

**Marks you cannot erase: Exploring the impacts of false positive ion scanner hits on families  
of Canadian prisoners**

by

Kaitlin MacKenzie

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Sociology

Carleton University  
Ottawa, Ontario

© 2017  
Kaitlin MacKenzie

## **Acknowledgements**

I would first like to thank my supervisor Aaron Doyle for providing me with ongoing support, and for offering me the opportunity to work on a project that I feel so strongly about.

Thank you to Justin Piché for introducing me to the MOMS group, and for going above and beyond to help me throughout this project.

Thank you to all of my family and friends for your unrelenting encouragement over these past couple of years.

Most of all, thank you to each and every person who shared their stories with me; your voices have helped shine a light on an ongoing injustice in this country.

Last but not least, thank you to the Advocacy MOMS; this project would not have been possible without you. Your generosity and commitment to social change are inspiring.

## Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	i
Table of Contents.....	ii
Abstract.....	iii
Chapter 1: Introducing the research and chapter overview .....	1
Chapter 2: A review of the literature and an investigation of the ion scanner in Canada and the United States .....	6
Chapter 3: Theorizing the research.....	31
Chapter 4: Research methodology and process .....	41
Chapter 5: Detailed findings and discussion.....	56
Chapter 6: The impacts of bringing public criminology into a university classroom .....	87
Chapter 7: Discussions, concluding thoughts, and moving forward .....	101
References.....	109
Appendices.....	127

## **Abstract**

This study explores the experiences of individuals who visit their loved ones in federal prisons in Canada, with a specific focus on the impacts of a drug-detection technology called the ion scanner, used to scan visitors to prisons for drugs. This machine is faulty, producing frequent false positives, and it negatively impacts the lives of prisoners and their families in various ways. For this research, I conducted open-focused interviews with eight individuals who have experienced false positive indications on the ion scanner upon visiting their loved ones behind bars. I argue that the ion scanner is a risk technology that is used to further stigmatize and in effect punish the families of prisoners. The ion scanner is a risk technology that is presented as objective and bias-free but the way it is used is shaped by hidden moral judgments about the individuals visiting their incarcerated loved ones. This research is a contribution to the literature on the collateral consequences of incarceration, adding to our knowledge of the pains of visitation. This research also contributes to literature on the uses and impacts of risk and surveillance technologies on families in carceral settings and more generally.

## **Chapter 1: Introducing the research and chapter overview**

We are living in a time that is characterized by constant change and unpredictability; Bauman (2000) refers to this present state as an era of “liquid modernity”. Ongoing developments in the realm of science and technology are a key characteristic of liquid modernity, as there are constant “improvements” being made in this field, never seeming to reach a final state (Bauman, 2000). There is little doubt that the rapid expansion of technological innovation has brought about significant positive impacts on various facets of society; the most obvious examples might be found in the fields of medicine, transport, and telecommunications. Developments in science and technology have allowed for human beings to live longer, to reach each other faster, and to communicate with one another with greater ease. That being said, technological advancements should not be conflated with improvements. There have been various, and often subtle, technological changes that have had detrimental impacts on certain populations. The rise of technology has opened the doors for the ascendancy of heightened risk management, in what Beck (1992) refers to as the “risk society” that characterizes modernity. The idea has become pervasive that all risks can be calculated and predicted, and that technology can be used to counter these risks, thus preventing harms to society. The quantification of risk has allowed for the development and implementation of prevention tools, coined “risk technologies” by Beck (1992), which are often declared to be free of bias; yet, in reality the technologies and how they are used in practice can serve to disempower and marginalize certain social groups. These technologies are often justified through the discourse of science, providing an impression of pure objectivity, which serves to veil the social and biased elements of surveillance and risk technologies and how they are employed in practice (Doyle, 2007).

This research focuses on one population in particular: families and loved ones of prisoners, in a Canadian context. This population is negatively affected by one piece of technology used to scan visitors to prisons, in an effort to detect and prevent drugs coming into prisons. This technological “innovation” is called the Ion Mobility Spectrometry device, commonly referred to as the ion scanner. This device can be found in airports, and is primarily used there to detect traces of explosives, but the focus of this research will be on the use of the ion scanner in carceral settings, specifically in Canadian federal prisons. The key empirical research questions explored throughout this project are: how does the Ion Mobility Spectrometry drug-detection system used in Canadian federal penitentiaries impact the loved ones of prisoners upon visitation, and how does it impact the lives of the prisoners? As I will discuss, the ion scanner is a useful example through which to explore the use of risk-management technologies more generally.

To explore these research questions, I conducted eight in-depth interviews with loved ones of prisoners who have experienced a false positive indication on the ion scanner upon one or more of their visits. I spoke with three mothers, three romantic partners, one father, and one sister who have loved ones behind bars in various Canadian prisons across the country. The participants are located throughout several provinces in Canada, and the interviews were conducted in person, over the telephone, and over Skype, an online video messaging program.

This research contributes to the literature on the collateral consequences of incarceration, particularly in Canada, and it can speak to American developments in this area as well, since the ion scanner is similarly implemented in the United States’ prisons. This research is unique because it is the first study in Canada to focus solely on the ion scanner and to investigate the impacts of false positive indications. This research contributes to work that problematizes the use

of this device, as it reveals the widespread negative consequences that the scanner creates, with little indication of any positive impact. Studying the impacts on the loved ones of prisoners, this risk technology provides an important example, because, as I will discuss, this is clearly a marginalized and stigmatized population subject to “guilt by association”. As such, they provide a revealing example through which to study the uses of impacts of this risk technology.

The underlying theoretical work in which this study is based is twofold: 1) studies of surveillance, science and technology and the impacts that technology has on social interaction; and 2) work on the notion of the risk society, posited by Beck (1992) in an effort to make sense of the presence of the ion scanner in a time fraught with risk aversion. As I will discuss, another key concept is stigma; much of the existing research on prisoners’ families emphasizes stigmatic experiences as examined by Goffman (1963) and built upon by scholars in more recent times.

Chapter 2 provides a review of the existing literature on the collateral consequences of incarceration for loved ones of prisoners. I zero in on experiences of the visitation process in prisons and the impacts that these experiences have. While there have been few studies to focus on the impacts of the ion scanner, some notable work in this area, such as by Hannem (2008), is discussed in this chapter. Using media sources dating back to 1995, I also make an attempt in this chapter to trace the history and presence of the ion scanner in both Canadian and American carceral institutions. I draw on sources such as newspaper articles, blogs, and lawsuits, to produce a timeline highlighting problematic developments; these begin to demonstrate the widespread harms that it can have behind bars.

In Chapter 3, the theoretical underpinnings of this research are explored. First, the theoretical frameworks used in similar studies are explained; these often rely on Goffman’s (1963) notion of stigma. This is followed by a discussion of the conceptual tools I incorporated

into this particular research project from science and technology, surveillance, and risk studies. Finally, this chapter explains why this research is important, and how it serves to fill certain gaps within criminological literature.

Chapter 4 reviews the methodology for this research project, starting by discussing several methodological considerations. The in-depth interview process and justifications for this method are examined, along with the sampling technique used. I present an overview of the participants. A secondary research method used was participant observation, involving my experience as a team leader in a course at Carleton University entitled Community Engaged Sociology, in which a team of students I led was working to reform the reliance on ion scanners in Canadian prisons. I also discuss the data analysis approach and considerations regarding leaving the research field in which I was situated.

Chapter 5 reveals the detailed findings of this research project, organized into five themes: preparing for a visit to federal prison, interactions between loved ones and staff, inconsistency and unpredictability associated with the use of the ion scanner, sanctions received by loved ones and the associated deterrent effect with respect to prison visits, the short and long-term emotional and psychological harms experienced by both loved ones and prisoners due to the ion scanner, and the resilience and resistance tactics employed by loved ones. Throughout this review of the findings there is discussion regarding how they contribute to the literature on stigma, on risk, and on science and technology studies.

Chapter 6 involves a discussion about public criminology. I draw upon the work of various scholars such as Ruggiero (2012), Piché, Gaucher and Walby (2014), among others, to provide a definition of public criminology that I believe can be effective. I use my experience as a Team Leader for Carleton's Community Engaged Sociology course to provide a recent

example of public criminology in action. This experience demonstrates an impactful way to engage students in sociologically and criminologically-related advocacy and community engagement.

Chapter 7 concludes the research by reiterating key findings and engaging in concluding discussions, reviewing the most unexpected findings, and presenting considerations for the future of research as it relates to the collateral consequences of incarceration.

I would like to preface this thesis with a quote from Stacey Hannem, who is, to my knowledge, the first criminologist to study the ion scanner as it relates to families of prisoners. At the 2016 Crime, Risk and Technology conference at Wilfrid Laurier University, Hannem (2016) spoke about her forthcoming paper on the ion scanner:

The ion scan technology persists despite its obvious flaws, as a means of providing a pseudo-scientific justification for what are essentially arbitrary decisions about risks to security, based on spurious courtesy stigmas, which assume that anyone associated with a convicted person is themselves more likely to be a criminal. While CSC claims to be using the ion scan to keep drugs out of prisons, the efficacy of this technology as it's currently being used is *questionable at best*. Fifteen years after its introduction, drugs are still readily available in Canadian prisons.

I move in the next chapter to examining previous literature on the collateral consequences of imprisonment, then to a history of the ion scanner's use in penal institutions.

## **Chapter 2: A review of the literature and an investigation of the ion scanner in Canada and the United States**

This chapter provides the academic and factual background to my study. It begins with a detailed overview of the current existing literature on the collateral consequences of incarceration, particularly as they relate to loved ones who are mothers, siblings, and romantic partners of the prisoners. I start by defining the term “collateral consequences of incarceration” as it relates to this research, then I provide an overview of studies that have been done in this area. The narrower focus of this literature review is on the visitation process, and the various harms that emerge from this experience; issues surrounding financial harm, stigmatizing encounters, psychological and emotional distress, and a heightened distrust in the criminal justice system are explored. I then move to an introductory discussion of the ion scanner as it relates to Correctional Service Canada’s searching policies. This is followed by a review of media stories and other available documentation in order to develop a brief history of the role and use of the ion scanner in both Canadian and American prisons since its implementation in the 1990’s.

### Overview of pertinent literature

#### *Collateral consequences of incarceration defined*

The terminology “collateral consequences of incarceration” can broadly refer to the pains experienced by individuals, which go beyond a lawfully prescribed criminal sanction. This definition is quite expansive and it is important to refine for this research. Travis (in Mauer & Chesney-Lind, 2002) refers to the invisible punishments experienced by prisoners as “the punishment that is accomplished through the diminution of the rights and privileges of citizenship and legal residency” (p. 15). Here, Travis (2002) is referring to community corrections, parole, probation, and other ways in which the criminal justice system subtly seeps into the lives of individuals, often in unexpected but harmful ways. While this terminology

accurately reflects the relatively invisible broad and diverse impacts criminalization of those involved in the criminal justice system, it does not explicitly refer to the further impacts on those additional people harmed because they have close ties with the criminalized person, even though these additional people, such as family members or romantic partners of the criminalized, have not themselves been accused of a crime or legally sentenced.

In a 1978 study, Bakker, Morris, and Janus were the first researchers to use the term “invisible victims” to describe the families of prisoners. However, their research referred only to children and partners of prisoners; parents and siblings of prisoners were not considered in their work. In recent decades, researchers have begun to use the term “invisible” or “hidden” populations (Coulthard, 2010; Cunningham & Baker, 2004) more commonly as more and more research is being done with these groups. When discussing the impacts of incarceration on prisoners’ children, Hagan and Dinovitzer (1999) refer to collateral consequences as instances wherein the social and human capital of prisoners, their loved ones and their communities are impaired (122).

Unlike much of the literature that deals with the collateral consequences of incarceration (Bakker, Morris & Janus, 1978; Light & Campbell, 2007; Matthews, 1983), I am steering away from framing the families of prisoners as victims. Criminologist Stacey Hannem raises important considerations regarding the use of language when referring to this particular population. Perpetuating the victim rhetoric can be problematic, and can serve to further marginalize, stigmatize, and disempower this group, in turn making it more difficult to achieve effective support through social policy and funding opportunities (Hannem, 2017). For the purposes of this research, merging the terminology used in previous research, the term “collateral consequences of incarceration” will hereafter refer to the “collection of costs” (Hagan &

Dinovitzer, 1999: 122), consisting of detrimental mental, emotional, and physical impacts which are indirectly caused by imprisonment; these consequences are experienced by the loved ones of prisoners, notably mothers, fathers, siblings, children, romantic partners, and dear friends, but they can also reverberate back into the lives of the prisoners themselves.

### *Existing research on families of prisoners*

Despite the extensive body of research concerning the effects of incarceration and the impacts of prisons on societies, research on how these institutions impact the lives of families and loved ones of prisoners has been relatively limited, especially in Canada (Hannem, 2008: 5). Studies exploring the effects of incarceration on the families of prisoners date back to the early twentieth century, with these studies taking place in the United States and Australia (Hannem, 2011; see Bloodgood, 1928; Sacks, 1938; Blackwell, 1959; Zalba, 1964; Anderson, 1965; Schneller, 1975). More recently, there has been ample research focusing specifically on children of prisoners, and how parental incarceration contributes to short and long-term impacts on various facets of their lives financially, socially, and emotionally (see Arditti, 2012; Poehlmann, 2005; Wakefield & Wildeman, 2014; Foster & Hagan, 2007; Geller, Garfinkel & Western, 2011; Turney, 2014; Murray, Bijleveld, Farrington & Loeber, 2014; Murray & Farrington, 2008; Nesmith & Ruhland, 2008; Dallaire, 2007; Huebner & Gustafson, 2007). While revealing important collateral impacts, these studies are not directly relevant to my project.

A key large-scale study on the families of prisoners was conducted in the United Kingdom by Pauline Morris in 1965. It was the first national study of its kind; using qualitative research methods, Morris (1965) conducted in-depth interviews and a 120-point questionnaire with 100 families of prisoners, 177 civil prisoners, 330 recidivist prisoners, and 330 first-time prisoners. Civil prisoners are defined as “prisoners committed or attached for contempt of court,

or failing to do or abstain from doing anything required to be done or left undone” (HM Prison Service, 2003: section 3.1). While the study states it is focused on the families of prisoners, this translates specifically to wives of prisoners. Morris (1965) found that wives of prisoners encountered various barriers to visiting their loved ones, due to the remote locations of the penitentiaries and their considerable geographical distances from major cities, the high costs associated with the visitation process, as well as the emotional and practical struggles of bringing their children along. While this study was conducted nearly half a century ago, the situation seems to remain largely unchanged today, as will be discussed.

A relatively recent large-scale research project on the effects of incarceration on families of prisoners, also in the United Kingdom, has been conducted by Rachel Condry in 2007. Condry’s (2007) participants were members of *Aftermath*, a self-help group for families of serious offenders. For this study, 32 in-depth interviews were conducted with family members of serious offenders; these participants were prisoners’ mothers, spouses, intimate partners, brothers, grandchildren, and nephews; the variety of interview participants effectively represented the entirety of the family unit.

Even more recently, Stacey Hannem’s (2008) doctoral research explored the collateral consequences of incarceration in a Canadian context in a large-scale research project. Hannem (2008) conducted in-depth interviews with wives, parents, children, and siblings of prisoners, for a total sample size of 28. Hannem’s (2008) research explores the effects that incarceration has on families of male prisoners, with a specific focus on stigmatizing and gendered experiences. This study found that families of prisoners experience stigmatization and isolation from their fellow community members as a direct result of being associated with criminalized men.

While these three large-scale studies took place over a significant period of time and spanned different countries, the emotional and financial impacts on family members remain generally consistent. While there have been other studies done in this area, the aforementioned three are the largest and most relevant to the exploration of the collateral consequences of prisoners' families. Further, while there are numerous negative impacts experienced by families of prisoners at each stage of the penal process, the remainder of the literature reviewed will be focused in particular on the visitation process itself.

*Visitation barrier: Financial burden*

Existing research collectively reveals that the visitation process in prison serves to create extreme difficulties and anxiety for family members visiting their loved ones behind bars. Visiting an incarcerated loved one can be a burden on families, partly as the cost of regularly travelling to visit the institution is considerable for numerous families not located in close proximity to where their loved ones are imprisoned (Bruynson, 2011; Hannem & Leonardi, 2015; Chui, 2009; Comfort, 2002, 2003; Condry, 2007; Morris 1965; Brooks-Gordon & Bainham, 2004; Dixey & Woodall, 2012; Christian, Mellow & Thomas, 2006; Murray et al., 2014; Grinstead, Faigeles, Bancroft & Zack, 2001). These findings are based on research conducted in China, the United Kingdom, the United States, and Canada, yet the conclusions remain consistent across countries: maintaining regular face-to-face contact with imprisoned loved ones can, and often does, create financial strains on families. In some cases, it was found that mothers of prisoners who were on low income would forgo basic necessities such as eating on visit days, in order to provide their sons with canteen food upon visitation (Condry, 2007: 56).

In Canada, federal penitentiaries are geographically dispersed across the expansive country (CSC, 2016a). For example: Grande Cache Institution in Alberta is over four hours away

from the nearest major city of Edmonton. These institutions often tend to be located in remote areas, which contributes to the complete removal of prisoners from society's gaze. In addition to this, it creates significant financial burdens for families and loved ones to visit. Hannem's (2008; 2011) research in Canada concludes that many romantic partners of prisoners tend to incur significant financial burdens when their loved ones are incarcerated, due to the loss of a supportive income, since they used to be dependent on this to live. Hannem and Leonardi's (2014) recent contribution to the literature surveyed 140 Canadian respondents, including both closed and open-ended questions. They found that parents of prisoners suffer some of the same financial burdens that romantic partners do, and discovered that many parents of prisoners "were on fixed incomes and found these kinds of additional expenses to be significant hardships" (Hannem & Leonardi, 2014: 23).

The cost of communicating via telephone is also significant. Many prisons only allow collect calls from prisoners to loved ones on the outside, and the cost of these calls can add up quickly. Literature exploring families' experiences of maintaining telephone communication with loved ones behind bars has found that these costs are often overwhelming for families (Braman, 2002; Hairston, 1998; Christian, Mellow & Thomas, 2006; Comfort, 2008; Murray et al., 2014; Grinstead, Faigeles, Bancroft & Zack, 2001).

#### *Visitation barrier: Stigmatizing interactions*

Drawing on the work of Clemmer (1940) and Sykes (1958), more recent literature has referred to the imprisonment of a loved one to be a type of "secondary prisonization" for women in particular, whereby their status of being a family member of a prisoner becomes their master status, and these individuals are often subject to the "pains of imprisonment" that occur beyond

the prison walls (Comfort, 2003: 471; Codd, 2008). Sykes (1958) explores the various pains of imprisonment by categorizing them into groups of deprivation; these include the deprivation of liberty, goods and services, autonomy, heterosexual relationships, and security. Sykes' (1958) notable contribution to the prison literature is built on in the work of Comfort (2003). Comfort (2003) draws on women's experiences visiting their loved ones at San Quentin, one of California's state prisons. Comfort (2003) analyzes all aspects of visitation: the architecture of the waiting rooms, the lengthy wait times, and the treatment of visitors by prison staff. Her findings suggest that the inability to understand or contest the prison regulations that are in place serve as a deprivation of autonomy. Further, the lack of amenities in the waiting areas as well as the lack of guidelines provided to loved ones of prisoners serves as a deprivation of goods and services (Comfort, 2003). In a study exploring the experience of women who visit their loved ones in Canadian prisons, Bruynson (2011) found that women often feel as though they are being criminalized when they go for a visit, due to the harsh and unwarranted treatment by penitentiary staff (51).

For the loved ones of prisoners, stigma is commonly felt throughout all stages of the penal process, from the arrest of a loved one all the way to the prisoner's re-entry back into the community post-incarceration (Hannem & Leonardi, 2015; Arditti, 2012; Braman, 2002; 2004; Condry, Foster & Hagan, 2007; Grinstead, Faigeles, Bancroft & Zack, 2001; Green, Ensminger, Robertson & Juon, 2006; Hagan & Dinovitzer, 1999; Huebner & Gustafson, 2007; Moerings, 1992; May, 2000; Moroney, 2008; Travis, McBride & Solomon, 2003; Western & Wildeman, 2009; McCuaig, 2007). There is also research to support the notion that the visitation process by a loved one can be particularly stigmatizing (Watson, 2014; Hannem 2008; Codd, 2008). All of

these experiences contribute to an experience that Stacey Hannem (2008) refers to as “sticky stigma”.

In Goffman’s (1963) seminal text *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity*, the term “courtesy stigma” is used to categorize stigma placed upon those who are socially related, in one way or another, to a stigmatized individual. These individuals “are all obliged to share some of the discredit of the stigmatized person to whom they are related” (Goffman, 1963: 30). Families of prisoners are thus prone to experience courtesy stigma. Courtesy stigma is not explored in great depth by Goffman, nor is it situated in relation to the three types of stigma initially proposed by Goffman: abominations of the body, blemishes of individual character, and tribal stigma (Goffman, 1963: 4). Hannem’s (2008) in-depth exploration of Goffman’s courtesy stigma led to her adoption of term I find more appropriate for this research: “sticky stigma”. Drawing on Goffman’s (1963) work, Hannem (2008) explores the notion of stigma among families of prisoners, and particularly the gendered nature of this stigmatization. Her research and that of others points to the notion that women are more likely than men to be affected by transferable stigma due to their relationship to the stigmatized individual (Gray, 2002; Hannem, 2008; Kampf, 2008; Smith, Mysak & Michael, 2008; Hannem 2011). Hannem (2011) argues that this tendency to stigmatize women more frequently than men stems from patriarchal notions which link women’s identities to their ability to be a good mother or marriage partner (190). Both mothers and romantic partners experience this sticky stigma in different ways. The romantic partner of an incarcerated individual is particularly stigmatized due to the idea that this person chooses to support their partner, as opposed to feeling obligated through blood ties (Hannem, 2011). Conversely, mothers of prisoners are often believed to be partially responsible for their child’s criminal act, as they are perceived to be responsible for the proper upbringing of

a law-abiding citizen (Hannem, 2008, 2011; Condry, 2007). While Hannem (2011) uses the terminology of “transferred stigma” or “sticky stigma”, and Condry (2007) utilizes the term “secondary stigma”, they both refer to the stigma of prisoners’ families as a contagion-like phenomenon wherein the individual’s stigmatization is an extension of the stigma faced by their loved one. Further, Condry’s (2007) research found that these individuals acquire a new status as “a ‘mother of a murderer’ or ‘wife of a sex offender’ and the blame this new status attracts” (Condry, 2007: p. 62).

In *Stigma Revisited*, Hannem (2012) discusses the particular stigmatic encounters that loved ones of prisoners face when dealing with the drug detection device commonly referred to as the ion scanner in Canadian federal prisons, the encounters that are the focus of this thesis. Hannem found that this drug-screening device is heavily critiqued by loved ones of prisoners, largely due to the inconsistency of the machine. In Hannem’s (2012) research, wives of prisoners indicated that being scanned positive on the ion scanner commonly resulted in stigmatizing interactions between prison staff and visitors, as visitors are often treated like a “criminal” when they falsely test positive on the machine. Despite staff supposedly being aware that the ion scanner produces high rates of false positives, family members explained that their treatment by staff was not at all sympathetic. The nature of these interactions between staff and visitors, particularly when dealing with the ion scanner, “serves to exacerbate the stigmatic attitudes that individual staff members often present to prisoners’ family members” (Hannem, 2012: 110). The experience of feeling targeted, accused, and “lesser-than” can result in a variety of negative outcomes; psychological and emotional harm are common consequences of these experiences.

### *Visitation barrier: Psychological and emotional distress*

Among the various collateral consequences of incarceration experienced by loved ones of prisoners, one of the most prominent themes that emerges is the irreparable psychological and emotional distress that is experienced. Psychological and emotional distress is difficult to assess; however, it is a consistent theme emerging from existing quantitative and qualitative research on this particular population. The prison visit is often an unsettling and traumatic experience during the imprisonment stage for family members and loved ones (Comfort, 2003; Dixey & Woodall, 2012). The physical environment of the prison itself is problematic for these individuals. The intimidating environment and the restrictions imposed in the prison are not child-friendly and many children are frightened of the procedures required for visiting (Brink, 2003; Chui, 2009; Comfort, 2007; Hairston, 1998). Even many adults find it unsettling to visit the institution and witness their loved one in such a hostile environment (Comfort, 2003; Dixey & Woodall, 2012).

Comfort (2003) applies the term “secondary prisonization” to characterize the procedures associated with visiting a prisoner behind bars. This includes the strict and often arbitrary enforcement of a dress code and rules regarding objects that they cannot bring into the institution, leaving women feeling shamed, humiliated and frustrated (Comfort, 2003; Girshick, 1994). The use of strip searches, more often used in American prisons, also cause individuals to feel humiliated and they serve as a deterrent for future visitation (Brooks-Gordon & Bainham, 2004; Fishman, 1998). The treatment of visitors seems to be contingent on how the guards perceive the woman's character, how they perceive the prisoners being visited, and how their partners behave within the confines of the institution (Brooks-Gordon & Bainham, 2004; Fishman, 1998).

When an individual is incarcerated, there is an emotional impact on their family members. Mothers of incarcerated sons experience psychological distress due to financial difficulties (Green, Ensminger, Robertson, & Juon, 2006; Hagan & Dinovitzer, 1999) and the loss of an emotional support system (Green, et al., 2006; Hagan & Dinovitzer, 1999; Ruiz, 2002). Spouses of offenders, specifically wives, often encounter symptoms of grieving (Daniel & Barrett, 1981), depression, and anxiety (Beck & Britto, 2006; Braman, 2002; Comfort, 2007; Light & Campbell, 2006; Lopoo & Western, 2005; Moerings, 1992; Morris, 1965). These stigmatic, psychological, and emotional repercussions experienced by individuals who are not even legally criminalized by the state often result in a loss of trust in the justice system as a whole.

#### *Heightened distrust in the criminal justice system*

Throughout the penal process, there are instances that can diminish one's level of trust in the criminal justice system, and the state apparatus more generally. There has been research to demonstrate that the incarceration of an individual and their experiences with the criminal justice system can, and often does, result in a decrease of trust towards criminal justice officials and the system (Uggen and Manza 2002; Weaver and Lerman 2010). However, research has also pointed to the widespread impacts that the criminal justice system has on those who are on the peripheries of the justice system. Witnessing the arrest of a loved one can often lead to hostility towards the police, and by extension, a lack of trust in authority figures (Dyches, 2009; Miller, 2006). This distrust often continues into the other stages of the penal process, and persists past the release of a loved one from prison into the community. Lee, Porter and Comfort (2014) find that the experiences of family members and partners of prisoners who have been exposed to the

internal workings of the criminal justice system lead to a higher distrust in government and lower political participation rates (57). While the experience of having a loved one incarcerated has many facets, the visitation process is particularly significant, because this serves as the intersection point where loved ones and prisoners connect within the walls of the total institution that is the prison. I now move to a discussion of the history of the ion scanner and the way it is used by prison staff and the issues this raises.

### Understanding the ion scanner

In order to understand the direct and collateral consequences of the Ion Mobility Spectrometry device in Canadian federal institutions, it is necessary to explore the function that this device serves, and to examine what its intended purposes are. The Ion Mobility Spectrometry Device is more commonly referred to as the ion scanner by prison staff and members of the public and it will hereafter be referred to as such. In Canada, all federally run prisons are overseen by Correctional Service Canada (CSC), a Government of Canada entity. CSC uses the ion scanner as a supposedly non-intrusive search tool in prison settings, in an effort to detect drugs that are coming into the penitentiary by visitors of prisoners and prison staff (Dastouri & Johnson, 2011). This tool is uniformly implemented at the federal level.

In a 2011 audit on the use of ion scanners in Canadian prisons, CSC defines this device as follows:

An IMS unit [ion scanner] is a type of trace detecting device that measures the deflection of particles after they are exposed to an electric field. The speed at which the particles move helps to determine the substance of origin. In a correctional setting, ion scanners may be placed at front entrances or within the mail room of the prison, where any object can be swiped. IMS devices detect minute traces of substances programmed into the unit. Samples are collected by wiping or vacuuming objects and then placing the filter or

swipe into the unit. Up to six seconds later, the results are displayed. (Dastouri & Johnson, 2011: 1)

While the ion scanner is used as a drug detection tool in carceral settings, this device can and does serve other purposes in different settings, such as airports (Hopper, 2011). Smiths Detection (2016), who label themselves as one of the “leading experts in safeguarding society”, widely advertise their ion scanner product to be used as a drug- and explosive-detecting device at airports. These devices are commonly used across North America, and in Europe as well. For example, in 2015, Smiths Detection signed a contract with Aena Internacional, a global airport services operator based out of Spain (Aena Internacional, 2017), which allowed for the installation of the ion scanner at 27 new airports (Smiths Detection, 2016). While these devices are continuously being used in airport settings, it is important to note that these are typically not the only security mechanism in place in those airports; the ion scanner is used as a complementary non-intrusive tactic, in addition to various x-ray devices, such as: eqo, Hi-Scan, Threat Identification Module, and OptoScreener, to name a few (Smiths Detection, 2016b). These devices work in conjunction with one another to identify “security threats” in airport settings. My research will demonstrate how this differs considerably from the use of the ion scanner in carceral environments, wherein the device is often used as the primary security mechanism.

According to correctional policy, CSC’s Commissioner’s Directive 566-8 outlines the searching procedures of visitors, and reads: “In all medium and maximum security facilities, there will be a non-intrusive search of all visitors every time they enter and leave the institution” (CSC, 2015). The ion scanner is considered by CSC to be a non-intrusive device used to detect traces of drugs on all visitors upon entering the institution. CSC introduced this drug-detection

technology in 1995, and they continue to be heavily relied upon by the institutions (Friedman, 1997: 121). Drug interdiction is a high priority for CSC, and it employs various technologies and tools in order to prevent the flow of drugs and other contraband into the institutions. In an effort to “crack down” on drugs in prison, each federal institution has been equipped with an ion scanner at each principle entry point (Dastouri, Johnson & Moser, 2012). CSC professes a zero tolerance approach to drugs, which is reflected in their 2007 report. This report is based on the results found by an Independent Review Panel appointed by the Government of Canada. The Panel described the presence of illicit drugs in prisons as “unacceptable”, and “dangerous” for both staff and prisoners (Sampson, 2007: vii). The Panel posed several recommendations which were intended to bolster CSC’s existing drug interdiction strategies. Some of these recommendations included: “Enhanced perimeter control, increased use of technology, more drug detector dogs, better search of vehicles and individuals entering the penitentiary, intelligence gathering and sharing” (Sampson, 2007: vii). The existing research on the collateral consequences of incarceration in Canada points to the ion scanner as being a source of frustration, anxiety, and trauma for visitors to the institution (Bruynson, 2011: 51-52; McCuaig, 2007: 61; Hannem, 2008: 224). This is due to the oversensitivity of the machine that detect traces of drugs, and the sanctions which stem from these false positive readings.

The following section attempts to trace the presence and use of the ion scanner in prisons across time in both Canada and the United States. It is important to preface this section with the acknowledgement that there is no systematic data available on the prevalence of the ion scanner; therefore what is provided is simply as much knowledge as can be derived from online media publications and websites, newspaper archives, and official prison documents.

### Tracking the ion scanner's carceral presence in Canada

The ion scanner was originally implemented as a pilot project by the Correctional Service of Canada in 1995-1996 in an effort to reduce the amount of drug-related activities taking place within the prison walls. Seven ion scanners were installed in the Atlantic, Quebec, and Ontario regions. Two types of “non-intrusive” devices were implemented: the ion scanner and a device called the Itemiser, which is a similar technology used to detect traces of drugs and explosives (Roberts & Rochefort, 1997). Roberts and Rochefort (1997), two CSC employees at the time, compiled a report which assessed the effectiveness of the ion scanner and Itemiser in these seven penal facilities.

In order to measure the effectiveness of these security devices on visitors to prisons, Roberts and Rochefort (1997) compared the number of drug overdoses, requests for protective custody, and assaults on staff and prisoners documented before and after the implementation of the ion scanner and Itemiser. They found that in nearly all instances, the frequency of these indicators decreased, which to CSC, indicated a true success. Furthermore, the report firmly states that these devices definitely served to deter visitors from smuggling drugs into the institutions (Roberts & Rochefort, 1997: 142). The oversensitivity of the machine is not addressed in this report, nor is the possibility of a false positive indication. As I will discuss, false positive findings are frequent, but if Roberts and Rochefort (1997) were aware of this, it did not seem worthy to mention in their report as a valid concern. These report findings seem to have provided the basis for the full implementation of the ion scanner in Canadian prisons and penitentiaries, as it has served as a primary drug-detection security technology since this pilot project.

In 2002, a few years after the full implementation of the ion scanner in federal penitentiaries, stories began to emerge from people who went to visit their loved ones in prison, and were unjustly turned away due to this device. Justice Behind the Walls, a website “dedicated to the protection and advancement of human rights in Canadian prisons” (Jackson, 2017), published an article reiterating the various complaints that were submitted from prisoners’ loved ones who had been denied visitation due to a false positive hit on the ion scanner (Jackson, 2002). The founder of Justice Behind the Walls, Michael Jackson, has been a human rights advocate and professor for over thirty years, and specializes in the rights of prisoners.

In 2004, CSC published a report on their drug interdiction strategies in Canadian prisons, and they included a brief paragraph that reassures the ion scanner’s effectiveness as both a drug-detection device and a deterrent for smuggling contraband into the prison walls (McVie, 2004). McVie (2004) also claims that the ion scanner is used in conjunction with other search and security measures, and thus is not a standalone searching technique. However, visitor testimonials often deny this claim, as evidenced in the various media accounts that emerged soon after this report.

In order to assess the impacts of the ion scanner in Canada, looking at media publications throughout the last decade is helpful to track the use of this device, but more importantly, to understand the impacts that it has on visitors and prisoners. Media publications regarding the adverse effects of the ion scanner on prisoners’ visitors have been emerging since the early 2000’s. An article from *The Chronicle Herald* in Nova Scotia referred to the various visitors who have complained about the ion scanner as being “defective” and claims that penitentiary staff are rarely searched because “they [Correctional Service of Canada] know how many false readings the machine can produce” (Stevens, 2008). The John Howard Society of Ontario created a

handbook for individuals who plan on going into prison facilities to visit their loved ones.

Published in 2011, this handbook designates an entire section to the ion scanner regarding how to avoid hitting a false positive; the handbook also states: “Some people have told us about getting a positive ‘hit’ even when they have not used or held any drugs” (John Howard Society, 2011: 10).

Since the early 2000’s, the Canadian mainstream media has continued to publish articles related to the overall ineffectiveness of the ion scanner, and its wide-ranging effects on families and prisoners in penal institutions across the country (see Harris, 2012; MacAlpine, 2016; Kenny, 2016; Harris, 2016; Lucchetta, 2016; Stevens, 2008; Vivar, 2014; White, 2017). While media outlets have been picking up on problems with this device for over a decade, this issue has also been addressed in Parliament. On October 6, 2011, the Correctional Investigator of Canada at the time, Howard Sapers, expressed his concern with the ion scanner during his presentation in the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security. Sapers stated that, due to the unreliability of the machine, prison staff tend to use the test results arbitrarily, sometimes allowing the visitor to enter despite having a false positive reading (Hansard, October 6, 2011). This discredits the machine and lowers the credibility of the institution. This also contributes to lowering the morale of staff, who do not have confidence in this drug-detection technology. However, while Mr. Sapers critiqued the ion scanner, there are important stakeholders and members of the public who think otherwise. One witness present, Mr. Kevin Snedden, Acting Assistant Deputy Commissioner of Ontario Corporate Services at CSC at the time, stated that:

If it's operating properly and operated properly by the operator, it's a very reliable tool. To guard against things like false positives, we'll run second tests and things of that nature [...] But not having that machine in the first place, or our detector dogs, would be detrimental to our goal of trying to keep drugs out of the institution. (2011)

Evidently, there are high-ranking members of the Correctional Service Canada who stand behind the ion scanner's effectiveness, and its ability to deter "drug smugglers" from prisons. That being said, although the ion scanner has been heavily relied on for visitations in Canadian prisons since the turn of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, even CSC has acknowledged its flaws and inconsistencies. In fact, CSC conducted an audit of the use of ion scanners in federal institutions in July 2011. In this review, CSC laid out all of the benefits and pitfalls that surfaced during this investigation (Dastouri & Johnson, 2011). The benefits expressed are: it is a fairly simple system to use, and it only requires a few hours of training. Further, they produce results within six seconds, they are portable, and they are relatively cheap to purchase and maintain (Dastouri & Johnson, 2011). They also mention the pitfalls of the ion scanner, which are significant. Dastouri and Johnson (2011) admit that: "One drawback of IMS technology is that it measures drug particulates down to the nanogram, identifying 'false positives frequently'" (p. 1). Heroin and amphetamines were proven to be difficult to detect using this machinery, along with substances which were not in powder form (marijuana, pills, etc.). Finally, this audit concluded that the ion scanner will detect certain prescription drugs (e.g. temazepam). While this report clearly concludes that oversensitivity is an issue, there are no recommendations or suggestions offered for improvement.

CSC's main priorities, according to the 2007 Review Panel, are: safe transition back into the community, safe and secure institutions for both staff and prisoners, improved interventions for Aboriginal prisoners, improved interventions for addressing mental health, and improved management practices (Sampson, 2007: 11-12). CSC's drug interdiction strategy claims to be "based on prevention, treatment, and enforcement" (Sampson, 2007: 27). According to the Panel, ion scanners on visitors at perimeter entrances are used inconsistently and staff needs more

training for this machine. The solution proposed was to enhance the use of the ion scanner technology (Sampson, 2007: 31). Section 71(1) of the Corrections and Conditional Release Act (CCRA), CSC's overarching policy, dictates that: "In order to promote relationships between inmates and the community, an inmate is entitled to have *reasonable* [emphasis added] contact, including visits and correspondence, with family, friends and other persons from outside the penitentiary, subject to such reasonable limits as are prescribed for protecting the security of the penitentiary or the safety of persons" (CCRA, 1992: 40). While CSC overtly promotes prisoner rehabilitation through contact with loved ones who live outside the prison walls, the existing research and family testimonials show that the ion scanner seems to effectively work against this aspect of the mandate.

Following the release of CSC's strategies stemming from the 2007 Review Panel, Michael Jackson and Graham Stewart (2009) published an extensive report critically examining each aspect of the proposed correctional strategy in Canada. In relation to the ion scanner technology, Jackson and Stewart (2009) explain that in 2006, CSC's Internal Audit Branch conducted an investigation evaluating the effectiveness of the ion scanners, and it was agreed upon that procedures related to the use of the ion scanner were not being properly adhered to. Further, they explain that this evaluation: "provides powerful confirmatory evidence that the abuse of ion scanning described in the accounts of visitors are not aberrations but part of a systemic failure by CSC staff to comply with law and policy" (Jackson & Stewart, 2009: xxii). Jackson and Stewart (2009) point out the hypocrisy and wilful ignorance of CSC as they ignore their own evidence while recommending a heavier use of and reliance on the ion scanner for visitation purposes (Jackson & Stewart, 2009: xxii).

In 2008, CSC was granted significant funding intended solely to enhance its drug interdiction strategies: \$120 million Canadian dollars over a five-year span (Watson, 2016). Despite this significant funding and focus on drug interdiction, grievances concerning security practices have only increased. Dr. Ivan Zinger, the Executive Director of the Office of the Correctional Investigator at the time, and current Correctional Investigator, comments on this funding at the 2011 Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security: “It is important to note that at the time no new funding was provided for or invested in substance abuse programming” (Hansard, October 6, 2011). Thus, of the \$120 million dollars to combat drugs in prisons, no funding was used for effective treatment strategies, nor were there any efforts made towards more harm reductionist approaches, which aim to minimize the health risk that illicit drugs create, especially the harms accompanied by injection drug use. Harm reductionist approaches which would address the harmful side effects of injection drug use in prisons could include “needle exchange, supervised use and maintenance programs for confirmed addicts and related measures related to safer sex, and tattoo services” (Jackson & Stewart, 2009: 75). Instead of funding these types of measures, this drug interdiction strategy primarily focused on strategies of enforcement.

In the most recent fiscal year between 2015 and 2016, there were eight inquiries or investigations, and one internal response to a complaint, all related to the faultiness of the ion scanner (Office of the Correctional Investigator [OCI], 2016). An inquiry refers to “the gathering of information in response to a complaint in order to respond to the question presented or to determine whether an investigation will be required in response to a complaint” (OCI, 2016: 88). An investigation refers to “a complaint where an inquiry is made with the Correctional Service and/or documentation is reviewed/analyzed by the OCI’s investigative staff before the

information or assistance sought by the offender is provided” (OCI, 2016: 88). These nine reports related to the ion scanner represent a significant increase from the previous year, wherein only one internal response and one investigation or inquiry were reported (Office of the Correctional Investigator, 2015). In 2016, a Canadian federal government e-petition opposing the ion scanner was sponsored by Member of Parliament Matthew Dubé, NDP public safety critic, and presented in the House of Commons. As will be discussed later in the thesis, related to this research, I was involved with creating and supporting this e-petition, initiated by an Ottawa citizen who has experienced the adverse effects of the ion scanner. We created this petition to pressure the government to re-evaluate the effectiveness of the ion scanner in keeping drugs out of prison. Further, the petition calls for the government to consider alternatives to the ion scanner. With over 600 signatures, the e-petition was tabled in the House of Commons on April 13, 2017 (Hansard, 2016; see also White, 2017). The government issued a response to this petition on May 29, 2017. The response, a half-page in length, recognizes the importance of family in prisoner rehabilitation, but it also comments on the importance of the ion scanner for detecting drugs. The response concludes with the Correctional Service Canada making a commitment to undertake “a review of the use of ion scanners in its institutions in light of concerns regarding their reliability” (Hansard, 2017: para. 4). Whether or not real action will be taken to conduct a reliable review remains to be seen.

While the ion scanner has been the centre of ongoing conversation in Canada since its pilot implementation in 1995, our neighbouring country to the South has faced a similar trajectory when it comes to this particular security device.

## Tracking the ion scanner's use in United States jails and prisons

The United States of America houses the largest number of prisoners per capita on the planet; their prison system houses over 2.3 million people (Wagner & Rabuy, 2017). Therefore, there is a strong likelihood that there are *many* people visiting prisons in the US to see their incarcerated loved ones. American media reports, prison blogs, and correctional policies indicate that the ion scanner is also commonly used across the country; however, it is also widely critiqued. According to a report published by the Federal Bureau of Prisons (BOP) (U.S. Department of Justice, 2003), the ion spectrometry mobility device was piloted in American prisons in 1998 wherein 28 prisons had this machine installed, a 1.8-million-dollar operation. The implementation of the device comes only a few years after the pilot implementation in Canada. The pattern that follows is similar to the situation in Canada.

After a two-year pilot test, the BOP claimed that the ion scanner contributed significantly to the decrease in drugs in prisons for both minimum and medium security institutions. The BOP report states that: “At the institutions we visited with ion spectrometry, the majority of wardens and correctional officers involved in processing visitors and visiting room monitoring believed this technology is an effective deterrent to drug smuggling” (U.S. Department of Justice, 2003 p. iv). This report pushed for more funding to be used to implement more ion scanner devices throughout the country.

In 1999, an article published in a Missouri newspaper reveals that a Missouri joint legislative panel challenged the use of the ion scanners in prisons, questioning its accuracy (Allen & Bell, 1999). This legal challenge came quite soon after the implementation of the device in 1998. Some news media outlets across the country have also openly questioned the reliability of this technology throughout the years since the implementation of the device (see AJ

Media, 2000; Bucsko, 2001; Lombardi, 2001; Berard, 2007; Thompson, 2005; Hartman, 2016).

Between 2002 and 2004, an online discussion forum titled PrisonTalk featured posts from various individuals across America who recounted their largely negative experiences with the ion scanner upon their visitation to prison (PrisonTalk, n.d.). In addition to media and informal complaints, lawsuits and formal complaints have also been used to combat the use of the ion scanner.

In 2004, the New York Civil Liberties Association sent a formal complaint to the New York State Department of Corrections imploring that the BOP discontinue the use of ion scanners as a searching tool upon prison visits. In 2010, the New York Civil Liberties Association filed a lawsuit against the New York State Department of Corrections (DOC), invoking the Freedom of Information Law in order to push the DOC to comply with their requests to access records regarding the use of the ion scanner in New York prisons. Further, a lawsuit was filed in 2011 against employees of the Maryland Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services based on the inaccuracy of the ion scanner, given that ion scanner results were being used as justification for strip searches of visitors to the institution (Braun v Maynard, 2011). While ion scanners are used across the United States, they are not used in every state. Since its original implementation, some states have decided to refrain from using the machine or they do not enforce strict sanctions for positive readings. For example: “In Florida, the Department of Corrections takes no action against a visitor testing positive unless a subsequent search produces contraband” (Dunn & Yuster, 2004: para. 22). In Massachusetts, the ion scanner ceased being used altogether after the 2001 lawsuit of *Bouchard v. Mahoney* challenging the accuracy of the device (Dunn & Yuster, 2004). The Massachusetts outcome in particular shows the potential for resistance to the ion scanner to curtail its use. Likewise, in 2008, the Federal

Bureau of Prisons suspended the use of ion scanners in US federal prisons due to their oversensitivity and their high frequencies of false positive drug detection hits (Sample, 2009). However, in 2010 the BOP reinstated the ion scanners, but only to be used “for testing prisoner mail, prisoner belongings, lockers, work areas and visitation rooms,” according to Joyce Conley, the Assistant Director for the Correctional Programs Division (Prison Legal News, 2010). However, soon after this “soft” re-implementation occurred, institutions “reportedly started using the machines on visitors” (Prison Legal News, 2010: para. 4), thus negating the BOP’s previous claims. The full-fledged re-implementation of the ion scanner on visitors became official in 2015, when California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation announced that they were planning to implement at least two machines at each state prison (KCRA, 2014; NBC Connecticut, 2015).

This brief review of media coverage thus reveals an ongoing conflict between carceral institutions, prison administrators, and the families of imprisoned loved ones over ion scanner use in Canada and the United States. For nearly two decades, the accuracy of the ion scanner has been intermittently contested, via media publications, lawsuits, blog posts, and complaints, yet there have been no major changes made to the way in which visitors to prisons are scanned and assessed. Despite the adverse consequences that the ion scanner creates for prisoners’ loved ones, which is explored in my research, this device continues to persist, thus fitting with the existing literature on the treatment of prisoners’ loved ones more generally refers to them as an invisible and marginalized population that gets minimal consideration by penal authorities.

This review of existing research on the ion scanner and its presence in both Canadian and American institutions leads to certain questions, such as: how exactly does the ion scanner impact a visitor’s experience? How frequent are these false positives? How do the interactions

between staff and the ion scanner impact the visitation experience? These questions are the driving force behind this research. The following chapter connects the aforementioned collateral consequences of incarceration with the theoretical frameworks used to explore them. I review theoretical frameworks that have been used for these types of studies in the past, then I present the framework that I have used to analyze my research.

### Chapter 3: Theorizing the research

In this chapter, I explore the more common theoretical frames that have been used in the existing literature regarding the collateral consequences of incarceration, and more specifically, the impacts of the ion scanner. I then put forth the theoretical considerations that overarch this research, focusing on the risk society, surveillance, and science and technology. This chapter concludes with an identification of gaps in the existing research and literature, and identifies ways that this research can effectively serve to bridge these gaps.

#### Commonly used theoretical frameworks

The most notable large-scale studies on the collateral consequences of incarceration have been theoretically grounded in the concept of stigma. Scholars have drawn upon Goffman (1963) as their foundation to explore and expand upon his seminal work; his notion of courtesy stigma has been built upon considerably and expanded in an effort to better situate the experiences of prisoners' families within the literature (Hannem 2008; Condry, 2007; McCuaig, 2007). "It [stigma] is a useful concept to help us understand how relatives of serious offenders had been marked, how their identities were perceived as spoiled, and the consequences that followed" (Condry, 2007: 62). For these scholars, and for myself, stigma has been a useful concept to draw upon when trying to make sense of the experiences of prisoners' loved ones and their interactions with others. Goffman's notion of the presentation of self has also been particularly useful for understanding how prisoners' loved ones negotiate their identities (McCuaig, 2007: 25). The current existing research on the ion scanner reveals that this device contributes to the exacerbation of stigmatic interactions between staff and visitors (Hannem, 2008), and this is further explored in my research. While stigma and self-presentation do play a significant role in this research, I argue that the literature on risk discourse, surveillance, and technology is also

important to consider in this analysis. This research uses these theoretical frameworks to analyze the findings.

Previous research has yet to frame the relationship between the visitor and the ion scanner in the context of the risk society and surveillance studies. This is how my theoretical framework diverts from previous work in this area. By bridging these different frames for theorizing the research, new questions emerge, such as: how do technological “innovations” such as the ion scanner serve to further stigmatize and harm certain groups? And how do actors of authority, such as prison staff, interact with these technologies, particularly when it comes to managing groups in such a risk-averse environment as the prison? Does stigma play a role in the way in which the ion scanner is managed by prison staff?

#### Framing the research

While drawing on grand theorists such as Beck is important and can be helpful when theorizing ideas around crime and security, I would like to point to the work of Valverde (2014) to think about this research. Valverde (2014) highlights the importance of recognizing that the work of some classical sociologists is Eurocentric and sometimes contains masculinist ideals, and it is thus pertinent to broaden the conception of what is meant by “theory”. My own research focusses on a contemporary criminological issue, and so while it is important to acknowledge the theoretical groundwork laid by certain theorists, it is also necessary to adjust the scope to draw upon more recent analyses in the realms of risk studies and science and technology studies, especially when grappling with contemporary social issues, particularly in the area of crime, justice, and security (Valverde, 2014). My own research makes attempts to bridge the work of macro-level sociology theorists and more recent studies.

## The risk society

This research is situated in the literature on the risk society, especially the work of Ulrich Beck (1992). From the middle of the twentieth century and onwards, Western society has been undergoing constant rapid social change, characterized by uncertainty, which largely contributes to our current understandings, and arguable *obsession*, with the notions of risk (Mythen, 2004). The term “risk” often holds an inherently negative connotation wherein notions of harm are implied (Mythen 2004: 12). I would like to draw upon the definition of risk put forward by Hacking (2003): “Risk is the calculating concept that modulates the relations between fear and harm” (27). This definition is useful for this research because it posits risk as a calculation, not an objective truth. Hacking’s (2003) definition also implies that risks are not inherently harmful, which is how the concept of risk is applied to this research. In terms of the prevalence of risk, Mythen (2004) even goes so far as to claim that “In one way or another, the defining markers of modern society are all associated with the phenomenon of risk” (1). Risk is a malleable term that can embody a variety of meanings (Mythen, 2014; O’Malley, 2006). For Giddens (1999), risk is inherently linked to the desire to control; more specifically, the desire to control the future. This is an interesting insight, because it suggests that with the rise of the risk society, the world is not necessarily more dangerous than it has been in past generations, but the defining difference is that the modern world is more attentive to and focused on future outcomes, particularly regarding safety (Giddens, 1999: 3).

Mythen (2004) posits that the meaning of risk remains contested by various social actors, which makes it such an interesting area of inquiry (2). While this research draws upon the risk society perspective to analyze findings, it is important to recognize that there are different ways to conceptualize risk. One might also be interested in exploring risk using the governmentality

perspective, the culture of fear perspective, or the anthropological perspective (Mythen, 2014: 27-46).

The governmentality perspective on risk, rooted in the work of Michel Foucault, lends its focus to the ways in which risk discourses come to exist, and how and why they are repeated to the point where they are permeated into everyday social lives and practices. This entails using a genealogical method to understand how risk is calculated and how it is used by the state to control certain populations (Mythen, 2014: 33-35). Alternatively, the culture of fear perspective instead lends itself to the study of the “prevailing mood of the present age” (Mythen, 2014: 38) and the central cultural place of risk, and it posits that society’s obsession with risk has allowed it to become an ubiquitous force, perceivable in all aspects of social life, despite the relatively safe nature of current Western societies in terms of crime (Mythen, 2014: 37-40). This perspective tends to focus on media analyses, and attempts to understand how the media constructs and perpetuates fear; this perspective focuses on the social construction of risks, as opposed to Beck’s position that there were materially real and new risks affecting society. In sum, “fear can be understood to be as much of a way of interpreting lived experience than a response to actual harms” (Mythen, 2014: 39).

Another perspective is the anthropological perspective, which focuses on the analysis of “social functions of risk within culture” (Mythen, 2014: 40). The crux of this perspective is the exploration of how risk is constructed and conceptualized within different cultures; the place risk is thus contingent on culture (Mythen, 2014: 41). While there is value in each of the aforementioned perspectives, and they overlap at points with each other and with Beck’s work, the risk society perspective is the most adept for addressing the research at hand. The risk society posits, on a macro level, that the rapid rise of capitalism has produced what he calls

“manufactured risks”; these risks, such as global warming, are viewed as “side effects” of the modern capitalist society. For Beck, manufactured risks are also a side effect of the rise of technology and science, and these risks have fostered detrimental impacts on various facets of the social world, such as in the realms of “health, the environment, security and politics” (Mythen 2014: 30). On a micro scale, everyday risk management practices encourage, or *demand*, individuals to plan their lives accordingly, in order to avoid harm (Mythen, 2014). While the risk society thesis holds realist views that certain new risks materially exist, Beck is also interested in the way major institutions socially construct internal rules for the ways in which risk is assessed and governed; Beck labels this process “relations of definitions” (Mythen, 2014: 30). I will show how the risk society thesis is well-positioned to understand the particular ways in which risk is governed and managed by correctional institutions, and how technology impacts this management.

Understanding how risk is managed by the state has been extensively theorized by O’Malley (1999) who is part of the governmentality school. O’Malley (1999) puts forth the idea that the government organizes all social phenomena in relationships to the risk that is associated to them. He states: “Problems for government therefore appear objectified and reified, identified and prioritized scientifically and intersubjectively rather than in terms of the value commitments and arbitrary moralities of some political regime” (O’Malley, 1999: 197). The observation that the state masks its moral subjectivity by using risk as an objective notion is important. If we hone in O’Malley’s (1999) conception of risk as an objective and scientific idea, this is tied to the notion that science and technology play an important role in risk management techniques.

### Bridging risk literature with work on science, technology and surveillance

In terms of governing the elusive notion of risk, the role of science and technology must be considered. Following Beck, Mythen (2014) discusses the importance of techno-scientific development in relation to risk, and claims that the rapid advancements of science and technology actually serve to increase harms rather than reduce them; he draws briefly on Beck's (2002) example of terrorism increasing due to the rise of technological advancements (31). As technology continues to advance at such an unprecedented pace, and if technology is equated with increasing power, Garland (2003) suggests that this allows for "new possibilities for the misuse or faulty deployment of [this] increased power" (3-4). In practice, what are ways in which the advancement of science and technology could serve to exacerbate harms in the name of risk management? Could such technology serve to exacerbate harms against and the marginalization of already vulnerable populations?

Surveillance studies speaks to the relationship between risk and the rise of technological developments. In fact, scholars have posited that the main impetus that has led to the widespread development and use of surveillance technologies is society's collective focus on security and the notion of managing risk (Bennett, Haggerty, Lyon & Steeves, 2014: 39). Work by seminal scholars in this area suggest that surveillance technologies can take many forms, in both private and public spheres; security cameras, consumer data collection, immigration and border patrol, airline security, and so on, are characterized as surveillance technologies (Lyon, 2006; Ericson & Haggerty, 1997). While surveillance tools are often perceived and portrayed as being objective instruments free of any moral judgments, in practice, these supposedly neutral technologies and how they are used often result in the unequal targeting of certain populations that are deemed "risky" or "suspect" by groups who often hold positions of power and authority (Lyon, 2006;

Hannem & Sanders, 2012; Walklate & Mythen, 2015; Hannah-Moffat, 1999, 2005). For example, in their work on the impacts of information technology (IT) on the everyday patrol work of Canadian police officers, Hannem and Sanders (2012) found that the ways in which the officers, IT designers, and police organizations use these technologies can lead to a legitimization of social profiling by using the technology to target specific “risky” groups. Yet acknowledgement of the diverse social impacts of this type of risk technology is largely lacking.

Hannem and Sanders (2012) state that “the social and the technological are co-constituted, with one making up the other” (391), to the point where Lyon (2001) suggests that we should refer to these two entities as the “technosocial” in order to demonstrate these “inextricable interactions” (23). That being said, organizational rhetoric often presents these as two separate entities that can be that be easily distinguished (Hannem & Sanders, 2012). Technological innovations are too often viewed as being deterministic, ignoring the reality that “technological systems are both socially shaped and have social consequences, some of which go beyond the intentions inscribed in their shaping” (Lyon, 2001: 25). Therefore, technology can, and often does, produce consequences beyond what its inventors intended. Douglas and Wildavsky (1983) discuss the notion of objectivity in their work on environmental and technological dangers:

Something has gone badly wrong with the idea of objectivity. It is taken out of context and turned into an absolute value for all discourse. The rules that produce objectivity rule out someone’s subjectivity. In the context of justice, an objective judgment is disinterested (but not necessarily right) (Douglas & Wildavsky, 1983: 72)

Even though risk and surveillance technologies are often labeled as objective, this ignores the context in which the technology is created. Further, it assumes that objectivity is synonymous with validity and fairness. In Rossi’s (2012) exploration of objectivity in risk, he concludes that all risks are “evaluative concepts” and real objectivity is impossible to reach: “Risk assessments

[...] have been thought to be completely value free. But this is not correct. Risk assessments involve epistemic value judgments regarding the status of knowledge claims” (Rossi, 2012: 239).

The ion scanner is a risk technology, not because it calculates riskiness per say, but because when this device produces a positive reading for illicit substances, it leads to what is known as a Threat Risk Assessment. These risk assessments are conducted by prison staff, yet this machine is still regarded as a drug-detection technology free of bias by Correctional Service Canada. This risk technology is framed using technical and scientific language that is often difficult to understand for the majority of people, which creates the illusion of bias-free technology (Doyle, 2007). Further, the use of “expert” voices and knowledge tend to “lump people, especially marginalized groups, together into risk categories” (Doyle, 2007: 8). This is reflected in the way in which the ion scanner is implemented in Canadian prisons, by covertly categorizing prisoners’ loved ones as a risky group.

Since risk knowledges tend to underlie any major institution, using the risk society framework to ground research on social institutions is useful (Ericson & Haggerty, 1997: 127). Ericson and Haggerty (1997) claim that studying the police as a site of managing risk knowledges is particularly fruitful, due to the intersectionality of the police with all other major institutions in a society. This, in turn, allows for a greater understanding of how risk knowledges shape various institutions (Ericson & Haggerty, 1997). While policing research can provide unique perspectives, I would argue that the visitation area of the prison as a site of investigation could provide a unique perspective regarding the management of risk knowledges and “risky” populations. Prisoners in carceral settings are perceived as *manageable* risks, and rehabilitation efforts are characterized by these risks, with an emphasis on cost efficiency and security maximization (Garland, 2001; Hannah-Moffat, 1999). However, what are the consequences of

shifting the “risky” population status from the prisoner to the visitor within the confines of the prison walls? How do authority figures use risk technologies within prisons to manage families of prisoners? The following section discusses the gaps within the existing literature and some theoretical holes that I seek to address in this research.

#### Gaps in the literature and required research

Notwithstanding the relatively few studies that have been conducted over the past century, experiences of families of prisoners are generally disregarded when it comes to discussions about crime and punishment internationally, and especially in Canada (Hannem, 2011: 183). My study addresses this gap.

This study has important practical implications. Within the area of prisoner rehabilitation literature, a significant portion focuses on the importance of maintaining meaningful familial ties throughout one’s incarceration. Extensive qualitative and quantitative research studies have found that visitation by loved ones plays a significant role in a prisoner’s effective reintegration and reduced recidivism (Hairston, 1998; Petersilia, 2003; Bales, Wang, Hay & Mears, 2008; Casey-Acevedo and Bakken 2001; Schafer 1994; Tewksbury and DeMichele 2005; Wooldredge 1999; Mills & Codd, 2008). As such, visitation by family members should be supported as a key priority for penal institutions, instead of fostering undue stress and harmful experiences which might deter future visitation. The Correctional Service of Canada (CSC) is mandated to assist in the rehabilitation of its prisoners, and they seem to recognize the importance of family contact. Their official website states that: “Positive contact with family and friends is very important in the successful reintegration of offenders” (CSC, 2016b: para. 1). Whilst this is acknowledged, current research has pointed to the visitation process as one fraught with disdain, discomfort, and stigmatization, thereby undermining one of CSC’s proposed intentions. This research seeks to

address this problem by exploring this contradiction between CSC's supposed intentions and the lived outcomes. Questions regarding the risk society and science and technology studies will come into play here.

This will help to fill the literature gap on the collateral consequences of incarceration. Specifically, it will explore how technologies such as the ion scanner might contribute to the secondary prisonization of the loved ones of prisoners (Comfort, 2003). Currently, there is a gap in the literature regarding this particular piece of technology, and its interplay between prison staff and prisoners' families. While the experiences of visitors with the ion scanner in federal prisons has been preliminarily explored in research (Hannem 2008; 2012; Bruynson, 2011), and critiques of this device as an effective drug interdiction strategy do exist (Jackson & Stewart, 2009; Watson, 2014), the experiences of prisoners' loved ones and prisoners themselves regarding the ion scanner has yet to be uniquely explored.

My study also contributes to knowledge on the use of risk technologies in practice more generally. Further to this point, Mythen (2014) provides a comprehensive overview of the risk society, drawing on foundational theorists such as Beck, and he emphasizes the importance of risk studies. That being said, while there has been a significant amount of literature on the theoretical usages of risk, Mythen (2014) warns that there is a dearth of literature exploring the *experiential* component to risk; there is a need for the exploration of the human experience of risk and the diversity of these experiences in risk-centered settings. This is another key place I would like to situate my research, by conducting interviews with individuals who have experienced the consequences of the ion scanner, a modern-day risk technology.

## Chapter 4: Research methodology and process

This chapter provides a detailed description of the research methods that were used in this project. Methodological considerations regarding this particular type of research are discussed, the choice of research methods and sampling techniques are discussed, and I provide information regarding the participants in the research. I discuss how my own social position factors into the way in which I was able to conduct this research, I consider the importance of taking a reflexive stance throughout the research process, and lastly, I discuss some limitations that can arise from these decisions.

### Methodological considerations

The research questions I sought to address are: How does the Ion Mobility Spectrometry drug-detection system used in Canadian federal penitentiaries impact the loved ones of prisoners upon visitation? How does it impact the lives of the prisoners?

The main research method used in this research was semi-structured in-depth interviewing. This method allows for a phenomenological approach to qualitative inquiry. Not to be mistaken for a generalization of participants' experiences, a phenomenological approach to research allows for "[describing] the common meaning for several individuals of their *lived experiences* of a concept or a phenomenon" (Creswell, 2013: 76). The phenomenon explored in this research is the set of collateral consequences of incarceration experienced by families with loved ones in prison, and the prisoners themselves, specifically in relation to their experiences with receiving a false positive indication on the ion scanner. By conducting in-depth semi-structured interviews with eight loved ones of prisoners from across Canada, I sought to draw out common meaning based on all of the experiences that were recounted to me (Schram, 2006: 99). Further, my experiences with leading a group of students in the Community Engaged Sociology

course working on pushing for reform in relation to the use of the ion scanner provided me with additional participant observation data in order to assess the impacts of a public criminology approach and hands-on approach to learning. These research methods are discussed later in this chapter.

Phenomenological inquiry typically involves in-depth interviewing as the chosen research method, because it can help the researcher understand the phenomenon in great detail (Creswell, 2013: 79). There are various reasons as to why interviewing was best suited to respond to my proposed research question. Shwartz-Shae and Yanow (2012) emphasize the importance of selecting an appropriate research method in order to effectively answer a research question (84). My own research question was most effectively answered by using extended, semi-structured interviews. The research question elicits responses that are neither right nor wrong, but they are an expression of experiences and emotions which serve to respond to the question. I did not seek to simply collect data from the research participants; I sought to engage in a “co-generation” of knowledge with the participants, acknowledging that no response is superior to another, but that their collective experiences were the focus of my inquiry (Shwartz-Shae & Yanow, 2012: 78-79). Conducting semi-structured interviews was the most effective method not only to understand the ways in which people experience the process of visitation with their loved ones in prison, but also to understand how this affects their lives in the short and long-term. The semi-structured interviews demonstrate a co-construction of knowledge between the participants and myself. This co-construction allows for valid knowledge about the “real world” to be uncovered, insofar as it is experienced and interpreted by the participants. The following sections describe each of my chosen research methods in more detail, and provides further justifications for the use of these methods.

## Data collection

### *Semi-structured interviews & e-journals*

The main research method used for this project was the in-depth, active semi-structured respondent interview. Tracy (2013) describes respondent interviews as “those that take place among social actors who all hold similar subject positions and have appropriate experiences, which attend to the research goals” (141). The social actors chosen for this research all have had the “appropriate experience” of testing falsely positive on the ion scanner machine upon visiting their loved one in a Canadian prison. Before beginning to conduct this research, I was approved by the Carleton University Research Ethics Board-A, clearance number 105509. These interviews were conducted using several platforms: face-to-face, online video calls using Skype, and over the telephone. Interviews lasted anywhere from thirty minutes to one hour and fifteen minutes. I created an interview guide, consisting of thirteen questions and several prompts (see Appendix A); however, the participants were encouraged to touch upon experiences which were not included in the interview guide if they felt that they were relevant to the discussion. In addition to interviewing, one of the participants has documented all of her visitation experiences in an electronic journal. In order to provide me with more details about her experiences with the ion scanner, she provided me with this journal and her consent to use it, and thus some of the findings in this research are retrieved from this source.

### *Sampling*

For the interview participants, I was searching for individuals who have loved ones incarcerated in a Canadian federal institution, who have experienced a false positive indication on the ion scanner. Throughout this thesis, I often refer to the participants as “family members”; this term is used in reference to parents, siblings, romantic partners, and close friends. Due to the

narrow scope of my research question, finding participants that could help me effectively respond to this question was not a simple endeavour. This research depended entirely on a snowball method of sampling. This snowball sample stemmed from my prior connection with a group called Mothers Offering Mutual Support (MOMS). MOMS is an Ottawa-based support group consisting of mothers, sisters, grandmothers, and aunts of prisoners (MOMS, 2017). This group meets on a monthly basis to share their stories and provide support to other women who are experiencing similar challenges while their loved ones face incarceration. This group provides both therapeutic and practical help; the members can share their struggles free from judgment, and they can also receive practical advice regarding how to navigate the criminal justice system while their loved ones are incarcerated. I became involved with this group in 2014, while working on a research project at the University of Ottawa on the collateral consequences of incarceration as part of my undergraduate coursework. Due to my conversations with several MOMS members, I became cognizant that a few members had experienced false positive hits on the ion scanner. Once I approached these members, they were able to put me in contact with other individuals from similar support groups across the country who had experienced a positive hit on the ion scanner. I was put in contact with another support group based in Edmonton called Together Overcoming Darkness and Despair (TODD) with a very similar mission statement to the MOMS (TODD, 2017). Through this connection, I was referred to other individuals in Western Canadian provinces. In order to reach participants, I sent out a recruitment e-mail (see Appendix B) to all of the contacts that I was provided by MOMS members.

In qualitative research, snowball sampling is a useful and common technique used to access hard-to-reach or “hidden” populations (Tracy, 2013: 136; Atkinson & Flint, 2001). While

this sampling method was not the most straightforward path to take, it yielded fairly positive results. Due to my initial connection with the MOMS, I was able to access individuals from differing geographical locations; this allowed me to hear experiences from loved ones who have visited different penal institutions across the country, and ranged in different levels of security. Using the snowball sample, I managed to interview a total of eight participants. While my original goal was to acquire ten, and there were individuals who demonstrated interest in participating, but never followed through with the interviews, it proved challenging to find 10 interviewees. Even with the help of MOMS and TODD, accessing individuals who have hit positive on the ion scanner proved to be quite difficult, even though it seems to be a relatively common experience for prisoners' loved ones, as they are a dispersed and low visibility population. It is understandable that people who have had to undergo these negative experiences would not be eager to discuss them with others, especially if these individuals have felt stigmatized by others due to having a loved one who is incarcerated. Nonetheless, I felt had reached something close to a point of saturation by the final interview, at least to a sufficient level for an exploratory project consistent with the time and space limitations of a Master's thesis. Creswell (2013) claims that the point of saturation is met when you "gather enough information to fully develop the model" (89). This fulfillment became evident to a reasonable extent when the same emerging themes continued to resurface with each participant. While the personal experiences with prison staff and the institution they were visiting often differed, the themes remained consistent, and no new major themes seemed to be emerging. That being said, had the parameters of this project been larger, more interviews would likely have been beneficial.

### *Situating myself in the research*

It is important to recognize my own role in this research, especially considering the unique way in which this research came to be. This research would likely not have been possible without my personal and professional connection to the MOMS group.

Since its inaugural meeting in 2011, the MOMS group has evolved tremendously, starting with four members to now having well over forty. Over time, these individuals have been indirectly forced to experience the ins and outs of the criminal justice system in an effort to provide support, both emotional and financial, for their loved ones on the inside. While these experiences are often fraught with pain and struggle, these women were provided with an insider perspective into the criminal justice system through the incarceration of their loved ones. Often these experiences with the justice system and the actors that work within it prove to be very different from what the MOMS members had expected. During meetings, they would often find themselves critiquing existing harmful policies and practices that their loved ones would be subject to. It is stemming from these experiences that the MOMS advocacy sub-group was formed. The Advocacy MOMS consists of a smaller subset of the MOMS members:

We advocate by attending workshops/conferences; engaging with governments, community organizations and educational institutions; mounting campaigns, utilizing media tools and holding public meetings. All of this equates to working for effective rehabilitation, humane treatment, and supportive reintegration for all those incarcerated. (MOMS, 2017b)

In the spring of 2016, I played a role in assisting the MOMS Advocacy group (along with the Criminalization and Punishment Education Project, a group I have been active in, led by professors and university students that worked closely with the MOMS) organize a 300-person forum at Ottawa City Hall in an effort to raise awareness about the abhorrent conditions at our local jail, the Ottawa-Carleton Detention Centre. Following this event, I was asked and agreed to

join the MOMS group. Meeting regularly, as a member of the Advocacy group, I was able to learn about all of the issues that the MOMS were concerned about, both provincially and federally. Among all of the issues being tackled by this inspiring group of women, one item struck a chord with me more than the others: the ion scanner. I would hear stories from these women who would drive for hours to see their sons in prison, and would prepare for days and sometimes weeks, just to be interrogated by staff, humiliated, and sometimes even turned away without a visit. I was shocked to learn that there had been very little research on this device, and the experiences of these visitors in relation to the ion scanner. After consulting with the MOMS Advocacy group and acquiring their approval, I decided to focus my research here.

#### *Benefits and pitfalls of chosen research method*

For the interviews that were conducted via Skype and telephone, this method involved certain benefits and pitfalls. While social cues were difficult to detect via telephone, the convenience of this method obviously allowed me to interact with individuals whom I would not have been able to access without these technologies. Opdenakker (2006) speaks to the benefits of telephone interviews, stating that some participants feel more at ease when they are not face-to-face with the researcher (4). In this technological age, Skype interviews have become an effective alternative to face-to-face interviews (Deakin & Wakefield, 2014). The ability to access geographically isolated individuals, and still be able to see them in real time is a considerable advantage (Deakin & Wakefield, 2014: 606). While it would have been ideal to have in-person face-to-face interviews with all participants, having the option to conduct Skype and telephone interviews allowed me to expand the scope of the research by interviewing individuals in various provinces across the country. Given the difficulty I faced locating potential interviewees, I am not sure I would have been able to access eight participants had I been restricted to the Ottawa

region.

Face-to-face interviews, while they can be extremely enriching and useful, also involve several factors that were considered before embarking on the research process. Opdenakker (2006) claims that one of the biggest advantages of face-to-face interviewing is the presence of social cues, which can add an enriching layer to the interview experience (2). However, a disadvantage that I had to be more mindful of is my ability to “lead” participants. While this can occur in any type of interview, this tendency might be stronger when I was in a face to face situation giving visible reactions to the responses. (Opdenakker, 2006: 2). Due to my past experiences with the MOMS, participants were already generally aware of certain preconceived notions that I hold regarding the utility of the ion scanner. While I did not wish to sway participants to respond in any particular way, and I did my best to keep personal opinions and anecdotes to myself during our conversations, I wonder if my prior relationship with certain participants might have impacted their responses.

I had to consider all aspects, both personal and interpersonal, that might have affected the responses of the participants. In order to put reflexivity into practice, I made a distinct effort not to disregard how my own circumstances could have affected the research process. As I am a member of the Advocacy MOMS who has engaged in various informal conversations regarding crime and justice in Canada, the other members have a general understanding of my own research interests and personal views more broadly. Considering that some MOMS members took part in this research, and most of the interview participants were aware of my advocacy work, this may have affected the ways in which they responded to my questions in the interview process. They may have provided me with responses that they thought I wanted to hear, and it is possible that they withheld experiences that they did not believe aligned with my own personal

views. In order to mediate this, I attempted to make sure I was clear in my intentions before beginning each interview. I made it clear to the participants that I was not seeking one particular answer, but I was interested in their own lived experiences, regardless of what they may be. This was evident in the questions I posed. Reflexivity also implicates an array of factors and personal characteristics in which I was aware of during the design stage of the research process, before entering the field (Schwartz-Share & Yanow, 2012: 100-101). My gender could have played a role in my access to these participants. While it is difficult to assess, I believe that being a female has granted me easier access into the group than if I were male, as most of the participants were female as well. While this consideration is important to acknowledge, it is one in which I have no control over. Regardless of these observations, the semi-structured interview was the method which served to best respond to my proposed research question.

### *Participants*

This research project features interviews with eight participants, who live in varying locations across Canada, particularly in Ontario and in the Western provinces. The sample consists of eight individuals who currently have, or have recently had, a loved one in federal prison in Canada. Federal penitentiaries, or prisons, in Canada house individuals who have been sentenced to two years or more. Each participant has also had at least one encounter with the ion scanner upon their visitation, where they have all experienced a false positive reading during one or more of their visits. In order to protect the confidentiality of each participant, pseudonyms were assigned. Each participant was asked if they would like to choose their pseudonym, and if that was the case, then that pseudonym was assigned. If they had no preference, then I assigned them a pseudonym I chose. The following is a list of the participants, with a short description of their relation to the prisoner that they have visited in a federal prison in Canada, based on the

information that they shared with me.

*Joe* has a son who has been recently incarcerated at a federal prison in Ontario. At the time that his interview took place *Joe's* son has been incarcerated for approximately three months at the same institution.

*Rachel* has a son who is incarcerated at a federal prison in Ontario. She has been visiting her son in prison for just over three years.

*Alice* has a son who was incarcerated at a federal prison in Ontario. While he has been released back into the community at this point, she visited her son in prison for approximately 1 year and 3 months. Her son spent the majority of his incarceration at the same institution, aside from a short assessment period where he was at another federal institution in Ontario.

*Autumn* has a fiancé who is currently incarcerated at a federal prison in Ontario. She has been visiting her fiancé for approximately 4 years now. He has been moved three times, but each time to prisons located in Ontario.

*Sarah* has been visiting her dear friend in prison for over 12 years now. While he has been moved to various institutions over the years, he is now incarcerated at a federal prison in Quebec.

*Kelly* has a brother who is incarcerated at a federal prison in Alberta. She has been visiting her brother for over eight and a half years.

*Shari* has been visiting her husband for over seven years. He is currently incarcerated at a federal prison in Alberta, and he has been moved around to many institutions in Canada

during his incarceration.

*Cheryl* has a son who is incarcerated at a federal prison in Alberta.

### *Participant observation*

While the in-depth interviews are used in order to respond to the proposed research question, as another component of this project, I also explored questions around advocacy and applying a public criminology approach when grappling with contemporary penal issues such as problems with the ion scanner, and particularly the relationship between public criminology and teaching. For several years, I had been active in the Criminalization and Punishment Education Project (CPEP), a group led by professors and students at two Ottawa universities aimed at getting academics to play a more active role in helping bring about positive change in the Canadian penal system, as well as being active with the Mothers Offering Mutual Support (MOMS) group. In the fall semester of 2016, I became team leader for a group of eight 4<sup>th</sup> year sociology and criminology students in a course titled *Community Engaged Sociology* at Carleton University. This relatively new course was introduced in the Winter 2015 semester. Along with CPEP, it is an initiative designed to bring research, teaching and community engagement into closer interaction. The course is designed in a way which allows students to use the knowledge and theory that they have acquired in their first three years of undergraduate study and to put it into practice in this course, by researching an issue and then working with a community organization on the issue and assisting with their advocacy efforts. Team leaders are graduate students chosen because the team projects closely aligned with the graduate students' thesis research. When I was the team leader in the Fall 2016 semester, I organized a project with the MOMS group; the students worked in collaboration with MOMS throughout the semester to create awareness videos regarding the harmful impacts of the ion scanner machine. These efforts

are discussed in Chapter 6.

Participant observation as a research method has often been associated with watching people and studying them from a distance (van den Hoonaard, 2012: 75). There are other forms of participant observation such as taking on the role of the “complete participant”, wherein the researcher becomes fully involved in the on-goings of the group and hides the fact that they are studying this group (van den Hoonaard, 2012: 83). While I was fully involved with the students in the Community Engaged Sociology group, I do not like to think of my observations as being deceptive in any way. Tracy (2013) effectively encapsulates what I have done by stating that “Participant observation includes not only *studying people*, but also *learning from (and with) people*” (Tracy, 2013: 65). During my experience as team leader for Community Engaged Sociology, I collected notes throughout the semester based on the experiences of the students in the course, my own experiences as a teacher for the course, and of the shared experiences between the students, MOMS, and myself. These observations allowed me to garner a greater understanding of how advocacy works in the classroom and its relationship to teaching, specifically as it relates to the ion scanner campaign. The advocacy work also allowed me to learn more about the ion scanner issue more generally, and the factors that may lead to the persistence in the use of the ion scanner in Canadian prisons, despite, as I will discuss, its continued ineffectiveness.

### Data analysis

Phenomenological research generally calls for the use of a coding method for the analysis stage. Coding allows for the researcher to “present the ‘essence’ of the experience” (Creswell, 2013: 191). In order to code my data, I transcribed all eight interviews. While codes have the

potential to reduce data to rigid categories, and can result in a loss of meaning, I use the term coding loosely. I compiled the experiences of participants with the ion scanner, in order to understand how these experiences have affected their lives, both in the short and long-term, as well as the lives of their loved ones behind bars. I did not use any preexisting codes; I used my own experience and knowledge of the data in order to establish unique codes, which were most fitting for the analysis (Creswell, 2013: 185). Once codes were identified throughout all of the transcriptions, then these codes were then organized into broader themes using the program software NVivo (Creswell, 2013: 186). Participants' experiences were brought to the fore by incorporating powerful quotations throughout the analysis. For this research, I placed an emphasis on the inclusion of participant quotations in order to avoid the misuse or misinterpretation of their experiences. Coding and thematic organization are crucial steps in the data analysis process; maintaining reflexivity throughout is also important.

Being a reflexive researcher does not end once the data is collected; in fact, reflexivity can become even more paramount during the data analysis processes (Shwartz-Shae & Yanow, 2012: 101). Maintaining an awareness of my own preconceived notions was important when I began to write up my analysis. Creswell (2013) explains that: "how we write is a reflection of our own interpretation based on the cultural, social, gender, class, and personal politics that we bring to research" (215). I am already aware that I was inclined to code for particular themes, such as: stigmatizing experiences with family and friends, negative encounters with criminal justice officials, harmful long- and short-term consequences of the ion scanner, and so on. These notions for codes stemmed from prior informal conversations that I have had with individuals who have tested positive on the ion scanner. My academic background in critical criminology has sensitized me to various penal issues, and the way in which I coded could have reflected that

to a certain extent. While I do not have any issues with these inclinations, it is important to acknowledge them in my work.

In order to address the complex realities of the participants, as well as my own preconceived notions, I employed certain mechanisms in order to reduce the likelihood of misunderstanding or misinterpreting the data. In the coding process, I sought codes that revealed emotions as well as situations. The situations refer to the lived processes under investigation, such as the process of undergoing a Threat Risk Assessment (as will be discussed shortly) or the process of being scanned by the ion scanner. It is possible that some lived processes expressed by participants were influenced by the fact they were recalled from some time ago, especially if they were recounting memories from a year or more in the past; this is normal and expected. However, I also coded heavily for emotions. Regardless of the lived processes expressed by participants, the emotions felt serve as an expression of their own realities. The emotional reactions to situations experienced by participants can be revealing. Emotions such as sadness, anger, guilt, frustration, expressed by participants deeply coloured their experiences, and I focused heavily on these in order to understand the impacts of the ion scanner and their visitation experience.

### Exiting the field

In undertaking this research project, I sought to be flexible in my approach to identifying a particular research focus. I began with an interest in contributing to the literature regarding the collateral consequences of incarceration. As previously stated, I discussed these issues with the MOMS group informally and attended meetings, and from these interactions I learned that the ion scanner contributes heavily to the collateral consequences of incarceration, and it deserved a

great deal more attention. I decided I also wanted this research to be in some way beneficial to the participants who have experienced the adverse effects of the ion scanner. I hoped that this research will be able to positively contribute to the current ion scanner campaign spearheaded by one member of the MOMS, with the ultimate goal of having the Correctional Service of Canada review the effectiveness of the ion scanner and to implement alternative search measures to replace this device. I would like my research to be mutually beneficial; I do not want to simply exit the research field without having provided any type of benefit to those who continue to suffer due to the ion scanner's presence in prisons. Tracy (2013) emphasizes the importance of "giving back" to the researched community, which is my intention. When conducting this research, I intended on giving back by taking part in advocacy work revolving around the ion scanner, and, in addition to the advocacy work I have already been involved in, I intend on continuing this advocacy by publishing articles and taking part in relevant public presentations in order to raise awareness about this issue. While publication in academic spheres is important and I intend to submit articles based on this research to one or more peer-reviewed journals, I am also aware that the majority of the general population cannot or do not access academic journals. Therefore, it will be important to publicize these findings in more mainstream media, such as news media outlets, both in print and online. By publishing via more mainstream avenues, this will also serve to raise awareness regarding the ion scanner among the general public. I intend to remain a member of the MOMS Advocacy group even after the completion of this research, therefore considerations for disengagement with the researched community need not be focused on at this point.

The following chapter presents the detailed findings from the eight interviews conducted for this research.

## Chapter 5: Detailed findings and discussion

In this chapter, the findings of this research project are detailed. The major themes explored are the extensive preparation undergone by loved ones before each visit, prison staff interactions with families and how they impact the visitation experience, the inconsistency and unpredictability of the ion scanner machine, the formal and informal sanctions received by visitors who test positive on the ion scanner, and how these contribute to deterring visitors from returning, the emotional and psychological harms experienced by visitors. Finally, I explore the resilience and resistance demonstrated by families in the face of these false positive indications.

### Preparing for a visit to federal prison

Before leaving for visits with their loved ones, all eight participants discussed undergoing what I would describe as intense preparations to avoid false positive hits. The individuals either continue to undergo these preparations before each visit, or they have engaged in these tactics in the past, to avoid receiving a positive hit on the ion scanner when they go to visit their incarcerated loved one. Rachel has been visiting her son in prison for over three years, and she elaborates on this preparation process:

Everything has to be cleaned. The car has to be washed inside. Any coin that you get has to be washed and dried, air dried and put in a ziplock plastic bag. The clothes that I'm going to be wearing the next day have to, are washed the night before and then put on straight from the dryer. There's no – hopefully there's no residue left after it goes through the washing. I don't wear any jewelry whatsoever to go in because that's a big hazard. I don't touch any money, I leave the house at around 8 o'clock for a visit for 12:30 and I don't stop along the way. So that's pretty much my routine when, when going to visit. [...] And you get your gas, I forgot to mention that because it's important, you get your gas the day before, because you can't touch – the gas fumes apparently will trigger it. –  
*Rachel*

Even though the participants visit loved ones in various different institutions across Canada, they all discussed the preparations that they undertake before each visit, and each description shared similarities. Washing clothes right before leaving, soaking jewelry and other items in disinfectant

solutions, and avoiding certain household and beauty products are common among the participants. Shari has been visiting her husband in prison for over seven years, and she discusses the measures that she takes before each visit:

I mean it sounds crazy, but um I – everything that I’m, all the clothes that I’m wearing, are going to be freshly laundered. I wash them, I hang them up in a closet and let them dry there because I do that with my clothes anyways. And I don’t touch them until the day that I’m going to go. Um I, and that includes jackets. [...] When I used to go into the medium, I had two jackets. So that I could put one in because we had to hang it up outside the visit room, and I don’t know who touches it then so I had two jackets I wore one in, hang it up, and I wore a different one in the afternoon visit. So um I cleaned everything, like my jewelry and everything and I wore jewelry on purpose because they like to target jewelry so I wore it so they could see that there’s something to target. Some people don’t and I don’t think that’s very smart because then they [penitentiary staff] choose skin or something like that [to swab] which is more dangerous, right? So I wore jewelry and I dunked everything that I brought in lemon juice and rinsed it off, let it dry. When – the times that I hit, I was told by my husband to use lemon juice and I just thought well vinegar should be the same. So I actually used vinegar and it didn’t work as well [laughs]. And after that, I just kept using lemon juice. I have a couple of times used rubbing alcohol but I, because that’s what they do there. But it’s too drying, I mean even lemon juice is really drying for your hands and everything but anyway. So I prepare everything, I take a towel that I put on the seat of my car even though it’s my car but, you know, you go to a mechanic and they sit there to drive your car around and you don’t know what they’ve been using. You can’t, even vacuuming is not good enough so I have a towel and uh and I also bring a squirt bottle with diluted lemon juice and I clean all the surfaces in my car, including my seat belt. Anything that I’m going to touch or that’s going to touch me. I have a shower just before I leave, I make sure in the shower that I clean the back of my neck and my ears because they tend to target that. And then I get dressed, then that’s the last thing I do before I leave the house. I leave, I go, um and I also take with me a little baggie with lemon juice soaked napkin – paper napkin, and I wipe my hands just before I get out of the car to go in. And yeah, I don’t take anything in with me except my ID, the money, and I go through a lot [laughs] I know it’s crazy but I do. –  
*Shari*

For visitors like Shari, visitation does not only entail driving to and from the institution, but it extends beyond that. Extensive preparations taken on by visitors add a significant amount of time and trouble to the overall visitation process, due to the fear of receiving a positive indication on the ion scanner. Oftentimes, participants learned to undergo these preparations after receiving a positive indication without contacting any illicit substances and from experiencing the

detrimental impacts of the ion scanner. However, two participants explained that they were informed about these necessary preparations by other people. Joe and his wife have been visiting their son, who has been incarcerated for just over three months, and he shared how they learned to prepare for visits in particular ways:

[Joe's wife] has gotten in touch with the MOMS group out of Ottawa and that's where she's gotten a lot of her information. So they were the ones who told her what the ion scan does, how it works, what they should do to protect it, all of that stuff so, she got a lot of that information from the MOMS group out of Ottawa – otherwise we would have had no idea whatsoever. – *Joe*

Even though Joe and his wife do not reside in the Ottawa region, where Mothers Offering Mutual Support (MOMS) hold their monthly meetings, they were able to receive helpful advice from the support group, which allowed Joe and his wife to help ease their worry about the ion scanner when going to visit their son. Two participants even stated that staff members at the Correctional Service Canada (CSC) were the ones who told them about how to properly prepare for 'passing' the ion scanner test:

A lot of the things that I do now came from the V&C [Visits & Correspondence] manager [at the prison]. She told me 'when you leave – don't stop until – leave your house and don't stop until you get here'. So a lot of the things she actually told me to do. So they [correctional staff] know that it has its issues, they're just not willing to do anything about it. – *Rachel*

The idea that prison staff have informed visitors on how to avoid hitting positive on the ion scanner demonstrates the widespread nature of the false positives. It also demonstrates the lack of trust that staff have in the machine's ability to effectively detect illicit substances, and thus to prevent drugs from entering the prison walls through visitors. There was only one participant who claimed that she did *not* go through intense preparations before her visits anymore:

Today, I guess I no longer do as many things because I know it doesn't really matter what I do. I've come to learn that I can test positive regardless what I do. But I don't wear any jewelry or metal purposefully. I think subconsciously, I think it's less of a trigger maybe.

But yeah, no I guess not other than that. I used to dry my clothes, wash my clothes, clean things, get quite stressed out, but I know now it's just what it is, right? – *Kelly*

Kelly has been visiting her brother in prison for eight and a half years, and, thus, while she used to undergo more rigorous preparations, she has now lost hope that these preparations will alter her results on the ion scanner. While the preparations that are undergone by the vast majority of participants may appear extreme, exaggerated, or unnecessary to those unfamiliar with the ion scanner, the following sections demonstrate that for visitors and their loved ones behind bars, these preparations are in fact necessary to reduce the likelihood of testing positive. A positive hit on the ion scanner can lead to a multitude of harms, thus taking precautions becomes the norm for regular visitors. Once loved ones arrive at the institution, new challenges often arise as they interact with the prison staff.

#### Interactions between loved ones and prison staff

The ion scanner is known to be oversensitive and “produce false positives frequently” (Dastouri & Johnson, 2011: 1). Due to this oversensitivity, it could be assumed that the prison staff who operate these machines would understand its flaws, and therefore would not treat all positive indications as leading to automatic assumptions of guilt. However, this does not reflect the experiences of the vast majority of participants in this study. When describing interactions with prison staff, four out of eight participants specified that after they hit positive on the ion scanner, the staff acted in ways that demonstrated suspicion and hostility. Kelly, whose brother is incarcerated, described an interaction that she and her father had with a correctional officer after receiving a positive indication:

As soon as you have one [positive hit] [...] the demeanour changes suddenly. Correctional staff are quite angry, they just become very angry. I don't know what it is, if it's suddenly they have more work to do – I don't know what it is. But you know I've watched my dad be screamed at for having one [false positive]. Myself, I've been yelled at for having [hit positive]. Other members [of a support group], what they've relayed has

been similar, right. It's, as soon as they've been questioned it's like they're looking for something from us that we can't give us. They're like 'tell us why, tell us where the drugs are', you know, and it's like we don't have anything to offer right? At least in my experience. – *Kelly*

Cheryl also discusses the aggressive behaviour that she has experienced from prison staff:

I think they're all, they're all kind of aggressive. And you, even though like I can be forward and stuff like that, when I'm in there, I feel kind of timid. Because you really don't want to upset anybody because you want your visit. So you sort of don't speak up and I think that makes them even more [pause] like I've never seen someone challenge them like 'this is bullshit, this is blah blah blah' no one ever says that ever – I've never seen that in all my visits. People just kinda meekly go along with it. So I've never seen anyone be nice before. – *Cheryl*

While the majority of participants experienced negative interactions with CSC that were described using terms such as “angry” and “aggressive”, this was not always the case. Some individuals described their interactions with staff as neutral, which will be discussed further. The behaviour described as angry and aggressive by prison staff towards visitors reflects the sticky stigma experienced by loved ones of prisoners, who are often perceived to be guilty due to their mere association with an incarcerated person (Hannem, 2008; Condry, 2007). The invisible traces apparently triggering the scanner become a metaphor for the sticky stigma that marks these loved ones of prisoners. When visitors hit positive on the ion scanner, CSC policy states that they are supposed to be taken aside and brought into a private room in order for a correctional manager to conduct a Threat Risk Assessment (TRA). The individuals I spoke with described their experiences of the TRA, and these experiences varied considerably. CSC policy dictates the instructions and conditions to follow during a TRA:

The designated manager will:

- a) meet with the individual in a **private area** with a witness;
- b) using discretion and **in a respectful manner**, interview the individual;
- c) give the individual the **opportunity to provide an explanation** for the positive search result (including mention of any products or medications);

- d) consider the results of the interview **in combination with other applicable information** that may be available (e.g. intelligence information, past inmate and/or visitor history, observed behaviour, and the search results of one or more means);
- e) based on an assessment of all of the above factors, make a decision on the status of the individual's request for access in accordance with legislation and policy; and
- f) document the decision by completing the Threat Risk Assessment (CSC/SCC 1300-01E) and provide a brief summary of the assessment and the rationale for the decision. (CSC, 2012a) [emphasis added]

These conditions are intended to be met for each TRA, and interactions between staff and visitor should remain consistent, regardless of who the visitor may be or who they are visiting at the prison. It is important to note that regardless of the outcome of the TRA, no subsequent physical searches are supposed to occur, such as a frisk or strip searches in order to prove or disprove drug possession. Alice describes her experience with the TRA when she hit positive on the ion scanner while attempting to visit her son:

So anyway, she called me into her office and she asked me a lot of questions. You know, was I a regular drug user, you know, had my son ever asked me to bring in illicit drugs into the facility, um, questions along that line. And you know, I answered 'no' to all those questions because that was true. And uh so it wasn't, I can't say it was done in a mean way or anything, it wasn't uh, I didn't feel threatened really. – *Alice*

This experience demonstrates a fairly neutral interaction between staff and visitor. While Alice lost time visiting her son due to the amount of time it took to undergo the TRA, her experience was not fraught with fear or anger. Unfortunately, this is the only participant who had this relatively calm experience. Cheryl discusses her daughter's experience of the TRA when she was trying to visit her brother in prison:

My daughter tested positive for I think it was cocaine. It wasn't the dog it was the scanner again and she will never go back. She was traumatized, they treated her... they locked her by herself in a room. They were waving a folder in her face saying 'we can arrest you right now' and she was crying. She's only 22. And she had worked the night before at a bar, she's a bartender and she had some tip money in her phone case and that's what they scanned and money is covered. So yeah they threatened to arrest her, and strip search her, and she's just like 'you can even look in my car I don't care'. And after all that, her crying and she's traumatized, they brought the dogs back in, they still let her have her visit. And then she never went back. So she sorta got some trauma around that. – *Cheryl*

Cheryl's daughter had a traumatic TRA experience which resulted in her never returning to visit her brother. When this is compared to Alice's experience, it demonstrates a significant inconsistency. This inconsistency is further discussed in the following section. Autumn, reveals that she has experienced an interrogation in the form of a TRA that broke several procedural rules, according to CSC policy.

Depends on the guard, some of them are really bad, some will ask like 'what's he in for? What's your relationship?' They brought up my past history, like and it wasn't even a proper Threat Risk Assessment, that's supposed to be done by a manager. And at [the prison], they gave me a manager two or three times but one of the Threat Risk Assessments was just done by the dog handler helping the ion scanner person. He was asking me all these questions in front of all the other people lined up there waiting for the dogs so it was in front of everybody. He was asking me questions like 'what's he in for?' [...] I don't know, they just, it's just like the tone. – *Autumn*

Autumn's experience involved being openly questioned in the presence of other visitors, thus breaching the first clause of the TRA process, which entails meeting with the individual in a private room with a witness. Kelly, whose brother is incarcerated, reveals her own experience with the TRA:

First, the drug dog guy and one of the guards interviewed me, and then a correctional manager came and interviewed me. And they asked me all kinds of questions about where I worked, where I stopped, why we were late again, sort of the same questions over and over and over again. Um, I answered them, I mean, to be fair I was probably just very short, I was just like 'yep this is it, this is it'. I was a little bit upset for sure because they... well they're very abrasive, there's not a lot of tact shown. They just, from the moment we walked in they were mad at us so they were quite adversarial. – *Kelly*

The Threat Risk Assessment, intended to be an objective procedure for detecting illicit substances, seems sometimes to be a tool used to contribute to exacerbate the stigmatization of prisoners' loved ones. This differential treatment of visitors for the TRA procedures leads into the next theme that emerged in the research, which is the inconsistency and unpredictability of the ion scanner, and the detrimental impacts that this can create.

## Inconsistency and unpredictability of the ion scanner

One of the main findings that emerged throughout this research process was that the ion scanner serves as a site of inconsistency and unpredictability; this was expressed by all eight of the participants in our discussions. One of the areas of inconsistency involves the way in which prison staff operate the ion scanner. Several participants speak out about these procedural and operational inconsistencies:

It seems like no one really knows what they're doing with that machine [the ion scanner]. So like he'll [correctional officer] put his gloves on and then get the thing [swab] then put it in [the ion scanner], then start giving someone else their keys and the machine, you're done, then he goes back, like there's no sterility. I don't really know but I'm assuming if you're doing that machine you should have different gloves for each one. – *Cheryl*

That's the other thing, they never change their gloves. Like sometimes they have a dual role, like they're doing the ion scanner but then they'll hippity hop over to the x-ray machine and they're touching the plastic basket and everything else and the controls. – *Rachel*

The guys know absolutely nothing about cross-contamination, honest to God, it's pathetic. It really is. Last time I was there, wasn't the usual guy, it was a different one, and the swabs are contained in a small round metal box. Now they're in a bunch, they're not individually wrapped or anything like that, they're in a box. Now, you're supposed to take them out of the container with a pair of forceps in order that, you know, your hands don't touch. Now who the hell knows where the forceps were, but anyway, I guess they had good intentions because you're supposed to take them out with a pair of forceps. Well, this guy just reached down in with his hands and pulled out a swab. Now he just contaminated the whole box. If there was anything on his gloves, it's on the swab. – *Rachel*

It seems to vary institution to institution. It depends on the person as well. You know, how meticulous they are with it or whether they seem to be taking it seriously, um and how you know, their choice of where they're going to swab and whether they wear gloves and whether they do anything to the machine in between, and uh – it really, yeah, it seems to vary quite a bit. – *Sarah*

The person that did it also didn't seem to be really clear on the procedure. My wife has read up extensively on procedures and testing and stuff and you know, when she scanned my wife first and she scanned positive, she used the same swab to swab me and scan, which is a direct violation. – *Joe*

These excerpts demonstrate the inconsistent procedures used by staff when handling the ion scanner at various federal prisons across Canada. CSC's Commissioner's Directive 566-8-2 outlines the technical operational requirements for using this device. It describes the steps that must be taken to avoid any possible cross-contamination. Gloves are only supposed to be changed after every instance that there is a positive indication (CSC, 2012b). However, these gloves are intended to be used for the sole purpose of swabbing for the ion scanner. Staff are not supposed to keep their gloves on while they are not working directly with this device. Yet, loved ones have provided detailed accounts of the cross-contamination that they have witnessed. The apparent inconsistency of the ion scanner operating procedures not only may lead to cross contamination but also serve to exacerbate the anxieties and fears that are already experienced by individuals who visit the institution to see and support their loved ones behind bars. Another area of inconsistency regarding the use of this search device is the differential treatment of visitors based on who is visiting and, apparently, on who is conducting the search. As mentioned in the previous section, visitors often feel as though their treatment and experience largely depends on the prison staff member who is on duty at the time of their search. Autumn, whose fiancé is incarcerated, speaks about her experience:

I've seen a girl the last time I went to visit, there was a girl like I went into the thing and I passed the ion scanner and she came in and you can smell the perfume on her from like far away and the guards they're like 'next time you wear perfume we're not letting you in' and she said ok and they ion scanned her and she came up over the threshold. And they didn't give her a Threat Risk Assessment, um they I think they rescanned her but I'm not 100% sure but they just let her in. They just let her in and they didn't even harass her. They didn't harass her at all or question her. The lady was really nice to her and was like 'oh you probably just picked something up on your way in or your perfume' and they just let her in. and I was standing there just so freakin' pissed I'm like 'are you kidding? If that was me I would be like harassed to the max and punished to the max and everything'. – *Autumn*

Autumn, a woman who identifies as Indigenous, feels as though the search procedures for visitation are very inconsistent and are dependent on the individuals operating the machine, rather than the machine itself, and that she is a target who is punished more than other visitors. Further to this point, some of the participants discuss the inconsistency in searching procedures regarding those who are visiting a prisoner, and those who are visiting the institutions in *other* capacities:

I notice that there's an inconsistency with how volunteers, staff, invited guests, students and visitors are treated, right? I've been to different federal prisons in all of those capacities and the only time I've been treated negatively is when I'm a visitor visiting a family member. I expressed that we're often viewed and treated as though were guilty by association, were traumatized already and we're further traumatized when we come there.  
– Kelly

They must be part of a church or a group or something, and they'll have like a visitor tag around their neck. And they go in – they're all joking and laughing and everyone's having a really good time [...] and it's completely different. When I did my practicum, there was a girl there that was just finishing her social work degree and she was a volunteer at [a prison] with an NA [Narcotics Anonymous] group, right, and she loved going, she thought it was great, like they loved her out there, it was really great. Well try to be a visitor, a visitor to an inmate, not just the institution. – Cheryl

All participants who were asked if they had ever seen a staff member be swabbed for the ion scanner stated that they had never witnessed this occur. Commissioner's Directive 566-8 states: "A routine non-intrusive search or a routine frisk search of another staff member *may* be conducted without individualized suspicion, when the other staff member is entering or exiting the institution" (CSC, 2015: section 29, emphasis added). According to this national policy that applies to all federal institutions, while staff *may* be searched, they are not obligated to be. CSC claims that "the presence of illicit drugs in a federal penitentiary is not only unacceptable but results in a dangerous environment for staff and offenders" (Sampson, 2007: vii). With this in mind, it might seem irresponsible for staff to forgo non-intrusive search measures such as the ion scanner, even if these were to occur on a randomized basis.

Even if the machine is operated properly and staff chose to express a non-threatening demeanour, four participants specifically mentioned the unavoidable unpredictability of the device.

I know that there are false positives so it could be anything, it could just be the machine that day [...] So you never know, you know, when you're going up to that ion scanner, what's gonna happen. – *Sarah*

I find that it's very arbitrary, I also find that it doesn't fill you with confidence. Like we can't confidently say, we can take all precautions when we go through the ion scanner. And I've told you about the stuff we go through just to go there. So we can't, every time [Joe's wife] goes, she's expecting to scan false positive. We have no confidence that everything we've done – and it's not so bad because we live a half-hour away. But people travel for hours to get there. [...] Because this thing is so sensitive, it'll pick up anything, and I believe for the technician to say 'oh the machine has been acting up' is ... I can't believe how unprofessional that is. – *Joe*

There's this little thing in the back of your mind and in my gut you know every time I go in and it's like 'take a deep breath, what are you walking into' right? The only thing consistent, or that has been consistent for myself and the members of [support group] is the inconsistency. Like it's never the same rules, it's never the same procedures, it's just always so different. – *Kelly*

This culmination of experiences supports the existing literature on risk technologies. These lived experiences provide a contemporary application of how these technologies which are supposedly designed to be objective and free of bias, are used in ways which serve to unfairly target individuals deemed risky by those who are in a position of authority (O'Malley, 1999; Lyon, 2006; Hannem & Sanders, 2012; Walklate & Mythen, 2015; Hannah-Moffat, 1999, 2005).

Whether it be the differential treatment of particular visitors, or of loved ones as a collective group, risk seems to be differentially targeted and treated in the visitation process, based on an assessment by CSC staff of the moral character of those under surveillance and their varied responses to the "objective" results of the ion scanner. In this case, due to the sticky stigma of being associated with a "criminal", loved ones of prisoners seem to be differentially targeted. In this case, the ion scanner is intended to serve as an objective surveillance technology. The

experiences of participants in this research demonstrate that prison staff understand families of prisoners as a risky population, and further, my exploratory data suggest they may understand certain family members and loved ones as riskier than others, which is exemplified by Autumn's experience of differential treatment.

The experiences of inconsistency regarding the operating procedures, the differential treatment of visitors, and the unpredictability of the device, all largely contribute to the emotional and psychological trauma that is discussed in a later section. These factors also contribute to deterring visitors from driving to prisons to visit their loved ones to begin with. Before entering into the discussion on how visits are deterred, it is important to understand the wide variety of sanctions, both official and unofficial, that can be experienced by individuals who hit positive on the ion scanner.

#### Sanctions received and the associated deterrence factor

There are a wide range of sanctions described by the individuals who participated in this research. Ultimately, these harms and punishments contribute to effectively deter individuals from visiting, and thus supporting their incarcerated loved ones. To preface this discussion, it is important to highlight the sheer volume of positive indications that occur in federal prisons. While I only had the opportunity to speak with eight individuals who have hit positive, every single participant claimed to know at least one, but usually several or even many other people who have experienced a false positive indication on the ion scanner as well.

Well I've spoken to people who've had a false positive. The lady I spoke to on Friday wanted my number and I e-mailed her that information. She actually scanned positive and had to do a closed visit. I don't know anybody who hasn't scanned positive [...] I've never witnessed someone who's actually tried to bring in drugs, and I've gone a lot and I never saw that. – *Cheryl*

It is important to recognize the widespread nature of these positive indications. These are not isolated experiences; they are the norm for visitors of prisoners. In 2011, the John Howard Society of Ontario released a handbook for families of prisoners to help them navigate the criminal justice system while their loved ones are incarcerated. The handbook, created by the provincial charitable organization, includes a section dedicated to the ion scanner, stating that: “Some people have told us about getting a positive ‘hit’ even when they have not used or held any drugs” (John Howard Society, 2011: 10). Several participants discuss the fact that they are not drug users and they explain their confusion as to where these drug traces came from.

This poor woman, she has 3 kids, you know they’re kind of middle childhood, and 2 of them are twins, twin boys. And she wants to go visit her husband who’s incarcerated. So she takes them and you know she says ‘I don’t have anything to do with drugs, why should I worry?’ well she kept hitting on the ion scanner and the last time she hit so high on cocaine that they turned her away. And now, guess what, she’s taking my advice and doing something. I mean but that’s the thing, I mean people think that I mean you should be able to think that way, but it’s not true. They think that ‘hey I don’t do anything so why should I be doing all these things?’ and they learn the hard way. – *Shari*

So my parents are Mormon, so if you didn’t know that means, they’ve never had caffeine, tobacco, anything. So for us, the fact that my dad would test positive is kind of ridiculous because he doesn’t even know like what drugs are. So he used to test positive all the time at the max. – *Kelly*

I mean I was totally innocent, I have nothing to do with drugs ever, you know, like never. I don’t even drink, you know. I don’t smoke, I don’t drink, I don’t do nothing. – *Shari*

These quotes illustrate the randomized nature of the ion scanner results. Five participants emphasized the fact that they were not carrying drugs, nor are they drug users. Not surprisingly, they occasionally came across as defensive about this. In addition, I have yet to hear of a case where the ion scanner has served to successfully identify drugs on a visitor entering a penitentiary. In their critique of CSC’s drug interdiction strategy, Jackson and Stewart (2009) target the ion scanner in this regard as well:

CSC has never been able to produce evidence of studies conducted by them or anyone else that establish the reliability of the technology in the field. There is no doubt that the technology is highly sensitive to certain substances and can identify extremely small amounts. What is in dispute, however, is the degree to which the technology can reliably differentiate between substances associated with illegal drugs and many other perfectly legal substances (82).

The sanctions which accompany positive indications can be quite harmful. Similar to the situation with other emergent tendencies that were found, the experiences of the individuals whom I spoke with vary greatly. Some visitors who tested positive on the ion scanner were still permitted to have their visit, the only impacts being the Threat Risk Assessment (TRA), and being assigned a specific table to sit at during the visit:

After talking to them for a while, I don't know, 10-15 minutes I guess she said 'okay I'm going to permit a visit. You'll have to sit at a scheduled table, and you know, then she said it would have to go to the Visitor's Review Board and that I probably would not be able to have another visit until the Visitor's Review Board had met and had discussed my case. – *Alice*

While Alice's experience may not seem like anything more than inconvenient, of everyone I spoke with, Alice's experience resulted in the least punitive action. Even though the TRA went fairly smoothly, Alice had to wait until the Visitor Review Board (VRB) made a decision on her case; therefore, it was about a month before she was able to visit her son again. Other visitors were moved from an open visit to a closed visit behind glass. While even this sanction is less severe than others, the loss of physical contact in a visit can be quite devastating for individuals, especially those who have been looking forward to it for long period of time. For that contact to be taken away solely due to a positive hit can be quite frustrating. More severe sanctions were expressed by other participants. Typically, after a positive hit and the subsequent Threat Risk Assessment, the Visitor Review Board will convene to discuss each positive indication, and a letter is sent to the respective visitor (CSC, 2012b: section 21). This letter is intended to outline the decision made by the VRB, and the potential sanction issued by CSC. Autumn, whose fiancé

is incarcerated, has received several sanctions which restrict her to a maximum of three visits, always behind glass, within a 90-day period. These sanctions were a result of positive indications on the ion scanner, in conjunction with the detector dogs. On one occasion, she received this sanction but never received the proper paperwork from the VRB, which caused CSC to impose harsher sanctions when she did not complete her three visits in the allotted timeframe:

I know what paperwork I'm supposed to get, I know what they're supposed to do, I know who I'm supposed to call and so the last time I hit [positive on the ion scanner], they gave me the paper saying that they're gonna contact me, they're going to have the VRB in five business days [...] I didn't get the letter for the last VRB, which is our last incident stating like our punishment and so I didn't get it until this day – I didn't get it. And they have a new correctional manager, which I called and tried to discuss this with her and she doesn't know what's going on so I was, I kinda tried to tell her, explain to her like the whole situation over again and of course I was getting a little bit heated up because ... because it's wrong [...] And because of that, when we started getting the visits in, I missed the deadline for, to get our visits in, like I missed the deadline and it's partly their fault, well mostly their fault and now I got like maximum punishment again for not getting our visits completed on time. – *Autumn*

Autumn shared that she has been assigned the 90-day visitation period three or four times now. Instead of being able to visit her fiancé as often as possible, she is subject to only three visits behind glass for three months. Not only was Autumn not carrying any drugs into the visit, but she also failed to receive the proper documentation from CSC after the incident occurred, which served to further punish her and her fiancé. The most punitive sanction delivered by CSC due to positive hits on the ion scanner was a 6-month complete visitation ban; this was delivered to two of the participants I spoke with. Kelly's story is particularly troubling and resulted in her being unable to see her brother for half of a year:

They scanned me three times with the ion scanner. And I don't know how to explain this fully but I knew I wasn't gonna get in just from their demeanour, I was like 'they're not gonna let me in' and I verbalized that to my sister and my dad. They asked me to scan the sole of my shoe, like not the top, the bottom of my shoe, which I don't have any control of what I walk in [...] The ion scanner didn't beep, they gave me no report, but they told me I tested positive for heroine and opiates. Then they brought the drug dog like to assess us. The dog did not hit on me, he showed interest but he didn't hit on me. [...] So fine,

then from there they said that they would let my dad go through, and my sister go through but not me, I had to go through an interview, which we weren't entirely comfortable because we all came together. Part of going to visit, whether its for a PFV or a visit, there's an unpredictability, right? Like we didn't know what's going to happen if we separate, we don't know, right? So we talked about it, my dad decided to go in because he thought my brother might be worried and we wanted him to have a visit anyways, right? And my sister and I would stay out. [...] After, so the three ion scans, the drug dog detection and two interviews of the same questions, I think it was probably ninety minutes or so, I just said 'this is enough, like I've answered your questions' and I decided to voice my opinion. [...] I explained my understanding of the ion scanner, that they didn't give me a report, it didn't beep, the sole of my shoe is not really something I can control. I just expressed my frustration, then they told me that in short they weren't going to let me in and that was it. They're like 'we're not gonna let you in because of this' and so we kind of – I think at one point I was crying, near the end. I was crying and I was just, I'm very passionate I was just upset. I said 'you know you treat us all like we've done something wrong – we've done nothing! You should treat us with incredible care because we're victims too. And all I'm doing is expressing my opinion'. So from there my sister and I left the prison, my dad stayed, we drove home and my mom came back after the PFV [Private Family Visit] to pick up my dad. I learned after the fact my brother got questioned by the drug dog guy about what my problem was. [...] I got a letter from the warden on October 30th, telling me that my visits had been suspended for 6 months for the following reasons: that one year previously I had been denied entry to a private family visit, which wasn't true. That I was uncooperative, which I don't think was true, I went through three scans, the drug detector and two interviews, and then they cited Commissioner Directive 770-17 which I had no access to [this is not a valid Commissioner's Directive, according to CSC's website]. I wasn't able to find it. – *Kelly*

Kelly's experience with the ion scanner and drug detector dogs resulted in an extremely punitive sanction for her and her family, including her brother who was waiting to see her, unable to know what was going on. She was unable to contest the accusations about the positive hit from the year before, even though she was certain that it was unfounded. As Kelly mentioned, she has very little control over which substances she may or may not walk on; to choose the sole of her shoe to swab led Kelly to believe that she was being purposefully targeted by staff, further discrediting the "objective" nature of the ion scanner as a risk technology.

Another participant, Shari, who visits her husband regularly in prison, has also been given a 6-month visitation ban as a result of hitting positive on the ion scanner. These formal sanctions can have widespread negative impacts, which is discussed in a later section. However,

it is also important to recognize the informal, less overt sanctions imposed on visitors and prisoners alike as a cost of the faulty searching procedures. For example, when taking time off work in order to attend a visitation the time may be wasted:

I called the institution to see if we could come on Saturday and they told us ‘no you have to be here by 4 o’clock on Friday’. So we took the time off work knowing that we could be penalized for it anyways. I think I took an unpaid day and my sister took most of the day off. – *Kelly*

Kelly and her sister took the day off from work, and Kelly was not even able to see her brother due to a false positive hit. Not only was her time wasted, but a considerable amount of money was wasted including the cost of travel for a five-hour trip and the amount of money that would have been earned had she not requested the time off work. This further contributes to the existing extensive list of financial burdens which often accompany the prison visitation process (Bruynson, 2011; Hannem & Leonardi, 2015; Chui, 2009; Comfort, 2002, 2003; Condry, 2007; Morris 1965; Brooks-Gordon & Bainham, 2004; Dixey & Woodall, 2012; Christian, Mellow & Thomas, 2006; Murray, Bijleveld, Farrington & Loeber, 2014; Grinstead, Faigeles, Bancroft & Zack, 2001). However, in Kelly’s case, the financial loss that she experienced did not even result in a visit with her brother. Another participant’s experience demonstrates how the ion scanner can impact the well-being of the prisoner as well, through the official documentation of these positive indications:

It’s frustrating. I mean I was totally innocent, I have nothing to do with drugs ever, you know, like never. I don’t even drink, you know. I don’t smoke, I don’t drink, I don’t do nothing. So to have that and know that that was over my head, and the other thing is [...] the other consequence was that I had a community assessment shortly after that. So community assessment is a report that they do to determine whether you’re going to be a good support to your loved one, right? And so I had a community assessment and they said that I was a poor community support because of hitting on the ion scanner. – *Shari*

In an effort to support her husband through regular visits to the prison, Shari’s experience with the ion scanner may have an impact on her and her husband’s future together upon release back

into the community. Once again, Shari was not apprehended for attempting to smuggle drugs, nor was there any proof beyond the positive ion scanner indications.

As I will discuss, all of the combined formal and collateral sanctions experienced by families and loved ones may lead them to conclude that avoiding visitation altogether may be a safer option for everyone involved in the face of the ion scanner's unpredictability and the potential sanctions that are associated with it. Safety, in this case, is not only for their own personal safety, but also the safety and future of their incarcerated loved one. After their experiences with the ion scanner, some participants' experiences are so upsetting that they have difficulty returning to the prison. This was commonly discussed by the individuals I spoke with. Even though each individual involved in this research is extremely committed to their loved one in prison, and still continue to visit despite the adverse consequences that they may face, two participants expressed hesitance to return after hitting positive. There are some individuals that may not even attempt to visit, based on the stories that they have heard from others:

Other family members will decide that they are not even going to try to visit on the basis of stories about the ion scanner, they're just not prepared. I mean it's only the most devoted family members who will run the gauntlet of the ion scanner because you know, it's just so important to visit. – *Sarah*

Some people who have never even visited may be deterred from doing so. The fear of punishment and humiliation can be powerful; though it is difficult to assess how many individuals have been discouraged from visiting due to these circumstances. As Sarah notes, only the most devoted loved ones will likely attempt to visit, as the ion scanner serves as yet another deterrent to the visitation process, which is already an anxious experience without the use of this device.

While none of the participants were fully deterred from visiting again, Cheryl recounts two members of her own family who refuse to return after their experience. Visiting a prison can

be logistically difficult, expensive, unpleasant, and intimidating to the newcomer even if everything goes smoothly. As previously mentioned, Cheryl's daughter will never return to visit due to her traumatic experience during the TRA following her positive ion scanner hit. Cheryl's mother also refuses to return after her experience with the drug detector dogs after hitting positive on the ion scanner:

My mom went once and she was so traumatized, she'll never go again. She's 79. And she just said 'I can't do that ever again'. Absolutely devastating, and they screamed at my mom and I had to stand there and take it - because I wanted a visit! And she was crying because they were yelling and screaming at her. It's because she put her hands up when the dog rushes at you, and my mom is kind of scared of dogs so she went like this [hands up gesture] and they're like 'take your hands down! You'll be waiting in the car!' like screaming and my mom just started bawling. – *Cheryl*

This woman's grandson will apparently only ever have one visit with his grandmother, due to the deterring impacts of the security technology used in federal prisons, combined with the aggressive treatment by staff. This notion that the ion scanner keeps people from visiting their loved ones instead of fulfilling its purpose of keeping drugs out is common among the participants.

The intent is to keep visitors out, to keep people out. I mean, it's coming throughout Canada, fewer and fewer and fewer people are going into prisons. And I've heard many human rights lawyers talk about how important it is that people go in and they see what's happening and they pay attention to who's in there. So I think it's a way of keeping people out, not drugs, that's what I believe. – *Kelly*

Well I think for sure that it has an effect in deterring family visits for sure because I'm sure that those people [...] that have tested positive multiple times, must be very, very leery of going back. – *Alice*

When I asked if the ion scanner serves to fulfill its intended purpose of keeping drugs out of prison walls, participants were skeptical:

Not at all, not at all, no. I mean if anything it creates a false sense of security for the jail. – *Sarah*

No. No I do not. In fact, if I was to categorize this, I would say ‘how come you are not scanning every worker, every support staff, and every guard?’ because we all know how drugs are getting into prisons. – *Joe*

Well, no. [...] Because, let’s just say you did have that many drugs or drugs you’re bringing in, it would detect it, you’re not allowed in. but it’s detecting it when there isn’t, I don’t think it honestly has anything to do with that in my gut and I guess my cynical, jaded opinion [...] I mean, it’s coming throughout Canada, fewer and fewer and fewer people are going into prisons. And I’ve heard many human rights lawyers talk about how important it is that people go in and they see what’s happening and they pay attention to who’s in there. So I think it’s a way of keeping people out, not drugs, that’s what I believe. – *Kelly*

While the previous quotes depict three participants who do not believe in the effectiveness of the ion scanner, all eight participants responded no to this question. The aforementioned statements reflect a distrust in CSC’s staff and policies, and its ability to truly “protect” those on the inside from the flow of drugs. This finding fits with the literature on heightened distrust in the criminal justice system, wherein families of prisoners who are exposed to the realities of the system in turn become dissatisfied and lose confidence in the abilities of criminal justice actors (Lee, Porter & Comfort, 2014). In addition to serving as a deterrence tool, these formalized and collateral sanctions contribute to a variety of emotional and psychological harms, as I will elaborate in the next section.

### Emotional and psychological harms experienced

The findings that have been discussed thus far highlight the intense preparation required for a visitation, the nature of the interactions between staff, participants, and the ion scanner, the inconsistency of this machine, and the sanctions administered to visitors who experience a false positive indication. This next section highlights the emotional and psychological harms that are experienced when a positive hit is received, both in the short-term and in the long-term. Further,

family members reveal how these experiences impact the prisoner who is waiting for their loved one to be scanned, hoping that they are able to make it past this unpredictable machine.

### *Short-term harms*

When a loved one hits positive on the ion scanner, what is felt at that moment? How does the interaction with this device, coupled with the interaction with prison staff, impact the emotional and psychological well-being of that individual? While all eight participants had their own unique experience which elicited various emotions, several consistencies emerged. Five participants explained that when they hit positive on the ion scanner and had to undergo the TRA, they felt as though they were being punished and treated as though they had committed a criminal act.

We [Joe and his wife] believe it's designed to punish the prisoners further by limiting their visitation because people get intimidated and they won't go. And that's what it does, it really intimidates people and limits their visitation. – *Joe*

Essentially, you get hugely punished for the mistakes that the machine is making [...] So she was treating me like an inmate. Not that I think inmates should be treated like that but seriously, visitors should not be treated like that. – *Shari*

The ion scanner has been a really humiliating process because all of a sudden you're branded as this drug dealer, right, and you're viewed as that. I mean members of our group, even if correctional staff don't mistreat you, it's suddenly you feel that and you feel the need to defend yourself. – *Kelly*

The feeling of wrongful and unjust punishment is common among the individuals I spoke with; the feeling that they are being penalized as a result of making an effort to visit and support their loved one who is being punished. This further contributes to the heightened distrust in the criminal justice system. These experiences speak to Rachel Condry's (2007) notion of "secondary prisonization" whereby families of prisoners feel as though they are also undergoing punishment associated with the criminalization of a loved one. While Condry's work does not explore the impacts of prison drug interdiction technologies, these findings suggest that the

impacts of the ion scanner serves to exacerbate the secondary prisonization that is already experienced by families of prisoners. Other words used by participants to describe their experience of receiving a positive indication are: humiliated, invasive, sadness, anger, frustration, and fear. Another common emotion felt by participants was shock. Since they were not carrying any illicit substances, the positive indication and subsequent treatment by staff came as a huge shock, as expressed by half of the participants.

You know, I thought, you know, maybe this particular ion scanner is less sensitive or whatever. So when I did get a false positive I was quite shocked, you know I wasn't expecting it. – *Alice*

We've never been involved in the criminal justice system prior to this issue so we had absolutely no experience with it at all and this was quite a shock when it happened. – *Joe*

Shocked um I just was, I was completely stunned and I just I said to the guy, 'look at me', you know? – *Sarah*

Expressing the sentiment of shock upon hitting positive was common: shock that they hit positive despite not carrying any drugs, and also shock that their preconceived ideas regarding the criminal justice system did not align with their own experiences and those of their loved ones. This latter point speaks to a certain level of privilege among a number of the participants I interviewed. Prior to their loved one's imprisonment, the majority of these individuals had not experienced the justice system in this capacity. Therefore, the feeling of being shocked by the ion scanner could have been internalized differently by other individuals who have been exposed to the criminal justice system more frequently throughout their lifetime, particularly if they came from more marginalized groups. Sarah elaborates on the fear that was expressed by several of the participants:

The fear it puts into you, that was the strangest thing. Even though I knew that it was unfounded, um, you think 'oh god did somebody plant something on me, am I about to get arrested?' you know? – *Sarah*

According to Sarah, hitting positive on the ion scanner was a fearful experience because it elicits the feeling of guilt, even though she was not carrying or even using any drugs. While the experience of hitting positive has immediate negative impacts on individuals, participants also expressed harms that extended beyond the visitation process and into their personal lives at home.

### *Long-term harms*

Individuals who hit positive on the ion scanner over a year ago still recall the incident and discuss how the trauma has impacted them beyond that single day. Kelly, who hit positive over a year ago while attempting to visit her brother, describes how she has been impacted.

That experience was, I mean it's been a long time but it was very traumatizing for me. I thought like, I felt like my love was being used against me, I don't know how else to explain it, and it was hard. – *Kelly*

Kelly mentions the trauma experienced the day she hit positive and in the days that followed.

Feeling emotionally traumatized was also expressed by five other participants who had similar experiences; however, this trauma is experienced differently by each participant.

[Joe's wife] doesn't typically sleep for two nights before she has to go visit. She has nightmares and she – it completely destroys her because there's no defense. – *Joe*

While Joe's wife cannot sleep for days before her visit in fear of the ion scanner's unpredictability, Autumn describes her ongoing battle with anxiety and how this is impacted by the ion scanner and the drug detector dogs.

I was like that for 2 years. Extremely paranoid like hand sanitizer, not touching anything, but I was like well ok well I can't live like this anymore, I started getting really depressed and like not going anywhere, not wanting to like even family things, I was just like ok I can't live like this anymore. Going to therapy did help like saying it's not me, because I thought it was me I was like 'ok it's me I'm doing something wrong here', like I blamed it on myself. That's what the therapist helped me with she's like it's not you it's the machine, it's a technical difficulty and I'm like 'ok I can't keep living with doing this to myself', it's like emotional abuse or something. – *Autumn*

Autumn halted contact with her family and friends in fear that she would be “contaminated” by trace amounts of drugs, which would trigger the ion scanner or set off the drug detector dogs.

This experience speaks to the widespread impacts that these risk technologies can have on people who are deemed innocent by the law, yet are treated as guilty by association. In discussing the impacts of the ion scanner, it is also important to consider the harms experienced by prisoners, which I turn to next.

### *Harms to prisoners*

Participants divulged how their experience with the ion scanner impacts their loved one who is often left waiting for their visit, wondering what is happening, with no way of knowing what they are experiencing. Positive indications on the ion scanner are noted in a prisoner’s correctional file. These notes can be used against the prisoner and their loved one in community assessments, parole hearings, and applications to be moved to a lower security institution. Alice, who has only hit positive on the ion scanner on one occasion, discusses her son’s experience when applying for parole:

Well uh, it was noted at his parole hearing. It was mentioned as something, and it was something in the form of ‘well okay, Ms. [name] we see that you’ve been a regular visitor with your son, you’ve been offering him a lot of support blah blah blah, um yes we do notice you did have a positive on the ion scanner, okay, one was above level, and one was below level, and okay apart from that we don’t notice anything’. It was mentioned. Now it didn’t affect his parole because he was given parole at that time. But it just shows you that it is noted. And I mean they do take note of visitors, like they do take note of how often you’re coming, who comes, blah blah blah, and yeah. So if somebody came and had a bunch of hits, you have to wonder, you know, how much weight would they give that?  
– Alice

Fortunately, Alice’s son received parole despite her positive indication on the ion scanner.

However, as she mentioned, how much weight would be given to the ion scanner if the visitor hit positive more than once? Rachel, who has been visiting her son for over three years, has

undergone multiple false positive hits, and this was reflected in her son's experience when applying to be moved to a lower security institution.

He had applied for – to go to a camp, like a minimum [security institution]. And in his report comes 'well your visitors have tested positive on the ion scanner, so there was no support given for a lower classification at this time'. Now, when they're coming up in reports, they don't put it in context – they don't say 'out of 100 visits, she's tested positive 4 times', they just put in 'she's tested positive 4 times', which is unfair for one thing. And when they do the TRA, the threat risk assessment, which is what they call the interview by the supervisor, they will tell you, and even CSC employees will tell you that the ion scanner is only one part of the threat risk assessment and it's given very little weight. Well, that is absolute nonsense because there, you cannot rebut the evidence of the ion scanner in any way, you cannot – even if you offered to be searched, they won't do it. I have offered urine samples, I've offered blood, I've offered hair samples, everything, and they will not do anything that will allow you to prove that you're innocent. I mean, you're just guilty. If it's given very little weight, why is it showing up in reports that the IPO's [Institutional Parole Officers] are writing for the inmates?

Not only do the families of prisoners suffer in various ways when they hit positive on the ion scanner, but the prisoner can be significantly impacted as well. This begs the question of whether or not some prisoners discourage their loved ones from visiting, both in fear of them having to undergo the emotional ordeal that accompanies the ion scanner and of having their positive hits negatively impact their own imprisonment. Family members also understand this risk and understand that their misfortune can impact their loved one.

That also goes on your loved one's record - their prison file that someone has tested positive, like you were trying to bring drugs in, but it goes against *them* and it's a false positive. – *Cheryl*

The knowledge that a positive hit can impact the loved one may further contribute to the feeling of helplessness that visitors often feel when faced with the ion scanner, as it is yet another aspect of their loved one's criminalization that they have little control over, though the repercussions can be severe. In addition to tangible harms that the ion scanner can cause for prisoners, loved ones also describe the emotional and psychological harms that are experienced. Autumn's fiancé

is aware of the troubles that she has been through due to the visitation process, and she describes how this impacts him as well:

For several reasons he started getting anxiety attacks but every time I go to visit to this day, like we both have to work on like not getting like panic attacks, like not getting anxiety attacks.

Similar to Autumn's fiancé, Shari's husband also suffers from psychological distress whenever she comes to visit him.

My husband suffers from, well he's got bipolar disorder, so he suffers from anxiety quite a bit. And that just, this whole ion scanner to this day, destroys him. Every time I visit, he worries and worries and worries and worries and he does not stop. – *Shari*

Even if a prisoner does not live with any mental health issues, they are certainly impacted by the struggle that their loved one is forced to undergo.

I think overall it disappoints him. When we come to visit in particular for PFVs [Private Family Visits], he's like our host right, it's like we're coming into his home, so he tries very hard to make it as pleasant as he can. And that's a heavy burden to bear when you don't have any control over things that happen. There's been other negative experiences while we were visiting him. He just shakes his head, he apologizes, and yeah I think it disappoints him, I think it disheartens him, I think it contributes to the guilt he already feels. Not only did he hurt us by what he did, we're continually hurt when we come to see him right? So, I think it's just makes his burden heavier honestly. He hasn't really said blatant like 'this makes me angry' but I can see it, right? – *Kelly*

He's horrified by the whole thing. And he's very upset about my daughter [hitting positive] because she's so straight, like because of him probably [...] Anyways so for her, who is so against that kind of stuff, and to be treated so badly, to be put in a room alone, to be held and screened and threatened, he's going to be upset about that. – *Cheryl*

In their response to an e-petition challenging the ion scanner, CSC states that “visitors of inmates are not penalized with restricted visits based on ion scanner results alone” (Hansard, 2017: para.

3). The experiences of some of the individuals I spoke with differ significantly from CSC's rhetoric. The negative consequences of this problematic risk technology seep into numerous facets of people's lives, particularly impacting the loved ones of prisoners. However, it is important to recognize that these individuals are also often resilient and maybe resistant to the

ion scanner. They do not all silently stand by while this device continues to harm them and their loved ones.

### Resilience in the face of the ion scanner and engaging in resistance

Participants recounted their experiences of harm, punishment, and trauma, but they also expressed tactics of resilience and resistance, particularly those who have hit positive on more than one occasion, and those who have been visiting their loved one for a long period of time. Organizations such as the John Howard Society, Mothers Offering Mutual Support (MOMS), and Together Overcoming Darkness and Despair (TODD) have all contributed to helping individuals prepare themselves for the ion scanner, and to understand the potential consequences before their arrival at the prison. Resilience is “the process of adapting well in the face of adversity, trauma, tragedy, threats or even significant sources of stress (American Psychological Association, 2014: para. 4)”. While all eight participants have hit positive, each of them have returned to visit, or plan to do so. Four participants claimed that if they remain complacent in the face of receiving a positive indication, they are more likely to be allowed their visit due to the fact that the prison staff holds all the power.

To me there was really no point in even talking to them because, or arguing with them because they have pretty much all the power. They’re in their own little fiefdom, they don’t really care what the outside says. And if you don’t do what they say then they can make it difficult. – *Rachel*

However, tactics of resistance also emerged in this research. It is important to understand the distinction between resilience and resistance in this context. While resilience might entail using tactics that will increase the chances of a visitation, resistance emerges when a visitor has become exhausted and angered with the very presence of the ion scanner, and thereby resorts to

more adversarial tactics in an effort to refute the accusations that have been thrust upon them. In Hollander and Einwohner's (2004) extensive review of relevant literature, they found that when defining resistance, a certain degree of action and opposition are always involved. The role of power is also central to resistance; Hollander and Einwohner (2004) draw upon the work of Foucault (1978) to argue: "Where there is power, there is resistance, and yet, or rather consequently, this resistance is never in a position of exteriority in relation to power" (548). The power yielded by prison staff has inevitably led to resistance by those who are subject to that power. The tactics of resistance utilized by some of the individuals I spoke with have sometimes proven to be effective, while other times they have not. Autumn recounts her and her fiancé's acts of resistance towards the ion scanner:

He [Autumn's fiancé] put in the institutional grievances and they still haven't been looked into so after all this stuff at [the federal prison] I'm like 'ok like nobody's doing anything I'm just gonna have to take this into my own hands now'. So I'm waiting on help with the human rights complaint form. – *Autumn*

Autumn's fiancé has filed his own grievances regarding the ion scanner, and she has been in contact with a human rights lawyer in order to better understand her own rights as a visitor, and to potentially turn to further legal action. Shari also refuted her sanctions each time she hit positive on the ion scanner:

I did actually rebut every single hit by the way. I sent a letter every single time. And one time it actually helped. I remember the person in V&C [Visits and Correspondence] she said 'hey your letter worked! You know, your sanctions haven't changed, or gotten worse'. – *Shari*

After Kelly's incident with the ion scanner which resulted in a six-month visitation ban, she also took action by sending a letter to the Minister of Public Safety, as well as to her local Member of Parliament, explaining the injustices that she has experienced. After Kelly expressed her concerns, she noticed a shift in attitude from prison staff:

I will say since I voiced [...] my concerns that day, and I wrote the letter, I have nothing, just solely because of that, to be clear. But I have noticed the treatment and attitude is very very different now at [the prison]. I don't know if it's just because of that, I don't know if it's because there's been some training, I don't know if it's because of understanding, I don't know what it is. But it's been – people are much nicer now. So, seem to be, not always, but generally yeah they're way nicer. There's still been some incidents but nothing quite to that level. – *Kelly*

Kelly's resistance tactics seemed to have made a noticeable difference to her. Rachel has had a very similar experience to Kelly in terms of a shift in attitude from prison staff. Rachel has spoken out against the ion scanner, as she has hit positive on several occasions. Her son has also filed a multi-prisoner institutional grievance against CSC's use of the machine. Rachel attributes an improvement in the staff's procedures she has observed to the complaints that she, her son, and others have been making regarding the ion scanner:

I notice that their technique about swabbing at [prison] anyway has improved because they're supposed to clean their whole area around them before they even start swabbing people. They're also supposed to test their own hand which I've never seen anybody do. They're also supposed to put in a test swab before they do it. And I've noticed that wherever I am in the line, doesn't really matter because whoever gets there first goes up first. So I've been first, I've been second, I've been third, and now it really doesn't matter where I am in the line, they put a test swab through before they do mine. – *Rachel*

These various techniques of resistance pursued by the participants, such as letter writing, official grievances, contacting lawyers, seem to have made some positive differences. However, what about those who do not fight back against the machine, in fear of losing their visitation rights, or in fear of hurting their incarcerated loved one? This is a very fine line that must be walked by loved ones. Also, why do some people speak out while others do not? Cheryl expresses the importance of the existing support groups in Canada, and how they contribute to individuals feeling less lonely throughout this process:

That's why groups like TODD and MOMS, like I've heard, have been instrumental in some people just getting, just feeling better [...] You don't feel alone anymore. You just don't feel alone. The more people I can reach when I go to visit [the prison], I just get everyone all the information because they're feeling the same way. – *Cheryl*

It seems that a significant part of this resistance is fueled when individuals who hit positive come to realize that they are not alone; they are not the only ones who have had to deal with these procedures, and they understand that the machine is heavily flawed, and it is not their own faults.

I've noticed also that other people are now starting to speak up, they're not afraid of speaking out [...] I heard one woman say to him [correctional officer] 'you have to change your gloves'. So people are speaking out, they're not intimidated by this technology as much as they used to be because technology is everywhere and everybody knows that there can be a glitch. – *Rachel*

### Summary

Despite the challenges that are faced by loved ones of prisoners and the prisoners themselves, there are tactics of resilience used by individuals to deal with the ion scanner's faultiness, in addition to small acts of resistance being employed by individuals to combat the use of the machine. The use of the ion scanner to screen visitors to prisons in Canada has created a plethora of issues for those who wish to visit and support their loved ones. The preparations taken by individuals are intense and time consuming, yet unfortunately they do not seem to be exaggerated or unnecessary. Further, the interactions between staff and visitors, and the Threat Risk Assessment largely serves to exacerbate the fear and stigmatization already felt by this invisible population. The people I spoke with all point to the inconsistency and unpredictability of the ion scanner in terms of the operating procedures, and also the noticeable differential treatment of visitors. The sanctions received for hitting positive also vary greatly, ranging from no official sanction, to six-month visitation bans. These sanctions serve as a deterrent for all visitors, perhaps even for people who have never visited because they are daunted by the presence of these intense security measures. These official punishments create additional harms,

both short-term and long-term for loved ones and for the prisoners in which they are making attempts to visit.

In the autumn of 2016, a nation-wide act of resistance was mobilized led by a member of the MOMS group, through the creation of an e-petition, it was presented in the House of Commons in April 2017. The details of this act of resistance is discussed in the following chapter. Chapter 6 explores the notion of tying together advocacy and education, by applying a public criminology approach to the classroom experience at Carleton University.

## **Chapter 6: The impacts of bringing public criminology into a university classroom**

*“Nowhere is the gap between perception and evidence greater than in the study of crime and punishment” (Uggen & Inderbitzin, 2010: 726)*

This chapter is dedicated to the exploration of public criminology through the experience of teaching in a sociology course at Carleton University entitled Community Engaged Sociology. I begin by providing an overview of public criminology, and drawing on the work of others in order to define what I believe to “count” as effective public criminology. This is followed by a description of the Community Engaged Sociology course, previous projects that have been completed in this course, and the project that I led with a group of eight students, in collaboration with MOMS Ottawa. I use my own experience with the Community Engaged Sociology course to provide a tangible example of how public criminology can be used in a university setting, and how elements of critical pedagogy are interwoven in this type of course. Finally, barriers are presented and recommendations for the future are suggested.

### Understanding public criminology

Public criminology has been defined differently by an array of sociological and criminological scholars, yet generally, there are certain commonalities in how it is understood. Some argue that engaging in public criminology has been longstanding; however, it has been defined and redefined at different points in time, varying by context (Clear, 2010; Rock, 2014). Public criminology, drawing on Burawoy’s (2005) notion of public sociology, involves making scholarly research more accessible, and more widely known to an audience beyond that of academia; one underlying idea of this traditional definition of public criminology is to make the general public more aware of the research in these fields (Uggen & Inderbitzin, 2010). Further, the general purpose of making those outside of academia more aware of the research being

undertaken is intended to lead to positive social change, and this oftentimes involves changes in public policy involving crime and punishment. Public criminology can also involve a different approach, wherein criminologists make attempts to shift penal policy in a more direct manner, bypassing trying to alter public opinion and simply working directly with policy makers or pursuing other avenues of change (Loader & Sparks, 2011).

Currie (2007) argues that before we can impact legislation and reach policy-makers in an effective manner, we must first “help inform the public mind” (178). However, in which ways can we engage with the public successfully? Among the most well-known work on public criminology is that of Loader and Sparks (2011), who categorize the roles of public criminologists into six possible capacities: the democratic under-labourer, the scientific expert, the policy advisor, the observer-turned-player, the social movement theorist, and the lonely prophet. While there is value in these roles and what each of them can offer, they have been criticized for being too categorical, reformist, and paternalistic (see Carrier, 2014; Piché, 2016). The roles of public criminologists do not always have such defined boundaries, and they should not be expected to be so clearly distinguished (Carrier, 2014). Instead of focusing on the distinct roles set out by Loader and Sparks’ (2011), I would like to instead turn to an alternative way of thinking about public criminology.

Ruggiero (2012) poses a question regarding how public criminologists in academia can effectively engage in a participatory democracy, while maintaining their credibility as social scientists. He responds to his own question by positing that:

One response may lie in the choice of research questions made in dialogue with communities affected by crime and crime control, rather than determined by institutional funding bodies. Dissemination of findings, in this case, would not be limited to the professional community, but would attempt to access public forums, thus reducing ‘servility’, the chief pathological trait of academic research. (Ruggiero, 2012: 154)

Uggen and Inderbitzin (2010) also underline the importance of forming research questions with “affected communities as opposed to say ‘filling potholes’ in the professional literature” (728). This way of engaging in public criminology fits with abolitionist ideals, as discussed by Ruggiero (2012) and Piché (2016). The abolitionist movement has always engaged with the public, particularly marginalized populations, in order to produce knowledge (Ruggiero, 2012; Piché, 2016). Abolitionists “seem aware that disadvantaged people have to find their own way of articulating their experiences of injustice and expressing their need for recognition.” (Ruggiero, 2012: 157). Engaging and consulting with populations that are most impacted by crime and punishment policies should be a core element of any public criminological endeavor. One way that we can engage in a more abolitionist public criminology is through the role of “researcher-as-facilitator”, which involves “a focus on relationship-building that fosters trust necessary for intellectual engagement among peers, as well as the circulation of power during the process” (Piché, Gaucher & Walby, 2014: 450). An example of this is the *Journal of Prisoners on Prisons*, where former and current prisoners are provided with the space to publish their own work on the struggles of imprisonment; in this case, academics serve as facilitators for criminalized individuals to disseminate their work (Piché, 2016: 82).

Another important element that needs to be addressed in our work, yet is often disregarded, is emotion. Mopas and Moore (2012) insist that criminologists must take into consideration the impact that emotion has on the public’s perceptions of crime and punishment. To ignore the legitimacy of these emotional responses to crime is to ignore a crucial element needed to effectively engaging with the public. This is an important component to public criminology that is often overlooked; academics who attempt to use facts and research to support their claims, while simultaneously dismissing the emotional responses to crime as irrational or

false, cut against the notion that public criminology seeks to engage with and speak to the understandings and reactions of the general public. Barak (2001) stresses that criminology ought to provide the public with a more “realistic” image of crime and punishment, however, it is important to question reality itself. Keeping this in mind, Ahmed (2004) suggests that the way in which people emotionally react to certain events “helps to shape the borders between ‘us’ and ‘them’” (in Mopas & Moore, 2012: 190). It is important to consider that emotional responses to crime and punishment often create their own realities for people, and to ignore that can be problematic. Therefore, in order to break down us versus them barriers and reveal the “realities” of crime, the acknowledgement and consideration of emotions are essential in this work.

The world of academia places overwhelming value on publishing research, yet too often does not provide the space for the dissemination of research findings in other forums in an effort to inform the public and engage with individuals and institutions in “the field” who can affect legislative changes (Currie, 2007). One recommendation that has been made in order to remedy this current reality has been put forth by Currie:

We should begin seriously to train students to do this kind of criminology—a kind of criminology that, again, is hard and demanding work, requiring much more systematic preparation than we now give it. We could do this in part by setting up special training programs within departments, but also, by seeing to it that the mission of dissemination, synthesis and communication is woven into every facet of the education of graduate students. (Currie, 2007: 187).

The literature on public criminology does not consider the role of teaching very much. Engaging in public criminology with students is an area deserving of more attention. While, doing this work within the current restrictive and publication-driven environment of academia can be challenging, it is important to push for opportunities to engage students in this work. This is where I begin my discussion about my own experiences with public criminology in the classroom, in a Carleton University sociology course.

## Bringing public criminology into the classroom: Community Engaged Sociology

### *Course description*

In the winter 2015 semester, a course entitled Community Engaged Sociology was introduced at Carleton University, spearheaded by Deborah Connors, Aaron Doyle, and Laura McKendy. This fourth-year sociology course aims to provide a space for students to put their theoretical knowledge to practice by working with local community organizations and assisting with their advocacy and research efforts, in an attempt to push for positive social change (Carleton University, 2017). The class consists of approximately 24 students, and the students are divided into three groups. Each group is assigned a team leader; one group is led by the Professor, and the other two are led by either PhD or Master's students. The graduate student team leaders are chosen because the projects dovetail with the graduate students' thesis research. Each group is then partnered with a local community organization, non-profit, or informal advocacy group. The purpose of this partnership is to provide students with the opportunity to learn extensively about one organization, to learn about the needs of a particular group, and to assist that group by completing a project that endures for the entirety of the semester. One of the most important elements of this course is the opportunity for students to create their own projects in collaboration with a community organization.

Students have worked with a variety of organizations, and there have been many successful projects undertaken since the inception of the course. In 2016, when I was a student in Community Engaged Sociology, our group partnered with the Criminalization and Punishment Education Project (CPEP). CPEP is a group comprised of professors, students and activists who tackle local and national criminological issues by undertaking collaborative research projects and public education campaigns (CPEP, 2017). CPEP emerged as part of the same movement

towards public engagement that led to the creation of the Community Engaged Sociology class. By partnering with CPEP, we were able to learn about the issues that are ongoing at Ottawa's notorious jail, the Ottawa-Carleton Detention Centre (OCDC). As a group, with guidance from our team leader, Laura McKendy, we interviewed former prisoners of the jail and conducted research regarding their needs while they are inside. Our conversations with former prisoners and their loved ones pointed to the need for more practical information for first-time prisoners. Our group managed to create a pamphlet for prisoners containing important information for prisoners, such as legal aid information, guidance for filing a grievance, contact information for the Ombudsman, canteen and visitation privileges, and so on. This brochure was presented to Ontario's Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services; it was approved, although they had made several changes to the document, mainly by cutting out some content. This brochure can now be found inside OCDC, accessible to all prisoners.

Aside from CPEP, students have had the opportunity to collaborate with various organizations in Ottawa, such as: The Alliance to End Homelessness Ottawa, Prostitutes of Ottawa-Gatineau Work Educate & Resist (POWER), the Ottawa Coalition to End Violence Against Women (OCTEVAW), and Discovery University. During the Fall 2016 semester, I had the opportunity to become a team leader in the course, and my group collaborated with MOMS.

#### *Collaboration with MOMS: Project overview*

Once I decided to focus my research on the ion scanner and its adverse impacts, I approached members of MOMS during an advocacy meeting to ask if they would be interested in collaborating with students on these issues, with the hopes of increasing public awareness. Two MOMS members came to the first class of Community Engaged Sociology to present an overview of their organization, and to provide an explanation of the issues that they, and other

families, face due to the presence of the ion scanner in prisons. After the representatives from the three organizations presented to the class, students had the opportunity to select which group they identify most with and are most interested in working with.

On several occasions, the students met with members of MOMS or we contacted them to ask questions about their group, and to inquire further about the ion scanner and other collateral consequences of incarceration faced by prisoners' loved ones. It became evident that public awareness was one of the most important elements for this particular campaign, since many people have never heard of the ion scanner or the impacts that they have on this hidden population. The main project that the students worked towards was the creation of two short videos. Each video was to be approximately two minutes long in order to maximize the possibility that viewers will watch the entirety of the videos. The students conducted interviews with two MOMS members who have had experiences with a false positive indication on the ion scanner and have endured adverse consequences. Footage from these interviews were used to create the awareness videos. There was also an advocacy portion of the project, which consisted of garnering support for an e-petition spearheaded by members of MOMS, and assisted by members of CPEP. The e-petition is a way for citizens to voice their concerns to the Government of Canada. Once approved, these petitions are posted to the House of Commons website. An e-petition can be created by any member of the public, however there are mandatory steps involved; the petition must be sponsored by a Member of Parliament and five other Canadian citizens, and it must acquire at least 500 signatures within 120 days. If this is successful, the petition is tabled in the House of Commons and the federal government has 45 days to issue a response. In order to garner support for the petition, the students created poster boards about the ion scanner, and set up tables at Carleton University. Further, each student was responsible for

acquiring signatures from their own personal connections, by talking with family and friends, or their fellow peers in school. These were the main components of their project for the semester.

### *Project outcomes*

The students successfully completed all components of their project. The two videos that they filmed and edited can now be found on YouTube (see Appendix C & D). These videos have been used by MOMS in advocacy efforts to raise awareness about the ion scanner. Further, the e-petition reached over 600 signatures. The students' tabling and word-of-mouth efforts greatly contributed to these signatures. The e-petition was presented in the House of Commons by NDP Member of Parliament Matthew Dubé on April 12, 2017. The Government of Canada issued a response to this petition on May 29, 2017, stating that the Correctional Service of Canada will commit itself to undertake a review of the ion scanners (Hansard, 2017).

While it is difficult to predict if this commitment will be upheld and if it will result in effective changes, it is still a tangible outcome of advocacy, and the students played a significant role in that. If nothing else, the success of the e-petition provides a space for on-going media attention and advocacy. In addition to the tangible outcomes for this project, the students were also provided with hands-on training with professional video equipment and editing software in order to create the videos. The students also gained experience by conducting interviews with two MOMS members, and learning how to craft an interview guide.

### *Observed impact: Effective public criminology?*

The project initiated, developed, and produced by the students differed greatly from the academic work that they were accustomed to in the university setting. Compared to the majority of other university courses, there was a fair amount of fluidity and looser organization involved in this project, as it was a group effort with several moving parts. Despite being somewhat

unfamiliar with this new way of engaging in the school setting, the students worked extremely hard, and they expressed that they learned a lot about an issue which they had never been exposed to before. In their end-of-semester assessments for the course, several students expressed great appreciation for being provided with the opportunity to put their theoretical knowledge into practice. They were all very dedicated to this project. Being able to meet with members of this group and to understand these issues from a more personal perspective rather than reading it from a textbook, allowed the students appreciate the issues in different ways, and motivated them to create effective and powerful videos. The ability to see their work be used towards affecting social change seemed to inspire them in ways that traditional classroom environments could not do. Three out of the eight students in the group asked to stay involved with the ion scanner campaign after the semester ended. In the months following the end of the course, there was another tabling opportunity to raise awareness for the ion scanner campaign and to acquire more signatures; these three students attended and helped to increase the number of signatures on the e-petition. This course thus made an impact on the students, to the point where several students sought to continue assisting in advocacy efforts on this issue.

I argue that the Community Engaged Sociology course serves as an illustration of a successful public criminology endeavour taking place in a university setting. This course brings public criminology into the classroom by having students engage with contemporary sociological and criminological issues, thereby “training” students this way, as Currie (2007) suggests. This course also upholds certain abolitionist ideals within public criminology, by having students and affected communities work on projects together and in consultation with one another, thereby having the students take on the role of “researcher-as-facilitator” (Piché, Gaucher & Walby, 2014; Ruggiero, 2012; Uggen and Inderbitzin, 2010; Piché, 2016).

Research conducted by Hannem and Leonardi (2014) on families of prisoners culminated in a list of concrete recommendations for Canadian policy and beyond. One of their recommendations reads: “Continued efforts to destigmatize families of offenders, including community awareness of the impact of crime on families and challenging myths and stereotypes about families affected by crime and incarceration” (Hannem & Leonardi, 2014: 28). While the students in this course benefitted greatly from this experience, so too did the MOMS, and in turn, families of prisoners across Canada, as the videos served to raise public awareness and to challenge common stereotypes regarding prisoners’ families and the notions of “drug smuggling”. Beyond the tangible products that the students and MOMS co-created, this particular approach to public criminology served to empower MOMS as a group, and it allowed the group to acquire useful advocacy opportunities and tools in order to assist them with future efforts.

The videos created by the students also emphasized the importance of feelings and emotions of the people whose visits were disrupted after a false positive on the ion scanner. The videos describe the emotional reactions to hitting positive, and while they critique the ion scanner for its unreliability and oversensitivity, the videos also provide a humanistic appeal by demonstrating the experiences of these individuals in their own words. Drawing on the work of Sara Ahmed (2004), Mopas and Moore (2014) claim: “the way we emotionally react to certain people and things helps to shape the borders between ‘us’ and ‘them’” (190). In one of the videos, one MOMS member remarks: “They would allow us a visit but behind the glass. It's hard to even to hear properly, let alone to be able to reassuringly touch him. I was just totally distraught; my daughter was traumatized. It is causing a lot of aggravation to families like me”. Instead of using hard “facts” and statistics, these videos make use of emotion in an effort to both

raise awareness, and to foster understanding among the public, in an attempt to dismiss the notion that families of prisoners are an “imagined criminal Other” (Young, 1996), thus breaking down barriers of the “us and the” dichotomy.

This course exemplifies the bridging of public criminology into a university setting. As a team leader, I was provided with a great deal of freedom, as were the students, to learn from MOMS Ottawa, and to assist them with their advocacy project in an impactful way, allowing for a mutually beneficial experience.

### *Barriers and looking forward*

Community Engaged Sociology is a course that exists within the current climate of academia which encourages, and often requires, frequent publication yet does not emphasize the effective dissemination of research to the public (Currie, 2007). Educators often find themselves trapped in the “institutional box” where there are increased pressures to conform one’s teaching to institutional regulations (Fobes & Kaufman, 2008). While this course proved to surpass these challenges and be successfully integrated into Carleton University’s course calendar, it is important to note the difficulty of making this course a reality. The course is unconventional in its requirements, engages students with potentially controversial actions, and requires a high level of resources (two teaching assistants in a class with 25 students); Aaron Doyle, one of the co-founders of the course, said the creators of the course were lucky to have support from colleagues and key administrative decision-makers. The course fits with a recent emphasis from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada on “knowledge mobilization” and partnering with communities. It also fits with a movement at our own university and across Canada towards “community engaged pedagogy” in universities. These trends fit well with the public criminology movement.

It is important to encourage the implementation of similar courses in universities, especially for upper-year students who have learned about current sociological and criminological issues in their coursework, but have not necessarily had access to the outlets which allow them to put this knowledge to use in terms of advocacy. On this note, Currie (2007) claims that:

We need to develop more effective advocacy organizations through which the collective knowledge of the field is brought to the public table – organizations that will allow us to be more assertive about social policy than we have let ourselves be up to now. (188)

Integrating a public criminology approach in the classroom setting has certain benefits, and can foster long-term engagement in students. However, it is also important to recognize the value of both formal and informal organizations who dedicate themselves to advocacy and research. CPEP and the MOMS Advocacy group are two examples of the type of organization that Currie (2007) describes. The MOMS Advocacy group is unique in the sense that it emerged as a subgroup to MOMS in response to issues that they and their criminalized loved ones were experiencing. Alternatively, CPEP was co-founded by two university professors, Aaron Doyle and Justin Piché, in the fields of criminology and sociology in response to the research they have done and their desire to advocate for social change by collaborating with students, community members, and those affected by criminalization. Therefore, while introducing more community-based engaged courses into university curricula is important, so too is the creation of advocacy organizations that are connected to the realities of criminalization and punishment on the ground, which foster knowledge and action oriented around social change.

### Critical pedagogy and reflexivity

The student experience in this course was impacted by the way in which the course was designed, and by my own experiences and positions as a student and social advocate. Fobes and Kaufman (2008) reassert the importance of critical pedagogy in educational institutions, specifically in the discipline of sociology. Following the seminal work of Paulo Freire, critical pedagogy is intended to encourage “the eradication of the teacher-student contradiction whereby the teacher teaches and the students are taught”, as well as “promote a problem-posing dialogue [...] that emanates from the lived experiences of the learners” (Fobes & Kaufman, 2008: 26-27). Engaging in critical pedagogy involves observing the social world in which we live, reflecting upon it, and pushing for positive transformation; thus, there is a heavy focus on praxis.

Freire (1998) insists that an educator cannot be objective in their engagements with students: “I cannot be a teacher without revealing who I am. Without revealing, either reluctantly or with simplicity, the way I relate to the world, how I think politically” (Freire, 1998: 87-88). The lived and learned experiences of the educators and the students play a central role in the way in this course was received. Community Engaged Sociology employed a critical pedagogical approach, whereby my own experiences as a researcher and as an active member in CPEP and MOMS influenced the project that we undertook, and it shaped the ways in which I communicated with the students. Abiding by a Freirian model, I did not hide my own resistance to the ion scanner, nor did I mask my dissatisfaction and disdain for the ways in which it negatively impacts those who are subject to it. Throughout my experience in this course, I was allowed the space to make my own resistance the resistance of others as well. While I did not hide my own preconceived ideas and positions, I was also conscious to provide a safe space for

the students who did not necessarily share my own views, and encouraged questions or issues regarding any material that we were working with.

This course allowed me to apply my own academic interests and social justice tendencies to this university course by engaging with a motivated group of students. While the students learned about a particular social issue in great depth, they also taught me a great deal by posing challenging questions, and by proposing creative ways to frame the videos in order to effectively raise awareness. Being close in age to the students also allowed for a more informal and conversational relationship, and it allowed us to engage in open dialogue. This relationship was also beneficial to me, as when I was confronted with a question of which I was unaware of the answer, I never hesitated to admit that I did not know.

My security is grounded on the knowledge, which experience itself confirms, that I am unfinished. On the one hand, this knowledge reveals to me my ignorance, but on the other hand, it reveals to me that there is much I may still come to know (Freire, 1998: 120).

## **Chapter 7: Discussions, concluding thoughts, and moving forward**

As I have shown in this master's thesis, the impacts of the ion scanner on families of prisoners are wide-ranging. While the machine itself is prone to producing false positive results, it is the way in which prison staff interact with this faulty technology that is problematic and often harmful for visitors of prisoners. This highlights what Lyon (2001) refers to as the "technosocial" characteristic of surveillance technologies, wherein devices such as the ion scanner often produce unanticipated consequences "which go beyond the intentions inscribed in their shaping" once they are inserted into social contexts that influence how the technologies are employed (25). The ion scanner is a particular kind of risk technology, as it is used only to detect the presence of illicit substances, rather than to calculate the level of risk. Once there is a positive finding on the ion scanner, prison staff at their discretion conduct a Threat Risk Assessment (TRA), wherein their own judgments are used in order to deem whether or not a visitor is of good moral character and whether or not they "deserve" a visit. The technosocial elements of the ion scanner ought to be conspicuous, yet when reviewing the benefits and pitfalls of the device, CSC fails to acknowledge the impacts of these aforementioned social factors (Dastouri & Johnson, 2011).

The findings from this research further negate the common assumption that risk technologies are free of human bias. Echoing the work of various other scholars, this research further supports the notion that certain populations are deemed risky by figures of power and authority, who then can use technologies, such as the ion scanner, to arbitrarily target individuals, using the device as a justification for objectivity (O'Malley, 1999; Lyon, 2006; Hannem & Sanders, 2012; Walklate & Mythen, 2015; Hannah-Moffat, 1999, 2005). Several participants in this study expressed that the instance they hit positive on the ion scanner, the

demeanour of CSC staff became angry, accusatory, and aggressive. When undergoing the Threat Risk Assessment, a process required by CSC policy, one participant, Alice, described the interaction as “neutral”. However, several other participants recounted much more negative experiences, characterized as traumatic. Most of the participants recounted stigmatic interactions with prison staff, feeling accused of an offence that had not been committed. While many participants experienced similar interactions with prison staff, the most striking theme that emerged was the inconsistency and unpredictability of the ion scanner and the subsequent resulting sanctions. Family members and loved ones of prisoners seemed to be treated differently from other prison visitors and there is at least a small amount of evidence that some family members and loved ones were treated differently from others. While this requires more investigation, this inconsistency seemed at least partly rooted in the assessment by staff of the moral character of the particular visitors, and, as one interviewee, Autumn, suspected this may in turn be at least partly shaped by factors such as racialization, the socio-economic status of the visitors, and other dimensions of marginalization. More evidence is needed to confirm this, but, if it is the case, this would be a clear example of how the “objective” character of a risk technology marks underlying moral evaluations of its target marginalized populations.

Loved ones observed that some CSC staff followed proper procedure, yet there are several instances where staff disregarded policy and acted in unpredictable ways. Procedural discrepancies were prominent in the findings, and inconsistent treatment was also a significant theme among participants. Several loved ones felt as though they were viewed as risky by staff due to their association with a prisoner, and this was reflected in the way they were treated upon hitting positive on the ion scanner. The combination of being labeled risky by authority figures and being subject to an unreliable risk technology fosters an environment wherein families of

prisoners are differentially treated and largely made to feel as though they have done something wrong. The use and abuse of the ion scanner reflects Garland's (2003) work which suggests that the increase in use of technology in certain social situations can result in the creation of new ways for misusing power (3-4). Several people whom I spoke with experienced such vastly different treatment from prison staff as a result of a positive ion scanner indication. As mentioned, some positive indications were met with relatively neutral exchanges between prison staff and loved ones. Yet in Kelly's situation, for example, her positive indication led to a Threat Risk Assessment characterized by hostility and aggression, resulting in a 6-month visitation ban from seeing her brother. The ways in which prison staff used the ion scanner and administered Threat Risk Assessments for all eight participants were varied. This inconsistent and unpredictable use of this risk technology and practice speaks to the arbitrary power that the staff hold over these individuals, and the ion scanner is a mechanism by which they can use and abuse this power.

Some individuals in this research mentioned how they felt as though they were treated differently than those who visit the prison in differing capacities, such as volunteers, invited guests, staff, and students. This was specifically identified by Kelly and Cheryl, who have both experienced entering a prison in a different role in the past. This perceived differential treatment reflects the grouping of individuals with certain common traits into "risk categories" (Doyle, 2007: 8), impacting their experiences. Loved ones of prisoners pertain to a risk category due to their mere association with someone who is convicted of a criminal offense. Ericson and Haggerty (1997) would call this categorization a "risk knowledge" that underlies carceral institutions across the country.

The ion scanner seems to operate as a deterrent for visitors who wish to see their loved ones behind bars. Hitting positive on the ion scanner and being treated unfavourably by prison staff can contribute to this deterrence, but the sanctions received by participants have also played a significant role in this deterrence. Families have been punished by having their open visits moved to closed visits, being permitted only three closed visits within a 90-day period, being refused visitation, and given a six-month visitation ban.

Emotional and psychological harm are spurred by these sanctions, and they can impact families and prisoners long after hitting positive. The feeling of shock, and being punished and wrongfully criminalized was felt by participants who experienced a false positive, contributing to the secondary prisonization of prisoners' families (Condry, 2007). In the long-term, loved ones describe their experience with the ion scanner, and the experiences of some of their family members, to be traumatic, and it has caused lasting anxiety issues for one of the participants, Autumn, and her fiancé. For prisoners, knowing that their loved ones can hit positive and be punished for it can cause a significant amount of grief and anxiety. Prisoners can also suffer from their loved one hitting positive on the scanner, as the incident is included in their file, and can be used against them when they apply for parole, or when applying to transfer from one institution to another. Psychological distress has also been experienced by prisoners, as told by their families, such as heightened anxiety. The existing literature on the collateral consequences of incarceration depicts a bleak picture for the loved ones of prisoners in Canada, addressing extensive financial, emotional, and psychological impacts (Morris, 1965; Condry, 2007; Hannem, 2008, 2011; Bruynson, 2011; Hannem & Leonardi, 2015; Chui, 2009; Comfort, 2002, 2003; Brooks-Gordon & Bainham, 2004; Dixey & Woodall, 2012; Christian et al., 2006; Murray et al., 2014; Grinstead et al., 2001; Braman, 2002; Hairston, 1998; Foster & Hagan, 2007;

Arditti, 2012; Green et al., 2006; Hagan & Dinovitzer, 1999; Huebner & Gustafson, 2007; Moerings, 1992; May, 2000; Moroney, 2008; Travis et al., 2003; Western & Wildeman, 2009; McCuaig, 2007; Codd, 2008; Watson, 2014). Experiences with the ion scanner upon visitation to federal prisons reveals yet another layer of harms felt by families of prisoners, adding to the current extensive list of harms.

The ion scanner and the way in which it is interacted with by staff creates an array of consequences for families and prisoners alike, yet many of the individuals I spoke with demonstrated significant resilience and resistance to this machine. Admitting that their friends or family have been deterred from visiting while they continue to visit demonstrates their resilience to this machine and commitment to their incarcerated loved one. They have learned from their experiences and have adapted in order to increase their chances of obtaining their visit by effectively preparing for the visit, and by remaining complacent in order to avoid provoking prison staff. However, participants who have hit positive several times and seek to remove the ion scanner from the prison have also taken action by filing grievances, contacting lawyers, and writing letters to Ministers and Members of Parliament. These acts of resistance have made some differences for certain visitors, though the machine persists.

Chapter 6 demonstrates the impacts that advocacy can potentially have on public perceptions and penal policy. While it is important to continue to contribute to knowledge concerning the collateral consequences of incarceration in Canada and beyond, it is arguably more important to engage in more public criminology in order to push for changes within and beyond the carceral systems in which we study. To echo Currie (2007), we need to push for the formation and strengthening of advocacy groups which use academic research and knowledge and use it for effective engagement and advocacy efforts. Carleton University's Community

Engaged Sociology course provides a venue for students to engage in advocacy, and this has proven to be fruitful and has also fostered lasting impacts on the students, as being involved in such projects can reach and engage them and teach them different kinds of skills that a typical university class cannot. Yet, a review of university sociology courses offered at Canadian institutions reveals that courses like this are fairly uncommon.

### Research expectations and moving forward

Before starting the interview process, there were certain findings in which I expected to uncover. From the previous informal conversations I had with individuals who have hit positive on the ion scanner, I was somewhat aware of the intense preparation, some of the sanctions, and the emotional and psychological harms caused by this device. Hannem's (2012) research on the ion scanner points to some of these harms, claiming that the device allows for heightened stigmatization of prisoners' families upon visitation. My own research echoes this finding, but also goes beyond it by revealing the various punishments imposed upon visitors. I did not expect to uncover such severe punishments for a positive indication, contributing to longstanding emotional and psychological harms.

Further, I did not expect to find such inconsistent procedures and variable Threat Risk Assessment outcomes. The inconsistent treatment, reactions, and sanctions by penitentiary staff serve to further validate the power that the ion scanner yields. These inconsistencies reflect an overall arbitrary carceral environment wherein prisoners and their loved ones are subject to harm and punishment on a whim, which further disempowers these groups. On its own, it is simply a device that detects for traces of illicit substances in an array of contexts. Yet, when the ion scanner is implemented in a carceral setting, authority figures can use this machine to unevenly manage and surveil prisoners' families.

This research is particularly relevant because the ion scanner persists in federal prisons across Canada, as well as in various prisons in the United States, despite the issues it causes and the lack of empirical evidence validating its effectiveness. This issue is not stagnant, and this research contributes to the existing knowledge on the impacts of the ion scanner, raising questions about whether it fulfils its intended purposes of drug interdiction and enforcement, while serving to keep families out. While this research fills a gap in the current literature, more research is needed in the area of risk technologies in carceral settings, particularly for families of prisoners. The differential impacts of the drug detector dogs were mentioned by participants in this research; future research on the ion scanner, drug detector dogs, and any other drug-detection technology used to search prisoners' families deserves greater attention. Further, in order to provide a more holistic understanding of the issue, future research could focus on speaking with prison staff in order to document their experiences and perspectives regarding the ion scanner. This research contributes to the literature on surveillance and risk technologies, as it relates to a prison setting wherein the primary targets of the ion scanner are not prisoners themselves.

The ion scanner is a risk technology often taken for granted as objective and free of bias. Yet, in practice it functions as an added barrier for families to spend time with their incarcerated loved ones, thereby discrediting CSC's "commitment" to facilitating consistent communication between prisoners and their families. This drug-detection device has proven to be ineffective, unpredictable, and outdated. To reduce the extensive harms faced by families of prisoners upon visitation, the use of this device in federal Canadian prisons must be discontinued immediately. However, CSC's prominent focus on drug interdiction will not allow for the ion scanner to be simply removed; an alternative technology has been suggested by several members of MOMS.

The body scanner, commonly found in airport settings, could be used to scan prisoners upon exiting the visitation room after seeing their loved ones. This negates the need to extensively search families, and it also reduces the invasive nature of post-visit searches for prisoners, which can currently involve humiliating and degrading strip searches. The body scanner technology has the ability to detect various substances without requiring any physical contact with the individual undergoing the search (Government of Canada, 2013).

While replacing an outdated and ineffective risk technology with a more accurate and less invasive one is a practical solution that can be implemented by CSC, there is a larger issue that must be addressed, that is, the treatment of prisoners' loved ones as a uniformly risky and population. Treating individuals as though they are inherently guilty by association serves only to perpetuate an "us versus them" mentality, leading to a continuation and exacerbation of stigmatic encounters and a heightened distrust between prison staff and prisoners' families. The ion scanner and its harmful impacts on families of prisoners is symptomatic of the widespread penal culture of retribution, harm, and risk, posing under the guise of rehabilitation and care.

## References

- Aena Internacional. (2017). *Global airport services operator*. Retrieved from <http://www.aena.es/en/corporate/global-airport-services-operator.html>.
- AJ Media. (2000, May 20). Drug detection device angers prison visitors. Retrieved from [http://lubbockonline.com/stories/052000/nat\\_LA0639-9.001.shtml#.WLMVrRIrKkY](http://lubbockonline.com/stories/052000/nat_LA0639-9.001.shtml#.WLMVrRIrKkY)
- Ahmed, S. (2004). *The cultural politics of emotion*. London: Routledge.
- Allen, W., & Bell, K. (1999, October 11). Panel assails machine that "sniffs out" drugs during prison visits: In some cases, families of Missouri inmates are turned away for what they say are false-positive readings. *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*. Retrieved from <https://www.newspapers.com/newspage/142804368/>.
- American Psychological Association. (2014). *The road to resilience*. Retrieved from <http://studentsuccess.unc.edu/files/2015/08/The-Road-to-Resiliency.pdf>.
- Anderson, N. (1965). When father goes to gaol. *Melbourne, Australia: Victorian Council of Social Service*.
- Arditti, J. A. (2012) *Parental and social effects of imprisonment on children, parents, and caregivers*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Atinkson, R., & Flint, J. (2001). Accessing hidden and hard-to-reach populations: Snowball research strategies. *Social Research Update*, 33, 1-8.
- Mears, D. P., Wang, X., Hay, C., & Bales, W. D. (2008). Social ecology and recidivism: Implications for prisoner reentry. *Criminology*, 46(2), 301-340.
- Barak, G. (2001). Newsmaking criminology. In E. McLaughlin & J. Muncie (Eds.), *The sage dictionary of criminology* (190-191). London: Sage.

- Bakker, L. A., Morris, B. A., & Janus, L. M. (1978). Hidden victims of crime. *Social Work*, 23(2), 143-148.
- Bauman, Z. (2000). *Liquid modernity*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Beck, U. (1992). *Risk society: Towards a new modernity* (Vol. 17). Munich, Germany: Sage Publishing.
- Bennett, C. J., Haggerty, K. D., Lyon, D., & Steeves, V. (Eds.). (2014). *Transparent lives: surveillance in Canada*. Athabasca, Alberta: Athabasca University Press.
- Berard, Y. (2007, July 29). Prison tests keeping out some drugs, and visitors. *Ft. Worth Star-Telegram*. Retrieved from <http://www.november.org/stayinfo/breaking07/IonTests.html>.
- Blackwell, J. (1959). *The effects of involuntary separation on selected families of men committed to prison from Spokane County, Washington* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from State College of Washington.
- Bloodgood, R. S. (1928). *Welfare of prisoners' families in Kentucky*. US Department of Labor, Children's Bureau. Publication no. 182. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.
- Braman, D. (2002). Families and incarceration. In Mauer, M. & Chesney-Lind, M, *Invisible punishments: The collateral consequences of mass imprisonment* (118-135). New York: The New Press.
- Braun v Maynard. No. 10–1401. (2011). Retrieved from <http://caselaw.findlaw.com/us-4th-circuit/1574976.html>.
- Brooks-Gordon, B., & Bainham, A. (2004). Prisoners' families and the regulation of contact. *The Journal of Social Welfare & Family Law*, 26(3), 263-280.

- Bruynson, K. (2011). *Experiences of partners of male prisoners* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from University of Ontario Institute of Technology.
- Bucsko, M. (2001, August 27). Scanning of prison visitors under fire. *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*. Retrieved from <http://old.post-gazette.com/regionstate/20010827drugscanreg6p6.asp>.
- Buroway, Michael. 2005. For public sociology: Contradiction, dilemmas and possibilities. *American Sociological Review*, 70: 4–28.
- Carleton University. (2017). SOCI4850D: Community Engaged Sociology. Retrieved from <https://carleton.ca/socanth/courses/sociology/sociology-undergraduate-courses/soci-4850d/>.
- Carrier, N. (2014). On some limits and paradoxes of academic orations on public criminology. *Radical Criminology*, 4, 85-114.
- Christian, J., Mellow, J., & Thomas, S. (2006). Social and economic implications of family connections to prisoners. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 34(4), 443-452.
- Chui, W. H. (2009). 'Pains of imprisonment': Narratives of the women partners and children of the incarcerated. *Child and Family Social Work*, 15, 196-205.
- Clear, T. R. (2010). Editorial introduction to "Public Criminologies". *Criminology & Public Policy*, 9(4), 721-724.
- Clemmer, D. (1940). *The prison community*. Boston, MA: Christopher Publications House.
- Codd, H. (2008). Who cares? The effects of imprisonment on families. In *The shadow of prison: families, imprisonment and criminal justice* (44-79). Cullompton, Devon: Willan Publishing.
- Comfort, M. (2002). 'Papa's house': The prison as domestic and social satellite. *Ethnography*, 3(4), 467-499.

- Comfort, M. (2003). In the tube at San Quentin: The “secondary prisonization” of women visiting inmates. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 32, 77-107.
- Condry, R. (2007). *Families shamed: The consequences of crime for relatives of serious offenders*. Cullompton, UK: Willian Publishing.
- Correctional Service Canada. (2015). Searching of staff and visitors. *Commissioner’s Directive 566-8*. Retrieved from <http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/politiques-et-lois/566-8-cd-eng.shtml>.
- Correctional Service Canada. (2016a). National Facility Directory. Retrieved from <http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/institutions/001002-0001-eng.shtml>.
- Correctional Service Canada. (2016b). Visit an offender. Retrieved from <http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/family/index-eng.shtml>.
- Correctional Service Canada. (2012a). *Use of non-intrusive search tools*. Retrieved from [http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/politiques-et-lois/566-8-1-gl-eng.shtml#E\\_Conducting\\_a\\_Threat\\_Risk\\_Assessment](http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/politiques-et-lois/566-8-1-gl-eng.shtml#E_Conducting_a_Threat_Risk_Assessment).
- Correctional Service Canada. (2012b). *Commissioner’s Directive 566-8-2: Technical requirements for Ion Mobility Spectrometry devices*. Retrieved from <http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/politiques-et-lois/566-8-2-gl-eng.shtml>.
- Correctional Service Canada. (2015). *Commissioner’s Directive 566-8: Searching of staff and visitors*. Retrieved from <http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/politiques-et-lois/566-8-cd-eng.shtml>.
- Coulthard, J. (2010). *Parental incarceration and the ties that bind: Children of offenders as collateral damage* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from McGill University.
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

- Criminalization and Punishment Education Project (CPEP). (2017). *Mission statement*. Retrieved from <http://cp-ep.org/mission-statement/>.
- Cunningham, A., & Baker, L. (2003). *Waiting for mommy: Giving a voice to the hidden victims of incarceration*. London, ON: Centre for Children and Families in the Justice System, of London Family Court Clinic.
- Currie, E. (2007). Against marginality: Arguments for a public criminology. *Theoretical Criminology, 11*(2), 175-190.
- Dallaire, D.H. (2007). Incarcerated mothers and fathers: A comparison of risks for children and families. *Family Relations, 56*, 440-453.
- Dastouri, S., & Johnson, S. (2011). Use of ion scanners in correctional facilities: An international review. *Research Review, 11*(1), 1-2.
- Dastouri, S., Johnson, S., & Moser, A. (2012). Drug detection strategies: International practices within correctional settings. *Addictions Research Centre: Correctional Service of Canada*
- Deakin, H., & Wakefield, K. (2013). Skype interviewing: Reflections of two PhD researchers. *Qualitative Research, 14*(5), 603-616.
- Dixey, R., & Woodall, J. (2012). The significance of 'the visit' in an English category-B prison: views from prisoners, prisoners' families and prison staff. *Community, Work & Family, 15*(1), 29-47.
- Douglas, M., & Wildavsky, A. (1983). *Risk and culture: An essay on the selection of technological and environmental dangers*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.

- Doyle, A. (2007). Trust, citizenship and exclusion in the risk society. In Law Commission of Canada (Eds.), *Risk and trust: Including or excluding citizens?* (7-22). Nova Scotia: Fernwood Publishing.
- Dunn, C., & Yuster, D. (2004). *Letter: Ion scanner abuse cited by NYCLU*. Retrieved from <https://www.nyclu.org/en/letter-ion-scanner-abuse-cited-nyclu>.
- English Oxford Living Dictionaries. (2017). Definition of risk in English. Retrieved from <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/risk>.
- Ericson, R. V., & Haggerty, K. D. (1997). *Policing the risk society*. Oxford, UK: OUP Oxford.
- Fobes, C., & Kaufman, P. (2008). Critical pedagogy in the sociology classroom: Challenges and concerns. *Teaching Sociology*, 36(1), 26-33.
- Foster, H., & Hagan, J. (2007). Incarceration and intergenerational social exclusion. *Social Problems*, 54(4), 399-433.
- Foucault, M. (1978). *The history of sexuality: Volume 1 (Robert Hurley, Trans.)*. New York, NY: Random House.
- Freire, P. (1998). *Pedagogy of freedom: Ethics, democracy, and civic courage*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers Inc.
- Friedman, A. (1997). Control of the Dangerous Classes: Bureaubabble and the Beep. In B. Gaucher (Ed.) *Writing as Resistance: The Journal of Prisoners on Prisons Anthology* (pp.185-199). Toronto: CSPI.
- Garland, D. (2001). *The culture of control: Crime and social order in contemporary society*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Garland, D. (2003). The rise of risk. In Ericson, R. V., & Doyle, A (Eds.), *Risk and morality* (48-86), Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

- Geller, A., Garfinkel, I., & Western, B. (2011). Paternal incarceration and support for children in fragile families. *Demography*, 48(1), 25-47.
- Giddens, A. (1999). Risk and responsibility. *The Modern Law Review*, 62(1), 1-10.
- Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster, Inc.
- Government of Canada. (2013). *Airport full-body scanners*. Retrieved from <https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/healthy-living/your-health/lifestyles/airport-full-body-scanners.html>.
- Gray, D. E. (2002). 'Everybody just freezes. Everybody is just embarrassed': Felt and enacted stigma among parents of children with high-functioning autism. *Sociology of Health and Illness*, 24(6), 734-749.
- Green, K. M., Ensminger, M. E., Robertson, J. A., & Juon, H. S. (2006). Impact of adult sons' incarceration on African American mothers' psychological distress. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 68(2), 430-441.
- Grinstead, O., Faigeles, B., Bancroft, C., & Zack, B. (2001). The financial cost of maintaining relationships with incarcerated African American men: A survey of women prison visitors. *Journal of African American Studies*, 6(1), 59-69.
- Hagan, J., & Dinovitzer, R. (1999). Collateral consequences of imprisonment for children, communities, and prisoners. *Crime and Justice*, 26, 121-162.
- Hairston, C.F. (1998). The forgotten parent: Understanding the forces that influence incarcerated fathers' relationship with their children. *Child Welfare*, 77, 617-639.
- Hannah-Moffat, K. (1999). Moral agent or actuarial subject: Risk and Canadian women's imprisonment. *Theoretical Criminology*, 3(1), 71-94.

- Hannah-Moffat, K. (2005). Criminogenic needs and the transformative risk subject: Hybridizations of risk/need in penalty. *Punishment & Society*, 7(1), 29-51.
- Hannem, S., & Leonardi, L. (2014). Family Victim Research: Needs and Characteristics Ontario Region, Kingston: Canadian Families and Corrections Network.
- Hannem, S. N. (2008). *Marked by association: Stigma, marginalisation, gender and the families of male prisoners in Canada* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Carleton University. (9780494474662)
- Hannem, S. N. (2011). Stigma and marginality: Gendered experiences of families of male prisoners in Canada. In Doyle, A., & Moore, D. (Eds.), *Critical criminology in Canada: New voices, new directions* (183-217). Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.
- Hannem, S. N. (2012). The mark of association: Transferred stigma and the families of male prisoners. In Hannem, S., & Bruckert, C. (Eds.), *Stigma revisited: Implications of the mark* (95-117). Ottawa, ON: University of Ottawa Press.
- Hannem, S. N. (2017, May). “*And what about the families?*”: *Challenging stigma in popular and political discourse on families affected by incarceration*. Paper presented at the Critical Criminology/Representing Justice Conference, Ottawa, ON.
- Hannem, S. N. (2016). Anti-fungal or opiate? Visitor or vector? The ion mobility spectrometry device and risk management in correctional institutions. *2016 Crime, Risk and Technology Conference*. Brantford, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University.
- Hannem, S. N., & Sanders, C. B. (2012). Policing “the risky”: Technology and surveillance in everyday patrol work. *Canadian Sociological Association*, 49(4), 389-410.

- Hansard. (October 6, 2011). *Standing committee on public safety and national security*. (Publication No. SECU-6). Ottawa, ON: Parliament of Canada.
- Hansard. (2016). Petition to the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness: Petition No. 421-01279. Retrieved from <https://petitions.parl.gc.ca/en/Petition/Details?Petition=e-516>.
- Hansard. (2017). Response to petition no. 421-01279. Retrieved from [http://www.ourcommons.ca/Content/ePetitions/Responses/421/e-516/421-01279\\_PS\\_E.pdf](http://www.ourcommons.ca/Content/ePetitions/Responses/421/e-516/421-01279_PS_E.pdf).
- Harris, K. (2012; May 30). Dogs out-fetch high-tech tools in prison war on drugs. *CBC News*. Retrieved from <http://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/dogs-out-fetch-high-tech-tools-in-prison-war-on-drugs-1.1219522>.
- Harris, K. (2016, December 21). Inmate families say prison drug-scanning tool finds false positives at 'alarming' rate. *CBC News*. Retrieved from <http://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/federal-prisons-drugs-ion-scanners-1.3905662>.
- Hartman, K. E. (2016, April 15). The war on drugs isn't even working in prison. *VICE News*. Retrieved from [https://www.vice.com/en\\_us/article/the-war-on-drugs-isnt-even-working-in-prison](https://www.vice.com/en_us/article/the-war-on-drugs-isnt-even-working-in-prison).
- HM Prison Service. (2003). *Unconvicted, unsentenced and civil prisoners (order number 4600)*. Retrieved from [https://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:LY0RsOVjOqMJ:https://www.justice.gov.uk/downloads/offenders/psipso/ps0/PSO\\_4600\\_unconvicted\\_unsentenced\\_and\\_civil\\_prisoners.doc+&cd=3&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=ca](https://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:LY0RsOVjOqMJ:https://www.justice.gov.uk/downloads/offenders/psipso/ps0/PSO_4600_unconvicted_unsentenced_and_civil_prisoners.doc+&cd=3&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=ca)

- Hollander, J. A., & Einwohner, R. L. (2004). Conceptualizing resistance. *Sociological Forum*, 19(4), 533-554.
- Hopper, T. (2011, August 10). Timeline: How Pearson International Airport catches smugglers. *National Post*. Retrieved from <http://news.nationalpost.com/news/canada/timeline-how-pearson-international-airport-catches-smugglers>.
- Huebner, B.M., & Gustafson, R. (2007). The effect of maternal incarceration on adult offspring involvement in the criminal justice system. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 35, 283-296.
- Jackson, M., & Stewart, G. (2009). A flawed compass: A human rights analysis of the roadmap to strengthening public safety.
- John Howard Society of Ontario. (2011). *Visiting a loved one inside: A handbook for people visiting a prisoner at an adult correctional facility in Ontario*. Retrieved from <http://www.johnhoward.on.ca/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/JHSO-Prison-Visit-Handbook-July-2014-FINAL.pdf>.
- Johnson, S., & Dastouri, S. (2011). Use of ion scanners in correctional facilities: An international review. *Research Review*, 11(1).
- Jackson, M. (2002). *The ion scanner: Arbitrariness at the front gates*. Retrieved from [http://justicebehindthewalls.net/resources/news/ion\\_scan.pdf](http://justicebehindthewalls.net/resources/news/ion_scan.pdf).
- Kampf, A. (2008). 'A little world of your own': Stigma, gender and narratives of venereal disease contact tracing. *Health*, 12(2), 233-250.
- KCRA. (2014). California prisons toughen screenings of visitors. Retrieved from <http://www.kcra.com/article/calif-prisons-toughen-screenings-of-visitors/6416973>.

- Kenny, K. (2016, December 14). Ion scanner readings blamed for visitor refusal at Gravenhurst prison. *Our London*. Retrieved from <http://www.ourlondon.ca/news-story/7015967-ion-scanner-readings-blamed-for-visitor-refusal-at-gravenhurst-prison/>.
- Lee, H., Porter, L. C., & Comfort, M. (2014). Consequences of family member incarceration: Impacts on civic participation and perceptions of the legitimacy and fairness of government. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 651, 44-73.
- Light, R., & Campbell, B. (2007). Prisoners' families: Still forgotten victims?, *Journal of Social Welfare and Family Law*, 28(3-4), 297-308.
- Loader, I., & Sparks, R. (2011). "Criminology's public roles: A drama in six acts", in Mary Bosworth and Carolyn Hoyle (eds.), *What is Criminology?* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press).
- Lombardi, K. (2001, July 26 – August 2). False alarm : A new machine designed to ferret out drug smugglers among prison visitors is targeting grandmothers, substance-abuse counselors, and other innocent bystanders. *Boston Phoenix*. Retrieved from [http://www.bostonphoenix.com/boston/news\\_features/top/features/documents/01730790.htm](http://www.bostonphoenix.com/boston/news_features/top/features/documents/01730790.htm).
- Lucchetta, C. (2016, November 18). How prison keeps families in the dark. *TVO*. Retrieved from <http://tvo.org/article/current-affairs/shared-values/how-prison-keeps-families-in-the-dark>.
- Lyon, D. (2001). *Surveillance society: Monitoring everyday life*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

- MacAlpine, I. (2016, June 6). Reliability of drug scanners called into question. *The Whig*. Retrieved from <http://www.thewhig.com/2016/06/06/reliability-of-drug-scanners-called-into-question>.
- Matthews, J. (1983) *Forgotten Victims*, London, UK: NACRO.
- Mauer, M., & Chesney-Lind, M. (2002). *Invisible punishment: The collateral consequences of mass incarceration*. New York, NY: The New Press.
- McCuaig, E. (2007). *Doing time on the outside: Managing relationships with imprisoned men* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from the University of Ottawa.
- McVie, F. (2004). *Drugs in federal corrections: The issues and challenges*. Retrieved from <http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/research/forum/e133/e133c-eng.shtml>.
- Moerings, M. (1992). Role transitions and the wives of prisoners. *Environment and Behavior*, 24(2), 239-259.
- MOMS. (2017). *Mothers Offering Mutual Support (MOMS): About us*. Retrieved from <http://www.momsottawa.com/>.
- MOMS. (2017b). *MOMS: Advocacy*. Retrieved from <http://www.momsottawa.com/advocacy/federal/>.
- Mopas, M., & Moore, D. (2012). Talking heads and bleeding hearts: Newsmaking, emotion and public criminology in the wake of a sexual assault. *Critical criminology*, 20(2), 183-196.
- Moroney, S. (2008). One step at a time: Reshaping life following crime within the family. Kingston: Canadian Families and Corrections Network.
- Morris, P. (1965). *Prisoners and their families*. London, UK: George Allen & Unwin Ltd.

- Murray, J., Bijleveld, C. C. J. H., Farrington, D. P., & Loeber, R. (2014). *Effects of parental incarceration on children: Cross-national comparative studies*. Gwynn Oak, MD: United Book Press.
- Murray, J., & Farrington, D.P. (2008). The effects of parental imprisonment on children. In M. Tonry (Ed.), *Crime and justice: A review of research* (133-206). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Mythen, G. (2004). *Ulrich Beck: A critical introduction to the risk society*. London, UK: Pluto Press.
- Mythen, G. (2014). *Understanding the risk society: Crime, security and justice*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- NBC Connecticut. (2015). Illicit drugs “rampant” in California state prisons. Retrieved from <http://www.nbcconnecticut.com/news/national-international/Illicit-Drugs-Rampant-in-California-State-Prisons-308907981.html>
- Nesmith, A., & Ruhland, E. (2008). Children of incarcerated parents: Challenges and resiliency, in their own words. *Children and Youth Services Reviews*, 30(10), 1119-1130.
- NYCLU v. New York State Department of Correctional Services. No. 3338-10. (2010). Retrieved from [https://www.nyclu.org/sites/default/files/releases/Ion\\_Petition\\_05.26.10.pdf](https://www.nyclu.org/sites/default/files/releases/Ion_Petition_05.26.10.pdf).
- O'Malley, P. (1999). Consuming risks: Harm minimisation and the government of ‘drug users’. In Smandych, R. C. (Ed.), *Governable places: Readings on governmentality and crime control* (191-214), Aldershot: Dartmouth Publishing Company.
- O'Malley, (2006) ‘Criminology and Risk’ in G. Mythen and S. Walklate (Eds.), *Beyond the Risk Society*. London: McGraw-Hill.

- Opendakker, R. (2006). Advantages and disadvantages of four interview techniques in qualitative research. *Qualitative Social Research*, 7(4), 1-10.
- Piché, J. (2016). Assessing the boundaries of public criminology: On what does (Not) Count. *Social Justice*, 42(2), 70.
- Piché, J., Gaucher, B., & Walby, K. (2014). Facilitating prisoner ethnography: An alternative approach to “doing prison research differently”. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 20(4), 449-460.
- Poehlmann, J. (2005). Representations of attachment relationships in children of incarcerated mothers. *Child Development*, 76, 679-696.
- PrisonTalk. (n.d). Prison & jail ion spectrometry drug scanners: Experiences and advice [blog post forum]. Retrieved from <http://www.prisontalk.com/forums/showthread.php?t=82515>.
- Roberts, J. E., & Rochefort, J. (1997). Strategies for the detection of drugs within the Correctional Service Canada: Research and development initiatives. In Enabling Technologies for Law Enforcement and Security (pp. 138-149). *International Society for Optics and Photonics*.
- Rock, P. (2014). The public faces of public criminology. *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, 14(4), 412-433.
- Rossi, J. (2012). The prospects for objectivity in risk assessment. *J Value Inquiry*, 46, 237-253.
- Ruggiero, V. (2012). How public is public criminology? *Crime, Media, Culture*, 8(2), 151-160.
- Sacks, J. G. (1938). *The social and economic adjustments of families of a selected group of imprisoned felons* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from the Catholic University of America.

- Sample, B. (2009). BOP suspends use of ion spectrometry drug detection devices. Retrieved from <https://www.prisonlegalnews.org/news/2009/feb/15/bop-suspends-use-of-ion-spectrometry-drug-detection-devices/>.
- Sampson, R. (2007). A roadmap to strengthening public safety: Report of the Correctional Service of Canada Review Panel. *Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada*.
- Saulnier, A. (2015). Racialized borders: Hypothesizing the diasporic implications of discriminatory surveillance at Canadian borders. *Journal of Borderlands Studies*, 30(2), 227-245.
- Schneller, D. P. (1975). Prisoners' families: A study of some social and psychological effects of incarceration on the families of negro prisoners. *Criminology*, 12(4), 402-412.
- Schram, T. H. (2006). *Conceptualizing and proposing qualitative research*. North York, ON, Canada: Pearson Education.
- Shwartz-Shae, P., & Yanow, D. (2012). *Interpretive research design: Concepts and processes*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Smiths Detection. (2016). *Smiths Detection*. Retrieved from <http://www.smithsdetection.com/>.
- Smiths Detection. (2016b). *Checkpoint security solutions for today and tomorrow*. Retrieved from <https://www.yumpu.com/en/document/view/36748577/checkpoint-security-solutions-for-today-and-tomorrow>.
- Smith, G., Mysak, K., & Michael, S. (2008). Sexual double standards and sexually transmitted illnesses: Social rejection and stigmatization of women. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research*, 58(5-6), 391-401.

- Stevens, D. (2008, June 3). Striking prisoners upset by scanner. *The Chronicle Herald Nova Scotia*. Retrieved from <https://confrontation.wordpress.com/2008/06/04/striking-prisoners-upset-by-scanner/>.
- Sykes, G. M. (1958). *Society of captives: A study of a maximum security prison* by Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Thompson, D. (2015, June 21). California inmates die of drug overdoses at rate nearly triple the national average. *U.S. News*. Retrieved from <https://www.usnews.com/news/us/articles/2015/06/21/illicit-drugs-rampant-in-california-state-prisons>.
- TODD. (2017). *Together Overcoming Darkness and Despair (TODD): Support and advocacy foundation*. Retrieved from <https://toddcanada.org/>.
- Tracy, S. J. (2013). *Qualitative research methods: Collecting evidence, crafting analysis, communicating impact*. West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Travis, J., McBride, E. C., & Solomon, A. L. (2003). Families left behind: The hidden costs of incarceration and reentry. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.
- Turney, K. (2014). The consequences of paternal incarceration for maternal neglect and harsh parenting. *Social Forces*, 92(4), 1607-1636.
- Uggen, C., & Inderbitzin, M. (2010). Public criminologies. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 9(4), 725-749.
- Uggen, C., & Manza, J. (2002). Democratic contraction? Political consequences of felon disenfranchisement in the United States. *American Sociological Review*, 67(6), 777-803.
- U.S. Department of Justice. (2003). *The Federal Bureau of Prisons; Drug Interdiction Activities*. Retrieved from <https://oig.justice.gov/reports/BOP/e0302/final.pdf>.

- Valverde, M. (2014). Studying the governance of crime and security: Space, time and jurisdiction. *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 14(4), 379-391.
- van den Hoonaard, D. (2012). *Qualitative research in action: A Canadian primer*. Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press.
- Vivar, J. (2014, July 2). Drug detectors unfairly target visitors. *The Whig*. Retrieved from <http://www.thewhig.com/2014/07/02/drug-detectors-unfairly-target-visitors>.
- Wagner, P., & Rabuy, B. (2017, March 14). Mass incarceration: The whole pie 2017. *Prison policy initiative*. Retrieved from <https://www.prisonpolicy.org/reports/pie2017.html>.
- Wakefield, S., & Wildeman, C. (2014). Before and after imprisonment in *Children of the prison boom: Mass incarceration and the future of American inequality* (44-69). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Walklate, S., & Mythen, G. (2014). *Contradictions of terrorism: Security, risk and resilience*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Watson, T. M. (2014). *Risks inside and beyond institutional walls: Organisational responses to substance use in Canadian federal prisons* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from the University of Toronto, Centre for Criminology and Sociolegal Studies.
- Watson, T. M. (2014). The elusive goal of drug-free prisons. *Substances Use & Misuse*, 1-13.
- Weaver, V. M., & Lerman, A. E. (2010). Political consequences of the carceral state. *American Political Science Review*, 104(4), 817-33.
- Western, B., & Wildeman, C. (2009). The black family and mass incarceration. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 621, 221-242.
- White, P. (2017, February 2). Prison visitors petition Ottawa to scrap sensitive drug scanners. *The Globe and Mail*. Retrieved from

<http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/national/prison-visitors-petition-ottawa-to-scrap-sensitive-drug-scanners/article33891061/>.

Young, A. (1996). *Imagining crime: Textual outlaws and criminal conversations*. London: Sage Publications.

Zalba, S. R. (1964). *Women offenders and their families*. Los Angeles, USA: Delmar.

## Appendices

### Appendix A: Interview guide

#### Interview guide

##### Introduction

- 1) How long have you been visiting your loved one in jail and/or prison?
  - Which institution is he/she being held in right now?
  - Has he/she been moved from one institution to another or have they remained at the same institution?
- 2) Has MOMS/T.O.D.D. been helpful to you when it comes to navigating the criminal justice system?

##### Impacts of ion scanner on loved ones

- 3) Did you prepare for your visit in any way before leaving for the penitentiary?
- 4) Have you ever received a false positive result on the ion scanner upon visitation? If yes, please explain what happened in as much detail as you can recall.
  - Were you still able to visit with your loved one after the false positive?
  - Was your visitation altered in any way?
  - How did this experience make you feel?
  - Did this experience impact your future visitations?
- 5) Could you describe your interactions with correctional staff when you received this false positive?

##### Impacts of ion scanner on prisoners

- 6) How did this experience impact your loved one?
  - Did they experience any emotional or psychological distress as a result of your experience with the ion scanner?
- 7) After the incident with the ion scanner, were there any other repercussions for your loved one?
  - Were there any institutional consequences? (e.g. marked on their record)
- 8) Do you know of anybody else who has had a negative experience with the ion scanner?
- 9) After your experience, did you have any contact with the institution about the specific incident?

##### Going forward

- 10) Do you plan on going back to visit your loved one?
- 11) In your own opinion, do you feel as though the ion scanner fulfills its intended purpose (to keep drugs out of prisons)?
- 12) Do you have any general comments about the ion scanner based on your experience that you would like to share?
- 13) Do you have anything else that you would like to add?

### Appendix B: E-mail recruitment script

**Kaitlin MacKenzie, BA**  
**Master's Candidate in Sociology**  
**A study of the collateral consequences of incarceration in a Canadian context**

---

I am inviting you to complete a one-on-one interview that will take approximately one hour. As part of the graduate program in Sociology and Anthropology at Carleton University, I am carrying out a study to learn more about the experiences of women with loved ones in prison; specifically, I am seeking to learn more about experiences with the Ion Spectrometry Mobility device (ion scanners) and their effects on visitation. In order to be eligible to participate in this study, you must currently have, or have had in the past, a loved one incarcerated at a federal penitentiary in Canada. Additionally, you must have had encounters with the ion scanner wherein you experienced a false positive result. Your name has been referred to me by a current MOMS member.

The risks in this study are minimal, but can include psychological harm that may arise from recounting harmful experiences. The participants in this study will be completely anonymized, and all personal information or details can be altered in order to avoid any possibility of being identified. There will be no available monetary compensation for participating in this study. You can stop being in this study any time during the interview and afterwards up to March 2017. I have attached a copy of the consent form for this study that gives you full details. This research has been cleared by Carleton University Research Ethics Board-A (clearance #105509). If you have any ethical concerns with the study, please contact Dr. Andy Adler, Chair, Carleton University Research Ethics Board-A (by phone at [613-520-2600 ext. 4085](tel:613-520-2600) or via email at [ethics@carleton.ca](mailto:ethics@carleton.ca)).

I would like to thank you in advance for your time and consideration. If you choose to participate, I will contact you again to make arrangements for our interview.

**Kaitlin MacKenzie BA,**  
Master's Candidate in Sociology  
Department of Sociology and Anthropology  
Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario  
**Tel:** [REDACTED]  
[kaitlin.mackenzie@carleton.ca](mailto:kaitlin.mackenzie@carleton.ca)

Department of Sociology and Anthropology  
B750 Loeb Building  
1125 Colonel By Drive  
Ottawa, ON, K1S 5B6  
[Soc-anthro@carleton.ca](mailto:Soc-anthro@carleton.ca)  
Phone: 613-520-2582  
Fax: 613-520-4062

Appendix C: Community Engaged Sociology video #1



URL: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cIZTN\\_MQzk](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cIZTN_MQzk)

Appendix D: Community Engaged Sociology video #2



URL: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=evL7nTCrprM>