

Criminology and Criminal Justice

<http://crj.sagepub.com/>

Introduction

Stephen Farrall and Richard Sparks
Criminology and Criminal Justice 2006 6: 7
DOI: 10.1177/1748895806060664

The online version of this article can be found at:
<http://crj.sagepub.com/content/6/1/7>

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

On behalf of:



British Society of Criminology

Additional services and information for *Criminology and Criminal Justice* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://crj.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://crj.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

Permissions: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

Citations: <http://crj.sagepub.com/content/6/1/7.refs.html>

>> [Version of Record](#) - Jan 24, 2006

[What is This?](#)



Introduction

STEPHEN FARRALL AND RICHARD SPARKS

University of Keele, UK and The Edinburgh Law School, UK

Interest in the topics of the ‘resettlement’, ‘re-entry’ and ‘reintegration’ of people after they have undergone a criminal sanction has grown rapidly in recent years, at least if the extent of the published literature on these subjects is any measure. Discussions about the status and social situation of ex-offenders vis-a-vis their life chances, their citizenship, their efforts to take responsibility for their actions, or their recognition of the harm they may have caused, have cropped up time and again in criminological debate. In part, this is a regular feature of academic and policy-related research. However, the dramatic increases in incarceration rates in the USA and latterly, even if as yet on a lesser scale, in the UK and various other countries (see, for example, Petersilia, 2003) have made this topic an increasingly pressing one. Larger numbers of people face their futures carrying the legacies of a criminal conviction. In some instances—such as restrictions on access to higher education for prisoners in the United States or on the voting rights of ex-prisoners there; or the widening trends in several countries towards lifelong supervision or restriction of certain categories of offender on grounds of risk—it would seem that the social consequences of conviction have become not just more widespread but also weightier and ‘stickier’ than in the preceding decades. In some urban centres, again more especially but by no means exclusively, in the United States the numbers of people removed from and *returning to* the most stressed and disadvantaged areas has itself become a major social issue, prompting a new research focus on the so-called ‘collateral consequences’ of mass imprisonment there (see Clear et al., 2003; Fagan et al., 2003). Such developments serve to make questions about life *after* or *beyond* punishment all the more pointed.

The focus here on resettlement, and subsequent pathways away from crime, we feel, can be understood as a development and extension of recent work on desistance from crime. Interest in the lives of those individuals

who have transgressed social or legal norms has traditionally often ceased either at the point of sentence or at the formal expiry of a penalty. Latterly research has begun to include a greater understanding of the social and personal consequences of conviction (not all of which need be entirely negative). Recent studies by Maruna (2001) and Farrall (2002), for example, have started to connect the literature on desistance with that undertaken in the name of assessing 'What Works?', and have fed into the renaissance of interest in resettlement. Alongside this, of course, there have been several attempts to advance theories that explain why people stop offending (e.g., Sampson and Laub, 1993; Moffitt, 1997; Farrall and Bowling, 1999; Maruna, 2001; Maruna and Farrall, 2004, amongst others) and what this means for resettlement and reintegration theories and practices. Whilst building upon this body of thought, this collection of essays seeks in particular to contribute to the exploration of the subsequent lives and fortunes of those who have undergone imprisonment or other sanctions—in other words what lies *beyond* punishment?

At one level, thinking about 'after punishment' inevitably also means thinking about communities—ex-prisoners return to 'the community' and those who have served non-custodial sentences remain in it although on somewhat altered terms. For many of the men and women who leave prison, who complete periods of community supervision, or who cease offending without any formal interventions from the criminal justice system, a return to or at some level a 'reconnection with' the community is an important step in the process by which they put their 'pasts behind them' (and conversely for those who are less resolute or less fortunate there are parallel processes that seem always to ensure that their pasts 'catch up with them').

The pathways through which people stop offending and are 'resettled', 'reintegrated', 'rehabilitated', 'reformed', and so on, have only of late received very much attention. All of these 're-' words imply that this group of people is in some way returned (another 're' word) to some state that they had previously occupied. However, the 'reintegrated' may often not have been very 'integrated' in the first place and the 'reformed' may feel as if they need to 'form' themselves all over again. An interest in the communities to which these men and women return and the roles that they play in fostering (or indeed, inhibiting) rehabilitation is something that for very many years eluded many studying criminal careers. In the UK, John Barron Mays (1952) was one of a very few criminologists who addressed the relationship between the community and the criminal careers of those individuals who resided within it. Mays (1952: 10) reported that '[f]ew of the youngsters interviewed are likely to develop into confirmed adult criminals and their delinquency may be regarded as a phase . . .'. He then went on to discuss possible reasons for this—chiefly the development of awareness by these young people that involvement in crime may have negative consequences for themselves as well as other people. Mays's article, whilst obviously representing one of the very first tentative steps in

the United Kingdom towards a recognition that not all youthful offending develops into sustained criminal careers, avoids the pitfalls of focusing only on individual factors and remains committed to a belief that if one can better understand the form of a local community, one can better understand the criminal careers of the people who live within that community.

Thereafter, much criminal careers research in both the UK and the USA became, and remained for a considerable period, quite strongly offender-centred and displayed less concern to explore any connection between the individual career and the local habitat and context in which it unfolded. For example, the Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development has been by common consent a ground-breaking and admirably sustained project. However, despite the fact that all of the sample members lived in the same area at the point of their recruitment into the research, the publications resulting from this research have paid rather little attention to the local environment or changes to it over time. West (1969: 15–26) devoted some space to a discussion of the neighbourhood in the first report on the Cambridge Study. However, even by the time of the second report (West, 1973), these topics had been dropped from the main focus of the study. Even when it was observed that those men who had left London were more likely to have ceased offending (Osborn, 1980), there was little discussion of the areas to which the men had moved or the possible influence of these on their behaviour.

The work of Sampson and Laub (1993) has marked a watershed in research into criminal careers. Using data collected in the 1950s, Sampson and Laub in a number of articles (Sampson and Laub, 1994, 1997; Laub et al., 1998; Laub and Sampson, 2003) re-orientated research on criminal careers by focusing on the *social processes, relationships and events* that lay behind both criminal careers and some people's efforts to put crime behind them. Sampson and Laub de-centred the offending subject, and started a quantitative investigation of not just criminal careers, but crime and criminal careers in the community setting.

For example, Sampson and Laub (1994) argue, fairly uncontroversially, that there are direct relationships between overly harsh discipline and lack of supervision on the part of parents and the delinquency of their children. Such parenting often leads to the breaking of bonds of respect and trust between parents and children, making subsequent child rearing all the harder. However, over and above these factors (which are essentially individual- and household-level processes) Sampson and Laub cite more structural influences, such as family poverty and community disadvantage as further encouraging childhood delinquency. They cite Rutter and Giller (1983: 185) who report that 'serious socio-economic disadvantage has an adverse effect on the parents, such that parental disorders and difficulties are more likely to develop and good parenting is impeded'. Communities that are severely disadvantaged, in short, make it harder for good parenting to thrive: parents are under too much stress themselves and are less well resourced than (for example) middle class

households. Such circumstances help to perpetuate delinquency, as poor parenting is itself associated with problematic behaviour and leads to a diminishing of parents' ability to control their children. Using data on males born between 1924 and 1935 in Boston, Sampson and Laub (1994) find support for their theoretical model. They conclude by arguing that 'poverty appears to inhibit the capacity of families to achieve informal social control, which in turns increases the likelihood of adolescent delinquency' (1994: 538). Furthermore, they argue that by focusing their interest in the structural factors as well as the direct causes, they are able to uncover the role played by poverty in mediating the relationship between parenting style and childhood delinquency.

There were, of course, already a number of other studies that touched on the interface between criminal careers and communities. In a very different vein, Hobbs's study of east-end entrepreneurs was one. Hobbs's discussion of Jack (1989: 154–62) and the values held by many of the residents in the area in which he lived, demonstrated the important role played by the local milieu in shaping the way in which criminal careers were played out. Support for the 'Bonetti' job (1989: 157–8) elevated Jack's position in the local community (see also Foster, 1990). In the USA, but partly inspired by Willis's *Learning to Labour* (1977), we find another study of great interest to those studying criminal careers and who wish to keep one eye on the role of communities also, that by Jay MacLeod (1987, 1995). MacLeod studied two gangs growing up in 'Clarendon Heights' and charted their feelings about their own criminal and deviant behaviour and the neighbourhoods in which they lived. MacLeod's study, and especially the second edition of his book which includes his eight-year follow-up of the same individuals, charts the connections between individual criminal careers and community structures and forms. As MacLeod notes:

Aspirations reflect an individual's view of his or her own chances for getting ahead and are an internalisation of objective probabilities. But aspirations are not the product of rational analysis; rather, they are acquired in the habitus of the individual. A lower-class child growing up in an environment where success is rare is much less likely to develop strong ambitions than is a middle-class boy or girl growing up in a social world peopled by those who have 'made it' and where the connection between effort and reward is taken for granted. (1995: 15)

MacLeod's work suggests that as some opportunities are eroded (in this case, employment and opportunities to 'make it') so behaviours are altered, and that this frequently has implications for some people's involvement in crime. These sorts of processes were highlighted in the analyses presented by Farrall (2002: 145–92), in which employment and employment stability were frequently reported to be associated with desistance. Poor employment prospects encourage engagement in offending which may ultimately serve to block subsequent opportunities for legitimate employment and desistance. Hagan (1997) argued that western industrialized nations have,

during the last quarter of the 20th century, witnessed an overall slow-down in economic growth. This has been:

... characterised by increased unemployment and income inequality, led by the loss and only partial replacement of core sector manufacturing jobs with less stable and poorer paying service sector jobs. (Hagan, 1997: 289)

Many of the poorest men and women were amongst those who lost most during this period of economic upheaval. These economic changes have resulted in huge social changes. For example, a significant proportion of young people leaving school (depending on the period during which they enter the labour market) will either expect *not* to work, will experience economic instability or may become accustomed to periodic unemployment. As well as helping to maintain the concentration of poverty, such changes will create:

a social context that includes poor schools, inadequate job information networks, and a lack of legitimate employment opportunities [that] not only gives rise to weak labour force attachment, but increases the probability that individuals will be constrained to seek income derived from illegal and deviant activities. (Wilson, 1991: 10, cited in Hagan, 1997: 292)

In other words the economic changes of the last quarter of the twentieth century have resulted in reductions in human and social capital, focused in certain places and amongst certain groups of people. In less advantaged communities, individuals, families and 'aggregations of individuals' will be amongst those who have experienced reductions in social capital. Those most likely to be negotiating life after punishment are therefore also amongst those most likely to have limited legitimate resources both in terms of their human capital (i.e. their own skills) and in terms of the skills and knowledge which permeate the communities in which they live (their social capital).

This discussion of communities brings us on to a closely related topic: the importance of place. Giddens (1984) puts considerable emphasis on the importance of places in the reproduction of social forms. Other commentators writing within the criminological arena have similarly noted how important specific places are in the production of criminal events generally (e.g., Sherman et al. and Reiss quoted in Bottoms and Wiles, 1992). Whilst Hagan's work (1997) suggested that there are certain meso-level social or community structures which influence individuals' desires, motivations and abilities to engage in, or refrain from, offending, a similar, but often neglected dimension can be found in the work of Meisenhelder (1977), who refers to the spatial dimension of *desistance*. Not all 'places' are alike in terms of their ability to either facilitate or confirm a would-be desister's status as an 'ex-offender'. For example, some places (bars, gambling halls, snooker halls or certain street corners) have a negative effect, suggesting that an individual has not recanted their old ways and are still engaged in illegal or 'shady' activities. Other places are suggestive that an individual

has made the break with crime, and these include churches, reputable employers, domestic family homes and other 'conventional' civic associations. Still other places may convey neither positive nor negative messages (for example, a large out of town supermarket or a railway station).

The explanation given by the likes of Meisenhelder (1977), echoing Goffman (1963), is that the places where an individual lives out his or her life communicates some element of 'who' they are and 'what' they do. Time spent in snooker halls or certain bars suggest a routine engagement with others who may themselves continue to be engaged in illegitimate endeavours. On the other hand, routinely spending time in stable employment, engaged in childcare duties, with other 'benevolent' bodies such as churches or civic groups, or engaged in some other 'constructive' use of one's leisure time can help to create (at least) the image of a reformed or reforming character.

Let us consider briefly the experiences reported by Anthony, interviewed by Farrall in early 1999 and again in mid-2004. Anthony's relationship with his local town centre had changed dramatically over the course of these five or so years. Unlike during previous interviews with him (see Farrall, 2002, 2003; Farrall and Maltby, 2003) Anthony had been working at the same job for a number of years. As such his relationship with the town centre ceased to be one of 'drunken entertainment', and started to become one characterized by the daily routines of life. During these forays into the town centre, Anthony encountered some of his old friends. This brings with it certain dilemmas: maintaining cordial relationships (if not actual friendships) with old acquaintances whilst not risking his 'respectable' identity:

[I've only got] to cross the road and I can see two kiddies sat on the bench who I know, so that's, you know, what I mean. The kind of thing I don't like nowadays. *Right*. I'd rather be ignorant and uncommunicating to people now. I still don't like people, people who are too sly, too devious.

Oh, did you go over and talk to them or?

No, no. I said 'alright' but I can't remember. They were begging on the benches at lunchtime so I didn't stop and have a chat. Do you know what I mean? Don't do your street-cred much good. *[Laughter]* But they're mates. I've known them for years but, like I said, I told you about them earlier, scag-heads now. One of them in particular begs in town all the time. *Right*. He floats from spot to spot. One of his spots happens to be outside my bank.

Anthony's interview extracts suggest that, over time, as an individual moves from being 'an offender', to 'a desister', to 'an ordinary person', so their relationship with physical spaces changes. Anthony used to view the town centre as somewhere in which fights could be watched and engaged in and women pursued (see Farrall, 2002). This relationship of 'deviant consumption' has transformed into one of 'respectable reproduction' as he

visits the town centre to buy clothes, visit his bank and so on. These quotes, taken as a whole, also point to the fact that places are key in understanding how desistance occurs for some people. As Bottoms and Wiles (1992) note, places are crucial in understanding patterns of offending, and in particular how places are important *generators* of actions and not merely *venues* in which actions are performed.

MacLeod's observations on aspiration, brings to mind more recent work on the role of *hope* in the desistance process (Burnett and Maruna, 2004; Farrall and Calverley, 2005). Although employing quite different approaches to hope (Burnett and Maruna use prospective quantitative data, basing their work on the insights of Stotland, 1969, whilst Farrall and Calverley employ retrospective qualitative data and draw heavily upon Simpson's definition of hope), both studies support the contention that 'hope for the future seems to play a significant role in predicting . . . success . . .' (Burnett and Maruna, 2004: 399). Farrall and Calverley argue that

[hope] provides [desisters] with the vision that an alternative 'normal' life is both desirable and, ultimately, providing they overcome the obstacles and uncertainties that remain, possible. For hope to be meaningful, the object or situation desired must appear attainable at some level. (2005: 192–3)

For those in the early phase of desistance, their hopes had their origins in a range of social situations. For some this was their success at finding and keeping employment. For others, hopes were reinforced by their relationships with their respective partners. For yet others, it was their continued involvement with rehabilitation programmes and the emotional support they received which grounded their hopes in reality. Farrall and Calverley's argument (that involvement in some aspects of community life can sustain hope) is the flip-side of Burnett and Maruna's declaration that:

. . . herein lies the failing of the 'prison works' doctrine. The notion that Britain's 'decent but austere' prisons can both scare inhabitants straight through sheer deterrence, and also somehow become hotbeds for hope and developing self-efficacy seems a far-fetched fantasy to say the least. (2004: 401).

Either way, hope would appear to be emerging as a key variable in successful efforts aimed at 'reintegrating', 'resettling' and 'rehabilitating' ex-offenders. Furthermore, unsurprisingly but crucially, it appears to be supported by 'healthy' communities and undermined by custodial experiences.

This Special Issue

This collection is the result of two two-day seminars organized by members of the Department of Criminology at Keele University. These seminars explored desistance from crime, reintegration into the community and trajectories of offending behaviour and compliance. (The first of these seminars was held in September 2004 and the second in March 2005.) The

seminars have brought together criminologists of contemporary periods with crime historians and focused on: both aided and unaided attempts at desistance and reintegration; those sentenced to a range of court disposals (prison or probation); a range of criminal justice arenas (England, Wales, and Scotland); and considered various key groups (women, older prisoners, persistent offenders). Inevitably we could not accommodate all of the papers herein. A fascinating contribution by David Gadd on an ex-racist, 'Frank', will appear in *Theoretical Criminology*, whilst papers by Stephen Farrall and Adam Calverley on citizenship and desistance and by Barry Godfrey, David Cox and Stephen Farrall on desistance from crime in the late nineteenth century will appear as chapters in books by those respective author teams. David Smith gave a stimulating presentation on data stemming from the Edinburgh Study of Youth Transitions and Crime, a continuing project that has been at particular pains to discern the sorts of connections between action and local context that concern most of the contributors here.

The first two papers are engaged in a dialogue about what resettlement 'is' and how it might best be theorized. Maguire and Raynor, building upon their own considerable experience of resettlement initiatives, seek to clarify this somewhat under-theorized field. Writing from a Scottish perspective—where probation supervision has not yet been divorced from social work to the same extent as has latterly been the case in England and Wales—McNeill returns to problems originally raised by Bottoms and McWilliams in their celebrated 1979 article. McNeill seeks to identify the 'complex interfaces between technical and moral questions that preoccupied Bottoms and McWilliams', whilst addressing the moral values which ought to feature in current debates about the future of penal systems. The work of Crawley and Sparks reminds us that, for some, there is no 'after punishment'. The recent surge in incarceration in England and Wales has helped to create a situation in which many more prisoners are over 65 years of age. For some of these inmates there exist very real questions about whether there *will* be a point in their future lives when they are not in prison. Even those older prisoners who expect to be released report considerable anxiety at this prospect—providing a less rosy image of resettlement into the community than the cosy diction often appears to imply. Burnett and Maruna, taking a more optimistic and hopeful tone, report on one specific study of preparing low-risk inmates for release. Their article harks back, in many ways, to the New Careers Movement of the 1960s and 1970s, and in so doing provides a glimpse of not just the past way of doing resettlement, but a future direction too. Their work is informed by the symbolic interactionist perspective and embodies a sense that criminal justice systems ought to and can indeed treat their 'subjects' more humanely.

Intervening with drug users, especially poly-drug users, who may often experience many other problems, has become a growing problem for the criminal justice system. Mike Hough and Tim McSweeney report on one such project that sought to nudge drug users from dependency towards

employment. Whilst the scheme itself was successful, Hough and McSweeney take the opportunity to reflect on the problems of multi-agency and partnership working—an increasing feature of the criminal justice landscape in recent years. In ‘Desisting From Drug Use’, Frisher and Beckett contrast the sociological and bio-psychosocial perspectives on drug addiction. Ultimately, they seek to reject both of these approaches, favouring a model which incorporates behavioural choice.

We are grateful to all the contributors and other participants in the Keele seminars for their thoughtful and collegial work and for the prompt and co-operative responses to our editorial prompting. We would like to acknowledge Keele University for financial and material support and for the congenial environment it provided for these discussions. We are also grateful to Tim Newburn for his help, guidance and support.

References

- Bottoms, A. and W. McWilliams (1979) ‘A Non-Treatment Paradigm for Probation Practice’, *British Journal of Social Work* 9(2): 159–202.
- Bottoms, A. and P. Wiles (1992) ‘Explanations of Crime and Place’, in D.J. Evans, N.R. Fyfe and D.T. Herbert (eds) *Crime, Policing and Place*. London: Routledge.
- Burnett, R and S. Maruna (2004) ‘So “Prison Works”, Does it? The Criminal Careers of 130 Men Released from Prison under Home Secretary, Michael Howard’, *Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, 43(4): 390–404.
- Clear, T., D. Rose, E. Waring and K. Scully (2003) ‘Coercive Mobility and Crime: A Preliminary Examination of Concentrated Incarceration and Social Disorganization’, *Justice Quarterly* 20(1): 33–64.
- Fagan, J., V. West and J. Holland (2003) ‘Reciprocal Effects of Crime and Incarceration in New York City’, *Fordham Urban Law Journal* 30: 1551–602.
- Farrall, S. (2002) *Rethinking What Works with Offenders: Probation, Social Context and Desistance From Crime*. Cullompton, Devon: Willan Press.
- Farrall, S. (2003) ‘“J” accuse: Probation Evaluation-Research Epistemologies (Part Two: This Time Its Personal and Social Factors)’, *Criminal Justice* 3(3): 249–68.
- Farrall, S. and B. Bowling (1999) ‘Structuration, Human Development and Desistance From Crime’, *British Journal of Criminology* 39(2): 252–67.
- Farrall, S. and A. Calverley (2005) *Understanding Desistance From Crime*. London: Open University Press.
- Farrall, S. and S. Maltby (2003) ‘The Victimisation of Probationers’, *Howard Journal of Criminal Justice* 42(1): 32–54.
- Giddens, A. (1984) *The Constitution of Society*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Goffman, E. (1963) *Stigma*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Hagan, J. (1997) ‘Crime and Capitalization: Toward a Developmental Theory of Street Crime in America’, in T. Thornberry (ed.) *Developmental Theories of Crime And Delinquency*. New Brunswick: Transaction Press.

- Laub, J.H. and R.J. Sampson (2003) *Shared Beginnings, Divergent Lives*. Harvard, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Laub, J., D. Nagin and R. Sampson (1998) 'Trajectories of Change in Criminal Offending: Good Marriages and the Desistance Process', *American Sociological Review* 63: 225–38.
- MacLeod, J. (1995) *Ain't No Makin' It*. 2nd Edn. Oxford: Westview Press.
- Maruna, S. (2001) *Making Good: How Ex-Convicts Reform and Rebuild Their Lives*. Washington DC: APA Books.
- Maruna, S. and S. Farrall (2004) 'Desistance From Crime: A Theoretical Reformulation', *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 43: 171–94.
- Mays, J.B. (1952) 'A Study of a Delinquent Community', *British Journal of Delinquency* 3: 5–19.
- Meisenhelder, T. (1977) 'An Exploratory Study of Exiting From Criminal Careers', *Criminology* 15: 319–34.
- Moffitt, T. (1993) "'Life-Course Persistent" and "Adolescent-Limited" Antisocial Behaviour: A Developmental Taxonomy', *Psychological Review* 100: 674–701.
- Osborn, S.G. (1980) 'Moving Home, Leaving London and Delinquent Trends', *British Journal of Criminology* 20(1): 54–61.
- Petersilia, J. (2003) *When Prisoners Come Home*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rutter, M. and H. Giller (1983) *Juvenile Delinquency: Trends & Perspectives*. New York: Guilford.
- Sampson, R.J. and Laub, J.H. (1993) *Crime in the Making: Pathways and Turning Points Through Life*. London: Harvard University Press.
- Sampson, R. and J. Laub (1994) 'Urban Poverty and the Family Context of Delinquency', *Child Development* 65: 523–40.
- Sampson, R.J. and J.H. Laub (1997) 'A Life-Course Theory of Cumulative Disadvantage and the Stability of Delinquency', in T. Thornberry (ed.) *Developmental Theories of Crime and Delinquency*. London: Transaction.
- Simpson, C. (2004) 'When Hope Makes us Vulnerable', *Bioethics* 18(5): 428–57.
- West, D.J. (1969) *Present Conduct & Future Delinquency*. London: Heinemann.
- West, D.J. with D. Farrington (1973) *Who Becomes Delinquent?* London: Heinemann.
- Willis, P.E. (1977) *Learning to Labour*, Aldershot: Gower.
- Wilson, W.J. (1991) 'Studying Inner-City Social Dislocations: The Challenge of Public Agenda Research', *American Sociological Review* 56: 1–14.

STEPHEN FARRALL is a senior research fellow in the Research Institute for Law, Politics & Justice at Keele University. He is the author or co-author of two books on desistance from crime and numerous articles on the same topic. With Richard Sparks, Shadd Maruna and Mike Hough, he is organizing a series of seminars funded by the ESRC on the topic of 'Life After Punishment'.

RICHARD SPARKS is Professor of Criminology at the University of Edinburgh. His main research interests lie in the sociology of punishment (especially imprisonment); penal politics; and public responses to crime and punishment. Richard is the author of *Television and the Drama of Crime* (1992) and co-author (with Tony Bottoms and Will Hay) of *Prisons and the Problem of Order* (1996) and (with Evi Girling and Ian Loader) of *Crime and Social Change in Middle England* (2000). He has edited several books including, most recently (with Tim Newburn), *Criminal Justice and Political Cultures* (Willan, 2004).
