

INFORMATION TO USERS

This dissertation was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed, the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again - beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.

University Microfilms

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

A Xerox Education Company

73-5449

MOORE, Merlyn Douglas, 1942-
A STUDY OF THE PLACEMENT AND UTILIZATION
PATTERNS AND VIEWS OF THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE
GRADUATES OF MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY.

Michigan State University, Ph.D., 1972
Sociology, criminology

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

A STUDY OF THE PLACEMENT AND UTILIZATION
PATTERNS AND VIEWS OF THE CRIMINAL
JUSTICE GRADUATES OF MICHIGAN
STATE UNIVERSITY

By

Merlyn Douglas Moore

A THESIS

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

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

College of Social Science

1972

PLEASE NOTE:

Some pages may have
indistinct print.

Filmed as received.

University Microfilms, A Xerox Education Company

ABSTRACT

A STUDY OF THE PLACEMENT AND UTILIZATION PATTERNS AND VIEWS OF THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE GRADUATES OF MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

by

Merlyn Douglas Moore

This study was part of a coordinated research project conducted by the School of Criminal Justice concerning criminal justice education. The School received a grant from the Michigan State Planning Agency, the Office of Criminal Justice Programs, in order to conduct systematic planning and research in a number of areas. To plan effectively in the area of criminal justice education there must be a clear understanding and knowledge of what happens to the student following graduation. A review of the literature revealed that there have been relatively few studies done that have been concerned with the graduates of criminal justice programs.

In an effort to cast more light on this subject area, this writer conducted a survey of the School's graduates to gather information concerning placement and utilization of its graduates, as well as their views toward the criminal justice program and selected criminal justice issues related to criminal justice education. The population surveyed was the total number of graduates of Michigan State University who majored in criminal justice (excluding foreign students residing in foreign countries). Consideration of the size and geographical dispersion of the population resulted in the determination that the most appropriate means of data-gathering would be accomplished through the use of the mailed, self-

administering questionnaire.

After development of the questionnaire, a pre-test was given to a purposive sample of 150 graduates. As a result of the pre-test, revisions were made and the revised questionnaire was sent to 1,822 graduates. After approximately three weeks a follow-up letter was sent out to those graduates who had not yet responded.

As a result of the initial mailing and follow-up, 1,161 questionnaires were returned. Along with this, 91 questionnaires were returned unanswered by the U. S. Post Office as being undeliverable. This represented a useable return percentage of 67.1.

The major purpose of this research was to discover "what is", since this particular body of knowledge is practically non-existent. Thus this study represents a new body of information that should contribute towards (1) an understanding of placement and utilization patterns of criminal justice graduates; (2) an understanding of placement and utilization policies of various criminal justice agencies; (3) a determining of the strengths and weaknesses in the criminal justice program at Michigan State University; (4) an understanding of selected issues in criminal justice as perceived by criminal justice graduates; (5) a source for both criminal justice students and criminal justice programs across the nation to utilize; and (6) establishing a more coordinated placement program between the School and the criminal justice field.

Some of the more salient results of the study were: (1) a majority of graduates (608 or 53%) chose a public law enforcement agency as their initial employment opportunity; (2) the four most frequently mentioned reasons by graduates who chose not to enter the criminal justice field

or a related area were (a) jobs were simply not available, (b) low salary, (c) lack of opportunity, and (d) a physical restriction; (3) a majority of graduates (640 or 62%) were initially placed at the level of operation; (4) a majority of respondents (67%) felt their college training was best utilized through their initial job placement; (5) 50% of the respondents reported that their present job is not with the same agency/organization that initially hired them; (6) the public law enforcement category remains the largest single present employment category with 510 graduates (45%); (7) although there was considerable transposition between agencies/organizations on the part of a number of respondents, a majority of graduates have remained in their initial area of employment (e.g., 74% who began in public law enforcement are still in that area; 42% are still in private law enforcement, 84% are still in non-law enforcement; 75% are still in the military); (8) as a group, the majority of respondents (722 or 67%) feel their criminal justice education is being utilized in their current employment position; (9) the majority of criminal justice graduates rank the factor that "graduates of degree programs usually start on the lowest step of the law enforcement agency ladder", as being the most detrimental to the recruitment of college graduates into the criminal justice field; (10) the public law enforcement category (federal level) is thought to put forth the greatest effort in recruiting college graduates, and the private law enforcement category was thought to provide the least effort; (11) the public law enforcement category (state and local level) ranks as the category providing the least effort in placing graduates in positions commensurate to their education, and the public law enforcement

category (federal level) is thought to provide the greatest effort; (12) a majority of graduates espouse many of the recommended changes suggested by the President's Commission (1967) pertaining to personnel policy revisions; (13) a majority of graduates feel their agencies espouse many of these recommended changes; (14) 547 graduates (57%) feel the School of Criminal Justice should not leave the criminal justice program unchanged. A majority of respondents feel there should be an "integration of both the operational and administrative approaches" to criminal justice education; (15) overwhelmingly, the graduates (977 or 98%) feel their college education had been a positive influence on their career.

TO

MY PARENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This dissertation reflects the effort and support of many persons. The author wishes to express his sincere appreciation to the following people, who together made this study possible:

Eleven-hundred forty-nine criminal justice graduates, whose cooperative effort made the study possible;

Michigan Office of Criminal Justice Programs, without whose financial assistance this study would not have been possible;

Professor John H. McNamara, Graduate Committee Chairman, and Professors Leonard Kasdan, James B. McKee, and Ralph F. Turner, members of the Graduate Committee, for their assistance and guidance during the doctoral program;

Professor Larry Hoover, for his suggestions in the preparation of the final draft;

Mrs. Liesa Gilbert, for her painstaking efforts in typing and editing the final draft;

Mr. Chuck McCallum, for his assistance in providing a most up-to-date address list of past graduates of the School of Criminal Justice;

Mr. James Mullin, for his assistance in computer programming;

Mrs. Joan Dunn, for her assistance in key punching and verification of the data;

The faculty and students of the School of Criminal Justice for their assistance in the development of the survey instrument;

and last, but not least, the author's wife, Barbara, and daughter, Jennifer, for being the motivating force behind the author's academic pursuits.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Chapter</u>		<u>Page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vi
I.	THE NATURE OF THE PROBLEM	1
	Introduction to the Problem	1
	Statement of the Problem	6
	Importance of Study	7
	Statement of Hypotheses and Their Rationale	8
	Definitions of Terms Used	22
II.	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	24
III.	METHODOLOGY	40
	Description of Sample	41
	Construction of the Instrument	41
	Pre-Testing the Instrument	42
	Sampling Techniques and Research Design	43
	Analysis Techniques	44
	Limitations of Study	45
IV.	DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS	46
	Format of Data Presentation	46
	General Information	47
	Educational Information	49
	Post-College Initial Placement Information	54
	Present Employment Information and Views Toward Selected Issues in Criminal Justice	84

<u>Chapter</u>		<u>Page</u>
V.	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	117
	Summary	117
	Conclusions	120
	Discussion	133
	Implications for Future Research	138
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	140
	APPENDICES	143

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	General Characteristics of the Sample	47
2	Year of Graduation (BS)	50
3	Year of Graduation (MS)	50
4	Area of Specialization	51
5	Degree of Satisfaction with Curriculum by Area of Specialization	53
6	Initial Job Placement	56
7	Degree of Satisfaction with Level of Initial Placement by Initial Major Employment	58
8	Degree of Satisfaction by Public Law Enforcement Initial Placement	60
9	In-Service, Prior-Service, Pre-Service Students by Initial Placement in Non-Law Enforcement/Law Enforcement Work ...	63
10	Initial Placement with Agency or Organization	64
11	Initial Placement Position by Initial Major Employment ...	65
12	Initial Placement Position by Public Law Enforcement Category	66
13	Initial Placement Position by Degree Received	67
14	Initial Placement Position by In-Service, Prior-Service, and Pre-Service Graduates	68
15	Year of Graduation by Initial Placement Position	69
16	Time Sequence Before Being Promoted or Assigned to a Spe- cialized, Supervisory, or Administrative Position by Initial Major Employment	70
17	Pay Incentive Program by Initial Major Employment	73
18	Managerial/Internship Program by Initial Major Employment	73

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
19	Lateral Entry Policy by Initial Major Employment 74
20	Entry Level by Initial Major Employment 76
21	Degree of Preparedness for Initial Job Placement 77
22	Degree of Preparedness in Comparison with Fellow Workers .. 77
23	Degree of Preparedness for Initial Job Placement by Area of Specialization 78
24	Utilization of College Training Through Initial Job Placement 79
25	Initial Entrance Salary 81
26	Length of Time Remained with Initial Job After Graduation Before Accepting Second Job 82
27	Length of Time Remained with Criminal Justice Agency After Graduation Before Accepting Second Job - In-Service Personnel 83
28	Present Employment 85
29	Present Employment by Initial Major Employment 88
30	Present Job Position by Present Employment 90
31	Extent Criminal Justice Education Utilized in Current Position 91
32	Number of Agencies Worked for Since Graduating from M.S.U. 92
33	Present Salary 93
34	Factors Ranked as Most Detrimental to the Recruitment of College Graduates 94
35	Ranking of Agencies' Efforts Towards Recruiting College Graduates 95
36	Ranking of Agencies' Efforts in Placing College Graduates in Positions Commensurate with Their Education 96
37	Lateral Entry Policy 100
38	Lateral Entry Policy by Public Law Enforcement Category ... 101

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
39	Initial Job Entry - Degree Holder and Non-Degree Holder 104
40	Initial Job Entry - Undergraduate Degree Holder and the Graduate Degree Holder 105
41	Agency Feeling on Difference in Initial Job Entry Between Non-Degree Holder and Undergraduate Degree Holder by Public Law Enforcement Category Breakdown 106
42	Agency Feeling on Difference in Initial Job Entry Between Undergraduate Degree Holder and Graduate Degree Holder by Public Law Enforcement Category Breakdown 108
43	Response of Bachelor and Master Degree Holders 110
44	Thrust of Criminal Justice Program 113

CHAPTER I

THE NATURE OF THE PROBLEM

Introduction to the Problem

The criminal justice arena can be viewed from a variety of sociological perspectives. For instance, the work of Skolnik relates to the institutional analysis of the law in the sociology of law. His primary aim was to investigate how value conflicts in a democratic society create conditions that affect the capacity of the police to respond to the rule of law.¹ Another major perspective derives from the study of organizations and their personnel. In the case of the police and other criminal justice agencies in the American criminal justice system, one can gain some understanding of the effectiveness of the system and its personnel by examining the concept of professionalization and its emphasis on education.

In order to consider the concept of professionalization, some consideration must be given to the term "profession", for many occupational groups with but slight intrinsic claim to the quality status of a profession have appropriated the concept. Basically, the term "profession" is properly attached only to those occupations which are based upon a high degree of intellectual content. It would seem proper to delineate a profession as follows: (1) a service oriented rather than product oriented, function; (2) utilization of scientific knowledge and specialized talents;

¹Jerome H. Skolnick, Justice Without Trial: Law Enforcement in Democratic Society (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966).

(3) personnel who have achieved a high level of competence based on a mastery of considerable intellectual content; (4) personnel who are given extensive autonomy and authority in exercising their special competences; (5) personnel who have strong commitments to a career based on their special competence; (6) personnel who are committed to the free spirit of inquiry, and whose loyalties relate more to the profession than to an employing organization, and whose values relative to personal accomplishment relate to esteem of professional peers, rather than to hierarchical supervisors; and (7) personnel who are determined to influence change by taking action to eliminate or ostracize all incompetent and immoral members of the occupation.²

Although there are many personnel of professional competence in the criminal justice arena, the occupational grouping categorized as the criminal justice field as a whole does not meet the standards of a profession to the degree that it should, even though it is a professional activity. This observation was clearly reflected in the work of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice. Many of its recommendations concerned giving professional status and recognition to those personnel who merit such prestige, and to provide incentives to those members of the organization who might be persuaded to increase their technical competence and general education. In addition, many of these recommendations were developed as incentives to attract the college educated graduate, since the qualities which criminal justice officials claim

²A.C. Germann, "Recruitment, Selection, Promotion and Civil Service", a paper submitted to The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, 1967, pp. 193-196.

to look for in recruits are the very ones which a liberal education is believed to enhance. According to Saunders, a liberal education is believed to nurture: a knowledge of changing social, economic, and political conditions, an understanding of human behavior; and the ability to communicate; together with the assumption of certain moral values, habits of mind, and qualities of self-discipline which are important in sustaining a commitment to public service.³

The matter of recruiting and retaining criminal justice personnel deserves further mentioning - that is to the extent to which a criminal justice agency makes particular provisions for attracting and retaining college educated individuals into their agencies. For it goes without saying that unless substantial retentive features are built into an organization's structure (such as that recommended by the Commission), the professionally educated individual will seek a career elsewhere.

The developing professionalization movement in criminal justice provides the necessary base for the application of sociology to criminal justice concerns. Because of its emphasis on education, the professionalization concept has opened the way for what is probably the most significant "application" of sociology to date.⁴ Although there have been a number of studies recently of college students - their attitudes and opinions, and changes in these as a consequence of their college experience,

³Charles B. Saunders, Jr., Upgrading the American Police: Education and Training for Better Law Enforcement (Washington, D.C., The Brookings Institution, 1970), pp. 82-83.

⁴Paul F. Lazerfield, William H. Sewell and Harold L. Wilensky, The Uses of Sociology (New York: Basic Books, Inc. 1967).

and also of what happened to them after college⁵ - there has been little definitive data available on the criminal justice graduate. Is he, in fact, attracted to the criminal justice field? Is he placed and utilized in positions commensurate to his professional training? Does he espouse many of the recommended changes that research investigations by sociologists state are needed? Does his agency espouse such feelings? Does he remain in the criminal justice field for a career? These are just some of the questions that this study hopes to answer.

This study was part of a coordinated research project conducted by the School of Criminal Justice concerning criminal justice education. The School received a grant from the Michigan State Planning Agency, the Office of Criminal Justice Programs, in order to conduct systematic planning and research in a number of areas. The goals of the project were to enhance the teaching and advising of students in the School, to update and revise the present curriculum, to improve the placement and utilization of the School's graduates in the field, and to develop a teacher preparation program for criminal justice higher education programs as well as to work toward the articulation of criminal justice education programs in the State of Michigan.

To accomplish some of the above stated goals, the School conducted a survey of its graduates to gather information concerning placement and utilization of its graduates, as well as their views toward the criminal justice program and selected criminal justice issues.

⁵James B. McKee, Introduction to Sociology (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969) p. 509.

This writer saw the need for such research when inquiry into what happens to graduates of criminal justice programs proved negligible. Important questions concerning where graduates go after graduation, what placement and utilization patterns do they meet, what do they think about their studies in criminal justice, why do non-law enforcement graduates choose not to enter the field for which they are prepared, and other similar questions have been left virtually unanswered. Some of these questions have been partially answered, but for the most part not by individual schools. For example, there have been a few surveys done by independent sources that have contributed towards answering some of these questions and they will be discussed in the review of the literature section. Surprisingly, this writer knows of no criminal justice school that has conducted research of this kind. The importance of this fact can be ascertained from the following observations.

Tenney noted that most professional disciplines--law, medicine, social work, etc.--have some knowledge as to where individuals educated in these disciplines have gone following completion of their formal education. A professional school undertakes to maintain such information. From a professional point of view, it is important to know how many lawyers, doctors, or social workers are in private practice, government service, teaching, or related activities. Professional schools are interested from both a recruitment and curriculum point of view in what happens to their students.⁶ Yet criminal justice programs have been in existence for forty years with

⁶ Charles W. Tenney, Jr., Higher Education Programs in Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice (Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971) pp. 57-58.

little systematic research concerning what becomes of their graduates.

Thus, research of this nature is essential if the criminal justice discipline is to reach professional stature and also important, from the School of Criminal Justice's standpoint, to maintain the School's function of providing leadership in the field of criminal justice education and enhancing the progress toward the professionalization of the criminal justice arena.

Statement of the Problem

It is the purpose of this report to: (1) inquire about the initial placement and utilization of past graduates from the School of Criminal Justice; (2) inquire about the criminal justice program and preparation they received while attending Michigan State University; (3) inquire about their present employment; (4) survey the graduates on personnel procedures and related concepts as they relate to criminal justice higher education; and (5) inquire as to the direction the School should take in the criminal justice program as perceived by its graduates.

Inquiring into the past experiences of graduates of Michigan State's School of Criminal Justice will enable this writer to: (1) compare the placement and utilization patterns exercised by the various criminal justice agencies; (2) compare placement and utilization patterns of bachelor degree holders and advanced degree holders; (3) compare the initial placement patterns of in-service, prior-service, and pre-service graduates; and (4) ascertain the reason or reasons that some graduates do not choose, or choose to leave the criminal justice field. Inquiring about the criminal justice program and preparation received while attending Michigan State

should provide feedback for purposes of evaluating the School's curriculum for possible improvement. Through the constructive appraisal of the School's program by graduates now in the field, a more relevant program may be developed in an effort to bring the objectives of the School and those of the criminal justice agencies into closer harmony. Inquiring about the graduate's present employment will not only provide exact information as to what has happened to the individual student following graduation, but it will also allow one to look at the mobility patterns of criminal justice graduates. Finally, the descriptive data alone will help to answer many questions concerning the areas contained within the survey instrument that is necessary for future planning.

Importance of Study

To the best of this writer's knowledge there have been relatively few attempts made to determine what happens to the criminal justice student following graduation. Thus this study represents a new body of information that should contribute towards: (1) an understanding of placement and utilization patterns of criminal justice graduates; (2) an understanding of placement and utilization policies of various criminal justice agencies; (3) a determination of the strengths and weaknesses in the criminal justice program at Michigan State University; (4) an understanding of selected issues in criminal justice as perceived by criminal justice graduates; (5) a source for both criminal justice students and criminal justice programs across the nation to utilize; and (6) establishing a more coordinated placement program between the School and the criminal justice field.

Statement of Hypotheses and Their Rationale

Hypothesis I. A majority of graduates, if they had to do it over again, would (1) choose again the same area of specialization and (2) again choose the criminal justice area as their college major.

Rationale: This assumption is based on the belief that graduates would want to work in the field they studied four or more years in college for.

Hypothesis II. A majority of criminal justice graduates will have felt satisfied with the criminal justice curriculum while attending Michigan State University.

Rationale: According to Larkins in his survey of the industrial security graduates of Michigan State, the majority of graduates were more than satisfied with the criminal justice curriculum while attending M.S.U.⁷ Assuming that the industrial security graduate is not that differentiated from other graduates in other areas of specialization, one can predict that the majority of respondents will be satisfied with the curriculum that was in effect during their study in the program. However, it should be noted that Havemann and West reported that the greatest dissatisfaction with the college experience among college graduates was the curriculum pursued while attending college.⁸

Hypothesis III. The majority of criminal justice graduates will have chosen a public law enforcement agency as their initial employment opportunity.

⁷ Hayes C. Larkins, "A Survey of Experiences, Activities, and Views of the Industrial Security Administration Graduates of Michigan State University" (Unpublished masters thesis, Michigan State University, 1966), pp. 27-31.

⁸ Ernest Havemann and Patricia Salter West, "They Went to College, The College Graduate in America Today" (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1952)

Rationale: According to a survey conducted in 1966, the largest single category of initial employment after graduation was public law enforcement.⁹ It should be noted, though, that in a recent study conducted by Newman and Hunter, over half of all pre-service graduates in criminal justice programs failed to enter law enforcement.¹⁰

Hypothesis IV. A significant number of those whose initial employment was with a public law enforcement agency will have been dissatisfied with their initial placement position.

Rationale: Evidence regarding the variance between the expectations of the college graduate and the actual placement and utilization procedures utilized by public law enforcement agencies suggest that those choosing public law enforcement would be significantly more dissatisfied.¹¹ There is evidence to support the claim that better educated and more intelligent men are more liable to experience frustration and dissatisfaction within the police system.¹² Levy's study drew the conclusion that police departments

⁹Richard Post, "Post Graduation Activities of Police Administration Students", October 1967 (Mimeographed), pp. 4-6.

¹⁰Charles L. Newman and Dorothy Sue Hunter, "Education for Careers in Law Enforcement: An Analysis of Student Output 1964-67", Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, Vol. 59 (March 1968), pp. 139-140.

¹¹Thompson S. Crockett and John Moses, "Incentive Plans for Law Enforcement Education", The Police Chief, Vol. 28 (August 1969), pp. 28-52.

¹²Ruth Levy, "Summary of Report on Retrospective Study of 5,000 Peace Officer Personnel Records", Police Yearbook 1966, p. 62. Arthur Neiderhoffer, in Behind the Shield: The Police in Urban Society (New York: Doubleday Company, 1967), made the point that men with higher levels of education tend to become more frustrated and cynical the longer they remain patrolmen because their expectations are higher (p. 235).

do not sufficiently meet the needs of their better educated officers.

Hypothesis V. Those graduates who chose not to go into law enforcement related work will have done so for the most part because of one of two reasons - low salary or lack of opportunity.

Rationale: A study by Tenney found that upon questioning a significant number of law enforcement graduates, two answers were predominantly given to the question of why they chose a different occupation. The report stated that "the two reasons most frequently mentioned were the relatively low salaries and the lack of opportunity, that is, for advancement and for the display of initiative."¹³

Hypothesis VI. A majority of those not entering law enforcement related work will have been pre-service students rather than in-service or prior-service students.

Rationale: Newman and Hunter found that among graduates of baccalaureate programs in law enforcement, about three-quarters of those not previously in law enforcement and over half of the entire number did not enter the field following graduation.¹⁴

Hypothesis VII. Those graduates whose initial employment was with a category other than that of public law enforcement will be more favorable in their satisfaction with initial placement than will those graduates choosing a public law enforcement agency.

Rationale: According to the literature, college graduates are becoming

¹³Tenney, op. cit., p. 62.

¹⁴Newman and Hunter, op. cit., p. 140.

more and more disenchanted with the personnel policies of public law enforcement agencies. Thus, many are selecting other areas of employment because of better job satisfaction.¹⁵ One may assume then that the graduates surveyed in this study will be no different - those whose initial placement was with a private law enforcement agency, a non-law enforcement agency, or the military will have had a more favorable perception in their satisfaction of initial placement.

Hypothesis VIII. In spite of the President's Commission recommendation of February 1967, there will be no difference in placement and utilization patterns between 1938-1967 graduates and 1968-1971 graduates who chose the public law enforcement category.

Rationale: Based on conversations, lectures, readings, and observations, this writer agrees with the general belief that "commissions are good for compiling factual data but their usefulness in creating action programs is negligible". Also, the literature shows that the police are typically defensive toward those who would investigate their practices and thus the lack of acceptance of most Commission recommendations is foreseeable.¹⁶

Hypothesis IX. There will be a significant difference in the degree of satisfaction one has toward his initial placement with a public law

¹⁵Richard H. Blum, Police Selection (Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas Company, 1964); A.C. Germann, Police Personnel Management (Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas Company, 1963).

¹⁶Harold K. Becker, Issues in Police Administration (Metuchen, New Jersey: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1970), p. 102; John M. Pfiffner, "The Function of the Police in a Democratic Society" (Unpublished paper, Youth Studies Center, University of Southern California, 1963), pp. 9-10.

enforcement agency - depending on whether the agency was at the municipal, state, or federal government level. It is hypothesized that the degree of satisfaction will be the lowest at the municipal or local level, and the highest at the federal level.

Rationale: Saunders has suggested that most graduates enter federal, military, retail, and industrial security agencies rather than local agencies, reflecting the low status and satisfaction of placement at the municipal level.¹⁷ The literature is replete with findings on the low satisfaction given an individual at the local level. On the other hand, the status and satisfaction held by many state and federal jobs is much higher. Thus one may assume that the degree of satisfaction will vary with whether the agency was at the municipal (local), state, or federal governmental level.

Hypothesis X. There will be significant differences in the time sequence before being promoted or assigned to a specialized, supervisory, or administrative position dependent upon area category. It is assumed that the public law enforcement category will show the longest time sequence before being promoted or assigned to a specialized, supervisory, or administrative position and within this category the municipal governmental level will show the longest time span.

Rationale: The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice directed its attention to this problem when they observed the difficulty in recruiting college graduates. College graduates are likely to be deterred from a police career by the fact that it traditionally and almost universally starts at the bottom. A young man enters a police

¹⁷Saunders, op. cit., pp. 108-109.

department as a uniformed patrolman and serves in that capacity for a considerable period of time--rarely less than two years and more often four or five--before becoming eligible for promotion.¹⁸ On the other hand, the literature shows that this is not the case for categories outside the public law enforcement category.¹⁹

Hypothesis XI. Few, if any respondents in the public law enforcement category will say there was a pay incentive program for personnel taking college credit courses in their respective agencies.

Rationale: A 1968 survey of 783 police departments throughout the country showed the extent to which incentives are offered the police officer for having a college education. They found that only thirty-three (0.42%) departments reported pay increases available for completed college courses.²⁰

Hypothesis XII. A policy of lateral entry will be relatively non-existent in agencies categorized as public law enforcement, while, on the other hand lateral entry will be an existing concept in agencies categorized as private law enforcement, non-law enforcement, or the military.

Rationale: Although the military services and the commercial and industrial world allow lateral entrance, the American public law enforcement

¹⁸The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967), p. 107.

¹⁹Bruce Smith, Police Systems in the United States (New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1960), pp. 319-320.

²⁰Crockett and Moses, op, cit., pp. 28-52.

system has for the most part failed to adopt a policy of lateral entrance.²¹ There have been notable exceptions such as in St. Louis, Missouri and San Diego, California, but these are quite the exceptions from the rule.²² Thus, it would seem that lateral entry will be relatively non-existent in public law enforcement, but very much in evidence in the other categories.

Hypothesis XIII. Few, if any respondents in the public law enforcement category will have participated in a managerial/internship trainee program for the college graduate; on the other hand, there will be a significant number of managerial/internship trainee programs for college graduates in the private law enforcement, non-law enforcement, and military categories.

Rationale: The utilization of the managerial/internship concept in the criminal justice field is a relatively recent phenomenon. Although numerous programs entitled "internship" do exist, most such programs are little more than modified field observation experiences. On the other hand, extensive use of the internship concept has been implemented in the areas of public administration,²³ management,²⁴ and business.²⁵ Thus, it is reasonable to assume that such a program would be relatively

²¹Larry D. Soderquist, "Upgrading the Service", The Police Chief, (August 1969), pp. 65-66.

²²Germann, op. cit., pp. 175-176.

²³James R. Watson, "Internships for Public Service Training", State Government, (March 1967), pp. 67-71.

²⁴Charles A. Ullman, "Management Internships in the Federal Government", Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 36 (May 1958), pp. 616-622.

²⁵Frank C. Pierson, The Education of American Businessmen, (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1959).

non-existent in the public law enforcement category while it would very likely be in effect in many agencies in the private law enforcement, non-law enforcement, and military categories.

Hypothesis XIV. The majority of criminal justice graduates will have felt prepared for their initial job placement.

Rationale: Larkins found that the majority of his respondents felt very well prepared for their initial position.²⁶ Although these were industrial security majors, this writer feels the preparation given in the other areas of specialization are comparable, thus negating differences in the preparation students receive in the various areas of interest.

Hypothesis XV. The majority of criminal justice graduates will feel their college training was not best utilized in their initial job placement.

Rationale: The literature suggests there is often disparate views between schools of criminal justice and criminal justice administrators regarding what skills and knowledge college trained criminal justice specialists should have. Often the college graduate feels he is assuming menial and non-challenging tasks that would be better suited for someone else and feels that his college training received in school is not being utilized to a significant degree.²⁷

²⁶Larkins, op. cit., p. 28.

²⁷Saunders, op. cit., p. 84; Germann, op. cit., p. 114; The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, op. cit., p. 107.

Hypothesis XVI. The majority of criminal justice graduates will be pleased with their present job position.

Rationale: Larkins found that 91% of the industrial security graduates surveyed were satisfied with their present job position.²⁸ It may be assumed that similar results can be expected from this study since one can suppose most graduates would not be in their present jobs unless they were pleased with their present position.

Hypothesis XVII. The degree criminal justice graduates will feel their criminal justice education is being utilized in their present position will depend largely on their present employment category.

Rationale: It can be assumed that those graduates who do not enter the criminal justice field or a related work area will least likely feel that their criminal justice education is being best utilized in their present position. On the other hand, it can be assumed that those working in the criminal justice arena or related area will feel their education is being better utilized.

Hypothesis XVIII. The majority of criminal justice graduates will have remained in the area of employment that was their initial work experience.

Rationale: Post reported that the majority of graduates, regardless of category, remained in the area of employment that was their initial placement.²⁹ Although it might be expected that a significant number may change job positions or agencies, it is assumed they would remain

²⁸Larkins, op. cit., pp. 38-39.

²⁹Post, op. cit., pp. 8-14.

for the most part in the category of initial placement.

Hypothesis XIX. The majority of criminal justice graduates will feel that the factor which is most detrimental to the recruitment of college graduates into the criminal justice field is that graduates of degree programs usually start on the lowest step of the law enforcement agency ladder.³⁰

Rationale: It is thought by this writer that this factor is most detrimental in the recruitment of college graduates into the criminal justice field. Although the literature suggests a number of factors resulting in low recruitment figures of college graduates, it is believed that this particular factor is most detrimental, based upon interviews with past and present students at the School.

Hypothesis XX. The majority of criminal justice graduates will rank the public law enforcement (state and local level) category as the one utilizing the least effort in the recruitment of college graduates.

Rationale: The literature on personnel recruitment of college graduates is abundant with efforts by industry, governmental agencies, and the military to fill their growing labor needs. Although public law enforcement is beginning to compete with these other areas for the graduate, the literature suggests they are increasingly frustrated in their efforts.

³⁰A.C. Germann, Police Executive Development, (Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas Company, 1962); Soderquist, op. cit., pp. 53-76, George Shepherd, "Are We Aiming Too Low in Recruitment", The Police Chief, (January 1967), pp. 20-24.

Hypothesis XXI. The majority of criminal justice graduates will rank the public law enforcement (state and local level) category as the one utilizing the least effort in the placing of college graduates in positions commensurate with their training.

Rationale: Since, typically, the college graduate begins work at the lowest rank in a public law enforcement agency regardless of qualifications, one can hypothesize that this particular category utilizes the least effort in placing college graduates in positions commensurate to their training. Since the other categories utilize lateral entry, management trainee programs, and the like, it is expected that they will receive a higher ranking.

Hypothesis XXII. The majority of criminal justice graduates will feel that personnel performing specialized functions not involving a need for general enforcement power should be hired for their talents and abilities without regard to prior criminal justice experience.

Rationale: In order to enhance the professionalization concept of the criminal justice discipline, it is assumed most graduates would look at the above as optimizing the utilization of persons with particular expertise which is needed by the organization and contributes immensely toward the professionalization of criminal justice.

Hypothesis XXIII. The majority of criminal justice graduates will feel an agency or organization would benefit by having a lateral entry policy for recruitment of personnel at certain job positions.

Rationale: Generally, the advantages of lateral entry are thought to

far outweigh any problems that instituting a lateral entry system might entail.³¹ The President's Commission fully endorsed the lateral entry concept and recommended its immediate implementation by the entire American police community. Thus one can assume that a majority of graduates would agree with the Commission's recommendation and want to see the concept of lateral entry implemented.

Hypothesis XXIV. The majority of criminal justice graduates will feel it would be desirable to have internship/understudy programs in order to develop lateral entry programs within their agencies.

Rationale: If it can be assumed that most graduates will feel the need for lateral entry, then they also would endorse internship/understudy programs to help implement a lateral entry policy.

Hypothesis XXV. The majority of criminal justice graduates will feel that special considerations (entry level, salary, promotional eligibility, etc.) should be given by criminal justice agencies to the educational qualifications of individuals.

Rationale: Although it has been clearly illustrated by Crockett and Moses³² that most police departments do not feel the need for incentives for police officers having a college education, it can be assumed that the respondents, college educated, would feel the need for such consideration by criminal justice agencies to attract a better qualified

³¹William Hewitt, "Lateral Entry and Transferability of Retirement Credits", a paper submitted to The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, 1967.

³²Crockett and Moses, op. cit., pp. 28-52.

individual, provide greater diversity of growth in the agency, and encourage others to continue their education.

Hypothesis XXVI. The majority of criminal justice graduates will feel there should be a difference in initial job entry between the non-degree holder, the undergraduate degree holder, and the graduate degree holder.

Rationale: It is this writer's belief that whereas educational achievement is the basis for many varied job classifications, the criminal justice graduate will feel that a different job entry level is necessary for non-degree holders, undergraduate degree holders, and graduate degree holders. If there is to be a movement toward higher standards of professionalization this will have to be the case. As recognition grows that the administration of criminal justice requires highly skilled specialists, the potential recruitment base should be broadened beyond the four-year liberal arts schools to include graduate schools as well. If there is no separation for initial job entry, the potential recruitment base of degree holders and advanced degree holders will be negligible.

Hypothesis XXVII. The majority of criminal justice graduates will feel that not all criminal justice personnel should be required to have a college degree.

Rationale: In lectures and conversations over the past few years, this writer has developed the opinion that although most students and professors are in favor of increased educational standards for criminal justice personnel, there are working levels that do not necessitate all

personnel having a college degree. Thus it can be assumed that a majority of graduates will not believe that a college degree should be a prerequisite for entry into the criminal justice field. An interesting sidelight to this question will be to compare the responses of the graduates in the different categories of job classification. It may be that a majority of graduates in one or more categories might feel that most all criminal justice personnel should be required to have a college degree.

Hypothesis XXVIII. The majority of criminal justice graduates will feel that criminal justice agencies should take immediate steps to establish a minimum requirement of a baccalaureate degree for all supervisory and executive positions.

Rationale: In keeping with the professionalization concept for the criminal justice discipline, this step would seem to be in order if criminal justice is to provide better, more knowledgeable leadership and strive to reach the professional stature of other professional disciplines. The President's Commission's findings and the examples of criminal justice agencies that have established a minimum requirement of a baccalaureate degree for all supervisory and executive positions demonstrate the value of such steps.³³

Hypothesis XXIX. The majority of criminal justice graduates will feel that the thrust of the criminal justice program at Michigan State should be left unchanged.

³³See Donald E. Clark and Samuel G. Chapman, A Forward Step: Educational Backgrounds for Police, (Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas Company, 1966).

Rationale: If one is to assume that a majority of criminal justice graduates felt satisfied with the curriculum and preparation they received while attending Michigan State, it can also be assumed they would then feel the program should remain unchanged. If anything should be changed it might be that there has to be created a compromise of some sort between the thrust of the School of Criminal Justice and the objectives in the criminal justice field.

Hypothesis XXX. The majority of criminal justice graduates will feel the School should take an active part in helping place students in the criminal justice field.

Rationale: In my conversations with students over the past few years, a major criticism of the School was the lack of assistance it provided in helping them seek employment. Although there is currently a job information file located within the Brennan Library in the School of Criminal Justice, it is felt that more can be done to assist the student by having a position (possibly handled by a graduate assistant) created that would actively seek and direct itself to placing graduates in the criminal justice field.

Definition of Terms Used

Lateral Entry: As used throughout this study, the term refers to the appointment of administrative, professional, and technical personnel above normal entrance levels into an organization from the outside.

Pre-service: Refers to a person with no law enforcement experience before graduation from Michigan State University.

In-Service: Refers to a person who was employed by a law enforcement agency while attending Michigan State University.

Prior-service: Refers to a person who had had law enforcement experience but was not so employed at the time he was attending Michigan State University.

Managerial/Internship Trainee Program: A type of participant program designed to provide an educational experience for the trainee who has accumulated a body of substantive knowledge, acquired specific skills, and developed a degree of technical mastery in a given field prior to his involvement as a trainee.

Public Law Enforcement: Refers to all state, federal, university, and municipal governmental police, security, and investigative functions. It also includes probation, parole, corrections, and highway traffic personnel employed by governmental organizations.

Private Law Enforcement: Refers to individuals who engage primarily in a police/security function for an industrial, business, or private investigative organization. It also includes private agencies concerned with delinquency prevention, rehabilitation of offenders, etc.

Non-Law Enforcement: Refers to all other areas of employment such as education (including criminal justice), research, sales, personnel, etc.

Career Military: Refers to all career active duty military personnel, including those engaged in law enforcement or security activities while on active duty.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

There have been relatively few studies that have been done specifically on the subject area of this research design, namely, the placement and utilization patterns and views of criminal justice graduates. Although there have been a number of surveys of criminal justice higher education programs, these surveys have only been concerned in an incidental matter with the graduates of these programs. As a result, research regarding graduates themselves is almost non-existent. Questions such as what has been their experience, where do graduates go after graduation, what do they meet in the way of placement and utilization policies in their new job, why some choose not to go into criminal justice work, what their reasons are, and many more questions of this nature need answering. Some of these questions have been answered in the surveys that follow. Only data that could be compared with similar information obtained from this study will be discussed.

A. Let us begin by discussing those criminal justice program surveys that have touched upon questions regarding graduates themselves.

1. Law Enforcement Education: A Survey of Colleges and Universities Offering Degree Programs in the Field of Law Enforcement³⁴

In 1968 the International Association of Chiefs of Police, with

³⁴Thompson G. Crockett, "Law Enforcement Education: A Survey of Colleges and Universities Offering Degree Programs in the Field of Law Enforcement", International Association of Chiefs of Police, (1968).

financing provided by the Ford Foundation, conducted a survey of 362 colleges and universities concerning criminal justice higher education programs. The survey included data on the number of programs at the associate, baccalaureate, and graduate degree levels; on student enrollments; on graduates of law enforcement programs; on program faculty; on textbooks used; on titles of law enforcement courses offered in each of the programs; and on campus-based police training.

What we are concerned with here is the data that applies to the graduates of these programs, or more specifically, the information directly related to this study. The survey indicated that the majority of pre-service graduates of both two-year and four-year programs apparently did not enter the police service: of the two-year programs less than half (35%) were reported as entering law enforcement after graduation; of the four-year programs less than a third (25%) were reported doing so. But the key words are police service, and one must avoid clouding the issue. This writer has read numerous findings referring to the above observation. In many of them the phrase criminal justice field is substituted for police service, giving a different connotation to the findings. For example, Tenney, in his analysis of Newman and Hunter's survey, described below, suggested that the findings³⁵ were at variance with the I.A.C.P. survey. On the contrary, Newman and Hunter estimated that about 70% of the two-year graduates would be entering the field following graduation. The I.A.C.P. survey suggested 60% but had limited the pre-service total to include only those entering the police occupation. The Newman and Hunter estimate did not.

³⁵Tenney, op. cit., p. 59.

As a result, it can be assumed that at least one-quarter of the remaining graduates (40%) in the I.A.C.P. study would more than likely choose a law enforcement category of another nature. In the I.A.C.P. survey, it was surmised that many pre-service graduates sought careers in federal or state investigative agencies, which offered higher status and salaries, or took jobs in related occupations in the criminal justice field. Thus the statistics for the criminal justice field and criminal justice education are encouraging rather than discouraging when involving manpower output.

A second related item from the I.A.C.P. survey is the number of graduates who were in-service students. In the two-year program about 25% were in-service; in the four-year program about 22% were in-service. It should make an interesting comparison as to the number of in-service graduates this study reveals. Also, to clarify the pre-service confusion, the present study should shed some light on this important issue.

2. Education for Careers in Law Enforcement: An Analysis of Student Output 1964-1967³⁶

A survey of 99 law enforcement programs conducted in the fall of 1966 by Charles L. Newman and Dorothy Hunter and sponsored by the Center for Law Enforcement and Corrections of the Pennsylvania State University was undertaken to determine how many new people these programs were contributing to the field of law enforcement. (It should be noted that law enforcement did not necessarily mean the police although this was the major emphasis.)

³⁶ Charles L. Newman and Dorothy Sue Hunter, op. cit., pp. 139-140.

Newman and Hunter found that among graduates of four-year programs in law enforcement, about three-quarters of those who could be classified as pre-service, and over half of the entire total did not enter the field following graduation. They went on to comment that, "It is obvious that the important and necessary questions are those concerning what fields these people enter instead of law enforcement, and WHY they do not enter the field for which they have prepared and in which they are qualified." It is hoped that the present study will answer these important questions as well as provide a comparison with Newman and Hunter's finding regarding initial entry into the field.

3. A Survey of Degree Programs in Criminology and Corrections³⁷

In a survey of 63 degree programs in criminology and corrections conducted by Loren Karacki and John J. Galvin of the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, one of the concerns of the Commission was the employment obtained by graduates of criminology and corrections programs. In a breakdown of undergraduate and graduate degree recipients, the following results were obtained. Of the 477 undergraduates reported on, 130 went into probation or parole work, 57 into institutional treatment work, 42 into institutional custody, 1 into administration, 3 into research, 6 into teaching, and 238 were either unknown or listed as "other". Of those responding "other", the majority

³⁷Loren Karacki and John J. Galvin, "A Survey of Degree Programs in Criminology and Corrections", Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, 1970 (Mimeographed).

were either students or policemen. For purposes of comparison with the present study, if one eliminates the 238 unknown or "other" category by percentage, 54.4 percent entered probation or parole work, 23.8 percent entered institutional treatment work, 17.6 percent went into institutional custody, and 4.2 percent entered either administration, research, or teaching.

Among graduate degree recipients of 66 reported on, 16 entered probation or parole work, 7 institutional treatment, 4 institutional custody, 5 administration, 5 research, 16 teaching, and 13 classified as unknown or "other". Again, "other" was made up of mostly student or police employment type. Eliminating the unknown or "other" category as we did above, by percentage, 30.2 percent entered probation or parole work, 13.2 percent went into institutional treatment work, 7.5 percent into institutional custody, 9.4 percent into research, and 30.2 percent into teaching.

When the percentage figures for undergraduate degree holders are compared with graduate degree holders, it is quite evident that a major change occurs from level of operation type positions such as probation, parole, and institutional positions, to the more specialized positions of administration, research, and teaching. Among those with undergraduate degrees, 95.8 percent entered probation, parole, or institutional positions, while only 4.2 percent became administrators, researchers, or teachers. In contrast, only 51 percent of those holding graduate degrees entered at the level of operation, whereas 49 percent entered administrative, research, or teaching positions.

It will be interesting to note if a similar pattern develops from the present study. If similarities do develop, Karacki and Galvin's

observation is most relevant. They observed that ". . . the shift away from probation and parole work at the graduate level is especially striking in view of the importance frequently attached to graduate degrees for this kind of work. Both in absolute and relative terms, it is apparent that graduate programs in criminology and corrections are not producing many people who are entering probation and parole work, while those at the undergraduate level are producing them. Yet the preference for hiring appears to run counter to this pattern, as graduate degrees continue to receive strong endorsement for probation and parole work.³⁸

B. So far we have discussed surveys whose major emphasis has been of criminal justice programs. The following are surveys whose major concern was criminal justice graduates.

1. A Survey of Law Enforcement Graduates³⁹

In 1970 the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice commissioned Dr. Charles W. Tenney, Jr., former Dean of Northeastern University School of Criminal Justice, to conduct a survey of criminal justice education programs. Along with this Dr. Tenney conducted two surveys of program graduates. One survey consisted of a sample of graduates of two and four-year criminal justice programs throughout the nation; the other of the L.E.A.A. graduate fellows who had, under the Law Enforcement Assistance Act, received fellowships for study at one of three universities offering graduate study in

³⁸Ibid., p. 14.

³⁹Tenney, op. cit., pp. 60-78

criminal justice. (John Jay College of Criminal Justice, City University of New York; School of Criminal Justice, Michigan State University; and School of Criminology, University of California (Berkeley)). The following discussion pertains to the results of the first survey as it is closer related to the present study.

The survey population consisted of 423 graduates of two and four-year criminal justice programs throughout the country, of which 238 completed questionnaires were returned. As a group they were relatively young, 70 percent being under thirty-five years of age, and overwhelmingly male caucasians.

The results closely related to the present study are as follows:

(a) Almost half (45 percent) of the graduates responding were employed in law enforcement at the time they were awarded their degree. Of this group 37 percent had left the field. On the other hand, of those who were not in law enforcement at the time of graduation (55 percent), 50 percent were presently employed by a law enforcement agency. These results provide some contrast to the before mentioned surveys, possibly caused by the meaning given by the individual surveys and respondents to the term "law enforcement".⁴⁰ Hopefully, the present study will clarify this.

(b) Of those respondents reporting present employment in public law enforcement work, 42 percent said they were employed at the municipal

⁴⁰In his cover letter to the graduates Tenney noted that the term "law enforcement" used throughout the questionnaire was to be used in the broadest sense to include all areas of criminal justice, such as police, corrections, probation, parole, and courts.

level, 30 percent at the state level, and 14 percent each at the county and federal level. In this group only 22 percent reported that their agency offered incentive pay to encourage its employees toward a college education.

(c) Of those respondents reporting, 56 percent indicated that they were employed in a law enforcement agency; 44 percent said they were not. Tenney noted that it was interesting that only 28 percent of those not employed in a law enforcement agency reported working in a field or position related to law enforcement, such as industrial security. This writer was also surprised at the relatively high non-law enforcement figure and expects the present study's findings to show a much lower percentage.

(d) The two reasons most frequently mentioned as to why individual respondents did not go into law enforcement were low salaries and lack of opportunity.

(e) Of those individuals in law enforcement only nine percent believed their education had enabled them to advance more rapidly through the ranks. This particular question is quite similar to question 19, section 3 of the instrument used in this dissertation, and a comparison, with limitations, will be made.

The above survey is the closest towards realizing the goals of this study - for Dr. Tenney does attempt to answer particular questions concerning criminal justice graduates. Dr. Tenney noted that "to the best of his knowledge there had not previously been any attempt made to determine what happens to the student following graduation."⁴¹

⁴¹Tenney, op. cit., p. 60.

He is partially correct. Until the present study there hadn't been a comprehensive and sophisticated undertaking of this kind yet attempted - although there have been at least two specific but limited surveys done at Michigan State's School of Criminal Justice. Dr. Tenney's survey represents a step in the direction toward a new body of information that is long overdue. This study represents another.

Professor William H. Hewitt of Pennsylvania State University noted the importance of such research when he called for "research--that is, what is going on at other universities offering P.A. (Police Administration or Criminal Justice), extent of use, what has been their experience, where do their students go after graduation, where do the students usually originate who feed into the program, are all students admitted who apply or is there a selection procedure, what type of "counseling out" policies are in existence and how are they implemented, what do you do with the student who lacks the medical qualifications for a career in law enforcement, what forms of recruiting and public information programs are employed--and with what degree of success, and what is the percentage of officers from the police community to non-police officers in the program?"⁴²

Although much of the foregoing can be obtained by surveys of criminal justice programs,⁴³ many answers cannot be so obtained. They can only be forthcoming through surveys of criminal justice graduates.

⁴²William W. Hewitt, "Problems in Establishing and Expanding Police Programs at the College Level". A panel discussion paper presented before the 4th Annual International Association of Police Professors.

⁴³Especially if future surveys are like the HEW sponsored survey being conducted by Esther Eastman of Kent State University's Institute of Government Research and Service. This writer has only seen the survey instrument which in this writer's opinion is by far the most comprehensive and sophisticated of its kind.

This brings us up to those M.S.U. surveys that were previously mentioned.

2. A Survey of Experiences, Activities, and Views of the Industrial Security Administration Graduates of Michigan State University⁴⁴

In 1966 a survey of all (167) industrial security graduates was conducted by Hayes Larkins. Although the survey utilized a specific population, it is related to the present study in that it was a survey of criminal justice graduates and provided a reference from which the present study developed. In addition, many of Larkins' findings can be compared with findings from the present study - as they pertain to industrial security. For example, certain background information, educational information, and employment information may be compared and updated for utilization by the industrial security graduate and program.

3. Post Graduation Activities of Police Administration Students⁴⁵

A survey was conducted among all graduates of the School during March and April, 1967 to determine their current location and post-graduation employment history. A one-page questionnaire contained the following information: age, date graduated, degree received, major, and employment, requesting the respondent to begin with his/her current position and list all employment subsequent to graduation. Questionnaires were mailed to 1,439 graduates, of which 108 were returned for reasons such as undeliverable, address unknown, etc. There were 899 responses for a useable

⁴⁴Larkins, op. cit., 109 pp.

⁴⁵Post, op. cit., 14 pp.

return rate of 67.4 percent.

As previously indicated, the survey was intended to determine the employment patterns (both initial and current) of all responding graduates. The following results were obtained.

INITIAL EMPLOYMENT	N	%
(a) No. who began in public law enforcement	413	47
(b) No. who began in private law enforcement	96	9
(c) No. who began in non-law enforcement	146	15
(d) No. who began in military	244	29
STILL EMPLOYED		
(e) No. who began in public law enforcement currently in public law enforcement position	306	74
(f) No. who began in private law enforcement still in private law enforcement position	47	49
(g) No. who began in non-law enforcement position still so employed	126	86
(h) No. who began in military still in military position	123	50
CURRENTLY EMPLOYED		
(i) No. currently employed in public law enforcement	389	43
(j) No. currently employed in private law enforcement	81	10
(k) No. currently employed in non-law enforcement	290	32
(l) No. currently employed in military	139	15

From the above many important comparisons will be made with the present study's findings to insure the development of a reasonably accurate picture of employment patterns of criminal justice graduates.

An attempt has been made in this chapter to bring into focus those studies that are directly or indirectly related to the subject area of this research design, namely, the placement and utilization pattern and views of criminal justice graduates.

The literature revealed that little attention has been given to the criminal justice graduate per se. Thus, this study represents a new body

of information and a contribution, notwithstanding its explicit limitations, to an understanding of criminal justice higher education. Common to all studies reviewed (with the exception of Tenney's study) was the lack of a theoretical base from which to begin. All demonstrated the practical need to describe "what is" but failed to provide a "theoretical" underpinning for added relevance. This study provides this added feature by examining the concept of professionalization and its emphasis on education as related to the sociological perspective on organizations and their personnel.

Before going on to Chapter 3 concerning the methodology of the present study, this writer feels this would be an appropriate time to give the reader a brief overview of Michigan State University's School of Criminal Justice.

School of Criminal Justice, Michigan State University

The School of Criminal Justice at Michigan State University has devoted its efforts to the improvement of the justice process for nearly four decades. The history of the School begins with its inception as the School of Police Administration and Public Safety in 1935. As the program evolved and as additional faculty with different professional and academic backgrounds joined the program, the curriculum became more interdisciplinary with courses of study which would prepare students for a wide variety of positions in the criminal justice system and positions in related areas. Simultaneous with the expansion of the program into other areas than law enforcement, the program gradually expanded the level of degrees offered. In 1957 a masters curriculum was introduced,

and in 1969 a doctoral program was approved and enrolled its first students. Approximately 2400 students had earned degrees from the School by the end of the 1970-71 school year. Enrollment in the School grew steadily, but gradually, from 1935 to 1967. Then it spiraled upward at an unprecedented rate. The number of students enrolled has risen from four-hundred in 1968 to over twelve-hundred at the present time (1972). Of the present enrollment, approximately eleven-hundred students are undergraduates, one-hundred are masters candidates, and ten are doctoral candidates.

The faculty of fifteen is interdisciplinary in both a professional and academic manner. Professional experience of the faculty covers a variety of positions in law enforcement, corrections, the courts, criminalistics, highway traffic, industrial security, and delinquency prevention and control. Academic disciplines represented are: political science, sociology, social work, education, law, chemistry, systems science, and psychiatry. All of the faculty hold advanced or professional degrees and many have been active in their own academic disciplines as well as the field of criminal justice. As suggested by the heterogeneous nature of the faculty, the research and scholarly activities have covered a broad number of issues related to criminal justice. The School is presently attempting to establish an administrative mechanism, such as a research center, which would allow for conducting more systematic and long-range research of significance to the entire criminal justice system.

The School of Criminal Justice has also a long history of offering short courses and seminars to practitioners in the field. In 1951 a program of law enforcement in-service instruction and institutes was begun and has continued to the present. In 1965 the National Center on Police-

Community Relations was founded within the School and has grown and developed to the present. Over the years the School has developed both short and long-range direct linages with specific criminal justice agencies and communities through consultantships, jointly-sponsored programs, program evaluation, field service training of students, short courses, and institutes for practitioners. The School has begun in the past year to develop a more systematic type of relationship with criminal justice agencies through the establishment of "laboratories of experimentation" with specific communities such as Jackson, Michigan.

Additionally, the School has enjoyed many years of association with foreign criminal justice systems and their representatives. The School has provided direct technical assistance to agencies in several nations, beginning with the West German Police and exchanged instructional personnel with several foreign educational institutions. Formal ties exist between the School and agencies in Britain, Japan, Taiwan, Viet Nam, the Netherlands, West Germany, and Norway. Students from Michigan State have spent summer terms studying through the School's Comparative Criminal Justice Program in Britain. Over twenty-five students will again be participating in the program this summer (1972). In addition, informal ties exist with over sixty other nations through foreign students or visiting lecturers who have attended the School. The contact with foreign justice systems provided by these ties immeasurably enhances the School's ability to maintain an appropriate perspective on the American process of justice.

The curriculum of the School reflects the diversity of the criminal justice system itself. The curriculum is designed at both undergraduate

and graduate levels to allow students to prepare to enter any component of the criminal justice system. Students at the undergraduate level may concentrate study in any of six cognate areas: (1) law enforcement administration; (2) highway traffic safety administration; (3) criminalistics; (4) the prevention and control of delinquency and crime; (5) correctional administration; (6) industrial security. In addition, many students utilize the undergraduate program as a pre-law course of study. The School offers over thirty undergraduate courses. However, concentration in a particular area of interest is allowed only after the completion of a core of courses designed to provide an overview of the administrative, behavioral, and legal problems of the system. Beyond completion of this core, considerable flexibility exists. Students at both the masters or doctoral level may choose as elective a broad range of courses, or decide to concentrate their graduate study in administration, research, social behavior, or education. The viability of the graduate program is attested to by the diversity of financial awards which have been received by students working toward advanced degrees. These awards have included: O.L.E.A. Fellowships, L.E.A.A. Executive Development Fellowships, General Motors Fellowships, National Science Foundation Fellowships, Allstate Graduate Assistantships, and a number of university-sponsored assistantships and stipends.

The School is committed to further expanding the graduate program. A faculty resolution adopted in February 1972 reads: "Resources should be so allocated as to allow expansion of the graduate program. Thus, all new resources should be used to enhance the graduate program." The resolution was a response to the anticipated increasing need and demand for

graduate education in the coming years.

Concurrent to addressing the need to expand the graduate program, the School's faculty also passed a resolution relating to the general structure of both undergraduate and graduate curriculums. That resolution reads: "The School should provide a broad orientation to criminal justice for all baccalaureate graduates while still allowing the student to focus, through advisement and course offerings, on specific aspects of the system. Students in the graduate program will receive a more sophisticated systemic orientation while simultaneously pursuing an in-depth specialization." Although students now receive a broad orientation to criminal justice in the totality of the curriculum, the faculty nevertheless is revising the curriculum so that a more systemic perspective is provided in every course.

At the beginning of 1972 the School received a grant from the Michigan State Planning Agency, the Office of Criminal Justice Programs, in order to conduct systematic planning and research in a number of areas. One of these areas is the subject of this study. This project is expected to yield a good deal of baseline data useful not only for planning immediate changes but for the development of a continuing evaluation of the nature of the School's progress in providing leadership in the field of criminal justice education. It is the intention of the School to place much more emphasis on empirical research in the future. This emphasis is seen as badly needed to provide more accurate and significant information for the field of criminal justice.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This particular study was part of a coordinated research project conducted by the School of Criminal Justice concerning criminal justice education. The project was perceived as one which would improve the quality of education in the School of Criminal Justice through providing more individualized supervision of its students' study, through the development of a program for preparing community college instructors and coordinators, through a thorough revision of the School's curriculum, and through improvement of the placement and utilization of its graduates.

To help achieve the improvement and utilization of graduates of the School of Criminal Justice and contribute toward a thorough revision of the School's curriculum, this writer, as a member of the project staff, conducted a survey of the School's graduates to gather information concerning placement and utilization of its graduates as well as their views toward the criminal justice program and selected criminal justice issues concerning criminal justice education, since many of these graduates are now in positions where they can strongly affect related policies and practices. Also, to help achieve the above stated goal, a major purpose of the study was to tell "what is", since as the review of the literature demonstrated this particular body of knowledge is relatively small and we are often confused by conflicting findings and assumptions. Under these conditions, it is of great value merely to know the current state of affairs.⁴⁶ This research is seen as a step in this direction.

⁴⁶Walter R. Borg, Educational Research: An Introduction, (New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1963) pp. 202-262.

Description of Sample

The population from which the sample was drawn is the total number of graduates of Michigan State University who majored in criminal justice. The population surveyed is composed of graduates who have been awarded a Bachelor of Science and/or Master of Science degree in criminal justice, and one graduate who has received his PhD. Foreign students residing in foreign countries were not included.

Construction of the Instrument

Consideration of the size and geographical dispersion of the population resulted in the determination that the most appropriate means of data-gathering would be accomplished through the use of the mailed self-administering questionnaire. Interviewing was rejected because it was not feasible for both reasons of time and cost.

In the development of the questionnaire, careful thought was given to those areas that would elicit information relative to the purpose of the study. Assistance was solicited from faculty members and students of the School of Criminal Justice in the development and selection of questions used in the questionnaire. Throughout the entire selection process the chief criterion of acceptability was the probable value of the information these questions would elicit for purposes of achieving the aims of this study.

The questionnaire consisted of four sections that were designed to measure the following: (1) general background information; (2) educational information; (3) post-college initial placement information; and (4) present employment information and views toward selected issues in

criminal justice. For explanatory purposes, some questions were constructed allowing an open-ended response. This procedure allowed for a more in-depth type of analysis.

Pre-Testing the Instrument

After development of the questionnaire, a pre-test was given to a purposive sample of 150 graduates. Three categories of graduates were selected: (1) those residing in the Greater Lansing, Michigan area; (2) those residing within Michigan but not the Greater Lansing area; and (3) those residing out of state. A random selection of 50 graduates from each category was selected. The rationale for this pre-test design was based on getting a fairly precise indication of what to expect for the overall study's return rate.

For example, the following return rate was realized from the three categories selected: 33 returned questionnaires residing in the Greater Lansing area; 32 returned questionnaires residing within Michigan but not in the Greater Lansing area; 32 returned questionnaires residing out of state. This represented an overall return rate of 65 percent, and since there were no significant differences in response between the three categories it was assumed that an overall return rate of 70 percent for the remainder of the study was a distinct possibility.

As a result of the pre-test, revisions were made of certain questions, some questions were deleted, and some questions were added to the study in accordance with the information received from the pre-test results.

Sampling Techniques and Research Design

A general cover sheet and letter was included with the revised questionnaire⁴⁷ stating the purpose of the overall study. The rationale was to reduce any doubts about the authenticity of the study and to demonstrate the importance of the respondent's cooperation. Also, the School director's signature was used on the letter to add to the authenticity of the study and to increase the return rate.

To obtain a most reliable address list, the School files were checked as to the most recent address listed; the Office of Alumni Affairs for their most recent addresses; the staff, faculty, and students of the School of Criminal Justice for knowledge of past students' present addresses. In this way these efforts brought the address list to a high degree of accuracy. Only 91 questionnaires were returned by the U.S. Post Office as being undeliverable for such reasons as address unknown, etc.

In addition, the following techniques were used to increase the return rate of the questionnaires: (1) a stamped, self-addressed return envelope accompanied the questionnaire; (2) sponsorship by the School was sought and received to seek added importance and authenticity to the study; (3) an inducement of receiving a copy of the results was offered to respondents to increase their interest in responding; (4) respondents were given a guarantee of anonymity by not being asked for their names or requested to sign their questionnaires; (5) follow-up letters were sent out after a set period of time, requesting those who had not returned questionnaires to please do so.

⁴⁷See Appendix A.

On March 7, 1972 1,822 questionnaires were mailed to all graduates of the School of Criminal Justice who had graduated between 1938 and December, 1971. Although there have been 2,253 graduates during this time period, only 1,822 were sent a questionnaire, the reasons being: 209 graduates could not be located; 150 graduates were sent pre-test questionnaires; 36 graduates were foreign students residing in foreign countries; 24 graduates were deceased; and 2 graduates were not surveyed (Director Brandstatter and the author).

After approximately three weeks a follow-up letter,⁴⁸ along with a copy of the questionnaire, was sent to those graduates who had not yet responded.

As a result of the initial mailing and follow-up, 1,161 questionnaires were returned. Along with this, 91 questionnaires were returned unanswered by the U.S. Post Office as being undeliverable.

Thus 1,731 graduates received the revised questionnaire and 1,161 answered it. This represented a useable return percentage of 67.1 percent. Considering the length of the survey instrument and the nature of the sample surveyed, the return percentage was very gratifying.

Analysis Techniques

All responses to the questionnaire were compiled and coded and punched on I.B.M. cards. All data manipulation was made by computer. Descriptive survey tables were produced showing frequency and percentage distributions. Comparisons of selected variables were in the form of contingency tables utilizing frequencies, percentages, and means, and done by cross-tabulating techniques. The statistical analysis utilized was the chi-square test for

⁴⁸ See Appendix B.

significance and the level of significance chosen was the .05 level or less. The computer program utilized was the analysis of contingency tables. (ACT Program)

Limitations of Study

1. The study is limited by the factors inherent in the use of any questionnaire. These factors include the difficulties in establishing reliability and validity of the survey instrument, the difficulties in receiving cooperation of the sample selected, and the misinterpretation, bias, and frame of reference of those responding.
2. The absence of a follow-up to those not responding did not allow for a possible determination of error due to non-response.
3. Although all open-ended responses were compiled and coded, they were not completed in time for the computer analysis. Therefore, cross-tabulating techniques were not done between specific variables and open-ended responses, thus allowing for some of the richness to be lost in the overall analysis.

CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

Format of Data Presentation

The survey population consisted of 1,822 graduates of the School of Criminal Justice who had graduated between 1938 and December, 1971. Ninety-one questionnaires were returned marked "addressee unknown" or "moved, left no forwarding address". One-thousand, one-hundred sixty-one completed questionnaires were returned, of which 1,149 were returned in time for the computer analysis.

The data collected will be presented in four sections, as those sections appear in the survey instrument. In this way the results will follow in the same order in which the hypotheses were presented in Chapter 1. The procedure this writer will utilize is to restate each hypothesis, show data relating to it, and then make a statement about whether the hypothesis was rejected or accepted. As conditions warrant, a discussion may follow if cross-tabulating techniques suggest a further explanation is necessary to interpret or clarify the overall findings.

1. GENERAL INFORMATION

Table 1 shows the overall characteristics of those respondents who took part in the study.

Table 1
General Characteristics of the Sample

<u>Characteristics</u>	<u>Category</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1. <u>Age</u>	Under 25	141	12
	25-29	249	22
	30-34	216	19
	35-39	198	17
	40-44	184	16
	45-49	77	7
	50-54	51	4
	55-59	28	2
	60 and above	2	0
2. <u>Sex</u>	Male	1054	92
	Female	94	8
3. <u>Race</u>	Caucasian	1127	98
	Negro/Black	9	1
	Mexican American	2	0
	American Indian	1	0
	Oriental American	4	0
	Foreign Student	5	0
4. <u>Residence</u>	Alabama	1	0
	Alaska	2	0
	Arizona	8	1
	Arkansas	1	0
	California	63	6
	Colorado	13	1
	Connecticut	7	1
	Delaware	1	0
	Florida	27	2
	Georgia	24	2
	Hawaii	5	0
	Idaho	2	0
	Illinois	64	6
	Indiana	10	1
	Iowa	5	0
	Kansas	7	1
	Kentucky	5	0
	Louisiana	1	0
	Maine	3	0
	Maryland	26	2
	Massachusetts	10	1
	Michigan	548	48
	Minnesota	7	1
	Mississippi	4	0
	Missouri	18	2
	Montana	0	0

Table 1 (Cont.)

<u>Characteristics</u>	<u>Category</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
4. <u>Residence</u>	Nebraska	2	0
	Nevada	3	0
	New Hampshire	1	0
	New Jersey	16	1
	New Mexico	2	0
	New York	27	2
	North Carolina	3	0
	North Dakota	3	0
	Ohio	44	4
	Oklahoma	3	0
	Oregon	2	0
	Pennsylvania	18	2
	Rhode Island	1	0
	South Carolina	3	0
	South Dakota	2	0
	Tennessee	7	1
	Texas	17	2
	Utah	2	0
	Vermont	0	0
	Virginia	47	4
	Washington	10	1
	West Virginia	5	0
	Wisconsin	24	2
	Wyoming	0	0
	Washington, D.C.	4	0
	Foreign Country	30	3

* Percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number.

As reflected by Table 1, the overall sample was a relatively young group. Seventy percent were under thirty-nine years of age and fifty-one percent were thirty-four or under. The respondents were, as one would expect, overwhelmingly male, since the majority of positions in the criminal justice arena are male dominated. The racial make-up was almost entirely white (98%) with only 21 respondents included in all other racial groups. This, again, could be expected since the literature suggests that minority

group members are not likely to choose the criminal justice area as a career.⁴⁹ A significant finding was the surprisingly wide geographical dispersion of the responding group. The graduates were dispersed throughout 47 of the United States and the District of Columbia, with an additional 30 respondents residing in foreign countries. Michigan had the largest percentage of graduates residing within it, with 48%, with significant numbers residing in California (6%), Illinois (6%), Ohio (4%), and Virginia (4%).

II EDUCATIONAL INFORMATION

The majority of respondents, 975 (85%), received only their bachelors degree from the School of Criminal Justice, with 112 (10%) of those responding having earned a masters degree. Sixty graduates (5%) received both degrees from the School. Tables 2 and 3 below indicate the respondents' year of graduation.

⁴⁹ See for example: Nicholas Alex, Black in Blue: A Study of the Negro Policeman, (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1969); David H. Bayley and Harold Mendleson, Minorities and the Police: Confrontation in America, (New York: The Free Press, 1969).

Table 2
Year of Graduation (BS)

<u>Year</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1938	1	0	1955	18	2
1939	12	1	1956	32	3
1940	7	1	1957	34	3
1941	12	1	1958	41	4
1942	5	0	1959	46	4
1943	10	1	1960	36	3
1944	1	0	1961	40	4
1945	0	0	1962	42	4
1946	0	0	1963	34	3
1947	13	1	1964	55	5
1948	8	1	1965	42	4
1949	19	2	1966	50	5
1950	21	2	1967	58	6
1951	19	2	1968	65	6
1952	25	2	1969	61	6
1953	34	3	1970	64	6
1954	31	3	1971	<u>99</u>	<u>10</u>
			Total	1036	97

* One-hundred thirteen did not respond.

** Percentages were rounded to nearest whole number.

Table 3
Year of Graduation (MS)

<u>Year</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1960	2	1	1966	23	14
1961	1	1	1967	18	11
1962	0	0	1968	19	12
1963	3	2	1969	14	9
1964	15	9	1970	24	15
1965	11	7	1971	<u>33</u>	<u>20</u>
			Total	163	101

* Nine-hundred eighty-six did not respond.

** Percentages were rounded to nearest whole number.

As the above tables indicate, a significant number of respondents were relatively recent graduates. One only has to go back to 1963 to reach a majority of those holding bachelor degrees; and only to 1968 for a majority of masters degree holders. This fact will be kept in mind in particular facets of the analysis to follow.

A majority of the respondents indicated that their area of specialization in the School of Criminal Justice was law enforcement administration. Table 4 below gives the overall distribution.

Table 4

Area of Specialization

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Law Enforcement Administration	756	67
Security Administration	168	15
Correctional Administration	51	5
Criminalistics	24	2
Delinquency Prevention and Control	111	10
Highway Traffic Administration	<u>21</u>	<u>2</u>
Total	1131	101

* Eighteen did not respond.

** Percentages were rounded to nearest whole number.

It was hypothesized that:

Ho₁ a majority of graduates, if they had to do it over again, would (1) choose again the same area of specialization and (2) again choose the criminal justice area as their college major.

To the former, 874 (79%) said they would choose the same area of specialization, and 868 (77%) felt they would again choose the criminal justice

area as their college major. Of those answering no to again choosing the same area of specialization, a majority of them felt they would specialize in an area outside of criminal justice. The most frequently mentioned areas were business administration and law. For those choosing an area within the School of Criminal Justice, a majority of them chose security administration. Of those responding no to choosing the criminal justice area as their college major, a majority of them said they would major in either business administration or law. Over forty majors were mentioned showing a great variety of choices including two respondents who chose library science and oceanography. As a result of the above findings, HYPOTHESIS I was accepted.

Regarding the criminal justice curriculum, it was hypothesized that:

Ho₂ a majority of criminal justice graduates will have felt satisfied with the criminal justice curriculum while attending Michigan State.

The results indicate this to be the case. Of 1,125 graduates responding to this question, 825 (73%) said they were satisfied with the curriculum. Even when separating the respondents by area of specialization, a majority in all areas answered that they were satisfied. (Table 5)

Table 5

Degree of Satisfaction with Curriculum
by Area of Specialization

Question 6. Were you satisfied with the criminal justice curriculum while attending M.S.U.?

<u>Area of Specialization</u>	<u>Yes</u>		<u>No</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Law Enforcement Administration	551	74	196	26
Security Administration	118	72	45	28
Correctional Administration	36	71	15	29
Criminalistics	14	61	9	39
Delinquency Prevention & Control	81	74	29	26
Highway Traffic Administration	15	75	5	25

* Thirty-five did not respond.

** Percentages were rounded to nearest whole number.

*** The chi-square value of 2.175 was not significant at the .05 level.

When comparing satisfaction with curriculum by degrees received, it was interesting to note that the degree of satisfaction was almost identical. (705 bachelor degree holders (73.74%) were satisfied with the curriculum, as were 80 masters degree holders (73.39%) who were satisfied.) Apparently the undergraduate and graduate degree curriculums are both thought of quite favorably. As a result of the previous findings, HYPOTHESIS II was accepted.

Of course there were 300 graduates (27%) who were not satisfied with the curriculum and they shouldn't be ignored. The most frequent criticism mentioned was "too much theory and not enough practical application in the curriculum". If, as we will see later, most graduates initially begin at the "level of operation" in the criminal justice arena, they may have a valid criticism.

When asked whether they had received a graduate degree or law degree from another M.S.U. School or Department, or from another educational institution, 155 (14%) said they had, while 986 (86%) said they had not. Coupling this with the 15% who had received a masters degree from the School, one is impressed by the educational achievements of the responding group. Of those indicating they had, 28 respondents reported they held a law degree; 8 reported they had their doctorate degree; and the remaining number reported they now held a masters degree. Although most degrees were either directly or indirectly related to the criminal justice area, (e.g., a number of degrees were in public administration, social work, guidance and counseling, and education) there were a few that showed a definite change of interest. For example, one respondent received a masters degree in geology; another in Russian studies; and still another in religion. The most frequent areas of study for those holding a masters degree were education, business, and the social sciences.

III POST-COLLEGE INITIAL PLACEMENT INFORMATION

The review of the literature previously mentioned that significant percentages of students in and graduates of law enforcement programs were in-service students. The results of this survey do not show this to be the case at Michigan State University. Only 187 of those responding (17%) were in-service students as opposed to 783 respondents (70%) who were pre-service students. One-hundred forty-seven (13%) reported they had had prior experience in the criminal justice field but were not employed while attending Michigan State. Even if one were to combine in-service and

prior-service respondents, the resulting percentage (30%) would be significantly lower than that reported by the I.A.C.P. survey and Tenney's survey of 45%. One explanation for the above is that most criminal justice programs could be classified as training programs which would tend to attract a large number of in-service personnel. Michigan State University's School of Criminal Justice, on the other hand, could be classified as a social science program which would be more attractive to the pre-service student. Since most programs have a "training" emphasis, one could expect to find a significant number of in-service students attending them.⁵⁰ Both the I.A.C.P. survey and Tenney survey involved respondents from a number of programs, thus creating a greater chance for in-service respondents.

It was hypothesized that:

Ho₃ the majority of criminal justice graduates will have
 chosen a public law enforcement agency as their ini-
 tial employment opportunity.

Table 6 indicates this to be the case.

⁵⁰Tenney, op. cit., pp. 1-19.

Table 6
Initial Job Placement

		<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
<u>Public Law Enforcement</u>		608	53
<u>Police</u>	<u>Number</u>		<u>Percent</u>
Federal	105		9
State	53		5
County	32		3
Municipal	<u>218</u>		<u>19</u>
Subtotal	408		36
<u>Corrections</u>			
Federal	3		0
State	49		4
County	58		5
Municipal	<u>2</u>		<u>0</u>
Subtotal	112		9
<u>Private Law Enforcement</u>		143	13
<u>Non-Law Enforcement</u>		222	19
Non-Related	170		15
Criminal Justice Related	<u>52</u>		<u>5</u>
Subtotal	222		20
<u>Career</u>			
<u>Military</u>		142	12
Non-Related	19		2
Criminal Justice Related	<u>123</u>		<u>11</u>
Subtotal	142		13
<u>No Initial Employment</u>		<u>28</u>	<u>2</u>
	Total	1143	99

* Six did not respond.

** Eighty-eight responses (8%) to the public law enforcement category were classified as "other".

*** Percentages were rounded to nearest whole number.

As Table 6 shows, 53% of those responding indicated their initial job placement was with a public law enforcement agency. A further breakdown of the public law enforcement category indicated that 36% went into police work, 9% into correctional work, and 8% into agencies that were categorized as "public law enforcement" but not necessarily police or correctional related. For example, some respondents were initially employed with a state tax enforcement agency, which required an "other" categorization. Another example that comes to mind is the "attorney general's intelligence unit". This categorization was also given an "other" classification.

By further breaking down the police and correctional categories, it can be seen that a significant number of those entering the police "profession" went into municipal police work. The federal police subcategory was a second choice. For those who chose the correctional field, almost all were initially employed at the state and county level.

Although 19% of those responding were initially employed in the non-law enforcement category, it is significant to note that 5% of the overall sample could be classified as having their initial employment in non-law enforcement or criminal justice related. This sub-categorization included those individuals who went into criminal justice education, criminal justice research, criminal law, and the like.

The military category produced an even greater percentage (11%) of respondents who were categorized as criminal justice related. This sub-categorization included respondents associated with the Army military police corp, the Air Force security police, and various intelligence groups in all branches of service.

Since 53% of the responding group did choose a public law enforcement agency as their initial employment, HYPOTHESIS III was accepted.

Of those whose initial employment was with a public law enforcement agency, it was hypothesized that:

Ho₄ a significant number will have been dissatisfied with their initial placement position.

It was also hypothesized that:

Ho₇ those graduates whose initial employment was with a category other than that of public law enforcement will be more favorable in their satisfaction with initial placement than will those graduates choosing a public law enforcement agency.

Table 7 shows the respondents' satisfaction with their level of initial employment.

Table 7

Degree of Satisfaction with Level of Initial Placement by Initial Major Employment

Question 11. Were you pleased with the level of this initial placement?

<u>Initial Major Employment</u>	<u>Thoroughly Satisfied</u>		<u>Satisfied But Expected Higher Position</u>		<u>Somewhat Dissatisfied Because of Low Position</u>		<u>Thoroughly Dissatisfied</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Public Law Enforcement	439	75	67	11	60	10	22	4
Private Law Enforcement	72	52	35	25	17	12	14	10
Non-Law Enforcement	110	58	40	21	22	12	18	9
Career Military	87	81	11	10	6	6	4	4

* One-hundred twenty-five did not respond.

** Percentages were rounded to nearest whole number.

*** The chi-square value of 52.768 was significant at the .001 level.

As Table 7 indicates, a significant number (439 or 75%) of those whose initial employment was with a public law enforcement agency were thoroughly satisfied with their initial placement position, and only those graduates whose initial employment was with the military were more favorable in their satisfaction with initial employment. Therefore, HYPOTHESIS IV and VII are rejected. In conclusion, the above results did not support earlier evidence (Crockett and Moses, 1968; and Levy, 1966) that those choosing public law enforcement could be more dissatisfied than if they had chosen a different occupation.

Even with a further breakdown of the public law enforcement category, all sub-categories were more than satisfied with initial job placement.

Although there were differences in the degree of satisfaction, dependent upon whether the agency was at the municipal, county, state, or federal government level, the differences observed were not statistically significant.

Table 8
Degree of Satisfaction by
Public Law Enforcement
Initial Placement

	Satisfied		Dissatisfied	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Police				
Federal	96	93	7	7
State	46	92	4	8
County	21	66	11	44
Municipal	173	83	35	17
Correctional				
Federal	3	100	0	0
State	43	90	5	10
County	47	81	11	19

* Five-hundred sixty-five did not respond.

** Table 8 was produced by collapsing the two "negative" rating spaces together and labelling this as dissatisfied, and collapsing the two "positive" rating spaces and labelling this as satisfied.

*** Percentages were rounded to nearest whole number

**** The chi-square value of 51.990 was not significant at the .05 level.

It had been hypothesized that:

Ho₉ the degree of satisfaction will be lowest at the municipal or local level and highest at the federal level.

Table 8 above indicates this to be the case both for the police and corrections categories. The degree of satisfaction was the lowest at the municipal or county level and the highest at the federal level. Therefore, HYPOTHESIS IX was accepted. However, it should be noted that the differences observed were not statistically significant.

For those graduates who chose not to go into law enforcement related work, it was hypothesized that:

Ho₅ they will have done so for the most part because of one of two reasons - low salary or a lack of opportunity.

Although both of these reasons were frequently mentioned, there were two

other reasons given by a number of respondents. In fact, one of the reasons, that jobs were just not available, was the most frequently mentioned explanation. The other reason was that of having a physical restriction. Such things as age, high blood pressure, hay fever, height, vision, and weight were all mentioned as factors in preventing some graduates from entering law enforcement. One graduate said:

"Students should be made aware of physical restrictions they might encounter when seeking employment. I went through four years of school with high blood pressure which was controlled by medicine, never thinking it would be detrimental to getting a job in the field of law enforcement."

Another commented:

"I'm sure that my comment of my inability to secure employment due to a defect in my eye sight is one of a minority type problem. In my case it was major in that I was forced to leave my chosen profession. I make this point only that many students desired to be a particular type of employee but for some reason they can not achieve this goal for any number of reasons. This is an important part of the responsibility of the school advisors when talking with prospective students in the chosen school. I believe that I was let down in this respect."

Perhaps the most cogent comment on this subject area was the following:

"Unless the School's policy has changed, I was never interviewed prior to being accepted into the School of Criminal Justice. It is therefore possible to be unfit for any police position but still be allowed to pursue a degree in Police Administration and upon completion of college, find it very difficult, if not impossible, to find a position within a law enforcement agency. I believe in fairness to the student and to law enforcement. An "initial interview" program should be established in an attempt to advise a person if he is potential police material. This would possibly mean records checks, physical requirements, etc."

Regarding the most frequently mentioned reason for not going into public law enforcement - simply that there were no jobs available - comments such as the following were given:

"I think it should be noted that policewoman positions are far and few between and competition is almost "dog eat dog". They should be aware of the difficulties and very few openings in getting a job."

"Students should be made aware from the start of how saturated the field they are in will be when they graduate - for example, those in juvenile corrections should be made aware of the fact that that area is completely saturated. There simply are no openings in juvenile courts, agencies, etc. unless one has a MSW or a good contact with the personnel manager. It should be the school's responsibility to make the students aware of conditions such as these."

"At the present I am unemployed. The past few months have been very frustrating. After a certain amount of time, one becomes very discouraged not finding an opening in his/her field without "time" becoming a major factor. One, two, or more months may pass before it becomes a matter of just plain survival. One does have to eat, pay rent and other bills. Many devoted criminal justice majors find jobs in unrelated fields, just because of necessity."

Although low salary and lack of opportunity ranked second and third as reasons given for not pursuing public law enforcement work, there were two other reasons frequently mentioned, ranking first and fourth, the former being that there were simply no jobs available and the latter being a physical restriction. However, HYPOTHESIS V is accepted, as a physical restriction or that jobs were simply not available are not reasons relating to choice.

According to the literature surveyed earlier, a majority of those not entering law enforcement related work will have been pre-service students rather than in-service or prior-service students. As a result it was hypothesized that:

Ho₆ a majority of those not entering law enforcement related work will have been pre-service students rather than in-service or prior-service students.

As Table 9 indicates, this, in fact, is the case.

In regard to the initial placement of respondents, the following frequency distribution can be seen:

Table 9

In-Service, Prior-Service, Pre-Service Students by
Initial Placement in Non-Law Enforcement/Law Enforcement Work

<u>Status of Student</u>	<u>Initial Placement in Non-Law Enforcement</u>		<u>Initial Placement in Law Enforcement</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
In-Service	15	8	169	92
Prior-Service	28	19	116	81
Pre-Service	170	22	591	78

* Thirty-six did not respond.

** Percentages were rounded to nearest whole number.

*** Twenty-four reported no initial employment.

**** The chi-square value of 108.571 was significant at the .001 level.

From the above it is quite evident that of those who went into non-law enforcement related work, an extremely large number were pre-service students. However, over three-quarters (78%) of those not previously in law enforcement did enter the criminal justice field or a related area. This finding is at variance with Newman and Hunter's study which concluded that about three-quarters of the pre-service graduates did not enter the field following graduation.

Also noteworthy from the above table is the percentage of in-service students who do not enter law enforcement related work. It was surprising to observe that 8% immediately left the field for non-law enforcement work. It should be noted though that a majority of all respondents in each service category did enter law enforcement related work. As a result of the above findings, HYPOTHESIS VI was accepted.

Table 10

Initial Placement with
Agency or Organization

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Specialized Position	103	10
Supervisory Position	107	10
Administrative Position	62	6
Level of Operation	640	62
Other	<u>117</u>	<u>11</u>
Total	1029	99

* One-hundred twenty did not respond

** Percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number.

As can be seen from the above distribution, the majority of graduates were initially placed at the level of operation. By cross-tabulating the variables of initial placement position and initial major employment, one is able to see significant differences.

Table 11

Initial Placement Position
by Initial Major Employment

<u>Initial Major Employment</u>	<u>Special- ized Position</u>		<u>Super- visory Position</u>		<u>Admini- strative Position</u>		<u>Level of Operation</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Public Law Enforcement	49	8	12	2	16	3	488	82
Private Law Enforcement	11	8	24	18	24	18	63	46
Non-Law Enforcement	34	18	12	7	14	8	69	38
Career Military	8	7	59	52	8	7	18	16

* One-hundred twenty-three did not respond.

** One-hundred seventeen reported their initial placement was "other".

*** Percentages were rounded to nearest whole number.

**** The chi-square value of 481.544 was significant at the .001 level.

If one's initial placement was with public law enforcement, he could expect a position at the level of operation. This category overwhelmingly demonstrated that the initial placement position for this type of work was at the level of operation. A further breakdown of the public law enforcement category gives the following distribution.

Table 12

Initial Placement Position by
Public Law Enforcement Category

	<u>Initial Placement Position</u>							
	<u>Special- ized Position</u>		<u>Super- visory Position</u>		<u>Admini- strative Position</u>		<u>Level of Operation</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
<u>Police</u>								
Federal	8	8	0	0	0	0	90	87
State	8	16	1	2	3	6	33	65
County	3	9	0	0	3	9	25	78
Municipal	13	6	3	1	7	3	186	88
<u>Corrections</u>								
Federal	4	8	5	10	1	2	34	69
State	1	2	0	0	0	0	54	95
County	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	100
Municipal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

* Five-hundred sixty did not respond.

** One-hundred five were categorized as "other".

*** Percentages were rounded to nearest whole number.

**** The chi-square value of 229.851 was significant to the .001 level.

***** A limitation on the significance of the chi-square value should be mentioned due to a number of cells having an expectant value of less than one.

As Table 12 indicates, a majority in all police and correction sub-categories were initially placed at the level of operation.

Differences in position level were reviewed relative to degree awarded, and it was found that the degree level did make a significant difference in initial placement.

Table 13
Initial Placement Position by
Degree Received

<u>Degree Received</u>	<u>Initial Placement Position</u>							
	<u>Special- ized Position</u>		<u>Super- visory Position</u>		<u>Admini- strative Position</u>		<u>Level of Operation</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Bachelor	75	8	79	9	46	5	587	66
Masters	19	22	22	26	12	14	23	27

* One-hundred twenty-two did not respond.

** One-hundred seventeen were categorized as "other".

*** Forty-seven respondents were not included as they had received both degrees.

**** Percentages were rounded to nearest whole number.

***** The chi-square value of 70.269 was significant at the .001 level.

Baccalaureate degree holders were much more likely to be placed initially at the level of operation. On the other hand, a majority of master degree holders were initially placed in specialized, supervisory, or administrative positions.

There was a significant difference when looking at initial placement position by in-service, prior-service, and pre-service graduates.

Table 14

Initial Placement Position by
In-Service, Prior-Service, and Pre-Service Graduates

<u>Initial Placement Position</u>	<u>Status of Students</u>					
	<u>In-Service</u>		<u>Prior-Service</u>		<u>Pre-Service</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Specialized Position	20	12	22	16	60	8
Supervisory Position	41	25	10	7	56	8
Administrative Position	14	9	10	7	38	5
Level of Operation	73	45	78	57	472	67

* One-hundred forty-one did not respond.

** One-hundred fourteen were categorized as "other".

*** Percentages were rounded to nearest whole number.

**** The chi-square value of 60.041 was significant at the .001 level.

As Table 14 indicates, an in-service student had more of a chance of receiving an initial placement position at other than the level of operation position. The pre-service student was the most likely to have an initial placement position at the level of operation.

As an interesting sidelight, a comparison of placement and utilization patterns between 1938-1967 graduates and 1968-1971 graduates was made in light of the President's Commission recommendations of February, 1967. It was hypothesized that:

Ho₈ in spite of the President's Commission recommendations of February, 1967, there will be no difference in placement and utilization patterns between 1938-1967 graduates and 1968-1971 graduates.

As a result of the analysis, there was no discernable change in pattern that could be ascertained between 1938-1967 graduates and 1968-1971 graduates regarding initial placement position. For example, if we take the years 1964, 65, 66, and 67 and compare them with 1968, 69, 70, and 71 with respect to initial placement position, we have the following:

Table 15

Year of Graduation by
Initial Placement Position

<u>Initial Placement Position</u>	<u>Year of Graduation</u>							
	<u>64</u> <u>%</u>	<u>65</u> <u>%</u>	<u>66</u> <u>%</u>	<u>67</u> <u>%</u>	<u>68</u> <u>%</u>	<u>69</u> <u>%</u>	<u>70</u> <u>%</u>	<u>71</u> <u>%</u>
Specialized Position	6	10	15	13	9	14	15	4
Supervisory Position	12	7	15	2	12	2	4	10
Administrative Position	4	0	6	9	3	7	5	3
Level of Operation	69	71	58	70	66	68	69	69
	N = (70)(53)(61)(76)				(84)(75)(88)(124)			

* Percentages were rounded to nearest whole number

** "Other" category was not included.

As one can see from the above table, there were no changes in placement and utilization patterns by year of graduation. No one pattern could be discerned causing one to doubt if the President's Commission recommendations for three levels of entry and the establishment of lateral entry within the criminal justice field was taken very seriously. Therefore, HYPOTHESIS IX was accepted.

It was hypothesized that:

Ho₁₀ there will be significant differences in the time sequence before being promoted or assigned to a specialized, supervisory, or administrative position dependent on area category.

It was assumed that the public law enforcement category will show the longest time sequence before being promoted or assigned to a specialized, supervisory, or administrative position, and within this category the municipal governmental level will show the longest time span.

Table 16

Time Sequence Before Being Promoted or Assigned
to a Specialized, Supervisory, or Administrative Position
by Initial Major Employment

Question 12. If your initial placement was at the level of operation, how long was it before you were promoted or assigned to a specialized, supervisory, or administrative position?

<u>Time Sequence</u>	<u>Initial Major Employment</u>							
	<u>Public</u>		<u>Private</u>		<u>Non-Law</u>		<u>Military</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Less than 1 Year	44	8	32	25	29	17	16	17
1-2 Years	66	11	16	13	26	15	18	19
2-3 Years	37	6	3	2	14	8	3	3
3-4 Years	32	6	3	2	5	3	0	0
More than 4 Years	89	15	2	2	10	6	2	2
Haven't Been Promoted or Reassigned as of Yet	118	20	5	4	8	5	1	1

* One-hundred eighty did not respond.

** Three-hundred Ninety (47%) responded "not applicable".

*** Percentages rounded to nearest whole number.

**** The chi-square value of 151.230 was significant at the .001 level.

As Table 16 indicates, the time sequence before being promoted or assigned to a specialized, supervisory, or administrative position did produce significant differences between the public law enforcement

category and the other three area categories. Between the latter three there were no significant differences. A majority of the respondents in these groupings reported that this particular question was not applicable to them (already were in such a position) or that if they started at level of operation they were promoted or assigned in less than one year or between one to two years. This was drastically different from those respondents in the public law enforcement category. While 38%, 32%, and 36% of those respondents in the private, non-law, and military categories said that the time sequence was less than one year or one to two years before being promoted or assigned, only 19% of the public law enforcement respondents said likewise. An even greater difference can be noted by looking at the response to "haven't been promoted or assigned as of yet". Twenty percent of public law enforcement respondents responded to this whereas only 4%, 5%, and 1% from the private, non-law, and military categories answered this item. Although it had been assumed that the above would be the case, it had also been assumed that within the public law enforcement category the municipal or local governmental level will show the longest time span before promotion. The cross-tabulations showed this not to be the case. There was little distinguishable difference at any governmental level. Nevertheless, there were significant differences between initial major employment categories, especially between the public category and the private, non-law, and military categories. As a result HYPOTHESIS XI was accepted.

Within Section 3 three questions were asked to respondents regarding whether a lateral entry policy, pay incentive program, or managerial/internship trainee program existed in the agency/organization that hired them. It was hypothesized that:

Ho₁₁ few, if any respondents in the public law enforcement category will say there was a pay incentive program for personnel taking college credit courses in their respective agencies;

Ho₁₂ a policy of lateral entry will be relatively non-existent in agencies categorized as public law enforcement, while on the other hand, lateral entry will be an existing concept in agencies categorized as private law enforcement, non-law enforcement, or the military;

Ho₁₃ few, if any respondents in the public law enforcement category will have participated in a managerial/internship trainee program for the college graduate; on the other hand there will be a significant number of managerial/internship trainee programs for college graduates in the private law enforcement, non-law enforcement, and military categories.

In looking at the frequency distribution for the entire sample, it was found that only 18% said their agency/organization had a pay incentive program; 32% said there was a managerial/trainee program; and 32% said there was a lateral entry policy within their agency/organization. By a further breakdown by initial major employment, the following distributions were observed.

Table 17

Pay Incentive Program by
Initial Major Employment

Question 14. Was there a pay incentive program for personnel taking college credit courses?

<u>Initial Major Employment</u>	Yes		No	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Public Law Enforcement	96	16	495	84
Private Law Enforcement	26	19	110	81
Non-Law Enforcement	43	24	133	76
Career Military	13	13	89	88

* One-hundred forty-four did not respond.

** Percentages were rounded to nearest whole number.

*** The chi-square value of 8.238 was significant at the .05 level.

Table 18

Managerial/Internship Program by
Initial Major Employment

Question 15. Did your employer have any managerial/internship trainee programs for college graduates?

<u>Initial Major Employment</u>	Yes		No	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Public Law Enforcement	129	22	461	78
Private Law Enforcement	68	50	69	50
Non-Law Enforcement	77	44	99	56
Career Military	42	43	56	57

* One-hundred forty-eight did not respond.

** Percentages were rounded to nearest whole number.

*** The chi-square value of 64.289 was significant at the .001 level.

Table 19

Lateral Entry Policy by Initial
Major Employment

Question 13. Was there a lateral entry policy in the agency/organization that hired you?

	Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%
Public Law Enforcement	124	21	461	79
Private Law Enforcement	69	52	64	48
Non-Law Enforcement	76	46	91	54
Career Military	43	44	55	56

* One-hundred sixty-six did not respond.

** Percentages were rounded to nearest whole number.

*** The chi-square value of 76.192 was significant at the .001 level.

As indicated by Table 17, few respondents (16%) in the public law enforcement category reported there was a pay incentive program within their agency. Of course, even in the other categories there was little in the way of pay incentive programs. Thus, HYPOTHESIS X was accepted.

Table 18 reflected similar results. Few (22%) in the public law enforcement category said their employer had a managerial/internship program for college graduates. On the other hand, the other employment categories showed a much larger percentage of respondents who reported there was such a program. As a result, HYPOTHESIS XII was accepted.

On the subject of lateral entry, this writer found it very difficult to analyze because of possible misinterpretation of the questionnaire by the respondents. Although the public law enforcement category was considerably below the other categories in saying that a lateral entry policy existed, he was surprised at the relatively high percentage

(21%) who answered affirmatively. He believed this figure to be high because the literature suggested a dearth in lateral entry policies in public law enforcement agencies. It is possible that correctional respondents, lateral transfer misinterpretations, and those who equated lateral entry with only top level administrative hirings may have accounted for this high percentage. By the same token, having been in the military, he knew that the military had such a policy - yet 56% of the military respondents gave negative responses. Nevertheless, the results indicated a significant difference between the public law enforcement category and those agencies categorized as private law enforcement, non-law enforcement, and the military. Therefore, HYPOTHESIS XIII was accepted, even though 21% cannot be said to be "relatively non-existent".

When asked whether there were any difficulties in getting their initial job that they felt were attributable to their criminal justice or police administration degree, only 69 or 7% said that they did have some difficulty. Of this number, the majority had difficulty when applying to municipal police departments. Explanations such as "the Chief objected to hiring college graduates", "too much line level resentment toward degree person", "they felt I would leave for a better position because of my education", and "they didn't want college grads because of previous experience" were frequently mentioned. For those master degree holders (4) who responded to this question, the explanation given was that "I was discouraged by state and local police agencies as being over-qualified".

When asked, did all newly hired personnel start at the same entry level regardless of their level of education, the following was observed.

Table 20

Entry Level by
Initial Major Employment

Question 17. Did all newly hired personnel start at the same entry level regardless of their level of education?

<u>Initial Major Employment</u>	<u>Yes</u>		<u>No</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Public Law Enforcement	434	73	157	27
Private Law Enforcement	65	47	72	53
Non-Law Enforcement	81	45	100	55
Career Military	49	48	54	52

* One-hundred thirty-seven did not respond.

** Percentages were rounded to nearest whole number.

*** The chi-square value of 77.186 was significant at the .001 level.

As Table 20 indicates, a significant difference between the public law enforcement category and the remaining three is very evident. The public law enforcement category overwhelmingly answered yes (73%). On the other hand, a majority in the private, non-law, and military categories responded negatively. It seems that the value of an education, at least for entry level, was significantly below the norm for the public law enforcement category.

It was hypothesized that:

H_{014} the majority of criminal justice graduates will have felt prepared for their initial job placement.

As Table 21 indicates, this was, in fact, the case.

Table 21

Degree of Preparedness for
Initial Job Placement

Question 20. How well do you feel your college major prepared you for your initial job placement?

	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Extremely Well	230	22
Adequately	630	60
Inadequately	101	10
Cannot Say	88	8

* One-hundred did not respond.

** Percentages were rounded to nearest whole number.

Over 230 (22%) felt they were extremely well prepared, while another 630 (60%) said they were adequately prepared. Only 101 (10%) felt they were inadequately prepared.

When asked to compare their preparedness with their fellow workers, they were even more confident.

Table 22

Degree of Preparedness in
Comparison with Fellow Workers

Question 21. How well prepared were you to assume your job responsibilities in comparison with your fellow workers?

	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Extremely Well	442	42
Adequately	533	51
Inadequately	21	2
Cannot Say	53	5

* One-hundred did not respond.

** Percentages were rounded to nearest whole number.

Over 442 (42%) answered "extremely well", and 533 (51%) responded "adequately". Only 21 (2%) felt they were inadequately prepared. The quality of their educational experience was apparently thought of as being very good.

Even by looking at the degree of preparedness by area of specialization within the college major, one can observe the positive nature of the respondents.

Table 23

Degree of Preparedness for Initial
Job Placement by Area of Specialization

<u>Area of Specialization</u>	<u>Degree of Preparedness</u>							
	<u>Extremely Well</u>		<u>Adequately</u>		<u>Inadequately</u>		<u>Cannot Say</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Law Enforcement Administration	151	22	409	60	66	10	52	8
Security Administration	30	19	95	60	19	12	15	9
Correctional Administration	13	27	29	60	2	4	4	8
Criminalistics	4	17	15	63	2	8	3	13
Delinquency Prev. and Control	26	25	60	57	8	8	11	10
Highway Traffic Administration	4	19	14	67	2	10	1	5

* One-hundred fourteen did not respond.

** Percentages were rounded to nearest whole number.

*** The chi-square value of 7.263 was not significant at the .05 level.

All specialization areas were observed as providing a "positive" degree of preparation for the respondents' initial job placements. As a result of the above findings, HYPOTHESIS XIV was accepted.

When asked whether their college training was best utilized through their initial job placement, 640 (59%) said it had been. This had not been

expected, as it was hypothesized that:

H_{015} the majority of criminal justice graduates will feel that their college training was not best utilized.

Table 24

Utilization of College Training Through
Initial Job Placement

Question 18. Do you feel your college training was best utilized through your initial job placement?

<u>Initial Major Enrollment</u>	<u>Yes</u>		<u>No</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Public Law Enforcement	40	69	184	31
Private Law Enforcement	76	55	63	45
Non-Law Enforcement	84	43	110	57
Career Military	73	68	36	32

* One-hundred sixteen did not respond.

** Percentages were rounded to nearest whole number.

*** The chi-square value of 44.678 was significant at the .001 level.

Since only 393, or 41% of the overall sample felt they had not been best utilized, HYPOTHESIS XV was rejected. For those who gave negative responses they were asked how they could have been better utilized, and the two most frequent answers were (1) assignment to a specialized or administrative position, and (2) by taking a job in the criminal justice field. Surprisingly enough the public law enforcement category had the highest percentage of respondents who felt their college training was best utilized through their initial job placement. However, a possible misinterpretation may have accounted for this. The writer felt that the term "utilization" was taken to mean that if they went into the area of their training, the respondents felt they were best utilized. Although

this is one meaning of the word, this writer had hoped for an understanding of "utilization" in the job itself. For example, if a security administration graduate went into plant protection work, some might say his college training was best utilized even though his initial job placement was plant protection patrolman. Was this graduate best utilized? This might account for the high percentage given to public law enforcement and the low percentage given non-law enforcement.

The respondents were also asked whether their education had enabled them to progress more rapidly in their career than their fellow employees who lacked their educational qualifications. For the overall sample, 680 respondents (68%) said that it did. Of those who gave negative responses, many felt that experience was more important to advancement. Some felt that nepotism and political interference negated the value of their education. Others gave negative replies because all employees in their particular agencies were required to have a degree, thus negating any advantages.

Respondents were asked to indicate their initial entrance salary, and the frequency distribution was as follows:

Table 25
Initial Entrance Salary

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Less than \$6,000	457	43
\$6,000 - \$7,999	266	25
\$8,000 - \$9,000	203	19
\$10,000 - \$11,999	76	7
\$12,000 - \$13,999	30	3
\$14,000 - \$15,999	15	1
\$16,000 - \$17,999	3	0
\$18,000 - \$19,999	4	0
\$20,000 and over	1	0

* Percentages were rounded to nearest whole number.

** Ninety-four did not respond.

Interestingly enough, when cross-tabulating the above table by initial major employment, initial entrance salaries between job categories were quite similar. This writer had expected the public law enforcement category to be below the other categories.

The graduates' year of initial placement, as might be expected, had a great deal to do with the salary scale they averaged. Through 1963 a majority of graduates made less than \$6,000 as an initial salary. Graduates from 1964 to 1968 averaged \$6,000 to \$7,999, and 1969 to 1971 graduates' initial entrance salaries averaged \$8,000 to \$9,999. Regardless of year of initial placement, a majority of respondents were satisfied with their initial entrance salary.(64%)

A final determination in Section 3 that this writer inquired about

was the length of time graduates remained with their initial jobs before accepting a second one. Of the 576 respondents who responded to this item, 179 (31%) were still employed with the same agency. Table 26 gives the overall distribution of this inquiry.

Table 26

Length of Time Remained with Initial Job After
Graduation Before Accepting Second Job

Question 25. How long did you remain with your initial job after graduation before accepting your second job?

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Still Employed	179	31
Less than 1 Year	95	16
1 - 2 Years	119	21
2 - 3 Years	61	11
3 - 4 Years	40	7
4 - 5 Years	22	4
5 - 6 Years	15	3
6 - 7 Years	6	1
7 - 8 Years	5	1
8 - 9 Years	11	2
9 - 10 Years	10	2
More than 10 Years	12	2

* Percentages were rounded to nearest whole number.

** Five-hundred seventy-three did not respond.

*** The reason for the large number of non-respondents was due to the fact that the question was an open-ended item.

As Table 26 indicates, a significant number of graduates left their initial job after a short period of time. For example, 48% left between a time span of less than one year to three years. Since this has been a criticism by criminal justice officials - that the recruitment of college-educated

graduates or the upgrading of personnel through education is not worth the effort because such "overly qualified" men will become dissatisfied and leave for "bigger and better things" - an inquiry was also made of in-service personnel. Table 27 gives the results of this inquiry.

Table 27

Length of Time Remained with Criminal Justice
Agency After Graduation Before Accepting Second Job
- In-Service Personnel -

Question 26. If you were employed by a criminal justice agency at the time of graduation, how long did you stay with that agency after graduation before accepting another job?

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Still Employed	39	33
Less than 1 Year	26	22
1 - 2 Years	14	12
2 - 3 Years	14	12
3 - 4 Years	7	6
4 - 5 Years	0	0
5 - 6 Years	6	5
6 - 7 Years	4	3
7 - 8 Years	2	1
8 - 9 Years	2	1
9 - 10 Years	3	3
More than 10 Years	2	1

* Percentages were rounded to nearest whole number.

** Sixty-eight did not respond.

Of the 187 in-service students who responded to the questionnaire, 119 answered this question. As reflected by Table 20, results were very much like those obtained in Table 19 of the overall sample. Thirty-three percent were still employed with the same agency. However, a significant number 54 (46%), had left their agency during a time span of less than one year to three years. What would need to be done is to compare the above with mobility patterns in other fields to see if this is a valid criticism. Of course, assuming that it was, this would not mean that higher education is not needed for criminal justice; it would simply mean for criminal justice to create changes to attract and retain competent and qualified individuals. For example, when asked what their major reason was for leaving their initial job, the overwhelming answer given by respondents was for "a better opportunity". Criminal justice agencies obviously should make strides to create "the better opportunity" within their own agencies.

IV. PRESENT EMPLOYMENT INFORMATION AND VIEWS TOWARD SELECTED ISSUES IN CRIMINAL JUSTICE

The data revealed an interesting transposition of agencies by graduates. Of the 1,107 respondents, 554 (50%) reported that their present job was not with the same agency/organization that initially hired them.

The present employment of responding graduates indicates a somewhat different pattern than for initial employment. (See Table 6)

Table 28
Present Employment

		<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
<u>Public Law Enforcement</u>		510	45
<u>Police</u>	<u>Number</u>		<u>Percent</u>
Federal	118		10
State	61		5
County	28		3
Municipal	<u>152</u>		<u>13</u>
Subtotal	359		31
<u>Corrections</u>			
Federal	3		0
State	56		5
County	42		4
Municipal	<u>1</u>		<u>0</u>
Subtotal	102		9
<u>Private Law Enforcement</u>		84	7
<u>Non-Law Enforcement</u>		360	32
Non-Related	284		25
Criminal Justice Related	<u>76</u>		<u>7</u>
Subtotal	360		32
<u>Career</u>			
<u>Military</u>		119	11
Non-Related	28		3
Criminal Justice Related	<u>91</u>		<u>8</u>
Subtotal	119		11
<u>Unemployed</u>		47	4
<u>Student</u>		<u>13</u>	<u>1</u>
	Total	1133	100

* Sixteen did not respond

** Forty-eight responses (5%) to the public law enforcement categories were classified as "other".

*** Percentages were rounded to nearest whole number.

Although public law enforcement remained the largest single category with 510 graduates (45%), it also was the category that lost the most graduates. Initially there were 608 graduates (53%) in public law enforcement; presently there are only 510 graduates (45%). Of the overall total, 31% are in police work, 9% are in correctional work, and 5% in agencies that could be categorized as "public law enforcement" but not necessarily police or corrections related (e.g., state arsenal investigation unit, state tax enforcement agency, Attorney General's special intelligence unit).

As Table 28 indicates, the municipal police sub-category continued to have the largest number of graduates, but likewise it also showed the largest number of graduates lost to other occupations. There were 218 graduates who responded that their initial job placement was with municipal police; presently there are only 152 so employed. Of the 98 lost by the public law enforcement category, 66 were municipal policemen. Both the federal and state police gained graduates, with the federal level picking up another 13 graduates and the state police increasing their number by 8 graduates. In the correctional area the federal and municipal levels all but remained the same. The state correctional area was increased by 7 graduates while county corrections lost 16 graduates. By combining the police and correctional areas a pattern can be observed more readily. Federal and state agencies show an increase of 28 graduates while county and municipal agencies show a decrease of 87 graduates. It seems that federal and state employment is more attractive.

The private law enforcement and career military categories lost graduates. The former lost 59 graduates and the latter 23 graduates. The private law enforcement category's loss was substantial as this represented a percentage drop of approximately 6% from initial placement.

The only major employment category showing a gain in the number of graduates was that of non-law enforcement. There are 138 more graduates presently employed in this category than at the time of initial placement. Of those in non-law enforcement, 76 or 21%, are employed in jobs that could be considered to be criminal justice related (e.g., 32 criminal justice faculty, 9 criminal justice researchers and consultants, 6 criminal justice lawyers, and a number of court-related personnel). For the remaining 284 graduates, a full spectrum of occupations are included (e.g., 5 ordained ministers, 1 university soccer coach, 1 stock broker, 2 commercial airline pilots, 1 medical doctor, 1 dentist, 2 engineers, and numerous graduates in insurance, sales, and law).

One final note that should be mentioned is that 47 graduates (4%) reported they were presently unemployed. Although this figure is alarming, it is below the national unemployment figure of 5.5%.

It was hypothesized that:

No₁₈

the majority of criminal justice graduates will have remained in the area of employment that was their initial work experience.

Table 29

Present Employment by
Initial Major Employment

<u>Initial Major Employment</u>	<u>Present Employment</u>									
	Public Law Enforc't		Private Law Enforc't		Non- Law Enforc't		Career Mili- tary		Unem- ployed	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Public Law Enforcement	449	<u>74</u>	16	3	109	18	5	1	20	3
Private Law Enforce'mt	26	18	59	<u>42</u>	51	36	2	1	3	2
Non-Law Enforcement	20	9	5	2	182	<u>84</u>	5	2	3	1
Career Military	11	8	4	3	16	12	104	<u>75</u>	3	2
No Initial Employment	1	4	0	0	2	7	2	7	18	<u>64</u>

* Twenty did not respond.

** Thirteen respondents in the "student" category were not included.

*** Percentages were rounded to nearest whole number.

**** The chi-square value of 170.957 was significant at the .001 level.

Table 29 indicates, the hypothesis is very much substantiated by the data. Although there was considerable transposition between agencies/organizations on the part of a number of respondents, they have for the most part remained in their initial major area of employment. For example, 74% who began in public law enforcement are still in that area; 42% are still in private law enforcement; 75% are still in the military, and; 84% are still in non-law enforcement. It should be noted that the private law enforcement category was the only major area of employment that showed a considerable change. Most respondents indicated they had left the private law enforcement field for either public law enforcement (18%) or non-law enforcement (36%) work. However, since most graduates remained with their initial major area of employment, HYPOTHESIS XVIII was accepted.

The data indicated this to be the case. Most of the respondent group (880 or 81%) reported that they were either "thoroughly satisfied" or "satisfied" with their present position. Only 218 or 19% answered "somewhat dissatisfied" or "thoroughly dissatisfied". Therefore, HYPOTHESIS XVI was accepted.

Even if one were to look at individual job categories, he would get similar results. All categories were equally satisfied in the present job position. Of those individuals in public law enforcement, 81% gave positive responses; those in private law enforcement 79%; those in non-law enforcement 82%; and those individuals in the military 84%.

A related question to the above concerned the graduates' current job position, and to what extent they felt their criminal justice education was being utilized. It was hypothesized that:

H_{017} the degree criminal justice graduates will feel their criminal justice education is being utilized in their present position will depend largely on their present employment category.

As a group, the majority of respondents felt their criminal justice education was being utilized in their current position extremely well (269 or 25%) or adequately (453 or 42%). Seventeen percent (190) felt they were inadequately utilized, and sixteen percent (179) felt their education was not utilized at all. Individual employment categories presented a different picture.

Of the individuals reporting present position, rank, or title, a completely different pattern was noticeable from the response given for initial placement position. (Table 11)

Table 30

Present Job Position by Present Employment

<u>Present Employment</u>	<u>Present Job Position</u>							
	<u>Special- ized Position</u>		<u>Super- visory Position</u>		<u>Admini- strative Position</u>		<u>Level of Operation</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Public Law Enforcement	93	18	136	27	90	18	188	37
Private Law Enforcement	8	10	28	33	36	43	12	14
Non-Law Enforcement	81	23	130	36	103	29	41	12
Career Military	15	13	62	52	39	33	2	2

* Fifty-three did not respond.

** Student and unemployed categories were omitted.

*** Percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number.

**** The chi-square value of 559.948 was significant at the .001 level.

***** A limitation on the chi-square value should be mentioned due to a number of cells having an expectant value less than one.

All categories showed a significant increase in graduates at specialized, supervisory, or administrative positions. Since the survey included 1938-1971 graduates, this could be expected as many should have reached such a position by this time. This was, in fact, the case as only 10% of those graduating between 1938-1960 are presently in level of operation type positions as apposed to 90% of those graduated between 1960-1971.

It was hypothesized that:

Ho₁₆

the majority of criminal justice graduates will be pleased with their present job position.

Table 31

Extent Criminal Justice Education
Utilized in Current Position

Question 4. In your current position, to what extent do you feel your criminal justice education is being utilized?

	Extreme-ly Well		Ade-quate-ly		Inade-quate-ly		Not at All	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Public Law Enforcement	144	28	244	48	94	19	25	5
Private Law Enforcement	22	27	45	54	12	14	4	5
Non-Law Enforcement	66	19	112	32	63	18	107	31
Career Military	30	26	43	37	18	16	25	22

* Sixty-five did not respond.

** Percentages were rounded to nearest whole number.

*** Student and unemployed categories were omitted.

**** The chi-square value of 170.788 was significant at the .001 level.

***** A limitation on the significance of the chi-square value should be mentioned due to a number of cells having an expectant value of less than one.

Although a majority in all categories gave a positive response to this question, a difference between categories was evident. Public and private categories were the most positive, with the military next, and the non-law enforcement category a poor last. Of course, this could have been predicted as their educational training was in criminal justice and they are currently in non-law enforcement work. On the other hand, public, private, and military categories for the most part are in positions in criminal justice or related areas and graduates would feel their criminal justice education was being utilized. Therefore, HYPOTHESIS XVII was accepted.

Those respondents who are not presently employed in law enforcement were asked to mention the major reason they are not now in law enforcement.

The two reasons most frequently mentioned were low salary and lack of opportunity; that is, for advancement and creative change. A number of respondents said they received better opportunities elsewhere. Several were rejected from entering law enforcement because of physical reasons. One individual said he didn't go into law enforcement work because of "frustration and what was considered inappropriate educational training". (MSW was required for promotion and he only had MA degree.)

In order to touch upon the mobility pattern of the criminal justice graduate, the respondents were asked to indicate the number of agencies for which they have worked since graduating from Michigan State University.

Table 32

Number of Agencies Worked for Since
Graduating from M.S.U.

Question 6. For how many separate agencies have you worked since graduating from M.S.U.?

<u>No. of Agencies</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1	509	47
2	304	28
3	159	15
4	65	6
5	18	2
6	13	1
7	12	1
8	1	0

* Sixty-seven did not respond.

** Percentages were rounded to nearest whole number.

As Table 32 indicates, the average number of agencies worked for was approximately two. Although not knowing the mobility ratio for other occupational

groupings, this writer felt this average to be below the norm. Over 90% of those responding indicated they had worked for only one, two, or three agencies.

Present and future students should be encouraged by the annual salary now being made by past graduates.

Table 33

Present Salary

<u>Salary Range</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Less than \$6,000	33	3
\$6,000 - \$7,999	32	3
\$8,000 - \$9,999	76	7
\$10,000 - \$11,999	152	14
\$12,000 - \$13,999	177	16
\$14,000 - \$15,999	173	16
\$16,000 - \$17,999	120	11
\$18,000 - \$19,999	80	7
\$20,000 and over	238	22

* Sixty-eight did not respond.

** Percentages were rounded to nearest whole number.

The average salary is in the \$14,000 to \$15,999 range, and 438 or 40% of the respondents earn above this figure. The mean salary is maintained regardless of present employment category.

When asked whether they were satisfied with their present salary, 60% of the overall sample gave a positive response while 40% responded negatively. A majority in all present employment categories were satisfied with their present salary.

In order to determine the factors thought to be most detrimental to the recruitment of college graduates into the criminal justice field, the respondents were given a list of eight factors to rank in the order of their importance.

It was hypothesized that:

Ho₁₉ the majority of criminal justice graduates will feel that the factor which is most detrimental to the recruitment of college graduates into the criminal justice field is that graduates of degree programs usually start on the lowest step of the law enforcement agency ladder.

The following is the result of their rankings.

Table 3⁴

Factors Ranked as Most Detrimental to the
Recruitment of College Graduates

Question 10. Based on your own experience, rank in the order of their importance the factors you consider most detrimental to the recruitment of college graduates into the criminal justice field. (1 being most detrimental, to 8 being least detrimental.)

<u>Order of Ranking</u>	<u>Mean</u>
1. Graduates of degree programs usually start on the lowest step of the law enforcement agency ladder.	3.16
2. Pay scales in criminal justice work.	3.17
3. Social status of criminal justice employment.	4.07
4. Civil service laws.	4.56
5. Opposition to college-educated personnel on the part of administrators in criminal justice agencies.	4.63
6. Unrealistic expectations of graduates.	4.82
7. Danger involved in some kinds of law enforcement.	5.63
8. Employee unions.	5.90

* The respondents were also given an "other" category to list other factors felt by them to be very detrimental to recruitment of the college graduate. The two most frequently mentioned were "political interference", and "court decisions".

As indicated by Table 34, the factor ranked as most detrimental was, in fact, that which was hypothesized. However, it should be noted that the pay factor had an almost identical ranking. Despite the closeness (3.16 - 3.17), HYPOTHESIS XIX was accepted.

The respondents were also asked to rank the various employment categories in (1) their effort towards recruiting college graduates, and (2) their effort to place college graduates in positions commensurate with their education. It was hypothesized that:

Ho₂₀ the majority of criminal justice graduates will rank the public law enforcement (state and local level) category as the one utilizing the least effort in the recruitment of college graduates.

and

Ho₂₁ the majority of criminal justice graduates will rank the public law enforcement (state and local level) category as the one utilizing the least effort in the placing of college graduates in positions commensurate with their training.

Tables 35 and 36 give the results of their rankings.

Table 35

Ranking of Agencies' Efforts Towards
Recruiting College Graduates

Question 11. How would you rank these agencies in their effort towards recruiting college graduates? (1 being the greatest effort, to 5 being the least effort.)

<u>Order of Ranking</u>	<u>Mean</u>
1. Public Law Enforcement (Federal Level)	1.97
2. Non-Law Enforcement	2.77
3. Public Law Enforcement (State and Local Level)	3.33
4. Career Military	3.45
5. Private Law Enforcement	3.57

Table 36

Ranking of Agencies' Efforts in Placing College
Graduates in Positions Commensurate
with Their Education

Question 12. How would you rank these agencies in their effort to place college graduates in positions commensurate with their education? (1 being the greatest effort, to 5 being the least effort.)

<u>Order of Ranking</u>	<u>Mean</u>
1. Public Law Enforcement (Federal Level)	2.34
2. Non-Law Enforcement	2.45
3. Career Military	3.17
4. Private Law Enforcement	3.20
5. Public Law Enforcement (State and Local Level)	3.82

As Table 35 indicates, public law enforcement (federal level) was thought to put forth the greatest effort in recruiting college graduates. The private law enforcement category was thought to provide the least effort. This was interesting in that a number of graduates in private security had asked the whereabouts of security administration graduates, since they needed qualified personnel. The lack of communication between the School and private law enforcement in recruiting seems very evident. Since the public law enforcement (state and local level) category ranked third in the overall listing, HYPOTHESIS XX was rejected.

As Table 36 indicates, public law enforcement (federal level) was also thought to provide the greatest effort in placing college graduates in positions commensurate with their education. Since a degree is necessary for federal law enforcement, one could predict this outcome. If this writer had hypothesized the order of ranking, he would have hypothesized what resulted. Since he did hypothesize that the public law enforcement category (state

and local level) would rank as the category providing the least effort in placing graduates in positions commensurate to their education, HYPOTHESIS XXI was accepted.

An interesting interpretation to the above discussion can be made upon comparing the mean values of Tables 35 and 36. The public law enforcement category at both the federal, and state and local levels was the only category where the mean value was greater for the utilization effort than the recruitment effort.⁵¹ Apparently the recruitment effort by public law enforcement has increased significantly in recent years while the utilization effort (placing college graduates in positions commensurate with their educational training) has not been given the same needed emphasis. This is especially the case at the public law enforcement (state and local) level. The frustration and growing sense of irritation or despair that can develop from such a situation needs no documentation. If the placement and assignment of the college graduate limits him to routine and nonchallenging tasks, he may become bored and leave for other fields.

In recent years a number of recommendations concerning the personnel aspects of the criminal justice system have been made. For example, in 1967 the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice recommended that:

Police departments should take immediate steps to establish a minimum requirement of a baccalaureate degree for all supervisory and executive positions; and secondly, that the ultimate aim of all police departments should be that all

⁵¹The greater the mean value the more negative the order of ranking

personnel⁵² with general enforcement powers have baccalaureate degrees.

Other recommendations such as executive development programs, specialized hiring, and lateral entry have been made with the concept of professionalization by the revision of personnel practices being foremost in mind.

To see what criminal justice graduates think about these and other related recommendations and what their agency's policy is on such matters, graduates were asked their views on a number of questions related to the above.

When asked whether personnel performing specialized functions not involving a need for general enforcement power be hired for their talents and abilities without regard to prior criminal justice experience, 788 graduates (74%) answered yes. Their reasons were many and varied but reflected a general theme. Some of the answers were as follows:

(Yes) to optimize the utilization of persons with particular expertise which are needed by the organization;

(Yes) there is an extreme need for well-educated "planners" and "researchers" in criminal justice; most departments cannot get them from within;

(Yes) expertise is its own answer; experience doesn't necessarily improve it; its often a cop-out, a weakness of the system. We thus under-utilize talent;

(Yes) not to do so deprives the agency of their expertise; prior criminal justice experience has only a relative and qualitative value;

Among those graduates who gave a negative response, their comments reflected the felt need for prior experience. As one individual put it:

⁵²U.S. President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, op. cit., pp. 109-110.

knowledge without experience is like water with no pitcher in which to carry it.

Since it was hypothesized that:

Ho₂₂ the majority of criminal justice graduates will feel that personnel performing specialized functions not involving a need for general enforcement power should be hired for their talents and abilities without regard to prior criminal justice experience,

and this was, in fact, the result, HYPOTHESIS XXII was accepted.

A majority of respondents in all job categories, with one exception, said it was their agency's policy to do just that. The one exception was the municipal police sub-category. A majority of respondents in this category gave such negative reasons as "civil service prevents it" and "departmental politics prohibit it".

When asked whether their agency or organization would benefit by having a lateral entry policy for recruitment of college educated personnel at certain job positions, 633 respondents (68%) felt that it would. Most of the positive responses felt that it would improve efficiency in some areas and help to attract and retain graduates whose talents are necessary to achieve and maintain the concept of professionalism. Among the negative responses (293 or 32%) were those indicating that "street experience" is necessary, morale would be severely damaged, or dissension would result. Since it was hypothesized that:

Ho₂₃ the majority of criminal justice graduates will feel an agency or organization would benefit by having a lateral entry policy for recruitment of personnel at certain job positions,

and this, in fact, was the case, HYPOTHESIS XXIII was accepted.

When asked whether their agency had such a policy, the respondents replied as follows:

Table 37

Lateral Entry Policy

Question 14. Does your agency have such a policy?

<u>Agency Category</u>	<u>Yes</u>		<u>No</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Public Law Enforcement	171	36	298	64
Private Law Enforcement	43	56	34	44
Non-Law Enforcement	138	64	76	36
Career Military	53	58	38	42

* Two-hundred eighty-six did not respond.

** Percentages were rounded to nearest whole number.

As Table 37 indicates, a majority of respondents in the private, non-law enforcement, and military categories felt their particular agency had such a policy. On the other hand, a majority in the public law enforcement category said they did not. However, a majority of respondents in two public law enforcement sub-categories (federal police and state corrections) reported they did have such a policy. The following is the breakdown for the public law enforcement category.

Table 38

Lateral Entry Policy
by Public Law Enforcement Category

<u>Police</u>	<u>Yes</u>		<u>No</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Federal	54	53	48	47
State	16	27	43	73
County	7	26	20	74
Municipal	24	17	121	83
<u>Correctional</u>				
Federal	1	33	2	67
State	33	65	18	35
County	14	36	25	64
Municipal	0	0	1	100

* Forty-two did not respond.

** Forty-one respondents were categorized as "other".

*** Percentages were rounded to nearest whole number.

**** The chi-square value of 66.593 was significant at the .001 level.

As can be discerned from the above table, a significant difference between the municipal police sub-category and the remaining sub-categories is quite evident. The municipal police respondents were overwhelmingly in agreement that their particular agency did not have a lateral entry policy.

It was hypothesized that:

Ho₂₄ the majority of criminal justice graduates will feel it would be desirable to have internship/understudy programs in order to develop lateral entry programs within their agencies.

Eight-hundred sixty-eight graduates answered the question as to the desirability of having internship/understudy programs in order to develop lateral entry programs. Five-hundred fifty-seven (64%) thought it would

be desirable. One individual said, for example, that he thought "education and experience make wonderful bed partners". Another said that in other professions, internship is beneficial to the graduate and is also a good recruitment device. Throughout many of the positive replies, the general theme of "gaining experience" was very apparent. Since a majority of respondents felt it to be desirable, HYPOTHESIS XXIV was accepted.

When asked whether their agency had such a program, a similar pattern to that of the lateral entry policy question developed. The public law enforcement category was the only one where a majority of respondents replied that their particular agency did not have such a program. As in the case earlier, the federal police and state corrections sub-categories were the only categories to have a majority of respondents replying that there was such an existing program.

The respondents were asked whether criminal justice agencies should give special consideration (entry level, salary, promotional eligibility, etc.) to the educational qualifications of individuals. It was hypothesized that:

Ho₂₅ the majority of criminal justice graduates will feel that special consideration (entry level, salary, promotional eligibility, etc.) should be given by criminal justice agencies to the educational qualifications of individuals.

As a group, an overwhelming majority (933 or 87%) thought that special consideration should be given by criminal justice agencies. The comments that follow give an indication of this attitude.

(Yes) a person with education beyond high school is bringing more talent to the agency and also has gone through an extensive training period on his own initiative;

(Yes) simply to attract and retain better educated personnel;

(Yes) education receives special consideration in other disciplines; if criminal justice is to think of itself as professional, it must do the same;

(Yes) to encourage the hiring of better educated individuals who in turn would encourage better performance and caliber of employees;

(Yes) there is now sufficient evidence to suggest that while college graduates are by no means a panacea, they do contribute significantly to effective law enforcement;

(Yes) because while books can't teach you the actual experience, they do give a degree of objectivity which the street experience may tend to obscure and which is necessary for supervisory, administrative positions.

Of those individuals who gave negative responses to this question, one individual's comment summarizes their general feelings:

(No) a person should first prove himself competent and qualified as well as sufficiently sound in good character strengths to perform at the level his degree suggests he should be capable of - the degree itself is not the end of the educational experience.

Since the majority of criminal justice graduates did feel special consideration should be given, HYPOTHESIS XXV was accepted.

The respondents were asked what factors, if any, other than education, should play a significant part in receiving special consideration. Unequivocally, the experience factor was most frequently mentioned. A second factor frequently mentioned was prior performance; that is, demonstrated ability.

When asked what their particular agency's policy was, most said special consideration was given by their agency. However, in most cases, the consideration given consisted of only salary increases (especially in the public law enforcement category). Many municipal police respondents

replied that no consideration is given at all.

Concerning whether there should be a difference in initial job entry between the non-degree holder, the undergraduate degree holder, and the graduate degree holder, two questions were asked the respondents. The following are the results of their responses.

Table 39

Initial Job Entry - Degree
Holder and Non-Degree Holder

Question 17. Should there be a difference in initial job entry between the degree holder and non-degree holder?

Yes		No	
N	%	N	%
733	71	298	29

	Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%
Public Law Enforcement	310	64	173	36
Private Law Enforcement	61	75	20	25
Non-Law Enforcement	229	76	74	24
Career Military	84	82	19	18

* One-hundred thirty did not respond.

** Forty-nine "unemployed" and "student" responses were omitted.

*** Percentages were rounded to nearest whole number.

**** The chi-square value of 23.342 was significant at the .001 level.

Table 40

Initial Job Entry -
Under-Graduate Degree Holder and
the Graduate Degree Holder

Question 18. Should there be a difference in initial job entry between the under-graduate degree holder and the graduate degree holder?

<u>Yes</u>		<u>No</u>	
<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
601	59	414	41

	<u>Yes</u>		<u>No</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Public Law Enforcement	255	52	231	48
Private Law Enforcement	46	62	28	38
Non-Law Enforcement	201	68	93	32
Career Military	61	60	40	40

* One-hundred forty-six did not respond.

** Forty-eight "unemployed" and "student" responses were omitted.

*** Percentages were rounded to nearest whole number.

**** The chi-square value of 21.657 was significant at the .001 level.

As Tables 39 and 40 indicate, a majority of respondents, either as a group or by individual employment categories, felt there should be a difference in entry level between the non-degree holder, the undergraduate degree holder, and the graduate degree holder. They were more positive in their feeling that there should be a difference in initial job entry between the degree holder and non-degree holder than they were regarding the difference between the undergraduate degree holder and the graduate degree holder.

The private, non-law, and military categories had substantial majorities on both questions. The public law enforcement category showed a majority on both, but a breakdown of this category showed some rather

surprising results. On the first question the municipal police sub-category felt there should not be a difference. On the second question all police sub-categories felt there should not be a difference. This was quite surprising to this writer as the sample consists of all college graduates. It seems that the police sub-culture has a significant influence. Reservations concerning the value of their criminal justice education may also lie in the fact that there appears to be scant recognition of the fact that education alone does not mold behavior. Environment shapes behavior, and the environment of criminal justice has yet to be meaningfully addressed either from within or from without criminal justice agencies. As a result, there exists a serious disequilibrium between the educational experience and the work experience, and is one which is not moderated by the notion of either a common educational base or variable educational base among criminal justice personnel.

Nevertheless, since it was hypothesized that:

Ho₂₆ the majority of criminal justice graduates will feel there should be a difference in initial job entry between the non-degree holder, the undergraduate degree holder, and the graduate degree holder,

HYPOTHESIS XXVI was accepted.

The respondents were asked whether their agencies felt there should be a difference, and respondents in all major categories, with the exception of the public law enforcement category, replied that their agencies did feel there should be a difference. Within the public law enforcement category the following breakdowns were noted.

Table 41

Agency Feeling on Difference in Initial Job
Entry Between Non-Degree Holder and Undergraduate
Degree Holder by Public Law Enforcement Category Breakdown

Question 17. Does your agency feel there should be a difference?

	Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%
<u>Police</u>				
Federal	66	66	34	34
State	18	32	39	68
County	8	29	20	71
Municipal	26	18	120	82
<u>Correctional</u>				
Federal	2	67	1	33
State	43	84	8	16
County	28	78	8	22
Municipal	0	0	0	0

* Percentages were rounded to nearest whole number.

** Forty-two were categorized as "other".

*** The chi-square value of 130.818 was significant at the .001 level.

Table 42

Agency Feeling on Difference in Initial Job
Entry Between Undergraduate Degree Holder and Graduate Degree
Holder by Public Law Enforcement Category Breakdown

Question 18. Does your agency feel there should be a difference?

	Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%
<u>Police</u>				
Federal	38	39	59	61
State	10	19	42	81
County	6	24	19	76
Municipal	14	10	127	90
<u>Correctional</u>				
Federal	3	100	0	0
State	28	55	23	45
County	13	37	22	63
Municipal	1	100	0	0

* Thirty-nine were categorized as "other".

** Percentages were rounded to nearest whole number.

*** The chi-square value of 72.680 was significant at the .001 level.

Table 41 indicates a sharp difference between police and correctional areas. With the exception of the federal police area, the police sub-categories are thought to be very much opposed to different entry levels based on educational achievement. On the other hand, all correctional sub-categories felt there should be a difference.

Table 42 indicates an even stronger opposition on the part of the police category, as all sub-categories were very much opposed to different entry levels between undergraduate and graduate degree holders. Ninety percent in the municipal police sub-category alone felt their particular agency was against such a policy. Although the correctional area as a

group were evenly split on this question, they were much more positive than the police sub-category.

The respondents were asked whether they felt most all criminal justice personnel should be required to have a college degree. It had been hypothesized that:

Ho₂₇ the majority of criminal justice graduates will feel that not all criminal justice personnel should be required to have a college degree.

Although the question was poorly phrased on the survey instrument, it was possible to conduct an analysis by looking at the respondents' open-ended responses and comparing it with the coded responses. The terminology "most all" in the above question was interpreted by the majority of respondents as meaning "all" and therefore the question, "do you feel most all criminal justice personnel should be required to have a college degree" will be interpreted in this manner. The majority of respondents (550 or 51%) felt that not all criminal justice personnel should be required to have a college degree. Most of their reasons centered around the idea that many positions do not require college educated personnel, and that it would also be economically unfeasible. For those who felt criminal justice personnel should be required to have a college degree, the most frequent reasons stated were (1) to achieve professionalism, and (2) to provide a better background and understanding of people and customs, thus developing more tolerance and understanding in stress situations. Since the frequencies were so similar, the question involving whether criminal justice personnel should have a college degree, this particular issue seems at an impasse. Even when comparing individual

job categories one is struck by the apparent deadlock. No significant differences were noted.

Recency of graduation was also cross-tabulated with the graduates' responses. The following distribution resulted:

Table 43

Response of Bachelor
and Master Degree Holders

Question 19. Do you feel most all criminal justice personnel should be required to have a college degree?

<u>Year of Graduation</u>	<u>Bachelors</u>		<u>Masters</u>	
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
1938	1	0	--	--
1939	7	2	--	--
1940	4	3	--	--
1941	6	5	--	--
1942	2	1	--	--
1943	0	7	--	--
1944	1	0	--	--
1945	0	0	--	--
1946	0	0	--	--
1947	8	3	--	--
1948	3	3	--	--
1949	10	5	--	--
1950	11	10	--	--
1951	9	8	--	--
1952	10	9	--	--
1953	13	18	--	--
1954	12	17	--	--
1955	5	12	--	--
1956	19	13	--	--
1957	16	16	0	0
1958	19	21	0	0
1959	21	24	0	0
1960	17	18	1	1
1961	18	20	1	0
1962	20	18	0	0
1963	16	16	1	1
1964	23	31	7	8
1965	15	23	5	5
1966	19	28	9	13
1967	38	18	7	10
1968	29	32	11	7
1969	26	33	6	8
1970	30	31	11	12
1971	48	49	14	18
Total	477	494	73	83

Table 43 (Cont.)

Response of Bachelor
and Master Degree Holders

- * Seventy-two did not respond.
- ** Percentages were rounded to nearest whole number.
- *** The chi-square value of 2.987 was not significant at the .05 level.

Contrary to the belief by many, Table 42 indicates that the more recent graduate is more likely to respond negatively to the notion that most all criminal justice personnel should be required to have a college degree. A possible explanation for this is the uncertainty concerning the value of education in the criminal justice arena and the questioning of the assumption that higher education is the panacea for all ills or difficulties that may arise. One individual who responded negatively wrote:

"While perhaps desirable, it is highly improbable because one becomes bored with routine, frustrated with lack of advancement, and irritated by the hoax attached to a college degree."

On the other hand, the less recent the graduate, the more likely he is to respond positively. He equates his success with the fact of his education and therefore sees education as one of life's necessities.

The dichotomy that exists over the educational strategy to professionalize criminal justice is nowhere more apparent than in the responses to this question. However, since a majority (although just barely) felt that not all criminal justice personnel should be required to have a college degree, HYPOTHESIS XXVII was accepted.

Respondents were also asked whether their individual agency was receptive to the idea that most all personnel be required to have a college

degree. Surprisingly, the public law enforcement category was most receptive. This can be explained by the fact that federal law enforcement positions require a degree in most cases and federal respondents therefore gave very few negative responses. Correctional respondents, because of degree requirements in their area, were also very positive in their responses.

The final question related to recommendations concerning the personnel aspects of the criminal justice system asked the respondents whether criminal justice agencies should take immediate steps to establish a minimum requirement of a baccalaureate degree for all supervisory and executive positions. It was hypothesized that:

Ho₂₈ the majority of criminal justice graduates will feel that criminal justice agencies should take immediate steps to establish a minimum requirement of a baccalaureate degree for all supervisory and executive positions.

The results indicate this to be the case. Over 678 respondents (65%) felt that immediate steps should be taken. Most positive responses said that this would provide better, more knowledgeable leadership and enhance the concept of professionalism. A very significant fact concerning this question was that all job categories were in close agreement on this question (e.g., public law enforcement (64%); private law enforcement (68%); non-law enforcement (62%); and career military (64%). When asked their agency's policy on the matter, most replied that they had already taken this step or were leaning in this direction. As a result of the above findings, HYPOTHESIS XXVIII was accepted.

In order to assist the School in the updating and revision of its

curriculum and overall program, graduates were asked their views on the direction the School should take in preparing future graduates and helping place students in the criminal justice field. It was hypothesized that:

No₂₉ the majority of criminal justice graduates will feel that the thrust of the criminal justice program at Michigan State should be left unchanged.

Table 44 shows the results of the inquiry on the direction graduates feel the School should take.

Table 44

Thrust of Criminal Justice Program

Question 21. Do you feel the School of Criminal Justice should change their thrust toward preparing students for positions at the level of operation?

Yes		No	
<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
451	43	590	57

* Percentages were rounded to nearest whole number.

** One-hundred eight did not respond.

Question 22. Do you feel the School of Criminal Justice should leave the preparation at the level of administration to the graduate level of study?

Yes		No	
<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
358	35	673	65

* Percentages were rounded to nearest whole number.

** One-hundred eighteen did not respond.

Question 23. Do you feel the School of Criminal Justice should leave the program unchanged.

Yes		No	
<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
407	43	547	57

* Percentages were rounded to nearest whole number.

** One-hundred ninety-four did not respond.

As Table 4⁴ indicates, no one approach received an affirmative majority. The reason for this can be explained by the analysis of the open-ended response "other" given the graduate if he was not in favor of the three choices listed on the survey instrument. Almost invariably the response given by the respondents was "the integration of both approaches". Many made it very clear that they felt the thrust had been skewed toward the "administrative" level and that a balance between both was needed. Some of their comments were as follows:

achieve a balance whereby more operational training is given but not to where it overshadows administration;

try to prepare students for both levels by dropping some administrative courses and adding some geared toward operational level;

a more equitable mixture of level of operation and administrative level courses would be much more acceptable to student and prospective employer.

In general, a number of graduates felt there was "too much theory" in the curriculum and not enough emphasis on "operational" matters. A few individuals suggested a "cooperative educational" area of specialization similar to that developed at the School of Criminal Justice, Northwestern University, Boston, Massachusetts. Of course, some students took a middle-of-the-road approach to the above. They stressed the need for more "field training" in conjunction with their education - possibly a term near the beginning of the program so that the student can get an idea of what field he wishes to specialize in or to what degree to pursue; and the regular field training term near the end which shows the student how his acquired knowledge "fits". As a result of the above, HYPOTHESIS XXIX was rejected.

When asked whether the School should take a much more active part in helping place students in the criminal justice field, 926 graduates (89%) were in agreement that the School should. One individual thought the School should consider hiring a full-time criminal justice counselor who would work closely with the students in areas of job placement, and providing career information on the total criminal justice system. Another philosophical student gave the following rendition of the School's part in the area of placement:

The School offers students a fine book entitled "How to Swim". For a period of approximately four years, we read it, discuss it, take exams on it, and pass it. Then we are let out into the "social waters" - some swim, some drown. It's about time the School of Criminal Justice gets its students' feet wet. Then no one will drown.

This, and other comments suggest the felt need for the School to take a much more active part in helping place students in the criminal justice field. Since it was hypothesized that:

Ho₃₀ the majority of criminal justice graduates will feel the School should take an active part in helping place students in the criminal justice field,

and the majority felt this way, HYPOTHESIS XXX was accepted.

A final note to be mentioned is that the graduates were asked a closing question as to whether they felt their college education had been a positive, negative, or neutral influence on their career. Overwhelmingly, the graduates gave a positive response. Nine-hundred seventy-seven said their education had been a positive influence on their careers, while only forty-five graduates felt their education to be either a neutral or negative influence on their respective careers. One individual summed it up

best by stating "it had disciplined me to study and seek answers to perplexing problems, to experiment, to validate, but most importantly bringing myself to the realization that education and learning is a continually ongoing and lifelong experience".

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

I. SUMMARY

This study was part of a coordinated research project conducted by the School of Criminal Justice concerning criminal justice education. The School received a grant from the Michigan State Planning Agency, the Office of Criminal Justice Programs, in order to conduct systematic planning and research in a number of areas. To plan effectively in the area of criminal justice education there must be a clear understanding and knowledge of what happens to the student following graduation. A review of the literature revealed that there have been relatively few studies done that have been concerned with the graduates of criminal justice programs.

In an effort to cast more light on this subject area, this writer conducted a survey of the School's graduates to gather information concerning placement and utilization of its graduates, as well as their views toward the criminal justice program and selected criminal justice issues related to criminal justice education. The population surveyed was the total number of graduates of Michigan State University who majored in criminal justice (excluding foreign students residing in foreign countries). Consideration of the size and geographical dispersion of the population resulted in the determination that the most appropriate means of data-gathering would be accomplished through the use of the mailed, self-administering questionnaire.

After development of the questionnaire, a pre-test was given to a purposive sample of 150 graduates. As a result of the pre-test, revisions

were made and the revised questionnaire was sent to 1,822 graduates. After approximately three weeks a follow-up letter was sent out to those graduates who had not yet responded.

As a result of the initial mailing and follow-up, 1,161 questionnaires were returned. Along with this, 91 questionnaires were returned unanswered by the U. S. Post Office as being undeliverable. This represented a useable return percentage of 67.1.

The major purpose of this research was to discover "what is", since this particular body of knowledge is practically non-existent. Thus this study represents a new body of information that should contribute towards (1) an understanding of placement and utilization patterns of criminal justice graduates; (2) an understanding of placement and utilization policies of various criminal justice agencies; (3) a determining of the strengths and weaknesses in the criminal justice program at Michigan State University; (4) an understanding of selected issues in criminal justice as perceived by criminal justice graduates; (5) a source for both criminal justice students and criminal justice programs across the nation to utilize; and (6) establishing a more coordinated placement program between the School and the criminal justice field.

To discover if the hypotheses presented in Chapter I and discussed in Chapter IV would be accepted or rejected, all responses to the questionnaire were compiled and coded and punched on I.B.M. cards. Descriptive survey tables were produced showing frequency and percentage distributions. Comparisons of selected variables were in the form of contingency tables utilizing frequencies, percentages, and means, and done by cross-tabulating techniques. The statistical analysis utilized was the chi-square test for

significance, and the level of significance chosen was the .05 level or less. The computer program utilized was the analysis of contingency tables. (ACT Program)

II. CONCLUSIONS

The results of this study provided considerable information on which to base the following findings:

I. GENERAL INFORMATION SECTION

1. The overall sample was a relatively young group. (70% were under 39 years of age and 51% were 34 or under.)
2. The respondents were overwhelmingly male. (92%)
3. The racial make-up was almost entirely white. (98%) Only 21 respondents were included in all other racial groups.
4. The respondents were dispersed throughout 47 of the United States and the District of Columbia, with an additional 30 respondents residing in foreign countries.

II. EDUCATIONAL INFORMATION SECTION

1. The majority of respondents (85%) received only their bachelors degree from the School of Criminal Justice. Ten percent of those responding earned a masters degree. Five percent received both degrees from the School of Criminal Justice.
2. A significant number of respondents were relatively recent graduates.
3. A majority of the respondents (67%) indicated their area of specialization in the School of Criminal Justice was Law Enforcement Administration.
4. A majority of graduates (874 or 79%), if they had to do it over

again, would again choose the same area of specialization, and (868 or 77%) felt they would again choose the criminal justice area as their college major.

5. Of those answering negatively to again choosing the same area of specialization, a majority of them felt they would specialize in an area outside of criminal justice. The most frequently mentioned areas were business administration and law.

6. Of those responding negatively to choosing the criminal justice area as their college major, a majority of them said they would major in business administration or law.

7. A majority of graduates (825 or 73%) replied they were satisfied with the criminal justice curriculum while attending Michigan State University.

8. Of those graduates who were not satisfied with the curriculum (300 or 27%), the most frequent criticism mentioned was "too much theory and not enough practical application in the curriculum".

9. One-hundred fifty-five graduates (14%) said they had received a graduate degree or law degree from another M.S.U. School or Department or from another educational institution.

10. Of those indicating they had been awarded advanced degrees elsewhere, 28 graduates reported they held a law degree, 8 reported they held a doctorate degree, and the remaining number reported they held a masters degree.

III. POST-COLLEGE INITIAL PLACEMENT INFORMATION

1. Only 187 of those responding (17%) were in-service students; 783 respondents (70%) were pre-service students; and 147 (13%) were prior-service students.
2. A majority of graduates (608 or 53%) chose a public law enforcement agency as their initial employment opportunity.
3. Of those entering public law enforcement, the largest percentage went into municipal police work. For those who chose the correctional field, almost all went to correctional agencies at the state and county level.
4. A significant number (439 or 75%) of those whose initial employment was a public law enforcement agency were thoroughly satisfied with their initial placement position, and only those graduates whose initial employment was with the military were more favorable.
5. The degree of satisfaction with initial job placement for both the police and correctional sub-categories was the lowest at the municipal or county level, and the highest at the federal level.
6. Although low salary and lack of opportunity were frequently mentioned as reasons for not going into law enforcement related work, two other reasons were also given. One of the reasons, that jobs were just not available, was the most frequently mentioned explanation. The other reason was that of having a physical restriction, particularly of height or vision.

7. Of those who went into non-law enforcement related work, an extremely large percentage (80%) were pre-service students. It should be noted though, that a majority of all respondents in each service category chose to enter law enforcement related work.
8. A majority of graduates (640 or 62%) were initially placed at the level of operation. The public law enforcement category overwhelmingly demonstrated that the initial placement position for this type of work was at the level of operation. (82%)
9. Baccalaureate degree holders were much more likely to be initially placed in a position at the level of operation. On the other hand, a majority of graduate degree holders were initially placed in specialized, supervisory, or administrative positions.
10. The in-service student had more of a chance of receiving an initial placement position at other than the level of operation than did the prior-service or pre-service student.
11. There was no discernable pattern that could be ascertained between 1938-1967 graduates and 1968-1971 graduates regarding initial placement position.
12. A significant percentage of respondents in the private (38%), non-law (32%), and military (36%) categories, who started at level of operation were promoted or assigned in less than one year or between one to two years. Only 19% of the public law enforcement respondents reported likewise.

13. In looking at the frequency distribution for the entire sample, it was found that only 18% reported their agency/organization having a pay incentive program tied to education; 32% reported a managerial/trainee program; and 32% reported there was a lateral entry policy within their agency/organization.
14. Few respondents (16%) in the public law enforcement category reported having an educational pay incentive program within their agency.
15. Few respondents (22%) in the public law enforcement category reported their employer having a managerial/internship program for college graduates. On the other hand, the other employment categories showed a much larger percentage of respondents who reported there was such a program.
16. Few respondents (21%) in the public law enforcement category reported their employer having a lateral entry policy.
17. Correctional agencies were more positive in reporting that a lateral entry policy existed than were police agencies. In the police sub-category, the municipal police agency was least likely to have such a policy.
18. Seven percent of the graduates reported having difficulties in getting their initial job which they felt were attributable to their criminal justice degree. Of this percentage, the majority had difficulty when applying to municipal police departments.

19. As a group, 62% reported that all newly hired personnel start at the same entry level regardless of their level of education. Of this percentage, 68% were public law enforcement respondents.
20. Over 230 graduates (22%) felt they were extremely well prepared for their initial job placement, while another 630 (60%) felt they were adequately prepared.
21. When asked to compare their preparedness in comparison with their fellow workers, they were even more confident. There were 442 (42%) who answered extremely well, and 533 (51%) who responded to adequately.
22. A majority of respondents (67%) felt their college training was best utilized through their initial job placement.
23. As a group, 680 respondents (68%) reported their education had enabled them to progress more rapidly in their career than their fellow employees who lacked their educational qualifications. Of those who gave negative responses, many felt that experience weighed more heavily.
24. Through 1963 a majority of graduates' initial entrance salary was less than \$6,000. Graduates from 1964 to 1968 averaged \$6,000 to \$7,999, and 1969 to 1971 graduates' initial entrance salaries averaged \$8,000 to \$9,999.

25. A significant percentage of graduates left their initial job after a short period of time (e.g., 48% left between a time span of less than one year to three years).
26. Forty-six percent of the in-service personnel who responded to the questionnaire left their agency between a time span of less than one year to three years.

IV. PRESENT EMPLOYMENT INFORMATION AND VIEWS TOWARD SELECTED ISSUES IN CRIMINAL JUSTICE

1. The data reveals an interesting transposition of agencies by graduates. Fifty percent of the respondents reported that their present job is not with the same agency/organization that initially hired them.
2. Although public law enforcement remains the largest single category with 510 graduates (45%), it was the category that lost the most graduates. Initially, there were 608 graduates (53%) in public law enforcement; presently there are only 510 graduates (45%).
3. The municipal police sub-category continues to have the largest number of graduates (152 or 13%) in the public law enforcement category, but likewise, it also showed the largest number of graduates lost to other occupations.
4. Within the public law enforcement category, federal and state agencies show an increase of 28 graduates, while county and municipal agencies show a loss of 87 graduates.

5. The occupational category showing the only gain in the number of graduates is that of non-law enforcement. There are 138 more graduates presently employed in this category than at the time of initial placement.
6. A considerable number of non-law enforcement graduates (76 or 21%) are employed in jobs that could be considered to be criminal justice related (e.g., 32 criminal justice faculty, 9 criminal justice researchers and consultants, 6 criminal justice lawyers, and a number of court-related personnel).
7. Although there was considerable transposition between agencies/organizations on the part of a number of respondents, a majority of graduates have remained in their initial area of employment (e.g., 74% who began in public law enforcement are still in that area; 42% are still in private law enforcement, 84% are still in non-law enforcement; 75% are still in the military).
8. The private law enforcement category is the only major area of employment that shows a considerable change. Most respondents indicated they had left the private security field for either public law enforcement (18%) or non-law enforcement (36%) work.
9. All present major employment categories show a significant increase in graduates at specialized, supervisory, or administrative positions.
10. A majority of the respondent group (880 or 81%) reported they are

either "thoroughly satisfied" or "satisfied" with their present job position.

11. As a group, the majority of respondents (722 or 67%) feel their criminal justice education is being utilized in their current employment position.

12. Those respondents who are not presently employed in law enforcement mention low salary and lack of opportunity as the two major reasons they are not presently in law enforcement related work.

13. The average number of agencies worked for by the criminal justice graduate since graduation from Michigan State University is two.

14. The average annual salary now being made by past graduates is in the \$14,000 to \$15,999 range, with 40% of the respondents earning above this figure.

15. The majority of criminal justice graduates rank the factor that "graduates of degree programs usually start on the lowest step of the law enforcement agency ladder", as being the most detrimental to the recruitment of college graduates into the criminal justice field.

16. The public law enforcement category (federal level) is thought to put forth the greatest effort in recruiting college graduates. The private law enforcement category was thought to provide the least effort.

17. The public law enforcement category (state and local level) ranks as the category providing the least effort in placing graduates in positions commensurate to their education. The public law enforcement category (federal level) is thought to provide the greatest effort.
18. A majority of criminal justice graduates (74%) feel that personnel performing specialized functions not involving a need for general enforcement power should be hired for their talents and abilities without regard to prior criminal justice experience.
19. A majority of respondents in all job categories, with one exception, report it is their agency's policy to hire specialists. The one exception is the municipal police sub-category.
20. A majority of respondents (633 or 68%) feel their agency or organization would benefit by having a lateral entry policy for the recruitment of college educated personnel at certain job positions. A majority of respondents in all job categories feel this way.
21. A majority of respondents in the private, non-law, and military occupational groupings report that their particular agencies have a lateral entry policy. On the other hand, a majority in the public law enforcement category said they did not. However, a majority of respondents in two public law enforcement sub-categories (federal police and state corrections) reported they did have such a policy.
22. A majority of respondents (557 or 64%) feel that it would be

desirable to have internship/understudy programs in their agencies in order to develop lateral entry programs.

23. The public law enforcement category is the only one where a majority of respondents report that their particular agency does not have an internship/understudy program. As was noted in number 21. above, the federal police and state corrections areas are the only sub-categories to have a majority stating there is such an existing program.

24. An overwhelming majority (933 or 87%) thought that criminal justice agencies should give consideration (entry level, salary, promotional eligibility, etc.) to the educational qualifications of individuals.

25. A majority of respondents report that their particular agency's policy is to give special consideration, but only in the form of salary increases. Many municipal police respondents replied that no consideration is given at all.

26. A majority of respondents, either as a group or by individual major employment categories, feel there should be a difference in entry level between the non-degree holder, the undergraduate degree holder, and the graduate degree holder. However, the municipal police sub-category felt there should be no difference between the non-degree holder and the degree holder; and all police sub-categories feel there should be no difference between the undergraduate degree

and the graduate degree holder.

27. A majority of respondents in all major employment categories, with the exception of the public law enforcement category, reported their agencies feel there should be a difference in initial job entry by degree levels.
28. The police sub-categories, with the exception of the federal police, are very much opposed to different entry levels based on educational achievement. On the other hand, all correctional sub-categories feel there should be a difference.
29. The majority of respondents (550 or 51%) feel that not all criminal justice personnel should be required to have a college degree.
30. A majority of respondents (569 or 62%) in all major employment categories reported that their particular agencies are receptive to the idea that most all personnel be required to have a college degree. However, the county and municipal police sub-categories are not of this opinion.
31. A majority of respondents (678 or 65%) feel that immediate steps should be taken to establish a minimum requirement of a baccalaureate degree for all supervisory and executive positions. All job categories are in close agreement on this question.
32. Five-hundred forty-seven graduates (57%) feel that the School of Criminal Justice should not leave the criminal justice program unchanged.

A majority of respondents feel there should be an "integration of both the operational and administrative approaches" to criminal justice education.

33. A significant number of graduates (926 or 89%) are in agreement that the School of Criminal Justice should take a much more active part in helping place students in the criminal justice field.

34. Overwhelmingly, the graduates (977 or 98%) feel their college education had been a positive influence on their career.

III. DISCUSSION

"There can be no adequate technical education which is not liberal, and no liberal education which is not technical; that is, no education which does not impart both technique and intellectual vision. In simpler language, education should turn out the pupil with something he knows well and something he can do well. This ultimate union of practice and theory aids both."

Alfred North Whitehead

One of the most salient results of this study was the concern expressed by a majority of graduates as to the direction the School of Criminal Justice should take towards the criminal justice program. Many of the graduates feel the thrust of the School's program should be a proper blending of both "practical" and "theoretical" education and training. While most feel the School would be well advised to leave basic training in methods to the hiring agencies, many feel some attention should be paid to the operational aspect of the criminal justice field. As one individual commented:

It is most important that the "asministrative" aspect of criminal justice work be emphasized by the School, but this does not mean that other aspects be overlooked. Failure to recognize the legal and operational aspects have built a gulf between the School and many operational agencies. Hopefully, the School, in the future, will be able to demonstrate to criminal justice practitioners that it accepts them for who they are, as they are, and challenge them to gain perspective and change where change is needed.

Numerous comments such as the above clearly illustrate the need for a "coexistent" approach to criminal justice educational programs. The graduates have indicated that a proper mixture of "operational" and "administrative" educational training is essential to produce the much needed change agent.

It remains to be seen what the School of Criminal Justice meant when stating the following goal and objective:

To implement in its program a blending of general (fundamental) liberal education,⁵³ interdisciplinary social and behavioral science, and professional knowledge, the latter providing some limited opportunity for specialization at the undergraduate level - in short, education in breadth and depth. The School educates students for a career in the sense that ultimately they assume specific responsibility within a system of interrelated responsibilities.⁵⁴

Hopefully, it will mean a "coexistent" approach to make the academic offerings more relevant, and contribute towards breaking down whatever insulation now exists between the academicians and the practitioners. Practitioners must become aware of the opportunities that criminal justice programs of this type could offer and take full advantage of them.

Accordingly, another significant result of this study concerns the criminal justice field itself, especially municipal or local law enforcement.

Generally, it is conceded that today's criminal justice system has a need for higher educated personnel. The demands being placed by contemporary society upon our criminal justice system are unprecedented in magnitude and complexity. Today an effective criminal justice system depends to a great extent upon the abilities of quality personnel being able to cope with these ever increasing demands and responsibilities. As stated in the 1970 Comprehensive Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Plan for Michigan:⁵⁵

⁵³ Emphasis placed by the author.

⁵⁴ Resource Analysis: School of Criminal Justice, Michigan State University, fall 1971.

⁵⁵ Comprehensive Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Plan for Michigan, 1970, p. 27.

The one most critical commodity in any system is that of personnel. Without individuals to plan, establish, implement, and improve a system there can be no system. Furthermore, unless quality personnel contribute to a system on all levels, there will inevitably be a breakdown in the quality of that system's product. Should there be a functional failure of any component of the system, the entire system will soon fail.

This quality problem for the developing system of criminal justice has led criminal justice recruiters to look towards the colleges and universities for the needed personnel. However, this growing awareness by criminal justice officials of the need for higher education has apparently not created the same awareness for a revision of personnel practices such as that suggested by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement to attract and retain college educated individuals.

What must be recognized is the high priority that must be placed upon the developing of an increased awareness among criminal justice officials and their agencies with regard to recruitment and utilization of college graduates.

The neglect of this problem must be resolved, since there seems to be little value or hope in recruiting and retaining college graduates if avenues of challenge that provide for several levels of placement, flexibility in job utilization, innovative promotional procedures and the like are not implemented.

The results of this study indicate that the American criminal justice system for the most part is moving in the direction of professionalization in the area of personnel policy development. As a group, the majority of graduates feel their criminal justice education is being utilized in their current employment position and are very satisfied with their present job placement.

Their views toward those recommendations associated with personnel revision are very encouraging. A majority of graduates in all major employment categories feel that (1) personnel performing specialized functions not involving a need for general enforcement power should be hired for their talents and abilities without regard to prior criminal justice experience; (2) their agency or organization would benefit by having a lateral entry policy for the recruitment of college educated personnel at certain job positions; (3) it would be desirable to have internship/understudy programs in their agencies in order to develop lateral entry programs; (4) criminal justice agencies should give consideration (entry level, salary, promotional eligibility, etc.) to the educational qualifications of individuals; (5) there should be a difference in entry level between the non-degree holder, the undergraduate degree holder, and the graduate degree holder; and (6) immediate steps should be taken to establish a minimum requirement of a baccalaureate degree for all supervisory and executive positions.

However, the graduates' perceptions of their agencies' policies on the above issues present a somewhat different picture. All employment categories are seen as being receptive or having implemented the above recommendations, with the exception of the public law enforcement category and specifically the municipal police sub-category. Of all those items pertaining to personnel revision, the municipal police agency is seen as being only receptive to two recommendations. One of these, that special consideration should be given to the educational qualifications of individuals is a "watered down" receptiveness since it only applies

to salary increases. The other item, that immediate steps should be taken to establish a minimum requirement of a baccalaureate degree for all supervisory and executive positions, is seen as presently being implemented in the majority of police agencies.

In conclusion, the criminal justice graduate does espouse many of the recommended changes that are seen necessary for the criminal justice field and its components becoming professional. Likewise, his individual agency/organization is seen as being receptive, or having implemented many of the recommended changes that are a step in that direction. The one exception to the above is the municipal police agency, although it is noted that change does seem to be taking place even within this agency.

To enhance the change process, criminal justice higher education and the criminal justice field cannot overlook the contributions each can make to the other. Neither the schools nor the agencies have fully realized the potential profits of working together. No matter how much progress is achieved in either group, if the gains are made independently and there are no joint efforts conducted in order that both groups benefit, criminal justice higher education and the criminal justice field cannot provide the impetus for constructive change in today's society.

IV. IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Due to the nature and scope of this study, the following recommendations or suggestions for additional inquiry and research are posed:

1. Additional conceptualization, perhaps using set theory relationships, is needed to further the reliability and validity of the data, and to encourage and permit theory construction.
2. A more detailed statistical analysis on the existing data should be made to add further substance and clarification to the overall findings. The utilization of various multivariate data-analysis techniques would be very appropriate.
3. This study should be continued, but needs to be broken down into more manageable segments. Experimental designs should be considered to allow the development of predictive principles and to identify cause and effect relationships. (e.g., A separate study needs to be made of the non-college graduate utilizing many of the items within the original survey instrument to add an element of precision not possible in the initial study.)
4. Information provided from this study should be utilized by the School of Criminal Justice to assist them in curriculum and program development as well as establishing a more coordinated placement program between the School and the criminal justice field; and assist them in identifying problems that may exist between criminal justice higher education and the criminal justice field.

5. Additional research efforts should be made of other criminal justice programs' graduates to provide needed data for comparative analysis purposes.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Books

- Alex, Nicholas. Black in Blue: A Study of the Negro Policeman. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1969.
- Bayley, David H. and Harold Mendelson. Minorities and the Police: Confrontation in America. New York: The Free Press, 1969.
- Becker, Harold K. Issues in Police Administration. Metuchen, New Jersey: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1970.
- Blum, Richard H. Police Selection. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas Company, 1964.
- Borg, Walter R. Educational Research: An Introduction. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1963.
- Clark, Donald F. and Samuel G. Chapman. A Forward Step: Educational Backgrounds for Police. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas Company, 1966.
- Germann, A.C. Police Executive Development. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas Company, 1962.
- Germann, A.C. Police Personnel Management. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas Company, 1963.
- Havemann, Ernest and Patricia Salter West. They Went to College, The College Graduate in America Today. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1952.
- Lazerfield, Paul F., William H. Sewell and Harold L. Wilensky. The Uses of Sociology. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1967.
- McKee, James B. Introduction to Sociology. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969.
- Neiderhoffer, Arthur. Behind the Shield: The Police in Urban Society. New York: Doubleday Company, 1967.
- Pierson, Frank C. The Education of American Businessmen. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1959.

Saunders, Charles B., Jr. Upgrading the American Police: Education and Training for Better Law Enforcement. Washington, D.C., The Brookings Institution, 1970.

Skolnick, Jerome H. Justice Without Trial: Law Enforcement in Democratic Society. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966.

Smith, Bruce. Police Systems in the United States. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1960.

B. Government Publications

The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967.

Tenney, Charles W., Jr. Higher Education Programs in Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971.

C. Periodicals

Crockett, Thompson S. and John Moses. "Incentive Plans for Law Enforcement Education". The Police Chief, Vol. 28 (August 1969), 28-52.

Levy, Ruth. "Summary of Report on Retrospective Study of 5,000 Peace Officer Personnel Records". Police Yearbook, (1966), 61-63.

Newman, Charles L. and Dorothy Sue Hunter. "Education for Careers in Law Enforcement: An Analysis of Student Output 1964-67". Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, Vol. 59 (March 1968), 138-143.

Shepherd, George. "Are We Aiming Too Low in Recruitment". The Police Chief, (January 1967), 20-24.

Soderquist, Larry D. "Upgrading the Service". The Police Chief, (August 1969), 53-76.

Ullman, Charles A. "Management Internships in the Federal Government". Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 36 (May 1968), 616-622.

Watson, James R. "Internships for Public Service Training". State Government, (March 1967), 67-71.

D. Unpublished Materials

- Crockett, Thompson S. "Law Enforcement Education: A Survey of Colleges and Universities Offering Degree Programs in the Field of Law Enforcement". International Association of Chiefs of Police, 1968.
- Germann, A.C. "Recruitment Selection, Promotion and Civil Service". Paper submitted to The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, 1967.
- Hewitt, William. "Lateral Entry and Transferability of Retirement Credits." Paper submitted to The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, 1967.
- Hewitt, William. "Problems in Establishing and Expanding Police Programs at the College Level". A panel discussion paper presented before the 4th Annual International Association of Police Professors, 1970.
- Karacki, Loren and John J. Galvin. "A Survey of Degree Programs in Criminology and Corrections". Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, 1970. (Mimeographed).
- Larkins, Hayes C. "A Survey of Experiences, Activities, and Views of the Industrial Security Administration Graduates of Michigan State University". Unpublished masters thesis, Michigan State University, 1966.
- Office of Criminal Justice Programs. "Comprehensive Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Plan for Michigan, 1970."
- Pfiffner, John M. "The Function of the Police in a Democratic Society". Unpublished paper, Youth Studies Center, University of Southern California, 1963.
- Post, Richard. "Post-Graduation Activities of Police Administration", October 1967. (Mimeographed).
- School of Criminal Justice. "Resource Analysis". Michigan State University, Fall 1971.

APPENDIX A

ORIGINAL COVER LETTER OF MARCH 17, 1972
AND
QUESTIONNAIRE PERTAINING TO THE
PLACEMENT AND UTILIZATION PATTERNS AND
VIEWS OF THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE GRADUATES
OF MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY East Lansing . Michigan 48823

College of Social Science . School of Criminal Justice . 405 Olds Hall

March 7, 1972

To the Graduates of the School of Criminal Justice:

This questionnaire is part of a coordinated research project being conducted by the School of Criminal Justice concerning criminal justice education. Two of the areas of interest are the improvement of placement and utilization of graduates of the School, and the revision and updating of the existing criminal justice curriculum.

The School of Criminal Justice, with the financial assistance of the Michigan Office of Criminal Justice Programs, is undertaking a survey of all its graduates to gather information concerning placement and utilization of its graduates, as well as their views toward the criminal justice program and selected criminal justice issues.

To realize the goals of this project your full cooperation is urgently requested. The information you contribute will be used for the following purposes:

1. To provide feedback for purposes of evaluating placement and utilization patterns of the School's graduates.
2. To provide feedback for purposes of evaluating the School's curriculum for possible improvement.
3. To establish a more coordinated placement program between the School and the criminal justice field.

Please do not sign your name to this material. The aim is not to identify individuals. However, each questionnaire is given a number to identify them individually for statistical purposes, and to allow the research staff to send a summary of the findings to individuals who have so requested.

The answers to the questions that follow will be made available only to the research staff from the School of Criminal Justice. Your information will be held in the strictest confidence and the results will be tabulated on a group basis only. Please take the necessary time to complete the enclosed questionnaire and return to the School at your earliest convenience.

Yours sincerely,

A. F. Brandstatter
Director

QUESTIONNAIRE

A Study of the Placement and Utilization
Patterns and Views of the Criminal Jus-
tice Graduates of Michigan State University

INTRODUCTION

Two particular concerns are foremost in this study. The first is that the data collected be accurate and of the highest quality. The second is that there is a minimization of effort on your part in answering the questionnaire. Hence questions for the most part require only a code number for the answer appropriate to you on the line to the right of each question. However, some questions require a written response. Space is provided to answer them. If you wish to comment on any of your answers, do so on the margins of the questionnaire or on the additional space provided. Thank you for your cooperation.

NOTE: If you wish to have a copy of the summary of this study, indicate by checking the box provided. If your address has changed, indicate your new mailing address: _____

GENERAL INFORMATION

Section 1: This section concerns certain background information on yourself.

1. Age:
Code: 1 - Under 25
2 - 25-29
3 - 30-34
4 - 35-39
5 - 40-44
6 - 45-49
7 - 50-54
8 - 55-59
9 - 60 and above

2. Sex:
Code: 1 - Male
2 - Female

3. Race:
Code: 1 - Caucasian
2 - Negro/Black
3 - Mexican American
4 - American Indian
5 - Oriental American
6 - Foreign Student
(If so, what country?)

4. City and state of residence: _____
If residing outside USA, what country? _____

EDUCATIONAL INFORMATION

Section 2: This section concerns certain educational information while a student in the School of Criminal Justice (prior to 1970 referred to as the School of Police Administration and Public Safety).

1. Year of graduation from School of Criminal Justice: _____
2. Degree(s) received from School of Criminal Justice:
Code: 1 - Bachelors
2 - Masters
3 - Doctorate

* IF YOU RECEIVED MORE THAN ONE DEGREE FROM THE SCHOOL, INDICATE BOTH CODES, AND PLEASE SHOW BOTH GRADUATION DATES.

2. (cont'd from page 2)
- 4 - Entered military service.
 - 5 - Took a job in a criminal justice agency.
 - 6 - Returned to my job in a criminal justice agency.
 - 7 - Took a job in an agency related to criminal justice.
 - 8 - Took a job in an agency unrelated to criminal justice.
 - 9 - Other _____

3. Your degree(s) held when taking your first job:
 Code: 1 - Bachelor 2 - Masters 3 - Doctorate _____

4. How did you obtain your initial major employment after leaving M.S.U.?
 Code: 1 - M.S.U. Placement Bureau
 2 - School of Criminal Justice job file.
 3. Through University faculty member.
 4. By personal means.
 5. Other _____

5. If you were on leave from, or a full-time employee of a criminal justice agency while attending M.S.U., indicate by placing a check mark in the box provided:

What type of agency? _____

6. If you had prior criminal justice experience but were not employed in the field while attending M.S.U., indicate by placing a check mark in the box provided.

What type of agency? _____

NOTE: IN QUESTION 7 FOLLOWING:

PUBLIC LAW ENFORCEMENT (Criminal Justice) category refers to all state, federal, university, and municipal governmental police, security, and investigative functions. It also includes probation, parole, corrections, and highway traffic personnel employed by governmental organizations.

PRIVATE LAW ENFORCEMENT (Criminal Justice) category refers to individuals who engage primarily in a police/security function for an industrial, business, or private investigative organization. It also includes private agencies concerned with delinquency prevention, rehabilitation of offenders, etc.

NON-LAW ENFORCEMENT (Criminal Justice) category refers to all other areas of employment such as education (including criminal justice, research, sales, personnel, etc.

CAREER MILITARY category refers to all career active duty military personnel including those engaged in law enforcement or security activities while on active duty.

7. After graduation from M.S.U. School of Criminal Justice, your initial major employment was with:
 Code: 1 - A public law enforcement agency? If so, what type of agency?

2 - A private law enforcement agency? If so, what type of work?

*3 - A non-law enforcement agency? If so, what type of work?

* FOR THOSE GRADUATES WHO UPON GRADUATION WENT IMMEDIATELY ON TO GRADUATE SCHOOL, INDICATE YOUR INITIAL PLACEMENT UPON COMPLETION OF YOUR GRADUATE WORK; THOSE GRADUATES (BS, M.S.U.) WHO SPENT MORE THAN 1/2 YEAR EMPLOYED BEFORE RETURNING TO M.S.U. FOR MS DEGREE, INDICATE INITIAL PLACEMENT AFTER BS DEGREE.
 (cont'd next page) 146

7. (cont'd from page 3)

*4 - The career military? If so, what branch and type of work?

* FOR THOSE GRADUATES WHO UPON GRADUATION WENT INTO THE MILITARY, BUT NOT AS CAREER, INDICATE YOUR INITIAL PLACEMENT UPON RETURNING TO CIVILIAN LIFE.

*5 - Have had no initial major employment experience at this time. _____

* IF YOU ANSWERED #5 ABOVE, GO ON TO SECTION 4.

* IF YOU ANSWERED #3 ABOVE, What was your major reason for going into law enforcement related work? _____

* IF YOU ANSWERED #1 ABOVE, INDICATE THE FOLLOWING:

(a) What type of agency?

- Code: 1 - Police
- 2 - Correction
- 3 - Other _____

(b) What governmental level (referring to (2) above)?

- Code: 1 - Federal
- 2 - State
- 3 - County
- 4 - Municipal
- 5 - Other _____

8. How long after graduation was it before you accepted your initial employment? _____

9. What was your initial position with the agency or organization? _____

10. Your initial placement with the agency or organization was:

- Code: 1 - A specialized position (research/planning; criminalistics, etc.).
- 2 - A supervisory position.
- 3 - An administrative position.
- 4 - At level of operation (e.g., patrolman, corrections officer).
- 5 - Other _____

11. Were you pleased with the level of this initial placement?

- Code: 1 - Thoroughly satisfied.
- 2 - Satisfied, but had expected higher position.
- 3 - Somewhat dissatisfied because of low position.
- 4 - Thoroughly dissatisfied.

12. If your initial placement was at the level of operation, how long was it before you were promoted or assigned to a specialized, supervisory, or administrative position?

- Code: 1 - Less than 1 year.
- 2 - 1-2 years.
- 3 - 2-3 years.
- 4 - 3-4 years.
- 5 - More than 4 years.
- 6 - Haven't been promoted or reassigned as of yet.
- 7 - Not applicable.

13. Was there a lateral entry policy in the agency/organization that hired you? NOTE: LATERAL ENTRY IS REFERRED TO AS THE APPOINTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE, PROFESSIONAL, AND TECHNICAL PERSONNEL ABOVE NORMAL ENTRANCE LEVELS INTO AN ORGANIZATION FROM THE OUTSIDE.

- Code: 1 - Yes
- 2 - No

14. Was there a pay incentive program for personnel taking college credit courses?

Code: 1 - Yes 2 - No

15. Did your employer have any managerial/internship trainee program for college graduates?

Code: 1 - Yes 2 - No

16. Were there any difficulties in getting your initial job that you feel were attributable to your criminal justice or police administration degree?

Code: 1 - Yes 2 - No

If yes, please explain: _____

17. Did all newly hired personnel start at the same entry level regardless of their level of education?

Code: 1 - Yes 2 - No

18. Do you feel your college training was best utilized through your initial job placement?

Code: 1 - Yes 2 - No

If no, how do you feel you could have been better utilized? _____

19. Do you feel your education has enabled you to progress more rapidly in your career than your fellow employees who lack your educational qualifications?

Code: 1 - Yes 2 - No

Why or why not? _____

20. How well do you feel your college major prepared you for your initial job placement?

Code: 1 - Extremely well 3 - Inadequately
2 - Adequately 4 - Cannot say

21. How well prepared were you to assume your job responsibilities in comparison with your fellow workers?

Code: 1 - Extremely well 3 - Inadequately
2 - Adequately 4 - Cannot say

22. Using the scale that follows, indicate your initial entrance salary for your first job placement after graduation from M.S.U.:

Code: 1 - Less than \$6,000 6 - \$14,000-\$15,999
2 - \$6,000-\$7,999 7 - \$16,000-\$17,999
3 - \$8,000-\$9,999 8 - \$18,000-\$19,999
4 - \$10,000-\$11,999 9 - \$20,000 and over
5 - \$12,000-\$13,999

23. Year of initial placement? _____

24. Were you satisfied with your initial entrance salary?

Code: 1 - Yes 2 - No

25. How long did you remain with your initial job after graduation before accepting your second job? _____

26. If you were employed by a criminal justice agency at the time of graduation, how long did you stay with that agency after graduation before accepting another job? _____

23. Leave the program unchanged?
Code: 1 - Yes 2 - No
Other: _____

24. Do you feel the School should take a much more active part in helping place students in the criminal justice field?
Code: 1 - Yes 2 - No

25. Overall, do you feel your college education has been a positive, negative, or neutral influence on your career?
Code: 1 - Positive 2 - Negative 3 - Neutral
Please explain your answer: _____

=====

Thank you very much for your time and effort in answering this questionnaire. Please enclose the completed questionnaire in the stamped, self-addressed envelope and return to: School of Criminal Justice, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48823.

The additional sheet has been provided for further comments you may wish to make on specific questions within the questionnaire, or comments of a general nature on the overall study.

APPENDIX B

FOLLOW-UP LETTER OF APRIL 2, 1972
TO CRIMINAL JUSTICE GRADUATES WHO
HAD NOT YET RESPONDED

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY East Lansing . Michigan 48823

College of Social Science . School of Criminal Justice . 405 Olds Hall

April 2, 1972

Dear Graduates:

Approximately three weeks ago you received a copy of a questionnaire sent to all criminal justice graduates as a part of a coordinated research project being conducted by the School of Criminal Justice concerning criminal justice education. At the present time we have received replies from more than half (approximately 52%) of the graduates. Although the response has been encouraging, your reply is urgently requested to fully realize the goals of the overall project.

Enclosed is a copy of the questionnaire in case the original one was misplaced. If you haven't yet completed the questionnaire, please take the necessary time to do so.

In the event you have already completed the questionnaire and it is now in the mail, please disregard this letter.

Thank you for your cooperation in this study.

Yours sincerely,

A. F. Brandstatter
Director

AFB/lg
Enc.