SELECTED PAPERS FROM THE WORKSHOP FOR CORRECTIONAL EDUCATORS IN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES HELD IN ALBANY, NEW YORK AUGUST, 1973

VINCENT O'LEARY, DIRECTOR
SCHOOL OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT ALBANY

SPONSORED BY
THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF CORRECTIONS

817/6-74/5C

SELECTED PAPERS

from

THE WORKSHOP

for

CORRECTIONAL EDUCATORS

in

COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

held in

Rensselaerville, New York

August, 1973

Sponsored by

THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF CORRECTIONS

This program was made possible by a grant from the United States Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. The views expressed in this publication are those of the authors, and do not represent a statement of position of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, nor of the National Institute of Corrections.

PREFACE

In August, 1973, an experimental Workshop was undertaken for educators from twenty-two universities and colleges who were concerned with correctionally oriented programs in higher education. No resources existed where educators engaged with these types of academic concerns could consider collectively such matters as trends in contemporary corrections, educational techniques, or curriculum design. Since thousands of persons were being educated in such programs and thousands more will be in the future, there existed then, and continues to exist, a clear need to foster the strongest possible kind of programs in this area in recognition of their present and potential impact on corrections in the United States. In order to begin to address this need, the National Institute of Corrections collaborated with a team of faculty members from the School of Criminal Justice at the State University of New York at Albany to undertake an experimental program to uncover means to assist teachers in these programs. Included in the faculty team were Professors Vincent O'Leary, Donald Newman and Fred Cohen. Two advanced graduate students, Sherwood Zimmerman and Lucien Lombardo were associate members of the team.

A sixteen day Workshop was carried out at the Institute of Man and Science in Rensselaerville, New York. The educators who participated in this program were drawn from programs which varied in educational level, program size as well as geography. Of the twenty-two participants, ten represented community college associate degree programs. Five of these programs were located in the East, three in the South and two in the Mid-West. These programs ranged in size from 45 to nearly 500 students. There were also twelve participants representing senior colleges and universities. All of these schools offered four year bachelors degrees and eight offered

graduate degrees. Two of the four year program participants were from institutions located in the East, three from the South, three from the Mid-West and four from the Far West. These programs ranged in size from 121 to nearly 15,000 students.

During the workshop program a variety of materials and issues were examined. Although expert faculty were generously employed, the major concern of this program was the heavy involvement of the participant educators. Working on a variety of tasks in small groups, the participants examined a number of crucial and relevant issues in higher education.

Another facet of participant involvement was the development in conjunction with a member of the faculty team of a topic relevant to criminal justice and correctional education culminating in the submission of a consultant's paper to the institute. (These papers represent the ideas and concerns of specific individuals involved in the correctional education enterprise).

The papers in this volume represent those submitted by the participant educators. They were selected from among others because they dealt with areas of particular interest to those administering corrections and criminal justice education programs. Though they differ in methodology, taken together these papers cover a great deal of territory. Some selections provide and analyze data which expand the information base for further discussions, while others attempt to clarify specific issues and questions involved in this important educational endeavor.

In his paper, "Correctional Manpower and Correctional Education in Colleges and Universities," Thomas Phelps draws on the California experience to explore the relationships between correctional education programs and correctional agencies. In addition to providing data on the employment patterns of criminal justice graduates, Phelps discusses the evaluation of

criminal justice education programs from the perspective of manpower development, as well as efforts by state agencies to recruit the graduates of these higher education programs.

The second paper in this series is a comparative study of Undergraduate students in four year law enforcement and criminology bachelor degree programs. In this study Barton L. Ingraham and Knowlton W. Johnson test a number of hypotheses derived from the literature concerning backgrounds, attitudes and career aspirations of law enforcement and criminology students.

Kenneth Taylor's paper, "Admission and Retention Policies in Colleges Granting Degrees in Corrections" discusses the policies of the educational institutions participating in the institute. He also raises and discusses issues which may have implications for the future in criminal justice and correctional education: minority recruitment and admission quotas.

The remaining two papers focus on more substantive educational mechanisms. Lawrence McCurdy's contribution, "A Representative Curriculum from Two Year Corrections Programs in Community and Junior Colleges in the United States," focuses on the specific area of correctional curriculum and provides a mathematical summary of the curricula of 34 associate degree correctional programs. His study provides an overall picture of correctional curricula in terms of the emphasis given to various subject areas.

Ronald Boostrom's, "Action Research as a Tool for Corrections Educators," discusses issues involved in working with agencies and provides a description of an actual action research project. Action research is seen as a supplement for or alternative to the more traditional internship program.

The thread which binds all of the papers in this series together is the need for collaboration and coordination between institutions of higher education and the agencies of corrections, criminal justice systems, and plan-

ning agencies. Perhaps the issues raised and the methods they proposed as solutions will spur others to take a closer look at their programs and foster a spirit of cooperation among all those involved in this educational enterprise.

August 1973

Vincent O'Leary
School of Criminal Justice
State University of New York at Albany

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CORRECTIONAL MANPOWER AND CORRECTIONAL EDUCATION IN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Thomas R. Phelps
Department of Criminal Justice
California State University
Sacramento, California

The past decade has seen the concern for change in the criminal justice system documented in the reports of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice (1967) and the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals (1973).[1] With this concern has come comprehensive Federal involvement beginning in 1968 with the passage of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act (Public Law 90-351). This legislation established the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration within the United States Department of Justice, and gave it a mandate to revitalize the criminal justice system by strengthening the police, modernizing the courts, and reforming corrections.

An important milestone in the activities of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration was reached with the creation of a National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals in October 1971. This Commission was asked to propose guidelines for a more effective criminal justice system, and in late 1973 the Commission released its summary volume entitled, A National Strategy to Reduce Crime.[2] The Commission recognized that corrections will have to share the responsibility for crime reduction and that closed system so characteristic of corrections in the past will have to begin to open itself and to look outside the walls of incarcerative institutions. Community corrections and resource identification was to be the key to the success of corrections.

Education for Corrections. With this new emphasis, corrections will have to find manpower with the capacity to: (1) isolate and identify the inner resources of the correctional client; (2) search for ways to reintegrate the ex-offender; and, (3) evaluate the success of programs which have an impact on crime reduction and offender rehabilitation. Personnel is the most important element in the correctional budget; however, the system has long failed to utilize the potential manpower reserves available from one thousand college and university programs.

Interest in the corrections component of the criminal justice curriculum within the context of higher education was given added impetus in 1965 with the passage of the Correctional Rehabilitation Study Act (Public Law 89-178). This act provided for "an objective, thorough, and nationwide analysis and reevaluation of the extent and means of resolving the critical shortage of qualified manpower in the field of correctional rehabilitation."[3] The Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training was partially funded through this legislation and produced a number of reports which, if implemented, might have mitigated the crime problem.[4] In 1969 Vernon Fox prepared guidelines for corrections programs in community and junior colleges.[5] At the same time the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, through its Office of Educational and Manpower Assistance, began providing grants and loans to criminal justice students enrolled in degree programs. This Law Enforcement Education Program (LEEP) has provided financial assistance to students who are employees of police, courts, and corrections agencies. Though the emphasis was upon upgrading the skills of those in the field, pre-service students, preparing for careers in the field, have also benefited from this program.

Comprehensive Federal involvement in upgrading education for law enforcement and correctional personnel commenced in 1968 with the passage of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act (Public Law 90-351). Title I, Part D, Section 406 of the legislation authorized the establishment of the Law Enforcement Education Program (LEEP):

> ...the Administration is authorized, after appropriate consultation with the Commissioner of Education, to carry out programs of academic educational assistance to improve and strengthen law enforcement.[6]

Law enforcement is defined as "all activities pertaining to crime prevention or reduction and enforcement of the criminal law."[7] This definition was expanded in the amended 1968 Act which is known as the Omnibus Crime Control Act of 1970 (Public Law 91-644). It reads:

> Law enforcement means any activity pertaining to crime prevention, control or reduction or the enforcement of the criminal law, including, but not limited to police efforts to prevent, control, or reduce crime or to apprehend criminals, activities of courts having criminal jurisdiction and related agencies, activities of corrections, probation, or parole authorities, and programs relating to the prevention, control, or reduction of juvenile delinquency or narcotic addiction.[8]

Further amendments to the original 1968 legislation will be found in the Crime Control Act of 1973 (Public Law 93-83). Section 406 states: "...the Administration is authorized...to carry out programs of academic educational assistance to improve and strengthen law enforcement and criminal justice."[9]

Since 1969, the Law Enforcement Education Program has provided financial assistance to over 300,000 students. This totaled 40 million dollars in 1973 when 990 schools were able to provide assistance to 95,000 students.[10] In-service personnel receiving grants under this program agree to remain in the field for two years following completion of their academic program. The pre-service student accepting a LEEP loan must seek and find employment in a

law enforcement or criminal justice agency. The loan recipient must complete four years of full-time employment with a public criminal justice agency in order to avoid repaying his loan.

The LEEP guidelines state that "applications from personnel in corrections, probation, parole, and courts must be given equal treatment with applications from police officers."[11] Since appropriations are inadequate to meet the applicant demand, priorities have been established for the assignment of LEEP funds. However, after the first five priority groups are funded, little remains for the other categories. This situation can be expected to continue into fiscal year 1975 (July 1, 1974 through June 30, 1975) when the order of priority will be as follows:

(1) New or returning applicants who are state or local criminal justice personnel on leave;
(2) Returning in-service LEEP recipients except transfers;
(3) Returning in-service LEEP recipients who are transfers holding associate degrees or equivalent credit hours;
(4) Returning pre-service LEEP recipients except transfers;
(5) Returning pre-service LEEP recipients who are transfers holding associate degrees or equivalent credit hours;
(6) New applicants who are state or local criminal justice personnel;
(7) New pre-service applicants, excluding pre-law students and candidates for law degrees;
(8) New applicants who are eligible in-service teachers;
(9) New applicants who are eligible federal criminal justice personnel;
(10) New in-service applicants who are candidates for law degrees.[12]

The Employment of Criminal Justice Graduates

Not much background information is available that is helpful in identifying the LEEP student. It is important that more be known about the pre-service student who selects an undergraduate major in criminal justice or a

related field. How often does he find employment in a criminal justice agency following graduation? Informal estimates have placed the figure at 50 percent but this is only an assumption. In addition, the pre-career student tied to his "classification seven" is not likely to be considered for financial help.

Criminal justice programs in colleges and universities should determine whether their graduates have attempted to find employment in the field. This career expectation is important. If they actively seek employment and are rejected then it is critical to know why. It would also be revealing to know what becomes of criminal justice majors who make no effort to work in the field.

A recent study by Zerikotes identified the employment patterns and career expectations of graduates from a criminal justice program located at a four year university in a large urban community.[13] The population studied included all graduates receiving a Bachelor of Arts degree in Criminal Justice at one California State University during the period January 1968 through June 1971. Questionnaires were mailed to 331 of these students. Responses were received from 153 graduates or 46 percent of the population. Of those responding, 121, or 79 percent were currently working for a criminal justice agency. Only 11 were employed in corrections, while 110 were affiliated with law enforcement agencies. One-half, or 55, of the law enforcement positions held by graduates were in local police and sheriffs departments. Only 21 percent of the graduates, or 32 of them, were not working for a criminal justice agency. When asked why they were not actually in the field, 15 said jobs were not available, 3 hadn't planned to enter the field, and 14 gave other reasons. One-fourth of those employed in occupations other than criminal justice identified their current position as insurance adjuster. Other job titles included: teacher, labor organizer,

junior economic analyst, training officer for a state agency not related to criminal justice, assistant manager for a retail food store, business manager, and staff member of the Chancellor's Office for the California Community Colleges. These positions attest to the liberal arts nature of the criminal justice curriculum. These graduates can influence community attitudes and policies in law enforcement and corrections. In conclusion, it should be mentioned that 69 of the graduates in this program (or 45%) were employed in the field of criminal justice while pursuing their undergraduate degree. Following graduation, the number of respondents employed in the field was 121 or 79 percent. Only four in-service students departed the field of criminal justice following graduation. This study reaches several important conclusions: (1) in-service personnel tend to remain in the system after completing the Bachelor of Arts degree in Criminal Justice; (2) upgrading the professional competencies of in-service personnel does not result in an attrition rate which is damaging to operational agencies; (3) pre-service personnel do attempt to obtain employment in criminal justice agencies following graduation; and, (4) pre-service personnel who do not enter the field are likely to obtain employment in areas related to criminal justice or positions which provide an opportunity for influencing local policies in criminal justice matters.

In an effort to identify both in-service and pre-service students, the University of California Center for the Administration of Justice has been constructing profiles of the LEEP student in their program. Carter and Nelson forwarded a questionnaire to the 783 students who had received LEEP funds while enrolling in their program (Fall 1969 through Fall 1972). Answers were returned by 390 students. This 50 percent response is similar to the 46 percent obtained by Zerikotes. The Carter and Nelson LEEP student profile identifies:

1. Agency affiliation: law enforcement (58 percent); corrections including probation, parole, and correctional institutions (36 percent); the courts (3 percent); and, other criminal justice related activities including teaching (3 percent).

2. Organizational ranking of correctional personnel (when supplied by respondents): line personnel (54 percent); supervisors (28 percent); and, directors or program supervisors (18 percent).

3. Previous experience in a criminal justice agency: law enforcement student (over 11 years); corrections student (under 11 years); and, the court agency student (7 years).

4. Part-time or full-time teaching faculty assignments in colleges and universities: full-time or part-time faculty at four year schools (9 percent); full-time or part-time faculty at community colleges (21 percent); and, in-service instructors for their own agencies (24 percent).

5. Class standing: the majority of LEEP students at the University of Southern California are graduate students (96 percent).

6. Average age of LEEP students in this program: law enforcement (36 years); corrections (40 years); and, courts (36 years).

7. Sex composition: the majority of students are males (94 percent).

8. The racial and ethnic breakdown of LEEP student population: Caucasian (82 percent); black (10 percent); Mexican-American (4 percent); native-American Indian (3 percent); and, Oriental (1 percent).[14]

The Standards and Evaluation Division of the State of California Office of Criminal Justice Planning has provided a profile of in-service and pre-service students enrolled in criminal justice program. There were 109 colleges and universities participating in the LEEP program in fiscal year 1973. A total of 41,538 students were enrolled in such programs. In-service students totaled 21,982 and the pre-service enrollment was 19,556.

The number of students participating in the LEEP program was 15,439 or approximately 37 percent. Those students receiving financial assistance from LEEP include 13,618 in-service students and 1,821 pre-service. The LEEP award level allocated to California colleges and universities for fiscal year 1973 totaled $4,497,801.[15]

Less money was allocated to LEEP participating colleges and universities in California for the 1974 fiscal year (July 1, 1973 to June 30, 1974). The award amount was $3,859,859 to 105 schools. The number of students enrolled in criminal justice and related programs in these schools increased: 25,062 in-service and 22,293 pre-service students. All of these students did not request or receive LEEP grants or loans. Those receiving financial assistance from this source include 15,526 in-service criminal justice personnel (62 percent of the total enrollment) and only 2,075 pre-service students (which is 9 percent of the number taking such courses). The number of participating schools decreased from 109 to 105 in 1974. A study of agency affiliation of the in-service LEEP participating student reveals the following profile: police services, 63 percent; corrections, 28 percent; courts, 5 percent; and; other, 4 percent. The high police services representation among students receiving financial assistance through LEEP is in keeping with the current criminal justice manpower situation in California. According to the Office of Criminal Justice Planning the criminal justice personnel in the state include: 75,692 police officers; 20,152 corrections personnel; and, 6,350 courts personnel.[16]

Even though progress has been made in developing correctional programs in the schools, it would appear that corrections has not utilized them as readily as the police agencies. The Office of Criminal Justice Planning offers the following reasons for the disproportionate participation by corrections in undergraduate education: (1) 72 percent of the county probation

departments require the undergraduate degree for entry level employment; (2) a high school diploma or its equivalency is demanded for correctional officers and group supervisors; (3) the college degree or its equivalency is required for positions such as parole agent or correctional counselor. Therefore, in-service correctional personnel are more likely to be enrolled in graduate programs which explains the high representation of corrections in the University of Southern California program. The entry level educational requirement for police is frequently a high school diploma although the Associate of Arts degree is becoming the standard as departments upgrade entrance requirements.

Assessing correctional manpower needs. Manpower development is defined as:

> ...the process by which potentially qualified personnel and in-service personnel are selected and developed to their desired, fullest capabilities to better prepare them for their future, as well as present positions, in order to meet the individual, organizational, program and system needs of criminal justice.[17]

The National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals stresses the "need for effective selection, placement, and evaluation of personnel."[18] Attempts to determine current and projected manpower requirements in corrections have been largely unsuccessful in the past, although the highest expenditure in a criminal justice agency budget is allocated to personnel. Resources for determining these needs are not well developed. Corrections has traditionally operated its programs with a smaller staff than it needs. Personnel in this field often express dissatisfaction with the program effectiveness of corrections. The prison reform movement along with heightened community fear of probationers, prisoners, and parolees adds a chilling validity to the employee's response. The increase in urban vio-

lence and the use of guerrilla tactics by those who had had correctional care and processing points up the need for new input into corrections.

One example of manpower assessment is the state planning agency in California (i.e., Office of Criminal Justice Planning) which has attempted to assess the number of correctional personnel needed by the state for 1975. The staff of this agency is cautious in its predictions and stresses the need for greater concern in collecting data which will increase the usefulness of manpower surveys. It has not been easy to collect even the most basic information identifying the number of personnel currently employed in criminal justice. For example, in reviewing the current literature dealing with criminal justice manpower in California, it was found that reports were often in conflict, and that definitions of work categories are not the same in any two reports. A study of existing reports published within a few months of each other revealed the following conflicting figures on the number of law enforcement officers in California: (1) there are 57,971 law enforcement officers in California; (2) there are 48,331 police officers in California; (3) there are 30;243 in California; and, (4) there are 44,523 police officers in California. Things were little better when an attempt was made to determine the number of court personnel. Although the courts are the smallest segment of the criminal justice system the figures ranged from 1671 to 3332. In corrections, the figures on the number of personnel ranged from 4337 to 18,985. Although the studies reviewed were appropriate to the needs of the agencies preparing them, no one study was available which could correctly provide a systematic view of the number of criminal justice personnel employed in the various agencies comprising the system.

The Office of Criminal Justice Planning is now developing comprehensive base-line, profile and characteristic data in the following related areas:

equipment, expenditures, facilities, and manpower. In the meantime, the agency has projected correctional manpower needs for California in 1975. Estimates were determined by using the standards related to manpower needs developed by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice in 1967.[19] The standards were applied to available California data to reach the projections identified in Table 1. The number of corrections personnel needed in 1975, when compared with 1971 staffing, totals an additional 7,216 positions or a 35.8 percent increase in line operations personnel. There is reason to believe that similar growth trends exist in other states. Cobern warns that corrections must obtain the resources to

TABLE 1

California Manpower Requirements for Corrections

Personnel Category	Employed in 1971	Needed in 1975	Change
County probation: adult and juvenile	9,160	12,250	+3,090
California Youth Authority: juvenile parole and institutions	3,562	4,938	+1,376
Dept. of Corrections: adult parole and institutions	7,430	10,180	+2,750
Total	20,152	27,368	+7,216

Source: State of California Office of Criminal Justice Planning, 1974 California Comprehensive Plan for Criminal Justice (Sacramento: Office of Criminal Justice Planning, 1974), pp. 193-195.

handle the increased workloads brought about by greater police effectiveness in apprehending offenders.[20] The Office of Criminal Justice Planning in California has stated: "The greatest need in the manpower development program area is a systematic, comprehensive manpower survey of all criminal jus-

tice personnel in the state."[21] Jo Wallach and her staff have summarized the type of information which is needed:

1. Recruitment methods.
2. Selection methods and entry requirements.
3. Knowledge of the roles and tasks to be performed so that we know who to recruit and who to select and how to train and educate those we select as well as those already employed in the system.
4. Sizes of organizations, occupational levels, deployment and utilization of personnel.
5. Profiles of personnel -- how many line, supervisorial, administrative and specialized.
6. How much training has personnel at all levels received, how much education, how many personnel are there, how many new ones must be trained, how old are they, what race, what sex, how much experience have they had, what training do they feel they need?[22]

The National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals states: "...those concerned with the development of criminal justice manpower must be prepared to evaluate their education and training programs continually."[23]

The Office of Criminal Justice Planning, through a grant from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, established the State Manpower Development Advisory Committee. California is one of several states using this model. The state planning agency serves in an advisory role in the administration of the LEEP program. The agency is responsible for the development of a statewide manpower plan for utilization of criminal justice personnel, it provides technical assistance to educational institutions approved to receive LEEP funding, the staff serve as a liaison between the schools and the regional office of LEAA, and it monitors the programs to assure that the education curricula is meeting the needs of criminal justice personnel. The State Manpower Development Advisory Committee is composed of representatives from higher education, operational agencies in criminal justice, state planning office, private industry, and associations concerned with accreditation of educational programs. The Committee has two responsibilities: (1) it serves in an advisory capacity to the manpower development unit of the Office of Criminal Justice Planning; and, (2) it reviews LEEP applications from colleges and universities approved by LEAA to receive financial funding for students enrolled in such programs.

Evaluating criminal justice education. The major activity of the State Manpower Development Advisory Committee has been in the area of educational manpower assessment. Over 100 two year and four year colleges and universities have requested and received LEEP education funds each year. The Committee studies the applications and recommends to the Office of Criminal Justice Planning the level of funding for each of the schools. These recommendations are forwarded to the Executive Director of the Office of Criminal Justice Planning. He reviews the recommendations and forwards them to the Regional Administrator of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.

In an effort to determine the quality of criminal justice education programs in colleges and universities the Committee and the state planning agency manpower development staff requested supplemental information from each school requesting funds for fiscal year 1975 (July 1, 1974 to June 30, 1975). The questions emphasize the following areas: program management; curriculum; faculty; and student representation. The questions have evolved from the request experience of the past several years. Answers are needed if the field wishes to fill in the many gaps which prohibit both state and national evaluations of higher education for criminal justice. The following information will serve to upgrade degree programs designed for criminal justice personnel and others considering a career in the field:

PROGRAM MANAGEMENT:

1. Is there a full-time or part-time program coordinator?

   a. If so, please name and specify his/her activities, i.e., promotes communication with criminal justice agencies, other academic disciplines, the financial aids office, etc...

   b. How much release time does the coordinator receive for these activities?

   c. How much of the coordinator's time is devoted to instructing in the program?

   d. If a police academy exists, how much time does the coordinator spend in this activity?

   e. What contributions did the coordinator provide in the application for LEEP funds?

2. Is there a Criminal Justice Advisory Committee?

   a. If so, please name and list occupations.

   b. What are the Committee's responsibilities? More specifically, what has the Committee done to improve curriculum, evaluate the program and as an overseer of LEEP Administration?

   c. How many meetings were held this academic year? Please attach minutes of meetings held.

3. Is there a staff member within the financial aids office responsible for LEEP?

   a. If so, how much time is devoted to LEEP?

   b. Does this staff member attend the Criminal Justice Advisory Committee meetings?

4. What method is used in disbursing LEEP funds to students (check, credit, etc...)?

5. In relation to the applicable term (semester, trimester, quarter) when does the student receive his/her LEEP money?

6. Give some indication of how fiscal year 1974 funds have been utilized, i.e., was the amount initially awarded disbursed among eligible students or will there be an excess of funds at the end of the fiscal year?

7. What is your institution's defined service area?

   a. How does your institution assess the criminal justice educational needs in your service area?

   b. Please identify the criminal justice agencies in your service area.

8. What financial, program and career counseling are students provided? (Be specific)

   a. When and by whom (name, title) are students made aware of the contractual obligations in receiving LEEP funds?

CURRICULUM:

1. If your institution is a community college, does the program include the "core curriculum": Administration of Justice, Principles and Procedures of the Justice System, Concepts of Criminal Law, Legal Aspects of Evidence and Community Relations? If not, is the institution contemplating adopting the core curriculum?

2. What curriculum innovations are taking place or have taken place in the last year?

3. Please submit a copy of the schedule of courses to be offered (1974-75) or are now being offered (1973-74).

4. Is the course work in your program transferable to other institutions?

   a. Please attach articulation agreements.

FACULTY:

1. What steps have been taken to rate (evaluate) the quality of existing faculty? Attach any pertinent documents.

2. For the next academic year are there new faculty positions being requested, being filled or planned?

   a. If so, how many, in what capacity (full-time or part-time) and in what areas are the new faculty most experienced, i.e., academically and/or through work experience.

   b. In what areas will the new faculty members be instructing: police, courts, corrections, other (be specific)?

3. Utilizing the LEEP 1 application, Part III, No. 1, titled FACULTY, provide an additional column here which corresponds to the individual faculty members indicating which courses the faculty member will be instructing (1974-75) or has been instructing (1973-74).

STUDENTS:

1. The following data should reflect the most current academic period (semester, trimester, quarter).

   a. How many students receiving LEEP funds are in-service? How many are pre-service?

   b. Of the in-service students receiving LEEP funds, how many are employed in (a) police, (b) courts, (c) corrections and (d) other (specify)?

2. Of the total number of criminal justice students (including non-LEEP students) as identified in the application for funds (LEEP 1, Part III, No. 2, D), how many are in-service? How many are pre-service?

NARRATIVE:

1. What has your institution done to improve the quality of the program, in terms of program management, curriculum, faculty, and student representation during the 1973-74 academic year?

2. What is your institution planning to do to improve the quality of the program, in terms of program management, curriculum, faculty and student representation during the 1974-75 academic year?

FOR THOSE INSTITUTIONS CONDUCTING EXTERNAL DEGREE, EXTENDED UNIVERSITY AND OFF-MAIN CAMPUS DEGREE PROGRAMS UTILIZING LEEP FUNDS, PLEASE INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING EVALUATION IN YOUR APPLICATION FOR FUNDS.

Each institution will evaluate their off-main campus program(s) so as to assure OCJP and LEAA that these programs are of comparable quality as their main campus program in relation to the following criteria:

A. Student services

   1. Financial, Programmatic and Career Counseling
   2. Library Service

B. Coordination of Program Services

   1. Program Coordinator
   2. Instructor availability or accessibility to students
   3. Institution's policy on recruitment of faculty
      i.e., How does the off-main campus instructor compare with on-main campus instructors when reviewing qualifications for hiring.

C. Program Site or Location

   1. Neutral Setting

D. Student Representation

   1. Number of matriculated students in each location according to general student mixture

      a) By criminal justice system component, i.e., police, courts, corrections
      b) In-service mixture versus pre-service mixture
      c) Students from other career fields.[24]

An assessment of educational programs in criminal justice is an important step in developing data for effective use of manpower in corrections. Trethric, in his study of Criminal Justice programs in six California State Universities, states:

> ...there is little evidence to indicate that a common body of knowledge exists in the field of Criminal Justice education. During recent years many new Criminal Justice related programs have been developed and many existing programs have undergone change....Unfortunately, however, these improvements have not been directed toward a designed goal or minimum standards in this educational field....This uncoordinated and piecemeal effort in designing Criminal Justice educational programs does little to contribute toward the improvements required in Criminal Justice education and the necessary development of a standardized body of knowledge that is based on the actual roles and objectives of personnel performing tasks in the criminal justice system.[25]

Agency recruitment and criminal justice education. Most correctional positions are covered by civil service, and there are certain requirements

which must be considered. The following are the most common: residency rules; unnecessarily long experience requirements; restrictions based upon age, sex, and physical characteristics (e.g., height or weight); written entrance examinations; barriers to hiring the physically handicapped; and, legal or administrative barriers to hiring ex-offenders. Recruitment of qualified personnel has often been inhibited by these restrictions. The National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals has recommended that these practices be eliminated hoping to interest qualified people in correctional work.[26]

A serious limitation on hiring is the requirement that experience precede employment into an entry level position. A few years ago it was possible to substitute years of education for experience; but now many agencies require experience plus the degree. One-year internships in correctional agencies during undergraduate years may satisfy this requirement, and it is sometimes possible to obtain college credit for volunteer assignments in criminal justice agencies.

The corrections agencies have yet to recognize the recent development of criminal justice programs. The students enrolled in a LEEP supported program in a college or university provide the agency with a manpower pool of individuals who have made a commitment to the field by selecting an approved major related to criminal justice. A review of recent job specifications for corrections positions illustrates corrections' failure to take into consideration these pioneering efforts. Some examples follow:

1. The group counselor position is the entry level classification in the counseling series in a juvenile probation department. Specific duties include counseling, supervision, care and custody of a group of juveniles in the detention center and shelter operated under the direction of the juvenile court. Minimum educational requirements include completion of at

least 60 units at an accredited college or university. The announcement stresses applicant completion of at least one course in psychology or sociology. No preference is given to those who have majored in criminal justice or LEEP supported educational programs. However, candidates are expected to have: knowledge of behavior patterns of delinquent and non-delinquent juveniles; knowledge of abnormal psychology; and methods for encouraging, instructing, and directing a group of juveniles.

2. The deputy probation officer trainee is the entry class for the county probation series. The applicant is expected to have a broad experience or educational background which would provide:

(a) Knowledge of individual and group behavior;
(b) Ability to effectively communicate orally and in writing;
(c) Ability to establish and maintain effective relationships with clients and families of all ages, from a variety of ethnic and cultural backgrounds;
(d) Ability to collect, interpret and evaluate data, validate conclusions and define and select alternatives;
(e) Ability to find creative solutions to a variety of problems and for a wide variety of clients;
(f) Ability to exercise initiative, work under limited supervision, and effectively complete assignments under the pressure of peak work loads and statutory deadlines.

The only requirement mentioned in the job specification is the possession of a valid California driver's license.

3. Correctional officer in any Department of Corrections institution or group supervisor at a California Youth Authority institution. Minimum age for employment is 21. Education requirement is the completion of high school or its equivalent. College training may be substituted for the required experience on a year-to-year basis. The written examination covers the following areas: ability to follow directions; analytical ability; cor-

rectional supervision; and, understanding individual and group behavior.

4. The correctional counselor position in the Department of Corrections institutions is the entry level job category for those in the rehabilitation or treatment area. Assignments include classification, group counseling, and group therapy. A college degree is required although the major field of study is not specified. Candidates without previous experience in the rehabilitation field may substitute graduate work in sociology, psychology, criminology, or an accredited school of social work. Applicants substituting education for the entire experience requirement must have completed the equivalent of one academic year in an approved course in supervised casework or correctional fieldwork during or supplemental to their graduate work. The written examination includes the following subject areas: fundamentals of correctional casework; causes and treatment of delinquency and criminality; supervision of prison inmates; ability to analyze data; and knowledge of individual and group behavior.

5. Youth counselor in a California Youth Authority institution or conservation camp. This position involves counseling and supervising wards in their daily living and activity programs, preparing social evaluations, conducting group counseling sessions, and individual counseling for a caseload of approximately ten wards. To be appointed to this position a person must have reached his 18th birthday. A college degree is required although no major concentration of study is recommended. The educational requirement can be waived by one year of experience in the position of a group supervisor. The written entrance examination stresses: cultural differences and delinquent subcultures, and treatment and supervision of delinquent youth.

Correctional job classifications ignore pre-service students who are graduates of criminal justice education programs. Requirements for entrance

level positions are listed in the job announcement together with subject areas to be included in the written examination. These skills can be obtained locally in existing criminal justice educational programs, but the job announcements make no reference to this fact. Frequently, educational requirements are limited to such general statements as two courses in sociology or psychology or a degree from a college or university. Experience is often substituted for the educational requirement. This does not help the in-service correctional worker obtain advancement within the agency through enrollment in criminal justice higher education programs. Successful candidates are picked on the basis of previous agency employment in a lower level position, experience replacing the educational requirement. Undergraduate internships and volunteer work assignments in this field are also generally overlooked in determining which pre-service students will be employed. Completion of the introductory course in sociology or psychology is considered adequate as against a major in criminal justice from a department identified as a manpower resource. In fact, many staff members from the hiring agencies are teaching one or more courses in these educational institutions. Probation departments have actually compiled their employment lists by ranking candidates according to the last digit of their social security number. The failure of corrections agencies to recognize the university role in upgrading education and their failure to rewrite job specifications for entry level positions are serious matters. Local and state corrections departments are besieged by applicants with general but not specific qualifications.

The National Advisory Commission recommends each state establish a coordinated state plan for criminal justice education no later than 1975. This viewpoint is expressed in the following standard in the Report on Corrections:

Each state should establish by 1975 a State plan for coordinating criminal justice education to assure a sound academic continuum from an associate of arts through graduate studies in criminal justice, to allocate education resources to sections of the State with defined needs, and to work toward proper placement of persons completing these programs.

1. Where a State higher education coordinating agency exists, it should be utilized to formulate and implement the plan.
2. Educational leaders, State planners, and criminal justice staff members should meet to chart current and future statewide distribution and location of academic programs, based on proven needs and resources.
3. Award of Law Enforcement Education Program funds should be based on a sound educational plan.
4. Preservice graduates of criminal justice education programs should be assisted in finding proper employment.

Each unified State correctional system should ensure that proper incentives are provided for participation in higher education programs.

1. Inservice graduates of criminal justice education programs should be aided in proper job advancement or reassignment.
2. Rewards (either increased salary or new work assignments) should be provided to encourage in-service staff to pursue these educational opportunities.[27]

The manpower development unit of California's Office of Criminal Justice Planning and its State Manpower Advisory Committee have been working to implement the coordinated state plan for criminal justice education. Hopefully, the correctional agencies will take the initiative recognizing the growth in criminal justice education in the past five years and not overlook the resources available to them. If correctional agencies take a salutary attitude toward manpower development and criminal justice education, the resistance which hampered the acceptance of rehabilitation programs can be avoided.

FOOTNOTES

1. The summary volumes are the following: President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1967); and, National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, A National Strategy to Reduce Crime (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1973).

2. LEAA Newsletter, Vol. 3, No. 7 (Sept.-Oct., 1973), p. 4.

3. Correctional Rehabilitation Study Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-178), p. 1.

4. The final report of the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training is the following: A Time to Act (Washington, D. C.: The Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, 1969). All Commission reports are available from the American Correctional Association, 4321 Hartwick Road, L-208, College Park, Maryland 20740.

5. Vernon Fox, Guidelines for Corrections Programs in Community and Junior Colleges (Washington, D. C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969).

6. Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (Public Law 90-351).

7. Ibid.

8. Omnibus Crime Control Act of 1970 (Public Law 91-644).

9. Ibid.

10. LEAA Newsletter, Vol. 3, No. 7 (Sept.-Oct., 1973), p. 35.

11. Guideline Manual: Law Enforcement Education Program, U. S. Department of Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1974), p. 20.

12. Ibid., p. 19.

13. Clifford J. Zerikotes, "The Utilization of Manpower in the Criminal Justice Field: The First Employment Patterns of California State University, Sacramento, Criminal Justice Department Graduates, January 1968 through June, 1971" (unpublished Master's thesis, California State University, Sacramento, 1972).

14. Robert M. Carter and E. K. Nelson, "The Law Enforcement Education Program -- One University's Experience," Journal of Police Science and Administration, Vol. 1, No. 4 (Dec., 1973), pp. 491-494.

15. 1974 California Comprehensive Plan for Criminal Justice (Sacramento: Office of Criminal Justice Planning, 1974), p. 211.

16. Ibid., p. 219.

17. Ibid., p. 190.

18. National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, Report on Criminal Justice System (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1973), p. 165.

19. The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, Task Force Report: Corrections (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1967), pp. 6-9, 99, 196-198, and 213-215.

20. Morris Cobern, "Some Manpower Aspects of the Criminal Justice System," Crime and Delinquency, Vol. 19, No. 2 (April, 1973), pp. 187-199.

21. 1974 California Comprehensive Plan for Criminal Justice, p. 198.

22. Ibid., p. 199.

23. Report on Criminal Justice System, p. 169.

24. LEEP Application: Supplemental Information Requested by the Office of Criminal Justice Planning (Sacramento: Office of Criminal Justice Planning, 1974).

25. Ronald J. Trethric, "An Analysis of the Criminal Justice Curriculum in California State Universities: 1968-1973" (unpublished Master's thesis, California State University, Sacramento, 1973), pp. 1-2.

26. National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, Report on Corrections (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1973), pp. 471-495.

27. Ibid., p. 490.

CHARACTERISTICS OF UNDERGRADUATES IN A STATE UNIVERSITY WITH SPECIAL INTEREST IN LAW ENFORCEMENT AND CRIMINOLOGY: A COMPARATIVE STUDY

Barton L. Ingraham and Knowlton W. Johnson
Institute of Criminal Justice and Criminology
University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland

Although a great deal has been written on the subject of the education and training which students considering careers in law enforcement and corrections are receiving at the 515 colleges and universities which offer criminal justice and/or corrections curricula in the United States today,[1] there are few studies examining the characteristics of students enrolled in such programs.[2] Fewer still are studies which compare pre-service students enrolled in criminal justice and corrections programs with students of similar age enrolled in other university or college academic disciplines.[3] Even though, as George Lankes suggests,[4] the agencies which have been receiving increasing numbers of these students will have to adapt to their needs in order to continue to attract them, little, if anything, has been done to detect the nature and character of the "new breed" which is emerging from colleges and universities today.

Various authors have asserted that persons attracted to police careers have certain characteristics and attitudes which fit in with the nature and requirements of police work. Among them are an authoritarian personality, a crime-control philosophy as opposed to a helping or treatment philosophy, conservative rather than liberal political views, and working-class backgrounds and attributes including career plans which stress the material benefits and security connected with the job. It is asserted that those drawn to work in corrections and academic criminology are less authoritarian, adhere to the helping or treatment approach to crime, are more liberal in their

political views, tend to come from higher socioeconomic levels of the middle class (the managerial and professional levels) and stress the goals of personal development and professional achievement.[5] It might be extrapolated from this that college students who plan to go into corrections and criminology will tend to be more academically qualified than students who go into law enforcement.[6] It is further assumed that these different orientations and personal characteristics carry over into the career which is selected by the student and lead in part to the problems of communication and cooperation which are encountered when attempts are made to increase the interagency contacts between police and corrections.

The research which has been done comparing the attitudes and personality traits of <u>in-service</u> police college students and students from other disciplines does not, on the whole, support these assumptions. Guller, for instance, comparing in-service police college students with civilian undergraduate students at John Jay College of Criminal Justice in New York City, found that the police students sampled were not significantly more dogmatic than a randomly selected group of predominantly white, upper middle class, suburban-dwelling and liberally-oriented students who had not been exposed to the conservative traditions of police organizations.[7] Smith, Locke and Walker in their 1968 study of authoritarianism in police college students and non-police college students at John Jay found that the police student scored significantly <u>lower</u> on the Rokeach dogmatism scale[8] than the non-police college student enrolled in the same classes. Another interesting, if somewhat puzzling, finding of their study, however, was that of the group of 89 non-police college students sampled, those indicating a high level of interest in a police career tended to score higher on

the dogmatism scale than those who indicated no such career interest. Parker, Reese and Murray, in their study of authoritarianism in police college students at Midwestern University in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, found no significant differences between the groups as to authoritarian attitudes. It was also found that interpersonal training had no significant effect in reducing authoritarian attitudes of the experimental group of police students.[9] O'Neill, Stoval and Lloyd, comparing the attitudes toward the value of education of thirty police officers of the Long Beach, California police department attending advanced officer training and twenty-six college students attending a sociology class at California State College at Long Beach, discovered no significant differences between the groups, but did find significant differences <u>within</u> both groups as to attitudes toward education: the older the police officer or sociology student, the more positive his attitude toward education.[10]

George Lankes' study,[11] which compared 70 police science students with 90 undergraduate business administration students at Erie Community College in Buffalo, New York, is the only study found in the published literature which has compared <u>pre-service</u> criminal justice students (i.e., police science students)with undergraduate students from another discipline - business administration. Lankes found a higher percentage of male students enrolled in police science studies (93.3% as compared with 77.7%); a higher percentage of veterans of military service (17% as compared with 11%) and a higher percentage of students who had been out of high school for at least one year (25% as compared with 17%). But he also found that the high school rankings of both groups were approximately the same. Both groups were average as far as the ability to communicate with others, to read and understand written ideas and concepts. Based on their high school pre-

paration in mathematics and natural sciences, they were better-than-average in matters involving logic and the applied sciences. Lankes also found that the drop-out rate of police science students was somewhat high (35%), but considerably less than that of the business administration group (50%). Nevertheless, 70 percent of 19 graduating students in police science continued their studies in four-year colleges and universities following their graduation in 1970, as contrasted with only 48 percent of the business administration students. Lankes concluded that a good grade of student was applying for, entering and completing the police science curriculum in the two-year community colleges and that these students were sufficiently academically motivated to continue their educations to the baccalaureate degree level.

The foregoing studies seem to suggest that there is nothing particularly unique about the attitudes or personality traits of undergraduate students enrolled in law enforcement studies. (The authors were unable to find similar studies pertaining to students enrolled in criminology or corrections curricula). However, care should be taken in the interpretation of the results of these studies. For one thing, none of them dispute the finding that students from the lower socioeconomic strata are drawn to these disciplines. For another, some studies indicate that the longer police college students are enrolled in academic studies the less conservative, dogmatic and authoritarian they become,[12] whereas the longer they remain connected with a criminal justice agency the more conservative, dogmatic, and authoritarian they become.[13] These findings strongly suggest that academia has a socializing effect on students' attitudes in one direction (a liberalizing effect), and that the occupation which the student later selects has a socializing effect in the opposite direction (toward conservatism, authoritarianism and crime-control views). Therefore, the lack of differences between students enrolled in criminal justice curricula and students enrolled in other disciplines may be no more than an artifact of the particular environment in which they find themselves. It may be that dogmatic, authoritarian and conservative views are not rewarded with good grades in American colleges and universities today, and that all students quickly learn this, whereas such views may often be regarded with favor in criminal justice agencies. Comparative studies of the attitudes of criminal justice students and other students must be interpreted in the light of this very real possibility; the difference in viewpoints and underlying value orientations may be far greater than the attitudinal surveys would lead us to believe.

A shortcoming of the Lankes study is the fact that Lankes compared police science undergraduate students and business administration students. Both kinds of students usually come from similar socioeconomic strata, and it is extremely likely that they share middle-of-the-road political views. Moreover, all job-oriented academic disciplines are traditionally the refuge of the academically less gifted, as is indicated by the high drop-out rate in both disciplines in Lankes' study. Therefore, his study does not render a true picture of the criminal justice undergraduate student as compared with the average university student, and no study contrasts criminal justice (or law enforcement) students with their counterparts in the area of criminology and corrections. Perhaps, the only adequate setting for such a comparative study is a large four-year state university with a completely diverse and heterogeneous student population.

The present study was undertaken in order to remedy some of the deficiencies of these earlier studies. It uses data collected in a comprehen-

sive research project covering juniors and seniors enrolled in criminology and criminal justice courses at the University of Maryland (College Park Campus). This study focuses on three groups of students: law enforcement majors, criminology majors and non-majors enrolled in courses in law enforcement and criminology. As described in the following section, comparative data were collected describing the age and sex, ethnic composition, socioeconomic status (measured by the father's occupation and education), political orientation, tentative plans following graduation, scholastic aptitude and achievement, motivations in attending college and in applying for jobs, and opinions on important issues in criminal justice.

Four hypotheses were tested:

1. That law enforcement majors would tend to be drawn to a greater degree from lower socioeconomic, working-class families than criminology majors and non-majors.

2. That law enforcement majors would tend to be more conservative politically than their counterparts in other majors and that they would adhere more to a crime-control philosophy in matters dealing with criminal offenders and the operation of the criminal justice system, rather than a treatment or helping philosophy.

3. That law enforcement majors would have lower scholastic aptitude (measured by S.A.T. scores) and would be lower scholastic achievers in college (in terms of grades received) than majors from the other two groups.

4. That law enforcement students would be more career-oriented in their motivations for attending college and, in considering careers, would be motivated more highly by the material benefits and security connected with the job sought than majors in the other two groups; criminology majors and non-majors, on the other hand, would tend to stress self-actualizing

goals in their reasons for attending college and the kinds of employment sought.

METHODOLOGY

The data for this study were taken from a comprehensive research project whose purpose was the accumulation of baseline data for educational policy-making in the Institute of Criminal Justice and Criminology at the University of Maryland. The data accumulated included information relating to students' background and psychological profiles, students' perceptions and behavior with respect to various educational processes involving the Institute and its faculty, and environmental conditions possibly affecting their perceptions and behavior while attending the University.

Sampling and data collection. The student population of interest were juniors and seniors majoring in criminology and law enforcement or majoring in other fields (government and politics, psychology, sociology) with a special interest in criminology and law enforcement.[14] Freshmen and sophomores were not included because their contact with the Institute and its curriculum is limited. In the Fall of 1972 there were a total of 180 criminology majors and 140 law enforcement majors. However, for the Spring of 1973, when the data were collected, the exact number of criminology and law enforcement majors could not be determined and information as to the total number of non-majors taking law enforcement and criminology courses in the Spring of 1973 was also not available.[15]

In April of 1973, the Project Coordinator, assisted by an undergraduate research assistant, developed and administered a questionnaire[16] to students enrolled in upper division undergraduate criminology and law enforcement courses.[17] A saturation sampling method was employed since the target population was small, finite and accessible and there was no inten-

tion of generalizing the findings to other educational institutions.[18]

Acceptable questionnaires were received from 83 criminology majors, 75 law enforcement majors and 44 non-majors. By an inspection of official class rosters for the Spring of 1973, it was determined that the sample comprised 75 percent of the total criminology junior and senior enrollment, 86 percent of the total law enforcement junior and senior enrollment, and 40 percent of non-majors of interest who were enrolled in Institute courses. The stated response rates for law enforcement and criminology enrollment appear to be sufficiently representative of the populations of interest.[19]

Method of data analysis. The data of interest in this study consist of 11 variables taken from the larger study discussed earlier. These variables are:

1. Age
2. Sex
3. Ethnic-racial background
4. Socio-economic status of family (measured by father's occupation and education)
5. Political orientation (self-assessment)
6. Tentative plans after graduation (career aspirations)
7. Educational background and scholastic aptitude (measured by high school senior class rank, and S.A.T. scores)
8. Educational achievement at the University of Maryland (measured by Grade Point Average, overall and in criminology and law enforcement courses).
9. Motivations for attending college (5 indicators based on Maslow's hierarchy of needs).

10. Motivations when applying for jobs (5 indicators based on Maslow's hierarchy of needs)
11. Opinions on important issues in criminal justice (5 indicators based on issues)

The principal bases for the selection of these variables were two-fold: first, their relevance to the hypotheses which this study seeks to test, and second, their policy relevance to the criminal justice educators and those criminal justice administrators considering special curricula graduates for employment.

The analysis of the data is descriptive. Answers to the hypotheses stated are generated by using contingency table analysis, comparing percentages within and across the three groups of students being considered. Concern for the contaminating effects resulting from large sex differences between the three groups created the need to conduct an additional analysis of the data controlling for sex, with females being eliminated from the samples.[20]

Tests of significance were not appropriate for this study since a saturation sample technique was employed rather than probability sampling. Consequently, conclusions drawn from the comparative analysis will be based purely on reported percentages.[21]

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS*

Age. The mean age for all three groups was approximately the same, about twenty and one-half years. When the sex of the respondent was controlled (i.e., when all females were eliminated from the samples), there were no significant changes in the age distribution.

*The data are presented in tabular form in the Appendix

Sex. The three groups, however, did differ substantially in their sex composition. In the law enforcement group, males outnumbered females nine-to-one (89% males), whereas in the criminology group females outnumbered males six-to-four (61% being females). The sample of non-majors was about evenly divided between males and females (48% males to 52% females). The large number of females in the criminology program at the University of Maryland may reflect the fact that criminology was until recently an area of specialization within the Department of Sociology and attracted students with purely academic (rather than pre-professional) interests in the social sciences. Some studies have indicated that females are drawn disproportionately to such academic disciplines.[22]

Ethnic composition. All groups were composed predominantly of white students. Blacks were most represented in the law enforcement group, constituting nine percent of that group (which is roughly their representation in the entire student body at the University of Maryland, College Park Campus). They were least represented in the non-major group (2%) and constituted seven percent of criminology majors. The number of Mexican-Americans (2) and Orientals (2) in all groups was so small as hardly to be worth mentioning.

Father's occupation. The data in Table 1 show that all students sampled came predominantly from families where the father held a white-collar job. The job descriptions, "sales, white-collar," "management," and "professional," accounted for over two-thirds (69%) of all students. The other job descriptions -- "unskilled worker" and "low service operator" (which were lumped together in Table 1 under "unskilled worker") and "skilled worker" -- accounted for thirty-one percent of all students.

However, as to this indicator of the student's socioeconomic status, the data reveal some interesting differences between the three groups. In

the law enforcement group, the blue-collar and low-paid service occupations accounted for forty-two percent of the sample, whereas in the criminology group and non-major group they constituted only twenty-six percent and nineteen percent respectively. No remarkable changes were noted in these figures when female respondents were eliminated. This finding supports the hypothesis (Hypothesis 1) that law enforcement studies draw greater proportions of students from the lower socioeconomic strata of the general population than do either criminology studies or the other academic disciplines represented by the non-majors taking law enforcement and criminology courses.

Father's education. Some further support for the hypothesis is derived from comparing the level of the father's education in the three groups. In all groups over fifty percent had fathers with at least some college education. However, the percentage figure was lowest for the law enforcement majors (51%), highest for criminology majors (65%), and next highest for non-majors (59%).

Political orientation. It is a noteworthy finding of this study that a majority of the students sampled who were enrolled in law enforcement and criminology courses at the University of Maryland, whether majors or not, counted themselves as being "very liberal" or "slightly liberal" (approximately 61%). Forty-six percent of the law enforcement majors so evaluated themselves, seventy-three percent of the criminology majors and sixty-four percent of the non-majors. Law enforcement majors reveal themselves to be the more conservative group, with forty-three percent placing themselves in the "middle-of-the-road" category, as compared with only about one-fifth of the other two groups (19% and 20% respectively). A curious -- if not too significant -- outcome of the survey was that the law enforcement group numbered among its members two students who described themselves as politically

"New Left," whereas the other two groups numbered only one each in this category. Also, only one student described himself as radically conservative ("New Right") and that student was a non-major. Eliminating females from the sample, the results were as follows: forty-four percent of the law enforcement males categorized themselves as "very liberal" or "slightly liberal" and 45.5 percent as "middle-of-the-road"; 63.7% of the male criminology majors categorized themselves as very or slightly liberal and 21.2% as middle-of-the-road (with 15% now falling in the "slightly conservative" category, an increase of seven percentage points); 63.9 percent of the male non-majors placed themselves in the very or slightly liberal category and 23.8 percent in the middle-of-the-road position. Thus, it would appear that sex had some effect upon the political orientation results of this study. In both the law enforcement and criminology major groups, the removal of females from the sample had the effect of increasing the conservatism of both groups, although the basic relationship between them (a difference of at least twenty percentage points on "middle-of-the-roadism") did not change. The results should be kept in mind when we later review the results of our questionnaire relating to major issues in criminal justice.[23]

Our hypothesis (Hypothesis 2) that students attracted to law enforcement studies would be more conservative in their political views than students enrolled in other academic disciplines, including criminology, seems confirmed by the data. It is significant, nevertheless, that a near majority of even law enforcement majors (49%) place themselves on the liberal-to-left radical end of the political spectrum and that almost all of the remainder go no further toward the right than the nondescript category, "middle-of-the-road". Thus, although law enforcement majors may lean more in the direction of political conservatism than their counterparts in other fields, they are still very far from the rugged and fundamental conservatism

attributed by many writers to American police forces.

Career Aspirations

From the data presented in Table 2A it would appear that the two most popular choices for postgraduate occupations for law enforcement majors in general are work with a city, county or state police department (21%) or with a federal law enforcement agency (36%). Very few (only 9%) plan to continue their studies on a postgraduate level, either in law school or in graduate school. The great popularity of federal law enforcement agencies probably derives from the student's belief that the federal law enforcement work is more professional in character, pays better, allows for more rapid advancement, and does not involve onerous, dangerous and difficult patrol duty. In contrast, a far greater percentage of criminology majors and non-majors (23% and 42% respectively) plan to go on to graduate study in law school and graduate school. This seems to be the most popular choice by far of non-majors. The most popular choice of postgraduate occupations among criminology majors was working with a community-based treatment agency treating juveniles, 37 percent of the criminology majors indicating a preference for this kind of work. Other kinds of work in corrections -- e.g., working with adult offenders in the community or in penal institutions or working with juveniles in institutions -- accounted for only seven percent of the choices of criminology majors. In fact, there was only one criminology student (out of 79) who expressed a primary interest in working in an adult correctional institution! The reason for the lack of interest in working with adult offenders is difficult to interpret, although, considering the nature and reputation of prisons and reformatories in the United States today, it is not too difficult to explain the preference for community-based treatment of offenders over institutional treatment. An

interesting finding was that working with juveniles in the community was also a popular occupational choice among non-majors taking criminology and law enforcement courses, sixteen percent of this group indicating a preference for this kind of work. After postgraduate studies, this choice rated the highest preference of any kind of work in the criminal justice system, including work with law enforcement agencies, with criminal justice planning agencies, private security and other kinds of correctional occupations. In all groups the number of students indicating that they were undecided or thinking of some other kind of work comprised less than twenty percent of the entire sample.

Eliminating females from the samples, we find some interesting changes in the results tabulated in Table 2A. Counting the responses of male students alone, we find (see Table 2B above) that there are no substantial changes as far as law enforcement majors are concerned.[24] The most significant change shows up in the responses of male criminology students to the fourth and fifth occupational choices (federal law enforcement agency work and work with juveniles in the community): the percentage of male criminology majors indicating an interest in federal law enforcement is twenty-five percent, as contrasted with thirteen percent of the entire group of majors; the percentage of male criminology majors indicating an interest in community corrections of juveniles, on the other hand, is only twenty-five percent, as contrasted with thirty-seven percent of the entire group of majors. It appears, therefore, that the reason for the considerable interest displayed by criminology majors in work with juveniles is significantly affected by the presence of female criminology students, who may feel that work with adult offenders is unsuitable for them and who would prefer to work with more easily manageable juveniles. This analysis of the

effect of the sex of the respondent is strengthened by the fact that all of the non-majors who expressed an interest in non-institutional work with juveniles were females. The other significant variation of the data appears in the choice of law school by fifty percent of the male non-majors. This is more than double the figure (23%) for the entire group of non-majors.

Scholastic Aptitudes and Achievement

In order to test the hypothesis (Hypothesis 3) that law enforcement majors would have lower scholastic aptitude and would be lower scholastic achievers in college on the average than majors from the other two curricula, a comparison study of the three groups was done as to the high school senior class rank and Scholastic Aptitude Test scores (both verbal and mathematical) in order to measure their scholastic aptitude, and as to their cumulative grade point average (G.P.A.), their G.P.A.'s computed on the basis of criminology course grades, and G.P.A.'s computed on the basis of law enforcement grades, in order to measure scholastic achievement while attending the College Park campus of the University of Maryland.

As to high school rank (see Table 3) the hypothesis was confirmed: fifty-eight percent of the law enforcement majors ranked in the top thirty percent of their high school classes, whereas sixty-eight percent of criminology majors and sixty-six percent of non-majors were so ranked. It is clear when controlling for sex, however, that the relative presence of females in the major has something to do with the differences between the groups, because, when sex is controlled and only males compared, the differences are less striking. Fifty-seven of the male law enforcement majors were in the top thirty percentile of their high school senior classes, as compared with 63.3 percent of the male criminology majors, and 57.2 percent of the male non-majors. This finding suggests the possibility that, at

least as to high school rankings, the socioeconomic status of the respondent may have less to do with the differences between law enforcement majors and other majors than does the relative number of females in the curricula.

As to Scholastic Aptitude Test scores (see Table 3) the third hypothesis is only partially confirmed. If we count any S.A.T. scores over 500 as a good score,[25] we note that there is no difference in the percentage of law enforcement and criminology majors scoring over 500 on the S.A.T. verbal test (47% in both cases), and a difference of approximately eight points in favor of law enforcement majors on the S.A.T. math test (53.5% of law enforcement majors versus 45% of criminology majors). A substantially larger percentage of non-majors (63%) scored over 500 on the S.A.T. verbal test than the other two groups, and their performance as a group on the S.A.T. math test was almost eighteen percentage points above that of the law enforcement group (71%). However, if we look solely at excellent scores (601-750),[26] it appears that the law enforcement group outscores both of the others on S.A.T. math scores, but falls behind both of the other groups in the number of students scoring 601 or better on the S.A.T. verbal test. These findings indicate that law enforcement majors at the University of Maryland are somewhat stronger as a group than criminology majors and non-majors in mathematical ability but weaker in verbal skills. Thus, the third hypothesis is confirmed only as to aptitude in verbal skills, which, unfortunately, are still probably emphasized to a greater degree in social science work at the University than mathematical skills.

As to educational achievement (see Table 4), determined by the cumulative grade point average of the student at the University of Maryland, the figures again reveal a significant difference between law enforcement majors, criminology majors and non-majors: fourteen percent of the first group have a 3.0 cumulative G.P.A. or better; twenty-one percent of the criminology group have achieved that cumulative G.P.A., and forty-four percent

of the non-majors. It would even appear that both of these latter groups get better grades on the average in law enforcement courses than law enforcement students do themselves! Sixty-one percent of the law enforcement majors have a 3.0 G.P.A. or higher in their major courses, as compared with seventy-three percent of the criminology students taking such courses and sixty-two percent of the non-majors. It might be argued that criminology majors and non-majors take fewer law enforcement courses than law enforcement majors and that, therefore, their grade point averages in these courses could be expected to be higher. But, by the same token, law enforcement majors take fewer criminology courses than criminology majors, and the results in Table 4 indicate that even here the G.P.A. for criminology courses is lower on the average than that of criminology majors and non-majors taking the same courses.

When the sex of the respondent is controlled and only males are compared, the relationship remains the same: 7.6 percent of male law enforcement majors have a cumulative G.P.A. of 3.0 or higher; 12.1 percent of male criminology majors, and 33.4 percent of non-majors. Approximately fifty-eight percent of male law enforcement majors have a 3.0 or better G.P.A. in their major subject, compared with a 66.6 percent and sixty-five percent of criminology majors and non-majors, respectively, in law enforcement courses they have taken.[27] Thus, although males do worse than females in all groups, the sex composition of the samples does not affect the basic relationship shown. The hypothesis that criminology majors and non-majors will have higher scholastic aptitude and will be higher achievers in college than students majoring in law enforcement is partially confirmed by the data. Lower percentages of law enforcement majors ranked in the top one-third of their high school classes, scored good or excellent scores on the S.A.T. verbal tests, and maintained 3.0 G.P.A.'s while attending the University of Maryland. On the other hand, as a group they showed greater aptitude in mathe-

matical skills than criminology majors and as to excellent scores outranked non-majors.

Motivations for Attending College and Choosing a Career

Those questions given to the sample of students involved in this study which ranked in order of importance their reasons for attending college and factors considered when applying for a job were based conceptually on A. H. Maslow's theory of the hierarchy of needs. Maslow, in his book, Motivation and Personality (1954),[28] conceptualized the following five levels of needs which lay at the basis of most human motivations:

1. physiological needs; for example, hunger, thirst.
2. safety needs; for example, security, stability.
3. belongingness and love needs; for example, affection, identification.
4. esteem needs; for example, self respect.
5. need for self-actualization, defined as the need to express one's potentialities in their most effective and complete form.

According to Maslow, these five levels of needs are arranged in a hierarchy from "lower" needs at the top to "higher" needs at the bottom, and one develops psychologically by progressing to the satisfaction of "higher needs" after the fulfillment or satisfaction of needs of a lower order. Thus, one would expect that a person who comes from deprived circumstances, in which the lower needs are not adequately gratified, would be at a more primitive level of motivational development than Maslow's highest level of motivated man, the "self-actualizing man."

Our fourth hypothesis, stated earlier in this paper, is that law enforcement students would be more career-oriented in their motivations for

attending college and, in considering careers, would be motivated more by the material benefits and security connected with the job than majors from the other curricula. This hypothesis was founded on the frequent observation that working-class youth tend to stress such goals over the goals of prestige, self-esteem and self-actualization.[29] Since we hypothesized that law enforcement would draw more students from lower socioeconomic working-class families than either criminology or other social science disciplines (see Hypothesis 1, above), it would be logical to assume, if this relationship between socioeconomic class and motivation actually exists, that law enforcement majors would tend to emphasize Maslow's "lower needs" and that criminology majors and non-majors would tend to stress the "higher needs" of belongingness, achieving personal and social esteem, and developing to the fullest whatever they feel are their potentialities (self-actualization).

To test this hypothesis we asked a set of questions relating to motivations for attending college and acquiring a higher education (see Table 5) and another set of questions relating to the relative importance of factors considered when applying for a job (see Table 6). The relationship between the factors we measured and Maslow's needs are as follows:

Table 5	Table 6	Maslow's Needs
a. Opportunity for securing well-paying job	Adequate pay to meet needs of family	Physiological
b. Preparation for stepping into "real world"	Good job security and employee benefits	Safety needs
c. Contacts I make and social life I enjoy	Opportunity for good fellowship and harmonious relations	Belongingness and affection
d. Personal pride and respect of others	Job allows advancement based on achievement	Esteem and self-respect
e. Opportunity for exploring one's interests and desires	Job allows freedom and opportunity to grow	Self-actualization

The results of our study only partially confirm the hypothesis. The ordering of needs is approximately the same for all groups. All groups rank the self-actualizing need ([e] above) as first among their priorities for both sets of situations. Thirty-six percent of law enforcement majors ranked this as the most important reason for attending college, 54 percent of the criminology majors did so, and 53 percent of non-majors did likewise (see Table 5). The corresponding figures in Table 6 (under "Job allows freedom and opportunity to grow") were: law enforcement majors, 53.5 percent; criminology majors 67 percent; and non-majors, 80.5 percent. It will be observed, however, that the percentage of students feeling that this need is of first importance, steadily increases as one moves from law enforcement majors, to criminology majors, to non-majors, which is the direction one would expect if the hypothesis mentioned above were valid. When females were eliminated from the sample, the self-actualization motive continued to rank first in importance in the greatest percentage of cases, except on one instance (non-majors) where an equal number of males students selected factor a. in Table 5 ("Opportunity for securing well-paying job") as being of first importance.[30] Another result of eliminating females from the samples was the almost uniform reduction[31] of the percentage figure of students making this their first choice of needs. This indicates that females are somewhat more likely than males to express self-actualization as their primary motivation; males tend to emphasize adequate pay and job security.

The next most popular choice for first priority among the motivations both of attending college and considering employment for all groups was "Opportunity for securing well-paying job" (factor a. in Table 5) and "Adequate pay to meet needs of family" (factor a. in Table 6). This finding indicates that Maslow's most basic need (physiological need) ranks as

of first importance in the next largest group of students. Thirty-two percent of law enforcement majors ranked this need as of primary importance in reasons for attending college, twenty-five percent of criminology majors did likewise, and twenty-two percent of non-majors. Twenty-eight percent of law enforcement majors ranked adequate pay as their primary need in considering employment, compared with fourteen percent of criminology majors and 7.5 percent of non-majors. Again, we note a steady decline in the importance of this factor as one moves from law enforcement majors, to criminology majors, to non-majors, which result in consistent with our hypothesis. Controlling for sex does not produce any remarkable variations in this result, except that the percentage of criminology majors indicating this factor as their primary motivation almost doubles (from fourteen percent to 27.3 percent) when females are eliminated from this group, and there is an even split of non-major males between this factor and self-actualization, when motivation for attending college is concerned (30 percent in both cases) and between this factor and self-esteem when motivations in considering employment are concerned (10.5 percent in both cases).[32]

The third most popular choice for first priority among all groups was "Preparation for stepping into the 'real world'" (factor b. in Table 5) and "Job allows advancement based on achievement" (factor d. in Table 6). Factor b. in Table 5 relates in Maslow's conceptual scheme to the need for safety and security, whereas factor d. in Table 6 relates to personal pride and the respect of others. It is not clear why a second-level need (need for security and stability) should be uppermost in the minds of some students when considering the value of their education, while when considering what to look for in a job many of them choose needs (self-actualization and self-esteem based on achievement) which do not emphasize security. Again, one observes that the importance of factor b. in Table 5 decreases

slightly as one moves from law enforcement majors, to criminology majors, to non-majors, and the same phenomenon may be observed to a lesser degree with factor d. in Table 6. No significant changes were noted in these results when sex was controlled, with one exception: the percentage of criminology majors indicating factor d. in Table 6 as their primary motivation increased from eight percent to 15.6 percent.

The ordering of the remaining factors (factors c. and d. in Table 5 and factors b. and c. in Table 6) varied among the groups, but the percentage figures and differences in these cases were so small and varied to such a minimal degree, whether the sex of the respondent was controlled or not, that no significant conclusions can be drawn from the data.

In summation we can state that most of the respondents, regardless of their major or sex, indicated that self-actualization was their primary motive both for attending college and in looking for a suitable job. Next in importance came job benefits, the most important aspects of which were adequate pay, prestige and advancement-potential rather than security or good fellowship. However, we also observed important differences between the groups as to the numbers within each group indicating the above motivations as being of first priority. Substantial differences were discovered between law enforcement majors, criminology majors and non-majorswhich were consistent with our hypothesis that law enforcement majors would tend to stress to a lesser degree the "higher order" needs (according to Maslow's scheme) than either criminology majors or non-majors. These differences were partially affected by the sex of the respondent, since the amount of the difference decreased when only male students were compared.

We have already noted in our discussion of Table 1 and the socioeconomic characteristics of the students within each comparison sample that each group contained different percentages of working-class (blue collar) and

upper-class (white collar) families, the law enforcement majors containing the largest percentage of students from the former class. Do our findings merely reflect the socioeconomic composition of each group of students? Although it would have been interesting to explore this possibility, we unfortunately did not control for the socioeconomic level of the respondent as we did for sex, and so we are unable at this time to give an answer to the foregoing question.

Student Views on Issues in Criminal Justice

Finally, in order to test our hypothesis (Hypothesis 2) that there would be important differences between the views of students majoring in law enforcement, in criminology, and non-majors taking courses in both of these fields at the University of Maryland with regard to important and contemporary issues in criminal justice, we asked the following six forced-choice questions:

1. a. There should be more emphasis placed on deterrence as a means of crime control.
   b. Minimal emphasis should be placed on deterrence as a means of crime control.
2. a. Interagency cooperation between police and corrections-oriented agencies is necessary if crime is to be reduced.
   b. There are too many negative aspects to police-correction oriented agencies working together in solving crime problems.
3. a. Citizens should obey all laws passed by legislation even though they feel specific laws not to be "with the times."

3. b. It is justifiable for citizens to violate specific laws passed by legislation provided that the violation can be defended on rational grounds and be supported by information that shows the laws not to be "with the times."

4. a. Policemen's role in our society should be that of a public servant.

   b. Policemen's role in our society should be that of an enforcer of the law.

5. a. There should be more emphasis placed on home-staying treatment (probation, half-way houses, etc.) than on institutional treatment (prison).

   b. There should be more emphasis placed on institutional treatment (prison) than on home-staying treatment.

6. a. Protecting the community should be the most important goal of any agency which handles persons labelled as criminals.

   b. Helping the individual should be the most important goal of any agency which handles persons labelled as criminals.

Our second hypothesis states that those students attracted to law enforcement as a major will be oriented more favorably toward the crime-control philosophy as opposed to the helping or treatment philosophy and will emphasize the punitive and deterrent functions of law enforcement and corrections over the helping or treatment functions. Law enforcement majors will, in greater numbers than either criminology majors or non-majors, believe in

strict adherence to the law as written without special exceptions being made for unjust, irrational or outdated laws. They will view the policeman's role to be that of law enforcer rather than public servant and will be somewhat hostile to the idea of interagency cooperation between police and corrections agencies due to the conflicting nature of their tasks. Finally, hypothetically, law enforcement majors will be more favorably disposed toward incarceration and institutional treatment of offenders than their counterparts in criminology and other social science disciplines. The ideal response of a person adopting an unmitigated crime-control position with regard to the six questions stated above would be: (1)-a; (2)-b; (3)-a; (4)-b; (5)-b; and (6)-a. Conversely, the ideal response of a person adopting a completely liberal treatment or helping philosophy of crime control would be: (1)-b; (2)-a; (3)-b; (4)-a; (5)-a; and (6)-b.

When one examines the data tabulated in Table 7, one observes the following:

1. The majority of all three groups agreed on all six questions. Generally, with the exception of their answer to the first question, this majority answered the questions in a manner consistent with the treatment or helping philosophy of crime control.

2. Notwithstanding the above, there were significant differences between the three groups, especially as to questions 1 and 6.

3. On the most important question relating to the goals of a criminal justice agency (question 6), law enforcement majors were about evenly divided between the crime-control philosophy and the treatment or helping philosophy (49% to 51%), whereas the other two groups divided along much sharper lines (criminology majors: 25% to 75%; non-majors: 29.5% to 70.5%).

4. With the curious exception of their response to the question as to the policeman's role (question 4), criminology majors were more treatment-

oriented than either of the other two groups and, of course, more favorably disposed toward community-based treatment than institutional treatment of offenders.

Controlling for the sex of the respondent produced no substantial alteration in either the nature or the direction of the responses, except in two minor instances. When the answers of male non-majors to questions one and six were examined, it was found that there were changes in excess of nine percentage points. The percentage of male non-majors selecting the first alternative to question 1 (a) increased from fifty-seven percent (for the whole sample) to 66.7 percent, and the percentage of the same group selecting the first alternative (a) to the last question increased from 29.5 percent to forty-three percent, indicating, perhaps, that males are more crime-control oriented than females.

None of these results is particularly surprising. Higher education in the United States has a liberal bent,[33] and courses taught in both law enforcement and criminology -- at least, in four-year colleges and universities -- might be expected to share this liberal bias in favor of treatment and rehabilitation of offenders, of service-oriented police operations, and of taking a less rigid, discretionary approach to the violation of laws, particularly when those laws are felt to be out of "sync." with changes in social values (e.g., victimless crimes, discriminatory laws, etc.). The law enforcement faculty at the University of Maryland College Park campus (four professors) is about evenly divided between professors espousing a crime-control philosophy in their classes and those advocating a treatment-service philosophy; the criminology faculty (three professors), on the other hand, is entirely disposed in favor of the latter view. Most of the texts and reading materials designed are treatment-service oriented in content. Of course, students are not influenced solely by the views of their college

teachers nor by the assigned readings. They bring with them to college value orientations acquired in high school and as the result of interaction with their peers. The influence of the media also cannot be overlooked. All of these influences combine in favor of the treatment-service approach to crime control and against the deterrent and punitive approach. It is therefore not at all surprising to find that a majority of all groups, regardless of major and of sex, favor this view toward crime control.

Nevertheless, the results of our survey are basically supportive of the hypothesis that law enforcement majors will be more favorably disposed toward the punitive and deterrent crime-control model than their peers in criminology and other academic disciplines. As to almost every question the direction of the responses was similar: the level of agreement in favor of the treatment-service method of crime control increases as one progresses from law enforcement majors to non-majors to criminology majors.

SUMMARY

Although no previous study has indicated such a result,[34] the present study tends to support the thesis that there is something in the nature of self-selection at work attracting to the fields of law enforcement and criminology (corrections) students with differing philosophies and objectives in life, philosophies and objectives which are at least somewhat consistent with the role attributes and operating philosophies of the agencies toward which the students' career aspirations are directed. The value of the present study over those which have preceded it is two-fold: (1) the population of students sampled was, at the date of sampling, as yet uncontaminated by contact with any of the criminal justice agencies toward which they were occupationally inclined -- i.e., the students surveyed were almost all pre-service students. Thus, for the most part, their views and attitudes could not yet have been affected by an occupational role or

"working personality;"[35] (2) the present study engaged in a much broader and far-ranging examination of the demographic, motivational and attitudinal characteristics of the students surveyed and compared than earlier studies.

The faults of the present study are, of course, manifest: there is no claim that the composition of any of the groups of students compared is representative of similar groups of students at other colleges and universities, and, therefore, the results of this survey cannot be generalized to all students enrolled in similar programs in the approximately 514 colleges and universities elsewhere in the United States with criminal justice studies. Nevertheless, we believe that this study, with all its limitations, has certain important implications for those engaged in criminal justice education, as well as for those administrators of criminal justice agencies who will be employing this growing crop of college-educated youth.

First, as to criminal justice educators: criminal justice educators will have to pay more attention to the kinds of students who are enrolled in their courses. Although, as indicated above, the students in law enforcement and criminology are already inclined toward the operating philosophies of the agencies toward which they are occupationally oriented, their views and aspirations are still far removed from the frame of mind which would be satisfied with the kind of functions that are performed by line personnel in these agencies today. We have already noted that regardless of major, they are self-actualizing people who wish to develop and grow within the profession they have chosen; this is more important to them than salary or job security. They are not tied to rigid conformity in enforcing the laws as written. They endorse such progressive ideas as the development of helping relationships with clients as well as interagency cooperation. These students will either force change in the operations of the agencies in which they are employed, or will drop out disgusted and disgruntled at the tedious

and undemanding nature of the work which they find there. It is therefore imperative that criminal justice educators reach out to the professions and prepare the agencies to meet the demands and fulfill the needs of the students they are sending to them.

Second, as to the agencies themselves: if criminal justice agency employers are interested in attracting and retaining college-educated students, and in particular those with professional training, they should give more attention to the motivations and aspirations of these applicants. It is quite obvious from our survey that the college-educated policeman and corrections officer of tomorrow will not be content to seek out or remain in jobs where the opportunity for personal growth, professional advancement and monetary rewards are minimal.

In short, it is now apparent that the entire endeavor to improve the operation of the police and corrections through the introduction of academically trained personnel will be a monumental failure unless something is done soon to reformulate criminal justice roles, to conform the job to meet the needs and abilities of professionally trained and educated students. The duty to do something to bring the two together is not the job of the employing agencies alone -- although they bear a heavy burden of responsibility in this area -- but also the job of every person engaged in training and educating future criminal justice personnel.

FOOTNOTES

1. A computerized search of recent articles and books in the area of police science alone by the National Criminal Justice Reference Service of LEAA in April of 1973 requested by the author revealed fifty-six titles. See also Bibliography, "Higher Education in Criminal Justice," (School of Criminal Justice: Michigan State University, 1972) (unpublished) which reveals seventy-three published books, articles, reports and conference proceedings on the subject of higher education in criminal justice, eight unpublished reports and eleven dissertations and theses.

   For the number of colleges and universities offering associate, baccalaureate, masters and doctoral degrees in the field of criminal justice, see I.A.C.P. Bi-annual Directory for those years; see also Michael Langley, Yvonne Tibbs, William Hales, and Charles Hyder, "Curricular Differences Between Criminal Justice and Juvenile Justice," unpublished paper delivered at the Third Annual National Community College Social Science Association Convention, Chicago, Illinois, November, 1973, Table 1.

2. See George A. Lankes, "A Profile of the Police College Student," The Police Chief (April, 1971), 60-64; Michael E. O'Neill, William Stovall, C. N. Lloyd, "Police vs. College Students--Attitudes Toward Education," Police, 16 (January, 1972), 19-21; I. B. Guller, "Higher Education and Police-Attitudinal Differences between Freshman and Senior Police College Students," J. of Crim. L., Crim. & P. S., 63 (Sept., 1972), 396-401; Alexander B. Smith, Bernard Locke and William F. Walker, "Authoritarianism in Police College Students and Non-Police College Students," J. of Crim. L., Crim. & P. S., 59 (1968), 440-446; L. Craig Parker, Jr., Sander C. Reese and James Murray, "Authoritarianism in Police College Students and the Effectiveness of Interpersonal Training in Reducing Dogmatism," J. of Law Enforcement Education and Training, I, No. 1, (Sept. 1971), 20-26.

3. The Lankes article (supra, note 2) is the only one the authors have been able to find which compares pre-service law enforcement students with students enrolled in other academic disciplines.

4. Lankes, p. 64.

5. See Walter B. Miller, "Ideology and Criminal Justice Policy: Some Current Issues," J. of Crim. L. and Crim., 64, (June, 1973), 141-162 at pp. 148-151; Clifton Rhead, Arnold Abrams, Harry Trosman and Philip Margolis, "The Psychological Assessment of Police Candidates," Am. J. of Psych., 124 (May, 1968), 1575-1580; Martin Symonds, "Emotional Hazards of Police Work," paper presented before the Academy of Police Science, New York City, February 26, 1969, reprinted in Arthur Niederhoffer and Abraham S. Blumberg (eds.), The Ambivalent Force: Perspectives on Police (Waltham, Mass.: Ginn & Co., 1970), pp. 58-64.

6. Seymour M. Lipset, Political Man: The Social Bases of Politics (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday-Anchor Books, 1963), pp. 87-126, 318-322, 332-369; R. G. Braungart and David L. Westley, "Class and Politics in the Family Backgrounds of Student Political Activists," Am. Sociol. Rev., 31 (1966), 690-692; Kenneth Keniston, The Young Radicals (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1968), Appendix B, p. 307.

7. Op. cit., footnote 2.

8. Op. cit., footnote 2.

9. Op. cit., footnote 2.

10. Op. cit., footnote 2.

11. Op. cit., footnote 2.

12. Bernard Locke and Alexander B. Smith, "Police Who Go to College," in A. Niederhoffer and A. Blumberg (eds.), The Ambivalent Force, pp. 144-147.

13. See John H. McNamara, "Uncertainties in Police Work: The Relevance of Police Recruits and Background Training," in David J. Bordua (ed.), The Police: Six Sociological Essays (New York: John Wiley, 1967), pp. 163-252.

14. Whether students majoring in government and politics, psychology or sociology had a "special interest" in criminology or law enforcement was determined by the number of Institute courses they had taken or were planning to take. It was decided to include those individuals who had taken or planned to take at least six semester hours of Institute courses (2 courses).

15. Beginning with the 1972-73 academic year, student records were transferred from the individual departments to division level and ceased to be accessible.

16. The questionnaire consisting of 200 questions was pretested on a small sample of non-majors and former law enforcement and criminology students. The results of this pretest revealed ambiguities, generated suggested alterations, and provided an estimate of the amount of time needed for the student to complete the questionnaire (about forty-five minutes).

17. Distribution of questionnaires took place during the first ten minutes of regular class periods of criminology courses and law enforcement courses offered during the Spring of 1973. Questionnaires were given to absentees during a later class period. Students taking tutorial courses were notified to pick up a questionnaire from the office of the Project Coordinator. Students were asked to fill out a face sheet which asked for their academic status, name and telephone number. This sheet was detached from the questionnaire which contained an identification number and immediately returned to the Project Coordinator. Students were asked to return their completed questionnaires to the Coordinator's office at a convenient time later during the week. Confidentiality between the student and the Coordinator was preserved by not allowing instructors to have access to the face sheets, the source of

identification. It was explained to the students that telephone numbers were desired so that the student could be contacted in case he forgot to return the questionnaire. Informal reaction from a large number of students revealed that this procedure did not disturb them. Numerous follow-up phone calls were made in an effort to maximize the response rate. Seventy-eight percent of the questionnaires distributed were returned.

18. See James S. Coleman, "Relational Analysis: The Study of Social Organizations with Survey Methods," in Norman K. Denzin (ed.), Sociological Methods, A Sourcebook (Chicago: Aldine, 1970), pp. 115-126.

19. Admittedly, the 40% sample of non-majors enrolled in Institute courses does not allow us to make definite assertions as to representativeness of this sample. However, when looking at the characteristics of academic status (number of juniors and seniors in each group), sex (number of sociology, psychology and government majors), the sample of 44 non-majors was found to be similar to the total population of 112 junior and senior non-majors enrolled in law enforcement and criminology courses

20. See infra., page 12.

21. See Hubert M. Blalock, Social Statistics, Second Edition (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970).

22. The studies are cited in K. A. Feldman and T. M. Newcomb, The Impact of College on Students, I (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969), p. 153, where the authors state: "Original choice of major field is also associated with the sex of the students. Men overchoose engineering, physical science, pre-law, pre-medicine and business. Women are more likely than men to enter the curricula of education, humanities and fine arts, social science and biological science."

23. See discussion of Table 7, pages 29-34, infra.

24. With exception of a four-percentage point increase in the percentage of respondents in this group indicating an interest in federal law enforcement.

25. Based on data collected by the CEEB Educational Testing Service between May, 1969 and March, 1970 of the performance of all high school juniors and seniors tested, roughly 20% of all such students score 500 or better on scholastic aptitude tests. We are therefore counting such a score as a "good score" on the basis that a student so scoring ranks in the top one-fifth of all high school seniors and juniors in this regard. However, if one were to compare just those high school students (juniors and seniors) who elect to take the College Entrance Board S.A.T.'s, a score of 550 or better would be needed in order for the student to rank in the top fifth. See College Board Score Reports: A Guide for Counselors and Admissions Officers (Princeton, N. J.: College Entrance Examination Board, 1970), pp. 19-20, Tables 7 and 8. What is considered a "good score" from the point of view of the admitting college or university, of course, varies considerably.

26. See op. cit., preceding footnote. A score of 600 or better on CEEB S.A.T.'s, verbal and mathematical, places the student within the top 10 percentile of all high school juniors and seniors and within the top 13 percentile, if he or she is compared only with high school juniors and seniors taking the CEEB S.A.T.'s. For this reason, we feel justified in characterizing scores of 601 or better on the verbal and math S.A.T.'s as an "excellent" score.

27. The validity of these figures is somewhat in doubt because of the small sample size of some of the groups compared, once females have been eliminated.

28. A. H. Maslow, Motivation and Personality (New York: Harper, 1954); see also (same author), Toward a Psychology of Being (Princeton: Van Nostrand, 1962). See also Jay Hall and Martha Williams, "Work Motivation Inventory," paper published by Teleometrics, Inc., P. O. Box 5181, Austin, Texas.

29. See e.g., J. A. Davis, Undergraduate Career Decisions: Correlates of Occupational Choice (Chicago: Aldine, 1965); Morris Rosenberg, Occupations and Values (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1957), pp. 53-61.

30. The significance of this finding is reduced by the small number of male students in this group (20), once females were eliminated.

31. In two cases a reduction of more than twenty percentage points.

32. See remarks in footnote 30, supra.

33. Of 60,000 college professors surveyed by the Carnegie Commission, approximately 70% characterized themselves as "left" or "liberal," and fewer than 25% characterized themselves as "conservative" or "middle-of-the-road." A survey of social science professors by Everett Ladd and Seymour Lipset indicated that approximately 70% voted against the "conservative" presidential candidate in 1972, compared with approximately 75% against four years earlier. See Andrew Hacker, On Original Sin and Conservatives, New York Times Magazine, (February 25, 1973), sec. 6, p. 13.

34. See Introduction, supra.

35. Jerome Skolnick, Justice Without Trial (New York: John Wiley, 1967), ch. 3.

APPENDIX

Table 1.

	Mean Age	Sex		Ethnic-Racial				Father's Occupation					Father's Education					Political Orientation: Self-Assessment						
		Male	Female	White	Black	Mexican-American	Oriental	unskilled worker	skilled worker	white collar-sales	white collar-management	professional	under 12 yrs. education	high school graduate	1-3 years college	4 yrs. college	professional or graduate	New Left	very liberal	slightly liberal	middle-of-the-road	slightly conservative	very conservative	New Right
LENF MAJORS+ (N=75)	20.5 (N=72)	89	11	89	9	0	1	12	30	4 (N=72)	32	22	19	30	27 (N=74)	9	15	3	12	34	43 (N=74)	7	1	0
CRIM MAJORS (N=82)+	20.3 (N=77)	39	61	89	7	2	1	9	17	6 (N=80)	35	33	15	20	25 (N=80)	21	19	1	11	62	19 (N=81)	7	0	0
NON-MAJORS (N=44)+	20.3	48	52	98	2	0	0	7	12	14 (N=43)	37	30	9	32	23	18	18	2	30	34	20	11	0	2

Table 1. Comparison of Age, Sex, Ethnic-Racial Composition, Socioeconomic status, and Political Orientation of Law Enforcement majors, Criminology majors and Non-Majors taking law enforcement and criminology courses (stated in percentages, except for age)

Table 2A.

	Enter law school	Enter graduate school	City, county or state police department	Federal law enforcement agency	Agency working with juveniles in the community	Agency working with adult offenders in the community	Work with juvenile offenders in institutions	Work with adult offenders in institutions	Private security agency	Criminal justice planning agency	Undecided	Other
LENF MAJORS (N=75)+	4	5	21	36	5	1	3	1	0	4	7	12
CRIM MAJORS (N=82)+	8	15	4	13	37	1 (N=79)	5	1	0	2.5	4	10
NON-MAJORS (N=44)+	23	19	2	0	16	0 (N=43)	5	0	1	2	14	16

Table 2A. Comparison of Career Aspirations of Law Enforcement majors, Criminology majors and Non-Majors taking law enforcement and criminology courses (stated in percentages)

+ except where otherwise indicated in table

Table 2B. Comparison of Career Aspirations of Male Law Enforcement

	Enter law school	Enter graduate school	City, county or state police department	Federal law enforcement agency	Agency working with juveniles in the community	Agency working with adult offenders in the community	Work with juvenile offenders in institutions	Work with adult offenders in institutions	Private security agency	Criminal justice planning agency	Undecided	Other
MALE LENF MAJORS (N=67)	4.5	6	21	40	1.5	0	1.5	1.5	0	4.5	7.5	12
MALE CRIM MAJORS (N=32)	9.4	18.6	6	25	25	3	0	3	0	0	3	7
NON-MAJORS (N=20)	50	15	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	15	10

Table 2B.

Table 3. Comparison of Career Aspirations of Male Law Enforcement

	High School Senior Class Rank				SAT (verbal)				SAT (math)			
	Highest 10%	11-30%	31-60%	61-100%	601-750	501-600	401-500	400 or less	601-750	501-600	401-500	400 or less
LENF MAJORS (N=75)+	19	39	28	14	11	36	32	21	23	30.5	30.5	16
		(N=69)				(N=56)				(N=56)		
CRIM MAJORS (N=82)+	25	43	25	7	15	32	41	12	8	37	41	14
		(N=77)				(N=59)				(N=59)		
NON-MAJORS (N=44)+	46	20	32	2	23	40	26	11	20	51	23	6
						(N=35)				(N=35)		

Table 3. Comparison of Educational Background and Scholastic Aptitude of Law Enforcement majors, Criminology majors and Non-Majors taking law enforcement and criminology courses, prior to admission to University of Maryland (stated in percentages)

+except where otherwise indicated in table

	Cumulative Grade Point Average					G.P.A. Computed on Basis of CRIM course grades					G.P.A. Computed on Basis of LENF course grades				
	less than 2.0	2.0-2.49	2.5-2.99	3.0-3.49	3.5-4.00	less than 2.0	2.0-2.49	2.5-2.99	3.0-3.49	3.5-4.00	less than 2.0	2.0-2.49	2.5-2.99	3.0-3.49	3.5-4.00
LENF MAJORS+ (N=75)	3	50	33	10	4	6	35	26	27	6	1	13	25	46	15
	(N=74)					(N=70)					(N=72)				
CRIM MAJORS+ (N=82)	2	28	49	16	5	2	25	22	37	14	0	15	12	35	38
	(N=81)					(N=81)					(N=66)				
NON-MAJORS+ (N=44)	0	20	36	33	11	0	18	18	33	31	5.5	27	5.5	40	22
						(N=39)					(N=18)				

Table 4. Comparison of Scholastic Achievement of Law Enforcement majors, Criminology majors, and Non-Majors taking law enforcement and criminology courses while attending University of Maryland (stated in percentages)

+except where otherwise indicated

Table 4.

	Opportunity for securing well-paying job					Preparation for stepping into real world					Contacts I make and social life I enjoy					Personal pride and respect of others					Opportunity for exploring one's interests and desires				
	most important reason	2nd most important	3rd most important	4th most important	least important	most important reason	2nd most important	3rd most important	4th most important	least important	most important	2nd most important	3rd most important	4th most important	least important	most important reason	2nd most important	3rd most important	4th most important	least important	most important reason	2nd most important	3rd most important	4th most important	least important
LENF MAJORS+ (N=75)	32	24	21	11	11	20	17	17	20	26	10	15.5	18	28	28	7	21	26	19	27	36	21	17	21	5
	(N=71)					(N=71)					(N=71)					(N=70)					(N=72)				
CRIM MAJORS+ (N=82)	25	13	17	26	19	13	17	24	21	25	5	16	29	19	31	5	29	16	28	22	54	24	14	5	3
	(N=76)					(N=76)					(N=77)					(N=76)					(N=79)				
NON-MAJORS+ (N=44)	22	24	27	17	10	13	24	24	17	22	5	17	20	27	32	10	14.5	14.5	27	34	53	19	14	12	2
	(N=41)					(N=41)					(N=41)					(N=41)					(N=42)				

Table 5. Comparison of Law Enforcement majors, Criminology majors and Non-Majors taking law enforcement and criminology courses as to motivations in attending college (stated in percentages)*

+except where otherwise indicated in table
*based on Maslow's hierarchy of needs

Table 5.

	Adequate pay (meet needs of family)					Good job security and employee benefits					Opportunity for good fellowship and harmonious relations					Job allows advancement based on achievement					Job allows freedom and opportunity to grow				
	most important reason	2nd most important	3rd most important	4th most important	least important	most important reason	2nd most important	3rd most important	4th most important	least important	most important reason	2nd most important	3rd most important	4th most important	least important	most important reason	2nd most important	3rd most important	4th most important	least important	most important reason	2nd most important	3rd most important	4th most important	least important
LENF MAJORS+ (N=75)	28	20	18	24	10	4	16	25	27.5	27.5	8.5	30	10	8.5	43	10	17	32	25	16	53.5	15.5	14	14	3
		(N=71)					(N=69)					(N=70)					(N=69)					(N=71)			
CRIM MAJORS+ (N=82)	14	23	24	21	18	6.5	5	25	30	33	8	32	18	16	26	8	29	22	22	19	67	10	9	10	4
		(N=78)					(N=76)					(N=76)					(N=76)					(N=78)			
NON-MAJORS+ (N=44)	7.5	27.5	25	30	10	2.5	10	20	42.5	25	5	35	12.5	15	32.5	5	20	40	10	25	80.5	7	2.5	2.5	7
		(N=40)					(N=40)					(N=40)					(N=40)					(N=41)			

Table 6. Comparison of Law Enforcement majors, Criminology majors, and Non-Majors taking law enforcement and criminology courses as to ranking of factors which are considered when applying for a job (stated in percentages)

Table 6.

	Emphasis on Deterrence		Interagency Cooperation		Obeying Laws		Policeman's Role		Treatment of Offenders		Goals of Criminal Justice Agency	
	a. should be more emphasis on deterrence as a means of crime control	b. minimal emphasis should be placed on deterrence as a means of crime control	a. interagency cooperation between police & corrections necessary if crime to be reduced	b. there are too many negative aspects to interagency cooperation	a. citizens should obey all laws even though not with the times	b. justifiable for citizens to violate specific laws not "with the times" if rational grounds exist	a. policeman's role should be public servant	b. policeman's role should be that of enforcer of the law	a. greater emphasis should be placed on community-based treatment of offenders	b. greater emphasis should be placed on institutional treatment	a. protecting community most important goal of criminal justice agency	b. helping individuals labelled as criminal is most important goal
LENF MAJORS+ (N=75)	85	15	88	12	31	69	74	26	85	15	49	51
	(N=74)				(N=74)		(N=72)		(N=74)		(N=74)	
CRIM MAJORS+ (N=82)	68	32	95	5	23	77	68	32	99	1	25	75
	(N=79)		(N=81)		(N=81)		(N=78)		(N=81)		(N=81)	
NON-MAJORS+ (N=44)	57	43	91	9	25	75	71	29	93	7	29.5	70.5
							(N=42)					

Table 7. Comparison of Law Enforcement majors, Criminology majors and Non-Majors taking law enforcement and criminology courses as to opinions on important issues in criminal justice (stated in percentages)

Table 7.

+ except where otherwise indicated in table

ADMISSION AND RETENTION POLICIES IN COLLEGES GRANTING DEGREES IN CORRECTIONS

Kenneth Taylor
Department of Social Work and Correctional Services
East Carolina University
Greenville, North Carolina

> "All operating agencies of justice urgently need the close contact with academic thought that could be achieved through use of faculty consultants; seminars and institutes to anaylze current problems and innovations; advanced training programs for judges, police administrators, and correctional officers; and more operational research projects and surveys conducted in conjunction with agencies of justice."[1]

The foregoing recommendations, contained in the 1967 report of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, are focused primarily on the in-service education needs of higher echelon personnel within the criminal justice system. Of equal, or perhaps of even greater, importance is the role higher education can play in the recruitment, training, education and placement of those who deal with clients of the criminal justice system on a more direct, day to day basis. Correctional personnel are among those who may be included in this category; among them probation and parole officers, cottage parents, custodial officers and work supervisors. Studies by Glaser[2] and others, have shown that these individuals, because of their intimate contacts with clients of the system, have a far greater potential for constructive or destructive impact upon these clients, than do the relatively few professionally trained persons within the correctional hierarchy.

Historically, there has been always at least a few persons trained in colleges, universities, or professional schools who have found full or part-time employment in the correctional field in the United States. Among the first to be hired were chaplains, physicians and dentists. The education of these employees, however, was geared to the general needs of their profession and involved no specialization designed to prepare them specifically for dealing effectively with criminals. In

addition, the system offered few rewards; salaries were low, fringe benefits virtually non-existent and prestige did not attach to work in corrections. As a result, the incompetent or the emotionally unstable individual too often tended to drift into these positions.

Within the last four decades, the number of college trained professionals working within the area of corrections has increased. Among those who have found employment in corrections are teachers (both academic and vocational), clinical psychologists, social workers, rehabilitation counselors, individual and group therapists, organizational administrators, and manufacturing or service specialists. The increased involvement of professionals also heralded higher salaries, the introduction of fringe benefits, and heightening of prestige.

The academic community at the same time began to make efforts to provide some of the training and education which related directly to corrections. In the early years, particularly, these tended to be tangential or supplementary to already established programs. One seldom found, for example, a department, within a college or university, whose efforts were devoted specifically to preparing students to work with clients of the corrections system. Almost always courses offered were through traditional departments, as sociology, law and psychology. The courses most often taught were: Criminology and Juvenile Delinquency (sociology); Criminal Law and Criminal Procedure (law); Abnormal Psychology, Mental Testing and various behavioral therapies (psychology). The psychology courses were concerned with behavior in general, not specifically with criminal behavior. Relatively few students committed themselves to preparation for careers in the field of corrections, such as parole, probation or within correctional facilities. Some students, possessing degrees not directly related to corrections, did find themselves, more by accident than design, working within the system. Once in the field, some found the rewards sufficient

to hold them as career employees.

Recommendations by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice in 1967, the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders in 1968, the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence in 1969, and the National Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, 1973, all emphatically stressed the need for better trained and educated personnel throughout the criminal justice system. The Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act passed by Congress in 1968 implemented a number of the recommendations. Included was the provision of funds for the training and education of both in-service and pre-service (those preparing for careers in the criminal justice system) personnel. Many institutions of higher learning had, until this time, shown little, if any, interest in developing programs geared to preparing students for careers in the criminal justice system. However, what had previously been a trickle of funds from the Federal and State governments for correctional institutions, courts, and parole and probation departments, became what appeared to be a virtual torrent. Millions of dollars were allocated in an attempt to stem an apparent steadily increasing rise in the rate of crime throughout the country. After years of Federal aid in the funding of highways, hospitals, sewage systems, airports and education for elementary and secondary school children, nurses, engineers and school teachers, there finally came a national demand for intervention in the crime problem. As part of this general increase in support, education of criminal justice personnel came to be viewed as necessary to the improvement of the effective functioning of the official processes designed to deal with the crime problem.

Officials of LEAA estimate that by early 1972 approximately 1,200 institutions of higher learning had police science or correctional programs leading to certification, or associate, undergraduate or graduate degrees. In 1973, the

number of such certifying or degree granting institutions tapered off to approximately 1,000. Many of these programs offered curricula which were designed to prepare students to occupy entry level positions in police departments, juvenile and adult correctional facilities, and probation and parole departments. As promotional requirements became more stringent and lateral entry for qualified personnel became somewhat more prevalent, schools began to accommodate by offering courses appropriate to the needs of supervisory personnel. Still other colleges began to offer higher level courses in administration, budgeting, supervision, public relations and human behavior for upper echelon personnel.

In the past, many criminal justice agencies, corrections among them, had effectively insulated themselves from 'outsiders.' They required specified years of service at lower level positions to qualify for promotions or positions were denied those who could not meet residency requirements. Often oral examination boards were constituted which consisted largely of 'insiders,' even though there was in effect a merit system for entrance, retention and promotion. The pressure to change these and similar practices has been marked in recent years. An ever increasing public demand for improvement of the criminal justice system, supported by better educated persons in supervisory and administration positions, finally began to open opportunities in employment and promotion for more highly qualified personnel.

Improvement has begun. One can cite expanded employment opportunities for better trained and educated personnel; higher pay scales; more enticing fringe benefits; and the gradual increase of prestige which attaches to those working within the correctional system. With these improvements have come concommitant demands that those hired and retained show evidence of being able to perform their duties. New and more exacting personnel standards are being promulgated within the federal correctional system and many states. However, while such standards are much more common, the field of correction has a long way to go in

achieving the kind of standardization and certification program for personnel which is sbught by a number of correctional leaders.

Our society has been able to require certification or licensure for many tradesmen, such as barbers, electricians, plumbers, and cosmetologists, but not for those persons inthe criminal justice system who make many official and unofficial decisions affecting the lives of millions of our citizens. Furthermore, training periods for those who wish to become fish and game wardens or wildlife protectors, to name a few, usually are much longer in duration than those for most custodial workers and policemen. In all probability, however, even a simple certification program for those at the entry level for all components of the system will be years in gaining approval of law-making bodies. One need only review the history of the in-fighting, delays, frustrations, and compromises associated with the licensing laws for physicians, dentists, and laywers, to appreciate the enormous task facing those who are in the vanguard for promoting the needed legislation.

Developing effective certification programs in the correctional field does not involve only problems of specifying needed job competences; it involves as well the structure and nature of the academic programs which would be involved in such a process. Two methods used in certification are licensing examinations and apprenticeship. Licensing examinations are common to professionals such as nurses, physicians and dentists. The use of an apprenticeship period is also common to many of them as well as those who generally do not require a separate licensing examination such as social work or teaching. Whether by apprenticeship, licensing examination or both, the relationship between 'education' and work in a field in this setting is clear. The goal is to prepare one for employment in a profession. They guarantee some baseline level of skill mastery.

Schools of education, medicine, law and nursing seek to provide their graduates with a store of knowledge and skill basic to the practice of their respective professions. The relationship between professional education and future employment is underscored by the frequent requirement that professionals pass State licensing examinations. Because service to the public is involved, the State has sought to impose controls in the form of testing and licensing. Professional schools have carved out an identity which integrates higher education and job-specific training.

This kind of integration has not developed in the corrections field. As a matter of fact, many colleges and universities interested in corrections have sought to maintain a more detached stance. The values which they associate with higher education are research, academic freedom and unfettered, intellectual exploration.

Now, the foregoing description is not characteristic of a number of programs in higher education, particularly at the two year level. Many programs are concerned with employment and job specific skills. But there is this other and pronounced strain in higher education to treat corrections not as a "professional" field, but an area of inquiry and criticism. In its purest form, this "higher education" position has as its goal the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake. Education does not imply future employment and is made available to all those who wish to pursue it and meet prescribed requirements. What a particular graduate may do with his or her education is not the concern of the college or university. Education about corrections in this type of setting simply will not support a certification program with its heavy emphasis on practices and agency acceptance.

It must be recognized that part of the uncertainty which arises concerning admission and retention policies in schools with correctional components in their curricula results from the quite different function schools see themselves serving. Corrections education cannot be easily categorized as either a professional or content area. It appears to combine varying quantities of both at different levels. If higher education could choose one style or tradition with which to identify

itself, things would be somewhat simpler.

It may well be that there is no easily definable entity "corrections education" in higher education, at least not one that would, with any ease, encompass two year, four year and graduate programs. The Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training proposed one model which differentiated the functions of the three types of program. The graduate of a two year program would be considered a "sub-professional," the graduate of a four year program would be designated a "specialist," and those holding advanced degrees would be the "professionals."[3] This model is useful, but it is unidirectional in that higher education is seen as relatively passive and acted upon. The possibility that at least some types of higher education programs might prefer not to become directly involved with vocational training and would rather pursue the role of critic is scarcely mentioned.[4]

Two year programs, which often have the most direct link with corrections are faced with one set of problems. Some of those problems spring from the nature of their relationship to departments of correction: meeting manpower needs; using education to raise standard of practice; and perhaps discouraging those precluded from employment from continuing. Four year programs face another set of issues. Concern arises here about a broad based educational experience and the need to resist too narrow and insulated experience for the student. Graduate programs attempt to maintain independence of inquiry while maintaining entree in order to do necessary research. Preservation of a delicate balance which allows for objectivity is the goal. However, graduate programs are also involved in educating those who will enter the field with advanced degrees.

The enforcement of standards might be undertaken differently by each of the three types of programs, but the application of this principle is a difficult one. For example, the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice

Standards and Goals calls for the following standard in the correctional field:

> All job qualifications and hiring policies should be reexamined with the assistance of equal employment specialists from outside the hiring agency. All assumptions (implicit and explicit) in qualifications and policies should be reviewed for demonstrated relationship to successful job performance. Particular attention should be devoted to the meaning and relevance of such criteria as age, educational background, specified experience requirements, physical characteristics, prior criminal record or "good moral character specifications," and "sensitive job" designations. All arbitrary obstacles to employment should be eliminated.[5]

As laudable as this standard may be, the question which remains for higher education programs is the degree to which they will be willing to shape these admission and retention criteria to those characteristics of "successful job performance." Professional schools traditionally have undertaken the task of screening certain applicants from admission to their programs. It is the practice in many professional schools to eliminate from the program those deemed psychologically unfit for practice in the profession. Schools of nursing have administered psychological tests to prospective students. Professional schools have perceived some obligation to screen applicants based not necessarily upon ability to learn, but upon suitability for employment.

As regards higher education in corrections, two rather separate but related questions are raised. The first question is, "To what degree are their programs designed specifically as preparation for employment?" The second question is, "Do two year, four year and graduate programs in corrections each have separate functions which are reflected in their admission and retention policies?" These two questions in turn raise a series of other ones. If only a limited number of applicants can be accepted, do there exist valid and reliable criteria which insure that proper selections can be made? If, after admission, a student exercises poor judgment in his personal affairs or perhaps acquires a criminal record that may preclude entry or retention in a correctional agency, is he allowed to

remain in a higher education program? If either a statewide or nationwide certification or licensure program becomes an actuality, should those who obviously cannot meet standards be admitted or retained? These, and other questions may not seem of great importance to criminal justice programs now enjoying almost unlimited expansion possibilities, but eventually decisions concerning admission and retention such as those now faced by various professional schools throughout the country, will undoubtedly have to be made.

Perhaps tentative answers to some of these questions could be obtained by reviewing a sample of admission and retention policies of institutions of higher learning offering degrees in corrections. An opportunity to do so presented itself in August of 1973. A Workshop for Correctional Educators in Colleges and Universities was held at that time at the Institute of Man and Science at Rensselaerville, New York, with the help of faculty from the School of Criminal Justice, State University of New York at Albany.

Those attending as faculty and Workshop participants were polled to ascertain the admission and retention policies of the institutions they represented. They were also asked if any changes were contemplated in the future and some personal opinions about present and proposed policies.

Certificate and Associate Degree Programs

Twelve of the institutions of higher learning represented at the Institute offered associate degrees in corrections or certificates for completion of courses. Many of those institutions were community colleges. Their students were fairly evenly distributed between pre and in service status. Any pre or in service student who met the college admission requirements could enroll in the corrections program as a degree candidate. In-service personnel did not have to meet any academic requirements to be enrolled in the certificate program. Screening to discover any personality traits, criminal record, or physical conditions that might preclude employment in the correctional system was not done. The assumption appeared to be that anyone who wished could avail himself or herself of the training and education offered.

Two of the schools required that their degree students undergo a period of field training in criminal justice agencies. No attempt was made to eliminate those from field training who might have personal adjustment difficulties or who might engage in behavior that could result in cancellation of their field placement. Similar policies were in effect in three other schools which encouraged, but did not require, field placement. Only those students whose academic work was unsatisfactory, or who were dismissed from the college for serious disciplinary infractions were dropped from the program.

Counseling by faculty was either non-existant or took place on an informal basis. One of the schools did not have any type of student counseling program. In other schools a type of informal counseling was reported to be the practice. It was only in that manner that any student who appeared to have a physical, character or emotional problem, that might reduce or eliminate employment possibilities, would be advised to transfer to another program. If, however, he chose not to do so, no further effort would be made to force the change.

Only one of the twelve schools had a limit on the number of students who could be enrolled in the criminal justice program. No attempt was made to give preference according to acaddmic or other qualifications should more than the top limit seek admission. Admissions were simply discontinued when the designated number was reached.

Most of the schools did not actively engage in helping their graduates find positions. Only one school indicated that it would pass on to a prospective employer unsolicited information reflective of negative traits which might be discovered by faculty members during a student's period of attendance at the school. If asked by a prospective employer about a specific trait, however,

most indicated that an attempt would be made to be truthful.

In summary, it would appear that colleges offering certificates for completion of courses or associate degrees take the position that everyone who meets admissions requirements for the college should be allowed to enroll in the corrections program if they wish to do so. Informal discussions were the only means used to discourage poor employment risks from remaining in the programs.

Undergraduate Programs

Many similarities in policy were found between those colleges which granted certification and associate degrees and the eleven which offered undergraduate degrees in corrections. Of the eleven schools, only two, one of which was privately endowed, had any veto power over students seeking admission to the corrections program. In nine of the colleges, any student who met the admissions requirements and indicated that he wished to major in corrections, was assigned to the department. Two of the faculty members interviewed indicated a belief in the need for the establishment of a limit on the number of students allowed to major in corrections. Of course, this would result in the initiation of some kind of a selection process. In the privately endowed colleges, students were taken on a first come, first served basis. However, admission requirements to the college were quite high, thus assuring the department academically well prepared students.

One college indicated that it actively enlisted the cooperation of the local Department of Corrections in the selection of those students permitted to enter correction programs as majors. If a correctional employee has completed most of the general college requirements, which takes about two years, and maintained a 2.0 average, he might submit an application with the recommendation of his agency for admission to the correctional services program. An interview is then arranged with a faculty member, who recommends (with or without reservation) acceptance in the department, or disapproval, while presenting reasons for his

action. A decision for or against acceptance would be based largely on academic standing, interest, past records, conduct, and personality factors which might indicate an ability to work well with others. The application and faculty member recommendation is then reviewed and acted upon by the school's admission committee. An appeal procedure is available to those not selected, or those selected but dropped from the program later for other than academic reasons. Inasmuch as most departments in this particular school of the university operate on a quota system, this method of selection has been readily accepted by the student body. Quotas are raised by the Dean of the school only after additional faculty members had been hired, instead of the common procedure of allowing the growth of a high student/faculty ratio and requesting additional instructors in order to meet the teaching load.

Only two of the eleven colleges required a field placement in a criminal justice agency for all majors. Six of the others encouraged students to take field placements and helped identify agencies which would cooperate and also helped with supervision.

All of the colleges reported having advisee systems. Informal suggestions are made to students who seem to have personality, emotional or physical problems which might interfere with subsequent employment in the criminal justice system that they transfer to another department or perhaps drop out of college. Only academic failure or disciplinary action by the college, however, can remove them from college and thus force withdrawal from the corrections program.

Graduate Programs

Of the Institute participants, eleven represented colleges and universities offering graduate degrees in corrections. As might be expected, there was a much greater variety in the selection and retention policies than found with the other degree granting institutions. In all instances, however, students first had to

meet all graduate school requirements for admission, which generally were based on the undergraduate quality point average, the Graduate Record Examination score and, in some instances, the Miller Analogies test score. In four universities, acceptance into the Graduate School and a preference for admission to the corrections program were the only criteria used for placement. In all the others, the corrections department head, or a committee he appointed, would select from among those student/employees who met the graduate school requirements and expressed an interest in the corrections program and recommend these applicants.

In a few instances, decisions were relatively easy to make; students were accepted on a first come, first served basis. Otherwise, decisions hinged almost entirely on a combination of academic achievement scores and test results, with decisions being made in favor of those having the highest scores. In one instance members of a minority group were sometimes selected in preference to others who might have had higher scores. In another instance the departmental chairman arbitrarily decided to fill his quota by dividing it equally between females and minority group members, providing of course, all met the requirements for acceptance in the graduate school. These two groups then competed among their peers for the allocated student positions, but all other applicants, regardless of qualifications, were not considered for the program. Retention in all programs was based primarily on maintenance of expected academic standards set by the graduate school, or sometimes at a higher level set by the department chairman.

Overview

Looking at all programs represented atthe Institute, it is evident that the desire for training and education in correctional subjects is, with only a few exceptions, the sole criterion for acceptance in a program once the academic

requirements are met. In fact, such things as a criminal record, the possibility of being an alcoholic or drug addict, physical defects, or having serious mental disorders, all of which would militate against being hired in a correctional position, have little, if any, importance in being accepted for higher education, at least to the extent that the schools are generally representative.

A number of those interviewed indicated that they felt their main concern was to help students gain an education in any field they wished and for whatever reason they may have in getting it. The prospective employing agency must make the ultimate decision concerning the overall fitness of the graduate for entrance into their ranks. These same individuals were not concerned about preparing students for the job market. Only two of those interviewed felt colleges should consider overall fitness to work in criminal justice agencies and academic potential in the admission process.

At this point in time, therefore, it appears that most students who meet and can maintain academic standards have little, if any, difficulty in gaining admission to and being retained in a school where they can secure an education that helps prepare them for work in a criminalljustice agency. With only three exceptions, two at the graduate level and one at the undergraduate level, do they actually face the possibility of competing with others for acceptance into a corrections program.

Admission and Retention Criteria

As yet there is no proven set of personal characteristics or academic criteria that would be infallible predictors of future success in the correctional field for those who must make decisions for acceptance or non-acceptance of students to a corrections program when quotas are used.

Meanwhile, those entering criminal justice agencies as lawyers, physicians, and dentists will continue to be measured by the standards established for their

professions. Others, such as clinical psychologists, vocational teachers, social workers, and rehabilitation counselors can be judged against a set of guidelines established by their national organizations, but not yet translated into certification or licensure in many states.

The issue of testing instruments for correctional workers was addressed by the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals in the Commission's Report on Corrections. The Commission argued for the need to:

> Make a task analysis of each correctional position (to be updated periodically) to determine those tasks, skills and qualities needed. Testing based solely on these relevant features should be designed to assure that proper qualifications are considered for each position.
>
> Use an open system of selection in which any testing device used is related to a specific job and is a practical test of a person's ability to perform that job.[6]

This standard implies recognition by the Commission of the value of relevant job specific testing devices.

Both the National Advisory Commission and the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training stress that such testing devices should be aimed at inclusion and not exclusion. A National Institute of Corrections was called for by the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training's Report to undertake organized planning for correctional manpower development which would involve Federal and State governments as well as various regions and correctional educators.[7] The development of such organized planning for manpower development would go hand in hand with the use of testing devices which would allow for consideration of qualifications in addition to education and prior experience. Conceivably one who had lower education or experience qualifications, but whose status as minority group member or ex-offender met a particular correctional need, would be hired instead of one with higher "formal" qualifications. Furthermore, under such a system pertinent life experience could be considered a valid qualification

for certain types of jobs. The implications of such a policy of course have important meaning for admission and retention policies in colleges and universities.

It must be recognized that the issues raised and discussed in terms of colleges and universities with correctional programs, are issues which face all institutions of higher learning and all academic departments within those institutions. One set of issues relates to the extent to which higher educational programs will be required to demonstrate the relevance of their curricula to specific competencies required on a job. Part of the answer to that question will depend upon how much a school sees itself as a professional or training program as was discussed earlier. Another set of issues relates to the kind of criteria required for admission. If, for example, belonging to a minority group gives one a special facility for working in correctional programs where such a minority group is heavily represented, should admissions criteria, which will very likely exclude such persons, be rigorously applied? In several of the programs represented at the Institute, preferential admissions policies for minority students were employed, and minority students with lower academic rank or lower GRE scores than other candidates were admitted to programs.

Medical and law schools have faced just such a situation. The courts will have final say concerning the propriety of this type of discrimination as they have already in several cases not yet binding throughout the country.[8] Whatever the courts may eventually decide, there are issues which need to be considered carefully before colleges establish, as policy, this type of preferential admission standard.

There are a number of reasons offered in support of altering admission policies regarding minority groups. Included among these are: (1) "culturally deprived" individuals can overcome their social, personal and educational handicaps by being exposed to quality education often denied them because they cannot

meet admission requirements; (2) the opportunity for higher degrees will open to them more prestigious and better paying positions, thus helping them achieve the social advantages that accompany economic advantages; and (3) it is one means of aiding in the reduction of discrimination against minority groups. Further, as was observed by the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals in their report on Corrections, "Minorities are found disproportionately in the ranks of corrections: overrepresented as clients and underrepresented as staff."[9] It has been postulated that increased utilization of minorities in corrections would have a number of beneficial effects. It would increase communication with clients, the workers would be more accessible to the clients, and workers would serve as positive role models.[10] In essence it is held that minority group members are better able to represent, counsel, and understand the life-style of other minority group members, thus their clients will be more willing to accept their counsel and advice.

Reducing admission standards for minority group members may aid in the achievement of some goals while at the same time creating new problems. Defining "cultural deprivation" is rather difficult; however, such deprivation is often considered a basic cause of many of the problems that beset members of minority groups. There are, for example, some members of these groups who are reared by parents who are well educated professionals. These students grow up in middle class neighborhoods, and would not, in all likelihood, be disadvantaged in terms of opportunity. Yet, without adequate means to determine the extent of their deprivation, if any, or an economic status test, they could be admitted under special minority admission standards.

The hope of proponents of special admission standards in higher education for culturally deprived individuals is that they would be more likely to perform

at a higher level than they have in the past when offered quality education. Unfortunately, the opposite often results. In speaking about the experience of law schools which have accepted minority students who are below the usual admission standards Graglia states:

> The effects of "cultural deprivation," will, if anything, accumulate and become more disadvantageous as the student reaches higher educational levels. It is difficult to accept that "cultural deprivation" results not in deficiency in essential law school skills, but merely in ability to demonstrate them and that they are likely to appear for the first time in law school. Although a difference in motivation can make a difference in performance despite objective criteria, I know of no way to measure motivation other than by performance and have no reasons to believe that the "culturally deprived" are more highly motivated than others to succeed academically.[11]

He goes on to state, "Inadequate grade school, high school, and college educational opportunities cannot be redressed by offering quality law school education. In quality education it is not possible to begin at the top."

Admittance to an institution of higher learning by some who just barely meet *minimum* admission standards or who are accepted in a special category not meeting these standards, poses other problems. Should there also be a reduction of academic achievement standards for these students? If not, it is reasonable to expect that many of them will not be able to compete successfully with those better prepared and qualified and thus fail academically? Should there be two standards of performance? If so, is this being fair to other students, or to graduates who may be judged for certain positions partially on the calibre of their school's graduates? But perhaps of much greater importance is the possible effect it may have on those minority group members who did meet the higher standards for admission and achievement, but who may be looked upon by others as being less qualified because others of the same group had special concessions made for them.

The proponents of special admission standards admit many of these difficul-

ties yet argue that a number of students who would never have qualified for admission under existing standards, have completed programs at the same standards as others and are making contributions in society. Obviously, there are greater difficulties with such programs and special resources are required, but they must be continued. The key is realistic expectations and a willingness to set up practical programs of assistance.

The above discussion relates primarily to graduate education. The necessity of providing special remedial programs at lower levels is even more acute.[12] Community colleges seem almost ideally constituted for this task. Four year schools might develop special intensive remedial programs designed to provide those facing difficulties with the skills necessary to success. It is not unreasonable to argue that where schools adopt a policy of preferential admissions for the "culturally disadvantaged" they also contract a responsibility toward those students. To admit such students without also making provision for some type of remedial assistance is almost tantamount to assuring either failure or dilution of academic standards.

It is an unfortunate fact of life that resources are limited. Culturally deprived, minority group members may not be the only students in need of remedial aid. Given the limitation on resources, another dilemma develops; has not the university a responsibility to assist all students having difficulty with academic work and not just those admitted on special bases? The issues involved are anything but simple.

Summary

If one can generalize from the reports of 35 criminal justice programs spread almost equally between institutions of higher learning granting associate, undergraduate, and graduate degrees and certification programs, the emphasis is primarily on providing quality education for anyone who meets admission requirements

rather than preparing individuals for specific positions in the criminal justice system. Admission policies are based almost entirely on academic preparation and do not bar those having personal characteristics that may possibly be undesirable or even unacceptable in the hiring standards of the various criminal justice agencies. Retention policies are based almost solely on maintaining minimum academic standards. There is a trend, particularly at the graduate level, to establish quotas for the number of students to be admitted. With this has come, in one instance, a policy of admitting females and minority group members, even though they are not necessarily the ones withthe best qualifications. If one can judge from the experience of law and medical schools, there will be increasing pressures for admittance of special groups even though they may not necessarily meet the minimum admission requirements. Some of the issues raised by the adoption of such a policy are explored in this paper.

FOOTNOTES

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

2. Glaser, Daniel, The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System, New York, The Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., 1964.

3. Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, "Perspectives on Correctional Manpower and Training," 1970, p. 28.

4. Ibid., p. 93.

5. National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, "Corrections," (Washington, 1973), p. 474.

6. Ibid., p. 471.

7. Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, "Perspectives on Correctional Manpower and Training," 1970, p. 469.

8. The Supreme Court considered the matter, but chose not to make a judgment on this issue in the DeFunis case. See DeFunis v. Odegaard 94 S. Ct. 1704 (1974).

9. National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, p. 465.

10. "Perspectives on Correctional Manpower and Training," p. 29.

11. Graglia, Lino A., "Special Admission of the 'Culturally Deprived' To Law School," University of Pennsylvania Law Review, Vol. 119, pp. 351-363.

12. Such programs have been used by the City University of New York ever since it established its open admission policy four years ago. The results of this remediation program and its value are still being debated as the first class to be admitted under this program graduates. (See New York Times, June 7, 1974).

A REPRESENTATIVE CURRICULUM FROM TWO-YEAR CORRECTIONS PROGRAMS IN COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES IN THE UNITED STATES

Lawrence McCurdy
Department of Urban Services
Washington Technical Institute
Washington, D. C.

The field of Correctional Education is relatively new compared with other disciplines, with significant developments occurring mostly within the last decade. Among the numerous factors influencing these developments, several have acted synergistically to bring about rapid changes in many areas. Correctional agency manpower needs, now generally established on a rehabilitative basis, have led to a demand for a significant number of two-year college programs geared primarily to meet the specialized educational needs of correctional officers who lack higher education experiences. The recently increasing number of community junior colleges across the country, in addition to established four-year institutions, provides a convenient vehicle for this type of specialized educational program, thus further stimulating the growth of this field. In addition, the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) has done much to provide financial aid to students participating in these programs. The report by the Board of Higher Education in Illinois underscores the urgency for new programs in corrections.

> Education over the centuries has been the instrument through which society has taught the positive attitudes and humane values that have moved it forward. In times like these, when great social change is in process, all institutions of society must reassess their roles in the effort to avoid, or where necessary to reverse, the process of dehumanization that so often accompanies great quantitative growth. It is imperative that every college and every university become fully sensitized to the responsibility it must assume as a medium for advancing and strengthening the citizenry. The vast resources, energies, and capabilities of higher education must be employed in

> innovative, experimental, and creative ways if new means to insure broad social justice are to be found.[1]

Many new programs have been recently developed and implemented in an effort to respond to these agency and community demands for higher educational attainment among corrections personnel.

Since the field is relatively new, there are few curricula models to guide educators in curriculum development. The combination of inputs from various correctional agencies and existing regional and institutional differences in the composition of Sociology and Criminology departments, along with other factors, have led to the development of a number of distinctly different corrections curricula. It is quite possible that each curriculum represents different educational and philosophical approaches to the questions of who needs to be educated for what type of service and for what reasons in relation to social goals.

It is the purpose of this paper to analyze these various curricula and establish a current base line that will reflect the aggregate composition of two-year corrections curricula at community junior colleges throughout the United States. The intent is to provide a profile of the curricula offered to students in correctional education programs. This overview of the current status of correctional education programs while at the same time providing a cohesive picture of what is occurring on a national basis. The study should provide a clear point of departure for new directions in correctional education.

METHODOLOGY

Program Selection

Of the more than 1100 community and junior colleges in the nation, only a handful offer a two-year program specifically in corrections. The programs for this study were obtained from a very recent survey conducted

by the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC). This report included a listing titled, "Inventory of Community College Educational Programs in Corrections," which was based on results of a mail questionnaire conducted in the Spring of 1972.[2] Seventy-one institutions were classified in that inventory as either 1) offering certificates or associate degree programs in Corrections, Criminal Justice with option in Corrections, or Law Enforcement with option in Corrections; or 2) offering corrections courses for credit. Of the many programs at the 71 institutions, 34 programs at 33 institutions met the following additional criteria for inclusion in this study: 1) must be a two-year or associate degree program; 2) program must not be a part of a four-year program offered at the same institution; 3) program must be labeled as a corrections program (see Table 1); 4) a full curriculum could be derived from the catalog. All references to criminology type programs under many headings were checked to ascertain the existence of options relating specifically to corrections. Institutional data relevant to this study for the colleges offering the 34 programs are listed in Table 1.

It should be noted that some states and regions have a heavy representation, such as California and Florida, while other states have little or no representation. Some states, therefore, will have a greater effect on the data than others.

Confidence levels for this study were not computed because the 34 programs were derived from the population in the AACJC inventory which was not designed with the additional criteria of this study in mind. No claim is made as to statistical validity in terms of a complete universe of programs or an adequate sample thereof. However, it is reasonable to assume that almost all colleges having two-year corrections programs would have responded to the AACJC inventory. While it is possible that the 34 programs meeting the above criteria are not the complete universe of two-year corrections

TABLE 1

INSTITUTIONAL DATA FOR COLLEGES WITH TWO-YEAR CORRECTIONS PROGRAMS

State	College or Institution	Catalog Year	Credit System	Minimum No. Credits to Complete Program	Name of Program or Degree
Arizona	Pima College	73-74	Semester	70	Corrections
California	Contra Costa College	73-74	Semester	62	Criminal Justice Systems & Corrections
	East Los Angeles College	73-74	Semester	62	Administration of Justice/ Corrections Option
	Mount San Antonio College	73-74	Semester	60	Correctional Science
	Porterville College (two programs)	73-74	Semester	67	Corrections/Probation & Parole
				68	Pre-Law Enforcement/ Corrections
	San Bernardino Valley College	72-73	Semester	65	Correctional Work
	Santa Ana College	73-74	Semester	60	Administration of Justice/ Corrections
Connecticut	Manchester Community College	74-75	Semester	60	Correctional Services
District of Columbia	Washington Technical Institute	73-75	Quarter	92	Correctional Administration
Florida	Hillsborough Community College	73-74	Semester	60	Preventions & Corrections
	Lake Sumter Community College	73-74	Semester	64	Pre-Criminology & Corrections
	Palm Beach Junior College	73-74	Semester	64	Law Enforcement/ Corrections
	Tallahassee Community College	73-74	Semester	60	Criminal Justice/Corrections
Illinois	Illinois Central College	72-73	Semester	64	Corrections

TABLE 1 (Cont.)

INSTITUTIONAL DATA FOR COLLEGES WITH TWO-YEAR CORRECTIONS PROGRAMS

	Joliet Junior College	73-74	Semester	64	Corrections
Iowa	Southeastern Community College	74-75	Quarter	90	Law Enforcement & Corrections
Maryland	Catonsville Community College	72-73	Semester	64	Correctional Services
Michigan	Jackson Community College	72-74	Semester	62	Corrections
Minnesota	Lakewood State Junior College	72-74	Quarter	90	Corrections
New York	Elko Community College	71-72	Semester	63	Law Enforcement & Corrections
	Ulster County Community College	74-75	Semester	62	Correction Administration
North Carolina	Davidson County Community College	73-74	Quarter	106	Criminal Justice/Corrections
	Halifax County Technical Institute	72-73	Quarter	110	Correctional Science
	Wilson County Technical Institute	71-73	Quarter	109	Corrections & Juvenile Delinquency
Oregon	Clackamas Community College	73-74	Quarter	94	Criminal Justice/Corrections
Pennsylvania	Community College of Allegheny Co.	72-73	Quarter	90	Corrections Administration
	Harrisburg Area Community College	73-75	Semester	60	Correctional Rehabilitation
South Carolina	Palmer College	72-73	Quarter	99	Correctional Administration
Texas	Alvin Junior College	73-74	Semester	62	Correctional Science
Vermont	Chaplain College	72-73	Semester	60	Correctional Practices
Virginia	Northern Virginia Community College	73-74	Quarter	97	Corrections Science
Washington	Everett Community College	71-72	Quarter	90	Corrections
	Olympia College	73-74	Quarter	93	Corrections

programs in the nation, the size of this sub-population is nevertheless very substantial. Considering these factors, the results of this study can be viewed as a strong indicator of what is occurring nationally in the field of Correctional Education throughout the more than 1100 community and junior colleges.

Course Titles

The 34 programs were examined by states and institutions in alphabetical order. Each curriculum was then analyzed with respect to course titles and credit hours.

A separate course title category was established based on the courses appearing in the first catalog reviewed. In the second and subsequent catalogs, new course title categories were added and titles similar or identical to previous ones were entered in the appropriate existing categories. All course titles were checked by consulting the course descriptions in each catalog to insure similarity, or to determine significant differences for establishing a new category.

The name of the course title category was amended as entries in that category were added. The name of each category evolved in this fashion to reflect the most common elements of each of the titles, which varied slightly from one program to the next. For example, the course titled Contemporary Treatment Concepts" evolved into "Contemporary Issues in Corrections." In some cases, noticeably different course titles were included in a given category if the course description clearly indicated that the course covered this area. In the few cases where a course description indicated that the course could be put in more than one category, a judgment was made based on the main thrust of the course. Categories were sometimes combined if: 1) a large number of course descriptions occurred with each course covering two

closely related areas (e.g. "counseling techniques" and "interviewing techniques," which were combined under the title "Counseling and Interviewing Techniques"); and 2) closely related categories occurred outside of the correctional core area with a small number of entries (e.g., "industrial psychology" and "applied psychology," which were combined as "Industrial and Applied Psychology").

Some categories with very small representation were retained due to their uniqueness even though they could have been combined with a larger, overlapping category (e.g. "History of Corrections," and "Health and Hygiene for Inmates" could have been included, respectively, in "Introduction to Corrections," and "Correctional Principles and Procedures").

General categories outside the correctional core area like Humanities and Science were established to accommodate those programs that did not specify a particular course. If, however, other programs specified these courses, they were listed as such. Thus, it is unknown whether the Humanities area might be filled out with courses in Music or Philosophy. The separate Philosophy category was retained because this course was specified in other corrections programs.

Weighting System and Computations

The amount of credit was recorded for each course entry. Courses offered in the Quarter system were weighted in relation to the Semester system since Semesters were used by the majority of colleges. Course entries were also weighted if listed as options or alternatives. If a student was allowed to select a specified number of courses from a group of courses, each course was given its proportionate weight in the group and entered into its appropriate category. The minimum number of courses and credits required to complete a program was used in all cases.

TABLE 2

PROPORTION OF COURSE TITLE CATEGORIES

Rank Order	Course Title Category	Proportion of Curriculum * (Percent)
1	Electives (open)	9.37
2	English Composition	6.52
3	Introduction to Sociology & Social Problems	6.43
4	Introduction to Psychology	4.34
5	Analysis of Criminal Behavior**	3.57
6	Physical & Natural Sciences	3.63
7	Criminal Law	3.63
8	Criminal Justice System	3.46
9	Introduction to Corrections**	3.23
10	American National Government	2.79
11	Correctional Principles & Procedures**	2.68
12	Speech	2.68
13	Counseling & Interviewing Techniques**	2.64
14	Humanities	2.33
15	Juvenile Offender	2.30
16	Mathematics	2.19
17	Electives (Corrections Related)	2.16
18	State & Local Government	1.98
19	Physical Education	1.93
20	Psychology of Personality & Social Adj.**	1.74
21	Organization & Management of Correctional Institutions	1.68
22	Fieldwork	1.60
23	Probation & Parole	1.58
24	Corrections & Social Welfare Services**	1.52

TABLE 2 (Cont.)

PROPORTION OF COURSE TITLE CATEGORIES

Rank Order	Course Title Category	Proportion of Curriculum* (Percent)
25	Social Science	1.46
26	Legal Aspects of Evidence, Search, & Seizure**	1.36
27	Contemporary Issues in Corrections	1.21
28	Law Enforcement	1.17
29	Health Education & First Aid	1.14
30	United States & World History	1.13
31	Correctional Treatment Programs & Techniques**	1.12
32	Community Based Corrections Programs**	1.00
33	English Literature	.915
34	Sociology of Ethnic Relations	.821
35	Constitutional & Civil Law**	.812
36	Psychology of Behavioral Disorders**	.803
37	Technical Writing	.798
38	Prison Society	.784
39	Typing	.704
40	Basic Education & Learning Skills**	.657
41	Spanish Language	.564
42	Developmental Psychology	.531
43	Industrial & Applied Psychology	.483
44	Corrections & the Law	.470
45	Community Relations	.469
46	Life Sciences	.423
47	Police Operations & Systems	.423
48	Economics	.376
49	Criminal Investigation Techniques	.329
50	Sociology of Marriage & the Family	.329
51	Philosophy	.305

TABLE 2 (Cont.)

PROPORTION OF COURSE TITLE CATEGORIES

Rank Order	Course Title Category	Proportion of Curriculum* (Percent)
52	Black History	.282
53	Public Administration	.282
54	Anthropology	.282
55	Social Obstacles to Rehabilitation for Released Offenders **	.235
56	Directed Research Project	.235
57	Corrections Recreation Programs	.219
58	College Orientation	.219
59	History of Corrections	.156
60	Traffic Control	.141
61	Patrol Procedures	.141
62	Mental Health Technology**	.141
63	Social Services & the Law **	.141
64	Urban Sociology	.141
65	Psychology of Incarcerated Offenders	.141
66	Court Systems	.141
67	Criminal Justice Information Systems	.141
68	Defense Firearms & Tactics	.125
69	Behavior Modification	.094
70	Health & Hygiene for Inmates	.094
71	Personnel Management & Labor Relations	.070

* Weighted frequency of course titles divided by weighted total of all course title entries

** See text under Results section

.141 ≃ one 3 credit semester course

The entries for each category were added to obtain frequencies, and the percent computed of the total for all entries. The percentage tabulated for each course represents a measure of the emphasis given to each subject in two-year corrections curricula. The results were computed to three places for ranking purposes only since the data, using the methods of this study, are not considered to be accurate enough for presentation with this degree of precision. It should be noted that if only one course anywhere in the nation were to be developed and added to any of the categories below one percent, the ranking of that course category could be significantly altered.

RESULTS

The results are listed in Table 2. The 71 course title categories reflect the extent of the wide variety of course offerings in the field. While this table shows rank order and the extent of emphasis that a subject is currently given in two-year programs, it is unwieldly for examining other curriculum issues.

In order to facilitate examination of the aggregate curriculum in different ways, a regrouping was carried out along conventional "departmental" lines and appears in Table 3. This regrouping and labeling is arbitrary, and the data could be rearranged in a number of formats in relation to various considerations. For example, Human Services courses as labeled in Table 3 (which excludes Administration of Justice and Humanities courses) make up approximately 21% of two-year programs while Corrections and closely related courses in the major make up approximately 36%. This regrouping also provides a more cohesive picture of the relative weight of corrections area courses. In Table 2, the fragmentation of the basic sub-areas into separate categories tends to dilute the strength of the corrections area when compared to other areas which were not spread over as many categories.

TABLE 3

DEPARTMENTAL GROUPING OF COURSE TITLE CATEGORIES

Order from Table 2	Course Title Categories	Percent from Table 2	Proportion of Curriculum (Percent)		
9	Intro. to Corr.	3.23	6.07 Basic Corr.	24.00 Corr.	36.48 Major
59	History of Corr.	.15			
11	Corr. Prin. & Proced.	2.69			
21	Organ. & Met. of Corr. Inst.	1.68	13.93 Spec. Corr.		
70	Health & Hyg. for Inmates	.09			
57	Corr. Rec. Pgms.	.21			
31	Corr. Treat. Pgms. & Tech.	1.12			
27	Contemp. Issues in Corr.	1.21			
32	Comm. Based Corr. Pgms.	1.00			
55	Soc. Obst. to Rehab. for Rel. Offd.	.23			
23	Prob. & Parole	1.58			
15	Juv. Offd.	2.30			
5	Analysis of Crim. Behav.	3.57			
38	Prison Society	.78			
65	Psych. of Incar. Offd.	.14			
17	Corr. Rel. Elec.	2.10	4.00 C. Elec. & Field.		
56	Dirc Research Proj.	.23			
22	Fieldwork	1.60			
28	Law Enfor.	1.17	2.33 Law Enfor.	12.48 Major.Related	
47	Police Oper. & Spec.	.42			
49	Crim. Invest. Tech.	.32			
60	Traf. Control	.14			
61	Patrol Proced.	.14			
68	Def. Firearms & Tact.	.12			
8	Crim. Just. Sys.	3.46	3.74 C.J. System		
66	Court Sys.	.14			
67	Crim. Just. Info. Sys.	.14			
7	Crim. Law	3.63	6.41 Law		
35	Const. & Civ. Law	.81			
26	Legal Aspts. of Evid. Srch. & Sz.	1.36			
44	Corr. & the Law	.47			
63	Soc. Serv. & the Law	.14			
4	Intro. to Ps ch.	1.3	7.99 Psych.	20.83 Human Services	
20	Psych. of Per. & Soc. Adj.	1.74			
42	Dev. Psych.	.53			
36	Psych. of Behav. Disord.	.80			
69	Behav. Mod.	.09			
43	Instst. & Appl. Psych.	.48			
13	Counsel. & Interv. Tech.	2.14			
3	Intro. to Soc. & Soc. Prob.	5.43	9.38 Soc. & Soc. Welf.		
24	Corr. & Soc. Welf. Serv.	1.52			
62	Mental Health Tech.	.14			
34	Soc. of Eth. Rel.	.82			
50	Soc. of Marr. & the Fam.	.32			
64	Urban Soc.	.14			
45	Comm. Rel.	.46	.82 Pub. Admin.		
71	Person. Mgt. & Labor Rel.	.07			
53	Pub. Admin.	.28			
54	Anthro.	.28	2.92 Humanities	10.94 Soc. Sci. Spec. Std	
51	Phil.	.30			
14	Humanities	2.33			
10	Amer. Natl. Govt.	2.79	4.77 Government	7.64 Soc. Sci.	
18	State & Local Govt.	1.98			
30	U.S. & World Hist.	1.13	1.41 History		
52	Black Hist.	.28			
25	Soc. Science	1.46			
48	Economics	.37	4.05 Science	19.07 Gen. Ed. & Learn. Skills	
6	Phy. & Nat. Sciences	3.63			
46	Life Sciences	.42			
16	Mathematics	2.19			
2	Eng. Comp.	6.52	10.91 English		
37	Tech. Writ.	.79			
33	Eng. Lit.	.91			
12	Speech	2.68			
41	Span. Lang.	.56	3.07 H. & Phys. Ed.		
40	Basic Ed. & Learn. Skills	.65			
39	Typing	.70			
29	Health Ed. & First Aid	1.14			
19	Physical Ed.	1.93			
58	College Orientation	.21			
1	Open Electives	9.37			

Limitations

A mathematical approach was used to represent and analyze the curricula in order to maintain a level of objectivity with respect to a large number of entries. On the other hand, due to the inherent nature of the material being examined, a mathematical approach is not completely successful in exposing all facets of the problem. A main consideration in this regard is that judgements had to be made, based on interpretations of the English language, when it was unclear where to put a course that did not fall neatly into one of the categories. Given this type of limitation, the methods used accomplish the primary purpose in representing the curricula. A question still remains, however, as to how closely any published curriculum represents what is delivered in the classroom.

> As anyone familiar with the ways of higher education knows, titles (and especially titles of courses) can be misleading. The most sophisticated of subject treatments can be masked behind a simple title, and vice versa. Nevertheless, course titles do offer some clues to subject matter treatment and content...[3]

The character of any course will also depend on the instructor, his materials, his students, and other variables.

Course Title Relationships

Several observations concerning the relationships of various course title categories were noted during the data collection process. These observations are outlined below (in the order that they appear in Table 2) to pinpoint further the nature of some courses, especially where some ambiguity might arise as a consequence of the short labels used for each category.

(5) Analysis of Criminal Behavior - includes criminology courses.

(9) Introduction to Corrections - courses usually included some content on history and philosophy of corrections.

(11) Correctional Principles and Procedures - includes custody and classification courses, slight overlap with Correctional Treatment Programs and Techniques and with Counseling and Interviewing Techniques categories.

(13) Counseling and Interviewing Techniques - Substantial overlap with Correctional Treatment Programs and Techniques.

(20) Psychology of Personality and Social Adjustment - includes courses titled as Social Psychology or Sociology of Group Behavior.

(24) Corrections and Social Welfare Services - substantial overlap with Community Based Corrections Programs, slight overlap with Social Obstacles to Rehabilitation for Released Offenders.

(26) Legal Aspects of Evidence, Search and Seizure - slight overlap with Constitutional and Civil Law.

(31) Correctional Treatment Programs and Techniques - substantial overlap with Counseling and Interviewing Techniques.

(32) Community Based Corrections Programs - substantial overlap with Corrections and Social Welfare Services, slight overlap with Social Obstacles to Rehabilitation for Released Offenders.

(35) Constitutional and Civil Law - slight overlap with Legal Aspects of Evidence, Search and Seizure.

(36) Psychology of Behavior Disorders - includes Abnormal Psychology courses.

(40) Basic Education and Learning Skills - occasionally includes special subjects such as Use of the Slide Rule or Speed Reading, but usually these slots are used for Mathematics or English courses.

(55) Social Obstacles to Rehabilitation for Released Offenders - slight overlap with Corrections and Social Welfare Services and with Community Based Corrections.

(62) Mental Health Technology - subject material often included in Corrections and Social Welfare Services courses.

(63) Social Services and the Law - subject material often included in Corrections and Social Welfare Services courses.

Applications

As mentioned earlier, the results provide a base line reflecting the course offerings of two-year corrections programs. The results can also be viewed as an educational background sketch showing what two-year graduates will be bringing to the field of corrections. In relation to current and future manpower needs of correctional and related human services agencies, it may be desirable to alter various curricula appropriately. The educational background sketch also shows how graduates will be prepared for transferring to four-year colleges and universities, and could serve as a springboard for seeking solutions to articulation problems. In relation to these and other curricula issues, the results invite comparison with the Criminal Justice models given in Charles W. Tenny's report.[4]

If used with discretion, the results can provide information for curriculum development and revision at individual colleges. If a college decided to institute a two-year corrections degree program, the results of this study could be converted to a two-year curriculum. While this approach is ill-advised since (among other reasons) it would yield a "middle-of-the-road" curriculum, it might nevertheless be a starting point that could be molded to address new trends in corrections or specialized needs with respect to a given region or population. One of the important issues that should be considered in this regard is expressed in the introduction of Charles W. Tenny's report.

> In law enforcement higher education [as compared to other disciplines] no such common agreement on goals yet exists, and indeed considerable difference of opinion exists as to whether higher education for criminal justice should focus on simply improving the performance of what is currently being done, or whether it should focus on changing what is being done. The issue should be one of emphasis; more often it is one of alternatives. And in a field which only recently commenced to establish its educational foundations, the choices can be (and are) crucial.[5]

In terms of curriculum revision, the results in Table 2 indicate treatment of some subjects that in the past have not been generally associated with this field, and other institutions might want to explore one or more of these dimensions for inclusion in their program.

FOOTNOTES

1. Board of Higher Education and the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission, "Social Justice and Higher Education in Illinois," September, 1970, p. 6.

2. Andrew S. Korim, "Improving Corrections Personnel Through Community Colleges," submitted to Law Enforcement Assistance Administration by American Association of Community and Junior Colleges and the American Bar Association, Washington, D. C., August, 1973, p. 26.

3. Charles W. Tenny, Jr., "Higher Education Programs in Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice," Submitted to Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, June, 1971, p. 50.

4. Ibid., pp. 27-31.

5. Ibid., p. 5.

ACTION RESEARCH AS A TEACHING TOOL FOR CORRECTIONS EDUCATORS

Ronald L. Boostrom
School of Public Administration and Urban Studies
California State University
San Diego, California

It has been generally accepted as a maxim of education for corrections students that some sort of practicum or internship experience should be required for potential practitioners and administrators. However, many students in corrections and/or criminal justice programs are interested in the possibilities for using social scientific resources to help rationalize programs designed to cope with the social problems of crime and delinquency. Student involvement in the social process of improving and validating improvements in social practice and policy may be much more meaningful for the student, and for correctional practice in the future, than simply exposing students to existing correctional realities. Those agencies involved in the delivery of correctional services have typically been unable to develop procedures and manpower necessary to link basic and applied research to social practice.

Rational practice requires that objective evaluation procedures which can influence future decision-making be built into correctional programming. Experiences in California and New York have shown that legislators are likely to demand social accounting procedures in the future prior to allocating financial resources to corrections agencies. This is an area where alliances between educational institutions and correctional agencies can be fruitful. Students can provide critical manpower and resources, with the aid of educators, to help rationalize the correctional process. Students can be active participants in the process rather than just passive receivers of

predigested information about existing practices. As active participants in the process, providing a necessary function which they are uniquely able to perform by virtue of their institutional affiliation, students will develop a need to know which will make their involvement in the educational process more meaningful. In this paper we will consider an example of student involvement in action research initiated by the author. We will also consider the impact of such student involvement on agency practice.

Students in the Field

A prime requisite for programs of higher education which attempt to provide relevant information and experiences for potential professionals in corrections is some method of exposing students to realistic problems faced by practitioners and administrators in correctional agencies. In the development of corrections programs within institutions of higher education this has traditionally meant that the curriculum has included some type of field work experience which is a mandatory part of the program, at least for pre-service students.

With the above in mind, the author, along with another participant in the Institute for Correctional Educators, circulated the following memorandum to other participants during the course of the Institute in August, 1973:

> We are interested in the potential for learning and the problems involved in exposing students to, and involving students in, realistic situations and practical problems dealt with "in the field" by correctional practitioners. Questions can be formulated by students when real problems arise in the course of involvement in such projects because he or she will now have an experience based on a need to know. This encourages learning situations which are problem centered and which can be of mutual benefit to students and practitioners. Information is not forced on the student exclusively from the perspective and experiences of the instructor. The instructor, instead, can function as a resource to aid the student in formulating his own questions based on his own experiences. The instructor takes on the responsibility for

> encouraging the student to generalize from his specific experiences and for helping the student fit these experiences into a more general framework or theoretical perspective.
>
> In view of this interest, we would like to get as much input as possible regarding programs that utilize action projects to meet this need, from participants at this workshop. We would like to pose the following question and gather from each of you personal data on: What kinds of experiences, problems or successes have you and your students had with these kinds of learning experiences?

The author conducted follow-up interviews during the closing period of the Institute with representatives of four-year college and university corrections programs. All of the participants interviewed stated that they did include action programs for students as part of their curricula. They said that such programs represent a valuable and necessary part of the programs which they represented. When asked to describe the content of such programs, each participant interviewed described an internship program in which students are placed for a given period of time with a participating correctional agency. The average internship program described required a minimum number of hours work in a correctional agency so that students can get a "feel for" the every-day realities of work in a correctional agency. Students typically work alongisde correctional practitioners and may be allowed some responsibility for limited and supervised casework, counseling or custodial relationships with correctional clientele.

It is clear that the type of internship exposure described by participants is indeed necessary for all students preparing for entrance into the corrections field. However, this kind of participation in social action inevitably leaves some students dissatisfied and leaves corrections agencies basically unchanged. Many students have read sufficient literature critical of the present function of the "correctional system" to desire participation in meaningful reform efforts which might provide more viable professional roles for them in the future.

Corrections educators cannot ignore the fact that many serious challenges to correctional practice have arisen from the evaluative studies of social scientists who have studied the practice and outcomes in this field.[1] We also cannot afford to ignore the idealism and need for positive involvement apparent among much of the present-day student population, including those interested in the field of corrections. This, in itself, provides a formidable resource for actualizing a more positive future for the field of corrections, allowing for the encouragement, rather than stifling, of creativity and change.

Given the present state of affairs in the field of corrections[2] it seems imperative that correctional educators ask the following kinds of questions for their own benefit, the benefit of their students, and for the future of corrections. To what extent and in what manner can corrections students involve themselves in working toward organization change which might lead to better delivery of correctional services, facilitating positive outcomes for correctional clientele? To what extent is it possible for corrections students to become active participants in action research in partnership with corrections agencies, rather than remaining passive recipients of conventional correctional wisdom?

Ralph Nader and his associates have managed to tap the idealism and activism of students and channel it toward positive efforts to achieve meaningful social change. The Public Interest Research Groups, financed by student fees and staffed by students and established professionals, have been the result. Involvement in the management of social change has provided a creative outlet for talented and imaginative students. Can corrections educators and administrators also provide such creative channels for

student energy, idealism and expertise? This would seem to constitute a meaningful challenge for the field in the future. Are we up to it? If we do not provide suggestions and leadership in this area, who will?

Change management is the essence of the enterprise of corrections. Correctional agencies are charged with the social responsibility for developing appropriate strategies for facilitating positive change in their clientele. Even the most committed correctional practitioners and administrators are having trouble these days justifying this historical mandate in the face of mounting criticism from many quarters.[3] Those systems, such as the corrections systems developed by the states of New York and California, which have been most open to evaluative efforts mounted from outside the "system" have also been most vulnerable to criticism. This has made some correctional administrators "gun shy" where evaluation of programs is concerned.

Specific reforms have been advocated as though they were certain to be successful. Correctional administrators, in common with administrators in general, try to limit evaluation of their programs to those outcomes they feel they can control.[4] As public agencies are forced to vie for scarce resources, they are being asked to take greater responsibility for assessing program outcomes and for making more efficient use of available resources. Legislators are paying greater attention to those social scientists advocating that some of the available resources be earmarked for evaluation of social action programs.[5] This will be the reality of the future with which both correctional administrators and practitioners will have to live. The student of corrections today should be learning about the realities of tomorrow which they will inevitably face as professionals and which will limit their options for decision-making. It has been the rule in the past that strategies for change have generally not been pretested, coordinated or evaluated, "therefore their efforts are diffuse and marginally effective."[6] But this is not likely to be the reality of the future, and potential correctional administrators might as well learn this now. Correctional agencies need help today in articulating rational and realizable goals and in creating programs which set rational criteria for the measuring of outcomes. Corrections students, with the resources of the college and university at their disposal, can provide such help. The help must be offered and correctional administrators must be convinced of the wisdom of entering into reciprocal relationships with institutions of higher education in order to take advantage of such help. If this is forthcoming, the burden will be placed on corrections educators to build such capabilities into their programs.

Action Research and Model Program Design

With all of the above in mind, the author decided, during the 1972-73 school year, to transform a graduate seminar in the Criminal Justice Administration Program at San Diego State University into an experiment in correctional treatment-evaluation model building. After some initial discussion of background information relevant to the issues we have discussed here, the class was divided into task groups charged with developing a realistic model which could be applied in an existing correctional agency.

This particular graduate seminar was composed of both pre-service and in-service students. The class contained enough practitioners who knew their way around the correctional scene in San Diego to make it possible to choose a realistic setting for which a model program could be designed. It was discovered in the course of initial exploration of this idea that a local honor camp, recently integrated into the structure of probation adult services, was searching for a new treatment program modal-

ity. After touring this camp and talking with administrators, the class decided to gear their model treatment-evaluation program to the realities of implementation in this camp. The class made the further initial decision to work from a basic model "significant other" program which had been previously implemented at another similar camp in the San Diego area.[7] Because this program had been abandoned at the other camp, it was decided to significantly modify this basic model.

The class was divided into five teams, each responsible for developing a different aspect of the model program. These were: (1) treatment modalities; (2) classification; (3) significant other program; (4) integration and overall design; and (5) post release programming. During the course of the semester, students worked in task groups on these different aspects of the model project. Using resources suggested during class discussion sessions, and using each other and also outside corrections professionals as resources, they devised an integrated treatment-evaluation program which they proposed for implementation at the Viejas Adult Rehabilitation Center in San Diego County.

The proposal presented to the instructor is reproduced here so that the reader can judge the worth of this type of class project for corrections students.

INTRODUCTION

Social identity, the manner in which people organize, categorize and type their expectations of themselves and others, is at best unpredictable and elusive in the complexity of technological, pluralistic society. A simplistic, taken for granted, attitude masks the dynamism of human interaction of the "normal" level. At the deviant level the meaning of the interaction has reached the height of absurdity. This proposal endeavors to stabilize the interaction of fifty offenders and those closest to them, their significant others. This project does not propose that the offender's

behavior will be changed by the manipulations of the treatment, personnel or researcher. The offender, and the offender only, is the one who will change his behavior for good or for ill.

Three basic observations about human interaction, coming from the perspective of Symbolic Interactionism, underlie this study. The first premise is that "human beings act toward things on the basis of the meanings the things have for them."[8] This premise is basically taken in the social and psychological sciences - thus it is considered unimportant or "a mere neutral link between the factors responsible for human behavior and this behavior as the product of such factors."[9] Consequently, psychologists turn to explanations for behavior such as stimuli, unconscious motives, perception, cognition, ad infinitum. The sociologists postulate such factors as status, social roles, norms and values. Human interaction is bypassed by these intellectual manipulations; one merely identifies the precipitating and resulting behavior.

The second premise basic to the study is that meaning arises out of social interaction. The meaning is not inherent or intrinsic in the object. The traditional philosophical view is shattered by this stance. Also, Symbolic Interactionism does not see "meaning as arising through a coalescence of psychological elements in the person."[10] Meaning is not inherent in an object, but arises in the interaction.

The third premise is that meanings are modified in the interaction by an interpretative process arising between the person and the things he encounters. Thus, the interaction is fluid and flexible.

With these basic premises a new methodology must be introduced. The nature of the empirical world must be respected and a scientific stance must be assumed to show the respect. Data is collected from the interaction, upon which no definitions are superimposed. The researcher must see the action from the point of view of the person who is forming the action.

The three premises can be summarized in one word, responsibility. The actor has the power and the privilege to shape the interactions in which he is involved. The actor is liberated from any sense of victimization in the realization that he is free to shape his own responses.

Being free to shape ones own responses, one is loosened from the delusion of isolation and is capable of interacting with the significant other. The interaction with the significant other is the source of self evaluation and self esteem. The encounter with the significant other can be ecstatic or dangerous. The persons most essential to one's self identity are most problematic. The goal is to work out patterns of "mutual

self esteem maintenance."[11]

The goal and hypothesis of this project is that the establishment of "mutual self-esteem" between the offender and the significant other will reduce recidivism.

Historically correctional institutions have attempted to either label "something" as "counselling" or have initiated treatment programs with little thought as to how such a program will assist the offender once he is released from the institutional setting.

The concept of a significant other program is a breakthrough from past mistakes in that a tested I-level classification system is being used to determine who should be in the program; the proper treatment modalities to assist the individual are applied; the individual who means the most to the resident is involved with the resident during the resident's confinement, and the program is continued once the resident leaves the institutional setting and returns to his own environment. Hence the program provides a continuum from time of confinement to release from probationary status. Thus, this is a dynamic approach designed to produce continuing results beyond the period of confinement.

THE CLASSIFICATION CENTER

Inmates from San Diego County Jail are screened by the County Classification Committee to determine their suitability for placement in the Probation Department's Adult Institutional Services Division.

As of July 1, 1973, there will be eight institutions. Six are located in rural areas of San Diego and two are located in the City of San Diego.

All male residents will be sent from County jail to the Classification Center where they will remain for two weeks.

In addition to receiving an orientation as to Departmental rules and regulations, residents will receive a battery of tests to best determine educational, vocational and psychological needs.

Tests will be administered by the center's Correctional Counsellor. Included in the psychological testing will be the Jesness Inventory. This inventory will be used to determine the I-level and subtype of all residents received at the Center.[12]

During the initial counselling interview, the Correctional Counsellor will identify those residents eligible for the Significant Other program by utilizing the following criteria, and will note the data on the file face-sheet:

A. Age: 18 to 30 years
B. Probation: Probation being a condition of the sentence with at least one year of local residency probation remaining upon completion of custody.
C. Sentence: A minimum of six months in custody.
D. Significant Other: A significant other in the resident's life, (wife, girlfriend, parent, etc.), who will cooperate in the program.
E. I-Level: I_4NA and I_5N. (It may be possible to include borderline I_4NX if the population is too low).
F. Offense: No restriction on the type of offense.

After all of the residents who are eligible for the Significant Other program are identified, they will be called together and the program explained to them. Those residents not wishing to participate will be classified to other camps.

The resident who does want to participate will have his Significant Other contacted and if the Significant Other is willing to cooperate, a Jesness Inventory will be administered to the Significant Other.

The Correctional Counsellor will also screen men who meet the criteria as stated for the Significant Other program but who either don't have a Significant Other in their life or don't desire the Significant Other's involvement in the program. If these residents agree to entering the program, after careful orientation by the Center's Correctional Counsellor, they will become members of the control group, as opposed to those in the experimental group.

The Center's Classification Committee will select both control and experimental residents and classify them to the Viejas Rehabilitation Center weekly.

Residents in the experimental group will be identified by a red mark on their folder name tabs. Residents in the control group will be identified by a blue mark on their folder name tabs.

After classification is completed, the camp clerk will prepare a list identifying the name, file number and date of each resident's classification in each of the two groups. One list will be forwarded to the Departmental Statistician and a copy forwarded to the Counsellor at Viejas Rehabilitation Center.

For purposes of clarification, it should be remembered that both the experimental group and the control group will meet the same criteria and receive the same counselling, with the exception that with the control group there will be no Significant Other in the counselling program.

VIEJAS REHABILITATION CENTER

The Viejas Rehabilitation Center is located approximately forty-five miles east of the city of San Diego. Realizing that the transportation of the Significant Other and/or child care may be a problem, we shall request assistance from the Department's Volunteers in Probation (V.I.P.) program to provide these services.

Group meetings for the experimental group will be held on Saturday afternoons and for the control group on Saturday nights. In this way the Significant Other will be free to attend the meetings and work projects involving the residents will not be interrupted. Each group will meet in the camp's staff lounge.

Once the resident is classified to the Viejas Rehabilitation Center two treatment modalities will be utilized: Transactional Analysis and Reality Therapy. The reasons for these modalities are:

A. Denial of the medical model which starts with the premise that the resident is "sick."
B. Each modality is predicated on individual action and responsibility.
C. Each modality is suitable for the I-level classification and can be taught to the staff in a short period of time.
D. Each modality can be taught to the resident in either the experimental or control group and the significant other in the experimental group so that the primary principles of their inter-actions can continue to utilize these principles after release from the camp.
E. Supervising Probation officers who continue the program after the resident is released from camp will have training in these modalities.

Training for the staff at the Viejas Rehabilitation Center will consist of sixty-eight (68) hours of I-level training; twenty-four hours (24) of Transactional Analysis training and twenty hours (20) of Reality Therapy Training prior to the implementation of the program. As such the staff of Viejas will be "I-leveled" and receive training necessary to conduct this program.

The control group will consist of ten residents and one officer. The experimental group will consist of five residents and their significant other with one officer. All told, there will be five control groups and five significant other groups. Although the camp has a resident population of ninety-six (96) residents, the population will have to be reduced to seventy-five residents in order to operate the program. The staffing pattern will have to remain the same as a ninety-six (96) man camp since some officers will be required to maintain supervision of those residents not in counselling sessions.

Residents and their significant other will spend the first session in a conjoint session and the second session would be a group session with other residents and their significant other. The remaining eight sessions will alternate between conjoint sessions and group sessions. Following each conjoint session, the resident and his significant other will be allowed one-half hour in privacy to discuss what they have learned or gained from the session. During this total of ten weeks, Transactional Analysis will be utilized in order to provide a common means of communications (adult to adult in T.A. terms).

Once this rational interaction of communications is achieved, the remainder of the sessions will involve reality therapy group sessions and the discussion of practical matters. The goal is that this rational-functional communication will be generalized to the resident and his significant other upon the resident's release from camp and will be continued with the assistance of the supervising Probation Officer.

Residents in the control group will receive ten one-hour sessions utilizing transactional analysis in order, again, to provide a common means of communication. The remaining weeks in camp will be spent in the modality of reality therapy in order to assist the residents to place a rational assessment on his goals, necessary vocational and educational counselling and post release planning. It should be mentioned that this is also the function with the experimental group after they complete T.A. and begin to use the reality therapy modality.

An important factor to consider is each Saturday there will be a different officer conducting the groups due to staffing patterns. Thus, all staff will have to complete training in all modalities.

Each quarter the officer will complete a "case classification guide". This is to designate problem areas to be identified and goals to be achieved. Quarterly case summaries will also be dictated following the I-level format.

POST RELEASE SUPERVISION

Once the residents from either group are ready to be released from custody, the Departmental Statistician will be notified in advance and assign the case on a random basis to both subsidy[13] and regular caseloads. Thus a subsidy caseload will consist of residents who have been in either the experimental or control group. By the same token, a non-subsidy caseload will also contain residents from either the experimental or control group.

The Supervising Probation Officer will be of the same "I-level" and receive training in not only "I-level" but, in addition, Transactional Analysis and Reality Therapy.

In the subsidy caseload, the Supervising Probation Officer will continue with conjoint sessions with the experimental group and regular group sessions with the control group until such time as the resident is released from probation, his probation is revoked or goals achieved. Each quarter he will complete the Case Classification Guide and use the standard I-level narrative format to evaluate the resident's progress.

For those residents in a non-subsidy caseload, the Supervising Probation Officer will not continue with either the control group counselling sessions or the conjoint counselling sessions of the experimental group. However, through his training he will be able to observe and evaluate how each group is progressing and so note this information on the Case Classification Guide.

The rationale for the post-release supervision design is to determine if a continuation of the program in Viejas has any merit on post-release supervision either in a subsidy caseload, where the resident will continue to receive treatment, or in a non-subsidy unit where he does not receive the same treatment as that given in Viejas.

Once a year the Statistican will call for cases involving both the control group and the experimental group in order to evaluate the data from each group and to furnish the Department with a progress report.

At the end of three years, the project will be evaluated in terms of its overall effectiveness and a determination made as to whether or not the project should be continued. If it is shown that recidivism is not reduced (since this is the main purpose of the project), then the project shall be discontinued.

This proposal was forwarded in June, 1973 to the Chief Probation Officer of San Diego County, Ken Fare. Mr. Fare indicated that the proposal would be studied carefully for possible implementation in his department. In the Fall of 1973 the proposal was adopted by the Viejas Rehabilitation

Center as the basis for a trial treatment-evaluation program to be implemented by camp personnel. The author consulted with camp administrators during the initial implementation of the program. An agreement was reached with the administrators responsible for the program that students from the Criminal Justice Administration Program at San Diego State University would remain involved in the program, especially in the evaluation aspects.

The Politics of Program Implementation

At the present time the second phase of this project, as far as its use as a learning experience for correctional students is concerned, is just getting underway. A graduate intern has been assigned as a liaison between the camp program and the educational program. At the present time, students are learning that modifications in the program are taking place because of the administrative realities of the camp situation. They are experiencing the politics involved in the attempt to impose an experimental model on an ongoing correctional setting. All of this is providing a unique opportunity for students to attempt the application of theory and experimental design in the face of an obdurate reality.

There is an inherent risk involved in this kind of educational undertaking in the attempts to specify goals and expected outcomes and to adopt rational means for achieving these in an orderly and efficient manner--that they may prove threatening to practitioners and correctional administrators. Action-research may be perceived as a threatening intrusion by alien outsiders because experience has shown that most attempts to rationalize the process serves to indicate that organizational claims that positive change is being produced are not born out by the measuring rod provided by evaluation techniques. Students and professors who manage to convince high-level administrators that they have something valuable to

offer the organization may find that their efforts are undermined and discredited by lower-level administrators and practitioners. These "line" personnel may interpret the activities of these "outsiders" as a "head hunting" expedition by naive and hostile forces unable to relate to their sense of reality.

All of these factors can give idealistic students who want to work for social change a negative view of the possibilities. Thus, an attempt to educate potential correctional practitioners and administrators, through the mechanism of action research, to agency realities may serve to "turn off" some of the best students who experience organized resistance to change. A close look at the realities of organizational politics may convince them they do not want to play the game. Correctional personnel may also feel that the educational benefits of participation in action research programs do not outweigh the possible personal and organizational risks involved.

If the instructor is interested in preparing the best students for entry into the corrections "system" this method may prove to contain some built-in disadvantages. Some of the best students may decide to "drop out" of the established corrections system even before they have been admitted to functional status within an existing agency structure. In the process of measuring agency realities by a yardstick which cannot be fully controlled by those with a stake in existing agency policy, a disappointing and disagreeable profile may emerge.

If this process is perceived as a contest between competing parties, each misunderstanding the perception of the other, its educational benefits are likely to be minimal for all concerned. Thus, action research must include strategies for dealing with potential conflicts in a productive way

so that all parties can learn from the experience. Malcolm Klein has suggested that investigation into the collaborative process should be incorporated in training programs in higher education "for both researchers and practitioners vis-a-vis each other's roles."

> The collaborative process gets blocked by differences in values, language, experience, and by honest misunderstandings. The values, perhaps, should not be changed, but the language, experiences, and misunderstandings are open to modification.[14]

Klein has also suggested that the clinical knowledge, based on accumulated personal knowledge transformed by personal needs and values, which is relied upon in dealing with day-to-day correctional realities, resists intellectualism and abstract conceptualization.[15] Thus, the academic researcher is not likely to be appreciated initially when meeting the correctional practitioners on his own "turf," where correctional mythology permeate the atmosphere.

Carol Weiss has stated that

> The programs with which the evaluator deals are not neutral, antiseptic, laboratory-type entities. They emerged from the rough and tumble of political support, opposition, and bargaining. Attached to them are the reputations of legislative sponsors, the careers of administrators, the jobs of program staff, and the expectations of clients...The politics of program survival is an ancient and important art. Much of the literature on bureaucracy stresses the investment that individuals within an organization have in maintaining the organizations existence, influence, and empire....
>
> Bureaucrats, or in our terms, program administrators and operators, are not irrational: They have a different model of rationality in mind... Accomplishing the goals for which the program was set up is not unimportant, but it is not the only, the largest, or usually the most immediate of the concerns on the administrator's docket....
>
> In sum, social programs are the creatures of legislative politics and of bureaucratic politics. The model of the system that is most salient to program managers--and the components of the system with which they are concerned--are bound to be different from the model of the social scientist/evaluator....[16]

These differing perspectives will create problems for students and faculty unaware of, and unschooled in, the political reality of organizational life. However, these potential conflicts can, in themselves, become a valuable learning experience for aware students of human service delivery systems.

For instance, Donald Cressey has pointed out some elements in a "vocabulary of adjustment" by which treatment personnel can justify continuing any program as "corrective":

> --The program is worth it if it saved one man.
> --If the treatment had not been introduced, the recidivism rates might have been even higher....
> --The program certainly contributed to the rehabilitation of some of the clients.
> --You can't expect any system in which the criminal is seen for only a few hours a week to significantly change personalities....

Unless students are made aware of these possibilities, they may come away from the action research experience disheartened and cynical about correctional possibilities.

The kind of political realities we have considered here have created tensions and compromises in our attempt to institute a rational action research program at the Viejas Adult Rehabilitation Center in San Diego.

Program Results

As a result of our experiences in attempting to facilitate adoption of a significant other treatment-evaluation program, we have had to deal with the issues raised by staff misunderstanding and resentment of changes in organizational procedure. We have discovered that the way in which change management procedures are introduced into the agency, and the personalities involved in this process, are all important. In this case outside change agents have been successfully integrated into the camp process so that they have served as catalysts for change.

Functionaries within corrections agencies normally have adjusted in a cynical fashion to the "reality" of reduced expectation in order to avoid anxiety and frustration. This action-research project has forced a readjustment of expectations to the realities of personal and organizational change. The camp setting can no longer be seen as a place where work projects totally define organizational reality. The expectation of changes in personal interaction and understanding are playing an increasing part in the symbolic process of defining organizational success or failure.

Thus far, however, this process has involved many compromises with experimental design. When the significant other program was instituted, existing residents in the camp were asked to indicate their interest in being involved in this program. Thus, rather than being assigned to the program through the mechanism of a rational and controlled classification process, those who were interested and eligible were allowed to enter the program. This also has meant that thus far no control group is available for purposes of comparison. If experimental comparison is to take place with this initial group in the program, a control will have to be constructed in an after-the-fact fashion.

No provision has thus far been made for controlled follow-up of residents after they leave the camp setting. Some of those participating in the program will not be under probation supervision upon release. However, the possibility of consistent follow-up procedures is now being studied by students and administrators. This may lead to the extension of staff responsibilities to the maintenance of a half-way house and/or work release program in the urban community which would be available to residents upon release from the camp setting. Thus the logic imposed by the action research program has exposed the lack of logic inherent in the piece-meal approach which has been the rule, where residents are released back to the

street generally with some lack of resources and social margin they initially brought with them to the correctional setting. The staff now sees the value of a consistent logical process beginning with classification and extending to the post-release period. As a result of staff exposure to this program, more logic is being brought to the planning of controls and restraints in this correctional setting.

The primary problem faced by students who have been involved in this process has been proving that the realities of security and custody would not be disregarded. When these political realities were acknowledged staff support began to coalesce; the existing staff began to give their support to the program insuring that the possibility of institutionalization was to be supported--making action research an integral part of correctional programming with this situation.

If this experience with the use of action research as a teaching tool for corrections education programs has general applicability (and I am convinced it has), it provides a challenge for corrections educators to find means for involving students in the change process. Educators and students must, in turn, find ways to involve correctional clientele themselves in the process of change. If the promise of corrections is ever to be actualized this will have to take place. Student involvement can provide a catalyst for change and all parties can learn from one another if a reciprocal relationship can be established. All of the parties have a long-term stake in achieving these goals, although in the short-run it seems that too often all of the important elements necessary to implement the kind of program outlined here have worked at cross-purposes.

The specific example of action research involvement on the part of corrections students I have outlined here probably has more applicability for graduate students than for undergraduates. I have chosen to use this

example, however, because it relates to my immediate experience. It is to be hoped that the recounting of this experience at least serves as a goad to other correctional educators who might see the wisdom of encouraging greater student involvement in correctional programs.

In summary, let me add that my experience in this regard has validated the following statement by Ronald Lippitt:

> Our own experience with graduate seminars and practicums has revealed to me that there is a significant number of students both in the behavioral science departments and in the professional schools who are eager to explore these new roles and acquire the new skills which differ considerably from those of research production being typically taught in the behavioral science departments and from the skills of operating practice being taught in the professional schools. Certainly the training of research utilization agents requires a grounding both in behavioral science discipline and in professional values and technology. This obviously puts a strain on the fairly segregated curriculum designs and training sequences which still exist in most of our graduate programs.[17]

FOOTNOTES

1. c.f. the examples and references contained in the following works; Robert Martinson, "The Treatment Evaluation Survey," Office of Crime Control Planning (New York State, 1970); James Robison and Gerald Smith, "The Effectiveness of Correctional Programs," Crime and Delinquency 17 (January, 1971), p. 67-80; and David A. Ward, "Evaluative Research for Corrections," in Lloyd E. Ohlin (ed.), Prisoners in America (Englewood Cliffs, N. Y.: Prentice-Hall, 1973), p. 184-212.

2. See Ronald L. Boostrom, "Is Corrections a Viable Enterprise," Crime and Corrections 1 (Spring, 1973), p. 36-37.

3. c.f. Jessica Mitford, Kind and Usual Punishment: The Prison Business (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1973).

4. Donald T. Campbell, "Reforms as Experiments," American Psychologist 24 (April, 1969), p. 409-429.

5. c.f. John W. Evans, "Evaluating Social Action Programs," Social Science Quarterly 50 (December, 1969), p. 568-581.

6. Ira Kaufman, "Change Management: The Process and the System," in Gerald Zaltman, et al., Creating Social Change (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972), p. 22.

7. A similar program had been instituted several years earlier with the help of the social welfare program at San Diego State University.

8. Herbert Blumer, Symbolic Interactionism: Perspectives and Method (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1969).

9. Ibid.

10. Ibid.

11. Ibid.

12. This refers to the Interpersonal-Maturity Level measurement scale developed by the research division of the California Youth Authority.

13. A subsidy caseload refers to a Probation caseload for which the State of California is supplying funding so that fewer than normal clients are supervised by the probation officer carrying such a caselaod.

14. Malcolm W. Klein, "Collaboration Between Practitioners and Researchers: Relevant Knowledge in Corrections," Federal Probation 37 (December, 1973), p. 45.

15. Ibid., p. 42. See also Daniel Glaser, "The State of the Art of Criminal Justice Evaluation," Keynote speech given at Second Annual Meeting of the Association for Criminal Justice Research (California, Los Angeles, November 9, 1973).

16. Carol H. Weiss, "Where Politics and Evaluation Research Meet," Evaluation: A Forum for Human Service Decision-Makers, 1: 3/73.

17. Ronald Lippitt, "The Use of Social Research to Improve Social Practice," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry 35 (July, 1965), p. 669.

END