

1990

A study of the interaction between criminal justice programs in higher education and departments of corrections

Harold A. Farrier
Iowa State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/rtd>

 Part of the [Criminology Commons](#), [Higher Education and Teaching Commons](#), and the [Social Control, Law, Crime, and Deviance Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Farrier, Harold A., "A study of the interaction between criminal justice programs in higher education and departments of corrections " (1990). *Retrospective Theses and Dissertations*. 9363.
<https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/rtd/9363>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Iowa State University Capstones, Theses and Dissertations at Iowa State University Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Retrospective Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Iowa State University Digital Repository. For more information, please contact digirep@iastate.edu.

91

00430

U·M·I

MICROFILMED 1990

INFORMATION TO USERS

The most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

U·M·I

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600



Order Number 9100430

**A study of the interaction between criminal justice programs in
higher education and departments of corrections**

Farrier, Harold A., Ph.D.

Iowa State University, 1990

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

A study of the interaction between criminal justice
programs in higher education and departments of corrections

by

Harold A. Farrier

A Dissertation Submitted to the
Graduate Faculty in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department: Professional Studies in Education

Major: Education (Higher Education)

Approved:

Signature was redacted for privacy.

In Charge of Major Work

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Major Department

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Graduate College

Iowa State University

Ames, Iowa

1990

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	7
Basic Assumptions	9
Limitations	9
Definition of Terms	11
Organization of the Study	12
CHAPTER II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	13
Growth of Corrections Clients	13
The Need for Interaction	15
Research	18
Staff Development	24
Program Development	26
Summary	28
CHAPTER III. METHODOLOGY	31
Defining the Population	31
Determining the Sample	32
Constructing the Questionnaire	34
Conducting the Survey	34
Analysis	36

CHAPTER IV. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION	38
Sample	38
Profile of Respondents	38
Current Level of Interaction	39
Staff Training	43
Research	44
Develop Inmate Programs	45
Level of Interaction that Should Exist	46
Factors Promoting Interaction	54
Factors as Barriers	55
Additional Findings	57
Access to Prisons	57
Value of Cooperative Relationship	59
Summary of Findings	61
CHAPTER V. CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUMMARY	64
Conclusions	64
Recommendations	75
Summary	78
REFERENCES	82
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	87
APPENDIX A - SURVEY INSTRUMENT	89
APPENDIX B - INITIAL COVER LETTER	96
APPENDIX C - REMINDER POSTCARD	98
APPENDIX D - FINAL REMINDER LETTER	100

LIST OF TABLES

		PAGE
TABLE 1	A frequency of the extent and type of current interaction between academic programs and state departments as reported by respondents	41
TABLE 2	Frequency of initiation of a relationship by those agencies currently involved in a cooperative relationship	42
TABLE 3	A frequency of the attempts made to establish cooperative relationships as reported by those agencies working together	43
TABLE 4	Type of personnel trained by faculty as reported by the respondents	44
TABLE 5	The frequency of research projects reported began and completed in the twelve months preceding respondents receipt of survey	45
TABLE 6	Mean rating on scale of 1 (low) to 7 (high) and t value regarding faculty involvement in the planning of inmate prison programs	46
TABLE 7	A t-test between the current level of interaction with what the level of interaction should be and a measure of the magnitude of difference	48
TABLE 8	An analysis of the value of specific research projects and t-test measure of difference in response by academic programs and corrections	50
TABLE 9	The frequency of courses currently being offered at the prison site as compared with the frequency courses should be offered	52

TABLE 10	The frequency of reported state departments currently paying salaries to employees who attend school as compared with whether salaries should be paid	53
TABLE 11	Frequencies of state departments which currently pay tuition as compared to whether they should pay tuition	54
TABLE 12	Factors which are the most important and least important in promoting cooperative relationships as measured by Chi-square . .	55
TABLE 13	Factors which are the most important and least important barriers to cooperative relationships as measured by Chi-square Test of Independence	56
TABLE 14	The difference in faculty access to prisons, and access encouraged by state departments, as measured by the Independent t-test	58
TABLE 15	Independent t-test of difference in value held for cooperative relationship by those with a relationship and those with none	60

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTION

Formal systems for identifying and dealing with those members of society whose behavior runs counter to the acceptable social norms began to develop some 4,000 years ago with the Code of Hammurabi, though the science of punishment, deterrence, and incapacitation did not begin to emerge with support until the late 1700s with the rise of the Classical School of criminology (Thomas, 1987). The Classical School philosophers described prisons as those institutions which could serve society by deterring and incapacitating social violators as punishment for their transgressions. This general philosophy was to be modified significantly nearly 100 years later with the rise of the Positive School of criminology which held that criminal behavior was not manifested merely by rational and calculated behavior but by social and psychological forces over which the offender had little or no control. This philosophy gave rise to the expansion of involvement in the judicial and correctional systems by the disciplines of medicine, economics, psychology, and sociology (Barlow, 1987). While recognizing the important and valuable contributions these disciplines have made, and will

continue to make to the understanding of the criminal justice system through basic and applied research and programs in education, a serious deficiency continues to exist (Thomas, 1987). These disciplines began to colonize the study of crime within the disciplinary interests of each, in order to develop a body of knowledge and a theoretical base to fully understand criminal behavior, or the criminal justice system, a more encompassing approach than those offered by the traditional disciplines was necessary. "This gradual realization was one reason for the efforts made in the 1970s to unify crime and delinquency studies (Lejins, 1983).

Within the recognition of the need for a unified crime studies approach came the birth of "criminal justice" programs on a few of the nations university campuses. These higher education programs expanded the scope of study to include the broad field of America's justice system from investigation to apprehension through corrections, either as free standing departments of criminal justice, or as components within the departments of sociology, medicine, public administration, law, and other programs of study. The credit for the development of these programs, however, rests with the funding decisions of the U.S. government (Thomas, 1987; Lejins, 1983).

Federal efforts had never been a major means of funding

for crime control until the mid 1960s (Feeley & Sarat, 1980). In the early 1960s, polls relating to the concerns of the American people identified crime as a major public concern (Graham, 1980). The publication, in the early 1960s, of the FBI crime index contributed to crime becoming a major issue in the 1964 presidential campaign (Graham, 1980; Harris, 1970). From that time, throughout the 1960s, citizen concern about crime and what to do about it consistently ranked as one of the nations most serious public concern issues (Harris, 1970).

An important step in promoting criminal justice studies in the universities came with the federal governments establishment of the Law Enforcement Administration Act (LEAA) within the Department of Justice in June, 1968 (Lejins, 1983; Feeley & Sarat, 1980; Woodard, 1983). Particularly significant to the expansion of criminal justice programs was the third of the basic goals of LEAA; to encourage research and development for better methods of crime control and crime prevention. These federal resources provided the initial impetus for the establishment of research and teaching faculty and facilities in the universities (Woodard, 1973).

Once established, the federal budget of LEAA grew more rapidly than any previous government agency, from \$69 million in 1969 to nearly \$700 million three years later

(Woodard, 1973). Over the fourteen years LEAA was in existence (1968-1982), nearly \$10 billion was distributed to the criminal justice field, including academic criminal justice programs. A major contribution of LEAA to higher education came in the form of the Law Enforcement Education Program (LEEP) which provided tuition for students studying criminal justice. This program provided up to \$40 million in tuition grants to as many as one hundred thousand students per year. To qualify for LEEP support, academic criminal justice programs were expected to provide instruction in all the major elements of the field, rather than concentrating on a single criminal justice subsystem or social science discipline (Lejins, 1983).

The impact of this federal funding program in the area of criminal justice education is best reflected by the events which occurred in the ten-year period from 1965 through 1975. Academic programs in criminal justice in the United States grew from 95 to 1,348 with an additional 408 programs in the final planning stages. The bachelor's level programs increased by a factor of twenty-seven. These data include only those criminal justice programs that applied for LEEP support (Lejins, 1983). As a result of the federal support and this rapid emergence of criminal justice programs in higher education, degrees became

available on four academic levels: associate of arts, bachelor's, master's, and doctoral. In addition, numerous other colleges, institutes, and departments of such disciplines as sociology, political science, economics, psychology, public administration, and medicine continue to teach and sponsor research in the criminology and criminal justice area (Lejins, 1983).

Concurrent with the increase in number of criminal justice programs on the university campuses in the U.S., another phenomenon was occurring in the administration and management structure of the state agencies responsible for the administration of correctional programs. According to a study by the American Correctional Association (ACA), prior to 1968 only slightly more than a dozen states had a freestanding administrative corrections structure within state government. The remaining corrections programs were administered within the umbrella of a department of human services (12), a department of public safety (6), combined with mental health (3), or under the auspices of a state administrative board or other category of state governmental control (15). In order to give greater latitude to the state corrections administrator, to promote corrections into a position of greater visibility in state government, to identify and hold a single state administrator responsible for management of the growing

populations and problems of the state prisons, and other rationale for creating separate agencies, corrections departments emerged as major agencies in state governments nation wide. By 1989 only two states continued to administer its corrections programs within a larger umbrella agency, and one of those states, Wisconsin, reports a reorganization pending (Travisano, 1989b).

Notwithstanding the variety of reasons or rationale for the trend of establishing a central agency with the responsibility for managing the corrections programs within each jurisdiction, the movement placed the state corrections programs into a position of greater visibility in state government (Travisano, 1989a). The vast majority of state corrections administrators now report directly to the governor of the state and are held directly accountable for the quality, content, and nature of his/her respective correctional programs (Johnson, 1989).

The appearance of the academic criminal justice programs and the separate departments of corrections over the past two decades provides what Wertz (1978) and Travisano (1989b) consider the model environment for systematic study of the correctional process. Reed (1989) considered the 1980s as the ideal time for the establishment of cooperative relationships between academic criminal justice programs and corrections agencies to

further the training of corrections staff and develop effective programs for inmate rehabilitation. This study will explore and describe the progress of the interaction between these two public service agencies.

Statement of the Problem

The primary objective of this study, consistent with the work of Lejins (1983) and Peak (1985), will be the investigation of the current extent of interaction between academic criminal justice programs and state departments of corrections and the level of interaction that should exist. Factors that serve as barriers, or serve to promote, this interaction will be explored. Beto (1970), Lejins (1989), Peak (1985), and Swart (1978) are of the opinion that very little interaction exists between academic criminal justice programs and state departments of corrections although the potential for successful outcome of such interactions is great.

Travisano (1989a) describes corrections administrators as regularly making policy decisions on program management, inmate control, staff development, and other areas without benefit of supportive data based on sound theoretical concepts, often because they lack the staff and expertise to adequately collect or evaluate the data on which to base decisions. These administrators thus rely on their

previous experiences, their ability to interpret raw data, the close association and collective opinions of trusted staff, and a keen sense of political timeliness (Johnson, 1989).

Swart (1978) and Peak (1985) both indicate there exists little interaction between academic criminal justice programs and state departments of corrections. Peak (1985) agrees there is a need to know what goes on inside the prisons of the U.S., as well as a "tremendous need for cooperation between correctional practitioners and researchers" (p. 27), but describes a "cloak of secrecy" which surrounds the prisons.

This study will seek to answer the following research questions:

1. What is the current level of interaction between academic criminal justice programs and state departments of corrections?
2. What level of interaction should exist between academic criminal justice programs and state departments of corrections?
3. What factors tend to promote interaction between academic criminal justice programs and departments of corrections?
4. What factors tend to serve as barriers to interaction between academic criminal justice programs and

state departments of corrections?

For the purpose of this study the areas to be explored for potential interactions are correctional program research, inmate program development, and staff development programs. This study will provide a descriptive analysis focusing on the interaction through cooperative efforts between state departments of corrections and academic criminal justice programs offering a minimum of a master's degree in criminal justice.

Basic Assumptions

Underlying this study are four basic assumptions. It is assumed that:

- 1) the instrument can accurately collect the data,
- 2) the respondents accurately reflect the activity and opinions of the departments,
- 3) the chosen questions accurately identify the major issues relating to inter-departmental interaction,
- 4) the influence of other factors not included are randomly distributed.

Limitations

A major limitation associated with this study is the small number of academic criminal justice programs offering a doctoral level degree. In order to gain a sufficient response to conduct this research, academic criminal

justice programs offering a master's degree were included. In addition, it was assumed that academic doctoral programs place greater emphasis upon research. Because of this assumption randomly selected academic sociology programs with emphasis in criminal justice programs were included in the study.

Additional limitations of this study include:

1. The first criteria used to select academic programs in this study were criminal justice programs offering the doctorate degree.
2. The second criteria used to select academic programs were criminal justice programs offering a master's degree. These were selected randomly based upon jurisdiction and geographic proximity to the state department of corrections central office.
3. A third criteria for selecting academic programs were academic sociology programs which offer a doctorate degree with emphasis in criminal justice. These programs were randomly selected from jurisdictions where academic criminal justice programs offering a doctorate degree were not available.
4. The state departments of corrections included in this study were selected on the basis of the existence, within that jurisdiction, of an academic criminal justice program offering either a doctorate or master's degree, or an

academic sociology program offering a doctorate program with emphasis in criminal justice.

Definition of Terms

Interaction - is the active joint involvement of faculty from a university and staff from the department of corrections to plan, implement, monitor, and complete a project of mutual interest and benefit.

Department of corrections - is the state agency responsible for the administration of state funded correctional programs within that jurisdiction.

Department of criminal justice - is that department, school, or college in which the broad range of criminal justice courses are taught and a degree in criminal justice is offered, at least at the master's degree level.

Correctional administrator - may be the state director, commissioner, or secretary of the state department of corrections or a warden, superintendent, or chief administrator of a prison or other correctional program.

Staff development - is an activity designed to teach workers an appreciation and understanding of the criminal justice system and teach that person the necessary skills to perform assigned tasks.

Inmate programs - are those organized efforts to provide a learning experience for inmates and one in which knowledge or skills gained from that experience may transfer to skills contributing to living a more responsible life in free society.

Research - may be either experimental, quasi-experimental, evaluative, or descriptive in nature relating to the interaction between academic criminal justice departments and state departments of corrections.

Moderate rating - relates to the response categories of 3.0 to 5.0 on the Likert type response scale ranging from 1 (low) to 7 (high).

Moderately high rating - relates to the response categories of 5.1 to 6.0 on the Likert type response scale ranging from 1 (low) to 7 (high).

American Correctional Association (ACA) - is the professional association of corrections workers in North America.

Organization of the Study

This study will be divided into five areas:

- Chapter I Introduction and statement of the problem
- Chapter II Review of literature
- Chapter III Research design, data sample, method of data collection, and summary
- Chapter IV Analysis of data
- Chapter V Summary of the study, conclusions, discussion and recommendations

CHAPTER II.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The review of literature in this chapter will focus on the topic of interaction between academic criminal justice programs and state departments of corrections. The literature search was assisted by the use of ERIC at the Iowa State University library. The search also included the libraries at Drake University and the University of Iowa. A dissertation search resulted in the acquisition of materials through the interlibrary loan.

The growth in the number of correctional clients will be reviewed to provide an awareness of the need and opportunity for cooperative efforts between academic criminal justice programs and state departments of corrections. The factors determined as barriers, and those factors which promote interaction will be reviewed. Although the literature on the topic of interaction between the two agencies is limited, interviews with nationally recognized criminal justice academicians and corrections administrators contributed greatly to the knowledge base for this study.

Growth of Corrections Clients

Concomitant with the emergence of schools of criminal justice and separate state department of corrections

agencies to manage the nations prisons has been the growth of prison populations and the rate of incarceration. America's prison population has grown from under 200,000 in 1970 to over 578,000 in 1988, nearly a threefold increase. During the same time span the rate of incarceration grew from under 100 per 100,000 to over 235 per 100,000 U.S. population (Vital Statistics, 1989). This rapid expansion culminated into an annual operating expenditure conservatively estimated at \$16.5 billion. In addition, 29,022 prison beds were constructed in 1988 at a cost of \$1,276,672,292 with another 182 facilities, or additions, under construction in 36 jurisdictions to provide 67,347 more prison beds. The District of Columbia, the Federal Bureau of Prisons, and forty states are planning yet another 88,847 beds to house the influx of prisoners at an estimated cost of another \$3 billion (Camp & Camp, 1989).

Nearly 20,000 new positions were developed in correctional agencies in 1988 (Camp & Camp, 1989). The Federal Bureau of Prisons alone expect to employ workers in 8,000 new positions over the next four years in addition to replacements due to attrition (Quinlan, 1989). Corrections is a growth industry with no relief seen in the immediate future (Travisano, 1989a; Camp & Camp, 1989). The impact of the "War On Drugs" has not been factored in to the need

for additional prison space nor for additional workers (Travisano, 1989a).

George and Camille Camp support the common knowledge that problems abound in correctional agencies today. One needs only to read or watch the news to learn that prisons are overcrowded, understaffed, and under funded. Camp and Camp (1989) reports that on January 1, 1989, only twelve jurisdictions reported having adequate bed space, while the remaining forty jurisdictions were short on space by over 100,000 beds. Thirty-one of the correctional agencies were reported as under court order to improve their conditions of confinement. Recidivism rates continue at 32.6% (Camp & Camp, 1989).

The Need for Interaction

What the future holds for the correctional system and where the seemingly never ending spiral of prison population growth and tax expenditure increases, is open to conjecture. What is clear, however, is that "the correctional system...cannot be relied upon as the ultimate crime preventer; that task lies elsewhere" (Shover & Einstadter, 1988, p. 207). There is a need to know, however, what is being done and what works inside our prisons (Peak, 1985). As early as 1967 the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice

addressed the need for ongoing research. It stated, "There is probably no subject of comparable concern to which the Nation is devoting so many resources and so much effort with so little knowledge of what it is doing" (1976, p. 273). It also recognized that the criminal justice agencies may not have the means to conduct research and must look to university researchers for assistance. Dr. George Beto, then Director of the Texas Department of Corrections, in his 1970 address to the American Corrections Association as its president predicted that "higher education will become more involved in Corrections" (Beto, 1970, p. 36). Beto (1970) continued to emphasize that the creative involvement of the university in the day-to-day operation of the criminal justice system which will become widespread in nature and that both corrections and higher education will benefit from the involvement. The greatest needs, however, exist in the areas of research, staff development, and program development (Reed, 1989; Travisano, 1989a; Beto, 1989). Both academia and correctional administrators need to begin working through their differences and conflicting expectations in a concerted effort to reach an accord to move forward in unison (Reed, 1989).

Amos Reed (1989) calls it unfortunate that correctional administrators have not had the foresight to allow academic

professionals the freedom nor the opportunity to carefully measure the impact correctional decisions before they were made. Alan Breed, a long time director of the California Youth Authority and former Director of the National Institute of Corrections, echoed the sentiments of Mr. Reed by suggesting that corrections managers must first evaluate, then act decisively, in unison and with confidence (Breed, 1989). Clearly, the need for program and system evaluation have exceeded the research efforts. Less than 25% of the corrections agencies in this country have even a remnant of a research staff (Camp & Camp, 1988). This means that, corrections nationwide, is under pressure to engage in massive evaluation efforts without staff, analytical procedures, organization, or support (Adams, 1975; Felkenes, 1979). Evaluation is needed as a resource to assist staff to maintain program goals, determine need, direct resource allocation, and creatively manage this segment of the criminal justice system (Aaronson, Kittrie, Saari & Cooper, 1977).

Wertz (1978) believes the opportunity for the academic community to impact in a positive way the correctional community has never been greater nor needed more. She stated, "More day-to-day contact between the justice system and the University should take place" (Wertz, 1978, p. 161).

Although Peak (1985) qualifies his belief that there is a need for cooperative efforts between academicians and practitioners by emphasizing there must be support from higher levels of government, he states "The time is ripe for such endeavors to be viewed not as a threat, but rather as a partnership where common goals, objectives, and concerns are shared (Peak, 1985, p. 31).

Research

With more than three million persons in custody and under correctional supervision in the United States, and no indication of a leveling off in this growth industry, it is conceivable that research projects providing greater knowledge and understanding of what is happening in our society is overdue (Travisano, 1989a). There are barriers, however, that exist between the academicians and practitioners which impede this relationship. Dr. George Beto, in his 1970 presidential address to the American Corrections Association identified one barrier to cooperative research efforts when he stated, "I know of no other institution, unless it be organized Christianity, which has shown greater reluctance to measure the effectiveness of its varied programs than has corrections" (1970, p. 36). That reluctance, however, is based on the perception of the administrators who tend to view academic

research as irrelevant and untrustworthy (Weiss & Bucuvalas, 1980; Peak, 1985; Horowitz & Katz, 1975).

Shover and Einstadter (1988) explain that the perception of irrelevance as a barrier to interaction is a result of the focus, training, and experience of the correctional administrator which differs from that of the researcher. Caplan (1976) agrees when he concludes that the correctional administrator tends to rely on knowledge with which he or she is familiar and has control. Snow (1961) explains these conflicting perceptions as being the result of cultural differences between a society's intellectuals and those who apply scientific concepts. He describes the two groups as being comparable in intelligence, earning similar salaries, and not grossly different in social origin, but two groups in which the members have nearly ceased to communicate. Because of this lack of communication, each has developed a distorted image of the other. Weiss and Bucuvalas (1980) adds that correctional administrators tend to be in a hurry and want action. That correctional administrators are impatient with attempts to explain cause-and-effect relationships, identifying factors leading to social problems, or to theory development. Peak (1985) claims that the administrator is concerned about the here and now while the researcher is likely to be detached, interested in ideas and abstractions and thinking in terms

of generalizations. Additionally, the researcher may be concerned with proving a minor or conceptual point or resolving a measurement issue rather than addressing issues that have clear and practical application (Lorsch, 1979). The charge of irrelevance on the part of practitioners, or counter-charge of non-utilization by researchers is largely centered in different intellectual style and culture (Horowitz & Katz, 1975). The problem of irrelevance, though it may cause philosophical and methodological rifts, can be overcome by members of both professions being sensitive to the needs and purposes of the other (Peak, 1985) and jointly working to invoke relevancy at each step in the process. Lorsch (1979) describes the irrelevance barrier as a result of the traditional academic promotion criteria of most universities and the acceptance standards for most relevant journals which place more emphasis on theoretical elegance and methodological perfection than on practical use of knowledge.

A second barrier to greater interaction between the researcher and the correctional administrator is the lack of trust. Researchers have shown that administrators tend to censor and dismiss negative findings (Carter, 1971; Adams, 1975). Peak (1985) refers to the fundamental issue that pervades many prisons as the shroud of secrecy that surrounds the institution in which research is targeted.

The "total institution" nature of the correctional setting, which places significant emphasis upon "control" of the inhabitants, the subjects of study, undoubtedly impinges upon the researcher and his or her activity. This has been a recurring theme in attempting prison research. Unnithan (1986) describes the elaborate system of gaining clearance from higher officials, the lack of clarity in how or who makes the decision, secrecy cloaked under the guise of "security reasons", and outright hostility over the work he was performing characterized the setting for prison research. Horowitz and Katz (1975) discuss the problem of access and trust as examples of the theoretical differences in the norm of secrecy which guides bureaucratic behavior as opposed to the norm of publicity which governs most forms of academic behavior. Trust is a major bonding element in any relationship. Whether the lack of trust in this relationship be attributed, as Adams (1975) does, to the academician as being rigid, inexperienced, and self-interested or as Unnithan (1986) attributing the prisons as being "closed" to researchers, this factor serves as a major barrier (Peak, 1985).

While the above factors have been identified in the literature as potential barriers to the interaction between academic criminal justice programs and state departments of corrections, little consideration has been given to the

changing characteristics of the identified barriers. It is not within the scope of this research to determine if the barriers change, however, this study will attempt to measure the current existence of each of the above potential barriers. The researcher calls attention to the literature in the 1970s which identifies "lack of trust" as a barrier (Carter, 1971; Adams, 1975). By 1980 the predominant barrier identified was academic research being viewed by corrections administrators as irrelevant and not applicable to prison operations (Weiss & Bucuvalas, 1980; Felkenes, 1979). More recently, Peak (1985) and Unnithan (1986) have discussed the "closed" nature of prisons and that this "lack of access" of prisons to researchers has served as a barrier.

Though barriers to effective cooperative efforts are present, factors which promote interaction exist as well. An American Corrections Association (ACA) proposal for research calls for a cooperative focus of academic researchers and corrections administrators on demographics, innovations, program development, and staff education and training (Travisano, 1989b). Given a relatively high turnover of state administrators of corrections agencies, consistency in the management of these programs becomes a focal point (Camp & Camp, 1989). Inmate behavior and proper classification tools are regularly a point of

contention, and have been since the early 1970s, with ACA professional standards commissioners and ACA standards committee members as they struggle with the development and revisions of minimal standards of practice (Rauch, 1989). Sound research focused on any of these areas over a reasonable period of time would likely produce gigantic steps in the practice and knowledge of corrections as compared to the gradual evolution being experienced today (Reed, 1989).

Johnson (1989) suggests other factors may exist which promote cooperative efforts between the academic professionals and the corrections administrators. He emphasizes that where there exists a perceived need, the meshing of personalities of the agency leaders, and geographical proximity of the two agencies, the efforts to work together have been successful. Another factor which may also promote positive interaction between the two agencies, according to Webb (1989), is the opportunity to share knowledge and skills. Translating that knowledge into policy or practice areas, however, is not without limitations and must intimately involve both the administrator and the researcher (Scott & Shore, 1974). Once the interest of the participants have been sparked and the issues clearly delineated, other barriers begin to dissolve (Reed, 1989).

Staff Development

Myren (1975) suggests that the rapid growth in the numbers of prisons in the U.S. over the past decade, and the projected continued growth into the next century, opens a wide range of career lines to talented persons who wish to enter the corrections field. He claims that positions are, and will continue to be, available in operations jobs at all levels throughout the nation.

In-house staff development continues to be a major concern and effort of state corrections administrators nationwide (Camp & Camp, 1989; Rauch, 1989). The Federal Bureau of Prisons are in the process of expanding their in-service capability in order to provide sound basic skills for new employees of that organization. In a more stable period, potential managers matured into more responsible positions. Today, it has become necessary to provide additional educational programs for potential managers in order to prepare staff for the assumption of greater responsibility earlier in their careers than has been necessary in the past (Quinlan, 1989).

The need for quality higher education for those who enter a corrections career is greater than at any other time in the history of U.S. corrections (Rauch, 1989). Higher education programs must, however, be designed to conform to the traditional broad liberal arts curriculum as well as provide practical experiences which will convince

agency directors that the graduate will be able to function in the "real world" (Beto & Marsh, 1974; Breed, 1989).

Professionals of both groups, in the past, have failed to work together to achieve the goal of improving the correctional system (Felkenes, 1979; Peak, 1985; Wertz, 1978; Travisano, 1989a). Reed believes that part of the problem in promoting a greater effort to educate a larger proportion of the correctional workers is the reluctance of correctional administrators to set and enforce education based criteria for correctional positions, especially the correctional officer. In 1971, only one of the fifty-one state level agencies required a college degree for correctional officers (Swart, 1978). Swart (1978) and Camp and Camp (1989) assert that correctional programs must begin to develop specific educational criteria for employment, with specific recognition of the correctional curricula as the preferred criterion. This will not eliminate the need for intensive in-house training programs which provide an average of 220 hours of training prior to beginning the job, but could reduce this costly effort (Swart, 1978; Camp & Camp, 1989).

Administrators agree the efforts to educationally develop quality correctional workers needs to be systematized (Johnson, 1989; Reed, 1989). Amos Reed emphatically insists that the greatest contribution higher

education can make to corrections is to provide the appropriate courses at the correctional facility, particularly those courses which would allow the correctional worker to enter a degree track. He notes, in his career, staff involvement in university courses led not only to increased confidence in his job, but recognition from his peers and administrators (Reed, 1989).

O'Leary (1976) suggests that a basic component of a productive higher education program is a strong working relationship with field agencies. There is an urgent need for educators and corrections administrators to place a renewed commitment toward offering a proper blend of higher education and in-service training in order to provide the modern correctional worker the tools needed to successfully contribute to the future of correctional programs in this country (Gluckstern & Packard, 1977; Hoffman, Snell & Webb, 1976).

Program Development

Program development for inmates has received little attention in modern corrections, either in literature or in academic involvement, though it is not difficult to find academicians who critically insist that treatment programs in prisons are ineffective because of staffing, inconvenience, administrative philosophy, or prison

construction (Conklin, 1986; Barlow, 1987; Johnson, 1986). In contrast, Adams (1975) adds a seldom printed perspective that "...historically operating staff have been notorious for its readiness to innovate. How else explain the long parade of operations-initiated programs over the past two or three decades?" (p. 38). An innovative and cooperative effort occurred at the Mt. Pleasant Correctional Facility in Iowa in 1976 when the University of Iowa Medical School faculty worked with the Department of Corrections to establish a Therapeutic Community Substance Abuse Program for offenders. University faculty conducted a two year follow up evaluation of the program resulting in refinements to the program which continues to serve those inmates with a history of substance abuse (Scurr, 1989).

According to Burnett (1989) one area in which university faculty may make a contribution to the development of programs in prisons to design geriatrics programs for elderly inmates. Burnett claims there are essentially no prison programs designed for the older inmate, yet there are more than 30,000 U.S. prisoners over the age of 40. As this country's population ages, the management problems associated with the elderly prisoner will become even greater.

Summary

Corrections, throughout the decade of the 1980s, has been one of this nation's top growth industries (Travisano, 1989a). Camp and Camp (1989) reports that prison populations have doubled during the decade of the 1980s and nearly 20,000 new employees were added each year to the prison systems in the U.S. Peak (1985) argues there is a need to know what is being done, and what works, inside the prisons. The Presidents' Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice (1967) recognized that substantial resources and effort was being devoted to the corrections cause with little knowledge of what was being accomplished. Beto (1970) predicted that higher education will become more involved in corrections, yet concedes little is being accomplished in most jurisdictions (Beto, 1989), as have others (Peak, 1985; Reed, 1989; Breed, 1989; Travisano, 1989a; Lejins, 1989).

The greatest need for interaction between academic criminal justice programs and state departments of corrections is in the area of research (Reed, 1989; Breed, 1989; Beto, 1989; Travisano, 1989a; Wertz, 1978; Peak, 1985). Myren (1975) and Camp and Camp (1989) suggest that staff development programs are also an important area in which cooperative efforts in staff training are needed to prepare the new employees in corrections to act responsibly

as they supervise those who are incarcerated. Reed (1989) and Johnson (1989) believe the role of academic criminal justice faculty in this effort may best be accomplished through formal classroom courses and assisting state training academies develop curriculum responsive to the needs of the correctional practitioner. A third area in which productive cooperative efforts are needed, according to Conklin (1986), Barlow (1987), and Johnson (1986) is in the area of inmate program development. Burnett (1989) agrees that this is an area that has often been ignored and is rich in potential for productive results of joint efforts, particularly program development for the geriatric inmate.

Potential barriers to effective interaction between the academic criminal justice programs and state departments of corrections were identified by Peak (1985) and Weiss and Bucuvalas (1980) which included the perception by administrators that academic research is often irrelevant to the operations of a prison. Carter (1971) and Adams (1975) identified the potential barrier that administrators and faculty often do not trust one another. Unnithan (1986) added to the list of barriers that prisons are not made accessible to faculty for the purpose of research. Although Snow (1961) identifies a cultural barrier between the academic and the practitioner, the limited scope of

this research does not allow a thorough examination of this very broad and complex potential barrier.

In contrast, factors were also identified which may promote cooperative interaction between the two groups. Johnson (1989) suggested that the meshing of personalities between the directors of the academic criminal justice programs and the state departments of corrections was important in the development of cooperative efforts. Johnson also emphasized the importance of geographic proximity of the location of the two agencies as being important in promoting a relationship. Reed (1989) reported from his experience that cooperative efforts grew from a perceived need by one or the agencies. Webb (1989) suggested that a major factor which promotes interaction is the desire of the participants to share skills and knowledge. Some factors which promote interaction may in turn serve as barriers in another environment.

CHAPTER III.

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study is to determine the extent of existing interaction between academic criminal justice programs and state departments of corrections, to what the extent of interaction between these two agencies should be, and factors that promote interaction, and barriers to interaction. The methodology employed in this study is divided into the following categories: defining the population, determining the sample, constructing the questionnaire, conducting the survey, and analyzing the data.

Defining the Population

Corrections programs in the United States are varied in scope and size ranging from local pre-release programs to state prisons, and from single digit bed size jails to large corrections programs such as California with over 90,000 inmates. Over 1500 academic criminal justice programs exist in higher education that teach courses in criminal justice. A large proportion of these courses are taught in the traditional disciplines of sociology, psychology, public administration, medicine, or other area in higher education.

For the purpose of this study the corrections programs

included were those state wide departments headed by one administrator with a primary focus on prison operations. The academic criminal justice programs selected for this study were those programs which offered the doctorate in criminal justice, those programs which offered the master's degree in criminal justice, and those programs in sociology which offered the doctorate with emphasis in criminal justice. The top priority, or those selected first, were the academic programs which offered the doctorate degree. In those jurisdictions where the doctorate degree in criminal justice was not offered, an academic program offering the master's degree in criminal justice was randomly selected. In addition, in those jurisdictions where the criminal justice doctorate degree was not offered, a sociology program offering the doctorate degree with emphasis in criminal justice was randomly selected. It was assumed that a program offering the doctorate degree places greater emphasis upon research, an area of study in this research.

Determining the Sample

Included in the sample of universities were eleven criminal justice programs offering doctoral degrees. An additional thirty-five criminal justice programs offering the master's degree were included. The criteria for selecting masters level programs were as follows: (1) one

program was selected per state, (2) if more than one master's program existed in a state, the program located in closest geographical proximity to the city in which the department of corrections was located was selected, (3) in the event more than one master's level program existed in that city, one was chosen by simple random selection. In order to include a sufficient number of research institutions (defined as those offering the doctorate degree) in the sample, a department of sociology offering a doctoral degree with emphasis in criminal justice was selected in those states not represented by a doctoral granting school of criminal justice. There were 26 of these programs included in the sample. A total of 73 higher education institutions were included in this study.

The state departments of corrections in forty-three states and the District of Columbia were selected to be surveyed in this study. The criteria for selecting these jurisdictions were based upon whether a graduate level academic criminal justice program, or department of sociology offering the doctorate degree with emphasis in criminal justice, was represented in that jurisdiction. Those correctional programs in states without an academic criminal justice program offering a graduate degree were not included.

Constructing the Questionnaire

The questionnaire used in this study was compiled from a review of literature, previous research findings, and from observations of nationally recognized experts in the field of corrections and academic criminal justice programs. Twenty-nine questions were developed relating to the four basic areas of inquiry including the current level of interaction between academic criminal justice programs and state departments of corrections, the level of interaction that should exist, factors which promote interaction, and factors which serve as barriers to interaction.

A pilot survey was conducted including five university faculty and five corrections administrators not in the sample to address reaction to content, length, clarity, and the ordering of questions. The responses were most helpful in the clarification of individual questions, response sets, and terminology.

Conducting the Survey

The study was accomplished through a mailed survey format consisting of a questionnaire containing 29 inquiries. The response mode for the inquiries was based upon a Likert type scale of 1 (low) to 7 (high). The four questions of interaction were as follows:

1. What is the current level of interaction between academic criminal justice programs and state departments of corrections?
2. What level of interaction should exist between academic criminal justice programs and state departments of corrections?
3. What factors tend to promote interaction between academic criminal justice programs and state departments of corrections?
4. What factors tend to serve as barriers to interaction between academic criminal justice programs and state departments of corrections?

The 116 questionnaires were mailed directly to the chief administrator of each of the academic and corrections programs. The researcher recognizes that the chief administrator of the respective agency, or his/her designee, may not be aware of the specific interaction problems experienced by the faculty researcher, warden, or prison middle management staff, and that responses to the questionnaire may be more reflective of the responding individual than the department he or she represents. This study reflects instead, the general policy and direction of the respective departments as determined by the administrators.

Approval from the Human Subjects for Research Review

Committee at Iowa State University was sought and granted on September 5, 1989. Following the Human Subjects for Research Review Committee approval the questionnaire (Appendix A) and cover letter (Appendix B) were printed and mailed to the Chairs of 72 academic departments and the Directors of 44 state departments of corrections. A total of 116 questionnaires were mailed. A post card reminder (Appendix C) was mailed three weeks after the first mailing to all those who had not yet responded. After the second three week period, another questionnaire and cover letter (Appendix D) was forwarded to all those who had not yet responded. The researcher expected a minimum number of 30 usable responses from academic criminal justice programs and 30 usable responses from state departments of corrections.

Analysis

The data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, the Chi-square Test of Independence, and the t-test. The descriptive statistics were used to measure the promoting factors and barriers to interaction between the state departments of corrections and the higher education institutions. The Chi-square Test of Independence was used to measure the probability of independence between the responses of the academic criminal justice program

respondents and the state department of corrections respondents in regard to factors which may promote interaction and which factors may serve as barriers to interaction. When the theoretical sampling distribution of chi-square for 1 degree of freedom existed, and the expected frequencies in any of the cells were small, the Yates' correction for continuity was applied to the data. Where observed frequencies were too low, no test was used. The Independent t-test was utilized to determine the magnitude of differences in responses between the higher education respondents and the state corrections respondents and the Dependent t-test was used to measure the magnitude of difference between those responses relating to the level of interaction that currently exists and those responses relating to the level of interaction that should exist. The statistical calculations used in this study were based upon contents found in the Hinkle, Wiersma, and Jurs (1988) textbook for applied statistics.

CHAPTER IV.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter reports the findings of the survey of academic criminal justice programs and state departments of corrections relating to the current level of interaction, the desired level of interaction, factors which might promote interaction, and barriers to interaction. The responses to the survey data were analyzed by using descriptive statistics, chi-square, and the t-test to determine magnitude of difference in responses by group.

Sample

The sampling procedure reported in the previous chapter resulted in a sample of 116 subjects. A total of 85 usable questionnaires were returned for a response rate of 73.28%. The state departments of corrections returned 37 of 44 for a response rate of 84.09% while the higher education departments returned 48 of 72 for a response rate of 66.66%. Two questionnaires were returned with insufficient address and two were returned indicating a criminal justice program did not exist at that institution.

Profile of Respondents

The respondents to this questionnaire were representatives of higher education criminal justice

programs of study and state department of corrections. The statewide corrections departments were the larger of the two agencies with a mean number of employees of 5,507 providing services to an average of nearly 13,000 inmates. In contrast, the higher education programs consisted of an average of 15 employees providing an educational experience for an average of 342 students.

In regard to the years experience of the respective administrators of the two programs, the corrections administrator had worked in his/her profession for 19 years. The director of the academic criminal justice program had nearly 14.5 years of experience. This slight contrast in experience of the two groups of administrators may be due to the rank of the position within the respective organizations. The corrections director is the chief administrator of the agency while the criminal justice director has responsibility for a department within the larger organization of the university. Concerning minority employees, nearly 30% were minorities and 26% females while higher education faculty were nearly 30% females and 23% minorities.

Current Level of Interaction

The questionnaire used in this study contained questions designed to collect data in the four specific

areas of study. The first of the four questions to be reviewed in this study is, "What is the extent of current cooperative efforts of criminal justice programs in higher education and the state departments of corrections?" The respondents were asked to identify all areas in which a current cooperative relationship existed. Where no relationship existed, the respondents were directed to respond "None". Thirty-four of forty-eight academic criminal justice program respondents identified at least one area of cooperative interaction while twenty-four of the thirty-seven state corrections respondents identified at least one area of cooperative interaction. This represents 71% of the responding academic criminal justice programs and 65% of the state departments as being involved in a cooperative relationship with the other. Table 1 describes the current level of interaction between academic criminal justice programs and state departments of corrections. The cooperative arrangement most frequently identified by both sets of respondents was "Conduct research" (64.6%, 54.1%) followed by "Train staff" (37.5%, 32.4%) and "Develop programs" (12.5%, 29.7%). A fourth area identified in the open ended category of "Other" was "Student internships". Student internship was also mentioned regularly in the open ended response of Question 29 as being an area of cooperation.

TABLE 1 A frequency of the extent and type of current interaction between academic programs and state departments as reported by respondents

Type of existing cooperative arrangements with each other	Academic Programs		State Departments	
	n	%	n	%
Conduct Research	31	64.6	20	54.1
Develop Programs	6	12.5	11	29.7
Train Staff	18	37.5	12	32.4
Internships	5	10.4	4	10.8
Academic programs responding n = 48				
State departments responding n = 37				
It should be noted multiple selection could occur				

In an effort to determine if one group of agencies were more assertive in the initiation of the relationship, a question was asked relating to which agency initiated the cooperative efforts. Table 2 provides a frequency of the responses concerning the initiative taken. Although both agencies tend to take credit for the initial contact, the noticeable feature of this table is that it indicates a mutual effort was exerted by over 50% percent of the respondents from each professional group, 18 of 34 academic program respondents and 13 of 24 corrections respondents.

TABLE 2 Frequency of initiation of a relationship by those agencies currently involved in a cooperative relationship

Initiator	Academic Programs		State Departments	
	n	%	n	%
Corrections	3	8.8	6	25.0
University	13	38.3	4	16.7
Mutual	18	52.9	13	54.2
Don't Know	0	0.0	1	4.1
Academic programs responding		n = 34		
State Departments responding		n = 34		

A third question was designed to determine whether an effort was required by either or both agencies to solidify a working relationship following the initial contact. Table 3 shows that, of those academic and correctional agencies that currently have a working relationship, 27 of

33 academic respondents (81.8%) and all 24 of the corrections respondents (100%) report having made an effort to develop a cooperative relationship with the other agency.

TABLE 3 A frequency of the attempts made to establish cooperative relationships as reported by those agencies working together

Attempts to Develop	Academic Program		State Department	
	n	%	n	%
Yes	27	81.8	24	100.0
No	5	15.2	0	0.0
Don't Know	1	3.0	0	0.0
TOTAL		100.0		100.0
Academic Program	n = 33			
State Department	n = 24			

In contrast, however, of those agencies which reported no involvement in a joint effort, only 6 of 27 (22%) attempted to develop a cooperative working relationship. Seventy-eight percent of those respondents reporting no relationship either made no attempt or were unaware if an attempt had been made.

Staff Training

In order to gain a measure of the extent of training provided correctional personnel by faculty, the respondents were asked to identify a representative point on a 7 point

Likert scale with 1 representing "Low", 4 representing "Moderate", and 7 representing "High" activity. The mean response for those with a cooperative relationship was a score of 4.69 on the 7 point scale. There was no significant difference in how either Higher Education or Corrections responded. Table 4 reflects the type of correctional personnel being trained by faculty. Although middle managers and administrators receive a proportionately larger share of the training, the inservice education programs were spread across all four type of staff.

TABLE 4 Type of personnel trained by faculty as reported by the respondents

Type of Personnel	Academic Program		State Department	
	n	%	n	%
Uniform Officers	17	50.0	11	45.8
Counselors	11	32.4	11	45.8
Middle Managers	17	50.0	14	58.3
Administrators	14	41.2	17	70.8
Academic Program	n = 34			
State Department	n = 24			
<u>Multiple selection could occur</u>				

Research

Table 5 displays the number of respondents involved in cooperative research efforts and the total number of research projects began and completed during the 12 month

period preceding the respondents receiving the survey. The respondents indicated that 160 new research projects were started in the preceding 12 months as compared to 87 research projects completed in the same period. The mean number of research projects started in the 12 month period by reporting respondents was 3.5 while the mean number of research projects completed in the same time frame was 2.5.

TABLE 5 The frequency of research projects reported began and completed in the twelve months preceding respondents receipt of survey

Project Status	Number Respondents Reporting	Total Number Projects	Mean
Projects Began	46	160	3.5
Projects Completed	34	87	2.5

Develop Inmate Programs

The current extent of faculty involvement with correctional agencies in the development of inmate programs is displayed in Table 6. On a seven point scale with 1 representing "Low", 4 representing "Moderate", and 7 representing "High", the mean response for current faculty involvement in inmate program planning by corrections agencies was 1.96. The criminal justice programs report a slightly higher rating of faculty involvement at 2.24, yet

both groups of respondents rated the development of inmate programs as low current involvement in inmate program development. There is not a statistically significant difference in the response of either group when measured by the Independent t-test.

TABLE 6 Mean rating on scale of 1 (low) to 7 (high) and t value regarding faculty involvement in the planning of inmate prison programs

Group	n	Mean Rating	St. Dev.	t Value	2-tail Prob.
Corrections	24	1.96	1.58	-0.58	0.56
Higher Education	34	2.24	2.05		

Level of Interaction that Should Exist

A second major focus of this research is the extent of cooperative interaction between academic criminal justice programs and state departments of corrections. The research question is, "What level of interaction should exist between academic criminal justice programs and state departments of corrections?"

In order to measure the respondents opinions on the level of interaction that should exist as compared to the current level of interaction, three series of questions were asked. The first series asked for an evaluation of the current level of interaction in a specific area

followed by a question seeking an opinion about what the level of interaction should be in that specific area. The specific areas measured included research, faculty involvement in academy curriculum development, and faculty involvement in planning inmate programs. Table 7 displays a comparison and measurement of the magnitude of difference in the current level of interaction and the respondents opinions regarding the level of interaction they believe should exist in each of the three areas being studied.

The respondents indicated with a mean rating of 4.95 on a 7 point scale that academic research currently being conducted applies moderately well to the daily operations of the corrections programs. Although the respondents indicated that research should be more applicable, the magnitude of difference between the extent research currently applies, and should apply, is not significant as measured by the t-test of Independence.

In regard to the specific area of faculty involvement in the development of state department of corrections staff training academy curriculum, the current level of involvement as rated by the respondents was quite low at 1.45 on the scale of 1 to 7. The opinions of the respondents concerning what the level of involvement should be was also rated relatively low, with a mean score of 2.79 on the 7 point scale. The magnitude of difference,

TABLE 7 A t-test between the current level of interaction with what the level of interaction should be and a measure of the magnitude of difference

Response	Mean	St. Dev.	t Value	2-tail Prob.
Does research apply	4.95	1.62	-1.66	0.10
Should research apply	5.38	1.35		
Faculty plan academy curriculum	1.45	1.55	-5.43	0.01
Should faculty do more academy planning	2.79	2.35		
Faculty plan inmate programs	2.12	1.86	-6.55	0.01
Should faculty plan inmate programs	3.91	1.88		

however, between the current level of faculty involvement and the opinions of the respondents on what the level of involvement should be in developing academy curriculum is highly significant when measured by the Independent t-test.

Likewise, a low level of faculty involvement with the corrections administrator to plan inmate programs was reported in this study. The mean measure of the extent faculty should become involved in inmate program planning was within the moderate range at 3.91. Again, the magnitude of difference in the current level of activity and what should be the level of activity as measured by the Independent t-test was highly significant.

A second series of questions were directed toward an analysis of the need for research in six different and specific areas including demographics, inmate programs, prison management, innovations in the field of corrections, inmate classification systems, and inmate behavior. Table 8 displays an analysis of the importance assigned to each research topic by the respondents representing corrections and those representing higher education. The magnitude of difference in the response of the two groups was measured by the Independent t-test.

Both the corrections and higher education respondents identified inmate behavior as the most important area in which to do research of the six items presented. The mean

TABLE 8 An analysis of the value of specific research projects and t-test measure of difference in response by academic programs and corrections

Project by Group	n	Mean	St. Dev.	t Value	2-tail Prob.
Demographics					
Corrections	24	5.38	1.86	-0.20	0.84
Higher Education	34	5.47	1.58		
Inmate Programs					
Corrections	24	5.38	1.41	0.86	0.39
Higher Education	34	5.03	1.61		
Management					
Corrections	24	4.92	1.84	-0.92	0.36
Higher Education	34	5.35	1.67		
Innovations					
Corrections	24	5.00	1.87	-1.00	0.32
Higher Education	34	5.44	1.28		
Classification					
Corrections	24	5.13	1.68	0.23	0.82
Higher Education	34	5.03	1.34		
Inmate Behavior					
Corrections	24	5.63	1.61	-0.13	0.80
Higher Education	34	5.68	1.22		

of the response values assigned to inmate behavior by the criminal justice program respondents was 5.68 on the seven point scale described earlier. The mean of the response values assigned to the topic by correctional respondents was 5.63. The other five research items presented ranked closely behind inmate behavior with all areas receiving mean scores approaching the high range.

An Independent t-test was used to determine whether there existed significant difference between the values assigned by corrections respondents and those respondents representing criminal justice programs. All six t-tests failed to indicate a significant difference between the mean of the responses of the two groups.

The third series of questions designed to measure the extent of interaction that the state departments of corrections and academic criminal justice program respondents believe should exist focuses on the offering of higher education criminal justice courses at the prison site, the state department paying salaries to employees while they attend a higher education institution, and the state department paying the tuition for employees who participate in criminal justice course work. Table 9 displays information of whether courses are currently being offered at the prison site in which staff may enroll and whether courses should be offered at the prison site. At

the time of the survey, 10 academic and 12 corrections respondents indicated that courses were offered at the prison in which staff could enroll. In response to the follow up question, should courses be offered at the prison site, 83.8% of the corrections respondents expressed belief that courses should be offered. Twenty-nine percent of the academic respondents did not believe courses should be offered for staff at the prison site.

TABLE 9 The frequency of courses currently being offered at the prison site as compared with the frequency courses should be offered

Response Categories	Academic Programs		State Departments	
	n	%	n	%
Are courses offered?				
Yes	10	20.8	12	32.4
No	38	79.2	18	48.7
Don't Know	0	0.0	7	18.9
TOTAL		100.0		100.0
Should courses be offered?				
Yes	23	47.9	31	83.8
No	14	29.2	3	8.1
Don't Know	11	22.9	3	8.1
TOTAL		100.0		100.0
Academic Programs	n = 48			
State Departments	n = 37			

In regard to whether the state departments of corrections currently pay a salary to employees for

attending school or whether the state department should pay the salary, Table 10 displays the frequency of response concerning both questions. The largest response in this category by both the academic respondents and the corrections respondents was the state does not pay employees to attend a higher education institution full time. In contrast, both sets of respondents indicated the state department should pay the salary for employees who attend a higher education institution.

TABLE 10 The frequency of reported state departments currently paying salaries to employees who attend school as compared with whether salaries should be paid

Salary	Academic Programs		State Departments	
	n	%	n	%
Currently Pay				
Yes (Full)	2	4.2	7	18.9
Yes (Partial)	9	18.8	11	29.7
No	37	77.0	19	51.4
TOTAL		100.0		100.0
Should Pay				
Yes (Full)	16	33.3	15	40.5
Yes (Partial)	23	47.9	19	51.4
No	9	18.8	3	6.1
TOTAL		100.0		100.0
Academic Programs	n = 48			
State Departments	n = 37			

Table 11 provides a frequency description of the respondents in regard to the state departments currently

paying tuition for the employees to attend higher education classes in criminal justice and whether the departments should pay the tuition. At the time of the survey the majority of respondents indicated the state department did not pay the tuition charge for employees to attend criminal justice classes. In regard to whether the state departments should pay tuition, both groups were nearly unanimous in their opinions that the state department should pay either full or partial tuition.

TABLE 11 Frequencies of state departments which currently pay tuition as compared to whether they should pay tuition

Tuition	Academic Programs		State Department	
	n	%	n	%
Currently Pays				
Yes (Full)	2	4.3	12	32.4
Yes (Partial)	10	21.3	10	27.0
No	35	74.4	15	40.6
TOTAL		100.0		100.0
Should Pay				
Yes (Full)	20	42.5	18	48.6
Yes (Partial)	23	48.9	17	46.0
No	4	8.6	2	5.4
TOTAL		100.0		100.0
Academic Programs	n = 47			
State Departments	n = 37			

Factors Promoting Interaction

A third major area of interest in this research is to identify factors which promote cooperative relationships

between state departments of corrections and academic criminal justice programs. Table 12 shows that only one factor, "Reciprocal Need", is indicated as having the potential of being a promoter of a cooperative relationship. The need for reciprocal relationships was identified 34 times by the respondents as the most important factor for developing working relationships. No respondent identified this item as "Least Important". Of the remaining factors, geographic proximity, mandate by legislature, personalities of the administrators of the programs, and sharing skills, none were identified as being significant factors which promote cooperative relationships on the Chi-square Test of Independence.

TABLE 12 Factors which are the most important and least important in promoting cooperative relationships as measured by Chi-square

Factors	Most Important n	Least Important n	df	Chi- square	2-tail Prob.
Geo. Proximity	7	30	1	.67	0.41
Mandate	17	15	1	1.35	0.25
Reciprocal Need	34	0	Not Applicable		
Personalities	9	21	1	2.24	0.74
Sharing Skills	16	18	1	.28	0.60

Factors as Barriers

Those factors which may serve as barriers to the development of cooperative relationships between state

department of corrections and academic criminal justice programs developing cooperative relations. The factors selected for measurement in this study which may serve as barriers to cooperative relationships were found to be non-significant as measured by the Chi-square Test of Independence at the .05 level as shown in Table 13.

TABLE 13 Factors which are the most important and least important barriers to cooperative relationships as measured by Chi-square Test of Independence

Factors	Most Important	Least Important	df	Chi-square	2-tail Prob.
Personalities	11	16	1	.25	0.62
Geo. Proximity	9	38	1	2.74	0.10
Lack of Trust	19	13	1	.17	0.68
Lack Faculty Interest	18	9	1	.03	0.60
Lack Administrator Interest	19	6	1	.56	0.31

Only one factor, "Geographic Proximity" was found significant at the .10 alpha, but the relationship was negative. There were nine respondents who identified geographic proximity as being a most important factor, yet 38 respondents identified the same factor as the least important as a barrier. In fact, only two factors were identified more often as a most important barrier than were identified as a least important barrier. These included

the factors of "Lack of Faculty Interest" and "Lack of Administrator Interest". There were 18 respondents who identified "Lack of Faculty Interest" as a most important factor while 9 identified the factor as a least important barrier. A similar response was found with "Lack of Administrator Interest" with 19 identifying it as a most important factor and 6 identifying it as least important. The respondents who declared they did not have a cooperative relationship responded similarly as did those who were involved with a cooperative relationship.

Additional Findings

Access to Prisons

The review of literature revealed a lack of access to prisons as a factor which may interfere with conducting research (Unnithan, 1986; Adams, 1975). An attempt was made to measure this factor through the survey. Two questions were asked. First, the respondents were asked to assign a value on the seven point scale evaluating the level of access faculty were allowed to the prisons. A second question asked the respondents to evaluate the extent access to the prisons was encouraged. The respondents assigned a moderately high mean rating of 5.57 to the question of level of access to the prisons. In regard to the question of the extent of access to the

prisons was encouraged, however, the respondents assigned a mean rating nearly one point lower at 4.59. Table 14 displays a comparison and Independent t-test measuring the magnitude of difference in "Access" and "Access Encouraged". The results show a difference between "Access" and "Access Encouraged" as highly significant at the .001 alpha level. Although the respondents indicated the prisons are accessible, the access is not encouraged.

TABLE 14 The difference in faculty access to prisons, and access encouraged by state departments, as measured by the Independent t-test

Access	Mean	Standard Deviation	t Value	2-tail Prob.
Access	5.57	1.19	5.05	0.01
Access Encouraged	4.59	1.35		

There was not, however, a significant difference in how the corrections respondents and the higher education respondents evaluated "Access" and "Access Encouraged". The mean response of those representing higher education in regard to access was 5.62, higher than the evaluation by corrections representatives at 5.50. Both scores fall within the high moderate range. Both groups evaluated the "Access Encouraged" question nearly one full score lower with the mean of higher education at 4.50 and corrections

at 4.71.

Value of Cooperative Relationship

An effort was made in this study to determine whether academic criminal justice respondents differed from state department respondents in regard to the value each placed on the cooperative relationship. The question is, "Are these cooperative relationships valuable?" The respondents were asked their opinion of the value of a cooperative relationship between the state department of corrections and a criminal justice program at a university. With all responses tabulated, the higher education and corrections responses were nearly identical. The mean response for the higher education representatives was 5.29 while corrections evaluated the value of the relationship at 5.28.

There was a significant difference, however, in the mean rating of value of relationship of those academic criminal justice programs and the state departments who were involved in a cooperative relationship and those who were not. Table 15 shows a significant difference at the .05 alpha level between the mean value rating assigned by the two groups. The groups who are involved in a cooperative effort hold that relationship in higher esteem than those who have none.

TABLE 15 Independent t-test of difference in value held for a cooperative relationship by those with a relationship and those with none

Relationship	Number Cases	Mean	St. Dev.	t Value	2-tail Prob.
Cooperative	58	5.78	1.30	2.41	0.02
None	27	4.89	1.70		

Summary of Findings

The purpose of this study was to determine the current level of interaction between academic criminal justice programs and the state departments of corrections to determine the extent of interaction both groups believe should exist, to identify factors which might promote interaction, and to identify barriers to interaction. The findings reveal the current level of interaction was primarily in the area of research with 160 research projects having been started within the preceding 12 months. Cooperative efforts in the training of correctional personnel was the second leading area of interaction followed by joint efforts to develop inmate programs. These cooperative efforts were begun following a mutual attempt by both groups to establish a relationship. The respondents tended, however, to credit their own department for the initiation of the projects. There was significant variance between those departments with a working relationship and those without in regard to effort directed toward the development of the association. Over 90% of those with a cooperative relationship indicated they made a concerted effort to work together while only 22% of those without a cooperative relationship responded an attempt had been made.

In regard to the questions relating to the extent

of training provided by faculty, the mean response of 4.69 on a 7 point scale fell within the moderate range for both groups. The type of correctional personnel trained was fairly evenly distributed between correctional officers, counselors, middle managers, and administrators. The mean number of research projects began by each participating respondent was approximately 3.5. The involvement of faculty in the development of inmate programs was reflected by low mean scores by both groups. Though this area reflected the third most frequent area of interaction, the low mean scores seem to indicate minimal activity.

The second area of exploration in this research effort concerns the question of what level of interaction should exist between the two groups. The areas in which the respondents significantly indicated there should be more interaction included: (a) faculty involvement in the development of curriculum in the state department of corrections staff training academy; (b) faculty involvement in the development of inmate programs; (c) academic criminal justice programs offering more higher education courses at the prison; (d) state departments paying salaries of select employees to attend an academic criminal justice program, and; (e) state departments pay tuition for employees to enroll in criminal justice courses.

In regard to the factors which may promote greater

interaction between criminal justice programs and state departments of corrections, only one factor was positively identified. Thirty-four respondents with cooperative relationships identified the factor of "Reciprocal Need". None listed this factor as least important. Those respondents who do not have a cooperative relationship also listed "Reciprocal Need" as a most important factor, and in addition, identified "Mandate" as a second factor without a single listing as a least important factor.

Additional findings reveal that prisons are accessible to faculty for the purpose of research. The academic criminal justice respondents rated their access to prisons as moderately high. In contrast, respondents from both agencies gave only a moderate rating on a seven point scale to the question concerning prison officials encouraging access.

Finally, the respondents of those agencies which reported involvement in a cooperative relationship placed a very high moderate value on that relationship. In contrast, those respondents without a cooperative relationship placed a significantly lesser value on the development of a working relationship with the other group.

CHAPTER V.

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUMMARY

This final chapter contains a statement of conclusions based on the findings in Chapter IV, recommendations for practice and further research, and a summary of this investigation. The response to the survey was examined in relationship to the four questions being explored. Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the responses, and where appropriate the Chi-square Test of Independence was used to test relationship and the t-test was used to test magnitude of difference between pairs or between groups.

Conclusions

The demographic information collected about the respondent agencies in this study is generally self-explanatory, yet the employee characteristics warrant attention. The first female correctional officer to be employed in an all male inmate prison occurred at the Iowa Security Medical Facility in 1971. By January 1, 1982, 13% of all correctional officers in the United States were female (Camp & Camp, 1982). This study reflects a continued growth of female employees to a current level of 26% of the correctional work force. The one in four ratio

of female to male employees is representative of the changes which have occurred over the past two decades in U.S. prisons. This study also reflects the number of minority employees is now at 30% of the total U.S. correctional work force, yet short of the national goal of 46%, equivalent to the rate of incarceration of minorities (Camp & Camp, 1988).

The first question examined in the study asked the current level of interaction between academic criminal justice programs in higher education institutions and state departments of corrections. The review of literature and interviews conducted in the field reflected an opinion that interaction between the two agencies was quite low (Travisano, 1989a; Burnett, 1989; Unnithan, 1986), yet of the 85 respondents in the study, 58 indicated a relationship existed at some level. This represents 68% of the respondents indicating involvement in a working relationship.

The area in which interaction was reported occurring with greatest frequency was research. Fifty-two percent of the respondents reported 160 research projects being conducted in 24 state departments of corrections. Following research in frequency as an area of interaction was faculty involvement in staff development programs. Thirty of eighty-five respondents indicated faculty were

involved in staff development programs which included a balanced effort to train correctional officers, counselors, middle managers, and administrators. The faculty were also reported to be involved in the development of curriculum for training programs, though to a lesser degree.

The least frequent area of interaction was inmate program development as reported by both groups of respondents. Finally, internship programs were identified as an area of cooperative efforts by both criminal justice program respondents and corrections respondents in the "Other" response category and may have received a higher percent of responses had "Internship" been included as a response category.

There exists disparity between existing literature and interviews with nationally recognized professionals (Gluckstern & Packard, 1977; Graham, 1980; Reed, 1989; Peak, 1985) and the results of this study in regard to current interaction between higher education and corrections programs. The approximately two-thirds ratio of agencies involved in a cooperative relationship far exceeds the expectations of the researcher, the literature, or the nationally known professionals. This study does not attempt to measure the quality of the relationship nor the extent of productive results. The fact, however, that the two agencies are involved in cooperative dialogue speaks

well for the potential development of future productive relationships. One of the universities reported, "We have no official ongoing relationship with the department central office; but we have very close relationships with many staff, administrators, and their institutions". A department of corrections respondent added that in his jurisdiction the department of corrections has arrangements with many colleges and several schools within the university, including the school of criminal justice.

Perhaps of greater significance than the number of agencies working cooperatively is that the majority of these relationships were developed through mutual efforts. Nearly 90% of the agencies indicated an interest in developing cooperative programs. In addition, the agencies with a cooperative relationship, regardless of the productiveness of the effort, valued that relationship. On a 7 point scale, the respondents rated the value of that relationship with a mean value of 5.78.

An Independent t-test was administered to measure the magnitude of difference between the value rating of those agencies with a cooperative relationship and those agencies without a cooperative relationship. The results indicated a significant difference at the .05 alpha level. Those agencies involved in a working relationship with the other group placed greater value on that relationship than those

without cooperative programs.

This study indicates a higher than expected level of current interaction between the academic criminal justice programs and the state departments of corrections, particularly in the area of research. Those who administer these programs are making an effort to develop cooperative relationships, and those relationships are valued.

The second research question in this study examined the respondents opinions of the extent of interaction that should occur between academic criminal justice programs and state departments of corrections. Aaronson, Kittrie, Saari, and Cooper (1975) and Weiss and Bucuvalas (1980) describe the reluctance of correctional administrators to enter into research efforts with academic programs because of the administrators perception that academic research is irrelevant and untrustworthy. Shover and Einstadter (1988) explain the administrators' perception is a result of the focus, training, and experience of the administrator which differs from the researcher. This difference in background creates a barrier to interaction.

This study did not confirm the literature that either group was reluctant to become involved in a working relationship, that academic research was irrelevant, or that academic research was not applicable to the daily operations of corrections programs. It is the researchers

opinion that the extent of research being conducted in prisons by academic criminal justice faculty is increasing. One hundred sixty new research projects were initiated by the respondents during the 12 months preceding this study while approximately one-half that many projects (87) were being completed in the same time frame. In addition, neither the state department nor the academic respondents indicated, to a statistically significant level, an opinion that current research is either irrelevant or not applicable. The respondents rated current research as moderately applicable to daily prison operations, and although they indicated that research should be more applicable, the magnitude of the difference between the extent research applies and should apply, was not statistically significant at the .05 alpha level as measured by the Dependent t-test.

This study also examined areas in which the respondents believed further research should be conducted. Six areas of potential research were presented. The respondents consistently identified all 6 areas as needing further research. There was no statistically significant difference between how academic and corrections respondents replied as measured by the Independent t-test.

The academic and corrections respondents were also consistent in their opinions concerning the extent faculty

should be involved in staff development programs at the state corrections training academy and in the development of inmate programs. In both cases, the respondents indicated, at a highly significant level (sig. = .001), that faculty should be more involved in staff training and inmate program development.

The final area this study measured concerning the extent by which greater interaction should occur between academic criminal justice programs and the state departments of corrections related to whether more courses should be offered at the prison site. The majority of the respondents indicated that more courses for corrections employees should be offered at the prison site.

The researcher concludes that academic criminal justice program respondents and state department of corrections respondents who have experienced cooperative projects with one another prefer to have greater efforts extended toward cooperative programs in the areas of research, staff development, and inmate program development projects.

One of the university respondents indicated it would be most beneficial to criminal justice agencies if a good and trusting relationship between the university and criminal justice agencies (from police to corrections) be established that would foster student internships and research opportunities at both the undergraduate and

graduate levels.

Question three studied the factors which might serve to promote joint efforts of cooperation between the criminal justice programs and corrections programs. Of the six items reviewed as potential factors for the promotion of joint efforts, only one factor, "Reciprocal Need" was indicated as having the potential of being a promoter of a cooperative relationship.

One of the university respondents suggested that time be set aside to meet and talk without self-interests being advanced. He claims the doors have been opened in part because "we know each other and trust each other in terms of how we do business". He added, "more academicians need to experience the reality of applied research". A corrections respondent stated, "We tend to utilize special skills available from university faculty and students". A current project reported by this corrections respondent included faculty and students assisting in the development of a video tape to be used in the classroom, and for state department of corrections public awareness programs. Another project involved a university class conducting a public opinion survey on correctional issues providing the class an opportunity to learn how to conduct surveys and the state department of corrections needed information.

The fourth research question considered the factors

which might serve as barriers to the development of joint corrections and academic criminal justice programs. While many opinions may be found in the literature expounding upon the barriers to effective interaction between the two groups (Unnithan, 1986; Johnson, 1986; Adams, 1975), this study failed to reveal conclusive evidence that any of the potential barriers examined exist as significant factors. Only two factors, lack of faculty interest and lack of administrator interest, tended to be recognized as barriers, but neither was found statistically significant using the Chi-square Test of Independence. The researcher recognizes the factors chosen for examination may have not been the most significant barriers.

Although this research was unable to show any factor, as being statistically significant, either as a barrier or promoter of interaction, this researcher concludes there exists one particularly sound determinant which promotes interaction. The factor, "Reciprocal Need" received the most responses (34) as being "Most Important" in the promotion of cooperative relationships. "Reciprocal Need" was also the only factor which received no responses as "Least Important". Regardless of all the factors considered as barriers to interaction, including geographical proximity, mandate from the legislature, the meshing of personalities, or the desire to share skills,

when there exists a perception of need cooperative relationships can be established. It is also the opinion of this researcher that since no barriers were identified as statistically significant, if both groups determine a need and identify a benefit from a cooperative relationship, barriers are either resolved or ignored.

Additional findings in this study did not support the claim of Unnithan (1986) and Peak (1985) that there exists a lack of access to prisons for researchers. This study found instead, that access to prisons was relatively high. The mean response to the question of the level of access the faculty are allowed to prisons was 5.57 on a 7 point scale. Unnithan, for example, based his generalizations on his personal experience in attempting to conduct research in a single institution in a country foreign to the United States.

The mean response to the question "is access encouraged" was somewhat lower, 4.59 on a 7 point scale, than "access to prison". The indication is that access remains available to researchers on a moderate level. Although access is not encouraged by the correctional administrator, one should not expect access to a "secure" institution in our society to be encouraged. It is important, however, that researchers recognize access can be attained to the majority of U.S. prisons, and that the

researcher may initiate the process to gain access should they have interest in prison research. It is equally important that corrections administrators initiate the process with representatives of academic criminal justice programs when they have issues in need of research.

The researcher concludes the current level of interaction between the academic criminal justice programs and state departments of corrections is active and growing. This conclusion contrasts with the opinions of many of the active professionals in both academia and corrections, as well as the literature. There is, however, limited literature on the topic and many studies are dated by 10 years or more. There was interest in the topic during the decade of the late 1960s and early 1970s, but fewer publications have appeared during the 1980s. If this study accurately reflects the current activity, this may be an example of literature not keeping pace with practice.

In addition, this study suggests that both academic and correctional professionals believe that even greater interaction should exist. This is particularly true in regard to research. In those areas of faculty involvement in staff training and inmate program development, the level of involvement is low, however, the magnitude of difference between current activities and the level of activity that should exist was highly statistically significant. One

could conclude that a need exists for greater interaction in both areas.

Those respondents who have participated in a relationship between agencies place the greatest value on the cooperative effort. The researcher holds the opinion that if participants continue to value the relationship at the level expressed in this study, even more initiatives will be taken as both groups expand the relationship. Beto's prediction (1970) that academic criminal justice programs and state departments will work together closely may be developing. The next stage might result in a joint effort of both agencies to acquire resources for the expansion of the cooperation.

Recommendations

The findings of this study, while adding to the knowledge about the interactions between state departments of corrections and academic criminal justice programs, present additional research questions. The researcher believes that the following areas are particularly deserving of further study:

1. Although this study did not identify specific barriers to interaction, other factors may be determined to be significant. Those factors not examined, which should be studied in future research, include the educational

background and highest degree attained by the correctional administrator, the rate of turnover in positions of academic chair and corrections administrator, and the cultural differences between the two groups.

2. Further research is needed to determine the changing characteristics of potential barriers to cooperative relationships between the academic criminal justice program faculty and state department of corrections administrators. An understanding of these changing characteristics may allow for anticipation, or prediction, of potential future barriers to continued cooperation.

3. Additional study is needed in each of the areas of cooperation including research, development of inmate programs, and staff development. This study indicated that these were areas in which both researchers and practitioners believe further progress should be made in a effort to advance knowledge and skills.

4. The area of internships was identified on numerous occasions by the respondents as an area in which cooperative relationships exist. The advantage of gaining further knowledge on this topic goes beyond the study of organizational relationships. It could extend into the impact internships have on hiring practices of a field agency, professional advancement of the employed intern, and educational and competitive advantage the internship

provides the student in his or her upper-level course work.

5. A major finding in this study was the significant difference in the responses of those criminal justices educators and corrections administrators who were engaged in a cooperative relationship as compared with those educator and corrections respondents who were not engaged in a cooperative relationship. A more specific study is needed to determine the distinguishing characteristics that separated those who interacted and those who did not.

6. Those respondents who were involved in a cooperative effort reported they valued the relationship. Further study is needed to determine what specifically was valued and if that relationship resulted in improved performance of those agencies.

Administrators of both higher education institutions and state corrections departments can use the findings of this study to compare the extent of the interaction of their own departments with the respondents of this nationwide study. The results of this study might encourage those not involved in an interaction relationship to seriously consider the advantages of such an arrangement and share the value those involved seem to enjoy. Chief executives of a state or other jurisdictions may find this study as a valuable tool in assessing whether to

encourage various state agencies and academic departments to enter into sharing arrangements in an effort to gain the maximum value from tax expenditures.

This study has shown that two agencies with similar interests which become partners in the effort to assist and support one another in the development of programs, to explore paths toward new knowledge, and to share skills which promote the growth of the profession is an experience valued by both agencies. It is an area of study with boundless potential and is needed for both the academic and practicing professional.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to offer a descriptive view of the extent of interaction in the form of cooperative efforts between higher education programs offering at least a master's degree in criminal justice and state departments of correctional services. This study attempted to determine the extent of interaction that currently exists; to determine what the extent of interaction should be; to identify barriers to that interaction, and; to identify factors which may promote the interaction. The areas of focus in which the interaction was measured included research, inmate program development, and staff development programs.

The researcher concluded that a higher level of interaction exists between criminal justice programs in higher education and state departments of corrections than either the literature implies or the national experts realize. Both representatives of corrections and higher education criminal justice programs share the opinion that even greater interaction and cooperative efforts should occur, particularly those who have experienced this relationship. The statistically significant findings in this study were not the anticipated differing opinions between corrections practitioners and the criminal justice educators, but the difference in opinion between the representatives of those groups who have experienced cooperative relationships and those who have not. Factors which might promote a positive interaction, or serve as barriers to a relationship, were not identified as being statistically significant. The factor of reciprocal need, however, is a basis upon which sound cooperative relationships can be established and may well be the only basis upon which the relationship will continue.

If the results of this study are accurate, this research demonstrates that the majority (68%) of academic criminal justice programs and state departments of corrections are involved in cooperative relationships; that both academic and corrections program administrators

believe that current interactions should develop and expand; that these cooperative relationships are valued by those who are actively involved; and that barriers examined in this study are not significant as impediments to interaction when there is a reciprocal need for cooperative relationships.

While the extent of interaction between the two groups was shown by this study to be greater than the researcher expected, there exists opportunities for expansion of the relationship. The 24 state departments involved in cooperative programs represent only one-half of the state agencies participating in a program with a university.

The researcher holds the opinion that with academic recognition of the corrections process, the potential exists for greater local political respect and support, more resources to meet the growing demands of the state department, and an attractive environment in which to recruit and hire quality leaders from within the corrections profession. The support, resources, and talent may contribute to a more progressive and well managed correctional agency.

Advantages exist as well for the academic criminal justice program which fosters a working relationship with the field agencies. Not only does this relationship translate into greater access for research, but it enables

other areas of interaction to develop. The opportunity for faculty to be involved in the search for solutions to the prison operations problems allows greater faculty appreciation and understanding for operations and the need for future research and program involvement. An accessible correctional environment provides a laboratory for student learning which exceeds the capacity of the traditional classroom, whether this access be in the form of tours, correctional staff guest lectures, research supervised by faculty, or through internships. Relationships students develop with state administrators can be beneficial in the student's job search.

University and corrections administrators have an opportunity to shape the future of corrections theory, programs, and operations. Those who take advantage of the changing attitude toward cooperative efforts, as reflected in this study, will provide a model for the corrections industry. While our free society is locking up more of its citizens than ever before in its history, the need for a cooperative effort for theory development and problem resolution has never been greater nor has the potential existed to have as positive an impact on so many lives.

REFERENCES

- Aaronson, D. E., Kittrie N. N., Saari, D. J., & Cooper, C. S. (1977). Alternatives to Conventional Criminal Adjudication: Guidebook for Planners and Practitioners. Washington, D.C.: The American University.
- Adams, Stuart. (1975). Evaluative Research in Corrections: A Practical Guide. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Barlow, Hugh D. (1987). Introduction to Criminology. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company.
- Beto, George. (1970). Presidential Address, Proceedings of the American Correctional Association Congress. College Park, Maryland: American Correctional Association.
- Beto, George. (1989). Retired Director of Texas Department of Corrections and retired Director of Sam Houston School of Criminal Justice, Huntsville, Texas. Personal interview, August 16, 1989.
- Beto, G. and R. Marsh. (1974). "Problems in Development of an Undergraduate Criminal Justice Curriculum". Federal Probation, 38, 34-40.
- Blanchard, Robert E. (1975). Introduction to the Administration of Justice. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Breed, Alan. (1989). Retired Director National Institute of Corrections. Personal interview, August 16, 1989.
- Burnett, Cathleen. (1989). "Introduction". Older Offenders: Current Trends. Editor, Sol Chaneles. The Haworth Press, New York.
- Camp, George M. & Camp, Camille Graham. (1982). The Corrections Yearbook. South Salem, New York: Criminal Justice Institute.

- Camp, George M. & Camp, Camille Graham. (1988). The Corrections Yearbook. South Salem, New York: Criminal Justice Institute.
- Camp, George M. & Camp, Camille Graham. (1989). The Corrections Yearbook. South Salem, New York: Criminal Justice Institute.
- Camp, George M. & Camp, Camille Graham. (1984). The Corrections Yearbook. South Salem, New York: Criminal Justice Institute.
- Caplan, Nathan. (1976). "Social Research and National Policy: What Gets Used, by Whom, for What Purposes, and with What Effects?" International Social Science Journal, 28, 187-194.
- Carter, Reginald. (1971). "Client's Resistance to Negative Findings and the Latent Conservative Function of Evaluation Studies." American Sociologist, 6, 118-124.
- Conklin, John E. (1986). Criminology. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Feeley, Malcolm M. & Sarat, Austin D. (1980). The Policy Dilemma. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Felkenes, G. T. (1979). "The Criminal Justice Component in an Educational Institution". Journal of Criminal Justice, 7, 101-107.
- Gluckstern, Norma B. and Packard, Ralph W. (1977). "The Internal External Change-Agent Team: Bringing Change to a 'Closed Institution'". The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 13, 41-52.
- Goldstein, Michael S., Marcus, Alfred C. & Rausch, Nancy Perkins. (1978). The Nonutilization of Evaluation Research. Pacific Sociological Review, 21, 21-44.
- Graham, Fred P. (1980). "Criminal Justice Faces New Challenges in the 1980's." Justice Assistance News, 1, 2-14.

- Harris, Richard. (1970). Justice. New York: E. P. Dutton.
- Hinkle, Dennis E., Wiersma, William & Jurs, Stephen G. (1988). Applied Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Hoffman, Dennis E., Snell, Joel C., & Webb, Vincent J. (1976). "Insiders and Outsiders in Criminal Justice Education." Journal of Criminal Justice, 4, 57-61.
- Horowitz, Irving Louis & Katz, James Everett. (1975). Social Science and Public Policy in The United States. New York: Praeger Publishers.
- Johnson, Perry. (1989). Retired Director of Michigan State Department of Corrections. Personal interview, September 5, 1989.
- Johnson, Robert. (1986). Hard Time. New York: Brooks Cole Publishing Company.
- Kerle, K. (1978). "Criminal Justice Agent: What Community Colleges Can Do." Community College Frontiers, 6, No. 2,
- Lejins, Peter. (1983). "Educational Programs in Criminal Justice". Encyclopedia of Crime and Justice, 2, 688-691.
- Lejins, Peter. (1989). Retired Director of Criminal Justice Program, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland. Personal interview, September, 1989.
- Lorsch, Jay W. (1979). "Making Behavioral Science More Useful". Harvard Business Review, 165-180.
- Myren, R. A. (1975). "Education for Correctional Careers". Federal Probation, 39, 51-58.
- O'Leary, Vincent. (1989). President, University of New York, Albany. Telephone interview, September, 1989.
- Peak, Ken. (1985). "Correctional Research in Theory and Praxis: Political and Operational Hindrances". Criminal Justice Review, 10, 27-31.

- President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. (1967). Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.
- Quinlan, Michael. (1989). Director, Federal Bureau of Prisons. Personal interview, August 15, 1989.
- Rauch, Hardy. (1989). Director of American Correctional Association Committee on Accreditation. Personal interview, August 16, 1989.
- Reed, Amos. (1989). Retired Director of Corrections, State of Washington. Personal interview, August 16, 1989).
- Scott, Robert A. & Shore, Arnold. (1974). "Sociology and Policy Analysis", The American Sociologist, 9, 51-59.
- Scurr, David. (1989). Superintendent, Mt. Pleasant Correctional Facility, Mt. Pleasant, Iowa. Personal interview, August, 1989.
- Shover, Neal & Einstadter, Earl J. (1988). Analyzing American Corrections. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Snow, C. P. (1961). The Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Swart, S. L. (1978). "Correctional Education an Illegitimate Child in Search of Legitimacy". Proceedings of the One Hundred and Eighth Annual Congress of Corrections of the American Correctional Association. College Park, Maryland: American Correctional Association.
- The Research Center of The American Correctional Association and Its Affiliate Organizations. (1989). Unpublished manuscript. Baltimore, MD: American Correctional Association.
- Thomas, Charles W. (1987). Corrections in America. Vol. 7. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Travisano, Anthony. (1989a). Executive Secretary of American Correctional Association. Personal interview, September 13, 1989.

- Travisano, Anthony. (1989b). The Research Center of The American Correctional Association and its Affiliate Organizations. Unpublished Manuscript, American Correctional Association, Baltimore, Maryland.
- Unnithan, N. Pirabha. (1986). "Research In A Correctional Setting: Constraints and Biases". Journal of Criminal Justice, 14, 401-412.
- Vital Statistics in Corrections. (1989). Baltimore, Maryland: American Correctional Association.
- Webb, Vincent J. (1989). Professor, Criminal Justice, University Nebraska, Omaha. Telephone interview, August, 1989.
- Weiss, Carol H. & Bucuvalas, Michael J. (1980). "Truth Tests and Utility Tests: Decision-Makers' Frames of Reference For Social Science Research". American Sociological Review, 45, 302-313.
- Wertz, Janis M. (1978). The Accused Student and Student Offender: Criteria of a Policy Framework for The University. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Boston, Massachusetts.
- Woodard, Paul. (1973). Lecture on the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, Tape, Media Center, Iowa State University Library, Ames, Iowa.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I extend sincere appreciation to those faculty and friends who provided me with the essential support and assistance during the course of this study. Dr. George Beto and Dr. Peter Lejin who stressed the importance of, and need for, the study. Dr. Larry Ebbers guided me throughout my doctoral studies and was instrumental in the completion of the study. Dr. Anthony Netusil provided direction, clarification, and guidance through the statistical content of the study. Dr. Daniel Robinson, Dr. Thomas Thielen, and Dr. Ronald Simons all provided ideas, suggestions, and guidance which helped to strengthen the final outcomes. Dr. Dean Wright, a friend and confidant for many years continued to provide encouragement and a sounding block for imagination needed to continue to pursue and engage in the essential activities to complete the program. I acknowledge and appreciate the genuine interest and effort put forth by each of you which resulted in the past two and one-half years being a most enjoyable and memorable period of my life.

The completion of this dissertation represents an accomplishment and sacrifices beyond my own. My family's willingness to forego nearly three years of stable income

in order for me to pursue an educational dream, has been truly heart-warming. Kay, my wife, along with Andy and Matt, our children, have been a continuing source of strength and joy. They have my deepest respect and gratitude, and my commitment toward providing an even more rewarding future.

A special thanks to Jesse, whose continued support and encouragement was, as usual, more appreciated than she will ever know. Everyone should have a mother-in-law like Jesse.

Finally, I dedicate this effort to the memory of my father whose greatest ambition was to attend college but was instead called upon to support his brothers and sisters during a period of his own father's ill health. He was strongly committed to a dream that his son would have an opportunity to attend a higher education institution. And to my mother, who has always, and continues to provide emotional support and strength for our entire family.

APPENDIX A - SURVEY INSTRUMENT

1. Does your corrections (criminal justice) department have a cooperative arrangement with a criminal justice (corrections) program in which there has been an effort to: (Please check all that apply)

_____ CONDUCT RESEARCH

_____ DEVELOP INMATE PROGRAMS

_____ TRAIN STAFF

_____ OTHER (PLEASE LIST) _____

_____ NONE (IF YOUR RESPONSE TO QUESTION 1 WAS "NONE" SKIP TO QUESTION 3, OTHERWISE CONTINUE)

2. Which agency initiated (led) the cooperative arrangement?

CORRECTIONS___ UNIVERSITY___ MUTUALLY___ DON'T KNOW___

3. Has your department attempted to develop cooperative programs?

YES _____ NO _____ DON'T KNOW _____

4. In your opinion, how would you rate the value of a cooperative relationship between the state department of corrections and a criminal justice program at a university? (Circle one number)

LOW		MODERATE		HIGH		NO OPINION
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
						8

5. The following are factors which might serve to promote joint efforts of cooperation between the two agencies. Please designate the condition you believe to be the most important by placing a number one (1) beside the condition, and a number five (5) beside the least important condition.

_____ GEOGRAPHIC PROXIMITY

_____ MANDATE FROM THE LEGISLATURE OR GOVERNING BODY

_____ A RECIPROCAL NEED FOR A SERVICE/EDUCATIONAL RELATIONSHIP

_____ THE MESHING OF PERSONALITIES OF THE LEADERSHIP OF THE TWO AGENCIES

_____ THE SHARING OF SKILLS AND KNOWLEDGE

_____ OTHER (PLEASE LIST) _____

6. The following are factors (barriers) which might prevent joint efforts between the two agencies. Please designate the factor you believe to be the most serious barrier by entering a number one (1) in the blank, and a number five (5) beside the least serious factor (barrier).

_____ PERSONALITIES
 _____ GEOGRAPHICAL PROXIMITY
 _____ LACK OF TRUST
 _____ LACK OF INTEREST BY FACULTY (UNIVERSITY)
 _____ LACK OF INTEREST BY CORRECTIONS ADMINISTRATORS
 _____ OTHER (PLEASE LIST) _____

7. How would you rate the applicability to daily operations of research efforts by criminal justice faculty? (Circle one number)

LOW	MODERATE			HIGH	NO OPINION		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8

8. How important is it that research efforts be applicable to operations? (Circle one number)

LOW	MODERATE			HIGH	NO OPINION		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8

9. How many university research projects were approved to begin in the department of corrections within the last 12 months? (Circle one number)

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 or more

10. How many university directed research projects studying the prison were completed within the last 12 months? (Circle one number)

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 or more

11. To what level of access to the prisons are faculty allowed? (Circle one number)

LOW	MODERATE			HIGH	NO OPINION		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8

12. To what extent is access to the prisons encouraged?
(Circle one number)

LOW	MODERATE			HIGH	NO OPINION		
<u>1</u>	2	3	4	5	6	7	<u>8</u>

13. If university proposed research projects were declined in the past 12 months, please list the reasons for denial. If none were denied, check "NONE".

NONE _____

14. If university faculty are contracted to conduct research in a prison, please provide, from your perspective, the value of researching each of the areas listed from (A) through (F). (Circle one number for each area)

(A) Demographics and prisoner population projections

LOW	MODERATE			HIGH	NO OPINION		
<u>1</u>	2	3	4	5	6	7	<u>8</u>

(B) Inmate Programs (e.g., counseling programs)

LOW	MODERATE			HIGH	NO OPINION		
<u>1</u>	2	3	4	5	6	7	<u>8</u>

(C) Prison Management (e.g., styles of management)

LOW	MODERATE			HIGH	NO OPINION		
<u>1</u>	2	3	4	5	6	7	<u>8</u>

(D) Innovations (e.g., new electronic monitoring)

LOW	MODERATE			HIGH	NO OPINION		
<u>1</u>	2	3	4	5	6	7	<u>8</u>

(E) Classification Systems (e.g., security levels)

LOW	MODERATE			HIGH	NO OPINION		
<u>1</u>	2	3	4	5	6	7	<u>8</u>

(F) Inmate Behavior (e.g., assaults against staff)

LOW	MODERATE			HIGH	NO OPINION		
<u>1</u>	2	3	4	5	6	7	<u>8</u>

15. To what degree is there a sharing of personnel between agencies to provide in-service education for corrections staff? (Circle one number)

LOW		MODERATE		HIGH		NONE
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
						8

IF YOUR RESPONSE TO QUESTION 15 WAS (8) NONE, SKIP TO QUESTION 19, OTHERWISE CONTINUE.

16. Does this shared effort to provide correctional staff training involve: (check those which apply)

CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS
 COUNSELORS
 MIDDLE MANAGERS
 ADMINISTRATORS

17. To what measure are faculty involved in the Training Academy curriculum planning and development?

LOW		MODERATE		HIGH		NONE
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
						8

18. To what measure should faculty be involved? (Circle one number)

LOW		MODERATE		HIGH		NONE
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
						8

19. Does the criminal justice program offer college level courses at a field location (prison)? (Check one)

YES NO NOT SURE

20. Should college level courses be offered at a field location (prison)? (Check one)

YES NO NOT SURE

21. Does the department of corrections provide salary and expenses for select staff to attend college? (Check one)

YES (FULL) YES (PARTIAL) NO

22. Should the department provide salary and expenses for select staff to attend college? (Check one)

YES (FULL) YES (PARTIAL) NO

23. Does the department of corrections provide tuition payments for select staff to attend a criminal justice program?

YES (FULL) _____ YES (PARTIAL) _____ NO _____

24. Should the department of corrections provide tuition payments for select staff to attend a criminal justice program? (Check one)

YES (FULL) _____ YES (PARTIAL) _____ NO _____

25. To what frequency does criminal justice faculty become involved in the inmate program planning? (Circle one number)

LOW		MODERATE		HIGH		NONE
<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
						<u>8</u>

26. To what extent should faculty be involved in program planning? (Circle one number)

LOW		MODERATE		HIGH		NONE
<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
						<u>8</u>

27. At what level of activity does the state department of corrections recruit and hire graduates of the state criminal justice education program(s)? (Circle one number)

LOW		MODERATE		HIGH		NONE
<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
						<u>8</u>

28. Please provide the following information for your department. (Please use numbers)

- (a) Number of employees in your department _____
 (b) Number of students (or inmates) _____
 (c) Number of minority employees _____
 (d) Number of female employees _____
 (e) Number of years experience of department director in criminal justice or corrections _____

29. Please make any other comments you believe would add to the understanding of cooperative arrangements between these two agencies. (Answer on next page)

Please use the space below to make any comments relative to question number 29.

I greatly appreciate the time you have taken to complete this questionnaire. Postage for the questionnaire is prepaid, so all you need to do is tape it and drop it in the mail. Thank you.

APPENDIX B - INITIAL COVER LETTER

August 21, 1989

Dear Colleague:

While it is not uncommon that higher education programs in medicine, social work, psychology, and sociology participate in cooperative arrangements with state departments of corrections to plan and deliver services, little is known about the interaction of programs in criminal justice with corrections agencies. The cooperative efforts of these two rapidly growing agencies, explore the potential for cooperative programs, and determine the factors that present either a barrier or promote future cooperative efforts.

This survey will focus on three areas of relationships between corrections agencies and criminal justice programs of higher education including research, staff development, and program development. I am particularly desirous of obtaining your response because of your experience as a leader in the criminal justice field places you in the unique position of being one of the most knowledgeable person in America on these issues.

I fully appreciate your busy schedule and the enclosed instrument has been tested with a sampling of university faculty and corrections administrators regarding content and imposes upon a minimum of your time. The average time required to complete this survey was 6 1/2 minutes.

It will be greatly appreciated if you will complete the survey by September 28, 1989, tape, and drop this postage prepaid questionnaire in the mail. Be assured your response will be confidential. Only aggregated data will be examined or shared with others.

Thank you for your responsiveness and assistance.

Sincerely,

Hal Farrier

APPENDIX C - REMINDER POSTCARD

October 9, 1989

Dear Department Chair,

Approximately four weeks ago you received a self addressed questionnaire with return postage concerning the measurement of interaction between criminal justice higher education and corrections. It would be appreciated if you would, in the next 2 or 3 days, complete the questionnaire, tape it, and drop it in the mail. Thank you if you have already done so.

Should you wish, I will forward another questionnaire. My phone number is (515) 292-4449. Thank you for your time and assistance.

Sincerely,

Hal Farrier

APPENDIX D - FINAL REMINDER LETTER

October 23, 1989

Dear Department Chair,

You recently received a questionnaire from the Iowa State University College of Education seeking your views on the interaction between departments of criminal justice higher education and state departments of correctional services. If you have mailed it recently, I want you to know that your participation is appreciated.

If you have not mailed your questionnaire, I am requesting you to complete the enclosed questionnaire, tape it closed, and drop it in a mailbox.

I have had a very good completion record and return rate on the questionnaire, and would like very much to have your response included in the tabulation.

Thank you very much for your participation and assistance in the study.

Sincerely,

Hal Farrier

Enclosure