

Socio-Legal

NEWSLETTER No 65 SLSA

THE NEWSLETTER OF THE SOCIO-LEGAL STUDIES ASSOCIATION

AUTUMN/WINTER 2011

MAVIS MACLEAN AWARDED NEW SLSA ANNUAL PRIZE

The SLSA is delighted to announce that this year's winner of the SLSA Prize for Contributions to the Socio-Legal Community is Mavis Maclean.

Mavis has nurtured the careers of generations of socio-legal scholars, particularly in the family law area. She has been an amazing mentor, has introduced young scholars to her extensive networks and created valuable opportunities for them to present and publish their work. She has also acted as an important link between the academic and policy communities, not only providing academics with access to policymakers, but ensuring that policymakers received the best advice from the right experts. In doing so, she has promoted significant reforms and, just as importantly, has helped to avert some foreseeably adverse outcomes. In addition, her contributions extend to her own research, which has broken new ground both substantively and methodologically. Indeed, the fact that family law is such a thriving field of socio-legal research and teaching is due in no small part to Mavis's example and her encouragement and training of others to engage in this form of scholarship, as well as her fostering of scholarship through book and journal editing. Even after her 'retirement', Mavis continues to be active in research, editing, mentoring, networking, policy engagement and strategising. It is hard to imagine the socio-legal community without her.

The prize, which is sponsored by a private benefactor, will be presented to Mavis at the 2012 SLSA annual conference at Leicester De Montfort University.

FORTHCOMING EVENTS

Leicester 2012: call for papers now open

Our annual conference next year is at Leicester De Montfort Law School, 3–5 April 2012. Please see **page 4** for the list of streams and themes and the call for papers.

SLSA Postgraduate Conference 2012, Belfast

Our annual free postgraduate conference is being hosted by Queen's University Belfast on 12 and 13 January 2012. Full details are now available on the SLSA website. If you have any queries, please contact organiser Sally Wheeler [e s.wheeler@qub.ac.uk](mailto:s.wheeler@qub.ac.uk).

Doing, funding, teaching socio-legal scholarship: 13 March, 14 May and 31 October 2012

This is a trio of one-day conferences to explore these three key aspects of socio-legal studies. All three events will take place in London. Full details are available on the SLSA website at: [w www.slsa.ac.uk/content/view/291/330](http://www.slsa.ac.uk/content/view/291/330).

Exploring the 'legal' in socio-legal studies

This one-day conference will be on 21 September 2012 at the London School of Economics. Further details will be published in due course. Conference organiser: Dave Cowan [e d.s.cowan@bristol.ac.uk](mailto:d.s.cowan@bristol.ac.uk).

REF CONSULTATION

SLSA chair Rosemary Hunter summarises the SLSA's recent submission to HEFCE's consultation on Draft Panel Criteria and Working Methods for the REF.

Preparation of the SLSA response was informed by consultation with other learned societies in law, and by the seminar organised by the SLSA on 'impact' in the Research Excellence Framework (REF), held on 16 September 2011. The seminar provided a valuable opportunity for dialogue between the REF law sub-panel and members of the academic community. We are grateful to the British Academy for provision of the venue for the seminar and to the excellent panel of speakers including Gillian Douglas (REF law sub-panel chair), Hugh Collins, Costas Douzinas and Stephen Bailey. The following is an overview of the SLSA submission. The results of the consultation will be announced by the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) in January.

Individual staff circumstances

HEFCE's proposal that a reduction in outputs would only be allowed for women who had taken 14 or more months' maternity leave during the REF period attracted widespread condemnation. The SLSA's submission joined with many others in rejecting the proposal and supporting the alternative approach to allow a reduction in the number of outputs by one for each discrete period of maternity leave. We are pleased to note that HEFCE has already announced its intention to adopt this alternative. The SLSA also submitted that equivalent reductions should be allowed for each period of adoption leave or additional paternity leave (beyond the two-week period of statutory paternity leave) taken by any staff member during the REF period.

Main panel criteria and working methods

The SLSA argued that discipline sub-panels should have the capacity to issue separate guidance, as in the Research Assessment Exercise 2008.

Outputs

Assessment criteria for outputs

The SLSA expressed concern that Main Panel C's proposed application of the criteria of 'originality', 'significance' and 'rigour' was confusing and potentially contradictory, as it appeared to emphasise the significance of the output, and to correspondingly downplay the criteria of originality and rigour. We submitted that this proposal was unhelpful. Rather, we argued that sub-panels should be given discretion to apply the generic criteria in accordance with the norms of the relevant discipline.

Co-authored outputs

As socio-legal research is often undertaken and publications written collaboratively, we considered this to be an issue of particular concern to SLSA members. We welcomed the proposed procedures for dealing with co-authored outputs submitted by different higher education institutions (HEIs), but did not agree with the proposed restrictions on the submission of co-authored outputs for different staff members (page 3 ►)

SLSA *slsa noticeboard*

SLSA Executive Committee 2011–2012

CHAIR

Rosemary Hunter
University of Kent
e r.c.hunter@kent.ac.uk

VICE-CHAIR

Anne Barlow
University of Exeter
e a.e.barlow@exeter.ac.uk

SECRETARY

Amanda Perry-Kessaris
School of Oriental and African Studies
e a.perry-kessaris@soas.ac.uk

TREASURER

Linda Mulcahy
London School of Economics
e l.mulcahy@lse.ac.uk

MEMBERSHIP SECRETARY

Julie McCandless
London School of Economics
e j.c.mccandless@lse.ac.uk

RECRUITMENT SECRETARY

Marian Duggan
Sheffield Hallam University
e m.duggan@shu.ac.uk

POSTGRADUATE REPRESENTATIVE

Lydia Hayes
University of Bristol
e lydia.hayes@bristol.ac.uk

LEICESTER DE MONTFORT LAW SCHOOL 2012

CONFERENCE ORGANISERS
Gavin Dingwall
e gdingwall@dmu.ac.uk
André Naidoo
e anaidoo@dmu.ac.uk

WEBMASTER

Nick Jackson
Kent University
e n.s.r.jackson@kent.ac.uk

NEWSLETTER EDITOR AND WEBEDITOR

Marie Selwood
e marieselwood@btinternet.com

SLSA EXECUTIVE MEMBERS

Chris Ashford
University of Sunderland
e chris.ashford@sunderland.ac.uk

Sarah Blandy
University of Leeds
e s.blandy@leeds.ac.uk

Kevin Brown
University of Newcastle
e kevin.brown@newcastle.ac.uk

Sarah Christie
Robert Gordon University
e s.christie@rgu.ac.uk

Penny English
Anglia Ruskin University
e penny.english@anglia.ac.uk

Dermot Feenan
e dermotfeenan@yahoo.com

Sue Millns
University of Sussex
e s.millns@sussex.ac.uk

Vanessa Munro
University of Nottingham
e vanessa.munro@nottingham.ac.uk

Mark O'Brien
University of the West of England
e mark.o'brien@uwe.ac.uk

Phil Rumney
University of the West of England
e phil.rumney@uwe.ac.uk

Jane Scoular
University of Strathclyde
e jane.scoular@strath.ac.uk

Jo Shaw
University of Edinburgh
e jo.shaw@ed.ac.uk

Executive Committee news

The dates of future meetings are as follows:

- 18 January 2012, SOAS, London
- 5 April 2012, DMU, Leicester

There will be a meeting for officers only in **May 2012**. The 2012 AGM will take place at our annual conference. SLSA members are invited to propose items for inclusion on the agenda of future meetings: email SLSA secretary, Amanda Perry-Kessaris, e a.perry-kessaris.soas.ac.uk. Minutes and papers from past meetings are available at w www.slsa.ac.uk/content/view/105/269/.

Jo Hunt has stepped down from the Executive Committee. We thank her for her hard work over the past few years. Marian Duggan has taken over the role of recruitment secretary.

Newsletter contact details

Marie Selwood, Editor, *Socio-Legal Newsletter*
✉ 33 Baddlesmere Road, Whitstable, Kent
CT5 2LB t 01227 770189
e marieselwood@btinternet.com

Next copy deadline: 30 January 2012
Next publication date: 5 March 2012

www.slsa.ac.uk

The SLSA website contains comprehensive information about the SLSA and its activities and is also the home of the SLSA Membership Directory. The news webpages are updated almost daily with socio-legal news, events, publications, vacancies etc. To request the inclusion of a news item and for queries about the content of the website, contact Marie Selwood e marieselwood@btinternet.com.

Disclaimer

The opinions expressed in articles in the *Socio-Legal Newsletter* are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the SLSA.

. . . newsletter sponsors . . . newsletter sponsors . . .

Newsletter sponsorship

The *Socio-Legal Newsletter* is sponsored by a consortium of law schools interested in promoting socio-legal studies in the UK.

If you think that your institution would like to become involved in this initiative, please contact SLSA chair Rosemary Hunter e r.c.hunter@kent.ac.uk.

Newsletter sponsors 2010–2013 are: Birkbeck; Cardiff Law School; Centre for Socio-Legal Studies, Oxford; University of Exeter; University of Kent; University of Liverpool; London School of Economics; University of Nottingham; Queen's University Belfast; and University of Westminster.



Department of Law



The University of Nottingham

UNIVERSITY OF WESTMINSTER



UNIVERSITY OF LIVERPOOL



School of Law



Queen's University Belfast

University of Kent



REF CONSULTATION

... continued from page 1.

within the same institutional submission. We contended for the same rules as RAE 2008, i.e. that co-authored submissions should be treated the same regardless of whether the authors were in the same or different HEIs.

Double-weighted outputs

We submitted that Main Panel C should provide further guidance on the circumstances in which an output is likely to be considered worthy of double weighting, and that applications for double weighting should not be faced with the risk of an unclassified output if the application is rejected. We did not agree with the proposal that co-authored outputs should only be double-weighted in 'highly exceptional cases'. We considered that submissions for double-weighting should be accepted and treated in the same way, regardless of the number of authors.

Citation data

We welcomed the statements that sub-panels within Main Panel C will not use journal impact factors or any hierarchy of journals and, in the main, will not receive nor make use of citation data or any other form of bibliometric analysis in their assessment of outputs.

Impact

Unlike the other main panels, Main Panel C decided not to provide a detailed list of examples of impacts and evidence and/or indicators of impact on the basis that these could appear prescriptive or limiting. We submitted, however, that not only were the illustrative examples given by the other main panels manifestly helpful in conceptualising forms of impact and how they may be evidenced, while being very obviously non-exhaustive, but the lack of illustrations was itself likely to be limiting. We were also in favour of sub-panels within Main Panel C having discretion to specify their individual approaches

to impact, in accordance with the nature of the research undertaken and the kinds of impacts that may be achieved within the relevant discipline.

Evidence of impact

While the draft criteria refer to the need for impact case studies to include a 'chain of evidence linking excellent research within the submitting unit to the impact... claimed', we submitted that the panel should acknowledge that the connection between research and impact may be evidenced by inference rather than necessarily by the existence of positive data, and that the criteria should make clear that inference is an acceptable form of evidence in impact case studies.

Underpinning research

Rather than the quality of the underpinning research in impact case studies being directly assessed by the sub-panel, HEIs are asked to provide descriptive evidence to demonstrate that the work is of at least two-star quality. We considered this procedure to be problematic, as it introduces multiple possibilities for inconsistency and does not guarantee that poor quality underpinning research will be accurately identified. Accordingly, we favoured independent assessment of the quality of the research underpinning each case study by the sub-panel. If, however, HEIs are still required to make quality arguments, we submitted that, for consistency, the sub-panels should not accept either citation data or implied or overt journal rankings as indicators of quality in the assessment of the research underpinning the impact case studies. Rather, the quality of the research should be documented in terms of its originality, significance and rigour, as defined within the criteria relating to outputs.

Assessment of case studies – 'user' members of sub-panels

The SLSA urged that sub-panels commit to co-opting a sufficient range of additional research users across all spheres in order to provide appropriately expert assessments of all of the impact case studies they receive.

MEET YOUR EXEC

In an occasional series, members of the SLSA Executive Committee introduce themselves: on this page, Julie McCandless and, on page 4, Dermot Feenan.

Julie McCandless

During my LLB studies at QUB I developed an interest in the legal regulation of the family and gender. I volunteered at the Children's Law Centre in Belfast and took part in the student internship programme organised by the Gender, Sexuality and Family (GSF) Research Programme, which was directed by Martha Fineman and brought together scholars from Northern Ireland and North America. As a 'keen but green' law student, I had no clue who Martha Fineman was, so decided to read her book, *The Neutered Mother, the Sexual Family and Other Twentieth Century Tragedies* (1995) before having lunch with her during my internship. It was the first time I had read a piece of legal scholarship that matched my expectations of studying law. Rich in conceptual and contextual detail, it deliberately connected 'law' with 'society' – something that is second-nature now, but felt very novel after two years of black-letter legal study. It changed the direction and focus of not only the remainder of my undergraduate studies, but my future career.

After my LLB, I maintained involvement with the GSF Programme as an LLM student at Cornell. The programme brought to Cornell many fantastic researchers and it was during

this time that I met some of my future colleagues from Keele, where I later pursued my doctoral studies during the life-span of the Arts and Humanities Research Council Centre for Law, Gender and Sexuality. I also joined the SLSA during that year and found it a great link to research and scholarship back in the UK. It was at the SLSA annual conference in 2005 that I delivered my first academic paper. It was a bit shambolic (timing is still not my strong point!) but the environment was extremely supportive. In 2010, I joined the SLSA Executive Committee, taking over from Dermot Feenan as membership secretary.

I was a lecturer at Oxford Brookes from 2009–10, before taking up my post at the London School of Economics. I teach medical and family law, taking a socio-legal approach. My research focuses on gender, sexuality, assisted reproduction and parenthood. It has mostly been text-based, but, in 2009–2010, with Sally Sheldon, I conducted an interview study with key actors in the reform of the Human Fertilisation and Embryology Act 2008 funded by the SLSA grants scheme. At the moment, I am thinking about a socio-legal project on birth registration. (page 4 ►)

LSA international meeting, Hawaii

The SLSA is co-sponsoring the Law and Society Association's (LSA) international meeting **5–8 June 2012** in Hawaii. SLSA members planning to attend are invited to contact the SLSA liaison person for this event, Amanda Perry-Kessarlis [e a.perry-kessarlis@soas.ac.uk](mailto:a.perry-kessarlis@soas.ac.uk).

DE MONTFORT 2012: CALL FOR PAPERS

Call for papers

Abstracts (300 words max) are invited for the streams and themes listed below. To discuss your ideas prior to submission, contact the stream or theme organisers. Closing date: **16 January 2012**. Please include your title, name, institutional affiliation, and email address for correspondence. State clearly in the subject line of your email that you are submitting an abstract for the SLSA Conference 2012. Abstracts sent by the deadline will receive a decision in time to enable early registration by **31 January 2012**. Full details at: www.dmu.ac.uk/slsa.

Themes and convenors

The call for themes is still open: contact the conference organisers with your proposal at [e slsa2012@dmu.ac.uk](mailto:slsa2012@dmu.ac.uk)

Art, culture and heritage

Janet Ulph [e ju13@leicester.ac.uk](mailto:ju13@leicester.ac.uk)

Exceptional states: international economic law in times of crisis and change

Celine Tan

[e celine.tan@warwick.ac.uk](mailto:celine.tan@warwick.ac.uk)

Amanda Perry-Kessaris

[e a.perry-kessaris@soas.ac.uk](mailto:a.perry-kessaris@soas.ac.uk)

Streams and convenors

Administrative justice

Richard Kirkham

[e r.m.kirkham@sheffield.ac.uk](mailto:r.m.kirkham@sheffield.ac.uk)

Trevor Buck [e tbuck@dmu.ac.uk](mailto:tbuck@dmu.ac.uk)

Banking and finance law

Clare Chambers

[e clare.chambers@uwe.ac.uk](mailto:clare.chambers@uwe.ac.uk)

Challenging ownership: meanings, space and identity

Penny English

[e penny.english@anglia.ac.uk](mailto:penny.english@anglia.ac.uk)

Helen Carr [e h.p.carr@kent.ac.uk](mailto:h.p.carr@kent.ac.uk)

Sarah Blandy [e s.blandy@leeds.ac.uk](mailto:s.blandy@leeds.ac.uk)

Criminal law and criminal justice

Vanessa Bettinson

[e vbettinson@dmu.ac.uk](mailto:vbettinson@dmu.ac.uk)

European Union

Ian Kilbey [e ikilbey@dmu.ac.uk](mailto:ikilbey@dmu.ac.uk)

Family and children law and policy

Anne Barlow [e a.e.barlow@exeter.ac.uk](mailto:a.e.barlow@exeter.ac.uk)

Liz Trinder [e e.j.trinder@exeter.ac.uk](mailto:e.j.trinder@exeter.ac.uk)

Gender, sexuality and law

Chris Ashford

[e chris.ashford@sunderland.ac.uk](mailto:chris.ashford@sunderland.ac.uk)

Human rights and international criminal law

Elizabeth Craig [e emc22@sussex.ac.uk](mailto:emc22@sussex.ac.uk)

Richard Vogler

[e r.k.vogler@sussex.ac.uk](mailto:r.k.vogler@sussex.ac.uk)

Indigenous rights and minority rights

Sarah Sargent [e sjsargent@aol.com](mailto:sjsargent@aol.com)

Information technology law and cyberspace

Mark O'Brien

[e mark.o'brien@uwe.ac.uk](mailto:mark.o'brien@uwe.ac.uk)

Intellectual property

Jasem Tarawneh

[e jasem.tarawneh@manchester.ac.uk](mailto:jasem.tarawneh@manchester.ac.uk)

Intersectionality

Charlotte Skeet

[e c.h.skeet@sussex.ac.uk](mailto:c.h.skeet@sussex.ac.uk)

Labour law

Michael Jefferson

[e m.jefferson@sheffield.ac.uk](mailto:m.jefferson@sheffield.ac.uk)

Law and literature

Julia Shaw [e jshaw@dmu.ac.uk](mailto:jshaw@dmu.ac.uk)

Lawyers and legal professions

Andy Boon

[e a.boon@westminster.ac.uk](mailto:a.boon@westminster.ac.uk)

Legal education

Tony Bradney

[e a.bradney@law.keele.ac.uk](mailto:a.bradney@law.keele.ac.uk)

Fiona Cownie

[e f.cownie@law.keele.ac.uk](mailto:f.cownie@law.keele.ac.uk)

Medical law and ethics

Glenys Williams

[e gnw@aber.ac.uk](mailto:gnw@aber.ac.uk)

Mental health and mental capacity law

Nell Munro

[e nell.munro@nottingham.ac.uk](mailto:nell.munro@nottingham.ac.uk)

Peter Bartlett

[e peter.bartlett@nottingham.ac.uk](mailto:peter.bartlett@nottingham.ac.uk)

Policies, politics and theories of financial market regulation

Nicholas Dorn [e dorn@law.eur.nl](mailto:dorn@law.eur.nl)

Race religion and human rights

Fernne Brennan [e joash@essex.ac.uk](mailto:joash@essex.ac.uk)

Renewable energy and sustainable development

Jona Razzaque

[e jona.razzaque@uwe.ac.uk](mailto:jona.razzaque@uwe.ac.uk)

Sentencing and punishment

Gavin Dingwall [e gdingwall@dmu.ac.uk](mailto:gdingwall@dmu.ac.uk)

Karen Harrison

[e karen.harrison@hull.ac.uk](mailto:karen.harrison@hull.ac.uk)

Shifting paradigms in publicly funded justice

James Sandbach

[e james.sanbach@citizensadvice.org.uk](mailto:james.sanbach@citizensadvice.org.uk)

Sports law

Ben Livings

[e ben.livings@sunderland.ac.uk](mailto:ben.livings@sunderland.ac.uk)

Systems theories, law and society: critical perspectives and novel applications

Thomas Webb

[e t.webb@lancaster.ac.uk](mailto:t.webb@lancaster.ac.uk)

MEET YOUR EXEC

... continued from page 3.

Dermot Feenan

As an undergraduate in 1980s Belfast, dulled by the odd aridity of black-letter law, my occasional curricular exposure to sociologically informed, empirical studies, plus during vacation a door-to-door survey of welfare benefit take-up, helped not only to make better sense of law but stimulated an abiding concern about law and material disadvantage. This concern – later enriched by broader exposure to socio-legal research – informed my subsequent studies on, for example, health-care decision-making, ethnicity, sexuality and gender.

The SLSA has seemed at times like both a lighthouse and a refuge; respectively, illuminating the dark fastness of law and, through its conferences, offering a welcome connection with like-minded scholars. My gratitude informed a decision in 2006 to join the Executive, whence I organised two SLSA one-day conferences: 'Socio-legal Studies and the Humanities' and 'Exploring the "Socio" of Socio-Legal Studies'. I've also acted as

membership secretary, helped revise our Ethics Statement, and initiated and conducted an ethnic monitoring exploratory review. I currently chair the Research Grants Committee.

My final quarter on the Executive perhaps reflects an unconventionality characteristic of some socio-legal sensibilities. I took a year's sabbatical to reflect and recharge, including: training in shiatsu, a Japanese form of acupuncture therapy; spending time at a Benedictine monastery and a Buddhist retreat centre; studying yoga in India; founding the Holistic Health Centre, a not-for-profit collective providing treatments and services (such as acupuncture and meditation) based on need; and organising a conference and editing a book on socio-legal studies.

It has been sobering throughout this period not only to observe the increasing commodification and managerialism of higher education in the UK but to reflect on how related petty status-drives and ego-conflicts distract from healthier engagement with those around us. Still, there is a lure to socio-legal work in the academy that sees me return this year; via a visiting fellowship at the Institute of Advanced Legal Studies, London, to progress empirically based research on gender disadvantage and judicial appointments. *Plus ça change...*

FATHERS, LAWYERS AND THE WORK—LIFE BALANCE: MANAGING THE DOWNTURN

Richard Collier, Newcastle University, reports on his research project, funded by the SLSA Grants Scheme

If you spoke to male lawyers in City law firms, particularly those who have got young children, and ask them if they are happy with their work–life balance, I would expect very few to say they are. I imagine the stock response would be ‘no I’m not very happy, but I work in a City law firm and that’s how things are’. (Partner)

I am not doing this myself, because I want the glory of being Partner; I am doing it for my family, for my children, because I want my children to have the best . . . (Associate)

The personal issue for me is the stress it generates. I used to think I enjoyed stress . . . I used to sleep well every night . . . but I’ve now got health issues . . . I take a tablet, it goes away. But obviously it has an impact on me I wasn’t aware of . . . That’s not the getting to Partnership . . . it’s, it’s whenever you achieve something you want more, then the next stage, then the next . . . it is never ending, but I absolutely love it, and I love the material benefits. (Partner)

This project develops further an earlier study, published in Collier (2010), concerned with the interconnections between masculinities and fatherhood in the context of legal practice in large City law firms (see also Collier and Sheldon 2008). More specifically, in the spirit of reframing what continues to be referred to in the legal profession as the ‘women problem’, turning it on its head, the research explores the views of male lawyers themselves about a range of issues around work–life balance, gender equality and diversity within law firms. The SLSA funding supported a focused empirical study of male solicitors, at various stages of their careers, working within large commercial law practices. Interviews were undertaken during 2011 and this part of the study was also framed by a particular concern to address perceptions of the banking crisis of 2007–2010 and the economic downturn that gathered apace during 2008, with regard to how these have reshaped the debate about work–life balance in law. Focusing on a field of employment widely understood to be marked by a long-hours culture, strong organisational commitment and a ‘bottom-line’ need to meet client-led demands, the project seeks to add texture and complexity to our knowledge of men’s relationship to employment and family life, addressing social relations in a way which might bring conceptual analyses of both men’s practices and the gendered law firm closer to everyday experience.

Three specific research contexts framed the project and the study is pitched at a nexus of contemporary policy debates and scholarship on, respectively, women lawyers and the legal profession; work–life balance and diversity within law firms; and, finally, fatherhood, law and policy. Exploring how developments in each area have raised new and pressing questions about male lawyers, fatherhood and gender, the research charts key drivers of change in this area, looking in particular at the intersections between the business case for equality and men’s perceptions of social, cultural and demographic change around families and parenting. The interviews with male lawyers suggest that the argument that the profession is undergoing significant shifts in this area is, in fact, contradictory and double-edged.

Three points are of particular significance in this regard and are explored in the research: first, arguments relating to retention, recruitment and assumptions about the changing aspirations of lawyers, both male and female; second, the significance of the rise in the number of dual-earner households and later age of first parenting; and, third, perceptions of what

the project terms ‘the Deal’ made by these lawyers. The project here focuses on the complex, fluid and multi-layered nature of the way the already realised or potential financial rewards of a career in a large law firm are seen as enabling men’s participation in a range of high-end consumption practices. It explores, especially, how the adoption of a distinctive lifestyle and status is seen as coming ‘at the cost’ (the trade-off) of the long hours worked and high level of organisational commitment called for by the firm. The latter issue encompasses wider concerns around the changing nature of client demands in a rapidly changing global market for legal services.

The project proceeds to look closer at the interconnections between fatherhood, flexible working and the gendered cultures of law, identifying a gap between rhetoric of change and reality of practice. A range of issues around fathering are explored via an analysis of the ideas of ‘being there’ and intimate fatherhood, and the research reveals complexity in how men seek to ‘make it work’ in practice. The continuing resonance of traditional gendered divisions are then explored in four areas; first, in the nature of negotiations and practices around parenting and how flexible working operates; second, in the way assumptions about gender inform perceptions of those men who, in not ‘making it work’, are deemed to have problems in managing their commitments; third, in the description of women lawyers, in particular, women Partners in law firms; and fourth, in the interconnections between men’s work, consumption practices and construction of a gendered identity as a ‘successful’ lawyer.

In summary, focusing on the views of male lawyers, this project argues that complex changes are taking place in men’s lives that reflect significant demographic, cultural, economic and political shifts. These changes may well appear ‘under the radar’. They may often be unspoken. They are, however, potentially transforming in subtle ways the personal lives of lawyers and, with it, understandings of career success and well-being. They also question earlier perceptions of law as a ‘masculine’ profession and how aspects of ‘doing law’ might correlate with discourses of masculinity.

Looking towards the development of research in this area (a project is in preparation), the findings suggest socio-legal analysis of men’s gendered practices can usefully operate at four levels. First, at the level of the transnational global arena in which large law firms work, whereby business is frequently international in nature and male lawyers, particularly within certain departments, engage in significant amounts of overseas travel. Second, at the regional/local level of the specific cultures present within law firms, where marked differences can exist, for example, around the culture of working hours between firms within and outside the City of London, and in the UK and US; third, at the level of the interpersonal ‘everyday’ nature of lawyers’ work, of face-to-face interactions within law firms, including solicitors’ relationships with clients and support workers; and, finally, at the level of the individual, encompassing questions of men’s ‘bodily reflex practices’, biography/background and the movement and flows of men’s bodies as male lawyers moving between social spaces (e.g. between work and office, home base and overseas).

In the context of a legal profession facing acute challenges as a result of an amalgam of demographic, political and economic changes around families, parenting and gender equality, this SLSA-funded research argues that there is a pressing need for socio-legal studies to address the relative absence of focused research on male lawyers as men in law firms, that is, as gendered subjects.

References

- Collier, R (2010) *Men, Law and Gender: Essays on the ‘man’ of law*, Routledge
- Collier, R and Sheldon, S (2008) *Fragmenting Fatherhood: A socio-legal study*, Hart

SLSA SEMINARS

In the past 12 months, two SLSA-sponsored events have taken place. Aoife Nolan and Louise Ackers report on their successful seminars.

Economic and social rights in a time of austerity

The last two years have seen growing evidence of the deleterious global impact of the economic crisis on the poorest in society, together with increasing domestic concern about the potential impacts of austerity measures on the most vulnerable in the UK. At the same time, there has been a rising interest in the development of human rights accountability and adjudication in the area of economic and social rights (ESRs). Bringing these concerns together, the event sought to address the question of whether ESRs can play a role (whether as justiciable 'hard' rights or as normative values shaping and influencing policy) in challenging attempts by government to roll back the basic entitlements of the poorest in society.

The workshop, organised by Aoife Nolan (Durham Law School) and Sandra Fredman (Faculty of Law, Oxford) on 1 July 2011 (winner of the SLSA Seminar Competition 2011), considered the role of ESRs in the context of post-financial crisis austerity policies by exploring four themes: mainstreaming, legal processes, monitoring and equality. These topics were the subjects of expert panel sessions in which they were addressed by a range of practitioners, academics, policymakers and national human rights institution (NHRI) representatives. In addition to such actors, workshop participants included civil society members and public sector representatives.

The first session, chaired by Alice Donald (London Metropolitan) addressed 'Mainstreaming; how and to what extent can the law require governments to "mainstream" human rights?' Murray Hunt (legal adviser, Joint Committee on Human Rights (JCHR)) detailed how the JCHR has sought to get government and Parliament to engage with the changes in law, policy and practice required to comply with the UK's international ESR obligations. Highlighting the lack of debate in Parliament about the compatibility of the austerity programme with these obligations, he asserted that this has imposed fundamental limitations upon Parliament's ability to engage with those rights and understand them in the current UK context. John Kissane (Ministry of Justice) argued that ESRs, as set out in the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), do not loom large in the thinking of ministers and officials when forming policies; successive governments have consistently stated that the UK is committed as a matter of international law to progressively realise the ICESCR through a range of domestic measures but that the ICESCR is not in any sense taken as a template or the basis of a programme. He stated that government would argue that now is a time for economic and social policy to develop from the starting point of economic necessity rather than from the starting point of the delivery of rights.

'Legal processes' were the subject of the second session. Colm O'Conneide (University College London) spoke about the potential of the law to challenge ESR violations in a time of austerity. Having noted that social rights are much more embedded in other European countries than in the UK and enforced through a range of administrative and legal structures, he asserted that the traditional answer to the question about the role of law in a process of economic retrenchment in UK constitutional discourse is 'very little'. He argued, however, that there are a range of options for challenging austerity measures, including the public sector equality duties and traditional judicial review mechanisms influenced by the Human Rights Act 1998. Bob Hepple's (Cambridge) presentation focused on

engagement and negotiation in the context of litigation of ESR claims. He emphasised the lack of democratic citizen participation in austerity processes and looked at legal methods of securing participation in the shadow of the deterrent sanctions of the law. Highlighting the 'meaningful engagement' jurisprudence of the South African courts, he argued for a reflexive or responsive understanding of law. Duncan Wilson (Scottish Human Rights Commission) spoke about the role of NHRIs in guaranteeing ESRs in a time of austerity. His presentation addressed four questions. What is an NHRI? Why should NHRIs engage with ESRs? How do they engage with ESRs? And how do they do so in the context of economic austerity? In response, he discussed the role of NHRIs in promoting, protecting and monitoring ESRs and outlined the ways in which they have done so. He strongly emphasised that all of these functions have relevance in a time of austerity.

Maleiha Malik (King's College London) chaired the 'Monitoring' session opened by Aoife Nolan who focused on some of the concepts and challenges with regard to the employment of ESR-based budget analysis methodology to evaluate state compliance with international ESR obligations. She highlighted the connections between budgetary decisions and ESRs and delineated some 'positives' and 'negatives' when employing such methodology in the current UK context. James Harrison's (Warwick) presentation centred on equality and human rights impact assessments (EHRIAs). Drawing on previous research and a recent EHRIA assessing the impact of public spending cuts on women in Coventry, he outlined how EHRIAs can be utilised to make a contribution to decisions about public spending. Emphasising that many EHRIAs undertaken by central and local government in the UK are superficial, bureaucratic exercises, he made a number of suggestions on how future practice can be improved. Peter Reading (Equality and Human Rights Commission) pinpointed four key elements of the commission's work on ESRs: the implementation, monitoring and mainstreaming of ESRs and advising government and Parliament on ESR-related issues. Key to these are a forthcoming review and research project on ESRs and the development of a Human Rights Measuring Framework that incorporates a number of ESRs.

The final session on 'Equality' was chaired by Tarunabh Khaitan (Oxford). The first presenter, Sandra Fredman (Oxford) asserted that, in the absence of enforceable ESRs, UK litigants have used anti-discrimination law to advance ESR claims. However, she highlighted two key shortcomings in using the public sector equality duty to challenge austerity cutbacks: first, there are situations in which socio-economic disadvantage cannot be challenged under the status approach of the public sector equality duties. Second, the duty (or duties) is procedural in nature, rather than one intended to achieve results. These factors may result in such litigation and adjudication redistributing disadvantage. Sarah Spencer (Oxford) noted how, when talking about equality, migrants, who are largely excluded from equality protections on the grounds of nationality, are frequently ignored. She argued that it is a challenge for those in the equality field to embrace migrants within the equality agenda. She emphasised that, if migrants are not to enjoy equality of opportunity in all respects on arrival, it is not unreasonable to expect government to spell out why, in each case, it feels that the restrictions on rights that it is imposing are a proportionate means to achieve what it believes to be a legitimate aim.

There was extensive discussion and exchange following each session, with audience members challenging and engaging with the points made and views expressed by speakers. A report is currently being drafted that will include a thematic analysis of discussion. This report, together with podcasts of speaker presentations, biographies of speakers and other workshop details will be available at www.esrinateofausterity.com.

Aoife Nolan

Socio-legal perspectives on contemporary mobilities: theoretical and policy implications

This workshop, in November 2010 at the Centre for Research in the Arts, Social Sciences and Humanities (CRASSH), Cambridge, brought together delegates from a range of disciplinary and international backgrounds to share research and identify key policy implications. In substantive terms, it focused on the topic of internationalisation in higher education at UK and European level. Internationalisation has become a major theme in the development of the European Research Area (ERA) and the European Area of Higher Education (EAHE). The goal of 'internationalising' higher education (both teaching and research) has also become a central feature of national and institutional policy. Nevertheless, the concept remains 'slippery' with few attempts to define it and the outcomes associated with it. Lacking conceptual clarity, the process of defining indicators has taken place at a very crude level essentially capturing only longer-term forms of student and researcher mobility (or 'migrations').

The first day focused on the presentation and discussion of academic research on aspects of contemporary mobility in the EU. Louise Ackers (CRASSH/Liverpool) opened proceedings, speaking about contemporary mobilities, academic mobility, transnationalism and knowledge transfer processes. She was followed by Emília Rodrigues Araújo and Sílvia Silva (Braga) who reported on their recent work on mobility in research careers, internationalisation and discourses of displacement. Carolina Cañibano (Instituto de Gestión del Conocimiento y la Innovación) followed with a paper on international mobility as a driver and outcome of research activity and Chris Coey (Liverpool) spoke about the internationalisation of English higher education institutions. Kate Gedde (Lausanne) presented her work on career concerns among international postgraduates while Heike Jöns (Loughborough) talked about field-specific cultures of transnational academic mobility and collaboration.

Russell King, Jill Ahrens (both Sussex) and Allan Findlay (Dundee) presented their work on British students' international mobility to the 'near abroad' and Debbie Millard (Liverpool) focused on the internationalisation and nature of scientific networks. Charlotte O'Brien's (York) paper looked at disability,

unfree movement and de-activated citizenship and Carol Porter's (Liverpool) related research reflected concerns about internationalisation, mobility and equality and the challenges facing disabled researchers.

Finally, Pedro Videira (Lisbon) discussed mobility, networks and knowledge transfers from a theoretical and methodological perspective and Joanna Waters (Birmingham) and Maggi Leung's (Hong Kong) presentation was on 'Emergent transnational educational spaces: immobile Chinese students, mobile faculty, and British degrees in Hong Kong'.

On the second day, the authors distilled key policy messages from their research and presented these to a range of policymakers from the Department of Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS), the Economic and Social Research Council, the Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council, European Universities Association, Evaluation Partnership and the pro-vice chancellor for internationalisation at the University of Liverpool.

Since November 2010, the work has continued to develop in a number of ways. In the first instance, BIS, working with the research councils, organised a dedicated policy event focusing on the research presented by Joanna Waters. In the process of generating stronger regulatory action – and potentially a new Framework Directive on the European Research Area – Louise Ackers was invited to prepare a report summarising the present national regulatory situation in the UK, including both hard and soft law measures affecting researchers, research institutions and research funds. From September 2011, she will act as rapporteur for a new ERA expert group concerned with the research profession.

Many of the workshop papers are now published or in the process of being published in a wide variety of journals. During the workshop, participants discussed the idea of preparing a joint application for funding. This resulted in a successful application for FP7 funding. The study, spanning 14 EU countries, 'Mapping the population, careers and mobilities of doctoral graduates in the social sciences and humanities' will commence in March 2012.

The team are very grateful for the funding received from the SLSA in support of this event.

Louise Ackers

Journal of Law and Society (Winter 2011)

Articles

John R Commons and Max Weber: the foundations of an economic sociology of law – Michel Coutu and Thierry Kirat

Expert evidence and medical manslaughter: vagueness in action – Oliver Quick

The right to buy, the leaseholder and the impoverishment of ownership – Helen Carr

Gender diversity in the FTSE 100: the business case claim explored – Sally Wheeler and Mark McCann

The competition for pupillages at the Bar of England and Wales (2000–2004) – Anna Zimdars

Liberal forms of governing Australian indigenous peoples – David McCallum

Review article

'Law's meaning of life: philosophy, religion, Darwin and the legal person' by Ngaire Naffine – Bryan Thomas

Book reviews

The Judge as Political Theorist by Stephen Sedley – David Robertson

Tribal Constitutionalism by Tim Rowse – Kirsty Gover

The Regulatory Enterprise: Government, regulation, and legitimacy by Claudio Radaelli – Tony Prosser

socio-legal people . . .

PROFESSOR FIONA COWNIE, Keele University, and PROFESSOR ANTJE WIENER, University of Hamburg, have been elected as academicians of the Academy of Social Sciences.

STEFAN MACHURA has been promoted to senior lecturer at Bangor University.

DERMOT FEENAN is a visiting fellow at the Institute of Advanced Legal Studies, University of London, from October 2011–August 2012.

At the University of Westminster, ANDREAS PHILIPPOPOULOS-MIHALOPOULOS has been appointed professor of law and theory and HELENE LAMBERT has been appointed professor of international law.

Social & Legal Studies 20(4)

Contesting the bureaucracy: examining administrative appeals – Vicki Lens

Regulating financial derivatives? Risks, contested values and uncertain futures – Donatella Alessandrini

Girl interrupted: citizenship and the Irish – Mairead Enright

Ensuring that others behave responsibly: Giddens, governance, and human rights law – Alison Mawhinney

Climate change law: creating and sustaining social and economic insecurity – Angela Williams

Dialogue and debate: the currency of freedom – Jenny Steele, David Campbell, David McCallum and Pat O'Malley

Tribunal reform in Northern Ireland

In June 2010, *Redressing Users' Disadvantage: Proposals for tribunal reform in Northern Ireland* (G McKeever and B Thompson, Law Centre (NI)) recommended consultation on the structural needs of tribunal reform and research into user experience of advice, information and support services pre-hearing. Nuffield Foundation funding was obtained for Brian Thompson, University of Liverpool, and Gráinne McKeever, University of Ulster, respectively, to conduct the two projects.

Two workshops on the structural reform of tribunals were held for stakeholders from court and tribunal judiciary, government officials, academics and advice organisations. The new proposals deal with tribunal structures, judicial leadership and arrangements for oversight. A key aim is to allow sufficient flexibility for development, whether for the creation of new tribunals or the reorganisation of existing ones, as well as the possibility that tribunals reserved to the UK level may be made the responsibility of the devolved institutions. Thus, a separate Northern Ireland Upper Tribunal may be necessary to handle onward appeals from the proposed Northern Ireland Amalgamated Tribunal rather than that tribunal having an internal appeals section. In terms of leadership, the Lord Chief Justice of Northern Ireland welcomes the opportunity to become responsible for tribunal judges and specialist members and to secure their judicial independence. Finally, the proposals provide for an umbrella advisory committee structure for the consideration of matters of common concern (e.g. users' views, procedural rules, alternative dispute resolution and access to justice). The proposals are published in *Structural Tribunal Reform in Northern Ireland* (2011, Brian Thompson, Law Centre (NI)).

The user awareness research used a small qualitative study to examine the availability and adequacy of information and advice for tribunal users, focusing on Appeal Tribunals (social security and child support), Industrial and Fair Employment Tribunals and Special Educational Needs and Disability Tribunals. The report makes findings in three main areas – user awareness of support services, barriers to accessing support and experience of support services – and produces recommendations. One of the key findings was that users struggle to know where to get advice and support, did not seek help in a systematic way, and tended to come across sources of support incrementally and by chance. In common with other research, it was found that users do not always appreciate that the issues they are contesting, claiming or responding to are legal as well as factual and so do not seek advice on the legal issues. Instead, they tended to see the legal issue as another manifestation of their ongoing problems, rather than as a separate legal problem. While this constituted one of the main barriers to support, another was difficulty in understanding written information. Barriers increased where users had a range of vulnerabilities, creating a group of users that is particularly hard to reach. Where users accessed support organisations, they found this very helpful and regarded personal contact with advisers and support workers as very important. The main benefit in accessing advice was the provision of a means of resolving disputes at the earliest stage. Recommendations were made to improve initial decision-making, provide user-friendly, accessible written and video information, provide early consultations, facilitate referrals and explore innovative models of support, including education for support workers outside the legal/advice sectors. See *Supporting Tribunal Users: Access to pre-hearing information, advice and support for Northern Ireland tribunal users* (2011, G McKeever, Law Centre (NI)).

A number of these recommendations are echoed in the *Report of the Access to Justice Review for Northern Ireland* (2011, Department of Justice) and the tribunal reports will feed into the consultation on tribunal reform launched in November 2011.

Gráinne McKeever and Brian Thompson

Water rights research

Dr Bettina Lange, Centre for Socio-Legal Studies, Oxford University, has been awarded a small research grant of £7460 by the British Academy for a comparative pilot study 'Reconceptualizing farmers' water rights through stewardship'. This project examines how farmers' legal rights to access and use water resources are changing in light of contemporary expectations about water stewardship. Common law rights to water are increasingly interpreted in the light of general statutory duties to protect the environment, including water quality and quantity. Whereas in a number of Australian state jurisdictions, environmental duties of care have been enshrined in statutory provisions, water law in England has only begun to develop such duties. These duties of care matter because they are the prism through which conflicts between farmers' rights to natural resource use and wider public interest expectations in relation to sustainable water use are resolved. Over a period of 16 months, this socio-legal research project will gather, through interviews, qualitative empirical data about English farmers' and the Environment Agency's perceptions of rights of access to and use of water. The project also involves comparative analysis of Australian and English statutory and case law. The research is carried out in collaboration with Dr Mark Shephard, Centre for Agriculture and Law, University of New England, Australia.

Bettina Lange

Irish socio-legal studies network

On 29 August 2011, a seminar on child trafficking and separated children was hosted by the Socio-Legal Research Centre at Dublin City University (DCU). This event was held with a view to establishing an Irish socio-legal studies network. There has been a sizeable (and burgeoning!) Irish contingent attending SLSA annual conferences and other events in recent years and there is an increasing number of academics engaging in socio-legal research in Ireland. As a result, Irish legal academics and practitioners were invited to attend to discuss the interest in, and feasibility of, such a network, and to set out plans for potential collaboration in the field of socio-legal studies and to discuss the possibility of organising other socio-legal events in the future.

The August seminar formed part of a research project on developing a best practice model for the entry, residence and deportation of separated children in Ireland. The project is funded by DCU and led by Dr Elaine Dewhurst and Dr Noelle Higgins. Speakers included Detective Superintendent Noel Clarke from the Garda Anti-Human Trafficking Unit and Samantha Arnold, separated children's officer at the Irish Refugee Council.

If you would like to be included on an email list or have questions, suggestions, or ideas about the emerging network, please contact, [e sociolegalresearchcentre@gmail.com](mailto:sociolegalresearchcentre@gmail.com).

Michael Doherty

JLS sponsors workshops and seminars

The *Journal of Law and Society* (JLS) has launched a £10,000 per annum workshop/seminar sponsorship scheme. The JLS seeks to promote good quality socio-legal scholarship and proposals will be judged in the light of that broad overall aim. Applicants must normally offer the JLS first refusal of articles for publication coming out of the workshop or seminar. Applications giving full details of themes, socio-legal relevance, venue, speakers etc (max 1500 words) should be sent to the JLS editorial board [e black@cardiff.ac.uk](mailto:black@cardiff.ac.uk). Applications will be considered twice a year after **1 September** and **1 March**.

Stewart Field

Funding and prizes for Irish legal history

In January 2011, the Irish Legal History Society (ILHS) announced the launch of the W N Osborough Composition Prize in Legal History. The purpose of this prize is to encourage and promote high-quality research in Irish legal history. The prize is named after Professor W N Osborough, professor emeritus at University College Dublin, in recognition of his outstanding contribution to Irish legal history. This prize will be awarded to a member of the ILHS who has written a composition that is deemed to have made a significant contribution to the field of Irish legal history. The prize will be awarded every two years and the first closing date is **1 June 2012**. The ILHS is also pleased to invite applications for the Irish legal history student travel bursary 2012 to cover the travel costs of postgraduate students engaged in researching any area of Irish legal history. The closing date is **30 January 2012**. Membership forms are also available on the website – annual membership costs £40/€60 with a reduced rate for students. See www.ilhs.eu. For further information contact, Dr Thomas Mohr [e thomas.mohr@ucd.ie](mailto:thomas.mohr@ucd.ie) or Dr Niamh Howlin [e n.howlin@qub.ac.uk](mailto:n.howlin@qub.ac.uk). **Niamh Howlin**

Homelessness research

Caroline Hunter of York Law School is the principal investigator in a study, funded by the Economic and Social Research Council, of the use of medical evidence in homelessness cases. The research will be carried out with Jo Bretherton, Centre for Housing Policy, University of York, and Sarah Johnsen, Herriot Watt University. The project will focus on how local authority officers understand and use different medical evidence when making decisions about whether applicants are vulnerable for the purposes of the Housing Act 1996, Part 7. **Caroline Hunter**

Legal education and training review

Professor Fiona Cownie has been appointed to represent academic providers of legal education on the Consultation Steering Panel of the national Legal Education and Training Review currently being carried out for all the regulators of the legal professions – the Legal Services Board, the Bar Standards Board, the Solicitors Regulation Authority and the Institute of Legal Executives (see www.sra.org.uk/sra/news/letr-panel-appointment.page). The review is intended to cover education and training over a wide range of legal service providers including the academic stages of qualification, vocational training and education, and continuing professional development for all sections of the profession. It is intended to take account of the future demands on legal services and the contextual changes that will influence the shape of the legal services market in the future. Professor Cownie is one of only two people appointed to the consultation panel to represent all academic providers of legal education, the other being Dr Liz Mytton of Southampton Solent University. Professor Cownie is keen to encourage SLSA members to engage with the review once its consultation papers are published. Contact her on f.cownie@law.keele.ac.uk **Fiona Cownie**

New socio-legal courses at Sussex

A new sociology of law course introduces undergraduates to a variety of sociological perspectives on law by taking the relationship between law and modernity as its main theme. Law and social theory is a postgraduate course beginning with a consideration of classical social theory (Marx, Durkheim, and Weber) and proceeding to more recent works (e.g. Foucault and Bourdieu) and to reflect on how these might help us to understand the contemporary workings and roles of law and legal institutions. [e k.j.veitch@sussex.ac.uk](mailto:k.j.veitch@sussex.ac.uk) **Kenneth Veitch**

Housing wealth research

Professor Lorna Fox O'Mahony, Durham Law School, is part of a team which has been awarded £732,451 by the Leverhulme Trust. The project, led by Dr Beverley Searle, combines expertise from the universities of St Andrews, Durham and Birmingham. Entitled 'Mind the (housing) wealth gap: intergenerational justice and family welfare', the research will take place over three years and will focus on the transfer of wealth, particularly housing wealth, within families.

Firstly, it addresses inequalities in society, particularly the uneven distribution of housing wealth within and across generations. Those who do not have access to housing wealth are put at a disadvantage as housing increasingly determines life chances.

Secondly, it addresses these inequalities in the context of an ageing society. As people live longer, growing demand is placed on housing wealth. Parents face a difficult moral dilemma between saving wealth for their own welfare and health needs, against passing wealth on to their children to help them achieve educational, marital or housing aspirations. Thirdly, where housing wealth takes a central role in such decisions, this raises legal concerns about the protection of assets, particularly for vulnerable owners. Professor Fox O'Mahony will lead a workstream exploring the effectiveness of regulation of equity release schemes in addressing the particular vulnerabilities of marginal older owners.

Lorna Fox O'Mahony

Transitional Justice Institute

Amnesty guidelines

Dr Louise Mallinder and Professor Tom Hadden (Transitional Justice Institute, University of Ulster) have been awarded funding by the Nuffield Foundation for a 16-month project to create a bespoke set of Amnesty Guidelines and Commentary to explain best practice on the situations in which amnesties can contribute to protecting human rights and delivering transitional justice objectives. The underlying idea for this project is to address the growing controversy in international scholarship and practice surrounding the use of amnesty laws to address violent crimes. Although, in recent decades, there have been extensive and valuable advances in the development of the duty to prosecute serious human rights violations under international law, this legal framework remains patchy and piecemeal. As a result, this project will seek to explore the 'grey areas' created by the current framework in order to provide more detailed guidance to policymakers and activists grappling with complex legacies of past violence within transitional states.

UN reparations project

Professor Fionnuala Ní Aoláin, Dr Catherine O'Rourke and Aisling Swaine have been appointed as consultants on a study commissioned by UN Women and the UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, entitled 'Reparations for conflict-related sexual violence'. The goal of the study is to ensure best practice in transitional justice processes to deliver reparations in conflicted and post-conflict societies. The study aims to build on existing UN normative frameworks and operational guidelines to outline a legal framework for the right of victims of human rights and international humanitarian law violations to receive reparations. This research will involve reviewing current UN policy, reports, and evaluations on reparations for conflict-related sexual violence; reviewing court, state and other programmes to date regarding reparations; and analysing the roles and responsibilities of the various states involved.

Lisa Gormley

NO MORE VICTIMS: HOW CIRCLES UK IS REDUCING SEXUAL OFFENDING

Marian Duggan has been a volunteer with CoSA since January 2011. Here, she shares some thoughts about the project and its benefits in an effort to boost volunteer recruitment.

Circles of Support and Accountability (CoSA) is a community-based project rooted in a restorative justice approach to reducing sexual offending. This initiative is managed by Circles UK, a national body supporting the development, quality, coordination and effectiveness of local Circles of Support and Accountability. There are six key values of the CoSA project:

1. Safety: working towards the objective of no more victims.
2. Responsibility: holding individuals to account for their actions.
3. Inclusiveness: managing risk through inclusion not exclusion.
4. Community involvement: recognising the importance of community involvement.
5. Growth and learning: recognising that with necessary support and challenges, people have the ability to grow, learn and change their behaviour.
6. Individuality and respect: treating people with humanity and respect.

The CoSA rationale is based on reducing sexual offending through a co-ordinated approach involving Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangement members and volunteer members of the local community. These lay people are committed to addressing the key factors which may increase the risk of reoffending, such as social isolation and emotional loneliness. Prospective volunteers share statutory agents' objective of 'no more victims' and are drawn from varied backgrounds and demographics.

Volunteers are given initial training about the project, what they can expect, what kinds of core members they may be working with and an introduction into areas of risk, risk awareness and risk management (Wilson et al 2007). Any additional or specific training that is requested may also be provided where possible.

A Circle comprises four to six volunteers and the sex offender, who is referred to as the core member. As a Circle volunteer, you are committing yourself to a minimum of 12 months' involvement with the same core member. Circle meetings usually take place once a week for an hour, during which a supportive social network is built up between volunteers and the core member. In our Circle, one of the volunteers telephones the core member at a mid-point during the week to check in with him and ensure he is aware of, and still able to attend, our next meeting.

Although the primary objective is to encourage accountability and reduce the risk of reoffending, this can be done in a number of ways, many of which may not involve direct reference to the core member's previous offences or current risk. Circle volunteers' practical support can vary from offering guidance on developing social interests and hobbies through to everyday tasks such as filling in registration or application forms. In our Circle, a central method of addressing accountability is having our core member recognise how he is responsible for other aspects of his life before relating these to the choices he makes regarding his offending behaviour. In separating the act from the actor, we are helping him see his role in ensuring that, with our support, 'no more victims' is an achievable aim for him.

Practising what we preach

Many of us in academia may be involved with grass-roots organisations, statutory agencies, the third sector, or with individuals caught up in the criminal justice system. Because of time and resource constraints, it can be difficult to find space for individuals, and instead we offer support in a manner which fits with the business of academic life. In addition, the transience of the criminal justice system means that it may be difficult to forge meaningful relationships with those we are trying to help.

One of the aims of the Circle is to model appropriate behaviours, communications and relationships, mainly through volunteers' interactions with one another and with the core member. This form of experiential learning is designed to educate the core member both consciously and subconsciously. It must be stressed that neither the Circle nor the core member should be approached as an experiment of any sort. My fellow Circle volunteers have backgrounds in psychology and psychotherapy and my criminological background can be broadly framed as victim-focused. Although such knowledge is not necessary and not actively sought by CoSA co-ordinators, it is more likely the case that people working in these fields will have a natural predilection to engage in such voluntary projects (Cesaroni 2001; Drewery 2007). However, we are careful to ensure that we do not impose our own agendas on our core member as any change must come organically from him.

Being a CoSA volunteer is a rewarding experience; you know that you are making a difference. At the time of writing this piece, our Circle had been active for over six months. Over the course of this time, we have seen our core member become more confident, less socially withdrawn and awkward and more aware of himself, his actions and the feelings of those around him. This was more than we had anticipated in such a short time, but is a testament to his commitment to the Circle. As volunteers, we feel that the couple of hours we take out to see our core member are valued by him and he in turn feels valued by us. The physical changes we have seen in him (improvements in his personal hygiene, appearance and demeanour) also indicate that he is becoming more aware of his surroundings and is beginning to feel part of the wider community rather than extraneous to it. Our ultimate hope is that the less marginalised he feels, the less likely he is to engage in recidivist behaviours. This is a notion indicated by several studies conducted into the effectiveness of such restorative community initiatives (Hannem and Petrunik 2007; Kirkwood and Richley 2008).

As part of our criminology degree pathways at Sheffield Hallam University, we encourage our students to volunteer on mentoring and befriending schemes. This is not only to boost their practical experience but to enable them to see the reality of people's lives beyond the act for which they have been labelled. Encouraging students to become involved with CoSA with a view to putting their theoretical knowledge into practice is one way we busy academics can avoid the Ivory Tower accusations while making sure our work has the type of 'impact' we all desire. e m.duggan@shu.ac.uk w www.circles-uk.org.uk

References

- Cesaroni, C (2001) 'Releasing sex offenders into the community through circles of support – a means of reintegrating the "worst of the worst"', *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation* 34(2): 85–98
- Drewery, H (2007) 'The people behind circles of support', *Criminal Justice Matters* 52(1): 18–19
- Hannem, S and Petrunik, M (2007) 'Circles of support and accountability: a community justice initiative for the reintegration of high risk sex offenders', *Contemporary Justice Review* 10(2): 153–71
- Kirkwood, S and Richley, T (2008) 'Circles of Support and Accountability', *SCOLAG Journal*, 372 (Oct): 236–9.
- Wilson, R, McWhinnie, A, Picheca, J, Prinzo, M and Cortoni, F (2007) 'Circles of Support and Accountability', *Howard Journal* 46(1): 1–15

IMPACT ASSESSMENT 2014: OUTCOMES, NOT OUTPUT

Cedric Gilson, visiting fellow at the University of Westminster, attended two recent events on impact, the first at the LSE, the second at the British Academy.

The Research Excellence Framework (REF) as a practice clearly can be recognised within Michael Power's treatise *Audit Society* (1999). He characterises this as a culture comprising programmatic (normative) and technological (operational) elements (pp. 6–7). Programmes represent a level at which abstract ideals of the expectations of audit subsist in policy discourse; technologies signify the concrete tasks of providing evidence and materials for the purposes of verification.

As visiting fellow in law, my writing will not be included in the REF but this does not mean I lack concern for the effect of the assessment on my host institution. So, even though I can enjoy the luxury of living outside this episode of audit, nevertheless I can maintain interest in the process, and even as a phenomenon that itself is available for study. My colleague, John Flood, says that must represent the ultimate reflexivity!¹

The literature is not kind to research assessment exercises. As instances of critical approaches, Shore and Wright (1999) consider them a new form of 'coercive and authoritarian governmentality' and as belonging to 'an illiberal form of governance' (Shore 2008). Bowerman et al (2000) consider that public sector audit has an increasingly questionable future. Michael Power himself detects problems in the use of audit in what he describes as 'decoupling' and 'colonization' (1999: 13).

Regardless of sentiments concerning research assessments, few now can imagine professional life without some form of imposed overview, accountability and responsibility. They are important to government because of their use in allocating resources and overseeing research activity (Broadbent 2010). We might admit privately that appraisals do at least confer the benefit of attesting our academic standards (ibid). It is a banal observation that the 2014 review is inevitable and that compliance with its prescriptions is mandatory. How helpful and constructive it was, then, that two significant events took place this year to assist institutions in preparing their submissions.

The first, 'Investigating academic impact', was a one-day conference at the London School of Economics (LSE) on 13 June, with the aim of clarifying issues surrounding the meaning of impact; innovative ways in which academics can communicate their work; the impact that academic work has among policymaking and business communities; and how academics can start to assess the impact of their own work. Those unable to attend can recapture its wisdom by visiting the LSE public lecture podcast.²

A significant contribution was provided by the recommendations of the LSE Public Policy Group in its report *Maximizing the Impacts of Your Research: A handbook for social scientists*, which was described during the conference and is downloadable.³ The study, led by Patrick Dunleavy and Jane Tinkler, was aimed at 'developing precise methods for measuring and evaluating the impact of research in the public sphere' and helping universities 'to better capture and track the impacts of their social science research and applications work'. Its purpose was to develop guidance for colleagues where previously there was no single source of systematic advice on methods of maximising the academic impacts of research.

Abiding impressions from the very able presentations were that an estimate of the social usefulness of articles has become a prime requirement for grant applications as well as to the Higher Education Funding Council for England and that case studies were to be highly regarded. It was even suggested that a

well-written case study would stand in the stead of several articles of three-star quality in terms of impact assessment. Academics were exhorted to publish digitally as well as in print because the possibility for citations would be far greater. Attention should be paid to making titles more appealing because many were recondite, and recourse should be made to communications professionals for assistance.

The second event, "'Impact' in the REF", was hosted by the SLSA and British Academy, with support from the LSE, at Carlton House Terrace on 16 September. Some members of the REF law sub-panel were in attendance. The point of the meeting appeared to be a mixture of awareness-raising of the criteria for law submissions to the REF, amid the need for response from academics to the consultation document, at that time imminent,⁴ and the views of legal scholars of the effect of the REF on academic writing.

Gillian Douglas emphasised that assessments would rely heavily on outcomes, not outputs or dissemination. Bibliometrics were being abandoned in favour of impact,⁵ which would be given a 20 per cent weighting in the 2014 REF (and could be higher in subsequent rounds). One case study should be submitted per 10 members of academic staff. There would be a threshold acceptance level for articles submitted for assessment of two-star: panels of users and academics would decide whether material should be rated higher.

There was confusion over how this process would work and the meanings of terms like 'reach', 'significance', 'impact', 'benefit', 'esteem', 'usefulness' and others. Hugh Collins was concerned that legal scholarship would be impoverished and distorted by the need to comply with impact criteria, citing the 'virtual issue' of the *Modern Law Review* that was dedicated to study.⁶ It is difficult to see how some legal scholarship could be rendered in case-study form. Costas Douzinas said that legal research had not previously been empirically orientated towards policy. He championed critical legal studies as having provided the intellectual space and culture that had opened up and influenced writing in journals. He signalled the need for a wider, humanity-based approach to issues such as causation and a new legal paradigm with a hermeneutical slant. He said that universities already confer public benefit, so why the need for a second burden? Other comments from the audience concerned inconsistencies between the assessment criteria for law and those of other social science sub-panels.

It is open forums such as these that help to reduce the vulnerability of academics in the REF submission process.

Notes

- 1 In relation to this, see Power (1999: 121) on evaluation of audit.
- 2 [w http://blogs.lse.ac.uk/impactofsocialsciences/podcasts](http://blogs.lse.ac.uk/impactofsocialsciences/podcasts)
- 3 [w http://blogs.lse.ac.uk/impactofsocialsciences/the-handbook/](http://blogs.lse.ac.uk/impactofsocialsciences/the-handbook/)
- 4 See [w www.hefce.ac.uk/research/ref/pubs/2011/03_11/03_11c.doc](http://www.hefce.ac.uk/research/ref/pubs/2011/03_11/03_11c.doc).
- 5 See REF, University of East London, July 2011 at [w www.uel.ac.uk/ref/about.htm](http://www.uel.ac.uk/ref/about.htm)
- 6 [w www.wileyonlinelibrary.com/journals/mlr](http://www.wileyonlinelibrary.com/journals/mlr).

References

- Bowerman, M, Raby, H and Humphrey, C (2000) 'In search of the audit society: some evidence from health care, police and schools', *International Journal of Auditing* 4:71–100
- Broadbent, J (2010) 'The UK Research Assessment Exercise', *Australian Journal of Accounting* 20(52)(1):14–23
- Power, M (1999) *The Audit Society: Rituals of verification*, OUP
- Shore, C (2008) 'Audit culture and illiberal governance: universities and the politics of accountability', *Anthropological Theory* 8(8):278–99
- Shore, C and Wright, S (1999) 'Audit culture and anthropology: neoliberalism in British higher education', *Journal of the Royal College of Anthropology* 5(4):557–75

SOCIO-LEGAL PUBLICATIONS

Books

International and Comparative Criminal Justice and Urban Governance (2011) Adam Crawford (ed), CUP £90hb 618pp

Exploring the implications of criminal justice developments in a globalised world, this book offers conceptual contributions on international criminal justice institutions and practices, comparative penal policies, and international and comparative urban governance and crime control. The growing internationalisation of crime control raises complex questions about the future of criminal justice and urban governance. New institutions, the cross-border movement of people and goods and the transfer of criminal justice policies between jurisdictions present challenges to our understandings of criminal justice.

Juxtaposing Autonomy and Paternalism in Private Law (2011) Anthony Ogus and Willem H van Boom (eds), Hart £40 240pp

Selecting an appropriate balance between autonomy and paternalism requires consideration of moral, political and economic values. This collection deals with the task, locating itself within the broader context of the relationship between law and market forces. Concepts are defined and analysed, in particular the distinction between the coercive approach of 'hard paternalism' in the law, and the 'nudge' approach of 'soft paternalism'. Attention is focused on resolving tensions between concepts in the law of contract, where deficient information and mistakes can justify an interventionism.

Making Family Law: A socio-legal account of the legislative process in England and Wales, 1985 to 2010 (2011) Mavis Maclean with Jacek Kurczewski, Hart £17.50 136pp

Taking a sociological and empirically based approach, this book offers a rare insight into the real processes by which lawmakers attempt to influence (or fail to influence) human behaviour. This account of the legislative process in Westminster rests on Maclean's observations and discussion with key players from the standpoint of an academic adviser on research to the department responsible for family law-making (originally the Lord Chancellor's department, then the Department for Constitutional Affairs and now the Ministry of Justice) and draws on her long-standing involvement in and knowledge of the processes of lawmaking.

OLAF at the Crossroads (2011) Constantin Stefanou, Simone White and Helen Xanthaki, Hart £45 211pp

Since OLAF (the European Commission's Anti-Fraud Office) was set up in 1999, changes in its functional environment have taken place: continuing advances in EU criminal law, especially in the areas of mutual assistance and substantive criminal law; the reconstruction of Eurojust and Europol; and the prospect of the Lisbon Treaty. The authors believe that OLAF's current legal framework must address these issues and, taking a multidisciplinary approach, examine OLAF through the prism of law and EU politics, focusing on the identification of current problems in regulation and procedure, and on the feasibility of the institution in the future of European integration.

Emotions, Crime and Justice (2011) Susanne Karstedt, Ian Loader and Heather Strang (eds), Hart, £50 378pp

The return of emotions to debates about crime and criminal justice has been a striking development in recent decades, registered in the return of shame to justice procedures, a focus on victims and their emotional needs, the fear of crime, and highly emotionalised public discourses on crime and justice. How can we make sense of these developments? Do we need 'emotionally intelligent' justice systems, or are we messing with the rational foundations of liberal criminal justice? This volume brings together leading academics in a conversation about how to recalibrate reason and emotion in crime and justice today.

Europe's Constitutional Mosaic (2011) Neil Walker, Jo Shaw and Stephen Tierney (eds), Hart, £60 404pp

There has been much debate concerning the constitutional future of Europe, focusing on the (failed) constitutional treaty of 2003–2005 and on the Treaty of Lisbon. But this focus offers only a partial vision of the complex constitutional terrain of contemporary Europe. In addition, it is essential to explore other threads of normative authority within and across states, embracing internal challenges to state-level constitutional regimes; the growing jurisprudential assertiveness of the Council of Europe regime; as well as Europe's relations with broader international institutions. Together these create increasingly dense networks of constitutional authority within the European space. This multi-dimensional dynamic makes the academic challenge all the more important. Without this fuller picture it becomes impossible to understand the legal context of Europe today or the prospects of ongoing changes.

Landmark Cases in Family Law (2011) Stephen Gilmore, Jonathan Herring and Rebecca Probert (eds), Hart £60 330pp

Family law cases tend to raise controversial issues, often on striking facts, frequently provoking wider social debate and/or extensive publicity. Consequently, the landmark cases chosen for this collection provide considerable scope, not only for doctrinal analysis and explanation of the importance and impact of the decisions, but also for in-depth examination of the social or policy developments that influenced them. The stories behind the cases provide a fascinating insight into the complexities of family life and the drama that can be found in the family courts.

Sociology and Human Rights: New engagements (2011) Patricia Hynes, Michele Lamb, Damien Short, Matthew Waites (eds), Routledge £80 224pp

This collection examines the contribution sociological approaches can make to analysis of human rights, presenting innovative analyses of global human rights struggles by new and established authors, including new work addressing issues such as genocide in relation to indigenous peoples, rights-based approaches in development work, trafficking of children, and children's rights in relation to political struggles for the decriminalisation of same-sex sexual activity in India. It examines contexts ranging from Rwanda and South Korea to Northern Ireland and the city of Barcelona.

Queering Conflict: Examining lesbian and gay experiences of homophobia in Northern Ireland (2011) Marian Duggan, Ashgate £50 160pp

Queering Conflict offers a culturally specific analysis into the ways in which homophobia in Northern Ireland has been informed and sustained during the latter half of the twentieth century. It takes the failure of the British government to extend the 1967 Sexual Offences Act to Northern Ireland as its central point to demonstrate the subtle differences governing attitudes towards homosexuality in Northern Ireland.

At the Edge of Law: Emergent and divergent models of legal professionalism (2011) Andrew Francis, Ashgate £65 228pp

This is an analysis of the changing nature of contemporary legal professionalism. It employs a methodological approach and presents a series of case studies built on original empirical research. It focuses on those operating at the margins of legal professionalism in England and Wales, and also includes comparative material on the US and Canada.

Copyright and the Public Interest in China (2011) Guan Hong Tang, Edward Elgar £79.95/£71.96 online 304pp

Since 1990 China has awarded copyright, providing public, non-criminal enforcement. This book will appeal to students and researchers in intellectual property law, comparative law, Chinese studies, international commerce and information science. It will also be of value to lawyers and consultants with expertise in intellectual property law and China.

Children's Socio-Economic Rights, Democracy and the Courts (2011) Aoife Nolan, Hart £55 336pp

The subject of children's socio-economic rights is a comparatively neglected area. This is particularly true with regard to the role of the courts in the enforcement of such rights. This book focuses on the circumstances in which the courts can and should give effect to the socio-economic rights of children. The arguments put forward are located within the context of, and develop, long-standing debates in constitutional law, democratic theory and human rights. The claims made are supported and illustrated by examples of judicial enforcement of children's socio-economic rights from a variety of jurisdictions, rooting the work in both theory and practice.

Are Human Rights for Migrants? Critical reflections on the status of irregular migrants in Europe and the United States (2011) Marie-Bénédicte Dembour and Tobias Kelly (eds), £75 250pp

Human rights seemingly offer universal protection but irregular migrants have only problematic access to them. This book asks three key questions of practical and theoretical importance. First, what do we mean when we speak of human rights? Second, is the access of irregular migrants to human rights protection an issue of implementation, or due to the inherent characteristics of the concept of human rights? Third, should we look beyond human rights for an effective source of protection?

Housing Disadvantaged People? Insiders and outsiders in French social housing (2011) Jane Ball, Routledge £34.99 360pp

This book uses 'insider-outsider' theory for an economic analysis of exclusion in French social-housing allocation: its processes, institutional context and stigmatising effects. This highlights the spatial effects of nimbysism, excluding disadvantaged outsiders and concentrating them in deprived areas. Simultaneously, urban regeneration has reduced affordable housing stock and 'social mix' is a reason to refuse a social home. This book gives a detailed picture of French social-housing allocation for an interdisciplinary housing policy audience.

Resolving Disputes about Educational Provision: A comparative perspective on special educational needs (2011) Neville Harris and Sheila Riddell, Ashgate £65 238pp

This book uses a comparative approach to explore the nature of the disputes that arise between parents/children and education decision-makers over children's special educational needs and to consider the different methods adopted for the resolution of these disputes. In doing so it seeks to analyse the evidence with reference to a theoretical framework concerning: the nature of disputes, in particular those between citizen and state; the role of alternative dispute resolution mechanisms such as mediation and negotiation; and the rights of parents and children.

Comparative Criminal Justice and Globalization (2011) David Nelken (ed), Ashgate £60 228pp

In this collection, leading scholars discuss the implications of globalisation for the fields of comparative criminology and criminal justice. How far does it make sense to distinguish nation states, for example, in comparing prison rates? Is globalisation best treated as an inevitable trend or an interactive process? How can its effects on space and borders be conceptualised? How does it create norms and exceptions?

Sitting in Judgment: The working lives of judges (2011) Penny Darbyshire, Hart £27.50 474pp

The public image of judges has been dogged by stereotypes but reforms of the 1980s introduced change and, after seven years of research, with unprecedented access to the courts, the author presents a revealing picture of the judiciary. Not only do old stereotypes not hold, but modern judges are more representative of the population and the reforms are working. This book also gives a glimpse of the modern courtroom, describing a legal system under stress, suffering from a lack of resources and burdened with an ever-increasing caseload.

The Foundations of European Private Law (2011) Roger Brownsword, Hans-Wolfgang Micklitz, Leone Niglia and Steve Weatherill (eds) Hart £85 648pp

There is an urgent need for a deeper discussion of the theoretical, political and federal dimensions of the European codification project. While much work has already been done, these papers start with the proposition that further reflection and critical thought will enhance the quality of the ongoing work of the codification bodies. These papers are a comprehensive attempt to survey the codification project, its theoretical, political and federal foundations and future prospects for enforcement and compliance.

Understanding Law in Society: Developments in socio-legal studies (2011) Knut Papendorf, Stefan Machura and Kristian Andenaes (eds), Lit Verlag €24.90 296pp

This book starts with analyses of the sociology of law advanced by the most outstanding theorists in the field, Max Weber and Niklas Luhmann, and assesses their legacy. It then examines the gain sociology of law could have from a stronger focus on norms; it asks about the effects that courts have; it gives an international overview on 'alternatives of law'; and finishes by looking at the media and public perception of the legal system.

Getting a PhD in Law (2011) Caroline Morris and Cian Murphy, Hart £19.95 158pp

Legal methodology and the place of the PhD in the lawyer's career create challenges that are not addressed by existing study guides. This book provides a guide to the process from topic selection to thesis publication, drawing on interviews and case studies with students, supervisors and examiners.

Journals

This special issue of the *Northern Ireland Legal Quarterly* 64 (2) (winter 2011) on 'Socialising economic relationships: a critique of business regulation', edited by Bettina Lange and Dania Thomas, was inspired by a workshop at Oxford University in April 2010 funded through the SLSA seminar competition. This special issue rethinks what it means to socialise economic relationships, starting from the insights of the economic historian, sociologist and anthropologist Karl Polanyi who critiqued the myth of the self-regulatory capacity of markets and explored how economic relationships can be embedded in society. It argues that the developing field of the economic sociology of law can advance debates about business regulation by providing conceptual tools for exploring the contribution of law to disembed and re-embed economic into social relationships.

Calls for submissions

Global Constitutionalism: Human rights, democracy and the rule of law seeks to promote a deeper understanding of the foundations, limitations and principles of political order and their dynamics over time on a global scale. Editors: Anthony Lang, Mattias Kumm, Miguel Poiars Maduro and Antje Wiener. www.journals.cambridge.org/GlobCon/cfp.

Families, Relationships and Societies is designed to advance scholarship and debate in the growing field of families and relationships across the life course. Editors: Tess Ridge and Brid Featherstone. www.policypress.co.uk/journals_frs_cfp.asp?

International Journal for the Semiotics of Law special issue on 'Visual semiotics of the spaces we inhabit': email proposals to marusek@hawaii.edu by **15 March 2012**.

Irish Review of Community Economic Development Law and Policy: articles on any topic pertaining to community economic development law and policy, e.g. transactional law, grass-roots lawyering, integrating socio-legal rights and community development/social policy issues, or articles connecting these areas www.nclc.ie/overview/default.asp [e editor@nclc.ie](mailto:editor@nclc.ie).

- **JOURNAL OF ENVIRONMENTAL LAW: ANNUAL LECTURE 2011**

15 December 2011: Brunei Gallery Lecture Theatre, School of Oriental and African Studies, London

The conference title is 'Liability for damages in oil spill accidents: evaluating the United States and international law regimes'. Speaker: Professor Thomas Schoenbaum, George Washington University. This event is free but registration is essential. Further information is available at www.oxfordjournals.org/page/3817/9.

- **WOMEN, CRIME AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE PRACTICE: DIVERSITY, DIVERSION, DESISTANCE AND DIGNITY**

10–12 January 2012: Cambridge

An international conference in collaboration with Women's Breakout, UK to share learning and best practice in recognising the diverse needs of women, and the need to de-escalate both the pressures which lead towards crime and the steps towards custody; thus diversion from both crime and custody and desistance in terms of achieving what might help women's pathways away from crime. This involves considerations of dignity in attempting to meet women 'where they are' and to respond to women's real needs.

www.crim.cam.ac.uk/events/conferences/diversity-diversion/

- **INTERSECTIONS OF RIGHTS AND LAWS: ENVIRONMENT, LIVELIHOOD AND SELF-DETERMINATION**

12–13 January 2012: Institute of Commonwealth Studies, London

Keynote Speaker: Professor Tania Murray Li, University of Toronto.

www.slsa.ac.uk/images/2011autumn/flyer%20eng1%20end.pdf

- **TRANSGENDER AND INTERSEX IN THE ARTS, SCIENCE AND SOCIETY**

18–20 January 2012: Dresden, Germany

This is an international interdisciplinary conference for experts and a wider audience – lectures, presentations, discussions and artistic performances – organised by Prof Dr Stefan Horlacher, Dresden University of Technology. Conference attendance is free of charge and open to the public. Conference languages will be English and German. For information and conference registration, contact Stefan Horlacher at sekr-spraliwi-engl@mailbox.tu-dresden.de.

- **INTERNATIONAL GRADUATE LEGAL RESEARCH CONFERENCE: CALL**

19–20 April 2011: King's College London

This conference provides early career researchers with an opportunity to engage in academic debate. Call closes: 12 December 2011.

www.iglrc.com

- **CONTEMPORARY HOUSING ISSUES IN A CHANGING EUROPE**

20–21 April 2012: Centre for Housing Law, Rights and Policy, School of Law, National University of Ireland, Galway

The legal aspects of housing, land and planning are of central importance in the development of contemporary Europe. Regulatory weaknesses in many European states have had enormous consequences for financial systems. Limited access to adequate and affordable housing has impacted on older people, homeless people, people with disabilities, immigrants and those in poverty. Restricted bank lending, unaffordable housing and large mortgages will affect the lives of Europeans for years to come. At the same time, the spectrum of housing rights is being broadened across Europe. The Charter of Fundamental Rights has been incorporated into EU treaty law, and several international instruments have been accepted by the EU. www.conference.ie/Conferences/index.asp?Conference=135
housingconference@gmail.com

- **2ND INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON LAW, LANGUAGE AND DISCOURSE**

20–22 April, 2012: Zhejiang Police College, Hangzhou, China

Organised by Zhejiang Police College and Multicultural Association of Law and Language. The theme is 'multiculturalism, multimodality and multidimensionality'. Subthemes include: legislative language and discourse; courtroom language and discourse; investigation and interrogation discourse; corpus linguistics and legal discourse; information science and legal discourse; legal lexicography; law and semiotics. For more details: lldmall@hotmail.com.hk.

- **LAW AND SOCIETY ASSOCIATION INTERNATIONAL MEETING: CALL FOR PARTICIPATION**

5–8 June 2012: Honolulu, Hawaii

Theme: 'Socio-legal conversations across a sea of islands'. See the Law and Society Association's website www.lawandsociety.org/ for details. Possible topics include: courts and litigation; the training of a highly qualified, independent, and incorruptible judiciary; gender issues in law and society; legal education and the legal profession; indigenous peoples; religion and law; regulation; health; financial markets; immigration; human security; security; East-West dialogue; new concepts of legal pluralism and legal culture; colonialism, globalisation, and recolonisation; the UN and other transnational bodies. See the program committee website at www.lawandsociety.org/ann_mtg/am12/program_committee.htm. Deadline: 6 December 2012.

- **HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE ENVIRONMENT: IN SEARCH OF A NEW RELATIONSHIP**

14–15 June 2011: International Institute for the Sociology of Law, Oñati

This Global Network for the Study of Human Rights and the Environment (GNHRE) seminar (chaired by Anna Gear, GNHRE director) will bring together philosophers, lawyers, policy-makers, non-governmental organisation staff and activists in a search for a new conceptualisation of the relationship between human and environmental rights, blending theory, law and praxis in fresh and productive ways. Contact: Anna Gear anna.grear@uwe.ac.uk.

- **TAKING LIBERTIES: SEX, PLEASURE, COERCION (1748–1928)**

15–17 June 2012: Newcastle University

Keynote Speakers: Helen Berry (Newcastle University) on sex, marriage and the castrato; Joseph Bristow (University of California, Los Angeles) on Oscar Wilde's sexual practices; Cora Kaplan (Queen Mary, University of London) on rape, representation and slavery; Richard C Sha (American University) on romanticism and the paradoxes of free love. Key conference questions are: How are the complex relations between sexual licence, pleasure and coercion understood, represented and negotiated during the long nineteenth century? How did censorship and obscenity laws shape the literary/cinematic/theatrical landscape? How were sexually controversial texts – from erotica to triple-decker novels, from peep-shows to West-End theatre – produced, circulated, preserved and consumed? Enquiries to Ella Dzelzainis at ella.dzelzainis@ncl.ac.uk.

- **COMPARATIVE LAW: ENGAGING TRANSLATION**

21–22 June 2012: Kent Law School, Canterbury

Please see website www.kent.ac.uk/law/cecl/News.html for full details of keynote speakers and call for papers.

- **RC33 EIGHTH INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON SOCIAL SCIENCE METHODOLOGY**

9–13 July 2012: Sydney, Australia

The session on 'New ethnographies of crime and justice' will present new ethnographic research about crime and criminal justice. It is hoped that a side event will be arranged where a larger number of presenters will present ethnographic papers and reflections on professional practice. Some papers may be published in a special issue of *Current Issues in Criminal Justice* in 2013. For more information, contact Max Travers, University of Tasmania max.travers@utas.edu.au.

<http://conference.acspri.org.au/index.php/rc33/2012/index>.

- **SECOND INTERNATIONAL SOCIOLOGY ASSOCIATION FORUM OF SOCIOLOGY, SOCIAL JUSTICE AND DEMOCRATIZATION: CALL FOR PAPERS**

1–4 August 2012: Buenos Aires, Argentina

Objectives: to provide a meeting place for the various research committees, working groups, and thematic groups; to develop a socially significant theme involving public actors and to which different areas of sociology can contribute; to hold the interim Research Council business meeting attended by the delegates from all research committees. See www.isa-sociology.org/buenos-aires-2012/. Closing date: 15 December 2011.