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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

There is a lack of knowledge regarding the personality and attitudes of criminology students. The purpose of this study is to determine whether or not there are significant personality and attitudinal differences between law enforcement and correctional students. The investigation will, first, determine personality structure of criminology students utilizing the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule and the California F Scale. The study will also attempt to determine attitudinal differences by means of the Semantic Differential which will be constructed to elicit attitudes about such concepts as capital punishment, sex offenders, etc.

Hypotheses. There will be significant differences between the following: (1) the attitudes of law enforcement and correctional students as measured by the Semantic Differential; (2) the personality structure of law enforcement and correctional students as measured by the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule; and (3) the number of items endorsed on the California F Scale by law enforcement and correctional students.

Assumptions. The assumptions of this thesis are that the sampling procedure will be valid and representative of the criminology students at Fresno State College, that the test instruments are reasonably valid
and reliable, that the differences measured by the tests are directly
related to functional behavior, and that the subjects will be giving
candid responses to the test questions.

Background. Though a few exploratory studies have been carried
out, there is little information about the attitudes, personalities,
and beliefs of police officers. In 1967 a study was conducted in New York City investigating
authoritarianism in police officers. The authoritarian individual
was found to be one who cannot tolerate social ambiguity and perceives
objects in his social environment in a two-dimensional or dichotomous
manner, that is, good-bad, weak-strong, superior-inferior. The study
dealt with college and noncollege police officers. The hypothesis of
the study predicted that police officers who had not chosen to attend
college would reveal more authoritarian characteristics than the police
currently enrolled in college. The hypothesis was confirmed. Using
authoritarian scales developed by Rokeach and Piven, the investigators
demonstrated that noncollege trained policemen were more authoritarian
than college trained policemen and that, among college trained officers,
the older group (25 through 29) was more authoritarian than the younger
group (21 through 24).

---


2 Ibid., pp. 130-31.

3 Ibid.
Another study of police officers demonstrated low but negative correlations between scores for preferring to direct others and for dealing intellectually with ideas. The data also revealed a significant preference for avoiding conflict among the police officers studied. The officers in Sterne's sample had educational levels from grades seven through sixteen.

Solis L. Kates, using Rorschach Responses and Strong Vocational Interest Blank scales, has found that individuals with high police interests tended to be significantly introspective, to accept their own strivings and outlook as mature based on their own ability, and to be largely unresponsive to external stimuli. Interestingly enough, policemen satisfied with their jobs lacked the capacity to think along conventional lines.

Relative to these studies of police officers, Walter C. Reckless has said of correctional officers:

Top men in control of correctional agencies as well as the rank and file in correctional work need to develop faith in the workability of inexperienced college youth and confidence in the

---
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university's proper training and selection of students for careers in corrections. This statement is also easily applicable to law enforcement. Dr. Reckless lists desirable personality qualifications based upon standards of the American Parole Association. They include emotional stability, maturity, integrity, understanding, tolerance, etc. Other related studies by Hartwell and Burbank discuss the model personality of the probation officer. It is, however, imperative to point out that these characteristics are idealistic, and that little, other than surface information, is known about the actual psychological make-up of correctional workers or police officers.

Because of a lack of information, it is appropriate to investigate the attitudes and personalities of criminology students. Some similar and related studies have already been done with students majoring in other areas. For example, Farwell, Warren, and McConnel found some personality differences among college students who had high academic


9 Ibid., p. 40.


aptitude and were enrolled in different groups of colleges and in different specialized fields. A finding that colleges and universities differ in the types of students they attract was significant. Students in Ivy League universities were more strongly attracted to intellectual pursuits, perceived more complexly, were more independent, original, and flexible than were students in public universities. Students in Roman Catholic institutions generally had a weaker orientation toward intellectual activity, perceived less complexly, were less responsible in social behavior, and more authoritarian than students in Protestant institutions.

Students were examined in the following fields: social sciences, physical sciences, and engineering. In the social sciences and humanities, students tended to think reflectively on an abstract level and to deal with ideas rather than their practical application. Students in humanities and physical sciences scored high in perceiving and reacting to complex patterns of environmental stimuli, whereas other majors reacted to the simple and obvious. Physics, mathematics, social sciences and humanities students tended to respond to situations with novel and appropriate forms of behavior; that is, there was freedom of expression and independence of judgment. The humanities and social science students were low on the Authoritarianism scale, which measures rigidity, conventionalism, and identification with institutions or personalities characterized by power.

---

13 Ibid.
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Apparently, however, the study cited above (Smith, Locke, and Walker) is the only recent study dealing with law enforcement students. The present thesis is designed to eliminate this almost complete lack of information. This study will, in fact, investigate the personalities and attitudinal characteristics of two types of criminology students; those majoring in law enforcement and those majoring in corrections.

**Research Design**

**Population and Sample:** From a parent population of 109 advanced undergraduate students in the Department of Criminology at Fresno State College, approximately 50% of the population will be selected for participation in the experiment. It is planned that this percentage will be equally divided between law enforcement and corrections. The subjects will be self-selected in response to a standard statement concerning the purpose of the experiment.

**Research Procedure:** The three measuring instruments, the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, the California F Scale, and the Semantic Differential will be administered to each subject by allowing him to complete the tests at his leisure following standardized instructions. The design of the experiment will allow the comparison of mean scores on each test between the two groups of students (law enforcement and corrections).

**Procedure for Analyzing Data:** Primarily, two separate procedures will be used to analyze the collected test data. Two of the tests, the Semantic Differential and the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, yield
profiles rather than single scores. Using raw scores, these profiles will be averaged for the two groups and the mean profiles will be presented for the Semantic Differential. For the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule the difference in each variable will be treated by means of the Mann-Whitney U test and the Fisher T test.

For the California F Scale, which yields a single score, the data will be treated by means of the Fisher T test.

Obviously, it would be impractical to run T tests for all 15 points for all 15 mean profiles yielded by the Semantic Differential (SD Graphic displays will be used for treatment of SD data as well as for the 15 individual points of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule profiles). For the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, the .05 significance level will be assumed due to the low sample size and small expected difference between the two groups.

In addition to the rigorous statistical treatment of the data, graphic displays of mean profiles will be used to show the relationships established.

Definitions of Terms Used

The following terms are specifically defined to avoid amorphous and ambiguous meaning.

---


**Attitude.** A consistent, learned, emotionalized predisposition to respond in a particular way to a given object, person, or situation.

**Personality.** The unique pattern of traits which characterize the individual.

**Authoritarianism.** Preoccupation with dominance-submission, strong-weak, leader-follower dimension, identification with power figures; overemphasis upon the conventionalized attributes of the ego; exaggerated assertion of strength and toughness.

**Criminology.** That body of knowledge regarding crime as a social phenomenon. It includes the following divisions: (1) the sociology of law, which is an attempt at scientific analysis of the conditions under which criminal laws develop; (2) criminal etiology, which is an attempt at scientific analysis of the causes of crime; and (3) penology, which is concerned with the control of crime.

**Significance**

Since little is known about the individual whose interest lies in criminology, his personality and attitudes are obscure. If a more lucid conceptualization can be obtained of both the law enforcement and correctional student, the selection of those desiring to study criminology in college and those seeking occupational placement in the field may be implemented with more competence. Moreover, individuals who may do potential harm in the field can be detected and disqualified.

Another value in studying criminology students lies in an attempt
to discover why one individual's orientation is toward law enforcement and another's is correctional. In other words, what are some of the fundamental, psychological differences between the two? Moreover, since correctional students take many law enforcement courses and vice versa, it would be fruitful to know whether or not they have similar attitudes toward the same concepts. For example, how does the correctional student perceive the law enforcement student, and what does this mean for later work in the field in terms of cooperation?

Finally, criminology students are being examined because they are an available population from which to sample. More important, however, is that they will soon be professionals in the field, which implies that they should be among the elite in both qualification and character.

Limitations

Because of the restrictions of time and money this study will be limited to the Department of Criminology at Fresno State College rather than include additional criminology departments on other college campuses.

Furthermore, the particular sampling procedure was selected because classes extend for only 50 minutes which is insufficient time for administering the test instruments.

Organization of Remainder of the Thesis

The remainder of this thesis will discuss the meaning of the data collected from the Semantic Differential in Chapter II; the meaning of the data collected from the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule in
Chapter III; and the meaning of the data collected from the California F Scale in Chapter IV. Chapter V will summarize the results of all three tests and make appropriate conclusions in terms of the significance of the data.

Also a total sample of 109 advanced psychology students the test battery containing 16 concepts was administered to 62 subjects. The concepts are presented in a table on the following page. The academic rank of these students was junior (32), senior (35), and graduate students (i). Thirty-one of the students were correctional majors, representing 60% of all advanced students majoring in corrections. The other 59 students in the sample were law enforcement majors representing 40% of the total population of 70 law enforcement majors.

In appendix B are 15 concepts plotted on profiles using the Semantic Differential. The first concept, "Capital Punishment," is perceived by law enforcement students as slow, yet necessary, and good and clean; whereas correctional students feel that it is fast, unnecessary, bad, and slightly dirty. Students in both options, however, feel that it is cruel and unpleasant. Law enforcement students see it as successful, meaningful, valuable, moral, and effective, whereas the reverse is true for correctional students.

The second concept, "Prison," is perceived by both options in approximately the same manner. Law enforcement students, however, feel that "Prison" are slightly more necessary, good, clean, and kind. Although both options feel that "Prison" are unpleasant, correctional students feel more strongly about it. Law enforcement students feel
CHAPTER II

SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL

From a total sample of 109 advanced criminology students the test battery containing 15 concepts was administered to 61 subjects. The concepts are presented in a table on the following page. The academic rank of these students was juniors (32), seniors (25), and graduate students (4). Thirty-one of the students were correctional majors, representing 80% of all advanced students majoring in corrections. The other 30 students in the sample were law enforcement majors representing 43% of the total population of 70 law enforcement majors.

In Appendix B are 15 concepts plotted on profiles using the Semantic Differential. The first concept, "Capital Punishment," is perceived by law enforcement students as slow, yet necessary, and good and clean; whereas correctional students feel that it is fast, unnecessary, bad, and slightly dirty. Students in both options, however, feel that it is cruel and unpleasant. Law enforcement students see it as successful, meaningful, valuable, moral, and effective, whereas the reverse is true for correctional students.

The second concept, "Prisons," is perceived by both options in approximately the same manner. Law enforcement students, however, feel that "Prisons" are slightly more necessary, good, clean, and kind. Although both options feel that "Prisons" are unpleasant, correctional students feel more strongly about it. Law enforcement students feel
TABLE I

SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL CONCEPTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital Punishment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prisons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Offenders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation in Prisons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcotic Offender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homosexuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recidivists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firearms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexicans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negroes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hippies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that "Prisons" are more strong, active, successful, meaningful, valuable, and moral than do correctional majors. "Prisons" are also perceived as more conservative, intelligent, and effective by law enforcement students.

Again, there are similar feelings about the next concept, "Sex Offenders." Almost all of the scale items are moderately endorsed towards the negative end. Law enforcement students, however, see "Sex Offenders" as slightly more unnecessary, bad, dirty, cruel, and unpleasant than do correctional students. "Sex Offenders" are also seen as more of a failure, in addition to being meaningless, worthless, and especially immoral and unintelligent.

"Law Enforcement" as a concept is seen in a flattering light by both options. Law enforcement students, however, see the concept more positively than the correctional students see them. Especially noticeable are the positive scores on the scale items of kind and pleasant. Law enforcement students show somewhat positive scores, whereas correctional students give only slight endorsement. Also of interest is the fact that correctional students perceive "Law Enforcement" as slightly liberal, whereas law enforcement students see themselves as neither particularly liberal nor conservative.

For the concept of "Corrections," both options endorse the scale items in a similar, positive manner. It is interesting to note that law enforcement students perceive themselves as slightly more strong, active, successful, meaningful, and valuable, whereas correctional students do not perceive themselves quite so positively. Even more interesting, however, is that law enforcement students have a more
complimentary attitude toward "Corrections" than the latter do toward the former. On the other hand, law enforcement students see "Corrections" as slow, whereas correctional students see themselves as fast.

"Rehabilitation in Prisons" as a concept is endorsed almost identically by the two options and the scoring is toward the positive side; that is, the concept is seen as necessary, good, kind, pleasant, strong, active, meaningful, valuable, moral, intelligent and effective. Although both options feel that "Rehabilitation in Prisons" is slow, it seems ironic that correctional students see the concept as slower and somewhat of a failure.

"Narcotic Offender" was generally endorsed the same by both options, and the scoring was generally negative. Law enforcement students, however, see the drug addict as slightly more unintelligent, immoral, worthless, meaningless, cruel, bad, and unnecessary than do correctional students. One interesting difference is that law enforcement students see "Narcotic Offender" as active, whereas correctional students see him as passive.

Both criminology options feel that "Probation" as a concept is slow. Correctional students, however, perceive it as very necessary, whereas law enforcement students score "Probation" as good more heavily than correctional students. Interestingly enough, the concept of "Probation" is seen as almost moderately successful by correctional students, but somewhat of a failure by law enforcement students. The overall endorsement indicates that the former value probation more than the latter.

"Parole" is endorsed similarly to "Probation," that is, scoring is
on the positive end with correctional students valuing "Parole" more than law enforcement students.

The concept of "Homosexuals" has negative endorsements by both options. Law enforcement students, however, consider them to be more unnecessary, bad, dirty, cruel, and unpleasant than correctional students do. Furthermore, "Homosexuals" are believed to be more of a failure, in addition to being more meaningless, worthless, and immoral. It is interesting to note that correctional students see "Homosexuals" as somewhat conservative and intelligent, whereas law enforcement students believe them to be slightly liberal and unintelligent.

"Recidivists" as a concept has a slightly negative to moderately negative endorsement generally, and the scoring is somewhat similar for both options. Both options believe that "Recidivists" are slightly active and slightly liberal.

Both groups of criminology students consider "Firearms" to be slow. Law enforcement students, however, feel that they are slightly necessary, whereas correctional students believe that they are moderately unnecessary. Ironically, law enforcement students consider "Firearms" moderately ineffective, whereas the correctional students consider them to be moderately effective. In any event, law enforcement students generally value "Firearms" slightly more than do correctional students.

The concept of "College Education" is endorsed almost identically by both options; that is, they see it for the most part as moderately positive with high scoring on the intelligent, valuable and necessary items.
"Mexicans" as a concept has a neutral to slightly positive endorsement for both options. For the items of weak and passive, however, both groups have slightly negative scores, especially correctional students.

The scoring of "Mexicans" as a concept is nearly the same as the scoring of "Negroes" as a concept. Both options, however, consider "Negroes" a slight failure.

"Hippies" are felt to be slightly fast and necessary by correctional students, whereas for law enforcement students the reverse is true. Both options consider "Hippies" as moderately dirty, slightly kind, slightly active, slightly weak, and slightly immoral. Law enforcement students, however, feel that they are somewhat worthless and ineffective, whereas correctional students feel that they are somewhat valuable and effective.
CHAPTER III

EDWARDS PERSONAL PREFERENCE SCHEDULE

The data collected with the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule were treated by means of the Mann-Whitney U test. The results are presented in Table II.

"Heterosexuality," (59th percentile for law enforcement students; 39th percentile for correctional students), is significant at the .05, .02 level of confidence. The concept means to date and engage in social activities with the opposite sex, to show affection for and be in love with members of the opposite sex, to be considered physically attractive by members of the opposite sex, to talk with others about sex, to read literature involving sex, to listen to and tell jokes about sex, and to become sexually excited. Law enforcement's need for heterosexuality appears partially explainable because the field of law enforcement itself is highly masculine. It is a "Man's Job," embodying within its role authority and power. It is not an occupation for the weak, dependent, delicate, "innocent" or effeminate person.

Six other concepts are meaningful because of the tendencies (.15 p .10) toward differences between correctional and law enforcement students. For example, law enforcement students have a fairly high need for "Order." (63rd percentile for correctional students; 46th percentile for law enforcement students.) "Order," significant at the .10 level, means to have written work organized and orderly, to plan out a
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>CORRECTIONS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>LAW ENFORCEMENT</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Raw Score</td>
<td>Percentile</td>
<td>Mean Raw Score</td>
<td>Percentile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deference</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibition</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intracception*</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Succorance</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abasement</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurturance</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexuality**</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) * Norms for college students
2) * p .10
3) ** p .02
difficult task before starting, to have things neat and in order, to organize a trip in advance before starting, to have details of work organized before starting, to file letters and materials according to some system, to organize eating habits for certain times of the day, and to arrange things in life to avoid interruption. Correctional students, in other words, have a need for pattern, organization, and structure, whereas law enforcement students have a greater tolerance for ambiguity and disorder.

"Exhibition," (72nd percentile for law enforcement students; 62nd percentile for correctional students), means saying clever remarks, telling amusing jokes and stories, talking about personal adventures and experiences, having oneself noticed and commented upon, saying things simply for effect, talking about personal achievements, being the center of attention, using words that people do not understand, and asking questions others cannot answer. The law enforcement student, then, has a need to stand out among others, especially his peers, and to gain recognition.

The next concept towards which there is a strong tendency is "Autonomy." (52nd percentile for correctional students; 43rd percentile for law enforcement students.) Correctional students have a need to come and go as they desire, say what they think about things, be independent of others in decision making, do as they want, do the unconventional, avoid conforming situations, do things without regard to the opinion of others, criticize others in positions of authority, and avoid obligations and responsibilities.
"Intraception," (64th percentile for correctional students; 45th percentile for law enforcement students), means to analyze one's emotions and motives, to observe others and comprehend how they feel about difficulties, to imagine how others perceive things, to judge others not by what they do but by why they do things, to analyze other people's behavior, and to predict how they will act in future situations. In short, correctional students are more interested in the causes rather than the effects of an individual's behavior. They have a need to put themselves into another's role, and to understand the variables which create responses, whereas law enforcement students are concerned with the consequences or results of an individual's actions; for example, controlling crime rather than understanding the reasons for its development.

On the same hand, correctional students are inclined to be more "Nurturant," compared to law enforcement students. (63rd percentile for correctional students; 46th percentile for law enforcement students) They have a somewhat meaningful and consistent need to aid troubled friends, assist the less fortunate, show sympathy and kindness toward people, to be forgiving and generous, to be sympathetic with the hurt and sick, to express a great deal of affection toward others, and to allow troubled individuals to confide in them about personal problems. Since a good deal of correctional work is to rehabilitate and to therapeutically improve an offender, the concept of "Nurturance" seems relevant and at the same time related to "Intraception." In other words, the correctional student not only wants the troubled offender to confide in him, but also needs to discover the reasons for the latter's difficulties.
Another concept of importance is "Endurance". (57th percentile for law enforcement students; 44th percentile for correctional students). Law enforcement students tend to stay at a task until it is completed, work hard, finish jobs that are undertaken, stay with a puzzle or problem until it is solved, complete one job before starting another, work late hours at night to get a job done, work long hours without distraction, stay with a problem even though no progress is being made, and avoid interruption while at work. In other words, law enforcement students probably have a higher tolerance for frustration and stress than do correctional students. In addition, perhaps the former also have a greater capacity for ambiguity than do the latter, because unsolvable problems are not easily seen as such.

While the above data do not meet all the assumptions of the T test, McNemar says:

It must be thought that the assumption of normality underlying the use of t could be tested on the basis of the sample at hand either by testing the departure of $g_1$ and $g_2$ from zero, but these methods of testing for normality are not sensitive enough to lead us to reject, on the basis of a small sample, the hypothesis of normality unless the departure therefrom is very marked. Likewise, the as yet undiscussed test for a possible difference between variances is too insensitive when used with small samples to lead to rejection of the hypothesis of equal variances unless the difference between the two universe variances is sizable; hence it is difficult to be sure that the assumption of equality of variances is tenable when two groups are being compared by the t technique.1

CHAPTER IV

THE CALIFORNIA F SCALE

For the California F Scale, the subjects were instructed to indicate agreement or disagreement with each of 29 items. The score on the test was the total number of items agreed with minus the total number of items disagreed with. This resulted in means of -3.667 for law enforcement students and -9.580 for correctional students. The differences between these two means were tested statistically with Fisher's t-test. The difference was significant at the .05 level of confidence; that is, correctional students are significantly less authoritarian than law enforcement students. The California F Scale is presented in Appendix B.

Authoritarianism, regardless in whom it is found, involves a multitude of variables or components: a typical characteristic is conventionalism, defined as rigid adherence to common middle-class, white Anglo-Saxon values. Authoritarianism also involves submission, which reflects an uncritical attitude toward idealized moral authorities of the ingroup. Aggression, on the other hand, plays a part because there is a tendency to selectively perceive, reject, condemn, and to be punitive toward those who violate conventional values. The authoritarian is largely anti-intrusive. He lacks creativity, imagination and subjectivity. The authoritarian is preoccupied with the dichotomous dimensions of dominance versus submission, strong versus weak, and leader versus follower. While identifying with power figures, conventionalized
attributes of the ego are overemphasized, and the assertion of strength and toughness is exaggerated. Hostility is generalized and manifested as destructiveness and cynicism. Finally, the mechanism of projection stimulates the authoritarian personality to believe that chaotic and ominous things happen in his environment. Essentially, then, unconscious, emotionalized impulses are projected outward onto others.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The Semantic Differential revealed significant and meaningful differences between . . . . Law enforcement and correctional students. Both options, however, have similar feelings about many concepts, for example, "Sex Offenders," "Law Enforcement," and "Corrections." It is interesting to note that on each concept there was never complete agreement by both options. For example, the scoring of "Capital Punishment" showed that law enforcement students considered it as necessary, good, and clean, whereas correctional students felt that it was unnecessary, bad, and dirty. Contrary to law enforcement students, correctional majors also perceived it as cruel, meaningless, worthless, immoral and ineffective. In short, correctional students saw it as a failure. What has been said about "Capital Punishment" can also be said of "Hippies." Law enforcement students believe that they are worthless and ineffective, whereas correctional students feel that they are somewhat valuable and effective. Essentially, then, each option feels differently about each concept. In fact, law enforcement students generally score each concept as more positive or more negative than do correctional students.

For the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, law enforcement students revealed significantly more need for "Heterosexuality," which may be defined as a need to engage in social and affectional activities with members of the opposite sex than did correctional students.
Moreover, law enforcement students tend to have more of a need for "Exhibition;" that is, gaining recognition and notice among others. Correctional students, on the other hand, tend to be more "Nurturant" than law enforcement students. They appear to have a need to assist others who are in trouble. Law enforcement students, however, tend to have more of a need for "Endurance;" that is, they seem to have more determination at tasks than correctional students. Finally, correctional students tend to have more of a need for "Autonomy;" that is, to make individual decisions from available choices and alternatives within their immediate environment.

The third test, the California F Scale, produced significant results at the .05 level of confidence; that is, correctional students are significantly less authoritarian than law enforcement students. The authoritarian was described as rigid and as one who perceives his environment selectively and in a dichotomous manner.

It is significant that law enforcement students score each concept on the Semantic Differential as more positive or more negative than do correctional students. Law enforcement students also tend to score higher on the California F Scale which measures, in part, a tendency to perceive the environment in a dichotomous manner (that is, all good or all bad).

It may be important that correctional students have more of a need for autonomy than do law enforcement students in that they score lower on the California F Scale, on which high scores may indicate relatively uncritical submission to authority.
The significant difference between the two criminology options on the variable "Heterosexuality" may be related to the tendency of high scorers on the California F Scale to have an exaggerated concern with "sexual goings-on." Law enforcement students do tend to score higher on the F Scale than do correctional students.

The tendency of correctional students to be more nurturant toward others than law enforcement students as indicated on the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule is supported by their less than wholly negative view of "Hippies" indicated by the Semantic Differential and their relative lack of endorsement of F Scale items related to authoritarian aggression.

In Chapter I, wherein reference was made to a study by Smith, Locke and Walker concerning college and noncollege trained police officers; it was found that college trained police officers were significantly less authoritarian than noncollege trained officers. In the present study, law enforcement students are found to be significantly more authoritarian than correctional students. Law enforcement students, however, are not particularly authoritarian as a group. Since the college trained police officer is educationally and perhaps psychologically superior to the noncollege trained officer, what factors are operating within the potential policeman to bring him to the college campus rather than to a law enforcement agency for immediate employment? Obviously, there are some socioeconomic reasons. This writer, however, believes that a self-selecting factor; that is, a personality variable, is operating which draws certain individuals to the enforcement field for immediate employment. Research is needed to compare the college graduate in
law enforcement with his counterpart who lacks the education.

An area of need is an academic area where intensive research should be carried out with those working in the field and students of criminology. Little is known about what makes a competent police or parole officer, except an abstraction labelled "personality." It is much easier to describe undesirable characteristics of a potential police or parole officer than it is to discover and explain positive ones.

The data received from the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, although informative, do have utility even if they are descriptive and used to dichotomize criminology students. For example, correctional students have a meaningful need to be intraceptive. Efforts in college classrooms should perhaps be aimed towards sensitivity training and group interaction to refine and bring out in the correctional student his need for reflection and understanding. Moreover, the variables that make up the correctional student's need for nurturance should be discovered and then encouraged. Equally important is the encouragement of the need for autonomy. The correctional student is increasingly being employed in a bureaucratic environment where initiative, independence and creativity are lacking. The setting where positive concepts can be discovered and encouraged to grow is, of course, in the classroom. With the proper implementation the classroom can become an experimental laboratory.

To reiterate an earlier point, intensive research obviously needs to be undertaken with students and workers in the field of criminology. Law enforcement students seem to have a meaningful need to endure at tasks, but what value does "Heterosexuality" have, and what exactly does
it mean? What are the basic differences between the personalities of college and non-college trained police officers? What are some of the basic differences and similarities between law enforcement and correctional students? What effect does field experience have on the belief systems of criminology students when they leave the campus for employment?

In conclusion, then, the three hypotheses in this study were proved to be significant and meaningful. It was hypothesized that there would be significant differences between the following: (1) the attitudes of law enforcement and correctional students as measured by the Semantic Differential; (2) the personality structure of law enforcement and correctional students as measured by the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule; and (3) the number of items endorsed on the California F Scale by law enforcement and correctional students. This study is in reality an initial attempt at examining and understanding criminology students. The data presented here lack easy interpretation and explanation. In fact, the various psychological variables endorsed by both options on the test batteries only scratch the extremely complex and amorphous fringes of personality. In short, it must be kept in mind that personality is an on-going, even organic, process which is continually changing its needs and adopting itself to an ambiguous environment. Personality is not static but malleable. Law enforcement and correctional students cannot be understood by the utilization of the three tests in this study; such students can only be described.

Finally, it is significant and imperative to point out that the
three tests which were administered do not measure pathology, and that both options appear to be psychologically unique and healthy.
BIBLIOGRAPHY
A. BOOKS


B. PERIODICALS


