

Doctor *honoris causa*

Anthony Bottoms



UAB

Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona

Doctor honoris causa

ANTHONY BOTTOMS

Discurs llegit
a la cerimònia d'investidura
celebrada a la sala d'actes de l'edifici Rectorat
el dia 22 de novembre de 2022

UAB

Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona

Índex

Presentació d'Anthony Bottoms per Josep Cid Moliné	4
Discurs d'investidura d'Anthony Bottoms	11
<i>Curriculum vitae</i> d'Anthony Bottoms	27
Acord del Consell de Govern	49

PRESENTACIÓ
D'ANTHONY BOTTOMS
PER
JOSEP CID MOLINÉ

Rector Magnífic de la Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona,
Degana de la Facultat de Dret,
President del Consell Social,
Autoritats acadèmiques,
Senyores i senyors,

I met Professor Bottoms in 1999 when Professor Larrauri and I invited him to celebrate the 10th Anniversary of the Master's degree in Criminology and Sentencing Enforcement [*Master en Criminologia i Execució Penal*]. But at that time the Spanish community of scholars interested in Penology were already very familiar with the work of Anthony Bottoms. We had read his papers on the fine¹, the suspended sentence², on the English experience of limiting prison use³, and the non-treatment paradigm for probation practice⁴. These papers had been written in the nineteen seventies and eighties, which represented a period of change in Spain.

- 1 Bottoms, Anthony (1973): "The Efficacy of the Fine: The Case for Agnosticism", *The Criminal Law Review*, September, 543-549.
- 2 Bottoms, Anthony (1981): "The suspended sentence in England, 1967-1978", *British Journal of Criminology*, 21(1), pp. 1-26.
- 3 Bottoms, Anthony (1987): "Limiting Prison use: Experience in England and Wales", *The Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, 26(3), pp177-202.
- 4 Bottoms, Anthony & McWilliams, Williams (1979): "A Non-Treatment Paradigm for Probation Practice", *The British Journal of Social Work*, 9(2), pp. 159-202.

Article 25.2 of the Spanish Constitution was committed to the principle of rehabilitation (“Prison sentences must be aimed at re-education and social re-integration”), but we didn’t know how to put this principle in practice. And at that time Professor Bottoms was a source of inspiration for Spanish scholars. On the one hand, he advocated for the idea that alternatives to prison should not only be justified as being more capable of achieving rehabilitation but also for the humanitarian ideal of reducing the use of imprisonment. On the other hand, he proposed a new way of working with offenders in the community. Rehabilitation work should not be narrowly conceived as a way of ‘treating’ offenders as passive objects, but alternatively should be seen as a way of cooperating between the offender and the probation officer to solve social problems related to their offending.

Sir Anthony Bottoms is now Emeritus Professor of the Institute of Criminology in the University of Cambridge. He read law at the University of Oxford and went on to Cambridge to take a postgraduate diploma in Criminology. After two years of work as a probation officer, he returned to Cambridge for a research position. In 1969 he became the first lecturer in Criminology at the University of Sheffield where he was later promoted to Professor of Criminology. Finally, in 1984 he succeeded Nigel Walker in the Wolfson Chair in Criminology of the University of Cambridge and as Director of the Institute of Criminology until 1998. Although, formally, Professor Bottoms retired in 2006 he has been fully active since then, leading new research and making more important contributions.

I don’t think I am exaggerating if I say that for many years Anthony Bottoms has been and continues to be at the heart of that important institute. Allow me to mention three important dimensions of Professor Bottoms work there: directorship, theory and research, and hospitality.

As a director in 1995 he started the new “Cambridge Police Executive Program”, to bring senior police officers the best criminological

research on the practice of policing⁵. This is an example of Professor Bottoms' interest in the idea that criminology is an applied science which aims to improve justice and wellbeing in society. As Professor Bottoms says, "I have never much seen the point of criminology unless it connects with real world".⁶

In the Institute of Criminology, Anthony Bottoms has led or taken part in different research projects that have changed the way that criminology approaches some topics. One of these issues is the importance of the legitimacy we attribute to authorities to understand obedience to the law.

In cooperation with Richard Sparks and Will Hay, Professor Bottoms carried out a study of the disturbances in some maximum-security prisons in England in the nineteen eighties⁷. In their theoretical approach to the field work they were interested in how some prisons can achieve order and also in whether some of the ways of achieving that order were more desirable than others⁸. The results of this research led Professor Bottoms to underline the importance of the concept of legitimacy for analysing penological institutions and this conception has had an enormous importance in penology. The ideas and mentoring of Professor Bottoms have been very influential and probably one of the best examples is Alison Liebling's survey *Measuring the Quality of Prison Life*, which has been very important around the world as a way to analyse the quality of prison life—a survey that has also been also conducted by Spanish scholars⁹.

5 See: Neyroud, Peter (2022). "Learning to experiment: The Police, Science, and Evidence-Based Practice", in A. Liebling, J. Shapland, R. Sparks & J. Tankebe (eds.), *Crime, Justice and Social Order*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, p. 82.

6 Sparks, Richard & Lanskey, Caroline (2022): "Reflections on the Life of a British Criminologist. Tony Bottoms in Conversation", in A. Liebling, J. Shapland, R. Sparks & J. Tankebe (eds.), *Crime, Justice and Social Order*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, p. 22.

7 Sparks, Richard; Bottoms, Anthony & Hay, Will (1996): *Prisons and the Problem of Order*, Oxford, Clarendon Press.

8 Liebling, Alison (2022): "Penal legitimacy, well-being, and Trust", in A. Liebling, J. Shapland, R. Sparks & J. Tankebe (eds.), *Crime, Justice and Social Order*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, p. 278.

9 Liebling, Alison (2004): *Prisons and their moral performance. A study of values, quality and prison life*, Oxford, Clarendon Press.

The concept of legitimacy is important for understanding obedience to the law and the wellbeing of citizens throughout the criminal justice system. Together with his former student, Justice Tankebe, Professor Bottoms has been involved in a philosophical elaboration of the concept of legitimacy. He discusses the idea that legitimacy depends mainly on how people are treated by authorities¹⁰, and proposes other elements such as the respect of distributive justice. Taking their example, the *Black Lives Matter* movement, when Afro-American citizens complain about the use of arrest by police, this is not only the result of a lack of respect for the correct procedures, but also because police are more focused on black people than on other citizens.

Moving to another dimension of his life in the Institute of Criminology of Cambridge, Professor Bottoms is also an example of the openness of the Institute to Spanish scholars. Probably the first Spanish Scholar to visit was Dr. Manuel López Rey, a criminal law professor who went into exile after the Spanish civil war. In the last 25 years many scholars from our university, from other Catalan universities and from universities in other parts of Spain, have had the privilege of undertaking research visits to the Institute, being in contact with the excellent scholars there and benefiting from the library, the seminars, the colleges, and the city. Professor Bottoms has always been helpful in welcoming these both young and senior scholars to the Institute, contributing to the development of their research and to Spanish Criminology.

Coming back to the relation of Professor Bottoms with our university, in 2011 he returned to Barcelona to teach both on our degree in Criminology and on the Inter-university Master's degree in *Criminology and Sentencing Enforcement*. I remember our undergraduate students clapping when he reached the classroom. I was happy and also surprised because the two papers that these undergraduate young

10 Tyler, Tom (1990): *Why people obey the law*, New Haven and London, Yale University Press.

students had read by Professor Bottoms in their first and second year were not easy¹¹. In his lecture, Professor Bottoms presented theory and research on social ecology, another relevant topic in his career. From the Chicago School, we know that some areas of cities suffer more criminality and that this is related to their level of social disorganization. Professor Bottoms contributed to the renaissance of the tradition of the Chicago School in Europe and in his research showed the importance of government housing policies to the distribution of crime across the city¹². In recent papers, Professor Bottoms has looked in more detail at the disorganization thesis, showing the impact of disorder or incivility on the wellbeing of communities and arguing in favour of challenging incivility not only as a police matter, but also and mainly as community and institutional duty¹³.

In 2016 the Spanish Society of Criminology invited Professor Bottoms to give the inaugural lecture of the XI Conference of the Spanish Society of Criminology¹⁴, organized by our university in cooperation with the Catalan Ministry of Justice and the Spanish Society of Criminological Research. Professor Bottoms devoted this lecture to explaining criminological knowledge on desistance from crime. Desistance has probably been one of Professor Bottoms' favourite topics over the last 20 years. Together with Professor Shapland, Professor Bottoms

11 The two papers were: Bottoms, Anthony (2000): "The Relationship Between Theory and Research in Criminology, en R. King & E. Wincup (eds.), *Doing Research on Crime and Justice*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 15-60 (in the course of Introduction to Criminology) and: Bottoms, Anthony & Von Hirsch, Andrew (2010): "The Crime Preventive Impact of Penal Sanctions", In P. Cane, & H. Kritzer (eds.), *Oxford Handbook of Empirical-Legal Research*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 97-124.

12 Bottoms, Anthony (1994): "Environmental Criminology", in M. Maguire; R. Morgan; R. Reiner (eds.): *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 585-656.

13 Bottoms, Anthony (2006): "Incivilities, offence and social order in residential communities", in A. P. Simester & A. von Hirsch (eds.), *Incivilities: regulating offensive behavior*, London, Bloomsbury, pp. 239-280.

14 The XI conference of the Spanish Society of Criminology had rehabilitation as one of the main topics. The title of the conference was "Opening paths to reinsertion" ["Abriendo vías a la reinserción]. Cid, José, Ibáñez, Aina, & De la Encarnación, Esther (2016): "Libro de abstracts del XI Congreso Español de Criminología, Barcelona 2016", *Revista Española de Investigación Criminológica*, 14, 1-206. <https://reic.criminologia.net/index.php/journal/article/view/10>

developed innovative research on desistance in early adulthood. One of the findings of their research is that although some young people may be involved in a criminal lifestyle, they wish to become normal citizens. This research brings to criminology a lot of hope for the idea that offenders change and delegates to society—to families, to communities, to professionals—the role of favouring the moral process of learning to desist¹⁵.

I wish to end this speech by giving my heartfelt thanks to Professor Bottoms for having produced new criminological theory always sensitive to social justice, and for having honoured our university by agreeing to become a new member as honorary doctor.

És per tot això que tinc el plaer, l'honor i el privilegi de demanar al Rector Magnífic de la Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona que s'atorgui el grau de doctor *honoris causa* al professor Anthony Bottoms.

15 See Bottoms Anthony & Shapland, Joanna (2016): “Learning to desist in early adulthood. The Sheffield Desistance Study”, en J. Shapland; S. Farrall & A. Bottoms (eds.), *Global Perspectives on Desistance. Reviewing what Know and Looking to the Future*, London, Routledge, pp.99-125.

DISCURS D'INVESTIDURA
D'ANTHONY BOTTOMS

It is a very great honour to be awarded an Honorary Doctorate by the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, so the first thing that I want to do is to say a very warm ‘thank you’ to the Faculty of Law for proposing me for this honour, and to the Governing Council of the University for deciding to confer it upon me. I am both surprised and very grateful to be the recipient of such an honour, especially as I am, unfortunately, not able to make this address either in Catalan or in Spanish. I feel particularly honoured because I have seen from the website of the university that you award only a very small number of honorary doctorates each year.

But as well as being a great honour, it is also a real pleasure for me to be here, among colleagues and friends. As Professor Josep Cid Moliné has reminded me, it was in 1999 that I first came to Barcelona, when I was one of several speakers at a conference to celebrate the tenth anniversary of the foundation of the Master’s degree in Criminology, which at that time was jointly run by this university and the Catalan Ministry of Justice. I am pleased to learn that the Master’s course is still flourishing, and that it is now an inter-university collaboration involving four universities, including the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.

Some years later, in 2011, I came back to Barcelona to give several seminars to the Master’s course, as well as a lecture to undergraduates here at the Universitat Autònoma. On that same visit I also made presentations at the Universitat de Barcelona and the Universitat Pompeu

Fabra. Then in 2016 I was honoured to be asked to give the opening plenary lecture at the conference of the Spanish Society of Criminology, which was held that year in Barcelona, and organised by the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona in co-operation with the Catalan Ministry of Justice and the Spanish Society of Criminology. The title of my address on that occasion was ‘Desistance research and its relevance for criminology and criminal policy’. As I shall explain more fully later, desistance from crime has been one of the main topics in my recent research, and it is a topic to which both Professor Cid and I have contributed in our respective countries.

Of course, when making these various visits to Barcelona I have also enjoyed the many things that your unique city has to offer. Like thousands of other visitors, I have come to love this extraordinary place, and in particular its architecture, its museums and its special atmosphere.

I have been asked to say something about my research work. In recent years, this has focused particularly on desistance from crime and on the legitimacy of criminal justice systems. So I will try to explain how I came to focus on these two topics. There have been three stages to this journey. First came some studies of social order in prisons; these led, secondly, to a theoretical focus on the topic of compliance with laws and regulations; and that interest in compliance then led, thirdly, to my studies of desistance and legitimacy.

I’ll begin, then, with the prison studies. In the mid-1980s, the British government published a report following a series of disturbances in high-security prisons for long-term male prisoners.¹ That report led indirectly to the commissioning of several research projects, and I was invited to lead a team whose task was: ‘To describe accurately and to

1 Home Office (1984) *Managing the Long-Term Prison System: Report of the Control Review Committee* (London: Her Majesty’s Stationery Office).

explain the nature of control problems [in long-term prisons] and the conditions leading to their emergence’.

Our research focused on two contrasting long-term prisons, which I’ll call ‘Prison A’ and ‘Prison B’.

Prison A had a troubled recent history, having experienced a full-scale riot in 1983 and a smaller but very frightening incident in 1985, when some staff were trapped by prisoners. As a result, the Governor of the prison imposed what was described as a ‘restricted regime’, which made several changes intended to reduce opportunities for disorder. The most prominent of these changes was that each evening only two-thirds of prisoners were allowed out for the leisure period; the remainder had to stay in their cells. As you can imagine, this was not a popular policy among prisoners; but it greatly increased self-confidence among staff, who had been badly shaken by the recent major incidents.

Prison B was very different. It was one of only two high-security prisons that had experienced no serious loss of control. Many of its staff described it as offering ‘a liberal regime within a secure perimeter’, and a former Deputy Governor of the prison had said that this regime was intended to ‘help men return to a free society by reproducing the challenges of a free society so far as this is possible’. Within the English prison system, Prison B was widely regarded as the most liberal high-security prison, while Prison A was regarded as the most restrictive.

In the book resulting from our research,² we described the regime of Prison A as focusing particularly on ‘Situational Control’ – that is, on preserving order by restricting opportunities for disorder. Prison B, however, placed more emphasis on ‘Social Control’: that is, by offer-

2 R. Sparks, A.E. Bottoms and W. Hay (1996) *Prisons and the Problem of Order* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

ing prisoners more freedom, and building strong staff-prisoner relationships, it was trusting prisoners to respond positively to the liberal regime that they were offered.

For the first time in the mainstream prisons literature, in our book we introduced the concept of legitimacy into our analysis. We found that most prisoners in Prison B regarded their prison experience as more legitimate than did those in Prison A. But there were some interesting complications.

The Governor of Prison A, when he introduced the restricted regime, emphasised to staff the importance of what he called good ‘service delivery’ relating to things like meals, visits and pre-release courses. The staff responded well to this, and so most prisoners drew a distinction between what they saw as the fairness of the staff and the unfairness (or lack of legitimacy) of the regime, for which they blamed the Governor.

In Prison B, on the other hand, most prisoners greatly valued the more liberal regime and the way that the staff treated them. But the relatively light situational controls that were in place gave prisoners more opportunities to create trouble if they wished to. This created some non-trivial difficulties, the most important of which was that a minority of weaker prisoners felt unsafe and unprotected by the regime – for them, it was definitely not legitimate.

So what this research revealed was that there can be very contrasting ways of running a prison. But each of these prisons had its plus points and its minus points – neither was clearly ‘better’ than the other. Reflecting on this, we suggested changing the language through which these matters were usually discussed. Instead of talking about ‘control problems’, we suggested, it would be better to talk about ‘the problem of order’ in prisons. Because the fact is that every social community, including prisons, has a problem of order; and when we talk about

the problem of order, we are talking ultimately about the best way to order that community so that the people in it feel that their interests and their future are being properly attended to. What mix of social and situational factors might achieve the best social order in prisons?

Now fast forward nearly a decade, and I'm involved in another prisons research project, this time supporting my Cambridge colleague Alison Liebling, who led the research. This too was a government-funded study, commissioned to evaluate a new prisons-based policy called the 'Incentives and Earned Privileges' (or IEP) initiative.

This policy was introduced by the government with the aim of promoting social order by improving the behaviour of prisoners. The central maxim of this policy was that 'prison privileges must be earned by good behaviour'. It was decided that every prisoner would be placed in one of three new privilege categories ('basic', 'standard' and 'enhanced'), with each of these categories linked to a set of specific privileges. The privileges on offer in the higher categories were genuine – prisoners really did value them. The theoretical framework underpinning the policy was that of Rational Choice Theory. The expectation was that prisoners would act rationally and in their own best interests, which meant that they would improve their behaviour in order to secure these valued privileges.

The research was conducted over a period of a year in five prisons of varying type, including a women's prison and a young offender institution. The evaluation, unfortunately, demonstrated that none of the five prisons showed any behavioural improvements that could be attributed to the IEP policy.³ Of course, the governmental sponsors of the research were both surprised and disconcerted by these findings. Fortunately,

3 A. Liebling, G. Muir, G. Rose and A.E. Bottoms (1999) *Incentives and Earned Privileges for Prisoners: An Evaluation*, Home Office Research Findings No 87 (London: Home Office); A.E. Bottoms (2003) 'Theoretical Reflections on the Evaluation of a Penal Policy Initiative' in L. Zedner and A. Ashworth (eds), *The Criminological Foundations of Penal Policy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

however, the data collected by the research team were strong enough to explain the result. Prisoners were generally supportive of the basic principle that privileges should follow good behaviour, but they considered that the way in which the IEP policy had been introduced had in practice resulted in a significant degree of *unfairness*. In detail, the reasons for this differed in different institutions, but one important general issue was that the new policy significantly enhanced the discretionary decision-making powers of prison officers, and prisoners considered that these powers were often being used in arbitrary ways. As a consequence of this perceived unfairness, many prisoners chose not to engage positively with the new incentives system. Thus the expected ‘rational choice’ effects were displaced by a widespread sense among prisoners that the policy, as they actually experienced it, was unfair and lacked legitimacy.

So how did these two prison studies lead to my theoretical interest in compliance? Well, participating in these two fascinating projects had set me thinking about the variety of ways in which people can be encouraged, or coerced, into complying with rules and regulations. In the high-security prisons study, both situational factors and a degree of normative consensus had generated compliance. In the IEP study, normative unfairness had been crucial, but there was every indication that, without this unfairness, prisoners’ instrumental desire for better privileges would have generated greater compliance. So here were three main mechanisms of compliance – normative consensus; situational compliance; and instrumentally rational incentives and disincentives. Reflecting further, I realised that there is also a fourth main mechanism, namely compliance based on habit or routine. So I then published a paper outlining this fourfold classification of types of compliance.⁴ That paper also pointed out that, of course, in the real

4 A.E. Bottoms (2002) ‘Morality, Crime, Compliance and Public Policy’ in A.E. Bottoms and M. Tonry (eds), *Ideology, Crime and Criminal Justice: A Symposium in Honour of Sir Leon Radzinowicz* (Cullompton, Devon: Willan Publishing). A revised version of the classification of the mechanisms of compliance was published later: A.E. Bottoms (2019) ‘Understanding Compliance with Laws and Regulations: A Mechanism-Based Approach’ in M. Krambia-Kapardis (ed), *Financial Compliance: Issues, Concerns and Future Directions* (Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan).

world more than one of these types of compliance can be in play in the same situation.

My research activities have included some work on both instrumental and situational compliance, but my main interest has always been in normative compliance. This is probably, at least in part, a reflection of my legal background, and of my acceptance of what I regard as the profound observation of the Scottish jurist Neil MacCormick that a modern legal system is a form of ‘institutional normative order’.⁵ In my 2002 compliance paper, I developed the concept of normative compliance by identifying three sub-types of it, namely: Compliance resulting from acceptance of a norm; Compliance resulting from normative attachment; and Compliance resulting from legitimacy.⁶ Each of these subtypes has featured in my later research work, which – as I explained at the beginning - has focused mainly on the topics of desistance from crime and legitimacy. So now it’s time to look at this final stage of my research journey.

Criminology is a young science, and naturally enough many of its early endeavours were focused particularly on why people commit crimes. But, from about 2000 onwards, criminologists have increasingly turned to the subject of why people who have been offending stop doing so. This is a particularly interesting topic because, as a recent review of the research evidence put it, stopping committing crime is actually ‘the norm, even among those characterized as high-rate, chronic offenders’.⁷ With my growing interest in compliance, it was natural that I should want to undertake a research study on how this might happen.

5 N. MacCormick (2007) *Institutions of Law* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), p.11.

6 In my later 20019 paper (see note 4 above) I added a fourth sub-type, namely ‘Compliance resulting from a response to normative cues’, but this sub-type is not relevant in the present context.

7 B.E. Bersani and E.E. Doherty (2018) ‘Desistance from Offending in the Twenty-First Century’, *Annual Review of Criminology* 1: 311-334, at p.313.

This resulted in a research project called the Sheffield Desistance Study, which I conducted jointly with my Sheffield colleague Joanna Shapland.⁸ The fieldwork for this research took place in the years 2003-2007, and the study focused on male young adults who were persistent offenders.

At the start of the research, the 113 men in the Sheffield study were, on average, aged 20 years 9 months. However, on average each of them had already, by that age, been convicted for a non-motoring offence on no fewer than eight separate occasions; and 80% of them were then reconvicted during the three years that we followed their lives. We expected this high reconviction rate, because of the character of the sample we had chosen to work with. But we also knew from the general criminological literature that, for such samples, offending peaks at around age 20-21, after which there is a gradual aggregate reduction until, for most, offending stops in the late 20s or early 30s;⁹ and we wanted to study the beginnings of such processes.

Given this kind of criminal record, you will not be surprised to learn that most of these men had come to regard property offending as an obvious way to act when they were short of money. Moreover, when we asked them to look at a list of things that might be, for them, an obstacle to 'going straight', one of the items that scored near the top of the list was that they found committing offences to be exciting. Yet despite all this, the great majority of those in the study were not committed to continuing in crime. For example, in their first interview, more than half said they had 'made a definite decision to try to stop' offending, and a further one-third said they 'would like to stop, but I'm not sure if I can'. Even more encouragingly, when they were

8 For an overview of the Sheffield study see A.E. Bottoms and J. Shapland (2016) 'Learning to Desist in Early Adulthood: The Sheffield Desistance Study' in J. Shapland, S. Farrall and A.E. Bottoms (eds), *Global Perspectives on Desistance* (London: Routledge).

9 E.E. Doherty and B.E. Bersani (2018) 'Mapping the Age of Official Desistance for Adult Offenders: Implications for Research and Policy', *Journal of Developmental and Life-Course Criminology* 4: 516-551.

asked what sort of person they would like to be in a few years' time, the principal answers that they gave were 'go straight', 'live a normal life', 'be a good person' and 'be a family man'. So, at the outset of the research, they had a complicated mixture of values - some conventional, some less so. A key question for many of them during the three years that we followed them up was, therefore, which values would ultimately take priority?

A large proportion of the men made significant attempts to go straight, but very few of them did so without committing further offences. In other words – as other research has also shown – desistance is usually a gradual, not a sudden process. A main reason for this is that all of us find it difficult to change ways of behaving that have become habitual, and our very recidivistic sample had become very used to offending. Also, if they wanted to desist, there were many obstacles to overcome. Most members of this sample had a history of social disadvantage - for example, fractured family relationships, very poor school records leading to no qualifications, and a poor work record in an economy where unskilled work was less available than it used to be. So even the men who really wanted to desist did not find it straightforward to do so, because their criminal records and their various social disadvantages meant that their attempts to desist faced many challenges.

One matter that became clear in the course of our research was that for men of this age-group, with their kind of criminal and social background, there was very often a set of personal relationships that was of special importance in shaping the men's progress (or lack of it). These key personal relationships were with girlfriends, with male friends and with their families of origin, especially their mothers. The potentially positive impact of girlfriends on male offenders in their twenties is well known in the literature of criminology, but the other two relationships have been little explored. Because most of the Sheffield sample had no stable employment, they had no work colleagues as friends, so their male friends were usually those they had known for

some years and with whom they had committed offences. If they were serious about desisting from crime, it was then very often necessary to leave these friendships behind. As for families of origin, persistent offending had in many cases led to splits with parents, but as efforts to desist became apparent, better relationships with parents – especially mothers - frequently developed. So the life stories of the men who were trying to desist were, during the three or so years that we followed them, very often dominated by complex interactions between the would-be desister and his relationships with a girlfriend, with his mother and with his male ‘mates’.

The need that was felt by many members of our sample to distance themselves from male co-offending friends often led to a tactic that the Sheffield Study has uniquely explored, and which we called ‘diachronic self-control’. Diachronic self-control is self-control that is exercised *in advance* of an expected event (i.e., it is not synchronic). One important way of exercising it is to plan one’s future circumstances in such a way as to ‘increase the likelihood that [an unwanted inclination] will not be’ acted upon.¹⁰ ‘Unwanted inclinations’ can of course be of various kinds, and a standard example in the literature is of someone trying to lose weight who has unwanted inclinations for fatty foods. In the context of desistance, the unwanted inclination is, of course, the inclination to commit an offence. Ways of exercising diachronic self-control so as not to be tempted to commit offences included, in the Sheffield Study, staying at home instead of going out; deliberately avoiding places where violence might happen; and deliberately not meeting particular friends who might suggest committing an offence. Our data showed that three-quarters of the Sheffield men had used such a tactic at some time during the research period.¹¹

10 J. Kennett (2001) *Agency and Responsibility: A Common-Sense Moral Psychology* (Oxford: Clarendon Press), p.134.

11 A.E. Bottoms (2013) ‘Learning from Odysseus: Self-Applied Situational Crime Prevention as an Aid to Compliance’ in P. Ugwudike and P. Raynor (eds), *What Works in Offender Compliance?: International Perspectives and Evidence-Based Practice* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan).

If we now turn back to the various types of compliance that I previously outlined, we can see that the exercise of diachronic self-control uses a mixture of rational choice and situational control to achieve greater compliance. The would-be desister realises that, in certain circumstances, he might ‘do something stupid’, as some of our Sheffield respondents said to us. In more formal language, he thinks that if he goes to a particular place, or meets some particular people, he might be tempted back into committing an offence. So he makes a *resolution* – a rational choice – to avoid this by staying away from those circumstances. If he sticks to this resolution, he has reduced his opportunities to offend by staying away from particular *situations*.

But you’ll remember that I also spoke earlier about some sub-types of normative compliance. Two of these were ‘acceptance of a norm’ and ‘compliance through a normative attachment’. Some of the results that I’ve just described very much exemplify these. At the start of the research, the men had a mixed set of values; but by making a specific attempt to desist, they were accepting desistance as a normative priority. Meanwhile, their attachments both to their girlfriends and to their mothers were pulling them, normatively, away from crime.

I did however mention one further sub-type of normative compliance, namely ‘compliance based on legitimacy’. This was not something that was of explanatory importance in the Sheffield desistance study, but you will recall that it was a topic that my colleagues and I had focused on in the study of the social order of prisons. In recent years, it is a topic that I have explored much more fully.

This further strand of work has all been conducted jointly with my Cambridge colleague Justice Tankebe. Justice is a Ghanaian, who is especially interested in police studies, and we first began working together when I supervised his Ph.D. on police legitimacy. He finished his Ph.D. fifteen years ago, and he is now the Deputy Director of the University of Cambridge Institute of Criminology, but we have con-

tinued sometimes to work and think together about legitimacy, and we have now written several joint papers on this topic.¹²

Legitimacy has been well defined by a political scientist as ‘Power that is *acknowledged as rightful* by relevant agents’; and those agents include, of course, ‘those subject to the power’.¹³ There is, not surprisingly, good evidence that people are more likely to comply with laws when they acknowledge that powerholders are exercising their power legitimately.

I want to focus on just two of the matters that Justice Tankebe and I have particularly emphasised in our theoretical work on legitimacy in relation to criminal justice. The first of these is that legitimacy is always a dialogue. Every time that a police officer or a prison officer puts on a uniform and goes on duty, he or she is claiming to have some special authority that other citizens do not have. But, it has been wisely said, ‘The exercise of power is not a one-way transaction’;¹⁴ accordingly, those holding power must expect a variety of responses to their claimed authority. Such responses are sometimes especially influenced by the way that the powerholder is handling a particular incident, but on other occasions a response can be the result of more general perceptions of, say, the work of the police in that locality, or indeed of the exercise of political power in that state or province.

In thinking about such responses, Justice Tankebe and I have found it useful to draw on an essay on legitimacy by the philosopher Bernard

12 See especially A.E. Bottoms and J. Tankebe (2012) ‘Beyond Procedural Justice: A Dialogic Approach to Legitimacy in Criminal Justice’, *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* 102: 119–170; and A.E. Bottoms and J. Tankebe (2021) ‘Procedural Justice, Legitimacy and Social Contexts’ in D. Meyerson, C. Mackenzie and T. MacDermott (eds), *Procedural Justice and Relational Theory* (London: Routledge).

13 D. Beetham (2013) ‘Revisiting Legitimacy, Twenty Years On’ in J. Tankebe and A. Lieblich (eds), *Legitimacy and Criminal Justice: An International Exploration* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), at p.19 (emphasis in original).

14 W.R. Miller (1978) ‘Review of *Police: Streetcorner Politicians*’, *Journal of American History* 64: 1172.

Williams.¹⁵ In this essay, Williams points out that every sizeable community needs someone to be given some power, because otherwise there will be no effective social organisation, and people's basic safety could be at risk. So power-holders are necessary. However, citizens have *expectations* about how these holders of power should behave, and if they fail to meet those expectations then their legitimacy will become eroded. To express this point, Williams developed the concept of a 'basic legitimation expectation'; and for him, the difference between legitimate and illegitimate power lies in the ability of powerholders to honour citizens' basic legitimation expectations, to a reasonable extent, in specific situations.¹⁶

If this analysis is right, it is obviously important for the powerholders in any given community to understand what are the basic legitimation expectations of those over whom they exercise power. Naturally, these expectations are likely to vary in different communities, so this is (at least in part) an empirical matter. But Justice Tankebe and I have developed an argument – based on the available empirical evidence – that there are four things that are likely to count as basic legitimation expectations in most criminal justice contexts. These are:

First, effectiveness: that is, powerholders should fulfil well the tasks for which they have been appointed, especially keeping people safe;

Second, lawfulness: that is, powerholders should always work within the law;

Third, distributive justice: that is, powerholders should exercise their powers without discrimination on the basis of, for example, ethnicity, gender or wealth;

15 B. Williams (2005) *In the Beginning was the Deed* (Princeton: Princeton University Press), ch.1.

16 Williams' original concept was that of a 'Basic Legitimation Demand'; Justice Tankebe and I have amended this to what we regard as the more appropriate 'Basic Legitimation Expectation'.

Fourth, procedural justice: that is, when dealing with people and when making decisions, powerholders should treat people with respect. People should also be allowed to have their say, and they should be listened to carefully and dispassionately.

There has been a certain amount of academic debate about this suggested framework, but I am very pleased to say that it has recently been endorsed by a prestigious report on police legitimacy, published in the United States by the U.S. National Academies of Science, Engineering and Medicine. This report identifies what it calls ‘four pillars of legitimacy, based on four “basic legitimation expectations” as developed by Bottoms and Tankebe’.¹⁷

If we look back at the earlier prison studies in the light of this ‘four-pillar’ theoretical framework, we can see that the weaker prisoners in Prison B felt that the regime there was failing to protect them, so it was not *effective*, and therefore not legitimate. Meanwhile, the prisoners in Prison A knew that no other English high-security prison had imposed a ‘restricted regime’, so they thought that they were suffering a *distributive injustice*. Turning to the IEP study, here prisoners considered that the IEP policy was in principle legitimate, but that the way in which it was being implemented had led to many *distributive* and *procedural injustices*.

This concludes my brief account of one scholar’s recent research. You will have noticed, perhaps, that I have spoken both about empirical research projects and about the development of theory. This reflects my own strong belief that, in social science, good research and careful theorisation always need to be closely related.

I hope that what I have said today will have convinced you that criminology is a subject of great social importance. Therefore, in closing

17 National Academies of Science, Engineering and Medicine (2022) *Developing Policing Practices that Build Legitimacy* (Washington, D.C.: The National Academies Press), at p. 19.

this address, and in thanking you again for the award of this honorary doctorate, I would like to express my hope and my confidence that criminological research and teaching in the Faculty of Law at the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona will continue to develop and to flourish for many years to come.

CURRICULUM VITAE
D'ANTHONY BOTTOMS

QUALIFICATIONS

B.A. in Law, University of Oxford 1961 (M.A. 1965).

Postgraduate Diploma in Criminology, University of Cambridge 1962.

Ph.D. in Criminology (as university staff candidate), University of Sheffield 1974.

CAREER DETAILS

1962-64: Probation Officer, Essex Probation Area.

1964-68: Research Officer, Institute of Criminology, University of Cambridge.

1968-84: University of Sheffield: Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, then (from 1976) Professor of Criminology (personal chair).

1984-2006: Wolfson Professor of Criminology, University of Cambridge.

-
- 1984-2006: Fellow of Fitzwilliam College, Cambridge (Life Fellow from 2006).
- 2006-2007: Director of Research, Institute of Criminology, University of Cambridge.
- 2002-2007: Professorial Fellow in Criminology, University of Sheffield (post held concurrently with appointments at Cambridge).
- 2006- Emeritus Wolfson Professor of Criminology, University of Cambridge.
- 2006- Life Fellow, Fitzwilliam College, Cambridge.
- 2007- Honorary Professor of Criminology, University of Sheffield.

SENIOR ADMINISTRATIVE POSTS

- 1975-80: Director, Centre for Criminological Studies, University of Sheffield.
- 1981-84: Dean of the Faculty of Law, University of Sheffield.
- 1984-98: Director, Institute of Criminology, University of Cambridge.
- 1994-98: President (= Vice-Master), Fitzwilliam College, Cambridge.
- 2005: Acting Director, Institute of Criminology, University of Cambridge.

2008-14: Chair of the Board of Trustees, Westminster College, Cambridge (a college within the Cambridge Theological Federation).

2016-19: Director, Centre for Penal Theory and Penal Ethics, Institute of Criminology, University of Cambridge.

HONOURS AND AWARDS

Appointed Knight Bachelor in the Queen's Birthday Honours, 2001.

Fellow of the British Academy, 1997.

Honorary Degrees: LL.D., Queen's University, Belfast 2003; LL.D. University of Sheffield 2009; Hedersdoktor, Malmö University 2014; LL.D., University of Edinburgh 2015.

Criminology Awards: Sellin-Glueck Award, American Society of Criminology 1996 (for 'international contributions to criminology'); European Criminology Award, European Society of Criminology 2007 (for 'a lifetime contribution as a European criminologist').

Honorary Fellow, Corpus Christi College, Oxford 2012.

Presented with a *festskrift* by criminological colleagues, 2022: *Crime, Justice and Social Order: Essays in Honour of A.E. Bottoms*, edited by Alison Lieblich, Joanna Shapland, Richard Sparks and Justice Tankebe (Oxford University Press).

FORMAL VISITING APPOINTMENTS

Visiting Fellow, Institute of Criminology, University of Cambridge, Summer 1977.

Canadian Commonwealth Visiting Fellow, Simon Fraser University, Vancouver, Spring 1982.

University Visiting Professor, School of Law, Queen's University of Belfast, Autumn 1999.

Visiting Fellow, Australian Institute of Criminology, Canberra, November-December 2000.

PRINCIPAL PUBLIC SERVICE ROLES

Member of the Parole Board for England and Wales, 1974-76.

Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC): Member of the Council's Social Sciences and the Law Committee, 1979-1982; Government and Law Committee 1982-1985; and Society and Politics Research Development Group, 1990-1992.

Member of Cambridgeshire Probation Committee, 1984-91 and 1994-2000.

Member of the Home Office Research and Advisory Group on the Long-Term Prison System, 1984-90.

Consultant to the Audit Commission for its review of the Probation Service in England and Wales, 1988-89.

Specialist Adviser to the House of Commons Select Committee on Northern Ireland Affairs, 1998, 2003-4, 2007 (for three Inquiries of the Committee relating to the Northern Ireland prison system).

Commissioned by the Scottish Government to report on Scottish criminological research and the possible creation of a university-based Scottish Criminal Justice Research Centre, 2003; Centre subsequently established from 2005.

Chair, Independent Academic Reference Group, London Diamond Crime Prevention Project, London Criminal Justice Partnership 2007-2011.

Commissioned by the Sentencing Council for England and Wales in 2017 to conduct a review of the work of the Council, with special reference to any ways in which it might more effectively fulfil its statutory duties.

EDITORSHIPS

Editor, *Howard Journal of Penology and Crime Prevention*, 1975-1981 (Sole editor 1975-78; joint editor with A. Keith Bottomley 1979-81).

General Editor of the book series *Cambridge Studies in Criminology*, published by Gower, 1984-1990 (ten volumes published during this period).

TEACHING INNOVATION

- (1) At Sheffield University, led the creation of an M.A. course in Criminological Studies as part of the university's policy to es-

establish criminology as a ‘growth-point subject’. The course commenced in 1972 and is still flourishing.

- (2) In response to an approach by the then Director of National Police Training, oversaw the creation, within the Cambridge Institute of Criminology, of a part-time Master of Studies (M.St.) course for senior police officers and related personnel. The course commenced in 1996 and is still flourishing.
- (3) Orchestrated a successful tender bid to the English Prison Service, which led to the creation, within the Cambridge Institute of Criminology, of a part-time Master of Studies (M.St.) course, initially for senior prison managers but subsequently also for senior probation staff and related personnel. The course commenced in 1998 and is still flourishing.

NAMED LECTURES GIVEN

Frank Dawtry Memorial Lecture, University of Leeds, 1977.

James Smart Memorial Lecture, Lothian Police Headquarters, Edinburgh, 1989.

Bill McWilliams Memorial Lecture, University of Cambridge, 2006.

PUBLICATIONS

A. AUTHORED BOOKS

1. *Criminals Coming of Age: A Study of Institutional Adaptation in the Treatment of Adolescent Offenders*, by A.E. Bottoms and F.H. McClintock. London: Heinemann Educational Books, 1973. pp. xxiv + 495.
2. *The Urban Criminal: A Study in Sheffield*, by John Baldwin and A.E. Bottoms, in collaboration with Monica A. Walker. London: Tavistock Publications, 1976. pp. x + 262.
3. *Defendants in the Criminal Process*, by A.E. Bottoms and J.D. McClean. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1976. pp. xviii + 265. [This volume was reissued in the Routledge Reprint Series, 2013].
4. *Social Inquiry Reports: A Framework for Practice Development* by Anthony Bottoms and Andrew Stelman. Aldershot: Wildwood House, 1988. pp. viii + 136.
5. *Prisons and the Problem of Order* by Richard Sparks, Anthony Bottoms and Will Hay. Oxford: Clarendon Press 1996. pp. xiii + 384.

B. PUBLISHED RESEARCH REPORTS

1. *The Suspended Sentence after Ten Years: A Review and Reassessment*, by A.E. Bottoms. Leeds: University of Leeds, 1980. pp.56. [Expanded version of the Frank Dawtry Memorial Lecture 1977].

-
2. *Prosecutions by Private Individuals and Non-Police Agencies*, by K.W. Lidstone, Russell Hogg and Frank Sutcliffe, in collaboration with A.E. Bottoms and Monica A. Walker. Royal Commission on Criminal Procedure, Research Report No.10. London: H.M.S.O., 1980. pp. xii + 236.
 3. *Intermediate Treatment and Juvenile Justice: Key Findings and Implications from a National Survey of Intermediate Treatment Policy and Practice*, by Anthony Bottoms, Phillip Brown, Brenda McWilliams, William McWilliams and Michael Nellis, in collaboration with John Pratt. London: H.M.S.O., 1990. pp. vi + 192.
 4. *Intensive Community Supervision for Young Offenders: Outcomes, Process and Cost*, by Anthony E. Bottoms [Economic Study by Martin Knapp and Andrew Fenyo]. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Institute of Criminology, 1995. pp. vi + 74.
 5. *An Exploration of Staff-Prisoner Relationships at HMP Whitemoor*, by Alison Liebling and David Price, with the advice of Anthony Bottoms. London: Prison Service Research Report No.6, 1999. pp.114.
 6. *Criminal Deterrence and Sentence Severity: an Analysis of Recent Research*, by Andrew von Hirsch, Anthony E. Bottoms, Elizabeth Burney and P-O. Wikström. Oxford: Hart Publishing, 1999. pp.viii + 64.
 7. *Accrediting Offender Programmes: A Process-based Evaluation of the Joint Prison/Probation Services Accreditation Panel*, by Sue Rex, Roxanne Lieb, Anthony Bottoms and Louise Wilson. Home Office Research Study 273, London: Home Office, 2003. pp.xii + 98.
 8. *The Quality of Probation Supervision: A Literature Review*, by Joanna Shapland, Anthony Bottoms, Stephen Farrall, Fergus McNeill, Camilla Priede and Gwen Robinson. University of Sheffield Centre for Criminological Research, Occasional Paper 3, 2012. pp 55.

-
9. *The Sentencing Council in 2017: A Report to Advise on how the Sentencing Council can Best Exercise its Statutory Functions*, by Anthony Bottoms, assisted by A R (Jo) Parsons. London: Sentencing Council, 2018. pp. 45.

C. EDITED BOOKS

1. *The Coming Penal Crisis: A Criminological and Theological Exploration*, edited by A.E. Bottoms and R.H. Preston. Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1980. pp. xiv + 242.
2. *Problems of Long-Term Imprisonment*, edited by Anthony E. Bottoms and Roy Light. Aldershot: Gower, 1987. pp. viii + 336.
3. *Community Penalties: Change and Challenges*, edited by Anthony E. Bottoms, Loraine Gelsthorpe and Sue Rex. Cullompton, Devon: Willan Publishing 2001. pp. xiv + 255.
4. *Ideology, Crime and Criminal Justice*, edited by Anthony Bottoms and Michael Tonry. Cullompton, Devon: Willan Publishing 2002. pp. xxiii + 184.
5. *Restorative Justice and Criminal Justice: Competing or Reconcilable Paradigms?*, edited by Andrew von Hirsch, Julian Roberts, Anthony Bottoms, Kent Roach and Mara Schiff. Oxford: Hart Publishing, 2003. pp. xii + 348.
6. *Alternatives to Prison: Options for an Insecure Society* edited by Anthony Bottoms, Sue Rex and Gwen Robinson. Cullompton, Devon: Willan Publishing 2004. pp. xx + 436.
7. *Challenging Crime: A Portrait of the Cambridge Institute of Criminology*, edited by Catharine Walston; advisory editors Anthony

Bottoms, Manuel Eisner and Friedrich Lösel. London: Third Millennium Publishing, 2009. pp.144.

8. *Hearing the Victim: Adversarial Justice, Crime Victims and the State*, edited by Anthony Bottoms and Julian Roberts. Cullompton, Devon: Willan Publishing, 2010. pp. xxiv + 292.
9. *Young Adult Offenders: Lost in Transition*, edited by Friedrich Lösel, Anthony Bottoms and David P. Farrington. Abingdon, Oxford: Routledge, 2012. pp.xvi + 175.
10. *Global Perspectives on Desistance: Reviewing What We Know and Looking to the Future*, edited by Joanna Shapland, Stephen Farrall and Anthony Bottoms. Abingdon, Oxford: Routledge, 2016. pp. xvi + 304.
11. *Penal Censure: Explorations within and beyond Desert Theory*, edited by Antje du Bois-Pedain and Anthony Bottoms. Oxford: Hart Publishing, 2019. pp. xx + 307.

D. FORTY SELECTED JOURNAL ARTICLES AND BOOK CHAPTERS BEFORE 2010

1. 'Children, Young Persons, and the Courts - A Survey of the New Law', *Criminal Law Review* (1970), pp.368-95 [with J.D. McClean and K.W. Patchett].
2. 'The Efficacy of the Fine: The Case for Agnosticism', *Criminal Law Review* (1973), pp.543-51.
3. 'On the Decriminalisation of English Juvenile Courts' in *Crime, Criminology and Public Policy: Essays in Honour of Sir Leon*

Radzinowicz, ed. Roger Hood. Heinemann Educational Books (1974) pp. 319-345.

4. 'Reflections on the Renaissance of Dangerousness', *Howard Journal of Penology and Crime Prevention* (1977), vol.16, pp.70-96 [Inaugural Lecture, University of Sheffield].
5. 'A Non-Treatment Paradigm for Probation Practice', *British Journal of Social Work* (1979), vol. 9, pp. 150-202 [with William McWilliams].
6. 'The Suspended Sentence in England 1967-78', *British Journal of Criminology* (1981), vol.21, pp.1-26.
7. 'Housing Policy and Crime in the British Public Sector' in *Environmental Criminology*, ed. Paul Brantingham and Patricia Brantingham, Sage Publications (1981), pp.203-225 [with Polii Xanthos].
8. 'The Dangerousness Debate after the Floud Report', *British Journal of Criminology* (1982), vol.22, pp.229-254 [with Roger Brownsword].
9. 'Dangerousness and Rights' in *Dangerousness: Problems of Assessment and Prediction*, ed. J.W.Hinton. Allen and Unwin (1983) pp. 9-22 [with Roger Brownsword].
10. 'Neglected Features of Contemporary Penal Systems' in *The Power to Punish*, ed. David Garland and Peter Young. Heinemann (1983), pp. 166-202.
11. 'Social Enquiry Reports Twenty-Five Years after the Streatfeild Report', in *Barbara Wootton, Social Science and Public Policy: Essays in Her Honour*, ed. Philip Bean and David Whyne, Tavistock Publications (1986), pp.245-276 [with William McWilliams].

-
12. 'Housing Tenure and Residential Community Crime Careers in Britain', *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research*, (1986), vol. 8, pp. 101-162 (Special volume on *Communities and Crime*) [with Paul Wiles].
 13. 'A Localised Crime Survey in Contrasting Areas of a City', *British Journal of Criminology* (1987), vol.27, pp.125-154 [with R.I. Mawby and Monica A. Walker].
 14. 'Limiting Prison Use: Experience in England and Wales', *Howard Journal of Criminal Justice* (1987), vol. 26, pp. 177-202.
 15. 'Reflections on the Criminological Enterprise', *Cambridge Law Journal* (1987), vol.46, pp.240-263 [Inaugural Lecture, University of Cambridge].
 16. 'A Tale of Two Estates' in *Crime and the City*, ed. David Downes. Macmillan (1989) pp.36-87 [with Rob Mawby and Polii Xanthos].
 17. 'The Concept of Intermediate Sanctions and its Relevance for the Probation Service' in *The Criminal Justice System: A Central Role for the Probation Service*, ed. Roger Shaw and Kevin Haines. Cambridge Institute of Criminology (1989), pp. 84-104.
 18. 'The Politics of the Police 1955-1964: A Royal Commission in a Decade of Transition' in *Policing, Organised Crime and Crime Prevention* (Proceedings of the British Criminology Conference 1989, vol.4), ed. Rod Morgan, Bristol and Bath Centre for Criminal Justice (1990), pp.1-17 [with Simon Stevenson].
 19. 'Crime Prevention Facing the 1990s', *Policing and Society* (1990), vol.1, pp.3-22 [Shortened version of the James Smart Memorial Lecture 1989].
 20. 'The Aims of Imprisonment', in *Justice, Guilt and Forgiveness in the Penal System*, ed. David Garland, University of Edinburgh Cen-

tre for Theology and Public Issues, Occasional Paper No.18 (1990), pp.3-36.

21. 'The Control of Long-Term Prisoners in England: Beyond the Control Review Committee Report', in *Special Units for Difficult Prisoners*, ed. A. Keith Bottomley and Will Hay, University of Hull (1991), pp.1-15.
22. "'What Went Wrong?': Criminal Justice Policy in England and Wales 1945-1970' in *Unravelling Criminal Justice: Eleven British Studies*, ed. David Downes. Macmillan (1992), pp. 1-45 [with Simon Stevenson].
23. 'Environmental Criminology' in *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology*, ed. Mike Maguire, Rod Morgan and Robert Reiner. Oxford University Press (1994), pp. 585-656. [Also chapters on the same subject in the second (1997), third (2002) and fourth (2007) editions of this *Handbook*; in the second and third editions these were written jointly with Paul Wiles].
24. 'Situational and Social Approaches to the Prevention of Disorder in Long-Term Prisons' in *Long-Term Imprisonment: Policy, Science and Correctional Practice*, ed. Timothy J. Flanagan, Sage Publications (1995), pp.186-196 [with Will Hay and Richard Sparks [with Will Hay and Richard Sparks].
25. 'The Philosophy and Politics of Punishment and Sentencing' in *The Politics of Sentencing Reform*, ed. C.M.V. Clarkson and R. Morgan. Clarendon Press (1995), pp.17-49.
26. 'Crime and Insecurity in the City' in *Changes in Society, Crime and Criminal Justice in Europe*; vol.1, *Crime and Insecurity in the City*, ed. C. Fijnaut, J.Goethals, T. Peters and L. Walgrave. Kluwer Law International (1995), pp. 1-38 [with Paul Wiles].

-
27. 'Understanding Crime Prevention in Late Modern Societies' in *Preventing Crime and Disorder: Targeting Strategies and Responsibilities*, ed. T.H. Bennett, University of Cambridge Institute of Criminology (1996), pp.1-41 [with Paul Wiles].
 28. 'Five Puzzles in von Hirsch's Theory of Punishment' in *Fundamentals of Sentencing Theory*, ed. Andrew Ashworth and Martin Wasik. Clarendon Press (1998) , pp. 53-100.
 29. 'Interpersonal Violence and Social Order in Prisons', *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research*, (1999), vol. 26, pp.205-281 [Special volume on *Prisons*].
 30. 'Compliance and Community Penalties' in *Community Penalties: Change and Challenges*, ed. Anthony Bottoms, Loraine Gelsthorpe and Sue Rex. Willan (2001), pp. 87-116.
 31. 'Morality, Crime, Compliance and Public Policy', in *Ideology, Crime and Criminal Justice*, ed. Anthony Bottoms and Michael Tonry. Willan (2002), pp. 20-51.
 32. 'The Divergent Development of Juvenile Justice in England and Scotland' in *A Century of Juvenile Justice*, ed. Margaret K. Rosenheim, Frank E. Zimring, D. S. Tanenhaus, and B. Dohrn. University of Chicago Press (2002), pp.413-504.
 33. 'Theoretical Reflections on the Evaluation of a Penal Policy Initiative' in *The Criminological Foundations of Penal Policy: Essays in Honour of Roger Hood*, ed. Lucia Zedner and Andrew Ashworth. Oxford University Press, (2003), pp. 107-194.
 34. 'Some Sociological Reflections on Restorative Justice', in *Restorative Justice and Criminal Justice*, ed. Andrew von Hirsch, Julian Roberts, Anthony Bottoms, Kent Roach and Mara Schiff. Hart Publishing (2003), pp. 79-113.

-
35. 'Towards Desistance: Theoretical Underpinnings for an Empirical Study', *Howard Journal of Criminal Justice* (2004), vol. 43, pp. 368-389 [with Joanna Shapland, Andrew Costello, Deborah Holmes and Grant Muir].
 36. 'Incivilities, Offence and Social Order in Residential Communities' in *Incivilities: Regulating Offensive Behaviour*, ed. Andrew von Hirsch and Andrew Simester. Hart Publishing (2006), pp. 239-280.
 37. 'Desistance, Social Bonds and Human Agency: A Theoretical Exploration' in *The Explanation of Crime: Context, Mechanisms and Development*, ed. Per-Olof H. Wikström and Robert J. Sampson. Cambridge University Press (2006), pp. 243-290.
 38. 'The Relationship between Theory and Empirical Observations in Criminology', in *Doing Research in Crime and Justice* (2nd edn), ed. Roy King and Emma Wincup. Oxford University Press (2008), pp. 75-116.
 39. 'The Community Dimension of Community Penalties', *Howard Journal of Criminal Justice* (2008), vol. 47, pp. 146-169 [Revised version of the Bill McWilliams Memorial Lecture 2006].
 40. 'Disorder, Order and Control Signals', *British Journal of Sociology* (2009), vol. 60, pp. 49-55.

E. JOURNAL ARTICLES SINCE 2010

1. 'Social Structures and Desistance from Crime' *European Journal of Criminology*, (2010) vol. 7, pp.546-570 [with Stephen Farrall and Joanna Shapland].

-
2. 'Reflections on Social Values, Offending and Desistance among Young Adult Recidivists', *Punishment and Society*, (2011) vol.13, pp. 256-282 [with Joanna Shapland].
 3. 'Actief volwassen worden: een verklaring voor de daling in criminaliteit onde jonge volwassenen' ['Active maturation: explaining the crime drop in early adulthood'] *Justitiele Verkenningen*, (2011) vol. 37 (5), 11-29 [Dutch translation of a plenary lecture given at the annual conference of the Dutch Society of Criminology, Leiden, June 2011].
 4. 'Active Maturation: Why Crime Falls in Early Adulthood', *Eurovistia: Probation and Community Justice*, (2012) vol. 2, no. 1, pp.39-42 (Shortened English-language version of Paper E3, above).
 5. 'Beyond Procedural Justice: A Dialogic Approach to Legitimacy in Criminal Justice', *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, (2012) vol. 103, pp 119-170 [with Justice Tankebe].
 6. 'Can Persistent Offenders Acquire Virtue?', *Studies in Christian Ethics*, (2014) vol. 27, pp. 318-333 [with Joanna Shapland].
 7. 'Crime Specifics, Offender Residences and Social Change: Developing *The Criminology of Place*', *Jerusalem Review of Legal Studies* (2017) vol. 15, pp.1-11.
 8. "'Punishment" in Non-Custodial Sentences: A Critical Analysis', *Criminal Law Forum* (2017) vol. 28, pp. 563-587.

CHAPTERS IN EDITED BOOKS SINCE 2010

1. 'Understanding Repeat Victimization: A Longitudinal Analysis' in *International Handbook of Criminology*, ed. Schlomo Shoham,

Paul Knepper and Martin Kett. Taylor and Francis (2010), pp. 649-680 [with Andrew Costello].

2. 'The Crime-Preventive Impact of Penal Sanctions' in *The Oxford Handbook of Empirical Legal Research* ed. Peter Cane and Herbert M. Kritzer. Oxford University Press (2010), pp. 96-124 [with Andrew von Hirsch].
3. "'The Duty to Understand": What Consequences for Victim Participation?', in *Hearing the Victim*, ed. Anthony Bottoms and Julian Roberts. Willan (2010), pp. 17-45.
4. 'The Phenomenon of Victim-Offender Overlap: A Study of Offences against Households', in *Hearing the Victim*, ed. Anthony Bottoms and Julian Roberts. Willan (2010), pp. 104-140 [with Andrew Costello].
5. 'Steps Towards Desistance among Male Young Adult Recidivists' in *Escape Routes: Contemporary Perspectives on Life after Punishment*, ed. Stephen Farrall, Mike Hough, Shadd Maruna and Richard Sparks. Routledge-Cavendish (2011), pp. 43-80 [with Joanna Shapland].
6. 'Developing Socio-Spatial Criminology' in *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology* (5th ed), ed. Mike Maguire, Rod Morgan and Robert Reiner. Oxford University Press (2012), pp. 450-489.
7. 'Perceptions of the Criminal Justice System by Young Adult Would-be Desisters', in *Young Adult Offenders*, ed. Friedrich Lösel, Anthony Bottoms and David Farrington. Routledge (2012), pp. 128-145 [with Joanna Shapland and Grant Muir].
8. 'Human Reflexivity and Randomized Controlled Trials in Criminology – Two Case Studies' in *Kriminologie, Kriminalpolitik und Strafrecht aus Internationaler Perspektive: Festschrift für Martin*

Killias, ed. André Kuhn, Christian Schwarzenegger et al. Stämpfli Verlag (2013), pp. 35-49.

9. 'Learning from Odysseus: Self-Applied Situational Crime Prevention as an Aid to Compliance' in *What Works in Offender Compliance: International Perspectives and Evidence-Based Practice*, ed. Pamela Ugwudike and Peter Raynor. Routledge (2013), pp. 67-89.
10. "'A Voice Within": Power-Holders' Perspectives on Authority and Legitimacy' in *Legitimacy and Criminal Justice: An International Exploration*, ed. Justice Tankebe and Alison Liebling. Oxford University Press (2013), pp. 60-82 [with Justice Tankebe].
11. 'Geography of Crime and Disorder' in *Encyclopedia of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, ed. Gerben Bruinsma and David Weisburd. Springer (2014), pp. 1943-1956.
12. 'Desistance from Crime' in *Forensic Practice in the Community*, ed. Zoë Ashmore and Richard Shuker. Routledge (2014), pp. 251-273.
13. 'Civil Peace and Criminalization' in *Criminalization: The Aims and Limits of the Criminal Law*, ed. Antony Duff, Lindsay Farmer, Sandra Marshall, Massimo Renzo and Victor Tadros. Oxford University Press (2014), pp. 232-269.
14. 'Learning to Desist in Early Adulthood: The Sheffield Desistance Study' in *Global Perspectives on Desistance: Reviewing What We Know, Looking to the Future*, ed. Joanna Shapland, Stephen Farrall and Anthony Bottoms. Routledge (2016), pp 99-125 [with Joanna Shapland].
15. 'Offending and Offence Patterns in the Early Stages of Desistance: A Study of Young Men in England' in *The Routledge International Handbook of Life-Course Criminology*, ed. Arjan

-
- Blokland and Victor van der Geest. Routledge (2017), pp. 301-323 [with Joanna Shapland].
16. 'Desistance from Crime and Implications for Offender Rehabilitation' in *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology* (sixth edition) ed. Alison Liebling, Shadd Maruna and Lesley McAra. Oxford University Press (2017) pp. 744-766 [with Joanna Shapland].
 17. 'Police Legitimacy and the Authority of the State' in *Criminal Law and the Authority of the State*, ed. Antje du Bois-Pedain, Marcus Ulväng and Petter Asp. Hart Publishing (2017) pp.47-88 [with Justice Tankebe].
 18. 'Exploring an Institutional and Post-Desert Theoretical Approach to Multiple Offense Sentencing' in *Sentencing Multiple Crimes*, ed. Jesper Ryberg, Julian V. Roberts and Jan W. de Keijser. Oxford University Press (2018), pp. 31-56.
 19. 'The Importance of High Offender Neighborhoods within Environmental Criminology' in *The Oxford Handbook of Environmental Criminology*, ed. Gerben J. N. Bruinsma and Shane D. Johnson. Oxford University Press (2018), pp. 119-149.
 20. 'Prologo' in *Un Estudio sobre la Formacion de la Criminologia Espanola* by Alfonso Serrano Maillo, Aranzadi (2018).
 21. 'Disengaging from Peers in the Process of Desistance' in *Desistance Processes Among Young Offenders Following Judicial Interventions*, ed. Hans-Jorg Albrecht, Maria Walsh and Elke Wienhausen-Knezevic (A volume in the Research Series of the Max Planck Institute for Foreign and International Criminal Law, Freiburg). Duncker and Humblot (2019), pp. 29-50 [with Joanna Shapland].
 22. 'Understanding Compliance with Laws and Regulations: A Mechanism-Based Approach' in *Financial Compliance: Issues*,

Concerns and Future Directions ed. Maria Krambia-Kapardis. Palgrave Macmillan (2019), pp. 1-45.

23. 'Offending, Victimisation and Desistance: The Lives of Adult Young Men from the Sheffield Desistance Study' in *The Architecture of Desistance*, ed. Stephen Farrall. Routledge (2019), pp. 203-226 [with Joanna Shapland].
24. 'Introducing "Desistance" into Criminal Justice Supervision Policies and Practices: Possibilities and Challenges' in *The Architecture of Desistance*, ed. Stephen Farrall. Routledge (2019), pp. 249-277 [with Joanna Shapland].
25. 'Penal Censure, Repentance and Desistance' in *Penal Censure: Explorations Within and Beyond Desert Theory*, ed. Antje du Bois-Pedain and Anthony Bottoms. Hart Publishing (2019), pp. 109-139.
26. 'Procedural Justice, Legitimacy and Social Contexts' in *Procedural Justice and Relational Theory*, ed. Denise Meyerson, Catriona Mackenzie and Therese MacDermott, Routledge (2021), pp. 85-110 [with Justice Tankebe].
27. 'Criminal Justice and the Ethics of Jesus' in *Criminology and Public Theology*, ed. Andrew Millie, Bristol University Press (2021), pp. 21-43.
28. 'Desistance Research and Penal Policy' in *Criminology and Democratic Politics*, ed. Tom Daems and Stefaan Pleysier, Routledge (2021), pp. 88-102.
29. 'Criminology and "Positive Morality"' in *Crime, Justice and Social Order*, ed. Alison Liebling, Joanna Shapland, Richard Sparks and Justice Tankebe, Oxford University Press (2022), pp. 33-59.

-
30. 'Legitimacy and Evidence-Based Policy', in *The Oxford Handbook of Evidence-Based Crime and Justice Policy*, ed. Daniel Mears and Brandon Welsh (forthcoming) [with Justice Tankebe].

Acord 37/2021, de 17 de març, del Consell de Govern

Vista la petició formulada pel Deganat de la Facultat Dret, i l'acord de la Junta de la Facultat de data 12 de febrer de 2020 pel qual se sol·licita al Consell de Govern el nomenament del doctor Anthony Bottoms, com a doctor *honoris causa* de la Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.

Atès que tant del currículum del candidat com de la documentació referent als seus mèrits i de les circumstàncies que concorren, queda acreditat que la seva activitat en el camp de la docència i de la recerca el fan mereixedor d'obtenir la distinció de doctor *honoris causa* de la Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.

Atès que la Normativa que regula el procediment per a l'atorgament del títol de doctor *honoris causa* aprovada pel Consell de Govern en data 26 de maig de 2004 en el seu article 5.2 estableix que el Consell de Govern podrà atorgar un nomenament cada dos anys a la Facultat de Ciències, la Facultat de Filosofia i Lletres i a la Facultat de Medicina, i un nomenament cada quatre anys a cadascun dels centres restants.

Atès que la proposta de la Facultat de Dret compleix els requisits exigits a la normativa abans esmentada.

Vista la conformitat del Gabinet Jurídic.

Per tot això, a la vista de les consideracions anteriors, a proposta de la Junta de la Facultat de Dret, el Consell de Govern ha adoptat els següents

ACORDS

PRIMER. Nomenar el doctor Anthony Bottoms, doctor *honoris causa* de la UAB.

SEGON. Encarregar a la secretària general l'execució i el seguiment d'aquest acord.

TERCER. Comunicar el present acord a la Facultat de Dret.