

## INFORMATION TO USERS

This reproduction was made from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this document, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help clarify markings or notations 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 through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark, it is an indication of either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, duplicate copy, or copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed. For blurred pages, a good image of the page can be found in the adjacent frame. If copyrighted materials were deleted, a target note will appear listing the pages in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed, a definite method of "sectioning" the material has been followed. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. For illustrations that cannot be satisfactorily reproduced by xerographic means, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and inserted into your xerographic copy. These prints are available upon request from the Dissertations Customer Services Department.
5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases the best available copy has been filmed.

**University  
Microfilms  
International**

300 N. Zeeb Road  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106



8507550

**Terrill, Clarence Ray**

A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF THE DIFFERENCES OF PERCEPTIONS OF  
BENEFIT OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE EXPERIENTIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS AT  
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY: A FOLLOW-UP

*Michigan State University*

PH.D. 1984

University  
Microfilms  
International 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Copyright 1985

by

Terrill, Clarence Ray

All Rights Reserved



A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF THE DIFFERENCES OF PERCEPTIONS  
OF BENEFIT OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE EXPERIENTIAL EDUCATION  
STUDENTS AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY:  
A FOLLOW-UP

By

CLARENCE RAY TERRILL

A DISSERTATION

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

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Educational Administration

1984

Copyright by  
CLARENCE RAY TERRILL

1985

## ABSTRACT

### A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF THE DIFFERENCES OF PERCEPTIONS OF BENEFIT OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE EXPERIENTIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY: A FOLLOW-UP

BY

Clarence Ray Terrill

This post-hoc study was undertaken to develop insight into the value of the experiential education program of the School of Criminal Justice at Michigan State University. The study describes the effects of the program on graduates in terms of: a) career development, b) career stability, c) agency shock, and d) burnout. The study examines field experiences and work experience in order to describe the impact of these experiential education opportunities on graduates' careers. Students of Michigan State University who participated in a field experience offered during Spring Term 1975 entitled Criminal Justice Practicum were compared to students who did not participate on the basis of career stability, career opportunity, agency shock, and burn-out.

The sources of data included the current and historical literature on the subject of experiential education; the Michigan State University School of Criminal Justice faculty; the students who participated in the Criminal Justice Practicum during Spring Term 1975; and the graduates of the Criminal Justice program during Spring, Summer, and Fall Term, 1975.

This post-hoc study was undertaken to develop insight into the value of the experiential education program of the School of Criminal Justice at Michigan State University. The study describes the effects of the program on graduates in terms of: a) career development, b) career stability, c) agency shock, and d) burnout. The study examines field experiences and work experience in order to describe the impact of these experiential education opportunities on graduates' careers. Students of Michigan State University who participated in a field experience offered during Spring Term 1975 entitled Criminal Justice Practicum were compared to students who did not participate on the basis of career stability, career opportunity, agency shock, and burn-out.

The sources of data included the current and historical literature on the subject of experiential education; the Michigan State University School of Criminal Justice faculty; the students who participated in the Criminal Justice Practicum during Spring Term 1975; and the graduates of the Criminal Justice program during Spring, Summer, and Fall Term, 1975.

The information and data gathered in both Phase I (1975) and Phase II (1981) were presented. The results of the research questions proposed were individually discussed;



and from the data it was concluded that one of the eight research hypotheses could be rejected in the null form (practicum graduates will not find a job in the criminal justice system any sooner than non-practicum graduates), six could not be rejected in the null form and one could not be statistically tested. Recommendations for further research of this area of education were also included.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to express his graditude to the School of Criminal Justice for help in securing the population sample for this research. The assistance provided made this research possible.

The author is indebeted to Dr. Howard Hickey, Chairman, for his constant guidance and review of this research project. It would not have been possible for the author to complete this study without Dr. Hickey's assistance and direction in meeting the problems that arose during this research.

The author would also express a debt of graditude to the Apple Computer Corporation for the author's Apple ][e Serial Number 379484454. without the assistance of which this research project would never would have been completed.

Most of all, the author wishes to express his deepest graditude and appreciation to his wife Judith, daughter Colleen, and son John for their concern, understanding, sacrifice and moral support. Without which, this author could not have completed this study.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES.....	viii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Purpose of the Study.....	1
Background of Experiential Education.....	3
The Problem.....	3
The Importance of the Study.....	4
Operational Definitions of Terms.....	4
Deliniation of the Problem.....	9
Scope and Limitations of the Study.....	11
An Overview of the Study.....	13
II. A SELECTED REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	14
Introduction .....	14
The History of Experiential Education.....	14
Extent and Development of General Experiential Education.....	19
A Model for Successful Field Experience Programs.....	24
Summary.....	25
III. METHODOLOGY.....	27
Introduction.....	27
The Setting for Michigan State University..	27

## CHAPTER

	Experiential Program History.....	28
	The Present Program.....	29
	Types of Agency Placements.....	31
	Requirements for Completion of the Program.....	32
	The Role of the Practicum Coordinator.....	33
	Administrative Support.....	34
	Population.....	34
	Sample.....	34
	Design.....	35
	Duration of Phase I (1975) of the Study....	36
	Duration of Phase II (1981) of the Study....	36
	Questionnaires Employed to Gather Data.....	36
	Faculty Interviews.....	42
	Analysis of the Data.....	43
	Summary.....	44
IV.	PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA.....	45
	Introduction.....	45
	Results of Phase I.....	45
	The Purpose of the Practicum Program.....	46
	Faculty Expectations.....	47
	Expectations for the School.....	47
	Expectations for the Students.....	50
	The Criminal Justice Practicum and the Curriculum.....	52
	The Faculty's Rating of the Criminal Justice Practicum.....	55
	Student Rating of the Criminal Justice Practicum as a Course.....	56

## CHAPTER

Student Expectation.....	57
Student Achievement of Goals.....	62
Supporting or Inhibiting Factors for Student Participation.....	66
Influential School Factors.....	66
Influential Extraneous Factors.....	74
Summary of Phase I.....	78
Results of Phase II.....	79
Agency Shock.....	79
Perceived Shock.....	80
Burn-Out.....	82
Still Working in the System.....	83
Number of Months in First Position.....	85
Number of Months Worked in the System.....	87
Reasons Graduates Left the System.....	88
Time to First Criminal Justice Employment.....	90
Months to First Criminal Justice Employment.....	90
Career Stability.....	92
Number of Jobs Held.....	93
Number of Months on First Job.....	91
Non-Practicum Student's Perception of School's Objectives.....	95
Practicum Student's Perception of School's Objectives.....	97
Differences of Perception of School's Objectives.....	99
Value of Criminal Justice Courses.....	101

CHAPTER	Summary.....	107
V.	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....	108
	Summary.....	108
	The Literature Reviewed.....	109
	Design of the Study Reviewed.....	110
	Summary of Findings.....	111
	Conclusions.....	116
	Implications.....	118
	Summary.....	122
APPENDIX A --	PRE-PRACTICUM QUESTIONNAIRE.....	124
APPENDIX B --	POST-PRACTICUM QUESTIONNAIRE.....	126
APPENDIX C --	NON-PRACTICUM QUESTIONNAIRE.....	131
APPENDIX D --	FOLLOW-UP PRACTICUM QUESTIONNAIRE.....	134
APPENDIX E --	FOLLOW-UP NON-PRACTICUM AND PRACTICUM LETTERS.....	140
APPENDIX F --	FOLLOW-UP NON-PRACTICUM QUESTIONNAIRE.....	143
APPENDIX G --	FACULTY INTERVIEW QUESTIONS.....	149
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....		150

## LIST OF TABLES

### TABLE

4.1	Faculty Expectations for the School of C.J. Practicum.....	50
4.2	Faculty Expectations for Practicum Students.....	53
4.3	Faculty Understanding of the Criminal Justice Practicum.....	55
4.4	Student Expectations.....	59
4.5	Graduates' Perceptions of the School's Objectives.....	61
4.6	Goals and Objectives Accomplished by the Practicum Students.....	64
4.7	Rating of Objectives Compared.....	65
4.8	Influential Factors in Choosing Not to do a Practicum.....	72
4.9	Agency Treatment of Students.....	73
4.10	Influential Factors in the Decision to do a Practicum.....	75
4.11	How Students Found Out About the C.J. Practicum.....	75
4.12	When Students Found Out About the C.J. Practicum.....	76
4.13	Factors for Non-Practicum Students.....	77
4.14	Perceived Agency Shock.....	80
4.15	T-ratios of Perceived Preparation for Shock.....	82
4.16	Still Working in the Criminal Justice System.....	83

4.17 Still Working in the Criminal Justice System of Those Who Found Work.....	85
4.18 T-Ratios of Number of Months on 1st Job.....	86
4.19 T-Ratios of Number of Months in C.J. System.....	88
4.20 Reasons for leaving the C.J. System.....	89
4.21 T-Ratios of Number of Months to 1st Job.....	91
4.22 T-Ratios of Numbers of Criminal Justice Jobs.....	94
4.22A The Number of Months on the 1st Job.....	95
4.23 Non-Practicum Perceptions of Objectives 1975-1981.....	97
4.24 Practicum Perceived Objectives 1975-1981.....	99
4.25 Non-practicum & Practicum Graduates 1975 - 1981....	101
4.26 Phase I Course Ranking.....	103
4.27 Phase II Course Ranking.....	105
4.28 Phase I and II Criminal Justice Course Rating.....	102



## CHAPTER I

### Introduction

Since 1906, institutions of higher learning have been discovering and incorporating programs of field experience into their curricula. The earliest forms of field experience used in this country were cooperative work study programs which were programs that allowed the students to alternate between periods of study and periods of work during the academic year. This form of field experience is only one of several which will be identified. All of these forms of field experience can be categorized under the broad title of experiential education.

### Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this post-hoc study is to develop insight into the value of the experiential education program of the School of Criminal Justice at Michigan State University. The study will describe the effects of the program on graduates in terms of: a) career development, b) career stability, c) agency shock, and d) burn-out. The study will examine field experiences and work experience in order to describe the impact of these experiential education opportunities on graduates' careers. Students of Michigan State University who participated in a field experience offered during Spring Term, 1975, entitled Criminal

Justice Practicum will be compared to students who did not participate on the basis of career stability, career opportunity, agency shock, and burn-out.

Specifically this study will investigate and attempt to identify:

- 1) The goals and objectives held by the School of Criminal Justice faculty for the Criminal Justice Practicum in 1975.
- 2) The extent to which field study experiences were considered an important part of the curriculum of the School of Criminal Justice by the Faculty in 1975.
- 3) Those policies or activities on the part of the School of Criminal Justice and its faculty which, in the opinion of the students, prove supporting or inhibiting to participation in the practicum program in 1975.
- 4) The goals and objectives held by students in the School of Criminal Justice for the practicum experience and their perception of the value of those goals and objectives after a period of six years of work in the Criminal Justice system.
- 5) Those areas of curriculum found most valuable by the students in their field experience and their perception of those areas six years after graduation.
- 6) The length time after graduating 1975 criminal justice graduates found employment in the criminal justice system.
- 7) The length of time after graduating in 1975 that criminal justice graduates remained in their first position.
- 8) The stability of employment in the criminal justice system experienced by 1975 criminal justice graduates.
- 9) The amount of agency shock encountered by graduates upon entering their first employment.

### Background of Experiential Education

The University of Cincinnati in 1906, under the guidance of the late Herman Schnider, developed the first field study program in the United States (Wilson and Lyons, 1961). This program allowed engineering students the opportunity to work in industry during one-half of the academic year and study the other half. This form of cooperative education was acclaimed and imitated by many other schools in the years that followed. The Michigan State University Criminal Justice Practicum program started as an eighteen-month required program in 1935 and has been reduced in length over the years until today it is a program that is a one-term optional program. All this change has not eliminated problems and questions that the coordinators have about the program.

### The Problem

The value of experiential education has been discussed by educators for a considerable period of time. This study will investigate the effects of experiential learning in criminal justice education on graduates with regard to career stability, ability to obtain a first position in the

### The Importance of the Study

A review of the literature reveals that there have been few evaluative studies of the criminal justice experiential education at Michigan State University. This longitudinal study was undertaken in an attempt to fill that void. It was hoped that the information and recommendations generated by this study will provide guidance to the directors of the School of Criminal Justice in developing a curriculum and a practicum program that will maximize the educational value for future criminal justice students.

### Operational Definitions of Terms

At this point, operational definitions will be presented to insure a clear statement of the research questions to the reader. Experiential education will be defined for the purpose of this study as:

Any structured program of education which allows students to be exposed to a real world situation, outside the classroom, for which academic credit is given. The structure referred to may take the form of very close supervision by the coordinator of the field experience with on-site visits and assignments from the coordinator or the structure may be as loose as only a confirmation of the placement and a review by the coordinator of a final paper written by the student intern.

Experiential education, in institutions of higher learning today, can be found in several forms. Some of the various forms of experiential education include the following:

- 1) Cross-culture experience
- 2) Institutional Analysis/Career Exploration
- 3) Pre-Professional training
- 4) Work experience
- 5) Service learning internship
- 6) Field research

Each of these is defined as follows:

- 1) Cross-culture experience. "The student becomes involved in another culture or subculture, either overseas or within the United States, as an observer/participant with the intention of learning more about that culture or subculture as well as his own" (Duley, 1974, p. vii).
- 2) Institutional Analysis/ Career Exploration. " The student becomes involved in a period of supervised work that allows an opportunity to develop skills and knowledge, tests abilities and career interests, and examines the culture of the institution in light of the student's previous theoretical education of such operations" (Duley, 1974, p. vii).
- 3) Pre-Professional Training. "The student is placed with an agency, firm, or institution and assigned responsibilities under the supervision of a professional in the field of education, medicine, law, social work, or other type of placement. During the placement, the student applies the theories learned in the classroom into practice and gains skills in the profession, and he is evaluated by the professional supervisor" (Duley, 1974, p. viii).

- 4) Work Experience (Cooperative Education). "Cooperative education is that education plan which integrates classroom experience and practical work experience in industry, business, government, or service-type work situation in the community. The work experience constitutes a regular and essential element in the educative process and some minimum amount of work experience and minimum standard of successful performance on the job are included in the requirements of the institution for a degree" (National Commission for Cooperative Education, 1971, p. 53).
- 5) Service Learning Internship. "Service learning has been defined as: The integration of the accomplishment of a task which meets human need with conscious educational growth. A service learning internship is designed to provide students a responsibility to a public need and significant learning experience within a public or private institution for specific period of time, usually 10 to 15 weeks" (Sigmon, 1972, p. 2).
- 6) Field Research. "The student works on a group or individual research project in the field under the supervision of a faculty member. This is accomplished by applying the concepts and methodologies acquired in an academic discipline like sociology, geology, or geography" (Sigmon, 1972, p. 24).

The School of Criminal Justice at Michigan State University offers two types of experiential education placements both of which are offered under the title and number: Criminal Justice Practicum - CJ 490. Both of these types of placement are variations of what Duley (1974) referred to as Pre-Professional Training. The options include (Michigan State University School of Criminal Justice, 1975):

- 1) Internship
- 2) Multi-agency Placement

Each of these is defined as follows:

- 1) **Internship:** A field placement of ten weeks in duration with an agency for eight hours per day, five days per week. Students who participate in an internship are expected to perform duties in the agency under the supervision of agency personnel. Placements of this nature are with such agencies as the Ingham County Probate Court, Michigan Department of Corrections, the State Attorney General's Office, and others too numerous to mention here.
- 2) **Multi-agency Placement:** A placement with several agencies for a period of from one to three weeks each. Students who participate in such placements are expected only to observe agency operations and not perform any duties other than those that might be required sporadically. Agencies used in this sort of placement include; East Lansing Police Department, Lansing Police Department, Michigan State University Department of Public Safety, Ingham County Sheriff's Department and others.

In order to further understand the areas investigated by this study, several other terms and phrases must be defined:

- 1) **Goals:** A goal is a broad statement of intended performance, knowledge or attitude that a student will eventually exhibit in the long run, as a result of a learning experience like a college program.
- 2) **Objectives:** An objective is a student's intended behavior at the end of a unit of instruction or course.
- 3) **Goals and objectives:** For the purpose of the hypotheses are those ends the student planned to, or eventually did accomplish while participating in a Criminal Justice Practicum.
- 4) **Courses:** Those courses in criminal justice in the 1975 curriculum taken by the students.
- 5) **Practicum Graduates:** Those graduates who took a course entitled Criminal Justice 490 during the Spring Quarter of 1975.

- 6) Non-Practicum Graduates: Those graduates who did not take a course entitled Criminal Justice 490 during work at Michigan State University but did receive a four year degree from Michigan State University in Criminal Justice.
- 7) Burn-out: The phenomenon of becoming frustrated and emotionally drained of career aspirations and desires in the criminal justice system thus causing the graduate to leave the criminal justice system in an effort to relieve that frustration and emotional drain.
- 8) Agency Shock: Any and all of the adverse effects of a person's entry into an agency environment which is markedly different from that to which an individual is accustomed, i.e., agency procedures, operational systems, personnel, and cultural environment.
- 9) First Employment: The graduate's first full-time position with an agency in the criminal justice system.
- 10) Job Stability: The relative performance of the graduate at one criminal justice agency as measured by the number of job changes made during their career (to the point of this study).
- 11) Criminal Justice Career: The pursuit of a livelihood in the criminal justice system to include police, courts, prosecution, and corrections.
- 12) Phase I: That portion of the study conducted during 1975.
- 13) Phase II: That portion of the study conducted during 1981.
- 14) Experimental subjects: Those graduates who are defined as Practicum Graduates above.
- 15) Control Subjects: Those graduates who are defined as Non-Practicum Graduates above.



### Delineation of the Problem

The research hypotheses to be tested in this study deal with the graduates' perception of the amount of agency shock encountered upon entry into a criminal justice agency, with the graduates' tendencies toward staying in the criminal justice system, with the graduates' stability within the criminal justice system, and with the graduates' abilities to find a position after graduation. Specifically, this study will investigate the following research hypotheses:

- 1) The experimental subjects will perceive that they encountered less agency shock upon entering into a criminal justice agency than control subjects perceived they encountered upon their entry into a criminal justice agency.

This hypothesis is proposed to test one of the assumed values of experiential learning, that is, that students who have worked in a real world agency will be better prepared to deal with the environment of the real world of work.

- 2) The experimental subjects will experience less burn-out than control subjects experience in their criminal justice career.

This hypothesis is proposed because experimental learning is many times acclaimed as an excellent method of career exploration.

- 3) There is a significant difference between the experimental subjects and the control subjects in the length of time taken to find Criminal Justice employment after graduation.

This hypothesis is to be investigated to determine if students who participate in a criminal justice practicum sufficiently learn the procedures, processes, and sources for finding employment in the criminal justice system so as to give them an advantage over their contemporaries without such an opportunity.

- 4) There are significant differences between the experimental subjects' and the control subjects' stability in their Criminal Justice careers.

This hypothesis is investigated in an attempt to determine if a student's exposure to a criminal justice agency or agencies enables them to select the correct agency for them based on their personality and experience in the system.

- 5) Between Phase I and Phase II, the control subjects will significantly change their perception of the objectives of the School of Criminal Justice for offering the Criminal Justice Practicum.

This hypothesis is investigated in an attempt to identify if after a real world work experience, graduates who did not participate in an experiential education program changed their perceptions of the value of experiential education programs.

- 6) Between Phase I and Phase II the experimental subjects will significantly change their perceptions of the objectives of the School of Criminal Justice for offering the Criminal Justice Practicum.

This hypothesis is investigated to reveal if after a real world work experience graduates', who did participate in an

experiential education program, perceive of the value of experiential education in a way more similar to graduates who did not participate in an experiential education program.

- 7) There are significant differences between the experimental subjects' and the control subjects' perception of the School of Criminal Justice for offering the Criminal Justice Practicum during Phase II.

This hypothesis is investigated to determine if after six years of real work experience, graduates who participated in an experiential learning program perceive the value of that experience differently from those graduates who did not participate in an experiential education program.

- 8) Between Phase I and Phase II both groups of graduates will perceive the value of the courses offered by the School of Criminal Justice significantly different from their initial perceptions.

This hypothesis is to be examined to determine if graduates in either or both groups change their opinion of the value of their course work in Criminal Justice after spending a period of time in the real world of work.

#### Scope and Limitations of the Study

Phase I of this study was conducted during the Spring Quarter of 1975 at Michigan State University and included all of the 30 students participating in the Criminal Justice Practicum that term. A random sample of the non-practicum students was also conducted to obtain the data for the non-practicum areas of the study. A total of 50

questionnaires were sent out to the non-practicum students with return addressed and postage paid envelopes. Phase II of this study was conducted during academic year 1980-1981 at Michigan State University. It was conducted by including all of those students/graduates in the practicum class of Spring 1975. It also included a new random sample of 60 Michigan State University students who graduated in 1975 who did not participate in the Criminal Justice Practicum. Of the several limitations imposed upon a research project of this nature, the lack of standardized and objective evaluation instruments appears to have furnished the greatest liability. The instrument developed for Phase I was constraining in several respects because of its design. This caused difficulty in generalizing the data to the entire population and generally caused the study to be descriptive in nature. Another limiting factor is that the Phase I (1975) responses of Practicum students were less than 100 percent response of the sample. The actual response was approximately 65 percent, this factor also makes generalization limited. One other limiting factor is the fact that the original sample of Non-Practicum students was lost between Phase I and Phase II which also affected the generalizability of the data.

The results of this investigation are limited to a comparison between those Michigan State University students who elect to participate in the Criminal Justice Practicum and a sample of those students who chose not to participate.

The very nature of the program's self-selection process imposed some variables which prohibit generalization of this study beyond that population which is under examination.

### An Overview of the Study

This study explores the experiences of the Criminal Justice students at Michigan State University. In Chapter II, a review of the literature is presented to facilitate the reader's understanding of the history as well as the state of the art of experiential education and its utilization in colleges and universities across the United States today. Chapter III describes the methodology and design of this study. It explains the longitudinal nature of the study and the complexity of the data obtained from this research. Chapter IV presents a detailed analysis of the data gathered in the course of this six-year study. In the final chapter, this research is summarized and several recommendations and conclusions concerning the Criminal Justice Practicum at Michigan State University as well as other criminal justice experiential education programs at colleges and universities around the country are presented.

## CHAPTER II

### SELECTED REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

#### Introduction

During the development of this review of the literature, numerous books, articles, and pamphlets on the subject of experiential education in Criminal Justice and other disciplines were reviewed. This review will reveal that experiential education is still in its infancy when compared to the traditional teacher-student-text model of education. It was first introduced in higher education in this country in approximately 1906. Since its introduction, experiential education has been modified, enhanced, and revised by the many colleges and universities that have employed it. As a result of these many applications of experiential education, research has begun to identify those elements necessary for a successful program. This review will clearly demonstrate that there is value in experiential education.

#### The History of Experiential Education

In 1945, Lynd made the observation that the notion of field and experiential education had been growing in colleges and universities over the proceeding decades (Lynd, 1945). Twenty years later, McGrath and Meeth (1965) referred to the use of field experience education programs as one of the "innovations" that still appeared to be growing in its use and availability in institutions of higher education. This would appear to indicate that

educators have been confused about how innovative field experience education is. They do point out that experiential education has been employed since the turn of the century, and it is still being discovered by educators as a new method of exposing students to certain bodies of knowledge (Meeth and McGrath, 1965). Dressel (1968) explained this slow development of experiential education in liberal arts colleges as indicative of the difficulties innovators have had in changing the curriculum of their schools from the trichotomy of the teacher-student-text relationship of the in-put/out-put model to a model that deviates from that classical school of education. Part of the problem is that this type of classical method has been in existence since Socrates and before. Dressel (1968) points out that liberal arts educators find it difficult to accept such a notion as experiential education because, historically speaking, the concept is an infant when compared to the traditional model.

Another reason that educators have been slow to accept the experiential model is the fact that for many years there were no empirical studies of the value of such programs. It was not until May of 1957 that anyone undertook the task of evaluating whether or not the philosophies and broad values of a richer and more meaningful education, claimed by those who used and developed experiential programs, were really valid (Dressel, 1968).

The first evaluation of such programs was undertaken by the Study of Cooperative Education Committee under a grant from the Thomas Alva Edison Foundation (Wilson and Lyons, 1961). This study found several positive values in the use of experiential education. This supportive evidence aided the advancement of experiential education in the field. The study found, in brief, that (Wilson and Lyons, 1963):

- 1) The students more closely relate theory and practice and find their studies more meaningful as a result of field experience;
- 2) Field study programs motivate the student in his academic work, because the students see the connection between the experience and their studies;
- 3) Students are aided by the evaluation of their own abilities to operate in their chosen field of endeavor through the field study experience.

The results of that study are relevant to this study in that they point to the fact that there is sufficient educational value in the cooperative model of experiential education to develop and refine present experiential education programs.

With the support of educators (in the form of such studies as done by the Cooperative Education Committee) and the demand of students for relevance in their education, universities and colleges have responded to these pressures by exploring, establishing, and expanding field experiential education programs in their institutions. In support of this expansion, Mayhew (1971) maintains that these types of experiences are not only good to offer to the student but



are the right of every student. Lynd (1945) also defends the technique of experiential education when she said:

"With recognition that many different kinds of learning are a part of the real world, field work is used in certain specific situations to help students acquire facts, skills, concepts, or methods which they cannot get so well, or more often cannot get at all, in another way... Field work may also be of the utmost importance in developing relationships among different areas of knowledge and between college and community life (Lynd, 1945)."

Many educators are beginning to hold the belief that the opportunity to apply the principles of theory to practical situations through experiential education programs contribute significantly to the educational experience. In fact, Henderson claims (1970):

"Experience as one of the primary methods in developing the whole personality which includes increasing the ability to think effectively and to couple the thinking of the individual with his acting and being. The aim is to make the learning process more genuine, more meaningful to the student, and to teach him how to make his thinking on social problems applicable to the culture in which he lives."

Henderson (1970) goes on to say that if learning of the theoretical is combined with practical application, learning should be more rapid with longer retention and a higher degree of competence acquired by the student.

Gould and Cross (1972), in their book the Exploration in Non-Traditional Study, speak of non-traditional study as a group of changing educational patterns which are caused by changing needs and opportunities of the society. Much of non-traditional study, Gould (1972) points out, is not new but rather has been brought to the public's attention in recent times

through some of the main proponents of that form of education. Although the particular thrust in their work is toward non-traditional study and external degree programs, the definition may also be extended to other off-campus learning experiences, including those experiential education programs or activities that occur outside of the conventional classroom setting under the direction of a college or university. Experiences such as work experience, service experience, and cultural experiences are among the vast variety of educational programs or study models that fall under the title of non-traditional study. These models of experiential education, specifically models in criminal justice, are the subject of this study.

In Exploration in Non-Traditional Study, which has been acclaimed as the first scholarly, carefully done exploration of non-traditional study, the authors set forth that learning can and does take place in different ways for different students. They are also quick to point out that confusion surrounds all aspects of non-traditional learning today (Gould and Cross, 1972). Confusion, among other things, surrounds what this type of learning is and what it is expected to do for the student. When one is beginning to study the history and development of experiential education on college campuses, it is somewhat surprising to find that such confusion exists. It would seem to the casual observer that the continued expansion and increasing popularity of these field studies would stand to attest to the fact that

experiential education had been evaluated. With the exception of student teaching, nursing experience programs, and the medical internship programs (areas which are not the concern of this study), this is not necessarily the case.

### Extent and Development of General Experiential Education

Experiential education can be found on college campuses in several forms. It may be in the form of field trips, extensive programs of foreign study, observation programs with little participation, internships with maximum student participation, service projects, or cooperative work experience programs. Programs of experiential education are found under the broad title of independent study, which may be any one of a number of different types of programs. Underlying all of these different programs is the belief that there is educational value in a program that mixes the practical with the theoretical, or that some concepts and skills can best be learned outside of the classroom.

In 1906, experiential education made its appearance in this country. Under the direction of Herman Schnider, the University of Cincinnati developed and instituted a form of field study, a cooperative work study program (Henderson, 1970). The program was designed to require students to alternate between periods of study and periods of work. Students worked as apprentice workers serving as an extension of this program. The students were also required

to spend one extra year in their college program in order to complete the requirements for the degree (Henderson, 1970).

Antioch College in the 1920's (and later Northeastern University) allowed students to mix work with their studies in a structured program. Lynd (1954) discussed the program at Antioch and acclaimed it as a pioneer concept in the movement for making field experience an essential element in a college program. Lynd (1945) claimed, "For the majority of Antioch students, the work has been at least as important a part of their college experience as their academic studies."

Bennington College, since its inception in the 1930's, has sought to provide students with experiences outside of the traditional classroom setting. Bennington students are allowed to spend as much as one full year on work study, or research off campus (Mayhew and Ford, 1965). Over time, the list of colleges and universities that offered experiential education programs grew, and the types of experiential educational programs were expanded.

By 1958, Wilson and Lyons (1958) discovered more than sixty universities and colleges with cooperative education programs in operation. Eleven years later, in 1969, two surveys reported the fact that the experiential education programs had continued to grow. Dressel and Delisle (1969) developed a list of results from a randomly selected catalog survey of one-third of all four-year liberal arts institutions listed in the 1964 edition of the American

Council on Education's American Universities and Colleges, and discovered that 5.6 percent of the schools had work study or cooperative programs.

In that same year, Brick and McGrath (1965) surveyed (by way of a questionnaire) all four-year schools of higher education with liberal arts curricula in the United States. Their source for selecting the schools was the Education Directory, Part, Higher Education, published by the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1965-1966. Through their survey, they discovered that 54.3 percent of the schools reported either having in operation, or planning to have in operation a program of work study (McGrath, 1965). Comparing the results of these two surveys, some questions arise as to why there is disparity between the results. The discrepancies may well be the result of inadequate catalog descriptions of experiential education programs, which misled Dressel and Delisle (1969) in their conclusions. For example, 58.4 percent of the schools in their survey had Independent Study programs which could be where some of the experiential education programs were concealed (Dressel and Delisle, 1969).

Somewhat related to the work experience already discussed are service-learning programs. Earlham College, over a quarter of a century ago, developed a program of community dynamics. This program enabled students to assist in community projects for the betterment of the society.

Another school that has had a learning-service program in operation for a considerable period of time is Brooklyn College in New York City. In Indiana, Goshen College has had a trimester program of study and service; the object of which is to experience and investigate another culture and to donate service to people in need (Meeth and McGrath, 1965).

In the Southern states, service-learning programs had their greatest development. In 1969, the Southern Regional Educational Board established a program to enable students to participate in off-campus internships of a learning-service nature. In 1971, the General Assembly of North Carolina appropriated funds to allow for increasing use of the internship and evaluation of the service-learning experiential education model (Sigmon, 1974). This development is somewhat unique inasmuch as the main thrust of the program comes from outside of the educational institution. The schools which have been most successful in developing and operating this type of program in this area are Appalachian State University, Mars Hill College, University of North Carolina at Charlotte, University of North Carolina at Greensboro, and Pembroke State University (Sigmon, 1974). In each of these schools, a relationship has been developed between the school and the public agencies in the area.

According to Sigmon (1974), the key question at these successful schools has become "What is the limit within the

Baccalaureate degree for experiential education credits?"

This type of situation is exemplary of how valuable these educational experiences are considered by schools with successful programs. Sigmon (1974) notes that four major benefits were revealed in studying these successful programs:

- 1) Students develop more hopeful, knowledgeable, and concerned attitudes toward community problem solving.
- 2) Students experience an increased motivation to work and learn in public need settings after learning to work effectively with others in internships.
- 3) Students learn a great deal about their personal abilities and cultural commitments.
- 4) There is an immediate impact on the student's behavior and on their plans for the future (Sigmon, 1974).

These results would seem to indicate that service learning programs of this type could cause the questions related to the maximum number of credits to become a reality. The North Carolina Internship Office has not been a program, but rather enabler of college and agency based programs for student involvement (Sigmon, 1974). This model should be considered by other agencies and higher education institutions as a possible model of experiential education. Based on the above results, other schools should be attracted to the service-learning model as a method of presenting a body of knowledge to their students. Probably the greatest variety of field study and experiential education takes place under the broad title of independent honors courses. These programs were the result of the

philosophy that fused academic and off-campus experience as a valid, efficient and desirable form of education. Colleges offering such programs included Reed, Sarah Lawrence, Bennington, Brad Stephen, and Goddard (Quinn, 1972).

#### A Model for Successful Field Experience Programs

A successful field experience does not just happen because experiential learning is so superior to the traditional models that it cannot fail. To be successful, a field experience program must be well conceived, planned, implemented, and evaluated. This process is not so simple as to be accomplished by any faculty person the departmental chairperson designates to be the coordinator without released time. In fact the most successful programs are far from such after thoughts. Such programs are coordinated by full-time faculty members who spend many hours working on them as a part of their regular load.

One model for the development of field experience programs designed by Davis, Duley, and Alexander (1977) proposes an eight-step process to design such programs:

- 1) Identify program goals and student goals.
- 2) State agreed-upon goals in the form of instructional objectives.
- 3) Arrange field placement.
- 4) Prepare students.
- 5) Place students.
- 6) Monitor the field placement.



7) Assess student learning.

8) Evaluate the program.

This model demonstrates that the development of a field experience program requires considerable effort on the part of the faculty person serving as the coordinator. The coordinator is the keystone in any successful experiential education program. The position of the coordinator must be stable, and the assignment must be one viewed by the faculty as a desirable position. The coordinator's position must not be temporary or an overload assignment. It is recommended that the position be filled by a person who believes in experiential education, someone who can communicate well with the operational agencies in all areas of student placements, a diplomat who can massage and develop relations with local agencies, and a person who can communicate well with students (Davis, Duley, and Alexander, 1977).

#### Summary

During the development of this review of the literature, numerous books and articles on the subject of experiential education were reviewed. This review revealed that experiential education is still in its infancy when compared to the traditional teacher-student-text trichotomy model of education. It was first introduced in higher education in this country in approximately 1906 at the University of Cincinnati (Wilson and Lyons, 1961). Since its introduction, experiential education has been modified,

enhanced, and revised by the many colleges and universities that have employed it. As a result of this, many applications of experiential education research have begun to identify those elements necessary for a successful program. Specifically, a successful program should identify and state in instructional terms the program and learner goals, arrange and monitor placements, prepare students for placement, assess student learning, and evaluate the program (Davis, Duley, and Alexander, 1977). The success of experiential programs rests heavily on the shoulders of the coordinator who is the keystone of the program. The coordinator's position must be more than an additional duty added to some faculty member's work load. The faculty member must be knowledgeable of agencies and of the experiential education theories as well as a believer in the concept of such education.

The literature clearly demonstrates that there is value in experiential education. It does as a minimum enhance classroom learning, and it certainly assists students in career decisions.

## CHAPTER III

### METHODOLOGY

#### Introduction

The problem of this study was to assess the effect of an experiential education program on graduates of the School of Criminal Justice at Michigan State University in terms of 1) career development, 2) career stability, 3) career opportunities, and 4) agency shock. This chapter includes a description of the setting, the sample, the duration of the study, the design of the study, the variables studied, the survey methods used, and a description of the analysis of the data.

#### The Setting for Michigan State University

The setting for this study was the criminal justice program at Michigan State University in East Lansing, Michigan. This program began as the Department of Police Administration in 1937. Ultimately, it became the School of Criminal Justice in 1968. The School is located in the College of Social Science and has currently (1981) enrolled approximately 900 undergraduate students, 90 Master's degree candidates, and 25 Ph.D. candidates. The undergraduate curriculum provides a basic orientation to the institutions and processes of criminal justice. The School's philosophy is founded on two essential propositions: (1) The systematic study of crime, criminal behavior, and criminal justice

process constitutes an appropriate and highly important function of higher education, and (2) because of the complexities of the phenomena attendant to crime in contemporary society, it has become increasingly important for higher education to devote its resources to preparing students for careers in criminal justice and related areas (Michigan State University, 1981).

#### Experiential Program History

Michigan State University School of Criminal Justice has offered a program of experiential, field study since the inception of the school in 1935. Initially, the program was a required part of the curriculum and each student was expected to complete an eighteen-month internship within the area of his/her own specialty. To achieve the purpose of the program, students were assigned to federal, state, county, municipal, and private agencies so they could become familiar with each agency. The desired benefits of this program were perceived as follows (Michigan State University, 1975):

1. To provide the student with the opportunity to be observers and participate in their chosen field. The student, through placement in various agencies, was allowed to compare, analyze and gain an appreciation for the many agencies in the system, cooperatively working toward the administration of justice. These experiences should subsequently help the employed student and graduate to place into proper perspective his/her own role and contribution, while applying practical knowledge to existing working relationships.

2. To provide the student with an opportunity to observe the application of technical skills by proficient practitioners. The students having been exposed to the underlying principles in the classroom were then exposed to the application of prescriptive theory to real world situations.
3. To provide the student with an opportunity to determine the various employment requirements, benefits, and their suitability to a career in that field of Criminal Justice. Conversely, training agencies were afforded the use of field study programs as a recruiting and preliminary training program for prospective employees.
4. To provide the student with personal association with men and women working in their chosen field of endeavor. These friendships are considered a valuable part of the field experience program.

Since its inception, the complexion of the field study program has been changing. The program began as an eighteen-month program. In approximately 1949, the program was altered to require only a twelve-month placement. Then, in 1956, the program was modified to a three-term requirement. In 1961, the program was further reduced to a two-term requirement. In 1963, the program became a one-term requirement. Finally, in 1965, the program became an optional one-term program.

#### The Present Program

Today, the Criminal Justice Practicum is still optional and it is open to all criminal justice seniors. The students who participate in this program may choose to do either a ten-week internship or a ten-week multi-agency placement. The number of credit hours available for participation in the program is variable; from one to twelve

credits, depending on the duration and number of hours per week worked. The catalog description of the Criminal Justice Practicum as it appears in the 1981-1982 Michigan State University Catalog is as follows:

Criminal Justice 490. Criminal Justice Practicum Fall, Winter, Spring, Summer. Variable credit. May reenroll for a maximum of 12 credits... Majors only. A planned program of research internships, observation, study, and work in selected criminal justice agencies. Supplements classroom study with participation in criminal justice systems of the United States and foreign nations.

The methods utilized to evaluate the student's achievement in the program is the "Pass-No Grade" System. This system (according to the 1975 Michigan State University Academic Handbook) is based on the student achieving the numerical grade equivalent of 2.0 for which he/she is awarded credit for the course. This system, however, does not award a numerical grade, only the credits appear on the student's transcript (Michigan State University, 1975).

Evaluation of the student's performance is based on an evaluation of the student at the end of the field experience. The student must write a paper at the end of the course. This paper is supposed to analyze the student's experience in light of prior classroom experiences. The paper is also to synthesize the prescriptive theory and the practical experience into a meaningful body of knowledge concerning the Criminal Justice System in the student's area of specialization.

### Types of Agency Placements

As mentioned earlier, there are two types of agency placement available to the student. One of these is the Internship and the other is the Multi-Agency placement. Internships include such agencies as the Ingham County Probate Court, Jackson County Probate Court, and the State of Michigan's Consumer Fraud Division of the Attorney General's Office. Students who participate in an internship normally work in an agency for forty hours per week for ten weeks. Students are generally allowed to work under the supervision of an agency employee, performing duties required of any agency employee. The students are usually employed on special projects within the agency. For example, at Ingham County Probate Court, the student may handle a probation case load of four to ten clients. The student case worker is required to accomplish all those client services which a regular professional case worker would perform.

Multi-agency placements are made in a variety of agencies. The list is comprised almost exclusively of law enforcement agencies. These placements are almost exclusively observational in nature. This is due to the fact that students cannot carry out law enforcement duties because they are not certified police officers.

A typical ten-week Multi-Agency placement would be as follows, two weeks each with:

East Lansing Police Department  
Michigan State Police  
Michigan State University Department of Public Safety  
Ingham County Sheriff's Department  
Lansing Police Department

During the student's placement with each of the agencies, he/she is assigned to ride on patrol in all of the above agencies, assigned to the investigation unit in the majority of the agencies, assigned to the school safety unit in at least one of the agencies, and allowed to observe most of the ongoing operations of each department. In this type of placement, the student serves almost exclusively in an observer role with few or no agency duties to perform.

#### Requirements for Completion of the Program

Students who participate in the Criminal Justice Practicum are expected to meet several requirements in order to receive credit for the course. Those requirements are as follows (Michigan State University, 1975):

1. Fill out an application
2. Sign a liability and insurance waiver
3. Attend a Pre-Practicum meeting
4. Submit Daily Report forms
5. Attend Mid-Term Practicum meeting
6. Submit Final Paper (approximately one page per credit hour.)
7. Attend Post-Practicum meeting
8. Send Agency Thank You letter(s)



### The Role of the Practicum Coordinator

The Coordinator of the Criminal Justice Practicum is responsible for all phases of the field study program. In addition, administrative duties such as scheduling and confirming assignments with agencies are performed. The Coordinator has two major areas of concern -- students and agencies. Concerning students, the Coordinator must be available to provide assistance when necessary to make the experiential education program a more beneficial and relevant educational experience. These duties include matching students to agencies that best reflect the students' interests, provide ongoing supervision during a student's placement, provide a feedback and discussion mechanism through the mid-term and final meetings as well as being available whenever student problems arise. As a matter of course, the students are urged to meet with the Coordinator at any time during their placement period to discuss their reaction to and feelings about the Criminal Justice Experiential Education Program (Michigan State University School of Criminal Justice, 1975).

Concerning the agencies, the Coordinator maintains a liaison with participating agencies, works out any difficulties related to a specific student placement, and attempts to recruit new agencies for the program.

### Administrative Support

The coordinator is supported in the operation of the practicum through the use of one secretary on a one-eighth time basis and by a graduate assistant on a half-time basis. The function of the secretary is to do all of the necessary clerical duties to support the program. The graduate assistant serves as the assistant coordinator and performs those duties delegated by the coordinator. Those delegated duties include counseling students from time to time, evaluation of Student Final Papers, and assist in the annual evaluation of the practicum program.

### Population

The School of Criminal Justice had approximately 900 undergraduate students, 90 Master's degree candidates, and 25 Ph.D. candidates enrolled during Phase I (Michigan State University, 1975). The Senior Class of 1975 consisted of 287 students in the Spring Quarter: and when all of the 1975 graduates were counted the total number of graduates was 316. These figures are based on an actual hand count of the School of Criminal Justice class roster and graduation lists for all quarters of 1975.

### Sample

The criteria for selection of the samples used in this descriptive study included the following:

- 1) The practicum (C.J. 409) class of Spring Quarter, 1975, was chosen as the experimental group because of the time constraints of Phase I of this study. All members of

that class were included in the sample. The class selected was a typical class in that it was composed of approximately thirty students and the class was normally distributed with internship and multi-agency students as well as males and females. The sample consisted of 30 Criminal Justice Seniors.

2) The control group (1975) was selected from a random sample of all 183 Criminal Justice Seniors of the class of 1975 who had not taken C.J. 409. This group was selected as the control group because it was from the same population of the university as the experimental group.

3) The control group (1981) was selected from a random sample of all 206 Criminal Justice Seniors of the class of 1975 who had not taken C.J. 409. This group was selected as the control group because it was from the same population of the university as the experimental group. The original control group (1975) was not used in Phase II due to the fact that the original sample was lost between 1975 and 1981.

### Design

This study is a descriptive post-hoc study conducted over a six-year period. The groups selected for the study were chosen on the basis of availability at the time of the initial portion of the study in 1975. The second survey and

sample was conducted in the Spring of 1981. The period of six years had no major significance except that it was sufficiently long enough to adequately test the research questions.

#### Duration of Phase I (1975) of the The Study

Phase I was conducted over the period of time from April to June, 1975. This Phase was instituted as part of the graduation requirements for a Master of Science in Criminal Justice at Michigan State University in August, 1975.

#### Duration of Phase II (1981) of the The Study

Phase II was conducted during May and June of 1981. This time period was selected because it coincided with the sixth anniversary of the completion of the experimental group's practicum in Criminal Justice at Michigan State University. This Phase was instituted as a part of the dissertation requirements for a Doctor of Philosophy in Administration of Higher Education.

#### Questionnaires Employed to Gather Data

Five different questionnaires were used to obtain data from the respondents. These instruments were all developed by the investigator. The initial design was adapted from an instrument developed by Quinn (1972) in her study of experiential education at Michigan State University. The reliability and validity of the items in the instrument were tested by Quinn (1972) and found to

be acceptable. The five questionnaires employed were a pre-practicum questionnaire, a post-practicum questionnaire (1975), a non-practicum questionnaire (1975), a follow-up practicum questionnaire (1981), and a follow-up non-practicum questionnaire (1981).

The pre-practicum questionnaire (See Appendix B) was designed to identify:

- a. At what point and through what medium students became aware of the Criminal Justice Practicum.
- b. Factors that presented problems in students choosing to participate in the practicum.
- c. Students' perceptions of the rationale of the School of Criminal Justice objectives for offering the Criminal Justice Practicum.
- d. The goals and objectives the students held for their field experience prior to their participation.

The post-practicum questionnaire (See Appendix C) was designed to identify:

- a. The students' accomplishments in their field placements.
- b. Those areas of the classroom learning that the students viewed as most beneficial to their field experience.
- c. Those areas of the classroom experience learning that the students view as deficient and which resulted in a loss of efficiency in their field experience.
- d. Those changes the students would make in the practicum program if they were empowered to do so.

The pre-practicum questionnaire (1975) was administered at the pre-placement meeting for Spring Term practicum students. Eighteen responses were received at the time, due

to the fact that approximately ten students missed that meeting. The questionnaire was then accompanied with a self-addressed, postage paid envelope which was mailed to the absent students. The response from this mailing was only three additional returns. Thus, the sample for the pre-practicum students was twenty-one (70 percent) of the practicum students. This percentage was hoped to be near 100 percent. However, lack of cooperation on the part of the students precluded this researcher from obtaining that goal.

The post-practicum questionnaire (1975) was administered at the end-of-term meeting held the last week of Spring Term 1975. At that meeting, seventeen responses were received. A questionnaire was then mailed with a self-addressed, postage paid envelope to each of the eleven students who were absent from that meeting. The return of the mailed questionnaires resulted in only three more responses. The final size of the post-practicum sample thus was twenty (66.6 percent) students.

The non-practicum student questionnaire (1975) (see appendix D) was designed to identify:

- a. Those factors that were most instrumental in the student's decision not to participate in the Criminal Justice Practicum.
- b. The student's knowledge of the Criminal Justice Practicum concerning placements and academic credit available.
- c. What value the student observed in the Criminal Justice Practicum.

- d. How and when the students became aware of the Criminal Justice Practicum.
- e. Whether the time in the student's academic career that he or she became aware of the program played a role in the decision to participate in the practicum.

The non-practicum questionnaire was administered to fifty Criminal Justice Seniors the last week of the Spring Term in 1975. The selection process employed to obtain this sample required the manual sorting of all senior cards to insure that only seniors who had not previously enrolled in the Criminal Justice Practicum and who were not enrolled in the program for Summer were included in the available pool for the sample. The next step was to number all remaining cards sequentially from 100 to 283. A table of random numbers was then employed to draw a sample of fifty cards. Those persons selected for the sample were then sent a letter, a questionnaire, and a return envelope with postage paid (see Appendix E). The response received from this sample totalled twenty-one (42 percent).

The follow-up Practicum (1981) questionnaire (see Appendix F) was designed to identify:

- a. The highest degree attained and year and quarter the graduates received their B.S. or B.A. Degree.
- b. The length of elapsed time between graduation and obtaining the first employment in the Criminal Justice system and what type of position was obtained.
- c. The length of time the graduates remained in their first position as well as how many positions they had held in the Criminal Justice System since graduation.

- d. The reason graduates that left the system did so.
- e. The graduate's perception of the reason why the School of Criminal Justice offers the Criminal Justice Practicum.
- f. The graduate's perception of the value of each course they took in the Criminal Justice curriculum.
- g. The amount of agency shock the graduates encountered in their first position and whether they perceived that college had prepared them to deal with that shock.
- h. The graduates' perception of the value of the stated objectives established during the pre-practicum research.

The follow-up practicum questionnaire (1981) was administered to all but one of the thirty Spring, 1975, practicum students. The reason only twenty-nine questionnaires were sent out was that one of the graduates' addresses could not be located. The addresses were located by researching Michigan State University Alumni/Donor Records and by letters to the last known permanent address of graduates' parents.

The response to the initial mailing was twenty (20) responses, which was equal to approximately 66 percent. A follow-up mailing returned four additional surveys for a total of twenty-four (24) or 80 percent of the Spring 1975 Criminal Justice Practicum class. The success of this survey is believed to be the result of the use of "guilt money" attached to each questionnaire. A one dollar bill was attached to each questionnaire with an explanation that conveyed thanks for the time needed to fill out the survey.



The follow-up non-practicum questionnaire (1981) (See appendix G) was designed to identify:

- a. The highest degree attained, and year and quarter the graduates received their B.S. or B.A. Degree.
- b. The length of elapsed time between graduation and obtaining the first employment in the Criminal Justice system and the type of position obtained.
- c. The length of time the graduates remained in their first positions as well as how many positions they have held in the Criminal Justice System since graduation.
- d. The reason(s) graduates that left the system did so.
- e. The graduates' perceptions of the reason why the School of Criminal Justice offers the C.J. Practicum.
- f. The graduate's perception of the value of each course they took in the Criminal Justice curriculum.
- g. The amount of agency shock the graduates encountered in their first position and whether they perceived that college had prepared them to deal with that shock.
- h. The graduates' perception of the value of the stated objectives established during the pre-practicum research.

The follow-up survey of non-practicum graduates was administered to sixty (60) Criminal Justice graduates during the month of May, 1981. The process employed to select the sample was one of sorting through the graduate lists for Spring, 1975, Summer, 1975; Fall, 1975; and Winter, 1976; and removing any graduate who according to the School of Criminal Justice had taken the Criminal Justice Practicum. The next step was to sequentially number the remaining names from 100 - 306. A table of random numbers was then employed

to obtain a sample of sixty (60) names with ten additional names selected as alternates, (alternates were chosen to insure that sixty valid addresses could be obtained) for a total of seventy (70) graduates. The results of the search for valid addresses netted sixty-two (62) out of seventy (70) selected. Thus, two (2) alternates were not sent surveys. The letter that accompanied the survey did not contain guilt money due to the expense. The final results of the follow-up survey were an acceptable twenty-four (40 percent) which was approximately the predicted outcome. This rate of return was very comparable to the initial survey of 1975 non-practicum students, which was twenty-one (42 percent).

#### Faculty Interviews

Faculty interviews were conducted during the first two weeks in June, 1975. All faculty members with the exception of one and the chairperson of the Master Degree research project were interviewed. The reason for not interviewing the chairperson was that he was instrumental in the development of the research instrument and, thus, his responses would have tainted the data. The interviews were conducted in the informal atmosphere of each faculty person's office with the exception of one interview. It was felt that those surroundings would create a more relaxed atmosphere and allowed the faculty persons to be at ease

during the questioning. The areas covered in the interviews (see Appendix H) were generally concerned with the operation of the practicum and attempted to identify:

- a. The goals and objectives the faculty held for the Criminal Justice Practicum.
- b. The extent to which faculty members considered the field study experience an important part of the Criminal Justice curriculum.
- c. Those changes faculty members would like to see made in the practicum program.
- d. The depth of knowledge they possessed about the practicum.

These data were then coded wherever possible and transcribed in a manner that consolidated the answers from each question in one summary document. These data are presented in Chapter IV.

#### Analysis of the Data

The data obtained from the surveys and interviews were statistically analyzed using mean and percentage comparisons. Where appropriate, the data were analyzed using Introstat 2.1: A Microcomputer Statistical Package for the Behavioral Sciences, the Apple ][ version, 1982. The statistacial analysis employed was the "T"-test. The data presented are of value to practicum coordinators of criminal justice practica and students that explore this area through research in the future. It is hoped that other researchers will refine and replicate this study in the near future.

Summary

The nature of this study was descriptive. It utilized library research, five survey instruments, and twenty interviews to gather the data. The source of data included the current and historical literature on the subject of experiential education, the Michigan State University School of Criminal Justice faculty, the students who participated in the Criminal Justice Practicum during Spring Term, 1975, and the graduates of the Criminal Justice program as of Summer Term, 1975.

## CHAPTER IV

### PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

#### Introduction

The purpose of this study was to investigate the value of the experiential education program of Michigan State University's School of Criminal Justice and to describe the effects of that program on graduates in terms of career stability, career opportunity, agency shock, and burnout. In this chapter, the investigator presents the results of the survey questionnaires and interviews that were used to collect the data from student/graduate sample and the Criminal Justice Faculty.

This chapter is divided into two sections. In the first section the results of the surveys and interviews that were conducted during Phase I (1975) of the study are presented. In the second section, the results and analysis of the survey conducted during Phase II (1981) of the study are presented.

#### Results of Phase I

In order to develop an understanding of the Criminal Justice Practicum, it was necessary to look to the stated goals and objectives of the program as articulated by the School of Criminal Justice. To accomplish that, a review of the pertinent literature available (in 1975) on the subject

of the Michigan State University School of Criminal Justice Practicum was undertaken. The result of that review was that there is little written on the subject of the goals and objectives for the program. The only comment that was discovered was a statement of the purpose of the practicum. This comment was located in the first section of the May, 1975 Practicum: Student Handbook, which states:

"The Purpose of the Practicum Program

The Criminal Justice Practicum is an integral part and extension of the academic offerings of the School of Criminal Justice. As such, its primary purpose is to broaden the educational experience of senior students and graduate students by giving them an opportunity to observe and work with practitioners in the field.

This opportunity is available to all students in the several curricula of the school and permits each student to work within the area of his own specialization. To achieve this purpose, students may select a placement from federal, state, county, municipal, and private agencies so they can become familiar with the administration and operational complexities within each organization.

Past experiences with the program indicated that almost without exception students benefit greatly from this opportunity to correlate their own experiences thereafter."

Armed with this statement of goals and objectives, it was determined that further research was necessary to develop a full understanding of the goals and objectives of the School of Criminal Justice Practicum. This research entailed ascertaining what the faculty considered to be the important outcomes of the practicum or field study program of the School of Criminal Justice.

### Faculty Expectations

The goals and objectives held by the faculty of the School of Criminal Justice for the Criminal Justice Practicum can be divided into two major subdivisions: those held for the School and those held for the students that participate in the program.

### Expectations for the School

The valuable outcomes of the Criminal Justice Practicum for the School of Criminal Justice as stated by the faculty during interviews conducted in 1975 were:

- 1) Improvement of relations between the school and participating agencies.
- 2) Improvement of the quality of the graduates of the School of Criminal Justice.
- 3) Placement of the graduates of the School in agency positions.
- 4) Improvement of classroom instruction.

These values, goals or important outcomes were the most often mentioned by the faculty during faculty interviews. Other results were mentioned, but they were only mentioned once each. It appears that the four desired goals mentioned above were generally agreed upon as the primary values of the program. A discussion of each of these values will reveal some of the rationale that was employed in arriving at these goals.

Eight members of the faculty (47 percent) stated that one of the most important results of the practicum was improved relations between the School of Criminal Justice and the agencies in the field. This value was the most often stated. The faculty members generally added a disclaimer to the statement by stating, "This result will only be positive if the students perform well. The program could have a negative effect on the relations between the School and the agencies if the students do not perform up to expected standards of the agencies." This goal or value is directly related to the value listed as Number 3 (Placement of graduates of the School in agency positions).

Seven members of the faculty (41 percent) mentioned the value of graduate placement through the practicum. This value, coupled with the one previously mentioned, reflects the fact that graduate placement and relations between the agencies are areas of great concern for the faculty. This philosophy is in keeping with the stated goals in the literature and, thus, would tend to demonstrate that the faculty are of the same philosophy as the coordinator of the program.

Seven members of the faculty (41 percent) indicated that the practicum enhanced the quality of the graduates of the School of Criminal Justice. This reaction generally came from the faculty members that had been with the Criminal Justice School the longest. This phenomena would appear to indicate that the older faculty members feel that



the reputation of the school rides on the fact that the school's graduates that do participate in the practicum are somehow receiving a better education in the field of criminal justice. This also suggests that that type of quality is demanded in jobs in the field.

Only five members of the faculty (29 percent) mentioned that the presence in the classroom of students who had participated in the practicum would enhance the quality of the class and that those students would better understand the course material presented. Some of the comments were: "Students in the classroom that have been in the field will keep the professor on his toes," "Students bring the real world back to the classroom," and, "The practicum helps to motivate the student to work harder in his/her course work." These comments would indicate that at least those faculty members quoted above would be in favor of requiring the student to have at least one term left after completion of the practicum. This is an interesting situation, especially when one considers that many students who choose to participate in the practicum wait until the last term of their senior year to take the course. This practice is not at this time prohibited as it is at other institutions.

Table 4.1 -- Faculty Expectations for the School  
of C.J. Practicum

OBJECTIVE OF C.J. PRACTICUM BY FACULTY OF C.J.*		
	N = 17	NUMBER PERCENT
1) Improvement of relations between the school and participating agencies.	8	47%
2) Improvement of the quality of the graduates of the School of Criminal Justice.	7	41%
3) Placement of the graduates of the School in agency positions.	7	41%
4) Improvement of classroom instruction.	5	29%

\* Based on data developed from faculty interviews.

#### Expectations for the Students

The valuable consequences, goals, or terminal objectives of the practicum held for the students as stated by the faculty were:

- 1) Provide the student with an opportunity to observe and/ or work in the real world of criminal justice and apply the prescriptive theory, learned in the classroom, to those situations.
- 2) Provide the student with an opportunity to observe the criminal justice system in operation, to meet and work with practitioners in that system, and enable them to decide if a career in the system is compatible with their personality and goals in life.
- 3) Expose the students to the dysfunction of the criminal justice system and thus enable them to understand the dysfunctional characteristics of the system.

A discussion of each of these most often mentioned values and goals, along with some of the singular goals mentioned, will give the reader a better understanding of the faculty held goals and objectives for the students.

Fourteen of the members of the faculty (82 percent) interviewed mentioned as a goal for the student to have the opportunity to see the real world and apply the prescriptive theory learned in the classroom to those situations. This value is probably the most obvious and was certainly the most often mentioned value of the program. The faculty members that did not mention this goal may very well have not done so because they considered it to be so obvious as to not require verbalizing. This goal is the primary objective of all experiential education programs. The root word of experiential is experience. Experience refers to experiencing something to which a body of knowledge is to be applied. Thus, it is expected that the primary, or at least most considered goal of an experiential education program in Criminal Justice, would be the experiencing of the real world of criminal justice and the testing of the theories learned to those particular situations.

The next most often verbalized goal or objective of the practicum was to provide the students with an opportunity to observe or work in the system so that they could come to some decision concerning of whether their personality and desired goals and objectives are compatible with the criminal justice system. Nine members of the

faculty (53 percent) mentioned this as a goal or value, especially for those students who had not worked in the criminal justice system. However, several faculty members mentioned that the program is valuable to practitioners (who are interested in a different area of the system) because they would possibly benefit from the knowledge with respect to a change in their career plans. This objective was the second most verbalized. It was expressed by five (29%) faculty members that due to the nature of the experiential education program, participating students would be able to determine whether or not their personality was suited for the area they intern in as a result of the program. This result was viewed as a positive result by those faculty members that expressed it.

#### The C. J. Practicum and the Curriculum

The position of status a course holds in a curriculum should influence how the faculty and the School support and promote it. During this study an attempt was made to:

1. Determine how well the faculty understood the Criminal Justice Practicum.
2. Measure the faculty rating of the Practicum in comparison with other courses in the Criminal Justice Curriculum.
3. Ascertain where the faculty felt the Practicum fit into the generalist approach curriculum for undergraduates.

TABLE 4.2-- FACULTY EXPECTATIONS FOR PRACTICUM STUDENTS

----- Faculty Held Objective For Practicum Students* -----			
	N = 17	Number	Percent
-----			
1. Provide the student with an opportunity to observe and/ or work in the real world of criminal justice and to apply the prescriptive theory, learned in the classroom, to those situations.		14	82%
2. Provide the student with an opportunity to observe the criminal justice system in operation, to meet and work with practitioners in that system, and enable them to decide if a career in the system is compatible with their personality and goals in life.		9	53%
3. Expose the students to the dysfunction of the criminal justice system and thus enable them to understand the dysfunctional characteristics of the system.		5	29%
-----			

\* Based on data developed from faculty interviews.

In order to understand how the faculty viewed the Practicum on the status ladder of the curriculum, it is necessary to investigate how completely the faculty understood the Practicum program. This was accomplished by asking each each faculty member to state what range of experiences were available to the Criminal Justice student at Michigan State University in the practicum program (i.e.,

the types of agencies and number of credits available). It should be noted that this was the first question asked to protect this item from information revealed during the remaining discussion of the Practicum. The faculty responses were measured in the following manner:

- a. A rating of "1" was assigned to those responses that contained an accurate description of both the type of agencies and the available number credits.
- b. A rating of ".5" was assigned to those responses that contained either the accurate number of credits or an accurate description of the agencies available.
- c. A rating of "0" was assigned to those responses that contained neither an accurate description of agencies nor the correct number of credits available.

The results of these questions as a review of Table 4.3 reveals were: nine (53 percent) of the faculty members scored a 1, had a full understanding of the practicum program; five (29 percent) of the faculty members scored a .5, had a partial understanding of the program; and three (18 percent) of the faculty members scored a 0, scored no understanding of the program. The average score of the faculty was .676. It should be mentioned that those persons who are most directly concerned with the counseling of the students did have a very thorough understanding of the program.

Table 4.3 -- Faculty Understanding of the  
Criminal Justice Practicum

Amount of Understanding of Practicum	Faculty N	Faculty Percentage
Full Understanding	9	53%
Partial Understanding	5	29%
No Understanding of the Program	3	18%
Total:	17 = N	100%

#### The Faculty's Rating of the Criminal Justice Practicum

The faculty, during the interviews, developed an analogy which compared the Practicum to other Criminal Justice courses based on region and depth of course material and the overall importance in the curriculum. This made coding of their responses to the question of: "Compared to other classes in the curriculum, how would you rate the Criminal Justice Practicum?" a very easy matter. The faculty related the Practicum to the core and elective courses for a comparison. The results of this question were as follows: four (23.5 percent) of the faculty rated the Practicum as equal to the core courses; four (23.5 percent) rated the Practicum as less equal to the core but superior to the elective courses; four (23.5 percent) of the faculty members rated the Practicum as equal to the elective

courses; two (12 percent) of the faculty members rated the Practicum as inferior to the Criminal Justice elective courses; and three (17.5 percent) faculty members stated that the practicum could not be compared to other courses. One of the three persons who indicated that the comparison could not be made stated that to attempt to compare the two was like trying to compare apples and oranges.

This diversity of rating would indicate that 47 percent of the faculty feel that the Practicum is more valuable to the student than elective courses, and 70.5 percent of the faculty consider the Practicum to be at least equal to any Criminal Justice elective course offered.

These data would seem to indicate that the faculty feel that the Practicum is an important course and probably should be maintained in the curriculum.

Student Rating of the Criminal Justice  
Practicum as a Course

Neither of the student questionnaires specifically addressed the question of how the students rated the Criminal Justice Practicum to other classes. However, eight (40 percent) of the students spontaneously stated in the area which asked, "How would you change the Criminal Justice Practicum program?," that they would require it of all Criminal Justice students. In addition to this information, a majority of the students related in their final papers that the Practicum experience was one of the most valuable courses they had taken in the School of Criminal Justice.



Some of the students went so far as to say that much of their course work was a waste of time when compared to the field experience.

These data are indicative of the general student opinion concerning the Criminal Justice Practicum. The data would indicate that students who participate in the Practicum rate it high on the curriculum status ladder because it contributed to their better understanding of the applied theory in a real world setting.

#### Student Expectation

Students come to the Criminal Justice Practicum with many diverse goals and expectations for their experiential field study. These goals and objectives range from the student who desired to receive 12 credits and nothing more, to the student who wanted to obtain as much knowledge as possible about the agency or agencies where he/she was placed. The method used to identify the goals and objectives of the student was to ask them on an open-ended question on the pre-practicum questionnaire. Nineteen (19) basic goals and objectives were identified (see Table 4.4). The most frequently mentioned was the development of an understanding of real world criminal justice systems and situations. The least often mentioned goal was the development of an understanding for the immediate issues in the criminal justice system, the credit enrolled for, and the development of report-writing techniques. None of the stated goals were voiced by the majority of the responding

students. The most frequently stated goal was only voiced by eight (38 percent) of the students. This diversity of response may be a result of the students not actually questioning their personal expectations at the beginning of their practicum. They may have thought of their placements, but not verbalized them before. This could have very possibly resulted in an incomplete response to the questionnaire. Whatever the reason was for this diversity in goals, the students did cover most of the main goals that could be desired from an experiential education program in criminal justice.

An analysis of the most frequently mentioned goals may be of value in an attempt to comprehend the students' thought processes while answering the questionnaire. Table 4.4 reveals that the first statement that dealt with an understanding of the real world situation in the criminal justice system was the most commonly held goal for participating students in the experiential education program. This was also the most commonly held value by the faculty for the students. It would appear that the faculty and students' expectations for the practicum are mutually strong for this particular goal.

The second most common goal, on the part of the students, was to develop an understanding of the effectiveness of agency functions. This is compatible with

Table 4.4 -- Student Expectations

* GOALS AND OBJECTIVES STATED BY THE PRACTICUM STUDENTS	** FREQUENCY OF STATEMENTS	
	(N=21)	Percentage
1. DEVELOP AN UNDERSTANDING OF WHAT THE REAL WORLD SITUATION IS IN THE C.J. SYSTEM.	8	38
2. DEVELOP AN UNDERSTANDING FOR THE EFFECTIVENESS OF AGENCY FUNCTIONS.	7	33
3. LEARN SKILLS ASSOCIATED WITH THE HANDLING OF AGENCY CLIENTS.	6	29
4. DEVELOP AN UNDERSTANDING OF AGENCY FUNCTIONS.	6	29
5. HELP STUDENT TO REACH A DECISION FOR POSSIBILITY OF WORKING IN THAT AREA OF C.J.	5	24
6. COMPARE OBSERVATIONS WITH CLASSROOM STUDIES.	5	24
7. EXPERIENCE DOING AGENCY DUTIES ON THEIR OWN.	4	19
8. DEVELOP INTERVIEWING TECHNIQUES.	4	19
9. DEVELOP AN UNDERSTANDING FOR OVERALL RELATIONSHIPS OF VARIED AGENCIES (C.J. SYSTEM)	4	19
10. LEARN TO EFFECTIVELY COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE WORKING IN THE C.J. SYSTEM.	4	19
11. LEARN THE DUTIES OF CERTAIN AGENCY PERSONNEL.	3	14
12. DEVELOP INVESTIGATIVE TECHNIQUES BOTH FORMAL AND INFORMAL.	3	14
13. LEARN HOW CLIENTS ACTUALLY FLOW THROUGH THE SYSTEM.	2	10
14. DEVELOP AN UNDERSTANDING FOR THE ATTITUDES/PHILOSOPHIES OF PERSONNEL IN C.J. SYSTEM.	2	10
15. BECOME AWARE OF THE ALTERNATIVES AVAILABLE IN HANDLING CLIENT PROBLEMS.	2	10
16. DEVELOP COUNSELING TECHNIQUES.	2	10
17. DEVELOP AN UNDERSTANDING FOR THE IMMEDIATE ISSUES IN THE C.J. SYSTEM	1	5
18. THE CREDITS ENROLLED FOR.	1	5
19. DEVELOP REPORT-WRITING SKILLS.	1	5

\* These goals and objectives were obtained through an open-ended questionnaire at the pre-placement meeting.

\*\* The frequency of the statements was obtained through the evaluation of the answers on an open-ended questionnaire. Some of the statements were by virtue of their vagueness interpreted by the researcher.

the first goal mentioned. Students who are interested in understanding the real world situation of the system would be interested in finding out about real world functions of the criminal justice agencies. This goal would be considered by some to be identical with the first. On the contrary, this goal narrows the scope to the student's search to understanding of the system. This narrowing may very well be reflective of the diverse types of placements available to them. That is, the student who does the multi-agency placement generally has broader goals than the student who has an internship with one agency. This may be the explanation for the differences in goals that occurred.

Another goal mentioned by five of the students (24 percent), was to help the student to reach a decision concerning the possibility of working in that particular area of criminal justice. This objective was also frequently mentioned during interviews with the faculty as an outcome for the students. This would seem to indicate that the students and faculty do in fact have mutually held expectations for the practicum. This would also imply that the students are meeting some of the expectations of the faculty concerning experiential education.

Table 4.5 represents a list of possible objectives that the School of Criminal Justice might have for offering the Practicum. As the table demonstrates, the Practicum students and Non-Practicum students both felt that the primary reason for the School of Criminal Justice offering

the Practicum was Professional Preparation and Knowledge of Self-Abilities, Values, etc. This response would indicate that the students see the School as being concerned with the students obtaining pre-occupational experience and developing an understanding of his/her abilities and values in that real world setting. These goals are congruent with the expectations of the faculty: that the students explore career possibilities. It also touches on the area of an opportunity to observe and work in the real world with the opportunity to apply prescriptive theory to those real world situations.

Table 4.5--Graduates' Perceptions of The School's Objectives

-----  
 WHAT ARE THE SCHOOL OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE'S OBJECTIVES IN  
 OFFERING A PRACTICUM AS YOU SEE THEM?  
 (1 = VERY IMPORTANT AND 5 = VERY UNIMPORTANT)  
 -----

OBJECTIVES	N = 20	
	PRACT.MEAN	NON-PRACT. MEAN
1. Professional Preparation.	1.85	1.80
2. Knowledge of Self-Abilities, Values etc.	1.83	2.13
3. Self-Reliance and Self-Direction.	2.15	2.40
4. Application of Theory to Practical Situations.	2.15	2.25
5. Professional Service.	2.30	2.13
6. Development of Awareness of Social Issues.	2.40	3.06
7. Understanding and Acceptance of Others.	2.45	3.06

The item in Table 4.5 that refers to the application of theory to practical situations is directly related to the faculty expectation of observing or working in the real world and applying the prescriptive theory to those situations. As a review of Table 4.5 indicates, the practicum students felt that the School's objectives in offering the student the opportunity to apply theory to practical situations was important (a mean score of 2.15). Fifty percent (10 students) rated it as very important and another twenty percent (4 students) rated it as important. This would support the faculty expectations for the students to see the real world and apply academic theory to actual real life situations.

#### Student Achievement of Goals

At the completion of the Practicum, the students were asked to evaluate their achievements of their stated goals on a scale from one to five, where one was equal to totally accomplished the goal and five equal to no accomplishment of the goals. Table 4.6 illustrates the results of that question. It is interesting to note that the mean response was 1.84 and that only three means fell into the neutral zone (2.50+ to 3.50-). This would indicate that the students generally accomplished the goals they set for themselves

This table seems to indicate that the students accomplished the most in the area of career exploration. It is interesting to note that the most mentioned goal of the students on Table 4.6, that of development of an understanding of what the real world situation is in the criminal justice system, ranked third in the student's accomplishments. Another interesting shift took place in the goal to develop an understanding of the relationship of the different agencies in the criminal justice system. This goal ranked in the 7, 8, and 9 bracket on the list of mentioned goals; but in the table of accomplishments it ranked 18th. This demonstrates that this goal was not as well achieved by the students as they would have liked.

The students also rated their accomplishment of goals they had previously rated as objectives for the School of Criminal Justice in offering the Criminal Justice Practicum.

The results depicted in Table 4.7 reflect that rating. It is of interest to note that the least important (in the students' opinion) objective of the School was the most achieved. It is also interesting to note that the second most important (in the students' opinion) objective of the school dropped to fifth position for accomplishment. The over- all accomplishment of the objectives appears to be met according to the data in Table 4.7.

Table 4.6 -- Goals and Objectives Accomplished by the  
Practicum Graduates

Rate your accomplishment of the goals listed, where 1 = total accomplishment and 5 = no accomplishment.				
* GOALS AND OBJECTIVES ACCOMPLISHED BY THE PRACTICUM STUDENTS	** FREQUENCY OF STATEMENTS		ACCOMPLISHMENT	
	(N=21)	Percentage	Mean Score	
	RANK	RANK	(Scale 1-5)	
1. DEVELOP AN UNDERSTANDING OF WHAT THE REAL WORLD SITUATION IS IN THE C.J. SYSTEM...	8	38	3	1.70
2. DEVELOP AN UNDERSTANDING FOR THE EFFECTIVENESS OF AGENCY FUNCTIONS.....	7	33	8	1.94
3. LEARN SKILLS ASSOCIATED WITH THE HANDLING OF AGENCY CLIENTS.....	6	29	8	1.95
4. DEVELOP AN UNDERSTANDING OF AGENCY FUNCTIONS.....	6	29	4	1.75
5. HELP STUDENT TO REACH A DECISION FOR POSSIBILITY OF WORKING IN THAT AREA OF C.J. .	5	24	1	1.45
6. COMPARE OBSERVATIONS WITH CLASSROOM STUDIES.....	5	24	13	2.00
7. EXPERIENCE DOING AGENCY DUTIES ON THEIR OWN.....	4	19	6	1.80
8. DEVELOP INTERVIEWING TECHNIQUES.....	4	19	14	2.25
9. DEVELOP AN UNDERSTANDING FOR OVERALL RELATIONSHIPS OF VARIED AGENCIES (C.J. SYSTEM)	4	19	18	2.75
10 LEARN TO EFFECTIVELY COMMUNICATE WITH PEOPLE WORKING IN THE C.J. SYSTEM.....	4	19	8	1.95
11 LEARN THE DUTIES OF CERTAIN AGENCY PERSONNEL.....	3	14	2	1.55
12 DEVELOP INVESTIGATIVE TECHNIQUES BOTH FORMAL AND INFORMAL.....	3	14	14	2.25
13 LEARN HOW CLIENTS ACTUALLY FLOW THROUGH THE SYSTEM.....	2	10	4	1.75
14 DEVELOP AN UNDERSTANDING FOR THE ATTITUDES/PHILOSOPHIES OF PERSONNEL IN C.J.SYSTEM	2	10	8	1.95
15 BECOME AWARE OF THE ALTERNATIVES AVAILABLE IN HANDLING CLIENT PROBLEMS.....	2	10	8	1.95
16 DEVELOP COUNSELING TECHNIQUES.....	2	10	17	2.55
17 DEVELOP AN UNDERSTANDING FOR THE IMMEDIATE ISSUES IN THE C.J. SYSTEM .....	1	5	16	2.50
18 THE CREDITS ENROLLED FOR.....	1	5	7	1.90
19 DEVELOP REPORT WRITING-SKILLS.....	1	5	19	2.80

\* These goals and objectives were obtained through an open-ended questionnaire at the pre-placement meeting.

\*\* The responses shown here are the result of listing the goals and objectives on an end of practicum questionnaire.

Mean scores based on: (1 = objective totally accomplished and 5 = not accomplished).



Table 4.7 -- Rating of Objectives Compared

HOW WELL DO YOU FEEL THAT THE PRACTICUM HAS MET THE OBJECTIVES LISTED BELOW? (1 = Totally met & 5 = Totally not met.)

WHAT ARE THE SCHOOL OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE'S OBJECTIVES IN OFFERING THE PRACTICUM (1 = VERY IMPORTANT & 5 = VERY UNIMPORTANT)

Obj.	Pract. Met	Obj.	Importance of		
Practicum Students	N=20	MEAN	RANK	MEAN	RANK
-----					
1. Understanding and Acceptance of Others.		1.95	1	2.45	7
2. Knowledge of Self-Abilities, Values etc.		2.10	2	1.83	1
3. Self-Reliance and Self-Direction.		2.15	3	2.15	3
4. Application of Theory to Practical Situations.		2.30	4	2.15	4
5. Professional Preparation.		2.32	5	1.85	2
6. Professional Service.		2.60	6	2.30	5
7. Development of Awareness of Social Issues.		2.75	7	2.40	6

The students generally ranked the objectives in the same order of achievement as they did in importance which would mean that they felt that the program was successful in its attempt to achieve their goals.

### Supporting or Inhibiting Factors for Student Participation

Many factors can have an effect on the participation of students in the Criminal Justice Practicum. These factors can be categorized into the following areas:

- 1) School influences
- 2) Agency influences
- 3) Extraneous influences

School influences can come from such sources as faculty, literature, and program design. Agency influences can come from such areas as treatment of student interns, participation or non-participation in the experiential education program, and agency reputation. Extraneous influences can come from the student's financial, transportation, time, and credit hour situations. Any one or all of these can be the critically influencing factor in the student's decision to participate or not to participate in the Criminal Justice Practicum.

#### Influential School Factors

The School of Criminal Justice has a very substantial effect on whether or not a student participates in the practicum. The faculty exert a great deal of influence on the students in their possible participation in the program.

In order for the faculty to positively influence the student to participate, they (the faculty) must have a thorough understanding of the program. This understanding must include a knowledge of the types of placements

available and the number of credit hours available through the Practicum program. The faculty as a whole, as mentioned in an earlier section of this chapter, apparently do not fully understand the program. This lack of knowledge must play a part in the faculty's role in promoting the program to the students.

During the faculty interviews, each faculty person was asked if he or she actively promoted the Criminal Justice Practicum to the students with whom they came in contact. The results of this question were as follows: ten (59 percent) of the faculty members said that they promoted participation in the Practicum to their students. However, most of the faculty that positively responded to this question were quick to qualify their statements. These disclaiming qualifications are interesting to note. One faculty person stated, "Yes, I promote the program, but it's a joke with only 23 elective credits available to the students." Another member stated, "Yes, but only on a limited basis, because the subject only comes up occasionally." Another member stated, "I promote the program some, to students in my area. However, I generally promote the volunteer program through the M.S.U. Volunteer Bureau." Still another member stated, "Yes, but I warn the students of the limitations of the program, such as limited placements, and the requirements of transportation in some placements, etc." These responses would indicate that even the faculty members who promote the program feel a need to

add disclaimers when they publicize the program. This would show that they are not totally comfortable with the program as it is presently designed.

Of the seven (41 percent) that stated they did not promote the program, most felt a need to explain why they did not do so. These reasons ranged from no contact with undergraduate students to it does not come up in conversation with the students that they come in contact with. These various responses would indicate that the faculty would probably be more inclined to promote the program if they had more contact with the students, if they better understood the program, and/or if some modification of the program could be accomplished. This is apparent to this researcher due to the poor understanding of the program depicted in Table 4.3 displayed earlier in this chapter, and the statements of, "it's a joke..." and, "I warn the students of the limitations."

University and School produced literature also has an influential effect on the student's decision to participate in the Criminal Justice Practicum. This influence may be only to inform the student that the program exists. Literature was the source of revelation about the program for five (24 percent) of the non-practicum students and five (24 percent) of those students that did participate in the practicum. This data would indicate that the literature does have an impact on some twenty-four percent of the students in learning about the practicum program.

This is indicative of the fact that literature should accurately describe the program and the program requirements and prerequisites. The catalog description found in the 1975 edition states that students who enrolled should satisfy the following prerequisites: CJ 318, 335, 365, 375, 392 (Michigan State University, 1975). These prerequisites do not appear in any other literature, including the Practicum: Student Handbook (See Appendix C), which spells out clearly the requirements for enrolling in the course. This would indicate that the present catalog could discourage many students from pursuing a practicum placement even though they may be qualified for participation. This example would seem to indicate that the literature should express the true requirements of the program. It should also be accurate in its description of the program for the same reasons. This researcher is well aware that many of the factors, such as scheduling, might inhibit participation of the students in an experiential education program. It is with this understanding in mind that the following comments are made. The design of the program can also have an influential effect on the student's decision to participate in a field experience. This influence is exerted through difficulties in applying for the program and restrictions and demands placed on the participating students.

The survey of students who did not participate in the practicum revealed that students do not participate for many and diverse reasons. The reasons stated ranged from no

knowledge to no placements in the student's area of interest. The first stated reason may or may not be a fault in the design of the program. However, the latter statement, if accurate, would demonstrate a flaw in the design of the program. Upon reviewing the questionnaires, it would appear that those students who expressed the feeling that no placements were available in their area of interest are in three areas: Courts, Security Administration, and Pre-Law. These students expressed the feeling that they had at least done some exploration of the program. Nevertheless, this researcher has knowledge of placements in the program in each of these areas of interest. This would indicate that these students were misled by either a faculty person, the literature, or peers. Another reason stated for not participating was that the program is too police-oriented in nature. This statement was made by two (10 percent) of the non-practicum students and reveals that they were either misled by some faculty person, school literature, or that they did not explore the program sufficiently. The only other comment to be made on the program's design in this section is that the students who did not participate in the program rated the statement "Red Tape" (Arrangements, etc.) as the most important reason for not doing a practicum (See Table 4.8).

A review of this table reveals that the mean score for "Red Tape" was 2.64, which would indicate that this was a critical factor in some students' decisions. However, this

item is the most important factor of those listed, and this probably means that students who do not participate in the Practicum consider the red tape involved in getting into the program as part of the causes who they do not participate. In actuality, the "red tape" consisted of an application form and a deadline of approximately three weeks before the end of the prior term.

Agencies can be a factor in the student's decision to do a a practicum. Influencing agency factors include the following: treatment of the student interns, agency participation or non-participation, and agency reputation in the criminal justice community. Two of these factors can be partially controlled by the School and Practicum Program and the other cannot. This section will only address those factors most likely to be influenced by the program. Those factors that can be controlled by the Practicum program are treatment of the students and agency participation. These two factors probably have more influence on the student than the agency reputation, thus are the critical ones. The agency influence is exerted on the students through the students' peers as opposed to any direct influence. Peers are the source of information about the Practicum program for the students that participate in the program 47 percent of the time and 28 percent of the time for students who do not participate. This would indicate that peer communication is a very important source of information for the students. Thus, with peer communication being the main

source of information about agency factors, the agency factors can play an important part in the students' decisions.

Table 4.8-- Influential Factors in Choosint not to do a Practicum

Factor	Percent Rating* (N = 17)						Mean
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(NR)@	
1. Red Tape (arrange- ments)	24	29	24	6	35	0	2.64
2. Time (job conflict)	29	24	6	18	24	0	2.82
3. Time (course con- flict)	24	12	4	6	18	0	3.05
4. Credit hours (too few)	0	12	48	6	24	10	3.05
5. Limited experiences	18	12	18	12	35	0	3.41
6. Distance	12	12	18	12	29	12	3.41
7. Cost	6	18	29	12	35	0	3.52
8. Expectations of Faculty	0	0	29	29	29	12	3.53

@ NR = No Response

\* Items were rated on a scale of 1=Very important & 5=Very Unimportant. All scores are percentages.

The responses received from the question, "If you were the head of the agency you were placed at, how would you treat student placements differently?" clearly demonstrate that the majority of the students were treated well by the agencies.

Only five (25%) students felt that major changes in the treatment of students were necessary. These suggestions include; "more intensive instruction of interns", "more supervision, student involvement, and responsibility", "more direction in the beginning", "take more time to explain what has happened", and "agency personnel should should be less



uptight and defensive." These are categorized as major changes by this researcher only because they were the most serious criticisms made by the students. In actuality, these changes are not major, but only minor.

Table 4.9-- Agency Treatment of Students

Comments on Treatment	* Number of Agencies
Treated Very Well--No Change	13
Minor Changes Needed	2
Major Changes Needed	5

\* Based on student responses on the post-practicum questionnaire in 1975, the number of agencies that were rated (it was possible for one student to rate several agencies).

The other controllable agency factor is that of participation of agencies. This factor bears on the students' decisions only to the point that the greater the variety of agencies to choose from, the more likely it is that the students will find an agency that suits their needs. This factor is really a joint area of responsibility of the school and the agencies. The Practicum Coordinator must actively recruit agencies through personal visits and liaison work between the school and the agencies. The agencies must also have a feeling of commitment and responsibility toward the school and the students or they

will not participate. The area of agency recruitment is an area of difficulty in the program and will be addressed in greater detail in the following chapter of this study.

#### Influential Extraneous Factors

Many factors not directly associated with the school and the agencies enter into the students' decisions to participate in the Criminal Justice Practicum. These factors include; cost of participation, distance of placements, time conflicts, and when the student found out about the program. This list is not inclusive, due the individual nature of any decision made by the student to participate. However, this list is representative of the major factors that play a role in most students' decisions to participate.

The investigation of this area was accomplished by requesting that both Practicum and Non-practicum students rate importance of these factors and several others. Table 4.10 illustrates the importance of cost, distance, and time factors in the students' decisions.

This data would indicate that these factors were not the most critical factors. It does illustrate that the Practicum students view the importance of these factors in a somewhat different light than the non-practicum students.

Table 4.10 -- Influential Factors in the Decision to  
do a Practicum

(1 = Very Important -- 5 = Very unimportant)

Mean		Factor
Practicum Students	Non-practicum Students	
2.95	3.52	Cost
3.45	3.41	Distance
3.45	3.82	Time (conflict with part-time job)
3.85	3.05	Time (conflict with other courses)

Table 4.11 -- How Students Found out about the C.J.  
Practicum

(1 = Very Important -- 5 = Very unimportant)

PRACTICUM STUDENTS	NON-PRACTICUM STUDENTS	SOURCE OF INFORMATION
N=22	N=21	
47%	28%	Peers
29%	19%	Faculty
24%	24%	Literature
0%	24%	Did not find out
0%	5%	Chance

Table 4.12 -- When Students found out About the C.J.  
Practicum  
(1 = Very Important -- 5 = Very unimportant)

PRACTICUM STUDENTS	NON-PRACTICUM STUDENTS	STUDENT STATUS WHEN INFORMED
N=22	N=21	
66%	38%	Junior
19%	24%	Freshman or Sophomore
10%	9%	Senior
5%	5%	Prior to enrolling at MSU
0%	24%	Never did find out

This difference may be reflective of a more thorough exploration of the program by the practicum students than by the Non-practicum students. Nothing else can be concluded from the data due the neutral nature of the mean scores.

Table 4.12 illustrates when and how the students first became aware of the Criminal Justice Practicum. This data would indicate that most students found out about the program in their junior year from their fellow students. It is also interesting to note that 24 percent of the Non-Practicum students never did find out about the program prior to the point of receiving the survey. This data would indicate that approximately one out of four Criminal Justice Seniors was not aware of the opportunity to participate in a field experience in Criminal Justice at Michigan State University. In comparison to this data, when the Criminal Justice Faculty was asked if they thought undergraduates were aware of the opportunity, their response indicated that a large portion of the faculty appeared to operate under a

misconception about how well informed undergraduates really are about the Criminal Justice Practicum. Twelve faculty members (70 percent) stated they felt that undergraduates were well informed about the Practicum, three faculty members (28 percent) stated they felt that undergraduates were not informed about the Practicum, and two faculty members (12 percent) stated they were not certain if the undergraduates were aware or not. Of the faculty members who stated that undergraduates were aware of the Practicum, seven (58 percent) expressed the belief that those became aware of the Practicum in their junior year. This would indicate that those faculty members are in tune with this aspect of the program.

The point in the student's academic career when they became aware of the opportunity to participate in an experiential education program is somewhat influential in the decision to participate in the program. This is illustrated in Table 4.13.

Table 4.13 -- Factors for Non-Practicum Students

If you had learned about the C.J. practicum sooner, would you have participated in the program?  
(Non-Practicum Students)

Response	Number of Students	Percent
Yes	7	38%
Not Sure	6	33%
No	5	28%

From the data contained in Table 4.13, it would appear that seven (38 percent) of those students who did not participate would have if they had received information sooner about the program. Another six (33 percent) were not sure, which indicates that some of them may have also participated if they had learned of the program sooner. This would suggest that the time of first information concerning the program does in fact play a critical role in the student's decision to participate in the Criminal Justice Practicum.

#### Summary of Phase I

The results of Phase I (1975) seem to indicate that students hold several goals and objectives to be basic to their field experiences. Those goals and objectives include an understanding of the real world situation in the criminal justice system, learning skills necessary to deal with agency clients, and reaching a decision concerning their careers in the criminal justice system. Those goals and objectives were very similar to those held by the Criminal Justice Faculty for the students. Specifically, the faculty goals and objectives for the students were; 1) to provide the student with an opportunity to observe and work in the real world of criminal justice and apply the theory from the classroom to those situations; 2) to provide the student with an opportunity to observe, meet, and work with criminal justice practitioners and for students to come to a decision about a career in the criminal justice system; and 3) to

help the student develop an understanding of the dysfunction of the criminal justice system.

Phase I, found that there are several factors that influence the Practicum. Those factors include the faculty, students, curriculum, and the participating agencies. Each of these factors exerts some influence on the effectiveness of the operation of the Practicu.

### Results of Phase II

In this section of the study, the research hypotheses will be presented followed by the experimental (null) hypotheses. Specifically, the 1981-1982 study investigated the following questions:

#### Agency Shock

- 1) The experimental subjects will perceive that they encountered less agency shock upon entering into a criminal justice agency than the control subjects perceived they encountered upon their entry into a criminal justice agency.
- 1a) There will be no significant difference between the control and experimental groups on the perception of the amount of agency shock experienced upon entering a criminal justice agency.

This hypothesis was proposed to determine if one of the assumed values of experiential learning is that students who have worked in an agency will be better prepared to deal with the environment of the real world of work. This hypothesis was tested through two survey items (given a definition of agency shock):

Agency Shock is any and all of the adverse effects of a person's entry into an agency environment which is markedly different from that to which the individual is accustomed, i.e., agency procedures, operational systems, personnel, and cultural environment.

- 1) How much agency shock did you encounter upon beginning your first position in the Criminal Justice System?
  - a. None
  - b. Less than average
  - c. More than average
  - d. A great amount

#### Perceived shock

The data indicate that the null hypothesis can not be rejected. The data in Table 4.14 shows that the mean scores show only a .07 difference between practicum and non-practicum students.

Table 4.14 --T-ratios of Perceived Agency Shock

(On a scale where 1=None & 2=Great Amount)

Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-Value *
Non-practicum	19	2.53	1.17	.202
Practicum	22	2.46	1.10	
Internship	13	2.46	1.05	
Multi-Agency	9	2.44	1.24	

\*Degrees of Freedom for pooled variance = 39



Graduates were also compared concerning whether they felt their college study prepared them for agency shock.

They were asked:

- 2) Whether or not you encountered agency shock upon your entrance into your first position in the Criminal Justice System, do you think your college preparation equipped you to meet such shock?

The data obtained from this item, as demonstrated by the information in Table 4.15, indicate only a slight difference (.45) between practicum and non-practicum graduates in their perception of how college study prepared them for agency shock.

The data did not indicate that participation in a Criminal Justice Practicum had an effect of any significance on the amount of agency shock graduates perceived that they encountered upon their entry into the Criminal Justice work force. It is possible that the definition used to describe agency shock may have been deficient, or the self-reported nature of the data may have caused an under- estimation of the college preparation of practicum graduates and an over estimation of those graduates of the amount of agency shock they really encountered. The opposite (in both cases) may also be true for the non-practicum graduates.

Table 4.15 -- T-ratios of Perceived Preparation for Shock

(On a scale where 1 = none and 5 = a great deal)

Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-Value *
Non-practicum	22	3.32	1.17	1.12
Practicum	23	2.87	1.49	
Internship	13	2.69	1.38	
Multi-Agency	10	3.10	1.66	

\*Degrees of Freedom for pooled variance = 43

Burn-Out

- 2) The experimental subjects will experience less burn-out than control subjects experienced in their criminal justice career.
- 2a) There will no significant difference between control and experimental subjects concerning the amount of burn-out that they experience in their criminal justice careers.

This hypothesis was proposed because experimental learning is many times acclaimed as career exploration that will allow the learner to make better informed decisions concerning career opportunities. In order to measure burn-out in criminal justice graduates, several questions were used to develop the data: 1) Whether or not the graduate was still employed in the criminal justice system at the point of the gathering of the data for Phase II of this study; 2) The number of months the graduates held their first position in the criminal justice system; 3) A calculation of the number of months worked in the criminal justice system during the period of the study; and 4) An evaluation of the

following possible reasons for terminating their employment in the criminal justice system: money, job satisfaction, frustration and non-monetary rewards, administrative problems, or other reasons.

#### Still Working in the System

The true test of burn-out in any career field may be the answer to the question, "Are you still working in that field?" The data in Table 4.16 demonstrates no evidence of a difference between practicum and non-practicum graduates. As the table graphically displays, non-practicum graduates reported that 54 percent (13 graduates) were still working in the system and 46 percent (11 graduates) were no longer or never had been working in the system. Practicum graduates reported exactly 50 percent (12 graduates) were still employed in the criminal justice system and 50 percent (12 graduates) were no longer or never were employed in the criminal justice system.

Table 4.16 -- Still Working in the Criminal Justice System

Group	Still working		Not Working	
	N	Percentage	N	Percentage
Non-practicum	13	54	11	46
Practicum	12	50	12	50

If the above data are adjusted so as to remove those graduates who never found employment in the criminal justice system (one graduate in the experimental group and five graduates in the control group), a considerable difference is noted. The data Table 4.17 demonstrates that 68 percent of the non-practicum graduates were still employed in the system compared to 52 percent of the practicum graduates still employed in the criminal justice system. These results would indicate that the null hypothesis is supported. The difference between the two groups might be explained by the fact that practicum graduates, through the process of their experiential education, were exposed to and learned the techniques for securing a position in the criminal justice system. They learned the proper responses to be given during interviews. They learned to display those qualities that agency employers are looking for in a candidate for a position in criminal justice agencies. Many agency personnel are more than willing to discuss what agency interviewers and application screening committees look for in a candidate. They may have displayed a position that masked their true personalities and temperaments in order to obtain the positions. It probably was not until later that those personalities and temperaments surfaced and ultimately caused them to leave the system. The

non-practicum graduates may never have had the opportunity to learn those techniques necessary to cover their true personality and attitudes and, thus, they never obtained employment in the criminal justice system in the first place.

Table 4.17 -- Still Working in the Criminal Justice System of Those Graduates that Found Work

Group	Still Working Percentage	Not Working Percentage
Non-practicum	68%	32%
Practicum	52%	48%

#### Number of Months in First Position

Another measure of burn-out employed in this study is the number of months the graduates held their first position in the criminal justice system. This question was selected to measure how quickly graduates burned-out on their first position in the criminal justice system.

The data in Table 4.18 demonstrates that practicum graduates stayed an average of thirty-two and forty-six one hundredths (32.46) months on their first position in the criminal justice system. The non-practicum graduates stayed an average of twenty and fifty-four one hundredths (20.54) months in their first position. This difference was not significant at the .05 level. If the practicum sample is

divided into internship and multi-agency graduates, a difference in the average number of months on the first criminal justice job is observed between the two groups. The internship graduates held their first position in the system an average of thirty-one and fourteen one hundredths (31.14) months compared to the multi-agency graduates who stayed an average of thirty-four and three tenths (34.3) months. This may be indicative of the fact that the more exposure a student has to different potential employing agencies, the longer they tend to stay in their first position. This difference was not statistically significant at the .05 level.

Table 4.18 -- T-Ratios of Number of Months on 1st Job

Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-Value
Non-practicum	24	20.54	23.82	-1.625 *
Practicum	24	32.46	26.89	
Internship	14	31.14	28.15	.28 #
Multi-agency	10	34.30	26.40	

\*Degrees of Freedom for pooled variance = 46 with a criterion score of 1.684 at the .05 level of significance

#Degrees of Freedom for pooled variance = 23 with a criterion score of 1.711 at the .05 level of significance

Number of Months Worked in the System

The number of months worked in the criminal justice system by each group was also studied. A comparison was made of the two groups in an attempt to determine if the difference demonstrated in the number of months on the first job remained constant during the entire period of the study.

As the data in Table 4.18 demonstrates, the difference between the mean number of months on the first criminal justice job between the practicum and non-practicum graduates was eleven and ninety-two one hundredths (11.92) months. The data in and Tables 4.19 and 4.20 demonstrates that practicum graduates worked an average of forty-six and four one hundredths (46.04) months and non-practicum graduates worked an average of thirty-five and seventy-nine one hundredths (35.79) months in the system. The mean difference between the average of the two groups for the total number of months worked was ten and twenty-five one hundredths (10.25). The mean difference for the number of months on the first job and the mean difference for the total number of months worked was one and sixty-seven one hundredths (1.67) months.

Table 4.19 -- T-Ratios of Number of Months in C.J. System

Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-Values*
Non-practicum	24	35.79	30.20	-1.23
Practicum	24	46.04	27.53	

\*Degrees of Freedom for pooled variance = 46  
with a criterion score of 1.684 at the .05 level of  
significance

#### Reasons Graduates Left the System

A comparison of graduates who left the criminal justice system was made in an attempt to determine if there was a difference between the two groups concerning typical burn-out symptoms, that is, lack of money, frustration with the criminal justice system, administrative problems, job satisfaction and non-monetary rewards, or other reasons. This comparison was accomplished by requesting that graduates who left the system rated each of the above symptoms of burn-out on a scale from one to five where one equals very important and five equals very unimportant.

A review of the data in Table 4.20 demonstrates that "other reasons" [with a mean score for the practicum graduates of one (1.00) and one and thirty-three one hundredths (1.33) for the non-practicum graduates] was considered the most important reason for leaving. An explanation of why this was the highest rated reason is that



those graduates that rated this reason with one exception rated it very important. The other graduates failed to rate the item on the questionnaire at all. Thus, only those non-practicum graduates who considered it very important or important rated the reason "other" at all. Some of the specific "other" reasons specified included; 1) "There were no jobs that I was interested in," 2) "I found other interests," 3) "I changed my career goals," 4) "Jobs I wanted were not available," and 5) "I became a full-time mother." The next most important rated reason was job satisfaction and non-monetary reward with a mean score of one and eight tenths (1.80) for practicum graduates and two (2.00) for non-practicum graduates. The data fails to indicate that there is a real difference between practicum and non-practicum graduates in their reason for leaving the system.

Table 4.20 -- Reasons for leaving the C.J. System

REASON	PRACTICUM	NON-PRACTICUM
Administration Problems	3.63	4.00
Frustration	3.00	2.50
Money	2.50	2.50
Satisfaction	1.80	2.00
Other Reasons	1.00	1.33

Time to First Criminal Justice Employment

- 3) There is a significant difference between the experimental subjects and the control subjects in the length of time taken to find Criminal Justice employment after graduation.
- 3a) There is no significant difference between the experimental subjects and the control subjects in the length of time taken to find Criminal Justice employment after graduation.

This hypothesis was investigated in an attempt to show that students learn the procedures and sources of employment in the system through their exposure to that system. The survey item used to test this hypothesis asked the graduate two questions:

- 1) What year and term did you graduate from Michigan State University with your B.S. or B.A. Degree?
- 2) What was the month and year you started your first full-time job in the Criminal Justice System?

Months to First Criminal Justice Job

The data demonstrates a wide range of the number of months that graduates spent looking for employment in the criminal justice system. The range was from zero to seventy-two months spent locating a position in the criminal justice system. Those students who started their first job either before graduation or during the same month as graduation were coded as zero months. At the other end of the spectrum, those graduates who never found a job in the criminal justice system were coded as seventy-two months.

When the practicum graduates were compared with the non-practicum graduates, a significant difference (at the .05 level) was noted in the mean number of months to the first job in the criminal justice system. As the data in Table 4.21 demonstrates, the practicum graduates found their first job in an average of nine and seventeen one hundredths (9.17) months and non-practicum graduates found their first job in the system in an average of twenty-one and twenty-nine one hundredths (21.29) months. When the data was further analyzed, it was discovered that when those graduates who never found a job in the system were removed from the sample practicum graduates found their first position in a mean time of four and nine tenths (4.9) months and non-practicum graduates in eleven eleven and thirty-seven one hundredths (11.37) months.

Table 4.21 -- T-Ratios of Number of Months to 1st Job

Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-Value
Non-practicum	24	21.29	27.54	* 1.89#
Practicum	24	9.17	15.21	
Non-practicum (With 0 months removed)	19	11.37	11.37	** 1.53
Practicum (With 0 months removed)	10	4.90	5.47	

\* Degrees of Freedom for pooled variance = 46 with a criterion score of 1.684 at the .05 level of significance

# Significant at the .05 level of significance

\*\*Degrees of Freedom for unpooled variance = 28 with a criterion score of 1.714 at the .05 level of significance

CAREER STABILITY

- 4) There are significant differences between the experimental subjects' and the control subjects' stability in their Criminal Justice careers.
- 4a) There are no significant differences between the experimental subjects' and the control subjects' stability in their Criminal Justice careers.

This hypothesis was investigated in an attempt to determine if a student's exposure to a criminal justice agency enabled him/her to select the correct agency for himself based on his personality and that exposure. The survey items used to measure and test this hypothesis queried the graduates concerning:

- 1) The number of positions the graduates have held in the criminal justice system. This data was obtained in an attempt to demonstrate how physically stable the graduates were in their criminal justice employment.
- 2) The length of the graduates first employment in the criminal justice system. This data was obtained in an attempt to measure the amount of preparation for a criminal justice career that the college experience provided. The data should provide a measure of the graduates' career stability.
- 3) The total number of months the graduates were employed in the criminal justice system during the period of this study. This data was collected to measure the permanence of the graduates' career commitment to criminal justice.

- 4) The determination of the graduates employment status in the criminal justice system at the point of the gathering of the data for this research. This data is the clearest test of the graduates' career stability in the criminal justice system. If the graduate is no longer in the criminal justice system, he cannot be stable in that system.

#### The number of jobs held

The data concerning the number of jobs the graduates held during the studied period failed to demonstrate that a significant difference (at the .05 level of significance) between the mean number of jobs the practicum graduates held (1.53) and the mean number of jobs the non-practicum graduates held (1.57) was obtained. However, the range for the non-practicum graduates was from zero to five jobs. It is also of interest to note that twenty-one percent (5 graduates) of the non-practicum graduates never found a position in criminal justice compared to four percent (1 graduate) of the practicum graduates. It is also interesting to note that four percent (1 graduate) of the non-practicum graduates held four positions, and four percent (1 graduate) held five positions compared to zero percent of the practicum graduates for both categories. This broader range of number of positions might suggest that non-practicum students demonstrate somewhat less stability in the criminal justice system than practicum graduates, but further study is needed to fully support this position.

Table 4.22 -- T-Ratios of Numbers of Criminal Justice Jobs

Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-Value
Non-practicum	24	1.58	.88	.25 *
Practicum	24	1.50	1.35	

\* Degrees of Freedom for pooled variance = 46 with a criterion score of 1.684 at the .05 level of significance.

#### Number of Months on First Job

The data in Table 4.22A demonstrates number of months that practicum and non-practicum graduates held their first position in the criminal justice system. As the data indicates, non-practicum graduates spent fewer months in their first position in the criminal justice system. The mean number of months non-practicum graduates held their first position was twenty and fifty-four one hundredths (20.54) months compared to the practicum graduates who held their first position from mean of thirty-two and forty-six one hundredths (32.46) months. The difference, though not statistically significant at the .05 level, is large enough to be of interest when discussing career stability. The direction of the difference would indicate that practicum graduates experienced something that was at least somewhat contributory to the graduates' career stability in the criminal justice system. One of the possible reasons for

the large difference between the two groups may well be the number of non-practicum graduates who never found a position in the system. Thus, these graduates spent zero months on their first job. This data is, however, still indicative of career stability as this study defines it.

Table 4.22A -- The Number of Months on the 1st C.J. Job

Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-Value
Non-practicum	24	20.54	23.82	-1.63 *
Practicum	24	32.46	26.89	

\* Degrees of Freedom for pooled variance = 46  
with a criterion score of 1.684 at the .05 level of  
significance.

#### Non-Practicum Students' Perception of School's Objective

- 5) Between Phase I and Phase II the control subjects will significantly change their perception of the objectives of the School of Criminal Justice for offering the Criminal Justice Practicum.
- 5a) Between Phase I and Phase II the control subjects will not significantly change their perception of the objectives of the School of Criminal Justice for offering the Criminal Justice Practicum.

This hypothesis was investigated in an attempt to identify if after a period of real life employment in the criminal justice system, graduates who did not participate in an experiential education program perceived of the value

of experiential education differently than they did while they were undergraduates. The data in Table 4.23 demonstrates that non-practicum graduates' perception of the objectives of the School offering the practicum changed an average of thirty-five one-hundredths (.35) toward one (on a scale of 1 = Very Important to 5 = Very Unimportant) which is not significant at the .05 level of significance. The objective showing the largest shift was "Professional Service" with a change of sixty-seven one-hundredths (.67) toward five. It is of interest to note that the non-practicum graduates shifted toward a mean score of five on three of the objectives, one stayed virtually unchanged (knowledge of self-abilities, values, etc.), and three moved considerably toward five on two objectives (Professional Preparation and Professional Service being the largest shift). If the objectives are categorized as Borzak (1981) suggests into four groups: 1) objectives concerning self-knowledge, 2) objectives concerning direct participation, 3) objectives concerning academic inquiry, and 4) social impact, all of the objectives which scored mean scores closer to one in 1981 than in 1975 were objectives concerning self-knowledge and academic inquiry. These results might be indicative of a concern on the part of the graduates for the value of improving the individual self and acquiring knowledge as opposed to finding a job or serving others but further research would be needed to test this suggestion.



Table 4.23--Non-Practicum Perception of Objectives 1975-1981

PERCEIVED OBJECTIVES OF THE SCHOOL Non-Practicum Graduates	MEAN NON-PRACT 1975	MEAN NON-PRACT 1981	75->81 CHANGE *T-Ratio	
1. Professional Preparation	1.80	2.40	.60	1.18
2. Knowledge of Self-Abilities, Values, Etc.	2.13	2.20	.08	.19
3. Self-Reliance & Direction	2.40	2.13	-.27	-.67
4. Application of Theory	2.25	2.47	.22	.47
5. Professional Service	2.13	2.80	.67	1.64
6. Development of an Awareness of Social Issues	3.06	2.53	.47	1.08
7. Understanding & Acceptance of Others	3.06	2.93	-.13	-.25
MEAN	2.29	2.64	.35	1.04

\* None of the T-values were significant at the .05 level,  
with a criterion score of 2.047

This slight shift may possibly be the result of the graduates already having employment or made career decisions. This may be the reason for the slightly lower rating of direct participation objectives in 1981 as compared to their rating of them in 1975.

#### Practicum Students' Perception of School's Objectives

- 6) Between Phase I and Phase II the experimental subjects will significantly change their perception of the objectives of the School of Criminal Justice for offering the Criminal Justice Practicum.
- 6a) Between Phase I and Phase II the experimental subjects will not significantly change their perception of the objectives of the School of Criminal Justice for offering the Criminal Justice Practicum.

This hypothesis was investigated to see if after a real work experience students' perceptions of the need for experiential education is similar to those of the faculty or if possibly the goals of the faculty are not congruent with the reality of the actual professional world. The results illustrated in Table 4.24 indicate that the mean score for all seven of the objectives either shifted toward five (on a scale where 1 = Very Important and 5 = Very Unimportant) or stayed virtually the same (less than a .10 change). The average change of the mean scores was four tenths (.40) which was similar to the non-practicum graduates. It is of interest to note that the shift of the two groups was in the same direction. That is, practicum graduates shifted on the whole toward five and non-practicum graduates shifted on the whole toward five. It is also of interest to note that the objective "Professional Service" demonstrated the largest shift toward five in both groups (.53 in the practicum group and .67 in the non-practicum group). Professional Service is the only objective to shift a considerable amount in both groups (though the shift was statistically not significant). This shift could be indicative of the possibility that professional service was considered less important by criminal justice graduates six years after graduation than by criminal justice seniors in 1975. It should also be noted that "Professional Service" was not considered to be the least important objective, but is ranked in the bottom two by both groups. The other objective ranked in the

bottom two categories by both groups was "Understanding of Others." This objective was rated in the bottom two by both groups during both Phases I and II.

Table 4.24--Practicum Perceived Objectives 1975-1981

(On a scale where 1=Very Important & 5=Very Unimportant)

PERCEIVED OBJECTIVES OF THE SCHOOL Practicum Graduates	MEAN PRACT 1975	MEAN PRACT 1981	75->81 CHANGE	T-Ratio
1. Professional Preparation	1.85	1.79	-.06	-.20
2. Knowledge of Self-Abilities, Values, Etc.	1.83	2.29	.46	1.66
3. Self-Reliance & Direction	2.15	2.17	.02	.05
4. Application of Theory	2.15	2.08	-.07	-.17
5. Professional Service	2.30	2.83	.53	1.87
6. Development of an Awareness of Social Issues	2.40	2.67	.27	.74
7. Understanding & Acceptance of Others	2.45	2.67	.22	.71
MEAN	1.96	2.36	.40	2.70

\* None of the T-values were significant at the .05 level.  
with a criterion score of 2.047

#### Differences of Perception of School's Objectives

- 7) There are significant differences between the experimental subjects' and the control subjects' perception of the School of Criminal Justice for offering the Criminal Justice Practicum during Phase II.
- 7a) There is no significant difference between the experimental subjects' and the control subjects' perception of the School of Criminal Justice for offering the Criminal Justice Practicum during Phase II.

This hypothesis was investigated to determine if, as a result of a full-time work experience, graduates who participated in experiential education perceived the value of that experiential education experience differently than graduates who never participated in an experiential education program.

The data in Table 4.25 demonstrates that there is no significant difference at the .05 level between the two groups in their perception of the objectives of the School of Criminal Justice in offering the Criminal Justice Practicum. When the means of each group were averaged and compared, practicum graduates scored an average mean score of 2.36 and non-practicum graduates scored an average mean of 2.64. It is interesting to note that the objective of professional preparation was ranked first by the practicum graduates with a mean score of one and seventy-nine hundredths (1.79) on a scale where 1 = Very Important and 5 = Very Unimportant. The highest ranked objective by non-practicum graduates was self-reliance and direction with a mean score of two and thirteen one-hundredths (2.13). The difference between the two first ranked objectives is only sixty-six one-hundredths (.66), which is the largest difference of any of the objectives tested. The difference between the average means is only twenty-eight

one-hundredths (.28) which is statistically insignificant at the .05 level. The two are very similar in their evaluation of the objectives of the School of Criminal Justice offering the Criminal Justice Practicum.

Table 4.25 -- Non-practicum & Practicum Graduates 1975-1981

(On a scale where 1=Very Important & 5=Very Unimportant)

PERCEIVED OBJECTIVES OF THE SCHOOL	MEAN PRAC 1975	MEAN NON-PRAC 1975	MEAN PRAC 1981	MEAN NON-PRAC 1981
1. Professional Preparation	1.85	1.80	1.79	2.40
2. Knowledge of Self-Abilities, Values, Etc.	1.83	2.13	2.29	2.20
3. Self-Reliance & Direction	2.15	2.40	2.17	2.13
4. Application of Theory	2.15	2.25	2.08	2.47
5. Professional Service	2.30	2.13	2.83	2.80
6. Development of an Awareness of Social Issues	2.40	3.06	2.67	3.53
7. Understanding & Acceptance of Others	2.45	3.06	2.67	2.93
MEAN AVERAGE	1.96	2.29	2.36	2.64

#### Value of Criminal Justice Courses

- 8) Between Phase I and Phase II both groups of graduates will perceive the value of the courses offered by the School of Criminal Justice significantly different from their initial perceptions.
- 8a) Between Phase I and Phase II both groups of graduates will not perceive the value of the courses offered by the School of Criminal Justice significantly different from their initial perceptions.

This hypothesis was to be examined to determine if graduates in either or both groups changed their opinion of the value of their course work in Criminal Justice after spending a period of time in the real world of work. However, when the data were analyzed it was discovered that the original (Phase I) design of the study failed to obtain the necessary data to complete a test of the hypothesis. The data gathered in Phase I (1975) concerning this hypothesis did not identify any ranking or evaluation of the criminal justice courses by the non-practicum graduates. The data gathered in that phase (1975) also failed to have the practicum graduates clearly rank the of courses in the 1975 Criminal Justice curriculum at Michigan State University. What was obtained were data concerning a ranking of those three courses that the practicum graduates thought were the most valuable to their practicum. The graduates were also requested to evaluate the courses that they had identified as being valuable, quite valuable, or very valuable. The ranking was then accomplished by assigning a weight to each course mentioned by the graduates. The weight was determined by frequency of mention and evaluation of amount of value. All of the courses were mentioned at least once but due to the open-ended nature of the item that requested the course names, the data obtained could not be used to statistically test the hypothesis. Table 4.26 is the result of these data.

The data presented in Table 4.26 were obtained during Phase II (1981) by requesting that the graduates, both practicum and non-practicum, rate each of the courses found in the Criminal Justice curriculum in 1975 on a scale of from one to four where one was equal to very valuable to career and four was equal to no value to career.

Table 4.26 -- Phase I Course Ranking

Phase I Courses Practicum Students Cited as Valuable  
To Their Field Experience

Times Mentioned	COURSE Number & Title	# Total Weighted Pract. Point value 1975-Rank	
8	C.J. 355 JUVENILE DELINQUENCY	21	1
8	C.J. 375 CRIMINAL LAW	18	2
7	C.J. 455 ADV. JUVENILE DELINQUENCY	17	3
7	C.J. 368 CORRECTIONS PROCESS	16	4
6	C.J. 335 POLICE ADMINISTRATION	13	5
3	C.J. 392 METHODS IN C.J.	12	6
2	C.J. 315 CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION	6	7
2	C.J. 318 POLICE COMM. RELATIONS	4	8
1	C.J. 495 CRIME PREVENTION SEM.	3	9
1	C.J. 475 CRIMINAL EVIDENCE	2	10
1	C.J. 472 CRIMINAL PROCEDURE	2	10
1	C.J. 225 POLICE SCIENCE LAB	1	12
1	C.J. 409 GREAT ISSUES IN C.J.	1	12
1	C.J. 110 INTRO. TO C.J.	1	12
1	C.J. 491 SENIOR SEMINAR	1	12
1	C.J. 440 INTRO. TO HWY. TRAFFIC	1	12

#As determined by volunteered selection of valuable courses and then rating the course on a scale of 1 = very valuable and 2 = quite valuable and 3 = valuable--Tie ranks were awarded for equally rated courses.

The data reveal that some limited comparison can be made of the data obtained from both phases of the study. It is of interest to note that the top five ranked courses by the practicum graduates in Phase II (1981) were C.J. 225, C.J.

475, C.J. 375, C.J. 472, and C.J. 355 and the top five courses ranked by the non-practicum graduates were C.J. 475, C.J. 375, C.J. 318, C.J. 495, and C.J. 315. The data in Table 4.27 also reveal that the top five courses as ranked by the practicum graduates in Phase I (1975) were C.J. 355, C.J. 375, C.J. 455, C.J. 368 and C.J. 335. A review of these data reveal that two of the top courses for both groups in Phase II (C.J. 375 and C.J. 475) are both in the top five for each group. This would tend to support the theory that at least those two courses are considered to be quite valuable in careers in criminal justice. It is of further interest to note that one of those courses is the only course to be ranked in the top five in all three of the rankings of courses (Phase I and Phase II). That the course was the criminal law course did not shock this investigator inasmuch as criminal law is the foundation of what criminal justice is all about. It is also of interest to note that the data in Table 4.27 indicate that the two bottom ranked courses in Phase II were ranked number four and number five in Phase I. These data would seem to indicate that the perceptions of the practicum graduates did not remain constant during the period of six years of the study concerning all of the courses in the Criminal Justice Curriculum at Michigan State University.



Table 4.27 -- Phase II Course Ranking

COURSE				PRACTICUM		NON-PRACTICUM	
				Mean	# Rank	Mean	# Rank
A.	C.J.	110	INTRO. TO C.J.	2.53	9	2.64	8
B.	C.J.	225	POLICE SCIENCE LAB	1.33	1	3.00	13
C.	C.J.	315	CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION	2.29	6	2.36	5
D.	C.J.	318	POLICE COMM. RELATIONS	2.67	10	2.20	3
E.	C.J.	335	POLICE ADMINISTRATION	2.94	16	2.64	8
F.	C.J.	355	JUVENILE DELINQUENCY	2.28	5	2.38	6
G.	C.J.	368	CORRECTIONS PROCESS	2.93	15	3.00	13
H.	C.J.	375	CRIMINAL LAW	1.78	3	2.07	2
I.	C.J.	392	METHODS IN C.J.	2.79	13	2.80	11
J.	C.J.	409	GREAT ISSUES IN C.J.	2.33	8	3.50	16
K.	C.J.	440	INTRO. TO HWY. TRAFFIC	2.89	14	3.00	13
L.	C.J.	455	ADV. JUVENILE DELINQ.	2.29	6	2.57	7
M.	C.J.	472	CRIMINAL PROCEDURE	2.00	4	2.71	10
N.	C.J.	475	CRIMINAL EVIDENCE	1.33	1	2.00	1
O.	C.J.	490	SENIOR SEMINAR	2.67	10	2.80	11
P.	C.J.	495	CRIME PREVENTION SEM.	2.71	12	2.22	4

# As determined by volunteered selection of valuable courses

and then rating the course on a scale of 1 = very valuable

and 2 = quite valuable and 3 = valuable--Tie ranks were awarded for equally rated courses.

Table 4.28--Phase I &amp; Phase II Criminal Justice Course Rating

COURSE Number & Title	PRACTICUM		NON-PRACTICUM
	#75-Rank	*81-Rank	*81-Rank
A. C.J. 225 POLICE SCIENCE LAB	12	1	13
B. C.J. 475 CRIMINAL EVIDENCE	10	1	1
C. C.J. 375 CRIMINAL LAW	2	3	2
D. C.J. 472 CRIMINAL PROCEDURE	11	4	10
E. C.J. 355 JUVENILE DELINQUENCY	1	5	6
F. C.J. 315 CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION	7	6	5
G. C.J. 455 ADV. JUVENILE DELINQUENCY	3	6	7
H. C.J. 409 GREAT ISSUES IN C.J.	12	8	16
I. C.J. 110 INTRO. TO C.J.	12	9	8
J. C.J. 318 POLICE COMM. RELATIONS	8	10	3
K. C.J. 490 SENIOR SEMINAR	12	10	11
L. C.J. 495 CRIME PREVENTION SEM.	9	12	4
M. C.J. 392 METHODS IN C.J.	6	13	11
N. C.J. 440 INTRO. TO HWY. TRAFFIC	12	14	13
O. C.J. 368 CORRECTIONS PROCESS	4	15	13
P. C.J. 335 POLICE ADMINISTRATION	5	16	8

# As determined by volunteered selection of valuable courses  
and then rating the course on a scale of 1 = very valuable  
and 2 = quite valuable and 3 = valuable--Tie ranks were awarded for equally rated courses.

\* As determined by rating of courses listed on a scale of 1 = very valuable in career and 4 = no value in career.

### Summary

In this chapter, a description of the information and data gathered in both Phase I (1975) and Phase II (1981) was presented. The results of the research questions proposed were individually discussed and from the data it was concluded that one of the eight research hypotheses could be rejected in the null form, six failed to be rejected in the null form, and one could not be statistically tested. In Chapter Five, a summary of major findings will be presented, and conclusions will also be offered. Recommendations for further research will also be presented

CHAPTER V  
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

This study sought to explore the experiences of the Criminal Justice students at Michigan State University concerning the value of the experiential education program of the School of Criminal Justice at Michigan State University. The study describes the effects of the program on the graduates in terms of a) career development, b) career stability, c) agency shock and d) burn-out. The study examined field experiences and work experiences in order to describe the impact of those experiential education opportunities on graduates' careers. Students of Michigan State University who participated in a field experience offered during Spring Term 1975 entitled Criminal Justice Practicum were compared to students who did not participate on the basis of career stability, career opportunity, agency shock, and burn-out.

Specifically this study investigated and attempted to identify:

- 1) The goals and objectives held by the School of Criminal Justice faculty for the Criminal Justice Practicum in 1975.
- 2) The extent to which field study experiences were considered an important part of the curriculum of the School of Criminal Justice by the Faculty in 1975.

- 3) Those policies or activities on the part of the School of Criminal Justice and its faculty which, in the opinion of the students, prove supporting or inhibiting to participation in the practicum program in 1975.
- 4) The goals and objectives held by students in the school of Criminal Justice for the practicum experience and their perception of the value of those goals and objectives after a period of six years of work in the Criminal Justice system.
- 5) Those areas of curriculum found most valuable by the student in their field experience and their perception of those areas six years after graduation.
- 6) The length time after graduation 1975 criminal justice graduates found employment in the criminal justice system.
- 7) The length of time 1975 criminal justice graduates remained remained in their first position.
- 8) The stability of employment in the criminal justice system experienced by 1975 criminal justice graduates.
- 9) The amount of agency shock encountered by graduates upon entering their first employment.

#### The Literature Reviewed

During the development of the review of the literature numerous books and articles on the subject of experiential education were reviewed. Those reviews revealed that experiential education is still in its infancy when compared to the traditional teacher-student-text trichotomy model of education. Experiential education was first introduced in higher education in this country in approximately 1906 at the University of Cincinnati (Wilson and Lyons, 1961). Since its introduction, experiential education has been modified, enhanced, and revised by the many colleges and universities

that have employed it. As a result of these many applications of experiential education, research has begun to identify those elements necessary for a successful program.

Specifically, a successful program should identify and state in instructional terms the program and learner goals, arrange and monitor placements, prepare students for placement, assess student learning, and evaluate the program (Davis, Duley, and Alexander, 1977). The success of experiential programs rests heavily on the shoulders of the coordinator, who is the keystone of the program. The coordinator's position must be more than a duty added to some faculty member's work load. The faculty member must be knowledgeable of agencies and the theories of experiential education as well as a believer in the concept of such education.

The literature clearly demonstrates that there is value in experiential education. According to the literature, experiential education does, as a minimum enhance classroom learning and it certainly assists students in career decisions.

#### Design of the Study Reviewed

The nature of this study was longitudinal and descriptive in nature. It was conducted in two phases: Phase I was conducted in 1975 during the Spring Quarter, and Phase II was conducted in 1981 during the Spring Quarter. It utilized library research, five survey instruments, and twenty interviews to gather the data. The sources of data

included the current and historical literature on the subject of experiential education, the entire Michigan State University School of Criminal Justice faculty, and the 1975 graduates of the School of Criminal Justice at Michigan State University. Three samples were utilized for comparison. The experimental group consisted of all thirty criminal justice students that participated in the Criminal Justice Practicum during Spring Term 1975. The control group was actually two groups: The first group (Phase I, 1975) was a randomly drawn sample of fifty 1975 criminal justice students who had not participated in a criminal justice practicum. The second group (Phase II, 1981) was a randomly drawn sample of sixty 1975 criminal justice graduates who had not participated in the Criminal Justice Practicum during their undergraduate Criminal Justice program while at Michigan State University.

The statistical treatment used was the t-ratio. The questionnaires were computed and scored, and statistical procedures were derived from Introstat 2.1 for Apple II computers.

### Summary of Findings

The results of Phase I (1975) seem to indicate that students hold several goals and objectives to be basic to their field experiences. Those goals and objectives include an understanding of the real world situation in the criminal justice system, learning skills necessary to deal with agency clients, and reaching a decision concerning a career

in the criminal justice system. These goals and objectives were very similar to those held by the Criminal Justice Faculty for the students. Specifically, the faculty goals and objectives for the students were 1) To provide the student with an opportunity to observe and work in the real world of criminal justice and apply the theory from the classroom to those situations; 2) To provide the student with an opportunity to observe, meet, and work with criminal justice practitioners and to come to a decision about a career in the criminal justice system. and 3) To help the student develop an understanding of the dysfunction of the criminal justice system.

The results from Phase I also demonstrated that there were several factors that influence the practicum. Those factors include the faculty, the students, the curriculum and the participating agencies. Each of these factors exerted some influence on the effectiveness of the operation of the practicum.

In Phase II (1981) the results of the research questions proposed were individually discussed and from the data it was concluded that one of the eight research hypotheses could be rejected in the null form, six could not be accepted in the null form, and one could not be statistically tested. The statistic used to test



experimental hypotheses was the T-ratio. Below are the research hypotheses with an explanation of why the hypothesis was selected for study and the result of the analysis of the data.

#### Hypothesis 1

The experimental subjects will perceive that they encountered less agency shock upon entering into a criminal justice agency than control subjects perceived they encountered upon their entry into a criminal justice agency.

This hypothesis was proposed to test one of the assumed values of experiential learning; that is, that students who have worked in real world agency will be better prepared to deal with the environment of the real world of work. The data did not support this hypothesis at the .05 level.

#### Hypothesis 2

The experimental subjects will experience less burn-out than control subjects experience in their criminal justice career.

This hypothesis was proposed because experiential learning is many times acclaimed as an excellent method of career exploration. The data also failed to support this hypothesis at the .05 level of significance.

#### Hypothesis 3

There is a significant difference between the experimental subjects and the control subjects in the length of time taken to find criminal justice employment after graduation.

This hypothesis was investigated to determine if students who participate in a criminal justice practicum sufficiently learn the procedures, processes, and sources for finding

employment in the criminal justice system so as to give them an advantage over their contemporaries who did not have a similar opportunity. This hypothesis was the only one that was supported by the data at the .05 level of significance.

#### Hypothesis 4

There are significant differences between the experimental subjects' and the control subjects' stability in their Criminal Justice careers.

This hypothesis was investigated in an attempt to determine if a student's exposure to a criminal justice agency or agencies enables him or her to select the correct agency for based on personality and experience in the system. The data failed to support this hypothesis at .05 level of significance.

#### Hypothesis 5

Between Phase I and Phase II the control subjects' will significantly change their perception of the objectives of the School of Criminal Justice for offering the Criminal Justice Practicum.

This hypothesis was investigated in an attempt to identify if after a real world work experience graduates who did not participate in an experiential education program changed their perceptions of the value for experiential education programs. The data also failed to support this hypothesis.

#### Hypothesis 6

Between Phase I and Phase II the experimental subjects will significantly change their perceptions of the objectives of the School of Criminal Justice for offering the Criminal Justice Practicum.

This hypothesis was investigated to reveal if after a real world work experience, graduates who did participate in an experiential education program were perceptive of the value of experiential education differently so as to be more aligned with graduates who did not participate in an experiential education program. The data also failed to support this hypothesis at the .05 level of significance.

#### Hypothesis 7

There are significant differences between the experimental subjects and the control subjects perception of the School of Criminal Justice for offering the Criminal Justice Practicum during Phase II.

This hypothesis was investigated to determine if after six years of a full-time work experience, graduates who participated in an experiential learning program perceived of the value of that experience differently from those graduates who did not participate in such program. The data also failed to support this hypothesis at .05 level of significance.

#### Hypothesis 8

Between Phase I and Phase II, both groups of graduates will perceive the value of the courses offered by the School of Criminal Justice significantly different from their initial perceptions.

This hypothesis was examined to determine if graduates in either or both groups change their opinions of the value of their course work in Criminal Justice after spending a

period of time in the real world of work. However, this hypothesis could not be tested because of the fact that several vital components of the data were not gathered during Phase I (1975).

### Conclusions

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions may be drawn:

1. Based on the data gathered concerning all but one of the research hypotheses and the review of the literature, the Criminal Justice Practicum may need some modifications to become totally effective in attaining the most beneficial result. The modifications might include: a) An attempt to increase the knowledge of the criminal justice faculty concerning the Criminal Justice Practicum through inservice training, b) An attempt to increase the amount and accuracy of publicity concerning the Criminal Justice Practicum provided criminal justice undergraduate students in their sophomore and junior years, and c) Consideration of changing the method of selecting the Practicum Coordinator.
2. Based on the raw data, the research hypotheses may well be correct. A review of the data indicates that the mean scores of the items employed to measure the effect of the practicum all lean in the predicted direction. However, the differences

were not large enough to be statistically significant at the .05 level of significance. The size of the sample and the nature of the self-selection process may have had a negative result on the data used to test the hypotheses. If the study had been conducted over an entire academic year, the result may very well have supported the research hypotheses. If the study had been over an entire academic year, the sample would have included all the students that participated in the Criminal Justice Practicum for the entire year as well as all the members of the graduating class for that year. The result of such a study might very well demonstrate that the Criminal Justice Practicum at Michigan State University does provide the valuable outcomes stated in the literature.

3. Based on the data, the practicum may in fact have little or no academic value that is measurable within a six year period. The value of the practicum may not be apparent until ten years, fifteen years or some longer period of time after graduation. The trends that appeared in the data may dramatically increase over a longer period of time. Thus, if the study could be repeated at the end of twelve or fifteen years the differences may very well be statistically significant.

4. The data obtained from this study may not have addressed the areas studied in enough depth or in the correct manner. The out-come may be incorrect as a result of not asking the right questions. Possibly a more detailed and indepth study would have developed data that would have supported the research hypotheses.

### Implications

From the findings and conclusions of this study, two areas of implications seem apparent: first, those implications for the practicum itself; and secondly, those implications for further research.

It may be implied that the practicum may very well benefit from some modifications which might enhance the academic value of the practicum. Those modifications concern the faculty, the literature used to advertise the course, the Practicum Program, and the Practicum Coordinator.

The Faculty can be one of the most important factors in the success of a field experience program. In order to promote and support the program, they must fully understand what the program is and does, and what is needed to improve it. This knowledge, as reflected in the data, does not appear to have been developed in the faculty. The following suggestions may accomplish those ends:

- 1) All faculty members should be given a copy of the current Practicum Student Handbook and requested to respond with an evaluation of the contents of that volume.
- 2) All new faculty members should be interviewed by the Practicum Coordinator with the goal of developing an understanding of experiential education in the new faculty member and to seek new and innovative ideas for the practicum from them.
- 3) At least once annually, the Criminal Justice Practicum should be placed on the agenda of the School of Criminal Justice Advisory Committee for the purpose of discussing the direction and value of the program.

The literature used to advertise the practicum can play a key role in a student's decision to participate in the practicum. Thus, it is important that the literature used and produced by the School of Criminal Justice and the University reflect accurately the requirements and expectations of the program and that it be distributed to all potential participants in the program. The following are suggestions for accomplishing those ends:

- 1) All literature currently in print pertaining to the practicum should be reviewed and rewritten where necessary to insure accuracy of the requirements and the concept of the program.
- 2) A policy should be established which would require that all new Criminal Justice students be given all material pertinent to the program by the academic advisor. The advisor should also be required to review that material with the student.
- 3) An annual review of the pertinent literature should be conducted by the Practicum Coordinator to insure completeness and accuracy.

The Practicum Program itself may be in need of some review. Such a review could include asking several relevant questions which might include:

- a. Should the course be more than one term in duration for some placements?
- b. Should the course be graded in some other manner?
- c. Should students be allowed to enroll in the practicum during their last term in the Criminal Justice Program?
- d. How does the practicum fit into the present curriculum?

These questions are all difficult to answer. The data provided by this study does not answer several of them. Many of them are addressed in the literature. It would seem to appear that they do need to be addressed regularly if the Practicum is to be an important and effective part of the Criminal Justice Curriculum.

According to the literature, the coordinator is the keystone of any successful experiential education program. The position must be a stable one and the assignment must be one that is viewed by the faculty as a desirable position. In order to coordinate the program efficiently and properly, the coordinator designation must not be temporary or an overload assignment. The position must be filled by a person who believes in experiential education, one who is enthusiastic about this type of education, one who can communicate well with all areas of student placement and one who is a diplomat who can massage and develop relations



with local agencies and communicate well with students :  
 (Styles and Pace, 1969). The coordinator can make or break  
 a program. If the practicum is to be a strong and valuable  
 part of the Criminal Justice Curriculum, consideration  
 should be given to the following suggestions for accom-  
 plishing those ends:

- 1) The coordinator should understand, be enthusiastic  
 about, and believe in experiential techniques of  
 education.
- 2) The coordinator's position should be filled by a  
 faculty person that is not on temporary  
 assignment.
- 3) The School of Criminal Justice should explore the  
 possibility of requiring the position be filled by  
 a faculty member with the rank of Associate  
 Professor or higher on a tenure track.
- 4) The position of coordinator should be filled by a  
 person knowledgeable of all areas of criminal  
 justice.
- 5) The coordinator should make periodic visits to all  
 agencies to insure that the agencies and students  
 are working well together and that no problems are  
 being encountered.

It may be implied that further research needs to be  
 done in this area. Several suggestions seem to be  
 appropriate at this point. Those suggestions include a) A  
 replication of this study over the course of an entire year  
 to include all practicum students and the entire graduating  
 class for the year b) A study of the students that chose to  
 take certain elective courses compared to students who did  
 not take that course to see if other courses had an impact  
 on the areas studied in this study and c) An ethnographic  
 study of the Criminal Justice Practicum. A replication of

this study over the course of an entire year may very well demonstrate that the practicum graduates do, in fact, experience less agency shock and less burn-out, and have more stable careers in criminal justice. The data from this study may very well be the out-come of a unique group of students in the 1975-76 graduating class. It may not be representative of the whole practicum class of 1975-76.

A study of the effect of other elective classes in the Criminal Justice Curriculum on agency shock, burn-out, and career stability similar to this study may reveal that other courses in the curriculum caused the results obtained in this study and not the students' participation in the practicum. The out-come might also demonstrate that the combination of the practicum and other courses had a greater impact on the graduates than just the practicum.

An ethnographic study may provide greater insight into the true impact of the practicum than the present study. Due to the indepth and intense nature of such a study the impact of a practicum on graduates might be better identified and understood as a result.

#### Summary

Because of the complex nature of the areas reviewed in this study, few statistically significant outcomes were obtained. The results were encouraging to this investigator but were not conclusive. It is hoped that this research with all of its limitations has created a footing for further research in this area. There is certainly a void in

the literature on experiential education in the area of criminal justice. The desire of this investigator is that this work has begun to fill that void, and that others will follow who will completely fill it. To further that end, a copy of this dissertation will be given to the School of Criminal Justice at Michigan State University in the hope that Criminal Justice students will benefit from the outcomes obtained.

APPENDIX A  
PRE-PRACTICUM QUESTIONNAIRE

SCHOOL OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE  
College of Social Science  
Michigan State University  
East Lansing, Michigan

## PRACTICUM QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What is your name? \_\_\_\_\_
2. What is your area of interest in Criminal Justice?  
\_\_\_\_\_
3. What is your approximate G.P.A. in Criminal Justice? \_\_\_\_\_  
All course work at M.S.U.? \_\_\_\_\_
4. What kind of field study experiences were available to you?
5. Why did you choose the one you did?
6. How did you first find out about the opportunity of enrolling for the C.J. Practicum?
  1. Literature
  2. Faculty (if faculty who? \_\_\_\_\_)
  3. Peers
  4. Chance
  5. Other (Please explain if known)
7. When did you first find out about the opportunity of enrolling in the C.J. Practicum?
  1. Prior to enrolling at M.S.U.
  2. During your Freshman or Sophomore Year.
  3. During your Junior Year.
  4. During your Senior Year.

8. Which of the the following, if any, presented problems for you in choosing or in participating in your field study experience?
  1. Cost
  2. Distance
  3. Credit hours (Too few for time expended).
  4. Limited opportunities.
  5. Red tape (arrangements, etc.).
  6. Expectations of the faculty.
9. Have the objectives of the C.J. Practicum been made clear to you?
  1. Yes
  2. No
10. What are the School of Criminal Justice's objectives in offering the C.J. Practicum as you see them?
  1. Professional preparation.
  2. Professional service.
  3. Self-reliance and self-direction
  4. Knowledge of self-abilities, values, etc.
  5. Understanding and acceptance of others.
  6. Application of theory to practical situations
  7. Development of awareness of social issues.
  8. Other.
  9. Not really sure.
11. Do you think most C.J. students are aware of the possibility to enroll in the Criminal Justice Practicum?
  1. Yes
  2. No
12. Do you think the environment here (faculty attitudes, etc.) affect the practice of field study?
  1. Positively
  2. Negatively
13. List all those accomplishments you plan to attempt to complete, during your placement, e.g. learning skills X and Y, acquire knowledge about X and Y, etc.

APPENDIX B  
POST-PRACTICUM QUESTIONNAIRE

SCHOOL OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE  
College of Social Science  
Michigan State University  
East Lansing, Michigan

June 3, 1975

Dear Practicum Student

First let me congratulate you on your completion of your practicum placement. I hope that it was a fulfilling experience for you and that you found it challenging.

The purpose of this letter is to send you a post-practicum questionnaire which will enable us to better evaluate the function of the practicum so that future placements can be made even more meaningful.

Please find the enclosed questionnaire and take a few minutes to fill it out. Your cooperation is greatly appreciated in this matter. Thank you for taking a few minutes out of your busy schedule to do this favor for me!

Sincerely yours,

Clarence R. Terrill  
Assistant Practicum Coordinator

CT: sd



## PRACTICUM QUESTIONNAIRE

Imagine that you are just starting your practicum and answer the following questions.

1. Which of the following presented problems for you in choosing to participate in your field study experience. (Rate each item on a scale where 1 = Very important and 5 = Very unimportant)

- |   |                |
|---|----------------|
| a. Cost                                     | 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. |
| b. Distance                                 | 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. |
| c. Credit hours (Too few for time expended) | 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. |
| d. Limited opportunities                    | 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. |
| e. Red tape (arrangements, etc.)            | 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. |
| f. Time (conflict with part-time job)       | 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. |
| g. Time (conflict with other course work)   | 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. |
| h. Expectations of the faculty              | 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. |
| i. Other please specify _____               | 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. |

2. What are the School of Criminal Justice's objectives in offering a Practicum as you see them. (Rate each item on a scale where 1 = Very important and 5 = Very unimportant)

- |  |                |
|--|----------------|
| a. Professional preparation                      | 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. |
| b. Professional service                          | 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. |
| c. Self-reliance and self-direction              | 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. |
| d. Knowledge of self-abilities, values, etc.     | 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. |
| e. Understanding and acceptance of others        | 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. |
| f. Application of theory to practical situations | 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. |
| g. Development of awareness of social issues     | 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. |
| h. Other   | 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. |
| i. Not really sure                               | 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. |

3. Rate each of the following as they affect the C.J. Practicum here at M.S.U. (Rate each item on a scale where 1 = Negative and 2 = No affect and 3 = Positive).

- |                                  |          |
|----------------------------------|----------|
| a. C.J. Faculty attitudes        | 1. 2. 3. |
| b. C.J. Curriculum               | 1. 2. 3. |
| c. The instructional environment | 1. 2. 3. |

4. Name \_\_\_\_\_

5. Agency or Agencies you were placed with: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_.

6. Credits Enrolled for in the C.J. Practicum \_\_\_\_\_

7. List up to five courses that you feel were valuable in your field experience and rate them on their value in your field experience. (1 = Very Valuable 2 = Quite Valuable & 3 = Valuable)

- |          |    |    |    |
|----------|----|----|----|
| a. _____ | 1. | 2. | 3. |
| b. _____ | 1. | 2. | 3. |
| c. _____ | 1. | 2. | 3. |
| d. _____ | 1. | 2. | 3. |
| e. _____ | 1. | 2. | 3. |

8. List those areas of your prior classroom education which you feel were deficient, which if, rectified, would have enabled you to have a more successful practicum placement.

GENERAL CURRICULUM:

SPECIFIC COURSES:

9. Rate your accomplishment of the goals listed below, where 1 = total accomplishment and 5 = no accomplishment.

a. Learn skills associated with the handling of agency clients:

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

b. Develop an understanding of agency functions:

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

c. Enable you to reach a decision for possibility of working in that area of C.J.:

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

d. Learn the duties of certain agency personnel:

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

- e. Experience doing agency duties on your own:
  - 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
- f. Develop an understanding for the effectiveness of agency functions:
  - 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
- g. Learn how clients actually flow through the C.J. System:
  - 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
- h. Develop an understanding for the attitudes and philosophies of personnel in the C.J. System:
  - 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
- i. Compare observations with your classroom study:
  - 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
- j. Develop Interviewing techniques.
  - 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
- k. Become aware of the alternatives available in handling client problems:
  - 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
- l. Develop counselling techniques:
  - 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
- m. Develop an understanding for the overall relationship of the different agencies in the C.J. System;
  - 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
- n. Learn to effectively communicate with people working in the C.J. System:
  - 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

- o. Develop an understanding of what the real world situation is in the C.J. System:

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

- p. Develop investigative techniques both formal and informal.

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

- q. Develop understanding for the immediate issues in the C.J. System:

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

- r. Twelve credits or what ever number of credits you signed-up for:

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

- s. Develop report writing skills:

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

10. If you were the practicum coordinator how would you change the C.J. Program?

11. If you were the faculty of the School of Criminal Justice how would you change the C.J. Program?

12. If you were the head of the agency you were placed at how would you treat students differently?

13. How well do you feel that the Practicum has met the objectives listed below? (Rate each on a scale where 1 = Totally met and 5 = Totally Unmet).

- |  |                |
|--|----------------|
| a. Professional preparation.                     | 1. 2. 3. 4. 5  |
| b. Professional service.                         | 1. 2. 3. 4. 5  |
| c. Self-reliance and self-direction              | 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. |
| d. Knowledge of self-abilities, values, etc.     | 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. |
| e. Understanding and acceptance of others.       | 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. |
| f. Application of theory to practical situations | 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. |
| g. Development of awareness of social issues.    | 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. |
| h. Other.  | 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. |
| i. Not really sure.                              | 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. |

APPENDIX C  
NON-PRACTICUM QUESTIONNAIRE

SCHOOL OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE  
College of Social Science  
Michigan State University  
East Lansing, Michigan

May 20, 1975

Dear Criminal Justice Senior:

First, let me congratulate you on your academic progress to date. I am a Master's Degree Candidate and I am working on a study of the Criminal Justice Internship program. I would greatly appreciate it if you would take a few moments to fill-out the enclosed questionnaire. This information will enable us to make recommendations for the improvement of the program. It is hoped that these recommendations will allow some students to do an internship who might not do so due to some problem with the present program.

Thank you for your cooperation in this matter, it is greatly appreciated!

Sincerely yours,

Clarence R. Terrill  
Graduate Assistant

CT: sd

NON-PRACTICUM QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What is your area of interest in Criminal Justice? (pick one)
  - a. Law Enforcement
  - b. Corrections
  - d. Juvenile Delinquency
  - e. Security
  - f. Other
  
2. What is your Grade Point Average in Criminal Justice course work \_\_\_\_\_ Overall GPA? \_\_\_\_\_.
  
3. Are you aware of a course called C.J. 490 "Criminal Justice Practicum?"
  - a. No -- if no go to # 9
  - b. Yes -- if yes go to next
  
4. What is your understanding of the kind of student placements available to you?
  - a. Length \_\_\_\_\_
  - b. Amount of credit \_\_\_\_\_
  - c. Type of agencies \_\_\_\_\_

---
  
5. How did you first find out about the Practicum? (pick only one)
  - a. Literature
  - b. Faculty
  - c. Peers
  - d. Chance
  - e. Other
  
6. What are the School of Criminal Justice's objectives in offering a Practicum as you see them. (Rate each item on a scale where 1 = Very important and 5 = Very unimportant)
 

a. Professional preparation	1. 2. 3. 4. 5
b. Professional service	1. 2. 3. 4. 5
c. Self-reliance and self-direction	1. 2. 3. 4. 5
d. Knowledge of self-abilities, values, etc.	1. 2. 3. 4. 5
e. Understanding and acceptance of others	1. 2. 3. 4. 5
f. Application of theory to practical situations	1. 2. 3. 4. 5
g. Development of awareness of social issues	1. 2. 3. 4. 5
h. Other	1. 2. 3. 4. 5
i. Not really sure	1. 2. 3. 4. 5

7. Rate each of the following as they affect the C.J. Practicum here at M.S.U. (Rate each item on a scale where 1 = Negative and 2 = No affect and 3 = Positive).
- a. C.J. Faculty attitudes 1. 2. 3.
  - b. C.J. Curriculum 1. 2. 3.
  - c. The instructional environment 1. 2. 3.
8. When did you first find out about the opportunity of do a Practicum?
- a. Prior to enrolling at M.S.U.
  - b. During your Freshman or Sophomore Year
  - c. During your Junior Year
  - d. During your Senior Year
9. Which of the following presented problems for you in choosing to participate in your field study experience. (Rate each item on a scale where 1 = Very important and 5 = Very unimportant)
- a. Cost 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
  - b. Distance 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
  - c. Credit hours (Too few for time expended) 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
  - d. Limited opportunities 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
  - e. Red tape (arrangements, etc.) 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
  - f. Time (conflict with part-time job) 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
  - g. Time (conflict with other course work) 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
  - h. Expectations of the faculty 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
  - i. Other please specify \_\_\_\_\_ 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
10. If you had learned about the C.J. Practicum earlier would you have taken it?
- a. Yes
  - b. Not sure
  - c. No



APPENDIX D

FOLLOW-UP PRACTICUM QUESTIONNAIRE

NAME \_\_\_\_\_

ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_ PHONE # (\_\_\_\_) \_\_\_\_-\_\_\_\_

1. What year and term did you graduate from Michigan State University with your B.S. or B.A. Degree?
  - a. 1975      b. 1976      c. 1977      d. 1978      e. 1979
  - a. Fall      b. Winter      c. Spring      d. summer
2. What is the highest degree you have attained?
  - a. B.S. or B.A.
  - b. M.S. or M.A.
  - c. Ph.D.
  - d. Did not graduate from M.S.U.
3. What was your area of interest in Criminal Justice at Michigan State University?
  - a. Law Enforcement
  - b. Corrections
  - c. Juvenile Delinquency
  - d. Security Administration
  - e. Other (Please Specify) \_\_\_\_\_
- 3a. What agency(s) did you do your Criminal Justice Practicum with?
  - a. \_\_\_\_\_
  - b. \_\_\_\_\_
  - c. \_\_\_\_\_
  - d. \_\_\_\_\_
  - e. \_\_\_\_\_
  - f. \_\_\_\_\_
4. What was the first full time job you took in the Criminal Justice System after your graduation from Michigan State University with your B.S. or B.A.  
Your Title \_\_\_\_\_  
Location of Agency \_\_\_\_\_  
Type of Agency \_\_\_\_\_

Page two

5. What was the month and year you started that job?

a. Jan      b. Feb      c. March      d. April      e. May  
f. June      g. July      h. Aug      i. Sept      j. Oct  
k. Nov      l. Dec

a. 1975      b. 1976      c. 1977      d. 1978      e. 1979  
f. 1980

6. How long did (have) you hold (held) the above position?

\_\_\_\_\_ months

\_\_\_\_\_ years

7. If you do not hold the position with the agency you named in question #5, how many other full time positions in the Criminal Justice System have you held since that one, including your present position if it is in the Criminal Justice System? (Circle the appropriate number.)

1    2    3    4    5    6    7    8    9    10    More than 10

8. Are you presently employed in the Criminal Justice System in a full-time capacity?

a. Yes (if yes go on to #11 below.)  
b. No (if no go on to the next question, #9 below.)

9. If you are not presently employed in the Criminal Justice System, what month and year did you leave your last position in the Criminal Justice System?

a. Jan.      b. Feb      c. March      d. April      e. May  
f. June      g. July      h. Aug      i. Sept      j. Oct  
k. Nov      l. Dec

a. 1975      b. 1976      c. 1977      d. 1978      e. 1979      f. 1980

Page three

10. If you are not now employed in the Criminal Justice System, what were the major factors for your leaving the system? (Rate the following on a scale where 1 = Very important and 5 = Very unimportant.

a. Money ----- 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.  
 b. Job satisfaction with the  
     C.J. System ----- 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.  
 c. Frustration with the C.J. System --- 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.  
 d. Administrative problems ----- 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.  
 e. Other (Please be specific as possible)  
     ----- 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

11. As you see them, what are the School of Criminal Justice's objectives for offering a Criminal Justice Practicum at Michigan State University? (Rate each of the items below on a scale on which 1 = Very important and 5 = Very unimportant.

a. Professional Preparation ----- 1.2.3.4.5.  
 b. Professional Service ----- 1.2.3.4.5.  
 c. Self-Reliance and Self-Direction ----- 1.2.3.4.5.  
 d. Knowledge of Self-Abilities, Values, Ect. 1.2.3.4.5.  
 e. Understanding and Acceptance of Others-- 1.2.3.4.5.  
 f. Application of Theory To Practical  
     Situations-----1.2.3.4.5.  
 g. Develop Awareness of Social Issues -----1.2.3.4.5.  
 h. Other (Please Specify) ----- 1.2.3.4.5.  
 i. Not really sure ----- ()

12. Rate each of the following Criminal Justice Courses that were offered at Michigan State University in 1975 on a scale where 1 = the course has been very valuable to my career in Criminal Justice, 2 = the course was quite valuable to my career, 3 = the course was of some value to my career, 4 = the course was of no value to my career, and 5 = did not take the course.

C.J. 110 Introduction to Criminal Justice - 1.2.3.4.5.  
 C.J. 225 Police Science Lab----- 1.2.3.4.5.  
 C.J. 315 Criminal Investigation ----- 1.2.3.4.5.  
 C.J. 318 Police Community Relations ----- 1.2.3.4.5.  
 C.J. 335 Police Administration ----- 1.2.3.4.5.  
 C.J. 355 Juvenile Delinquency -----1.2.3.4.5.  
 C.J. 368 Corrections Process ----- 1.2.3.4.5.  
 C.J. 375 Criminal Law ----- 1.2.3.4.5.

Page four

C.J. 392	Methods in Criminal Justice -----	1.2.3.4.5.
C.J. 409	Great Issues in Criminal Justice -	1.2.3.4.5.
C.J. 440	Intro. to Highway Traffic	
	Administration-----	1.2.3.4.5.
C.J. 455	Advance Juvenile Delinquency -----	1.2.3.4.5.
C.J. 472	Criminal Procedure -----	1.2.3.4.5.
C.J. 475	Criminal Evidence -----	1.2.3.4.5.
C.J.	Senior Criminal Justice Seminar -----	1.2.3.4.5.
C.J.	Crime Prevention Seminar -----	1.2.3.4.5.

For the purpose of this study, "agency shock" is defined as any and all of the adverse effects of persons entering into an agency environment which is markedly different from that to which an individual is accustomed, i.e. agency procedures, operations, personnel and cultural environment.

13. How much agency shock did you encounter upon beginning your first position in the Criminal Justice System?
  - a. None
  - b. Less than average
  - c. Average
  - d. More than average
  - e. A great amount
  
14. Whether or not you encountered agency shock your entrance into your first position in the Criminal Justice System, do you think your college preparation equipped you to meet such shock?
  - a. Definitely
  - b. I think so
  - c. I don't know
  - d. I don't think so
  - e. Definitely not
  
15. If you could advise students at Michigan State University who were about to do a Criminal Justice Practicum, how would you rate the following goals or objectives as to their importance in the students practicum. (Rate each item so that 1 = Very important and 5 = Very unimportant.)
  - a. To learn skills associated with the handling of agency clients:
    1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
  
  - b. To develop an understanding of agency functions:
    1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

Page five

- c. To reach a decision for possibility of working in that area of C.J.?  
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
- d. To learn the duties of certain agency personnel:  
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
- e. to experience doing agency duties on your own:  
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
- f. To develop an understanding for the effectiveness of agency functions:  
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
- g. To learn how clients actually flow through the C.J. System:  
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
- h. To develop an understanding for the attitudes and philosophies of personnel in the C.J. System:  
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
- i. To compare observations with your classroom studies:  
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
- j. To develop interviewing techniques:  
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
- k. To become aware of the alternatives available in handling client problems:  
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
- l. To develop counseling techniques:  
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
- m. To develop an understanding for the overall relationship of the different agencies in the C.J. System:  
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
- n. To learn to effectively communicate with people working in the C.J. System:  
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
- o. To develop an understanding of what the real world situations is in the C.J. System:  
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
- p. To develop investigative techniques both formal and informal:  
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

Page six

- q. To develop an understanding for the immediate issues in the C.J. System:
  - 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
- r. The twelve credits or whatever number you signed up for:
  - 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
- s. To develop report writing skills:
  - 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

APPENDIX E

FOLLOW-UP NON-PRACTICUM AND PRACTICUM LETTERS



CLARENCE R. TERRILL  
DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION  
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION  
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY  
EAST LANSING, MICHIGAN

Dear M.S.U. Alum:

Please let this correspondence serve as my introduction to you. I am at present a graduate student at M.S.U. in the College of Education. I am also a graduate of the School of Criminal Justice at M.S.U. My present research is a project that is concerned with criminal justice graduates' success as a result of their experience as students in the School of Criminal Justice at Michigan State University.

As you may remember I surveyed your practicum class in 1975. This project is a follow-up survey of that original study. I am sure that you, as a loyal Spartan will be interested in assisting present and future Criminal Justice students at M.S.U. receive the most beneficial type of educational experience possible. I am also sure that your loyalty will be greatly appreciated by those students that will be the beneficiaries of the best possible C.J. education at Michigan State University.

Please find attached a questionnaire. Your cooperation in completing and returning this questionnaire to me in the enclosed postage paid self-addressed envelope will be appreciated. If you do not desire to include your name that is your choice. Whether or not you include your name, all responses will be treated in the strictest confidence. Once the data is compiled your questionnaire will be destroyed and all data will be presented in only a consolidated form.

Your time and cooperation in this matter will assist a poor graduate student to complete his dissertation and obtain a job! Thank you for your help in this project. If you would like a copy of the abstract of my disseration please enclose a self-addressed envelope and I will send you a copy.

Sincerely,

Clarence R. Terrill  
PhD Candidate

CLARENCE R. TERRILL  
DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION  
(continued)

P.S. Please accept the enclosed dollar bill as a token of my thanks for your cooperation and time. I realize that your time is much valuable than this meager consideration represents but I hope it will convince you of my appreciation for your help!

CLARENCE R. TERRILL  
DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION  
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION  
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY  
EAST LANSING, MICHIGAN

Dear Alum:

Please let this correspondence serve as my introduction to you. I am at present a graduate student at M.S.U. in the College of Education. I am also a graduate of the School of Criminal Justice holding both my Masters and Bachelors Degrees in Criminal Justice. My present research is a project that is concerned with criminal justice students in the School of Criminal Justice at Michigan State University.

Your name has been chosen at random to be a part of this study. I am sure that you as a loyal Spartan will be interested in assisting present and future Criminal Justice Students at Michigan State University receive the most beneficial type of educational experience possible. I am also sure that your loyal assistance will be greatly appreciated by the students who will be the beneficiaries of the best possible Criminal Justice education at Michigan State University.

Please find attached a questionnaire. Your cooperation in completing and returning this questionnaire to me in the enclosed postage paid self-addressed envelope will be appreciated. If you do not desire to include your name your responses will be treated in the strictest confidence. Once the data is compiled your questionnaire will be destroyed and all data will be presented in only a consolidated form.

Your time and cooperation in this matter will assist a poor graduate student to complete his dissertation and obtain a job! Thank you for your help in this project.

Sincerely,

Clarence R. Terrill  
PhD Candidate

APPENDIX F  
FOLLOW-UP NON-PRACTICUM QUESTIONNAIRE

NAME \_\_\_\_\_

ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_ PHONE # (\_\_\_\_) \_\_\_\_ - \_\_\_\_\_

- A. Did you participate in a Criminal Justice Practicum while you were at Michigan State University?
- a. YES  
b. NO
1. What year and term did you graduate from Michigan State University with your B.S. or B.A. Degree?
- a. 1975      b. 1976      c. 1977      d. 1978      e. 1979  
a. Fall      b. Winter      c. Spring      d. summer
2. What is the highest degree you have attained?
- a. B.S. or B.A.  
b. M.S. or M.A.  
c. Ph.D.  
d. Did not graduate from M.S.U.
3. What was your area of interest in Criminal Justice at Michigan State University?
- a. Law Enforcement  
b. Corrections  
c. Juvenile Delinquency  
d. Security Administration  
e. Other (Please Specify) \_\_\_\_\_
4. What was the first full time job you took in the Criminal Justice System after your graduation from Michigan State University with your B.S. or B.A.
- Your Title \_\_\_\_\_
- Location of Agency \_\_\_\_\_
- Type of Agency \_\_\_\_\_
5. What was the month and year you started that job?
- a. Jan b. Feb c. March d. April e. May f. June g. July  
h. Aug i. Sept j. Oct k. Nov l. Dec  
a. 1975 b. 1976 c. 1977 d. 1978 e. 1979 f. 1980

Page 2

6. How long did (have) you hold (held) the above position?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ months  
 \_\_\_\_\_ years
7. If you do not hold the position with the agency you named in question #5, how many other full time positions in the Criminal Justice System have you held since that one, including your present position if it is in the Criminal Justice System? (Circle the appropriate number.)
- 1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9   10   More than 10
8. Are you presently employed in the Criminal Justice System in a full-time capacity?
- a. Yes (if yes go on to #11 below.)  
 b. No (if no go on to the next question, #9 below.)
9. If you are not presently employed in the Criminal Justice System, what month and year did you leave your last position in the Criminal Justice System?
- a. Jan b. Feb c. March d. April e. May f. June g. July  
 h. Aug i. Sept j. Oct k. Nov l. Dec
- a. 1975 b. 1976 c. 1977 d. 1978 e. 1979 f. 1980
10. If you are not now employed in the Criminal Justice System, what were the major factors for your leaving the system? (Rate the following on a scale where 1= Very important and 5 - Very unimportant.)
- |   |                |
|---|----------------|
| a. Money -----                            | 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. |
| b. Job satisfaction with the C.J. System  | 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. |
| c. Frustration with the C.J. System ----- | 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. |
| d. Administrative problems -----          | 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. |
| e. Other (Please be specific as possible) | 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. |
| _____                                     |                |

Page 3

11. As you see them, what are the School of Criminal Justice's objectives for offering a Criminal Justice Practicum at Michigan State University? (Rate each of the items below on a scale on which 1 = Very important and 5 = Very unimportant.
- a. Professional Preparation ----- 1.2.3.4.5.
  - b. Professional Service ----- 1.2.3.4.5.
  - c. Self-Reliance and Self-Direction ----- 1.2.3.4.5.
  - d. Knowledge of Self-Abilities, Values, Ect. -- 1.2.3.4.5.
  - e. Understanding and Acceptance of Others ---- 1.2.3.4.5.
  - f. Application of Theory To Practical Situations 1.2.3.4.5.
  - g. Development of Awareness of Social Issues -- 1.2.3.4.5.
  - h. Other (Please Specify) \_\_\_\_\_ 1.2.3.4.5.
  - i. Not really sure ----- ()
12. Rate each of the following Criminal Justice Courses that were offered at Michigan State University in 1975 on a scale where 1 = the course has been very valuable to my career in Criminal Justice, 2 = the course was quite valuable to my career, 3 = the course was of some value to my career, 4 = the course was of no value to my career, and 5 = did not take the course.
- C.J. 110 Introduction to Criminal Justice -1.2.3.4.5.
  - C.J. 225 Police Science Lab -----1.2.3.4.5.
  - C.J. 315 Criminal Investigation -----1.2.3.4.5.
  - C.J. 318 Police Community Relations -----1.2.3.4.5.
  - C.J. 335 Police Administration -----1.2.3.4.5.
  - C.J. 355 Juvenile Delinquency -----1.2.3.4.5.
  - C.J. 368 Corrections Process -----1.2.3.4.5.
  - C.J. 375 Criminal Law -----1.2.3.4.5.
  - C.J. 392 Methods in Criminal Justice -----1.2.3.4.5.
  - C.J. 409 Great Issues in Criminal Justice -1.2.3.4.5.
  - C.J. 440 Intro. to Highway Traffic  
Administration-----1.2.3.4.5.
  - C.J. 455 Advance Juvenile Delinquency ---- 1.2.3.4.5.
  - C.J. 472 Criminal Procedure ----- 1.2.3.4.5.
  - C.J. 475 Criminal Evidence ----- 1.2.3.4.5.
  - C.J. Senior Criminal Justice Seminar ----- 1.2.3.4.5.
  - C.J. Crime Prevention Seminar ----- 1.2.3.4.5.

Page 4

For the purpose of this study, "agency shock" is defined as any and all of the adverse effects of persons entering into an agency environment which is markedly different from that to which an individual is accustomed, i.e. agency procedures, operations, personnel and cultural environment.

13. How much agency shock did you encounter upon beginning your first position in the Criminal Justice System?
  - a. None
  - b. Less than average
  - c. Average
  - d. More than average
  - e. A great amount
14. Whether or not you encountered agency shock your entrance into your first position in the Criminal Justice System, do you think your college preparation equipped you to meet such shock?
  - a. Definitely
  - b. I think so
  - c. I don't know
  - d. I don't think so
  - e. Definitely not
15. If you could advise students at Michigan State University who were about to do a Criminal Justice Practicum, how would you rate the following goals or objectives as to their importance in the students practicum. (Rate each item so that 1 = Very important and 5 = Very unimportant.)
  - a. To learn skills associated with the handling of agency clients:  
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
  - b. To develop an understanding of agency functions:  
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
  - c. To reach a decision for possibility of working in that area of C.J.?  
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
  - d. To learn the duties of certain agency personnel:  
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
  - e. to experience doing agency duties on your own:  
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.



Page 5

- f. To develop an understanding for the effectiveness of agency functions:  
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
- g. To learn how clients actually flow through the C.J. System:  
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
- h. To develop an understanding for the attitudes and philosophies of personnel in the C.J. System:  
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
- i. To compare observations with your classroom studies:  
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
- j. To develop interviewing techniques:  
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
- k. To become aware of the alternatives available in handling client problems:  
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
- l. To develop counseling techniques:  
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
- m. To develop an understanding for the overall relationship of the different agencies in the C.J. System:  
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
- n. To learn to effectively communicate with people working in the C.J. System:  
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
- o. To develop an understanding of what the real world situations is in the C.J. System:  
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
- p. To develop investigative techniques both formal and informal:  
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
- q. To develop an understanding for the immediate issues in the C.J. System:  
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
- r. The twelve credits or whatever number you signed up for:  
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

Page 6

- s. To develop report writing skills:
  - 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

APPENDIX G  
FACULTY INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

## C.J. FACULTY INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What is the range of experiences available to C.J. students here at M.S.U. in the C.J. Practicum?
2. What do you see as the value of experiential education for students?
3. What do you see as the most important outcomes for the School of C.J. from the Practicum?
4. How does the C.J. Practicum fit into the School of C.J. new curriculum and focus?
5. If you were the Practicum Coordinator what changes would you make in the program, if any?
6. If you were the Practicum Coordinator with no other duties what changes would you make?
7. Compared to other courses in C.J., how would you rate the importance of the Practicum?
8. Do you think that most undergraduates are aware of the opportunity to participate in the C.J. Practicum? When do they become aware?
9. Do you actively promote the practicum to the C.J. students you come in contact with?
10. Do you feel that a student receives more of a body of knowledge from A. or B. Below?
  - A. A ten week multi-agency , Ride-along Placement.
  - B. A ten week internship with an agency like Probate Court.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### BOOKS AND Pamphlets

- Allen, Herman R. Open Door to Learning. Urbana: University of Illinois, Press 1963.
- Andelotte, Frank. Breaking the Academic Lockstep. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1944.
- Baskin, Samuel (ed). Higher Education: Some New Developments. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1965.
- Borzak, Lenore (ed). Field Study: A Sourcebook for Experiential Learning. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1981.
- Cross, K. Patricia, Beyond the Open Door. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1971.
- \_\_\_\_\_. New Students and New Needs in Higher Education. Berkley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, 1972.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Missing Link: Connecting Adult Learners to Learning Resources. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1978.
- \_\_\_\_\_ and Samuel B. Gould. Exploration in Non-Traditional Study. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1972.
- \_\_\_\_\_ and John R. Valley. Planning Non-Traditional Programs. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1976.
- Davis, Robert H., John S. Duley, and Lawrence T. Alexander. Field Experience: Guides for the Improvement of Instruction in Higher Education No. 8. Michigan State University, 1977.
- Dressel, Paul L. College and University Curriculum. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1968.

- \_\_\_\_\_ and DeLisle, Frances H.  
Undergraduate Curriculum Trends. Washington,  
 D.C.: American Council on Education, 1969
- Duley, John S. (ed). Implementing Field Experiences  
 Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.,  
 1974.
- Gordon, Garey R. and R. Bruce McBride. Criminal  
 Justice Internships: Theory into Practices.  
 Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishing Company, 1984.
- Henderson, Algo D. The Innovative Spirit. San  
 Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1969.
- Keeton, Morris T. and Association. Experiential  
 Learning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1976.
- Lynd, Hellen Merrel. Field Work in College Education.  
 New York: Columbia University Press, 1945.
- Mayhew, Louis B. and Patricia J. Ford. Changing the  
 Curriculum. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.,  
 1971.
- Meeth, Richard L. and Earl J. McGrath. Organizing for  
 Teaching and Learning: The Curriculum in Higher  
 Education: some Newer Developments. New York:  
 McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1965.
- Michigan State University Publication. This is Michigan  
 State University: 1979 Fact Book. East Lansing:  
 Michigan State University, 1979.
- Michigan State University Publication. 1980-81 Academic  
 Programs. East Lansing: Michigan State  
 University, 1979.
- National Commission for Cooperative Education. College,  
 Universities and Community colleges Offering  
 Cooperative Education Programs. New York:  
 National Commission for Cooperative Education, 1971.
- Quinn, M.E. "An Investigation of Undergraduate Field Study"  
Experiences at Michigan State University.  
 Doctoral Dissertation, Michigan State University,  
 1972.
- Sigmon, R. A. A Notebook on Service learning. Raleigh:  
 North Carolina Internship Office, 1972.

- Styles, Jimmy and Denny F. Pace. Guidelines for work Experience Programs in the Criminal Justice System. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1961.
- Terrace, Herbert and Scott Parker. Psychological Statistics Vols I, II, III, IV, V, VI, and VII. San Rafael, Calif.: The American University. 1975
- Vermilye, Dyckman W. (ed). Relating Work and Education: 1977 Current Issues in Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1976.
- Wilson, James W. and Edward H. Lyons. Work-Study College Programs. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1961.