President’s Welcome

Let me, first and foremost, offer my greetings to all conference-goers. It is very likely that you are reading this column as you prepare for, or arrive at, our Annual Conference in Sydney, so please accept a warm harbour-city welcome.

In the past month I have been privileged to hear two great speeches, and I plan to devote the first part of this column to sharing with you some of the thoughts that emerged from the mouths of the respective and respected orators.

The first was the address given to the 17th World Congress of Criminology hosted by the International Society of Criminology in Monterrey, Mexico in August by the presumably ecclesiastically-inspired Jesús Murillo Karam. Mr Karam has served as the Attorney General of Mexico under President Enrique Peña Nieto since December 2012. He is one of the architects of Mexico’s public security strategy. One might have expected a rousing call to arms for Mexicans (if not the Americas) to tackle head on, and with a heavy hand, the many problems besetting Mexico and other Central American nations: gangs and their violent internecine wars, drug cartels, and human trafficking. Instead we heard (through an excellent interpreter) a calm, yet passionate, approach to the pursuit of civil society centred around policy-makers’ need to understand the desires of youth, enhancing (not trampling upon) their human rights, building their employment prospects, and lifting their rates of education from a lamentable contemporary nadir. It was inspiring stuff.

The second was the address to the graduands at one of the recent graduation ceremonies at the University of South Australia by the former (and first full time) Human Rights Commissioner for Australia, Mr Brian Burdekin. Brian was awarded an honorary Doctor of the University, and proceeded to offer these thoughts to those present:

I also want to challenge you to be conscious of the obligations we all share – both professionally and personally – to create a culture of human rights, of tolerance, of non-discrimination, of respect for individual differences, and one in which the rights of the most vulnerable and disadvantaged in our country are respected and protected ... Never forget that the birthright you have enjoyed in this enormously fortunate country and the privilege you have of a higher education give you the opportunity and responsibility to help those less fortunate than yourselves.

I was reminded by these remarks that, yes, we are privileged to have the insights that we regularly test and discuss, and some of us (including myself) were privileged to have had a largely free education. Given that the segments of society who are regularly under the gaze of criminologists are often the most vulnerable and disadvantaged in our country, we do have an obligation to society generally to convert the insights gained from our position of privilege into remediation wherever possible.

Let me return briefly to the subject of the 17th World Congress of Criminology in Monterrey. It was an excellent conference and easily the best organised of the five that I have attended over the last 16 years. There were over 1300 registrants, of whom only 200 or so were non-Mexican (so there’s a lot of interest in criminology in Mexico!). The Australians who attended included Rick Brown from the Australian Institute of Criminology, the recently retired (and thus relaxed) Peter Grabosky, and the University of Queensland’s Angela Higginson who had the honour of addressing a plenary session on a panel discussing innovative approaches to reducing...
President’s Welcome Cont’d

The AGM will be held on Thursday with me about this during the conference.

There has been some discussion around the subject of Australia (specifically Brisbane) convening the next Congress in July of 2017, to coincide with ANZSOC’s 50th anniversary, and hosted primarily by the Australian Institute of Criminology. Negotiations are still continuing, and I will keep all members apprised of developments as they unfold.

I have enjoyed being your president for the past two years and I plan to offer myself at the Annual General Meeting on October 2 for a further two year term. Indeed, let me encourage all members to attend the AGM. Given the flurry of activity around nomination forms, there should be a ballot or two for the positions opening up. I am delighted that there is such interest in members offering themselves for these roles. Let me offer my thanks to all the members of the committee this past year, especially to Noel Turner, our retiring treasurer. Noel has indicated that he will not be seeking re-nomination. He has been an exceptionally diligent purse-manager. My two vice-presidents, Gail Mason and Antje Deckert have provided me with enormous assistance. I especially want to pay tribute to Gail, who is not seeking re-election. She has given countless hours to the furtherance of criminology in Australia, and has been a real asset to the committee’s deliberations for many years. Her wise counsel has been invaluable to me over the past two years especially. I also want to thank Kate Sweeney for her work as secretary of the Society. She is now a proud mother, and, during her maternity leave, Melissa Christie has stepped in to tackle the tasks assigned to this role, and has done so with alacrity.

Secretary’s Report

Hello! My name is Melissa Christie – I am very honoured to tell you that I am the newly appointed acting Secretary of ANZSOC for the next 12 months, whilst Kate Sweeney is on maternity leave. Kate gave me an excellent handover and I am quickly beginning to understand all that is ANZSOC. I am also filling Kate’s role as the Conference Coordinator at the Australian Institute of Criminology. The role is a bit of a dream job for me, organising three conferences for 2015.

Speaking of conferences, welcome to the ANZSOC Conference being hosted by the Sydney Law School. I will be on the ANZSOC desk at various times throughout the conference so please feel free to come and introduce yourself. If you are not an ANZSOC member, now is the time to get involved. Please come and speak with me about this during the conference.

The AGM will be held on Thursday 2 October (during lunch). I urge all members to attend and see what the society has been achieving over the last 12 months and to cast a vote in the ANZSOC Committee member elections.

My last update is a little administrative – I have a new phone number. You can now contact me on (02) 6260 9218. I look forward to meeting you throughout the conference!

Melissa Christie
secretary@anzsoc.org

Finally, allow me to offer my gratitude to the people at the University of Sydney Law School whose work has allowed this state of the art conference to unfold. Thomas Crofts, Murray Lee, Rebecca Scott-Bray, Garner Clancy, Gail Mason, Laura Wajnryb McDonald, Carla Viola and Louise Boon-Kuo are to be congratulated on their diligence and expertise. Conferences only come together if a team has put in the long hours and done the hard yards. They deserve our thanks!

Rick Sarre, ANZSOC President
rick.sarre@unisa.edu.au

Rick Sarre with a few members of the Conference Committee, Professor Gail Mason, Dr Garner Clancy & Ms Laura Wajnryb McDonald

PacifiCrim Editor’s Note

Welcome to the second edition of PacifiCrim for 2014 and to the 27th Annual ANZSOC Conference! I want to echo Rick’s welcome to our incoming Secretary Mel Christie and send a big congratulations to our wonderful Secretary Kate Sweeney and her partner Josh, who proudly welcomed Henry Ethan Sweeney on Wednesday 6 August 2014.

In this edition, we showcase the 2014 ANZSOC award recipients, Professor David Biles reflects on his role as an ongoing media contributor, and we celebrate the J V Barry Library’s 40th birthday. This edition also highlights two projects being undertaken by ANZSOC members which are having strong policy and public impact. The first snapshot examines the implications of the decisions to restrict the provision of Legal Aid services and the two-tiered “justice” system this creates. The second discusses Victoria’s highly problematic law and order agenda, which John Elder, writing for The Age newspaper in June, described as allowing “the sound and fury of talkback tyrants to once again overwhelm reason”. This snapshot offers the experts’ views on the Victorian Government’s decision to abolish defensive homicide.

From 2015, we will feature book reviews to showcase the innovative research of our members. If you have a book coming out, or a research snapshot to share in the next edition of PacifiCrim, please send me an email or pop over and say hi during one of the conference breaks.

Congratulations to the conference committee for organising such an interesting and full program. I hope everyone enjoys having the opportunity to network, learn more about some of the fantastic research being undertaken by our members, engage in friendly, scholarly debate, and enjoy the Sydney sunshine.

Asher Flynn, PacifiCrim Editor
asher.flynn@monash.edu
Editor’s Note: Professor David Biles is one of Australia’s most celebrated criminologists. He has been, for many years, a contributor to The Canberra Times on matters of criminology and criminal justice. In this piece he reflects on the “trials and tribulations”, “joys and frustrations” of this rewarding, and challenging role. David’s blog can be found on the ANZSOC website at: http://www.anzsoc.org/cms-david-biles/index.php.

I have to say that whenever my work has been edited, I have been grateful to have been quietly corrected, rather than allowing my mistakes to appear in print.

The greatest joy that comes from writing newspaper articles is the reaction of readers. These take several forms. The most significant reactions take the form of letters to the editor, which may be mildly or seriously critical of the opinions that have been published. Either way, they show that some interest has been stirred.

Much more common are emails from readers, many of whom are strangers to me, and are generally more friendly than the letters to the editor. Finally there are face-to-face conversations with other criminologists, corrections workers, friends and neighbours or people in the street who recognise me from the (unflattering) photo that has been used in the newspaper, and often seek my views on various subjects of local interest.

The reactions from readers help to keep the writer in the real world of crime and punishment, with all of its emotional overtones, and well away from the ivory tower of academe.

**Professor David Biles**

David Biles is an internationally recognised criminologist with degrees in psychology, education and sociology. His earlier positions have included: Deputy Director, Australian Institute of Criminology in Canberra; Head of Research, Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody; and Senior Lecturer in Criminology, University of Melbourne. He has also worked as an Education Officer in Victorian prisons for a period of 11 years. More recently he worked as Professorial Associate in corrections at Charles Sturt University.

He was the foundation Honorary Secretary of the Australian and New Zealand Society of Criminology, and served as President from 1979 to 1983. In 2003, David was awarded the Order of Australia Medal (OAM) “for service to criminology, as an educator, researcher and adviser,” and in 2004 he was awarded the Honorary degree of Doctor of the University by Charles Sturt University.

David Biles in the *Canberra Times*

Obervant visitors of the ANZSOC website will have noticed that in April 2014 a new element was added to the site with my name being listed along with other options such as Publications, Conferences etc. Visitors who took the next step will have discovered that they had been given direct access to opinion piece articles that I had written for *The Canberra Times* since 2011. I believe that about 35 articles are accessible.

The purpose of this contribution to *PacifiCrim* is to share with fellow criminologists some of the highs and the lows, the trials and the tribulations as well as the joys and the frustrations of being a semi-regular contributor to the daily newspaper which is published in the national capital.

Before that, however, it is necessary for me to acknowledge that the idea of re-publishing some of my work on the website came, not from me, but from a good friend; John Myrtle, a former librarian at the Australian Institute of Criminology. I had sought John’s advice as to whether or not he thought my journalistic writings could be consolidated into a book, and he argued that it would be easier and more effective to approach the Society about finding some space on their website.

John agreed to make the initial approach to the Society and also provided summaries of the articles from *The Canberra Times* website. All that I had to do was to obtain permission to re-use the articles. This was readily given, with a gracious suggestion that it would be splendid if the fact that the articles had been first published in *The Canberra Times* could be mentioned.

Throughout most of my career in criminology I had written occasional articles for the Melbourne Age and the *Australian*, but it was only around 2010 that I decided to make a serious attempt at becoming a semi-regular contributor to *The Canberra Times*. I guess I was motivated by the feeling that I still had opinions that I wanted to express and the local newspaper seemed to be an appropriate vehicle. It was certainly not for the money, as the remuneration offered to casual contributors is quite modest.

Soon after a few of my thousand-word pieces had been published, I realised that contributors never knew when their work would be used, or even whether it would be used at all. The writer also has no say in the title and sub-title that will appear above his/her name. For most of my pieces, the titles have been clever, witty or just right, but for a few I have felt that the title missed the central point. The same applies with cartoons that are used occasionally to accompany a published article. Most often I have thought the cartoons were brilliant, sometimes so good that they tended to outshine the article. It is a joy when that happens. Then there is the question of editing for typographical or grammatical errors or simply to ensure that the article does exceed not the word limit imposed.

**Professor David Biles**

David Biles in the *Canberra Times*
Sentencing consistency is widely accepted as a fundamental outcome expected from a criminal justice system. In New Zealand, sentencing is expected to be consistent between similar offenders, convicted of similar offences, in similar circumstances.

Consistency promotes confidence in justice and respect for the rule of law. Perhaps surprisingly there has been very limited research to determine the level of consistency in most countries. Most of the research has focussed on measuring consistency between genders and ethnicities. The obvious exception is the United States where research has also focused on disparity between locations.

In New Zealand, the abortive attempt to introduce sentencing guidelines was supported by claims of widespread inconsistency, but ultimately rejected for several reasons, including that any inconsistency was insufficient to warrant change. The under informed and unfinished debate on the state of sentencing consistency motivated Wayne to investigate the extent of disparity (if any) between District Court circuits for a doctoral thesis. His thesis examined consistency in six contexts spanning the various combinations of two sentencing decisions and three offences. The decision to incarcerate or not (the in-out decision) and the determination of the length of incarceration were separately examined for aggravated drink driving, male assaults female, and burglary. Varying degrees of inconsistency were found in each context; there was greater inconsistency in the sentencing of aggravated drink drivers and burglars than for male assaults female; and there was greater inconsistency in the in-out decision than the determination of sentence length. These results were not surprising given the wide discretion judges have which is influenced by the varied circumstances of the communities in which they sit.

The modelling used adds to the picture of sentencing for aggravated drink driving. The thesis employed multi-level modelling techniques for two purposes. First, to identify sentencing factors with statistically significant random effects e.g. where the factor has a different impact on the determination of sentence between circuits. The second purpose was to identify any circuit level factors (characteristics) associated with variation in sentencing between circuits. The most notable finding was that whether a circuit was metropolitan or provincial was significant. An offender sentenced in a provincial circuit was 3.8 times more likely to be incarcerated than a similar offender sentenced in a metropolitan circuit.

The article and thesis were restricted to observations of sentencing by judges sentencing in their home circuit. Since the completion of the thesis, additional models splitting judges into six categories have been assembled. The six categories were provincial judges sentencing in their home circuit, or in another provincial circuit or in a metropolitan circuit; and metropolitan judges sentencing in their home circuit, or in another metropolitan circuit or in a provincial circuit. The results are provisional and have not been fully analysed but the initial findings are fascinating.

Wayne Goodall recently completed his doctorate and is now seeking to return to the Public Service. Immediately prior to his study he spent three years working on the drafting of sentencing guidelines. Prior to that, he worked for 12 years in a variety of roles in the justice sector. Wayne is intending to publish further articles arising from his doctorate and related research and, employment permitting, to expand into wider sentencing research.

Dr Russil Durrant is a senior lecturer in Criminology at Victoria University in Wellington. Russil teaches courses in criminal psychology, criminological research methods and criminal and investigative psychology. Russil’s current research focuses on the application of evolutionary theory to the understanding of criminal behaviour, with a particular focus on aggression, violence, and war. He is also carrying out research on the psychology of punishment and sentencing and how responses to crime are shaped by a range of factors.
The J V Barry Library: 40 Years On

Editor’s Note: The J V Barry Library at the Australian Institute of Criminology turns 40 this year. We asked one of its key former librarians, John Myrtle, to reflect upon its history.

“Among those who strove for [the] creation of [the Australian Institute of Criminology] was the late Sir John Barry of the Victorian Supreme Court and it is planned that the Institute’s library will be known as the J V Barry Memorial Library to perpetuate Sir John’s endeavours” (AIC Annual Report 1973).

Twelve months after the establishment of the Australian Institute of Criminology, a ceremony was held in Canberra on 12 February 1974 to mark the official opening of the J V Barry Library (as it was later to be known) by Mr Justice McClemens of the Supreme Court of New South Wales. Those present at the ceremony would not have envisaged that the library would develop, not only to provide valuable support for the Institute’s research work, but also to have an impact in supporting the work of researchers and practitioners in Australia and the wider international community.

An early recruit of the library was Sylvia Blomfield and it was her vision and leadership that led to the J V Barry Library developing as a significant information provider for those working in the field of criminology.

The Institute initiated a national clearinghouse for researchers and practitioners. Information was disseminated with an Information Bulletin and, in time, this evolved into a reference database called CINCH. Initially, the Institute’s research staff provided searches from the database batch-mode and the database became a service managed by library staff, publicly available through various online service providers and also on CD-ROM.

In 1977 the Institute convened the first seminar of librarians in the criminal justice system. This brought together librarians representing police, corrections, courts, universities and associated government departments, and asserted that there was a clear need for the J V Barry Library to provide a coordinating role in the collection and dissemination of criminological information in Australia. At this time, which pre-dated the availability of computer-based networks, the J V Barry Library served as the hub for a combined catalogue of the criminology holdings of participating libraries, and also a union list of criminology periodicals held in Australian libraries. Altogether, the Institute convened eight criminal justice librarians’ seminars, the final one in 1992, all of which provided a valuable channel of communication for information providers.

From the 1980s, the availability of PCs in the work environment and the development of computer-based networks revolutionised library work and information provision and this enhanced the services provided by the J V Barry Library. The Institute became a full participant member of the National Library’s Australian Bibliographic Network (ABN) meaning that the Institute’s library holdings were disseminated to libraries throughout Australia. A decade later, the availability of email services, the Internet, and web-based services led to very significant changes for the library’s work especially with the development of international links. The Institute’s website was launched in 1996 and library staff played a vital role in developing the website into an important text-rich source of criminal justice information.

From its early days, the Institute was affiliated with the United Nations’ Centre for International Crime Prevention and the Institute’s library exploited early, basic email services to link with other UN affiliates.

These links quickly evolved, and in 1991 the Institute participated in an inaugural meeting for world criminal justice librarians convened at Rutgers University, New Jersey. Following from the meeting, the World Criminal Justice Library Network (WCJLN) was established and altogether there have been ten meetings of the Network, with the seventh hosted by the Institute in Canberra in 2003.

Now, in 2014, the J V Barry Library houses the most comprehensive library-based collection in the field of criminology and criminal justice in Australia. The modest library launched in Canberra in February 1974 has developed into a major criminal justice information resource that supports the information needs of the Institute’s research programs and provides services to key stakeholders and other clients, both in Australia and in different parts of the world.

John Myrtle, ARC Centre of Excellence in Policing and Security
Griffith University

The J V Barry Library

A Personal Note: I was employed as the Institute’s librarian from 1986 to 2003 and would like to pay tribute to the many skilled and committed colleagues with whom I worked, and to Janet Smith, who succeeded me as the Institute’s library manager and brought energy and a fresh vision to the Library’s work. Sadly Janet died from breast cancer in 2011. On the occasion of the 40th birthday of the J V Barry Library, I extend my best wishes to the current Library Managers Janine Chandler and Jane Shelling, and the Institute’s library staff.

John Myrtle & Janet Smith
Six common crime types in NSW, including non-domestic violence, residential burglary, personal theft, theft from motor vehicles, malicious damage and shoplifting, which together account for around 70 percent of all recorded crimes in NSW. Importantly, these strategies had to be suitable for implementation by local government. The plan was for CPD to use our research to decide where to invest crime prevention funding for local councils. While there are almost certainly different views about the merits of this approach, it was driven by a commendable goal, which was to encourage greater attention to the evidence base among those councils applying for funding.

Systematic reviews are a popular and important mechanism for drawing together the findings from multiple studies. But traditional reviews have attracted criticism because of their focus on outcomes at the expense of understanding how particular strategies work best. It’s widely accepted that the process of translating evidence into practice isn’t as straightforward as simply choosing from a list of effective strategies. There are many factors that will be considered by practitioners in deciding what to do, not just whether something has worked in the past. And there are a large number of weaker evaluations that can still offer value in terms of informing practice.

With this in mind, we approached our review a little bit differently. We developed a methodology for reviewing studies that combined elements of experimental and theory-based research designs and approaches to evaluation. This method placed greater emphasis on factors such as local context, the mechanisms underpinning an intervention and the requirements for successful implementation, alongside evidence of effectiveness. We felt that this approach would help to better inform the process of selecting and adapting effective interventions by providing more useful information on the effectiveness of different prevention strategies, the circumstances in which they can work, how they work, and how to implement them. It was reassuring to discover recently that a similar approach has been adopted by the What Works Centre for Crime Reduction in the UK.

Based on our review of more than 100 studies using this methodology, we identified a number of strategies supported by evidence of effectiveness and sound theory that were suitable for local government. We also identified success factors and requirements for successful implementation. In addition to our report, detailed information on the characteristics of specific interventions (or combinations of interventions), the steps needed to implement them and illustrative cases studies were used to develop practitioner-focused resources.

These resources were developed to help councils select, adapt and implement evidence-informed strategies to reduce the six crime types.

However, almost as important as what we found was what we didn’t find. Despite the wealth of information that was available, it was clear that there remain significant gaps in the evidence base for community-based crime prevention. While some common responses, such as access control measures, lighting and CPTED, were well supported by evidence, limited research has been conducted looking at the effectiveness of other initiatives popular with local councils, such as community development and engagement, social and recreational services and various interagency responses to crime problems. After nearly three decades of local government led crime prevention plans, this research is an important and timely reminder that we still need to better understand the role and impact of local government crime prevention.

We therefore need to ensure there are processes for capturing and sharing the various evaluations that are conducted by and for community-based organisations, including local councils. We need to find new ways of promoting innovation and evidence-based decision-making. But, most importantly, we have to keep promoting, encouraging and conducting high quality evaluation of local government crime prevention. It is for this reason that one of the areas of research I am particularly looking forward to progressing in the near future will involve working in partnership with local councils to develop and evaluate innovative crime prevention projects.

Anthony Morgan is the Research Manager for the Crime Prevention and Evaluation Research program at the Australian Institute of Criminology. His main research interests are community-based crime prevention and program evaluation. Anthony was the lead author of the National Crime Prevention Framework, has developed performance frameworks for crime prevention and has conducted research into the use of CCTV and police and local government crime prevention. Anthony has been responsible for the evaluations of community crime prevention programs, specialist court models for Indigenous offenders, offenders with impaired decision-making and care and protection matters, Indigenous drug and alcohol treatment programs, policing responses to alcohol-related violence and family violence prevention programs. He has developed cost-benefit models for imprisonment and community corrections and is currently managing a large-scale program of work evaluating national law enforcement databases for cybercrime, DNA and ballistic evidence.
ANZSOC Research Snapshot: Access to Justice

Since 2013 and continuing into 2014 (and beyond), restrictions to Legal Aid and prescriptive changes to social, legal and welfare services have significantly increased demand for legal services in Australia, while simultaneously increasing the extent of unmet legal need. Underpinned by government rhetoric of austerity, this resource-stricken environment has created a hierarchy of legal needs that has fuelled a robust contest over prioritisation of government-funded serious criminal cases, at the expense of criminal representation in the lower courts, and serious civil and family law matters. This has raised some important questions for practitioners, activists, academics and stakeholders alike, namely, who deserves Legal Aid? Should we seek to provide more people with less services, or spend more money assisting fewer vulnerable clients? Who are the core clients of Legal Aid services? And in the context of finite funding and expanding demands, on what criteria are priorities decided and who decides those criteria?

These questions were the key focus of a Monash University workshop run by ANZSOC members, Dr Asher Flynn, Emeritus Professor Arie Freiberg, Professor Jude McCulloch and Associate Professor Bronwyn Naylor in July 2014. This was the second workshop held by this team (the first took place at the University of Warwick in England in March 2014) to examine the implications of cuts to Legal Aid funding and services across England, Wales and Victoria. A diverse range of stakeholders and groups were in attendance at the July workshop, including: Victoria Legal Aid, Victoria Aboriginal Legal Services, the Law Council of Australia, the Criminal Bar Association, the Law Institute of Victoria, the Women’s Legal Service Victoria, the Federation of Community Legal Centres, legal practitioners, members of the judiciary, a range of legal centres, the Australian Productivity Commission, and academics from Australia and the United Kingdom.

The workshop provided a forum to debate the ways in which we as practitioners, academics, activists and stakeholders should or could respond to prescriptive Legal Aid policy decisions. The failure of Australian and English governments to consider the far-reaching consequences of reduced funding and restrictive policy measures for the services provided by Legal Aid, private practitioners and Community Legal Centres was a common issue identified across the day. In a law and order climate, we are witnessing changes to judicial sentencing practices, such as the introduction of baseline sentencing, and a stronger focus on punitive measures involving mandatory jail time. It was argued by many, that restrictions on front-line and holistic legal service provisions would only lead to increased delays at every turn of the criminal and civil justice processes, and ultimately increase financial and social costs for the community. In this way, we are creating, what many of those practising law describe as “a perfect storm” of injustice.

In the criminal context, a primary concern was the seeming disregard for the impact of resource cuts on representation in the lower courts and what was perceived as a devaluing of the often serious issues and consequences dealt with in the Magistrates Court. The diminishing attention to the legal issues dealt with in Victoria’s lower court was identified as clearly problematic for unrepresented defendants having to navigate an increasingly complex legal system. At the same time, it reduces the opportunities for practitioners to develop advocacy expertise in the Magistrates Court, in preparation for running cases involving more serious indictable offences in the higher courts.

In Victoria, numerous incentives are available to defendants to waive their right to trial and plead guilty. These vary from sentence and charge discounts, to plea negotiations and even indications of the likely sentence from the Magistrate. The pre-trial process itself involves multiple hearings to facilitate early disclosure, discussion and resolution. Yet a policy decision has been made to remove an accused person’s access to Legal Aid in all matters deemed unlikely to result in a custodial sentence. This decision has been justified on the basis that those facing the most severe form of punishment should be prioritised when there is a reduced pool of funding available. However in light of the incentives provided to defendants to plead guilty, and the serious implications that arise from a guilty plea (e.g. registration on the Sex Offender’s Registry), there are significant concerns arising from this policy decision. The potential for serious miscarriages of justice, on par with the threat of a false conviction due to an error at trial, arises from induced guilty pleas. It is therefore vital that any changes to the provision of Legal Aid take into consideration how the current system incentivises guilty pleas, and what this means when there is no lawyer to act as that final source of protection for accessing justice.

Participants at the workshop discussed the need to ensure that changes to legal aid funding and policies did not result in a two-tiered system of justice; one for those who can afford legal representation, and one for those who can’t. This concern was linked with the shift in government policy away from social responsibility to address needs, and citizens as having rights, towards discourses about who is ‘individually deserving’, and who is not. In this climate, the public can be led to accept problematic changes to basic legal service provision, and the legal sector is left to decide not what unmet can be met, but what unmet need can they afford not to meet.

The workshop identified the need to continue to publicly highlight the importance of meeting legal need both on the front-line, and through funded research that examines, critiques and advises how changes in government policy impacts on all members of the community. More information on the project is available at: http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/law/research/centres/accesstojustice

Associate Professor Bronwyn Naylor, Professor Jude McCulloch, Dr Asher Flynn, Ms Natalie Byrom & Professor Jackie Hodgson at the Legal Aid workshop
The ubiquity of social media poses a challenge to criminological understandings of online crime. Since the 1990s, online crime has often been situated within ‘cyberspace’, an online universe in parallel to our own. However the transformations of social, economic and political life wrought by social media, collapses simple distinctions between ‘online’ and ‘offline’ worlds. Instead, it calls our attention to the uncertain boundaries between public and private life, and the potential for both empowerment and harm in the unprecedented visibility offered by social media.

Female social status has historically been closely tied to norms of modesty and chastity, and girls and women are differentially vulnerable to harm when ‘private’ information or images are circulated publicly without their consent. This is a common form of online victimisation, in which girls and women can find humiliating material distributed by abusive partners or ex-partners, peer groups (in schools or workplaces, for instance) or by anonymous online networks. Although this behaviour is intended to cause significant reputational damage, girls and women victimised in this way are frequently denied legal redress.

While the publicity of social media can be used against girls and women, it also offers them unprecedented access to public dialogue and representation. Social media is the first media platform whose content providers, distributors and audience are primarily female. It is therefore not only a platform for gendered victimisation but, as I discovered in the course of researching online abuse, it is also generating new opportunities for recognition and redress in the aftermath of victimisation.

The article examines how, in the decade since the development of social media, there have been multiple instances in which girls and women whose claims of sexual victimisation have been excluded from formal redress within the criminal justice system have turned to social media to find alternative forums for the adjudication of their complaint. This can result in the informal sanctioning of the alleged offender and in some cases, can sway court processes in favour of the victim.

The article conceptualises the criminological significance of social media via an original theoretical framework that synthesises political theories of deliberative democracy with feminist critiques of the mass media and justice system. Critical theorists such as Jürgen Habermas and Nancy Fraser, who are often overlooked in criminological scholarship, are incorporated into an analysis of the online public sphere and its potential to disrupt the exclusion of subaltern groups from legal redress.

Through three case studies, the article develops an intersectional account of the apparent differential in online support enjoyed by some victimised girls and women and not others, examining relations of gender, class and age in the online public sphere.

New Scholar Prize 2014

Editor’s Note: Dr Michael Salter is the recipient of the 2014 New Scholar Prize for his article ‘Justice and Revenge in Online Counter-Publics: Emerging Responses to Sexual Violence in the Age of Social Media’, published in vol 9(3) of Crime, Media, Culture (2013).

While documenting the ethical and legal dilemmas posed by such online extra-judicial allegations, the paper cautions against one dimensional readings of this phenomenon as a form of vigilantism, and draws attention to the potential of social media to destabilise the relations of power that have previously marginalised allegations of sexual violence in the public sphere.

Dr Michael Salter, UNSW

Dr Michael Salter is a lecturer in criminology at the University of Western Sydney.

His research is focused on (1) violence against women and children, (2) the role of new technologies in representations and responses to male violence and (3) policy and practice in responses to gender-based violence. He is a consultant to VicHealth and Women NSW on the primary prevention of violence against women. His recent book ‘Organised Sexual Abuse’ (Routledge, 2013) was the first Australian study of multi-perpetrator child sex offending. He is published nationally and internationally in the areas of child abuse, domestic violence and sexual assault, with a focus on the social, political and economic antecedents to male violence.

American Society of Criminology Annual Meeting 2014

November 19—22, 2014
Marriott Marquis, San Francisco, California
https://www.asc41.com/annualmeeting.htm
Forthcoming Conferences

**Critical Criminology Conference 2014**

Research Praxis & Social Transformation in a Global Era?

4-5 December 2014

Monash University Law Chambers, Melbourne, Australia

The conference brings together academics, cross-sector stakeholders, legal practitioners, advocates, activists and students to reflect and renew discussions about the status and future of “critical criminology”. The conference will consider the unique and important place of critical criminology, with a particular focus on the multi-level barriers that impact on transformative research agendas and collaborations in the current social, political and economic climate.

Conference streams include: Re-theorizing Punishment’s Borders and Boundaries; Movements against State and Corporate Harm; Campaigns for Justice; From Theory to Praxis: Challenges in Critical Criminology; and Surveillance and the Technologies of Control.

Registration closes 17 October 2014

For full details and to view the conference program please visit:


---

**7-10 July 2015 at Queensland University of Technology, Gardens Point, Brisbane**

This conference will reinvigorate intellectual and policy debates about the link between social justice, social democracy and the reduction of harm, crime and victimization through the alleviation of inequalities and building of more socially just and inclusive societies.

For full details please visit: http://crimejusticeconference.com/

---

**Security and Rule of Law: The changing face of criminal justice**

For More Information, contact:

Professor Willem de Lint
E: willem.delint@flinders.edu.au
Allan Van Zyl Memorial Prize 2014

Editor’s Note: Jessica Holgersson is the recipient of the 2014 Allan Van Zyl Memorial Prize. The Allan Van Zyl memorial prize was inaugurated to assist residents of the Northern Territory studying or working in criminology or criminal justice to attend the ANZSOC annual conference. It was inspired by the memory of Allan, who worked tirelessly in the NT over many years to promote good justice outcomes for all residents of the north.

Congratulations on winning the Allan Van Zyl Memorial Prize! How does it feel to be the recipient of this award?
It’s a wonderful prize and I feel very privileged to have been chosen to receive it.

Can you tell us something about yourself and your work to date?
While studying at UNSW I worked with some very inspiring people at the Indigenous Law Centre. My time there motivated me to get out of Sydney for a while and explore the Top End of Australia. I travelled to Darwin on an Aurora Internship and spent time working within the Family Matters jurisdiction of the NT Magistrates Court. I fell in love with Darwin, and, since graduating, was lucky enough to be appointed as Associate to the Honourable Justice Graham Hiley of the Northern Territory Supreme Court.

What inspired you to apply for the award?
Justice Hiley’s Personal Assistant had heard about the award at Uni and said to me, “Hey, didn’t you study criminology? You should apply for this”! She flicked me the email and I knew straight away that I wanted to apply. The Northern Territory is such a unique jurisdiction, but it is also easy to get stuck here and forget about the rest of Australia, so it’s really important to have these opportunities to go interstate and discuss what’s going on in the Territory.

What are your key interests in criminology and how did these transpire?
My interest in criminology really transpired from a love affair with crime fiction as a teenager! I was addicted to the novels of Patricia Cornwell and Kathy Reichs. But my key interests have really transpired from my work. The Indigenous Law Centre and Northern Territory experience has fostered a passion for Indigenous justice and in particular, the child protection system and how it relates to indigenous children and families. Working within the Supreme Court has also piqued my interest in the judiciary, the sentencing process and the criminal trial.

What do you see as some of the key criminological challenges in the Northern Territory?
I would say the overwhelming challenge that we face every day in the Northern Territory Supreme Court relates to alcohol-related violence within indigenous communities. The Chief Justice earlier this year said, in relation to a matter in Tennant Creek, that “the offending was just another depressing example of drunken violence among the town’s Aboriginal people, and that related to the constant availability of alcohol”. He said “for the good of the community a system needed to be devised to further limit the consumption of alcohol, sooner rather than later”.

What do you see as some of the key criminological challenges in the Northern Territory?
I’ll hopefully be admitted as a lawyer in December, and I’m at the court until January, and then I’ll be looking for a job! I have always had two goals from the outset of my studies. The first is to be involved in a role that helps people, whether directly or indirectly. The second is to never sit still; to travel with my work and to never stop learning.

Jessica Holgersson
Jessica grew up on Sydney’s Northern Beaches. She completed a Bachelor of Social Science (Criminology) and a Juris Doctor at UNSW. Jessica moved to Darwin in 2013 and is currently the Associate to the Hon. Justice Graham Hiley RFD of the NT Supreme Court. Jessica also spent time working at the NT Magistrates Court, the Solicitor for the Northern Territory and NT Consumer Affairs.

International Society of Criminology
XVII World Congress in Mexico

This year, the International Society of Criminology held their 17th World Congress in Monterrey, Mexico from 10-14 August.

The theme of the conference was ‘Gangs, Trafficking and Insecurity: Empowering the Community’.

The Australian Institute of Criminology’s Rick Brown and ANZSOC President, Professor Rick Sarre, were snapped enjoying the event.
In July this year, the British Society of Criminology (BSC) held their annual conference in (surprisingly) sunny Liverpool. This is the pre-eminent annual British criminology conference, but I am pleased to report that over 30% of attendees were from Australia and New Zealand, many of whom were ANZSOC members. Given the current economic climate facing many countries, the entirely appropriate and important theme of the conference was ‘Crime, Justice, Welfare: Can the Metropole listen?’.

The BSC conference showcased an array of empirical and inspiring research. Sessions ranged from critiquing the impact of ‘austerity’ measures on accessing justice and human rights, to critical perspectives on criminal justice and ‘othering’. There was a strong mix of plenary sessions, individual/co-authored papers, roundtable discussions, and importantly, many opportunities to meet and network with leading international scholars.

The strong Australian contingency was reflected in the keynotes; the first given by Professor Raewyn Connell (University of Sydney) who provided an insight into how the ‘Northern-centric’ criminological project must reimagine familiar institutions and knowledges within the post-colonial context. Another keynote was given by Professor Chris Cunneen (James Cook University), who similarly emphasised the coloniality of power, the penal colonial complex and defined the return of the colonised within the metropole. The final keynote was a reflection on the intellectual, applied and thought-provoking impact on criminology of three past scholars – including Stanley Cohen, who although would not describe himself as a criminologist, showed how political the discipline could be. This session was brilliantly presented by Professor Jude McCulloch (Monash University), Professor Eamonn Carrabine (University of Essex) and Professor Joe Sim (Liverpool John Moores University).

The conference provided a wonderful opportunity not only to display what a broad discipline criminology is, but also to network and make connections with scholars that you have respected from afar. The wine receptions and conference dinner provided a less formal opportunity to build relationships with colleagues and scholars from all over the world. I was really impressed by the interest and support that was showed to attendees and presenters, as well as the healthy debate and critique of research.

The 2015 BSC conference will take place in Plymouth next year and I hope many of you will join them on their ‘Voyages of Critical Discovery’. With so many well-respected scholars from Australia and New Zealand having presented their work at the conference this year, perhaps the metropole is seeking to listen?

Kate Burns, PhD Candidate, Monash University

Editor’s Note: James Rodgers is the recipient of the 2014 New Zealand Abstract Award for his abstract ‘Fremantle Prison: Experiences of Prison Museum Employees’. His abstract is featured below.

Fremantle Prison (1859 – 1991) stands as a unique and popular tourist destination for those visiting Western Australia. The prison boasts high quality conservation, including cells and prisoner artwork dating to the period when European convicts were incarcerated. Tourists can explore tunnels beneath the prison on foot or in specially constructed canoes. The literature on dark tourism however, does not adequately describe the experiences of those who spend the majority of their time at these sites: the employees. This paper will present the results from nine semi-structured interviews conducted with Fremantle Prison staff (tour guides, managers, heritage conservation and interpretation staff, and curators). The interviews were conducted in June 2013 and analysed using a thematic approach. This presentation will include the experiences of tour guides, the disconnect between management and those who are presenting history to the public, and some of the unique events that occur while working at a site of former incarceration.

James Rodgers is a PhD student at The University of Auckland. His research investigates the role of international prison museums in educating, entertaining, and shaping public attitudes regarding prisons, and the cultural and penal heritage of these sites. Prior to starting his PhD, James completed a MA at AUT University on moral panics being driven by media outlets in New Zealand.
Over the past decade, defences to homicide have been the focus of much academic debate, parliamentary review and the subject of various law reform commission reports. Such activity has primarily evolved from concerns about the operation of gender bias in legal responses to intimate partner homicide. In particular, problems have been identified with the gendered operation of the partial defence of provocation, specifically in cases of men who kill their female intimate partners, while at the same time, self-defence has been seen to largely fail women who kill in order to protect themselves from violence from their male partners. In both contexts there has been a systemic failure to recognise the nature and impact of family violence.

In the Australian state of Victoria, a comprehensive package of reforms was implemented through the Crimes (Homicide) Act 2005 (Vic), which included the abolition of the controversial partial defence of provocation. The Act also codified self-defence to murder by expanding the scope of the defence so that it is more capable of accommodating the experiences of abused women who kill in ‘non-confrontational’ circumstances and recognised excessive self-defence through the creation of a new lesser offence of defensive homicide (equivalent to manslaughter). These reforms were supported by the introduction of a new provision which provides for the admission of evidence highlighting the relationship and social context of family violence to be admitted in cases of homicide where family violence is alleged.

In 2012, Dr Danielle Tyson (Monash Criminology), Dr Debbie Kirkwood (DVRCV) and Ms Mandy McKenzie (DVRCV) received funding from the Victorian Women’s Benevolent Trust to examine the impact of the reforms to homicide laws in Victoria in 2005 on legal responses to men and women who kill an intimate partner. The first phase of the project examined cases of women who killed their intimate partners since the reforms were implemented for the period 2005-2013. Full details of the findings of this first stage of the research can be found in the 2013 co-authored DVRCV Discussion Paper, Justice or Judgement? The impact of Victorian homicide law reforms on responses to women who kill intimate partners, available at: http://www.dvrcv.org.au/sites/thelookout.sites.go1.com.au/files/DVRCV-DiscussionPaper-9-2013_web.pdf.

Our analysis of legal responses to women who have killed their intimate partners in the eight years since the homicide law reforms were implemented in Victoria suggests that the potential for the reforms to improve outcomes for women defendants has not been realised. Furthermore, there is no evidence that self-defence can be successfully raised by female defendants at trial. In particular, there remains:

- Limited recognition of the nature, dynamics and impact of family violence on victims;
- Limited use of the new family violence evidence provisions (s 9AH);
- Limited use of family violence experts; and
- A need for defensive homicide, which is working for women defendants and remains an important safety-net for women whose claims to self-defence are unsuccessful.

Our findings showed there is an urgent need for comprehensive, consistent, and ongoing training for prosecuting and defence counsel, judges, expert witnesses, and other legal professionals, and this training should include cultural awareness training.

With its commitment to bringing about positive change for women defendants, Victoria has led the way for other Australian jurisdictions. If we are to secure legal justice for women who kill their intimate partners, urgent action is required. We must find ways to educate legal professionals about the appropriate use of the family-violence provisions and about how to best use witnesses with expertise in family violence, ensuring their expert evidence is strategically linked to the elements of the offences and defences.

In late 2013, the research team partnered with ANZSOC member, Associate Professor Bronwyn Naylor (Faculty of Law, Monash University), to undertake the second stage of the research: Legal Responses to Domestic Homicide. The project will evaluate the effectiveness of the homicide law reforms implemented in Victoria in 2005, particularly in relation to whether they have led to improved responses to homicides in the context of family violence. It will have a particular focus on cases of men who kill their intimate partners. The objectives are to:

- Identify and evaluate the ways in which family violence has been recognised and responded to in domestic homicides in Victoria since 2005;
- Increase the capacity of laws to respond appropriately to domestic homicides, by developing a set of evidence-based recommendations for law reform and legal practice; and
- Improve the practice of legal professionals involved in family violence homicide cases through community education sessions for legal professionals and targeted dissemination of research findings.

This project has been funded by the Legal Services Board Victoria, and will be completed mid-2015. The project will be guided by an Advisory Group of key stakeholders (cont’d p.13).
Since we commenced this research, the Government has introduced a bill into Victorian Parliament to abolish defensive homicide ostensibly to prevent unmeritorious use by men: Crimes Amendment (Abolition of Defensive Homicide) Bill 2014 (Vic).

Among the other proposed changes is a new simplified statutory test for self-defence that will apply to fatal and non-fatal offences alike, which provides that a person is not guilty of an offence if the person carries out the conduct constituting the offence in self-defence, if the person believes that the conduct is necessary in self-defence, and the person's conduct is a reasonable response in the circumstances as the person perceives them.

It is tempting to believe that ‘tweaking’ self-defence will create a situation in which women who kill in response to violence and abuse in relationships will be acquitted on the basis of self-defence. But our research has found that the problem is not about a failed law but one of implementation. Legislative change needs to be accompanied by changes in legal culture(s) and for this, there needs to be immediate and ongoing legal and community education.

Editor’s Note: You can read the research team’s concerns about the repeal of defensive homicide in their 2013 joint submission to the Department of Justice. Their submission received an endorsement from 15 other agencies from the legal, women’s and community legal sectors.


The Research Team: Dr Debbie Kirkwood, Ms Mandy McKenzie, Dr Danielle Tyson and Associate Professor Bronwyn Naylor

Celebrating 50 Years of ANZSOC

On October 24, 2017, ANZSOC will celebrate its 50th anniversary. A sub-committee has been formed for the purpose of exploring ideas for appropriate commemorative activities. Antje Deckert, Kathy Daly, Russell Smith, Philip Stenning, Tara McGee and myself have had our first meeting. Here are some ideas that we are exploring:

1. An edited volume on specific aspects of Australian and New Zealand criminological developments over the past 50 years.
2. Panels of young scholars discussing the future 50 years of trans-Tasman criminology.
3. PacifiCrim features on the careers of early prize-winners.
4. A dinner in October 2017, perhaps in the same room where it all began at the University of Melbourne.
5. An oral history project.
6. A call for papers critiquing selected articles from the early days of the ANZJOC.
7. A special conference.
8. A citation analysis of Australian criminology.

Members of the Society will be kept apprised of developments as they unfold. Anyone with other ideas is encouraged to email me and I will put them to the committee.

Professor Rick Sarre, President ANZSOC
rick.sare@unisa.edu.au
Leanne Weber’s Future Fellowship Success

Editor’s Note: In July 2014, the ARC announced the outcome of the Future Fellowship grants. ANZSOC member and Monash University criminologist, Dr Leanne Weber, received one of only two Future Fellowships awarded in Criminology. Leanne’s project, “Globalisation and the Policing of Internal Borders”, builds on a history of exceptional research impact and success. We spoke with Leanne about both her success in winning this award and throughout her stellar academic career.

After some years as an in-house researcher within criminal justice agencies in South Australia, Leanne spent 10 years living in England where she completed an MA in the Theory and Practice of Human Rights at the University of Essex, and went on to complete an M.Phil and PhD with the Institute of Criminology at Cambridge University.

Leanne has always had a keen interest in border control, and how this links in with human rights and criminological concerns. Her first empirical study in this field examined the decisions made by front line immigration officers to detain asylum seekers arriving at UK ports. This work culminated in an agenda-setting article, ‘The detention of asylum seekers: 20 reasons why criminologists should care’, appearing in vol 14, no 9 of Current Issues in Criminal Justice (2002).

Leanne returned to Australia in 2002 and took up her first academic teaching post at the University of Western Sydney. Four years later she moved to UNSW and co-edited the first major contribution to building a criminology of the border with renowned ANZSOC member and border expert, Professor Sharon Pickering (Monash University), entitled Borders, Mobility and Technologies of Control (2006: Springer). In 2007, Leanne received her first ARC Discovery grant as sole CI for a study on migration policing. This culminated in the publication of Policing Non-Citizens (2013: Routledge).

Other ARC grants shortly followed, including Fluid Security in the Asia Pacific with fellow ANZSOC members and (current) Monash University colleagues Professor Sharon Pickering and Dr Marie Segrave, and Dr Claudia Tazreiter (UNSW); Exporting Risk: The Australian Deportation Project with Professor Sharon Pickering, Dr Marie Segrave and Dr Mike Grewcock (UNSW); and Exploring the Experience of Security in the Vietnamese Australian Community: Practical Implications for Policing with a team from Swinburne University. Leanne was the successful recipient of a Larkins Research Fellowship with Monash University in 2011, where she joined the Monash criminology team and co-founded the Border Crossing Observatory (www.borderobservatory.com.au).

Since commencing at Monash, Leanne has had a number of major writing collaborations. This includes the co-authored (with Professor Sharon Pickering) book, Globalization and Borders: Death at the Global Frontier (2011, Palgrave), which won the inaugural ANZSOC Christine Alder Book Prize last year. In 2013, Leanne co-edited Stop and Search: Police Power in Global Context (2013, Routledge) with Professor Ben Bowling (King’s College, London); and this year, Leanne co-authored Crime Justice and Human Rights (2014, Palgrave) with fellow ANZSOC members, Elaine Fishwick (USyd) and Dr Marinella Marmo (Flinders).

With considerable support from Monash University and Border Observatory colleagues, Leanne was successfully awarded a Future Fellowship in 2014. The project builds on her first ARC Discovery project on migration policing, and extends the concept of the internal border beyond the enforcement of immigration law to include related policies and practices that divide populations into hierarchies of citizenship and belonging. Leanne explains her objective with the project as being “to move beyond critique of border control practices to make a positive contribution towards promoting social inclusion in an age of globalisation”.

Congratulations Leanne! We wish you all the best with the project and look forward to hearing more details of your successes as they arise.

Editor’s note: A summary of Leanne’s project

Globalisation and the policing of internal borders

In Australia, as elsewhere in the developed world, internal border policing is intensifying and diversifying as globalisation increases anxieties about inclusion and belonging. This research program will explore the construction of internal borders that are sometimes aimed at physically excluding unwanted populations from Australia, and at other times are designed to keep subordinate groups in their place. It will critically analyse three types of internal borders operating within Australia: structurally embedded borders that enforce the boundary between legal and illegal immigration status; socially constructed borders produced by the policing of public places that reinforce notions of entitlement and belonging; and borders created by new forms of welfare policing which differentiate responsible from irresponsible citizens. Through a series of situated case studies, the project will explore the role played by ‘race’, place and inequalities in citizenship in maintaining these boundaries and identify strategies for enhanced inclusiveness in the face of rapid global change. The academic contribution of the research will be to enhance the theorisation of the border and to integrate literatures on border control, post-colonialism, globalisation, social inclusion and citizenship.

Dr Leanne Weber
Congratulations on winning the Student Paper Prize! How does it feel to be the recipient of this award?

I was honoured to be nominated by my lecturer and mentor Dr David Plater, and I am delighted to be recognised for my commitment and contribution to such a vitally important area of law. I also feel privileged to be beginning my career in a profession where I can be continually challenged and work with innovative and passionate colleagues.

Your paper was taken from your honours thesis. Can you tell us a little bit more about your honours project and what practical implications you think it may have?

My honours thesis analysed sentencing outcomes of child exploitation material (CEM) offenders in South Australian courts. This examined 90 South Australian District Court and South Australian Court of Criminal Appeal sentencing remarks of all convicted child exploitation material offenders from the period of 13 January 2011 to 2 September 2013. Additionally, I also undertook interviews with ten District Court judges, Detectives from the South Australian Police, Psychologists at Owenia House and the Chief Psychologist of the United States Marshals Service to obtain opinions on the issues I highlighted in the thesis. My thesis is currently undergoing editing with the view of publication.

One particular area of concern arising from my research was the impact of CEM offending on victims. CEM offending often comprises material involving the permanent recording of a child being sexually, physically and/or psychologically abused. However, the seriousness of this offending is often not translated through sentencing remarks, as CEM offending often involves untraceable children who cannot be brought before the court to describe the impact of their degradation and exploitation. Additionally, many within the community would associate CEM offending with the modern sexualisation of society, thus drawing unwarranted comparisons to adult pornography.

Consequently, I intend to link together the research I did on victim advocacy for the Student Paper Prize with my research into CEM victims. I believe there is important research to be done on providing a better representation of CEM victims in the legal system.

Can you tell us a little bit about yourself and your study to date?

I graduated from my law degree earlier this year from the University of South Australia and I am currently completing my Graduate Diploma in Legal Practice at the Australian National University. This involves several placements in private practice, the Department of Public Prosecutions and the Crown Solicitors Office in their Civil Litigation department.

What are your key interests in criminology and how did these transpire?

I am really interested in looking at sentencing trends and outcomes and seeing how law reform and policy can impact on sentencing. I also find looking at the relationships between the judicial system, the police force and psychological treatment of offenders very interesting, especially with a view to strengthening the communication between these institutions.

Who have been some of the academics or researchers who have inspired you? In what ways?

My honours supervisor Dr David Plater has been an incredible mentor throughout my law degree and has guided me toward a passion for criminal law. Additionally, I hope to be working closer with Dr Jeremy Prichard and Professor Kate Warner in the near future. This is a very exciting prospect for me due to their highly regarded position in the legal community.

What does the future hold for you?

I am considering commencing my PhD in the area of CEM offending in 2015, but I am also contemplating going into practice for a few years before commencing full-time academic study. It is a difficult decision to make at the age of 21 so I am trying to consider all options possible to ensure I have a diverse and challenging career.
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Becoming a Member of ANZSOC

Types of Memberships

Benefits of Membership

⇒ Reduced conference fees
⇒ Free online / paper copies of the Journal and Newsletter
⇒ 25% discount on SAGE publications
⇒ Access to members' website
⇒ Eligibility for ANZSOC Awards
⇒ Networking opportunities

How to Apply

Application for membership can be completed online at www.anzsoc.org. If you have any queries regarding membership, please contact Melissa Christie, ANZSOC Secretary:

Mail: Secretary ANZSOC, Australian Institute of Criminology, GPO Box 2944, Canberra, ACT 2601, Australia
Email: secretary@anzsoc.org