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Abstract of Dissertation

Purpose: The purpose of this study was to investigate the perceptions of California police practitioners and post-secondary law enforcement educators regarding current and future curriculum issues. Through this method, a new core curriculum model was developed. Additionally, the study investigated which philosophical orientation should be used in the future to teach law enforcement courses at the post-secondary level.

Procedures: The sample population of police practitioners, included 380 officers from 15 California police agencies. Also, 23 educators from California State Universities, who offer a law enforcement major leading to a bachelor's degree, were sampled. A modified mail survey, with a researcher designed questionnaire was used. Respondents were asked to rate a list of courses and philosophical orientations as to the importance of each, currently and for the future. Descriptive information and differences between the groups' perceptions were determined using means, frequency distributions, and two-way analyses of variance.

Findings: The findings indicated that while police and educators do agree on the level of importance for a number of courses, currently and for the future, there were also a large number (43 percent) of courses where there were strong practical disagreements over the level of course importance. A statistically significant difference was found in 37 percent of the courses when comparing group means. However, there was strong agreement between police and educators as to the future philosophical orientation that should be used to teach law enforcement courses in the future.

Recommendations: (1) Core courses for police should be standardized among institutions. (2) Studies should be conducted to determine future societal changes and their impact on the police so that courses are developed to meet these needs. (3) Police should have more input into post-secondary curriculum issues. (4) Curriculum development in the future should be based on police and educators' perceptions, future trends, criminal justice system areas of concern, and the need to raise academic standards. (5) A study should be conducted to determine means by which police and educators can cooperate to solve educational problems.
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Higher education in society has long been held in high esteem by many Americans. Throughout our history, higher education has played an important role as a major contributing factor to the many accomplishments that have made America one of the leading nations in the world.¹

Today, the concept of higher education for law enforcement personnel has attained widespread acceptance. Roberg observed, "More and more agencies throughout the country are raising their standards requiring higher education as a condition of employment."² Upgrading the educational level of law enforcement is one of the most important challenges facing the police today.³ Higher education tends to be viewed positively by those in law enforcement because of the current need to professionalize and improve the variety of services now provided. Whisenand, in his article on the relationship between education and professionalization, stated:


In effect, the police are currently confronted by social problems of such complexity and magnitude that it takes a professional officer to effectively cope with them. It can be said, therefore, that a post-secondary education designed to produce a professional police officer is a societal demand and not one of our own contrivance.4

Despite the general acceptance for law enforcement higher education within the past decade, a substantial controversy has developed regarding the content, quality and future direction of this education.5 At the heart of this debate is the question of what core curriculum content and philosophical orientation is best suited to meet the present and future needs of law enforcement personnel.6 This question remains unanswered because of the lack of research and agreement on a model core law enforcement curriculum.7 As a result, law enforcement educational


leaders have lacked the necessary data to make a
determination regarding the future core curriculum content
and philosophical orientation for four year post-secondary
law enforcement education.

Given the importance of this issue, it is vital that
research be conducted to determine the views of both law
enforcement educators and police practitioners regarding
core curriculum content and philosophical orientation in
order to develop an effective instructional model. The
ultimate goal is to improve the quality of post-secondary
education for law enforcement personnel.

THE PROBLEM

Researchers have approached the development of an
appropriate law enforcement core curriculum from different
perspectives emphasizing current skills, knowledge, and/or
concepts. However, little has been done to determine the
perceptions that educators and police practitioners have
regarding the future needs for a law enforcement core
curriculum. This information can be used to develop a model
that satisfies the perceived needs of these two groups as
they consider the future role of law enforcement. Past
curriculum development has generally failed to take into
consideration the perceptions of police practitioners as to
the future relevancy of courses and to compare this
information with the educator's perspective. The problem of this study was to develop a model post-secondary core curriculum for California law enforcement personnel.

Purpose of the Study

The study investigated the perceptions of California law enforcement educators and police practitioners regarding current and future curriculum issues. The major purpose of the study was to develop a new core curriculum model which incorporates those courses that law enforcement educators and practitioners consider most important for a four year post-secondary law enforcement program. Specifically, the study attempted to answer the following questions:

1. What are the courses currently offered by California State Universities that have a four year law enforcement program?
2. What core courses are currently considered most important by law enforcement educators?
3. What core courses are currently considered most important by law enforcement practitioners?
4. Is there a significant difference between the perception of law enforcement educators and law enforcement practitioners with regard to the importance of current courses?
5. What core courses are considered most important in the future by law enforcement educators?
6. What core courses are considered most important in the future by law enforcement practitioners?
7. Is there a significant difference between the perceptions of law enforcement educators and law enforcement practitioners with regard to the importance of courses for the future?
8. What philosophical orientation do law enforcement educators believe should guide the core curriculum in the future?
9. What philosophical orientation do law enforcement practitioners believe should guide the core curriculum in the future?
10. Is there a significant difference between law enforcement educators and law enforcement practitioners with regard to the philosophical orientation of future programs?

Ancillary questions that were answered by this study include the following:

1. To what extent do course offerings differ among California State Universities that have a four year law enforcement program?
2. What is the educational background and work experience of educators and law enforcement practitioners?
Delimitations

This study was limited to a random sample of law enforcement personnel in California who are employed full-time by a Sheriff's department or municipal police department. Law enforcement educators were limited to those instructors who were teaching full-time at a California State University and whose primary responsibility is in the area of law enforcement. This area was further limited to those educators who teach in a four year program leading to a bachelor's degree that emphasizes law enforcement.

Definition of Terms

Core Curriculum - Those courses offered in a particular field of study that are required and/or are considered to be most essential.

Curriculum - Aggregate of all courses given in a particular field of study.8

Education - The process of imparting or acquiring general knowledge and developing the powers of reasoning or judgement.9

Model - A general representation to show the structure of that which has been developed.10

9 Ibid.
10 Ibid.
Philosophical Orientation - Philosophical orientation gives meaning and direction to our actions\(^\text{11}\) and influences the organization of the subject matter and methods of instruction.\(^\text{12}\) In this study, philosophical orientation is reflected in the objectives and purposes of instruction used to teach law enforcement curriculum.

Police or Law Enforcement Practitioners - Any sworn peace officer of the state who is responsible for enforcing the law and included within California Penal Code, Section 830.1.

Law Enforcement Educator - Post-secondary instructors who teach fulltime at a four year institution and whose primary responsibility is in the area of law enforcement.


\(^\text{12}\) Tanner and Tanner, pp. 87-89.
PROCEDURES

Sample Description

The sample population surveyed consisted of all law enforcement educators at California State University institutions and a random sample of California law enforcement practitioners. In order to accurately reflect the population of California law enforcement practitioners (44,885 officers), employment data and number/size of departments was obtained from the California Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST). From this list, a stratified random sample of departments was drawn. This was accomplished by classifying each of the law enforcement departments into five categories by the number of personnel they employ which was obtained from POST: 500 and over; 300 - 499; 100 - 299; 50 - 99; 1 - 49. Then, using a table of random numbers and a table for determining sample size (380 law enforcement practitioners) from a given population, a sample was selected which was proportional to the population.

Research Methodology

The literature in the field of law enforcement education and curriculum was reviewed. Additionally, college catalogues of California State Universities which offer a four year bachelor's degree with a major or strong emphasis on law enforcement were reviewed. From this review it was possible to determine current courses which are offered, philosophical orientations and future courses which are suggested for law enforcement post-secondary education. With this information, a questionnaire using a Likert-type response scale was constructed to derive information regarding the perceptions of respondents. The Likert-type response scale consisted of four degrees: unimportant, somewhat important, important, very important (see Appendix A). Each degree was given a point value (1, 2, 3, 4) which was used to determine those courses which were perceived to be the most important and thus form the basis for the model core curriculum. Individuals surveyed were asked to choose the level of importance for both "current" and "future" core courses. Also, individuals were asked to choose the level of importance for the "future" of each item dealing with philosophical orientation.
Data Collection Procedures

The survey (see Appendix A) was mailed to all law enforcement educators at California State Universities. A cover letter was used to briefly explain the purpose of the survey and study. A stamped, preaddressed return envelope for easy return of the completed survey was enclosed. A period of seven days from the time of mailing was given for the surveys to be returned. After that time, all those who failed to return the survey were contacted by telephone. For law enforcement practitioners, a training officer from each selected department was used to administer, collect and return the surveys. Each department was contacted by telephone to determine who the training officer was. A completion date was given and a stamped preaddressed return envelope for easy mailing was sent for return of the survey. Follow-up procedures were identical to those used for educators.

Instrument Validation

In order to establish content validity, the survey was submitted to a panel of four experts: Two educators and two law enforcement practitioners as well as the dissertation committee. Comments and suggestions from the panel were then incorporated into the questionnaire.
Statistical Analysis

On question one and ancillary question one, a chart was used to describe current courses offered by selected institutions and how the courses differ among institutions. For proposal questions two, three, five, six, eight, and nine, descriptive statistics were utilized to determine mean responses relative to the degree of perceived importance. From this, a ranking of importance was developed. For proposal questions four, seven, and ten, inferential statistics were employed using Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) to determine the differences between groups. In ancillary question two, descriptive statistics were used to identify the educational background and work experience of educators and practitioners. All statistical analyses were conducted utilizing the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS).

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

Because of the apparent lack of consensus among educators and the police practitioners as to the appropriate core curriculum model for law enforcement, it was important to establish a clear idea of their perspectives. Past research has analyzed tasks and skills, but only in the existing context and no consideration was given to future needs.
This study allowed for an identification of current perspectives and takes an important step forward in assessing future perspectives. The results of the study were valuable in developing a model core curriculum that incorporates those areas deemed to be most important by educators and law enforcement practitioners.

**Organization of the Remainder of the Study**

To complete this study four additional chapters were used. In chapter two a review of the related literature is presented. The chapter consists of an overview of historical events, research performed to determine the impact of post-secondary law enforcement education and curriculum issues. Chapter three consists of survey development, sample selection, and procedures for data gathering, and statistical analyses. Chapter four provides an analysis and discussion of the collected data, as well as statistical results. In chapter five the summary, conclusions, and recommendations for further study is presented.
Chapter 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Historical Overview of Post-Secondary Education for Law Enforcement Personnel

A history of law enforcement education, written by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, suggests that the need to improve the educational level and standards of law enforcement was recognized as early as 1891.\(^1\) Although police leaders of the time (1890-1910) correctly forecast the need for education to improve the quality of law enforcement services, the majority of police advocates were more concerned with other attributes such as bravery, physical size, agility, and independent decision-making.\(^2\) Early efforts to improve law enforcement personnel focused on training, not education. The International Association of Chiefs of Police formed in 1891 as the National Chiefs of Police Union, expanded its area of concern to include police training and thus became early proponents of police improvement through knowledge.\(^3\) These early efforts to increase the level of police education began to develop into recognized training and educational programs in the early 1900's.


\(^2\)Donald C. Dilworth, ed., The Blue and the Brass (Gaithersburg, Maryland: International Association of Chiefs of Police, 1976), p. 33.

\(^3\)Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, p. 21.
Development of Post-Secondary Programs in the U.S.

Today's educational programs for law enforcement personnel are the result of an evolutionary process which began with the establishment of formal training programs in 1908. August Vollmer is credited with the implementation of the first such training school in Berkeley, California in 1908. Although this effort was on a small scale, it began a trend toward the founding of a higher education degree program for police officers. In 1909, the New York City Police Department also began to operate its first formal training academy and although the New York City Police Department Academy became a model for formal training, Vollmer's program steadily evolved into a model post-secondary program and in 1916 moved to the University of California at Berkeley. Eastman and McCain noted that this move was the first official recognition of police higher education cooperation.

---


at a time when little thought was given to formally educating the nation's law enforcement corps at the post-secondary level. He expressed the philosophy that educational requirements for police officers should be raised to the standards of other professions.

In 1923, the first Berkeley police officer to graduate from the University of California, Berkeley received a bachelor's degree in Economics with a minor in Criminology. Gammage pointed out that this marked the first time that a recognized institution had granted credit for police courses in a degree program.

Between 1920 and 1930, only sporadic progress was made in developing higher educational programs for the police. However, again Vollmer was in the forefront of the police education movement. He assisted in establishing a program at the University of Southern California (USC), which by 1928 had developed into a regular academic subject area within the Department of Public Administration. This program, today, is one of the most enduring and successful

---


9Gammage, p. 63.
in the nation.\textsuperscript{10} Other police education programs which Vollmer helped establish included the University of Chicago in 1929, and San Jose State College in 1930.\textsuperscript{11} During the same period, Michigan State University, Indiana University, and Washington State University all developed post-secondary programs for police personnel and are still in operation.\textsuperscript{12}

Beginning in 1930, law enforcement received a steady increase of college matriculated personnel, largely due to the depression, which caused severe economic conditions. While this influx of college educated police personnel was not due to police higher education, it assisted in stimulating an appreciation for those who had earned a college degree.\textsuperscript{13} A second significant event of this period occurred in 1931 when the National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, (Wickersham commission), issued its report which encouraged higher education for the police system as a means to upgrade the quality of personnel and

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{10}Eastman and McCain, pp. 123-124.
  \item \textsuperscript{11}Gammage, pp. 64-66.
\end{itemize}
improve performance.\textsuperscript{14} The commission felt that if law enforcement were to improve the quality of personnel and thus service, they would need educated officers. The commission stated, "the greatest promise for the future of policing is the college or university."\textsuperscript{15}

In the 1940's, a significant number of World War II veterans returned home to find jobs difficult to acquire. Many of these veterans held a college degree and took law enforcement positions as a last resort.\textsuperscript{16} During this time the number of degree programs for law enforcement personnel grew considerably throughout the United States. This was also a time of renewed awareness and interest in the content and quality of such programs.\textsuperscript{17}

A major directional and qualitative change occurred in the 1950's. Several states, including California and New York, established training standards for police, for the first time. A second major theme of this era was the drive by officers to upgrade and professionalize the policing occupation. The effect of these two forces, along with the


\textsuperscript{15}National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, p. 139.

\textsuperscript{16}Carter, p. 10.

\textsuperscript{17}David A. Farris, "Five Decades of American Policing 1932-1982," The Police Chief, 49 (November 1982), 32.
growing realization of the need for higher education for all individuals after the Soviet launching of Sputnik in 1957, resulted in the recognition of education as a predominate tool to improve police service.\textsuperscript{18} The significance of these factors can be observed in the number of college and university programs developed for the police during this period and the number of baccalaureate degrees granted. The International Association of Chiefs of Police stated that from 1916 to 1950 only 104 baccalaureate degrees had been granted by police science programs in the United States. However, from the early 1950's to 1958, approximately 258 bachelor's degrees and 17 master's degrees had been granted.\textsuperscript{19}

No calculated emphasis was placed on higher education for all law enforcement personnel until the 1960's. Because of the societal turmoil in the 1960's and the police system's inability to cope with the divergent issues, the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice recommended that all police personnel have the equivalent of a college education.\textsuperscript{20}

\textsuperscript{18}Farris; p. 34.


Wilson pointed out that as a result of the Commission's report and other factors, Congress passed the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act in 1968. The Act created the Law Enforcement Education Program (LEEP) which was designed to defer college costs for those who were involved in or pursuing a career in the criminal justice field. The Act also provided funds to institutions of higher education to develop degree-related curricula.

By the 1970's, higher education for law enforcement became an "active ingredient in the career development of many departments." Higher education developed, for the first time, a widespread base of support throughout the United States. Although the figures of institutions granting degrees in the criminal justice field and the number of personnel involved are somewhat conflicting, there is general consensus that by 1970, over 292 colleges and universities offered criminal justice programs. By 1972, this had increased to approximately 515; and by 1976, over 1,200 programs were available. This trend continued, with the number of criminal justice programs at the post-secondary level growing to over 1,600 by 1978. It is

---


23 Farris, p. 36.
interesting to note that the number of officers who had completed a year or more of college in 1960 was approximately 54,000 and that by 1974 over 205,000 or 46 percent of the nation’s officers had completed a year or more of college.24

Because of the rapid expansion in the number of higher education institutions which offered law enforcement courses, core curriculum for these programs were often poorly designed. By the mid-1970's, many law enforcement educational programs were being criticized for their failure to adequately provide quality instruction with a curriculum that would meet the needs of police personnel. Although higher education for police personnel has gained an accepted status in academic terms and in the policing profession, the debate over curriculum content and future direction persists.25 Adding to this debate, remains the fact that there is no recognized accreditation agency for law


enforcement or criminal justice post-secondary educational programs.

The major historical factor increasing the level of higher education for law enforcement appears to emerge from the federal government. The governments' forceful recommendations and vast injection of funds into higher education, contributed to the proliferation of ill-defined programs that many feel have failed to meet the needs of the police. Over the past decade this controversy, regarding the rapid growth of law enforcement education, has grown as can be witnessed by the release of The Quality of Police Education report in 1978 and the subsequent criticism. Despite the causes of the current controversy, Sherman essentially argues that the present and future direction and quality of higher education for police officers, depends upon the development of relevant and applicable curriculum.

Federal Impetus For Post-Secondary Education

The federal government has a long history of involvement with education in general. Early legislation to support educational development included the Northwest

26Sherman, pp. ix-xv.
27Salten, pp. 22-26.
28Sherman, pp. 61-67.
Ordinance of 1787 and the Morrill Act in 1862.\textsuperscript{29}

Additionally, the government provided a number of legislative initiatives, such as the Smith Hughes Act in 1917,\textsuperscript{30} the National Defense Education Act in 1958,\textsuperscript{31} and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.\textsuperscript{32} As the importance of federal educational funds to the states grew, a separate Department of Education was instituted by President Carter.\textsuperscript{33} Just as the federal government has been instrumental in making recommendations and providing funds for general education, the government has also taken, at times, an active role in higher education and training for the police system.

The National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, known as the Wickersham Commission, presented a detailed report on the state of law enforcement in America. The report stressed the need for officers to receive a college education/training in order to enhance their effectiveness. The report indicated that minimum training

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{30}Tiedt, p. 23.
\item \textsuperscript{32}Tiedt, pp. 197-198.
\item \textsuperscript{33}Roald F. Campbell et. al., \textit{The Organization and Control of American Schools} (Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1980), p. 35.
\end{itemize}
standards for the police should be adjusted and recommended a curriculum in police science for a two year associate's degree.34 The importance of the report included the fact that for the first time the need for law enforcement personnel to be trained and educated was brought before the public.

While the Wickersham Commission brought the need for educating police to the forefront, it was not until 1965 that the federal government became involved in any significant manner in this area. President Johnson formed the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice. From the recommendations of the Commission's report, the Office of Law Enforcement Assistance, predecessor to the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, was formed.35 In addition, Congress passed the Law Enforcement Assistant Act in 1965. The act provided over 21.9 million dollars in funds for upgrading police services, with approximately 12 million dollars allocated for training.36

Further federal involvement was provided in 1967 by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the

________________________
34National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, pp.136-139.
35Farris, p. 35.
Administration of Justice. The Commission concluded that the goal of police agencies should be to have all personnel, with enforcement power, possess a bachelor's degree. This Commission proceeded one step further than previous commissions and recommended that all supervisory and executive positions require a baccalaureate degree.37

The major recommendations of the Commission's report resulted in Congress passing the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act (Public Law 90-351) which established the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA). LEAA set up the Law Enforcement Education Program which funded grants and loans to criminal justice students for tuition, books, and materials.38 The impact of LEEP was a significant contribution to the number of institutions offering degrees to law enforcement personnel and the number of officers who took advantage of the Government's generous offer. From 1969 to 1977, LEEP provided over 270 million dollars which funded over 528,000 man years of higher education.39

---


In 1973, the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals (NAC) issued its report which strongly criticized the law enforcement profession for its failure to raise educational requirements for police officers as had been recommended by the President's Commission in 1967. The NAC further recommended that by 1983, every police agency should require a baccalaureate degree as an entrance requirement. The NAC was the first commission to suggest that law enforcement agencies provide incentive pay to police officers to encourage them to pursue a college education.40

The Controversy Over Post-Secondary Education

There has been an ongoing controversy over the benefits and characteristics of higher education for law enforcement.41 Broderick stated, "For at least the past generation, education in law enforcement and debate about the quality of that education have increased in volume."42 Fischer proceeded to point out that the current controversy involves, but is not limited to, three specific aspects. First, do the police need a college degree? Second, does

42Broderick, p. 37.
having a college degree increase the work quality of the officer? And third, what type of degree is best, psychology, sociology, criminal justice?43

The controversy, as pointed out by Fischer, is not limited to these questions. There has also developed a philosophical debate over the direction and characteristics of post-secondary education programs for law enforcement personnel. Individuals in the policing occupation and educators have tended to shape this controversy in two divergent perspectives. First, there exists the traditionalist approach which views formal education as beyond the scope necessary to perform the tasks of a police officer. Thus, they believe it is of little practical value. Traditionalists prefer hands-on job training that relates practical skills to the demands of the job. The opposite view is expressed by reformers, who believe that officers need to be well grounded in theory through education. They feel this approach provides the officer with a firm background in order to develop alternative solutions to complex problems that officers must deal with.44

A number of authors have asserted that a major starting point of the police education controversy revolves around the quality of curriculum, instructors and applicability of courses. This development has followed

43Fischer, p. 313.

44Broderick, p. 37.
historical lines, which started as a result of the rapid influx of federal money into law enforcement education. The haphazard and often negligent manner in which institutions developed their programs, hired unqualified instructors, and substituted quantity for quality, has resulted in what many feel has been a continuing lack of quality education for the police.45

Others, such as former Philadelphia Police Chief and then Mayor Frank Rizzo, have stated their objections to police education bluntly. They argue that officers need only skills, not education.46 Many traditionalists feel that the quality of "common sense" is the basis for all police action and that it cannot be taught in a college. Because of these negative views, some have questioned the value and applicability of a college education for law enforcement personnel considering the high cost and perceived small benefit.47


The controversy over the quality of police education has lead many police practitioners to complain that higher education institutions tend to be isolated from the realities of the outside world. This isolation has caused practitioners to feel that "ivory tower" professors have done little to advance the development of quality in police education.48 This, along with the rapid development of educational programs, has lead some observers to argue that college and universities have maintained poor academic standards for law enforcement programs. Franks stated that this has led to the "reinforcement of mediocrity, rather than demand for superiority."49

A number of authors have stated that a college education for officers may in fact have a negative effect upon the ability of officers. Justification for this position rests upon several assumptions. First, a college educated officer, because of the traditional middle-class values reflected in the academic setting, may find it difficult to deal with and understand the issues and problems of lower socio-economic groups. Secondly, a college educated officer will tend to feel the job holds little attraction because of its often routine, unpleasant tasks and life threatening environment.

48Erikson and Neary, p. 39.

The college educated officer's sense of creativity and independence may be degraded because of the rigid, para-military organization that tends to demand unquestioned sacrifice and loyalty. Because of these characteristics, the college educated officer may be forced out of the occupation to seek employment that will appreciate and use this education.50

On the opposite end of the spectrum, there are numerous practitioners and educators who feel that a police system staffed by non-college educated officers would greatly detract from the system's ability to provide progressive, quality service. Hudzik insists that higher education provides a positive impact that develops future benefits. He feels that education acts to reduce authoritarian tendencies; assists the individual to be more innovative and resourceful and creates increased behavioral flexibility.51 Taft in conducting a number of interviews with police officers stated:

...they overwhelmingly believe that college study makes a better officer. The 'college cop' has demonstrated discipline, desire, and intellectual curiosity, they say. He or she has been exposed to new ideas and


51Hudzik, p. 70.
different types of people. It follows, they argue, that such officers think and perform better on the street or during an investigation than a less-educated officer.52

Both Shenkman and Lynch tend to agree that officers should have been exposed to a college education. They feel that education allows the officer to understand the inter-relationship of criminal justice system components, as well as societal demands that often determine the direction of the system. The educational experience additionally provides the officer an opportunity to develop personal associations outside the occupation. This tends to be important for the officer, for it allows him to break-away from the rigid attitudes and misconceptions of the police subculture.53

A number of characteristics have been attributed to the positive aspects of education. Officers who are college educated are more capable of dealing with a wide variety of people through increased understanding of cultural/behavior differences. Their ability to make sound decisions are increased, for they tend to possess cognitive maturity. Self-discipline has been inferred through the completion of

52Taft, p. 12.

a baccalaureate degree and the individual has demonstrated reading and writing skills.54

In 1978, The National Advisory Commission on Higher Education for Police Officers released its report "The Quality of Police Education." The Commission was initially formed to "assess the purpose and future of higher education for police officers,"55 and its report was extremely critical of the past and present methods of providing such education.56 The report had the effect of bringing the controversy to the attention of the public and by doing so created a new round of debate over the quality, benefits and delivery of police education.57

While the literature is replete with arguments both for and against higher education for police, several recent studies have pointed to the fact that practitioners and nonpolice alike feel that a college education is a desired


56Sherman, pp. 61-116.

benefit for police service. Bonzelet, in a study of police chiefs in the state of Arizona, found that the majority of chiefs felt that a college educated officer was superior to a non-college officer and believed that the future educational level of officers should include post-secondary education. A second unique study conducted by Powell, measured the attitude toward the need for higher education for law enforcement personnel. Those surveyed included police supervisors, educators, non-criminal justice educators and citizens. The results showed that all groups believed there was a need for higher education for law enforcement and felt that this education had a positive effect on the quality of police service.

As can be seen through the literature, there are strong arguments both for and against higher education for the police. These attitudes toward education have fairly deep roots in historical perspective and the benefits and quality of education for police is debated to this day.

Traditional law enforcement post-secondary education programs have grown out of the need to provide police officers with new or improved skills that can be directly


applied to the job. However, in review of the related literature, conflict has developed between this view and the belief by many educators that police personnel need far more than just vocational skills. This debate over the type of post-secondary education law enforcement personnel should obtain can be viewed as a transitional state in which future direction and quality are being developed.

Effects of Education on Law Enforcement Personnel

A multitude of opinions regarding higher education for law enforcement can be found in the literature. A number of government commissions have recommended higher educational standards for the police. With this in mind, researchers have examined the effect higher education has on police personnel. Swanson gives ample cause for the strong need to examine the research when he stated. "The literature on police education is extensive, but often appears bent on sustaining the notion that education for the police is good, rather than on offering empirical evidence that has been dispassionately analyzed."

Because the current debate over post-secondary education for law enforcement personnel has centered on

opinions, rather than on research, there is a strong need to review research that offers a more precise measure of the impact and direction of police education and its implication for curriculum development.

Attitudes

In three studies conducted between 1967-1970, it was found that police who attend college are less authoritarian than those who do not believe in college;61 that college freshmen who were police officers tended to be less authoritarian than non-police freshmen;62 and that officers who finish college are significantly less authoritarian than officers who have elected not to attend college or earn a degree.63 All three studies lead to the conclusion that education tended to have the effect of reducing authoritarian attitudes in police students. However, as Weiner pointed out, these studies tend to only show that policemen who are attracted to college tend to


be less authoritative in their attitudes and that education, in and of itself, did not tend to be the change agent. In a related study, Guller found that there did tend to be a change in attitude in officers who attended colleges. It was revealed that the more education an officer had the less dogmatic he appeared to be. Weiner's study continued to examine the question: "Does higher education make the police more flexible, less hostile, less prejudiced, less authoritarian, and less cynical? In short, does college affect police attitudes?" In an examination of 396 police officers, Weiner concluded that the level of education had little effect on the attitudes of those officers. He further described the variable of the police role as possibly having a negative effect on the outcome and the value of education. That is, because the police role tends to emerse and change the individual's beliefs and attitudes so drastically, any positive effect education may have tends to be diluted by the role of the officer. Parker et al stated the following with regard to Weiner's interpretation:

---


67 Weiner, pp. 319-324.
of the data:

While admittedly only a minority of relationships analyzed achieved significance (25 out of 74), it would appear to be more accurate to state that the data reported in this study suggest that higher education has a very modest impact on the attitude of police personnel, rather than the flat assertion that the educational level of the police does not affect their attitudes.68

In focusing in on another variable, Smith and Ostrom in their study found that college educated officers were less likely to believe in or advocate the use of force than non-college educated officers.69 Additionally, Dalley in his study of Royal Canadian Mounted Police, found that college educated officers tended to develop less conservative, authoritarian and traditionally rigid attitudes than did non-college graduates of similar experience levels.70

Although the literature regarding the relationship between education and police attitudes appears to present


somewhat ambiguous results, Sterling's work provides a second dimension to the collage. In examining role concepts in policing, Sterling asserted that college educated officers showed statistically significant higher levels of aspirations than did officers with only a high school background. These results may lend themselves to the assertion that college educated officers tend to be upwardly mobile because of intrinsic values they have assimilated in college and that in this regard higher education can be viewed to have a positive effect on police attitudes.

Performance

In addition to the literature on the impact of education on police attitudes, there is a second substantive body of literature that deals with the effect of education on police performance.

Roberg studied the effect of education on patrol personnel within two areas: first, on their belief system and secondly on the relationship of that system to job performance. He believed that education caused patrol personnel to be less dogmatic and found that their performance was positively affected by education. Additionally, Roberg correlated officers' levels of

71James W. Sterling, Changes in Role Concepts of Police Officers (Gaithersburg, Maryland: International Association of Chiefs of Police, 1972), p.68.
dogmatism with their performance. He asserted that officers that held a less dogmatic belief system also tended to have a higher level of job performance. From these results, Roberg concluded that education is a factor in increasing the performance level of patrol personnel and at the same time increasing the degree of receptiveness.72 Zelig re-examined Roberg's study and the results. He argued that it was based on faulty methodology and lacked perceptive interpretation. Zelig concluded that the relationship between these factors was complex and could not be identified readily with education alone.73

In a study that examined sixteen performance factors and education's effect on them, Cascio established that for some factors education did seem to be related to better performance, while for other factors, the reverse was true. He concluded that generally education did appear to have a positive effect on performance and that because of this, the process of selecting new police officers should view education as a performance variable worth consideration.74


While Cascio focused on standards of performance related to such factors as to number of injuries, disciplinary actions, use of force, personnel complaints, and the number of sick days per year, Finnigan's study proceeded from a behaviorally oriented viewpoint. Finnigan used four grouped factors: actual performance of assigned duties, specific traits such as appearance and demeanor, overall value to the department, and a supervisor's rating of the officer's ability to deal with crisis resolution. These four grouped factors were represented by twenty-three item statements.\textsuperscript{75} Finnigan concluded from the results that officers with higher levels of education consistently were rated higher and that this "difference between agents and officers was due primarily to education."\textsuperscript{76} Barry found that while increased education level appeared to have a direct effect on performance, he also found that many of those he interviewed felt an individual's attitude toward the work and level of experience was a more valid measure of superior job performance than educational background.\textsuperscript{77}


\textsuperscript{76}Finnigan, pp. 61-62.

Baehr78 and Cohen and Chaiken79 found a positive correlation between factors related to job performance and the officer's education, although Smith criticized the results of Cohen-Chaiken study based on their lack of control for other variables and small sample size.80

An interesting outgrowth of Finnigan's findings was the observation that the type of college degree, that is major field of study, had little or no relationship to performance ratings.81 In a later study of the relationship between college major and job performance, Madell and Washburn found officers with certain types of college degrees measured higher on the performance factors of promotions, favorable incident reports and interpersonal relationships. They concluded that Liberal Arts majors did not promote as frequently and did not have the superior incident reports that Business or Police Science majors tended to produce. Police Science majors also were found to rate significantly higher on interpersonal relationships

---


81 Finnigan, p. 62.
than Liberal Arts majors.82

These data suggest that the type of college major may have a positive relationship with specific factors related to job performance and that generally, those who majored in Police Science were viewed to perform at a higher level than those who majored in other areas.

**Professionalism**

The last aspect of education and its effect on law enforcement personnel revolves around the issue of professionalism. A college education is believed to be a factor in producing attitudes and performance that are consistent with the professional concept of law enforcement. This concept is characterized by "autonomy of decision-making, identification with professional reference group, dedication, a public service orientation and self-regulation."83 Miller and Fry conducted a study to measure the relationship between levels of education and the acceptance of professionalism, as characterized by the above factors. Their results showed that there was practically no correlation between the level of education and acceptance of

---

82 John D. Madell and Paul V. Washburn, "Which College Major is Best for the Street Cop?" *The Police Chief*, 45 (August 1978), 41-42.

the professional concept.84

In a related study, Miller and Fry examined the effect the level of education had on officers' perceptions of professionalism. Again, they observed little difference in perceptions towards professionalism based on the level of an officer's education.85

By far the most distinctive finding in the literature is that researchers in their study of this issue tend not to agree. These studies tend to reveal an ambiguous perspective that is highlighted by several contradictory re-examinations of an original study.

If those studies are examined, it can be observed that there tends to be a fairly even agreement, both for and against the assumption that education does have an effect on the attitudes and performance of police personnel. It can be further observed that there is a wide range of attitudes, beliefs or value systems and characteristics of performance that have been used to measure the impact of education on police personnel. One common theme that seemed to be repeated by many researchers was that the interpretation of results could not be made simply with use of limited characteristics. There appeared to be far more internal and external influences on the police system that

84Miller and Fry, p. 192.

made the issue much more complex and thus the results of the studies more open to a wide range of options. In this regard Hudzik stated:

Amid the claims and counterclaims concerning the value of a college education, inadequate research design and data collection efforts have left us without a firm picture of which effects are attributable to formal college education and which are caused by other factors.86

Although some questions remains regarding the impact of post-secondary education on the performance, attitude and professionalization of police personnel, the literature suggested that a positive impact exists. However, the literature also showed a lack of consistency among research findings which suggests that poorly designed curriculum content and philosophical orientation may have a significant effect on how higher education is perceived. Therefore, a study of curriculum content and orientation at this level is very important.

Curriculum For Post-Secondary Law Enforcement Programs

Higher education for law enforcement has been established as a goal based on the assumption that it leads to increased performance and improved service. To reach this goal, the curriculum of such programs must be seen as the cornerstone of improvement for law enforcement higher

86Hudzik, p. 69.
education. Sherman addressed this essential factor when he stated, "Perhaps the most important element of the quality of higher education for police officers is the curriculum." It appears that the impact of a post-secondary program on police personnel, is directly related to the quality of curriculum development.

**Curriculum Issues**

Kuykendall concluded that the purpose of higher education programs for law enforcement "should be to prepare students to become more effective practitioners than those individuals who do not graduate from such programs." Green further explained that based on such assumptions, traditional educational curriculum has developed from faculty perceptions of the need to improve both intellectual and general educational skills, with the ultimate aim of improving police services.

Several authors have contended that because of the on-going disagreement over perceptions of curriculum content and direction, education for law enforcement personnel

---
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89 Jack R. Greene, "Improving the Quality of Law Enforcement Education: The Role of Internship Programs," *Police Studies*, 2 (Spring 1979), 43.
has reached a turning point.90 A major reason for this crisis is the diversity of courses and the lack of consensus among educators as to what curriculum is best for law enforcement education.91

This current debate over curriculum should not persuade practitioners or educators to believe that past practices have been a failure. Rather, it should be realized that the field of criminal justice is new in comparison to other traditional subject areas and that change is necessary to accommodate the shifting needs of both society and law enforcement.92 Additionally, Sherman and McLeod have noted that, just as in other fields, conflict is common when debating the significance and applicability between application and skills versus theory and concepts. They concluded that all developing disciplines have undergone changes in their life cycle, moving from practice to theory. This is evident in the fields of medicine.

90Sherman and Bennis, p. 32; Julius Wachtel, "University Criminal Justice Education," The Police Chief, 47 (December 1980), 62.


92Broderick, p. 38.
engineering, agriculture and business education.93 Although this debate over curriculum content and diversity is likely to continue, several areas of concern will need to be answered before resolution of this issue is possible. First, criminal justice education has often been shaped by the parent field. This tends to give criminal justice education non-specific content that leads to the claim of non-relevance for practitioners. The need arises then to view criminal justice programs as separate entities.94 Secondly, there does not now exist a general philosophy of criminal justice education that could be used to guide curriculum development.95 And lastly, the call for curriculum standardization throughout post-secondary education has been made.96

There has been a growing trend among criminal justice

93Lawrence W. Sherman and Maureen McLeod, "Faculty Characteristics and Course Content In College Programs for Police Officers," Journal of Criminal Justice, 7 (Fall 1979), 250.


95Phillip L. Davis; "Toward A Philosophy of Law Enforcement Education." The Police Chief, 50 (February 1983), 48.

programs to seek out faculty personnel with advance degrees, i.e., the doctorate, with little attention paid to full-time occupational experience. Because the nature of the faculty is the most important influence in shaping the design of the curriculum, there has developed a gap between the faculty developed curriculum, based on theory, and its practical application as seen by the practitioner. While improved curriculum design is certainly the intended goal, because many faculty members lack practical experience, it has resulted in a failure to improve law enforcement curriculum.97

A long standing issue among practitioners and educators has been the conflict over whether curriculum should be training or educationally oriented. Those who advocate training tend to believe that higher education does not offer the practical value necessary for use by the police. Law enforcement administrators often want a curriculum designed to provide entering officers with a sense of maturity and practical skills. Educators insist that a well founded general background, gives the individual knowledge of principles and concepts that can be used as tools in dealing with a variety of situations and decisions.98 With regard to

97 Greene, p. 43; Wachtel, p. 64; Sherman and McLeod, p. 252.

98 Woska, p. 313; Beto, p. 36; Dull, p. 316; J. D. Jamieson, The Philosophy of Curriculum Development (ERIC ED 166 389), pp. 2-4.
this issue Wachtel stated:

To improve the quality of criminal justice programs does not require that we ignore practice; indeed, to call a major course of study "criminal justice" is an explicit promise to deliver knowledge relevant to real-world issues in that field.99

Efforts have been made to develop law enforcement curriculum through job analysis of the law enforcement officer. Several research projects in this area have shown somewhat divergent findings however. Tannehill attempted to determine the level of agreement between the police and police educators relative to certain knowledge and skill areas required for effective and successful police performance. He found that there was a close agreement on skills and perception of the importance of these skill areas between practitioners and criminal justice educators. This is significant, for it could lead to an effective curriculum foundation that has widespread appeal and more important, police-educator agreement.100 Todd, however, found that tasks were too diverse and that it would be difficult to develop a

99 Wachtel, p. 64.

curriculum standard based on job analysis.\textsuperscript{101} In addition to these studies, James Poland reasoned that any curriculum based on task analysis would be outdated within a short time, due to the changing nature of police roles. In order for task analysis to be a valid base for curriculum development, it must be blended with an estimation or prediction of the future. In this manner the curriculum hopefully meets current and future needs.\textsuperscript{102}

Several of the newest issues in curriculum follow trends that have their roots in societal-cultural change. Police education programs, just like a large number of higher education programs, began offering non-traditional curriculum. This innovate curriculum approach included credit for life experience, flexible class schedule, non-resident classes, individual study and non-traditional use of learning resources. While this approach to the curriculum tended to serve the needs of many police officers, it also drew a great deal of criticism for departing from traditional standards and for what some feel as the lowering of those standards.\textsuperscript{103}


\textsuperscript{103}Reed Adams, "Nonresidential Criminal Justice Graduate Degree Programs," Journal of Criminal Justice, 8 (Fall 1980), 164; Anderson, pp. 29-38.
An area of curriculum concern that seems to be growing in intensity is the need to examine ethical issues in policing and impart the essence of this critical area to students. Both Ward and Sherman warned that law enforcement work is filled with moral dilemmas that officers are not adequately prepared to deal with effectively.\textsuperscript{104} This issue is not currently fulfilled by most curriculum designs and it appears that in the future this area will become increasingly sensitive due to the delicate nature of police work.

**Curriculum Models For Law Enforcement**

At the heart of the quality movement in law enforcement higher education is the issue of what curriculum orientation is the best for the needs of the practitioner.\textsuperscript{105} The literature reveals that there does not appear to be one model of curriculum used for law enforcement or criminal justice. The models range on a continuum from pure training (vocational) to a liberal arts


\textsuperscript{105}Ward and Webb, p. v-1.
orientation that focuses on a generalized theory and philosophy. Additionally, each appears to be related to the educational objectives of the particular program or institution. Lynch elaborated on this when he stated:

The fundamental dilemma in devising a curriculum is the need to define a specific body of knowledge which can be organized into a relevant law enforcement curriculum which, on the other hand, will educate a person to do something that will provide both growth and expertise. The problem is particularly difficult because we do not have a clear picture, more or less agreed upon by experts in the field, of what we should educate an individual to do.

Curriculum models for law enforcement and criminal justice have followed major historical trends in education. August Vollmer's original curriculum (1916) was designed to be a broad-interdisciplinary approach, not one that just dealt with law enforcement. From this model developed technical or vocationally oriented curricula designed to teach students and officers specific skills that could be directly applied to the job.

The literature suggests that this framework remained in place through the 1960's. From 1916 to the 1960's, three basic models of law enforcement curriculum were prevalent.

---
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The first model, emphasized training or vocational courses that were task related such as first aid, firearms, and patrol procedures. This curriculum was designed to teach skills that would be used solely for practical application with little basis for theoretical application. The second model grew out of Vollmer's ideas and mixed the vocational content with more generalized courses. This curriculum with a professional orientation was designed to give students a broad base of courses with more emphasis on conceptual skills. This model also stressed the need for education in understanding human behavior, communication, and interpersonal relations. The social science model of curriculum, tended to be oriented toward the theoretical and research aspects of crime, criminal behavior, and the examination of the criminal justice system. This model does not lend itself to direct application in law enforcement.  

In the late 1960's, federal funds provided law enforcement education with the momentum to develop and grow.

---

Since that time, the vocational oriented curriculum tended to be used fairly exclusively in two-year, community college programs. The most used models in four year programs were the professional model and/or liberal arts model which emphasized social science and human behavior.\(^{110}\)

The professional model developed as a combination of the vocational and social science models with the philosophy that the law enforcement officer and student needed to be exposed to both general education and practical course content. The model, as used from the late 1960's, gave importance to the merging of theory with practice and used occupational training as a tool for the integration of course content.\(^{111}\) The occupational training described in this model generally referred to an internship experience. This approach provided a practical, functional dimension to the curriculum since grades often fail to measure an individual's competency in an area such as law enforcement. There are a number of advantages to this element of the professional model. It tends to develop positive academic-practitioner relations, provides immediate feedback as to the relevancy of the curriculum, reinforces certain course content and provides an avenue of learning not possible in

\(^{110}\)Fike, Harlan, McDowell, pp. 457-459.

\(^{111}\)Jamieson, p.4; Beto and Marsh, pp. 38-40; Reppetto, p. 31.
The liberal arts model was designed to prevent students "from becoming too narrowly specialized." Three purposes of a liberal arts model for law enforcement have been identified. First, it was to give a fundamental base of knowledge that revolves around the sciences, humanities and social science. Secondly, it was to develop communications and reasoning skills. Thirdly, it assisted in developing a well rounded individual capable of existing in a complex social world. While the model does not teach the student how to be or act like a police officer, it does provide the student with skills in analysis and application of divergent views and situations. It further provides the student with preparation for graduate study, which the other models tend not to do. Parker et al advocated the liberal arts approach when they stated:

Simply stated, if higher education is to promote change, it must in fact provide a different type of experience. These college or university programs that provide a broader based liberal arts or social science approach may in fact be more

---
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114Carter, p. 15.

115Repetto, p. 21; Paul J. Brantingham, "A Model Curriculum For Interdisciplinary Education In Criminology," Criminology, 10 (November 1972), 324-325.
In addition to the models that are currently in use, a number of suggestions have been presented as to the future orientation of curriculum design for law enforcement. It has been implied that future curriculum development take into account both academic interest and the relevancy provided by courses that examine practical law enforcement operations. This approach, which may be described as integrated-professional, suggests that law enforcement curriculum combine the necessity of providing a broad education with the requirement that students develop and demonstrate competency within the field. This perspective stresses practitioner-educator interaction; it is goal oriented, uses task analysis, requires demonstrated competency, leads to integration of course content and practical application via an internship and has a curriculum evaluation component which most programs today do not possess.

Both Dull and Hoover suggested that law enforcement curriculum be designed around a systems approach in which each element of the criminal justice system (police, courts, 
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correction), and its relationship with society would be studied. This approach tends to follow the liberal arts model, with more emphasis on conceptual and theoretical views, rather than on practical application. The advantage to such a curriculum is an increased interaction and communications between system elements; for example between police personnel and the courts, which may improve service and cooperation.119

Streib proposed that current curriculum models are limited and prone to examine only criminal justice issues. He believed that a new curriculum should be instituted that encompasses the examination of how behavior can be controlled within society. This "social control" curriculum, as described by Streib, would have at its center of development an examination of methods that could be used to control behavior through social means. This would be done through the study of such controlling elements as the family, religion, courts, and school. He believed this model is just an evolutionary process from other models and has the advantage of providing tools for social control for the police not commonly used today.120


In recent research Cocks investigated the need for higher education institutions to cooperate in the area of law enforcement curriculum. His conclusion was that some institutions do formally cooperate; however, there should be a greater emphasis on a model curriculum that is designed around universities and colleges that collectively develop a standardized curriculum.\footnote{121}

While much of the research in this area appears to focus on the curriculum design itself, other researchers have focused on the views of the practitioner-student to gain a clearer understanding of which curriculum model and orientation to course content is most desired by the consumers of these programs. One survey, concerning student expectations of the curriculum, found that 82 percent of the students wanted practical courses in job related areas. Few students (18\%) felt that a law enforcement curriculum should be more generalized in nature.\footnote{122} In a second survey, students were asked to select those curriculum areas they found to be the most useful. The results indicated that students felt that the content areas of practical law enforcement, psychology/sociology, communication


\footnote{122}{Jack L. Kuykendall, "Student Expectations and Curriculum Orientations," The Police Chief, 44 (August 1977), 83.}
From an analysis of these two surveys, which had a restricted sample population, it can be inferred that student practitioners feel the integrated professional model would more closely meet their needs than other models.

The Need For A New Curriculum Model

The literature is replete with the call for improved curriculum based on the desire to professionalize the law enforcement occupation. An improved curriculum is not just desirable but it is crucial if the police are to operate at reasonable levels of service in a vastly changing society. However, present curriculum designs do not appear to meet the future goals of law enforcement. The need for the police to operate and perform their service in a manner that acknowledges and uses a wide variety of knowledge, skills, and societal resources is quite apparent. In research designed to assess the current quality of curriculum, it was found that current curriculum programs did not meet standards for the future. In a recent study Posey concluded:

The programs offering bachelor's degrees in law enforcement or criminal justice are, at this point in time, immature, unsettled, moving

123 Barry, p. 350.
124 Fike, Harlan, McDowell, pp. 460-461.
through a state of change, and accompanied by the growing pains associated with that stage of development. 125

Some suggest that the controversy over police education has done little to promote needed curriculum direction to improve quality and thus calm the voices of critics and supporters alike. There is little empirical research upon which to base a new curriculum model and even less has been done to show the validity of existing police curriculum. In order for change to occur, it must be based on research that takes into consideration input from educators and practitioners and develops a model using present course content and future areas that law enforcement personnel must develop skills in. 126

A key component or justification for further research to develop a new curriculum model, rests with the view that a major reason for the current educational dilemma is the lack of cooperation between educators and the police. Because of this lack of joint curriculum development, the issue is likely to remain unsettled. Further research needs to be conducted that allows both educators and police practitioners to voice their concerns and thus determine a


curriculum that truly meets future needs of education and law enforcement.\textsuperscript{127}

To meet these growing concerns, the focus of attention has turned to providing research that enables law enforcement to qualitatively improve. This research then becomes the key to the future of police education.\textsuperscript{128} The importance of police education was predicted by Terry who stated, "The quality of the education that students receive will affect their perception of the future functioning of the criminal justice system."\textsuperscript{129}

\section*{FUTURE COURSES FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT}

Law enforcement post-secondary education courses have developed in the past from training needs. However, as the literature and college catalogues have pointed out, today's post-secondary law enforcement courses are a mixture of skills, theories/concepts, and professional education. In order to attempt to develop educational courses that would serve future needs, the literature was reviewed to analyze what areas appeared to be growing in importance and

\textsuperscript{127}Whisenand, p. 128; Kuykendall and Hernandez, p. 20.


would have a critical impact on law enforcement five to ten years from now. It is likely that these areas would then be incorporated into college curriculum for law enforcement if they were viewed as important by both educators and law enforcement. This review produced eight areas that appear to be growing in importance: police stress; study of human behavior; application of technology to investigations; development of skilled police managers; terrorism; labor relations; use of research for police problems and ethics.

Over the past decade, occupational stress in policing has developed into a new, but recognized field of study. Occupational stress in policing has been shown to have an adverse impact on the performance of officers and its effects have been the subject of widespread debate. In the future, this area will take on more importance as researchers continue to investigate the many relevant variables and push forward with new suggestions to remedy old problems. One of the major themes in this area is that law enforcement officers be fully aware of stress within the occupation and know how to effectively deal with it. One method to accomplish this, which has been suggested, is to insure that it is a required course.130

Since law enforcement's main function is the regulation of human conduct, it would seem that a large part of education/training time is spent dealing with this area. Unfortunately, little time is given to educating law enforcement practitioners to deal with human behavior. This area can be broken down into three parts that appear to have the greatest impact for the future. First, the area of applied psychology can be used to teach students human differences and its application to the police. Secondly, there is a growing need to understand how to deal with people who are in a stage of conflict. This is especially true for officers who must confront individuals who are suicidal; involved in marital disputes; or the newest form of conflict, hostage taking. Thirdly, because of the growing recognition of cultural differences and the related problems, officers must be able to understand the perspectives of different groups if they are to successfully deal with a culturally diverse population.¹³¹

Because of the increasing complexity of some types of crime (white collar, computer), traditional investigative techniques have not kept pace with these new trends. Newer techniques that involve the use of computer and/or analytical techniques have begun to be used with increasing frequency. It has been found that these investigative techniques make it far easier to detect, investigate and bring to trial persons involved in sophisticated types of crimes. 132

Policing has recognized the increasing need to change the methods under which traditional police organizations are managed. It has also been recognized that police managers of the future must be educated in areas that have not previously been emphasized. These areas include budget planning, program research and development, and management information systems, to name a few. Management of police organizations in order to meet future demands must insure that managers are skilled in the areas necessary for progressive change to occur. Without education in these

areas, traditional organizations will remain stagnant. 133

U. S. police agencies have with increasing frequency had to handle new threats against public safety that have come from the terrorist-subversive realm. In the past, most agencies have been unprepared to deal with such events due to their systematic lack of training and education. Many authorities have forecast the future need to insure that law enforcement personnel are well versed in this area so that they are prepared to deal with these situations when they develop. 134

Over the past decade, U.S. law enforcement personnel have joined a growing number of governmental employees in demanding the right to bargain for wages, hours and other working conditions. This has been brought about in most cases, because of the failure of police organizations and governmental agencies to solve the problems expressed by law enforcement personnel. Because of their dissatisfaction in economic and other areas, law enforcement personnel have often demonstrated a distinct sense of militancy that has


led to confrontations with established police and governmental authorities. These confrontations have often led to bitter and hostile feelings between working police officers and management (police and/or governmental). The problem of labor relations has continually grown over the past decade, however, solutions and education in this vital area have been wanting. The future holds that both officers and management alike must learn to bring about agreeable solutions to problems involving labor disputes if society is to be provided with professional law enforcement services.135

Of particular importance to law enforcement, is the growing awareness that solutions to contemporary problems can no longer be solved through guesswork. It has been recognized that it takes well designed research to develop the parameters of any problem and suggest and implement the correct solution. However, in the past, law enforcement leaders and students have not been exposed to educational courses dealing with research at the undergraduate level. In recent years several studies have recommended that undergraduate curriculums include such courses and recently several schools in this study have implemented research courses in their bachelor's curriculum. Closely aligned

with the growing recognition of the need for education in research methods, is the increasing use of computers and their applications in law enforcement. Although the use of computers in law enforcement has steadily grown, there has been no corresponding educational courses to provide law enforcement students/officers with opportunities to gain a basic understanding of the computers function, operation and uses as applied to law enforcement. This puts law enforcement at a distinct disadvantage. For while computers have had an increasing role in law enforcement application, there are few law enforcement personnel who are knowledgeable and able to use the computer to its fullest advantage.\footnote{Pearson, pp.136-137, p. 181; Sherman, p. 5; John Naisbitt, Megatrends (New York: Warner Books, 1982), pp.39-40; Lester Subin, "The Next Twenty Years," The Police Chief, 51 (April 1984), pp. 33-35; James Vandiver, "Coping with the Computer Revolution," The Police Chief, 51 (April 1984), 42-43; Donald Manson, "Law Enforcement Information Systems," The Police Chief, 51 (March 1984), 103-106.}

One subject that police agencies and educators seemed to consistently agree is important, is that of law enforcement ethics. In the past, textbook authors have given only limited space to this subject, although its importance seems to be growing as the number of complaints and lawsuits against law enforcement officers continue to increase in alarming numbers. In California it is a required part of every officer's training, but even
here little time is spent on this subject matter. Because of its importance, the most recent critical review of law enforcement higher education has recommended that courses in ethical conduct be included in the undergraduate curriculum to fill this void. 137

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Just as education for members of our society has become an intricate part of American life, police education has developed in similar ways. The literature points out that higher education for law enforcement personnel made very slow progress until the late 1960's. At that time, because of the increasing availability of federal funds, education programs for the police began to flourish.

With rapid and often haphazard development of police higher education programs there developed a strong controversy over the quality of such programs. At the center of this debate, questions arose concerning the need for police to have a college degree, the effect college

education had on the police and the present and future direction of police curriculum.

The literature strongly suggests that there are both positive and negative arguments regarding a college education for police personnel. Studies on the effect of this education on law enforcement personnel are somewhat ambiguous. One area that seems to have the least amount of research, but an equal share of controversy, is the present status of curriculum and its future direction.

The literature clearly indicates that post-secondary education for law enforcement personnel has advanced considerably in its standing as an academic discipline. It was also suggested in the literature that because of its rapid growth, law enforcement post-secondary education did not develop a coherent curriculum content, nor a consistent direction that was based on current as well as future needs.

In conclusion, it is apparent from the literature that there is a significant need to conduct research, from both an educator's and a practitioner's viewpoint, on the future of law enforcement curriculum in four year post-secondary programs. To this end, it is of equal importance to develop this data into a new curriculum design that addresses future law enforcement needs.
Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

The purpose of this study was to develop an appropriate law enforcement core curriculum for post-secondary institutions that offer a bachelor's degree with a major or strong emphasis in law enforcement. The fundamental assumption of this study was that a body of knowledge does exist regarding law enforcement curriculum at the post-secondary level that examines skills, content, and concepts. Little research had been done to investigate the perceptions of both law enforcement officers and educators as to the future importance and direction of this curriculum. The major objective of this study was to develop data that would indicate law enforcement courses perceived as most important for the future that could be used to develop a model core curriculum.

Sample Selection

Sampling procedures were developed based on the need to sample both California law enforcement personnel and law enforcement educators at post-secondary institutions. Criteria were developed in order to narrow the sample population to those who have knowledge, experience, or
education in the area being investigated, thus increasing the power of the results derived from the data.

The law enforcement population was defined as all sworn peace officers of the State of California who are listed under Section 830.1 of the California Penal Code. This population was further delimited to those law enforcement personnel in California who are employed full-time by a Sheriff's department or municipal police department. In order to accurately reflect the population of California law enforcement practitioners, the California Commission on Peace Officers Standards and Training (P.O.S.T) was contacted and the 1982 report Employment Data for California Law Enforcement was obtained. This report was the most current and accurate listing of employment data, number and size of departments, and mailing addresses for California. The report lists all law enforcement agencies in California, with the exception of one police department. From this report, a stratified random sample of departments was drawn. This was accomplished using the classification system of the report and grouping each law enforcement department into one of five categories by the number of personnel they employed (civilian and sworn). The five categories included: 500 and over; 300 - 499; 100 - 299; 50 - 99; 1 - 49. According to the P.O.S.T. report there were 44,885 officers in the study population. Using a table to determine sample size
(380 law enforcement practitioners) from a given population, a sample was selected which was proportional to the population. In order to maintain the same proportion of practitioners in each of the five categories in the sample, as in the population, it was necessary to determine the percentages of the population for each of the five categories and then apply this to the sample size. Table 1 represents the five categories, the population of each category, the percentage of each category in relation to the total police practitioner population, and the proportional sample population.

### TABLE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>PERSONNEL EMPLOYED</th>
<th>POPULATION</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF POPULATION</th>
<th>SAMPLE POPULATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Over 500</td>
<td>25,620</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>300-499</td>
<td>4,080</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>100-299</td>
<td>8,459</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>50 - 99</td>
<td>4,216</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1 - 49</td>
<td>2,510</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>44,885</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>380</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To adequately represent the population three departments from each category were selected using the following stratified random sample procedure. The P.O.S.T. report, Employment Data for California Law Enforcement, lists each law enforcement department in California. Departments in each of the five categories were given a two digit number that ran consecutively. Then a table of random numbers was used to select each of the departments. Table 2 represents the departments selected from each category.

**TABLE 2**
Law Enforcement Departments Surveyed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>PERSONNEL EMPLOYED</th>
<th>DEPARTMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Over 500</td>
<td>San Francisco P.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Los Angeles S.O.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fresno S.O.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>300-499</td>
<td>Santa Ana P.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Riverside P.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Berkeley P.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>100-299</td>
<td>Costa Mesa P.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brea P.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Madera S.O.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>50 - 99</td>
<td>Carlsbad P.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Napa S.O.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yuba City P.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1 - 49</td>
<td>Port Huenema P.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Taft P.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gonzales P.D.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


3Borg and Gall, p. 907.
The sample population for educator's, included all law enforcement educators at California State University institutions which offered a four-year degree with a major or strong emphasis in law enforcement. The rationale for using California State University institutions is the belief that these schools enroll and graduate more students than other post-secondary institutions and comprise the majority of post-secondary institutions offering a four-year, bachelor's degree in law enforcement in California. To identify the institutions within the scope of this study, catalogues from the nineteen campuses that make-up the California State University system were examined. It was noted that six institutions (Long Beach, Los Angeles, Hayward, Fresno, Sacramento, San Jose) met the criteria for inclusion in the study. However, upon personal contact to each of these institutions, it was found that California State University, Hayward employed only part-time instructors for law enforcement courses. Due to the criteria of this study (limited to educators who teach full-time), Hayward was eliminated from those institutions to be surveyed. The researcher contacted each of the five institutions used in the survey to determine the name of the law enforcement educators at each institution. This procedure resulted in identifying a total of twenty-three law enforcement educators.
Development of the Survey

The development and design of the survey was based on the objective of the study: to develop a model four year post-secondary core curriculum for law enforcement personnel in California. In order to develop a survey that would meet this objective, relevant professional journals, government documents, books, dissertations, and university catalogues were reviewed. A computer search at the University of the Pacific (Computer Reference Information Service CRIS), was used to further search related fields such as psychology, sociology, law, public administration in addition to criminal justice areas. The researcher also reviewed all relevant literature at the P.O.S.T. library in Sacramento, California.

From this review, it was possible to determine the extent and nature of current courses being offered to law enforcement students; the future direction and suggested courses for law enforcement post-secondary education; past, present, and suggested future philosophical orientations for law enforcement curriculum. This information was essential if the survey was to reflect all law enforcement courses that would lead to a four-year degree and the spectrum of philosophical orientation in use and those courses suggested for the future. These data were then used as the basis for the items included in the survey.
With this information, an original questionnaire was developed using a Likert-type response scale\(^4\) to obtain data regarding the perceptions of both law enforcement practitioners and educators as to the current and future importance of listed courses and the future direction of philosophical orientation toward these courses. The Likert-type response scale consisted of four degrees: unimportant, somewhat important, important, and very important. A four degree scale was used to force the respondents to make critical judgements regarding the "current" and "future" direction of each item, thus leading to more concise analysis of courses and philosophical orientation trends. Each degree, on the Likert-type scale, was given a point value (1, 2, 3, 4) which was used to determine those courses which are perceived to be the most important and thus form the basis for the model core curriculum (see Survey in Appendix A).

In order to establish content validity, the survey was submitted to a panel of four experts: Two educators, who instruct in the field of criminal justice and two law enforcement practitioners, as well as the dissertation committee. Panel members were given the survey instrument and a cover letter (see Appendix B) which asked them to examine the survey and make suggestions for improvement of the instrument. The researcher asked that the following criteria be used in reviewing the survey:

1. Are the instructions clear and concise?
2. Does the title of the survey give you a good idea of the area to be covered?
3. Does each course title and description give you a clear idea of what the course is about?
4. Are there any courses that you believe should be added to the survey that are not listed?
5. How long did it take to complete the survey?
6. Was the survey easy or difficult to read and complete?
7. Was it difficult to make judgements regarding the current and future importance of each item?
After reviewing the comments made by the validation panel, it was decided that no major changes in the survey instrument were needed. The comments did reveal the need for several minor additions and word changes and these were incorporated into the final draft of the survey. It was found that the survey took an average of twelve minutes to complete and that the survey instructions and items were clear and easy to understand.

Data Collection Procedures

Since a modified mail survey was the method of collection used, steps in conducting the survey as suggested by Borg and Gall,\(^5\) were followed to insure maximum return.

Law Enforcement Practitioners: After identifying the departments to be surveyed in this study, the researcher personally contacted each department by telephone to identify the training officer. The training officer was used to administer, collect, and return the survey. It was found that several departments did not have training officers due to their size and in each case the department head volunteered to perform the task of administering, collecting, and returning the survey. A person responsible for collecting the data was identified in thirteen of the fifteen departments used in this study. In the two

\(^5\)Borg and Gall, pp. 415-434.
remaining departments, the researcher collected the needed data. Each individual responsible for collecting the data was sent a package which included a cover letter explaining the purpose of the study (see Appendix C), the number of surveys necessary for law enforcement practitioners to complete, and a preaddressed stamped return envelope. Additionally, in order to insure a random sample in each department, a list of random numbers, taken from a table of random numbers, was selected for each department. The list of random numbers were to be used to select respondents from each department personnel list. A period of seven days from the time of mailing was given for the surveys to be returned. After that time, all those who failed to return the survey were contacted by telephone. Several exceptions to the above procedure should be noted. In one small department, the sample size equalled the number of practitioners. In this case all practitioners in the department were surveyed. For practical consideration, in the two largest departments in this survey, data collection procedures were modified. In both departments several substations were identified and sampled using a random sample technique.

**Educators:** Telephone contact was made with each educational institution that was surveyed to identify a person who would distribute the survey to each faculty.

---

6Borg and Gall, pp. 905-907.
member. In each case the department secretary volunteered to perform this task. The only exception to this procedure was at one institution where a professor in the department volunteered to distribute the survey. All institutions were sent a package for each faculty member that included a cover letter (see Appendix D) explaining the purpose of the study, a survey, and a preaddressed stamped envelope for easy return. Follow-up procedures were identical for educators as those used for practitioners.

Police practitioners were sent 380 surveys, of which 354 were returned (93.2% return rate). Educators were sent 23 surveys, of which 20 were returned (87% return rate).

**Statistical Data Analysis**

Statistical analysis was conducted using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). For the study question dealing with the educational and work experience of police practitioners and educators, the variables used were; age; police experience; level of education; name of college attended; and major field of study. Additionally, educators were asked what teaching position they held. Descriptive statistics used to analyze the data included the frequency distribution and percentage of respondents for each variable. For questions in the study dealing with police practitioners and educator perceptions of the importance of courses or philosophical orientation, descriptive statistics were utilized to
determine mean responses relative to the degree of perceived importance. Additionally, percentages were used to describe the respondents at each level of importance relative to the survey scale (1, 2, 3, 4). For questions in the study that dealt with determining whether a significant difference existed between police practitioners and educators perceptions, with regard to the importance of each course or philosophical orientation, inferential statistics were used. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to analyze these differences. A .05 significance level was used for the ANOVA. Based on these data, graphs and charts were used to display the results derived from the statistical analysis. This was used so that the findings were clearly presented in an illustrative manner that could easily be visualized by the reader. In order to develop a model core curriculum, criteria were developed for the inclusion of specific courses into the model. In consultation with a research professor and statistician, it was decided that all courses with a mean of 3.0 or higher should be considered essential and fall within the core curriculum definition. In addition to a mean of 3.0, those courses that should be considered for inclusion in the core curriculum should have 75% of the respondents (police and educators) who perceive the future courses as important and very important. Those courses whose mean ranked between 2.7 and 2.9 were considered to be
important courses that should be used to supplement core
courses or to be used as electives. Courses that fell below
the mean of 2.7 should be considered for possible revision
or elimination from post-secondary programs.
Chapter 4

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

Overview of the Purpose and Procedures

The main purpose of this study was to investigate the perceptions of California law enforcement practitioners and educators regarding current and future curriculum issues. Through this method, a new core curriculum model could be developed that incorporated those courses that law enforcement educators and practitioners considered most important for a four year post-secondary law enforcement program. Additionally, the study investigated which philosophical orientation should be used in the future to teach law enforcement courses. Data was obtained through a survey research method with a researcher designed questionnaire. The original survey was sent to a sample population of 380 California police practitioners and 23 law enforcement educators at five California State Universities. The data presented in this chapter are the result of those surveys returned to the researcher. There were 354 surveys returned by California police practitioners from the sample population, for a return rate of 93.4 percent. For educators, 20 surveys from the sample population were returned for a return rate of 86.9 percent.
Sample Description

The following demographic data from the sample population was used to answer the following research question: What is the educational background and work experience of educators and law enforcement practitioners? This information is presented in Table 3 and Table 4.

Police

Age distribution for police practitioners was considered well balanced, with the majority of officers (236/66.7 percent) falling between the ages of 26 and 40. It should be recognized that most California law enforcement agencies belong to a retirement system that allows practitioners to retire at age 50 with 20 years service, and most officers do retire around this age category, thus accounting for the small number of officers in the over fifty category. Total years of police experience were again reflective of representing all variables listed in this group. The vast majority of practitioners (269/75.9 percent) had between 4 to 20 years of total police experience, with the largest category of years of police experience being 4 to 7 years (100/28.2 percent). This distribution of practitioners police experience tends to be typical of the average police agency in this researchers experience.
### Table 3

Number and Percentage of Sample Police Practitioners by Selected Demographic Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 31</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 - 40</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 50</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Police Experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - 12</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 20</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less A.A.</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.A. or more</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU, Fresno</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU, Fullerton</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU, Long Beach</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU, Los Angeles</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU, Sacramento</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU, San Diego</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU, San Francisco</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU, San Jose</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno City</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Gate</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden West</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles City</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palomar</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco City</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasadena City</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC, Berkeley</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Redlands</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of San Francisco</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of S. California</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuba City</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No College or missing</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College Major</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>55.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No College</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department Size</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 + Personnel</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 - 499 Personnel</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 - 299 Personnel</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 99 Personnel</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 49 Personnel</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>354</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Practitioners highest level of formal education is important for two basic reasons. One, the data reflect that all police practitioners, with the exception of 11 (3.1 percent), have participated in post-secondary education at a college or university. Sherman pointed out that by 1974 over 46 percent of the nation's law enforcement practitioners had completed some college. This trend of post-secondary education for practitioners has continued as the data show with over 44 percent of practitioner respondents having completed a bachelors degree or higher and over 96 percent of the practitioners sample population completing from less than an Associate of Arts degree to a Masters degree. Secondly, because the practitioners in the sample group have a general post-secondary background, along with a meaningful level of police experience, it would appear that they have an appropriate perspective to provide perceptions regarding the focus of this research project.

Practitioners attended a wide variety of colleges and universities. Thirty-five percent (127 practitioners) attended or graduated from a California State University (CSU), with the highest number of practitioners (48 or 13 percent) attending or graduating from CSU, Fresno. Criminal justice was by far the most frequent college major given by practitioners, with over 55 percent reporting this major.

---

Psychology (18 or 5.1 percent), Sociology (22 or 6.2 percent), Public Administration (20 or 5.6 percent), and Business (20 or 5.6 percent) were selected by approximately the same number of practitioners. Apparently these majors tend to be popular alternatives to a traditional criminal justice curriculum. The data from the surveys reflect that those respondents in the "other" category had a wide variety of college majors which ranged from biology to recreational therapy. As to department size, the number and percentage of the responding sample population closely mirrors the total sample population as can be seen by comparing Table 1 and Table 3.

Educators

The data, as shown in Table 4, indicate that educators age level was far above that of police practitioners. Eighty-five percent of the educators are 41 years of age or over, compared to slightly over 20 percent of practitioners. There are no educators under 32 years of age. As to the position the educators held at the time of the research, there was no respondents who were lecturers or assistant professors. The respondents are evenly divided between associate professors (10 or 50 percent) and professors (10 or 50 percent). It is interesting to note that the respondents, as a group, appear to have considerable full-time police occupational experience,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 - 40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 50</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Professor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Professor</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupational Experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - 12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching Experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College Attended</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU, Fresno</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU, Los Angeles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC, Berkeley</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of S.California</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College Major</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
with 45 percent (9 respondents) of the educators having 8 or more years of police experience. Only two of the respondents had no full-time police experience. Seventy percent (14 respondents) of the educators who responded had 11 years or more of full-time teaching experience, with no respondents having between 0 to 5 years of experience. From analyzing the data of occupational and teaching experience, it can be inferred that the educators who responded were well versed in policing practices, as indicated by level of occupational experience. Additionally, they have had sufficient time to observe the occupation and post-secondary law enforcement curriculum from an academic viewpoint, thus mixing the practical (occupational experience) with its academic counterpart.

It should also be emphasized however, that 70 percent of the educators have been out of law enforcement for 11 or more years which may have some effect on the manner in which they perceive the importance of courses currently, as well as in the future. The data for the highest level of education for respondents revealed that 70 percent (14 educators) possessed doctorates, with no respondents possessing less than a masters degree. Thirty percent (6 educators) of the respondents attended the University of Southern California (USC), with the University of California, Berkeley (UC Berkeley) claiming 20 percent (4 educators) of the respondents as alumni. The research data reflect that respondents, in general, were primarily
educated in two fields of study, Criminal Justice (9 or 45 percent) and Public Administration (7 or 35 percent).

**Summary**

Police respondents, as a group, were far younger than educator respondents, with over 79 percent of police respondents below the age of forty-one, compared to only 15 percent of educator respondents in this category. Full-time occupational experience for both groups tended to be dispersed among the five categories, with police and educator respondents having similar response rates when comparing the combined experience categories that form a law enforcement career. This is done by placing the respondents in one of three categories corresponding to the number of years of full-time experience, exemplified by the following categories: novice officer (0-3 years of experience); mid-career officer (4-12 years of experience); older officer (13 to over 20 years of experience). The general educational level for police respondents was far below that of educator respondents, which is to be expected. Only 8 percent of the police respondents possessed a masters degree, while 100 percent of the educator respondents possessed a masters or doctorate degree. No meaningful comparisons between police and educators could be made for the university or college attended by both groups. However, when comparing the police and educators major field of study in college, it was clear that the field of study most often selected was Criminal Justice.
Law Enforcement Courses Offered by California State Universities and Differences Between Universities

The following data, as displayed in Table 5, are used to answer the question: What are the courses currently offered by California State Universities that have a four year law enforcement program? In addition, course catalogs from the universities described in Table 5, were used to answer the question: To what extent do course offerings differ among California State Universities that have a four year law enforcement program?

Current Courses

As the data indicate in Table 5, there are a number of courses that are commonly given at all listed universities. Of the 30 courses listed in Table 5, 8 courses (27 percent) are given by all listed universities. Additionally, there are a number of courses offered at four out of the five listed universities. Of the 30 courses listed in Table 5, 7 courses (23 percent) are offered by four out of the five listed universities. It should be noted that Table 5 indicates that there are 5 courses (17 percent) that are given by only one of the five universities listed and 7 courses (23 percent) that are not given by any of the institutions.
## Table 5

### Course Matrix of Universities Offering a Law Enforcement Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>San Jose</th>
<th>Sacramento</th>
<th>Fresno</th>
<th>Los Angeles</th>
<th>Long Beach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Administration of Justice</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Criminal Law</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Evidence</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Investigations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Communications</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Community Relations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Patrol Operations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Criminal Procedures</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Organization &amp; Management</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Police Supervision</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Personnel Management</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Comparative Police Systems</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Forensic Science</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Criminal Identification</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Crime Prevention</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Handling of Juveniles</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Internship</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Police Stress</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Psychology for Police</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Management of Conflict</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Cross-Cultural Differences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Technical Investigations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Management of Police</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Criminology</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Terrorism, Subversion, Cultism</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Labor Relations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Research Methods</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Contemporary Issues</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Computer Literacy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Ethics</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These 7 courses, not offered by any institution, are all considered courses for the future as described in Chapter 11.

Course Differences Between Universities

It should be recognized that although course titles may be the same from one institution to the next, the content of the course may reflect entirely different or adjusted subject matter. To analyze the differences in content, course catalogs from the five listed universities were used. It was found that of the 18 courses offered by two or more universities, 7 courses were found to have meaningful differences in subject matter among the offering universities. Those courses found to have meaningful differences included: Communications; Patrol Operations; Forensic Science; Criminal Identification; Handling of Juveniles; Terrorism, Subversion, and Cultism; Research Methods. In analyzing the differences a number of facts were revealed. It was found that only one institution (CSU, Fresno) offered a complete course in Communications which encompassed all aspects listed in Appendix A. Other institutions gave separate courses in Interview and Interrogation, and Report Writing or writing in general. Few of the institutions gave any time to interpersonnel or communications theory. Although Patrol Operations is only given at one institution (CSU, Fresno), it deserves comment since no other institution offers such a course today. Yet ten years ago it was a core course for a law enforcement
major. Traditionally, this course was skill oriented, teaching students how to be patrol officers. However, because of the changing academic standards at 4-year post-secondary institutions, away from skill related courses, it was removed and taught only at police academies or two year community colleges. It is found that CSU, Fresno's course in this area is non-skill related and deals with the administration and management of patrol operations, thus making an evolutionary change from skills to theories and their applicability. The largest differential in course content were found in the area of Forensic Science and Criminal Identification. Two institutions (CSU, Sacramento and Long Beach) offer a major in criminalistics/forensic science with a wide variety of course offerings in this area.

One institution (CSU, San Jose) offers an introductory course in Forensic Science and a separate course in the area of Questioned Documents, which is a specialization within forensic science/ criminalistics. CSU, Fresno offers one complete course in Forensic Science covering all basic areas. This course is closely aligned with the course described in Appendix A. Lastly, CSU Los Angeles ties both areas (forensic science - criminal identification) loosely together in two separate courses, Photography and Personal Identification Systems.

In the course area, Handling of Juveniles, the three institutions (CSU, Sacramento, Fresno, Los Angeles) that
offer such a course each have different course content. At
CSU, Sacramento the course focuses on three areas: planning
of juvenile programs; roles of agencies involved; innovative
strategies used in delinquency prevention. CSU, Fresno
has three courses in this area. First, a course in juvenile
law which includes its history and court procedures.
Secondly, a course in juvenile delinquency which includes
causal factors, treatment processes and control and
prevention programs. Lastly, a specific course dealing with
delinquency prevention is offered.

It is noted that there appears to be a mild degree of
overlapping course content within the three courses. For
CSU, Los Angeles their courses on juvenile law and procedure
appears to deal with law, juvenile rights, and an overview
of juvenile programs. Although the course of Terrorism,
Subversion, Cultism is new and one that is suggested for the
future, several institutions presently offer a course or
part of a course in terrorism. CSU, Sacramento's course
deals with several topical areas under the course title of
Violence and Terrorism. Such topics as the impact of
violence/terrorism on the quality of life; victimology;
victim services program; analysis of criminal careers;
hostage negotiations, are all included in this course. No
reference is given to subversive groups or the area of
cultism.

CSU, San Jose, offers a similar title for their
course, Violence and the Justice System. Topics for the
course centered around prevention and control of collective violence, such as gangs, organized crime, terrorism, and riots.

As can be observed, neither institution covers the area thoroughly in respect to the suggested future course content. The suggested course of research methods is offered by four of the five institutions. CSU, Sacramento and San Jose offer a course in this area which closely matches the suggested course listed in Appendix A. CSU, Fresno has just begun such a course which follows the basic format of CSU, Sacramento and San Jose. Of the four institutions, CSU, Long Beach is the only institution to offer two courses at the undergraduate level. One, course deals with basic statistics and includes research methods. The second course, deals with techniques of research, expanding on the basic concepts in the first course.

Summary

It should be recognized that an analysis of course catalogs is a valuable tool in examining current and future trends in courses offered in any field. However, one limitation should be mentioned. Course catalogs often do not reflect where the major emphasis within the topic area will be placed and how each instructor designs and teaches the course to best suit the needs of the student as perceived by the instructor. In summary, it was found that all five institutions appear to agree on the course areas that should
be taught, when those courses for the future are excluded. The analysis of the course catalogs also revealed that the majority of the courses that institutions offered were more similar than dissimilar in content, with the exception of the 7 areas noted.

Core Courses Perceived As Important
By Police and Educators

The following data, as displayed in Table 6, are used to answer the following questions: What core courses are currently and in the future considered most important by law enforcement practitioners? What core course are currently and in the future considered most important by law enforcement educators? Is there a significant difference between the perception of law enforcement practitioners and law enforcement educators with regard to the importance of current and future courses?

Current and Future Perceptions of Courses
By Police and Educators

1. Administration of Justice

Current: The data in Table 6 reveal that police gave this course a mean of 2.59, while educators viewed the course as far more important, with a mean of 3.40. This level of importance can also be displayed in the percentage of police and educators who are grouped under the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Police (N = 354)</th>
<th>Educators (N = 40)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level of Importance</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Level of Importance</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Administration of Justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>33 57 62 75 89 99</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>0 15 30 55 70 80</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>34 57 62 75 89 99</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>0 15 30 55 70 80</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Criminal law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>0 15 30 45 55 65</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>0 10 25 40 50 60</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>0 15 30 45 55 65</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>0 10 25 40 50 60</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>0 15 30 45 60 70</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>0 20 35 50 65 80</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>0 15 30 45 60 70</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>0 20 35 50 65 80</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Investigations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>0 15 30 45 55 65</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>0 15 30 45 55 65</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>0 15 30 45 55 65</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>0 15 30 45 55 65</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>1 5 10 25 50 65</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>5 20 35 50 65 80</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>1 5 10 25 50 65</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>5 20 35 50 65 80</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Community Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>2 32 48 64 80 95</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>0 50 30 40 60 80</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>2 32 48 64 80 95</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>0 50 30 40 60 80</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Patrol Operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>1 15 30 45 60 75</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0 35 50 65 80 95</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>1 15 30 45 60 75</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0 35 50 65 80 95</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Criminal Procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>2 42 64 80 95 110</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>0 15 35 50 65 80</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>2 42 64 80 95 110</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>0 15 35 50 65 80</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Organization and Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>4 42 42 64 80 95</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>0 10 30 50 65 80</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>4 42 42 64 80 95</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>0 10 30 50 65 80</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Police Supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>2 29 45 60 75 90</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>5 25 40 55 65 80</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>2 29 45 60 75 90</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>5 25 40 55 65 80</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Personnel Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>5 34 39 59 79 99</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>0 21 40 60 80 95</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>5 34 39 59 79 99</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>0 21 40 60 80 95</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Comparative Police Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>27 52 20 1 3 6</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>10 50 25 50 75 100</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>22 46 29 3 6</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>5 30 45 60 80 100</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Forensic Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>4 28 46 62 80 95</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>0 25 40 60 80 95</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>3 28 46 62 80 95</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>0 25 40 60 80 95</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*, ** Significant at .05 level
**, *** Significant at .01 level
*** Significant at .001 level
### Table 6 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Police (N = 354)</th>
<th>Educators (N = 20)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of Current and Future Courses</td>
<td>Level of Importance</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Level of Importance</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Criminal Identification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>2 28 47 23</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>0 35 45 20</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>1 22 44 35</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>0 35 40 25</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Crime Prevention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>3 27 50 20</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>0 35 35 30</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>3 16 40 41</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0 25 30 45</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Handling of Juveniles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>3 25 53 19</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>0 30 60 10</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>3 20 50 27</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0 35 45 20</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Internship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>6 28 46 20</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>0 20 50 30</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>6 20 42 32</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>5 5 30 60</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Police Stress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>1 14 42 43</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>5 25 40 30</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>1 10 29 44</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>5 10 40 45</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Psychology for Police</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>2 17 52 29</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>10 10 50 30</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>2 13 41 44</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>5 10 35 50</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Management of Conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>1 12 49 38</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>5 15 40 40</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>1 8 39 52</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>5 5 40 45</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Cross-Cultural Differences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>6 30 50 14</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>5 20 60 15</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>4 23 45 28</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>5 5 50 40</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Technical Investigations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>1 29 49 21</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>16 26 47 11</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>1 15 41 43</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>9 11 32 47</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Management of Police</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>6 31 49 14</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>0 10 45 45</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>3 20 46 31</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>0 5 30 65</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Criminology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>10 48 36 6</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>5 35 45 43</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>9 41 39 11</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>5 35 40 20</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Terrorism, Subversion, Cultism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>3 32 52 13</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>0 20 75 5</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>2 19 40 39</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>0 15 30 55</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Labor Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>9 40 38 7</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>5 35 55 9</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>7 39 37 16</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>0 20 50 30</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at .05 level
** Significant at .01 level
**TABLE 6 (Continued)**

Perceptions of Current and Future Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Police (N = 354)</th>
<th>Educators (N = 20)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level of Importance</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Level of Importance</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of Current and Future Courses</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Research Methods</td>
<td>Current 11</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Future 8</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Contemporary Issues</td>
<td>Current 5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Future 3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Computer Literacy</td>
<td>Current 5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Future 3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Ethics</td>
<td>Current 2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Future 2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at .05 level
** Significant at .01 level
*** Significant at .001 level
heading of "Important" (Level 3) and "Very Important" (Level 4). The percentages indicate that 57 percent of the police versus 85 percent of the educators felt this course was very useful. Using a t-test, the difference between means of the police and educators was found to be significant at the .001 level. It should be recognized, that for the purpose of this research, course means between police and educators are considered significant at the .05 level. From the data, we can conclude that there is a significant difference between the way police and educators perceive the current importance of this course.

Future: For the police, they perceive this course to be only slightly more important in the future as indicated by a mean of 2.67 percent. Educators perceived no difference in the level of importance for this course in the future as can be seen in their mean of 3.40. When analyzing difference in the percentages of police and educators who view the level of importance to be at the 3 or 4 level, it was found that 61 percent of the police and 85 percent of educators perceived the course to be very useful in the future. The t-test revealed that the difference between means of the police and educators were found to be significant at the .001 level. Again, it can be concluded that there is a significant difference between the way police and educators perceive the future importance of this course.

Summary: The data reveal that police do not view this course as important, either currently or in the
future. There is also no trend in the police mean or level of importance, between current and future, that indicates this course has grown in importance. However, the opposite view is taken by the educators who view the course as important currently and in the future. This type of significant disagreement suggests that the course is not acceptable to police in its current form and is in need of revision.

2. **Criminal Law**

   **Current:** Both the police and educators are in close agreement regarding the current importance of this course. With means of 3.44 for police and 3.45 for educators, it is easy to observe their perspectives. When examining the percentages of police and educators under the heading, level of importance, level 3 and 4, it is found that both groups are closely aligned (police-95 percent : educators-90 percent).

   **Future:** The data indicate that both police and educators perceive the future importance of this course as increasing with a police mean of 3.58 for the future and an educator mean of 3.50 for the future. While the percentage of educators under level of importance, level 3 and 4, remains the same (90 percent), the police have a slight increase (from 95 percent to 96 percent). The data also reveal a shift for both police and educators on the
percentage of respondents who increased their value of the course as indicated by the level of importance as seen in level 4.

**Summary:** Because of close agreement between police and educators, this course should be considered essential to the curriculum.

### 3. Evidence

**Current:** With a mean for police of 3.54 and for educators of 3.25, the data reflect that both groups view this course as important, although the police feel stronger in their perspective. The level of importance, as indicated by percentages on levels 3 and 4, indicate that here too, police (93 percent) perceive this course to be slightly more important than do educators (80 percent).

**Future:** Future means for police increased to 3.64, while the means for educators remained the same, 3.25. The data reflected that both groups shifted in the level of importance, as indicated by percentages on level 3 and 4. Police increased slightly to 95 percent, while educators declined to 75 percent.

**Summary:** The mean and level of importance for both groups, between current and future perspectives, indicate that police view the course as being slightly more important in the future. However, educators see the course as decreasing slightly in importance in the future.
4. Investigation

Current: The data reveal that the police had a mean of 3.21 and educators had a mean of 3.15. The level of importance, percentages of respondents at level 3 and 4, show that the police (85 percent) tend to value the importance of the course at the same level as educators (85 percent).

Future: The mean for police was 3.32 and for educators 3.20. The level of importance, as indicated by percentage of respondents at level 3 and 4, were 88 percent for police and 90 percent for educators.

Summary: The data reflect that the mean for each group increased slightly between current and future perspectives of the course. There appears to be little difference in the level of importance, as expressed by percentages, except to indicate a slight upward trend from current to future perspectives.

5. Communications

Current: The data reveal that, although both police and educators felt this course was important, there were moderate differences between the police means of 3.38 and the educators means of 3.10. This difference is also reflected in the level of importance, as indicated by percentage of respondents at level 3 and 4, which show that more police (94 percent) believe the course is important when compared to educators (75 percent). Although there was
not a statistically significant difference between the means of police and educators, in practical terms, the police believe the course to be more important than do educators.

**Future:** As can be observed from the data, both the police mean, 3.52 and the educator mean, 3.35, increased, while the level of importance, as indicated by percentage of respondents at level 3 and 4, for police (94 percent) remained the same and educators (80 percent) increased slightly.

**Summary:** The data reveal that both police and educators view the course as becoming more important in the future. It is also important to note that the level of importance, level 4, increased considerably from current to future for both the police (45 percent to 59 percent) and educators (40 percent to 60 percent), indicating that the course would become far more important in the future than it currently is.

6. **Community Relations**

**Current:** The mean of 2.82 for police and 2.70 for educators suggests that both groups view this course as currently being moderately important, and worth retaining in the curriculum. The level of importance, as indicated by the data, shows that only about half the police (66 percent) and educators (50 percent) perceive the course as important.
Future: Future means for police increased to 3.00, as did educator means, 2.80. A corresponding increase in the level of importance, percentage of respondents at level 3 and 4, occurred for police (73 percent) and educators (55 percent).

Summary: The data indicate that the police see this course as growing in importance in the future, more so than do the educators. However, when taking into account the means and level of importance (percentages) for both groups, between current and future, the data indicates that the course should be retained in the curriculum, but could be revised to better meet the needs of both groups.

7. Patrol Operations

Current: As can be seen from the data the police mean was 3.00, while educators rated the course at a mean of 2.80. The level of importance, percentage of respondents at level 3 and 4, show that more police (80 percent) feel the course is important than do educators (65 percent). These figures indicate that the police feel the course is currently essential while educators feel the course should be retained but, do not feel very strongly about this position.

Future: Table 6 shows the police mean to be 3.18 and the educators mean to 3.05. Level of importance showed an increase in both groups, especially for educators. The level of importance, by percentages of respondents at
level 3 and 4, shows police to have 84 percent and educators to have moved to 75 percent.

Summary: The data reflect an upward trend in the importance of this course by both groups. The educators' perspective (both current and future) has changed the most, both from the standpoint of their mean (2.80 to 3.05) and level of importance (65 percent to 75 percent). This would indicate that both groups tend to agree that this course will be essential in the future.

8. Criminal Procedures

Current: The data reflect that the police mean is 2.66 and the educators mean is 3.25. The level of importance, respondents at level 3 and 4, reflect that police (56 percent) believe the course should be eliminated or revised, while the educators (85 percent) believe the course is important. The t-test reveals that there is a statistically significant difference between the mean of the police and educators at the .01 level.

Future: The police mean increased slightly to 2.77, as did the educator mean to 3.30. Level of importance, as indicated by percentage of respondents at level 3 and 4, was 63 percent for police and 85 percent for educators. Because of the apparent differences between police and educators, the t-test revealed that the difference between group means was found to be significant at the .01 level.
Summary: The data revealed a strong difference of perspective regarding this course's importance for the police and educators. It appears that the police increase in means (2.66 to 2.77) indicates that they feel the course should be included in the curriculum, but from the trend of current and future levels of importance (56 percent to 63 percent), it appears their support for this course is moderate at best. It can be inferred from the data, that while the educators believe the course is important as it is currently taught, the police feel revision of the course may be appropriate.

9. Organization and Management

Current: The data in Table 6 show the mean for police as 2.60 and for educators as 3.25. Level of importance, percentage of respondents at level 3 and 4, reveal police (54 percent) do not feel the course to be very important, while educators (90 percent) believe the course is important. The t-test reveal that the difference between group means are found to be significant at the .001 level.

Future: The police mean is 2.88 and the educator mean is 3.50. Level of importance, as indicated by percentage of respondents at level 3 and 4, is 65 percent for police and 95 percent for educators. Again, the t-test reveal that the difference between group means is significant at the .001 level.
Summary: The data suggest, that when analyzing trends, the police believe this course will become more important in the future (mean from 2.60 to 2.88), although their level of support for such a perspective appears to be moderate (level of importance from 54 percent to 65 percent). However, the data reveal that the educators view this course as very important as can be seen from their means (from 3.25 to 3.50) and their level of support (level of importance from 90 percent to 95 percent).

10. Police Supervision

Current: The data show that police mean is 2.90 and the educators mean is 2.80. Level of importance, of respondents at level 3 and 4, for both the police (69 percent) and educators (70 percent) give the same level of support to this course.

Future: Police means increased to 3.15, as did the educators to 3.00. The level of importance, derived from percentages of respondents at level 3 and 4, suggest a growing support from the police (80 percent), while the educators (75 percent) remain close to the same level of importance.

Summary: The data suggest that there is close agreement between police and educators that this course will become more important in the future and should be an essential course in the curriculum.
11. Personnel Management

**Current:** Table 6 shows that the police mean is 2.79 and the educators mean is 2.95. Level of importance, percentages of respondents at level 3 and 4, connote that police support (61 percent) for the mean is moderate, while educators support (79 percent) is more favorable. Both groups believed that this course is important and should be retained in the curriculum.

**Future:** Both the means for the police (3.06) and the educators (3.16) have increased and show agreement between the groups that the course is important for the future. The level of importance, at level 3 and 4, suggest an upward trend for police (61 percent to 72 percent) and educators (79 percent to 84 percent).

**Summary:** There appears to be fairly close agreement on this course, as being essential, as the data from both groups indicates.

12. Comparative Police Systems

**Current:** The data reflect that the police mean is 1.94 and the educator is 2.45. Both these low means gives strong evidence that this course is currently viewed to have little importance or benefit to either group. This finding is also reflected in the low level of importance, as expressed in level 3 and 4, the police (23 percent) and educators (40 percent) place in this course. A t-test between group means found them to be significant at the .05 level.
Future: For the future, the data denote an increase in the means for both the police (2.14) and the educators (2.80). This upward trend is also reflected in the level of importance, percentages on level 3 and 4, for police (32 percent) and educators (65 percent). With a wide difference between police and educator means, the t-test revealed that there is a statistically significant difference between group means at the .01 level.

Summary: The data present strong evidence the police perceive this course to be unimportant (future mean 2.4) and that they are not willing to support this course as being part of the curriculum (32 percent on level 3 and 4). While the educators agree with the police at the current level, they strongly change their position in the future to one of support for this course remaining in the curriculum (mean 2.80). Because of this practical and statistically significant difference between groups, the course should be considered for elimination from the curriculum.

13. Forensic Science

Current: The means reflected by the data show the police mean to be 2.85 and the educators 3.05. Level of importance, percentage of respondents at level 3 and 4, for police are 68 percent and educators 75 percent.

Future: The police mean of 3.04 increased moderately, while the educators future mean of 3.15 also
increased. Level of importance for the police increased to 75 percent of respondent at level 3 and 4, while educators level of importance declined to 70 percent.

Summary: While both groups view this course as important, as seen through their means, there is an inverse relationship with regard to the level of importance for educators (75 percent to 70 percent) decreased, the police (68 percent to 75 percent) increased. The data, however, does not reflect this change to have any impact on the overall importance of this course.

14. Criminal Identification

Current: The police mean of 2.90 and the educators mean of 2.85 strongly indicate that both groups believe this course is important. Level of importance was found to be strong for both the police (70 percent) and educators (77 percent).

Future: The data reveal that both means tended to increase proportionally, with the police mean being 3.08 and the educators 2.90. The level of importance, as expressed by percentage of respondents at level 3 and 4, increased for police (77 percent) and remained the same for educators (77 percent).

Summary: The data suggest that there is fairly close agreement from both groups that this course is important.
15. Crime Prevention

**Current:** The data reflect the police mean to be 2.86 and the educators mean to be 2.95. The level of importance for police (70 percent) is slightly higher than the educators (65 percent).

**Future:** The data show that the means of both groups increased to the same level. Police had a mean of 3.20 as did educators, 3.20 mean. This accurately reflects the support this course has for the future, as presented in the level of importance, percentage of respondents at level 3 and 4. Police increased to 81 percent and educators increased to 75 percent.

**Summary:** The data strongly suggest that both groups feel this course to be important and support the course in the curriculum as can be seen by the level of importance.

16. Handling of Juveniles

**Current:** The data reveal that the police means (2.87) and the educators mean (2.80) were closely matched. This is also true for the level of importance, percentage of respondents at level 3 and 4, with police support at 72 percent and educators at 70 percent. The data suggest almost complete agreement that this course should currently be considered as an elective.
Future: Both the police mean of 3.00 and the educators mean of 2.85 increased. While the police's level of importance increased to 77 percent, the educators' dropped to 65 percent.

Summary: The trend, as indicated from the data, denotes that the police feel the course is going to be important. However, educators, although they see the course remaining in the curriculum, feel the course is not as important as the police perceive it to be. This can be demonstrated by the slight increase in the mean for educators (2.80 to 2.85), yet a corresponding overall decrease in educator support for the course as measured by the level of importance (from 70 percent to 65 percent).

17. Internship

Current: Data presented in Table 6 indicate the police mean to be 2.80 and the educator mean to be 3.10. This moderate differential in means is also reflected in the level of importance that the police (66 percent) and educators (80 percent) have expressed. Although this difference appears substantial, no statistical significance was found between means.

Future: Both the police mean (3.00) and the educator mean (3.45) appear to increase considerably for the future. An increase in the level of importance is also noted. Seventy-four percent of the police and 90 percent of the educators perceived the course as important as indicated
by the level of importance and the percentage of respondents at level 3 and 4. With an increasing differential between group means, the t-test revealed that this difference was significant at the .05 level.

**Summary:** It appears from the data, that both groups view this course as important, but the educators feel strongly that this course is essential for the future.

**18. Police Stress**

**Current:** The police mean of 3.26 is considerably higher than the educators mean of 2.95. Coupled with the level of importance, percentage of respondents at level 3 and 4, for police (85 percent) and educators (70 percent), this would tend to show the police feel far stronger about this course's importance than do the educators.

**Future:** The police mean increased to 3.48, as did the educators mean increase to 3.25. The level of importance, percentage of respondents at level 3 and 4, increased for police (89 percent) as well as educators (85 percent).

**Summary:** The data give strong evidence to suggest that both groups perceive this course to be growing in importance. There is close agreement between the groups as to the level of support each has for the course. This would indicate that this course will be considered essential in the curriculum.
19. Psychology for Police

Current: The data reveal the police mean to be 3.07 and the educators mean to be 3.00. The level of importance, as measured by the percentage of respondents at level 3 and 4, show that both police (81 percent) and educators (80 percent) are in very close agreement as to the current importance of this course.

Future: The means for police, 3.28, and the means for educators, 3.30, both show increases. A similar increase is found in the level of importance, percentage of respondents at level 3 and 4, for police (85 percent) and educators (85 percent).

Summary: The data suggest that both police and educators believe this course to be essential in the curriculum and that the educators feel slightly stronger in this perspective than do the police.

20. Management of Conflict

Current: The data reveal the mean for police as 3.24 and for educators as 3.15. The level of importance shows strong support by respondents of both groups (police - 87 percent and educators - 80 percent) for the course.

Future: The mean for police increased to 3.41 and the mean for educators increased dramatically to 3.50. The level of importance also increased proportionally for police (91 percent) and educators (95 percent).
Summary: The data suggest that both groups view this course as highly essential to the curriculum. This can be demonstrated by the high means and level of importance for both groups on current and future perspectives.

21. Cross-Cultural Differences

Current: The data show the police mean as 2.72 and the educators as 2.85. Level of importance, percentage of respondents at level 3 and 4, for police (64 percent) and educators (75 percent) infer moderate support for this course.

Future: The future means for the police are 2.97 and for educators 3.25. A similar increase occurred for the level of importance, percentage of respondents at level 3 and 4, for the police (73 percent) and educators (90 percent).

Summary: The data reveal that the police mean (current - 2.72, future - 2.97) shows an upward trend that indicate that the course should be retained in the curriculum. The level of importance (64 percent to 72 percent) shows that there is moderate support for the course's future. For the educators, however, the data indicates a shift in perception from simple inclusion in the curriculum to perceiving the course as essential in the curriculum as can be seen through the increased means (2.85 to 3.25). There is a strong increase in the support for
this perception, as can be seen by the greatly increased percentage of respondents who were at level 3 and 4 of the level of importance (from 75 percent to 90 percent).

22. Technical Investigations

Current: The data reveal the police mean to be 2.89 and the educators mean to be 2.53. Level of importance, by percentage of respondents at level 3 and 4, indicates moderate support for the perceptions of the police (70 percent) and educators (58 percent). The data reflect the fact that the educators do not currently view this course as essential or important to the curriculum. It can be inferred from this that they believe the course should be eliminated from the curriculum. The police however, believe the course is important to the curriculum.

Future: The police mean is 3.26 and the educators mean is 3.16. The level of importance, as indicated by percentage of respondents at level 3 and 4, indicate strong support for this increased importance of the course perception by the police (84 percent) and educators (79 percent).

Summary: The data suggest that the police perception of the course has moved from important (mean 2.89) to essential (mean 3.26). There appears to be adequate support (level of importance from 70 percent to 84 percent) for this increase in police perception. For educators, there is a meaningful shift of perceived importance
for this course, as reflected in the dramatic increase in means (from 2.53 to 3.16) and percentage of respondents at level 3 and 4 (from 58 percent to 79 percent). This would indicate that both police and educators now seem to agree that this course is essential for the curriculum.

23. Management of Police

Current: The data show the police mean as 2.72 and the educators mean as 3.25. Level of importance, percentage of respondents at level 3 and 4, show police (63 percent) only have moderate support for their perception, while educators (90 percent) are in strong agreement. There exists a large difference in the perception of the importance of the course between police and educators. The difference between group means was statistically significant at the .01 level.

Future: Future means for police are 3.03 and for educators, 3.60. Level of importance, percentage of respondents at level 3 and 4, for police (77 percent) increased to strong support. For educators (95 percent), there was only a slight increase to their already strong support for this course. Although both groups view this course as essential in the future, there still exists a large differential between police and educator means. The data reveal that the difference between the means was statistically significant at the .01 level.
Summary: The police shifted their perception of this course from important to essential and educators who felt this course was essential to start with (current) showed a meaningful shift in their perception as indicated by the changes in level 4 (45 percent to 65 percent) under level of importance. This course, although seen as essential by both groups, is viewed as more important by educators than by police.

24. Criminology

Current: The data indicate that the police mean is 2.38 and the educators mean is 2.70. The level of importance, percentage of respondents at level 3 and 4, indicated that support for this course by both police (42 percent) and educators (60 percent) was low. According to the data police feel this course should not be considered in the curriculum, while educators believe it should be included.

Future: The data indicate the police mean to be 2.52 and the educators to be 2.75. The level of importance suggested little change for the police (50 percent) or educators (60 percent) perception of this course.

Summary: The police view this course as not belonging in the curriculum. The educators view the course as important when considering the mean, however, there is weak support for the perception as measured by respondents
who view the course at level 3 and 4 (60 percent). It can be inferred from the data that this course is in need of revision or should be eliminated from the curriculum.

25. Terrorism, Subversion, Cultism

Current: The data reveal that both the police (mean 2.75) and the educators (2.85) believe this course is important. By examining the data on level of importance, it can be inferred that the police (65 percent) only have moderate support for these perceptions and the educators (80 percent) strongly support their perception of the course as important.

Future: The data reflect that both the means for the police (3.16) and the means for the educators (3.40) have increased considerably over the current perceptions of the course. The level of importance is also reflective of this change for both police (79 percent) and educators (85 percent).

Summary: It would appear from the data that this course will grow considerably in importance and would become an essential course in the curriculum.

26. Labor Relations

Current: The mean for police is 2.42 and for educators 2.60. Level of importance, percentage of respondents at level 3 and 4, indicates little support for the perception that this course should be in the curriculum, by either the police (45 percent) or the educators (60 percent).
**Future**: The mean for the police increased to 2.66 and the mean for educators increased dramatically to 3.10. These mean increases were also reflected in the level of importance, percentage of respondents at level 3 and 4, as perceived by police (55 percent) and educators (80 percent). The data reveal a wide difference between the perceptions of both groups. This is confirmed by the t-test which show that the difference between the group means are found to be statistically significant at the .05 level.

**Summary**: The data confirm that the police perceive that the course should be eliminated from the curriculum. However, the educators feel strongly that the course should be essential to the curriculum. Because of these differences, the data indicates that the course should be revised or consideration should be given to its elimination.

27. **Research Methods**

**Current**: The data reveal that there is a wide difference between the police mean of 2.40 and the educators mean of 3.05. The level of importance, percentage of respondents at level 3 and 4, strongly indicate that the police perception of this course is very low (45 percent) and from this we can infer that they feel it should be eliminated from the curriculum. For educators they feel strongly (85 percent) that the course is essential to the curriculum. The t-test revealed that there was a
statistically significant difference between the means of the two groups at the .001 level.

**Future:** There was an increase in the mean of the police (2.64) and a meaningful increase in the mean of the educators (3.50). While support for the level of importance of the course did increase for police to 58 percent of the respondents who were at level 3 and 4, this was not sufficient to raise the overall low perception of the course by the police. The educators not only meaningfully increased their mean, for the course, but increased their level of importance (90 percent). These large differences between the means of the group were found to be significant at the .001 level.

**Summary:** The data suggest that if the course is to remain in the curriculum, police must perceive this course as far more beneficial or the course should be revised.

28. **Contemporary Issues**

**Current:** The police mean was 2.50 and the educators was 3.05. Level of importance for police was low (45 percent), while for educators it was high (85 percent). The observed differential between group means was found to be statistically significant at the .001 level.

**Future:** The police mean increased to 2.70, as did the educators mean to 3.40. Corresponding increases in the level of importance were revealed by the data for
police (59 percent) and the educators (90 percent). With these large differences, the t-test revealed that the differences between them were significant at the .001 level.

**Summary:** The data indicate that although the police mean has increased from 2.50 to 2.70, reflecting that they perceive the course as important, the percentage of respondents at level 3 and 4 in the level of importance (from 45 percent to 59 percent) suggest low support for this perception. The educators however, have a strong and increasing perception of the course being essential, as indicated by their means (from 3.05 to 3.40) and level of importance (from 85 to 90 percent). Because of these differences between the groups, the course should be considered as important, but subject to revision.

29. **Computer Literacy**

**Current:** The data indicate the police mean as 2.81 and the educators mean as 2.90. Level of importance, percentages of respondents at level 3 and 4, are 66 percent for police and 75 percent for educators. It can be inferred from the data, that there is close agreement between the two groups on the value of this course.

**Future:** The data indicate the police mean as 3.30 and the educators mean is 3.75. Level of importance, percentage of respondents at level 3 and 4, show both police (83 percent) and educators (90 percent) have strong support for their perception of the course as being essential to the
curriculum. The data revealed a statistically significant difference between the two groups means at the .01 level.

Summary: The data give strong evidence to suggest that both groups equally view this course to be essential to the curriculum and have strong support from respondents in their perception of this course.

30. Ethics

Current: The data reveal the mean for police to be 3.10 and the mean for educators to be 3.45. Level of importance for both groups displayed high support for this course (police - 83 percent: educators - 90 percent). Course means between police and educators were significant at the .05 level.

Future: The police mean increased to 3.28 as did the educators mean to 3.50. The level of importance for police increased to 88 percent and the educators remained at 90 percent. However, when examining the educators' levels of importance, it was found that there was a slight increase at the 4 level (from 55 to 60 percent) and a decrease at the 3 level (from 35 to 30 percent).

Summary: Both the police and educators view this course as essential to the curriculum as can be demonstrated from the groups' high means and percentage of respondents at level 3 and 4 of the level of importance.

To enhance the visualization of differences between police and educator means, Figure 1 presents a graphic display between current and future courses for both groups.
FIGURE 1

This graph represents the means for all courses, current and future as perceived by police and educators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Administration of Justice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current - Police</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Educators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future - Police</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Educators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Criminal Law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current - Police</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Educators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future - Police</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Educators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Evidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current - Police</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Educators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future - Police</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Educators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Investigations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current - Police</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Educators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future - Police</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Educators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Communications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current - Police</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Educators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future - Police</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Educators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Community Relations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current - Police</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Educators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future - Police</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Educators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Patrol Operations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current - Police</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Educators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future - Police</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Educators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Criminal Procedures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current - Police</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Educators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future - Police</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Educators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Organization and Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current - Police</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Educators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future - Police</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Educators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FIGURE 1 (Continued)

**Graphic Display of Course Means**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Police Supervision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current - Police Educators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future - Police Educators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 11. Personnel Management      |      |
| Current - Police Educators    |      |
| Future - Police Educators     |      |

| 12. Comparative Police Systems|      |
| Current - Police Educators    |      |
| Future - Police Educators     |      |

| 13. Forensic Science          |      |
| Current - Police Educators    |      |
| Future - Police Educators     |      |

| 14. Criminal Identification   |      |
| Current - Police Educators    |      |
| Future - Police Educators     |      |

| 15. Crime Prevention          |      |
| Current - Police Educators    |      |
| Future - Police Educators     |      |

| 16. Handling of Juveniles     |      |
| Current - Police Educators    |      |
| Future - Police Educators     |      |

| 17. Internship                |      |
| Current - Police Educators    |      |
| Future - Police Educators     |      |

| 18. Police Stress             |      |
| Current - Police Educators    |      |
| Future - Police Educators     |      |
### Graphic Display of Course Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19. Psychology for Police</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current - Police - Educators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future - Police - Educators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Management of Conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current - Police - Educators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future - Police - Educators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Cross-Cultural Differences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current - Police - Educators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future - Police - Educators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Technical Investigations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current - Police - Educators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future - Police - Educators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Management of Police</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current - Police - Educators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future - Police - Educators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Criminology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current - Police - Educators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future - Police - Educators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Terrorism, Subversion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current - Police - Educators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future - Police - Educators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Labor Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current - Police - Educators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future - Police - Educators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Research Methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current - Police - Educators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future - Police - Educators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURSE</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Contemporary Issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current - Police Educators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future - Police Educators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Computer Literacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current - Police Educators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future - Police Educators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Ethics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current - Police Educators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future - Police Educators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rank Order of Current and Future Courses
by Mean and Percentages as Perceived
by Police and Educators

The criteria used to rank the courses was a two step process. First, courses are ranked by their mean, from the highest mean to the lowest mean. Secondly, the total percentage of respondents at level 3 and 4, of the level of importance, are used to further give a more accurate ranking between courses whose mean are the same.

Ranking of Courses by Current Perceptions
of Police and Educators

Table 7 and Table 8 display the rank order of courses for police and educators as they currently perceive them. This is necessary in order to determine which courses the police and the educators feel are most important currently. The criteria, discussed in Chapter 3, for inclusion of courses into the model core curriculum were used to determine the courses that police and then educators feel are currently essential, important, and those in need of revision or elimination. This criteria states that all courses with a mean of 3.0 or higher and having 75 percent of the respondents who perceive the course as "important" or "very important" in level of importance, shall be considered essential or falling within the definition of the core
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>PERCENTAGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Evidence</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Criminal Law</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Communications</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Police Stress</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Management of Conflict</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Investigations</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Ethics</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Psychology for Police</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Patrol Operations</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Police Supervision</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Criminal Identification</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Technical Investigations</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Handling of Juveniles</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Crime Prevention</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Forensic Science</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Community Relations</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Computer Literacy</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Internship</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Personnel Management</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Terrorism, Sub., Cultism</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Cross-Cult. Differences</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Management of Police</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Criminal Procedures</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Organization &amp; Management</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Administration of Justice</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Contemporary Issues</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Labor Relations</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Research Methods</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Criminology</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Comparative Pol. Systems</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 8**

Rank Order of Current Courses By Mean and Percentages as Perceived by Educators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>PERCENTAGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Ethics</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Criminal Law</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Administration of Justice</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Management of Police</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Organization &amp; Management</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Criminal Procedures</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Evidence</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Investigations</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Management of Conflict</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Internship</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Communications</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Research Methods</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Contemporary Issues</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Forensic Science</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Psychology for Police</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Personnel Management</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Police Stress</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Crime Prevention</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Computer Literacy</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Terrorism, Sub., Cultism</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Cross-Cult. Differences</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Criminal Identification</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Police Supervision</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Handling of Juveniles</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Patrol Operations</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Criminology</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Community Relations</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Labor Relations</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Technical Investigations</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Comparative Pol. Systems</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
curriculum. Those courses whose mean ranked between 2.7 and 2.9 were considered to be important courses that should be used to supplement core course or to be used as electives. Courses falling below 2.7 should be considered for possible revision or elimination from post-secondary programs.

**Police:** According to the data in Table 7, those courses listed as 1 through 9 fall within the parameters set for inclusion within the core curriculum. These 9 courses represent 30 percent of all courses listed. The police feel that courses listed as 10 through 22 in Table 7 are currently important and should act as a supplement to the core or as elective courses. This represents 43 percent of all listed courses. Police currently perceive that courses listed as 23 through 30 in Table 7, are in need of revision or elimination from the curriculum. These courses represent 27 percent of all listed courses. It is important to note that the data reveal that 4 (Police Stress, Management of Conflict, Ethics, and Psychology for Police) of the courses (44 percent) perceived as essential are not currently offered by most institutions in this research and that one course (Patrol Operations) is only offered by one institution. Of those courses that police currently feel should be revised or eliminated, 2 (Research Methods, and Labor Relations) were seen as future areas of emphasis according to the literature review. The data suggests that there is no
systematic grouping of courses into functional areas, as they apply to how the police ranked the courses as they currently perceive them.

**Educators:** As indicated by the data in Table 8, the educators perceived courses listed as 1 through 15 as falling within the parameters set for inclusion within the core curriculum. These 15 courses represent 50 percent of all listed courses. The educators perceive courses listed as 16 through 27 in Table 8 to be currently important and should act as a supplement to the core or as elective courses. These 12 courses represent 40 percent of all listed courses. Educators currently view that courses listed as 28 through 30 in Table 8, are in need of revision or elimination from the curriculum. These 3 courses represent 10 percent of all courses listed. The data indicates that educators currently perceive three courses (Management of Police, Management of Conflict, and Psychology for Police) to be essential, but they are not presently offered at any of the institutions in this research. The data for educators, suggest that there is no systematic grouping of courses into functional areas, as they apply to how the educators ranked the courses as they currently perceive them.

**Differences In Rank Order Of Courses Between Police And Educators As They Currently Percieve Them**

The data from Table 7 and Table 8 suggest that there is fairly close agreement between police and educators on
which courses should be currently perceived as essential. The exception to this, as indicated by the data, is that educators believe that there should be six more courses included as essential, than do the police. This agreement is demonstrated by the data, which show that of the nine courses the police feel are essential and fall within the core curriculum, educators agree on seven of the courses (Evidence, Criminal Law, Communications, Management of Conflict, Investigations, Ethics, Psychology for Police). This assessment of the data does not compare the means or percentage of respondents by level of importance.

The data from Table 7 and 8 also reveal large differences in the number and ranking of courses that fall into the category of being revised or eliminated. These courses would have a mean of less than 2.70. Table 7 reveals that police perceive 8 courses that should be revised or eliminated and that educators perceive only 3 courses falling into this category. Both groups agree on only 2 courses (Labor Relations, Comparative Police Systems) that are in need of revision or elimination.

From Table 7 and 8 the data reflect these differences in this category as follows: The police perceive that the courses of Criminal Procedure, Organization and Management, Administration of Justice, Contemporary Issues, and Research Methods, are all in need of revision or elimination. However, the educators not only perceive these courses as essential, but rank them high on their list of courses. The
course of Criminology, which is also ranked by the police as in need of revision or elimination, is listed by the educators as being in the category of important. While differences do exist between the police and educators, as they currently perceive courses, the data has shown that there is agreement on a number of courses that should be included as essential and important. However, there appears to be a high degree of disagreement over which courses should be eliminated or revised.

**Ranking of Courses by Future Perceptions of Police and Educators**

Table 9 and Table 10 display the rank order of courses for police and educators as they perceive them for the future. The same criteria for ranking these courses will be used, as explained in the current ranking of courses.

**Police:** According to the data in Table 9, those courses listed as 1 through 15 and 17, 18, and 19 fall within the parameters set for inclusion within the core curriculum. These 18 courses represent 60 percent of all listed courses. The police feel that courses listed as 16 and 20 through 25 in Table 9, are important for the future and should act as a supplement to the core or as an elective course. These courses represent 23 percent of all listed courses. Police, for the future, perceive that courses listed as 26 through 30 in Table 9 are in need of revision or
### Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>PERCENTAGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Evidence</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Criminal Law</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Communications</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Police Stress</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Management of Conflict</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Investigations</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Computer Literacy</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Ethics</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Psychology for Police</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Technical Investigations</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Crime Prevention</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Patrol Operations</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Terrorism, Sub., Cultism</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Police Supervision</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Criminal Identification</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Personnel Management</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Forensic Science</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Management of Police</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Handling of Juveniles</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Internship</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Community Relations</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Cross-Cult. Differences</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Organization &amp; Management</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Criminal Procedures</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Contemporary Issues</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Administration of Justice</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Labor Relations</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Research Methods</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Criminology</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Comparative Pol. Systems</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>PERCENTAGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Computer Literacy</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Management of Police</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Management of Conflict</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Organization &amp; Management</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Research Methods</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ethics</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Criminal Law</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Internship</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Terrorism, Sub., Cultism</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Contemporary Issues</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Administration of Justice</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Communications</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Psychology for Police</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Criminal Procedures</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Cross-Cult. Differences</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Police Stress</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Evidence</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Investigations</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Crime Preventions</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Personnel Management</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Technical Investigations</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Forensic Science</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Labor Relations</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Patrol Operations</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Police Supervision</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Criminal Identification</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Handling of Juveniles</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Comparative Police</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Community Relations</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Criminology</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
elimination. These courses represent 17 percent of all courses listed. It should be noted that the police perceive 7 of the courses (Police Stress, Management of Conflict, Computer Literacy, Ethics, Psychology for Police, Technical Investigations, and Terrorism, Subversion, and Cultism) out of the 18 that are perceived as essential in the future, to be suggested by the literature review as areas of future importance. These 17 courses are not offered by the majority of institutions in this research. Of those courses that police feel should be revised or eliminated in the future, 2 (Research Methods, and Labor Relations) were seen as future areas of emphasis according to the literature review. The data in Table 9 suggest that there is no systematic grouping of courses into functional areas, as they apply to how the police ranked the courses as they perceive them in the future.

**Educators:** As indicated by the data in table 10, the educators perceive courses listed as 1 through 21 and courses numbered 23, 24, and 25 as essential in the future and falling within the parameters set for inclusion within the core curriculum. These 24 courses represent 80 percent of all courses listed. The educators perceived courses listed as 22 and 26 through 30 in Table 10 as important in the future and they should act as a supplement to the core or as an elective course. These 6 courses represent 20 percent of all courses listed. The data in Table 10 reveals that educators felt all courses listed were
either essential or important to the curriculum in the future. They listed no course as in need of revision or elimination for the future. The data indicate that educators perceived essential for the future course curriculum, 10 courses that are either not offered or not offered by the majority of institutions in this research. The data in Table 10 suggest that there is no systematic grouping of courses into functional areas, as they apply to how the educators ranked the courses as they perceive them for the future.

Differences in Rank Order of Courses Between Police and Educators As They Perceive Them For the Future

The data from Table 9 and 10 suggest that the police and educators are in fairly close agreement on which courses they perceive as essential. The exception to this, as the data indicates, is that the educators believe that there should be 6 more courses included as essential, than do the police. This agreement in courses essential in the future is demonstrated by the data, which show that of the 18 courses that police feel are essential in the future, educators agree on 14 of those courses. Table 9 reveals that the police feel that 5 courses should be revised or eliminated, while educators perceive no courses needing revision or deletion in the future.
Summary of Differences Between Current and Future Perceptions of Courses by Police and Educators

Police: The data from Table 7 and Table 9, reveal that the police perception of courses between current and future remained fairly consistent, but did have a number of meaningful changes. The police perception of the top 10 courses remained constant between current and future perceptions with one major exception. The course Computer Literacy, which ranked number 17 (mean 2.81) on the current list, moved to number 7 (mean 3.30) on the future list. Additionally, those courses the police perceived to be in need of revision or elimination, remained the same with three exceptions. The courses Criminal Procedures, Organization and Management, and Contemporary Issues, all increased in their rank order and mean and were considered important as a future course. Overall, the data in Table 9 reveals that future course means and percentages of respondents who perceived the courses as important or essential, increased from current perceptions, as indicated in comparing Table 7 and Table 9.

Educators: The data from Table 8 and Table 10 reveal that the educators perception of courses between current and future present a high level of change that was considered meaningful. The educators perception of the top 10 courses changed dramatically. Where the courses Ethics,
Criminal Law, and Administration of Justice, were perceived to be the top three courses currently, the educators perception of these courses in the future reduced them to rank number 6, 7, and 11 respectively. It should be noted, that while these courses decreased in their rank order standing, their mean and percentage of respondents who perceived them as important and essential did not decrease. The course, Computer Literacy moved from being ranked number 19 (mean 2.90) by the educators currently, to being ranked first (mean 3.75) for the future. Additional top 10 courses which had meaningful changes were Criminal Procedures (from number 6 to 14 in rank), Evidence (from number 7 to 17), and Investigations (from number 8 to 18 in rank). The means and percentages of respondents who perceived these courses as important or essential, did not decrease. The last meaningful change occurred for the course Terrorism, Subversion, and Cultism, which moved from being ranked number 20 (mean 2.85) for current perceptions to 9 (mean 3.40) for future perceptions.

Future Philosophical Orientation As Perceived
By Police and Educators

The following data, as displayed in Table 11, is used to answer the following questions: What philosophical orientation do law enforcement practitioners believe should guide the core curriculum in the future? What philosophical
orientation do law enforcement educators believe should guide the core curriculum in the future? Is there a significant difference between law enforcement practitioners and educators with regard to the philosophical orientation of future programs?

Approach #1: The data in Table 11 indicates the police mean to be 2.82 and the educator mean to be 2.50. The level of importance, as indicated by percentage of respondents at level 3 and 4, reveal that far more police (68 percent), than educators (45 percent) believe this approach to be useful in the future. This suggests that practitioners view the approach as moderately useful in the future, however, educators perceive this approach as of little use to guide the core curriculum. Although there appears to be a practical difference between the police and educators, no statistically significant difference was found.

Approach #2: The mean for police was 3.12 and for educators 3.20. The level of importance, percentage of respondents at level 3 and 4, for police (84 percent) was slightly lower than for educators (85 percent). The data in Table 11 indicate that police and educators are in very close agreement as to the usefulness of this approach for the future. The data also suggest that both groups believe that this approach will be important in the future.

Approach #3: Table 11 indicate that the mean for police is 2.61 and for educators the mean is 2.80. The level
of importance for police is 55 percent and for educators 65 percent of those respondents who perceive the approach to be at level 3 and 4 under the level of importance. This denotes that police did not give much importance or support to this approach. However, educators believe the approach is useful, as indicated by a mean of 2.80. Although the mean indicate that educators feel the approach to be useful, this position is given only moderate support, as can be seen through the data under level of importance.

**Approach #4:** The data reveal a police mean of 2.45 and an educator mean of 3.05. Level of importance, as revealed by percentage of respondents at the 3 and 4 level, denoted that the police (39 percent) gave very little support to this approach. However, the educators (80 percent) gave strong support to this approach. This seemingly large difference between police and educators means was confirmed from the data. The data reveal that the difference between group means were significant at the .05 level.

**Approach #5:** The police mean was 3.51 and educator mean was 3.45. This close agreement displayed in the mean, is also shown by the level of importance each group indicated. The level of importance, percentage of respondents at level 3 and 4, for police is 93 percent and for educators is 90 percent. This high mean and level of importance shows that each group appears to feel very strongly
regarding this approach and very supportive of its usefulness for the future.

Figure 2 represents a graphic display of differences between police and educator means as they apply to the philosophical approaches.
TABLE 11

Level of Importance, Means, t-Test Ratios, and Probability Between Police Practitioners and Educators Perceptions of Future Philosophical Orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Level of Importance</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Level of Importance</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police (N = 354)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Educators (N = 20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Approach #1</td>
<td>6 26 47 21</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>20 35 20 25</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>-1.28</td>
<td>0.214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Approach #2</td>
<td>1 15 54 30</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>5 10 45 40</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Approach #3</td>
<td>9 37 40 15</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>10 25 40 25</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Approach #4</td>
<td>12 41 38 10</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>10 10 45 35</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>0.011 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Approach #5</td>
<td>1 6 35 58</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>0 10 35 55</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td>0.699</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at .05 level

FIGURE 2

This graph represents the means for the future philosophical orientation as perceived by police and educators.
Rank Order of Future Philosophical Orientations

As Perceived by Police and Educators

The criteria used to rank the philosophical approaches was a two step process. First, the approach was ranked by the mean; from the highest mean to the lowest mean. Secondly, the total percentage of respondents at level 3 and 4, of the level of importance, will be used to further give a more accurate ranking between approaches.

Police: According to the data in Table 12, the police feel strongly that Approach #5 is the most important philosophical course orientation for the future. Approach #2 is also felt to be important, as can be seen by its mean (3.12) and level of importance. Although Approach #1 was given a mean (2.82) that reflected a degree of usefulness for this orientation, its level of importance (68 percent) is considered having only moderate support. Both Approach #3 and Approach #4 are perceived by the police to lack any true usefulness in the future, according to the data in Table 12. It should be recognized the Approach #5 and #2 are closely related and both call for the police to be taught a course in a manner that stresses involvement and the ability to solve problems in a flexible manner.

Educators: According to the data in Table 13, the educators feel most strongly about Approach #5, as is reflected in their mean of 3.45 and the level of importance, percentage of respondents at level 3 and 4, as 90 percent.
### TABLE 12

Rank Order of Future Philosophical Orientations as Perceived by Police Practitioners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROACH</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>PERCENTAGES</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Approach #5</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Approach #2</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Approach #1</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Approach #3</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Approach #4</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 13

Rank Order of Future Philosophical Orientations as Perceived by Educators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROACH</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>PERCENTAGES</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Approach #5</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Approach #2</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Approach #4</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Approach #3</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Approach #1</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Closely following Approach #5 is Approach #2, with a mean of 3.20 and level of importance of 90 percent. The data reveal that educators also believe that Approach #4 will be useful in the future as can be seen in the mean of 3.05 and level of importance of 80 percent. Approach #3 was given a mean of 2.80 by the educators, which would indicate that the approach would be useful in the future. However, its level of importance (65 percent) would suggest that the educators only have moderate support for this position. As can be observed from the data in Table 13, Approach #1 appears to be perceived as not being very useful in the future. This is indicated by the data, which reflects a mean of 2.50 and a level of importance of 45 percent. It can be inferred from the data that Approach #5 is felt by the educators to be of most use in the future and that Approach #2 and #4 should be used to broaden the scope of the future philosophical orientation.

Differences In Rank Order of Future Philosophical Orientation for Police and Educators

The data, from Table 12 and Table 13, strongly suggest that both groups perceive Approach #5 as the most important and useful in the future, followed by Approach #2. As for Approach #4, there appears to be wide disagreement between police and educators on the relevance of this approach in the future. This can also be found to be true with Approach #3 and Approach #1, but to a far lesser degree than Approach #4.
Summary

The major purpose of this study was to develop a new core curriculum model that incorporated courses that both police and law enforcement educators considered most important. Additionally, this study investigated which philosophical orientation should be used in the future to teach law enforcement courses.

Demographic Data

The data from the survey (Table 3 and Table 4) reveal that police practitioners, on the average, were far younger than educators. Both practitioners and educators have a wide range of occupational experience. Police practitioners were found to have a wide range of educational experiences. The data demonstrated this through their educational level and diversity of major field of study. Because of the wide-spread geographical location of respondents, there were corresponding large numbers of colleges and universities the practitioners attended. The data for educators indicated not only good occupational experiences, but a strong teaching background as well. As should be expected, the educators level of education did not fall below the Masters level, with the vast majority of educators majoring in either Criminal Justice or Public Administration.
Law Enforcement Courses At California State Universities (CSU)

The data (Table 5) reflect that of the 30 courses listed in the survey, four out of the five or five of the CSU institutions listed offered slightly less than 50 percent of these courses to their students. It was also found that there exists a number of courses, that although they possessed the same or closely related title, the content of each course may have been different dependent on which institution it was taught at.

Perception of Police and Educators Toward Courses Currently and In The Future

The data (Tables 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10) reflect that while police and educators do agree on a number of courses, both in terms of current perceptions and for the future, there were also a large number (43 percent) of courses where there was strong practical disagreement over the level of importance. Of the 30 courses listed, a statistically significant difference was found in 37 percent of those courses.

Perception of Police and Educators Toward Philosophical Orientation In The Future

The data (Tables 11, 12, and 13) indicated strong agreement between police and educators toward one orientation (Approach #5), with secondary agreement on another orientation (Approach #2). This agreement between police and
educators suggest a combining of the orientations, which are closely related, to form one approach for the future.

**Recommended Core Curriculum As Perceived By Police and Educators**

The overall ratings of respondents were used to evaluate the importance of each course. In the survey, police and educators were asked to evaluate each course as they currently perceive it and secondly, to evaluate the course on how important it would be in the future, five to ten years from now. Current perceptions were used as a benchmark to indicate trends of each course, so that the perception of the importance of courses in the future would have more meaning. Since a major purpose of this research was to develop a new core curriculum, the future perceptions of both police and educators (Table 6) were used to select this new core. Because no system of weighting the combined scores of police and educators was used, the following criteria was developed to ascertain which courses would make-up the new model core curriculum. The new model core curriculum, as perceived by agreement between police and educators, consisted of all courses where the police and educator means were 3.0 or higher and the respondents level of importance, as indicated by the percentage of respondents at level 3 and 4, was 75 percent or higher. Based on this criteria, Table 14 represents the model core curriculum as suggested by police and educators. Table 14 is listed in the order the courses appeared on the survey (see Appendix A).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>POLICE MEAN</th>
<th>POLICE IMPORTANCE</th>
<th>EDUCATORS MEAN</th>
<th>EDUCATORS IMPORTANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Criminal Law</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Evidence</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Investigations</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Communications</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Patrol Operations</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Police Supervision</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Crime Prevention</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Police Stress</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Psychology for Police</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Management of Conflict</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Tech. Investigations</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Management of Police</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Terrorism,Subv.,Cultism</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Computer Literacy</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Ethics</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The Problem, Purpose, and Procedures of the Study

The problem this study addressed was the need to develop an appropriate future law enforcement core curriculum at the four-year post-secondary level, based on the perception of both law enforcement practitioners and educators. This was essential, since most curriculum matters at this level do not take into account the needs of law enforcement practitioners and have in the past failed to look at the future in terms of courses and philosophical orientation that direct and guide the core curriculum. The purpose of this study was to investigate the perceptions of California law enforcement educators and police practitioners regarding curriculum issues and from this a new core curriculum model was developed and a philosophical orientation for the future was suggested.

This study utilized a survey questionnaire to gather data from a stratified random sample of California law enforcement practitioners and all law enforcement educators at selected California State Universities. From the sample population of 380 practitioners and 23 educators, a return rate of 93.2 percent for practitioners and 86.9 percent for
educators was achieved. The returned surveys were processed at the University of the Pacific, computer services center, utilizing the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences.

Review of the Literature

A review of the literature concentrated on four major areas: (1) historical overview of post-secondary law enforcement education, (2) effects of education on law enforcement personnel, (3) curriculum for post-secondary law enforcement personnel, and (4) future courses for law enforcement. This review of the literature included pertinent articles, books, studies, and course catalogs that were used to develop appropriate courses for the survey.

Analysis and Interpretation of the Data

The research resulted in findings in five areas: (1) demographic data of both police practitioners and educators, (2) data relating to law enforcement courses offered at CSU's in this research and the differences among institutions, (3) current and future perceptions of police practitioners and educators toward law enforcement courses, (4) future perceptions of police practitioners and educators toward a philosophical orientation, (5) rating of the most essential courses to form a new model core curriculum.

The data indicated that the sample population for both groups were highly representative thus increasing the
value of the findings. Respondents in this research were asked to rate how they perceive the importance of 30 courses currently and in the future, as well as orientations for the future. This was achieved by using a four point Likert-type scale. From this scale a mean was determined as to the level of importance the respondents felt the course should have, as well as the percentage of respondents who were presented at each level of the Likert-type scale. This data was then used to rank order both groups, as to their current and future perceptions of the courses and their future perceptions of the philosophical orientation. From this data, those courses and philosophical orientations which were found to be most essential were used to develop a model core curriculum.

Conclusions

The following conclusion are based on the finding of this research.

1. CSU institutions who offer a four-year post-secondary law enforcement program, appear to be moving in a direction where the types of courses offered are similar among institutions.

2. Courses that are used in a future four-year post-secondary law enforcement program should change to reflect the future needs of law enforcement.
3. Police practitioners perceive courses in this research somewhat differently than educators, however, it seems that there is strong agreement on a set of core courses for the future.

4. There is strong agreement between police practitioners and educators as to the future direction of teaching methods, as indicated by their agreement in a consolidate philosophical approach.

5. Overall, educators were far more united in their opinions regarding their perception of importance for the courses, than were police practitioners.

6. It is the conclusion of this researcher that the new core curriculum model, Table 14, represents a highly meaningful change in the direction of law enforcement curriculum at the 4-year post-secondary level. Twelve of the courses listed in this model have not in the past been considered core courses by law enforcement educators. Additionally, 8 of the courses in the model have not been taught as part of a law enforcement curriculum in the past or currently. Lastly, this research and new core curriculum model provides insightful evidence that suggests that in order to have appropriate law enforcement curriculum, law enforcement practitioners must be included in the developmental process.

Recommendations

1. Core courses offered to law enforcement personnel in California should be standardized in four-year
post-secondary programs. This would better serve the needs of the police and improve the quality of the programs.

2. Additional research should be conducted to determine future changes in society and their impact on the police, so that course for law enforcement may be developed to meet these needs.

3. Police practitioners should have far more input into curriculum issues at the post-secondary level. This is necessary to balance academic perception with occupationally based perception of the police.

4. Future development of curriculum for law enforcement practitioners should be based on the perceptions of both police and educators, trends in our changing society, areas within the criminal justice system that display the most concern or difficulties for the police, and the need to raise the academic standards and relevance of all courses taught.

5. Further studies should be undertaken to determine ways in which the police and educators can gain cooperation from each other to solve educational problems.
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APPENDIX A

Questionnaire
SURVEY OF POLICE ATTITUDES TOWARD CURRENT AND FUTURE BACHELOR DEGREE CURRICULUM FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT

Time necessary to complete survey — 12 minutes.

Please circle the number that best represents your current status.

A. Age: 1) 21 - 25 2) 26 - 31 3) 32 - 40 4) 41 - 50 5) Over 50

B. Total Years of Police Experience: 1) 0 - 3 2) 4 - 7 3) 8 - 12 4) 13 - 20 5) Over 20

C. Highest level of formal education:
   1) High school graduate
   2) Less than A.A. degree or 0 - 59 semester units
   3) A.A., but less than Bachelors degree or 60 - 120 semester units
   4) Bachelors degree or 120 semester units or more
   5) Masters or at least 30 units above Bachelors
   6) Doctorate

D. Name of college/university you attended: __________________________

E. Major field of study in college: 1) Criminal Justice 2) Psychology
   3) Political Science 4) Sociology 5) Other: __________________________

F. Total number of department personnel (sworn/civilian): 1) 1 - 49 2) 50 - 99
   3) 100 - 299 4) 300 - 499 5) 500 and over

Instructions: This survey is designed to assess your current and future attitude toward specific areas of law enforcement course content that make up a four-year Bachelors degree program. Each question has two parts. First, it asks you to relate the relative importance of the area as you currently view it. That is, how important is the course in preparing students for law enforcement positions today, or in upgrading the knowledge of full-time officers. Secondly, it asks you to consider future trends and the changing nature of police service and rate how important the area will be in the future, five to ten years from now. Each question has a four-point scale that is used to rate each course and its relative importance. Please check the box that most clearly reflects your attitude toward each course.
SURVEY OF EDUCATOR’S ATTITUDES TOWARD CURRENT AND FUTURE BACHELOR DEGREE CURRICULUM FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT

Time necessary to complete survey — 12 minutes.

Please circle the number that best represents your current status.

A. Age: 1) 21 - 25  2) 26 - 31  3) 32 - 40  4) 41 - 50  5) Over 50

B. Position: 1) Lecturer  2) Assistant Professor  3) Associate Professor  4) Professor

C. Total Years of Full-time Police Occupational Experience:
   1) 0 - 3  2) 4 - 7  3) 8 - 12  4) 13 - 20  5) Over 20

D. Total Years of Full-time Teaching Experience:
   1) 0 - 5  2) 6 - 10  3) 11 - 15  4) 16 - 20  5) Over 20

E. Highest Level of Education: 1) Bachelor  2) Master  3) Doctorate

F. Name of college/university you attended: ________________________________

G. Major Field of Study: 1) Criminal Justice  2) Psychology
   3) Political Science  4) Sociology  5) Law  6) Other (List) __________________

Instructions: This survey is designed to assess your current and future attitude toward specific areas of law enforcement course content that make up a four-year Bachelors degree program. Each question has two parts. First, it asks you to relate the relative importance of the area as you currently view it. That is, how important is the course in preparing students for law enforcement positions today, or in upgrading the knowledge of full-time officers. Secondly, it asks you to consider future trends and the changing nature of police service and rate how important the area will be in the future, five to ten years from now. Each question has a four-point scale that is used to rate each course and its relative importance. Please check the box that most clearly reflects your attitude toward each course.
### COURSE CONTENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. Internship: Work experience in a police agency to increase the understanding of the occupation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Psychology for Police: Overview of applied methods of human behavior/interaction that give the officer understanding of human differences and how to deal with people more effectively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Management of Conflict: Principles and methods of successfully dealing with people in crisis. Includes suicide, the mentally ill, family disturbances, violence-prone individuals and hostage negotiations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Cross-Cultural Differences: Examines the basic cultural foundations of various groups police often come into contact with, in order to appreciate and understand their perspective and values.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Technical Investigations: Methods to assist the investigator in investigations. Includes use of the computer in crime analysis and criminal activity and other techniques that assist in solving cases.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Management of Police: Provides a general overview of various areas that police managers must be skilled in performing. Includes budget planning, manpower analysis, program research and development, equipment acquisition, career development, use of the computer for management information systems and eliminating the barriers between workers and management.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Criminology: Theories of criminal behavior, deviance and crime causation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Terrorism, Subversion, Cultism: Overview of theories, origins, and methods of dealing with each area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Labor Relations: Historical development and current issues related to law enforcement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Contemporary Issues: In-depth study of selected problems facing law enforcement/criminal justice system.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Computer Literacy: Understanding of computer function, use, hands-on operation as applied to law enforcement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please check the box that most clearly reflects your attitude.

### COURSE CONTENT

1. **Administration of Justice**: Survey of historical and functional aspects of the criminal justice system.  
   - Current  
   - Future

2. **Criminal Law**: Basic/advanced study of law.  
   - Current  
   - Future

3. **Evidence**: Basic/advanced principles and rules applying to evidence, search and seizure, and its introduction in court.  
   - Current  
   - Future

4. **Investigations**: Basic/advanced principles and methods of criminal investigation.  
   - Current  
   - Future

5. **Communications**: Basic/advanced principles and techniques of interviewing and interrogation, report writing or general principles of communications.  
   - Current  
   - Future

6. **Community Relations**: Explore relations between criminal justice agencies and the public.  
   - Current  
   - Future

7. **Patrol Operations**: Theories, objectives, activities, and the management of patrol operation.  
   - Current  
   - Future

8. **Criminal Procedures**: Role and responsibility of each segment of the system (police, courts, corrections), from arrest to disposition.  
   - Current  
   - Future

   - Current  
   - Future

10. **Police Supervision**: Principles in supervision include leadership, motivation, decision making and other topics relative to supervising personnel.  
    - Current  
    - Future

11. **Personnel Management**: Principles of an effective personnel system, including recruitment, selection, and training.  
    - Current  
    - Future

12. **Comparative Police Systems**: Study of the administration and operations of U.S. and foreign police agencies.  
    - Current  
    - Future

13. **Forensic Science**: Scientific analysis and identification of physical evidence. May include areas of blood, hair and fiber analysis, questioned documents, firearms and tool identification and other laboratory tests.  
    - Current  
    - Future

14. **Criminal Identification**: Personal identification in criminal investigations. Includes fingerprints, photography, voice identification, modus operandi, psychological profile or other means.  
    - Current  
    - Future

15. **Crime Prevention**: Planning and implementation of crime prevention. Includes civilian involvement in crime prevention and redirection of police resources.  
    - Current  
    - Future

16. **Handling of Juveniles**: Juvenile law, court procedures, problems in juvenile delinquency, their cause, treatment and prevention.  
    - Current  
    - Future
**Instructions:** The following questions ask you to rate the philosophic approaches that should be used in the future to teach law enforcement courses. Each statement describes a point of view on the method used to teach the overall curriculum. Take each statement separately and rate it as to its future importance and application as you perceive it.

**CURRICULUM PHILOSOPHY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>31. Approach #1: Course information can be directly applied to the job. Course content emphasizes skills related to tasks of the job with little attention given to theory or applied research.</th>
<th>Future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32. Approach #2: This approach emphasizes the need to develop professional standards of performance and for police to be able to go beyond merely performing a specific task. Police must be able to find alternatives for problems using course information.</td>
<td>Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Approach #3: Course content is taken from a wide number of fields (psychology, sociology, etc.) and applied to the police. Basic concepts and theory are stressed in this approach and the purpose is to develop a well-rounded individual who is not narrowly specialized in law enforcement.</td>
<td>Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Approach #4: This approach emphasizes the fact that law enforcement is only part of the criminal justice system. Course information is designed to give information regarding the specific area under study and to show where and how it fits into the criminal justice process. The purpose of this approach is to create a better understanding of the police role and its interrelationship with other parts of the system.</td>
<td>Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Approach #5: The primary purpose of this approach is to prepare individuals to be more effective police officers. Courses focus on the understanding and application of knowledge. Ethical, consistent behavior of law enforcement personnel is stressed along with creative thinking and problem solving. Course content is designed to teach individuals to address new and old problems in a flexible, humanistic manner.</td>
<td>Future</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENTS:** Are there any other educational courses for law enforcement personnel, not listed, that you feel would be important in the future, five to ten years from now?
APPENDIX B

Letter to Validation Panel
As we have discussed earlier, I am currently working to complete the requirements for an Ed.D. degree at the University of the Pacific. My dissertation topic is: "A Model Four Year Post-Secondary Core Curriculum for California Law Enforcement Personnel." The purpose of my study is to investigate the attitudes of both educators and law enforcement officers as to what law enforcement courses are viewed as the most important in the future. This information will then be used to develop a model core curriculum.

I am soliciting your assistance because of your experience and knowledgeableness in the field of law enforcement and education. Please examine the enclosed questionnaire and make notations as to any item that would improve the survey instrument. Specifically, in reviewing the instrument, please consider the following:

1. Are the instructions clear and concise. If not, what additional information do you need or would you feel is desirable.

2. Does the title of the survey give you a good idea of the area to be covered.

3. Does each course title and the description give you a clear idea of what the course is about. If not why: for each course that you have a problem with describe a suggestion to improve the item.

4. Are there any courses that you believe should be added to the survey that are not listed. This especially applies to courses that you feel will be important in the future.

5. How long did it take you to fill-out the survey.

6. Was the survey easy or difficult to read and fill-out.

7. Did you find it difficult to make judgements regarding the current and future importance of each item. That is, did you take the time to consider the future direction of law enforcement and make a decision as to the future importance of each item.

Please feel free to write your comments and suggestions on the survey or on this letter and return both in the stamped, self-addressed envelope. Thankyou for your time and assistance.
APPENDIX C

Survey Cover Letter to Police Practitioners
As we have discussed earlier, I am presently in the process of doing research and writing a doctoral dissertation on the topic, "A Model Four Year Post-Secondary Core Curriculum For California Law Enforcement Personnel," at the University of the Pacific. The purpose of this study is to investigate the attitudes of both law enforcement officers and educators as to which law enforcement courses are viewed to be the most important in the future (5 to 10 years from now). This information will then be used to assist in developing a model core curriculum for use at four-year educational institutions which offer a bachelor's degree emphasizing a law enforcement major.

The input of law enforcement officers in developing future curriculum at the higher education level is vital if we in the profession want quality education for our officers.

I appreciate your cooperation in collecting the information necessary to complete this study. When the research study has been completed you will receive the results and recommendations that are developed. You can expect the results no later than July 1984.

I have enclosed the survey that your officers should complete. I will need officers from your department to complete the survey. It should only take 10-12 minutes for them to complete the survey. I have also enclosed a self-addressed and stamped envelope for easy return of all surveys. Your completion of the surveys at your earliest convenience and returning it in the enclosed envelope will be greatly appreciated. The survey should be given to a random sample of sworn, full-time officers in your department. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at any time: (209) 299-3964: 72 N. Osmun, Clovis, Ca 93612.

Thank you for your assistance and your contribution to this study.

John H. Burge
APPENDIX D

Survey Cover Letter to Educators
I am currently an officer with the Fresno County Sheriff's Department and presently in the process of doing research and writing my doctoral dissertation at the University of the Pacific. My topic of research is curriculum development involving law enforcement courses at educational institutions in California that offer a bachelor's degree that emphasizes law enforcement as a major. The purpose of this statewide study is to investigate the attitudes of both law enforcement educators and officers as to which law enforcement courses are viewed to be most important in the future (5 to 10 years from now). By taking into account both law enforcement educators and officers perceptions of which courses are important in the future, it will assist in developing a model curriculum to meet the future needs of both the police and education.

I would sincerely appreciate your cooperation in the completion of this survey. Since a very precise sample was selected for this investigation, the active participation of everyone in the sample is essential to the success of the study. The results and recommendations of the study will be sent to you no latter than July 1984.

I have enclosed the survey instrument and a self-addressed, stamped envelope for easy return of the survey. Your completion of the survey at your earliest convenience and returning it in the enclosed envelope by will be greatly appreciated. If there are any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at home: (209) 299-3964: 72 N. Osmun, Clovis, Ca 93612.

Thankyou for your assistance and your contribution to this study.

John H. Burge