

Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| 1 Sentencing Decision-Making: Unravelling the Enigma | 1 |
| 1 Why Rethink Sentencing Research and Policy? | 2 |
| 1.1 An Enduring Enigma | 2 |
| 2 Sentencing as a Social Process: Three Key Qualities | 5 |
| 2.1 Sentencing Decision-Making Is Neither Magic Nor Machine, but Interpretive | 5 |
| 2.2 Sentencing Is Processual | 6 |
| 2.3 Sentencing Is Performative | 7 |
| 3 The Structure of the Book | 8 |
| References | 10 |
| | |
| 2 Sentencing Research and Policy: Presumed Autonomous Individualism | 13 |
| 1 Two Giants of Sentencing Thought in Combat | 14 |
| 1.1 The Legal-Rational Tradition | 15 |
| 1.2 The Judicial-Defensive Tradition | 17 |
| 1.3 The Two Traditions Share the Same Assumptions | 22 |
| 2 Autonomous Individualism and the Sentencing Cosmos | 24 |
| 2.1 Separate Autonomous Individual Entities | 26 |

| | | |
|----------|---|----|
| 3 | Law Versus Discretion: Are Legal Rules and Discretion Really Opposites? | 27 |
| 3.1 | Coercion Versus Freedom: The Autonomous Individual Judge? | 29 |
| 4 | Case Factors: Autonomous Individual Entities? | 37 |
| 4.1 | The Analysis of 'Factors' | 38 |
| 4.2 | Problematism 'Factors' | 41 |
| 5 | Conclusions and Implications | 44 |
| | References | 45 |
| 3 | The Social Production of Sentencing | 51 |
| 1 | How the Discretion-Versus-Rules Binary Dissolves | 52 |
| 2 | The Indivisibility of 'Rules' and 'Facts' | 55 |
| 2.1 | The Devil Is in 'the Facts' | 56 |
| 2.2 | The Devil Is in the Rule-Facts Dialogue | 57 |
| 2.3 | What Does 'Process' Mean in Sentencing Decision-Making? | 58 |
| 2.4 | Multi-conviction Cases | 59 |
| 2.5 | Offender Characteristics | 61 |
| 3 | How Reason-Giving and Accountability Are Socially Produced | 67 |
| 4 | Conclusions and Implications | 70 |
| | References | 70 |
| 4 | The Work of the Sentencing Professions: Animating Autonomous Individualism | 75 |
| 1 | Constituting the Rules-Facts Dialogue: The Role of the Sentencing Professions | 76 |
| 1.1 | Understanding Professional Work: The Problem of Apprehension | 76 |
| 2 | Conceptions of Professions | 77 |
| 2.1 | The Trait Model | 77 |
| 2.2 | The Proprietorial-Control Model | 78 |
| 3 | The Individualising Work of the Sentencing Professions | 83 |
| 3.1 | Autonomous Individualisation in the Discourse of Professional Responsibility | 83 |

| | | |
|----------|---|-----|
| 3.2 | The Autonomous Individualisation of the Subject of Sentencing | 85 |
| 4 | Conclusions | 88 |
| | References | 89 |
| 5 | The Humanising Work of the Sentencing Professions: Individualising and Normalising | 93 |
| 1 | Professional Boundaries | 94 |
| 1.1 | Inter-professional Competition and the Division of Sentencing Work | 95 |
| 2 | Performing Legitimacy: The Cultivation of Ideal Clientele | 96 |
| 2.1 | Humanisation Work Demands Acceptance of Autonomous Individual Responsibility | 97 |
| 3 | How Inter-professional Disconnections Generate Ideal Clientele | 107 |
| 3.1 | Temporal Separation? | 109 |
| 3.2 | Mutual Blindness | 111 |
| 4 | Conclusions | 114 |
| | References | 114 |
| 6 | The Rise of Technology and the Demise of the Sentencing Professions? | 119 |
| 1 | Technology and the Demise of Professional Discretion? | 120 |
| 2 | The Genesis and Development of the Sentencing Information System | 124 |
| 2.1 | Conceiving and Representing Case Similarity | 126 |
| 2.2 | Public Access and Use to Inform Public Knowledge About Sentencing Practices? | 127 |
| 2.3 | User Flexibility | 127 |
| 2.4 | Hand-Over to the Court Service | 128 |
| 3 | What Does Story of the Scottish SIS Signify? | 130 |
| 3.1 | Are Judicial Sentencers Losing Control Sentencing to Techno-Rational Instruments? | 130 |
| 3.2 | A Defensive Political Initiative? | 130 |
| 3.3 | The Indeterminacy of SIS 'Results' | 131 |
| 3.4 | Voluntary Use | 132 |

| | | |
|----------|--|------------|
| 3.5 | Meeting Judicial Demand | 133 |
| 3.6 | Are Technologies Such as the SIS De-Humanising Sentencing? | 134 |
| 3.7 | Are Sentencers Now Mere Consumers of Meaning Rather Than the Creators'? | 136 |
| 4 | Mirror Images: The New Penology-Inspired Literature and the Legal-Rational Tradition | 138 |
| 5 | Conclusions | 139 |
| | References | 140 |
| 7 | New Directions for Research and Policy | 145 |
| 1 | Loosening the Grip of Presumed Autonomous Individualism | 146 |
| 2 | What Should Sentencing Research and Policy Do Now? | 149 |
| 2.1 | An Interpretive Research Approach to Rules, Facts and Discretion | 149 |
| 2.2 | Re-thinking the Meanings of 'Efficiency' | 152 |
| 2.3 | Study the Experiences of People Proceeded Against | 157 |
| 2.4 | Parsimony and Proportionality' | 161 |
| 3 | Conclusions and Further Questions | 167 |
| | References | 169 |
| | Index | 173 |