

Australian and New Zealand Society of Criminology Inc. (ANZSOC) Newsletter

Volume 2, Number 1

July 2001

LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT

Despite the fact that membership fees in your society are lower today than they were three years ago, our ranks remain thinner than they should be. To help your society grow, it would be great if each member could recruit at least one new member between now and our next ANZSOC Conference in Brisbane next year.

I would also like to encourage some creative thinking on the part of all members about how we might begin to enhance our resource base by building an endowment. In the past few years, your society has begun receiving royalties from institutional subscriptions to our Journal. In addition, you will recall the resolution at our last meeting in Melbourne that the society will receive a portion of net profits from our conferences (25% or \$5,000, whichever is less). I am delighted to announce that following the outstanding conference in Melbourne, the Society has received \$5,000. It is my pleasure to congratulate, and to thank, Professor Arie Freiberg and his team for their tremendous contribution.

In addition to these revenue streams, we may wish to consider soliciting gifts and/or bequests, as do many learned societies around the world.

Why, you may wish to ask, should we be doing this? Quite simply, a stronger financial base will enable our society to do more.

You may already be aware that your Executive has passed up an invitation to host a reception at the annual meeting of the American Society of Criminology. Although it would have been nice to reciprocate for the hospitality extended by the ASC at our recent Melbourne conference, the Executive's decision is understandable, given the

state of the Australian Dollar, our limited resources, and the fact that only a small proportion of our membership will be attending the ASC meetings in Atlanta. But consider some arguably more worthy investments, such as financial assistance to enable students from around Australia and New Zealand to attend our Conferences.

Let me encourage all members to think about means by which we can grow our society, and new directions that we might take. Please communicate your ideas to your representative on the Executive, and be prepared to discuss them at our meeting in Brisbane next year.

Peter Grabosky, President



Peter Grabosky, ANZSOC conference dinner 2001

The Editors would like to thank our contributors, particularly the Queensland Criminal Justice Commission.

Table of contents

Letter from the President	1
ANZSOC Incorporated!	2
Essay: has criminology failed to deliver?	2
Job changes	6
Overseas visitors	6
In the United States: Notes from an expatriate	6
New Criminological Society	8
New Australian Books in Criminology	9
Reports from criminology research/teaching centres	9
The Criminal Justice Commission, Queensland	9
Prison Officers at University	10
ANZSOC 2001 Reviewed	11
Calls for papers	13
Criminal justice review	13
International criminal justice review	13
Critical criminology	13
Forthcoming conferences	14

The next copy deadline is

Monday 3 December 2001 The newsletter will appear twice a year. The next issue is scheduled for December 2001. Please email us with your contributions.

ANZSOC INCORPORATED!

On 4 April 2001, the Australian and New Zealand Society of Criminology Inc. was incorporated under the *Associations Incorporation Act 1981* (Victoria). This provides the Society with a sounder legal basis upon which to carry out its activities throughout Australia and New Zealand and marks an important milestone in the Society's history since its inaugural meeting took place on 24 October 1967 with The Honourable

Sir John Barry QC as President. The decision to incorporate was made at the recent annual general meeting of the Society that was held at the University of Melbourne on 22 February 2001. Although the Society is incorporated pursuant to Victorian law, the choice of this state for incorporation was merely for the sake of convenience as the Society's Public Officer, Dr Russell Smith, is located in Victoria, as are the Society's honorary lawyer, Mr David Hart of Foster Hart, and its honorary Auditor, Mr David Gorman of Griffiths Gorman, all of whom were involved in arranging the incorporation of the Society. The Society's Rules and Statement of Purposes are now located on its Website. The current Officers of the Society are: President Dr Peter Grabosky Vice Presidents Professor Allison Morris and Dr Don Weatherburn Treasurer Ms Jenny Mouzos Secretary Frances Gant.

Members of the Committee of Management are: (The officers of the Society) (The editor of the Journal, Dr John Pratt) (The convenor of the next conference Professor Ross Homel) Dr Janet Chan (NSW) Associate Professor Kathleen Daly (Qld) Dr Fiona Haines (Vic) Dr David Indermauer (WA) Dr Mark Israel (SA) Dr Russell Smith (ACT) Professor William Tyler (NT) Mr Reece Walters (NZ) Professor Kate Warner (Tas) The Society's Public Officer is Dr Russell Smith.

Prospective members of the Society should contact the honorary secretary, Frances Gant at frances.gant@aic.gov.au. Further information regarding the Society is contained on its Website <http://www.anzsoc.ecel.uwa.edu.au/anzsoc/default.htm>

ESSAY: HAS CRIMINOLOGY FAILED TO DELIVER?

There has been a spate of recent papers, notably in the BJC, questioning the extent to which criminology as a subject has lost the plot (see volume 40, number 2, 2000). This is not a new question, although the timing of its resurgence is interesting, and something I return to below.

In the first section of this short paper I look at the some of the people asking critical questions and at what they are saying. I then have a bit to

say about why I think the question is currently topical, and finally describe some responses from criminologists.

Current criticism

As Joan Petersilia said in her Presidential Address to the American Society of Criminology (ASC), which focused on the relevance of criminology to policy:

"The potential for policy 'irrelevance' is inherent in the scientific advancement of which we are all justly proud. It is also inherent in how we are trained, how we do our research, how we communicate our results and how we are rewarded." (Petersilia, 1991:8)

This theme was also selected by Zahn in his 1998 Presidential Address to the ASC, who in an otherwise fairly congratulatory speech, called for stronger research ties with practitioners, victims and offenders. He also quoted John Timoney, now Chief of Police in Philadelphia, as saying, when asked what could be done about crime, – "criminologists could stop being part of the problem".

Also at the 1998 ASC meeting, Jeremy Travis, then Director of the National Institute of Justice, gave a plenary presentation in which he called for a new relationship between researcher and practitioner – "a relationship of constructive engagement, of partnership in the development of useful knowledge, of symbiosis in the testing of ideas." (Travis, 2000:85)

Similar concerns have been expressed in the UK and Australia. In a recent speech to a criminological audience, Paul Wiles, Director of Research, Development and Statistics in the Home Office, said:

"Criminologists have ceased to play a significant part in the public debates about crime and crime policy, and the consequence has been that these debates have become less sophisticated and more simplistic." (Wiles, 1999)

And in Australia, David Brereton (1996) while noting that there has been a marked increase in the quality and quantity of criminological research available to the governments in Australia, argues that key areas of crime and justice policy continue to be developed with little

apparent regard to that research. More recently Braithwaite (2000) goes further in suggesting, "Criminology...is destined for decline." Although conceding that for the moment it is booming, "not fed by intellectual accomplishments of the field, but by the continuous growth in public sector employment in the criminal justice system combined with new expectations that police should be university graduates, and by even stronger growth in private policing." (2000:223) All of which resonates with Wiles comments that most criminologists spend their time training their students and writing for other specialists.

This apparent pessimism about the future of criminology is clearly at odds with what Garland and Sparks (2000) describe as "the rude health of contemporary criminology" (2000:190). They discuss this paradox at some length conceding that criminology has made a minimal contribution to the development of criminal justice policy, certainly far less than the founding fathers of the discipline in the UK might have hoped (Radzinowicz, (1999).

To quote Christie in the first volume of the journal 'Theoretical Criminology',

"Long reports of the obvious. Repetitions. Elaborate calculations leading to what we all know. How can it be like this? How come that so much criminology is that dull, tedious and intensely empty as to new insights? It ought to be just the opposite, in a science based on material from the core areas of drama. ..." (Christie, 1997: 13).

So on the one hand we have a booming discipline fuelled by a sudden influx of money through, for example, the Crime Act in the US (the US Federal Government spent US\$44 million on policing research related to the Crime Act from 1994 – 2000) and the Crime Reduction program in the UK (£25 million over three years). And on the other hand we see little evidence from past performance that the bulk of practicing criminologists in universities have been able to influence policy or practice to date, or have the inclination or indeed the expertise to do so in the future: a grim picture.

Why is this currently topical?

First, there is a growing demand for 'outcomes' in the public sectors of most advanced western

democracies. It is no longer enough for the police, for example, to say the x thousand tickets were issued or y thousand offenders arrested. There is a demand that crime goes down and stays there. This is, if you like, the bottom line of the crime business.

Of course, some police chiefs believe they know how to reduce crime. Crime has been falling across the United States for over a decade, but the debate continues as to the reasons. In New York, the police version of events is that crime went down because of COMPSTAT and zero tolerance. In San Diego, crime dropped because of problem-oriented policing. In Chicago, the community-policing program made the difference, and so on. There are two things we can infer from this, either what the police do is irrelevant and crime was going down anyway. Or, what they do does matter, but there are lots of ways of reducing crime. The sad fact is that we don't know, and the researchers and police have spent years arguing about it. If there had been an ongoing relationship between the police and academics then maybe some of those questions could have been answered with rather more confidence.

Second, there is increased public scepticism that the "professionals" - teachers, lawyers, doctors, and politicians - know what they are doing. The police understandably want to be seen as professionals, not service providers. The difference between a professional and a service provider, as I am using the term here, relates essentially to the extent to which the work is knowledge or evidence-based and to the existence of a strong ethical work context. We treat doctors as professionals because they draw on a body of well-established knowledge as they provide the care we need, and we expect them to behave with integrity. Medical ethics is an industry in itself. But there are no comparable bodies in policing - no "ethics police" with the power to strike off offending officers. And while there are lots of books published each year on policing, there is no published knowledge base on what works and what doesn't work in the profession. The only way to establish a real body of knowledge is through systematic and prolonged investment in research.

Finally, we have seen a massive shift to community policing in the US and elsewhere, which encompasses problem solving or problem-oriented policing (POP); ie data-driven processes. If POP is to become embedded in routine police work, then the researcher's skills will need to be developed in police agencies. Data needs to be analysed, interpreted and acted upon, and the police have not been trained to do this.

So, there are three reasons why the police may now need good research in a way they have not to date:

1. The outcome focus and the need to demonstrate that police action can affect crime rates;
2. The professionalisation of policing; the need for a body of knowledge on what works within an ethical framework; and
3. The shift to data-driven problem solving.

I use the police as a convenient example, but the same arguments hold for other elements of the crime business - the efficacy of prisons, the effectiveness of sentencing policy, the efficiency of the courts. Efficiency and effectiveness, costs and benefits are all concepts being applied to the crime business these days.

How is the criminological community responding?

Let us first confess that not all criminal justice practice is devoid of an evidence base. We currently find research influencing policing:

1. Where local relationships are particularly good (Sometimes researchers involved in such relationships are referred to as "tame" researchers);
2. Where there is a slow, steady, unrelenting build-up of evidence of a problem, which leads to improvements in police responsiveness or accountability;
3. Where extraordinary tenacity over decades, such as Herman Goldstein's efforts on problem oriented policing (POP), means the research message is hard to ignore; and
4. Where there is a major single incident that focuses minds on a particular

problem, like poor police-minority relations.

But, frankly we should be able to do better. It's a bit ad hoc!

There are also pockets of research activity, which suggest a more productive set of relationships, might be developing. There is, for example, more 'applied' research being done. The work completed under the general heading of situational crime prevention (Clarke, 1983) is a good example, and Clarke and others have now edited a substantial collection of research papers in the 'Crime Prevention Studies' series of books, of which there are now 10 volumes in print. In Australia too the work of Homel and his colleagues has an applied orientation and has proved effective in influencing policy and practice (see for example the Surfers Paradise Safety Project, Hauritz, et al, 1998). Indeed Homel argued persuasively for a closer relationship between research and practice in his inaugural lecture at Griffith (Homel, 1994). The criminologists based at the University of Melbourne also have a history of applied research and continue to welcome its development (Sutton, 2000), and to criticise 'criminology' for its lack of purposeful contribution to the development of social and penal policy. And in Western Australia and parts of New South Wales criminology is touching on policy and practice in new and challenging ways.

Thirdly there is a core of individuals, occupying key positions in terms of research funding, who are influencing the development of this agenda to a significant extent. These are the Heads of research in the National Institute of Justice in the US, the Home Office in the UK, the Institute of Criminology in Canberra and others. They now meet increasingly often to discuss emerging issues and share ideas.

Next there is a growing realisation that the training of researchers in the field needs to be carried out with different emphasis. More quantitative training, or at least as much as there is qualitative. Specific research-based training in the techniques of the applied researcher, and a better understanding of the ways in which policy advisers and practitioners work is also required. This information either needs to be built into the training programs at

post-graduate level, for those wishing to enter the applied research field, or, better yet, they need to be given the opportunity to work alongside policy advisers and practitioners as part of the ongoing professional experience. The kind of experience offered at the Queensland Criminal Justice Commission under the Direction of David Brereton.

The way in which researchers write their research reports is also an area in which training can help. The use of simple English needs to be encouraged, but this should be set in the context of greater understanding of the audience at which the report is directed.

The possibility that both policy advisers and practitioners are likely to become better 'customers' should help to create a virtuous circle. They need to become clearer in specifying what they want from research and more assertive in making sure they get it (Laycock, 2000). There is too much money on the table, and too much pressure on the delivery of results, for them to do otherwise.

Conclusions

This paper has described an evolving scene, one in which huge changes are underway in the relationship between government and the people governed. Aspirations have been expressed for more rational policy making and an evidence-base to practice. It is possible that these aspirations will prove to be transitory, as new governments are elected and a new agenda develops. But at the moment there is support at the very highest level of government, in the US, the UK, and in Australia for the kind of rational decision making which would raise the profile of research. The question is, how long will it last? And will the research community be able to respond to these challenges in timely fashion?

We will have to wait and see. But if research is to take on a more responsible and responsive role in relation to the development of social policy and practice, there has never been a better time to do so. My personal hope is that we can all rise to the challenge.

Has Criminology failed to deliver?

References

- Braithwaite, J. (2000) *"The New Regulatory State and the Transformation of Criminology"* British Journal of Criminology, 40 (2) 222-238
- Brereton, D. (1996) *"Does Criminology Matter? Politics and the Policy Process"* Current Issues in Criminal Justice, 8, (1)
- Christie, N. (1997) *"Four Blocks Against Insight: notes on the oversocialization of criminologists"* Theoretical Criminology, Vol 1 (1) 13-23
- Garland D. and Sparks, R. (2000) *"Criminology, Social Theory and the Challenges of Our Times"* British Journal of Criminology, 40 (2) 189-204
- Hauritz, M., Homel, R., McIlwain, G., Burrows, T. and Townsley, M. (1998) *"Reducing Alcohol related Harm Through Local Government Safety Action Projects: The Queensland Experience"* Contemporary Drug Problems, 25, 511-551
- Homel, R. (1994) *"Flawed Order: The Administration of Justice in a "Get Tough" Era"* An Inaugural Lecture, Griffith University, Faculty of Education, June 2, 1994.
- Laycock, G. (2000) *"Becoming More Assertive About Good Research: what police practitioners should ask of the academic community"* Subject to Debate: Police Executive Research Forum, 14 (7)
- Petersilia, J. (1991) *"Policy Relevance and the Future of Criminology – ASC Presidential Address, 1990"* Criminology, 29 (1)
- Sutton, A. (2000) *"Crime Prevention: A Viable Alternative to the Justice System?"* In D. Chappell and P. Wilson (eds) *"Crime and the Criminal Justice System in Australia: 2000 and Beyond"*: Butterworths
- Travis, J. (1998) *"Research and Practice: Can We Talk?"* Plenary presentation to the American Society of Criminology, November 1998, Washington DC, in *"Selected Speeches of Jeremy Travis"* National Institute of Justice, 2000
- Wiles, P. (1999) Speech given at Centre for Crime and Justice, King's College, London, November 1999. Text available on Home Office website www.homeoffice.gov.uk
- Zahn, M. A. (1998) *"Thoughts on the Future of Criminology – Presidential address to the American Society of Criminology, 1998"* Criminology, 37 (1), 1-16.

Professor Gloria Laycock, The Jill Dando Institute of Crime Science

JOB CHANGES

Dr John Fitzgerald has been appointed senior lecturer in the criminology department at the University of Melbourne.

Dr Peter Grabosky has been appointed professor of gambling studies in the Regulatory Network program at the Research School of Social Sciences, Australian National University.

Chris Libreri has been appointed as director of the ABS National Centre for Crime and Justice Statistics.

Dr Toni Makkai has been appointed as the Director of Research and **Dr Russell Smith** has been appointed Deputy Director of Research at the Australian Institute of Criminology.

Frances Gant has taken up the position of ANZSOC secretary.

Professor Clifford Shearing has been appointed to a professorial position in the Regulatory Network program at the Research School of Social Sciences, Australian National University.

OVERSEAS VISITORS

- Dr Gloria Laycock** spent 4 months early in the year at the AIC and recently returned to take up the position as Professor and Director of The Jill Dando Institute of Crime Science, School of Public Policy, University College London
- Dr Pat Mayhew** will be on secondment from the Home Office at the AIC from September 2000 for 18 months

IN THE UNITED STATES: NOTES FROM AN EXPATRIATE

So what's graduate study in the U.S. like? As I'm finishing up my fifth year and my exams behind me, it's not a bad time to reflect on my experiences. (The past five years have been spent at a West coast university, specializing in criminology within a sociology department. Caution should be exercised in making inferences to the broader population of programs.)

For me, the value of my degree has been in its combination of coursework and research. Although programs vary across departments and disciplines, the American Ph.D. generally has three stages. The first two years are spent in what is best described as a Masters by coursework and thesis. This is followed by 12-18 months of further coursework and study preparing for doctoral candidacy. During this time, most programs have some sort of examination structure, which certifies students

as having achieved the required competency in research methods and other areas of specialization. The final two years are spent in dissertation work, culminating in an oral defence before the student's supervisory committee. Thus, the American Ph.D. provides a formal and institutionalized way to obtain and extend core skills and knowledge in your field. This is what many believe is the key strength of U.S. programs. In my view, it is two particular features of this structure that are invaluable:

- the training in a core set of methodological skills (whether quantitative or qualitative). However, in this respect, many of my fellow students simply think I'm a masochist.
- the commitment of time to read and think about the classics and major developments in my particular field through the major exam (also known as "prelims") process. Although I'm not convinced that the exam itself is that important (other than perhaps as a motivating tool), there are few other times in an academic or research career when this amount of time can be dedicated to such a task. For me, this period of study was a time of re-discovery about the field I had chosen to study.

There are, of course, downsides to the highly structured nature of the American Ph.D. process, in particular you need to be prepared to be in graduate school (full-time) for a minimum of five years. Depending on the department, program coursework may not be flexible in accommodating the already acquired skills of incoming students. You may not always agree with the core set of skills and knowledge identified as a mark of a good criminologist or sociologist (especially as non-mainstream perspectives may be marginalized).

The major source of financial aid for both domestic and international students is through Teaching Assistantships (basically tutors) or Research Assistantships, which provide a stipend, a tuition waiver, and perhaps more importantly health insurance. The problem? Most appointments are only for the nine-month academic year. Immigration will expect you to have the financial resources *before* you leave to cover any shortfall between the stipend/waiver and estimated costs. To give you some idea of the expense, my institution currently estimates

that the cost for an international student are US\$33,720 a year, of which US\$16,104 is tuition fees (and this is a state university).

But there's more to life than just study (although I'll take the "fifth" if any of my professors hear about this admission). I'm now the proud owner of a social security number, a state ID card (as the legal drinking age in this state is 21 years), and to the detriment of my blood pressure, have the pleasure of filing two tax returns a year (one for each country). I've learnt to spell without a "u" (when it suits me), can tell the difference between a "nickel" (5 cents) and a "dime" (10 cents), eat "granola" instead of museli for breakfast, and get to see U.S. sitcoms a season early (when I have the time). I've bought burgers at "Micky D's" (i.e. McDonald's), where a medium coke equals an Australian large (so I'll leave it to your imaginations as to what the large and super-sized menu options look like).

And although I thought I spoke English, I've secretly been speaking a foreign language all my life! "Full-stops" (periods), "lifts" (elevators), and "fortnight" (14 days or two weeks) all require translations. Indeed, "potplants" caused outright amusement (being interpreted as marijuana, not a "potted plant"). On the plus side, my accent and quaint phrases gave me a "coolness" factor that I've never had before—that is, until people got to know me!

So if you are seriously considering coming to the U.S. to study, here's my recommendations:

- ❖ There is considerable variation in programs and their requirements. Make sure that you are aware of what you are going to have to do.
- ❖ Consider funding options carefully. The student (F-1) visa only allows work "on campus", which is restricted to 20 hours a week whilst you are enrolled full-time (enrollment full-time for three-quarters of the academic year is also a requirement of the visa). In addition, check the number of years that programs guarantee funding arrangements.
- ❖ Be selective in the number of programs you apply for. Many may disagree with this advice, but making applications gets expensive very quickly (especially with

the current exchange rates). For instance, every application will require an application fee (usually about US\$50), plus your GRE (a standardized aptitude test taken before applying) scores are only sent free to a small number of schools, then there is the cost of academic transcripts, and postage. By being selective, you'll be forced to evaluate more carefully why you want to go to particular programs, and this will mean a stronger statement of intent.

- ❖ Don't choose a school simply based on the presence of a single "well-known" researcher in your area. (This was the best advice I received.) What you want is a program that is strong in your areas of interest. As the program will take at least five years to complete, people can leave, go on sabbatical, take visiting appointments elsewhere, or be too busy to provide the mentoring relationship you would like. You don't want to be stranded with no one else to work with.
- ❖ Talk to people at the departments where you think you'd like to go, and in particular, e-mail current graduate students (although I can't guarantee that you'll get a high response rate). Descriptions in brochures are not always current, nor reflective of the informal departmental culture and direction. You don't want to spend five years in a place that is unsupportive of its graduate students or has strong faculty conflict.
- ❖ Consider other alternatives for gaining broader research experiences: exchange programs, visiting scholar arrangements and post-doc positions. Would they meet your career and academic goals better, be more conducive to your personal commitments?

In hindsight, would I do it again? Yes ... (I have to say this, as my American partner is reading this over my shoulder). The experience of doing a Ph.D. here has provided me with a diversity of tools, connections, and experiences that have contributed to my learning in ways I cannot regret. But I probably would go now for

somewhat different reasons, especially as the last few years have seen exciting research opportunities and programs growing in Australian and New Zealand criminology.

If anyone would like to discuss these issues further, or have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at cewbond@u.washington.edu.

Christine Bond, University of Washington, Seattle

NEW CRIMINOLOGICAL SOCIETY

EUROPEAN SOCIETY OF CRIMINOLOGY

Based on growing European unity, the presence of common problems in the field of Criminology and European Criminal Justice policies, and the need for more high quality cross-national comparative research in Europe, the European Society of Criminology was founded in September 2000. The aims of the society are:

- * To bring together in Europe, persons actively engaged in research, teaching and/or practice in the field of Criminology.
- * To foster Criminological scholarship, research, education and training.
- * To encourage scholarly, scientific and practical exchange and cooperation among criminologists in Europe and elsewhere.
- * To serve as a forum for the dissemination of criminological knowledge at the European level.

The society is examining proposals to create a ESC-Journal, which would be included in membership.

All persons engaged in research, teaching and/or practice in the field of Criminology are welcome to join the European Society of Criminology.

Membership dues have been set at 50 Euro for the current business year (2000-2001), and at 25 Euro for student members. In case you would like to join or if you have any inquiries about the European Society of Criminology, please write to:

Martin Killias
School of Forensic Science and Criminology

University of Lausanne
 CH-1015 Lausanne
 Switzerland
 Fax: (41)-21-692.46.05
 E-mail: Martin.Killias@ipsc.unil.ch

NEW AUSTRALIAN BOOKS IN CRIMINOLOGY

Considering Crime and Justice: Realities and Responses

Editors: Rick Sarre & John Tomaino with a foreword by Professor Kevin Howells.

Published by Crawford House Publishing, Hindmarsh, South Australia, 2000

To request an inspection copy, please contact Crawford House, <http://www.chp.com.au>

To purchase a copy, contact The Bookshelf, Currie Street. <http://www.bookshelf.com.au>

REPORTS FROM CRIMINOLOGY RESEARCH/ TEACHING CENTRES

THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE COMMISSION, QUEENSLAND

The Criminal Justice Commission (CJC) was established in Queensland with the proclamation of the *Criminal Justice Act 1989*. The CJC has three primary roles, these are:

- To investigate and report on official misconduct in the Queensland public sector and misconduct in the Queensland Police Service (an investigative/oversight role).
- To manage the witness protection program on behalf of Queensland law enforcement agencies (a management role)
- To monitor, review and report on the administration of criminal justice in Queensland (a research role).

The research aspect of the CJC is very largely the responsibility of the Research and Prevention

Division of the commission. The 'Prevention' element of the divisions activities are focussed upon the development and promotion of organisational practices that minimise opportunities for corruption in the workplace whilst the 'Research' element of the divisions activities are focussed upon monitoring the operation and administration of the broader criminal justice system.

At any given time, the Research and Prevention Division will be engaged in a wide variety of endeavours ranging from providing very detailed micro-level advice to public sector agencies about how they can reduce corruption vulnerabilities through to very macro-level analyses of 'system wide' phenomena such as the dramatic increase in prisoner numbers that occurred in Queensland between 1993 and 1999. At the present time, two of the most significant exercises being undertaken in the division are an examination of the adequacy of funding for the Legal Aid Queensland and the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions and an examination of the licensing and registration processes of Queensland Transport.

The Legal Aid project is a follow-up to research conducted in 1995. The objective of the research is to determine the current state of funding of the Legal Aid Queensland (LAQ) and the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions (ODPP) and highlight the ways in which the levels of funding of these agencies impacts on the criminal prosecution process. In addition, the research seeks to identify any new and/or continuing issues which may be impacting on the funding of the LAQ and ODPP.

On the corruption prevention 'side of the house', corruption prevention staff recently reviewed the licensing and registration processes of Queensland Transport (QT). A CJC investigation confirmed corrupt activity by a QT officer at a Customer Service Centre (CSC), which included the issuing of false drivers licences and motor vehicle registrations. This corrupt activity was very similar to that disclosed during a previous major investigation. The use of false identity documents such as driver's licences, facilitates a wide range of serious criminal activity including money laundering from drug trafficking, major fraud and avoidance of legal obligations. A range

of system improvement recommendations were made covering recruitment and selection of CSC staff, training and development, procedures and processes and management and supervision. A follow up review with QT staff will be undertaken in 12 months.

In addition to these two major projects, a range of other research exercises are also being undertaken. These include an analysis of data relating to substance abuse amongst a sample drawn from police watchhouses, an analysis of police 'ethics' based upon annual surveys of police recruits, an analysis of police use of information technology, and an examination of factors associated with juvenile offending.

PRISON OFFICERS AT UNIVERSITY

A formal partnership between the University of South Australia and the Department for Correctional Services has created the Diploma in Correctional Administration. This award is offered jointly by the University and the Department. The impetus for this partnership came from the vision of the then Chief Executive of the Department for Correctional Services that changing prisons would require staff to be equipped with the knowledge and skills to undertake a more complex work than had previously been expected.

The curriculum for this award was developed in 1995 from a similar award offered, at that time, through the New South Wales Centre for Professional Development, itself a partnership between Southern Cross University and the NSW Department for Correctional Services. South Australian correctional services personnel are enrolled by the University into the Diploma in Correctional Administration with the support of the Department. The Diploma is a two year (full time equivalent) external study program. The Associate Lecturers, many of whom are senior departmental staff, have adapted the curriculum for use in South Australia and guide students in their study and assess student work. The Program Director is a staff member of the University and works with Associate Lecturers to develop appropriate teaching and learning strategies and to moderate student assessment.

The Diploma in Correctional Administration is supported by the Department alongside its commitment to the competency based awards in Correctional Practice and Correctional Administration. The University of South Australia Diploma provides relevant industry specific knowledge and skills. New recruits to the Department are expected to complete two courses (subjects) in the Diploma in their first twelve months of employment whilst qualifying for the Certificate III in Correctional Practice.

Many staff choose to continue with their study of the Diploma beyond the initial two courses. In this they are supported by the Department which, having named the Diploma as a desirable qualification for promotion, meets the cost of students' tuition. Study materials are delivered to staff in their workplace and the Departmental library, in partnership with the University library, provides access to a range of relevant literature for students.

The Diploma introduces students to the theoretical base of correctional administration as well as providing them with the opportunity to acquire skills essential to their practice. Courses in communications, security management, dispute management and institutional management are interspersed in the Diploma structure with more theoretical studies of Punishment, the Social Sanction System and the History of Prisons.

The Diploma in Correctional Administration provides correctional services staff with a series of educational pathways. The Bachelor of Social Science (Justice Administration) articulation arrangement gives Diploma graduates entry into the final year of an undergraduate award. Diploma graduates are also granted entry into the Bachelor of Management (Justice) and the Bachelor of Social Work or the Bachelor of Social Science (Human Services) and are granted varying amounts of credit.

The partnership between the Department and the University of South Australia, developed through the Diploma has resulted in a number of other joint activities including the provision of psychological services to corrections and the development of a forensic psychology specialisation in the University. Research into the

changing work of correctional officers has been developed from the Diploma in a collaborative manner consistent with the Diploma partnership.

The partnership between the University of South Australia and justice agencies in the provision of educational programs for justice personnel commenced with the Bachelor of Social Science (Justice Administration). This innovative award established an articulation arrangement with the TAFE qualifications in justice and allowed students to gain their degree with one year of broadening social science study at University. This articulation recognised that students gaining the TAFE Associate Diploma were justice professionals with some years of experience as well as two years full time study (or, more usually its equivalent in part time study) at TAFE. Students from each of the TAFE streams of Police, Courts, legal services and corrections have successfully completed the degree in Bachelor of Social Science (Justice Administration).

Options for justice personnel completing their TAFE qualifications and seeking to study at the University of South Australia have recently been expanded. From 2001 students also have the option of

- entering the Bachelor of Business (Justice). Eighteen months credit in this award is granted to those students with a TAFE Associate Diploma who have five years experience in a justice agency.

Entering the Bachelor of Social Work or Bachelor of Social Science (Human Services). Twelve months credit in these awards is offered to students with a relevant TAFE Associate Diploma in Justice Administration



Arie Frieberg at ANZSOC

ANZSOC 2001 REVIEWED

From a graduate student ...

The ANZ Criminology Society Conference dawned hot and clear on the first day - hovering just under the 40 degree mark. It must have been a challenge for the many Northern hemisphere friends and colleagues who had made the trip over. One such from Canada told me that prior to his plane leaving Canada for Australia it had to be "de frosted" - and he wasn't complaining about the heat!

On arriving at the venue on the first day I immediately bumped into Arie Frieberg who appeared breezy and bright and still had his sense of humour intact despite having had the responsibility of organising the conference and all that that had entailed. I presented my paper - on ethnic-based differences in heroin offending - on the morning of the first day. This was excellent timing. Apart from the advantage of being able to get my part over early - the cumulative and occasionally soporific affects of the excellent food and drink on offer in abundance throughout the conference had not yet set in! Apart from controlling the urge to over-indulge on the food, the greatest difficulty of the conference was in choosing which sessions to sit in on. There were so many concurrent sessions - all of which sounded extremely interesting - that it made it a real challenge to decide which to attend. This was solved somewhat by friends filling me in on the missed sessions during breaks and myself reciprocating.



Allison Morris at the ANZSOC 2001 conference dinner

It was great to meet new friends, to catch up with colleagues from around Australia, to meet people who had previously been known only as author names and to meet, face to face, helpful colleagues previously spoken to only on the phone. By the afternoon of the last day the atmosphere was so relaxed that some of my colleagues from the Crim department brought along their dogs and ferrets to liven things up - (thankyou Bram for not bringing the snake).

Altogether it was a fantastic conference. Congratulations to all those involved in its organisation.

Lorraine Beyer, PhD student, Department of Criminology, University of Melbourne

l.beyer@pgrad.unimelb.edu.au

From an overseas visitor...



Ron Huff,
ASC president
ANZSOC conference
dinner

As this year's president of the American Society of Criminology (ASC), one of my top goals has been to promote global interaction among criminologists and their respective professional societies. Toward that end, I appointed liaison representatives from ASC to all of the related professional societies, including ANZ of course. In the case of ANZ, I decided to give this prestigious appointment to an untested newcomer named John Braithwaite, who serves on the ASC board - - perhaps the name rings a bell? He seems very promising and I've been encouraging him to publish as well.

In addition, I decided to attend both the ANZ meeting in Melbourne and (next September) the inaugural meeting of the European Society of Criminology in Lausanne, Switzerland. These duties are demanding, but someone has to do it! My wife and I had never visited "down under," so we decided that this would be a great chance to do so. We had a wonderful time in Sydney

(where we also visited with our friends, ["Hizzoner"] Duncan and Rhonda Chappell), snorkeling off Heron Island on the Great Barrier Reef and, of course, exploring Melbourne. Our only regret was not having the time to travel to New Zealand (about which we have heard so many wonderful things) on this trip, due to our duties back in California - - but next time!

As for the ANZ meeting, I found it to be very well organized and the quality of the sessions quite good. I heard many informative presentations and learned a great deal at the conference, as well as having a great time. The fellowship at the conference was most enjoyable, and I was made to feel right at home, once I learned that Foster's isn't as popular there as our TV commercials here imply. I wish that more ASC members could attend the ANZ meetings to see for themselves the high quality and diversity of scholarship represented on the program (and to try more Ozzie wines and beers such as Cascade). Besides, since the U.S. and Oz were both former British penal colonies for the transportation of convicts, we share a great deal of criminological tradition in many ways!

Special recognition goes to Arie Freiberg, one of the wittiest people I've ever met, for his contributions, not only to the substance of the conference but for hosting my wife and me at his home and for his infamous "Criminology Quiz" ("Who Wants To Be a Millionaire?") at the Melbourne Aquarium (where I kept hoping that the archway supporting the sharks above me was not built by the same contractor who built the tunnel in Melbourne) . Although Arie fell somewhat short of his fund-raising goal (about \$999,996 short, as I recall), it was quite an emotional experience to see the \$4 first prize awarded to the last contestants still standing (who, by the way, were just as inept as the rest of us but their turn was last!). This was a different version of the popular "Survivor: The Outback" TV show here in the U.S. I've asked Arie to reprise his quiz during our scholarship dance at the ASC meeting in November (but without some of the weird Ozzie questions that would paralyze our ASC members). I hope to see many of you there and in Lausanne. Thanks for making me feel at home "down under."



Adam Graycar, Paul Wiles and Rod Broadhurst at ANZSOC 2001

CALLS FOR PAPERS

CRIMINAL JUSTICE REVIEW

The *Criminal Justice Review* is a biannual scholarly journal dedicated to presenting a broad perspective on criminal justice issues. It focuses on any aspect of crime and the justice system, and can feature local, state, or national concerns. Both qualitative and quantitative pieces are encouraged, providing that they adhere to standards of quality scholarship. As a peer-reviewed journal, we encourage the submission of articles, research notes, commentaries, and comprehensive essays that focus on crime and justice-related topics broadly defined. Four copies of manuscripts should be submitted in English, follow APA style, be double-spaced throughout, including references, tables and indented quotations, and cannot be under consideration by another publication. An abstract not to exceed 200 words must be included with submissions. Send to: Michael S. Vaughn, Editor, Criminal Justice Review, P.O. Box 4018, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA 30302-4018; 404-651-3660; Email: cjr@gsu.edu; Web Site: www.gsu.edu/cjr.

INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE REVIEW

The *International Criminal Justice Review* is an annual scholarly journal dedicated to presenting system wide trends and problems on crime and justice throughout the world. Articles may focus on a single country or compare issues affecting two or more countries. Both qualitative and quantitative pieces are encouraged, providing

they adhere to standards of quality scholarship. Manuscripts may emphasize either contemporary or historical topics. As a peer-reviewed journal, we encourage the submission of articles, research notes, commentaries, and comprehensive essays that focus on crime and justice-related topics in an international and/or comparative context broadly defined. Four copies of manuscripts should be submitted in English, follow APA style, be double-spaced throughout, including references, tables and indented quotations, and cannot be under consideration by another publication. An abstract not to exceed 200 words must be included with submissions. Send to: Michael S. Vaughn, Editor, International Criminal Justice Review, P.O. Box 4018, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA 30302-4018; 404-651-3660; Email: icjr@gsu.edu; Web Site: www.gsu.edu/icjr.

CRITICAL CRIMINOLOGY

This open call requests quality manuscripts pertaining to critical criminology in all its manifestations, including critical legal studies and social justice issues. We welcome qualitative and quantitative methodologies, including non-traditional approaches to data gathering and analysis. Papers should expose and oppose forms of domination that include class, gender, race/ethnicity and sexual orientation - especially their intersecting and interlocking nature. We encourage works that focus on creative and cooperative solutions to justice problems, plus strategies for the construction of a more inclusive society.

Papers should be 4,000 to 6,000 words (including tables, illustrations, notes and references) and framed in a manner that would be of interest to an international audience. Book reviews are also welcome and shorter research notes (3,000 words) will be considered for publication. Please send 2 paper copies and 1 electronic copy (IBM compatible) to the appropriate editor listed below. Submissions from Australasia are welcome and can be sent to either editor. All manuscripts are subject to peer review.

For more information, see <http://www.critcrim.org/journal.htm>

ANZSOC CONFERENCE 2002: Preventing Crime and Doing Justice

The 16th annual conference of the Society will be held in Brisbane October 1 - 3, 2002. Hosted by the School of Criminology and Criminal Justice and the Key Centre for Ethics, Law, Justice and Governance at Griffith University, the conference next year will take place at the Sheraton Hotel, located above Central Station in the heart of Brisbane, accessible directly from the airport by SkyTrain.

Confirmed speakers include Tony Bottoms and David Farrington, both from the Institute of Criminology at Cambridge University. A large number of other speakers from Australia and around the world are expected to attend. Highlights of the social calendar will include a dinner at the old Boggo Road jail and a welcome reception co-hosted by the American Society of Criminology.

The ANZSOC conference will be held in conjunction with the Key Centre conference, Governance and Justice 2002 on October 3-5 (also at the Sheraton). The core themes of this conference will include crime prevention and governance, allowing a more intensive analysis of these and related issues than will be possible within the more eclectic ANZSOC conference.

ANZSOC paper abstracts are due by May 31, 2002. Conference information, including speakers, program, costs, registration, accommodation options and special events, will be posted over the next few months on the conference web site:
<http://www.qu.edu.au/school/ccj/ANZSOC2002>.

FORTHCOMING CONFERENCES

European Criminology Conference 6-8 September Lausanne, theme: Current Trends in European Criminological Research, details Martin.,Killias@ipsc.unil.ch

Re-Thinking Indigenous Self-Determination Conference, September 25-28, 2001, details www.uq.edu.au/politics/risd

2nd World Conference: Modern Criminal Investigation, Organised Crime & Human

Rights, 3-7 December 2001, ICC, Durban, South Africa, details www.crimeinstitute.ac.za

2nd Australasian Conference on Drugs Strategy, 7-9 May 2002, details www.adcuwa.org

16th International Symposium on the Forensic Sciences, Forensic Sciences Outcomes for Society, 13-17 May 2002, details www.nifs.com.au/ANZFSSymposium/index.htm

ACER Research Conference 2001, Understanding Youth Pathways: What does the research tell us? Melbourne, Victoria, 15-16 October, 2001, details www.psychsociety.com.au/news/conferences/canberra/canb_frame.htm

ANZSOC 16th Annual Conference, 1-3 October, 2002, Brisbane Queensland In conjunction with the conference Governance & Justice 2002 3-5 October 2002

Call for ANZSOC papers: Abstracts due Friday 31 May 2002, details <http://www.qu.edu.au/school/ccj/ANZSOC2002>.

CONTRIBUTE TO YOUR NEWSLETTER

Know of a conference that is coming up?

TELL US ABOUT IT. Been to an interesting workshop/conference? **LET OTHERS KNOW AND EMAIL US A PIECE**

Are you the postgraduate convener?

WHY NOT GET SOME OF YOUR STUDENTS TO CONTRIBUTE TO THE NEWSLETTER

Starting an exciting new research project?

USE THE NEWSLETTER TO COMMUNICATE WITH YOUR COLLEAGUES

Email contributions to either:

margaret.cameron@aic.gov.au

toni.makkai@aic.gov.au.

Only email contributions accepted.