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EDITORIAL: A DECADE OF REFLECTION
Paul Senior, Hallam Centre for Community Justice, Sheffield Hallam University

I have had the privilege of being the joint editor of this journal, first with the late Brian Williams and then Jean Hine since its inception in 2002. I feel proud therefore to be writing this editorial on the completion of the tenth volume of this journal. We were never quite sure that we would get this far and, at the same time, achieve and maintain the quality and diversity of contributions which we have managed. We have done this without a commercial publisher but with the goodwill and support of academic colleagues from De Montfort and Sheffield Hallam, administrative excellence in getting the journal from conception to published form from successive Hallam Centre for Community Justice Administrators, and the good advice and counsel of our Advisory Board.

It is though somewhat unnerving to be promoting a journal committed to exploring the positive contribution of community justice for over a decade when one of its key constituents, the probation service, has suffered unprecedented levels of attack, and now stands on the verge of extinction or at least severe constriction in the face of the current, seemingly ideological, assault by the current government.

Any review of the last 10 years would have to note that probation itself was not entirely lacking in responsibility for what happened to it when the National Probation Service was created in 2001. The loss of the voice of probation in the demise of ACOP, the simultaneous retirement of 50% of its leadership, the increasing difficulty the trade union at NAPO faced in remaining at the decision-making table, and the willingness of the new probation leadership to passively accept a series of managerialist and target-driven outputs left it vulnerable to attack. Practitioners became more office-bound and struggled to maintain their historic connections with local communities. The centre usurped the bottom-up developments of ’what works’ to impose a programme of CBT delivery which was ill-conceived in its scope and execution, and threw the champagne out with the cork in allowing some of the traditional essence of probation - case management, relationships, continuity of care, pro-social modelling - to be lost in the pursuit of bureaucratic targets such as breach statistics, risk assessment completions and programme completions. This distorted organisational priorities, as all target-driven reforms have a tendency to do (and Payment by Results is no less a target-based mechanism with all the likelihood of ’gaming the system’) and most disturbingly threatened the very essence of what probation is about. It is therefore somewhat surprising, though gratifying, that the resilience of probation practitioners has remained and its voice has been re-kindled to articulate a
coherent, evidence-based and robust defence of probation against the precepts suggested in the government paper 'Transforming Rehabilitation'. NAPO has continued, often as a lone voice, throughout the decade with a robust media presence which has produced challenging and thought-provoking analyses of practice. The setting up of the Probation Chiefs Association (PCA) and its work alongside the Probation Association (PA) has begun to produce a more coherent and robust defence of probation, though whether it is too little too late, only the outcomes emerging from government in May 2013 on the future arrangements for the delivery of community sentences will ultimately answer that question. The promotion of a probation register and Probation Institute by the PCA may act to defend probation as an occupation and we will watch this development with interest.

In the last few years the growth of social media has produced an immediacy to this strongly articulated defence of probation practice drawing on the insights of academic, researcher, practitioner and manager contributions, allowing an instant replay of thoughts through linking newspaper and academic articles, extensive blogging, campaigns, reports by think tanks and Penal lobby groups and just the reflective exchange of ideas. This became particularly noticeable during the probation consultation on 'Transforming Rehabilitation' when lobbying of MPs via E-petitions and multiple blogs, media appearances and response documents crowded the cyber waves linked via Twitter as people tried to come to terms with the plans for change. Though inevitably some of the debate can become a little stylised in 140 character exchanges and the mantra of PUBLIC GOOD: PRIVATE BAD did mar some of the debate, when you unpacked the thoughtfulness of the blogs and media discussions a clarity and more nuanced perspective emerged. Indeed I would argue that the role of the private sector is now so endemic given the way it has annexed such criminal justice practices as electronic monitoring; court escorting; private security; prisons; and most recently community payback and other bastions of public sector work in welfare, health and work that it is not possible (or even desirable?) simply to wish the private sector out of existence completely. Indeed should the public sector through probation and the police have engaged more robustly in the delivery of electronic monitoring at the outset as has occurred in other European jurisdictions and might this have changed the historical course of events?

Whilst the private sector, alongside the voluntary sector may have an important role to play in the delivery of community services, no convincing argument has yet been proffered that probation must not remain as the guardian of the statutory elements enshrined in the delivery of court sentences. Whilst probation is to retain a residual set of functions around public protection, risk assessment and management of ‘high risk’ cases and the provision of courts reports the abject failure to understand the interrelationships between those roles and the case management of individual service users threatens to fragment services, and ultimately to put the public at risk. The dynamics of risk assessment and management are complex and the professional judgement and coordination between services is a taken-for-granted often unnoticed set of skills which probation workers undertake on a daily basis. Static characterisations of risk as low, medium and high fails to acknowledge this complexity and it is not scaremongering to speculate that if services become fragmented that lines of responsibility will be obscured and good defensible decision making will not
be possible. This is about victim and public safety and alone should make politicians pause about instigating drastic ill-thought out changes.

However the evidence-base is far more extensive about the effective role that probation plays in managing service users resulting in a reduction in reoffending. A high quality, high performing and professionalised service with quality awards to support this and a growing history of effective partnerships to delivery alongside other providers should not be allowed to wither. Indeed this is precisely the high quality service government apparently desires. A brief look at Integrated Offender Management (IOM) shows a complex multi-agency system which has pooled budgets, created justice reinvestment and savings, (another government priority), and delivered a positive resettlement service to that neglected group of service users who have no statutory licence on release. At the core of IOM is the role of the probation worker providing the case management glue to link providers from the police, voluntary sector, health service and private sector. Do these dedicated hubs need the incentivisation of cash reward to focus on reducing reoffending or the stimulus of competition to perform better. The evidence from the research is that the public service ethos of delivery provides sufficient motivation to good practice and that cooperation rather than competition provides a stimulus to pool budgets and make savings. This is an alternative model to the profit-driven approach which has been so singularly unsuccessful in the Work Programme. But will government heed the constant tweeting of good news or will they seek to silence the voices of the probation chiefs by removing them from twitter as their voice becomes a significant countervailing force to the government rhetoric. Probation has belatedly found its voice again in the last few years and any attempt to silence it now should be resisted. Whether the government will listen to the cacophony of noisy dispute which has been created by responding to these reforms is doubtful. As co-editor I am committed to presenting evidence-based articles in these pages which demonstrates the wealth of good practice here and abroad. I hope we will still be celebrating and supporting probation in another ten year’s time.

...........................................

This final edition of Volume 10 has already experimented with the form of the journal by introducing two interviews, another thought-piece presented as a polemic for debate and a response to a thought-piece as well as a traditional article. The emergence of blogs as a form of expression of ideas is very similar to what we are trying to present in the Thought Pieces. So if you wish to send us a polemical argument on our core themes which draws maybe on a blog then we would be happy to consider them.

...........................................

We wanted to find a way of reflecting on 10 years of publishing and draw some lessons from it. I decided to sit down with one of our Advisory Board members, Emeritus Professor Mike Nellis to have a conversation about those 10 years. We spent an enjoyable day reflecting on some of the key themes and issues and then recorded the thoughts. This is presented as the opening article in this contribution.
Our Managing Editor, Professor Dave Ward, had recently spent some time in Canada and Jean Hine, my co-editor, was dispatched to discuss this trip with him. The resultant interview is a fascinating insight into the way in which public provision is managed in Quebec which shows many differences to that which we take for granted in the UK. He also en passant discovered that the underpinning CBT movement on accredited programmes which originated in Canada is in fact based on research within prisons and casts further doubt on their efficacy in the community context. This is a fascinating read.

Our Thought Piece this issue is from a reformed offender Trevor Hercules who makes an impassioned plea to locate work with reforming offenders in the context of their lived experiences. He terms the pressures on them as a 'social deprivation mindset, and he regards it as essential that you have to get beneath this mindset to impact on the individual and he strengthens the arguments for utilising peer mentors more to achieve this breakthrough. It also reminded me too of what I sometimes regard as the missing analysis in social capital discussions. Offenders are sometimes assumed to lack social capital and thus services are developed to integrate them back into society. However in my experience offenders have social networks which may be damaging to them but which nevertheless give them some support and also social obligation. What I might term illicit social capital. I think Trevor's description of the pressures to conform to a deviant lifestyle encapsulated in his notion of the social deprivation mindset is a perfect illustration of this tension.

Charlotte Knight in a brief piece develops the debate from a previous Thought Piece on the use of avatars in classroom based teaching. She welcomes the initiative but raises some important issues with regard to the complexity of social circumstances which can underpin complex decision making and cautions the need to align traditional methods alongside the use of this new technology.

Jo Ashby and Christine Horrocks focus on aspects of their research on coercive treatment for alcohol misuse and in particular focus on the use of Alcohol Treatment Requirements. This research was funded by the NHS and raises many issues about the nature of the interactions between male offenders and their female alcohol workers. They weave a challenging and pertinent account surrounding the complexities of compliance based treatment and air many neglected cultural and social dimensions.
THOUGHT PIECE

'Thought Pieces' are papers which draw on the author's personal knowledge and experience to offer stimulating and thought provoking ideas relevant to the aims of the Journal. The ideas are located in an academic, research, and/or practice context and all papers are peer reviewed. Responses to them, or new thought pieces are always welcome, should be submitted to the Journal in the normal way.

RESPONSE TO THOUGHT PIECE: THE USE OF AVATAR BASED LEARNING AS A MEDIUM FOR CRIMINAL JUSTICE EDUCATION:

VOL. 10, NO. 1, SPRING/SUMMER 2012
Charlotte Knight, De Montfort University

I was interested to read the Thought Piece by Annette Crisp on the use of Avatar based learning in the spring/summer 2012 edition of the journal. I think Crisp provides an example of some very innovative and creative pedagogical methods in criminal justice education that could be applied to a wide range of teaching and learning within universities. I am aware of the increasing use of a range of social media by young people in particular. Crisp challenges all of us involved in teaching and learning to embrace and harness these new forms of communication and interaction rather than simply ban them from the classroom. She gives examples of how the students in her teaching sessions have been engaged and enthralled by some of her use of avatars to explain theoretical perspectives and depict situations in which offending occurs, and how this has encouraged debate in the student group.

In wanting to support these developments and encourage this harnessing of new and creative forms of technology for teaching purposes I also wish to raise a few issues of concern that I hope will inform the debate that Crisp is stimulating through her work and her writing.

One question relates to the students themselves. Whilst it might be tempting to make assumptions that young students will find this form of learning more attractive than mature students I acknowledge this may not be the case. However, I can envisage some mature students being deterred by the use of 'virtual' characters as opposed to 'real' people, with the risk that images may appear to be cartoonish and provoke some
resistance to learning. I would be interested to know more about how different groups of students respond to these methods and how some potential resistance may be overcome.

My main concern relates to the issue of reductionism. The use of avatars may offer an opportunity to consider the visual ‘drama’ of an event or a set of circumstances, such as a domestic violence incident, as it unfolds and this may make a strong impact on students. However, with domestic violence as an example, I wonder if there is a risk that the multiple layers of social reality that underpin why it occurs, including issues of power and control that precede the violence, and how organisations should respond to this, may be subsumed. The more insidious long-term erosion of a woman’s respect, safety and emotional well-being that domestic violence in all its manifestations imposes, I would argue is much less easily depicted through the use of avatars. I wonder if there is a risk that ‘avatars’ are favoured for their visual appeal and other, more complex theories are confirmed as ‘boring’ subjects and less worthy of study. Is there a risk that using avatars for teaching about complex social issues, of which domestic violence is just one example, may narrow rather than widen the learning?

The author presents a strong argument for the use of enhanced and interactive ICT in teaching and there clearly is a case for the support, but not substitution for, traditional teaching methods. As well as lending themselves to classroom based teaching, such methods could also provide variety and motivation for students on distance learning programmes. I believe there is a need for engagement with, and debate about; the sorts of issues, theories, and methods of teaching that lend themselves well to this form of technology. There is also a need for discussion about what should remain embedded in the more traditional methods of classroom teaching, interactive debate and dialogue. I would hope that this is the start of a debate about how and when these methods could be best deployed and any safeguards that may need to be considered in their future use.

Charlotte Knight
Associate Researcher
Division of Community and Criminal Justice
De Montfort University, Leicester
THOUGHT PIECE

'Thought Pieces' are papers which draw on the author's personal knowledge and experience to offer stimulating and thought provoking ideas relevant to the aims of the Journal. The ideas are located in an academic, research, and/or practice context and all papers are peer reviewed. Responses to them, or new thought pieces are always welcome, should be submitted to the Journal in the normal way.

UNDERSTANDING THE “SOCIAL DEPRIVATION MINDSET”:
AN EX-OFFENDER SPEAKS
Trevor Hercules

Abstract

As an offender, even as an ex-offender, I always felt I was at war in some way with this society, from an early age, and it has been a long journey to get to the point where I now believe I must take on some moral responsibility, and put something back, based on my experience. When I look around at the young people of today and see the same things happening to them as happened to me when I was young, it seems to me that the politicians and professionals have still not learnt how to deal with “problematic youth”, the dangers and difficulties they face, and the problems they cause for others. The purpose of this article is to enable people to understand what I term the “Social Deprivation Mindset” (SDM) - the outlook of many young people today - and to suggest that the criminal justice system should place more emphasis on changing the mindset of problematic individuals, rather than placing most of their efforts on challenging their re-offending. I believe that there are and can be people like me, ex-prisoners, who have changed their own lives around and who can now play an important role helping others to change. I am not saying that all ex-prisoners can or are able to do this, and, of course, even I would advocate stringent rules and regulations being put into place by government agencies like probation to constrain harmful behaviour.
**Introduction**

I did not have a particularly promising start in life. No father around, and a mother who left me “in care”. From the age of 16 I waged war on this society in the sense that I was disruptive, uncooperative and never felt part of the respectable mainstream. At 15 I came out of care into hostels, then detention centres and borstals, eventually spending ten years of my life, on and off, in prison. And I was pretty disruptive there too. But I managed to turn my life around and have written two books that have been well received by the media and even used by academics who are interested in “desistance” and by trainee probation officers (Nellis 2001). “I was a product of a life lived with violence, as were others from the cesspools of urban slums like the one I came from, Ladbroke Grove” I wrote in one of my books “I had an aura of violence, it was in the way I walked, talked” (Hercules 2006). I’m not like that now.

When I first came out of prison, having served seven years for armed robbery, I wrote a book called *Labelled a Black Villain* (Hercules 1989). I was more political and better informed than I had been when I first went in, and I could see more clearly what life was like for young black people in Britain, and I was better able to articulate it. I was much more conscious of how racism worked, and I never underestimated the damage white people did. I wanted anybody to read my book, but some of it was addressed specifically to people in the black community, who could not see just how self-destructive some of our behaviour was becoming:

> If we’re not very careful we’ll be sucked into a vacuum of hostility and aggression not only towards those we believe are enemies but also towards ourselves. We’re gradually losing our grip, our control. We are frightening the community. We are frightening our mothers and fathers, our brothers and our sisters, our woman especially, our children. We are frightening them with our own blood, their blood, and our dogmatic, unbending rigidity and inflexibility to reason politely calmly and lovingly. If you don’t we all know what’s coming next, GANG WARFARE and KILLINGS, we only have to look at America to see that. As with all under-privileged people, the lack of opportunities to channel our frustration can lead us to take it out on each other (Hercules 1989, p26, emphasis in original)

My book got noticed - a section of it was reprinted in *The Observer* - but I never made a living out of it because that was not the object. I was an angry young man bursting at the seams to tell my side of the story, undiluted: how I and other black people felt about living in a white society. I was basically still living the same type of lifestyle even after that first book, and for better or worse I committed another crime, and did another prison sentence. I had not really changed as much as I thought or hoped I had, but by reoffending I realised I was letting the system win.
I had changed, and those people around me with goodness could see that change. And they were the ones I hurt the most. I cared nothing for others feelings, I was obnoxious, unforgiving, ruthless, and most of all frightening. I was a terror. Society was afraid of me, but I couldn’t have cared less because I deemed myself not part of society’ (Hercules 2006, p85)

The second time I came out I was determined to do something about the situation I could see around me, and since then I have been educating and mentoring young people in schools, re-educating gang members and doing courses for young men in prison. This does not exactly make me a living either, but I know it is useful and appreciated, and it sustains my sense of self-respect. And in many ways it is part of my own healing process; compensation for much of the negative things I have done in my life. Working with these young people has confirmed and deepened my understanding of what I knew from my own experience - although tragically the situation for them is even worse than it was for me, because people back then did not heed the warnings of what would happen if nothing was done.

Why has it got worse? Observation and experience tell me that in many of our most deprived communities a mentality has developed among young people - and some older people too - which I choose to call a Social Deprivation Mindset (SDM) and it is this that I believe has to be challenged and addressed if any real difference is to be made to the individuals concerned, concerning their re-offending behaviour. Just because I call it a “mindset” does not mean I do not think structural and cultural factors are in play. On the contrary, structure shapes their lives, and in the long run the only lasting solution is structural change which creates greater family stability and better educational and employment opportunities for young people. But we cannot wait for that to happen. We have to do something now, with the individuals who are affected by structural injustice, because if we do not they will harm other people - other vulnerable people - in their own communities - and harm themselves, and incidentally cost society a small fortune in dealing with them. We have to challenge the Social Deprivation Mindset as it plays out in their heads, challenge their outlook and preconceptions, tell and show them there is a better way to live even when their circumstances do not seem to change.

In the rest of this article I will explain what the social deprivation mindset is. There is a “hardcore” of people who are deeply affected by it, a “periphery” who are on the fringes of it, and many of whom would like to avoid it, but cannot. Even “the experts” seem to agree on that (Pitts 2009). We have to do something to help both groups. I think I know how.

**The Social Deprivation Mindset and “the Hardcore”**

What is this social deprivation mindset which is increasingly, in my opinion, becoming a feature of the lives of young people, both black and white, living in deprived circumstances? From my own personal experience and observations, it is mainly born out
of being deprived economically, living on large council estates where people struggle to make ends meet. Parents, where they are still around - fathers in particular may well be absent - and extended family members are often unemployed and cannot afford any luxuries, they have to make do with the bare essentials. Feelings of negativity and despair begin to rub off on young people, seeing how limited the opportunities have been for the older generation, how little they gained, even when they conformed and tried to get on. They begin to feel like social outcasts, alienated, abandoned by society and left to their own devices. All too often this is reality; they come from broken homes and no-one gives them moral or spiritual guidance. They do not have much enthusiasm for social responsibility. They know about drugs, crime and violence because it goes on all around them. They see people making money without having to work for it. They see and feel temptation. Quite probably someone in their extended family or peer group has already been caught up in the criminal justice system. They begin to think they have nothing to lose, they like the idea of taking some control over their lives, and they cease to care what anyone else thinks. That is the beginning of anti-social behaviour. Individuals see others thinking like them and band together to support each other; the mindset becomes a group thing, a shared thing. The more hostile they become towards society, the more they need each other and they develop tight rules, their own sense of justice and their own ways of enforcing it.

Although it is not an easy word to use, many of these people are like I was, “damaged” in some way or another. Both home life and society are to blame; young people are in a real and obvious way the products of our society. Without proper parenting, they may never have been shown real and true moral values, or if they once had them, only superficially, easily neglecting or repudiating them. They see things that people of that age should never have to witness: prostitution, drug use, domestic violence, alcoholism and a host of other things. Many stay away from their homes to avoid these things, knowing they would never have any privacy or security there. They learn early to live with material insecurity: no money to go to the pictures, or to go on school trips, no trainers to do gym, no new shoes or new clothes. Nothing compensated for this in their schooling. Their parents, perhaps, gave them no encouragement to learn, and even when good teachers tried to engage them, the pull of the streets was stronger. They glibly denounce a system that has rejected them, which it largely has, although they may exaggerate that to justify their own rebelliousness. Never having had much love or affection, they have none to give. They would rather be feared than loved. In doing what they like, they can be reckless with drugs, alcohol and sex, not caring who gets hurt as a result.

Once you believe you have nothing, and nothing to lose, who and what will you respect or even listen to? They decide what they will do to survive in a world they have no sense of having made. They mainly adopt this mindset to feel part of something that society does not offer them, belonging. They also believe it will ease the everyday pressures and confrontations that they and their siblings will have to face.

Respect is crucial to understanding the social deprivation mindset. We all need self-respect, and initially we build it in ourselves by drawing on the respect that others give to us. Suppose no one gives us respect? Where do we then get it from? In a deprived environment, with no sense of hope in a long term future, self-esteem, pride and respect
come from acquiring qualities that many would regard negatively; the ability to be ruthless and violent, to make easy money, to acquire the flashiest consumer goods. These have their equivalent in the social mainstream; bankers like to make easy money and be flashy consumers, but on the streets of deprived areas the specific ways that young men gain respect are very fragile, and need constant defending from people who would take them away and humiliate them. They will fight for status just like anyone else. In the Social Deprivation Mindset, in a situation where you have nothing else, maintaining respect, being somebody, is everything. Joining gangs, carrying knives and guns, fighting, taking drugs, often all stem from this. Being disrespected can lead to murder. The importance of this should not be underestimated. Once people start disrespecting you, your standing within that community is threatened, and, in addition, you yourself always have a strong incentive to challenge someone who is already well respected, just to enhance your own standing. But you disrespect them at your own peril. It is never easy to climb the ladder within that community, but being violent stands you in good stead. Status-driven and anger-driven violence is never far away in deprived communities. Violence, that others looking in from the outside will dismiss as “senseless”, but to those who live and understand the code, this is the way things are; the status quo. That is why it is so hard to get people to come forward as witnesses, especially young people, even in cases of extreme violence.

The desperate need for respect hardens you and anaesthetizes you to others’ feelings and this enables you to do things that most decent people would find wholly unacceptable. The lack of love, care and direction in your life, physically, morally and mentally, gives you a false perspective on right and wrong, and you begin to justify anything you do. How do I know this? I felt it keenly myself. I wrote in one of my books:

- I held the cold gun in my hand and stared straight ahead contemplating what I was about to do. Now in my coat pocket, the gun seemed even heavier. I opened the front door and stepped out into the cold October night. As the tears rolled down my cheeks, I looked heavenwards and silently asked god to forgive me for what I was about to do. However no man was going to disrespect me like that and think he could go on living. .... (Hercules 2006, p12)

This is what it means to become “hardcore”, to be in thrall to the Social Deprivation Mindset, and to become dangerous. Such people learn to dominate by fear and violence in their own communities; their “territories” would be a better word. They come to carry a lot of sway over the territories they occupy. While they are understandably feared, it is often true that the “hardcore” have also been the most victimised, and may once have been among the most vulnerable. Those who have no fathers, those who come from broken homes, those who have been abused physically and mentally, those in care, children’s homes, those who have been incarcerated in one institution or another. Among them are those who conclude they are being discriminated against by society; one set of hostile people after another, and that no conventional future is open to them. So what does this turn into out on the street? It means no ‘grassing’, join a gang, stealing, robbing, social disobedience, dislike of the police, stay in your post–code, carry knives, join in with any collective bad behaviour, confrontation or riot. The basis of their sense of grievance
may be real but they may well lack the words and ideas to articulate it any other way than by perpetual aggression. These people become progressively more angry. I called this the "rage within" (Hercules 2008) and it manifests itself as violence, always expecting and demanding respect and deference from others, responding with vicious fury when it is not given, hating whole categories of people who in their mind’s eye have let them down.

The Social Deprivation Mindset is not just out there in the community. It is endemic in our prison institutions, at their very core, where it is fed and reinforced. There you are in prison, with nothing and no prospects, your life can seem ruined, and with lots of hard dangerous people around you. They might become a threat to you, but just as easily you might bond with them, start to discuss your hated enemy the police (after all, they put you there) and all the wrongs society has ever done to you. If you were not already there, you are now well on your way to becoming “hardcore”. You are in the worst place you can be and there is no need to be afraid any more: it is easy to start thinking, “who cares? ... bring it on!”. On one level, being in jail adds to a sense of stigma that you are flawed and a failure, but to those with a pronounced Social Deprivation Mindset, this gets turned round; prison becomes a badge of honour, and having “done time” goes a long way to bestowing respect on you. Not all those involved in the August 2011 riots were “hardcore”. But those who were not are now likely to be influenced in some way due to the draconian prison sentences imposed on them.

The Social Deprivation Mindset and “the Periphery”
Not all young people commit themselves fully to the Social Deprivation Mindset, but living in the same areas as the “hardcore” people who do, they cannot avoid them or their influence. These I am calling the “peripheral” youngsters, and we should certainly be trying to work with them before they succumb to the same temptations, and take the “hardcore” path themselves. The older “hardcore” kids, inevitably see the younger ones as weaker than they are, and feel they can do things to anyone they see as vulnerable. How do young people on the periphery cope? Not signing up to this mindset you are in danger of abuse, physical harm, bullying and real violence against you. So there is pressure to adopt it, to defer to the hardcore at least superficially. From my experience and observations many young people on the periphery feed into the SDM when they are with their friends and peer groups; talking the slang, trousers hanging low, trying to impress each other. They cultivate a brash and aggressive manner.

It may be that this behaviour does not manifest itself when they are with their parents or authority figures, but once with their peer group this mindset takes over. Even the best-behaved child can get caught up in the moment, and do things they would never do when not adopting the SDM. Surprised parents will sometimes say, "my child is innocent, my child would never do that, my child knows better, my child was not brought up that way". That may well be true, but teachers often know better. Out on the streets, outside their family, and within school-based peer groups, they have to survive on terms set by others.

Many on the periphery of the SDM find ways to make themselves popular with those with a hardcore SDM by trying to befriend them, being subservient, joining in with any kind of
general disobedience against authority. They are easily engulfed. Even though they may say they did not actually do any looting or any other crime during the riots (that maybe true), but they got “caught up”. It is as if some part of them says, “heh, we’re with you, we’re part of what’s going on, we’re part of the riots, part of the rebellion, sticking two fingers up to authority ....”. “We’re with you guys, you guys who don’t care, those of you on our estates and on our streets, who says who’s cool and who’s not”. “We are with you guys who have influence over who gets beaten up and who gets bullied”. “Heh, please leave my brother and sister alone on the streets, don’t take money off them, I’m here with you”. Such is the power and intimidation of the hardcore that many on the periphery would rather go to jail, risk their families, than break these emerging bonds.

Teenage girls are also affected by the SDM. They are less likely to be “hardcore”, and more likely to be “peripheral”, but that does not mean they are not harming themselves or others, or that they do not need help in equal measure. Sometimes girls can be the instigators of much trouble, especially between rival gangs, or with rival girls. Status matters to them too, and they vie for favours from respected boys. They are also involved in carrying weapons and hiding weapons when the boys are about to be searched by authority or at any venue they may be attending. There was a famous case in the press about the murder of a young man who was deliberately set up by a seemingly trustworthy young lady from a rival gang. The papers called it ‘The Honey Trap Murder’ (Senior 2012). Today’s young people, I am sure, were meant for better things than this.

The Attributes of the SDM
How does the social deprivation make you think and act in the world? I think it has four inter-related attributes which I have called “justification”, “self-preservation”, “shut down” and “I don’t care”. Throughout my teenage and adult life these things were a constant presence, shaping what I did and how I felt (or failed to feel) about it. I will describe each one, and illustrate it with an example from my books.

Justification
The SDM, once you get into it (or it gets into you!) enables you to justify consciously or subconsciously almost any of your own wrong doings by feeding into the sense that you are deprived. And you really might be! It is just that that fact does not actually give you a reason or a right to abstain from moral and social responsibility; selling drugs, robbing, stealing, assaulting. You just think it does, at the time. I once did abstain from such responsibility. I suppressed all moral sense and I really did the robbery I describe here:

"Do not move, get your hands above your head, quick. We were in now. I held the gun to his head. Open the safe, said Dave as he dragged him towards it. I have not got the keys, said the terrified jeweller. But we had not come this far to be mugged off. If the safe is not open by the time I count to five your dead. He produced a key and began fumbling with the lock but was pushed aside by our youthful impatience. We rifled through the safe, then the shop for choice pieces of jewellery. We ran to the car, laughing, laughing
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like two demented lunatics on a high, buzzing without a care in the world. We had the goodies and that was all that mattered”
(Hercules 1989, 11)

Self-Preservation
Looking after number one, being alert to every threat or danger, real or imagined – that is what the SDM makes you like. Only, it is a type of learned, anti-social reaction to a perceived hostile environment; you develop it to protect yourself against real or imagined antagonism or violence. Carrying a knife, fighting, joining gangs, getting access to a gun all stem from this. Self-preservation may make a person look strong, from the outside, but the root of it is an ever-present fear and paranoia; fear of other gangs, fear that other people always have weapons and want to rob and harm you, fear of being a target for no greater reason than that someone else will gain respect from being seen to harm you, even a simple fear of leaving the small territory where you feel secure. This was me, once:

“I saw them approach from the corner of my eye, but late. They stood around the table looking at me. My line of exit was not cut off so at least they had not come to surround and trap me. I had no weapon, but then the thought came to me that perhaps I should put my hand in my pocket, as though I did have one. Quickly I dismissed the idea as highly dangerous. If they had theirs and really believed me to have mine, experience had taught me that this would only induce them to use theirs immediately. Self preservation - get yours in first before the other guy” (Hercules 2006, p 33.)

Shut-Down
It’s hard to deal with some of things you see going on in deprived communities; hard to be psychologically ready for violence all the time, hard to live with some of the things you yourself have done just to get by and stay respected. If you let yourself feel what most ordinary people think would be normal emotions, you would become weak, so you shut-down, numb yourself, and in that state of mind you can do things that a more sensitive person could not contemplate. Shutting-down is a learned mechanism that switches off and on, but the more you do it, the more permanent, unconscious and uncontrollable it becomes. The signs are: not caring, not listening, not communicating, and taking pride in being cold and unemotional. In some young people, shutting-down starts early, before they have any glimmer of understanding what is happening to them. As I wrote in Labelled a Black Villain (2006), I was a sullen and uncommunicative kid: now I know why:

“For as long as I can remember, social workers, child care officers and probation officers have tried to talk to me about my mother and family in general, but not a word would pass my lips even though they had the basic facts” (Hercules 2006,p17)

I Don’t Care
Shutting-down can lead to a conscious sense of indifference towards the wellbeing of others; not seeing them as people with feelings and even indifference to your own
wellbeing, other than in terms of whatever makes you feel good at any particular time. In your mind, “I won't feel” becomes “I don’t care”, a pro-active strike against the weight of perceived unfairness, injustice and the threat of being disrespected. It can be directed against authority in general, those “with money”, and the police in particular. It can even be against your own peers, who you might easily feel are also rivals, against whom you should retaliate first. It can move from “No we’re not moving, no we’re not leaving” or “We don’t care, we’re coming in” to outright criminal activity and rage-filled rebellion. The August 2011 riots were a very good example of the SDM in action. Well before then I understood how I had become someone who “just didn’t care”:

“We were a challenge and we challenged anything and anyone that did not agree with our point of view. We became isolated from the normal everyday members of our society that went about their normal everyday business. We found and joined with those regardless of skin or creed who had also become isolated or alienated for whatever cause. We formed and bonded together and pointed our accusing fingers at those we believed to be our oppressors and enemies. The anger and frustration just continued into adult life” (Hercules 1989, p 183)

**Doing something: changing the Social Deprivation Mindset**

It is my firm belief that many young people have not had proper moral guidance from family, schools or society, nor have they been educated to see that they could have other real options. I know from experience that life is very tough for these young people but I do not agree they have no options. Even though life is hard and you have to negotiate all the pitfalls and minefields of living in a deprived environment you do not have to give up hope of achieving something and making life for you and your family better. Things do not have to go on the way they are. There is a way out there; there is a light at the end of the tunnel. The fact is these young people do have something to lose - the change of a happy and fulfilling adulthood - but as teenagers they do not realize or fully understand that, any more than I did when I was young. I was a classic case of someone with a SDM.

Who can tell them this, get through to them, help them find the courage and confidence to break out of this mindset? Not many of the professionals, most of whose lives are too different from theirs ever to be credible. I think that what these young people need are adults who have been there, seen it and done it. Someone they can have empathy with, someone they can relate to, who they do not consider part of the system that alienates them, someone who they will listen to and ask questions of, like “how did you make it legit”, “what can I do to get away from the everyday madness that is effecting my whole family?” “How do I get out of carrying that gun for them, how can I save face if I don’t stab him?”

There are such people and I believe I am one of them. It is often only when people get older and realise that too much of life has passed them by that a sense of regret and, on the back of that, the motivation to change, kicks in. Sometimes it is only after repeat offending and repeat imprisonments that they do eventually come to realise they have
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done a lot of harm and need to change and, like me, start to feel they really ought to try and stop other young people taking the same path they did, and making the same mistakes. I do not feel I’m the only person who can do this; there are other ex-offenders out there with the same idea and I cannot understand why the professionals are not more enthusiastic about taking us up, unless it’s because they feel threatened by us.

Obviously training programmes have to be devised; it is probably not enough to give people a one-off talk; although some people might be inspired by that. I am not all that sure of the accreditation process that the National Offender Management Service (NOMS) wants to put people through before their programme can be run in a prison or in the community. That will probably exclude a lot of experienced ex-offenders like me; my own experience of NOMS has not been good in this respect. I think it is not so much how programmes are designed, but who delivers them, who has got credibility, that gives them the edge. Mike Nellis tells me that ‘desistance’ researchers are starting to move away from the question of “what works?” to the question “who works?” About time too.

I probably am obsessed with giving something back to society now. I am never off duty when it comes to challenging anti-social behaviour. A few years ago I was travelling on a packed bus. A young black guy was standing next me. A white man got on the bus and accidentally tripped over the young black guy, who chose to think it was on purpose, and began to abuse the white guy. Having seen for myself what happened, I intervened and explained to the young man that it was indeed an accident, asking him to consider what impression he was giving of himself and black people in general by mouthing off like that when he was in the wrong. We spoke for a few minutes. I suggested that he was not really like that, that this behaviour probably was not typical of him, certainly not the best of him, but that all the people on the bus were now looking at him as if he were an animal, and that if I was him, I would apologise. It cost nothing and it was the right thing to do. He took the criticism from me in a way he might not have done from someone else because in the moments we talked he knew and understood that I had been there, seen it, and done it; we had empathy and he trusted my judgment. He grasped this in the few minutes we spoke. He turned to the man and said “I am sorry”, loud enough for everyone to hear. The man accepted the apology, and the whole bus began to clap. I obviously cannot be sure that my intervention helped that young man develop a more tolerant attitude towards others, but I would like to think it did. It was better than doing nothing, turning a blind eye. It made me feel good doing it.

**Working in Schools**

In school the mindset might remain muted for a while, but it still causes trouble; playing up in class, being a bully or a thug, being rude, not learning, doing graffiti, abusing teachers, bunking off school, general disruption. In general, my observations from working in several schools and in the community, it produces kids who say ‘I don’t care, what can you do to me?’ This social disease has already spread to many of our inner city schools, where even teachers at times fear for their safety. Head teachers tell me the number of children having to be excluded from the classrooms because the teacher cannot cope with them has reached very high proportions. The Pupil Referral units where these children are sent can become more like places for the mentally insane. The abuse I have witnessed of teachers, who are just doing their jobs, is pretty commonplace. Many
schools I have worked in or visited seem to be having difficulty coping with this situation. In some places, police patrol outside schools at the end of the day to stop rival gang members confronting each other, and even special buses have been provided to take children home safely.

I have been asked to work with these difficult pupils in some London schools. The “Hercules Programme” I use with them is based on a set of core ideas, derived from my experience and is underpinned by my belief in the Social Deprivation Mindset: a) you have to start with the young in schools to forestall later problems on the streets b) many young people, especially in the inner cities, do need help with moral guidance and everyday decision making and c) this needs to be given by people who really know, and can show, that they know and understand the crazy pressures the kids are under. Professionals do not always know or understand this. Call me old-fashioned, but I know I needed this help; I may not have seemed to at the time, but I do know it now! And I believe that programmes such as these should be incorporated into the mainstream school curriculum, they should not just be add-ons.

**Working in Prisons**

A lot of the “hardcore”, and some of the “peripheral” youngsters, will find themselves in prison. That is a tragedy, but many of them will have committed serious crimes of violence, including murder, because that’s where, in extreme cases, the Social Deprivation Mindset leads. We cannot afford to write off the people who go to prison, no matter what they have done; one day they will come out, and we do not want them to be worse than when they went in, which they can easily become, because of all the pressures to be a bad man that prison puts on you. We also do not want their spirits broken by long sentences, which can also happen if people do not keep their minds active and get themselves an education which helps them understand themselves and society better, and why their lives turned out the way they did. I think with the right kind of effort it is possible to manage and perhaps change the social deprivation mindset while people are incarcerated. Prison is a place where, with the right handling, people can become amenable to change. When I have been invited into prisons I have tried to convince staff of this. It is not that some professionals are not already trying to do this, but they seem to be going about it in the wrong way. There are already cognitive skills programmes going on in prison, and I accept that some young people do get benefit from them, but the Home Office’s own evaluation of these programmes in 2004 indicated that they did not fully acknowledge “the realities of life for some prisoners”:

“Programme staff reported that the requirement to rigidly follow instruction manuals when delivering programmes made it difficult for them to respond to what were the realities of life for some prisoners. This lack of saliency and sensitivity of programme delivery and content resulted in programmes being perceived as patronising by some programme staff and programme participants (Clarke, Simmonds and Wyndall 2004, p 40).”
That is quite an indictment. How can you expect to get anywhere by ignoring “realities”? I figured, on the basis of experience, that maybe I could do something better. So building on the work I had done in schools, my life experience, and the two books I had written. I adapted the Hercules Programme for use in prisons. It is attuned to “the realities of life” and will reach people which official programmes may not reach. Some of these troubled and troublesome young people may indeed have psychological problems but I do not myself emphasise “cognitive deficits”. These young people have been told many times what they lack, as if this alone defined them. Some of these young people do lack manners, and the verbal skills to extricate themselves from a confrontation without violence, and it helps to acquire these. But why would you listen to somebody telling you what you lack, if you did not also feel that they liked you, understood you, saw where you were coming from and saw potential in you? I prefer to concentrate on young people’s strengths and to challenge the attitudes they have developed, not to deny that they are excluded from society and often treated badly, but to show them that the mindset they have developed in response to this makes matters worse for them as individuals and for their communities. I can tell them brutal truths about themselves, in blunt language, that they are highly unlikely to take from a white, or even a black, professional.

I cannot by myself change the prison regime or the world of the streets to which they will return, but I can show them a better way of thinking and living, and, because I have a credibility that a lot of professionals do not have, can maybe inspire them to try it. I am the living proof it can be done. Because I started where they started, but then turned my life round, I can become the hope that they need to see, until they have that hope for themselves.

**Changing Individuals Is Not Enough**

Suppose an individual does change while they are in prison; commits themselves to not offending, to living a new sort of life? What happens when they leave prison? A lot of the old pressures will still be there. There are still peer groups to contend with. Employment, I think is a big problem: society still sees those of us with a criminal past as mainly unemployable, more untrustworthy than the average bloke and probably unable to change. Yet many an ex-offenders will think: “prison doesn’t define me, that’s not who I am” and yearn for the chance to prove themselves. All the good they achieved in prisons can be undone back in the community if they do not find employment. Yet if they change or manage their SDM they will go a long way to freeing themselves and integrating back into society. I do firmly believe you first have to change that SDM before you can fully address peoples’ offending behaviour, but even that is not enough.

Since leaving prison all those years ago I find I am still defined and judged especially in trying to find work, on the fact that I have been locked up. Maybe it matters less to me, because I am trying to find work that actually utilises my prison experience, and while I am not alone in that, not every ex-offender wants this. They just want ordinary work to support themselves and their families, to live reasonably well and to reduce the temptation to re-offend. I am a great believer in willpower, in motivating yourself to change and sticking at it when things get rough, but I am not so stupid as to think people
can always do it on their own. People need friends and networks; the support of people who have gone through the same kinds of bad experience, and they do also need the right kind of professional help - that is from professionals who have bothered to find out what the realities of life are like for them.

So it is not enough to change individuals. Society has to change as well. Opportunities have to be created. Professionals have to be trained properly; exposed to a few realities. So we also have to change the thinking of government. The government has to do its bit to help ex-offenders in from the cold and back into society, to support their efforts at “desistance”. They need to create job opportunities; to do all they can to take away the stigma of being an ex-offender and they need to improve training for professionals. They could do worse than recommend my books on training courses. Above all, though, they need to challenge the SDM, because if that is not done a lot of the other efforts might be wasted, and that is where people like me come in. So the government needs to reduce obstacles to employing people like me in prisons and probation services, and to give us less of the bureaucratic runaround when it comes to accreditation.

**Conclusion**

So, have I convinced you? Although I cannot claim to be an academic, or even a “convict criminologist”, although I have heard they exist, I do believe there is room from outside of academia for someone like me with life experience of the subject matter to put forward my own views about causes and solutions. Let’s face it, no disrespect, the professionals do not seem to have made much progress over the years I have been around; things are worse for young people now than they were in the nineteen seventies. I do believe, however, that we should be exploring every avenue in the pursuit of understanding our social ills, listening to voices that are all too often ignored, as well as those from the government and academia. I know only too well from direct personal experience that there is SDM, how it arises, what its effects are and how to deal with it. I know this on a daily basis because, quite apart from my own past experience, I am confronted with it in the community I live in, and through my work in schools and prisons. Managing this mindset, as best I could, was part of what gave me the motivation to put something back, to prevent others doing the same kind of harm I did to myself and the community. It is not enough just to “reduce reoffending” - which sometimes seems like that is all the government wants - as if you could do that without first addressing the mindset that gives rise to offending in the first place! Tackling the SDM is a way forward because it can also be a way to give young people better lives, a better sense of their options, and a better sense of what they are personally capable of. That is what I, and others like me, want for the upcoming generation - not just reduced offending. We believe that there are many people caught up within our communities in spirals of despair and anger that they would gladly change if they knew how. Addressing what I term the Social Deprivation Mindset will not be some kind of magic cure - addressing structures matters too - but experience has taught me it is a practical place to start, and that people like me, ex-prisoners, are well equipped to take on this task.
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COERCIVE TREATMENT FOR ALCOHOL MISUSE: AN INTERACTIVE AND RELATIONAL ANALYSIS
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Abstract
Alcohol misuse has become central for policy makers with approaches to addressing and providing solutions a persistent challenge. Alcohol Treatment Requirements (ATRs) were introduced through the legislation of the Criminal Justice Act 2003, making available to the courts an ATR as one of the possible requirements of a community order for offenders who have committed an alcohol-related offence. This form of ‘coercive treatment’ is delivered collaboratively with the criminal justice system and the National Health Service (NHS) working in partnership. Those sentenced to the ATR are predominantly young male, persistent offenders presenting with severe alcohol problems. As part of a research project funded by the NHS, qualitative participant observations were undertaken during treatment delivery on the ATR. This paper presents an analysis of the interactions observed between male offenders and female alcohol workers. Explored is the nature of coercive treatment and how young men sentenced to treatment engage with the process. The analysis utilises positioning theory to show how control and compliance operate within a complex, relational and interactive encounter that while focussed on alcohol consumption and behaviour change are impacted upon by wider cultural and social issues.
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Background

Alcohol related crime and drinking patterns
There is mounting evidence highlighting the social and economic impact of alcohol misuse in the UK. Nutt, King and Lawrence (2010) recently reported that whilst heroin, crack cocaine, and metamfetamine were found to be the most damaging to individuals, alcohol was found to be one of the most harmful to others. Research has consistently shown that alcohol use is present in a high proportion of criminal offences (Budd, 2003; Richardson and Budd, 2003; Hall and Innes, 2010; Flately et al. 2010; Chaplin, Flately and Smith, 2011; Home Office 2012a; Home Office 2012b) with approximately half of all violent crimes, and 360,000 incidents of domestic abuse, linked to alcohol misuse (Strategy Unit, 2004; Home Office 2012b). Moreover, a study by Felson, Burchfield and Teasdale, (2007) found that for violence involving strangers, offenders were more likely to have consumed alcohol, whereas victims were more likely to be sober.

In order to understand better the impact of alcohol consumption there now exists a growing body of research exploring specific drinking patterns associated with criminal behaviour (see for example Klingemann, 2001; Richardson and Budd, 2003; Dingwall, 2006). For example, ‘heavy episodic’ drinking has been found to contribute to the risk of interpersonal violence and aggression for some people (Wells and Graham, 2003). Notably, the UK has been found to have high rates of ‘explosive’ drinking patterns, in which alcohol is consumed less frequently but then drunk to intoxication, leading to an increased risk of an alcohol-related crime being committed. Indeed Richardson and Budd (2003) found that ‘binge’ drinkers were five times more likely to admit to committing an offence involving fighting than those defined as ‘regular drinkers’.

Bearing in mind the evidence on drinking patterns, Models of Care for Alcohol Misusers [MOCAM] (National Treatment Agency, NTA, 2006) identifies ‘hazardous’ and ‘harmful drinkers’ as alcohol misusers. According to NHS Choices (2009) hazardous drinkers are described as a person who drinks over the recommended weekly limit (currently 21 units for men and 14 units for women) and harmful drinkers are described as a person who drinks over the recommended weekly limit and has experienced health problems directly related to alcohol. MOCAM states that these hazardous and harmful drinkers do not have significant evidence of alcohol dependence and thus advice and brief interventions are often suitable to meet the needs of both these groups. Drinking behaviour categorised as ‘dependent’ includes those with an increased drive to use alcohol and difficulty controlling its use despite negative consequences; with severe dependence associated usually with physical withdrawal symptoms upon cessation. Given growing evidence around drinking patterns and the social and economic impact it is unsurprising, although worrying, to know that the UK is reported to hold eighth position in the ‘hard drinking’ nations of Europe (British Medical Association, 2008). Furthermore, on a regional level, the highest levels of binge drinking, drinking with increasing risk and alcohol dependency, were found to be in the northern regions of England in particular in Yorkshire and Humberside, (Yorkshire and Humber Public Health Observatory 2005; 2010). In this paper we explore the delivery and
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impact of a criminal justice intervention aimed at reducing the consequences of harmful drinking patterns delivered in the Yorkshire and Humberside region.

Criminal justice and coercive treatment
While the alcohol market is said to be worth over £30 billion a year in the UK (Strategy Unit, 2003), alcohol misuse costs the country around £21 billion a year (Home Office 2012a). Hence, finding a way to reduce the social and economic cost of alcohol misuse has become a political imperative. However, Stimson et al. (2007) point out, a generalised ‘one size fits all’ approach to reducing alcohol-related harm cannot necessarily suit the diversity of drinking patterns. Nonetheless, the shift towards crime prevention and coercion has been growing in popularity since innovations such as the Drug Treatment and Testing Orders (DTTO), now Drug Rehabilitation Requirement (DDR), were introduced in Britain over a decade ago (Turnbull et al. 2000). Within this model, the offender receives treatment for abstaining or stabilising their drug habit with the goal being to reduce their drug use and re-offending, thus reducing the number of offenders in prison (Longshore et al. 2001). This new form of treatment strategy has been referred to as ‘coercive treatment’ whereby at sentence, offenders may be faced with an ‘offer they cannot refuse’ (Hough 1996) in that refusal to agree to treatment as part of a community sentence may well trigger a prison sentence.

In response to the growing levels of alcohol misuse in the UK (BMA, 2008) coercive treatment has been broadened out to address alcohol related offending. Community sentencing in the form of the Alcohol Treatment Requirement (ATR) was introduced in the UK via the Criminal Justice Act 2003. The ATR became one of the possible requirements of a community order for offenders who had committed an alcohol related offence. For an ATR to be granted by the courts there are several criteria that have to be fulfilled before such a requirement can be made available. Section 212(2) of the Criminal Justice Act 2003, states that the court must be satisfied that the offender is ‘dependent’ on alcohol in line with drinking patterns identified in MOCAM (NTA, 2006). Also, the court needs to be satisfied that the offender may be susceptible to treatment and thus is ‘willing to comply’ with the requirements of the order. Hence a full assessment of an offender’s drinking pattern is undertaken alongside an evaluation of their susceptibility to change. The latter requirement raises a somewhat interesting perspective when considered alongside the coercive element of a treatment programme such as the ATR. To what extent can any objective assessment of susceptibility and willingness to comply with treatment be measured when set against the potential outcome of a prison sentence if suitability is not demonstrated?

Unsurprisingly, motivation is widely viewed as a critical factor in treatment participation, retention and success, (Hiller, Knight, Leukefeld and Simpson, 2002; Miller and Rollnick, 2002; Longshore and Teruya, 2006). Consequently the concept of pressuring individuals into treatment has been the subject of heated debate (Lidz and Hoge, 1993; Lawental, McLellan, Grissom, Brill and O’Brien, 1996; Marlowe et al. 2001; Norland, Sowell and Dichiara, 2003). Some of the main questions arising from the debate include, does the coercive strategy of ‘forcing’ individuals into treatment work? Indeed, would those sentenced to treatment engage in the process to the same extent as those who
participate on a voluntary basis? Would coerced individuals show any improvements following treatment? The last question may indeed be the most important. Due to the coercive element those on the ATR might outwardly engage in the treatment process. However, will this be public compliance rather than any lasting commitment to change?

Together with concerns around the coercive element it is crucial to realise that the ATR is designed and delivered in a different format when compared with coercive treatment for illegal drug misuse. For example unlike the DRR the ATR does not rely on punitive drug testing that can result in sanctions. With coercive drug treatment programs the main objective is to become ‘drug free’ with the view that more drug free days translates into more ‘crime free days’ (Carver, 2004). This is in contrast to the ATR which considers ‘controlled drinking’ as an appropriate treatment goal for some individuals. It is important to stress that attendance on the ATR is mandatory and non-attendance can result in breach and a return to court for sentencing. However, the more open and flexible nature of the ATR has tentatively been presented as a significant factor relating to the success of the program (Ashby, Horrocks and Kelly, 2011). Therefore in this paper we aim to present research that centres on the delivery of mandatory sentencing within a treatment relationship; exploring the nature of engagement and interaction during treatment.

**The Study**

The research presented in this paper is drawn from a wider study which looked at a broad range of indicators on the ATR. The original study had three phases. Phase one involved a detailed review of treatment files and probation records. Here offenders’ records were analysed showing that the vast majority of those sentenced to the ATR were young persistent, predominantly white, male offenders whose drinking patterns were categorised as ‘dependent’ (see Ashby et al 2011 for more detailed information regarding the wider study). Notably, the most common offence category was violence against the person. The second phase involved qualitative participant observations of treatment sessions; and finally the third phase involved narrative interviews with offenders sentenced to the ATR. We report here on phase two; observations of the treatment sessions. Phase two and three of the research acknowledged that looking at the process of the ATR using treatment files and probation records gives only a limited perspective. Therefore having the opportunity to observe the treatment setting enabled a detailed and extended contextualisation of how the ATR was being delivered within a treatment based interaction.

**Observing treatment sessions**

The majority of treatment on the ATR was delivered at two probation sites where the offender met with their alcohol treatment worker; both of whom were female. Assessment for the ATR and the delivery of alcohol treatment took place in probation interview rooms with the researcher granted permission to observe treatment sessions involving the offender and the alcohol treatment worker. The inherent expectations in carrying out these particular observations were that the researcher would simply observe
the flow of events with no interruption or intrusion. However it needs to be acknowledged that the act of observation may have influenced those being observed (Emmerson, Fretz and Shaw, 2000). Moreover, although informed consent was gained at the beginning of each observation session, without doubt offenders could have been reluctant to talk about their offending or their drinking during such times that the researcher was present. Aiming to reduce the potential impact of what might be experienced as an obtrusive observation; rather than remaining outside the treatment interaction the researcher did at times participate in the process, in that if spoken to she replied and supported the process with positive reinforcement if appropriate. Hence the researcher was to a certain extent a participant observer.

As much detail as possible was written into the field notes, including: verbatim conversations and descriptions of body language etc. These field notes were often shared with the alcohol treatment workers in order to help with their completeness and accuracy. This supports Lofland and Lofland’s (1995:93) view that field notes are primarily ‘a running description of events, people, things heard and overheard, conversations among people and conversations with people’. However, it should not be assumed that writing and describing an observation is a straight forward and transparent process. As Coffey (1999:120) explains;

‘like any other text field notes are themselves literary creations authored and crafted ... In taking and making field notes we are involved in the construction and production of representations of a social reality which we are a part’.

Adding to this Harré and Mogghadam (2003) talk about the dynamics of the ‘evolving social episode’ and how their theory of social positioning is largely concerned with how speakers construct their identities and their relationships through talk. Therefore positioning theory was used as an analytical tool with which to approach the field notes, as it offered a useful way of understanding the ATR in relation to what occurs during the ‘treatment’ interaction. For example, how do the offenders talk about their drinking? How do they position themselves and others? As the research developed the processes of writing field notes became more focussed, shifting from gathering factual data (how many units offenders were drinking, previous offence history, mental health history) to focussing on the social interaction between the female alcohol worker and the male offender enabling a consideration of how individuals appear to co-construct their ‘selves’ through discursive action. Twenty three individual treatment sessions were observed; generating over 150 typed and hand written pages of field notes.

**Analysis**

**Gender and hegemonic positioning**

As explained earlier those on the ATR, and participating in this research, were predominantly male offenders (91%, n=74); the majority (59%, n=48) were between 18-35
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years of age with a high proportion sentenced for a violent offence (40%, n=32). Evidence shows that in general, men are more likely to consume alcohol than women and the relationship between men and alcohol is often portrayed as one of excess (Stimson et al. 2007; de Visser and Smith, 2007; Gelfer 2010). Work surrounding the relationship between men and alcohol has drawn specifically on drinking behaviour in relation to masculine identities as ‘hegemonic’ (Connell, 2003) in that the dominant ideal of masculinity is often surrounded by a discourse of ‘emotional toughness’ (de Visser and Smith, 2007) ‘macho masculinity’ (McVittie and Wilock, 2006) and ‘male bonding’ (Garvey, 2005). Moreover Gelfer (2010:132) suggests that ‘the consumption of large amounts of alcohol is an integral part of hegemonic masculine performances, and men may view such consumption as a way of reaping the benefits of being part of the hegemonic order’. Therefore alcohol is argued to be embedded into hegemonic forms of masculinity and is also viewed as an important resource in the social construction of masculine identities. Indeed de Visser and Smith (2007:609) found that a large majority of men believed that being able to ‘hold your drink’ was an important indicator of masculinity.

Given the offender characteristics (young, male and many with evidence of past violence) one might expect the offender to perform the hegemonic position during treatment. Thus they might resist being positioned as someone who is expected to comply with treatment and succumb to a level of control exerted by a female treatment worker. The field notes below present a rare glimpse into this complex interaction. For example, the following field note excerpt is representative of similar evidence in the wider corpus of data and clearly presents the normalised gender identity that might be prevalent in the lives of those sentenced to treatment.

Field notes: ‘Susan meeting Wayne’

I followed Susan down to the interview rooms in order to sit in and observe her session with an offender called Wayne. She went to collect Wayne and the following conversation ensued:

**Wayne:** ‘hello sweetheart’

**Susan:** ‘I am not your sweetheart, from now on you call me Susan’

**Wayne:** ‘oh sorry, Susan’

There is further evidence of expected gender positioning during the interaction between Amy and Dave in the following field notes. It is clear that Dave initially discursively positions himself as ‘abandoned’ with ‘no hope’ perhaps anticipating that Amy as a woman will sympathise with his story.

Field notes: ‘Amy and Dave’

**Dave:** ‘I can go see him whenever I want, but when it comes to being a father figure he were never there. I’ve got nine brothers and sisters, same father, four different mums ... he’s a knob head’

At this point in the interview Amy glances over at me. She appears not to be ‘phased’ by his manner and indeed seems to be relaxed and in
control of the interview. As part of the assessment Amy asks Dave if he is taking any other medication for any mental health issues.

**Dave:** ‘just depression’
**Amy:** ‘medication?’
**Dave:** ‘I was but I sacked it off [why?] cause I can’t be arsed, I just want to get off beer’

Amy goes on to ask Dave about his drinking and uses Likert scales for most of the questions which Dave seems to understand and respond well to.

During the interaction Amy resists being discursively positioned as the ‘caring female’ as she effectively takes control by promptly asking him Likert scale questions about his drinking. She is not drawn into a conversation about his depression. Indeed her resistance to take up the caring role may appear unfeeling and unresponsive but she is effective in engaging Dave and therefore successful in completing his assessment. Thus we begin to observe Dave complying with treatment:

‘**Amy and Dave continued …..’**

**Amy:** ‘how much are you drinking? How much did you drink yesterday?’
Dave tells Amy that he had drunk 6 litres of cider yesterday but this is probably a rough guess.
**Dave:** I always fall asleep, wake up and drink so I don’t know!’
**Amy:** ‘what do you want to do about your drinking?’
**Dave:** ‘stop!’
**Amy:** ‘why?’
**Dave:** ‘cause I’m addicted to it and its just making me feel ..... well how am I supposed to explain it? (Dave has now raised his voice and appears to be angry with Amy but Amy remains silent) like I can’t do what I want to do and I can’t get a job ... my granddad's an alcoholic so it must run in family, my brother in law died of it ..... I wanna get off it before I kill me self  ... either me liver or me kidneys are gonna go’
**Amy:** ‘talk me through a typical day’

With Amy’s continuing to complete Dave’s assessment, further positions of control are once again negotiated. In the interaction Amy needs to traverse delicately in order to sustain Dave’s engagement and also begin to set realistic goals for him. Dave becomes intensely frustrated with Amy’s questioning about his drinking and discursively positions her as ‘the expert’ by exclaiming ‘how am I supposed to explain it?’ However during this interaction Amy does not lose sight of trying to gain important information about his drinking behaviour and his goals. His final attempts to gain Amy’s sympathy are again resisted as Amy stays focussed on his drinking behaviour.

In the field notes there is much evidence that offenders on the ATR seem to initially be expectant of a relationship that is acquiescent with stereotypical, hegemonic gender positioning. However, what they encounter is a relationship that refutes simplistic gender positions requiring engagement with treatment expectations that is focussed on drinking patterns and behaviour change. Indeed, the analysis of this interaction reveals a complex
relationship founded upon issues of control and compliance. Importantly, while attendance is mandatory, participation during the treatment interaction is negotiated. The field notes reveal the on-going work and skills necessary in order to focus on the ATR’s aims around achieving controlled drinking and harm reduction. It may be important to consider the extent to which the outcome of treatment is reliant upon the skills and expertise of the treatment worker. The spotlight is often upon the offender and notions of susceptibility to change – a more relational and interactive analysis supersedes such individualising notions offering a more shared and situated approach to understanding behaviour change.

**Active engagement with treatment**

Engagement with treatment is often measured retrospectively as an outcome of treatment success (Miller, Walters and Bennett, 2001). Early evidence regarding the effectiveness of the ATR, in relation to attendance and completion, has been found to be comparatively high compared to other offender treatment programs (Ashby et al, 2011). While such evidence is encouraging, providing an indication that the majority of the offenders in this study were engaging with treatment, it is fair to say that attendance and completion rates do not provide insight into how engagement occurred or the nature of engagement. Therefore, having the opportunity to qualitatively observe the treatment setting of the ATR provided valuable data regarding the relational aspect of treatment delivery and engagement. Importantly, ‘therapeutic expectations’ embedded within the process and treatment of addictions is often a result of operating within a counselling approach to behaviour change (Miller and Rollnick, 2002; Soravia and Barth, 2008; DiClemente and Velasquez, 2002). Consequently, within this framework it is argued and generally accepted that individuals are more likely to adopt healthy behaviours if ‘they want to change rather than if they ought to or have to change’ (Botelho, 2004: 27). In this sense any notion of ‘control’ is argued to negatively jeopardise an individual’s desire and subsequent commitment to change (Meier and Davis, 1993). Therefore with the ATR research it was of interest to explore the extent to which the alcohol treatment workers engaged and utilised this therapeutic framework, given that treatment was coercive and attendance mandatory. This section of the analysis therefore presents data that further reveals the interactive and relational complexity of offender engagement.

**Field notes – ‘Susan and Carl’**

Carl is 20 years old and has been assessed as a dependent drinker. This is his second month of a 6 months ATR order. Susan begins to look through Carl’s drink diary (where offenders can record alcohol units consumed on a daily basis) and praises Carl for the evident effort in beginning to reduce his daily alcohol units.

**Carl:** ‘Yeah someone had stopped me other day and thought I’d been beaten up because I looked better’.

Susan reminded Carl that in order to detox he needed to be drinking less than 23 units per day. Carl said that from Monday he was considering cutting his units down further. He talked to Susan about the Crest lager he used to drink which was 10.5% and only cost £1.10
and described it as ‘like drinking tar’ (shaking his head). Indeed they both enter into a chatty light hearted conversation about this ‘new lager’. Nevertheless Susan quickly returns to focus on Carl’s drink diary and asks him to change his 8.5% cans of lager to 5% lager in order to suggest ways of reducing his units further. Susan then goes on to announce to Carl that she will be booking him in for a detox in 2 weeks’ time. They then begin to go over the finer details of the detox process and Carl seems to respond well to this.

Most of treatment sessions observed had similar conversations around consumption of alcohol. Shown is how Susan is able to engage Carl in treatment by focussing on levels of alcohol consumption. This simple yet effective approach in dealing with Carl’s alcohol consumption relies on facts (alcohol units) and figures (amount reduced daily) and provides Carl and the treatment worker with an accessible discursive framework where behaviour can be considered and potentially changed. Possibly, reflecting the idea that men have a very functional view of their bodies thus responding better to treatment interventions that offer facts and figures (White, 2001). While recognising the somewhat stereotypical implications; within this framework, alcohol consumption is mutually understood and consequently both are positioned as ‘knowledgeable’. This mutual understanding is signified by the ‘chatty conversation’ regarding new strong lagers that ensues between Susan and Carl. Indeed Carl appears to demonstrate new understanding as he shakes his head whilst reminiscing on his past drinking behaviour. This positive engagement enables Susan to shift Carl’s treatment goals swiftly as she talks about further reductions in his alcohol units. Thus Carl is positioned by Susan as someone who is ‘capable’ of taking the necessary steps forward in order to become alcohol free. Carl does not resist nor challenge Susan’s direction, rather he accepts the news that he could be potentially alcohol free in the near future. Treatment engagement in this instance, and many others analysed, is influenced less by a focus on an individual readiness to change and more on a shared interaction and goal setting. Yet, as with most of the treatment sessions observed, the treatment worker maintained her position as one controlling the interaction. There was a sustained focus on alcohol consumption with the coercive element of treatment in relation to expected compliance evident throughout. Would Carl be at this point so early on in his treatment without Susan’s efforts to remain within the boundaries of coercive treatment in relation to control and compliance? More importantly would Carl be considering detox if Susan took a more ‘empathetic, collaborative planning’ approach inherent in the counselling relationship and often advocated in addiction treatment (Miller & Rollnick, 2002; Myers and Salt, 2012). It is difficult to provide any absolute response to such speculation. It is reasonable to claim that treatment on the ATR operates at the relational level with the treatment workers’ ability to build rapport and respect evident. This said the relationship is one where the treatment worker retains control being situated within a criminal justice, coercive relationship. Mill, Brooks and Davies’ (2007) research regarding the DTTO make reference to the relationship between the worker and the offender with an acknowledgment of the importance of relationship- based working. What we hope we have done here is demonstrate how this relationship is made up of a series of positioning acts that are negotiated and remain focussed upon change.
Malignant positioning: control and resistance

We have presented how the treatment sessions are openly focussed on drinking patterns, control and behaviour change. It might be anticipated that during these treatment sessions as part of the ATR offenders would be expected to acknowledge the offence that resulted in their being sentenced to treatment. However, Langenhove and Harré (1999) argue that to explain someone’s action in ways that emphasise the person’s negative attribution is to position that person in a potentially ‘malignant’ way. Arguably such positioning may not bring about a positive relational interaction and subsequent desired compliance and behaviour change. Yet, some of the offences committed did prompt deliberation in relation to the treatment relationship and interaction and the potential need to challenge the acceptability of violence when intoxicated. For example Sean (male offender; dependent drinker with past history of domestic violence) explained to his treatment worker that he hit his partner because ‘She wound me up, the things that she said while I was drunk. I ‘m not a violent lad, I’m a big soft lad, I always have been’. During this particular encounter malignant positioning is clearly being resisted in Sean’s attempts to rationalise the violence and portray himself as a non-violent person. Indeed he is positioning himself as the victim of his partner’s abuse who should be blamed for his outbursts, ‘she shouldn’t say things when I am drunk’. By not challenging such accounts there is a danger of almost colluding and supporting unacceptable levels of gendered violence.

The following field notes taken from the observation of Ricky’s treatment session offer an indication of what might be seen as Ricky discursively resisting malignant positioning and the treatment worker’s responsive interaction. Ricky, similar to Sean, tries to avoid being positioned as a perpetrator of domestic abuse, rather he positions himself as someone whose violent behaviour is attributed to the inevitable consequence of drinking. He personally is not an angry man it is the drink that causes the anger:

Field notes – ‘Amy and Ricky’

Further on in the interview Ricky says that he doesn’t want to give up drinking

Ricky: ‘no I’ll never stop drinking, I just want to control it. I can’t see meself not drinking. I’m being honest about this’

Amy asks about the positive aspects of his drinking. Ricky mentions a long list including using alcohol as a ‘pain killer to forget’. Amy suggested that if he did enter treatment, he would need to have a period of abstinence to allow his body to recover and to begin to find new strategies to deal with his ‘bad thoughts’. Ricky replied by saying that he didn’t need alcohol every day. They then talked about the negative aspects of his drinking and he could see the ‘mess it’s got me into now’. Ricky goes on to reflect on the offence,

Ricky: ‘what happened, the violence, I’d drunk a lot of vodka that night, it brings out the worse side of me. It’s the first time it’s ever happened to me, I know I can get verbally aggressive’

Ricky stated that he really wants to address his drinking and wants a ‘normal life’
**Ricky:** ‘I don’t need to address my anger problems, it’s the drink that makes me aggressive, I don’t need anger management I need to deal with my drinking and get it under control’.

After the interview, Amy turned and asked ‘what did you think?’ I said I wasn’t sure to which she replied ‘he’s trying to pull the wool over my eyes’. When I get a chance to look at Ricky’s records, it was stated that he has a three year history of violent incidences with women (17 police callouts to domestic violence incidents).

Within positioning theory it is argued that people construct and resist certain positions; as with Sean and Ricky people constantly adopt and defend their positions and accept or confront the positions of others. Throughout the treatment session Amy appears to remain almost indifferent. She does not at any point respond to any of Ricky’s talk in an emotional, enraged or sympathetic way. Ricky appears to take up a position of authority as he states outright to Amy that he will ‘never stop drinking’, thus discursively adopting the role of knowledgeable expert someone who knows what’s good for him ‘I just want to control it’. By telling him quite clearly that if he did enter treatment he would need a period of abstinence, Amy reasserts her authority. Indeed Ricky is required to talk about the negative aspects of his drinking. Throughout this interaction there is an obvious taking and resisting of power; an interplay that demonstrates efforts to resist any malignant positioning. McMurran (2012) draws attention to the ways in which treatment interventions for offenders are often either targeting substance use or violence but not the two together. The ATR is one such targeted intervention focussing on those who are dependent drinkers aiming to reduce the level of alcohol consumption and by association the requisite societal and individual costs associated with drink dependency. Although it is evident in the data that both offender and treatment worker are aware of the potentially negative attribution that violence, in particular domestic violence, carries for those convicted of such offences the focus remains on alcohol consumption. Perhaps the treatment encounter offered a place to have such behaviours spoken about and while the treatment worker remained focussed on alcohol consumption and behaviour change the treatment workers’ refusal to lend any level of support to their rationalisations may have had an impact. Even so, as McMurran (2012) advocates, teaching offenders awareness skills around reduced attentional capacity and self-awareness, and strategies for coping with perceived provocation when under the influence of alcohol may have been useful. There was a great deal of talk around pre-planning for times when alcohol would be available and strategies for managing situations that might arise but this was predominantly about planning around consumption. Incorporating some of the alcohol related violence intervention approaches outlined by McMurran and colleagues (Walton et al., 2010) may be something that those developing the ATR might consider given the profile of those ‘sentenced to treatment’.

**Conclusions**

The wider study did show positive outcomes with regard to engagement and completion of the ATR. Yet, finding solutions to alcohol related offending, which continues to incur
huge consequences for society, requires more knowledge regarding the process and impact of planned interventions. In aiming to understand the delivery of the ATR as an alcohol treatment intervention specifically targeted at reducing the potential to reoffend, and thus reduce harm to others, this paper has explored the relational aspect of behaviour change. The observational data gathered during coercive treatment sessions shows how treatment involves a series of complex manoeuvrings and negotiations. The positionings of alcohol treatment workers and male offenders are situated within broader hegemonic ideals, professional boundaries and ATR related expectations. However, the clear message from the observation data is that the treatment sessions remained strongly focussed on alcohol consumption and reducing the harm of alcohol related behaviour. This persistent attention to the ATR aims did appear to ensure that treatment sessions fulfilled expectations for both the treatment worker and the offender. The resistance of any other positioning that might relate to a more caring or therapeutic relationship did appear to be effective in terms of engaging with the treatment aims of the ATR. Yet, as McMurran (2012) suggests other opportunities for a broader level of engagement around violence related offending and the impact of some of the hegemonic masculinity related issues appeared to be missed and might be something to work on as the programme develops.

Nonetheless, this analysis has highlighted the importance of the relational aspect of treatment on the ATR in getting these young men to comply and consequently engage positively with their treatment worker and treatment aims. Treatment on the ATR clearly situates interaction and engagement as more important features of behaviour change with compliance anticipated rather than required and punitively measured as with the DRR. Indeed it seems that the professional role occupied by the alcohol treatment workers has been shown to be effective in building and developing positive interactions that enable change at the very least to be considered.

Without doubt alcohol is one of the most harmful drugs overall in the UK, leading Nutt et al. (2010:1564) to conclude that ‘aggressively targeting alcohol harms is a valid and necessary public health strategy’. The data from the treatment sessions challenges the notion of coercion as a somewhat problematic strategy. This analysis has shed light on earlier questions concerning the potential for offenders to effectively engage and improve under coercive conditions. Indeed it has provided considerable insight into how young male persistent offenders can be effectively managed through the care and control of female alcohol treatment workers. There is certainly more work to be undertaken to consider the gender related implications within the data. It was clear that these young men responded well to the directional straight-forward goal setting offered by the treatment workers. This may have implications when considering the adoption of more specialised treatment modalities such as Cognitive Behavioural Therapy (Soravia and Barth, 2008) or Motivational Interviewing (Miller and Rollnick, 2002) that are currently widely adopted in the substance misuse treatment field. Indeed the ATR has been driven by public health policies (NTA, 2006) that rely on treatment approaches that emphasise individual agency in determining and enabling change. However to over-rely on these approaches is to critically ignore the relational nature of change and the role of the treatment workers in enabling change to occur as illustrated in this research.
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REFLECTIONS ON 10 YEARS OF THE BRITISH JOURNAL OF COMMUNITY JUSTICE

Dialogue between Professor Paul Senior, co-editor of the BJCJ since its inception in 2002 and Mike Nellis, emeritus professor at Strathclyde University and BJCJ Advisory Board member

Mike Thanks for the opportunity to discuss the 10th anniversary of the British Journal of Community Justice. The first and obvious thing I’d like to ask you is, why did you start this journal in the first place? Where was the space in the market for yet another criminology journal? Who was your target audience?

Paul I think the discussion started probably about four years before we actually produced the first issue and grew from a conversation between Dave Ward and myself about trying to create a journal which mirrored the British Journal of Social Work but was focussed much more exclusively on community justice, probation practice, and restorative justice. We felt it just did not exist in the market, the Howard Journal was slightly more to do with penal affairs, Probation Journal tended to produce much shorter articles and at that time before its re-badging, was much less of a peer reviewed journal and there was nothing there at a time of major change for probation, a time of developments in training and so on, that we felt there could well be a distinctive spot in the market. So Dave and I put some ideas together, spent a couple of years debating it and considered submitting it to a commercial publisher but for various reasons we just didn’t get off the ground, mainly being just too busy. Then Dave had an idea that we actually engaged our collective staff groups at Sheffield Hallam and De Montfort, and at that point we got support from both the two staff groups and Brian Williams came forward to co-edit with me and that’s how the journal started.

Mike Did it have something to do with the fact that both Sheffield Hallam and De Montfort were deeply involved in probation training?

Paul Indeed, the first issues of the journal were in 2002 and that was four years into the new arrangements for training so certainly both of us were delivering training contracts around different parts of the country, so both of us had a continued investment in probation practice in this new post-social work world. De Montfort were running programmes in the East of England and later in the Midlands, we
were running programmes in Yorkshire and Humberside and in Wales and later on the North-West so we felt we had a pretty good reach across the probation training arena.

Mike Where did “community justice” come from as the title? That would not have been everybody’s idea of a concept that you could actually do a lot with: it was not in widespread use, it seemed very nebulous, and even a bit controversial to many people, but you decided to go for the British Journal of Community Justice. Why was that?

Paul I think there were probably two or three quite distinctive elements to this. I guess the first of which was that it had become a term, probably more used in America, to describe restorative justice and we were quite keen that the journal encompassed some of the developments that were going on in that area. When probation training moved from social work training it was organised, quality assured if you like, by the new Community Justice National Training Organisation that had devised occupational standards for community justice so it felt to us that somebody was defining a certain segment of practice in criminal justice with that term of community justice. Most of the degrees that developed as part of the graduate training for probation were called community justice. At Hallam it was called the BA in Community Justice (Probation) so it was being developed I think as a positive spin on the whole debate about whether probation was a punitive correctional organisation or was it still engaged with communities and engaged in social and community justice. It was a catch all for all those elements I think. You are right about the fact that it was ill defined and imprecise but that actually gave us a fairly broad brush to start the journal and to explore the resonance that that term might have in developing the journal. In fact that’s exactly what Brian set out in the very first editorial, which was trying to define what community justice was.

Mike I notice in a 2003 editorial on change in probation that you went back to David Haxby’s 1978 book, ‘Probation, the Changing Service’. It had always had a bad press because he proposed way back then that the service should become “correctional” and it did not go down well. But you resurrected that book in quite a positive way, reminding people that he promoted not just “correctionism”, but also “community involvement”, a subject on which you have written a lot, and I am assuming that that too also played into your idea of “community justice”?

Paul Absolutely, I think that book was largely misunderstood. David Haxby actually proposed different models for the future of probation, one of which was much more rooted in local community and another in more control-oriented approaches, and that had been around since the early 80s and therefore that debate about whether probation was part of a local community response to problems of crime and disorder, or whether it was about carrying out public protection duties on behalf of the state, was still a live debate, was still being contested and the fact that training had been taken out of social work did not
necessarily mean that probation was not still a relevant vehicle for community engagement. I think one definition of community justice would be that you take your direction as an agency from what the community wants from its public sector services, so I think it offered that perspective and I think David Haxby had merely set that out as a potential alternative.

Mike  David Haxby was criticised at the time because he moved away from social work values, and in 1978 nobody really saw any merit in that, but of course by the time you established the journal the Home Office was forcing probation away from social work, into law enforcement. What I personally liked about this journal was its attempt to articulate a progressive vocabulary about probation that did not fall back, or draw on, notions of generic social work, which had ceased to be viable as a starting point for criticising or confronting what the government was trying to do to the probation service. Is that a fair comment?

Paul  That's absolutely the case. At the time there was a huge resistance and I was part of that resistance to any notion that probation should be involved in punishment, in control, in public protection matters. I think by the end of the century that battle had almost been lost and the battle was to retain any vestige of involvement in community resolution of problems of crime. I always thought that the debate about probation moving away from social work was a somewhat stylised debate. I was responsible for shaping the curriculum of the new award and if you look at that curriculum it still contained most of the methods, approaches, and social context setting that were relevant to the teaching of probation officers under the old social work training awards. There was a political imperative to get rid of the words 'social work' and its connotations but I do not think the values that were enshrined in the new award were that different, they were still humanistic, they were still valuing a model of work which was working alongside offenders and communities and people were being trained using many of the similar texts and debates as they had been just a few years previously under the old Diploma in Social Work model. We needed a new language, I don't think the world was the same as it was in the 70s, but many of the value positions being held by probation officers was still intact. I think we saw this journal as giving people an opportunity to debate those issues, to reassert, if you like, progressive community-centred practice.

Mike  I definitely got the impression looking through ten years' worth of the journals that you were into “agenda-setting”: you wanted this journal to address the burning issues and show the way forward. I think you tried to set agendas firstly through the editorials that you and Brian wrote (particularly yours, which were the more polemical of the two) but also through the special issues, which you always got out in a timely fashion, right up to the most recent one about “the rehabilitation revolution”. Can you say a bit more about this “agenda-setting”?
Paul  I think you can put a logic to where we’ve gone in hindsight, my memory of the experience of journal. We responded to the fact that at times we did not have sufficient articles being sent in voluntarily so we looked to commission in order to make sure that the journal was, in each issue of sufficient size and quality. We would target commissioned articles that reflected the areas that we thought needed some commentary. So in that sense we took charge of the agenda and tried to ensure that current arguments in various areas were kept to the fore. Ideally we did not want to commission articles, we wanted articles to be sent in by personal motivation but the reality was that submissions ebbed and flowed. I think what we did find over time, and again I think we stumbled across this rather than did this as a policy, that if we identified special issues we did get more submissions, it was almost as if a special issue triggered in people who were reading it ‘ah yes I’m working in that area, this is obviously something I should submit to’ so I think we were able to identify key topics and turn them around in a very short space of time compared to commercial journals. Special issues were quite effective in that way because we identified an issue, advertised it, had people sending articles in and within a year we had a focussed edition. Over the last three or four years the number of commissioned articles we have had has decreased. Special issues have given us a greater resilience really and also allowed us to experiment like we did with the Asian Pacific issue, and as we did on an issue on restorative justice from a forum that Brian Williams had set up before his untimely death. So it did give us a direction but it partly came out of trying to maintain sufficient quality, variety and sufficiency to be able to publish effectively three times a year.

Mike  Another of the things that struck me about BJCJ is the way in which it got contributions from big, respected names in the academic and the policy worlds, like David Faulkner and Martin Narey, but then juxtaposed them with articles from students and trainee probation officers. I always liked that about the journal and I wonder if you can say something about the wide spread of writers that you went for in the journal?

Paul  I think one thing we debated with the very first issue was who we were trying to encourage to write and whilst we did want to ensure that we picked up the leading figures in this broad field of community justice, we also wanted to be a vehicle for new writers. This was strongly championed as a theme by Brian. Brian was a particularly active PhD supervisor encouraging his students to publish and he was highly committed to doing that. In the very first edition we published an academic essay written by Sarah Jarvis who was on the Sheffield Hallam community justice degree and she wrote a reflective piece on her experience of the new award. It was the first year that the award was running and it was such a good piece of work that we were able to use that as an article almost unedited and that gave us a spring board for doing that. We have tried, if not in every edition, to encourage new writers and particularly people who had not previously published. I think after Brian Williams died we wanted to somehow institutionalise that commitment.
Mike  Let me turn to that as an issue, then. Brian’s death must have been a huge blow to the journal because there is a very clear and obvious sense in which it reflected concerns that you had both had for a long time. The varied ways in which the journal memorialised Brian is also interesting, and I wonder if you could say something about that?

Paul  Personally, it was a very difficult time for me and the journal. Brian and I had developed a good working relationship and I think we brought different things to the table, even though our backgrounds were very similar in terms of both working in the probation service and moving into academic life, Brian had increasingly gone down restorative, victim-oriented academic publications and was certainly the person that was pushing that area most strongly in the journal. We talked about what ways could we keep Brian’s contribution alive and we came up with two things, the first was that we would dedicate an issue to articles around a broad theme of social justice which reflected Brian’s personal practice, and we advertised for that. Such a huge response came from those that knew Brian that that turned into a whole year’s issue, so volume 6: 1, 2 and 3 became the Brian Williams memorial issues on social justice, the middle one of those was in fact a special issue on restorative justice which came out of Brian’s work with the European Restorative Justice Forum and was a collection of essays that they were going to publish with Brian elsewhere and were very keen to publish it with us as part of Brian’s legacy. Further to that we thought very hard about how we as a journal could maintain Brian’s commitment to publishing new and young writers and we came up with the Brian Williams Memorial Prize which is awarded annually for any current student, or a student who has been one in that year, who has not written or had published an academic article before. It is now in its fourth year and each year we have published the winner in one of the issues during the subsequent year and I think that is a very positive way to keep Brian’s approach to his work alive.

Mike  When you went for a new co-editor you chose Jean Hine and that kept the Hallam/De Montfort connection alive. What does Jean bring to the table in this?

Paul  The decisions about who should become co-editor after Brian was a decision for De Montfort University. We have maintained a joint approach to this but have always felt that we should co-edit jointly between Sheffield Hallam and De Montfort so it was clear that when Brian was no longer with us, De Montfort should be asked to provide a replacement and their staff decided it would be Jean Hine. I welcomed this as I had worked with Jean Hine many years previously in South Yorkshire Probation so we had a working relationship and importantly Jean brings a slightly different approach to both Brian and I and that’s probably reflected in the journal in recent years where new areas of interest have come forward. The essential direction of the journal is decided by the Inner Board as a whole of course which is composed of a number of staff from both institutions, many of whom have contributed tirelessly over the years including Simon Feasey,
Let’s change tack. I would like to explore your impressions of the journal. What do you see as the key themes that have emerged over the ten years, the predominant direction that the journal has gone in - then I can perhaps respond to that.

Mike  OK, in a rough and ready way, I think that the journal has had six core themes and a number of other subsidiary ones. Primarily it’s focused on change in the probation service; you’ve had a large number of articles about its restructuring and re-organisation, about the changing nature of probation practice, about probation values, and especially about probation training. Right up to your recent special issue on “the rehabilitation revolution” you have consistently tried to map what was happening to the probation service, what can still be said to be good about it, and what it might mean to engage in progressive practice in hard times.

Paul  I have no quarrel with that as it resonates with our professional backgrounds in probation, our research interests and our continued engagement in training and development of probation staff.

Mike  The second theme has been around the nature of ‘community justice” and particularly the relationship between “community justice” and “community safety”. You had a pioneering article in the first issue by Sue Raikes, a former probation officer who went into community safety, who did see some relevance in the new debates about “community justice”. No other British journal debated the topic of “community justice” quite as systematically as BJCJ did over the years. It is a difficult concept, and it maybe does have its dark side: Simon Green, for example, challenged the communitarianism version of community justice, because, unlike Gordon Hughes, say, he could see nothing progressive or useful about communitarianism. Some of the articles about “community justice” segued into the broader issues of social justice and social inclusion which, as you say, were particular the concern of Brian’s. You also linked it to topical issues about community involvement and the place of the voluntary sector. I think all of that has been to the good.

Paul  Yes, I agree that the growth of interest in probation partners such as the voluntary sector, police, prisons has been reflected in articles on those themes, simply because political changes forced more and more attention on what became known as a 'mixed economy of provision.' What about restorative justice?

Mike  There has been a definite thematic interest in restorative justice and on this you seem to have covered everything: theory, practice, evaluation, from victim/offender mediation, family group conferences, circles of support and accountability etc. I think the two special issues you did, one that Brian edited
himself, and the one that was edited in his name after he died are both important contributions: that last one is a 'must have' publication for anyone interested in restorative justice. Although it still has to be said that, on the ground, the probation service still does not really know what to do with restorative justice, it cannot be for want of this journal trying to make the connections between working with offenders and being involved in restorative justice. Rather like the debate on “community justice” and “community safety”, no other British journal has covered this quite as systematically as yours, in a way that made it very relevant to probation practitioners.

**Paul** OK. We also made a conceptual distinction between restorative justice and victim-specific articles.

**Mike** “Victims” as a specific topic outside of the framework of restorative justice was something that was always a little difficult for the probation service to handle. So another good thing about the journal is the number of articles, some written by Sandra Walklate, that you have had about victims. I have not got a clear sense of exactly what the theme was about victims, other than making sure victims do not get co-opted by right wing politicians as a stick to beat the probation service was there, I know that’s something that was dear to Brian’s heart, but more generally I am not sure that the journal moved towards a clear position on this, in the way that I do have a sense of it having a nuanced position on restorative justice, community safety and community justice. Maybe there’s more to be said about victims in future issues of the journal.

I think another theme was the international one, you have had articles about probation in Canada, Sweden, South Africa, Northern Ireland and a whole range of European countries in that special issue on restorative justice. I think they were the kind of articles that were both interesting in themselves and also very illuminating in terms of understanding “our” probation service through the eyes of people from abroad. Some journals are more obviously international and comparative than the BJCJ but I think the balance here between indigenous articles and articles from abroad, though not particularly systematic in its focus, was very well done.

**Paul** We have consistently tried to go beyond an Anglo-centric approach and have welcomed articles from around the globe. Our special issue on Asia-Pacific region was our most ambitious in this respect. Your sixth theme?

**Mike** Youth justice was a major theme, I think - you had Caroline Hoyle writing about restorative justice, Hazel Kemshall writing about social capital and desistance and an article that was straightforwardly about the future of youth justice policy by Roger Smith, and a number of other articles touched on general developments in community justice had a youth justice dimension. So although I don't think you were in the business of competing with the journal *Youth Justice*, I think you held your head up high on that subject. Some contributions were “must read” articles for anyone involved in youth justice debates.
Paul Where do you think the gaps were?

Mike The things that the journal did not cover as strongly - and this is not criticism as such, it just reflects what the core themes of the journal have been and what gets covered in other journals - but there has not been a lot on drugs, on mental health or on prisons. There was not a lot on research methods, although the article by Hazel Kemshead and colleagues about the depth to which researchers should go in order to make meaningful sense of offender perspectives is certainly an important one. Also, Paul McCoid’s article on evaluating restorative justice pretty much says all one needs to know about that subject, so although methods wasn’t a strong theme in the journal, I think that when you did publish in that area you did well. My friend Tony Goodman seems to have contributed the only historical article in the journal (apart from the one I did about probation in the media in the last issue!) but what he wrote about Borough High Street in London in the 1970s and 80s fitted well with the resettlement element in the change-in-probation theme which has been a core feature of the journal.

Paul So you think we achieved some coherence in our approach?

Mike Yes, definitely. More than that, in fact. What this all adds up to, I think, what I like about the journal and how I came to understand it by about 2005/6, (it didn’t take me until 2011 to work it out), is that you managed to create a new - well, redefined - knowledge base for a modern 21st century probation officer. Ostensibly, you were defining the parameters of community justice, but in doing so you were also saying, this is the practice knowledge, this is the policy knowledge, this is the theoretical knowledge that one needs to be a well-informed probation practitioner in the 21st century. That may not necessarily have been a clear intention when you started off, but that is what the journal became. Given your and Brian’s backgrounds, and those of the people you commissioned and who contributed to the journal, that isn't surprising. Even though the probation service is in a more shocking state than you would have wished when you started it ten years ago, the fact that you did this is a great commendation for the journal. You were right to identify “community justice” as a niche, and to work out its relevance for probation, and then to expand and widen that niche into a progressive, professional knowledge base. I find it hard to imagine that probation students over the years have not benefited greatly from picking up this journal and reading as much of it as they could.

Paul I don’t disagree with your overview of what we have done, I’ve done a quick exercise myself trying to categorise the different areas and probation is clearly the largest, restorative justice a close second, and I do think that was a reflection of both mine and Brian’s strengths, and I think you identified, quite pertinently, we are uncertain as to where we take issues around victims per se and I think that is probably because we have lost the guiding influence of Brian on that. Brian was writing more and more in that area and I think in the last four years would have enabled us to be clearer about where we take that area, I guess that is
something for the Board to think about in the future. I suppose looking at it retrospectively there is logic to where we have taken it. Though from my working knowledge of developing each issue, we have been more reactive and more pragmatic than necessarily clearly shaping and developing and we have responded to the changes in political context, we are able to get out articles a bit quicker than a commercial journal and I think our issue on rehabilitation revolution, which I’m quite proud of because I think we got out stuff early there before really the debate had moved on far from the somewhat broad and halting statements of the incoming coalition government. So we have been reactive and responsive to the changing world and maybe if anyone reads the issues from cover to cover they would actually see that and they would see the history of community justice developments through the way in which the journal has developed and responded.

Mike One gap that I would identify in terms of coverage is that of “offender perspectives”. You have had Hazel’s research methodology article on the need to gather offender perspectives in depth, but you haven’t had ex-offenders themselves writing for the journal and I wonder if you can comment on that? They would be an obvious choice for me, in a sense, given the focus on community justice and the acknowledged importance of listening to the “user voice”. So why have service users not been speaking in the journal?

Paul The simple answer is that you are right. I guess we have not commissioned anything and therefore we are at the mercy of what comes into us and we have not had submissions from ex-offenders until recently. This issue will actually contain a thought piece from an ex-offender, Trevor Hercules, and we would certainly be happy to encourage and develop that further. I think there is a shift going on in thinking, we have written about peer mentoring and peer research for instance, and we have written about the offender perspective, the key gap is the voice of the offender. We know it is an important and a growing theme in some of the developments around desistance and I suspect will become more of a theme for us in the future. We do reject articles, but we don’t reject huge numbers, we work with authors to try and get them to publish well and we just have not had submissions. I think we need to go back as a Board and look at that because I think you’re absolutely right, within the broad theme of community justice, the co-production of knowledge with offenders is very much an area that we ought to develop more of, so we will do that. What we are trying to do, which might relate to this as well, is we are also attempting to look at, or really ask the question, are there other things that you can do with an academic journal other than publish articles? And we are beginning to encourage the production of ‘thought pieces’ which are much more polemical than academically referenced articles, they explore a committed point of view and we have published two or three, one in this issue, and we are encouraging that. We are experimenting with interviews and dialogues of which there are two in this issue, so we are open to different forms of knowledge production and not simply maintaining a traditional approach to the production of an academic journal.
Mike You use the term “academic journal” there, and speak of experimenting within the parameters of that, but what strikes me about the BJCJ is its consistent orientation towards practitioners and policy makers. So I wonder whether the way to break out of the constraints of the academic journal is to think primarily, as I sense you did anyway, what is it that practitioners and managers need to know. That seems to me to have been your guiding principle as much as any conventional academic criteria.

Paul I guess that’s the case, and I think that’s a reflection of the history of my own work and Brian’s work and other Board members on the journal in that we have always combined practitioner, policy and academic concerns as a holistic triangulation. We, both De Montfort and ourselves, are engaged in contract research, we are out there working alongside agencies and practitioners, I believe strongly that community justice is an applied concept and it has its use in helping practitioners and policy makers move forward, drawing on the best of academic understanding, but very much located in the real world of policy and practice. I think that would be interesting if there were different editors, whether that focus would change over time but I think that’s so much part of both Brian and my history.

Mike I know that you and Brian did have a close working relationship and did have a shared history in probation and academia, but having known both of you it strikes me that there were certain differences of temperament between the two of you. Brian was openly despairing about what was happening to the probation service, even before NOMS, and that was one of the reasons why he moved into the victims and restorative justice field - he saw the opportunity for progressive developments there that he no longer saw in probation. What strikes me about you - Paul - is a kind of indefatigable optimism about the probation service, a sense that no matter what happens to the organisation’s structure, there will always be something to salvage. I think that was really reflected in most of the editorials you wrote, which always tried to be upbeat. I wonder if you are aware of that optimistic streak in your nature?

Paul I think you are spot on. I have always believed, and I think there was an article that was a very brief article, I think in either Community Care or Social Work Today, by David Millard written in about 1977 in which he talked about why he thought probation existed, and he said from a sentencer’s point of view, a magistrate’s point of view, that it existed in an area of uncertainty, that sentencers get a number of situations in which they are required to sentence and they do not quite know what to do, they could send to prison, they could put on probation, they could do other things, and probation has always flourished, as it were, in that area of uncertainty. I believe that the probation service as it’s constituted in the UK is the vehicle that has done that most effectively. I still believe that the quality of probation practitioners is high, their training is very good and the intellectual curiosity of probation officers enables and supports innovation and change, but if probation as an institution disappears, and clearly at the time of writing this that’s a possibility with the current Government, I do
not believe that what probation provides will disappear, it might come under a
different guise, a different shape, but there is still those areas of uncertainty for
the sentencer which a new body or new set of groups of people will need to
provide. If it is the voluntary sector then it takes probation back to its own
roots as a voluntary organisation, if it is the private sector then the private sector
would only do it on the back of ‘tupeeing’ across large numbers of probation
practitioners, because that is where the expertise lies. What I do not think will
happen is we will have a criminal justice system which is devoid of the kinds of
services, support, help, programmes, community engagement that probation
operates in, in that sense I can remain optimistic that there is a place for that
kind of work. I sometimes in my darker moments feel that the probation service
might have lost its way in terms of achieving that, but that’s maybe for a separate
discussion. I do believe that it is our role in this journal to present the innovative
and creative practice that’s out there that gives people a sense that that direction
is still there. I think my co-editor now, and Brian before, have a slightly different
set of interests and that is healthy because I think that gives the journal new
areas to go into whilst I continue to plough and trumpet the support of probation
as an institutional practice.

Mike Could you say a bit more about the Asian Pacific issue, because that clearly
reflects the links you’ve recently had with the Asian-Pacific world through your
university work in Hong Kong? There isn’t much in mainstream probation
literature in our part of the world about Asian Pacific work in this field, so I
think it was a very useful thing to do.

Paul I have always been very keen that we publish articles on international
experiences of community justice and I was given a unique opportunity to spend
seven months located in Hong Kong where I had done quite a bit of work there
already with the probation service locally and I had worked with the prison
service in Singapore and other parts of the Asian Pacific region, particularly New
Zealand. I used the opportunity while I was in Hong Kong to work with two
members of the advisory board, Professor Wing Lo and Professor Dennis Wong,
to produce a specifically Asian Pacific region edition. I think what was exciting
about that is that I have always been a little concerned that probation in the UK
or, more precisely in England and Wales thinks that it is exporting a very good
model, and when it takes in new ideas it tends to take in ideas that come from
North America or very occasionally Europe. I think there is an awful lot of good
practice in the rest of the world and particularly in South East Asia where I have
spent considerable time, so the opportunity to support a guest edition which the
board responded to well was one I could not miss. I worked very well with my
colleagues out there to produce what I think was a different and interesting
edition.

Mike I wonder if we could shift the focus a bit and go back to the target audience
after 10 years. How has the journal sold in the world, have you reached your
target audience? Have you got the kind of feedback from them that you were
doing something useful and it was along the right lines, what they wanted?
Paul  I think there’s probably been three phases in terms of who we have managed to target. Our first phase was when we first came into existence, we had a close relationship with the new probation training centres and we were able to get our journal established in university libraries and therefore accessible to students and the growing numbers of criminology students that came on board in the early part of the century as well. At that time the journal was solely hard copy and we were dependent on our subscriber base to get that out. We got nearly 200 subscribers but we were also entering a world in which modern readers approaches to journals was moving from the possession of individual copies to the use of e-journals and particularly this applied in the academic and student communities. We were unable to increase our subscriber base as we did not have, for instance, what the Howard League and the Probation Journal had, a subscriber base that was based on membership, and long standing membership and we were never going to reach that kind of number. So we began, in the middle part of our existence, I think to move towards an online journal approach, so we had both hard copy and online. We made the online version cheaper and accessible to subscribers just as an online version, and we tried to develop it, albeit through the Community Justice Portal (www.cjp.org.uk) rather than through commercial publishers. We talked a lot during this middle phase to commercial publishers and tried to interest them in considering taking over the journal as a going concern and whilst we had interest from one or two commercial publishers, neither what they offered us or what we felt we already had was sufficiently attractive to move us on. So we are now in phase three. We have not managed to increase the subscriber base sufficiently to feel that the quality that we think the journal has, is accessible widely enough, so we are looking at the possibility of open access publishing which would get us immediately to a much wider audience beyond academic circles. We do publish through EBSCO at the moment so most people who have access to academic libraries will be able to get hold of a copy of the journal, but we don’t know how successful that is, our ability to track the numbers of readers is fairly poor because we do not produce commercially so we do not have the tracking systems to know that. We are looking at the possibility of open access publishing and then we can track citations much more clearly and we can begin to track the reach of the journal more accurately.

Mike  Could you just say a little bit more about the relationship between the journal and the portal, because that is the other thing that Hallam is famous for, you have the Community Justice Portal. How have you seen those two things together - wholly separate, or are they related?

Paul  We launched the Community Justice Portal in 2002, so at a very similar time as we launched the journal. They were completely separate initiatives, the portal being entirely a Sheffield Hallam initiative. The conception of the portal was that we wanted to find ways to link to community justice practitioners, and policy makers. Interestingly one reading of the history of that is that we were like the predecessors to eBay in that we got there too early for the criminal justice world, we got there at a time when probation, prison and police did not routinely access
computers and certainly did not access the internet on their desks and therefore getting the portal used more extensively was a problem. More than one occasion we have contemplated closing down the portal. Actually through things like the publishing of the journal there, and we also run an e-learning platform for integrated offender management and the connectivity of social media the portal is quite vibrant now and we are making the most of these developments in social media, second generation social media, which is much more interactive and brings different media together much more effectively. So the portal now tweets and it will tweet the journal articles, it will tweet information and we have a healthy number of followers there, something like 700 followers there and they of course retweet us each week so it reaches quite widely around now. There is probably more interaction between the journal and the portal today than ever, as the portal tries to do what it set out to do 10 years ago in a world which has moved on in terms of technology.

Mike Do you know what the top downloaded articles in the British Journal of Community Justice have been, and can you discern any themes in terms of why they would have been the popular ones?

Paul I don't know the answer to that at the moment. I don't know whether we have the capability to tell you the answer to that. I think technically there are some difficulties identifying the different segments of the journal so I’m not sure.

Mike OK - let me just ask something contentious now. One of the well-known people that you got to write for the journal was Martin Narey and of course in the period when he was running NOMS you would not have picked him as the most likely candidate to talk about community justice. David Faulkner’s views, another of your big names, were quite at odds with Martin’s, so what was your aim in having Martin Narey contributing to the journal? Why did you want to give him space to argue his vision for NOMS, because at one level it’s not easy to connect his vision of NOMS with what the journal was all about?

Paul I think there were some historic connections which probably puts this into a different context. Firstly Martin Narey has a long history of engagement with Sheffield Hallam University, he studied there as an undergraduate, he has an honorary doctorate from the university and indeed became visiting professor with us in the centre. The article you refer to was actually the delivery of the first Community Justice Portal lecture, so there’s a connection also with the portal which has its own series of annual lectures and the intention initially had been that all the portal lectures would appear in the journal, but for various reasons that has not happened. Martin was the first one and we reproduced it in the journal. I do not think we would, or have ever consciously selected articles for support of a particular vision, so we would be more than happy to give exposure to people whatever their vision of community justice was. I guess people who choose to send articles in are more likely to do so because they feel it has a particular focus and a particular approach, but we would not refuse an article if it was well-written but from a differing perspective, so it would not have occurred
to us not to include Martin’s because his perspective might have been different, but because he was important player in that new world, in that new vision, and therefore it was important that his voice was heard.

What would you say of the overall quality of the journal over the ten years?

Mike  Well the quality is obviously very high, it’s variable in the way that every journal’s quality is variable, but it can certainly be said of the British Journal of Community Justice that it has contained articles that would easily have been publishable in more obviously prestigious journals, and in terms of some practice, policy, academic issues you have certainly had articles that should be on key reading lists. And you have defined a probation knowledge base.

Paul  So what are your favourite articles?

Mike  My personal favourite is Keith Davis’ article on “Time and Probation Practice” for the simple reason that he built on something that I had already written about, I think for the first time, in the Howard Journal. I’d always planned, because I was a bit disappointed with that first article, to write a better article about “time” and Keith went ahead and did it himself. I was, I admit, somewhat chagrined to see it, but I liked it and I was pleased to see someone pick up a theme I had identified earlier on. I think in terms of picking out any single issue, the memorial issue to Brian Williams with the European articles on restorative justice is essential reading for anybody in that field, and a very fitting tribute to Brian.

Paul  Do you think the BJCJ has a chance of surviving another 10 years?

Mike  The answer is “yes”, but I say that in the light of what you said earlier on about the likelihood of the probation service surviving as a separate organisation. You’re very confident that even if the organisation doesn’t survive - and heaven forbid that it should fall - the kinds of knowledge of how to work well with offenders will still be needed by someone somewhere in the criminal justice system, most likely in the voluntary sector, possibly to some degree in the private sector. I am more sanguine about that than you are. What worries me about the possible demise of the probation service is the inevitable fragmentation of the services and tasks that once comprised the probation service as a coherent social institution. If you fragment that into a mosaic of service provision, while it’s true that the tasks will still be going on, I fear there will be no sense of common identity among the people doing it, no sense of a common idea of “probation”, but sadly, no sense of a common idea of “community justice” either, around which a professional identity could be built and sustained. So my sense of the journal’s fate is very much tied up with whether the probation service itself does survive, and whether it can become an organisation that stands for, and practices, community justice. If Probation Trusts did care to think about words and concepts that might define their identity in 2012/2013, I think they would find “community justice” more
acceptable as a term than they might have done ten years ago. So yes, with commitment from a coterie of editors, editorial group and writers who would want to support a journal like this, yes it has a future, but whether it retains a coherent audience depends on whether the probation service continues to exist as a coherent organisation and on that I’m pretty pessimistic, I’m afraid.

Paul Well we might just have to rename it the British Journal of Privatised Justice! Thank you so much for your time and reflections.
REFLECTIONS ON COMMUNITY JUSTICE IN MONTREAL
By David Ward in conversation with Jean Hine

Jean Shall we start with where you went to, why you went and what you were doing while you were there, to give a context?

Dave I went to Canada on the invitation from a former PhD student, Dr Annie Pullen Sansfacon, who is a member of staff at the University of Montreal. We both share an interest in the theory and practice of empowerment through group work and so my main purpose for being there was to link into work that she was doing and to evaluate and engage with community based projects in Montreal that were taking a user community member centred approach. I was interested in addressing structural issues around whatever was the focus of the project. In addition, I agreed to run seminars, mainly for postgraduate students, around self-directed group work, social action participatory methods of research, which is a distinctive approach to user involvement in research. The seminars became very open with a mixed membership including people who were based in academic institutions and people who were members of projects working in the community and interested in the methodology. I ran seminars in three universities in Montreal and also in Quebec City and in another University in the Province of Quebec.

Jean Did they come up after you arrived - word got round that you were there?

Dave There had been a little bit of preparatory work before I got there but mostly it was sending emails around when I got there saying I was there and then people came back and made arrangements for me to go and lead workshops, rather than actively deliver seminars. The first part of the visit was fairly relaxed, getting to know the environment, getting to know people, getting to find one’s way around. As I got to know people and got involved in things it became busier and busier and it was very hectic towards the end. In particular this was true of my contact in the University of Montreal, which has a partnership with academic staff from two other universities, and a grant from the Canadian Research Council, (which is the equivalent of the ESRC), to do some action research with parents of children who are gender variant or gender non-conforming. This is very much an area which, if this is the right word, is being ‘discovered’ in the sense that as soon as one gets involved in the subject area you find that it is an issue. The experience of gender non-conforming children is not an uncommon thing and both the children and their parents have to struggle to manage their development and to access support services. There is also work with established services to help...
them provide appropriate and sensitive services to gender variant young people. One of the main things that I did, as part of the project, concerned the explicitly stated proposal that the methodology was going to be social action research. When I was in Canada I was to train the Research Assistants involved in the project in social action research methodology. While I was there I ran six half-day training workshops for three Research Assistants involved in this project on social action participatory research methods.

Jean: So this project is the social action of the parents trying to bring about change within organisations?

Dave: Yes - you’ve got it - the parents group is a group which was established on the basis that it was an opportunity for parents who had something in common, to get together. But then the facilitation of the group enabled the parents to have the option, which they took up, of becoming a change orientated group rather than a self-help group.

Jean: I see.

Dave: This is part of social action; self-help is embedded in the process of working together to change external circumstances. So I worked with the Research Assistants who were action research workers and I will come back to explain that in a second. They were action research workers in terms of social action group work methodology: preparing the group and working with the setting up of the group. They introduced the parents together, then worked with them to establish an agenda for the group, and then facilitated and supported whatever they decided to do. But the groups started after I had left.

Jean: I was going to say is it in its very early stages - but it was actually pre the group starting?

Dave: It was pre but then I went back to Canada for a fortnight in May, so I was able to spend a day with the group workers reviewing what had been happening. I had been given information between times anyway and had commented on it, but in May I was able to review with the action researcher facilitators what had been going on in the group.

Jean: And how did they find the experience?

Dave: We have written a paper which is currently out for review which we are hoping to have published in The Journal of Progressive Human Services, which is the North American equivalent of Critical Social Policy but more geared to practice: it is an interesting journal.

Jean: How long was this piece of work planned to last?

Dave: One of the features of social action work is that it is open-ended. The researchers have been specifically funded by the research grant for nine months, but the group takes over and plans its own future and decides where it is going to go. One of the commitments of the rest of the team is that they won’t just walk out when the funding ends. But the way research happens in Canada is interesting as well. When you are awarded a research grant you specifically
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cannot use that grant to buy yourselves out, you have to use the grant to buy in research support. It is a way of insisting that academics are trained as researchers and have opportunities to do research. So once you graduate from being a Researcher, you become a PI and become essentially a Researcher Supervisor. The academics are Research Supervisors within the contracts for academics in Canada which gives them a lot more space to do research as part of their job. A lot of the teaching in the universities in Canada is done specifically by people who are on teaching contracts, and usually they do that on a part time basis. So academics have a lot of opportunity for research and writing.

Jean You mentioned in one of your pieces that the link between academics and policy makers seems to be a lot more positive and stronger in Canada that it is over here. To what extent do you think that is related to the way in which the researchers work?

Dave Part of the background is that I went to Montreal, and Montreal is in Quebec, and Quebec is a very distinctive society. I suppose it is a bit like Scotland where it is small enough for everybody to know everybody else. What came over very clearly was that there were very strong personal and institutional links between academics and people in government. And that academics were almost routinely referred to in terms of being asked to advise. Well not advise but provide information to enable politicians to make decisions and I suppose civil servants to gather information in support of that. Also the press was very open. I saw references to articles on socially relevant topics in the press, which referred to university academics and to academic research within the articles. I have some examples I brought with me. That was one of the things which really struck me. Here is an article on homeless young people being targeted by the police. The author was a colleague at the University of Montreal who did research on this. She collected together a dossier with her co-researcher at the University of Ottawa. This is in an ordinary kind of newspaper and it is just not the way you would see it reported in the UK. We are not familiar with seeing the press comfortably refer to academic research.

Jean And is it a balanced report?

Dave Oh yes very - and that's the other thing. We would regard ‘balanced’ as perhaps meaning it is not right wing and not condemnatory of the socially disadvantaged. One of the things which stood out very strongly for me was the much more balanced approach to social issues in the press. This article is about the police targeting homeless young people and harassing them. It argues that to institute stronger penalties for juvenile offenders would be ineffective: the line is we want a much more liberal approach. This is partly mixed up in the fact that some of the Quebec identity is its liberalism and its social awareness compared with the rest of Canada. When I talk about what this situation is in Quebec and in Montreal it is important not to generalise and to see that as a reflection of what is going on in the rest of Canada. What underlines this is that the government of Canada, under Premier Harper, who is seen as very much a right-winger, is putting forward legislation which is a ‘two strikes and you’re out’ type of policy and with longer sentences. Quebec is seeking to resist that within its own...
jurisdiction and various constitutional battles are going on between Quebec and the federal government.

Jean  Do they have the right to make their own decisions in that respect?

Dave  What is critical of course is where is the dividing line. There is a federal penal code, but then there is flexibility about the implementation of it at a provincial level. But I am not familiar exactly with what the details of those divisions are. What we do have is a central government and it tends to be a federal Canadian government and because Canada is mostly English speaking it also gets associated with Anglophone culture. This is not related particularly to the UK but is related to the USA as opposed to Quebec, which is Francophone. It has its own identity and its identity is embedded in a whole range of things, which are different to what go on in the rest of Canada.

Jean  Is that just because they want to be different from the rest of Canada, not because they particularly see the French, for instance, going a different way and they want to be similar?

Dave  There is not an identity of that kind with France. It is a three-way relationship really for Francophone Canada. The relationship with Anglophone Canada, the relationship with France and there is also a relationship with the UK. And the relationship with France is more nostalgic than real because it goes back into the history that Quebec was wrested from France in the 1760s before the French revolution, and when Quebec was taken over by Britain as a result of a treaty which ended the Seven Years’ War. Britain was not particularly interested in Quebec in terms of colonising it. One of the things which is in the mythology of Quebec, was that apparently Voltaire said when the treaty was being negotiated to end the war, that the French had a choice of either giving up Guadeloupe and Martinique in the Caribbean, or Quebec. Voltaire was reported to have said whoever wants that place of ice and trees and dark nights when you could have the sugar and the spices and the sunshine of the Caribbean? So the French surrendered Quebec to the British, and for the British, Quebec was important strategically rather than a place they wanted to colonise. There was this view that the French at that point held Louisiana and they held Quebec, and in a sense they could have circled the British colonies down the Mississippi valley. By taking Quebec the British strategically prevented that, but what happened was that, as part of the settlement in effect Quebec became self-ruling. But self-ruling meant being self-ruled within the structures of pre-revolutionary France; the feudal structures where the dominant forces were the church and absentee landlords. There is a great ambivalence because the Quebecois on the one hand recognised that that allowed them to keep their French identity because the British did not impose anything, whilst Ontario and the rest of Canada was developed on the Westminster model, which was more capitalist and liberal. It encouraged and allowed commercial development and prosperity. So while the rest of Canada developed under the Westminster model, Quebec became almost a feudal backwater, and it remained a feudal backwater until the 1960s.

Jean  So is it still playing catch up or has it caught up?
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Dave
In some ways it has caught up but to some extent it is still playing catch up. In the 1960s was that there was an internal revolution within Quebec. It was known as the Quiet Revolution. Up to that point the church dominated education, health, the social field, and also culturally was very dominant. Commerce was largely in the hands of Anglophones who came in from other parts of Canada, rather than Quebecois Francophones. So there was this internal revolution in Quebec in the 1960s which threw off the power of the church, nationalised all the things that the church had done and the state took them over. It nationalised the commercial infrastructure and took over, in particular, power generation and the mining industries in the 1960s.

Jean
And is it still nationalised?

Dave
Largely yes and that is one thing one notices; a very, very strong public sector structure. As happens in revolutions, there was a strong reaction, which went from one thing to another. The distinctive French speaking, Catholic church had been the corner stone of Quebec identity, and Quebec became an aggressively secular French speaking state based on what it calls ‘public’ services but what in the French translation are ‘collective’ services. The population identifies with those services in a way which one does not experience here. The services are seen as ‘ours’ rather than seen as the state providing for us. I’ll give you an illustration which is the metro system in Montreal. We have London underground which will be the equivalent in London, and they have the UTM in Montreal, which is the ‘movement collective’. Public transport is not a service which you buy into, it is a collective service which we all own and contribute to in our fares.

Jean
So it is not paid for out of taxes?

Dave
It is partly paid for out of taxes because it is relatively cheap but there is no question of privatising it and there is a brilliant integrated public transport system of buses and underground which is this ‘movement collective’. It advertises every week in the newspaper special offers and things they are putting on. It presents itself as ‘this is our service to you’. It has this participatory kind of aura to it.

Jean
The distinctiveness that you mentioned - is this something the Quebecians see and feel and talk about?

Dave
Yes completely. There are two worlds in Canada, for Quebecois there is Quebec and what they call the ‘ROC’, which is the rest of Canada. So they talk about the ROC, while from what I hear, the rest of Canada regard the Quebecois as a bit ‘off the wall’. Quebec was seen as being ‘backward’, so there is an assumption that it must still be a little bit backward, not in the real world. So there is quite a lot of feeling that the rest of Canada has to subsidise Quebec. But although there is a transfer of resource around Canada from, in particular, the oil rich states of the mid-west of Canada, it is from west to east. In fact the poorest parts of Canada are the Maritime States which of course are English speaking; Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick and Newfoundland are the poorest parts of Canada, but in a sense that is overlooked by the Anglophones. They see Quebec as being the part of Canada which rides on the back of the rest of Canada.
Jean So as a consequence of this collective view of the world, do they have less social problems?

Dave I don’t know whether there’s a connection, but the collective view produced services and the public services tend to be of a high quality. In the criminal justice field the public services are geared towards help rather than punishment; they are very welfare orientated, very anti-carceral. I was told, (and I cannot currently verify this) that there are lower crime rates and lower recidivism rates in Quebec than there are in the rest of Canada.

Jean That is interesting because I had a look at those figures as I was wondering whether they sentenced differently. The statistics are a bit hard to make sense of because they do not add up. I have not brought them with me but although Quebec is different to some states, I only looked at the biggest provinces. There were some other provinces that had similar figures if you looked at the proportion of custody, and the proportion of probation. There were other places that were similar like I think Ontario was one that was similar and some that were very different, more punitive.

Dave Well if you go west it becomes more punitive I think.

Jean It could have been, I did not look at it geographically.

Dave So Ontario is seen as being more or less England in North America. Ontario, Toronto has a very strong identity with Europe and then as you go further west you move into the open country where it is very individualist. So you have the farmers in the prairies and they are huge farms, but also the frontier spirit of the mining and the oil industry in particular. And then British Columbia is seen as being different again because a huge proportion of the population in British Columbia is from Japan and China - from East Asia and is orientated very much towards the Pacific Rim and the kind of culture of the tiger economies. I just assume you would find that British Columbia was more liberal than the prairie states. The people I have spoken to say they can back up the view that the way of doing things in Quebec, particularly in relation to young people, works.

Jean So what does community justice mean to Quebecians?

Dave I don’t know whether community justice as a term would mean very much to Quebecians, but the under eighteens are all dealt with by the Child Protection Service, which is not Child Protection in terms of non-accidental injuries as we think of it, but is the social services for young people.

Jean So do the people who work there, presumably social workers, are they responsible for taking them through court and that sort of thing? Court reports?

Dave Yes

Jean Sentences from the court?

Dave Yes

Jean Do they have a similar range of sentences?
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Dave Yes the range of provision is very similar in terms of community provision and a lot of that provision is in fact provided for by what we would call third sector organisations. But there seems to be a more comfortable relationship between those and the state than there is here. Third sector organisations are involved because it is seen as right that they should be doing it rather than for economic reasons.

Jean Does that mean that their funding is more secure? The charitable, third sector organisations?

Dave Yes

Jean Because one of the problems with ours is its always short term isn’t it?

Dave Yes that kind of short termism people are not worried about where they are going to get their funding, or whether their funding is going to get renewed. It is just assumed that things will continue. Organisations will provide an annual report each year and if the annual report shows that the service is no longer viable or needed, well self-evidently it would be reviewed. I don’t know how to express it but there is not that sense of being under threat really. There is scrutiny but not with that motive.

Jean Yes so do they not have to divert as much of their attention to fundraising, to getting donations from people?

Dave There are some big foundations. I suppose that is a feature which seeps in from the USA; the notion of private beneficence is very strong. So the funding is mixed, and it is partnership funding, but the funding from the private foundations is very secure. The foundations are very secure. One of the things which is interesting about Canada, but also in Quebec, is the strong public investment in culture, and culture is not just highbrow culture it is popular culture as well. One of the people who, you hear a lot about is Celine Dion who is from Montreal. She seems not to be revered in the kind of celebrity way celebrities are treated here, the Posh Spice type thing, but just respected: somebody does well and when they do well it’s almost assumed that they then contribute to the community. She is a great contributor to voluntary and charitable works in the city but it is not presented or does not come over in the way it would be if some footballer set it up here where it would be seen as an exception rather than the rule. It’s taken for granted that that is the way it is. It is this collective culture that I experienced as being very, very strongly established everywhere, and permeates everything.

Jean The charities that provide services to young offenders or look after the sentences of young offenders, they do not find that these are the less attractive places for people putting their money?

Dave The view of the person who was my contact at the Centre de Jeunesse, which is the young offenders organisation, is that we accept in Quebec that the young people are not a problem for the present but hope for the future so we should invest in them. Now I did not always agree what was being done but it is nice to be able to get in to that kind of debate, about the nature of investment. A lot of the services, and a lot of the way things are done, they are very therapeutic and
individualistic in terms of medical model approaches to things and that is where my social action stuff comes in. But those are the services that are provided. There is no question that they should not provide services to help young people rather than punish them and let them learn their lesson. It is not a matter of letting them learn their lesson.

Jean: From what you have said you would expect restorative justice to be fairly strong?

Dave: I didn’t see it as being particularly strong but I would not have expected that would necessarily be the case because in a sense the investment is in helping. I think restorative justice comes up as an antidote to punishment. Restorative justice gets introduced in order to counter exclusionary policies whereas in Quebec there are not exclusionary policies in the first place. If you are not excluding offenders in the first place then the issue of dealing with their exclusion by reconciling the victim and the offender, or the community of the offender, does not come up.

Jean: So is there not a strong focus on victims either?

Dave: Only in one area did I notice it and that is in domestic violence - I found a lot of preoccupation with domestic violence in the adult criminal field. A lot of thinking about how to deal with domestic violence and the perpetrator in a more nuanced way, rather than just looking to the interests of the victim by protecting them from the perpetrator or dealing punitively with the perpetrator.

Jean: Interesting.

Dave: I found this very interesting because, in the work I do with the Probation Board in Nottingham and in particular with serious further offending. A lot of the serious further offending is around domestic violence. So I was interested in projects that were taking place in Montreal around domestic violence. When I say a nuanced way, dealing with domestic violence in a way that recognises the interdependence between the perpetrator and the victim. Not in terms of emotional interdependence which in a circular way comes around to blaming the victim, because it says that some women keep getting themselves into victim situations, becoming victims. But more about structural and material interdependence and that a crude or an unsubtle approach to domestic violence can rebound on the victim in terms of their material circumstances and their life opportunities. An example, deceptively trivial, that was given, in explaining a diversion programme for perpetrators, was that once someone has a criminal conviction they cannot get entry to the USA. That could mean no more holidays in Florida for the whole family, quite an issue if you think about Canadian winters. So although it is about putting the victim at the centre of attention, it is also recognising the complexities and ensuring that the victim does not come off worse whatever happens.

Jean: I see right ok, what about something like community payback or community service?

Dave: Yes they call it community service.
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Jean  So they do have it?
Dave  Yes. It is run by a voluntary organisation. I think it is run by the Howard League.

Jean  Of Canada?
Dave  Of Canada.

Jean  So I guess this is something like what is envisaged for over here, the third sector?
Dave  Well no, over here it is envisaged that it will be run by the commercial sector. I almost need to go back to why did I go to Canada? I went to Canada for the reasons I said in the beginning but also because of my work on the Probation Board here and because of what I’d experienced. My involvement in probation and criminal justice is just as much an intellectual academic area of interest as social action. Canada, it had seemed to me, had made a huge impact on the way the probation service had evolved in the last twenty years or so, particularly through What Works. And the importation of a system of providing responses which was predominantly based on the development of group work programmes and the dominance of programmes in probation practice. We had always been told that Canadians have produced the research that shows that it works. So that is the evidence base for us adopting it almost wholesale. So I was quite interested to see whether it was as it seems; whether that characterisation held up to scrutiny. That is one of the things that I did while I was there, to pursue and find out more about that.

The first thing that I found, which took me quite a long time to find it but it was the most important thing that I discovered, was there are two criminal justice systems in Canada. There is the federal system and the provincial system. The CSC, the Correctional Service of Canada, is essentially a prison based system which provides the facilities for people who are sentenced to over two years imprisonment within the Canadian penal code. There are no Probation Officers within this federal system, there are only Parole Officers who work predominantly within penal institutions and much less intensively in the community. Prisons are much more strongly resourced with Parole Officers and Psychologists who do the therapeutic work while Prison Officers are known as guards and they manage the day to day locking up, control and discipline of people within the institution. But compared with us the prisons are very well resourced with therapeutic professionals. The programmes have been developed and largely put in place within prisons whereas they have been transferred across the Atlantic and put in place in the UK within community based correctional services. So there is a big question for me as to whether one is looking at like for like. Whether the so-called success of programmes which have been instituted in prisons can be transferred to the community and can be assessed in the same way. Controversially I feel that this has been hidden from us here over the last twenty years.

Jean  Canada was important because that is where the LSIR had been developed, which was the first scale used for What Works. A lot of the programme material was actually developed here, in the UK.
I thought the programmes were developed over there, Think First and all of that stuff?

Some of the ideas for them might have come over but they were promoted as being very UK developed. The notion of CBT was coming in at that time as well. Meta-analysis was identifying CBT as working best and therapeutic programmes are seen as not being very good.

And where were the programmes though, the programmes were in the prisons?

They were primarily at that the stage yes because they can only use programmes that are evaluated to a certain sort of level in meta-analysis.

What is interesting is that the high status place to work is in prison because Officers in prison have got a captured audience and they can use their therapeutic skills to facilitate and lead the programmes that are put in place in prison. But because of the size of the country and the dispersal of the population, the role of the Parole Officer, once somebody has been released from prison and is on licence, is essentially just checking up. There is very little on-going work

So that is very much the American model isn’t it? Huge caseloads and little contact?

Yes in the community and that is the obverse from what it is here where Probation Officers want to work in the community and see going into work in a prison as being given a ‘sentence’. There it is entirely the opposite. People want to work in prison because that is where they feel they can use their skills. There is no specific training for Parole Officers; there is no such thing as probation training courses. People are recruited as psychologists or predominately criminologists so they have done criminology degrees at university and then they learn the correctional services application on the job, not through going through special courses. Their qualification is their degree or, more often, their master’s degree in criminology or psychology. Then they are employed as Parole Officers or as Probation Officers but Probation Officers only exist at a provincial level, based in the provincial services, the Ministry of Public Protection in the case of Quebec. They do social enquiry reports and they supervise community sentences very much in the way that we supervise them here. It appears as though in Canada you get people who get two years or more imprisonment and they go off into the federal system. But Quebec province has very few prisons so people who could be sentenced to less than two years seem to serve their time differently. You do not have a load of people on short term sentences so you get people either sentenced for over two years or sentenced to community disposals or weekend imprisonment. In the Quebec provincial system, most imprisonment is weekend imprisonment, periodic imprisonment and for which, indeed, there is some strong backlash against it because it is seen as a waste of time. So weekend imprisonment would probably be seen as a step forward here but there it is now seen as a waste of time because all it does makes people come away from their families for the weekend and while they are there they do nothing. They simply have to be occupied.
Jean: So is their role mainly surveillance as well the Probation Officers?
Dave: No they would work with people on supervision, on probation orders. The range of community sentences that Probation Officers would deal with here.

Jean: The court still decides what it is that the offender is going to do? That’s not down to the Probation Officer?
Dave: Yes and it was made very clear to me that Probation Officers, although they are recruited in the same way again predominately from psychology degrees and criminology degrees, don’t share a common identity with Parole Officers. Parole Officers are in the federal system and that is a whole different kind of world to the provincial system. In Quebec the provincial system as I say is very much geared to health, welfare and keeping non-custodial provisions.

Jean: Which presumably works through to individual officers and their recommendations in courts?
Dave: I would expect yes.

Jean: What about the notion of anti-oppressive practice? If again they have got a more inclusive society on the whole, are there groups that are not included?
Dave: Yes and this is one of the things which really fascinated me while I was there because what I began to see was a distinction between their welfare state and our welfare state. Their welfare state is public services for the majority but they are very, very poor people and an inadequate safety net for them. Public services are high quality and supported and accessed by the majority of the population but this access is dependent on the principle of contribution. For instance there is cheap child care which is state subsidised and costs a few dollars a day which has led to high female employment: it is the norm to work whether a single parent or in a couple. Social services have high quality surroundings and buildings and are accessed by all the population. There is a culture of collective provision for the mainstream majority but what shocked me was the lack of a safety net for people outside the mainstream. There were large numbers of beggars on the street and homeless people, often, I was told, people with mental health problems or even elderly people who did not fit within the structured provision. Old people were begging because they were not able to access full pension provision. The safety net is totally inadequate: I was told that it didn’t even cover rent for a room for somewhere to live. Soup kitchens are provided by voluntary organisations and are very visible even in fashionable parts of the city. Free care in care homes is available for the eligible but there seems to be a view that if you haven’t contributed you deserve what you get and there is no need for a comprehensive safety net because we have full employment. One academic I spoke with, whose speciality is homelessness, talked enviously of public provision for the homeless in the UK.

Jean: What about ethnicity and cultural differences?
Dave: What is absolutely crucial in Quebec is the Quebec and Francophone identity. There are a lot of immigrants who are French speaking, notably from the Caribbean and Africa. There is a particularly strong link with Haiti and there is a
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Haitian community which is fully integrated but there is some residual hostility to immigrants and a view that they see Quebec as a passport to the rest of Canada and, to some extent, to the USA and are not committed to the distinctive identity of Quebec.

Jean  What about the indigenous population?
Dave  The term used is aboriginal. They are very disadvantaged, marginalised and discriminated against. It is a big issue not only in Quebec but in Canada generally because of lack of progress in terms of resolving the rights of the aboriginal population and their achieving access to contemporary standards of living.

Jean  We are running out of time: any final thoughts?
Dave  Although the quality of the infrastructure, public services and the environment such as the cleanliness of the streets is striking, not everything is rosy.

People in Quebec are closer to power, which makes them more powerful. For instance a recent proposal to raise student fees led to a student strike and huge demonstrations right across the population. There was a sense that important principles had been betrayed. Free education was an important part of the collective provision and young people had been betrayed. I got no sense of people complaining about their taxes. The format of Quebec society has changed in the short period of time since its ‘quiet revolution’ in the 60s and 70s, but people are still committed to the original ‘collective’ principles.
Reforming Offender Management Services

In January of this year, a Ministry of Justice consultation paper, *Transforming Rehabilitation: A revolution in the way we manage offenders* was published calling for responses to a proposed strategy for the future delivery and commissioning of probation services. This builds on a previous consultation paper, *Punishment and Reform: Effective Probation Services*, published in March 2012. The overall case for reform made in the paper is the often heard, traditional one. Seeking to harness both retributivist and utilitarian responses to crime, it is for a criminal justice system that “punishes people properly when they break the law – and also supports them to get their lives back on track, so they don’t commit crime again in the future”. Aiming “to go straight to the heart of the issue”, the intention is to bring about a revolution in the way offenders are managed in the community by “extending competition of probation services” via a “new commissioning model to deliver better rehabilitation outcomes and value for money”. The core proposals include:

- The opening up of community orders and licence requirements for low and medium risk offenders to a diverse market of contracted private and voluntary sector providers. Through making payments in full only on the basis that a sufficient reduction in reoffending is quantitatively evidenced, providers will be incentivised “to focus relentlessly on rehabilitating offenders”. Accepting the need to support smaller organisations without the resources to bear the upfront costs required to operate effectively under the payment by results funding scheme, the National Offender Management Service will invest £500k to develop and execute a capacity building action plan for the voluntary and community sector. It is also accepted that a simple binary measure of desistance in offending could encourage providers to ‘cherry pick’ those offenders least likely to reoffend. Therefore, ways will be considered to ensure providers engage with “all offenders, even the most problematic repeat offenders”. Emphasising the need for greater flexibility and discretion in the delivery of rehabilitative services, the Ministry of Justice expects new providers to support offenders before and after release from prison to find accommodation and employment, access mental...
health, drug and alcohol treatment programmes, as well as address attitudes, thinking and behaviour.

- The extending of community supervision to offenders serving custodial sentences of less than 12 months. Non-compliance and a failure to engage with rehabilitative services to be addressed by “a scale of available measures” including “consideration of the option of custody as a last resort”. This revisiting of a previous proposal, made in the Halliday Report, *Making Punishments Work: A Review of the Sentencing Framework for England & Wales*, 2001, to provide a sentence of ‘custody plus’ for short sentence prisoners has substantial cost implications. It is acknowledged that the settlement for the 2010 Spending Review requires savings of over £2 billion by 2013/15. Therefore, it is intended that the costs of providing integrative offender management services to this additional group of prisoners who currently have no statutory licence or rehabilitative provision is to be met by driving down unit costs and releasing efficiencies through competition, as well as savings resulting from a potential reduction in reoffending rates.

- The repositioning of public sector probation as the body accountable for supervising offenders who pose the highest risk of reoffending and for ensuring contracted providers manage the risk of harm posed by offenders generally. No longer responsible for commissioning or providing rehabilitative services directly to offenders, the public probation service will prioritise public protection, primarily through providing advice to courts on sentencing, conducting initial risk assessments of offenders, and monitoring arrangements adopted by contracted providers for managing on-going risk.

- The commissioning of services as a national function focused on a configuration of 16 contract package areas. This new geographical structure to be aligned with Police and Crime Commissioner, local authority, as well as other Government department boundaries such as the Work Programme. Accordingly, public sector probation will be re-organised with fewer Probation Trusts, “or a different structure (such as a single national probation trust or direct delivery on behalf of the Secretary of State). The intention is to enter into national contract arrangements which are informed by local information and intelligence, and local delivery systems including Youth Offending Teams and Multi-agency Public Protection Arrangements. While it is proposed the areas are large enough to measure changes in reoffending, facilitate payment by results, and encompass prisons situated outside the local areas to which offenders return after release, it
is also expected that commissioning arrangements make use of local partnerships and draw upon local expertise.

Chris Grayling MP, Lord Chancellor and Secretary of State for Justice gave evidence on Transforming Rehabilitation to the House of Commons Justice Committee on 27 February. In this 1hr 37min question and answer session he outlines his views on the details of plans for the future of the Probation Service and supervision of offenders in the community.

A video of the evidence can be found at http://www.parliamentlive.tv/main/Player.aspx?meetingId=12683.

Transforming Rehabilitation. A revolution in the way we manage offenders. Consultation Paper CP1/2013 can be found at: https://consult.justice.gov.uk/digital-communications/transforming-rehabilitation

Changes and expansion to the prison estate

The Ministry of Justice has announced it intends to change and expand the capacity of the prison estate. It is intended that the closure of six older prisons including HMP Bulwood Hall, Canterbury, Gloucester, Kingston, Shepton Mallet and Shrewsbury; and the consequent reduction in around 2,000 places; will be offset by a new prison building programme. In particular the Ministry of Justice is to assess the feasibility of building Britain’s largest prison. Intended to hold more than 2,000 prisoners, the prison will be sited in either London, the North West of England or North Wales. The announcement follows the opening of HMP Oakwood near Wolverhampton in 2012 which has an overall capacity of 1,600 prisoners; as well as the planned construction of four ‘mini-prisons’ together holding up to 1,260 prisoners to be built at HMP Parc in South Wales, Peterborough in Cambridgeshire, The Mount in Hertfordshire, and Thameside in London. On announcing the proposals, Justice Secretary, Chris Grayling said:

*We hope to bring down the cost of our prison system, much of which is old and expensive. But I never want the Courts to be in a position where they cannot send a criminal to prison because there is no place available.*

Criminal Justice Reform Lecture

Damian Green, Minister of State for Policing and Criminal Justice recently delivered the Criminal Justice Reform lecture in which he discussed what he described as unacceptable delays in the criminal justice system. He diagnosed the problem as lack of a common vision and failure to exploit technology. He proposes to address the “causes of inefficiency” by working together with the police, judiciary, Crown Prosecution Service and court services to get rid of regional inequalities when dealing with cases and have a digital transformation of the entire criminal justice process.
Young People and the Criminal Justice System
Here’s a summary of recent developments about young people and the criminal justice system:
The government has announced a consultation on ‘Transforming Youth Custody: Putting education at the heart of detention’. This paper describes the Government’s plans for placing high quality education at the centre of youth custody. Plans to reform youth custody will see young people appropriately punished while at the same time learning to take responsibility for their actions and gaining the skills and qualifications they need to lead productive, law-abiding lives. The paper invites views and outline proposals for the implementation of Secure Colleges. The consultation paper covers: information on youth custody and the young people held there; the case for change; and a vision for Secure Colleges which place education at the heart of the system. The deadline for submissions is 30 April.

Details can be found at https://consult.justice.gov.uk/digital-communications/transforming-youth-custody

The Youth Justice Board is introducing It is anticipated that deployment will commence with YOTs in 2014/15 and secure establishments in 2014/15.
The House of Commons Justice Committee has published its report of an inquiry into Youth Justice with the headline “The Youth Justice System is currently failing children in care and care leavers and there should be more effort to prevent the unnecessary criminalisation of these vulnerable young people”. Whilst acknowledging the reduction in the number of young people in custody it recommends “A statutory threshold to enshrine in legislation the principle that only the most serious and prolific young offenders should be placed in custody”.

The full report can be found at: http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201213/cmselect/cmjust/339/339.pdf

The UK’s National Preventive Mechanism (NPM) is the group of 18 organisations designated to fulfill the UK’s obligations to ensure the independent monitoring of the treatment of and conditions for people deprived of their liberty. The purpose of monitoring is to prevent ill-treatment in all places of detention, including prisons, children’s homes and secure hospitals; places that are hidden from public view and where the people held there are inherently vulnerable. They have just published their Third Annual Report: Monitoring Places of Detention. In the forward to the report the Chief Inspector of Prisons states: “The use of force and restraint has been a key concern to all members of the NPM, regardless of the type of detention monitored or the jurisdiction in which they operate. Despite a plethora of guidelines and standards, we find that force is
often not used appropriately: it is used when it is not necessary; it is applied in a disproportionate manner; staff are not sufficiently trained; and governance arrangements are limited.”


The Prison Inspectorate and the Youth Justice Board have published a joint report entitled *Children and Young People in Custody 2011–12: An analysis of the experiences of 15–18-year-olds in prison*, which examines the perceptions of young men and women detained in young offender institutions across England and Wales. One conclusion is that despite the substantial reduction in the prison population “it is striking how little has changed and that may cast doubt on the assumption that, as the population decreased, it would include a greater concentration of young people with a serious offence background and major problems”.


Two other recent reports which present the views of young people have been published. Ofsted and the Children’s Rights Director for England published a report at the end of 2012 which focussed on the use of restraint in care homes.


The other produced by the Children’s Rights Alliance is entitled *Ending Violence Against Children in Custody*’ presents the views and opinions of children and young people about their personal experiences of violence in custody and their recommendations for how it can be reduced or eradicated.


**What Works Centre for Crime Reduction**

The government has announced the establishment of a What Works Network which will consist of six ‘centres of excellence’ that will advise government on key policy areas. In the words of the announcement, “This initiative will build upon existing evidence-based policy making. These independent specialist centres will produce and disseminate research to local decision makers, supporting them in investing in services that deliver the best outcomes for citizens and value for money for taxpayers. The centres will also feed
insights into the heart of government to inform national decision-making.” One of these centres will be the What Works Centre for Crime Reduction which will be based in the College of Policing which will work with academics, police and public bodies involved in community safety work to review the evidence. The College plans to tender with the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) for academic partners in What Works Centre activity during Summer 2013.


**Inquiry into Older Prisoners**
The Justice Select Committee has launched an inquiry to look into the mental and physical health and social care of into older prisoners (aged 60 and over). It will include looking for examples of good practice and identifying barriers to this, training of prison staff, the role of the voluntary and private sector and resettlement.

Details can be found at: http://www.parliament.uk/business/committees/committees-a-z/commons-select/justice-committee/news/new-inquiry-older-prisoners/

**Revised Framework for Recorded Crime Outcomes**
The Home Office has published its Revised Framework for Recorded Crime Outcomes with a report of the consultation responses and conclusions. The aim of the new framework is to strengthen police discretion which it is anticipated will provide a better service to victims of crime by removing perverse incentives that can be created by locally-set detection targets, and increase transparency in policing, and trust in national statistics. “By giving every crime an outcome, we will help the public understand – and therefore support or challenge – police activity.”

Detail of the proposed framework, including current and additional outcome categories are described in the report at: http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/publications/about-us/consultations/crime-outcomes-cons/consultation-response?view=Binary

**Policing and Justice Conference, 27th November 2013**
This conference will focus on the creation of Police and Crime Commissioners and multi-agency working between the police, probation and prisons and offer an overview of best practice across the sector, including work undertaken by the private and third sectors. Key issues to be discussed at this conference include: the impact of Police and Crime Commissioners 1 Year on; supporting the Probation Service to tackle reoffending rates; payment by results in the policing and justice sectors; breaking down barriers to tackling multiple disadvantage; transforming Rehabilitation; “tackling 21st century threats through
21st century policing”; early intervention to support young people to avoid criminality; and accountability and regulation in policing and justice.

BOOK REVIEWS

Edited by Rose Parkes, De Montfort University

A NEW RESPONSE TO YOUTH CRIME


This substantial and wide-ranging book sets out to provide a framework of evidence and analysis to support the work of the Independent Commission on Youth Crime and Antisocial Behaviour. Whilst highlighting the shortcomings of the existing systems, the emphasis is on supporting the effort to create viable, realistic and effective alternatives which are individualised, needs-led and ultimately more just.

In Chapter 2, David Smith offers a clear and very accessible piece which examines changing patterns of youth from the post war years to the present day. He starts by looking at the impact of population changes, immigration, life expectancy, education, employment and poverty. He then explores changes in maturity rates, sexual activity and pregnancy before focussing on young peoples` living arrangements and homelessness. Following an informative exploration of youth culture and the impact of advertising and marketing, Smith moves on to contend that a ‘widening of horizons’ has perhaps been the most significant change for young people. For the author, this widening of horizons encompasses the expansion of education, cheap overseas travel and the expansion of the media and later the breathtaking and complex expansion of the ‘new media’. Smith suggests that the changes that he outlines in this chapter are very much linked to trends in crime and that changes in young peoples` transitions and social structures are pivotal to explaining youth crime.

In Chapter 3, Larissa Pople and David Smith look at trends in crime and the political debate, media coverage and public anxiety around youth crime. Chapters 4 and 5 focus on responses to youth crime, the ‘creation’ of the phenomenon of antisocial behaviour, ‘moral panic’ and politicians ‘talking tough’. Chapter 6 examines the causes of offending and anti social behaviour and chapter 7 reviews progress in the development and testing of strategies for preventing crime. The focus here is on sustainable solutions and the capacity of communities to self-correct.
In Chapter 8 Barbara Maughan and Frances Gardener examine how plausible it is to conclude that family related changes are a factor in changing trends of youth crime. Chapter 9 explores models of youth justice, focussing on structures and systems and stresses the need for policy reform and a tangible person centred vision. Chapter 10 explores youth justice reform in Canada whilst in Chapter 11, Trevor Jones assesses the feasibility of a shift from ‘populist punitive’ responses in the UK towards a more balanced, evidence-based approach.

In the concluding chapter, David Smith sketches out a reform agenda for transforming youth justice. Smith recognises that the global recession and the consequent expenditure cuts could and should make cheaper and more effective alternatives to custody more attractive. However, the author also acknowledges the complexity of public opinion and the fact that ‘punitive rhetoric’ remains a potent vote winner.

‘A New Response to Youth Crime’ is an important addition to the youth justice literature and will be a valuable read for Social Work, Youth Work and Criminal Justice students and practitioners as well as for those involved in sentencing and policy-making.

Chris Cody, Social Work Placement Tutor, University of Bradford
CRIME AND ECONOMICS: AN INTRODUCTION  

Crime and Economics: An Introduction reflects what Albertson and Fox (p. 1) describe as the growth in the “reach” of economics’ in recent years and a belief that ‘criminologists and economists can do more together than we are able to apart’ (p. 4). While, of course, it might be argued, given the current economic crisis, that economics should be the last discipline seeking to increase its influence, there is little doubt that Crime and Economics: An Introduction is a useful text. It provides an introduction to economic theory and analysis, and demonstrates how economics informs, and has further potential to inform, understanding in various areas of criminological concern.

In Chapter 1 the scene is set by, among other things, outlining a justification for the book and discussing what the authors understand by ‘crime’ and ‘economics’. Chapter 2 introduces readers to economic concepts, ideas and theory, including supply and demand, profit, utility, rationality, market inefficiency and failure, and the limits of markets. Chapter 3 focuses upon modelling criminal behaviour by in particular exploring ‘the seminal work of Becker (1968), on which all subsequent [economic analysis in criminology] is based’ (p. 36). The fourth chapter examines the place of rational choice theory in criminology, while the fifth chapter introduces readers to relationships between crime, poverty and unemployment. Chapter 6 focuses upon the methods – costs analysis, cost-benefit analysis and modelling – that economists may employ to understand efficiencies in tackling crime. Chapter 7 explores various aspects of measuring the costs of crime. In Chapter 8 the focus is upon the economics of crime reduction, with a particular focus upon policing, situational and community-based crime reduction, and developmental crime reduction. Chapter 9 explores the economics of prison and community-based punishments as interventions aimed at cutting crime. Chapter 10 examines the economics of various aspects of organised crime and Chapter 11 discusses issues related to illicit drug use and markets.

Generally speaking, Crime and Economics: An Introduction is successful text. At an introductory level it takes readers through the ideas that underpin economic analyses and the ways in which those analyses have been used to help inform understandings of crime. It is undoubtedly the case that many criminologists from sociologically-informed traditions will find some of the claims and arguments of Crime and Economics: An Introduction difficult (for example, that offenders are rational, that emotions are rationally expressed and, as such, can be modelled (p. 8) and that ‘abuse’ can be monetised (p. 137)), but it is also the case that many criminologists in their own work will have made at least some venture into the economics of criminology when, for instance, engaging with the antecedents of offending and victimisation, and critically evaluating punishment regimes and other criminal justice interventions.

The strengths of Crime and Economics: An Introduction lie in its theoretical and empirical foci. It takes readers from the abstract to the empirical with a sharp focus. For the most, there is a critical engagement with particularly the empirical evidence, with it being
highlighted, for example, how and why studies have different results when substantively focusing upon the same issue. In this context, there is a great deal of discussion and evidence that is useful to criminology students. In particular, these relate to the effectiveness and, especially important for economists, the cost-effectiveness of criminal justice interventions. Chapters 9 and 11, for example, respectively provide particularly useful economic analyses of incarceration and community-based punishments, and of interventions in drug markets.

*Crime and Economics: An Introduction* though, is not without some limitations. One of these has been noted – a need to accept economic concepts and methods that are premised upon the ideas of rationality and quantification that are central to the application of economics to crime. In the final analysis, criminologists have to be convinced by concepts – such as ‘rational addiction’ and an ability to rationalise emotions – that, at least at first glance, seem counterintuitive. *Crime and Economics: An Introduction* makes strong arguments for the acceptance of such conceptualisations, but it also gives the impression that where analyses do not fit with the concepts, they are merely adjusted to help take account of any anomalies. In this context, for example, ‘the lack of apparent rationality’ witnessed in some models of rational choice theory is held to have ‘its root in the restricted model of rationality adopted’ (p. 83).

There are other issues that are by omission rather than commission. First, it is somewhat surprising (given that the book was written in 2010) that such little is noted about the current economic crisis that many countries, particularly but not limited to those in Europe, are facing. It has many implications for various discussions in the book, but makes little more than a couple of glancing appearances. Second, the externalities of crime that are considered are essentially negative in nature (a focus upon the potential harms produced by crime). However, there is little acknowledgement that, for some people (and the state) there may be some more positive externalities of crime. For example, an ability to increase a low income through cash or goods derived from crime may mean an individual and/or household might be better fed and clothed as a consequence of that crime. This may mean less need for social service, health and possible social security interventions. Third, the lack of conclusion brings the book to a somewhat abrupt halt. It would have been useful for the themes – such as difficulties with the nature and amount of existing criminological data, and economic problems with criminal justice and other policy interventions – that are apparent throughout the book to have been brought together for discussion in a conclusion.

That said, I would recommend *Crime and Economics: An Introduction* for teaching at an undergraduate level. Its analysis and in particular its focus upon evaluating empirical work in major areas of criminological debate means it is useful in understanding the efficacy and efficiency of many developments in recent nation-state and, in some instances, international criminal justice policy. Given the amounts of money spent on criminal justice policy, particularly in a period of austerity, it would also be useful for politicians and policy makers to avail themselves of the economic evidence of the ineffectiveness of many of the policies that they pursue.

*Chris Grover, Senior Lecturer in Social Policy, Lancaster University*
References:
This short, but packed, book offers a focused account of homophobia in the particular setting of Northern Ireland, where social, political and religious currents create tempestuous storms. Tracing different strands present in that space, and making sense of one manifestation of those currents, is a daunting prospect. The author states that the aim of the book is to ‘account for the ways in which homophobia has become normalised in facets of Northern Irish social and political cultures to the detriment of those affected by it’ (p.3) and certainly the book does this. It also presents a wider and soundly theoretical account of ways in which particular discourses work to support and legitimate fierce heteronormativity. Marion Duggan introduces her work by referring to the public statements of Mary Robinson in 2008 condemning homosexuality. This illustrates her contention, that the microcosm of Northern Ireland has produced particular and traceable manifestations of homophobia that contain lessons for understanding homophobia more generally.

The author offers six chapters, all of which present a different perspective and can be read alone. The first of these gives an overview of the history that has created the Northern Irish position that is one of the most concise and clear accounts of this troubled period that I have read. Using this background, the author develops a sophisticated account of ways in which nationalist and loyalist discourses both situated homosexual as ‘other’ and ‘threat’. Linking this with colonial discourses makes for a convincing argument for the specificity of the experience of homophobia at this point. This argument is well made and presented in writing that moves from theoretical to practical with clarity. This chapter is the conceptual underpinning of Duggan’s account.

The following chapters establish this conceptual analysis within action and reaction. The British Government’s failure to extend the 1967 Sexual Offences Act, (decriminalising some sexual acts between consenting men), to Northern Ireland meant that being gay was experienced against a background of secrecy, vigilance and fear even after the social positioning of gayness had begun to change on mainland Britain. This experience was situated against political, moral and religious discourse that Duggan presents as creating a climate of fear and revulsion which also created and recreated particular forms of support for families and masculinity. In their turn, these institutions were inimical to homosexuals.

There is a sense of relief in this reader when much of the work concentrates on the voiced experience of gay people, living through and resistant of the dominating force of homophobia so well established and explained. Chapter two uncompromisingly begins by discussing techniques of resistance to the actual and the perceived danger. However, there is also a thorough and grounded empirical account of violence, harassment and oppression experienced by homosexuals in Northern Ireland. One specific point here that
deserves further exploration is the difference in experience between rural and urban living: Duggan touches on this experience in the Irish setting, but does not extrapolate. The account leads back to the exploration, in chapter three, of ways in which the political climate and the actual policies that govern homophobia have changed and been changed and, therefore, offers a hopeful path through a book that could have been uncompromisingly doom laden.

It would be unrealistic to attempt to examine Northern Ireland without making some attempt to untangle the different religious perspectives of the actors. As Duggan herself says ‘Christian teachings around homosexuality have led people to focus on the primacy of sexual activity whilst overshadowing all other aspects of the committed relationship’ (p.94). This leads to specific and painful dilemmas for homosexuals and for others alike. It also can lead, and in Northern Ireland appears to have led, to contradictions in ways in which faith and sexuality interrelate. It is interesting that Duggan argues that protestants may have more difficulty in working with homosexuality that Catholics: it is an argument well-presented and justified in the book. Some of the experiences presented here could reverberate wherever faith and sexuality converge. For example, there could be lessons here that would inform inner city experience of conflict between faith and sexuality communities.

It would also be unrealistic to present the experience of homophobia without recognising that gender is a key player in this history. Duggan’s answer to this is to present the experience of lesbians as a specific chapter. Lesbians have a separate relationship to law from men: for example, the Sexual Offences Act 1967 does not have direct implications for women. They also have, arguably, a different relationship with dominating discourses from men. In this book, that experience is backgrounded throughout the discussion except in chapter 5. It would be difficult to broaden the arguments that support Duggan’s conceptual base by including a gender dimension, but it is sometimes frustrating that heterosexual and gender based arguments are not made more explicit.

To some extent, this points to both the strength and the weakness of this book. It is short, thorough, specific and packed with evidence to support a strong analytical model. This in turn reduces the opportunity to explore ways on which that model could be made more universal, or could be informed by other analyses.

Rd. Clare Beckett, Senior Lecturer in Probation Studies, University of Bradford
'Someone has to do it'. The final remarks in a long overdue but brilliantly incisive examination of the occupational culture of probation. This misunderstood and much maligned occupation is facing its worst crisis since its inception over 100 years ago. Government are intent on delimiting and denigrating the role of the probation service to the seeming but deceptive rigour of competition and payment by results. If ever there needed to be an exploration of the essence of what probation is about now is that time and this book does this job excellently. It is not a simple story nor one which can be told in a sound bite and this can explain the way in which the media often fails to grasp the essential significance of the work undertaken. Mawby and Worrall make no such mistake painstakingly drawing out the key features from 60 in-depth interviews conducted in 2010/11 with probation workers spanning over 50 years of collective experience.

The authors use the heuristic device of 'the square of probation' to shape their thinking about occupational culture. They argue firstly that probation is a socially tainted occupation by dint of its undeserving client group and the negative perceptions of the media and the public. Probation does 'dirty work' and it undertakes it in turbulent times where social, economic and political upheaval threatens its very existence. The book then describes the way the occupational culture is built focusing on concepts of motivation, artefacts, job crafting, coping strategies, nostalgia and diversity. The final element of the square is the way in which probation workers respond to the twists and turns of this organisation. They describe a range of responses which workers can turn to and this includes exit, voice, loyalty, neglect, cynicism, expediency and edgework. Edgework is most interesting as it expresses the notion of pushing the boundaries within which the institution seeks to hold its members accountable. The authors regard edgework as something which has been a constant feature of practice and continues to be practised to respond to the challenges of the working environment. It reminded me of the edgework described many years ago in Bruce Hugman's book 'Act Natural' where he worked as a detached probation officer working from his own home in the community in which he worked.

The authors build a convincing typology which describes three distinctive groupings emerging from their sample. These are then labelled 'lifers', 'second careerists' and 'offender managers'. These pen portraits are idealised conceptions but also demonstrate distinctive characterisations of the probation worker. They conclude that taking the key contributions of each ideal type would create a defensible description of the perfect probation worker. This draws on the idealism, vocationalism and intellectualism of the lifer; the life experiences, transferable skills and commitment to 'making a difference' of the second careerists; and the victim empathy, concern for public protection and willingness to challenge offending behaviour of the offender manager.
They go on to look at the daily routines of probation noting the differing environments in which this work takes place and they identify the changing nature of probation practice from being focused in the community and autonomously undertaking their work to the much more accountable and desk bound operatives of today. They look closely at the nature of the partnership work of the probation service and identify their changing relationships with the courts, the police and prison. They note the strong partnership that has developed in recent years with the police in contrast to a reduced emphasis on being a 'servant of the court' and a continuing though somewhat ambivalent relationship with prison, despite organisational merger within NOMS.

One of the most interesting chapters was the authors attempt to grapple with the lack of observer understanding, at times confused and almost contemptuous perceptions of the work of the service represented through worker's families, the wider public and the media. At a time when probation is under a real threat to its survival, the difficulties of developing a positive media image are crucial to this debate. The contribution here should certainly be read by all those seeking to develop a communications strategy to defend the service.

Grappling with four different voices of the probation service is attempted in chapter 7. The authors were somewhat surprised to find a continued commitment to religious motivation to practice, which whilst strongly expressed in the early years of probation the authors had speculated that this would now have disappeared. On the contrary they found the resilience of religious influence surprisingly sustained. They look at the declining influence of the trade unions, they examine the commitment to diversity and, in one of the most interesting sections, they contend that the organisation, though male dominated until the early 1990s, was undergoing what they describe as a 'feminisation' of the service. They regard this process as fundamental to the nature of the organisation today and they unpack this in detail and the implications of this for the future.

In the final chapter, despite concerns over the potential decline of the influence of the probation service, they noted a resilient morale and continued sense of direction from those they interviewed. The authors would regard the breakup of the probation service as deeply problematic. This would lead in their view to the fragmentation of criminal justice delivery and the dilution of a culture which is worth preserving because it does a difficult job well.

Clearly this book raises important questions about probation as an institution. If the institution becomes fragmented and even dismantled in the course of the next few years and suffers the loss of its collective wisdom, the ability to innovate and undertake edgework, will the essence of this rich occupational culture, so painstakingly described, simply disappear? How far is the rich complexity of probation work bound up with the transference of identity and practices through the culture of the organisation? Can probation be sustained in a myriad of loosely federated private and voluntary sector delivery partners with a tightly prescribed public protection service being the only vestige of this probation institution. It is a doubtful proposition.

I would have liked to have seen the authors use the material to discuss the role of training and staff development in the maintenance and reconstruction of the culture in recent
years and how this factor might sustain 'probation' in a non-institutional form. The debates on probation worker registration will be interesting to observe. They touch on the move from social work training to the current training model but without drawing it centrally into their analysis. This minor criticism apart I found this book one of the clearest statements of what probation is about, if you like, its very 'essence' is brilliantly captured here. Undoubtedly this book forms a robust defence for probation's continuation for another century and I can only hope that our Justice Ministers take time out to read this invaluable contribution to the conundrum of what probation does to support and reform our most vulnerable and sometimes difficult citizens. As Mawby and Worrall simply affirm: someone has to do it!

Professor Paul Senior, Professor of Probation Studies and Director of the Hallam Centre for Community Justice, Sheffield Hallam University