Title   Essays and studies in youth justice, crime and social control

Name   Richard Hill

ESSAYS AND STUDIES IN YOUTH

JUSTICE, CRIME AND SOCIAL CONTROL

RICHARD HIL

DOCTOR OF PHILOSPHY

2002

The thesis contains a report on the published work of Richard Hil covering the nature,

thematic content, significance and origins of this work in relation to selected areas of inquiry.

The document also contains, as appendices, a full bibliography of selected work published by

Richard Hil, a significantly abbreviated curriculum vitae, and a chronology of select research

and allied publications.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

The following report examines the contribution my publications have made over the course of a twenty-year career in government departments (in Britain) and academic institutions (in Australia) to advancing scholarly inquiry in the areas of Youth Justice, Young People and Social Welfare, and Criminology. In the section dealing with Youth Justice publications I have given particular attention to a dominant and coherent area of study under the heading Families, Crime and Juvenile Justice. The common thematic content of my publications focuses on the ways in which certain individuals and social groups perceive and experience systems of social control. Additionally, the report highlights a range of allied publications that have dealt with the consequences of largely state-sponsored policies and practices in relation to a range of 'subject populations'. It is argued that my contribution to advancing knowledge in the above areas has been achieved in two primary ways: (a) through a range of original publications based on theoretical and empirical studies, and substantial polemical and critical work; (b) through significant engagement in scholarly debate and discussion (including citation of my work in the publications of other academics) and facilitation of reflexive discussion among social welfare practitioners and policy makers. Finally, the report attempts to contextualise my publications through a detailed discussion of the personal and intellectual origins of my work over the past two decades. The latter involves a general review of the sociological, criminological and social welfare literature relating to a prevailing concern with what I have broadly termed the 'phenomenology of social control'.

INTRODUCTION

This report discusses the nature, thematic content, significance and origins of my scholarly publications over the past twenty years (1981 - 2001). Written while employed as a Research Officer in two British government departments (the Hampshire Probation and After-Care Service from 1979 to 1984 and the London Borough of Lambeth, Department of Social Services from 1985 to 1988), and as an academic at three Australian universities (1991-), the publications reflect my contribution to research and scholarship in three broad areas of inquiry: Youth Justice, Young People and Social Welfare, and Criminology. I produced the majority of my published works while employed in Australia as a Lecturer at James Cook University of North Queensland, Department of Social Work and Community Welfare (1991-6), University of the Sunshine Coast, Faculty of Arts (1996-7) and Queensland University of Technology, School of Justice Studies (1997 - 2002).

I intend to demonstrate that my publications have contributed significantly to advancing knowledge in the stated areas of inquiry. This is evidenced by the following: (a) numerous citations of my work in other scholarly publications; (b) contributions to polemical exchanges involving senior academics on a range of contemporary social policy and practice issues (c) facilitation of reflexive discussion among social welfare practitioners through the mediums of conferences, seminars, workshops and other educational and training forums. My work has been published in various forms, ranging from jointly authored and edited books, monographs, book reviews and journal articles. This reflects both the nature and scope of my publications as well as an ability to write fluently for a diverse readership.

Thematically, my publications tend to focus on the experiences of 'subjects' in systems of social control[1] (mainly criminal justice and welfare), and on the impact of various government policies and practices on subject populations. A significant number of my publications have thus been concerned with the way in which those individuals and

social groups caught up in systems of social control describe and interpret their own experiences. As noted in Chapter 3, I trace this area of scholarly interest (in what I have cautiously termed the 'phenomenology of social control') to a number of overarching personal experiences and intellectual concerns. My general commitment to conveying the voices of those caught up in systems of social control reflects a widely held view in the social sciences that the voices of 'experts' and 'professional opinion' should not be privileged over the narratives of subjects (see Cohen 1985; Masson 1988; Sibley 1995). As I argue below, the voices of subjects tend to reveal far more about the implementational realities of policy and practice than any number of official and/or 'expert' accounts. I illustrate this argument through a detailed discussion of a research project which I conducted over a number of years. This project (discussed below under the Youth Justice section) deals with the recent emergence and application of parental penalty in a number of western countries. I have argued (in a range of publications) that the realities of such penalty and the growth of responsibilized and individualistic discursive practices are experienced in particular (largely negative and counterproductive) ways by those subjected to such measures.

Generally, my publications are informed by a view that the experiential accounts of those caught up in systems of social control enable us to describe, assess and interpret the claims and justifications made by those who have power and authority over subject-others. In drawing on such accounts it is possible to compare and contrast the views of those who have a vested interest in ensuring the 'success' of particular regulatory projects with the experiential accounts of those who pass through them. In addition, I have also sought through my publications to: (a) engage in critical analysis of the official as well as unofficial claims, justifications and rationalisations made by policy makers, managers, practitioners and others, and (b) identify the emergent contexts of such discourses. Although covering a wide range of issues, concerns, topics and interests my published work is united around a number of closely interrelated themes that reflect my longstanding interest in how individuals and social groups view systems of social

control and how those in positions of power and authority explain, justify and ultimately legitimise various institutional goals and practices.

In outlining the origins, nature and breadth of my publications, as well as the contribution they have made to advancing particular areas of study, the following discussion is organised around four main objectives:

1. To illustrate the dominant and unifying themes underpinning my record of publications over the past twenty years (with a particular emphasis on a specific area of study: Families Crime and Juvenile Justice).

2. To outline the research designs and methodologies employed in my empirical work.

3. To demonstrate the contribution of my publications to furthering knowledge and debate in particular areas of inquiry.

4. To discuss the personal and intellectual origins of my work.

These objectives will be reflected in the general structure of the report. For purposes of convenience, I have divided the report into four main chapters. Chapter 1 addresses the thematic content of my publications. Particular attention is paid to a specific area of research focused on family-centred crime control policies. In Chapter 2 I focus on the contribution my publications have made to advancing particular areas of inquiry. Chapter 3 contextualises my publications through a discussion of the personal and intellectual origins of my work. I have sought to relate my personal background to the development of certain scholarly themes and interests over the past twenty years. Finally, Chapter 4 provides a summary of and conclusion to the report.

CHAPTER 1

SELECTIONS, THEMATIC CONTENT AND RESEARCH ORIENTATION

Introduction

This chapter will discuss the thematic content of the publications selected for inclusion in this report. Particular attention is paid to the epistemological contexts within which the publications were produced and to the various research designs and methodologies employed in my empirical studies. I discuss the latter in order to demonstrate the general approach I have used to record and analyse the experiences of subjects in systems of social control.

Although my publications reflect a strong emphasis on Youth Justice, there is considerable overlap with other areas of inquiry, due in part to a number of inherent thematic connections. My research interests (and subsequent publications) have been shaped to a large extent by my chosen career paths. For instance, as the publications list indicates (see Appendix 1), much of my work has been undertaken in the 'applied' areas of social work and probation practice. This reflects both my academic interests and a longstanding theoretical and professional association with social welfare practice. Accordingly, the sections below will map out the broad range of interests and concerns contained in my publications and the epistemological (and professional) contexts within which they were produced (see Appendix 3 for a chronology of select research interests and publications).

Youth Justice

The main part of my discussion in this section is devoted to a research project which I have called 'Families, Crime and Juvenile Justice' (see highlighted publications in Appendix 1). This is a discrete area of scholarly inquiry (conducted over a period of 7 years), which I believe has contributed significantly to advancing knowledge in an important field of contemporary penal policy; namely, the penalization of parents for

the offending of their children. In the latter part of this section I discuss a range of other publications that focus on youth justice issues.

Part 1: Families, Crime and Juvenile Justice

Since 1994 my research on families, crime and juvenile justice has involved a substantial amount of theoretical and empirical analysis resulting in a range of publications, identified below. The idea for such a project was entirely mine and throughout I have taken the lead role in developing theoretical and research ideas as well as actively encouraging my research colleagues to engage in the process of joint authorship. My published work in this area makes an original and important contribution to a wider body of literature which critiques simple assumptive linkages between 'poor' or 'neglectful' parenting and juvenile crime (see Cunneen and White 1996, Campbell 1994, Field 1990, Goldson 1999, Goldson 20000, Holman 1995, Hope 1994, Muncie 1999, Pitts, forthcoming, Pitts and Hope 1998, Sampson, Raudenbush and Earls 1997, Young 1999). Taken together, this body of scholarly work constitutes a powerful critique of the myths and misconceptions evident in many areas of contemporary criminal justice policy. Further, it points to factors beyond the family (such as poverty, disadvantage, marginalisation, lack of leisure and recreation faculties, and inadequate welfare and support services) that have contributed significantly to the hardship experienced by growing numbers of households in western countries. The literature also points to the fact that many disadvantaged families also find themselves increasingly subject to intensive forms of state regulation and control.

A further and vitally important argument contained in this literature relates to the ascendancy of the risk paradigm in key areas of criminal justice policy (see Pitts 2000, Pitts, forthcoming). In youth justice, the notion of 'risk' has been pivotal to the identification of a range of factors that supposedly predispose certain individuals to criminal behaviour. Central to such risk identification (and the process of prediction) are factors relating, closely to specific types of 'family functioning', especially those involving emotional and disciplinary relations between children, young people and their

parents. This sort of intra-familial perspective holds sway among a number of highly influential criminologists (see, for example, Farrington 1994) whose epistemological influences can be traced to the developmental work of academic psychologists such as John Bowlby and Donald Winnicott (Hil and McMahon 2001, Chapter 3). Essentially, this work is predicated upon the assumption that crime and delinquency originate from problematic (or 'dysfunctional') relationships between children and their parents, usually manifested in 'emotional problems' (lack of love or warmth from one or both parents) and/or disciplinary problems (not enough consistent application of parental regulation and control). The latter view is typically represented in the more recent developmental literature (Farrington 1994, Homel 1999) by reference to the absence of (or 'deficits' in) appropriate 'parenting skills'.

In seeking to counter many of the more simplistic assumptions in the developmental literature, especially those assumptions relating to deficit models of intra-family relationships and child rearing practices, it has been observed that the frequency and prevalence of such 'risk factors' tends to vary from one locality and neighborhood to another, and what appears to be more consistent in terms of explaining the emergence of offending behaviours are material disadvantage, lack of appropriate welfare and other local support services and differential policing practices (Pitts and Hope 1998). My own work has, through its critique of the developmental literature and an empirical study of the parents of criminalized children, contributed to a serious questioning of many of the assumptions associated with risk-based discourses. Additionally, my work also demonstrates that the epistemological foundations of parental penalty are at best flawed and may in fact produce all manner of unintended consequences. I have also argued that parental penalty reflects a return to moralistic and a highly individualistic explanations of offending that befit a new era of 'responsibilized' penal policy (Garland 2000).

Policy context and theory

My interest in the above area was generated by the growing tendency in western countries to penalise parents for the offending of their children. I became increasingly concerned by some of the more simplistic assumptions linked with 'parent blaming' discourses, particularly as they related to issues of crime and delinquency. Since the mid-1980s politicians, social commentators and policy makers increasingly viewed the 'causes of crime', as linked directly to 'poor parenting' skills and/or to 'neglectful parenting'. This in turn was linked to concerns over the supposedly ailing state of the 'traditional family' and the apparent decline of 'traditional family values' brought about, it was said, by post-war affluence, secularism, feminism, permissive values and so forth (Abbott and Wallace 1989).

Such views gained ascendancy in a political context in which the values of economic liberalism and the primacy of the market were regarded by the radical right as antithetical to the workings of the welfare state (see Glennester and Midgely 1991). Thus, my publications (see below) sought to argue that the emergence of parent-blaming discourses in the area of juvenile crime control should be seen as reflective of certain individualistic discourses and (especially) of a return to neo-classical interpretations of criminal action. I have further argued that the discursive notion of 'individual responsibility' has served to legitimate a wide range of 'devolutionary' policies and practices in a number of western countries. Families have had to take on more of the burdens of care and supervision of their children and greater direct responsibility when things go wrong. Governments have thus sought to locate the causes of crime and delinquency, truancy, and child abuse and neglect in the context of the 'dysfunctional' or 'failing' family. The origins of crime and delinquency were explained largely in terms of their essential moral character insofar as offenders and their families had supposedly 'failed' to exercise adequate 'responsibility' (Gottfriedson and Hirschi 1990).

The general aim of my study of families, crime and juvenile justice was to question many of the prevalent assumptions in governmental discourses on juvenile crime control, particularly in relation to parental penalty. I also sought to highlight some of the negative consequences associated with parental restitution measures in a number of western English-speaking countries (mainly Britain, North America and Australia). Such assumptions involved the essentialist proposition that the causes of juvenile offending could be attributed directly to the 'dysfunctional' structures, dynamics and interactions of certain families. I have argued that this sort of thinking derives from three interrelated sources: (a) the scholarly works of academic developmental psychologists; (b) from politically conservative and moralistic views about the 'failing' of 'dysfunctional' families, and (c) from a range of highly individualistic discourses on crime causation.

My research work in this area has included the publication of several refereed articles, two monographs and a book. The jointly authored text, *Families, Crime and Juvenile Justice* (Hil and McMahon 2001), is one of the few books in the field to employ qualitative methodologies and to report in detail on the actual experiences of the parents of juvenile offenders. It is also the first detailed work in Australia to focus in any theoretical or empirical depth on the issue of parental penalty and its consequences.

Research questions

Three dominant research questions emerged from the above: first, how can the emergence of parent blaming discourses and government statutes be explained? Second, how do the parents of juvenile offenders describe and interpret their own experiences of parental care and supervision, particularly in relation to the prevention of further offending among their children? Additionally, how do those parents subject directly to parental penalty reflect on their experiences? Although broad, these questions formed the foundations for a theoretical discussion of the emergent context of parent-blaming measures, as well as an empirical study of the parents of offending juveniles. An

appropriate research design and methodological techniques was formulated in order to address these questions.

Research design and methodology

The research design for this project involved two broad approaches: first, (beginning in 1993) the use of secondary sources to facilitate a theoretical discussion on the emergent context of parent-blaming discourses and practices; and, second, (from 1996-7) in-depth interviews with a small sample of parents of criminalized children. The former approach involved a critical reading of scholarly sources on families and crime and a review of other sources, including government legislation and reports, policy statements, and newspaper and magazine articles. The second approach was based on in-depth, semi-structured interviews with a sample of 20 families of criminalized children. Most of the parents interviewed for the study were single mothers. Seven families were indigenous and one family had recently migrated from the Philippines.

Publications

In an article published in the *Journal of Australian Studies* (Hil 1998b) I examined the emergence of the discursive notion of 'responsibility' in western systems of juvenile crime control (see also Hil 1999). I sought to highlight the socio-political contexts within which individualistic interpretations of 'responsibility' had arisen and the way in which this had been applied to specific areas of penal policy. Particular attention was drawn to a range of family oriented, crime control measures such as crime prevention programs, family group conferencing, community panels and curfews. I concluded that over recent decades the family had become a central feature of juvenile crime control policy in most western countries, and that this reflected a range of devolutionary practices that conferred increased responsibility for crime management on individuals and families. Parents had become absorbed directly into the crime control project under the pretext of 'conflict resolution' and increased 'family responsibility'. But more than this, parents were now being held directly responsible for the offending of their children, making them liable for criminal prosecution when this occurred. In its analysis

of the role of the family in juvenile crime control the above article laid the theoretical foundations for my empirical work on families that was reported in a number of subsequent publications.

My interest in family oriented crime control led to an analysis of academic studies dealing with the supposed relationship between families and crime – indeed, many contemporary crime control measures have been based directly on many of the conclusions drawn from such work. In what effectively became the literature review for the research project I co-authored an article that sough to critique the scholarly work on families and crime (Hil and McMahon 1995). Although this publication was written jointly, the idea for the article and the arguments contained in it were largely mine. In fact, I wrote the early drafts of the article and Dr McMahon provided useful comments, hence my decision to include him as joint author. At the time we were also working together on a grant application and I felt it appropriate that Dr McMahon and I be regarded as joint researchers on this project. The article questioned the reliance in academic literature upon a range of unwarranted assumptions about family life and their connection to crime and delinquency. Indeed, the academic literature was replete with epistemological errors.

Specifically, I drew attention to the following problems associated with much English, Australian and American family-focused research: 1. The absence or 'silencing' of the voices of family members themselves, thereby giving rise to misleading and value-laden interpretations of family life, including the somewhat cavalier use of terms such as 'argumentative', 'aggressive', 'conflictual' etc. (p. 5-6); 2. An over-reliance on positivistic methodologies that privileged the accounts of researchers over research subjects (p.7); 3. Lack of attention to the differential nature of policing in 'disadvantaged comminutes', especially in relation to working class and indigenous comminutes in Australia (p.6); 4. A distinct lack of theoretical attention to 'external' factors such as socio-economic disadvantage, marginalisation, exclusion, etc. (pp.6-7). We concluded that:

... much of the research in this area offers a highly fragmented and partial account of the experiences and perceptions of young offenders and their families. The denial of a voice to the subjects of research reinforces the reductionist position that the interpretations of lived experiences must come, first and foremost, from accredited 'experts' rather than from the subjects of analysis... Our contention is that those children and families who have been labeled as dysfunctional, deviant or simply criminal must be allowed to speak about their own experiences in and out of the criminal justice system (p.8).

My interest in the way in which scholarly literature had reported on families and crime dovetailed neatly with a growing awareness of parental penalty in western systems of juvenile crime control. I was especially interested in how academic discourse informed the development of policies in this area. Having received a Merit Research Grant form James Cook University, Dr McMahon and I embarked on the early stages of a research project based on interviews with the parents of offenders in North Queensland. (Eventually, the research findings were reported in book form – see below for discussion of *Families, Crime and Juvenile Justice*).

In two co-authored publications I summarised the initial findings of the research. In a monograph published by the Youth Research Centre at the University of Melbourne I, along with two other researchers (Hil, McMahon and Buckley 1996), reported on the findings from interviews conducted with three families. In a later publication (Hil 1998a) I reported on findings from interviews with 4 families. Both publications came to the same conclusion, namely, that the scholarly literature on families and crime was problematic and that the views and opinions of the parents of juvenile offenders revealed a somewhat different picture to the simple one of 'parental neglect' being articulated by politicians and others. In the latter publication I concluded that:

In examining the responses of parents to their children's offending it is apparent that popular and legislative assumptions of parental 'neglect' and indifference are simplistic and misleading. Parents in the study were actively involved in attempts to curtail their son or daughters' offending. While their attempts may have bordered on the socially unacceptable and were invariably less than successful, they nonetheless point to the active role played by parents (p.8).

The foundations for my research on parent-blaming discourse had been laid through a critical review of parental restitution legislation in Australia. In a monograph published by the Social and Welfare Research Centre at James Cook University, *Making Them Pay* (Hil 1996a), I examined the emergent context of parental restitution legislation in a number of States and Territories, and the critical responses of welfare and legal organisations and academics to the introduction of this legislation. The specific legislation under critical review included the *Juvenile Justice Act,* Queensland, 1992; *Children's (Parental Responsibility Act*, New South Wales, 1994; *Statute Law Revision Penalties Act*, Tasmania, 1994; *Young Offenders Act,* Western Australia 1994; and the *Juvenile Justice Act*, Northern Territory 1994. I concluded that parental penalty would do little to prevent further offending among young people. Indeed, it was likely that such measures would add to family discord, and could in fact lead to more homelessness, delinquency and increased financial hardship.

Families, Crime and Juvenile Justice (Hil and McMahon 2001) summarised and extended much of the research and theoretical work undertaken in the above publications (see also Hil 1996b, 1996c, 1996d, 1996e, 1994a, 1994b). The idea for the book was mine and I wrote the proposal that was sent to and eventually accepted by the publishers (Peter Lang in New York). I conceptualised the book both as a synthesis and extension of previous theoretical and empirical work, and as a direct contribution to advancing knowledge about the realities of parenting in respect of criminalised children. The book was also constituted as a critique of parental penalty, particularly as it had been applied in Australia. My intention was that policy makers and those who worked

directly with the families of juvenile offenders should be able to draw on the findings contained in the book. As noted below, since publication of the book I have sought to disseminate its findings to policy makers and practitioners at the Queensland Department of Families, Youth and Community Care – the agency most directly associated with the study.

Although the book was the result of a collaborative effort, I wrote chapters 1, 2, 3, 9, 10 and the conclusion. I co-authored the other chapters. The book reported on a detailed qualitative study of the parents of juvenile offenders in North Queensland, Australia. The study included some parents who had been fined by the Queensland Magistrates' Court for apparent criminal negligence in respect of their children's offending. Drawing on a qualitative approach, which involved face-to-face interviews with parents (as well as with a number of the young offenders themselves), the North Queensland study was designed so that parents and their children could speak as openly as possible about their experiences of crime and criminalisation. In-depth interviews were conducted with the 20 parents of juvenile offenders who had been sentenced for a variety of offences in the Queensland Children's Court. Our emphasis on reporting the experiences, views and opinions of 'respondents' was derived from previous studies undertaken by Dr McMahon and myself. Dr McMahon (1998a) had undertaken a qualitative study of welfare work in the United States, while I had completed a number of studies relating to the experiences of young people in various 'correctional' programs. These included a chapter on young people and institutional regulation in Australia (Hil and Simpson 1995); a study of 'wilderness schemes' (Hil, Craig and Keast 1995); a study of young offenders and their parents' experiences of the Townsville Youth Assistance Panel (Hil 1993; Hil 1995); an analysis of young offenders in a probation day centre (Hil 1980, 1982a, 1988); and a study of Afro-Caribbean young offenders attending Leeds Magistrates Court (Hil 1982b). The knowledge and insights gained from these studies enabled both Dr McMahon and I to develop a sound qualitative approach and to work with considerable mutual understanding about the essential objectives of our North Queensland study.

The results of the study demonstrated that, far from being simply uncaring, indifferent or 'negligent', parents of offenders had in fact attempted a wide range of measures to prevent their children from offending. We also found that the effects on the family of a son or daughter's offending was never less than traumatic for the family as a whole and that relations therein were never quite the same again. Equally traumatic (and often unproductive) were the interventions of numerous officials ranging from police officers, social workers to youth and community workers and others. We found that such interventions had generally not assisted parents in coping more effectively with their children. Indeed, on some occasions the interventions of officials made matters worse by often inadvertently increasing rather than decreasing family discord. We thus highlighted the poor interpersonal and communication skills displayed by welfare workers in dealing with these families – a point emphasised in a number of earlier client studies (see for example, Rees and Wallace 1982). Thus, while we did not dismiss the fact that parenting skills and negligence may have some bearing on offending, they were insufficient as explanations in themselves. A more complex and historically grounded account was therefore required in order to acknowledge the social and economic contexts of each family, intra-family relationships, differential policing practices, social reaction and various state sponsored regulatory practices.

The simple, although profoundly important, message threaded through the book, was that juvenile offending could not be attributed solely or primarily to 'poor' or 'neglectful' parenting. Additionally, we argued that the notion of the 'dysfunctional' family was highly problematic and that the link between 'the family' and crime was often based on moralistic and stereotypical descriptions of working class life. Further, we maintained that the proposition that 'parental neglect' caused or led directly to juvenile offending could not be easily demonstrated among the sample of parents we interviewed for the study. Rather, parents attempted to regulate and control the behaviors of their children through a range of cognitive and behavioral strategies, some of which could well be described as abusive. As noted, parents were rarely indifferent to

the offending of their children and nor did they necessarily lack parenting skills or love and affection for their children, as is often assumed in the developmental literature and government policy statements.

Contribution to advancing knowledge in the stated area

As noted in Chapter 2, the contribution that my publications have made to advancing an area of inquiry is gauged by its originality and the extent to which it adds to an existing area of study. I have also noted that I use the term 'advancing' in a wider sense to include the dissemination of my findings to academics, policy makers and practitioners.

As indicated above, my publications are original in that they are the first to address the question of parental penalty in Australia and among the first also to employ qualitative methodologies to gauge the actual experiences of those caught up in the workings of the criminal justice system. The results of my work compliment an existing body of scholarly literature that critiques simple linkages drawn between 'poor' or 'neglectful' parenting and juvenile crime. It also adds to a body of organizational publications that point to the possible consequences of parental restitution legislation (see Chapter 3, Hil and McMahon 2001).

My contribution to policy development is gauged through the many occasions on which I have discussed my research findings in government and non-government forums, including regional conferences and meetings held with the Queensland Department of Family Services, Juvenile Justice Reference Group and at the Queensland State Government Task Force on Youth Crime Prevention (see Appendix 2). I have also relayed my finding during a specially convened meeting with regional managers of the Queensland Department of Family Services. The same Department has recently approved funding for a training program in which I will focus on the findings of the book, especially in terms of its practice implications for frontline workers who work with the parents of offending children.

B. Other Youth Justice publications

The other publications included in this section cover a wide and varied range of youth justice issues. I have been particularly interested in the way in which youth crime has been reported by the media, especially in the Australian context. In an introduction to an edited book entitled *Youth, Crime and the Media* (Hil and Bessant 1997a), Dr Judith Bessant and I discussed the processes by which media reporting served to construct certain sections of the youth population as a threat to social order. Drawing on the works of Cohen (1980) and others, we gathered together essays by a number of leading Australian academics in effort to highlight the specific ways in which youth crime has been reported by the Australian electronic and print media over the past few years. *Youth Crime and the Media* is the first book of its sort in Australia and has been widely used in tertiary educational institutions. (Sections of the book were used as the basis for a submission to a Queensland State Government Inquiry into institutional abuses of children in that state: see Hil and Bessant 1999c). The initial idea for the book was mine. However, I worked closely with Dr Bessant on conceptualisation of the book (as a key edited text on the media treatment of youth crime) and we divided the job of editorship equally between us.

In Chapter 7 of the book I discussed the case of a localised 'moral panic' over youth crime in a North Queensland town which gave rise to a racialised public discourse on the supposed origins of crime in the area (Hil 1997b. See also Hil and Fisher 1994). I drew attention to local news reports which linked the actions of one Indigenous family to a generalised 'black crime problem'. I argued that the racialised contents of such reports needed to be located in the historical context of discourses that continually problematised Indigenous people in Australia – a theme to which I later returned in my study of vigilantism in North Queensland.

In a further discussion of issues that impacted directly on constructions of young people as a 'social problem', Dr. Judith Bessant and I (Hil and Bessant 1997b) addressed the connection often made in public discourse between juvenile crime and unemployment. We were especially concerned by continued references in the

criminological literature to deterministic accounts that correlated youth crime directly with unemployment. In reviewing the evidence on such matters we argued that simple deterministic correlations between crime and unemployment were likely to feed directly into those regulatory discourses that perceived certain sections of the youth population as a 'problem' requiring urgent state intervention. In a later essay on young people and public space, we (Hil and Bessant 1999a) again took issue with what we considered to be a deterministic tendency of neo-Marxists to equate certain social phenomena with economic forces. While not wishing to deny the structural conditions that framed the experiences of many young people in Australia and elsewhere, we nonetheless remained concerned by a number of simplistic and deterministic propositions that appeared to support (albeit unwittingly) many regulatory and other disciplinary agendas in late modernity

In other essays, I have focused on specific policies and practices that have contributed to the regulation and control of young people in Australia. Again, my work in this area has stemmed from my concern with the way in which young people in particular have been repeatedly viewed by the powerful as a threat to social order. Thus, in analytical work undertaken on a range of issues relating to youth crime control, I have sought to make explicit many of the assumptions that underscore current state-driven policies and practices in this area. My publications deal with issues such as the emergent contexts and consultation processes relating to juvenile justice legislation in Queensland (Hil 1993; Hil and Roughley 1997a,b); contemporary party political discourses on 'community' and crime control (Hil, Buckley and McMahon 1995); 'Day in Prison' programs in Queensland (Hil and Moyle 1992; Hil 1992; Hil and Keast 1992); the concept of 'targeting' as related to the implementation of juvenile offender programs in certain parts of Queensland (Hil and Seaton 1993; Hil 1994c); assumptions associated with the idea of 'high crime areas' (Hil, Zuchowski and Bone 1994) and concerns over organised street protests by young people (Hil and Bessant 1999b). (In all the above jointly authored publications I took the primary role in both the conceptualisation of the articles, the development of arguments and ideas and the writing of them).

Many of my essays have dealt with policies and practices adopted by the Queensland Department of Families, Youth and Community Care which have led to some lively exchanges on the future direction of youth crime control in that state (see also Hil and Crane 1997). As such, I consider that my publications have led to some constructive debates on youth justice that have gone some way towards advancing public discussion on such matters.

Finally, my more recent work has turned to an area which I hope to pursue in further studies over the next few years, namely, globalisation and its consequences on the governance of certain populations, with specific reference to young people. Thus, in an article published in the international journal *Crime, Law and Social Change*, I addressed many of the assumptions in current public discourse on 'globalisation' and its supposed link to rising levels of youth crime (Hil, forthcoming). In particular, I have sought to draw attention to the interface between contemporary governmental discourses on youth crime and the wider socio-political and economic transformations associated with globalisation. I discussed this issue in a keynote plenary address to the 2000 Conference of the International Federation of Social Workers and the International Association of Schools of Social Work in Montreal, Canada (see Appendix 3).

As noted in Chapter 2, many of the arguments and ideas contained in these articles have contributed both directly and indirectly to policy deliberations on matters of youth justice in Queensland. They have also been aired in various public settings (conferences, seminars, etc.) and discussed in government departmental forums (see Appendix 2 for details). The value of these publications resides in their commitment to questioning the conventional wisdoms and taken-for-granted assumptions evident in much contemporary youth justice discourse.

Young People and Social Welfare

The publications discussed in this section deal primarily with issues concerning young people and social welfare. I refer broadly to 'social welfare' as the provision of various

services to those in the 'community' requiring help, sustenance and support. Generally, the stated aims of such services are to improve the quality of life for individuals and their families, and to ensure greater access to and participation in the wider community.

In referring to the publications below, I discuss a number of issues and concerns facing particular groups of young people in systems of social control. These include young people with disability, young people in a rural area, and children and young people in state care. These publications demonstrate my concern with the way in which discrete social groups experience the realities of social control, whether in relation to the provision of employment services, social welfare and/or state care. Thus, the publications discussed below reflect the common thematic concerns evidenced throughout this report, namely, how those people in systems of social control describe and interpret their own experiences and how various policies and practices impact upon them.

The publications referred to in this chapter come in various forms: edited books, reports, articles and reviews. As such, they differ in style and content and are addressed to several discrete audiences. For instance, the two reports were commissioned by a local council and welfare agency respectively, and were concerned with a range of local and regional issues, while the articles on state wards were aimed at an 'academic' audience. It should be noted that although the reports discussed below were commissioned for specific organisational purposes, the findings were discussed publicly and were utilised in the formulation and subsequent implementation of various policy recommendations. In most of the publications cited below I generally took a major lead role in the formulation of the publication proposal and in writing the work, or I contributed on an equal basis with my co-researchers and authors.

In a co-edited volume entitled *Achieving Inclusion: Exploring Issues in Disability* (Hil, Caltabiano and Frangos 1997), a number of prominent Australian researchers contributed to an interdisciplinary perspective on research, policy and practice issues

relating to people with disability. I formulated the original idea for this book and invited two other academics from James Cook University to participate in this project. I took responsibility for the book proposal, its structure and planned content and its overall epistemological direction. I envisaged the book as a key Australian contribution to a multidisciplinary focus on disability. The book was intended to highlight the continued tendency in public discourse to represent people with disability in negative ways and to effectively exclude them from participation in key areas of life.

The book drew particular attention to the various ways in which processes of exclusion served to marginalise people with disability and to render them dependent on family members and/or the wider community. The book was prompted by continuing concerns over the lack of welfare and other types of provision for people with disability, evidence of widespread institutional abuses in Queensland and elsewhere, and the narrow understandings and questionable assumptions associated with 'disability'. Our aim was to focus on the means by which people with disability might benefit from a greater emphasis on strategies of inclusion, especially in relation to welfare matters, employment and the workplace.

The issue of employment had been taken up in an earlier study commissioned by the Whitsunday Shire Council in North Queensland. A report entitled *The Employment Needs of People with Disability in the Whitsunday Shire* (Hil, Wilkinson and McMahon 1996) contained the results of interviews with disabled people in the workforce and various employment advisory agencies and welfare organisations in the Shire. We also reported on issues that appeared to hinder the inclusion of people with disability in the local workforce. These included the continued tendency to marginalise such people, misconceptions about the nature and extent of their disabilities, and inadequate support and welfare services for this group of people. Published by the Centre for Social and Welfare Research at James Cook University of North Queensland, the report's findings were used by the Whitsunday Shire Council to improve welfare and employment services for people with disability in the region. The findings stemming from this

report complimented many of the issues highlighted in my studies of young offenders and their families. Specifically, the problems of labelling, stigmatisation and marginalisation that so often characterise the experiences of those referred to as 'offenders' are also evidenced, albeit in a different form and in different institutional and social settings, among people with disability. My involvement in this project was as a member of a research team. The research design and methodologies, interviews, collation and write-up of results were undertaken jointly with other members of the research team.

In another publication, again located in the Whitsunday Shire, I worked closely with two colleagues from the Centre for Social and Welfare Research on a study of 'youth need' (Hil, Cheers and Bone 1993a,b,c). The study included extensive in-depth, face-to-face interviews with both young people and service providers in an effort to ascertain their experiences and perceptions of youth-related social welfare and other services in the Shire. The eventual report, which received considerable public attention, noted that there were serious shortcomings in social, educational and welfare services for young people in the area. Specifically, we argued that the emphasis by local and state governments on the development of a tourism infrastructure had in part resulted in the effective marginalisation of the needs of many young people in the Shire. As a result of inter-state migration and the lack of affordable accommodation, many young people found themselves homeless and unable to access the often over-burdened local and regional services. In addition to addressing the problematic concept of 'youth need', we recommended the development and expansion of a range of services in the Shire and called for a program of public education in order to heighten awareness of the specific issues and concerns facing young people. A number of the recommendations in the report were discussed and eventually implemented by the Whitsunday Shire Council. Again, my involvement in this project was as a member of a research team. I participated equally in the formulation of the research design and methodologies, interviews, collation, analysis and write-up of a detailed report.

My efforts to highlight the specific problems faced by sections of the community are further evidenced in publications that report on studies of state wards in Australia. My publications drew attention to legislative provisions that protected state and territory governments from legal action in the event of maltreatment of young people while in state care (Hil and Bessant 1998a). It was argued that there was evidence of a somewhat contradictory attitude on the part of some governments in Australia in that they served to protect their own officials from those sanctions that were applicable to abusive parents. In highlighting what we considered to be a double standard we argued for a more equitable approach to accountability in respect of state care.

In a related area of inquiry, I focussed (again, with Dr Judith Bessant) on the selective public interest in 'spectacular' cases of child abuse and neglect rather than on the more 'mundane' abuses evident in many state-run institutions (Hil and Bessant 1998b). We alluded to the somewhat skewed and partial nature of public discourse on such matters as well as the pervasive and enduring record of institutional abuses of children and young people while in state care.

In an earlier publication (written while employed as a Research Officer with the London Borough of Lambeth, Department of Social Services), I reported on those children and young people placed on the 'at risk' register in the Borough who, as a result of not being allocated a social worker, had been allowed to 'drift' while in local authority care (Hil 1988). The article drew attention to the pressures faced by the local authority in terms of demands placed on social workers as a result of the number of children and young people on the 'at risk' register. This problem was compounded by high social worker caseloads, significant staff turnover and the growing bureaucratisation of social work (evidenced, for example, in more administrative duties). The issue of 'drift', therefore, was seen as systemic rather than a dereliction of duty on the part of social workers. The issues raised in the article (and in a report submitted to the management team of Lambeth Social Services Department) resulted in the acceptance of a number of recommendations relating to procedural and administrative matters in 'at risk' cases.

Finally, the other publications I have included under this area of study are book reviews dealing with research methods in social work (Hil 1992a), social casework (Hil 1992b) and families and children (Hil 1996). As a former social worker, and therefore keenly aware of the time constraints placed on practitioners, I have always considered such reviews to be important in terms of informing others about developments in the field. The book by Barber (1991) had a significant bearing upon my own approach to the teaching of social work theory and practice insofar as it questioned the excessive focus on one-to-one casework while at the same time calling for the development of more group-based and community-centred approaches.

Focused on what might be termed 'human service provision' the above publications are to some extent consistent with the concerns covered in the area of Youth Justice. Specifically, these publications emphasise the way in which service users (and service providers) of state-sponsored and other organisations reflect on their experiences. Apart from the polemical nature of the articles on state wards, my publications in this area are largely aimed at identifying particular shortcomings in the provision of services for certain 'disadvantaged' groups. Where appropriate, the studies have attempted to record the discursive accounts of 'respondents' as accurately as possible (although recognising the inherent subjectivity of any such analysis). Qualitative methodological techniques were used to achieve this objective. The rationale for taking such an approach, whether in relation to people with disability, young people or the service providers themselves, was to ensure not only that the views and opinions of all those concerned were conveyed through the text, but also to ensure a degree of critical engagement with the issues raised. I refer to 'critical engagement' in two senses: first, the need to subject the views of respondents to some degree of analysis without diluting the essence of what they are saying and second, to utilise these views as the basis for proposed changes to policy and practice.

Criminology

My publications in this area are drawn from a forthcoming book, articles and book reviews. The thematic focus derives from a concern with issues relating primarily to the workings of the criminal justice system, particularly as it impacts upon certain populations. Specifically, the publications reflect a general concern with how certain individuals and groups experience the operational practices of social control and how those systems often serve to stigmatise and negatively label those caught up in them. I refer also to those publications that in various ways deal with the construction of certain bodies of knowledge concerning 'crime' and 'crime prevention'. I have argued that such knowledge is predicated upon various criminological and other discourses that have served, in a range of complex ways, to position certain groups as a major threat to social order, thereby rendering them the targets of state intervention. This concern with the creation of the 'Other' is consistent with the common theme running through this report, namely, how subjects experience systems of social control and how official policies and practices impact upon them. The publications discussed in this section contribute to an understanding of how 'subjects' are constructed through certain discursive representations and practices, and how they are subsequently regulated and controlled through a range of specific state-sponsored interventions. The latter is discussed primarily in relation to recent developments in Queensland.

Understanding Criminology (Hil, Bessant and Watts, forthcoming) is a critical introduction to criminology. The book provides an overview of the historical development of criminological theories and includes a number of case studies on topical issues and controversies such as the supposed link between unemployment and crime; corporate and state crime, crime prevention, the family and crime, and young people and crime. Based on a post-structural perspective, the book concentrates on how criminology as a disparate body of knowledge has served (often inadvertently) to discursively represent certain groups as the 'Other'. It further examines (through the lens of 'governmentality') the contribution that criminology has made towards the policing, regulation and control of certain 'problem populations'. We argue for an

approach to criminology that focuses in more critical depth on the construction and representation of the 'crime problem' in late modernity and which lays bare the 'deep structures' of contemporary crime control. Additionally, we have sought to focus on the concept of 'justice' and the implicit and explicit ways in which criminologists have (or have not) dealt with this concept in relation to issues of crime, criminality and crime control. We have argued that in the wake of deepening social and economic divisions brought about by 'globalisation', the general shift to more punitive cultures of crime control in neo-liberal democratic states, and the growing ascendancy of techno-administrative criminology, the discipline may well benefit from a more critically reflexive analysis of its contribution to the study of crime and crime management – a reflexivity that is cognisant of the way in which changes to crime control occur in contexts shaped by altered social, economic and political, arrangements as well as by new strategies, systems and technologies of government. Although there is evidence of on-going reflexivity in the discipline (see, for instance, Nelken 1996; Walton and Young 1998, Garland 2000), we argue that further critical engagement with contemporary socio-political and economic issues is vital if the discipline is to avoid slipping steadily into the paradigmatic concerns of administrative criminology. Some of the main issues would, for instance, include an analysis of 'globalisation', militarism and contemporary modes of governance, re-examination of categories such as 'crime', 'crime rates' and 'crime prevention'; more critical discussion of the relationship between the 'crime problem' and other spheres of life; the role of 'self governance' in the crime prevention project, and unmasking contemporary processes of differentiation leading to the creation of the 'Other'.

My contribution to developing the above approach reflects a modest attempt over the years to question some of the received wisdoms of crime control discourse. Specifically, many of my articles have focussed critically on a range of State, Territory and Commonwealth Government crime prevention initiatives in Australia (Hil forthcoming a, b; Hil 2000a; see also Hil 2000 b; Hil 1999a-c; Hil 1996, Hil 1993; Hil, Bessant, Watts and Weber 1999). For example, I have drawn attention to a host of hidden

assumptions evident in the Commonwealth Government's recent report on crime prevention, *Pathways to Prevention* (Developmental Crime Prevention Consortium 1999). Written by a team of criminologists (most of whom are developmental psychologists), the report argues for a highly individualistic approach to crime prevention in which the 'causes of crime' are located in various 'dysfunctional' relationships within the family household. While the report acknowledges the possible influence of 'disadvantage' on crime, its epistemological focus remains firmly fixed on the individual cognitive and behavioural 'deficits' associated with offenders as well as the lack of skills and/or neglect exhibited by parents in respect of their offending children.

In my response to the report, I have highlighted the narrow conception of crime (in fact, there is little explicit discussion of this concept in the report), and its general failure to theorise the construction of the 'crime problem' (ignoring, for instance, the question of white collar crime and state crime). The report also fails to engage the question of 'policing' in any specific sense. Instead, the crime problem is associated closely with the actions of the urban and rural poor. I have argued that, in many ways, crime prevention discourse of the sort articulated in *Pathways to Prevention* dovetails neatly with current public discourse on the 'underclass'. Thus, the report proposed that crime prevention should be directed at specific 'problem populations' which are said to be made up of social groups most often linked to an aberrant (and excluded) 'underclass' — the poor, unemployed, single mothers, black people, youth and certain 'ethnic' groups. In my view (Hil 1999b), *Pathways to Prevention* reflects a range of contemporary individualistic discourses that are aimed at highly technical (that is, problem fixing) 'solutions' to a narrowly conceived crime problem. I further argue that it is useful to view current crime prevention initiatives in the context of governmental processes and practices that seek to 'manage' certain problem populations who are regarded by powerful groups as a threat to social and political order.

This argument has been addressed in different ways in relation to crime prevention strategies promoted by the Queensland and South Australian State Governments (Hil 1996; Hil forthcoming 'a'). My approach here has been to highlight many of the assumptions contained in these strategies and to offer alternative 'readings' of them. On reflection, what has concerned me most in such cases has been the continued tendency of some criminologists to locate their explanations of and proposed 'solutions' to crime in the context of administrative-correctional agendas. Thus, taken-for-granted categories such as 'crime' and 'crime prevention' become the operational conduits through which a raft of disciplinary measures can be exercised over certain problem populations. The socially constructed nature of such concepts and their location in the domain of contemporary government are seen as marginal (if not irrelevant) to the imperatives of crime prevention/reduction and order maintenance. I have therefore argued in my publications that the primary concern in many current approaches to crime prevention is to articulate and promote a range of operational practices and technologies that can be applied to certain social groups. Some of these 'technologies' include the implementation of various parenting programs, behavioural modification schemes, school-based assessment procedures, crime audits and so forth.

In another critical essay entitled *'Youth Crime, Risk and Governance: A View From Queensland'* (Hil 1999a), I addressed a number of issues relating to crime prevention research and policy in the Australian state of Queensland. Specifically, I took issue with the *Sibling Study* (Kennedy 1997), a major research project focussing on the 'bio-psycho-social' antecedents of youth crime. In addition to highlighting the epistemological foundations of the study (based heavily on a narrow 'developmental' perspective), I alluded to many misconceptions that it held of 'young offenders' in particular and of young people in general. In my view, the study ascribed a range of dubious characteristics to young people, thereby providing the questionable epistemological foundations for a variety of interventions into the lives of offenders and their families. I further noted that the study (and other allied policy and practice

initiatives based on the concept of 'risk') reflected wider discourses based on highly technical and individualistic conceptions of crime causation.

My appraisals of current crime control initiatives in Australia need to be viewed as part of a wider and burgeoning process of critical engagement. Thus, along with other scholars in Australia (see for example, Tait 2000; Bessant 1999; Bessant, Hil and Watts, forthcoming, Kelly 1999; Watts 1998), I have sought in a number of related publications to bring to light many of the epistemological problems associated with current risk-based approaches to crime prevention. We are particularly concerned about the return to a classical view of crime causation, which regards such behaviour as the by-product of moral failure and/or individual pathology. Our aim therefore is to identify the shortcomings of an individualistic approach and to question simplistic conceptions of 'crime' and the 'crime problem'. The latter point has been developed in polemical exchanges with Professor Ros Homel (Hil 1999b) and Professor Elliott Currie (Hil 2000b) both of whom, I believe, have tended (albeit in different ways) to place their preoccupations with crime prevention/control over and above some of the 'big questions' that continue to haunt criminology. Such questions include, for instance, the definition of 'crime', the relationship between crime and structural inequality and the continued differentiation of certain populations as the criminal 'Other'. (Having said this, I acknowledge that Professor Currie has highlighted such matters in other publications, as he has pointed out in a response to my comments – see Currie 1999).

Included in my list of publications are a number of other articles dealing with criminal justice issues. They include the emergence of vigilantism in many parts of Australia (Hil 1998a,d), 'racialised vigilantism' (Hil and Dawes 2000), ethical considerations in the study of vigilantism (Hil, Dawes and Eddy 1999), prison policy and practice in Queensland (Hil 1998b), and an earlier piece on the emergence of probation day centres in England during the early 1980s (Hil 1982).

My other publications in the area of criminology are presented largely in the form of book reviews and deal with topics such as: the sociology of punishment (Hil 1997), contemporary 'law and order' policies (Hil 1998c), 'cultures' of crime and violence in western countries (Hil 1995), Aboriginal perspectives on criminal justice (Hil 1994b), and prisons and accountability (Hil 1985). In a recent review essay (Hil 2000c), I have also considered current feminist debates on crime and masculinity and the general question of domestic violence. Again, the purpose of such publications has been to report on studies that have highlighted the unintended consequences of crime control and the suspect claims and justifications made on their behalf. The process of reviewing books has advanced my own knowledge of current arguments and controversies in criminology and to communicate my critical assessments of these books to a wider audience.

A Note on Research Design and Methodology

Many of the above publications are based directly on empirical studies that rely on the use of a wide range of qualitative research designs and methodologies. The latter have sought to convey the views and experiences of subjects in systems of social control. This broad approach is based on a range of theoretical traditions including symbolic interactionism, with its emphasis on meaning (see Plummer 1995); 'naturalism' which encourages an 'appreciative' stance on the part of the researcher in relation to the subjects of inquiry (Matza 1969); and Denzin's interpretivist interactive approach which 'attempts to make the world of lived experience directly accessible to the reader' (Denzin 1989: 10).

In adopting this broad commitment to what might be termed 'subject-centred' research, I have sought to apply methodological techniques that enable subjects to speak as openly and freely as possible, and to ensure that their accounts are reported as accurately as possible through the medium of text. Given the constraints of working as a researcher in government organisations (which tended to rely on the provision of statistically oriented research and information), such an approach was often difficult to

sustain. Where possible, however, I attempted to integrate the perspectives of subjects directly into the research design (for example, see Hil 1988– Youth Justice section). More recently, in my work on families and crime I have drawn explicitly on the interpretivist interactive tradition of inquiry (see Hil and McMahon, 2001 – Youth Justice section). This involved the use of methodological techniques such as in-depth, semi-structured interviews with individual and groups. Similarly, my recent work on vigilantism in North Queensland involved in-depth, semi-structured interviews with the residents of a suburb and members of a vigilante group (Hil and Dawes 2000 – see Criminology section). Further, in a study of Methadone users attending a Brisbane clinic I conducted sensitive semi-structured interviews with vulnerable and often traumatised respondents (many of whom had been heavily involved in various forms of criminal activity). Interviews were also carried out with service providers (Hil and Christie 2000 – for reference, see Criminology publications section).

The general methodological techniques employed in my fieldwork have been complemented by analysis of both primary and secondary source materials, including Acts of Parliament, government reports, departmental documents, case files and academic texts (books, monographs, articles, reviews, etc.).

Over the years I have demonstrated a capacity to identify key areas of research in the stated areas of inquiry and to develop informed and well-structured approaches to research. This required knowledge of appropriate methodological techniques as well as the practical, ethical and moral issues associated with qualitative inquiry. Consequently, I have produced an empirical body of work that reflects my interest in people's experiences of control systems and which in turn has been disseminated widely through publications, conferences, seminars and workshops (see Appendix 3). Based on the actual lived experiences of people in control systems, my published work has, I believe, helped to provide a more informed approach to policy and practice issues in Queensland and elsewhere (see Chapter 2).

Summary

This chapter has dealt with the nature, context and scope of my publications over the past twenty years. The publications were grouped into a number of inter-related areas of inquiry: Youth Justice, Young People and Social Welfare, and Criminology. I have demonstrated that a significant number of these publications focused on issues of contemporary scholarly and public interest. While my publications have been aimed at different audiences, they nonetheless demonstrate a significant degree of thematic unity. Additionally, many of my polemical and critical articles have been concerned with the implications of policies and practices on those people coming into contact with official agencies of social control. The chapter has also included a brief discussion on research designs and methodologies used in my empirical studies. This was undertaken in order to demonstrate some of the theoretical underpinnings of my research endeavours and to highlight the efforts I have made to record the views and perspectives of subjects in systems of social control. (For a more comprehensive discussion of the theoretical sources of my research interests, see Chapter 3).

CHAPTER 2

CONTRIBUTON OF PUBLICATIONS TO ADVANCING AREAS OF STUDY: REFLECTION AND COMMENT

Introduction

As noted, my publications have been produced for various audiences with different aims and objectives in mind. Some have been written specifically for management and administrative purposes while others have been aimed at an academic and popular readership. The degree of influence of each publication on the reader depends, of course, on how and why it was read in the first place (Bizzell 1992). Inevitably, personal interpretations (or 'readings') of my publications hinge on the reader's biographical experiences, cultural background, political affiliations, and professional perspectives (Ventola 1996). Although I am required in this report to demonstrate how these publications have contributed to 'advancing an area of study', I intend to move away from any narrow conception of 'scholarly'. Instead, I will broaden my analysis somewhat by commenting on how, for instance, social welfare and other practitioners have drawn upon the findings contained in my work. In short, I take an 'area of study' to apply to designated field of inquiry and to those people in and beyond the academy who read textual material for a wide range of policy, practice and other purposes.

Nature of Contribution

The rest of this chapter is devoted to an examination of the specific nature of my contribution to advancing the stated areas of inquiry. In order to avoid excessive repetition of the thematic content covered in Chapter 1 (which also includes some discussion of my contribution to advancing scholarship), I intend to refer to the various ways in which my publications have been read and received by others. It is the extent to which my work has been acknowledged, disseminated and incorporated into the viewpoints, arguments and practices of academics, policymakers and practitioners that I consider a particular area of study to have been 'advanced'. I also take the term to refer to the original nature of my publications insofar as they address new and innovatory

fields of social inquiry. In focussing on the way in which my work has been communicated to and received by others, the following discussion will cut across the areas of study discussed in Chapter 1.

I can claim to have advanced an area of study in a number of ways: (a) my work is original insofar as it covers new and innovatory aspects of social inquiry; (b) my published work (mostly refereed) is located in sources that are likely to be read by academics, policy makers and practitioners); (c) my work has been cited by my academic peers in their publications and (d) the contents of my publications have been discussed in various forums (conferences, seminars, lectures, training sessions and media interviews).

Substantiation

My contribution to advancing the stated areas of inquiry is evidenced by the following:

- A significant contribution to advancing knowledge in Youth Justice, Young People and Social Welfare, and Criminology. Based on theoretical and empirical work, the various essays and studies I have contributed to the advancement of knowledge in particular scholarly areas of inquiry, and to the facilitation of ongoing debate and discussion on a range of contemporary, social issues. My scholarly work on families, crime and juvenile justice is the first of its sort in Australia and adds significantly to an international body of work on such matters (see Chapter 1 for details). The results of this study straddle both academic and applied disciplines and have therefore been accessed by a large readership such as policy makers, managers, practitioners, academics, etc.

- Significant contributions to a wider public debate about the connection between parenting and youth crime. The work undertaken by Dr Tony McMahon and myself in Australia has had some influence in terms of contesting the more simplistic assumptions in this area. We have undertaken two major studies on families and crime over the past few years, resulting in a number of publications.

The conclusions stemming from these publications have also been communicated to wider audiences through the mediums of conferences, workshops, committees and seminars. For instance, in 1996 I undertook training workshops on communication and relationship building skills with practitioners of the Queensland Department of Families, Youth and Community Care. Additionally, in 1996 I presented my findings to a regional conference dealing with the Queensland *Juvenile Justice Act 1992* and to an international social work conference held in Israel, 1998 (see conferences listed in Appendix 3);

- A wide range of refereed and non-refereed publications which have appeared in Australian and international journals and magazines. For instance, many of my articles have been published or are due to be published in prestigious refereed journals such as the *Journal of Criminal Justice, Australian Social Work, Australian Journal of Social Issues, Journal of Australian Studies, Just Policy, Alternative Law Journal, Western Criminology Review* and *Crime Law and Social Change* (see Appendix 1);

- A number of articles have been cited in the works of other scholars such as a major textbook on Australian juvenile justice (Cunneen and White 1996); two recent books on youth justice issues (Davis 1996; Bessant, Watts and Sercombe 1998), a book on crime and Australia's Indigenous people (Cunneen 2001), and academic journal articles (see for instance, White 1999, Homel 2000, Haines and Sutton 2000);

- Work cited in Commissions of Inquiry reports at both state government and federal levels including the Queensland State Government's *Commission of Inquiry into Abuses of Children in Queensland Institutions* (Queensland State Government 1999) and the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission's *National Inquiry Report on the Removal of Aboriginal Children from their Families* (Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission 1997);

- Work cited in conference and seminar papers (Petrie 2000; Bessant 1998; McMahon 1998b; Crane 1997) and used as the basis of my own conference and other public presentations;

- Work relating to the Queensland Department of Families, Youth and Community Care that has contributed to considerable policy debate and discussion at a local and regional level in the state. For example, in mid 2000 I met with regional managers from the Department to discuss issues relating to the provision of services to young offenders and their families. As a result of this meeting I have been appointed to develop and implement a training program with the Department to examine practice approaches relating to the supervision of young offenders. The basis for the training sessions will be material extracted from a book co-authored with Dr Tony McMahon due to be published later in 2001.

- Published exchanges with other academies and social policy analysts in professional journals (Hil 2000 a, b – see Criminology section). These publications have led to my involvement in extensive advisory work with community organisations and issue-based presentations at conferences and other public forums (see Appendix 3 for details);

- Publications that have been used as the basis for submissions to Commissions of Inquiry, for instance, in the area of institutional abuses of children in Queensland (Hil and Bessant 1999c – see Youth Justice section);

- Implementation of recommendations relating to young people and people with disability in the Whitsunday Shire, Queensland. For example, recommendations concerning the provision of health and welfare services as well as leisure and recreation facilities for young people were formally debated and subsequently implemented during a session of a Whitsunday Shire Council meeting in 1996. Further, recommendations in a report (Hil, McMahon and Wilkinson 1995 – Young

People and Social Welfare section) dealing with disability and employment in the Whitsunday Shire were widely accepted by various agencies in the region. The report and its recommendations served to heighten community awareness of the issues facing people with disability in terms of their access to and participation in the workplace;

- Numerous media interviews on a variety of topics covered in both my empirical and work. For instance, I have discussed issues such as prisoner numbers in Queensland (*ABC Radio, Brisbane; 4BC, Brisbane; ABC, Bundaberg,* 28 November 2000*); Inside QUT,* 28 November 2000); increases in Queensland Crime figures (*Courier Mail,* 9 November 2000); including youth crime on the Sunshine Coast (*Sunshine Coast Daily,* 28 July 1999); young people 'at risk' (*Courier Mail,* 2 June 1999); school yard violence in the USA (*Radio 4EB,* 24 May 1999); the emergence of vigilantism in Queensland (*Courier Mail,* 21 August 1998); the impact of globalisation on juvenile crime (*International Federation of Social Workers* media team, 8 July 1998); the Youth Crime Forum held on 11 June 1998 (*Win Television News,* June 1998); the Sunshine Coast Youth Crime Forum (*Channel 7,* 10 June 1998); young people, vandalism and graffiti (*Sunshine Coast Daily,* 27 September 1998); juvenile crime issues on the Sunshine Coast (*Sunshine Coast Daily,* June 10 1998); vigilante research in Queensland (*5DM Radio* Adelaide, 11 May 1998); a paper I presented to the 'Youth '98' conference at the University of Melbourne (*Herald Sun,* 17 April 1998); Queensland political Opposition's promotion of 'early intervention' as a crime prevention initiative in Queensland (*Sunshine Coast Daily,* 23 February 1998); the launch of my jointly edited book, *Youth, Crime and the Media* (*Sunshine Coast Daily,* 25 November 1997); juvenile crime on the Sunshine Coast (*Radio CFM,* 29 October 1997); juvenile crime in Townsville and the public seminar organised by the Centre for Social and Welfare Research (*ABC Radio,* Townsville, 8 July 1996; *Channel 10,* 8 July 1996); the provisions under the *Juvenile Justice Act 1992* dealing with parental restitution (*Townsville Bulletin,* 13 May 1996); the proposals for a new *Juvenile Justice Act* (*Radio 4TO,* 5 July 1996);

juvenile crime forum organised by the Centre for Social and Welfare Research at James Cook University of North Queensland (*Channel 9*, 5 July 1996); juvenile crime and parental restitution legislation (*Radio 4TO*, 15 May 1995); the launch of the Socio-Legal Information Network Group (SLING), (*ABC Radio*, 26 October 1994); juvenile crime in the Townsville region (*ABC Radio*, 15 October 1994); juvenile justice and crime prevention (*Townsville Bulletin* July 1994); juvenile crime in Ayr (*4KIG Radio*, March 1994); juvenile crime in Queensland (*Win Television News*, February 1994).

My main contribution in the area of criminology has largely been in the form of critical engagement with criminologists, specifically in relation to contemporary approaches to crime prevention in Australia, as well as scholarly reviews of various key criminological texts. My articles on crime prevention are part of a wider criminological discourse concerned with attempts to theorise crime and its attempted management. Moreover, my publications in this area have been timely interventions given that they relate to on-going policy deliberations both at State and Commonwealth Government levels in Australia.

In an article dealing with a major empirical study of actual and/or potential young offenders (Kennedy 1997), I was the first in Australia to critically analyse the emergent context and questionable assumptions associated with this empirical contribution to criminological inquiry (Hil 1999a – Criminology section). The arguments contained in the article have been read widely and formed the basis of a conference on crime prevention held in July 1999 and a public seminar held in March 2000 (see Appendix 3).

Over the years I have sought to integrate my research and teaching. For instance, many of the conclusions stemming from my research and writing have been integrated into my teaching on the Bachelor of Social Work, Bachelor of Community Welfare and Masters in Social Policy programs at James Cook University of North Queensland, Bachelor of

Arts at Sunshine Coast University College, and the Bachelor of Arts (Justice Studies) and Masters in Arts (Justice Studies) at the Queensland University of Technology.

Summary

This chapter has focused on the contribution my publications have made to advancing particular areas of study – namely, Youth Justice, Young People and Social Welfare, and Criminology. I have taken 'advancing' to refer to the originality of my work and its general contribution to engaging others in critical reflection and scholarly debate. By 'originality' I refer to the new and innovatory contribution my work has made to advancing particular areas of study – see, for instance, my discussion of research on families and juvenile crime in Chapter 1. In addition to a discussion of my engagement with scholarly work (especially in Australia), I have also demonstrated how my publications have been communicated to and received by others in the academy and elsewhere.

My publications have been concerned with contemporary theoretical, social policy and practice-based issues, and the discursive tone of my work has generally been descriptive, polemical and critical. The latter, of course, carries risks but I believe that my approach has been constructive and aimed at providing an alternative perspective to many of the received wisdoms of the day. I believe my overall contribution over a twenty-year period needs to be gauged by the interests, debates and discussions I have contributed to generated in government departments and more generally in the world of the academy. Also, I have had some success in contributing publicly to debates on a host of contemporary issues through my participation in the media and forums such as seminars and conferences. The dissemination of my work through these mediums has facilitated debates on a range of issues and concerns to the forefront of current policy deliberations in Queensland and elsewhere. Indeed, my written work needs to be seen as integral to other forms of scholarly work aimed at articulating various thoughts, ideas and arguments to academic and other audiences. Moreover, my academic work over the years has been informed by a belief that it is important from both a scholarly and

political perspective to not only undertake high quality research and writing but also to ensure that certain issues are kept on the public agenda so that informed and meaningful discussion can take place.

CHAPTER 3
KNOWLEDGE CONSTRUCTION: PERSONAL AND INTELLECTUAL
ORIGINS

Introduction

My aim in this chapter is to trace the personal and intellectual sources of my interest in the stated areas of inquiry and especially to acknowledge the influence of a number of major theoreticians on my work over the course of a twenty-year career in government departments and academic institutions. The present chapter should be viewed in conjunction with the thematic interests identified in Chapter 1 and the contributions made to advancing areas of study discussed in Chapter 2. Essentially, this chapter is a general review of the literature that has influenced my reading and writing over the past two decades. The review has been undertaken by threading together the personal and intellectual origins of my work. In other words, as argued below, I attempt to locate the origins of my intellectual interests within a biographical context. Therefore, in reflecting on my published material I have endeavoured to remain cognisant of the way personal experience has fashioned my interests and concerns and how my work 'fits' into wider discursive contexts.

Thus, in contrast to a positivistic perspective on my publishing record – that is, a preoccupation with measurable quantity and quality of such material – I have taken a more introspective and interpretive position which acknowledges the interface between personal experience and intellectual labour (Bauman 1990; Mills 1959). Thus, in developing what is essentially a retrospective and 'autobiographical' analysis of my work I remain cognisant of the vital, indeed unavoidable, connection between textual material and the situational and personal contexts in which that work is located (see Conway 1990; Brewer 1998; Robinson 1992). My interest in certain social issues has thus been rendered meaningful by what I experienced prior to and during the development of my scholarly work. In short, I developed scholarly interests in certain areas precisely because they resonated so meaningfully with my personal experiences.

It is in this regard that I wish to demonstrate how my biographical experiences influenced my professional and scholarly interests.

The route to my interest in social issues came through a set of coincidental circumstances. Long before entering university I had some understanding of how structural inequalities had impacted on my life. As the son of Polish migrants who had experienced many forms of discrimination and the challenges and vagaries of industrial working class life (my father was a semi-skilled lathe operator and my mother worked in the factory 'canteen'), and having personally felt 'condemned' to secondary school education after failing my '11-plus' examinations, I soon came to realise how certain social arrangements served to shape my life. I also became acutely aware throughout my secondary school education of how pupils were expected to attain only what was deemed 'possible' or 'reasonable' in that environment. Rarely listened to or respected as individuals, our status as working class 'lads' seemed to confirm what the teachers already knew, namely, that our educational and intellectual horizons were very limited. The profound sense of being unheard helps to explain, at least in part, my later interest in the accounts of subjects – indeed, I have always found such accounts far more interesting and revealing than those of 'experts' or 'authority figures'. In aiming for a career on the factory 'shop floor' – a socio-cultural process described wonderfully by Paul Willis in his book, *Learning to Labour* (1977) – I was in effect giving expression to the extent of my occupational aspirations at the time. Like many of my friends, I had no real idea of what a university was, let alone a degree. Usually, our educational destination was a sandwich course at the local technical college. Formal education was considerably less important to us than, say, buying clothes and participating in various hedonistic activities (drug taking, alcohol consumption, going to parties and so forth).

In 1972, while studying for my Advanced Level examinations at a local technical college (Henley College of Further Education, Coventry), I discovered something of the joys of sociology. I was especially interested in a book by Stan Cohen (1972) entitled *Folk Devils and Moral Panics* not only because of the catchy title or the picture of a leather-

jacketed Rocker on the front cover (of the Paladin edition), but also because it dealt with a sub-culture of which I had once been a member – the Mods. While revelling in information about skirmishes between Mods and Rockers on the beaches of Brighton, Clacton and Margate (I had always envied the type of character depicted by rock singer Sting in the film, *Quadrophenia*), I became absolutely fascinated by the way Cohen described the 'social reaction' to such events. Specifically, I was made aware of the processes by which Mods and Rockers were regarded by the 'establishment' as a threat to social and political order, and how this was linked to wider post-war concerns about working class affluence and the supposed breakdown of 'traditional' moral authority.

Essentially, Cohen was describing processes that led to the representation of certain social groups as the 'Other', and therefore as a threat to social order. Cohen's brilliant analysis was assisted by his lucid, engaging and at times humorous prose. This was particularly refreshing after having read so many turgid textbooks during my A-level sociology course. I was drawn immediately – for both aesthetic and intellectual reasons – to Cohen's type of sociological inquiry. So impressed was I with his work that I applied successfully for a place at the University of Essex where Cohen worked as a Senior Lecturer in the Department of Sociology. In my second year I specialised in the Sociology of Deviance and was fortunate enough to have Stan Cohen as my educator.

Early on I learned that *Folk Devils and Moral Panics* was in fact part of a burgeoning critique of mainstream British criminology. This critique had emerged in America and Britain during the mid to late 1960s and was concerned with what was seen as an excessively positivistic (and correctionalist) approach to the study of crime (Garland 1997). I began to access works by American labelling theorists (for example, Becker 1973; Lemert 1972) and British 'social reaction' or 'sceptical' theorists (Cohen 1972; Young 1971) who insisted on a sociological approach that looked more closely at processes of social control as opposed to the individual ('pathological') characteristics of offenders. I was particularly interested in essays contained in two edited volumes *Images of Deviance* (Cohen 1971) and *Politics and Deviance* (Taylor and Taylor 1973),

both based on proceedings of the National Deviance Conference – a body made up largely of sceptical sociologists opposed to the positivistic inclinations of 'mainstream' British criminology. Later I read a range of other highly influential works on deviance and social control (Rock and Macintosh 1974; Taylor 1973), the media and deviance (Cohen and Young 1973; Chibnall 1977) and crime and delinquency (Wiles 1976).

Such works suggested that the study of crime and deviance required a more sociological approach than that offered by mainstream criminology. Thus, in contrast to the latter, sociologists regarded categories such as 'crime', 'criminality' and the 'crime problem' as deeply problematic and therefore as objects of analysis in themselves. Cohen's (1974) critical review of British criminology – updated over a decade later in another critical 'stocktaking' of the discipline (Cohen 1988) – was a devastating assault on the empiricist and correctional orientations of British criminology.

Interest among sociologists in the emergence of 'social reaction' led to a range of important theoretical articulations regarding the presence of deviants in the social body. Some members of the National Deviance Conference, however, developed an increasingly 'radical' approach to the study of crime and deviance. The most important text of the early 1970s, which I read with considerable interest and excitement, was *The New Criminology* by Ian Taylor, Paul Walton and Jock Young (1973). Drawing heavily from Marxist theory – and yet later denying that the text was explicitly 'Marxist' (Walton and Young 1998) – *The New Criminology* proposed a 'social theory' of crime that viewed 'working class crime' and processes of 'criminalisation' as the consequence of class conflict, material disadvantage and state control. The criminalisation of sections of the working class was regarded therefore as a by-product of the capitalist political economy in which the interests of corporate capital required the regulation and control of potentially disruptive sections of the population. According to Walton et al (1973), a fully social (materialist) theory of crime would take account of the historically contingent, immediate and wider contexts of criminal action.

Although initially enthused by *The New Criminology* and later essays contained in a companion reader (Taylor, Walton and Young 1975), I soon became aware of an often less-than-positive reaction to this body of thought as well as the general moral and political complexities associated with the concept of deviance (Pearson 1975). Edited by Downes and Rock, *Deviant Interpretations* (1979) offered one of the first major critical reactions to *The New Criminology*. Doubt was placed on the book's idealisation of the working class, its failure to acknowledge the victims of crime, its ignorance of women's issues, its excessive and misleading critique of some theories – for instance, labelling theory (Plummer 1979) – and the dubious claim that crime and deviance could be eradicated if structural inequalities disappeared (Cohen 1979). Thus, while *The New Criminology* provided a trenchant critique of most of the sociological theories of crime and deviance up to the early 1970s, it was somewhat less successful in developing a coherent 'social theory' of crime (Walklate 1998). Whatever its strengths and weaknesses, the book marked a crucial intervention in post-war criminology, and in many ways proved both the high-point of 'radical criminology' and the beginning of an altogether different debate about the antecedents of 'working class' crime (Young 1999). Perhaps the primary influence of the book on my own work has been in alerting me to the wider 'structural' and socio-political contingencies of crime and the way in which certain populations are repeatedly and consistently 'criminalised' by the state.

This theme of what might be termed 'differential criminalisation' was further articulated in one of the most impressive studies of crime in the 1970s: *Policing the Crisis* by Hall, Critcher, Jefferson, Clarke and Roberts (1979). Despite its laboured and somewhat 'over theorised' extrapolations on the so-called 'mugging' phenomenon (Cohen 1980), the book proved rewarding reading, particularly in its attempt to link the state's reaction to mugging with a host of other socio-economic and political concerns. Specifically, Hall et al argued that the state's response to mugging emerged against the backdrop of a deep and prolonged economic 'crisis' in capitalist countries. In order to contain potential outbreaks of social disorder among aberrant 'problem populations' the state, via the hegemonic mechanism of 'authoritarian populism', generated more

intensive and 'targeted' forms of regulation and control (harsher sentences, more police powers, etc.). Mugging therefore was used as a pretext to increase the general level of social control over particular sections of the population.

Three significant points emerged from my reading of *Policing the Crisis*: first, that social reaction to specific concerns over crime should be viewed against the backdrop of the dominant socio-economic and political arrangements of the day; second, that 'policing' (conceived in its broadest sense as the mechanisms used for social regulation and discipline) was focused on those groups deemed a threat to social order; and third, that analytical attention should be drawn to the particular discursive signifiers used to describe and interpret characters and social events. Indeed, my own work on the notion of 'responsibility' shares much in common with Hall et al's (1979) analysis of mugging. Like mugging, the notion of responsibility has provided a convenient discursive pretext for a range of regulatory practices in respect of certain populations. Thus, its significance derives not simply from the discursive relevance of the term but also from the specific disciplinary practises that occur through its presence in political and public consciousness.

Despite having reservations about Hall et al's analysis, particularly the absence of sufficient supporting evidence to justify their arguments (Cohen 1980), I nonetheless gained considerable insight from this and other works emanating from the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies at the University of Birmingham (see for example Willis 1977, 1978; Hall and Jefferson, 1976).

Policing the Crisis was one of the last major texts, at least in Britain, to make explicit use of Marxist theory in its analysis of crime. To be sure, other texts had been published around this time on capitalism and the 'rule of law' (see Fine, Kinsey, Lea, Picciotto and Young 1979) but the late 1970s and early 1980s were a time of profound theoretical transformation in criminology. This change can, I believe, be attributed to a number of overriding factors: a reaction to what was seen by some critics as the

determinism and idealism of *The New Criminology* (Downes and Rock 1979); the growing ascendancy in the 1980s of administrative criminology with its emphasis on victims and 'situational' crime prevention (Gilling 1997); the rise of new criminological 'realisms' that proposed to take crime and its effects 'seriously' (Brake and Hale 1993; Walklate 1998); the emergence of the 'justice movement' from the late 1970s onwards, underpinned by individualistic explanations of crime causation (Cohen 1985; Hudson 1993, 1996); the rise of radical political conservatism in the 'west' with its reliance on individualistic notions of 'self help' and 'responsibility' (which fed into the research agendas of administrative criminology); the emergence of serious doubts over the capacity of socialist states to deliver social justice – indeed, post-war evidence of systematic abuses of human rights in many communist bloc countries, as well as their lamentable economic records, served to strengthen the case of those who questioned the seemingly romantic claims of radical criminologists.

Although this is not the place to consider the many consequences of these developments on criminology, it is evident that the discipline has been profoundly affected from both within and without (Garland 1997; Young 1999). My own view is that the discipline is now in something of a theoretical impasse, having been traversed, restructured and re-shaped by various 'realisms', subjected to the occasionally unhelpful deconstructivism of postmodernist analysis, rendered secondary to the 'practical' imperatives of administrative criminology, and urged increasingly to demonstrate its 'practicality' and 'relevance' to governments and other funding bodies (Hil, Bessant and Watts, forthcoming – see Criminology section). However, I have gained much through reflecting on the issues and debates in theoretical criminology covering the past three decades or so. This has helped me to both formulate my own thoughts around the 'problem of crime' and to apply this knowledge to my research and writing.

The Phenomenology of Social Control[5]

In the mid-1980s I read two books by two complementary authors: *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (Foucault 1977a) and *Visions of Social Control: Crime, Punishment and Classification* (Cohen 1985). The former text was part of a larger project that sought to question many Marxist interpretations of history, particularly in relation to power, control and the creation of 'subject populations'. Central to Foucault's (1980a) project was a concern to unmask the 'production of truth' by focussing on the way in which discourses served to position particular populations as the subjects of concern, analysis and regulation. Indeed, Foucault was most interested in the 'genealogy of the modern subject' (Rabinow 1986) and the ways in which discourses served to legitimate a range of disciplinary practices. *Discipline and Punish* was very much in this mould. It alerted me to the importance of genealogical analysis as a way of highlighting the 'dividing practices' of the state in respect of those populations deemed most in need of regulation and control. In Foucault's description of the period of the 'great incarceration' in the nineteenth century I found a vivid and highly persuasive analysis of the discursive practices that rendered entire populations subject to the regulation and control of powerful social groups.

According to Foucault, this was achieved through the complex intersections of power and knowledge in which the claims to 'truth' in religion and science (and especially the social sciences) provided the necessary epistemological pretext for the creation of various regulatory regimes and interventionist practices. For Foucault, power was more than the simple 'top-down' exercise of state control, as often articulated in Marxist texts (especially in the 1970s). According to Foucault, power flowed through a complex network of 'capillaries' into various sites in the 'social body' (such as the family, school and neighbourhood), which in turn ensured the 'normalisation' of social relations and related processes of self-regulation and discipline.

Like many other academics over the past two decades or so, I was profoundly influenced by Foucault's work – especially his studies on insanity (1967), the human

sciences (1972, 1974), language (1977b) and sexuality (1980b). Indeed, it is fair to say that, along with others such as Derrida (1978), Foucault ushered in a paradigmatic shift away from the influence of Marxism to a perspective concerned with genealogical and discourse analysis (Boyne and Rattansi 1990). In a sense, the deconstructivist project developed by Foucault and others had already been in evidence among many western social scientists in the post-war period (Best and Kellner 1990), as it had been in the sociology of crime and deviance (Cohen 1996). Despite this, it seemed to me that Foucault was offering a mode of analysis that would enable researchers to look more closely at the ways in which current disciplinary practices are constituted and legitimated in the neo-liberal state.

Stan Cohen's *Visions of Social Control* (1985) is in many senses an extension of Foucault's work. Specifically, Cohen examined the historical development of 'master patterns' of social control ranging from the 'exclusionary' practices associated with prisons and asylums which emerged in the nineteenth century to more 'inclusionary' ('community-based') projects of more recent times. In a number of illuminating chapters, Cohen drew attention to the processes by which punitive and correctional practices have been legitimated through appeals to bodies of specialised ('scientific') knowledge. Cohen further highlighted the continual expansion of the 'net' of social control over the past 200 years or so, with the prison remaining at the core of an overarching and increasingly penetrative system of regulation and discipline. Cohen argued that the rise of various diversionary programs, 'alternatives to custody' and 'community-based' initiatives served mainly to expand the numbers of people under the direct (and indirect) supervision and control of the state.

Although Cohen's arguments were persuasive, I have since become increasingly aware that his reliance on a somewhat totalised conception of social control has been subject to emotive criticisms, principally on the grounds that: (a) it leads to a sense of 'terminal gloom' whereby it appears that little can be done to counter the forces of oppression and repression (Blagg and Smith 1989); (b) it tends to rest on an assumption of planned

and orchestrated social reaction to a particular event or series of events (Hunt 1999); (c) it assumes that unwanted and negative outcomes necessarily result from state-sponsored interventions (Van Krieken 1991); and (d) it concentrates excessively on social reaction and draws attention away from the consequences of certain actions on individuals and communities (Thompson 1998).

Such criticisms are a useful corrective to some of the assumptions often associated with Cohen's work on social control. However, in contrast to Hunt's (1999: 18-19) somewhat premature dismissal of Cohen's work, I would argue that the concept of social control and the arguments contained in *Visions of Social Control* are useful in alerting us to the way in which disciplinary practices have increasingly 'penetrated' various sites in the social body over the past 200 hundred years.

One of the major points I drew from Cohen's study was contained in an excellent chapter entitled 'Inside the System'. Here, Cohen called for more sociological attention to be drawn to the specific practices occurring in (often highly secretive) systems of social control and to the ways subjects experienced this from their perspectives. A similar point has been made in relation to the 'treatment' of those with mental health problems (Goffman 1960; Masson 1988) and others regarded as an actual or potential threat to social and political order (Sibley 1995). Such writers insist that if we are genuinely interested in understanding the impact of systems of social control on people, then it is necessary to listen to the accounts of 'inmates', 'patients' and 'offenders' rather than 'experts' and 'professionals'. In examining the sociological literature on crime and deviance, it is indeed interesting to note how the voices of those caught up in systems of social control have so often been ignored or relegated to the margins of interpretive analysis. Having said this, of course, there is a strong tradition of ethnographic inquiry in criminology that has focused on the accounts of members of sub-cultures as evidenced in the work of, for instance, Whyte (1955) and more recently, Gill (1977), Willis (1978), Foster (1990), and Greaf (1993). Nonetheless, it is apparent

that apart from such instances the narratives of subjects tend to remain largely peripheral to the current concerns of criminology.

Both Foucault and Cohen were calling (albeit in different ways) for more attention to be drawn to the objectifying processes that served to construct people as subjects, and to how those enmeshed in systems of social control articulated their own experiences (as opposed to the views of accredited 'professionals' and 'experts'). This simple yet profound point has informed much of my own work.

My interest in people's experiences of social control was strengthened in 1983-4 when I completed a postgraduate diploma in social work at the University of Southampton. My studies involved reading extensively in two broadly related areas: the sociological theories of phenomenology and ethnomethodology, and what became known in social work circles as 'client studies'.

In relation to the former, I read a number of texts dealing with phenomenological and ethnomethodological approaches to the study of deviance (for example Phillipson 1971; Himer, Phillipson and Silverman 1992; Atkinson 1978). In focussing on the meanings, 'underlying rules' and 'deep structures' of social behaviour, these theories offered what I considered to be an interesting and productive way of examining how people in systems of social control articulated their own experiences. At the same time, I was acutely aware of the many theoretical shortcomings associated with phenomenological and ethnomethodological studies, including their tendency to reduce social behaviour to what seemed like trivial interactional nuances as well as a general failure to locate people's experiences in wider historical and socio-political contexts. Despite such problems, I was made aware of the importance of 'meaning' as a way of helping us to interpret and understand social phenomena and human action. In an edited volume, *Understanding Everyday Life* (1973), Jack Douglas sought to contextualise the scope of phenomenological analysis. He remarked that '... social actions are meaningful actions; that is, they must be studied and explained in terms of their situations and their

meanings to the actors themselves' (Douglas 1973: 4). Douglas (1973: 39) further stated that '… taken for granted properties of everyday communications are of fundamental importance in understanding everyday life and all human events'.

In distinguishing between 'normative' and 'interpretive' paradigms (Wilson 1973), Douglas and others emphasised a sociological approach that took seriously the 'contextual determinants of meaning'. I considered phenomenology to be important in that it at least acknowledged the accounts of 'actors' themselves, even though in practice sociologists continued to impose their own interpretive frameworks on such accounts (Cohen 1980). The tradition of phenomenological inquiry has of course a long history, dating back to the work of Alfred Schutz (1970) and in a less explicit form to the early work on sub-cultures (see Whyte 1955) and the 'naturalism' of American sociologist David Matza (1969). The work of Sykes and Matza (1957) on the rationalisations used by offenders to account for their criminal actions ('techniques of neutralisation') and the literature on motivation in the sociology of deviance (Taylor 1979) further demonstrated the usefulness of a phenomenologically oriented perspective.

My reading in two other areas complemented a general interest in subject's experiences, namely, the emergence in the 1970s of feminist criminology and the growth in prison biographies and autobiographies. Carol Smart's *Women, Crime and Criminology* (1977) alerted me to the central importance of women's perspectives in the study of crime and criminology, and the way these perspectives had been largely excluded from the discipline since its inception. A traditionally male dominated criminology had thus disregarded women's issues and/or explained crime by women in terms of biological abnormality or pathological tendency (Naffine 1997). Significantly, women's voices had been excluded both in terms of authorship of scholarly texts and as subjects of analysis (Heidensohn 1989).

The same conspicuous omission, however, was not evident when it came to the study of male prisoners. Indeed, there has been a long tradition of such accounts in the popular and academic literature (Cohen and Taylor 1972). In more recent times, autobiographies by male prisoners (see for example Probyn 1977; Boyle 1983; McVicar 1979) have surfaced with great regularity. Although limited by a gender-specific perspective, such accounts were useful in alerting readers to some of the realities of prison life that often contrasted with the benevolent claims made by prison administrators and other government officials. The subjective accounts of prisoners were complemented by a number of excellent academic studies that focussed on the vagaries of prison life. For instance, Cohen and Taylor's (1972) study of the experiences of long term (male) prisoners in Durham prison, *Psychological Survival*, stimulated my interest in the way in which people experienced (and survived) life in 'total institutions'. Again, the message I gleaned from these sources was that if the experiences of 'subjects' were to be understood, then it was preferable to address our questions to inmates, patients, clients, consumers or any other individuals and social groups who came into contact with agencies of social control.

During my social work course at the University of Southampton (1983-4) I accessed a growing body of literature on 'oral history' (Thompson 1978). I was especially drawn to the popular works of Tony Parker (1973) and Jeremy Seabrooke (1973). It seemed to me that these writers were serious about conveying the voices of those often referred to (somewhat patronisingly) as 'ordinary people'.

Some years later I came across a book equally devoted to recording the voices of subjects: Roger Graef's (1993) brilliant study of a small group of 'serious young offenders' attending a residential unit in South London. In my view, the study is one of the most under-rated and yet illuminating accounts of young offenders' experiences ever written. What is particularly striking is the way the author contrasts the experiences and outlooks of his own (middle class) children with those of his comparatively disadvantaged respondents. The book thus highlights the importance of both giving a

voice to previously silenced people and of situating the researcher in relation to the subject of analysis.

I found the works of Tony Parker, Roger Graef and others refreshing insofar as they seemed to capture the essential meanings of what 'subjects' were saying without overloading them with excessive (and occasionally unhelpful) sociological analysis and interpretation. As Beresford, Green, Lister and Woodard (1999) point out in their recent study of poverty, the attempt to accurately report the narratives of 'respondents' (in this case, people who experience poverty) requires the use of methodologies which are different to the more conventional (positivistic) approaches to social research. Indeed, Beresford et al drew productively on 'new paradigm' research which, in seeking to involve research subjects in the design of the study, differed markedly from the positivistic divide often drawn between the researcher and subject. It was argued by Beresford et al (1999) that, at a minimum, any study devoted to recording the accounts of people requires research designs and methodologies that enable them to talk as openly and freely as possible.

The genre of studies known in social work as 'client studies' enhanced my interest in the phenomenology of social control. The work of Timms and Mayer (1970), Sainsbury (1982), Rees (1978), Rees and Wallace (1982) and Jordan (1979) alerted me to the importance of listening to clients' experiences of welfare services. This in turn highlighted the value of developing methodologies that allowed people to speak for themselves. Although criticised on a number of grounds – for instance, the abstracted emphasis on client's views (Fisher 1986), a narrow view of clients as 'consumers' of 'services' (Barber 1991) and a failure to see social welfare as a system of state control (Corrigan and Leonard 1978) – such studies nonetheless shed important light on the way service users reflected on their experiences. The studies also provided social service managers with some useful insights into the realities of welfare practice. As Rees and Wallace note in their study on clients' 'verdicts' on social workers (1982: 116):

Over the past twenty years, research of various kinds has given a chequered verdict on the achievements and shortcomings of social workers. Those practitioners that possessed a certain confidence, often illustrated by skills in advocacy and negotiation, were able to effect changes which clients valued at the time. Conversely, other clients found themselves disappointed by social workers' attitudes, relative ignorance and uncertainty. The meaning and weight of such conclusions varied according to the contexts in which such social work was carried out, and in which the research was conducted.

The above observations resonate with much of my own work over the past few years, especially the often marked contrast between what officials see as helpful or even benign intervention and the experiences of clients themselves. Certainly, the work of Rees and Wallace and others (and in a modest way, my own work) suggests that, at a minimum, we must remain cautious about the claims made by those who profess privileged knowledge and/or authority over others.

Finally, I wish to briefly mention the growing influence that postmodern writings have had on my more recent publications. While I have some serious reservations about much of this literature – specifically its tendency towards relativism, little or no attention to the state, the reduction of social phenomena to image and representation, and its often apolitical orientations (Best and Kellner 1990) – postmodernism has nonetheless provided a trenchant critique of the totalising and often highly simplistic conceptions associated with Marxist analysis. In highlighting the importance of discourse, difference and 'multiple realities', postmodernism has given recognition to the great range and diversity of human experience. Recent work by Young (1996) points to the usefulness of discursive analysis in appreciating the way certain populations are criminalised and rendered the 'Other' in late modernity. The insights gained from certain postmodern writers have been incorporated into my more recent work on youth crime and families as well as in a jointly authored text on criminology. I have also been impressed by David Sibley's *Geographies of Exclusion* (1995) which considers

processes of social exclusion in relation to a number of domains, including those organised bodies of knowledge that privilege one set of ideas over another. He argues that such exclusionary practices often mean that the voices of certain groups take precedence over others, thus ensuring the continued hegemonic dominance of powerful groups in society. Sibley's thesis dovetails neatly with many of the readings I have alluded to above and to some extent reflects my own emphasis on peoples' subjective experiences of social control systems.

Summary

In this chapter I have attempted to sketch the many personal and intellectual sources that have shaped my research and writings over the past two decades. While a number of scholarly sources in the areas of the sociology of crime and deviance, criminology, and client studies have not always been acknowledged explicitly in my publications, they have nevertheless shaped my general interest and thinking in relation to many of the themes identified in Chapter 1. As noted earlier, I believe that as a body of work focusing largely, although not exclusively, on the experiences of people in justice and welfare systems, my publications have contributed in various ways to advancing scholarly debate in these areas. My knowledge of the literature has also enabled me to identify the need for empirical work in a range of previously neglected fields of inquiry. This is reflected, for example, in my work on the families of juvenile offenders and in my current concern with aspects of informal crime control.

CHAPTER 4

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

This report has provided an overview of the nature, context and scope of my publications and the contribution they have made to advancing inquiry in the areas of Youth Justice, Young People and Social Welfare, and Criminology. I have also outlined the research designs and methodologies used in my empirical studies. This was done in order to demonstrate the use of particular empirical approaches aimed at articulating the voices of subjects through the medium of written text.

My publications reflect a longstanding interest in the way in which subjects in systems of social control describe and interpret their own experiences. Additionally, my work demonstrates a concern with the impact of state-sponsored policies and practices upon various individuals and social groups. As such, there is considerable thematic unity across the stated areas of inquiry. My contribution to advancing these areas of inquiry is evidenced in a wide and varied range of publications, citation of my work in other scholarly publications, collaborative research and writing, and the formulation of proposals for new research (relating, for instance, to work on families and juvenile crime). My contribution is further demonstrated through regular participation in scholarly debates on current policy and practice issues, often taking the lead in such exchanges. Over the years I have also sought to disseminate my research findings to different audiences and to participate actively in the academic community through conferences and seminars.

From the outset, I have argued for the importance of meaning as a bridge between personal and professional experience. Specifically, I outlined the way in which my experience of working class life in an English industrial city and involvement in a youth sub-culture dovetailed experientially with the issues discussed in the sociological literature on crime and deviance. My particular focus on the 'phenomenology of social control' reflects a longstanding interest in how the accounts of subjects contrast with

the claims made by those in positions of power and authority. This interest was heightened during the 1970s and 1980s by a growing awareness of studies on deviance, accounts of the experiences of 'clients' of social welfare agencies, feminist criminological perspectives, autobiographical prison literature, and the genealogical work of both Foucault and Cohen. While these writers have not always been acknowledged explicitly in my work they have nonetheless served to influence the general direction of my research and writing. Reflexive analysis of the sort required in this report has alerted me to the heavy direct and indirect influence that the above theoreticians have had on my work over the past few years. Further, I believe that this report illustrates not only a general commitment to certain thematic interests in the stated areas of inquiry but also an ability to engage various audiences on issues of scholarly interest and public concern. The depth and breadth of my publications over the past two decades, as well as the contribution I have made to advancing particular fields of study, illustrates a significant degree of engagement in the academy and an on-going commitment to the promotion of informed and critical scholarly debate.

In relation to the latter, I intend to build on the solid foundations established by my research and writing by pursuing other projects that focus more explicitly on the insights gained from post-structural perspectives (especially in relation to discursive representations of certain populations as the 'Other' and disciplinary practices evidenced in current approaches to crime prevention). I am currently working on two related projects that seek to question the many claims and justifications in contemporary crime control discourse. The first is a proposed empirical study of young people and their families who have been identified in current crime prevention discourse as being 'at risk'. The aim here is to focus on the personal accounts of these subjects in order to highlight some of the assumptions that permeate approaches to crime prevention, particularly those that rely on the notion of 'risk'. By drawing aspects of new paradigm research (that is, an approach that emphasises the inclusion of subjects directly in the investigative process), the study will develop an interpretivist perspective that contrasts sharply with positivistic studies mentioned in Chapter 1

(such as the *Pathways to Prevention* report). I intend to undertake this study because I believe that high quality and cogently theorised research offers one of the most effective ways of countering many of the questionable assumptions found in many areas of contemporary public discourse. Thus, I hope to demonstrate that the lived experiences of those deemed 'at risk' are likely to differ markedly to the views and opinions of 'experts' and 'officials' – a theme evident in a number of my earlier publications.

My second planned project is to focus on the emergence of law and order discourses in western states over the past few decades and to theorise their relationship to a range of overarching socio-political and economic transformations, with specific reference to 'globalisation'. I am particularly interested in the complex connections between what might be loosely termed 'structural' changes (brought about especially, but not exclusively, by 'globalisation') and the governmental discourses that seek to explain behaviour (including crime) as essentially reflective of individual 'deficits' and/or 'social exclusion'. In other words, I am concerned with the way in which socio-political and academic discourses often focus on the individualised and exclusionary (positivistic) 'causes' of certain behaviours (often in the reformative context of social democratic thought) while failing to address fully the implications brought about by wider transformative processes. Drawing on the work of Michel Foucault, David Garland, Stan Cohen, Albert Hunt, Jock Young, Pat O'Malley, Nick Rose, Alison Young and others, I intend to concentrate on the role that contemporary crime control discourses (especially those emanating from criminology) have played in promoting the radical differentiation of certain populations as the criminal 'Other'. But more than this, I propose to identify the consequences of such discourses in terms of the interventionist strategies that have emerged over recent years in western countries.

I view these two proposed projects as following on from a range of interests developed through my work over the past two decades. The combination of interfacing theoretical and empirical projects will enable me to critically analyse the discourses that currently

underpin a range of 'targeted' disciplinary strategies in late modernity. The published work discussed in this report has established the foundations for such an analysis.

Notes

1. Following Foucault (1977a), I use the term 'subject/s' to refer broadly to those individuals and social groups under the surveillance, control and regulation of various, largely state-sponsored, agencies and institutions. This of course does not suggest a simple 'top-down' application of state power, as often conceived in some areas of Marxist thought, but rather a concern with the way in which certain populations are problematised and thus made subject to various disciplinary practices. Although the body of my work has been concerned largely with the 'governance of others' (ostensibly through the processes and mechanisms of state-sponsored governance), I am acutely aware of the complex processes of 'self governance', that is, the exercise of regulatory practices through various sites in the social body (the individual, family, school, neighbourhood etc.) whereby 'normative' attitudes and behaviours are absorbed by and through a range of individual, group and 'community' practices. Similarly, when using the term 'social control' in its most generic sense as the 'organised ways in which society responds to behaviour and people it regards as deviant, problematic, worrying, threatening, troublesome or undesirable in some way or another' (Cohen 1985: 1), I am cognisant of the need to avoid any essentialist and/or simple hierarchical ('top-down') account of such phenomena (Edwards 1988: 10-11). As already noted, my concern in this report is with elements of social control practiced in neo-liberal democratic capitalist countries (like Australia) by various organisations and agencies in relation to certain populations deemed deviant, worrying, threatening and troublesome.

2. It should be noted that my definition of 'young people' accords with current Queensland State Government policy, namely, those people aged between 12 and 25 years. However, when referring to 'youth crime', the age range is restricted to those between 12 and 17 years inclusive, as defined in the Queensland *Juvenile Justice Act 1992*. Generally, I avoid reference to 'juvenile' since the term 'youth' has now been adopted as the official nomenclature of the Queensland Department of Families, Youth and Community Care.

3. Generally, I refer to the word 'critical' as a mode of analysis aimed at identifying the concepts, assumptions and propositions contained in any written or oral articulation of argument. It also seeks to expose claims to 'truth' that underpin the exercise of power and authority of one social group over another (Abercrombie, Hill and Turner 1986: 57).

4. Published by the Hampshire Probation and After-Care Service, the report was disseminated to a wider audience including academics, social welfare practitioners and others with an interest in this area. The report also constituted the basis of other publications (see Youth Justice references: Hil 1982a, 1988).

5. I use the term 'phenomenology' to refer broadly to that branch of sociological theory concerned with the study of meaning and human action. In my view, the main contribution of phenomenology has been to contest the positivistic assumption that human action is shaped simply by structural and/or other 'internal'/'external' drives, forces, causes and conditions. In emphasising agency, phenomenology locates the meanings of human action at the centre of sociological analysis. Although phenomenology has had considerable influence in sociology, it has been criticised on the grounds that it has tended to generate trivial studies of social action, is largely descriptive and avoids reference to the interface between agency and structure and often tends to disembody mind 'consciousness' and 'meaning' (Collins 2000; Wolff 1978). I acknowledge the shortcomings of phenomenology while at the same time recognising its vital contribution to relocating the 'actor' to the forefront of sociological inquiry. Phenomenology thus provides a useful corrective to crude positivistic interpretations of social action. I use the term in order to acknowledge the emphasis I have given to the articulations of 'subjects' in many of my essays and studies.

References

(A separate reference list containing all my publications referred to in this thesis is set out in Appendix 1)

Abercrombie, N., Hill, S. and Turner, B. (1986) *The Penguin Dictionary of Sociology*, London: Penguin.

Atkinson, M. (1978) *Discovering Suicide: Studies in the Sociology of Sudden Death*, Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Barber, J. (1991) *Beyond Casework*, London: Macmillan.

Bauman, Z. (1990) *Thinking Sociologically*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Becker, H. S. (1973) *Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance*, New York: Free Press.

Beresford, P., Green, D., Lister, R. and Woodard, K. (1999) *Poverty First Hand: Poor People Speak For Themselves*, London: Child Poverty Action Group.

Bessant, J., Watts, R. and Sercombe, H. (1998) *Youth Studies: An Australian Perspective*, Melbourne: Longman.

Bessant, J. (1998) *Crime, Young People and Citizenship*, Paper presented at the 'Youth '98' Conference, University of Melbourne, May.

Bessant, J. (1999) *Young People, Crime and Risk*, Paper presented at the conference, 'Risky Business: Youth Crime and Governance in Queensland', Queensland University of Technology, July 28.

Bessant, J., Hil, R. and Watts, R. (forthcoming) *Terra Calculus: Risk, Discipline and Social Regulation in Late Modernity*, New York: Peter Lang.

Best, S. and Kellner, D. (1990) *Postmodern Theory: Critical Interrogations,* London: Macmillan.

Bizzell. P. (1992) *Academic Discourse and Critical Consciousness,* Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Blagg, H. and Smith, D. (1989) *Crime, Penal Policy and Social Work,* London: Longman,

Boyle, J. (1983) *A Sense of Freedom,* London: Arrow.

Boyne, R. and Rattansi, A. (1990) *Postmodernism and Society,* London: Macmillan.

Brake, M. and Hale, C. (1993) *Public Order and Private Lives: The Politics of Law and Order,* London: Routledge.

Brewer, W. (1998) 'What is Autobiographical Memory?' in Rubin, D.C. (ed.) *Autobiographical Memory,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Campbell, B. (1994) *Goliath,* London: Macmillan.

Chibnall, S. (1977) *Law and Order News: An Analysis of Crime Reporting in the British Press,* London: Tavistock.

Cohen, S. (ed.) (1971) *Images of Deviance,* Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Cohen, S. and Taylor, L. (1972) *Psychological Survival: The Experience of Long Term Imprisonment,* Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Cohen, S. (1972) *Folk Devils and Moral Panics: The Creation of the Mods and Rockers,* London: Paladin.

Cohen, S. and Young, J. (1973) (eds.) *The Manufacture of News: Social Problems, Deviance and the Mass Media,* London: Constable.

Cohen, S. (1974) 'Criminology and the Sociology of Deviance in Britain', in Rock, P. and MacIntosh, M. (eds.) *Deviance and Social Control,* London: Tavistock.

Cohen, S. (1979) 'Guilt, Justice and Tolerance: Some Old Concepts for a New Criminology', in Downes, D. and Rock, P. (1979) (eds) *Deviant Interpretations: Problems in Criminological Theory,* London: Martin Robertson.

Cohen, S. (1980) *Folk Devils and Moral Panics: The Creation of the Mods and Rockers,* (second edition) New York: St. Martin's Press.

Cohen, S. (1985) *Visions of Social Control, Crime, Punishment and Classification* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Cohen, S. (1988) 'Footprints in the Sand: A Further Report in Criminology and the Sociology of Deviance in Britain', in Fitzgerald, M., McClennan, B., Pawson, J. (eds.) *Crime and Society,* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Cohen, S. (1996) *Social Control and the Politics of Reconstruction* in Nelken, D. (ed.) *The Futures of Criminology,* London: Sage.

Conway, M. A. (1990) *Autobiographical Memory: An Introduction,* Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Corrigan, P. and Leornard, P. (1978) *Social Work Practice Under Capitalism: A Marxist Approach,* London: Macmillan.

Crane, P. (1997) *Young People, Policing and Public Space,* Paper presented at seminar series, Sunshine Coast University College, Faculty of Arts, March.

Cunneen, C. (2001) *Crime, Power and Conflict,* Sydney: Allen and Unwin.

Cunneen, C. and White, R. (1996) *Juvenile Justice: An Australian Perspective,* Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.

Currie, E. (1999) 'Reflections on Crime and Criminology at the Millennium', *Western Criminology Review,* Vol. 2, No. 1. http://wcr.sonona.edu/v2n1/currie.html

Davis, M. (1996) *Gangland: Cultural Elites and the New Generationalism,* Sydney: Allen and Unwin.

Denzin, N. K. (1989) *Interpretive Interactionism,* Newbury Park: Sage.

Derrida, J. (1978) *On Writing and Difference,* Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Developmental Crime Prevention Consortium (1999) *Pathways to Prevention,* Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

Douglas, J (1973) 'Understanding Everyday Life', in Douglas, J. (1973) (ed.) *Understanding Everyday Life,* London: Routledge.

Downes, D. and Rock, P. (1979) (eds.) *Deviant Interpretations: Problems in Criminological Theory*, London: Martin Robertson.

Edwards, A. (1988) *Regulation and Repression: The Study of Social Control*, Sydney: Allen and Unwin.

Field S. (1990) *Trends in Crime and Their Interpretation*, Home Office Research Study No. 119, London, HMSO.

Fine, B., Kinsey, R., Lea, J., Picciotto, S. and Young, J. (1979) *Capitalism and the Rule of Law: From Deviancy Theory to Marxism*, London: Hutchinson.

Fisher, M. (1986) *In And Out Of Care: The Experiences Of Children, Parents, And Social Workers*, London: Batsford (in association with British Agencies for Adoption and Fostering).

Foster, J. (1990) *Villains: Crime and Community in the Inner City*, London: Routledge.

Foster, J. (1990) *Villains: Crime and Community in the Inner City*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Foucault, M. (1967) *Madness and Civilisation: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason*, London: Routledge.

Foucault, M. (1972) *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, London: Tavistock.

Foucault, M. (1974) *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*, London: Tavistock.

Foucault, M. (1977a) *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Foucault, M. (1977b) *Language, Counter Memory and Practice*: *Selected Essays and Interviews*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Foucault, M. (1980a) 'Interviews and Other Writings 1972-7', in Gordon, C. (ed.). *Power Knowledge*, New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Foucault, M. (1980b) *The History of Sexuality,* Volume 1. New York: Vintage Books,

Garland, D. (1997) 'Of Crime and Criminals: The Development of Criminology', in Britain, in Maguire, M., Morgan, M. and Reiner, R. (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Garland, D. (2000) 'The Cultures of High Crime Societies', *British Journal of Criminology,* Vol. 40.

Gill, O. (1977) Luke Street: *Housing Policy, Conflict and the Creation of the Delinquent Area*, London: Macmillan.

Gilling, D. (1997) *Crime Prevention: Theory, Policy and Politics*, London: University College Press.

Goffman, E. (1960) *Asylums: Essays On The Social Situation Of Mental Patients And Other Inmates*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Gottfriedson, M. and Hirschi, T. (1990) *A General Theory of Crime*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Goldson B (1999) 'Youth (In)justice: Contemporary Developments in Policy and Practice', in Goldson B. (ed.) *Youth Justice: Contemporary Policy and Practice,* Aldershot, Ashgate.

Goldson B. (2000) (ed*.) The New Youth Justice*, Lyme Regis, Russell House Publishing.

Graef, R. (1993) *Living Dangerously: Young Offenders in Their Own Words*, London: Harper Collins.

Glennester, H. and Midgely, J. (1991) *The Radical Right and the Welfare State*, London: Harvester Wheatshaeaf.

Hall, S. and Jefferson, T. (1976), (eds.) *Resistance Through Rituals: Youth Subcultures in Post-War Britain,* London: Hutchinson.

Hall, S., Critcher, C., Jefferson, T., Clarke, J. and Roberts, B. (1979) *Policing the Crisis: Mugging, The State and Law and Order*, London: Macmillan.

Haynes, F. and Sutton, A. (2000) 'Criminology as Religion? Profane Thoughts about Sacred Values', *British Journal of Criminology*, Vol. 40, No. 1.

Heidensohn, F. (1989) *Crime and Society*, London: Macmillan.

Himer, P., Phillipson, M. and Silverman, D. (1972) *New Directions in Sociological Theory,* London: Macmillan.

Holman, B. (1995) *Children and Crime,* Oxford: Lyon's Press.

Homel, R. (2000) 'Blazing the Developmental Trail', *Youth Studies Australia*, Vol. 19. No. 1.

Hope, T. (1994) *Communities, Crime and Inequality in England and Wales,* Paper presented to Copwood Round Table Crime and Disorder Conference, September 14-15, Cambridge.

Hudson, B. (1993) *Penal Policy and Social Justice*, London: Macmillan.

Hudson, B. (1996) *Understanding Justice: An Introduction to Ideas, Perspectives and Controversies in Modern Penal Theory*, Buckingham: Open University Press.

Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission (1997) *Bringing Them Home: Report of the National Inquiry into the Separation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Children from their Families*, Sydney: Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission.

Hunt, A. (1999) *Governing Morals: A Social History of Moral Regulation*, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Jordan, B. (1979) *Helping in Social Work*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Kelly, P. (1999) *Risk and the Regulation of Youth(ful) in an Age of Manufactured Uncertainties*, PhD thesis, Faculty of Education, Deakin University, Victoria, Australia.

Kennedy, L. (1997) *The Sibling Study: Code Book*, Brisbane: Department of Sociology, University of Queensland.

Lemert, E. (1972) *Human Deviance, Social Problems and Social Control*, Eaglewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Masson, G. (1988) *Against Therapy*, London: Fontana.

McMahon, A. (1998a) *Damned If You Do, Damned if You Don't: Working in Child Welfare*, Aldershot: Avebury Press.

McMahon, A. (1998b) *Social Work in Multiculturalism Societies.* Paper presented to the World Congress of Social Work, Jerusalem, July.

McVicar, J. (1979) *McVicar By Himself,* London: Arrow Books.

Matza, D. (1969) *Becoming Deviant*, New York: Prentice Hall.

Mills, C. W. (1959) *The Sociological Imagination*, London: Oxford University Press.

Muncie J. (1999) *Youth and Crime,* London, Sage Publications.

Naffine, N. (1997) *Feminism and Criminology*, Cambridge: polity Press.

Nelken, D. (1996) (ed.) *The Futures of Criminology*, London: Sage.

Parker, T. (1973) *The Man Inside,* London: Joseph.

Pearson, G. (1975) *The Deviant Imagination: Psychiatry, Social Work and Social Change*, London: Macmillan.

Petrie, S. (2000) *Peace Builders, Young People and Crime Prevention*, Paper presented at the Research Concentration in Crime, Youth and Community Justice Seminar Series, Queensland University of Technology, School of Justice Studies, May.

Phillipson, M. (1971) *Sociological Aspects of Crime and Delinquency*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Pitts, J. (forthcoming) 'Korrectional Kareoke: New Labour and the Zombification of Youth Justice', in Hil, R. and Tait, G. (eds.) *Hard Lessons: Reflections on Crime Control in Late Modernity*, Basingstoke: Ashgate.

Pitts, J and Hope, T. (1998) 'The Local Politicos of Inclusion: The State and Community', *Social Policy and Administration*, vol.13, No.5.

Plummer, K. (1979) 'Misunderstanding Labelling Perspectives', in Downes, D. and Rock, P. (eds.) *Deviant Interpretations: Problems in Criminological Theory*, London: Martin Robertson.

Plummer, K. (1995) *Telling Sexual Stories: Power, Change and Social Worlds*, London: Routledge.

Probyn, W. (1977) *Angel Face: The Making of a Criminal*, London: Allen and Unwin.

Queensland State Government (1999) *Commission of Inquiry into Abuses of Children in Queensland Institutions*, Brisbane: Goprint.

Rabinow, P. (1986) (ed.) *The Foucault Reader*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Rees, S. (1978) *Social Work Face to Face*, London: Edward Arnold.

Rees, S. and Wallace, A. (1982) *Verdicts on Social Work*, London: Edward Arnold.

Robinson, J. A. (1992) 'Autobiographical Memory', in Grunberg, M. and Morris, P. (eds.) *Aspects of Meaning*, London: Routledge.

Rock, P. and MacIntosh, M. (1974) (eds.) *Deviance and Social Control*, London: Tavistock.

Sainsbury, E. (1982) *Social Work in Focus*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Sampson R. J. Raudenbush S. W. & Earls F. (1997) Neighbourhoods and Violent Crime: A Multi-Level Study of Collective Efficacy, *Science,* 277 (August 15).

Seabrooke, J. (1973) *The Unemployed: A Hundred Years of Family Life and Tradition in a Working Class Street*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Schutz, A. (1970) *Alfred Schutz on Phenomenology and the Modern World*, Chicago: University of Chicago

Sibley, D. (1995) *Geographies of Exclusion: Society and Difference in the West London*: Routledge Press.

Smart, C. (1977) *Women, Crime and Criminology*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Sykes, G. and Matza, D. (1957) 'Techniques of Neutralisation: A Theory of Delinquency', *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 22, December, pp.664-70.

Tait, G. (2000) *Youth, Sex and Governance,* New York; Peter Lang.

Taylor, I., Walton, P. and Young, J. (1973) *The New Criminology*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Taylor, I., Walton, P. and Young, J. (1975) (eds.) *Critical Criminology*, London: Routledge.

Taylor, I. and Taylor, L. (1973) (eds.) *Politics and Deviance*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Taylor, L. (1973) *Deviance and Society*, London: Nelson.

Taylor, L. (1979) 'Vocabularies, Rhetorics and Grammar: Problems in the Sociology of Motivation', in Downes, D. and Rock, P. (eds.) *Deviant Interpretations: Problems in Criminological Theory*, London: Martin Robertson.

Thompson, K (1998*) Moral Panics*, London: Routledge.

Thompson, P. (1978) *The Voice of the Past: Oral History*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Timms, N. and Mayer, J. (1970) *The Client Speaks*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Van Krieken, R. (1991) *Children and the State: Social Control and the Formation of Australian Child Welfare*, Sydney: Allen and Unwin.

Ventola, E. (1996) (ed.) *Academic Writing: Intercultural and Textual Issues*, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Walmsley, D. J. (19990 'Community, Place and Cyberspace', *Australian Geographer,* vol.31, No.1.

Walklate, S. (1998) *Understanding Criminology,* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Walton, P. and Young, J. (1998) (eds.) *The New Criminology Revisited,* London: Macmillan.

Watts, R. (1998) 'Unemployment, the Underclass and Crime in Australia: A Critique, *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, Vol. 29, No.1.

White, R. (1999) 'Indigenous Youth and Offensive Space', *Social Alternatives*, Vol.18, No.2.

Whyte, W. F. (1955) *Street Corner Society: The Social Structure of an Italian Slum*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wiles, P. (1976) (ed) *The Sociology of Crime and Delinquency in Britain*, London: Martin Robertson

Willis, P. (1977) *Learning to Labour: How Working Class Kids Get Working Class Jobs*, Farnborough: Saxon House.

Willis, P. (1978) *Profane Culture*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Wilson, P. T. (1973) 'Normative and Interpretative Paradigms', in Douglas, J. (ed.) *Understanding Everyday Life*, London: Routledge.

Wolff, K.H. (1978) 'Phenomenology and Sociology' in Bottomore, T.B and Nisbet, R. (eds.) *A History of Sociological Analysis*, New York: Basic Books.

Young, J. (1971) *The Drugtakers: the Social Meaning of Drug Use*, London: Paladin.

Young, J. (1999) *The Exclusive Society: Social Exclusion, Crime and Difference in Late Modernity*, London: Sage.

Young, A. (1996) *Imagining Crime: Textual Outlaws and Criminal Conversations*, London: Sage.

APPENDIX 1

FULL CHRONOLOGICAL BIBLIOGRAPHY OF SELECTED PUBLICATIONS ACCORDING TO AREAS OF INQUIRY (YOUTH JUSTICE, YOUNG PEOPLE AND SOCIAL WELFARE, AND CRIMINOLOGY).

An asterisk indicates refereed publications. For the sake of convenience, I have placed my name first in the order of authors for each jointly authored publication cited below. The nature and extent of my contribution is set out in the declaration form attached to each publication.

Youth Justice

Hil, R. (2000) 'A Gloomy Vista? Globalisation, Juvenile Crime and Social Order: An Australian Perspective', *Crime Law and Social Change*, Vol. 33, pp. 369-384.

Hil, R. and McMahon, A. (2001) *Families, Crime and Juvenile Justice*, New York: Peter Lang.

*Hil, R. (1999) 'Parent Blaming and the Littleton High School Massacre', *Alternative Law Journal*, Vol. 24, No. 4, pp. 182-184.

Hil, R. and Bessant, J. (1999a) 'Spaced Out? Young Peoples' Agency, Resistance and Public Space', *Urban Policy and Research*, Vol.17, No.1, pp.41-49.

Hil, R. and Bessant, J. (1999b) 'School's Out! Street Protests, Young People and One Nation', *Transition*, Vol. 7, No 1, pp. 2-6.

Hil, R. and Bessant, J. (1999c) *Media Representation of Young People: Issues and Concerns*, Brisbane. Submission to the Queensland State Government Commission of Inquiry into Abuses of Children in Queensland Institutions.

*Hil, R. (1998a) 'Listening to the Families of Juvenile Offenders: A North Queensland Study', *Australian Social Work*, Vol. 51, No. 3, pp.3-8.

*Hil, R. (1998b) 'The Call to Order: Young People, Crime and Family Responsibility', *Journal of Australian Studies*, No. 59, pp. 101-114

Hil, R. (1997a) 'Punishing Parents Puts Pressure On Social Workers', *Professional Social Work*, April, pp.14-15.

Hil, R. (1997b) 'Waves, Epidemics and Racial War: The Construction of a 'Crime Problem' in Queensland', in Hil, R. and Bessant, J. (eds.) *Youth, Crime and the Media*. Hobart: National Clearing House for Youth Studies, pp.67-74.

Hil, R. and Bessant, J. (1997a) 'Introduction' in Hil, R. and Bessant, J. (eds.) *Youth, Crime and the Media*, Hobart, National Clearing House for Youth Studies, pp.1-6.

Hil, R. and Bessant, J. (1997b) 'Juvenile Crime and Youth Unemployment: Causality and the Corrective Agenda', in O'Connor, I. and Borowski, A. (eds.) *Juvenile Crime and Juvenile Justice*, Melbourne: Cambridge University Pres, pp.60-78.

Hil, R. and Crane, P. (1997) *Submission in Response to the Queensland State Government's (Draft) Statement on Youth Affairs*, Brisbane: Queensland University of Technology.

*Hil, R., McMahon, A. and Buckley, A. (1997) 'Family Experiences of Juvenile Crime: An Australian Perspective', *Asia Pacific Journal of Social Work*, Vol. 7, No. 1, pp.68-77.

*Hil, R. and Roughley, L. (1997a) 'Public Consultation and Juvenile Justice Reform: A Queensland Case Study', *Australian Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. 32, No.1, pp.21-36.

*Hil, R. and Roughley, L. (1997b) 'Fast Tracking Reform: Queensland's Juvenile Justice Act', *Social Alternatives*, Vol. 16, No. 1, pp.53-56.

*Hil, R. (1996a) *Making Them Pay: Parental Restitution in Australian Juvenile Justice*, Townsville: Centre for Social and Welfare Research, James Cook University of North Queensland.

*Hil, R. (1996b) 'Crime by Default: Legislating for Parental Restitution in Queensland', *Alternative Law Journal*, Vol. 20, No.8, pp.280-283.

*Hil, R. (1996c) 'Counting the Cost: Juvenile Crime, Parents and Restitution', *Just Policy*, Vol. 8, pp.11-19.

Hil, R. (1996d) 'The Family Fix', *Arena Magazine*, No. 23, June-July, pp.35-38.

Hil, R. (1996e) 'Who Pays for Crime? Penalising Young People and their Families', *Youth Studies Australia*, Vol. 15, No.4, pp.23-27.

*Hil, R., McMahon, A. and Buckley, A. (1996) *Another Hole in the Wall: Families, Crime and Punishment – A Progress Report on Researching in North Queensland*, Melbourne: University of Melbourne, Youth Research Centre.

*Hil, R. (1995) 'Small Initiative, Big Questions: An Analysis of the Townsville Youth Assistance Panel', *Australian Social Work*, Vol. 48, No 1, pp.23-29

*Hil, R., Buckley, A. and McMahon, A. (1995) 'Which community? Whose values?' *Alternative Law Journal*, Vol. 20, pp.228-230.

Hil, R., Craig, T. and Keast, T. (1995) 'Talk on the Wildside: Young Peoples Experiences of Wilderness Programs', in Hil, R., and Simpson, C. (Eds.) *Ways of Resistance: Young People and Social Control in Australia*, Sydney: Hale and Iremonger.

*Hil, R and McMahon, A. (1995) 'In The Shadows: The Silent And Silenced Family In Juvenile Justice Research', *Children Australia*, Vol. 20, No. 4, pp.4-8.

Hil, R. and Simpson, C. (1995) 'Introduction', in Hil, R. and Simpson, C. (Eds.) *Ways of Resistance: Young People and Social Control in Australia*, Sydney: Hale and Iremonger, pp.13-21.

*Hil, R. (1994a) *Justice, Punishment, Families and the State: The Changing Contours of Juvenile Justice*, Proceedings of the Families and the Future Conference, Northern Territory University, June 26-29, pp.143-155.

Hil, R. (1994b) 'Bringing it Home: Family Responsibility and Juvenile Crime', *Northern Radius*, Vol. 1, No. 2, pp.9-12.

Hil, R. (1994c) 'Changing Targets? Queensland Approach to Crime Prevention Revisited', *Criminology Australia*, Vol. 5, No. 3, pp.17-19

Hil, R. and Fisher, L. (1994) 'Symbolising Panic: The Construction Of a 'Black Juvenile Crime Problem' in Queensland', *Socio-Legal Bulletin*, No 13, Winter, pp.39-45.

Hil, R., Zuchowski, J. and Bone, R. (1994) 'Sites of Trouble: Demystifying 'High Crime Areas', *Youth Studies Australia*. Vol. 13, No. 2, pp.51-55.

Hil, R. (1993) 'Moral Panic and Juvenile Justice in Queensland: The Juvenile Justice Act 1992' in Hazelhurst, K. (ed.) *Perceptions of Justice: Issues in Indigenous and Community Empowerment*, Aldershot: Avebury, pp.51-70.

Hil, R. (1993) 'Good Intentions and Community Diversion: An Analysis of the Townsville Youth Assistance Panel', *Northern Radius*, Vol. 1, No 1, p.18.

Hil, R. and Seaton, S. (1993) 'Policy or Orthodoxy? Critical Notes on Queensland's Response to Juvenile Crime', *Criminology Australia*, Vol. 4, No. 4, April/May, pp.14-16.

Hil, R. (1992) 'Correction Through Aversion: Australian Day in Prison Programs', *Youth Action and Policy Association Newsletter*, Vol. 2, No. 3, pp.6-7.

Hil, R. and Keast, R. (1992) 'Correctional Shock: A Look at Prison Aversion Programs for Young People', *Transitions* (Youth Affairs Network Queensland), June, pp.38-41.

*Hil, R. and Moyle, P. (1992) 'A Day in Prison – A Solution to Reducing Juvenile Recidivism Rates or Not?' *Alternative Law Journal*, Vol.17, No.15, pp.224-226

Hil, R. (1988) 'Centre 81: Clients' and Officers' Views of the Southampton Day Centre', in Pointing, J. (ed.) *Alternatives to Custody*, Oxford: Blackwells, pp.71-91.

*Hil, R. (1982a) 'Conceptual Images of Social Work and Probation Practice: A Case Study', *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, Vol. 27, No.3, pp.255-264.

Hil, R. (1982b) 'Black Kids: White Justice', *New Society*, Vol.27, No.3.

Hil, R. (1980) *Centre 81: A Study of the Genesis and Development of the Southampton Day Centre*, Winchester: Hampshire County Council.

Young People and Social Welfare

*Hil, R. and Bessant, J. (1998a) 'Parenting on Trial: State Wards and Government Accountability in Australia', *Journal of Criminal Justice*, Vol. 26, No. 2. pp.145 -157

*Hil, R. and Bessant, J. (1998b) 'Moral Anguish and Systemic Failure', *Children Australia*, Vol. 22, No. 4, pp.22-26.

Hil, R., Caltabiano, M. and Frangos, R. (1997) 'The Challenge to Inclusion: Contexts and Policy Issues', in Hil, R., Caltabiano, M. and Frangos, R. (eds.) *Achieving Inclusion: Exploring Issues in Disability: Exploring Issues in Disability*, Townsville: Centre for Social and Welfare Research, James Cook University of North Queensland.

Hil, R. (1996) Review of Jamrozik J. and Sweeney, T. (1996) 'Children and Society', *Northern Radius*, Vol.3, No.2, pp. 40-41.

Hil, R., Wilkinson, R. and McMahon, J. (1996) *The Employment Needs of People with Disability in the Whitsunday Shire*, Townsville: Centre for Social and Welfare Research, James Cook University of North Queensland.

Hil, R., Cheers, B. and Bone, R. (1993a) *The Social Needs of Young People in the Whitsunday Shire,* Townsville: Centre for Social and Welfare Research.

*Hil, R., Bone, R. and Cheers, B. (1993b) 'A View from the Margins: Perceptions of Youth Need in a Rural Community, *Rural Social Work*, Vol.1, No. 1. pp.23-34.

*Hil, R., Cheers, B. and Bone, R. (1993c) 'Paradise Lost? Young People's Experience of Rural Life in the Whitsunday Shire', *Rural Society*, Vol. 3, No. 4, pp.9- 12.

Hil, R. (1992a) Review of Royse, D (1991) 'Research Methods in Social Work', Chicago: Nebon-Hall. *British Journal of Social Work*, Vol. 8, pp.363-365

Hil, R. (1992b) Review of Barber, J. (1991) 'Beyond Casework', London: Macmillan, *Australian Social Work*, Vol. 15, No.2, pp.53-54.

Hil, R, (1988) 'Drifting in Care: Home on Trial Placements', *Social Services Insight (Management Journal)*, No.16, August, pp.16-17.

Criminology
Hil, R., Bessant, J. and Watts, R. (forthcoming), *Understanding Criminology*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hil, R. (2000) 'Governing Through Risk: Young People, Crime and the Pathway to Prevention Report', *Children Australia*, Vol. 25, No.3, pp. 28-32.

Hil, R. (2000a) 'In Search of the Holy Grail: A Rejoinder to Professor Homel', *Youth Studies Australia*, Vol.19, No. 2, pp. 5o-2.

*Hil, R. (2000b) 'Toward A More "Progressive" Criminology? A Rejoinder to Elliott Currie', *Western Criminology Review*, pp.1-16. http://wcr.sonoma.edu/reviewer/hil.html

Hil, R. (2000c) Review essay of the following books in *Just Policy*, No. 18, April, pp.48-52: Carrington, K. (1998) 'Who Killed Leigh Leigh', Sydney: Random House; Pearson, P. (1998) 'When She Was Bad', London: Virago; Cook, S. and Bessant, J. (eds.) (1997), 'Women's Encounter With Violence', California: Sage.

Hil, R. & Christie, G. (2000) *Service Users and Providers' Perceptions of a Methadone Maintenance Program: A Pilot Queensland Study,* Brisbane: Alcohol and Drug Foundation, Queensland.

*Hil, R. and Dawes, G. (2000) 'The Thin White Line: Juvenile Crime, Racialised Narrative and Vigilantism – A North Queensland Study', *Current Issues in Criminal Justice,* Vol. 11, No. 3, pp.308-326

*Hil, R. (1999a) 'Youth Crime, Risk and Governance: A View From Queensland', *Social Alternatives,* Vol. 18, No.2.

Hil, R. (1999b) 'Beating the Developmental Path: Critical Notes on the Pathways to Prevention Report', *Youth Studies Australia,* Vol. 18, No.4, pp.49-50.

Hil, R. (1999c) 'Pathways to Nowhere: Risk Talk and Crime Prevention', *Arena Magazine,* No.43, October, pp.43-55.

*Hil, R., Dawes, G. and Eddy, E. (1999) 'Resolving Ethical Issues in the Study of Reactive Vigilantism: A Case Study', *Ethics and Justice,* Vol. 2, No. 3 and 4, pp.95-108.

Hil, R., Bessant, J. Watts, R. and Weber, R. (1999) *Thinking the Problem of Youth Violence and Families,* Paper presented to the Australian Institute of Criminology Conference, Children and Crime, Brisbane: Queensland University of Technology.

*Hil, R. (1998a) 'Cautionary Tales: Vigilantism, Crime and Social Order in Australia', *Just Policy,* No. 14, pp.22-31.

Hil, R. (1998b) 'The Road to Nowhere? Imprisonment, Queensland Style', *Prisoners Legal Service Newsletter,* No. 38 September, pp.

Hil, R. (1998c) Review of Hogg, R. and Brown, D. (1998f) 'Rethinking Law and Order', Armidale: Pluto Press, *Just Policy*, No. 14, pp. 58 – 60.

Hil, R. (1998d) 'Policing Space: Juvenile Crime and Autonomous Citizen Action', *Youth Studies Australia*, Vol. 17, No. 3, pp. 36-41.

Hil, R. (1997) Review of Hudson, B. 'Understanding Justice: An Introduction to Ideas, Perspectives and Controversies in Modern Penal Theory', *Just Policy*, No. 11, pp.55-56.

*Hil, R. (1996) 'Crime Prevention and the Technologies of Social Order: A Response to Philip Hill and Adam Sutton', *Just Policy*, No. 6, May, pp.59-62.

Hil, R. (1995) Review of Bessant, J. et al. (ed.) (1995a) Cultures of Crime and Violence: The Australian Experience, *Australian Social Work*, Vol.48, No.3, pp.57-58.

Hil, R. (1994) Review of Cunneen, C. (ed.) (1994), Aboriginal Perspectives on Criminal Justice, *Alternative Law Journal*, Vol.18, No.9, pp.197-198.

Hil, R. (1993) 'Targeting and Control: Unmasking the Rhetoric of Queensland's Crime Prevention Strategy', *Socio-Legal Bulletin*, No. 9, Autumn, La Trobe University (Reprinted in Transitions, Vol. 3, No. 3.), pp.23-28.

Hil, R. (1985) Review of McGuire, B. et al (eds.) (1985) *Accountability and Prisons: Opening Up a Closed World.* London: Tavistock, British Journal of Social Work.

Hil, R. (1982) 'Probation Day Care Provision: A Case Study', *Home Office Research Bulletin* No. 14, pp.38-40.

APPENDIX 2

SIGNIFICANTLY ABBREVIATED CURICULUM VITAE, MAY 2000
(EXCLUDING PUBLICATIONS CONTAINED IN APPENDIX 1)

PERSONAL DETAILS

ACADEMIC QUALIFICATIONS

September 1988 - June 1989, Thames Polytechnic, Certificate in Education (Tertiary Education)

October 1983 - October 1984, University of Southampton, Certificate of Qualification in Social Work (CQSW).

October 1976 - October 1977, University of Bristol, M.Sc. (Sociology).

September 1973 - June 1976, University of Essex, B.A. Social Studies (Hons.), Upper Second class (2:1).

PROFESSIONAL CAREER

(1998) Lecturer, School of Justice Studies, Queensland University of Technology.

(1997 1998) Lecturer, Faculty of Arts, Sunshine Coast University College.

(1991- 1997) Lecturer, Social Work and Community Welfare, James Cook University of North Queensland.

(October 1989 – January 1991, Social Worker, London Borough of Wandsworth.

(July 1989 - October 1989) Social Worker, London Borough of Kingston.

(November 1988 - July 1990) Lecturer (part-time), Lambeth Adult Education Institute.

(March 1988 - September 1988) Social Worker, Acton Social Services, London Borough of Ealing.

(November 1988 -July 1989) Lecturer, General studies (part-time), Carshalton College of Further Education.

(September 1985 - February 1988) Research Officer, Lambeth Social Services Department (London).

(October 1979 - October 1983) Research and Information Officer, Hampshire Probation and After-Care Service.

(October 1977 - October 1979) Tutor, University of York, Department of Sociology.

PUBLICATIONS (excluding those contained in Appendix 1)

Hil, R. (1998) *A Comment on Juvenile Justice Centres in Queensland*, Submission to Queensland Department of Families, Youth and Community Care, September 1998.

Hil, R and Bessant, J. (1999) *Differential Images of Young people in Australia.* Submission to the Commission of Inquiry into Abuse of Children in Queensland Institutions (The Forde Inquiry).

Hil, R. (1998) 'The Road to Nowhere? Imprisonment, Queensland Style'. *Prisoners Legal Service Newsletter*, No. 38 September.

Hil, R. (1998) *Thinking Again about Juvenile Crime: Issues and Strategies*. Proceedings of Youth Crime Forum, Sunshine Coast. Nambour: Youth and Community Combined Action Program.

Hil, R. (1997) 'Dissecting the Complex Nature of Crime', *Courier Mail*, November 17.

Hil, R. (1993) 'Good Intentions and Community Diversion: An Analysis of the Townsville Youth Assistance Panel', *Northern Radius*, Vol. 1, No.1.

Hil, R. and Bessant, J. (1998) 'Over-policing distorts juvenile crime problem', *The Australian*, December 10.

Hil, R. and Dawes, G. (1998) Vigilantism - The Worry Of Do-It-Yourself Justice, *JCU Outlook*, Vol. 10, No. 3.

Hil, R. and Henry, R. (1997) 'A Teflon Phenomenon? Pauline Hanson and Egalitarian Nationalism', *JCU Outlook* (James Cook University Newsletter), Vol.9, No.3.

Hil, R. (1997) 'Dissecting the Complex Nature of Crime', *Courier Mail*, November 17.

Hil, R. and Crane, P. (1997) *Response to the Queensland Government Policy Statement on Youth Affair*. Submission to Department of Families, Youth and Community Care, Brisbane. pp: 12.

Hil, R. and Bessant, J. (1997) *State Wards and State Care*, Submission to the Inquiry into the status of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, Joint Standing Committee on Treaties, Parliament of Australia.

Hil, R., McMahon, A. and Bessant, J. (1996) 'Don't Damn Law-Abiding Majority', *The Australian*, September 4.

Hil, R. (1996) 'Children, Crime and Justice', *Northern Radius*, Vol. 3. No. 2.

Hil, R. (1994) 'Bringing it Home: Family Responsibility and Juvenile Crime', *Northern Radius* Vol. 1, No. 2.

Hil, R. (1993) 'Good Intentions and Community Diversion: An Analysis of the Townsville Youth Assistance Panel', *Northern Radius*, Vol. 1, No.1.

Hil, R. (1992) 'Days in Prison', *Prisoners Legal Service Bulletin*, June.

Hil, R. and Gibney, J, (1992) *A Response to the Juvenile Justice Bill 1992*, Townsville Community Law Service (Submission to Queensland Office of Cabinet, regional consultation meeting.)

Hil, R. (1981) 'Too Much Prison?', *National Association of Probation Offices Newsletter*, No. 17, February.

Hil, R. (1983) *Groupwork and Probation: An Analysis of Groupwork Undertaken by Officers of the Hampshire Probation and After-Care Service.* (Commissioned by the Hampshire Probation and After-Care Service Management Committee.)

Hil, R. (1982) *A Study of Welfare Work in Hampshire Penal Institutions.* (A report submitted to the management group, Hampshire Probation and After Care Service).

Hil, R. (1981) *Helping Out: A Study of Voluntary Work in the Probation Service.* (A Study commissioned by the management committee of the Hampshire Probation Service.)

CONFERENCES

International

Hil, R. (2001) *Critical Criminology and the Challenge of Globalisation,* Paper presented to the International Sociology of Law conference, Budapest, July 4.

Hil, R. (2001) *New Directions for Critical Criminology in an Era of Globalisation.* Paper presented to Whither Critical Criminology? Conference at the University of Western Sydney, February 24.

Hil, R. (2000) *Globalisation, Crime and Governance: Implications for Social Work Theory and Practice.* Paper presented to the Joint Conference of the International Federation of Social Workers and the International Association of Schools of Social Work, Montreal, Canada.

Hil, R. Bessant, J Weber, R. and Watts, R. July 30. (1999) *Thinking About the Problem of Youth Violence and Families,* Australian Institute of Criminology conference, Brisbane, July 17.

Hil, R. (1998) *Space Invaders? Young People, Space and Social Work - An Australian Perspective.* Paper presented to British Association of Social Workers conference, 'Making a Difference', Southport, March 17.

Hil, R. (1998) *Globalisation, Juvenile Crime and Social Work - An Australian Perspective.* (Paper presented at the Joint World Congress of Social Workers - IFSW and the International Association of Schools of Social Work, Jerusalem, Israel July 5).

Hil, R. and Dawes, G. (1998) *A Rumble in the Suburbs: Vigilantism and Juvenile Crime,* Australian and New Zealand Society of Criminology, Gold Coast, July 18.

Hil, R., (1998) *Vigilantism, Juvenile Crime and the 'Policing' of Public Space*. 'Youth 98', Youth Voices, Public Spaces, University of Melbourne, April.

Hil, R. (1995) *Finding Fault: Juvenile Crime, Justice and the Ideology of Family Responsibility* (Paper presented to the Youth '95 international conference. National Clearing House for Youth Studies, Hobart, 7 November).

Hil, R. (1994) *Crime, Punishment, Families and the State: Changing Contours of Juvenile Crime Control in Queensland* (Keynote address to Families and the Future conference, Northern Territory University, June 26 – 29).

Hil, R. (1993) *Small Initiative, Big Questions: An Analysis of the Townsville Youth Assistance Panel.* (Paper presented to the 'Issues in Childhood' conference. Brisbane, Queensland University of Technology).

National/Local

Hil, R. (2000) *Putting Out the Spot Fires: An Irreverent Analysis of Crime Prevention Policy in Australia.* Paper presented at Seminar Series, School of Justice Studies, Queensland University of Technology, 13 March.

Hil, R. (1999) *Crime Prevention and the Pathways to Prevention Report.* Research seminar, Queensland University of Technology (Carseldine campus), 9 August.

Hil, R. (1999) *Too Much Crime Prevention? A Critical Comment of the Queensland State Government's 'Tough on the Causes of Crime'* Paper presented to the Youth Justice Coalition conference, Brisbane, 18 march.

Hil, R. (1998) *The Final Frontier? Public Space and Young People.* Paper presented at Youth Studies Research Unit seminar series, Sunshine Coast University College, 16 September.

Hil, R. (1998) *Searching for Causes: Juvenile Crime and the 'Moral Dimension.* Address to the Youth Crime Forum, Sunshine Coast University College, May 1996.

Hil, R. (1998) *The New Confinement'? Young People and Community Control.* Paper presented to Second National Conference of Community Based Criminal Justice Activists, Brisbane, March 26.

Hil, R. (1996) *One-way Panic: Reporting Juvenile Crime in Townsville.* Paper to public seminar organised by Townsville City Council, Mayoral Chambers, 15 July.

Hil, R. (1996) *Living the Experience: Families, Crime and Criminalisation.* Paper presented to the Australian Institute of Criminology conference, 12 September, James Cook University of North Queensland.

Hil, R. (1996) *Responding to Crime: A Brief Litany of Unintended Consequences.* Paper presented to annual general meeting of the Prisoners Aid Society, Townsville, 6 September.

Hil, R. (1996) *Punishing Parents for Juvenile Crime: The New Restitution.* Paper presented to public seminar organised by Centre for Social and Welfare Research, James Cook University of North Queensland, 8 July.

Hil, R. (1996) *Families, Crime and Criminalisation.* Paper presented to a Crime Prevention Summit organised by the Queensland State Government, Townsville.

Hil, R. (1994) *The Emergent Context of the 1992 Juvenile Justice Act*. Paper presented to Juvenile Justice Forum, Lifeline, 12 October.

Hil, R. and Gibney, J. (1992) *A Response to the Juvenile Justice Bill 1992*. Paper presented to Queensland Government Consultation Committee.

Hil, R. (1986) *Drifting in Care: The Lambeth Experience*. Paper presented to Lambeth Department of Social Services, Management Committee.

Hil, R. (1983) *The Limits to Prison and Alternatives to Custody*. Paper presented to National Association of Probation Officers, Hampshire branch.

Hil, R. (1979) *Researching Afro-Caribbean Youth and Crime*. Paper presented to the West Yorkshire Probation Service.

ADVISORY, CONSULTATIVE AND MANAGEMENT WORK

(2000) Convenor of 'Inside the Warehouse: Young People in Queensland Prisons', Queensland University of Technology, 28 November.

(1999) Australian Coordinator for the World Encyclopaedia Project (organised by the State University of New York).

(1999) Convenor of a conference on 'Risk, Young People and Crime Prevention', held at QUT, June-July 1999.

(1999) Member of the Inala Police-Youth Liaison Committee.

(1999) Director of the Research Concentration of Crime, Youth and Community Justice, School of Justice Studies, Queensland University of Technology.

(1999) Member of Juvenile Justice Reference Group, Queensland Department of Families, Youth and Community Care

(1999) Adviser on youth crime research project (youth crime) to Beenleigh Youth and Combined Community Action Group.

(1999) Appointed as reviewer for *Current Issues in Criminal Justice.*

(1999) Member of Queensland Task Force on Crime Prevention.

(1999) Member of Youth Affairs Network Queensland, Editorial Board, responsible for co-editing YANQ's journal, *New Transitions.*

(1999) Member of the Queensland Youth Justice Coalition.

(1998) Member of The Youth Crime Prevention Network, Sunshine Coast.

(1998) Appointed as reviewer of articles submitted to *Australian Social Work.*

(1998) Appointed as reviewer of papers submitted to the *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology.*

(1998) Member of Youth Justice Services Non-Government Organisations Information group.

(1998) Member of Youth Crime Network, Sunshine Coast region.

(1998) Referee for National Teaching Development Grant applications (Committee for University Teaching and Staff Development).

(1997) Adviser to Youth Affairs Network, Queensland on research into the Queensland Education Department's new policy on school suspensions and exclusions.

(1997) Member of the Editorial Board North Australian Social research Institute (NASRI).

(1997) Member of the Youth Workers Forum, Sunshine Coast.

(1996-7) Member of the Sharehouse management committee.

(1996) Founder of Youth Studies Research Centre (Sunshine Coast University College).

(1996) Moderator for Bachelor of Social Science (Youth Studies), Australian Catholic University, Melbourne.

(1993) Member of the Westcourt Youth Centre, management committee.

(1993-6) Member of the Northern Radius Editorial Committee.

(1993-5) Member of Management Committee of the Neighbourhood Youth Project, Thuringowa.

(1992 - 4) Member of the Townsville Community Legal Service, management committee.

(1992) Member of the Queensland Office of Cabinet consultation group regarding the Juvenile Justice Bill.

(1992-4) Founder and Coordinator of the Socio-Legal Information Network Group.

(1992) Submission for funding of Thuringowa YACCA program (Application accepted in 1992 for funding of $150,000).

(1990) Advisor to Thames Television, current affairs program on exemplary sentencing.

(1982) Adviser for a survey of public opinion on crime in Britain (The survey was undertaken jointly by *The Observer* newspaper and the National Association of Probation Officers).

(1981) Adviser for a survey of reception procedures in Probation area offices (This study undertaken by probation trainees at the University of Southampton, Department of Applied Social Studies).

(1981) Adviser to a study of lifers in British prisons. (This study undertaken by the Deputy Chief Probation Officer of the Hampshire Probation and After-Care Service and was eventually published by Heinemann Educational Books, London).

COORDINATION/FACILITATION OF WORKSHOPS

(February 1997) *Families of Juvenile Offenders: Theory and Practice.* Workshop conducted with childcare Officers of the Department of Families, Youth and Community Care.

(September 1995) *Responding to the Threat of Violence: Strategies for Social Welfare Practice*, Continuing Education Workshop, Mount Isa.

(September 1995) *Beyond 'Nothing Works'; Empowering Practice with Juvenile Offenders and Their Families.* Continuing Education Workshop, James Cook University of North Queensland, Mount Isa.

(1992) Submission for funding of Thuringowa YACCA program (Application accepted in 1992 for funding of $150,000).

(1990) Advisor to Thames Television, current affairs program on exemplary sentencing.

(1982) Adviser for a survey of public opinion on crime in Britain (The survey was undertaken jointly by *The Observer* newspaper and the National Association of Probation Officers).

(1981) Adviser for a survey of reception procedures in Probation area offices (This study undertaken by probation trainees at the University of Southampton, Department of Applied Social Studies).

(1981) Adviser to a study of lifers in British prisons. (This study undertaken by the Deputy Chief Probation Officer of the Hampshire Probation and After-Care Service and was eventually published by Heinemann Educational Books, London).

COORDINATION/FACILITATION OF WORKSHOPS

(February 1997) *Families of Juvenile Offenders: Theory and Practice.* Workshop conducted with childcare Officers of the Department of Families, Youth and Community Care.

(September 1995) *Responding to the Threat of Violence: Strategies for Social Welfare Practice*, Continuing Education Workshop, Mount Isa.

(September 1995) *Beyond 'Nothing Works'; Empowering Practice with Juvenile Offenders and Their Families.* Continuing Education Workshop, James Cook University of North Queensland, Mount Isa.

(25 October 1994) *Empowering Practice in the Context of Community Corrections*, - Queensland Corrective Services Commission.

(July 13 - 16 1994) *Interpersonal Communication and Interviewing Skills*, Open Learning Workshop.

(July 1994) *Reflections on the Juvenile Justice Act 1992*, (with A. Carter), Continuing Education workshop, James Cook University of North Queensland.

(10 - 11 March 1994). *Social Welfare and Community Corrections: Towards the Construction of an Empowerment Practice Model*, Queensland Corrective Services Commission.

(April 1993) *Violence in Social Work: Issues in Day-to-Day Practice*, workshop for agencies in the Townsville area.

(May 1992). *Dealing with Violence, Anger and Hostility: Issues, Strategies and Policies.* Department of Family Services and Aboriginal and Islander Affairs.

APPENDIX 3

A CHRONOLOGY OF SELECT RESEARCH AND ALLIED PUBLICATIONS UNDERTAKEN BY MR RICHARD HIL

The following inventory outlines the research activities undertaken while employed at three universities in Australia and two government departments in England. The symbol 'P' refers to primary studies based on empirical work, while 'S' refers to research work based largely on secondary source material. There is of course considerable overlap between works undertaken over this period. The second column refers to the location of the research in terms of geographical location. Although the emphasis in my published work has been on Australia much of my critical work covers developments in other 'western' (mainly English speaking) countries. The third column sets out a select range of publications relating to research conducted in each period of publications. The fourth column refers to the thematic areas set out in this report, namely Youth Justice (YJ), Young People and Social Welfare (YPSW), and Criminology (C).

CHRONOLOGY	RESEARCH TOPIC	LOCATION	SELECT PUBLICATIONS	THEMATIC AREAS
(1998) School of Justice Studies, Queensland University of Technology	Globalisation and youth crime (S)	International	Hil 2000	YJ
	Littleton High School massacre (S)	North America / International	Hil (1999)	YJ
	Young people and public space (S)	Australian	Hil & Bessant (1999c)	YJ
	Introduction to criminology (S)	International	Hil, Bessant & Watts (Forthcoming)	C
	Critique of risk-based crime prevention (S)	Australia	Hil (2000a)	C
	Reflexive criminology (S)	International	Hil (2000b)	C

CHRONOLOGY	RESEARCH TOPIC	LOCATION	SELECT PUBLICATIONS	THEMATIC AREAS
(1997-8) Faculty of Arts, Sunshine Coast University College	Vigilantism (S)	Queensland	Hil (1998a) Hil (1998d)	C C
	State wards (S)	Australia	Hil & Bessant (1998a) Hil & Bessant (1988b)	C C
(1991-7) Department of Social Work and Community Welfare, James Cook University of North Queensland	Vigilantism (P)	North Queensland	Hil & McMahon (Forthcoming)	YJ
	Youth unemployment and crime (S)	Australia / other 'western' countries	Hil & Bessant (1997b)	YJ
	Public consultation and juvenile justice reform (S)	Queensland	Hil & Roughley (1997 a/b)	YJ

CHRONOLOGY	RESEARCH TOPIC	LOCATION	SELECT PUBLICATIONS	THEMATIC AREAS
(1991-7) Department of Social Work and Community Welfare, James Cook University of North Queensland (cont)	Parental restitution (S)	Australia / other 'western' countries	Hil (1998)	YJ
	Youth diversion initiative (P)	North Queensland	Hil (1993)	YJ
	Juvenile Justice Act, Queensland (S)	Queensland	Hil (1993)	YJ
	'Day in Prison' programs (S)	Australia	Hil and Moyle (1992)	YJ
	Legislation relating to state wards (S)	Australia	Hil & Bessant (1998a)	YPSW

CHRONOLOGY	RESEARCH TOPIC	LOCATION	SELECT PUBLICATIONS	THEMATIC AREAS
(1991-7) Department of Social Work and Community Welfare, James Cook University of North Queensland (cont.)	Young people in rural areas (P)	North Queensland	Hil, Bone and Cheers (1996b)	C
	'Targeting' and police practices (P)	Queensland	Hil (1996)	C