

THESIS



This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

AN ANALYSIS OF INTERNSHIP EXPERIENCES FOR DIFFERENT TYPES AND LEVELS OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE PROGRAMS IN THE UNITED STATES

presented by

Marson Harry Johnson

has been accepted towards fulfillment of the requirements for

Ph.D. degree in <u>Administrat</u>ion and Higher Education

Major professo

Date July 25, 1980

**O**-7639

(11)8 9 1995 . 1233 JUN 1 1 1996 JUN 1 991 1998

OVERDUE FINES: 25¢ per day per item

#### RETURNING LIBRARY MATERIALS:

Place in book return to remove charge from circulation record

# AN ANALYSIS OF INTERNSHIP EXPERIENCES FOR DIFFERENT TYPES AND LEVELS OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE PROGRAMS IN THE UNITED STATES

By

Marson H. Johnson

#### A DISSERTATION

Submitted to Michigan State University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

#### DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Administration and Higher Education

#### ABSTRACT

#### AN ANALYSIS OF INTERNSHIP EXPERIENCES FOR DIFFERENT TYPES AND LEVELS OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE PROGRAMS IN THE UNITED STATES

By

Marson Harry Johnson

Criminal justice internship programs at institutions of higher learning provide opportunities for participants to gain skills and insights that cannot be found by simply studying books, listening to lectures, or working in laboratories. Experiential learning has been a slow, laborious developmental process for education in general and even slower for criminal justice education. Criminal justice education programs involving field internships were never a reality until Michigan State university offered an 18-month program in 1935.

This study was designed as an investigation of criminal justice internships in selected institutions of higher education in the United States, with principal focus on programs in three states, viz., California, Florida, and Michigan. Its purpose was to obtain detailed and factual information to (1) assess the levels and extent of academic supervision of criminal justice internship programs in selected associate, baccalaureate, and graduate level institutions; (2) to secure relevant viewpoints and information from internship coordinators concerning specific issues and operational concerns involved in designing and implementing an internship program; (3) to analyze the extent of agreement/disagreement on these issues and concerns; and (4) to develop from the data obtained a set of normative statements concerning the desirable characteristics of current internship programs in this field.

The principal research instrument was a questionnaire including both closed- and open-ended responses. The respondents represented a cross-section of private and public institutions; associate, baccalaureate, and graduate programs; and urban, suburban, and rural locations.

The findings indicated that there is a wide variation with respect to the types of internship programs being employed. Problems perceived by the respondents involving day-to-day program activity were minimal. Internship programs were offered at all institutions surveyed, but a majority of them were not required for completion of the program of studies. There was consensus among the respondents that the internship experience should be for at least one term. Liability of students in internships was an unresolved issue, but did not preclude the development and employment of internship programs.

It became readily apparent that no single model for conducting internship programs existed; moreover, while there needs to be an effort to provide a degree of consistency and possibly some standardization of internship program elements, the variety of levels, program purposes, and similar factors would seem to negate the desirability of developing a single model to be followed. Rather, a cooperative effort to develop broader, but relevant, criteria for establishing such programs at the various levels with consideration for the appropriate purposes of the total programs in the various locations would serve the profession better.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my appreciation to Dr. Walter F. Johnson, my chairman, for his continued assistance, direction, and insight into the domain of higher education administration. Without his guidance, this research could never have become a reality. The author gratefully acknowledges his indebtedness to Dr. Mitchell Silverman for his support in reading and commenting on the various drafts. Mitchell's critical review, constructive comments, and focus have been most needed and appreciated.

Special expressions of gratitude are due to: Dr. Harold Vetter, Chairperson, Department of Criminal Justice, who made available the full resources of his department in an effort to facilitate the successful completion of this project; Dr. William Blount for his assistance in statistical analysis; Dr. David Agresti for his editorial assistance; Dr. Vandel Johnson, Dr. Richard Featherstone, and Mr. Ralph Turner for their suggestions and insights; and Mr. James Tayman, my student, who was most helpful in compiling the data from the questionnaires.

A deep debt of gratitude is extended to Mrs. John Hope and Mrs. Thomas Cooley for their timeless retyping of the manuscript and invaluable editorial help.

To my parents, Irene and Harry Johnson, for their continued hope and encouragement over these many years.

ii

A very special award of merit is due to my wife, Sarah, for her patience and understanding during tedious and trying times. Without her support, both moral and physical, and words of encouragement when they were most needed from my children, Marson, Caroline, and Sheryl, this project could never have been accomplished.

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
LIST OF	TABLES	vi
LIST OF	APPENDICES	viii
Chapter		
Ι.	INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM	۱
	The Need for Evaluating Criminal Justice	
	Internships	3
	Purpose of the Study	5
	The Research Problem	5
	Significance of the Study	6
	Research Design	7
	Scope and Limitations	8
		8
		8
	Overview of the Study	9
		•
II.	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	10
	History	10
	Vocational Motive	12
	Internshin	12
	Experiential Learning	14
	Criminal Justice Internships	17
	Structure of Criminal Justice Internshins	10
	Summary	21
		21
III.	METHODOLOGY	22
	Introduction	22
		22
	Jampie	23
	Procedures for Data Analysis	20
	Procedures for Data Analysis	24
IV.	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	26
	Analysis of the Data	26
	Internship Offerings	27

Page

Characteristics of Respondents	27
Characteristics of the Institutions Represented by the Respondents	29
Types of Internships Offered	37
Areas	37 45
Types of Internships Offered by Level of Instruction . Types of Experiential Learning by Status of	45
	46
Section II: Supervision and Operational Issues and	10
Characteristics of Internship Supervision by	40
State Geographic Location	49
Regional Areas	54
Characteristics of Internship Supervision by	
Academic Level	57
Levels of Institution	57
Operational Issues and Concerns of Criminal Justice	63
Section III: Major Concerns	87
Section IV: Development of Normative Model for	00
Criminal Justice Internship Programs	88
V. FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	91
Findings and Conclusions	92
Discussion and Implications	94 97
APPENDICES	99
BIBLIOGRAPHY	160

### LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Academic Rank of Respondents	27
2.	Age of Respondents	28
3.	Level of Institution	29
4.	Internal Institutional Student Enrollment and Program Distributions	. 30
5.	Chi-square Tests on Level of Institution by State of Institution Surveyed	. 32
6.	Chi-square Tests on Status of Institutions by Level of Institution	. 34
7.	Chi-square Tests on Primary Curriculum Emphasis by Level of Institution	. 35
8.	Chi-square Tests of Internship Offers Cross-cultural Experience by State of Institution Surveyed	. 39
9.	Chi-square Tests of Internship Offers Work Experience or Cooperative Education by State Geographic Areas	. 40
10.	Chi-square Tests of Internship Offers Field Research by State of Institution Surveyed	. 41
11.	Chi-square Tests of Work Experience (Cooperative Education) Internships Offered by Level of Institution .	. 47
12.	Chi-square Tests of Students Evaluated by Journals by State of Institution Surveyed	. 50
13.	Chi-square Tests of Grading Format by State of Institution Surveyed	. 52
14.	Chi-square Tests of Student Evaluation in Internship Program by State Regional Levels	. 55
15.	Chi-square Tests of Internship Approval by Institutional Status	. 59

## Table

Page
------

16.	Chi-square Tests of Students Evaluated by Visitations by Status of Institution	60
17.	Chi-square Tests of Students Evaluated by Journals by Status of Institution	62
18.	Chi-square Tests of Internship Selection Based on College Grade Point Average by State of Institution Surveyed	65
19.	Chi-square Tests of Terms Internships Are Offered by State of Institution Surveyed	67
20.	Chi-square Tests of Ordinary Duration of Internship by State of Institution	<b>6</b> 8
21.	Chi-square Tests of the Time Commitment of Internship Experience by State of Institution Surveyed	70
22.	Chi-square Tests of Funds Available to Students for Field Study by State of Institution Surveyed	72
23.	Chi-square Tests of Limited Placement Sites by State of Institution Surveyed	73
24.	Chi-square Tests of On-Campus Communication Problems by Geographical Location of Institution	79
25.	Chi-square Tests of Requirement of Internship Program by Level of Institution	81
26.	Chi-square Tests of Internship Selection Based on College Grade Point Average by Level of Institution	83
27.	Chi-square Tests of the Time Commitment of the Internship Experience by the Level of Institution	85
28.	Chi-square Tests of Faculty Attitudes Toward the Internship Program by Level of Institution	86

### LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendi:	x	Page
Α.	THE QUESTIONNAIRE AND QUESTIONNAIRE WITH INTERNSHIP COORDINATORS' RESPONSES	100
В.	TYPES OF INTERNSHIPS OFFERED BY STATE GEOGRAPHIC AREAS .	112
С.	TYPES OF INTERNSHIPS OFFERED BY STATE REGIONAL AREAS	115
D.	TYPES OF INTERNSHIPS OFFERED BY INSTITUTIONAL LEVELS	118
Ε.	TYPES OF INTERNSHIPS OFFERED BY STATUS OF INSTITUTION	121
F.	ACADEMIC SUPERVISION LEVELS BY STATE GEOGRAPHIC AREAS	124
G.	ACADEMIC SUPERVISION LEVELS BY STATE REGIONAL AREAS	128
Н.	ACADEMIC SUPERVISION LEVELS BY INSTITUTIONAL LEVELS	132
Ι.	ACADEMIC SUPERVISION LEVELS BY STATUS OF INSTITUTION	136
J.	CRIMINAL JUSTICE INTERNSHIP ISSUES AND OPERATIONAL CONCERNS BY STATE GEOGRAPHIC AREAS	140
К.	CRIMINAL JUSTICE INTERNSHIP ISSUES AND OPERATIONAL CONCERNS BY STATE REGIONAL AREAS	145
L.	CRIMINAL JUSTICE INTERNSHIP ISSUES AND OPERATIONAL CONCERNS BY LEVEL OF INSTITUTION	150
Μ.	CRIMINAL JUSTICE INTERNSHIP ISSUES AND OPERATIONAL CONCERNS BY STATUS OF INSTITUTION	155

#### CHAPTER I

#### INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM

Brown and Thornton (1963) judged that work experiences and internships added importance as a means of learning at the level of higher education. Work experiences provided opportunities to gain skills and insight that could not be found by simply studying books, listening to lectures, or working in laboratories. Additionally, work experiences fill a directed level of teaching when supervised by college personnel (p. 162).

In 1906 at the University of Cincinnati a cooperative workand-study program under the direction of Herman Schneider was inaugurated as a form of field study. The plan called for students to spend alternate periods of study with the College of Engineering and at work on related jobs. They were expected to learn through apprenticeships with industry parallel extensions related to laboratory studies at the school, according to a study by Henderson (1970). This early approach to field study reflected the belief that there is value in the interweaving of theory and practice and/or that some experiences and learning can best be achieved outside of the traditional classroom.

The general philosophy of Justin Morrill College regarding field study programs placed the central emphasis on personal development and skill acquisition. In a 1965 student handout, four areas of

personal development and four areas of skill were described as requirements the students must consciously strive toward. The four areas of personal development included the following:

- 1. self-reliance
- 2. culture or environmental sensitivity
- 3. self-understanding
- 4. commitments to persons and relationships

The four skill areas included the following:

- 1. information source network development
- 2. decision making under conditions of stress
- 3. interpersonal communication including the interpretation of nonverbal cues
- 4. the combined use of observation, recording and writing skills

The literature of the 1960s and 1970s, as reflected in the Justin Morrill College student handout, the Council for the Advancement of Experiential Learning (CAEL), and other research, indicates a significant attempt to improve the goals and quality of experiential learning. Duley and Gordon (1977) identified 11 types of programs involving experiential learning. The 11 types of programs include the following:

- 1. Cross-Cultural Experience
- 2. Work Experience (Cooperative Education)
- 3. Preprofessional Training
- 4. Institutional Analysis
- 5. Service-Learning Internship
- 6. Social/Political Action
- 7. Personal Growth and Development
- 8. Field Research
- 9. Career Exploration
- 10. Academic Discipline/Career Integration
- 11. Career and Occupational Development

Davis, Duley, and Alexander (1977) followed with "Field Experi-

ence," wherein they identified eight steps in designing a field study program that reflects the following considerations:

- 1. Identify your goals and student goals
- State agreed-upon goals in the form of instructional objectives
- 3. Arrange field placement
- 4. Prepare students
- 5. Monitor placement
- 6. Place students
- 7. Assess student learning
- 8. Evaluate the program

Evaluation is presently the critical area of research involving internships, practicums, experiential learning, field experiences, student experiences, work experiences, etc. Quinn (1972), Duley (1977, 1978), Sherman (1978), Greene (1979), and others have conducted studies or expressed the need to evaluate internships with regard to philosophy, goals, objectives, quality, quantity, etc., and noted a specific need for data with regard to the supervisory impact on pro-

gramming and/or programs.

#### The Need for Evaluating Criminal Justice Internships

The growing emphasis on vocational goals for higher education has spurred renewed interest in making work experience a part of higher education. Cooperative education programs at Antioch College, Northeastern University, and other institutions have exposed many students to police work, and a number of them have followed up that brief contact with a career in policy work. Campus police forces at several of the larger universities have also given college students in a number of fields the opportunity to sample what police work is like. And since August Vollmer's tenure as police chief of Berkeley, some college students have also worked as sworn police officers in their college towns (Sherman, 1978, p. 161).

It is generally thought that for those students who participate in an internship program it allows them to make an intelligent choice of careers. Students who participate as cadets or interns may experience less reality shock at discovering the true nature of the work world. The Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 recognized the benefits of preservice work experience by authorizing a program of criminal justice internships. Sherman (1978) noted that the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) defined the eligibility requirements for those internships narrowly and for those students enrolled in a program offering a narrow training curriculum, the internship probably does little to enrich their education.

Greene (1979) concluded that against the backdrop of concern for the "quality" of police education, internship programs have received little consideration beyond a generalized assumption that they are worthwhile. However, on the positive side, internship programs have the potential to affect their sponsoring curricula as much as they are affected by them. Internship programs can provide essential linkages to the criminal justice curriculum by (1) providing a mechanism which mediates between teaching, research, and service interests and their relationships to the curriculum; (2) providing a method for verifying the cohesiveness of the curriculum by obtaining feedback as to the appropriateness of educational delivery and its utility for constituency groups, and (3) providing meaningful occupational grounding through the reinforcement of concepts and techniques acquired from classroom-based instruction. Each of these links highlights the various functions which internship programs can provide for the operation of criminal justice educational programs.

Internship programs can begin to provide a "quality control" connection between student, professional, and academic expectations by providing input and feedback into curriculum issues from at least

two major sources: (1) the professional community and (2) students. However, without academic supervision the "quality" of experience, in educational terms, is speculative. Academic supervision, therefore, strikes at the core of the control issue and closer supervision is required.

#### Purpose of the Study

The purposes of this study are as follows: (1) to collect detailed and factual information which will enable the researcher to assess the level(s) of academic supervision of criminal justice internship programs in selected Associate, Baccalaureate, and Graduate institutions within the states of California, Florida, and Michigan, respectively; (2) to secure relevant viewpoints and information from internship coordinators concerning specific issues and operational concerns involved in designing and implementing a criminal justice internship program; (3) to analyze the extent of agreement or disagreement on the issues and concerns examined; and (4) to develop from the data collected a set of normative statements concerning the desirable characteristics of present criminal justice internship programs.

#### The Research Problem

There are many issues and concerns which must be considered regarding academic supervision of criminal justice internship programs. Greene (1979) identified a number of factors that are crucial to the development of a "quality" academic supervised criminal justice internship program. They include:

- 1. Intensive supervision of program by faculty member(s)
- 2. Cost to institution

- 3. Certification of field supervisors in the placement setting (includes training)
- 4. Internal review sessions conducted by the academic staff
- 5. Feedback aiding curriculum integration

Other issues include:

- 1. Liability
- 2. Compensation (agency/participants)
- 3. Continuity
- 4. Minimum requirements for program participant(s)
- 5. Contracts or contractual agreements with institution (agency/participants)

While these factors vary in scope and some are more complex than others, they do, nevertheless, provide a useful starting point for identifying significant issues affecting criminal justice internship programs presently in existence. These issues will provide the broad focus for the research in this study. <u>The research problem will be</u> <u>an attempt to secure factual data regarding "quality" internship pro-</u> <u>gramming in the criminal justice field as related to the strength of</u> academic supervision.

### Significance of the Study

The significance of the study is related to the following points: It will (1) provide specific information concerning academic supervision of criminal justice internship programs as they presently exist in the states of California, Florida, and Michigan; (2) enable policy makers from various institutions to appraise their own positions with regard to programmatic and organizational issues of the various institutions; (3) allow greater understanding of the program efforts of other institutions; (4) consolidate supervisory data of a "quality" nature; and (5) provide guidance to other institutions that may be developing or considering the development of criminal justice internship programs.

#### Research Design

In order to obtain the information needed, two major phases of research will be undertaken by the researcher. <u>Phase One</u> will include the development of a questionnaire to determine the present state of the art within the institutions offering criminal justice internship programs in California, Florida, and Michigan. Selection of the institutions will be made using the <u>Criminal Justice Education Directory 1978-80</u>, as published by the International Association of Chiefs of Police. This publication lists criminal justice "intern programs available" in 47 California institutions, 15 Florida institutions, and 17 Michigan institutions for a total of 79 institutions within the three aforementioned states to be surveyed.

A cover letter accompanying the questionnaire will be sent to each of the internship coordinators informing them of the purpose of the study and requesting their cooperation in this research effort. Additional data will also be requested concerning the availability of internship outlines, syllabi, handouts, rating forms, etc., and those documents obtained will be summarized and available for future reference.

The data-analysis format for <u>Phase One</u> will be reported in descriptive and summary statistical text with accompanying narrative.

<u>Phase Two</u> will consist of the researcher physically contacting at least two institutions in each state, either in person or by

telephone, and conducting an in-depth interview designed to clarify specific issues and concerns surrounding the existing model and academic supervision regarding their criminal justice internship program. The selection of the institutions, and alternate institutions, to be interviewed will be generated by the preliminary Phase One data and a panel of peers, post-internship students, and other interested individuals who will have the opportunity to review available Phase One data.

Data analysis of the interviews in <u>Phase Two</u> will be reported in descriptive and summary statistical text with accompanying narrative.

#### Scope and Limitations

#### Scope

The delimitation of this study will include those institutions in California, Florida, and Michigan that have criminal justice intern programs as described in the <u>Criminal Justice Education Directory</u> <u>1978-80</u>, a minimum of two follow-up interviews from each of the three aforementioned states, and other relevant institutional data that may be generated by the research effort.

#### Limitations

The study is limited to the degree which the significant issues that are raised in the literature on the subject of academic supervision in criminal justice internship programs have been identified. The study is also limited by the reliability of the data collected by the questionnaire method in Phase One and the reliability of the data collected through the interview method described in Phase Two.

#### Overview of the Study

The study will be reported in five chapters. Chapter I will include the introduction, the significance of the study, the research problem, the research design, definitions of terms, scope and limitations of the study, and an overview of the study.

Chapter II will include a review of the literature related to the study and also a review of the evolution of criminal justice internship programs.

Chapter III will describe the study design and procedures employed in carrying out the study.

Chapter IV will contain a summary and analysis of the data collected from the questionnaire and internship data formats, student handouts, outlines, etc., returned by the institutions. Chapter IV will also contain a summary and analysis of the data collected from the interviews.

Chapter V will contain a summary of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

#### CHAPTER II

#### **REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE**

#### History

It was not until after the publication of Rousseau's epochmaking treatise of education, <u>Emile</u>, in 1762, that we find the true beginning of modern teaching methods (Noble, 1938, p. 197). Rousseau believed that all education should be conducted according to the maturing instincts and interests of the child, not forced upon them. Johann Pestalozzi had studied Rousseau and he urged that children be taught spinning, weaving, and other gainful activities at the same time that they were learning to read and count, thus associating industry with education (Noble, 1938, p. 200). This new form of instruction became known as the "object method" of sense perception.

Emanuel Fellenberg, a pupil of Pestalozzi, expanded this idea of industrial education to include agricultural and manual labor schools. Visitors from Germany, England, and America visited various Pestalozzi and Fellenberg experimental schools and carried their information back to their respective communities and institutions.

William Maclure, in 1806, hired Joseph Neef, one of Pestalozzi's assistants, "to come to Philadelphia for the purpose of establishing schools embodying the principles" (Noble, 1938, p. 201). During the period Neef was in Philadelphia, many of the operational periodicals published extensive accounts involving the "object method." <u>The</u>

<u>American Journal of Education</u> (1826-1831), <u>The Common School Journal</u> (1838-1848), and the <u>American Journal of Education</u> (1855-1881) were just a few that published articles on the subject from time to time.

Manual labor schools soon began to appear on the American scene, thus affording an opportunity for students to spend a part of their time in manual labor operating farms or shops. It was thought to be beneficial for all students; "for those young men who were unable to pay their own school or college expenses, it was to furnish the means for self-help; for those who were able to pay, it was to provide healthful exercise" (Noble, 1938, p. 205).

Edward H. Sheldon, superintendent of schools in Oswego, New York, became interested in the Pestalozzi type of instruction and directed his teachers at Oswego to experiment with the method. Noble (1938) discussed Sheldon's enthusiasm over the successful results of the trials, such that Sheldon

established a teachers' training school and sent to England for an instructor familiar with the practices then being popularized in that country by Dr. Charles Mayo. Miss Margaret E. M. Jones came over in response to Sheldon's request and began demonstrations in classroom procedure that soon attracted wide attention. Other normal schools in New York, New Jersey, and Michigan learned of the new method from Sheldon's training school. Syracuse, Chicago, Toledo, Cincinnati, San Francisco, and numerous smaller places took steps toward introducing it. Soon the little town in New York State became a center from which emanated the latest developments in Pestalozzian procedure, and teachers flocked to Oswego from many states to inform themselves concerning this newest teaching "fad." The enthusiastic quest became known as the Oswego movement (p. 209).

Prior to 1897, a more "energizing principle" of education was being sought to replace the object method, and, about 1914, the vocational motive began the ascendancy in the manual training schools.

#### Vocational Motive

The vocational motive finds the guidance function dominant and in addition to course work offers "exploratory" or "try-out" courses for the benefit of students who expect to go directly into industry from school. The student is led to discover his vocational preference by sampling a number of such short courses.

Schools began providing evening classes and job placement was further developed under the vocational motive. Nonvocational, prevocational, and vocational are areas that began to be delimited, and at the University of Cincinnati in 1906, Herman Schneider inaugurated a form of field study via a cooperative work-and-study program (Henderson, 1970, p. 18). Davies (1962), Quinn (1972), Houtz (1970), Wheaton (1950), and Newall (1952) provide historical and developmental origin data on the internship as it is known today, beginning with the University of Cincinnati program in 1906.

#### Internship

Davies (1962) published a significant study on internships in educational administration and dealt in depth with the definitional difficulties of what constitutes an internship. He noted that the term "internship" is borrowed directly from the medical profession (p. 1). The <u>Encyclopedia Britannica</u> bears this point out and notes that this hospital experience required of every medical doctor is at or near the end of his college preparation program, prior to his being licensed to practice medicine. Field experience under the guidance of veteran practitioners before a medical doctor is allowed

to practice on his own becomes mandatory and an integral part of his professional preparation.

In order to constitute a bona fide internship in educational administration, Davies (1962) states that the following conditions must be satisfied:

- 1. The student's field experience which is labeled "internship" is an integral part of his professional education which comes after or near the completion of his formal program of professional preparation.
- 2. His internship involves a considerable block of time--at least one semester on a full-time basis or the equivalent.
- 3. The student must be expected to carry real and continuous responsibilities in his field situation under the competent supervision of a practicing administrator.
- 4. The board of education or board of trustees of the institution in which he is interning supports the program at the policy level.
- 5. The professional school in which he is enrolled is joint sponsor of his program along with the school system or institution. The professional school also assists in his supervision.

Two additional conditions are highly desirable:

- 1. The state department of education recognizes and endorses the internship program for the state as a whole.
- The national and state associates of educational administrators are on record as endorsing--and even requiring-the internship as part of each practitioner's preparation and as part of his requirement for membership in the respective associations (pp. 1-2).

Davies (1962) directs the reader not to confuse internship with apprenticeship even though there may be a number of similarities. He notes that "internship emphasizes vigorous learning experiences in the field near the end of a formal preparation program" (p. 4). The apprenticeship emphasizes career guidance and exploration wherein the apprentice's role is primarily observational. Davies (1962) further presents charts on internships in 17 training institutions from about 1940 to 1950 that were available to school administrators. He also discusses Wheaton's research of 152 professional schools surveyed, reporting that:

- 1. Seventeen were operating internship programs.
- 2. Seven were operating modified programs.
- 3. Five were actively considering the idea of organizing in the near future.
- 4. Eleven stated that they were interested generally but were taking no active steps.
- 5. None of the others reported any interest (p. 18).

Ten pioneers in the educational internship field are also listed by Davies (1962), and they include the following:

- 1. Clarence A. Newell
- 2. William A. Yeager
- 3. Walter A. Anderson
- 4. E. C. Bolmeier
- 5. Burvil H. Glenn
- 6. O. H. Aurand
- 7. E. Edmund Reutter
- 8. Gordon A. Wheaton
- 9. Harvey M. Krenzberg
- 10. Ernest O. Melby

Davies (1962) views the internship program as focusing on learning for the intern--"which is much more easy to say than to achieve" (p. 32). The <u>Encyclopedia Britannica</u> defines learning as any relatively permanent change in behavior resulting from past experience.

#### Experiential Learning

The term "field experience" during the 1960s was being used to mean an off-campus learning activity, generally for credit, in which a student accepts a large share of the responsibility for his own learning in a situation carefully selected to facilitate learning. The broader term "experiential learning" is presently used quite frequently rather than the term "field experience" to describe such activities (Davis, Duley, & Alexander, 1977, p. 1).

The terms "internship," "field experience," "experiential learning," and "practicum" will be used interchangeably throughout this research effort, as the data warrant. The reader is directed to this problem because consensus at the practical level and the written material reflect this confusion within the field. This researcher prefers the term "experiential learning" and is pleased to note that more than 300 institutions of higher education are active members of Cooperative Assessment of Experiential Learning (CAEL), another initial Carnegie Corporation supported project (CAEL, 1979, p. 1).

The 11 types of experiential learning programs and the primary purposes served by each are reflected in the CAEL faculty handbook, <u>College Sponsored Experiential Learning</u> (Duley & Gordon, 1977) and are discussed as follows:

Cross-Cultural Experience. A student involves himself or herself in another culture or subculture of his or her own society in a deep and significant way, either as a temporary member of a family, a worker in that society, or as a volunteer in a social agency, with the intention, as a participant observer, of learning as much as possible about that culture and his or her own.

Work Experience (Cooperative Education). The National Commission for Cooperative Education has defined cooperative education as "that education plan which integrates classroom experience and practical work experience in industrial, business, government, or service-type work situations in the community. The work experiences constitute a regular and essential element in the educative process and some minimum amount of work experience and minimum standard of successful performance on the job are included in the requirements of the institution for a degree" (The National Commission for Cooperative Education, 1971).

Preprofessional Training. A student serves in assigned responsibilities under the supervision of a professional in the field of education, medicine, law, social work, nursing, or ministry, putting the theory learned into practice, gaining skills in the profession, and being evaluated by his or her supervisor.

Institutional Analysis. "A student has a temporary period of supervised work that provides opportunities to develop skills, to test abilities and career interests, and to systematically examine institutional cultures in light of the central theoretical notions in a chosen academic field of study" (Zauderer, 1973, p. 1).

Service-Learning Internship. "Service-Learning has been defined as: the integration of the accomplishment of a task which meets human need with conscious educational growth. A service-learning internship is designed to provide students responsibility to meet a public need and a significant learning experience within a public or private institution for a specified period of time, usually 10 to 15 weeks" (Sigmon, 1972, p. 2).

Social/Political Action. A student secures a placement, under faculty sponsorship, which provides an opportunity to be directly engaged in working for social change either through community organizing, political activity, research/action projects, or work with organizations seeking to bring about changes in the social order. A learning contract is usually made with a faculty sponsor to be fulfilled by the student in this type of experience.

Personal Growth and Development. A student undertakes a program in an off-campus setting that is designed to further his or her personal growth and development, such as the wilderness survival programs of the Outward Bound Schools, an apprenticeship to an artist or a craftsperson, residence in a house of a religious order for the development of his or her spiritual life, or participation in an established group psychological or human relations program.

Field Research. A student undertakes an independent or group research project in the field under the supervision of a faculty member, applying the concepts and methods of an academic discipline such as geology, archeology, geography, or sociology.

Career Exploration. A student secures a supervised placement in business, government, industry, a service organization, or a profession in order to perform a useful service, to analyze the career possibilities of that placement, and to develop employmentrelated skills. The educational institution provides the means of structured reflection, analysis, and self-evaluation; the agency supervisor provides an evaluation of the student's work and career potential.

Academic Discipline/Career Integration. "A student is employed in a business, government, industry, service organization, or profession prior to entry into the educational institution. The faculty members and the educational institution provide the means of structured analysis and evaluation based on the academic discipline involved, integrating theory and practice and heightening the student's awareness and understanding of the world and his/her career in a conscious systematic fashion" (Currier, 1975, p. 5).

Career or Occupational Development. A student is assisted in finding a series of two or more placements which are chosen, in consultation with an advisor, to provide the opportunity for advancement in skills and experience related to a specific career. This is particularly useful in technological programs when classroom and on-the-job learning are closely integrated.

Experiential learning programs are commonly referred to as internships when reviewing the criminal justice literature.

#### Criminal Justice Internships

In 1908, August Vollmer, the Town Marshall of Berkeley, California, began a police training program which later developed into the Berkeley Police School. Northwestern University in 1909 held the First National Conference on Criminal Law and Criminology, where educators and practitioners from every branch of the American Criminal Justice System attended. This conference resulted in the establishment of the American Institute of Criminal Law and Criminology and the early development of police courses as well as texts.

Vocational skills for the field-level police officer were started in Detroit at a Police Academy in 1911, and seven years later in 1918 the New York City Police Academy began to use Columbia University as a resource for its program. Inservice courses for police officers were offered through the extension division of the University of Wisconsin in 1927.

In 1931 the Wickersham Crime Commission recommended improvements upon higher education for police: Universities should compete with each other in training men to be the most efficient police leaders possible, university training courses should provide education on the social aspect of police work, and state supported and controlled schools for police should be developed.

The first Bachelor of Arts degree with a major in a law enforcement field was offered by Michigan State University under its new Department of Police Administration in 1935. The Michigan State degree was awarded after completion of a five-year program, including an 18-month field internship. Upon graduation, students had the opportunity of working for the state police at the salary level of a third-year officer.

In 1937, California, Colorado, Nebraska, New York, Oregon, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, and Wisconsin made use of federal vocational education funds for police training.

The Society for the Advancement of Criminology in 1949 conducted a survey of every post-secondary institution in the United States to find out how many schools were offering programs in the criminology field. Only 20 schools, of 325 responding, met the survey requirement of offering at least a two-year major in the field of criminology. By 1957, only 56 institutions in 19 states were offering degrees in the area of criminal justice.

In 1968, the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) was created to establish programs of educational assistance that would improve law enforcement (Kobetz, 1978, pp. 2-4).

According to Farmer (1978), there are 328 cooperative education internship programs in higher education institutions for the police

and criminal justice today, which represents approximately 40 percent of all police college and university programs. This figure also represents a rather dramatic rate of growth for internship experiences, up some 900 percent from 10 years ago (p. 452).

#### Structure of Criminal Justice Internships

Curriculum design of criminal justice internships and their management denotes a great deal of consensus on a number of issues. Recent studies (Tenney, 1971; Schrink & Grosskopf, 1978; Greene, 1979) have shown that careful agency selection on the part of the institution may have a great deal to do with the individual and agency perception of success with regard to the program. Supervision is a second factor that general agreement appears to center upon, including field work being conducted reasonably close to the institution. Time to spend during the entire internship process, including agency and institutional supervision, appears to be a determinant in a successful experience for all parties involved.

Schrink and Grosskopf (1978) outline the parameters of a successful internship in the following manner:

- 1. Stated purpose of internship
- 2. Understand benefits to all involved
- 3. Respect placement agency needs
- 4. Essential that agency has a supervisor
- 5. Knowledge of number of interns that can be placed at any given location
- 6. Type of student
- 7. Duration of internship
- 8. Written reports made available to all parties
- 9. Liability insurance
- 10. Waiver
- 11. Prescreening of participants
- 12. Final selection process
- 13. Orientation of all parties

- 15. Regular group meetings
- 16. Conferences
- 17. Agency responsibilities
- 18. Financing understandings and agreements
- 19. Grading
- 20. Termination or suspension problems (pp. 38, 40, 42).

According to Houtz (1970), the framework in which an internship

could be structured and yet allow for individual interests and needs

includes:

- 1. The internship should be taken concurrently with content courses except for the first term or semester.
- 2. The internship should include a minimum of two specialized areas with the intern having an opportunity to utilize the last term or its equivalent as an "assistant dean."
- 3. The internship should be a minimum of five hours a week for a specified number of weeks.
- 4. Regular hours should be assigned for internship activities.
- 5. The internship should include the usual activities of the profession.
- 6. Regular arrangements should be made to give academic credit for the internship in the student personnel curriculum.
- 7. The internship should be planned by the faculty director and the supervisor of the specialized area.
- 8. Evaluation of the intern should be submitted by the supervisor of the intern to the faculty member responsible.
- 9. The internship should be supervised by interested and competent professional personnel (p. 47).

Even though Schrink and Grosskopf (1978) wrote about criminal justice internships and Houtz (1970) wrote about internships in student personnel programs, the similarities between their recommendations cannot be avoided. Agreement on these areas, it is suggested, will give the internship program the successful impetus necessary to serve all parties concerned. Disagreement and difficulty with any one, group, or all of these areas will weaken even the best program and may even result in the loss of the internship program.

#### Summary

Experiential learning has been a slow, laborious developmental process for education in general and painfully slower for criminal justice education in particular. Criminal justice education programs involving field internships were never a reality until Michigan State University offered an 18-month program in 1935. The Kobetz (1978) material gave us our first comprehensive look at where criminal justice internship programs exist presently, but Farmer (1978) stated that "a review of literature describing internship programs in law enforcement higher education yields few results" (p. 1). However, Greene (1979), Farmer (1978), and others have expressed many of the concerns and problems that exist within our experiential learning efforts in many of today's higher education institutions. The remainder of this research will attempt to identify and discuss the state of the art within our criminal justice experiential learning efforts.

#### CHAPTER III

#### METHODOLOGY

#### Introduction

Since 1967, when it became necessary for this researcher to select a location for the then-required practicum offered by the School of Police Administration and Public Safety at Michigan State University, an expressed interest in the development and function of criminal justice internship programs surfaced. As a result, he was privileged to have spent his internship activities in Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Germany, and England studying criminal justice systems in the different countries visited. Interim years have found the writer engaged in developing foreign comparative methodological exchange programs for other students at institutions of higher education. These interests and activities resulted in a need to better understand criminal justice internship efforts throughout the United States. A review of the literature was undertaken and a proposal developed to research and develop criteria for conducting internship experiences for different types and levels of criminal justice programs. The proposal was presented to a Doctoral Committee consisting of Dr. Walter F. Johnson, Chairman; Dr. Vandel C. Johnson, Dr. Richard Featherstone; and Mr. Ralph Turner for their comments, suggestions, and recommendations. The proposal was accepted with minor revisions.
#### Sample

The sample for the present study was selected from the Kobetz (1978) <u>Criminal Justice Education Directory 1978-1980</u> and delimited to include primarily those institutions in California, Florida, and Michigan that indicated they have criminal justice intern programs. This publication listed criminal justice "intern programs available" in 47 California institutions, 15 Florida institutions, and 17 Michigan institutions reflecting a total of 79 institutions to be surveyed. An additional 24 institutions were selected from 20 other states for comparative purposes. California, Florida, and Michigan were selected for the study because they appeared to cover the liberal active West, elements of the deep South, and the conservative, industrialized-type states, respectively. The "Other" states category was randomly selected later as a control group for comparative purposes.

One hundred and three institutions were surveyed, and a total of 69 responded between November 1979 and February 1980. The respondents included 29 California institutions, 13 Florida institutions, 12 Michigan institutions, and 15 institutions from 24 other states surveyed. This represents a 67 percent return rate of all institutions surveyed.

# Instrumentation

An initial questionnaire (Appendix A) was developed for use in acquiring data that would allow the researcher to determine the present state of the art within those institutions offering criminal justice internship programs in California, Florida, and Michigan,

respectively. The questionnaire consisted of 32 responses and was designed to elicit information on the status of the institution (public or private; urban, suburban, or rural; two year, four year, other), current enrollment in the institution and the criminal justice program, criminal justice program emphasis, types of internship programs offered, availability of internship program, internship program selection criteria, when internship offered, duration of internship, levels of student commitment, objectives of internship, supervision level(s), internship program evaluation level(s), placement issues or problems, and miscellaneous other issue or problem concerns.

The initial questionnaire was developed and approved by the researcher's committee and distributed to 103 institutions indicating they had criminal justice internship programs. A 49 percent return was generated from the first mailing of the questionnaire, and a second follow-up letter requesting the return of the questionnaire sent out earlier succeeded in generating the present 67 percent response rate.

# Procedures for Data Analysis

After examining the results and determining the frequencies generated by the questionnaire, it was decided the majority of the responses reflected nonparametric statistical levels of measurement, and the results were then analyzed by the statistical procedures developed for the <u>Statistical Packages for the Social Sciences</u> (SPSS) Batch System for OS/360, Version H, Release 8.0, October 15, 1979.

The .05 level of significance was established by the researcher as the most appropriate level of significance in reporting the critical data. <u>Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences</u> (Siegel, 1956) was consulted for statistical procedures involving independent samples generated by the questionnaires and cross-tabulations when employing Chi-square tests, as reported in Chapter IV, Results and Discussion.

The data which are reported in Chapter IV represent the questionnaire (Appendix A) responses and reflect <u>Phase One</u> of the proposal and research design. <u>Phase Two</u> of the research design (proposed initially) was not undertaken or completed because the panel specified by the writer, in the original proposal, decided that the information gathered as a result of the additional interviews would not substantially increase the value of the project. The varying practices reported by the respondents regarding criminal justice experiential learning programs at their respective institutions did not lend themselves to modeling as originally proposed, since the majority of the institutions operate criminal justice internship programs designed specifically for their needs, resources, and participating students.

# CHAPTER IV

# RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

# Analysis of the Data

The purpose of this study was to: (1) collect detailed and factual information that will enable the researcher to assess the level(s) of academic supervision of criminal justice internship programs in selected Associate, Baccalaureate, and Graduate institutions within the states of California, Florida, and Michigan, respectively; (2) secure relevant viewpoints and information from internship coordinators concerning specific issues and operational concerns involved in designing and implementing a criminal justice internship program; (3) analyze the extent of agreement or disagreement on the issues and concerns examined; and (4) develop from the data collected a set of normative statements concerning the desirable characteristics of present criminal justice internship programs. In order to accomplish these ends, four specific research questions were posed and relevant data for each collected. However, prior to discussing data relevant to these specific questions, the investigator feels that descriptive data related to the characteristics of the educators sampled should be presented.

## Section I: Demographic Characteristics and Internship Offerings

#### Characteristics of Respondents

The data presented in this section were obtained from an analysis of internship coordinator responses to respondent characteristic items included in the questionnaire (Appendix A).

The 69 internship coordinators responding to the survey represented 29 from California, 13 from Florida, 12 from Michigan, and 15 from other institutions of higher education throughout the United States that specifically indicated in Kobetz (1978) they offered a criminal justice internship program to their students. The distribution of respondents, by their academic rank, is presented in Table 1.

Rank	Number	Percentage of Total Respondents
Professor	16	23.2
Associate Professor	11	15.9
Assistant Professor	17	24.6
Instructor	25	36.2
Column total	69	100.0

Ta	ы	е	1:	Academic	Rank	of	Respondent	S
		<b>_</b>				~ .		-

Male respondents constituted 92.8 percent and female respondents 7.2 percent of the sample, respectively. Blacks made up 11.6 percent, whites 79.7 percent, Spanish 5.8 percent, and others 2.8 percent of the sample. The ages of the respondents are presented in Table 2, and it is interesting to note the broad variation in reported ages. As seen in Table 2, 8.7 percent of the respondents were under 30 years of age, 37.7 percent were between 30 and 40 years of age, 24.6 percent between 41 and 50 years of age, 18.8 percent between 51 and 65 years of age, with 10.1 percent failing to report their age. This indicates a possible necessity of knowing the ages of the seven nonreporting respondents for clarification purposes if age is to be used as a variable in Chi-square tests. All levels of education from the Bachelors Degree up were represented in our current sample, with 6 (8.7%) at the Bachelors level, 33 at the Masters (47.8%), 28 Doctorate (40.6%), and 2 Juris Doctorate (2.9%).

Age	Number	Percentage of Total Respondents
Under 30	6	8.7
30-40	26	37.7
41-50	17	24.6
51-65	13	18.8
Age not reported	7	10.1
Column total	69	100.0

Table 2. Ave of Responder
---------------------------

As can be seen from these data, the individuals involved in the administration of criminal justice internship programs represented a broad spectrum of educational backgrounds and diverse individual characteristics. Considering the numerous disciplines that are represented in criminal justice education along with the complex nature of the content of the problems being studied, these broad individual data responses may influence the characteristics of the institutions represented by the respective individual respondents.

#### Characteristics of the Institutions Represented by the Respondents

Of the 69 internship coordinators responding to the questionnaire, 54 came from the public sector (78.3%) and 15 from the private sector (21.7%) institutions of higher education. Of the institutions being studied, 39 (56.5%) were located in an urban area, 13 (18.8%) in a suburban area, and 17 (24.6%) in a rural location. The urban setting was defined by the institution being within the city limits of a large Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA). The suburban institutions were those located outside the major city limits proper but still within a SMSA, and a rural institution as being located outside a SMSA altogether.

These institutions were further categorized by the level of education they provided. The distribution of institutions by level of education is presented in Table 3.

Level	Number	Percentage of Total Respondents
Associate	32	46.4
Baccalaureate	27	39.1
Graduate	10	14.5
Column total	69	100.0

Table 3: Level of Institution

In addition, total institutional enrollment, criminal justice program enrollment, and primary curriculum emphasis for each of the institutions surveyed is summarized in Table 4.

	Number	Percentage of Total Respondents
Total	Institutional Enr	ollment
Less than 2,000 students 2,001- 5,000 students 5,001-10,000 students 10,001+ students Column total	7 18 19 25 69	10.1 26.1 27.5 36.2 100.0
Total Crimi	nal Justice Progr	am Enrollment
Less than 100 students 100- 500 students 501-1,000 students 1,001+ students Column total	13 33 14 9 69	18.8 47.8 20.3 13.0 100.0
Primary Cur	riculum Emphasis	of Institution
Criminal Justice Corrections Law Enforcement Criminology Other Column total	37 1 11 19 <u>1</u> 69	53.6 1.4 15.9 27.5 1.4 100.0

Table 4: Internal Institutional Student Enrollment and Program Distributions

As noted in the results reported with regard to the characteristics of the institutions represented in the present study, there appear to be considerable differences from one program to the next with respect to primary curriculum emphasis, the number of students served as majors, and the overall size of the institutions as defined by student body enrollment.

Similar to the results discussed earlier with regard to the characteristics of the coordinators, these findings might best be explained again in light of the complex natures of both the criminal justice field and educational programs to serve its needs.

With respect to the descriptive data, it was felt some of the data warranted further analysis. In order to accomplish this task, Chi-squares and cross-tabulations were computed for each of the following variables: Associate, Baccalaureate, and Graduate programs with the state of the institution surveyed by means of the procedures developed in the SPSS statistical package for OS/360, Version H, release 8.0, October 15, 1979. The results of the analysis of differences between levels of institution by a function of the state of the institution surveyed are presented in Table 5.

Table 5 shows that the Chi-square tests for differences between the level of institution by the state where the institution is located are significant at the .05 level. This finding appears to reflect the difference between the number of two-year (Associate Degree) programs available in California when compared to all the states surveyed. The results tend to support the findings of Kobetz (1978), who reported that California had double the total number of institutions offering Associate Degree programs with 80, when compared to other two-year programs in the various states throughout the country.

	Cal	ifornia	Flo	rida	Micl	nigan	0th	iers	To	tal
	zI	82	ZI	<del>2</del> 6	ZI	<del>8</del> 8	zI	89	zI	<del>2</del> 6
Associate	20	69.0	2	38.5	4	33.3	κ	20.0	32	46.4
Baccalaureate	5	17.2	5	38.5	8	66.7	6	60.0	27	39.1
Graduate	4	13.8	က	23.1	0	00.00	n	20.0	10	14.5
Column total	29	42.0	13	18.8	12	17.4	15	21.7	69	100.0

Table 5: Chi-square Tests on Level of Institution by State of Institution Surveyed

Chi-square = 16.32779 with 6 degrees of freedom; significance = 0.0121.

The second analysis done using Chi-square assessed differences in the status of institutions (public and private) by the level of institutions (Associate, Bachelors, and Graduate). This analysis yielded a Chi-square of 12.65813, which was significant at the .05 level. These differences (presented in Table 6) reflect the fact that public institutions of higher learning appear to be more widely involved in the field of criminal justice education than is the case for colleges and universities that are funded privately. It is this writer's contention that the significant gap between the public and private institutions and program offerings will continue to grow for the foreseeable future. This position is based on the continuing difficult economic forces operating in the criminal justice field today. With the dismantling of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) and similar funding sources which were readily available during the past 10 years to both public and private institutions offering criminal justice programs, and the present inflationary spiral, it appears plausible that the private institutions will find criminal justice educational monies difficult to locate.

The last analysis assessing differences with regard to the descriptive variables was a Chi-square analysis of differences in primary curriculum emphasis (criminal justice, corrections, law enforcement, criminology) by level of institution (Associate, Baccalaureate, Graduate). As noted in Table 7, a Chi-square of 19.76 for six degrees of freedom was found to be significant at the .05 level of confidence.

	Acco	0+c+c	Daced	ot conne l		+0	F	-
	DCCH	LIALE	Darra	laurea ce	מומת	חם רב	5	, n
	zI	%	Z	%	z	%	zi	8
Public	31	96.9	16	59.3	7	70.0	54	78.3
Private	-	3.1	11	40.7	m	30.0	15	21.7
Column total	32	46.4	27	39.1	10	14.5	69	100.0

5
t
Ę
t.
S
Π
of
_
è,
á
2
B
S
0
Ē
Ę
Ċ.
ns
Η
of
S
t
ta
S
ы
S
st
e -
່ຍ
ar
Ъ
Š
÷
ວ
9
e
[d]
Ta

Chi-square = 12.64816 with 2 degrees of freedom; significance = 0.0018.

Institution
of
Level
þ
Emphasis
Curriculum
Primary
u
Tests
chi-square
0
7
Table

	Asso	ciate	Bacca	laureate	Gra	duate	Tot	ca l
	zI	<del>8</del> 6	zI	96	zI	<del>8</del> 8	zI	86
Criminal Justice Curriculum	11	34.4	18	66.7	ω	88.9	37	54.4
Corrections Curriculum	-	3.1	0	0.00	0	00.0	-	1.5
Law Enforcement Curriculum	11	34.4	0	0.00	0	0.00	Ξ	16.2
Criminology Curriculum	6	28.1	6	33.3	-	1.11	19	27.9
Column total	32	47.1	27	39.7	6	13.2	68	100.0

Chi-square = 19.76610 with 6 degrees of freedom; significance = 0.0030.

This explanation of differences in curriculum emphasis as a function of the level of institution appears to center on those differences of orientation between the two-year programs and those of the Baccalaureate and Graduate educational institutions. If the titles of the curricula being offered are a valid representation of the programs which they name, it can be assumed that the associate degree programs have a strong emphasis in the technical and skill training areas. In contrast, the titles of the four-year and graduate programs significantly more often represent a less practical and more theoretical approach to the study of crime. This raises a noteworthy question regarding the relationship between educational orientation and the types of internships selected for a given program, which is beyond the scope of the present study.

In addition to the practical orientation reflected in the curriculum titles of the two-year programs, there may also be a direct response to the demands for certification training by local police and correctional agencies on the part of these same two-year institutions. The two-year institution is perhaps in the best position to fulfill these educational needs in that they have been developed to respond to the needs of the communities they serve. Unlike many of the four-year and graduate institutions, the two-year institutions are located in population centers and can provide a maximum variety of programming with a flexibility of scheduling that could not be accomplished in the larger institutions which are not nearly as accessible and flexible in solving practical problems.

The data in Table 7 indicate that law enforcement and correctional curricula were offered <u>only</u> at the associate degree level. While programs labeled as criminal justice and/or criminology were offered at all institutional levels (Associate, Baccalaureate, and Graduate), the practical application of a corrections and law enforcement curriculum only at certain associate-level programs may reflect a practical orientation as discussed earlier. The more theoretical criminal justice and criminology curriculum of study appears at the baccalaureate and graduate levels of criminal justice programming, as noted by the respondents in Table 7.

#### Types of Internships Offered

Types of internships offered as a function of (a) the respondent state locations, (b) internal state regional areas, (c) respondent institutional levels, and (d) respondent institutional funding status were analyzed using the same Chi-square technique referred to above. The respondents were asked to clarify their programs in terms of 10 of the categories of experiential learning developed by Daley and Gordon (1977), as previously discussed in Chapter II.

#### Types of Internships Offered by State Geographical Areas

The results of these analyses showed that there were significant differences between state geographical areas on three types of internships, including Cross-cultural Experience, Work Experience (Cooperative Education), and Field Research. The data for these three variables can be found in Tables 8, 9, and 10. Table 8 shows that there was a significant Chi-square (8.82 and 3 <u>df</u>, p < .05) among the state geographic areas with respect to providing Cross-cultural Experience in their respective criminal justice internship programs. The data indicated that the differences were most pronounced between respondents reporting from California and those reporting from all remaining states surveyed. The schools in California reported using Cross-cultural Experience to a greater degree than their counterparts in other areas of the country.

Similarly, the results reported in Table 9 reveal significant differences between the state geographical areas with respect to the use of Work Experience (Cooperative Education) forms of internship. The analysis yielded a Chi-square value of 10.17 for 3 <u>df</u>, which was significant at the .05 level. Again California differed from the other areas in terms of implementing these types of experiential learning experiences. In addition, Florida was unique in its lack of use of the Work Experience and Cooperative Education internship.

In contrast to the results reported for Cross-cultural Experience and Work Experience (Cooperative Education) internships, the data indicated that there was a significant lack of the use of Field Research placements, as noted in Table 10. Comparisons between geographical areas showed that the respondents from Florida indicated in 100 percent of the cases that they did not use Field Research placements, with California responding "No" in 86.2 percent, Michigan in 75.0 percent, and Others 53.3 percent. The Chi-square for these variables equalled 16.68 for 3  $\underline{df}$  and was significant at the .05 level.

	[a].	i forni a	Flo	uri da	MiC	hinan	÷	arc	L L	tal
	Z	<i>36</i>	. <b>z</b>	2 26	Z	24 24	5 2	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	z	<i>3</i> 6
Yes	6	31.0	-	7.7	0	0.0	-	6.7	=	15.9
No	20	69.0	12	92.3	12	100.0	14	93.3	58	84.1
Column total	29	42.0	13	18.8	12	17.4	15	21.7	69	100.0
Chi coura - 0 020E1	C 4+ P-1					- 0 0317				

xperience by State of Institution	
ers Cross-cultural E	
of Internship Off	
Chi-square Tests	Surveved
Table 8:	

Chi-square = 8.82851 with 3 degrees of freedom; significance = 0.0317.

Geograph	ic Areas									
	Cal	ifornia	Floi	rida	Mich	igan	Oth	lers	To	tal
	<b>Z</b>	86	zI	86	zI	86	ZI	8	Z	86
Yes	25	86.2	ъ	38.5	7	58.3	10	66.7	47	68.1

State	
þ	
Education	
Cooperative	
or	
Experience	
Work	
Offers	
Internship	
of	
Tests	Areas
Chi-square	Geographic
Table 9:	

Chi-square = 10.17725 with 3 degrees of freedom; significance = 0.0171.

31.9

22

33.3

ഹ

41.7

ഹ

61.5

ω

13.8

4

٩

100.0

69

21.7

15

17.4

12

18.8

13

42.0

29

Column total

	Cali	fornia	Flo	rida	Mich	igan	Otl	lers	Tot	al
	zI	<del>8</del> 4	ZI	<del>8</del> 4	ZI	89	zI	<del>2</del> 6	zi	<del>3</del> 6
Yes	4	13.8	0	0.0	m	25.0	7	46.7	14	20.3
No	25	86.2	13	100.0	6	75.0	ω	53.3	55	79.7

n Surveyed
Institutior
y State of
Research b
rs Field
ship Offe
f Interns
Tests o
Chi-square
Table 10:

Chi-square = 10.68325 with 3 degrees of freedom; significance = 0.0136.

100.0

69

21.7

15

17.4

12

18.8

13

42.0

29

Column total

I

The differences between geographical areas noted above with regard to the types of experiential learning again can best be explained in terms of the types of diverse missions found in criminal justice education. As shown, California reported a much higher use of Cross-cultural Experience and Work Experience (Cooperative Education) oriented programming when compared to the other geographical areas. In terms of the former, the emphasis on Cross-cultural Experience type internships probably reflects the interest on the part of California educators to meet the needs of its large minority communities. This would be especially true with respect to the Hispanics, who have a strong and unique cultural heritage.

This raises the question as to why the Florida and Michigan areas do not give greater emphasis to Cross-cultural learning experiences. One possible explanation related to the fact that the main minority groups in these areas are in some ways different from those found in California. While it is true that Florida has had for many years a large Spanish-speaking population, it should be noted that until the past year these people have been an integral part of the communities in which they live. Unlike the Hispanics residing in the West, the individuals comprising the Florida group have a heritage stemming directly from Europe. In addition, many of the Cubans, especially in the Miami area, are from traditionally middle- and upper-class backgrounds and were the merchants and professionals in pre-Castro Cuba. Therefore, even though these people do have special needs related to language, their value system is very similar to that found in the larger culture.

A few comments should also be made about the other large minority groups, particularly the blacks, in the geographical areas studied. It can be argued that it would be very difficult to program for Crosscultural Experience internships in that these people differ from the larger American culture only in very diffuse ways. Unlike the Chicanos, these other groups are a group within a group and their culture is a variation on the dominant cultural theme. Often the lines between one value system and the other are vague, and many times are indistinguishable.

Other differences that must be accounted for are those reported above with respect to Work Experience or Cooperative Education internship experiences. The findings indicate that California offers these types of placements to a greater extent than the other areas sampled. Several possible explanations can be used for these results. First, it could be argued that because of the large number of city colleges attuned to community needs, as discussed previously, the California schools have a stronger focus in developing internship programs which reflect the technical and skill aspects of the criminal justice professions. In contrast, the other programs, even though many are based in urban areas, do not appear to be as technical or pragmatically oriented.

The second possible explanation reflects directly upon the definition of the various experiential learning types employed in the present study. As noted earlier, these definitions were taken directly from the CAEL guidelines, one of the accepted voices in the field of cooperative education. Unfortunately, the possibility exists

that the results reflect a basic confusion on the part of the respondents with respect to the defined meaning of each of the 10 categories used in this study that CAEL advocates. This would provide a much more logical explanation of the large discrepancy found between the California and Florida respondents in that these educational institutions, to a great extent, also issue associate degrees where appropriate and reflect similar needs.

The confusion over definition also seems to be the logical explanation with respect to significant differences found in the assessment of the use of Field Research placements. It is felt that many of the institutions surveyed were in all probability assigning students to agencies which have a primary focus on Field Research tasks. This would be particularly the case with those students who are routinely assigned to the various planning and evaluation units within the criminal justice field. However, it can be argued that often times the work done by such units is viewed more in terms of their service value than with respect to the actual functions which they carry out. Added evidence for this position comes from the results to be discussed in more depth later, on student requirements, which clearly document that many of the internship programs require the students to carry out projects during this part of their educational experiences.

In addition to the significant results presented above with respect to differences between state geographical areas and the types of experiential learning programs offered their students, data for the other seven classes of experiential learning can be found in

Appendix B. The summary of these data shows that with the exception of the three classes of experiential learning for which significant differences were found, the state geographical areas are consistent in their development and selection of internship placements.

# Types of Internships Offered by State Regional Areas

In contrast to the data presented on internship placement as a function of state regional areas (urban, suburban, or rural), no significant differences were found when categories of educational experiences were analyzed with respect to those same state regional areas. The data for the 10 classes of experiential learning in terms of urban, suburban, and rural split can be found in Appendix C.

These results likely reflect the fact that crime is still overwhelmingly a problem of the big cities, in spite of recent trends showing rapid increases in suburban and rural criminal activity. Because of its concentration within the urban area, by far the greatest number of experiential learning activities are to be found in these settings. Thus, educational programs, no matter where their regional location exists, must concentrate on the urban areas for the major development of their internships in criminal justice.

#### Types of Internships Offered by Level of Instruction

Analysis of the data on type of experiential learning as a function of educational level (Associate, Baccalaureate, and Graduate) of the responding institutions yielded one significant Chi-square

(10.33) for 2 <u>df</u>, which was significant at the .05 level for Work Experience (Cooperative Education) types of internships. The findings presented in Table 11 indicate that those programs at the associate level clearly use the work-oriented category of internship to a greater extent than is the case for either the bachelor degree or graduate degree programs.

In order to discuss these results, the basic difference and orientation presented elsewhere in this dissertation with respect to educational orientation and philosophy between two-year, four-year, and graduate facilities must be considered. Traditionally, those institutions offering solely an associates level of education have catered strongly to the vocational, technical, and commercial needs found in their immediate surroundings. Therefore, it should not be surprising that these departments would gravitate to work in cooperative settings to a significantly greater extent than the four-year and graduate institutions. The latter, by and large, are much more concerned with theoretical and academic pursuits.

No significant differences among the three educational levels were found on any other of the experiential learning categories. The results for these types of experiences can be found in Appendix D.

# Types of Experiential Learning by Status of Institution

No significant differences were found between public and private institutions with regard to the types of experiential learning the respondents indicated their respective institutions selected for their students. (The data for this analysis are in Appendix E.)

ffered by Level	Total
) Internships 0	Graduate
Cooperative Education	ccalaureate
f Work Experience (	sociate Ba
Chi-square Tests o of Institution	As
Table 11:	

	Asso	ciate	Baccal	laureate	Grad	uate	To	tal
	zI	82	zI	84	zI	96	zI	86
Yes	28	87.5	14	51.9	ъ	50.0	47	68.1
No	4	12.5	13	48.1	ъ	50.0	22	31.9
Column total	32	46.4	27	39.1	10	14.5	69	100.0

Chi-square = 10.33591 with 2 degrees of freedom; significance = 0.0057.

As noted in the previous discussion, internship placement appears to be more a function of the location of the opportunities than a direct result of the characteristics of the institutions themselves. Therefore, it is not surprising that both the public and private schools are remarkably similar in this area.

# Section II: Supervision and Operational Issues and Concerns

As noted in Chapter I, four primary issues were focused upon in the present study. In the interest of organization and clarity, the results pertaining to each one of these topics are presented separately. This format is necessitated because of the large number of individual analyses required by the type of data collected. Therefore, the specific topics discussed are: (1) collect detailed and factual information that will enable the researcher to assess the level(s) of academic supervision of criminal justice internship programs in selected Associate, Baccalaureate, and Graduate institutions within the states of California, Florida, and Michigan, respectively; (2) secure relevant viewpoints and information from internship coordinators concerning specific issues and operational concerns involved in designing and implementing a criminal justice internship program; (3) analyze the extent of agreement or disagreement on the issues and concerns examined; and (4) develop from the data collected a set of normative statements concerning the desirable characteristics of present criminal justice internship programs.

In order to evaluate academic internship supervision, a number of different characteristics, including the individual(s) approving

the internship, the individual(s) evaluating the internship, the types of evaluation used, the student grading system, and the agency responsible for the supervision were assessed as a function of the individual states, states' internal regional areas, academic level of the institution (Associate, Baccalaureate, or Graduate), and the status (Public or Private) of the institution. These data were analyzed using the same Chi-square techniques discussed previously in the results section.

# <u>Characteristics of Internship</u> <u>Supervision by State Geographic</u> <u>Location</u>

Analysis of the data related to supervision of internship programs as a function of the individual responding states by means of Chi-square resulted in only two of these factors being significant. Significant differences were found with respect to differences between the states surveyed by their use of student journals for evaluation and the institutions' grading format. It was found that there was considerable variability with respect to how the various state institutions employ their use of student journals in the evaluation process, with the largest differences being between California and Michigan. The Chi-square for these differences equalled 7.63 for 3 <u>df</u>, which was significant at the .05 level (see Table 12). This finding is of particular interest in that it was the only student evaluation format on which significant differences were found.

The differences found between the states and their use of journals as a means of student evaluation are difficult to explain.

Table 12:	Chi-square	. Tests	s of Students	Evalu	ated by	Journals	by State	of In	stitution	Surveyed	_
		Cal	ifornia	Flo	rida	Mich	ıİgan	ot	hers	Ĩ	otal
		Z	8	z	8	Z	%	Z	%	Z	%
Yes		e	10.3	с	23.1	9	50.0	4	26.7	16	23.2
N		26	89.7	10	76.9	9	50.0	=	73.3	53	76.8
Column	total	29	42.0	13	18.8	12	17.4	15	21.7	69	100.0
Chi-square	i = 7.63093	with 3	degrees of	freedo	m; sign	ificance	= 0.0543.				

0.0543.
11
significance
freedom;
of
degrees
e
with
7.63093
B
ni-square

Several alternative reasons may be given for these results. First, there may well be some definitional problems as to what constitutes a journal. Therefore, programs which use a broad category of projects could conceivably view the keeping of a daily log in terms of a term project rather than the development of a journal. Second, the process of assigning students responsibility for keeping a journal may not be considered a traditional academic pursuit and therefore would not be valued as a legitimate means of student evaluation. Last, a possibility exists that even though journals are assigned to students they are not considered, in many cases, in the evaluation process and therefore become, in a sense, a "busy work" assignment.

The second variable pertaining to internship supervision as a function of state geographic area of which significant differences were noted was related to the type of grading system used to evaluate students. The results presented in Table 13 clearly indicate the large amount of variability across the various types of grades that can be used for the different state geographic areas. As noted in the table, both California and Michigan used the numerical system along with the SU format as its primary means of grading. To add to the variability, those schools comprising the other geographical area used alphabetical (ABCD) grading most frequently while relying on the SU format as their second most common way of assigning grades. These differences yielded a Chi-square equalling 28.89 with 18 df, which was significant at the .05 level.

	Cali	ifornia	FIC	nrida	Mich	ıigan	Oth	lers	IC	tal
	Z	26	ZI	<del>9</del> 6	ZI	8	ZI	96	ZI	%
4,3,2,1	15	53.6	5	41.7	7	63.6	2	14.3	29	44.6
C NC	£	17.9	-	8.3	-	9.1	0	0.0	7	10.8
ΡF	2	۲.۲	0	0.0	-	9.1	2	14.3	£	7.7
S U	-	3.6	5	41.7	-	9.1	4	28.6	11	16.9
A,B,C,D	n	10.7	-	8.3	-	9.1	£	35.7	10	15.4
C NC or 1,2,3	2	۲.٦	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	3.1
P F or 1,2,3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	-	7.1	-	1.5
Column total	28	43.1	12	18.5	=	16.9	14	21.5	65	100.0

.0497.
0
gnificance =
S.
freedom;
of
degrees
18
with
.89403
28
II
Chi-square

It is quite likely that the differences in grading systems are dictated by general administrative practices of the representative schools from which each program was sampled. In most cases the universities, community colleges, and junior colleges do not allow individual departments the privilege of originating unique grading systems within their own units. In addition, there is a tendency, especially in undergraduate programs, to use grading systems that are easily interpretable by the graduate and professional schools to which their students might apply. Therefore, many of the programs as indicated by the present research would opt for a four-point numerical or alphabetical system.

In addition to the variables related to the evaluation of students presented above, no significant differences were found with respect to the individual approving the internship (V-44), the agency responsible for the evaluation of the internship (V-45), and the use of outside supervision (V-64). These results are summarized in Appendix F. With respect to the individual approving proposed internships, the respondents indicated that generally this responsibility was assigned to either the chairman of the department or a faculty member. In terms of the agent evaluating the student, this responsibility in the majority of cases was either shared between the faculty and the agency or the faculty and the student participant. (The results for Variable 55 are presented in Appendix F.) With respect to the origin of supervision, an overwhelming number of respondents indicated that the outside agency has responsibility for supervising the student. These data appear to indicate that with respect to the

supervision aspects of internship programming, the responsibility is shared between the educational institution and the agency providing the educational experience.

# <u>Characteristics of Internship</u> <u>Supervision by State Regional Areas</u>

The data for internship supervision as a function of the state regional areas are presented in Appendix G. One significant difference between urban, suburban, and rural areas was found when these results were analyzed by means of Chi-square. The difference found with respect to who is responsible for the student being evaluated in the internship program (V-45) in the various state regional locations (Urban, Suburban, or Rural) was significant at the .05 level with a Chi-square of 18.03 and 10 df. Perusal of this information summarized in Table 14 shows that with respect to evaluating the internship experience, the urban institutions employ a faculty and agency coordinated evaluation effort as the basic formula for evaluating their interns. Suburban and Rural evaluation efforts bring the student into the evaluation process with the faculty and agency established coordinated involvement. This evaluation activity involving directly all parties concerned speaks highly of the effort to coordinate and monitor internship programs within the respective state regional locations of the various institutions. Only a few respondents (8) involving 12.1 percent of the total population surveyed indicated that only faculty members evaluated the participating student interns, and this may reflect a difficulty in coordinating evaluation efforts.

Table 14: Chi-square Tests of	Student	Evaluation	in Inte	rnship P	rogram b	y State R	egional Le	vels
		Jrban	Sub	urban		Rural	•	Total
	Z	24	Z	%	Z	<b>%</b>	ZI	<del>8</del> 6
Faculty	5	13.5	0	0.0	e	18.8	ω	12.1
Agency	L	2.7	-	7.7	-	6.3	r	4.5
Faculty and Agency	24	69.9	4	30.8	£	31.3	33	50.0
Faculty, Agency and Student	7	18.9	7	53.8	9	37.5	20	30.3
Faculty and Peers	0	0.0	0	0.0	-	6.3	-	1.5
None	0	0.0	-	7.7	0	0.0	-	1.5
Column total	37	56.1	13	19.7	16	24.2	99	100.0

Le
Regional
State
þ
Program
Internship
in
Evaluation
Student
of
Tests
Chi-square
14:
Table

Chi-square = 18.03416 with 10 degrees of freedom; significance = 0.0544.

Perusal of the information summarized in Appendix G shows that with respect to internship approval (V-44) the faculty and chairperson share primary responsibility for approving the student's internship program. The findings with respect to who approves the internship are similar to those previously reported when the aspect of supervision is considered in light of states' geographic locations.

When dealing with the specific techniques used in evaluating students, it is interesting to note that the use of written reports by the students appears to be the most consistent procedure employed for evaluative purposes (see Appendix G). All other forms of evaluation are used by some of the institutions but not to the degree that is found with the written reports. The one exception is formal testing (V-53), which is important in that it is rarely used by the respondents of the present study.

With respect to the internship grading format (V-55), no differences were found with respect to the grading system employed as a result of geographical regional status. As was the case with the state comparisons presented earlier, those systems based on a fourpoint numeric format or its letter-grade equivalent were most prevalent. Again, in the area of outside agency supervision responsibilities (V-64), the results indicate that the agency in which an individual is placed is generally given this task and they respond accordingly.

On the basis of these results, it is apparent that urban, suburban, and rural differences in the location of an educational institution have little, if any, effect on policies related to supervision

of students in criminal justice internships. The important finding in these data and in those presented in the previous section is the apparent willingness on the part of criminal justice educators to share important responsibilities with both the students and the agency providing the internship.

#### <u>Characteristics of Internship</u> <u>Supervision by Academic Level</u>

The results generated for the characteristics of internship supervision as a function of academic level can be found in Appendix H. Again, no significant differences were found between the Associate, Baccalaureate, and Graduate institutions and between the supervision they provided their students. The same patterns noted in the previous two sections are generally consistent with the data reported in Appendix H. Again, the important findings concern the willingness on the part of the respondents to share supervision and evaluation tasks with both the students and agency personnel.

## <u>Characteristics of Internship</u> <u>Supervision by Status Levels</u> of Institution

The results relating to the characteristics of internship supervision to the status of the institution are presented in Appendix I. As noted in this Appendix, three of the variables--person(s) approving proposed internship (V-44), visitations as a part of the evaluation process (V-50), and the use of a journal for evaluation purposes (V-51)--yielded significant Chi-squares. In the latter two cases, because of the assumptions noted in Siegel (1956), the corrected

Chi-square procedure was used to interpret the data. No differences between public and private institutions were found on the remaining nine variables tested in this category.

The differences found on Variable 44 between public and private institutions with respect to who is responsible for approving the internship were significant at the .05 level, Chi-square = 15.27 for 7 <u>df</u> (see Table 15). Analysis of Table 15 shows that while the public institutions tend to share responsibility for approving internship programs between the faculty, chairman, and others, the power of approval in the private schools is concentrated in the office of the chairman. Possibly the best explanation of this finding centers on the fact that the faculty and staff in public institutions are comprised of greater numbers, thus allowing the departmental administrator to delegate such responsibilities.

The next two variables on which significant differences were found between public and private schools relate to the process of evaluating students. The findings presented in Table 16 show that the public and private institutions are almost reverse of each other in terms of using visitation as an evaluation technique. In this case public schools much more frequently visit students placed in internships than is the reported case for private institutions. These differences are significant at the .05 level, corrected Chisquare equalling 4.71 with 1 <u>df</u>; significance equals .05. In Table 16, as with the previous results of the internship program, it appears that the differences presented with regard to the use of visitations is probably a function of differences in the numbers of faculty
	Pul	olic	۲	ivate	To	tal
	Z	%	ZI	89	Z	%
Faculty	13	25.5	-	6.7	14	21.2
Cha i rman	7	13.7	6	60.0	16	24.2
Committee	2	3.9	-	6.7	r	4.5
Field Coordinator	9	11.8	0	0.0	9	9.1
Study Coordinator	-	2.0	0	0.0	-	1.5
Everybody	10	19.6	2	13.3	12	18.2
Chairman and Field Coordinator	£	9.8	-	6.7	9	9.1
Student and Coordinator	7	13.7	-	6.7	ω	12.1
Column total	51	77.3	15	22.7	66	100.0

Status
Institutional
þ
Approval
Internship
of
Tests
Chi-square
15:
Table .

Chi-square = 15.27828 with 7 degrees of freedom; significance = 0.0326.

	Pub	l ic	Pri	vate	Tot	al
	ZI	۶۹	ZI	89	zI	88
Yes	37	68.5	ß	33.3	42	60.9
No	17	31.5	10	66.7	27	39.1
Column total	54	78.3	15	21.7	69	100.0

Table 16: Chi-square Tests of Students Evaluated by Visitations by Status of Institution

Corrected Chi-square = 4.71375 with 1 degree of freedom; significance = 0.0299.

Raw Chi-square = 6.10155 with 1 degree of freedom; significance = 0.0135.

personnel available when public institutions are compared to those funded privately. It could be argued that such visits, if done on a routine basis, would require a significant number of man hours, a luxury that the private school cannot afford.

The last variable (V-51) on which significant differences between public and private institutions were found deals with the use of journals. In this case, the private schools appeared to use journals as a means of evaluating students in a greater proportion of cases than did the public schools. In fact, the respondents from the private schools were almost equally divided between those who used journals and those who didn't, while the results for the public schools showed a disproportionate number of schools that did not use this method of evaluation. The corrected Chi-square for these differences was 4.36 with 1 df, which was significant at the .05 level (Table 17). These findings probably reflect the need on the part of private schools to use alternative evaluative procedures which minimize the need for extensive staff.

On all other variables assessing the impact of public or private status on internship supervision, no differences were found. Again, with the exception of the variables just presented, there appears to be a general willingness to share responsibility with students and agency staff in important supervisory matters among all programs sampled.

nstitution	Total	<b>N</b>
ournals by Status of I	Private	<b>N</b>
Chi-square Tests of Students Evaluated by Jo	Public	<u>N</u>
Table 17:		

significance = 0.0366.	<sup>•</sup> icance = 0.0149.
reedom;	; signif
ee of fi	freedom
degr	e of
with ]	degre
2	_
.3669	with
4	72
li av	931
lari	5
squ	H
chi-	Juare
ed	-50
ect	Chi
Corr	Raw

62

76.8

53

53.3

ω

83.3

45

23.2

16

46.7

~

16.7

თ

Yes

٩

100.0

69

21.7

15

78.3

54

Column total

### <u>Operational Issues and Concerns of</u> <u>Criminal Justice Internship Programs</u>

The second major purpose of this study was to secure relevant viewpoints and information from those responding internship coordinators concerning specific issues and operational concerns involved in designing and implementing a criminal justice internship program. Ten survey questions (Appendix A) were used to generate these data; they included Questions 15 through 20, 27 through 29, and Question 32. These questions in turn yielded information resulting in the 19 variables used in the analysis in the present section. These variables will be discussed in terms of their relationship to (1) state geographical areas, (2) state regional areas, (3) academic level of internship program, and (4) status of institutions.

Organizational issues and concerns by state geographical areas. The results of the analysis of the program operations data as a function of state geographical area can be found in Appendix J. Six of the variables (V-33, V-37, V-38, V-39, V-56, and V-62) yielded differences as a result of variation between state geographical areas. They included internship selection based on college grade point average (V-33), the terms internships were offered (V-37), the ordinary duration of the internship (V-38), the time commitment by the participant to the internship program (V-39), funding available to students participating in field study (V-56), and limited placement sites available to participating students (V-62). No such differences were indicated by the other 13 variables concerned with the operations of criminal justice programs.

The first significant Chi-square test of 7.75 with 3 df that was significant at the .05 level was developed between state geographic areas (California, Florida, Michigan, and Others) with respect to the internship selection being determined by a student's college grade point average (V-33). Table 18 shows that Michigan requires the college grade point average of the potential internship candidate be considered in almost 42 percent of the responding institutions. In contrast, California requires that the student's college grade point average be considered in less than 7 percent of the reporting institutions. This might be explained by the number of two-year institutions, as previously discussed, that exist in California than in the other responding state geographical locales, and/or the emphasis on practical-need-related associate degree programs that are offered in California, giving all students an opportunity to participate in an internship experience regardless of their grade point average.

Michigan, on the other hand, had the largest single percentage (67%) of four-year respondent institutions, and this may reflect an existing attrition rate involving grade point average as a selection device for criminal justice internship participation. Second, a larger degree of internship requirements involving grade point average between Michigan four-year institutions may exist due to competitive quality placement sites available to the respective institutions. Last, Michigan institutions may simply use college grade point averages as an incentive for students interested in participating in a criminal justice internship program.

	Cali	fornia	Flo	rida	Mich	า1ุดม	Oth	lers		tal
	Z	<b>=</b> 29)	= )	:13)	ž)	=1Ž)	۳ ۳	-15) 	2	=69)
	ZI	86	Z	26	zI	84	ZI	84	Z	26
Yes	~	6.9	m	23.1	ъ	41.7	പ	33.3	15	21.7
No	27	93.1	10	76.9	7	58.3	10	66.7	54	78.3
Column total	29	42.0	13	18.8	12	17.4	15	21.7	69	100.0
Chi_connare = 7 75460 with	2 der	rees of fr	- mobee	cinnifi	- anco	0 0514				

by State	I
Average	I
Point	
Grade	
College	,
uo	
Based	
Selection	
Internship	yed
of	rve
Tests	ton Su
Chi-square	of Institut
::	
Table 1	

0.0014. /./54by with 3 degrees of treedom; significance Ch1-square

A Chi-square of 21.49 with 9 df, which was significant at the .05 level, is noted in Table 19 for differences between state geographic areas with respect to the number of terms they offer internship programs. The significant differences reported in this table reflect variation between California and the other geographical entities being assessed. Respondents from California indicate that they are fairly well divided in offering internship programs of two terms, three terms, and on a yearly basis. In contrast, in the other state geographical areas evaluated, the largest proportion of cases indicated internships could be taken during any term during the year. There is some confusion inherent in interpreting the results on this variable. It can be argued that in some of the cases the selection of either two terms or three terms carries the same meaning, depending upon whether the institution is on a semester or quarter basis. However, analysis of the individual cells in Table 19 indicates that only in the case of California would there be a significant shift in the results if the two categories were combined. Overall, it is clear that most criminal justice programs surveyed attempt to maximize the opportunity for participation in experiential learning by making it available throughout the calendar year.

The third variable on which significant differences were found between state geographical areas dealt with the number of terms comprising the duration of the internship. This analysis yielded a Chi-square of 18.42 with 9 <u>df</u>, which was significant at the .05 level. Analysis of Table 20 indicates a large degree of variation between all of the state geographical areas with respect to the number of

	Cal	ifornia	Flo	rida	Mich	nigan	0th	iers	To	tal
	ZI	8	Z	96	Z	82	z	89	ZI	88
l term	0	0.0	-	7.7	0	0.6	-	6.7	2	3.0
2 terms	6	32.1	2	15.4	-	9.1	0	0.0	12	17.9
3 terms	12	42.9	0	0.0	ĸ	27.3	4	26.7	19	28.4
4 terms	7	25.0	10	76.9	7	63.6	10	66.7	34	50.7
Column total	28	41.8	13	19.4	=	16.4	15	22.4	67	100.0
Chi-square = 21.49167 wi	th 9 d	egrees of	freedom	I; signif	icance	= 0.0106.				

Table 19: Chi-square Tests of Terms Internships Are Offered by State of Institution Surveyed

	Cal	i fornia	Flo	rida	Mich	nigan	0th	lers	T	tal
	z	<del>8</del> 6	z	<del>2</del> 6	ZI	<del>9</del> 6	ZI	<del>2</del> 5	Z	%
Less than one term	-	3.7	0	0.0	2	18.2	0	0.0	ĸ	4.6
One term	14	51.9	6	75.0	5	45.5	14	93.3	42	64.6
More than one term	12	44.4	2	16.7	ĸ	27.3	-	6.7	18	27.7
Combinations	0	0.0	-	8.3	-	9.1	0	0.0	2	3.1
Column total	27	41.5	12	18.5	=	16.9	15	23.1	65	100.0

Table 20: Chi-square Tests of Ordinary Duration of Internship by State of Institution

Chi-square = 18.42288 with 9 degrees of freedom; significance = 0.0306.

terms that they require a student to participate in an internship activity. The one clear finding is that the majority of respondents require students to participate in one or more terms of experiential learning with few programs accepting less than one term of field experience. This finding can be interpreted to mean that the respondents participating in the present study consider experiential learning an important enough component of criminal justice education to warrant significant allocations of time for its pursuit. However, this emphasis must be tempered by the fact that only 20.3 percent of those participating in the study require internship experiences, even though all of the programs sampled have an experiential learning component in their programs. (See Question 15 in Appendix A.)

The analysis of the amount of time commitment of the internship experience as a function of the state wherein the institution is located yielded a Chi-square of 18.65 for 9  $\underline{df}$ , which was significant at the .05 level. These results, which are summarized in Table 21, showed that all of the state geographical areas extensively use parttime internship experiences. While the greatest number of respondents from California indicate that their programs are characterized by part-time internships, the other geographical areas show much more variation in the use of alternative scheduling practices. For example, Florida, Michigan, and other institutions surveyed also used fulltime internships, or combinations of both full-time and part-time experiences. Again, these results reflect a lack of uniformity with respect to criminal justice practices in the criminal justice education field throughout the country. In all likelihood, the results

	Cali	ifornia	Flo	ırida	Micl	higan	Oth	lers	Ţ	otal
	ZI	84	zI	8	zI	86	ZI	89	ZI	86
Full time	0	0.0	-	8.3	ĸ	27.3	2	33.3	6	13.6
Part time	25	89.3	ω	66.7	9	54.5	œ	53.3	47	71.2
Work study	2	7.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	3.0
Full or part time	-	3.6	r	25.0	2	18.2	2	13.3	8	12.1
Column total	28	42.4	12	18.2	=	16.7	15	22.7	99	100.0

Chi-square Tests of the Time Commitment of Internship Experience by State of Institution Surveyed Table 21:

.

Chi-square = 18.65131 with 9 degrees of freedom; significance = 0.0283.

reflect unique needs of the institutions and the communities they served in the sample population.

The fifth variable for which significant differences were found related to funds available to students for field study as a function of state geographical areas. The data in Table 22 indicate a Chi-square equal to 21.50 for 6 df, which was significant at the .05 level. As noted in Table 22, Florida differed most dramatically from the other geographical areas in that all of the respondents from this state indicated that no financial support was available to the students attending its programs. In contrast, a number of the respondents from the other states indicated that they subsidize students either in terms of a stipend or attempted to pay work-related expenses. Probably the variation in these funding practices reflects differences in the budgeting processes of the state agencies from the area sampled. Those states that are most fiscally conservative probably reflect their economic postures in the amount of funds made available to the agencies in which criminal justice students would normally intern. Thus, it could be expected that the surplus funds that are normally used to support students in experiential learning programs would be sparse at best.

The results in Table 23 show that significant differences existed between the state geographical areas with respect to the availability of internship placement sites. The Chi-square for this analysis equalled 7.70 for 3 <u>df</u>, which was significant at the .05 level. With the exception of California, the other state geographical areas sampled in the majority of cases appeared to have little difficulty

Institution
itate of
by S
Study
Field
for
Students
to
Available
f Funds
ts o
Tes
Chi-square Surveyed
Table 22:

	Cali	ifornia	Ē	orida	Mich	ıigan	0th	iers	To	tal
	Z	<del>8</del> 6	zI	89	zI	<del>8</del> 6	Z	<del>2</del> 6	Z	%
Yes	2	۲.٦	0	0.0	2	18.2	8	53.3	12	18.2
No	20	71.4	12	100.0	7	63.6	5	33.3	44	66.7
No cost	9	21.4	0	0.0	2	18.2	2	13.3	10	15.2
Column total	28	42.4	12	18.2	1	16.7	15	22.7	66	100.0

Chi-square = 21.50844 with 6 degrees of freedom; significance = 0.0015.

	Cali	fornia	FIG	orida	Mich	ıigan	0th	iers	Tc	tal
	zI	8	zi	88	zI	89	zI	89	ZI	<del>8</del> 8
Yes	12	41.4	0	0.0	ĸ	25.0	£	33.3	20	29.0
No	17	58.6	13	100.0	6	75.0	10	66.7	49	71.0
Column total	29	42.0	13	18.8	12	17.4	15	21.7	69	100.0

Table 23: Chi-square Tests of Limited Placement Sites by State of Institution Surveyed

Chi-square = 7.70058 with 3 degrees of freedom; significance = 0.0526.

in securing internship placements for their students. However, in California there was a more even split between those indicating difficulty in finding sites and those responding that the sites were available. Part of the problem in California may stem from the fact that the competition between educational institutions for a fixed number of placements is more keen than would be the case for the other geographical areas surveyed. It is noted in Table 23 that the number of institutions responding from California was at minimum twice that of every other reporting area.

The remaining variables summarized in Appendix J were not significant with respect to differences attributable to state geographical area. However, the data contained in Appendix J reveal some interesting characteristics with respect to some of the organizational practices of all the institutions sampled.

One of the most interesting findings, alluded to above, relates to Variable 31, which assessed the obligation of participating in an internship program. The data clearly show that while all programs responding to the survey had internship programs, the majority in fact did not require their students to participate in them. There are a number of different explanations for this practice. First, some programs use the internship experience as a reward for those students who have excelled in school. In this case, the internship placements have been developed as potential entry points into the criminal justice professions. Second, many programs have sizable numbers of students already employed in criminal justice occupations. Often times it is felt that requiring such students to participate

in a field placement poses an undue hardship upon an individual already working in the field. Third, the philosophy of education of many programs is based upon the notion that effective educational experiences can best be achieved by maximizing the alternatives available for a given individual. Therefore, while internships are considered a valuable asset for some students, other types of programming may be considered equally important for others.

The item that received the strongest consensus of the respondents to the survey (V-32) dealt with the use of high school grades as a determinant for internship placement. As noted in Appendix J, every respondent indicated that these data did not enter into their decisions. This total lack of consideration probably stems from a question of domain with respect to who makes the decisions in higher education.

In addition to Variable 32, Variables 34 and 35 also dealt with the practices used to select students for internships. In both cases there appeared to be a fairly even spread of variation on whether students and faculty and staff were instrumental in the selection process. This again reflects a lack of uniform procedures with respect to the daily workings of criminal justice education programs.

It is important to note that the respondents strongly indicated that the objectives of their internship programs (V-40) were formally stated. This practice indicates that an attempt is being widely made in the field to avoid problems of communication with regard to experiential learning. It would be interesting to see the relationship between the objectives of one program with those of the others

to see how consistent the standards for these programs really are.

•

Evaluation of faculty attitudes toward criminal justice internship programming was sampled by Variable 57. These results showed that the attitudes expressed by faculty were strongly in favor of experiential learning. These findings with those reported elsewhere in this chapter clearly indicate a commitment on the part of criminal justice educators for experiential components in their curriculum.

Variables 58 and 59 deal with specific problems that faculty encounter with respect to internship programs. In the case of these two variables, the respondents indicated that they were fairly equally distributed between those who had time and supervision problems and those who did not. These differences in all likelihood reflect problems associated with variation in the demands placed on individual faculty members' time as a function of the individual institutions in which they work.

Another finding of the present study relates to the data for Variable 60, which evaluated difficulties stemming from campuswide communication. The individuals sampled clearly indicated, as a group, that this was not a major issue with respect to the internship programs. This finding takes on added importance when the current emphasis on communication breakdown is considered. One possible explanation is that once an internship program is approved, its implementation and administration require relatively little communication throughout the parent institution. It might be argued that the major

areas of communication focus on the relationship between a given department and the agencies at which it places students.

A similar trend was noted for Variable 61, dealing with oncampus coordination even though it was not as strong. Again, the majority of cases of those responding to the survey indicated that problems in on-campus coordination did not exist. However, in the present case more individuals did express some difficulty with respect to the coordination issue. The differences between the findings reported for communication and coordination could relate to the essential nature of each of these practices. It can be argued that communication takes place on a much more direct and personal level, which tends to minimize those problems associated with formal administrative structure. In contrast, coordination often times requires the involvement of the bureaucracy, thereby increasing the probability that problems will occur.

The last variable (V-66) summarized in Appendix J deals with problems related to liability of participants in internship programs. Respondents indicated in a majority of cases that this was not a significant issue with which they must deal. However, it should be noted that there were a number of cases in which concern was expressed with respect to the liability issue. It could be that this particular problem is situation specific in that those placements which are potentially dangerous for the students must be handled differently from those where no hazard exists.

Organizational issues and concerns by state regional areas. Data related to organizational issues and concerns as a function of

urban, suburban, and rural differences are presented in Appendix K. Of the 17 variables found in the Appendix, only one yielded significant differences as a function of the urban, suburban, and rural split. This variable (V-60) dealt with problems related to on-campus communication and resulted in a significant Chi-square of 7.28 with  $2 \frac{df}{df}$ , which was significant at the .05 level. A review of Table 24 indicates that the urban and rural areas overwhelmingly indicated that such problems did not exist on their campuses. However, in contrast, there was a more even split between those stating they had problems and those stating they did not from the respondents of the suburban areas. Finding a plausible explanation for this result is extremely difficult, unless the differences noted are really a function of a hidden variable not tapped by the present analysis.

With respect to the other 16 variables, summarized in Appendix K, similar explanations can be given to those used under the previous subheading. Again, the results indicate a high degree of consistency in terms of commitment to experiential learning and the lack of basic problems in administering and carrying out internship programs. With respect to the issue of liability, we find the same relative split between those having difficulties and those who are not for the urban, suburban, and rural categories that were reported with respect to state geographic areas.

Organizational issues and concerns by institutional level. The results pertaining to organizational issues as a function of the academic level are summarized in Appendix L. Four of these variables

	U	ban	Subu	ırban	Rı	ıral	T	tal
	Z	26	ZI	89	ZI	<del>8</del> 4	Z	8
Yes	5	5.1	4	30.8	-	5.9	7	10.1
No	37	94.9	6	69.2	16	94.1	62	89.9
Column total	39	56.5	13	18.8	17	24.6	69	100.0
			1		1000			

Chi-square Tests of On-Campus Communication Problems by Geographical Location of Institution Table 24:

Chi-square = 7.48170 with 2 degrees of freedom; significance = 0.0237.

(V-31, V-33, V-39, and V-57) yield significant differences between the Associate, Baccalaureate, and Graduate institutions.

The results related to these differences for Variable 31 are presented in Table 25. This analysis indicates that significant differences Chi-square equalling 24.34 with 10 df, which is significant at the .05 level, existed between the various levels of institutions with respect to the obligation of internship placement. The two-year schools clearly differed from both the four-year and graduate institutions with respect to the degree that they did not require experiential learning. In contrast, both the four-year and graduate programs more often required that their students participate in internship programs. These results are considered to reflect several factors. First, it can be argued that the four-year and graduate institutions have more hours with a given student that can be used for education in field settings. Second, up until recently, the student bodies attending the two-year institutions differed significantly from those attending the four-year and graduate programs in several fundamental ways. Those attending two-year schools to a greater extent were already holding positions in criminal justice professions. In addition, more of these same individuals were going to school on a parttime basis, making internship programming more difficult. Last, the two-year programs, especially for those individuals planning to continue their education, must use a greater proportion of their time for general education requirements than is the case for the four-year and graduate institutions.

	Asso	ciates	Bach	elors	Grä	aduate	Ţ	tal
	Z	%	zI	8	Z	%	2	%
Required	2	6.5	10	37.0	2	22.2	14	20.9
Not Required	28	90.3	16	59.3	2 2	55.6	49	73.1
Encouraged	0	0.0	-	3.7	0	0.0	-	1.5
Required With No Previous Experience	0	0.0	0	0.0	-	1.11	-	1.5
Required for Police Certification	-	3.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	-	1.5
Graduates Only	Ο	0.0	0	0.0	-	1.11	-	1.5
Column total	31	46.3	27	40.3	6	13.4	67	100.0

of Institution
Level
ą
Program
Internship
of
Requirement
of
Tests
Chi-square
Table 25:

Chi-square = 24.34428 with 10 degrees of freedom; significance = 0.0067.

The second variable for which significant differences were found between the two-year, four-year, and graduate programs dealt with the use of college grade point average as an important factor in determining internship candidates. Table 26 reveals a Chi-square of 13.50 with 2 df, which is significant at the .05 level. Further examination of this table indicates that the differences mainly occur between the four-year institutions when compared to the two-year and graduate programs. The respondents from the two-year and graduate programs clearly minimized the importance of the grade point average (GPA) in the internship selection process. In contrast, a large number of the respondents from the four-year schools felt that GPA was a useful criterion. The difference between graduate and four-year levels is easily explainable; in order to remain in graduate degree programs, the individual must maintain an above-average level of performance. However, the same explanation cannot be used when comparisons are made between the four-year schools and two-year programs. These differences can best be explained by the surprising lack of emphasis on performance criteria in the two-year schools with respect to evaluating students. This lack of emphasis stems from the open enrollment policies characteristic of many of the two-year schools and the strong pressures on such institutions to maintain high enrollment figures.

The third variable (V-39) on which significant differences were found as a function of the academic level of the institution dealt with the time commitment of the internship experience. The results presented in Table 27 again show that the four-year schools differ

	Asso	ociates	Bach	lors	Grac	luate	To	tal
	ZI	<del>9</del> 6	ZI	84	z	%	<b>Z</b>	%
Yes	2	6.3	12	44.4	-	10.0	15	21.7
N	30	93.8	15	55.6	6	90.0	54	78.3
Column total	32	46.4	27	39.1	10	14.5	69	100.0
Chi_contave = 13 50308 .	0 4+ i	dogwoor of f		anificanco =	¢ 100 0			

rage by	
int Avei	
rade Pot	
College G	ŀ
uo p	
Base	
Selection	
Internship	
of	tion
Tests	nstitu
Chi-square	Level of I
Table 26:	

Chi-square = 13.50398 with 2 degrees of freedom; significance = 0.0012.

significantly from their two-year and graduate counterparts (Chisquare = 14.31 with 6  $\underline{df}$ , significance = .05). In this case, the four-year schools were much more inclined to use full-time placements while the two-year and graduate programs mainly opted for part-time internship experiences. Again, the most plausible explanation for these differences relates to the time constraints found in the twoyear and graduate programs when compared to the four-year schools and a greater flexibility and the use of alternative educational programming.

The last variable, Variable 57, for which significant differences were found between two-year, four-year, and graduate institutions dealt with faculty attitudes toward experiential learning. These results are contained in Table 28 and show a Chi-square of 10.42 with 4 df, which was significant at the .05 level. The data in Table 28 indicate that with respect to faculty attitudes, the main differences occur between respondents of graduate institutions and those representing the two-year and four-year schools. In this case, individuals working in graduate programs were less likely to express favorable attitudes and more likely to express mixed attitudes toward internship programming. In comparison, respondents from the two-year and four-year schools with few exceptions expressed favorable attitudes toward the internships. These differences probably reflect the unique mission and characteristics of graduate education in the field when compared to the two-year and four-year programs. It can be argued that the orientation of graduate-level education is primarily focused on the training of high-level professionals who will

01 10213201 10								
	Asso	ociates	Bac	helors	Gra	iduate	T	tal
	Z	26	Z	<del>5</del> 2	Z	89	ZI	88
Full Time	2	6.7	7	25.9	0	0.0	6	13.6
Part Time	25	83.3	14	51.9	8	88.9	47	71.2
Work Study	2	6.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	3.0
Full or Part Time	-	3.3	9	22.2	-	11.1	8	12.1
Column total	30	45.5	27	40.9	6	13.6	99	100.0

Chi-square Tests of the Time Commitment of the Internship Experience by the Level Table 27:

Chi-square = 14.31306 with 6 degrees of freedom; significance = 0.0263.

TUS LI CULION								
	Asso	ociates	Bach	elors	Gra	duate	To	tal
	Z	86	ZI	96	ZI	96	ZI	86
Favorable	27	90.0	25	92.6	9	66.7	58	87.9
Unfavorable	2	6.7	-	3.7	0	0.0	ĸ	4.5
Mixed	-	3.3	-	3.7	m	33.3	5	7.6
Column totals	30	45.5	27	40.9	6	13.6	66	100.0

of
Level
by
Program
Internship
the
Toward
Attitudes
Faculty
of
Tests
Chi-square Institution
able 28:

Chi-square = 10.42147 with 4 degrees of freedom; significance = 0.0339.

alternately fill administrative and academic posts in the field. Many would point out that the educational needs at this level are quite different than those found in the pre-professional training and education that takes place at the two-year and four-year levels.

With the exception of the four variables just discussed, the remaining variables can be discussed in the same light that they were under the previous two subheadings.

Organizational issues and concerns by status of institution. The data relating to organizational issues and concerns by the status of the institution can be found in Appendix M. No significant differences were found between public and private educational institutions with respect to the variables used in evaluating issues related to organizational practices. The results in Appendix M reflected the same trends discussed and explained earlier in this section. In general, there is a surprising lack of problems relating to the daily operation of internship programs in criminal justice education. In addition, there appears to be a fairly uniform commitment with respect to experiential learning in the field.

# Section III: Major Concerns

As noted in Section II, the summary of the specific analysis on pertinent issues and concerns yielded a number of noteworthy results. There appears to be considerable agreement with respect to the importance of experiential learning as an integral part of criminal justice education. In addition, the data supported widespread commitment on the part of criminal justice educators to the actual use of the

internship experiences for their students. Furthermore, there was a great deal of agreement that the problems related to the administration of internship programs were negligible. Last, the data indicate a general willingness on the part of criminal justice educators to share responsibility with students and agency personnel in important substantive areas in order to successfully implement their internship programs.

With respect to disagreement on the issues and concerns examined, these generally related to specific programmatic functions. Some disagreement was noted with respect to the use of various criteria on who should be selected and placed in internship settings. Disagreement was also noted when such factors as full- or part-time placements should be used, whether such placements should be mandatory or not, and who should be responsible for evaluating such placements were considered. In addition, differences were noted with respect to the faculty attitudes toward experiential learning when respondents from graduate institutions were compared to their other colleagues.

## Section IV: Development of Normative Model for Criminal Justice Internship Programs

The results presented in the previous sections clearly indicate that at the present time there is a lack of unifying philosophy and practices with respect to experiential learning throughout the country in criminal justice education. It is the writer's contention that a set of standards and goals developed to homogenize internship programming would be most difficult to develop at the present time. This appears to be the case because the data in the present study

provide evidence that a great deal of variability exists among individual criminal justice departments at all academic levels, both in the public and private sector and from all geographical and demographic areas.

In fact, it can be strongly argued that to standardize experiential learning in the criminal justice field might in fact be an undesirable goal rather than a desirable objective. This contention is based on the fact that standardization would lead to rigidity in criminal justice educational programming and would eliminate the flexibility needed to respond to unique educational needs as they arise. Furthermore, the implementation of set standards and practices, with the exception of recognized minimum qualifications pertaining to faculty, curricula, and supportive resources, could lead to the same dilemma currently facing the field of teacher training at the present time. It is a genuine concern that the development of a standard model for criminal justice internship programs might become only part of a larger emphasis on standardized criminal justice education, leading to rigid certification procedures which in time will lead to mediocre educational experiences rather than superior educational programming for the criminal justice field.

In summary, the results from the present study do not lend themselves to the development of a normative model for criminal justice internship programs. This is the case because of the wide variation and differences found with respect to the organizational issues, administrative practices, and general concerns evaluated in the present study. It is the writer's opinion that in order to develop a normative

model, it would be necessary to bring together the respondents sampled in the present study, in an attempt to develop a consensus with respect to the issues involved.

# CHAPTER V

## FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study was an attempt to (1) collect detailed and factual information with respect to academic supervision of internship programs in Associate, Baccalaureate, and Graduate institutions in the states of California, Florida, Michigan, and other geographical areas; (2) evaluate relevant viewpoints and information characteristic of internship coordinators in specific issues and operational concerns in running criminal justice internship programs; (3) evaluate both agreement and disagreement with respect to such issues and concerns; and (4) assess the potential for the development of a normative model for criminal justice experiential learning based on the results thus collected.

In order to accomplish these tasks, a questionnaire was developed containing 33 items specifically designed to tap the dimensions discussed above. This questionnaire was then sent to a sample of 102 subjects who were listed as the individuals responsible for internship programs in <u>Criminal Justice Education Directory 1978-80</u> (Kobetz, 1978), from which 69 responded. These represented a cross-section of institutions characteristic of the academic levels; state geographical areas; public and private sectors; and urban, suburban, and rural areas. The data thus collected were then analyzed by means

of the SPSS Crosstabulation and Chi-square program (SPSS Batch System for OS/360, Version H, Release 8.0, October 15, 1979).

#### Findings and Conclusions

The results indicated that there appears to be considerable agreement with respect to the importance of experiential learning as an integral part of criminal justice education. The data also supported a large commitment by criminal justice educators to employ experiential learning experiences for their students and a general willingness to share responsibility with students and agency personnel in ensuring successful internship experiences. Last, the results indicated a great deal of agreement that problems relating to administering internship programs were negligible.

With respect to disagreement on the organizational issues and concerns examined, these were found to relate generally to specific programmatic functions. Disagreement of some note was found with respect to the use of various criteria in selecting and placing students in the experiential learning setting. Also, disagreement was noted with respect to the faculty attitude toward experiential learning when respondents from graduate institutions were compared to their four-year and two-year faculty counterparts. In addition, disagreement was noted when such factors as whether full- or part-time placements should be used and whether such placements should be mandatory or not were considered.

On the basis of these results, the following conclusions can be stated:

1. There is a large amount of variation with respect to the types of internship programming being used, which appears to be a function of a number of variables, including academic level and state geographical areas.

2. There is a uniform commitment to criminal justice experiential learning programs.

3. There is a lack of problems as perceived by the respondents with regard to the day-to-day activity of these programs.

4. There seems to be a majority opinion in the field that these programs should not be required even though there is an overwhelming commitment that they should be offered.

5. There is a lack of consensus whether the criminal justice internship should be part time or full time, even though there appears to be a greater consensus that the internship program should be one term in length or greater.

6. There is a consensus on the part of some institutions that liability of students in internship placements is an issue, but this issue does not preclude the development and use of internship programs.

7. There is a willingness of the respondents to share responsibility with students and agency personnel in important substantive program areas.

8. No single model appears to be feasible for all criminal justice internship programs.

#### Discussion and Implications

This research generally supports the parameters of a successful criminal justice internship program outlined by Schrink and Grosskopf (1978) and the framework in which an internship could be structured according to Houtz (1970) as previously discussed in Chapter II. Respondents to the questionnaire (Appendix A) indicated that in 78.3 percent of the institutions the purposes and objectives of the criminal justice internship were formally stated. Formally stated purposes and objectives allow the institution and participants a necessary structure wherein activities can be developed, shaped, and evaluated. Accountability of all parties involved in the criminal justice internship can be assessed. This basic foundation can contribute greatly to the success of an internship program.

Second, the results indicate a 92.8 percent cooperative effort on the part of outside agency placements (V-65) and an 84.1 percent favorable faculty attitude to their respective internship programs (V-57). This cooperative and favorable attitudinal atmosphere benefits all parties involved and indicates an understanding of the needs of the institution, placement agency, and students participating. Cooperation strengthens the purposes and objectives of an internship and signifies respect for the internship effort and all parties involved.

Supervision is provided by the agency hosting the intern in 95.7 percent of the responding institutions' programs (V-65). This finding supports the entire internship program through a sharing of responsibility for the program's success and furthers accountability
of the program. The agency is assured of a viable role in developing and strengthening the effort expended in the internship experience.

Only 4.3 percent of the respondents indicated that the ordinary duration of the criminal justice internship program could be taken for less than one term. Continuity of programming and the ability to rotate interns is apparent in the effort to agree on the length of time an internship effort should be scheduled. Depth of programming is also affected by the length of time the intern will be with the agency. Consistency of type of experiential learning experience can also be affected by time.

Evaluation of the interns involved a number of methods, with the greatest emphasis being placed on the written report format. The respondents indicated they used a written report evaluation format at 91.3 percent of the institutions. Students were also evaluated by the agency in which they were placed in 81.2 percent of the institutions and through an oral reporting effort in 62.3 percent of the responding institutions. Other forms of evaluation employed in the assessment of the participants included visitations (60.9%), interviews (52.2%), projects (31.9%), journals (23.2%), and tests (7.2%). Evaluation is a critical element to any sound criminal justice internship program if accountability is to be meaningful and changes are to take place when problems develop. The range of evaluation techniques used by the respondents, singly and in combination, supports their concern for evaluation.

Liability was considered by 65.2 percent of the respondent institutions to constitute no major problem for the internship program.

Because the respondents were in agreement only two-thirds of the time, it may be necessary in further research to explore this area in greater detail. It may be explained that a waiver process is being used at many of the institutions and/or they have not had any major problems arise out of any liability issues.

Pre-screening of participants, final selection of the placement sites, and an orientation of all parties appear to be the responsibility of the department chairman or a designated faculty member. These activities are necessary to ensure a stable internship program and fix a certain level of accountability.

Funding appears to be somewhat of a problem in that 63.8 percent of the respondents have no funds available for students participating in their respective criminal justice internship programs. Only 17.4 percent indicated that they did provide some sort of funding, and 14.5 percent noted that there were no costs incurred by the student. As monies become tighter and inflation higher, it may be necessary to reevaluate funding issues with regard to criminal justice internship programming.

Grading of students indicated a large amount of variability (Table 13) across the various types of grades that can be used, and this difference may be dictated by general administrative practices of the representative schools from which each program was sampled. Grades are an integral part of any internship program because they reflect upon the students' efforts, the methods of evaluations, and competency. The largest proportion (60%) of the reporting institutions use either an alphabetic or numeric grade reporting format.

The parameters this research effort appears to support when considering development of a criminal justice internship program include the following:

- 1. Formally stated purposes and objectives
- 2. Cooperation of all participants (institution, placement site, and student)
- 3. Placement site supervision
- 4. Duration of internship at least one term long
- 5. Flexible evaluation techniques
- 6. Liability consideration (waivers, insurance, etc.)
- 7. A responsible internship coordinator at the institution (pre-screening, site selection, orientation, etc.)
- 8. Monetary considerations (paid interns, travel costs, special equipment, etc.)
- 9. Grading format

#### Recommendations for Further Research

The broad data gathered in Phase I and reported in Chapter IV appear to describe the present state of the art with regard to institutions of higher education offering a criminal justice internship program. Numerous agreements and disagreements were reported along with the large amount of variation generally apparent between individual institutional internship programming as it presently exists. The present research effort may be helpful to those institutions contemplating a criminal justice internship program. However, there was no single best model developed from the data, but some criteria for conducting a criminal justice internship program were developed, as previously noted. There is a need for further research to be conducted in some very specific areas, i.e., funding availability to students and agencies involved in internship programs, liability issues, grading format, etc.

The proposed Phase II must be undertaken and completed if modeling criminal justice internship programs is to become a reality. The original proposal to contact personally at least two of the respondent institutions in each of the three states surveyed (California, Florida, and Michigan) was considered by the previously specified panel as not substantially increasing the value of the project because the respondents of the proposed Phase II (1) would not be selected randomly, (2) would constitute a small sample, and (3) would report their present situation. If modeling is to be successful, a cross-section of respondents and correlational analysis techniques are necessary. A series of surveys conducted at various national meetings, i.e., American Society of Criminology and American Criminal Justice Association, might be useful. The development of accepting standards, goals, and objectives regarding criminal justice experiential learning activities should be the next research effort undertaken to expand the present study.

APPENDICES

#### APPENDIX A

# THE QUESTIONNAIRE

AND

# QUESTIONNAIRE WITH INTERNSHIP COORDINATORS' RESPONSES

#### APPENDIX A

#### CRIMINAL JUSTICE INTERNSHIP PROGRAMS QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Position of person completing this questionnaire: 2. What is your faculty rank? 3-5. Are you: ( ) Black ( ) White ( ) Hispanic ( ) Other () Under 30 years old
() 30-40 years old
() 41-50 years old
() 51-65 years old
() Over 65 years old ( ) Male
( ) Female 6. What is the highest degree you have attained? ) Bachelors ) Masters ) Doctorate **Other** (please specify) 7-9. Is your institution: ( ) Public ( ) Private ( ) Urban ( ) Two year
( ) Suburban ( ) Four year
( ) Rural ( ) Other (please specify) 10-11. What is the current total enrollment in your institution? In Total Institution In Your Program ) Less than 100 ) 100-500 ) 501-1000 Less than 2000 ) 2000-5000 ) 5001-10,000 ) More than 10,000 More than 1000 12. What is your primary curriculum emphasis in your program? Criminal Justice ) Corrections ) Law Enforcement ) Law-Related Other (please specify)

- Internship programs offered by your department are best described 13. as: (check all applicable)
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Cross-Cultural Experience
  - Work Experience (Cooperative Education)
  - Preprofessional Training
  - \_\_\_\_ Institutional Analysis

  - Service-Learning Internship Social/Political Action Personal Growth and Development
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Field Research
  - Career Exploration
  - Academic Discipline/Career Integration
  - Other (specify)
- The internship experiences indicated are available to: (check all 14. applicable)
  - \_\_\_\_Department majors only
  - Superior students only
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Seniors
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Juniors
  - <u>Sophomores</u>
  - Freshmen
    - REMARKS\_\_\_\_\_
- 15. Your internship program is:
  - \_\_\_\_Required of students
  - Not required of students
    - REMARKS\_\_\_\_\_
- Selection of participants for the internship program is based upon: 16. (check all applicable)
  - \_\_\_\_\_High school performance
  - \_\_\_\_ College grade point average
  - Student's desire to participate
  - Recommendation of faculty or staff
  - Other (specify)

- 17. The internship experiences are offered: (check all applicable)
  - \_\_\_Fall term Winter term \_\_\_\_\_ Spring term Summer term REMARKS\_\_\_\_\_
- 18. The ordinary duration of an internship experience is:
  - Less than one term One term More than one term
- 19. The internship experience is a:
  - Full-time commitment (40 hrs. per week)
    Part-time commitment (less than 40 hrs. per week) REMARKS \_\_\_\_\_
- 20. The objectives of the internship experiences have been formally stated and published with rationale.

 Yes No			
REMARKS	 	 ·····	 

- 21. Pre-internship experiences which prepare a student specifically for the internship include:
  - \_\_\_\_ Orientation seminar(s)
  - \_\_\_\_Faculty interview(s) \_\_\_\_Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_
- 22. Post-internship experiences or follow-up programs include:

Seminar(s) Conferences Group discussions Other (specify)

- 23. Proposed internship programs are approved by:
  - Individual faculty member
  - Individual faculty n
    Department chairman
    Committee

  - Field study coordinator Other (specify)
- 24. A student enrolled in an internship program is evaluated by: (check all applicable)
  - \_\_\_\_\_Faculty member
  - Agency or outside personnel Fellow students

  - \_\_\_\_\_ Self
  - Other (specify)
- 25. Techniques or tools used to evaluate students are: (check all applicable)

  - Written reports Oral reports Agency or outside assessments

  - \_\_\_\_\_ Interviews \_\_\_\_\_ Visitations
  - \_\_\_\_ Journals
  - Projects Tests

  - Other (specify)
- 26. Students completing an internship experience receive grades of:
  - 4, 3.5, 3, 2.5, etc. P/N \_\_\_\_\_ S/U
- 27. Funds are available to students for the field study.
  - Yes
  - No
  - No extra expense involved for the student
- 28. Faculty attitudes toward internship programs are:
  - \_\_\_\_Favorable Unfavorable REMARKS\_\_\_\_\_

- 29. Special problems for the faculty or department in relation to the internship programs are: (check all applicable)
  - Faculty time Supervision On-campus communication Coordination Limited placement sites
  - Other (specify)
- 30. Outside agencies or placements provide supervision.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: Please include comments for those items where you believe some explanation would be useful in interpreting the practices or procedures you employ in your program.

Questionnaire has been completed by:

Name\_\_\_\_\_

TITLE\_\_\_\_\_

DEPARTMENT\_\_\_\_\_

Please return completed questionnaire to:

Marson H. Johnson Department of Criminal Justice University of South Florida Tampa, Florida 33620 CRIMINAL JUSTICE INTERNSHIP PROGRAMS QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Position of person completing this questionnaire: V-2 2. What is your faculty rank? 3-5. Are you: 

 (64) Male
 V-4
 (8) Black
 V-5
 (6) Under 30 years old

 (5) Female
 (55) White
 (26) 30-40 years old

 (4) Hispanic
 (17) 41-50 years old

 (2) Other
 (13) 51-65 years old

 (--) Over 65 years old

 V-3 6. What is the highest degree you have attained? (6) Bachelors
(33) Masters
(28) Doctorate
(2) Other V-6 Juris Doctorate (please specify) 7-9. Is your institution: (39) Urban (32) Two year V-8 (13) Suburban V-9 (27) Four year (17) Rural (10) Other (54) Public (15) Private (please specify) 10-11. What is the current total enrollment in your institution? In Total Institution In Your Program (7) Less than 2000 (18) 2000-5000 (19) 5001-10,000 (25) More than 10,000 (13) Less than 100 V-11 (33) 100-500 (14) 501-1000 V-10 (9) More than 1000 12. What is your primary curriculum emphasis in your program? (37) Criminal Justice
(1) Corrections
(11) Law Enforcement
(19) Law-Related
(1) Other <u>Mis</u> V-12 Missing data (please specify)

- 108
- 13. Internship programs offered by your department are best described as: (check all applicable)
- V-13 11 Cross-Cultural Experience
- V 1447 Work Experience (Cooperative Education)
- 31 Preprofessional Training V-15
- V-16 5 Institutional Analysis
- 35 Service-Learning Internship 4 Social/Political Action V-17
- V-18
- V-19 26 Personal Growth and Development
- 14 Field Research V-20
- V-21 37 Career Exploration
- 25 Academic Discipline/Career Integration V-22
- 2 Other (specify) Ride Along/Observation V-23
- 14. The internship experiences indicated are available to: (check all applicable)
- V-24 49 Department majors only
- 3 Superior students only V-25
- V-26 31 Seniors
- V-27 24 Juniors
- 13 Sophomores V-28
- V-29 8 Freshmen
  - **REMARKS** 4 all students, 1 graduates with no experience, V-30 2 C+ or above students, 1 some Freshmen
- 15. Your internship program is:
- 14 Required of students V-31
  - 49 Not required of students

**REMARKS** 4 encouraged, 2 missing

- 16. Selection of participants for the internship program is based upon: (check all applicable)
- V-32 0 High school performance
- 15 College grade point average V-33
- V-34 52 Student's desire to participate
- V-35 33 Recommendation of faculty or staff
- Other (specify) 5 no requirements, 1 faculty approval, V-36 4 agency approval, 1 LEAA required, etc.

17. The internship experiences are offered: (check all applicable)

V-37	2 One term 12 Two terms 19 Three terms 34 All year REMARKS 2 missing cases
18.	The ordinary duration of an internship experience is:
V-38	<u>3</u> Less than one term <u>42</u> One term <u>20</u> More than one term
19.	The internship experience is a:
V-39	9 Full-time commitment (40 hrs. per week) 47 Part-time commitment (less than 40 hrs. per week)
	REMARKS 2 work-study, 8 optional, 3 missing
20.	The objectives of the internship experiences have been formally

- 20. The objectives of the internship experiences have been formally stated and published with rationale.
- $V-40 = \frac{54}{13} \frac{\text{Yes}}{\text{No}}$

**REMARKS** 2 missing

- 21. Pre-internship experiences which prepare a student specifically for the internship include:
- V-41 <u>6</u> Orientation seminar(s) <u>13</u> Faculty interview(s) <u>50</u> Other (specify) <u>miscellaneous</u>
- 22. Post-internship experiences or follow-up programs include:

23. Proposed internship programs are approved by: 14 Individual faculty member 16 Department chairman <u>3</u> Committee 6 Field study coordinator 30 Other (specify) 24. A student enrolled in an internship program is evaluated by: (check all applicable) 8 Faculty member Agency or outside personnel Fellow students

- 25. Techniques or tools used to evaluate students are: (check all applicable)
- V-46 63 Written reports
- 43 Oral reports V-47

O Self

V-48 56 Agency or outside assessments

58 Other (specify) mixes

- V-49 36 Interviews
- 42 Visitations V-50
- V-51 T6 Journals
- V-52 22 Projects V-53 5 Tests

V-44

V-45

- V-54 2 Other (specify) Phone
- 26. Students completing an internship experience receive grades of:

29 4, 3.5, 3, 2.5, etc. 7 C/NC 5 P/N V-55 TT S/U 17 Other (specify) Numerical/alphabetical mixes

27. Funds are available to students for the field study.

- 28. Faculty attitudes toward internship programs are:
- <u>58</u> Favorable V-57 3 Unfavorable

REMARKS 8 mixed

29. Special problems for the faculty or department in relation to the internship programs are: (check all applicable)
V-58 36 Faculty time
V-59 35 Supervision
V-60 7 On-campus communication
V-61 24 Coordination
V-62 20 Limited placement sites
V-63 12 Other (specify) Travel expenses, cronyism, geography, agency limitations, etc.

30. Outside agencies or placements provide supervision.

V-64 <u>66</u> Yes No REMARKS\_\_\_\_\_\_

31. Outside agencies or placements cooperate in evaluation.

V-65 <u>64</u> Yes No REMARKS <u>4 do not ask agencies to participate in evaluation</u>

32. Is liability of participants in internship programs an issue?  $V-66 \xrightarrow{19}{45}$  Yes REMARKS 5 sometimes or missing data

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: Please include comments for those items where you believe some explanation would be useful in interpreting the practices or procedures you employ in your program.

- V-67 Respondent states
- V-68 Courses offered days
- V-69 Courses offered evenings
- V-70 Courses offered to accommodate shift workers

(Use back of page if necessary)

APPENDIX B

### TYPES OF INTERNSHIPS OFFERED BY STATE GEOGRAPHIC AREAS

	AREAS
	GEOGRAPHIC
	STATE
8	Вγ
<b>APPENDIX</b>	OFFERED
	INTERNSHIPS
	РF
	TYPES

				State	S					
	Cali (N	fornia =29)	E.	orida V=13)	Mic  R	higan =12)	Oth N	ers 15)	°ŽI L	tals =69)
	Z	%	Z	86	Z	%	Z	%	Z	8
CROSS-CULTURAL EXPERIENCES (V-13)										
Yes No	9 20	31.0 69.0	- 21	7.7 92.3	12	0.0 100.0	1 14	6.7 93.3	11 58	15.9 84.1
WORK OR COOPERATIVE EXPERIENCES (V-14)										
Yes No	25 4	86.2 13.8	ഗയ	38.5 61.5	5	58.3 41.7	10	66.7 33.3	<b>4</b> 7 22	68.1 31.9
PREPROFESSIONAL TRAINING (V-15)										
Yes No	13 16	44.8 55.2	ഗയ	38.5 61.5	<b>8</b> 4	66.7 33.3	10 10	33.3 66.7	31 38	44.9 55.1
INSTITUTIONAL ANALYSIS (V-16)										
Yes No	2 27	6.9 93.1	13	0.0 100.0	-=	8.3 91.7	13	13.3 86.7	5 64	7.2 92.8
SERVICE OR LEARNING INTERNSHIP (V-17)										
Yes No	14 15	48.3 51.7	7 6	53.8 46.2	99	50.0 50.0	8	53.3 46.7	35 34	50.7 49.3

							1			
				States				- - - -		
	Cali (N	fornia j=29)	I.I.	orida V=13)	Mich (R	nigan 12)	Oth (N	ers 15)	و ۲	tals =69)
	Z	84	Z	%	Z	%	Z	%	Z	%
SOCIAL OR POLITICAL ACTION INTERNSHIP (V-18)										
Yes No	1 28	3.4 96.6	0 13	0.0 100.0	-=	8.3 91.7	13	13.3 86.7	<b>4</b> 65	5.8 94.2
PERSONAL GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT INTERNSHIP (V-19)										
Yes No	1181	37.9 62.1	6	46.2 53.8	4 00	33.3 66.7	5 10	33.3 66.7	26 43	37.7 62.3
FIELD RESEARCH INTERNSHIP (V-20)										
Yes No	<b>4</b> 25	13.8 86.2	13 13	0.0 100.0	ოი	25.0 75.0	8	46.7 53.3	14 55	20.3 79.7
CAREER EXPLORATION INTERNSHIP (V-21)										
Yes No	17 12	58.6 41.4	9	46.2 53.8	ნ ო	75.0 25.0	5 10	33.3 66.7	37 32	53.6 46.4
ACADEMIC DISCIPLINE OR CAREER EXPLORATION INTERNSHIP (V-22)										
Yes No	8 21	27.6 72.4	ഗയ	38.5 61.5	4 00	33.3 66.7	8	53.3 46.7	25 44	36.2 63.8

APPENDIX C

### TYPES OF INTERNSHIPS OFFERED BY STATE REGIONAL AREAS

			Re	jions				
	50	rban N=34)	ndu Subi	urban =13)	20	ural V=17)	20	vtals V=69)
	Z	26	Z	%	Z	8	Z	%
CROSS-CULTURAL EXPERIENCES (V-13)								
Yes No	7 32	17.9 82.1	11	15.4 84.6	2 15	11.8 88.2	11 58	15.9 84.1
WORK OR COOPERATIVE EXPERIENCES (V-14)								
Yes No	24 15	61.5 38.5	64	69.2 30.8	14 3	82.4 17.6	47 22	68.1 31.9
PREPROFESSIONAL TRAINING (V-15)								
Yes No	17 22	43.6 56.4	ഗയ	38.5 61.5	<b>6</b> 8	52.9 47.1	<b>31</b> 38	44.9 55.1
INSTITUTIONAL ANALYSIS (V-16)								
Yes No	2 37	5.1 94.9	12	7.7 92.3	2 15	11.8 88.2	5 64	7.2 92.8
SERVICE OR LEARNING INTERNSHIP (V-17)								
Yes No	22 17	56.4 43.6	40	30.8 69.2	ნდ	52.9 47.1	35 34	50.7 49.3

APPENDIX C TYPES OF INTERNSHIPS OFFERED BY STATE REGIONAL AREAS

			Rec	nions				
	150	rban N=34)	Subr	urban =13)	1 W C	ural V=17)		otals  =69)
	Z	26	Z	8	z	%	Z	96
SOCIAL OR POLITICAL ACTION INTERNSHIP (V-18)								
Yes No	36 36	7.7 92.3	12	7.7 92.3	0 71	0.0 100.0	4 65	5.8 94.2
PERSONAL GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT INTERNSHIP (V-19)								
Yes No	17 22	43.6 56.4	8 2	38.5 61.5	4 13	23.5 76.5	26 43	37.7 62.3
FIELD RESEARCH INTERNSHIP (V-20)								
Yes No	6 33	15.4 84.6	3 10	23.1 76.9	5 12	29. <b>4</b> 70.6	14 55	20.3 79.7
CAREER EXPLORATION INTERNSHIP (V-21)								
Yes No	21 18	53.8 46.2	7	53.8 46.2	<b>0</b> 0	52.9 47.1	37 32	53.6 46.4
ACADEMIC DISCIPLINE OR CAREER EXPLORATION INTERNSHIP (V-22)								
Yes No	15 24	38.5 61.5	ഗയ	38.5 61.5	12	29. <b>4</b> 70.6	25 44	36.2 63.8

APPENDIX D

#### TYPES OF INTERNSHIPS OFFERED BY INSTITUTIONAL LEVELS

	LEVELS
	INSTITUTIONAL
0	Вγ
<b>APPENDI</b>	OFFERED
	INTERNSHIPS
	OF
	TYPES

		In	stitutio	nal Levels				
	Asso ( <u>N</u> =	ciate 32)	Bach ( <u>N</u> =	elors 27)	Bra (S	duate =10)	το Γ	tals =69)
	Z	<del>8</del> 9	Z	<del>8</del> 6	Z	%	Z	8
CROSS-CULTURAL EXPERIENCES (V-13)								
Yes	7	21.9	2	7.4	~ ~	20.0	<b>[</b> ]	15.9
No	<b>4</b> 7	/8.1	<b>G</b> Z	92.0	∞	80.0	28	84.1
WORK OR COOPERATIVE EXPERIENCES (V-14)								
Yes	28	87.5	14	51.9	Ъ	50.0	47	68.1
No	4	12.5	13	48.1	വ	50.0	22	31.9
PREPROFESSIONAL TRAINING (V-15)								
Yes	12	37.5	14	51.9	2	50.0	31	44.9
No	20	62.5	13	48.1	പ	50.0	38	55.1
INSTITUTIONAL ANALYSIS (V-16)								
Yes	2	6.3	2	7.4	-	10.0	S	7.2
No	30	93.8	25	92.6	ნ	90.0	64	92.8
SERVICE OR LEARNING INTERNSHIP (V-17)								
Yes	15	46.9 53 1	15	55.6 44 4	ហហ	50.0 50.0	35 34	50.7 49.3
		>>	-		>	>.>>	5	ン・ソフ

		In	stitutio	nal Levels				
	Asso ( <u>N</u> =	ciate 32)	Bach ( <u>N</u> =	elors 27)	Grac ( <u>N</u>	duate =10)		als 69)
	Z	%	Z	%	Z	۶۹	Z	86
SOCIAL OR POLITICAL ACTION INTERNSHIP (V-18)								
Yes No	1 31	3.1 96.9	ן 26	3.7 96.3	8 7	20.0 80.0	<b>4</b> 65	5.8 94.2
PERSONAL GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT INTERNSHIP (V-19)								
Yes No	12 20	37.5 62.5	12 15	44.4 55.6	8 0	20.0 80.0	26 43	37.7 62.3
FIELD RESEARCH INTERNSHIP (V-20)								
Yes No	3 29	9.4 90.6	8 19	29.6 70.4	3	30.0 70.0	1 <b>4</b> 55	20.3 79.7
CAREER EXPLORATION INTERNSHIP (V-21)								
Yes No	19 13	59.4 40.6	16 11	59.3 40.7	8 %	20.0 80.0	37 32	53.6 46.4
ACADEMIC DISCIPLINE OR CAREER EXPLORATION INTERNSHIP (V-22)								
Yes No	8 24	25.0 75.0	14 13	51.9 48.1	43	30.0 70.0	25 44	36.2 63.8

APPENDIX E

# TYPES OF INTERNSHIPS OFFERED BY STATUS OF INSTITUTION

		Stat	sus			
		01 ic =54 )	Pri	vate 15)		als 69)
	N	%	Z	8	Z	%
CROSS-CULTURAL EXPERIENCES (V-13)						
Yes No	9 45	16.7 83.3	2 13	13.3 86.7	11 58	15.9 84.1
WORK OR COOPERATIVE EXPERIENCES (V-14)						
Yes No	40 14	74.1 25.9	7 8	<b>46.7</b> 53.3	47 22	68.1 31.9
PREPROFESSIONAL TRAINING (V-15)						
Yes No	24 30	44.4 55.6	7 8	<b>46.7</b> 53.3	31 38	44.9 55.1
INSTITUTIONAL ANALYSIS (V-16)						
Yes No	<b>4</b> 50	7.4 92.6	1 14	6.7 93.3	5 64	7.2 92.8
SERVICE OR LEARNING INTERNSHIP (V-17)						
Yes No	27 27	50.0 50.0	8	53.3 46.7	35 34	50.7 49.3

APPENDIX E TYPES OF INTERNSHIPS OFFERED BY STATUS OF INSTITUTION

		Statu	S			
		b11c =54)	Pri	ivate =15)	Tot (N=	cals 69)
	z	%	Z	%	Z	%
SOCIAL OR POLITICAL ACTION INTERNSHIP (V-18)						
Yes No	3 51	5.6 94.4	14	6.7 93.3	<b>4</b> 65	5.8 94.2
PERSONAL GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT INTERNSHIP (V-19)						
Yes No	22 32	40.7 59.3	4[	26.7 73.3	26 43	37.7 62.3
FIELD RESEARCH INTERNSHIP (V-20)						
Yes No	11 43	20.4 79.6	3	20.0 80.0	14 55	20.3 79.7
CAREER EXPLORATION INTERNSHIP (V-21)						
Yes No	30 24	55.6 44.4	78	46.7 53.3	37 32	53.6 46.4
ACADEMIC DISCIPLINE OR CAREER EXPLORATION INTERNSHIP (V-22)						
Yes No	23 31	42.6 57.4	13	13.3 86.7	25 44	36.2 63.8

APPENDIX F

### ACADEMIC SUPERVISION LEVELS BY STATE GEOGRAPHIC AREAS

	GEOGRAPHIC AREAS
	STATE
×	ВΥ
APPENDI	LEVELS
	<b>SUPERVISION</b>
	ACADEMIC

	Ĭ			State	S					
	Cali (N=	fornia 29)	Elo N=	rida 13)	Mic Nic	higan =12)	SC SC	hers =15)		tals =69)
	Z	86	Z	24	Z	<del>8</del> %	Z	89	Z	<del>8</del> 6
INTERNSHIP APPROVAL (V-44)							2     			
Individual faculty member	9	21.4	S	41.7	-	9.1	2	13.3	14	21.2
Department chairman	7	25.0	2	16.7	Υ	27.3	4	26.7	16	24.2
Committee	-	3.6	0	0.0	2	18.2	0	0.0	e	4.5
Field study coordinator	2	7.1	-	8.3	Υ	27.3	0	0.0	9	9.1
Internship coordinator	0	0.0	0	0.0	-	9.1	0	0.0	-	1.5
Everybody involved	2	17.9	2	16.7	-	9.1	4	26.7	12	18.2
Chairman and field-study coordinator	က	10.7	-	8.3	0	0.0	2	13.3	9	9.1
Student and field-study coordinator	4	14.3	-	8.3	0	0.0	m	20.0	ω	12.1
EVALUATION OF INTERNSHIP PROGRAM (V-45)										
Faculty member	2	7.1	2	16.7	2	18.2	8	13.3	ω	12.1
Agency personnel	2	۲.۱	0	0.0	0	0.0	-	6.7	e	4.5
Faculty and agency personnel	10	35.7	10	83.3	9	54.5	7	46.7	33	50.0
Faculty, agency, and student	13	46.4	0	0.0	r	27.3	4	26.7	20	30.3

		State	Si		
	California ( <u>N</u> =29)	Florida ( <u>N</u> =13)	Michigan ( <u>N</u> =12)	Others ( <u>N</u> =15)	Totals ( <u>N</u> =69)
	<u>N</u> %	<b>N</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Z</b>	<b>N</b>
Faculty and peers	1 3.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	1 1.5
None	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 6.7	1 1.5
STUDENTS EVALUATED BY WRITTEN REPORTS (V-46)					
Yes No	28 96.6 1 3.4	11 84.6 2 15.4	11 91.7 1 8.3	13 86.7 2 13.3	63 91.3 6 8.7
STUDENTS EVALUATED BY ORAL REPORTS (V-47)					
Yes No	17 58.6 12 41.4	7 53.8 6 46.2	10 83.3 2 16.7	9 60.0 6 40.0	43 62.3 26 37.3
STUDENTS EVALUATED BY OUTSIDE AGENCY (V-48)					
Yes No	23 79.3 6 20.7	10 76.9 3 23.1	11 91.7 1 8.3	12 80.0 3 20.0	56 81.2 13 18.8
STUDENTS EVALUATED BY INTERVIEWS (V-49)					
Yes No	18 62.1 11 37.9	7 53.8 6 46.2	6 50.0 6 50.0	5 33.3 10 66.7	36 52.2 33 47.8
STUDENTS EVALUATED BY VISITATIONS					
Yes No	19 65.5 10 34.5	7 53.8 6 46.2	8 66.7 4 33.3	8 53.3 7 46.7	42 60.9 27 39.1

				States						
	Cali	fornia =29)	E =	rida 13)	Mic Nic	higan =12)	55	chers (=15)		tals =69)
	Z	86	Z	8	Z	%	Z	<del>26</del>	Z	86
STUDENTS EVALUATED BY JOURNALS (V-51)										
Yes No	3 26	10.3 89.7	3 10	23.1 76.9	99	50.0 50.0	14	26.7 73.3	16 53	23.2 76.8
STUDENTS EVALUATED BY PROJECTS (V-52)										
Yes No	11 18	37.9 62.1	3 10	23.1 76.9	5	<b>41.</b> 7 58.3	3	20.0 80.0	22 47	31.9 68.1
STUDENTS EVALUATED BY TESTS (V-53)										
Yes No	2 27	6.9 93.1	11	15.4 84.6	12	0.0 100.0	141	6.7 93.3	5 64	7.2 92.8
INSTERNSHIP STUDENTS GRADING FORMAT (V-55)										
Alphabetical (ABCD) Numerical (4321) Pass/Fail (PF, CNC or SU)	3 10 10	10.7 53.6 35.7	<b>6</b> 5 –	8.3 41.7 50.0	971	9.1 63.6 27.3	702	35.7 14.3 50.0	10 29 26	15.4 44.6 40.0
AGENCY PROVIDES SUPERVISION OF INTERN (V-64)										
Yes No	28 1	96.6 3.4	]2 	92.3 7.7	=-	91.7 8.3	15	100.0	66 4	95.7 4.3

APPENDIX G

#### ACADEMIC SUPERVISION LEVELS BY STATE REGIONAL AREAS

	AREAS	
	REGIONAL	aions
	STATE	Re
X	Вγ	
<b>APPEND1</b>	LEVELS	
	SUPERVISION	
	ACADEMIC :	

			Rec	gions				
	<b>n</b> ~	rban <u>N</u> =39)	Subi Subi	urban =13)	R.	ural N=17)	ο Ξ Γ	tals =69)
	Z	જ્ય	Z	8	ZI	88	ZI	8
INTERNSHIP APPROVAL (V-44)								
Individual faculty member	8	21.6	e	23.1	ĸ	18.8	14	21.2
Department chairman	6	24.3	e	23.1	4	25.0	16	24.2
Committee	-	2.7	-	7.7	-	6.3	m	4.5
Field-study coordinator	2	13.5	0	0.0	-	6.3	9	9.1
Internship coordinator	0	0.0	-	7.7	0	0.0	-	1.5
Everybody involved	7	18.9	2	15.4	က	18.8	12	18.2
Chairman and field-study coordinator	3	8.1	2	15.4	-	6.3	9	9.1
Student and field-study coordinator	4	10.8		7.7	R	18.8	ω	12.1
EVALUATION OF INTERNSHIP PROGRAM (V-45)								
Faculty member	5	13.5	0	0.0	n	18.8	8	12.1
Agency personnel	<b></b>	2.7	-	7.7	_	6.3	m	4.5
Faculty and agency personnel	24	64.9	4	30.8	2	31.3	33	50.0
Faculty, agency, and student	7	18.9	7	53.8	9	37.5	20	30.3

			Rec	jions				
	55	rban V=39)	Subt Subt	urban =13)	J Z	iral  =17)	το L	tals =69)
	Z	۶۹	Z	82	Z	<del>36</del>	Z	સ્ટ
Faculty and peers	0	0.0	0	0.0	-	6.3	-	1.5
None	0	0.0	-	7.7	0	0.0	-	1.5
STUDENTS EVALUATED BY WRITTEN REPORTS (V-46)								
Yes No	37 2	94.9 5.1	12 L	92.3 7.7	14 3	82. <b>4</b> 17.6	63 6	91.3 8.7
STUDENTS EVALUATED BY ORAL REPORTS (V-47)								
Yes No	26 13	66.7 33.3	ഹയ	61.5 38.5	თდ	52.9 47.1	43 26	62.3 37.7
STUDENTS EVALUATED BY OUTSIDE AGENCY (V-48)								
Yes No	31 8	79.5 20.5	12 1	92.3 7.7	13 4	76.5 23.5	56 13	81.2 18.8
STUDENTS EVALUATED BY INTERVIEWS (V-49)								
Yes No	18 21	46.2 53.8	20	61.5 38.5	10 7	58.8 41.2	36 33	52.2 47.8
STUDENTS EVALUATED BY VISITATIONS (V-50)								
Yes No	23 16	59.0 41.0	01 e	76.9 23.1	σω	52.9 47.1	42 27	60.9 39.1
			Reç	rions				
---	----------	--------------	--------------	--------------	------------	--------------	--------------	--------------
	Γ.Ξ.	an =39)	Subu Subu	Irban 13)	22	ral =17)	Tot: (N=(	als 59)
	z	مح	ZI	%	ZI	96	Z	%
STUDENTS EVALUATED BY JOURNALS (V-51)								
Yes No	10 29	25.6 74.4	10	23.1 76.9	14 3 14	17.6 82.4	16 53	23.2 76.8
STUDENTS EVALUATED BY PROJECTS (V-52)								
Yes No	14 25	35.9 64.1	112	15.4 84.6	11	35.3 64.7	22 47	31.9 68.1
STUDENTS EVALUATED BY TESTS (V-53)								
Yes No	36 36	7.7 92.3	13	0.0 100.0	15	11.8 88.2	5 64	7.2 92.8
INTERNSHIP STUDENTS GRADING FORMAT (V-55)								
Alphabetical (ABCD) Numerical (4321)	14 14	13.5 37.8		8.3 58.3	4 8	25.0 50.0	10 29	15.4 44.6
Pass/Fail (PF, CNC, or SU)	18	48.6	4	33.3	4	25.0	26	40.0
AGENCY PROVIDES SUPERVISION OF INTERN (V-64)								
Yes No	37 2	94.9 5.1	13	100.0 0.0	16	94.1 5.9	90 3	95.7 4.3

APPENDIX H

•

ACADEMIC SUPERVISION LEVELS BY INSTITUTIONAL LEVELS

	i	Lev	el of Ir	nstitution	S			
	Ass( ( <u>N</u> )	ociate =32)	Bact (N	nelors =27)	Grac (N	duate =10)	Tot N=	als •69)
	ZI	%	Z	%	Z	8	z	%
INTERNSHIP APPROVAL (V-44)								
Individual faculty member	6	30.0	æ	1.11	2	22.2	14	21.2
Department chairman	5	16.7	6	33.3	2	22.2	16	24.2
Committee	-	3.3	2	7.4	0	0.0	e	4.5
Field-study coordinator	2	6.7	4	14.8	0	0.0	9	9.1
Internship coordinator	-	3.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	-	1.5
Everybody involved	4	13.3	5	18.5	n	33.3	12	18.2
Chairman and field-study coordinator	m	10.0	Υ	1.11	0	0.0	9	9.1
Student and field-study coordinator	2	16.7	-	3.7	2	22.2	8	12.1
EVALUATION OF INTERNSHIP PROGRAM (V-45)								
Faculty member	S	10.0	4	14.8	-	11.1	8	12.1
Agency personnel	2	6.7	-	3.7	0	0.0	ε	4.5
Faculty and agency personnel	14	46.7	13	48.1	9	66.7	33	50.0
Faculty, agency, and student	10	33.3	8	29.6	2	22.2	20	30.3

APPENDIX H ACADEMIC SUPERVISION LEVELS BY INSTITUTIONAL LEVELS

		Lev	el of I	nstitutions				
	Ass( ( <u>N</u>	ociate =32)	Bacl	helors =27)	Grac (N	luate =10)	οŻ	tals =69)
	Z	96	Z	26	Z	<del>2</del> 6	Z	<del>8</del> 8
Faculty and peers	-	3.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	-	1.5
None	0	0.0	-	3.7	0	0.0	~	1.5
STUDENTS EVALUATED BY WRITTEN REPORTS (V-46)								
Yes No	28 4	87.5 12.5	26 1	96.3 3.7	6 –	90.0 10.0	63 6	91.3 8.7
STUDENTS EVALUATED BY ORAL REPORTS (V-47)								
Yes No	19 13	59.4 40.6	18 9	66.7 33.3	4 6	60.0 40.0	43 26	62.3 37.7
STUDENTS EVALUATED BY OUTSIDE AGENCIES (V-48)								
Yes No	26 6	81.3 18.8	22 5	81.5 18.5	8 0	80.0 20.0	56 13	81.2 18.8
STUDENTS EVALUATED BY INTERVIEWS (V-49)								
Yes No	16 16	50.0 50.0	15 12	55.6 44.4	ഹവ	50.0 50.0	36 33	52.2 47.8
STUDENTS EVALUATED BY VISITATIONS (V-50)								
Yes No	23 9	71.9 28.1	14 13	51.9 48.1	പവ	50.0 50.0	42 27	60.9 39.1

		Lev	el of I	nstitution				
	Ass( ( <u>N</u>	ociate =32)	Bacl	helors =27)	Gra( ( <u>N</u>	duate =10)	Tot ( <u>N</u> =	als 69)
	Z	<del>8</del> 6	Z	8	z	24	Z	8
STUDENTS EVALUATED BY JOURNALS (V-51)								
Yes No	<b>4</b> 28	12.5 87.5	9 18	33.3 66.7	43	30.0 70.0	16 53	23.2 76.8
STUDENTS EVALUATED BY PROJECTS (V-52)								
Yes No	11 21	34.4 65.6	9 18	33.3 66.7	8 %	20.0 80.0	22 47	31.9 68.1
STUDENTS EVALUATED BY TESTS (V-53)								
Yes No	3 29	9.4 90.6	2 25	7.4 92.6	00	0.0 100.0	5 64	7.2 92.8
INTERNSHIP STUDENTS GRADING FORMAT (V-55)								
Alphabetical (ABCD) Numerical (4321)	3 17	10.0 56.7	600	23.1 30.8	- 4	11.1 44.4	10 29	15.4 44.6
Pass/Fail (PF, CNC, or SU)	10	33.3	12	46.1	4	44.4	26	40.0
AGENCY PROVIDES SUPERVISION OF INTERN (V-64)								
Yes No	30 2	93.8 6.3	27 0	100.0 0.0	6 –	90.0 10.0	66 3	95.7 4.3

APPENDIX I

# ACADEMIC SUPERVISION LEVELS BY STATUS OF INSTITUTION

	INSTITUTION
	0F
_	STATUS
X	ВΥ
APPEND	LEVELS
	SUPERVISION
	ACADEMIC

		Sta	tus			
	PZ	blic =54)	Ϋ́Ρ	ivate =15)		tals =69)
	Z	96	Z	%	Z	89
INTERNSHIP APPROVAL (V-44)						
Individual faculty member	13	25.5	-	6.7	14	21.2
Department chairman	7	13.7	6	60.0	16	24.2
Committee	2	3.9	-	6.7	n	4.5
Field-study coordinator	9	11.8	0	0.0	9	9.1
Internship coordinator	<b>~~</b>	2.0	0	0.0	-	1.5
Everybody involved	10	19.6	2	13.3	12	18.2
Chairman and field-study coordinator	5	9.8	-	6.7	9	9.1
Student and field-study coordinator	7	13.7	-	6.7	8	12.1
EVALUATION OF INTERNSHIP PROGRAM (V-45)						
Faculty member	9	11.8	2	13.3	8	12.1
Agency personnel	-	2.0	2	13.3	Υ	4.5
Faculty and agency personnel	27	52.9	9	40.0	33	50.0
Faculty, agency, and student	15	29.4	ß	33.3	20	30.3
Faculty and peers	-	2.0	0	0.0	L	1.5
None	-	2.0	0	0.0	-	1.5

		Status				
	Pub (N=I	ic (4)	Pri   =	vate 15)	Tot: (N=(	als 59)
	z	8	zı	8	z	<del>36</del>
STUDENTS EVALUATED BY WRITTEN REPORTS (V-46)						
Yes No	<b>4</b> 9 5	90.7 9.3	14	93.3 6.7	63 6	91.3 8.7
STUDENTS EVALUATED BY ORAL REPORTS (V-47)						
Yes No	36 18	66.7 33.3	7 8	46.7 53.3	43 26	62.3 37.7
STUDENTS EVALUATED BY OUTSIDE AGENCIES (V-48)						
Yes No	43 11	79.6 20.4	13	86.7 13.3	56 13	81.2 18.8
STUDENTS EVALUATED BY INTERVIEWS (V-49)						
Yes No	27 27	50.0 50.0	6 9	60.0 40.0	36 33	52.2 47.8
STUDENTS EVALUATED BY VISITATIONS (V-50)						
Yes No	37 17	68.5 31.5	10	33.3 66.7	<b>4</b> 2 27	60.9 39.1

		Statu	S			
	h L N L	ol ic =54)	r S	ivate =15)	To L	tals =69)
	N	%	Z	%	N	%
STUDENTS EVALUATED BY JOURNALS (V-51)						
Yes No	9 45	<b>16.7</b> 83.3	7 8	46.7 53.3	16 53	23.2 76.8
STUDENTS EVALUATED BY PROJECTS (V-52)						
Yes No	18 36	33.3 66.7	4 11	26.7 73.3	22 47	31.9 68.1
STUDENTS EVALUATED BY TESTS (V-53)						
Yes No	5 49	9.3 90.7	0 15	0.0 100.0	5 64	7.2 92.8
INTERNSHIP STUDENTS GRADING FORMAT (V-55)						
Alphabetical (ABCD) Numerical (4321) Pass/Fail (PF, CNC, or SU)	8 19 23	16.0 38.0 46.0	3 10 3	13.3 66.7 20.0	10 29 26	15.4 44.6 40.0
AGENCY PROVIDES SUPERVISION OF INTERN (V-64)						
Yes No	51 3	94.4 5.6	15 0	100.0 0.0	66 3	95.7 4.3

## APPENDIX J

# CRIMINAL JUSTICE INTERNSHIP ISSUES AND OPERATIONAL CONCERNS BY STATE GEOGRAPHIC AREAS

CRIMINAL JUSTICE INTERNSHIP	ISSUES	and operat	LIONAI	. CONCERN	S BY	STATE	GEOGRA	PHIC A	REAS		
				States							l
	Cali (N	fornia =29)		rida 13)	Wici Wi	igan ⊧12)	S.C.	hers =15)	μŪ	otal <u>N</u> =69	s ()
	Z	84	Z	26	Z	સ્ટ	Z	89	~	1	સ્ટ
REQUIREMENT OF INTERNSHIP PROGRAM (V-31)											
Required Not required Encouraged	-22 -1	17.9 78.6 3.6	102	15.4 76.9 7.7	87-	27.3 63.6 9.1	401	26.7 66.7 6.7	14 14 14	730	6
INTERNSHIP BASED ON:											
High school performance (V-32)	Ċ		, ( ,				Ļ		j		Ċ
NO College GPA (V-33)	67	100.0	<u>.</u>	00.0	2	0.00	<u>0</u>	0.001	0		0.0
Yes No	2 27	6.9 93.1	30 10	23.1 76.9	2	41.7 58.3	5 10	33.3 66.7	15 54	21 78	
Student desire to participate (V-34)											
Yes No	23 6	79.3 20.7	ഹയ	61.5 38.5	10	83.3 16.7	11	73.3 26.7	52	75	4.9
Recommendation of faculty or staff (V-35)											
Yes No	01 91	34.5 65.5	ഹയ	61.5 38.5	84	66.7 33.3	8	46.7 53.3	36	52	8 2

APPENDIX J

				States						
	Cali (N)	fornia =29)		rida =13)	Mic Nic	higan =12)	Sc	hers =15)	<u>و ح</u> ا	tals =69)
	N	%	Z	%	Z	%	Z	%	Z	8
TERMS INTERNSHIP IS OFFERED (V-37)										
One term	0	0.0	-	7.7	0	0.0	-	6.7	2	3.0
Two terms Three terms	٥٢	32.1 42 0	~ ~	15.4 0.0	~ ~	9.1 27.3	0 4	0.0	20	17.9 28.4
Four terms	1	25.0	20	76.9	~	63.6	2	66.7	34.	50.7
ORDINARY DURATION OF INTERNSHIP (V-38)										
Less than one term	- 5	3.7 51 0	00	0.0	<u>с</u> и и	18.2 15.5	0	0.0	е с V	4.6 61.6
More than one term	12	44.4	n m	25.0	94	36.4	<u>t</u>	6.7	20	30.8
TIME COMMITMENT OF INTERNSHIP EXPERIENCE (V-39)										
Full time	0	0.0	c	8.3	ŝ	27.3 54 5	ы	33.3 52.2	6 r	13.6
Full or part time	3 V	10.7	0 M	25.0	0 01	34.3 18.2	0 0		10	15.1
OBJECTIVES OF INTERNSHIP FORMALLY STATED (V-40)										
Yes No	21 7	75.0 25.0	10 3	76.9 23.1	۲ <sup>0</sup>	100.0 0.0	3 3	80.0 20.0	54 13	80.6 19.4

				State	S					
	Cali (N	fornia =29)	F10 (N=	rida 13)	Micl (R	nigan =12)	SC C	hers =15)	0 N N	tals =69)
	Z	%	Z	26	Z	26	Z	<del>8</del> 8	Z	24
FUNDS AVAILABLE TO STUDENTS FOR FIELD STUDY (V-56)										
Yes	200	1.7 1.7	0	0.0	~ ~	18.2	ω ц	53.3	12	18.2
No cost	9	21.4	0 0	0.0	~~~	03.0 18.2	0 Q	33.3 13.3	<b>‡</b> 2	00./ 15.2
FACULTY ATTITUDE TOWARD INTERNSHIP PROGRAM (V-57)										
Favorable	23	82.1	б <del>,</del>	75.0	Ξ	100.0	15	100.0	58	87.9
Unfavorable Mixed	N M	7.1 10.7	- ~	8.3 16.7	00	0.0	00	0.0	സന	4.5 7.6
SPECIAL INTERNSHIP PROBLEMS FOR FACULTY OR DEPARTMENT										
Faculty time (V-58)	٦L	55 J	ſ	38 F	ي د	50 D	σ	60 D	36	57 2
No	13	44.8	γœ	61.5	9	50.0	9	40.0	33.5	47.8
Supervision (V-59) Yes	15	51.7	y	46.2	L.	41.7	σ	60.0	35	50.7
No	14	48.3	~	53.8	~	58.3	9	40.0	34	49.3
Communication (V-60) Yes	4	13.8	C	0.0	-	8,3	2	13.3	7	10.1
No	25	86.2	13	100.0	Ξ	91.7	13	86.7	62	89.9
Coordination (V-61)	( 		c	- - -	ſ	C 1 C	L	ר ר ר		
res No	16	44.8 55.2	<u>, 0</u>	23.1 76.9	ოთ	25.U 75.0	° 0	33.3 66.7	45 45	34.8 65.2

•

		Stati	es			
	California ( <u>N</u> =29)	Florida ( <u>N</u> =13)	Michigan ( <u>N</u> =12)	Others ( <u>N</u> =15)	Totals ( <u>N</u> =69)	
	<b>N</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>N</b>	<u>N</u> %	<b>N</b> %	
Limited placement sites (V-62) Yes	12 41.4	0 0.0	3 25.0	5 33.3	20 29.0	
No	17 58.6	13 100.0	9 75.0	10 66.7	49 71.0	
LIABILITY OF INTERNSHIP PARTICIPANTS A PROBLEM (V-66)						
Yes	8 29.6	4 33.3	5 45.5	3 20.0	20 30.7	
No	19 70.4	8 66.7	6 54.6	12 80.0	45 69.2	

### APPENDIX K

# CRIMINAL JUSTICE INTERNSHIP ISSUES AND OPERATIONAL CONCERNS BY STATE REGIONAL AREAS

CRIMINAL JUSTICE INTERNSHIP ISSUES AND	OPERATI	CONAL CON	ICERNS I	3Y STATE	REGION	ial areas		
			Reg	ions				
	52	•ban <u> </u> =34 )	Subi (N	urban =13)	Ruy 	al 17)	ο Ξ	als 69)
	ZI	%	z	<i>6</i> 6	zI	<del>8</del> 6	ZI	<del>2</del> 6
REQUIREMENT OF INTERNSHIP PROGRAM (V-31)								
Required Not monimud	01	27.0 64 0	2[	15.4 84 6	2 4	11.8	14	20.9
Encouraged	t, ω	8. J	0	0.0	<u>t</u>	5.9	4	6.0
INTERNSHIP BASED ON:								
High school performance (V-32)								
No	39	100.0	13	100.0	171	0.00	69	0.00
College GPA (V-33)								
Yes No	31 3	20.5 79.5	103	23.1 76.9	13 13	23.5 76.5	15 54	21.7 78.3
Student desire to participate (V-34)								
Yes No	28 11	71.8 28.2	2	84.6 15.4	13 4	76.5 23.5	52 17	75.4 24.6
Recommendation of faculty or staff (V-35)								
Yes No	18 21	46.2 53.8	7 6	53.8 46.2	8 O	47.1 52.9	23 36	47.8 52.2

APPENDIX K

			Reg	ions				
	Γ.Ξ.	an =34)	ns Sub	urban =13)	2 Č	ral =17)	P ZI	tals =69)
	z	<del>8</del> 8	ZI	8	ZI	<del>3</del> 6	Z	86
TERMS INTERNSHIP IS OFFERED (V-37)								
One terms Two terms	0 "	0.0 13.5	04	30.8 30.8	2 6	11.8 17.6	26	3.0
Three terms Four terms	13	35.1 51.4	903	23.1 46.2	ט ט ט	17.6 52.9	34	28.4
ORDINARY DURATION OF INTERNSHIP (V-38)								
Less than one term One term More than one term	24 10	5.6 66.7 27.8	9 <del>-</del> 9	7.7 46.2 46.2	004	0.0 75.0 25.0	3 42 20	4.6 64.6 30.8
TIME COMMITMENT OF INTERNSHIP EXPERIENCE (V-39)								
Full time Part time Full or part time	4 27 6	10.8 73.0 16.2	м Ф –	23.1 69.2 7.7	312	12.5 68.8 18.8	9 47 10	13.6 71.2 15.1
OBJECTIVES OF INTERNSHIP FORMALLY STATED (V-40)								
Yes No	31 6	83.8 16.2	۲ 2	84.6 15.4	12 5	70.6 29.4	5 <b>4</b> 13	80.6 19.4

			Reg	lons				
	L'-Z	an =34 )	Subi Subi	urban =13)		ral =17)	Tot (N	als 69)
	Z	%	Z	26	Z	સ્થ	Z	89
FUNDS AVAILABLE TO STUDENTS FOR FIELD STUDY (V-56)								
Yes No	5 26	13.5 70.3	10	15.4 76.9	ഗയ	31.3 50.0	12 44	18.6 66.7
No costs	9	16.2	-	7.7	e	18.8	10	15.2
FACULTY ATTITUDE TOWARD INTERNSHIP PROGRAM (V-57)								
Favorable Ilnfavorable	32	86.5 2.7	12	92.3 7.7	14 1	87.5 6.3	302	87.9 4.5
Mixed	4	10.8	0	0.0		6.3	S	7.6
SPECIAL INTERNSHIP PROBLEMS FOR FACULTY OR DEPARTMENT								
Faculty time (V-58) Yes	19	48.7	6	69.2 69.2	ω (	47.1	36	52.2
No	20	51.3	4	30.8	δ	52.9	33	41.8
Supervision (V-59) Yes	20	51.3	6	69.2	9	35.3	35	50.7
No	19	48.7	4	30.8	Ξ	64.7	34	49.3
Communication (V-60) Yes	2	5.1	4	30.8	~	5.9	2	10.1
NO	37	94.9	6	69.2	16	94.1	62	89.9
Coordination (V-61)	( 	, , ,	L		L	7	¥C	
res No	13 26	33.3 66.7	0	40. <i>c</i> 53.8	12 0	70.6	45	54.0 65.2

			Regi	ons				
	Urba ( <u>N</u> =3	11 14)	Subu ( <u>N</u> =	irban 13)	Rur (N=	al (11)	P Z	tals =69)
	zI	96	ZI	86	zI	%	ZI	<del>26</del>
Limited placement sites (V-62) Yes	10	5.6	ъ	38.5	ъ 2	29.4	20	29.0
No	29 7	4.4	8	61.5	12	70.6	49	71.0
LIABILITY OF INTERNSHIP PARTICIPANTS A PROBLEM (V-66)								
Yes No	13 24 6	15.1 14.9	10 3	23.1 76.9	45	26.7 73.3	20 45	30.7 69.2

### APPENDIX L

# CRIMINAL JUSTICE INTERNSHIP ISSUES AND OPERATIONAL CONCERNS BY LEVEL OF INSTITUTION

CRIMINAL JUSTICE INTERNSHIP ISSUES AND O	Ass <u>N</u>	ociate =32) %	Lev ( <u>N</u> =	9Y LEVEL (	Grac ( <u>N</u>	duate =10)		=69)
REQUIREMENT OF INTERNSHIP PROGRAM (V-31) Required Not required	28 28	6.5 90.3	10 16	37.0 59.3	5 2	22.2 55.6	14 49	20.9 73.1
INTERNSHIP BASED ON:								
High school performance (V-32)								
No	32	100.0	27 .	100.0	10	100.0	69	100.0
College GPA								
Yes	2 30	6.3 93.8	12 15	44.4 55.6	<b>-</b> 9	10.0 90.0	15 54	21.7 78.3
Student desire to participate (V-34)								
Yes No	27 5	84.4 15.6	20 7	74.1 25.9	თთ	50.0 50.0	52 17	75.4 24.6
Recommendation of faculty or staff (V-35)								
Yes No	14 18	<b>43.</b> 8 56.3	14 13	51.9 48.1	თთ	50.0 50.0	36 36	47.8 52.2

APPENDIX L

TERMS INTERNSHIP IS OFFERED (V-37)	Asso ( <u>N</u> = <u>N</u>	ciate 32) %	Le Bac N	vel helors =27)	Graa ( <u>N</u>	=10) %		=69) %
TERMS INTERNSHIP IS OFFERED (V-37) One term Two terms Three terms	2010	5.5 29.0 32.3	0 2 0 2 0	0.0 11.1 22.2	<b>ω</b> Ο Ο	0.0 33.3	12	3.0 17.9 28.4
ORDINARY DURATION OF INTERNSHIP (V-38)								
Less than one term One term More than one term	10 10	3.4 62.1 34.5	9 6	7.4 70.4 22.2	450	0.0 55.6 44.4	42 20	4.6 64.6 30.8
TIME COMMITMENT OF INTERNSHIP EXPERIENCE (V-39) Full time Part time Full or part time	3 <sup>2</sup> 52	6.7 83.3 10.0	14 6	25.9 51.9 22.2	- 80	0.0 88.9 11.1	9 47 10	13.6 71.2 15.1
OBJECTIVES OF INTERNSHIP FORMALLY STATED (V-40) Yes No	24 7	77.4 22.6	2 <b>4</b> 3	88.9 11.1	აი	66.7 33.3	54 13	80.6 19.4
No	24 7	22.6	3 <sup>2</sup> 4	00.9 ]].]	ωσ	33.3	13 13	au.o 19.4

			Lev	/e1				
	Assoc	ciate 32)	Bact	nelors =27)	Grac ( <u>N</u> =	duate =10)		tals =69)
	2	%	Z	8	Z	8	IZ	<del>8</del> 8
FUNDS AVAILABLE TO STUDENTS FOR FIELD STUDY (V-56)								
Yes No	19	16.7 63.3	7	25.9	0 8 0	0.0	12 44	18.6 66.7
FACULTY ATTITUDE TOWARD INTERNSHIP PROGRAM (V-57)								
Favorable Unfavorable	27	90.0 6.7	25	92.6 3.7	000	66.7 0.0	- 3 58	87.9 4.5
SPECIAL INTERNSHIP PROBLEMS FOR FACULTY OR DEPARTMENT								
Faculty time (V-58) Yes No	16 16	50.0 50.0	13 14	48.1 51.9	3	70.0 30.0	33 33	52.2 47.8
Supervision (V-59) Yes No	17 15	53.1 46.9	12 15	44.4 55.6	40	60.0 40.0	35 34	50.7 49.3
Communication (V-60) Yes No	29 29	9.4 90.6	24	11.1 88.9	- 9	10.0 90.0	7 62	10.1 89.9
Coordination (V-61) Yes No	14 18	<b>4</b> 3.8 56.3	7 20	25.9 74.1	73	30.0 70.0	24 45	34.8 65.2

LIABILITY OF INTERNSHIP PARTICIPANTS A PROBLEM (V-66) Yes No	Limited placement sites (V-62) Yes No	
9 30.0 21 70.0	13 40.6 19 59.4	Associate ( <u>N</u> =32) <u>N</u> %
10 37.0 17 63.0	5 18.5 22 81.5	Level Bachelors ( <u>N</u> =27) <u>N</u> %
1 12.5 7 87.5	2 20.0 8 80.0	Graduate ( <u>N</u> =10) <u>N</u> %
20 30.7 45 69.2	20 29.0 49 71.0	Totals ( <u>N</u> =69) <u>N</u> %

APPENDIX M

CRIMINAL JUSTICE INTERNSHIP ISSUES AND OPERATIONAL

CONCERNS BY STATUS OF INSTITUTION

		olic 54)	(Nr	ivate	Tot	als
REMITREMENT OF INTERNSHID PROGRAM (V-31)	IZ	54	Z	~	2	66
Required	10	19.2	4	26.7	14	20.9
Not required Encouraged	40 2	76.9 3.8	2 9	60.0 13.4	49 4	73.1 6.0
INTERNSHIP BASED ON:						
High school performance (V-32)						
No	54	100.0	15	100.0	69	100.0
College GPA (V-33)						
Yes No	12 42	22.2 77.8	3 12	20.0 80.0	15 54	21.7 78.8
Student desire to participate (V-34)						
Yes No	42 12	77.8 22.2	10 5	66.7 33.3	52 17	75.4 24.6
Recommendation of faculty or staff (V-35)						
Yes No	24 30	44.4 55.6	6 9	60.0 40.0	33 36	<b>47.</b> 8 52.2

# CRIMINAL JUSTICE INTERNSHIP ISSUES AND OPERATIONAL CONCERNS BY STATUS OF INSTITUTION

APPENDIX M

			Status				
		ol ic ⊧54)		oriva ( <u>N</u> =15	te	(N=	als 69)
	Z	86		2	26	Z	26
TERMS INTERNSHIP IS OFFERED (V-37)							
One term	5	າ 3.8		აა		2 C	3.0
iwo cerms Three terms Four terms	25 25	17.3 30.8 48.1		6 N N	0.00	19 34	28.4 50.7
ORDINARY DURATION OF INTERNSHIP (V-38)							
Less than one term One term More than one term	2 34 14	4.0 68.0 28.0		- 0.0 -	6.7 3.3 0.0	42 20	4.6 64.6 30.8
TIME COMMITMENT OF INTERNSHIP EXPERIENCE (V-39)							
Full time Part time Full or part time	35 8	15.7 68.6 15.7			6.7 3.3	9 47 10	13.6 71.2 15.1
OBJECTIVES OF INTERNSHIP FORMALLY STATED (V-40)							
Yes No	44 8	84.6 15.4	10	ა. თ. თ.		54 13	80.6 19.4
FUNDS AVAILABLE TO STUDENTS FOR FIELD STUDY (V-56)							
Yes No No costs	10 33 8	19.6 64.7 15.7	2122		ມ ມ ມ ມ ມ ມ	12 10	18.2 66.7 15.2

Put ( <u>N</u> = FACULTY ATTITUDE TOWARD INTERNSHIP PROGRAM (V-57)	ע (P צ 1	ivate =15) %	Tota ( <u>N</u> =6	% 59) %
FACULTY ATTITUDE TOWARD INTERNSHIP PROGRAM (V-57)	<u> </u> Z	84	2	<del>6</del> 8
PROGRAM (V-57)				
Favorable 44	14	93.3	58	<u>.</u>
Unfavorable 3 Mixed 4	- 0	0.0 6.7	თ	<b>4.</b> 5 7.6
SPECIAL INTERNSHIP PROBLEMS FOR FACULTY OR DEPARTMENT				
Faculty time (V-58) Yes	7	46.7	36	52.2
No 25	8	53.3	33	47.8
Supervision (V-59)	7	<b>N</b> R 7	л Л	<b>FU 1</b>
No 26	8.	53.3	34 34	49.3
Communication (V-60)		1	I	
Yes 6 No 48	  4	6./ 93.3	62 62	10.1 89.9
Coordination (V-61) Yes 21	<u>۔</u> س	20.0	24	34.8
limitod placement often (V 62)	Ē		ā	
Ves 16	14	26.7 73.3	20 49	29.0 71.0

	Stat	Sus	
	Public	Private	Totals
	( <u>N</u> =54)	( <u>N</u> =15)	( <u>N</u> =69)
	<u>N</u>	<u>N</u>	%
	%	%	8
LIABILITY OF INTERNSHIP PARTICIPANTS A PROBLEM (V-66)			
Yes	17 33.4	3 21.4	20 30.7
No	34 66.7	11 78.6	45 69.2

YH9A901J818

### **YH9A901J818**

- Beto, G. J., & Marsh, R. Problems in development of an undergraduate criminal justice curriculum. <u>Federal Probation</u>, 1974, <u>38</u>(4), 34-40.
- Brown, J. W., & Thornton, J. W., Jr. College teaching: Perspectives and guidelines. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963.
- Brown, M. K. Evaluation of the UCLA community-police relations training program, 1970/71. Los Angeles: University of Galifornia, Los Angeles, Institute of Government and Police Affairs, 1971.
- Cain, A. A., & Kravitz, M. Public defenders programs--alected bibliography. Mashington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1978.
- Colbach, E. M., & Fosterling, C. D. Police social work. Springfield: Charles C. Thomas, Publisher, 1976.
- Council for the Advancement of Experiential Learning. A thumbnail success of Columbia, Md.: Author, 1979. (Letter)
- Davies, D. R. The internship in educational administration. Washington, D.C.: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1962.
- Davis, R. H., Duley, J. S., & Alexander, L. T. Field experience. Guides for the improvement of instruction in higher education. East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1977.
- Drake, M. K. UNO campus security intern program--Final evaluation -2701, Omaha: University of Nebraska Press at Omaha, 1975.
- Duley, J. S. Survey of current practice in field experience education, Michigan State University, 1977-1978. Paper #78. LES papers on learning and teaching. East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1978.
- Duley, J., & Gordon, S. <u>College sponsored experiential learning</u> CAEL handbook. Princeton, N.J.: CAEL Educational Testing Services, 1977.

- Ehrlich, T. Giving low-income Americans minimum access to legal services. American Bar Association Journal, 1978, 64, 696-98. Barton, 13). Chicago: William Benton, 1968.
- Epstein, J., & Vanderhoef, S. Paraprofessionalism: A study for the Winnipeg Police Commission. Winnipeg: University of Winnipeg, Institute of Urban Studies, 1977.
- Farmer, R. E. Internships in police higher education: An evaluation. Journal of Police Science and Administration, 1978, 6(4), 452-61.
- Fuller, R. B. Education automation: Freeing the scholar to return to his studies. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1962.
- Fuller, R. B. Operating manual for spaceship earth. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1969.
- Gallas, G. S. Court executive training program. Denver: University of Denver, Institute for Court Management, 1970.
- Goodman, L. S. Training aids. In R. L. Craig & L. R. Bittel (Eds.), Training and development handbook. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1967.
- Greene, J. R. Improving the quality of law enforcement education: The role of internship programs. Police studies: The international review of police development, 1979, 2(1), 43-49.
- Harvard University Law School--Center for Criminal Justice. Annual Report, June 30, 1973. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Law School, 1973.
- Henderson, A. D. The innovative spirit. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1972.
- Houtz, P. Internships in student personnel programs. In L. E. Fitzgerald, W. F. Johnson, & W. Norris (Eds.), College student personnel: Readings and bibliographies. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1970.
- Kaslow, F. W., & Abrams, J. C. Forensic psychology and criminal justice--An evolving subspecialty at Hahnemann Medical College. Professional Psychology, 1976, 7(4), 445-52.
- Kuldau, V. D. Criminal justice education--Myths or reality? Police Chief, 1975, 42(8), 18-19.

- Klotter, J. C., & Rosenfeld, T. Criminal justice instructional techniques. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, Publisher, 1979.
- Kobetz, R. W. Criminal justice education directory, 1978-80. Gaithersburg, Md.: International Association of Chiefs of Police, 1978.
- Kowitz, G. T., Graves, W. H., & Dronberger, G. B. Changing approaches to corrections. Journal of Criminal Justice, 1974, 2(2), 173-75.
- Larson, R. A. Legal paraprofessionals--Cultivation of a new field. American Bar Association Journal, 1973, <u>59</u>, 45-48.
- Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. Guidelines and participation--Criteria for internating program, May 1971. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1971.
- Leedy, P. D. Practical research: Planning and design. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1974.
- Levin, S. I. Summer youth programs at the New Haven Department of Police Services, 1972--Final report. New Haven, Ct.: New Haven Police Department, 1972.
- McCormack, R. J. Middle management exchange. Police Chief, 1973, 4<u>0</u>(1), 42-44.
- Milligan, B. E. Field placement--Its use at Niagra College. Police Chief, 1972, 39(11), 32-35.
- Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice. Criminal Justice education and training. The national manpower survey of the criminal justice system (Vol. 5). Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1979.
- National Law Student Internship and Placement Program--Final report. Chicago: National District Attorneys Association, 1975.
- Newell, C. A. Handbook for the development of internship programs in educational administration. New York: Cooperative Program in Educational Administration, Middle Atlantic Region, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1952.
- New York University, Criminal Law Education and Research Center. Report of the Director, 1969-1970. New York: New York University, 1970.
- Nie, N. H., Hull, C. H., Jenkins, J. G., Steinbrenner, K., and Bent, D. H. Statistical package for the social sciences (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1975.

- Noble, S. G. A history of American education. New York: Rinehart & . Co., 1938.
- Oberholtzer, W. D. <u>Beyond experience--Undergraduate internship in</u> adult corrections. Olympia, Washington Department of Social and Health Services, 1972.
- Peterson, J. L., & DeForest, P. R. <u>Status</u> of forensic science degree programs in the United States. Washington, D.C.: American Academy of Forensic Sciences, 1976.
- Problems in administering programs to improve law enforcement education--Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1975.
- Prout, R. Criminal justice internships--Exposure or attainment? Police Chief, 1975, 42(8), 36-37.
- Quinn, M. E. An investigation of undergraduate field study experiences at Michigan State University. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1972.
- Richert, J. P. Recruiting and training judges in France. Judicature. 1973, <u>57</u>(4), 145-49.
- Schoenfeld, B. N. Philadelphia-defender intern project. Harrisburg: Pennsylvania Department of Justice, 1974.
- Schrink, J. L., & Grosskopf, E. W. Law enforcement internship. Police Chief, 1978, 45, 37-38, 40-42.
- Sherman, L. W. The quality of police education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1978.
- Siegel, S. Nonparametric statistics for the behavioral sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1956.
- Silverman, I. J., & Vega, M. Field experience for criminal justice faculty--New currency for teaching. Lambda Alpha Epsilon Journal, 1977, 40(1), 16-20,
- Snarr, R. W., & McCauley, R. P. Minority recruitment manual for Ohio peace officers report, 1977. London, Ohio: Ohio Peace Officer Training Academy, 1976.
- Spearman, R. W., & Stevens, H. Step toward equal justice--Program to increase black lawyers in the South, 1969-1973. An evaluation report to the Carnegie Corporation of New York. New York: Carnegie Corporation of New York, 1974.

- Stone, J. C., & Robinson, C. N. The graduate internship program in teacher education: The first six years. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1965.
- Tenney, C. W., Jr. Higher education programs in law enforcement and criment frains justice. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, .7971.
- Treger, H. Social work in the police agency: Implications for education and practice. Journal of Education for Social Work, 1976, <u>12(2), 43-50.</u>
- 0.5. Department of Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. Manpower planning and development programs in the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration--Final report of the Task Force on Criminal Justice Education and Training. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1976.
- West, P. C. Breaking the security barriers. <u>Security Management</u>, 1975, <u>19</u>(1), 44-47.
- Wheaton, G. A. A status study of internship programs in school administration. A report of a Type C project. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1950.



