent around about] when Bill Clinton was US president and how all these allegations were dismissed and how, you know, some of the feminists at that time kind of pushed them under the rug as well… How do you think about that and then about all this #metoo stuff and [the] current US president? It's like, what has changed, you know? Has anything changed?…I think in the work that I've done because it's been so community-development focused that I have seen changes; on a broader scale I don't know, I don't know. But I think at the community level…there have been changes, I think people care more, hopefully they don't only care more because they have to care more… I think starting from a place where it's an issue anyways, that people [say] "okay this is an issue," whether you really believe it is or whether you have to believe it is…that's maybe a step up from…not everyone agreeing it's an issue. (Stephanie)

And so can Rehtaeh Parsons happen tomorrow? After all of these years of doing this? Rehtaeh Parsons will happen tomorrow, and will happen next year, and will happen the following year. Because we're not addressing the violence in a way that we need to be able to address it. And that's through strengthening the organizations who are in place in the communities, who are talking to the communities, who are working with their communities in order to be able to do it. (Kelly)

Works Cited

Adelman, Madelaine, Hillary Haldane, and Jennifer R. Wies. 2012. "Mobilizing Culture as an Asset." *Violence Against Women* 18, no. 6: 691-700.

Apthorpe, Raymond. 1996. "Reading Development Policy and Policy Analysis: On Framing, Naming, Numbering and Coding." *European Journal of Development Research* 8, no. 1: 16-35.

Barnes, Dayna and Annie Chau. 2014. *Preventing Violence against Women at St. Francis Xavier University Project: Policies and Procedure Guide*.

Beres, Melanie, Barbara Crow, and Lise Gotell. 2009. "The Perils of Institutionalization in Neoliberal Times: Results of a National Survey of Canadian Sexual Assault and Rape Crisis Centres." *Canadian Journal of Sociology* (Online) 34, no. 1: 135-163.

Biggs, Stephen and Sally Smith. 2003. "A Paradox of Learning in Project Cycle Management and the Role of Organizational Culture." *World Development* 31, no. 10:1743–1757.

Branch, Kathryn A., Tara N. Richards, and Elizabeth C. Dretsch. 2013. "An Exploratory Analysis of College Students' Response and Reporting Behavior regarding Intimate Partner Violence Victimization and Perpetration among their Friends." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 28, no. 18: 3386-3399.

Brodie, Janine. 1996. *Women and Canadian Public Policy*. Toronto; Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace & Co.

Buss, Doris E. 2009. "Rethinking 'Rape as a Weapon of War.'" *Feminist Legal Studies* 17, no. 2: 145-163.

The Canadian Press. 2013. "Sex Violence Victim Groups will be Helped, Liberals Vow: Stephen McNeil commits to providing multi-year funding for frontline groups." *CBC News*, September 19. Accessed May 1 2017. http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/nova-scotia/sex-violence-victim-groups-will-be-helped-liberals-vow-1.1860872

The Centre. 2013-2017. *Annual Report*.

DeBreuil, Brian. 2013. "News Beyond the Headlines: Social Media Demands Justice for Rehtaeh." *CBC News*, April 10. Accessed May 1 2017. http://www.cbc.ca/ns/beyondtheheadlines/2013/04/social-media-demands-justice-for-rehtaeh.html

Farwell, Nancy. 2004. "War Rape: New Conceptualizations and Responses." *AFFILIA* 19, no. 4: 389-403.

Ferguson, James, and Akhil Gupta. 2002. "Spatializing States: Toward an Ethnography of Neoliberal Governmentality." *American Ethnologist* 29, no. 2: 981-1002.

Foucault, Michel. 1991. "Governmentality." In *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality,* edited by Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon, and Peter Miller, 87-104. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Grace. 2017. Personal interview by Alison Armstrong.

Harriman, Nicholas. 2016. "Foucault & Governmentality." *YouTube*. Published September 7, 2016. Accessed October 11, 2017. Video, 33:23. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KWTXVPHc7dU

Harvey, David. 2008. *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Howes, Mick. 1992. "Linking Paradigms and Practice: Key Issues in the Appraisal, Monitoring and Evaluation of British NGO Projects." *Journal of International Development* 4, no. 4: 375-396.

Jessop, Bob. 2002. "Liberalism, Neoliberalism, and Urban Governance: A State-Theoretical Perspective." *Antipode* 34, no. 3: 452-472.

Jillian. 2017. Personal interview by Alison Armstrong.

Kelly. 2017. Personal interview by Alison Armstrong.

Kingfisher, Catherine. 2016. "Studying Gender and Neoliberalism Transnationally: Implications for Theory and Action." In *Mapping Feminist Anthropology in the Twenty-First Century,* edited by Ellen Lewin and Leni M. Silverstein, 256-275. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.

Kirby, Paul. 2012. "How is Rape a Weapon of War? Feminist International Relations, Modes of Critical Explanation and the Study of Wartime Sexual Violence." *European Journal of International Relations* 19, no. 4: 797–821.

Knight, Melanie and Kathleen Rodgers. 2012. "'The Government Is Operationalizing Neo-liberalism': Women's Organizations, Status of Women Canada, and the Struggle for Progressive Social Change in Canada." *NORA - Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research* 20, no. 4: 266-282.

Lau, Andree. 2012. "Amanda Todd: Bullied Teen Commits Suicide." *The Huffington Post B.C.,* November 10. Accessed March 22, 2018. http://www.huffingtonpost.ca/2012/10/11/amanda-todd-teen-bullying-suicide-youtube_n_1959668.html?utm_hp_ref=canada-british-columbia

Lichty, Lauren F., Rebecca Campbell, and Jayne Schuiteman. 2008. "Developing a University-Wide Institutional Response to Sexual Assault and Relationship Violence." *Journal of Prevention & Intervention in the Community* 36, no. 1-2: 5-22.

MacDonald, Aimee. 2015. *ACUDS: StFX Common Dataset: Updated: October 31, 2015*. Antigonish, NS. http://sites.stfx.ca/institutional_analysis/sites/sites.stfx.ca.institutional_analysis/files/StFX%202015%20ACUDS.pdf

Macleod, Catorina, and Kevin Durrheim. 2002. "Foucauldian Feminism: The Implications of Governmentality." *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* 32, no. 1:41-60.

Mosse, David. 2005. *Cultivating Development: An Ethnography of Aid Policy and Practice.* New York: Pluto Press.

Oksala, Johanna. 2013. "Feminism and Neoliberal Governmentality." *Foucault Studies,* no. 16: 32-53.

Pepler, Debra, and Penny Milton. 2013. *External Review of the Halifax Regional School Board's Support of Rehtaeh Parsons: Final Report*, edited by Penny Milton. Department of Education, issuing body and Canadian Electronic Library (Firm), Halifax: Nova Scotia Department of Education.

Province of Nova Scotia. 2013. *Action Team on Sexual Violence and Bullying: Progress Report and Transition Plan.*

Province of Nova Scotia. 2015. *Breaking the Silence: A Coordinated Response to Sexual Violence in Nova Scotia*.

Province of Nova Scotia. 2016. *Breaking the Silence: A Coordinated Response to Sexual Violence in Nova Scotia — Progress Report: Year 2 (June 2015-May 2016)*.

Province of Nova Scotia. 2017. *Breaking the Silence: A Coordinated Response to Sexual Violence in Nova Scotia — Progress Report: Year 3 (June 2016-May 2017)*.

Ready, Casey. 2016. *Shelter in a Storm: Revitalizing Feminism in Neoliberal Ontario*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Rehtaeh Parsons Society. 2014. "About Rehtaeh." Accessed April 8 2017. http://rehtaehparsons.ca/

Rodgers, Kathleen and Melanie Knight. 2011. "'You Just Felt the Collective Wind Being Knocked out of us': The Deinstitutionalization of Feminism and the Survival of Women's Organizing in Canada." *Women's Studies International Forum* 34: 570-581.

Rottenberg, Catherine. 2017. "Neoliberal Feminism and the Future of Human Capital." *Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 42, no. 2: 329-348.

Ruskin, Brett. 2015. “Court Strikes Down Anti-Cyberbullying Law Created After Rehtaeh Parsons’ Death.” *CBC News,* December 11. Accessed January 31 2018. http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/nova-scotia/cyberbullying-law-struck-down-1.3360612

Saint Mary’s University President’s Council. 2013. *Promoting a Culture of Safety, Respect and Consent at Saint Mary’s University and Beyond: Report from the President’s Council*. December 15, 2013. Halifax: Saint Mary’s University.

Segal, Murray D. 2015. *Independent Review of the Police and Prosecution Response to the Rehtaeh Parsons Case.* Halifax: Government of Nova Scotia.

Stephanie. 2017. Personal interview by Alison Armstrong.

Stephanie. 2018. Personal email communication with Alison Armstrong.

Task Force on Misogyny, Sexism and Homophobia in Dalhousie University Faculty of Dentistry. 2015. *Report of the Task Force on Misogyny, Sexism and Homophobia in Dalhousie University Faculty of Dentistry*. June 26, 2015. Halifax: Dalhousie University.

Wies, Jennifer R. 2009. "Boundaries in Carework: A Case Study of Domestic Violence Shelter Advocates in the USA." *Global Public Health* 4, no. 5: 464-476.

Wies, Jennifer R. 2008. "Professionalizing Human Services: A Case of Domestic Violence Shelter Advocates." *Human Organization* 67, no. 2: 221-233.

Wies, Jennifer R. 2011. "Anti- Domestic Violence Coalition Practice: Theorizing Collaboration and Participation." *Annals of Anthropological Practice* 35, no. 2: 66-78.

Wies, Jennifer R. and Hillary J. Haldane, eds. 2011. *Anthropology at the Front Lines of Gender-Based Violence*. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press.

Appendix I: Invitation to Participate

Title of research: Sexual Violence in Nova Scotia: An Anthropological Study of the Impact of Shifting Government Policies and Priorities on a Community-Based Organization
Name of researcher: Alison Armstrong, StFX Department of Anthropology, Undergraduate Honours student

Invitation to participate:
I, Alison Armstrong, would like to invite you, [name of participant], to participate in an anthropological research study on the shifts in government policy regarding sexual violence in Nova Scotia, and how this has impacted the front-line work of community-based organizations. After reading the following document, please show your agreement to participate by signing this invitation and the attached Consent Form.

Description of the research:
The question guiding this research study is, "how has the Nova Scotian provincial government's shifting policies and priorities, following the Rehtaeh Parsons case, affected the kind of work that a feminist community-based organization does around sexual violence?" The study will follow the provincial policy stream that addresses sexual violence, and specifically look at the shifts in policy and priorities that have happened in reaction to the case of Rehtaeh Parsons, a Nova Scotian teenager and victim of sexual assault who committed suicide in 2013. Further, this research aims to understand how these policies impact on the work of community-based organizations. The research will investigate how successive provincial governments have called upon community-based organizations to develop and deliver prevention and response services and programs for survivors of sexual violence without providing them with adequate or sustainable funding, and the impact this has had on front-line practice. While the goal of the project is to gain an in-depth understanding of how organizations are affected by shifting government policies in general, the research will be focusing on one organization: [the Centre]. This study is being done as part of the requirements for the completion of an undergraduate Honours degree in anthropology at St. Francis Xavier University.

What will be required of participants, including time commitment:
You have been identified as a key informant relevant to my research based on your knowledge of the historical trajectory of sexual violence policies in Nova Scotia and also based on your work experience in this field. Your participation in this research will be through a semi-structured interview which will be recorded. Interview questions will ask you to draw on your personal knowledge and experience. The interview is expected to last about one hour. You may be asked for a second interview to clarify or expand on points in the first interview. This second interview would be about 30 minutes.

Participation is voluntary; right to withdraw without negative consequences:
Participation in this research is voluntary and no consequences will result from refusal to participate. The decision to participate is not binding, and participants may choose to withdraw from the study at any point during the interview. A participant who wishes to withdraw from the study can simply tell the researcher. Participants have the right for recording to be stopped at any time upon request. Participants have the right to refuse to answer any question; this will not

result in the termination of the participant's involvement in the research study. Once part of or a full interview has been given, the researcher will retain that information with the consent of the participant.

Potential benefits and potential harms:
The Honours thesis that will be the result of this research will benefit organizations addressing sexual violence in Nova Scotia, including the Centre, by providing a concise overview of literature and tracing shifts in provincial policy with regards to sexual violence and the responses to these policies by community-based organizations over the past four years. As a participant, you will receive no direct benefit. There are no known harms associated with participation in this study; however, there may be harms that we do not yet know about.

Confidentiality:
Confidentiality is important in this study. Participants must understand that most key informants are connected to [the Centre] or have knowledge about policy and practice in handling sexual violence. This is a small community, but the researcher will make efforts to ensure confidentiality when writing her thesis by using pseudonyms and not describing the participant's relationship to the Centre. In cases where this information will be difficult to hide, the researcher will ask the participant whether they will allow their name and job title to be used. In other words, pseudonyms will be used for all participants, unless they state in writing that their identity may be revealed. All notes, digital recordings, and transcriptions will be kept in a password-secured file to which only the researcher and her two research supervisors will have access. Transcribed interviews will not be identified with participants' names, but rather with their pseudonym.

Release of data:
Signing this document gives permission for release of the data to the public domain within the confidentiality guidelines outlined above, including use of the data in the Honours thesis and presentations related to the Honours thesis (Honours thesis presentation and presentation at the StFX Student Research Day). This data may also be used by the researcher and her academic advisors when writing academic presentations and publications.

Miscellaneous:
Data will be kept for two years (until May 2020) following the completion of the study for future related academic projects.

Appendix II: Consent Form

I have received an Invitation to Participate for the research project titled "Sexual Violence in Nova Scotia: An Anthropological Study of the Impact of Shifting Government Policies and Priorities on a Community-Based Organization." I have had to opportunity to read this information provided and all questions I had about the study have been answered.

I agree to participate in this research study. I understand that I am doing so voluntarily and confidentiality will be maintained. I understand that I have the right to withdraw from the study at any point without negative consequences, and this can be done using the means outlined in the Invitation to Participate.

Please initial here _____ if you wish to have your name associated with the information you provide. Without an initial, a pseudonym will be used.

Signature of participant: _____, Date: _____

Appendix III: Interview Guide

1) General information
   a) Please state your name and job title at the Centre
   b) What background in the topic and/or education did you have before coming to the Centre?
   c) How long have you been working at the Centre?
   d) What projects and work have you been involved with during your time at the Centre?
2) Centre information
   a) What would you say are the primary roles of the Centre? How do you see your job fitting into this?
      i) Have you seen these roles of the Centre change over time? If so, how?
      ii) If education is noted as a role – ask participant to expand on what they are educating on.
   b) Who do you believe sets the goals of the Centre and impacts what work is done/not done?
   c) How is the work you are doing at the Centre funded?
      i) Are you in connection/communication with [funder(s) stated]? If so, in what ways?
      ii) How do you feel that your priorities and the priorities of [funder(s) stated] align?
   d) Do you do any work outside of your job description? What is it, and why is it not part of your job description?
   e) How do you record and keep track of the work you are doing? What are these records used for?
   f) Are you connected with other people in the field outside of the centre? If so, how do you work together and with what purpose? Ask about any networks
3) Rehtaeh Parsons (RP)
   a) What do you know of the RP case? What do you remember of the government's response?
   b) Do you remember any changes that took place at the Centre as a response to the RP case?
   c) Do you feel that RPs death impacted the work that you have done at the Centre since?
4) Provincial government policies
   a) What provincial government policies and practices do you know of that are currently in place to address sexual violence in our province?
      i) Which of these policies, that you know of, have affected work at the Centre? How?
      ii) Have any of these policies specifically impacted the work that you do? How?
   b) Do you remember any specific times when sexual violence policies were changed or new ones were implemented by the provincial government?
      i) Did this impact any work at the Centre? Changes to old programs or implementation of new ones?
      ii) How did you respond to these changes in provincial policies? How did those around you respond?
      iii) Have you or others at the centre tried to resist these policy changes in any way? How?
   c) How is the provincial government helpful in the work that you are doing? How is it hindering your work?
   d) In what ways do your personal priorities in your work align and/or not align with the priorities of the government?
   e) In what ways would you say the Centre is most directly impacted by the government?

5) Conclusion
   a) Do you have anything else you would like to say on any of the topics we have discussed or the work you do in general?