

PAPER GUIDE PPSIS TRIPOS Part IIB 2013-14
INT 6: Criminology, Sentencing and the Penal System

This is a shared Paper with Law – where it is Paper 23
LAW TRIPOS Part IB
LAW TRIPOS Part II

Paper Guide

Course organiser Professor Loraine Gelsthorpe, lrg10@cam.ac.uk, 01223 335377,
Institute of Criminology, University of Cambridge, Sidgwick
Avenue, Cambridge, CB3 9DA

Lecturers Professor Loraine Gelsthorpe lrg10@cam.ac.uk
Mrs Nicola Padfield nmp21@cam.ac.uk
Professor Anthony Bottoms, aeb11@cam.ac.uk
Professor Alison Liebling, al115@cam.ac.uk
Professor Lawrence Sherman, ls434@cam.ac.uk
Dr Justice Tankebe, jt340@cam.ac.uk

Supervision We operate a centralised supervision system whereby students
are allocated to supervisors by the Course Organiser – unless
College Directors of Studies have made other arrangements of
course.

Supervisors Professor Loraine Gelsthorpe lrg10@cam.ac.uk
Dr Caroline Lanskey, cml29@cam.ac.uk
Dr Michael Rice, mer21@cam.ac.uk
Jane Dominey, jad78@cam.ac.uk

Outline of the Course

➤ Aims and Objectives

1. To allow students to gain a critical and informed understanding of patterns of crime, pathways into and out of crime, and critical issues regarding law, policy and practice in relation to criminal justice and sentencing.
2. To introduce students to contemporary theoretical debates on the purposes of punishment, and on the aims of specific parts of the criminal justice system, and through this work to enhance students' ability to handle normative issues in relation to legal and sociological topics more generally, and enable them to assess in an informed manner policy proposals from government, pressure groups and others.

3. To introduce students to the reading and understanding of empirical research materials relating to aspects of what is known about what works with offenders (in terms of future behaviour), sentencing, criminal justice, and the penal system in England and Wales; and thereby to enable them to appreciate more generally the potential relevance of empirical research in the study of legal systems and social problems in modern societies.
4. To enable students to bring together, in an intellectually coherent way, reading materials and ideas relating to normative issues, sociological understandings of the shape of criminal justice in contemporary society, substantive law, and empirical research studies (i.e. 1, 2 and 3 above).

➤ Brief description of the paper

1. Historical Background: Recent developments in criminal justice and the penal system in England and Wales (excluding criminal trials and pre-trial procedure). Relationship of these developments to aspects of broader social change in late modernity.
2. Patterns of crime, offending and victimisation (primarily in England and Wales, with international comparisons where appropriate). Strengths and weaknesses of data sources.
3. Theories and findings on pathways into crime at individual, family and community levels of analysis, and evidence on what is known about the causes and prevention of crime, and desistance from offending.
4. Theories of punishment, and the law of sentencing: justifications for penal measures, especially desert, deterrence, incapacitation, rehabilitation, restorative justice and reparation. The efficacy of penal measures.
5. How the sentencing and penal system works: sentencing law: theory, policy and practice, the discretion to prosecute and alternative systems of intervention such as restorative justice.
6. Sentencing provisions in practice: community penalties, prisons, parole.
7. Dealing with identified groups of offenders: young offenders, dangerous and sex offenders, women offenders.
8. Contemporary issues in criminal justice: race and gender issues relating to fairness and discrimination; the link between politics and sentencing policy and practice.

- Mode of teaching 9, plus 1 revision, supervisions (4 in both Michaelmas and Lent terms, and 2 in Easter term)
- Mode of assessment Long Essays or Exam Paper

Assessed work (if relevant)

➤ List of LONG ESSAY TITLES for 2014-2015

1. 'The key issue for official criminology has been *to identify the causes of crime, while not implicating the state as one of them* (Tim HOPE, 2011). Discuss.
2. How far do we need to consider the social, economic and political context in which criminal justice policy is devised in order to understand the direction and shape that it takes?
3. How should the criminal justice and penal system deal with the socially-disadvantaged offender?
4. Disregarding the traffic lights when they are red is an offence commonly committed by student cyclists in Cambridge; it is also dangerous. Could it be prevented (or could the incidence be reduced) by making offenders subject to ritual humiliation using public stocks on Parker's Piece, to the accompaniment of drum rolls and solemn music?
5. A body of academic research suggests that youth justice should be based on the principle of minimum intervention. Do you agree? In the light of your answer, critically assess the English and Welsh youth justice system and outline what values you think should inform youth justice?
6. 'Does the cycle of violence from abusive parent to aggressive child arise from environmental transmission or genetic transmission?' (Lisabeth DiLALLA and Irving GOTTESMAN, 1991).
7. In what ways, if any, does the privatization of criminal justice (prisons and probation especially) address enduring problems in the delivery of criminal justice in England and Wales?
8. There are numbers of villains, rogues, brutes, thugs, and sometimes even monsters in our prisons. But mainly our prisons are filled with socially battered, illiterate, drug-addicted, mentally deficient and mentally ill people whose unhappy condition is closely connected with the reason they have landed in prison' (Hyman GROSS, 2012). Insofar as *any two* of these claims are true, what are their implications for penal

policy?

9. 'While the idea that community sentences can act as an alternative to custody is an attractive one and has been a significant aspect of criminal justice policy for 30 years, it has to be noted that there is little evidence to suggest that it has worked in practice' (George MAIR, 2011). Discuss.
 10. Is blame through the delivery of 'pain' or other disbenefits desirable or necessary for a morally acceptable sentencing and penal system? Are there legitimate alternatives?
 11. 'Individual differences exist, they are rooted in deficits, and they need to be 'fixed' or offending will continue for a lengthy period of time' (Francis CULLEN, 2012). To what extent is this a useful view to take for reducing re-offending?
 12. It is important to distinguish between 'stories' and 'lived reality'. To what extent is this comment relevant to our understanding of the impact of imprisonment?
- Submission: "All assessed essays must be submitted before the deadline in both electronic format and on paper. Please hand the paper copy in the **HSPS Faculty Office**. Please either send the essay as an attachment to an email to <pps-essays@hsp.cam.ac.uk> or provide it on a disk to the Faculty Office. Essays will not be registered as having been submitted until they are received in *both* electronic *and* paper formats".
 - Deadlines (via:
http://www.hsp.cam.ac.uk/pps/current/undergraduate/assignment_deadlines.html)

Outline of Lectures

- Title of Lecture series: CRIMINOLOGY, SENTENCING AND THE PENAL SYSTEM

The LECTURES will be held in LG 19, Faculty of Law, Sidgwick Site, on THURSDAYS at 4pm and FRIDAYS at 2pm - starting on October 9th.

List of Lectures in the series

MICHAELMAS TERM 2014

TOPICS listed in the order in which they will be covered	NAME OF LECTURER covering topic	Lecture numbers
--	------------------------------------	--------------------

<i>Introductory Lecture: Course Convenors:</i> What the course is about. Crime and punishment in modern Britain. How the criminal justice system works.	Prof Gelsthorpe <i>Course Convenor</i> & Mrs Nicky Padfield (<i>joint convenor for the Law Course</i>)	1
<i>Understanding crime rates and research evidence</i> Key problems and dilemmas. Measures and meanings re crime and victimisation; the problem with statistics, the influence of the media.	Prof. L. Sherman	2, 3
<i>Pathways Into and Out of Crime:</i> i) Natural resilience and protective factors, ii) Crime and the life-course, iii) Individual and family factors, iv) Community and Situational factors	Prof. L. Sherman	4, 5, 6, 7
<i>Theories of Punishment:</i> Rehabilitation. Restorative Justice.	Prof. L. Gelsthorpe	8, 9
<i>Theories of Punishment</i> Deterrence and Incapacitation; Desert; Links between Theories and Sentencing	Prof. A. Bottoms	10, 11, 12, 13
<i>Routes into the Criminal Justice System</i> Policing the public, other pre-court and policing issues. Diversion, cautions, fixed penalties and the discretion to prosecute. Criminal justice and legitimacy	Dr J. Tankebe	14, 15, 16
<i>Routes into the Criminal Justice System</i> Policing the public, other pre-court and policing issues. Diversion, cautions, fixed penalties and the discretion to prosecute.	Dr J. Tankebe	8, 9, 10
<i>Theories of Punishment</i> Deterrence and Incapacitation; Desert; Links between Theories and Sentencing	Prof. A. Bottoms	11, 12, 13, 14
<i>Theories of Punishment:</i> <i>Rehabilitation. Restorative Justice.</i>	Prof. L. Gelsthorpe	15, 16

LENT TERM 2015

TOPICS listed in the order in which they will be covered	NAME OF LECTURER covering topic	Lecture Numbers
<i>Dealing with Offenders</i> The sentencing framework: law and practice. Focusing on fines, community orders,	Mrs N. Padfield	17, 18, 19, 20

imprisonment (both determinate and life sentences); special sentences for serious and dangerous offenders; 'ancillary' orders. What sentences mean in practice.		
<i>What Works & Dealing with Specific Groups of Offenders</i> : What works with offenders in the community and other issues relating to community penalties.	Prof. L. Gelsthorpe	21, 22, 23
<i>Dealing with Specific Groups of Offenders</i> : Special groups of offenders: women, BME and issues of fairness and justice.	Prof. L. Gelsthorpe	24, 25, 26
<i>Dealing with Specific Groups of Offenders</i> : What works with young offenders and other issues relating to youth justice.	Prof. L. Gelsthorpe	27, 28, 29
<i>Dealing with Specific Groups of Offenders</i> : Offenders in prison and other prison issues	Prof. L. Gelsthorpe	30, 31, 32

EASTER TERM 2015

TOPICS listed in the order in which they will be covered	NAME OF LECTURER covering topic	Lecture Numbers
<i>Critical Issues - Getting out of prison</i> : Early release and parole, and recall.	Mrs N. Padfield	33, 34
<i>Critical Issues in the Delivery of Criminal Justice</i> : Criminal justice issues in late modernity.	Prof. L. Gelsthorpe	35
<i>Critical Issues in the Delivery of Criminal Justice</i> : Recent Developments. Concluding lecture.	Prof. L. Gelsthorpe & Mrs N. Padfield	36 Review session

Reading lists and additional reference material

Main Texts:

Easton and Piper, *Sentencing and Punishment: The Quest for Justice* (3rd ed 2012)

[There's some supporting material online for this text

http://global.oup.com/uk/orc/criminology/easton_piper3e/]

OR

Ashworth, *Sentencing and Criminal Justice* (5th ed 2010)

[Available online. The quickest way to find the title is by searching from the UL's ebooks page: <http://www.lib.cam.ac.uk/ebooks>. The search terms Ashworth Sentencing will do the trick.]

Additional Reading:

- Gelsthorpe and Padfield (eds), *Exercising Discretion: Decision-Making in the Criminal Justice System and Beyond* (2003)
- Gelsthorpe and Morgan, eds, *Handbook of Probation* (2007)
- von Hirsch and Ashworth, *Proportionate Sentencing: Exploring the Principles* (2005)
- Laub and Sampson, *Shared Beginnings, Divergent Lives* (2003)
- Liebling, assisted by Helen Arnold, *Prisons and Their Moral Performance* (2004)
- Mackenzie, *What Works in Corrections* (2011)
- Maguire, Morgan and Reiner (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology* (5th ed 2012)
- McGuire (ed) *Offender Rehabilitation and Treatment: Effective Programmes and Policies to Reduce Reoffending* (2002)
- Sherman and Farrington, et al, *Evidence-Based Crime Prevention* (2006)

LONG VACATION READING LIST

Criminology, Sentencing and the Penal System: General

- *The Penal Landscape*. The Howard League Guide to Criminal Justice in England and Wales; eds. A. Dockley & I. Loader (Abingdon: Routledge, 2013)
- *The Penal System: an introduction*, M. Cavadino, J. Dignan & G. Mair (London: Sage 2013; 5th edition)
- *Out of Sight, Out of Mind: why Britain's prisons are failing*, J. Podmore (London: Biteback, 2012)
- *The Culture of Control: crime and social order in contemporary society*, David Garland (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001 (Chapter 1). [Available online. The quickest way to find the title is by searching from the UL's ebooks page: <http://www.lib.cam.ac.uk/ebooks>. The search terms Garland Culture will do the trick.]
- 'Sentencing: theory, principle, and practice' A. Ashworth & J. Roberts, (2012) in M. Maguire, R. Morgan & R. Reiner (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology* (Fifth ed., pp. 866-894). Oxford: Oxford University Press
- *Punishment*, Thom Brooks (Abingdon: Routledge, 2012)

Biographical and autobiographical accounts:

- *All God's Children* (1996) Fox Butterfield
- *From the Inside: Life in a Women's Prison* (2003) Ruth Wyner
- *The Damage Done* (2008) Peter Woolf
- *Prisonomics* (2013) Vicky Price
- *In the Place of Justice: A Story of Punishment and Deliverance* (2010) Walter Rideau

Websites to explore:

- Prison Reform Trust - <http://www.prisonreformtrust.org.uk/>
- Centre for Crime and Justice Studies (CCJS) - <http://www.crimeandjustice.org.uk/index.html>
- Howard League - <http://www.howardleague.org/>
- The Sentencing Council's website: <http://sentencingcouncil.judiciary.gov.uk>
- The Judiciary's website: <http://www.judiciary.gov.uk>
- Ministry of Justice: <https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/ministry-of-justice>
- Youth Justice Board: <http://www.justice.gov.uk/about/yjb>

Sample examination paper (June 2014)

Past Exam Paper

- 1 Using research evidence, discuss two different policies or practices that the criminal justice and penal system has adopted or could adopt to increase the chances of offenders finding pathways out of crime.
- 2 **Either** (a) Pre-court diversionary options have expanded enormously in recent years. What are the advantages and disadvantages of such expansion?
Or (b) To what extent should existing empirical evidence on the effects of prosecution on repeat offending guide decisions whether or not to prosecute?
- 3 Is blame through the delivery of 'pain' or other disbenefits desirable or necessary for a morally acceptable sentencing and penal system? Are there legitimate alternatives?
- 4 Should men and women be treated the same or differently within the criminal justice and penal system?
- 5 Is the criminal justice and penal system in England and Wales racist?
- 6 **Either** (a) In what ways, if any, does privatization address the problems of imprisonment?
Or (b) Does the moral performance of prisons matter in terms of the legitimacy of imprisonment?
- 7 A body of academic research suggests that youth justice should be based on the principle of minimum intervention.
Do you agree? In the light of your answer, critically assess the English and Welsh youth justice system.
- 8 **Either** (a) Is 'payment by results' a good way to reform criminal justice?

Or (b) The results regarding the effectiveness of community penalties have seemed quite promising in recent years, yet the Government is set to change the structure and delivery of such penalties.

Are the reforms needed if we already know ‘what works’?

9 Alex and Bea are charged in the Crown Court with possession of a controlled drug, namely heroin, with intent to supply it to another, contrary to s. 5(3) of the Misuse of Drugs Act 1971. Alex alone is also charged with exposure, contrary to s. 66 of the Sexual Offences Act 2003. The police received a telephone call from a restaurant customer about a man outside exposing his penis. The police arrived, two people, Alex and Bea, ran away, and, as they ran, they dropped a plastic bag which contained five wraps of a small quantity of white powder which on later analysis is shown to be heroin. The police caught up with them. During a search of the flat which Alex and Bea share, police discovered weighing scales and other drugs paraphernalia. Alex has pleaded guilty to both charges against him; Bea pleaded not guilty, but has been convicted by a jury.

Alex is 23. He has two previous convictions, one for sexual assault and one for possessing a small amount of heroin. He has previously been warned for possession of cannabis. He pleads guilty on the basis that he does occasionally sell heroin, but only to friends and to finance his own habit. He has no memory of the offence of sexual exposure, but accepts that CCTV evidence shows him appearing to masturbate outside a busy restaurant. He says he was probably ‘high’ on a cocktail of drugs at the time. A pre-sentence report states that Alex has a significant drug problem but appears reluctant to face up to this.

Bea is 26. She has two previous convictions for possessing heroin with intent to supply. The pre-sentence report describes her as a young woman of limited intelligence who is easily led by others; she has had a troubled life. Bea has been unemployed since leaving school, and has a three year old son who mostly lives with her mother. Bea is determined to end her addiction to hard drugs and alcohol as she does not want to lose contact with her son.

What sentences are available in the Crown Court? What statutory rules and principles must the judge observe? Might this be a situation where it would be appropriate to suspend a sentence of imprisonment?

[The maximum sentence for an offence under s.5(3) is life imprisonment, and for exposure is two years’ custody.]

10 ‘The Supreme Court’s judgment in the case of *Osborn, Booth and Reilly* (2013) has wide-reaching implications for the Parole Board as it fundamentally changes the way in which the Board must view the concept of an oral hearing and significantly broadens the circumstances in which the law requires it to hold one’.

In the light of the Supreme Court’s judgment, and other empirical evidence as well as theoretical ideas, what changes do you consider to be necessary to current prison release and recall procedures?

11 ‘The legislative development of the sentence of life imprisonment illustrates the worst aspects of the legislative process in England and Wales as it affects sentencing. Virtually none of the many legislative changes that have taken place in the last decade have been carefully thought through; most of them had been rushed on to the statute book without adequate consideration, either to meet a problem which has arisen out of the failure of Parliament to

anticipate the inevitable, or to make a political point by demonstrating the Government's toughness without any serious thought about the implications of the legislation being enacted.' (THOMAS, 2013)

Do you agree with this assessment of the various forms of life sentence available in English law?

12 Section 125(1) of the Coroners and Justice Act 2009 provides that when sentencing offences committed after 6 April 2010,

'Every court -

(a) must, in sentencing an offender, follow any sentencing guidelines which are relevant to the offender's case, and

(b) must, in exercising any other function relating to the sentencing of offenders, follow any sentencing guidelines which are relevant to the exercise of the function,

unless the court is satisfied that it would be contrary to the interests of justice to do so.'

Does this provision inappropriately curtail the discretion of the sentencing judge?

13 How far do we need to consider the social, economic and political context in which criminal justice policy is devised in order to understand the direction and shape that it takes?

14 'Legitimacy and compliance are both deeply implicated in and interconnected with each other in ways that require close conceptual scrutiny and empirical analysis and demand our attention in thinking about ways of better regulating people's behaviour and fostering conformity with prevailing social norms.' (CRAWFORD and HUCKLESBY, 2013)

Critically discuss this statement in the light of criminological insights.

Examiner's Report (2014) : Int 6: CRIMINOLOGY, SENTENCING AND THE PENAL SYSTEM
Three Hour Paper

Examiner's Report

Int 6: Criminology, Sentencing and the Penal System

2014

General Observations

This year, seven candidates took the paper by writing two 5,000-word essays and thirteen candidates took it by examination. This is a shared Paper with Law candidates. (There are different examiners for the PPS and Law candidates).

Numbers of candidates answering each examination question

1 2a) 2b) 3 4 5 6a) 6b) 7 8a 8b 9 10 11 12 13 14

8 1 0 7 9 4 6 0 5 4 2 1 0 1 1 3 0

On the whole, most candidates recognized that this Paper requires an understanding of broad criminal justice and criminological themes, as well as a detailed understanding of certain aspects of criminal justice practice.

One other general observation is that the best scripts are those where candidates *critically engage* with the research literature (that is, they discuss research findings and arguments based on research findings) rather than just making a point and then ‘name dropping a random list of names’ in the hope that one or more of the researchers’ names mentioned might be relevant. Of course, general points may be informed by reading but it is good to indicate what it was about the reading that was useful where possible.

Specific Observations

Question 1 was answered well on the whole, although the best essays were specific in regard to two different policies or practices, and the weaker scripts were sometimes more vague and threw in a number of policies or practices in the hope that they might be relevant.

Only one Int 6 candidate answered question 2a) and none answered Question 2b). Across both PPS and Law *Question 2a* was generally well done; candidates showed a good knowledge not only of various pre-court options (informal diversion, cautions, conditional cautions, PNDs, Fixed Penalties, and so on) but were also prepared to asses whether they were ‘expanding’ and whether they were ‘a good thing’, some sensibly looking at the question from the perspective of different categories of offenders and/or victims. The weakest scripts confused pre-court diversionary options with diversion from custody.

Question 3 produced mixed-quality essays. The best answers were characterized by nuanced appreciation of what ‘pain’ might entail (with some of the very best answers referring to ‘emotional pain’ implicit in restorative justice) – which might be conceived as an alternative to the delivery of ‘pain’ or other disbenefits via retributive and deterrence based sentencing. Other alternatives discussed included ‘rehabilitation’. The very best answers argued for a hybrid approach, combining pain and other disbenefits with constructive possibilities such as rehabilitation and restorative justice.

Question 4 was the most popular question. The weakest answers simply rehearsed a long list of factors relating to women’s needs but without any comparison with men, and without reference to the nature of crimes that women commit. Some of these answers needed more focus. The best answers conveyed an understanding of women’s crime and levels of risk as well, as illustrating women and men’s different needs (and areas of overlap). A number of candidates made an important distinction between differentiation at the point of sentencing and differentiation in relation to the ‘content’ of penalties (arguing for both community penalties and prison regimes to be ‘gender-informed’). Most candidates did well on this question.

Question 5 was attempted by four candidates. It was generally answered well. Many of the candidates displayed sound knowledge of research evidence on over-representation and discrimination at various levels of the criminal justice system. The best answers combined this

knowledge with a clarification of what racism entailed, highlighted the complexities involved in equating over-representation with racism, and discussed other explanations for the research evidence.

Question 6a was answered well by most candidates who addressed it who considered the case for and against privatisation of prisons, the existing problems of state provision in practice, and the evidence to date on relative quality and performance. The best answers managed to include good examples and showed a wide range of reading, as well as a subtle understanding of the complexities involved. The weakest answers got the facts wrong, misunderstood how private prisons operated, or why they were introduced, and focused on one or two issues rather than giving a broad and well-grounded overview of the subject.

No Int 6 candidate attempted Question 6b), which was a question about the quality of prison life, what matters to correctional service users [in the abominable jargon], and the problems of measuring the effectiveness of prisons.

Question 7. The best answers immediately recognized that the argument for minimum intervention comes from McAra and McVie, based on their Edinburgh study. Candidates were divided more or less equally in regard to whether or not to support the claim. Some answers were creative and rather than supporting 'minimum intervention' expressed a need to place education at the heart of youth justice (and not just at the heart of custody, at that). The best answers thoughtfully outlined problems with the present system, its tiering, seeming inflexibility, and lack of evidence as to 'what works' before turning to the notion of minimum intervention. Some of the best answers drew on evidence regarding restorative justice in Northern Ireland, the case for a child-centred, 'rights' led system, and the core principle indicated in the Independent Commission on youth justice that interventions should at least 'do no harm'.

Both parts of Question 8 were answered well on the whole, although in 8b a small number of candidates were clearly hard stretched to think what structural changes Government has in mind in regard to community penalties (tiers one and two of offenders will be managed by the private and voluntary sector, whilst tiers 3 and 4 – the more serious offenders – will be managed by a newly created 'national probation service'). The best answers to 8a referred not only referred to evidence from HMPs Doncaster and Peterborough, but to the 'Welfare to Work' evidence following payment by results initiatives undertaken by the Department of Work and Pensions.

Question 9 provided the 'customary' sentencing problem. The three separate questions at the end were designed to get students to focus on these issues, in order to avoid rather mindless recitations of the decision-making process recommended by the Sentencing Council. The rules and principles are sometimes difficult to explain and to apply. Some students had little to say about suspended sentences, and others did not spot that Bea faced a mandatory minimum sentence (would it have been 'unjust in all the circumstances' to impose it?). The better students addressed the question of dangerousness, albeit briefly, because exposure is one of the scheduled offences. Thoughtful as well as accurate answers were well rewarded.

No INT 6 candidates attempted Q 10. The question involved identifying the paucity of empirical evidence in this country. The best answers (across Law and PPS) also at least mentioned release on HDC (home detention curfew), and ROTL (temporary license) as well as Parole Board release and recall decision-making. They also went back to first principles - as did Lord Reed in the Supreme

Court!

Question 11 few students overall chose to write on life sentences, and those who did were sometimes marked down significantly for mentioning only very few of the variations: for example, not mentioning the mandatory life sentence, whilst focusing on IPP (or vice versa). Whilst candidates would not have been expected to recognize all 11 possible types of life sentences currently being served, a recognition of the complexity was essential. (This question was a subtle tribute to the late great David Thomas, citing as it did one of his last commentaries in the *Criminal Law Review*).

Question 12 was a straight-forward question which asked students to consider the role of discretion in sentencing. Good answers considered the role of the Sentencing Council, as successor to the Sentencing Guidelines Council, and used case law examples as well as Guidelines to explore whether judges should have more or less freedom to impose the 'right' sentence. Even hypothetical examples can be used to tease out the issues. There is also a significant academic literature, of course.

Question 13 Some of the answers were very good indeed, and referred not only to Garland's *Culture of Control* but to Beck and *The culture of risk*, and to the work of Bauman, Sennett and other sociological commentators - whilst at the same time, rooting observations in evidence of changes in terms of criminal justice policy and practice. Thus general concerns about terrorism and the development of a culture of risk also translate into a risk dominated criminal justice system and public protection stances (as demonstrated in the creation of Imprisonment for Public Protection in the CJA 2003) for example. The best answers discussed new public management and economic constraints regarding criminal justice spending, thus accounting for the swing towards privatization. This was an opportunity to bring sociological insights into play; the very best scripts showed wide reading and comprehension of the politics of criminal justice policy.

Q. 14 [No Int 6 candidate attempted this question.] It is one which draws directly on both 'what works' evidence regarding rehabilitation and its effects, and 'what matters' in terms of interventions being *meaningful to* and *having legitimacy* for consumers of those interventions. The question is really about 'why people obey the law'; it invited candidates to use criminological insights and research evidence to discuss this. There are Instrumental, restraint-based and normative approaches to compliance, for instance. The most effective interventions are those which arguably change 'hearts and minds' because the interventions make sense to those subject to them.

LONG ESSAYS

The long essays submitted were excellent on the whole. The very best essays were conceptually clear and consistent, demonstrated understanding of current debates, and offered well-reasoned, reflective and original arguments. The best essays also revealed wide reading and were 'polished' pieces of scholarship as well as being both thoughtful and thought-provoking.

Lorraine Gelsthorpe
Examiner
June 2014