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The traditional way to learn about social sciences in a university setting includes taking courses that teach theoretical frameworks and scientific methodologies that are required for one’s major area of study. The courses that are taught to students are determined by what major they sign up for. After a student has taken all required courses, what skills does the student have to take with him after graduation?

Whether participation is pursued solely for academic credit, for career development, or for civic engagement, an experiential experience typically enhances a student’s connection between academic content and “real world” applications. Bridging the gap between “real world” situations and the classroom demonstrates the need for the application of knowledge.

This project’s primary purpose was to examine the student’s internship experience and determine whether it helped to enhance his or her ability to achieve the predicted outcomes of the internship program. A combination of quantitative and qualitative methodologies was deemed appropriate for empirical analysis. This evaluation project measured enhancement outcomes of an internship program, which rationalized potential designs for the undergraduate sociology major/minor and the undergraduate criminology minor, offered by a higher educational institution.
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Experiential education as we know it today encompasses an array of potential experiences, including service-learning internships, academic service-learning, community service-learning, cooperative education programs, and applied practicum. This chapter provides a formal introduction to the field of experiential education.

The conceptual framework for experiential learning dates back to the early periods of Medieval Europe (Hindman, 2009). Early versions of such vocational training used to take the form of apprenticeships that ranged from five to seven years of service. These apprenticeships were used as a pathway for students of a specific trade to get into a trade guild, which is an association of specialists in a specific field of work. While vocational apprenticeships and “journeyman” programs are still offered in many of the fields in which this style of instruction originated, college students today have the opportunity to participate in an internship or co-op, in conjunction with their chosen collegiate curriculum.

In 2009, Spradlin stated that, “In the late 1970s and ’80s, more and more college faculty members began to establish internship programs after hearing about them from colleagues at other institutions” (p. 1). Universities took the lead in making internships more appealing to and productive for students by giving course credit for internships, and
advisers pushed internships as a way to get ahead in the competition for jobs. Colleges and major universities then took this idea and tweaked it in such a way that it allowed students to gain college credit while testing out possible careers.

Most early university internship programs were established in fields such as business and medicine. Soon, after the surge of new interest in these curricula, most universities established internship programs in other disciplines such as psychology and social work. These early programs served as a way for students to try out possible future careers without the commitment of having to work a full-time job (Spradlin, 2009). The primary purpose of this study was to examine the student internship experience and determine whether it helped to enhance the ability to achieve the intended learning outcomes of the internship programs in Sociology and Criminology at a regional university located in the southeastern United States (Western Kentucky University) (Appendix A).
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter discusses the theoretical designs and models used in experiential education. This chapter also reports the research related to the practical application of internships, the knowledge ascertained through the classroom, the problems and implications of existing internship designs, and the benefits gained from an experiential education.

Experiential Education

The variations among the terms used to describe outside-the-classroom learning opportunities can be condensed into one phrase: experiential education. Juliet Miller, from the U.S. Department of Education, defines an experiential education as “all programs that are designed to expand the setting of learning experiences beyond the traditional school environment to occupational and community settings and these programs use planned experiences…to promote cooperation between traditional educational institutions and business, industry, labor, government and community groups to support learning” (p. 3). Some examples of experiential education include service-learning internship, academic service-learning, community service-learning, cooperative education program, applied practicum, experiential learning, and, most commonly,
internship program. All of these examples use experiential components in their curriculum with the only difference being due to logistical and operating issues (Miller, 1982). Now that the meaning and modes of experiential learning have been discussed, the following section summarizes literature which directly informs the analysis conducted in the current study.

**Sociological Component of Experiential Education**

Research indicates that cooperative education curriculum promotes the ability of students to achieve one of the beneficial goals of the sociological curriculum: “to promote students’ abilities to apply the sociological perspective to understand their lives” (American Sociological Association, 1991, Parilla & Hesser, p. 312). Using this sociological perspective allows a student to create what C. Wright Mills (1959) coins a “sociological imagination.” This way of thinking allows a student to comprehend the connection between history and biography, and when students execute this ideological mindset, the integration of a sociological education and career clarification happens (Miller, 1990). Internships also shed light on various topics relating to sociology such as diversity, the extreme complexities of social organizations, and even participant observation (Parilla & Hesser, 1998).

Following the research reviewed above, the current project aims to critically assess areas of enhancement (i.e., benefits) that an internship is supposed to advance for the student. The areas being measured are components that maximize learning in experiential education (Conference on Undergraduate Internships, 1976). Parilla and Hesser (1998) concluded that “when analyzing the experience, the end result that is wanted is one that intends to build bridges between sociological tradition and research on
post-secondary teaching and learning as it relates to the experience-based learning of internships” (p. 311). Integrating a practical element into higher education enables students to not only acquire knowledge related to their chosen area of study, but also the ability to apply it outside of the classroom (Deuster, 2009).

For this application to occur, one first needs to comprehend the connection between learning and personal efficacy. Markus, Howard, and King (1993) found that by combining applied experiences and knowledge from the classroom “student participation in community service can have a significant effect upon their personal values and orientations toward their community” (p. 416). For example, by utilizing one of the elements of an experiential education, reflective observation, one can then reflect on what they learned in the classroom and how that enables them to achieve a higher level of self-efficacy (Kolb, 1984). This reflection allows a person to recognize their personal weakness and then in turn they can abandon these downfalls so that they can focus on positive personal development. Krug (1991) concluded that only curriculums that endorse more reflection opportunities for their applied placements demonstrate positive civic responsibility. To where as civic responsibility is representative of one’s sense of personal empowerment, interpersonal (social) empowerment is representative of experiential learning through its active learning traits that includes working with other people. This encapsulation of two mechanisms of empowerment promotes the idea that the two are undoubtedly linked.

Munter (2002) states “The individual moves from being a passive consumer of information to becoming an active, aware, responsible citizen, focused not only on his/her own personal development, but also on becoming an agent of change…they are
assuming meaningful roles and responding to real issues in ways that have long-lasting impacts on their own lives, as well as the lives of those whom they are serving” (p. 5).

This leads to the inquiry of how does empowerment promote positivistic values? Wilson et al. (2001) suggests “changing relationships, roles, and responsibilities are key to practicing conditions of democracy and forming critical judgments about public education. . . This change is the most difficult and challenging part of reform because it requires a change of hearts as well as minds” (p. 69). This suggests that empowerment is not easily achieved because a person has to be motivated in order to become self-empowered. Waterman (1997) found that when a person can be self-motivated to promote positivistic values, it is correlated with community service. Inversely, motivators for civic responsibility can be from the community itself. Stelljes (2008) found that applied learning experiences enticed students to reflect on their personal situation within society and that a combination of real world learning and classroom learning were major factors that caused experiential experiences to have a very thorough influence students ability to commit to future civic involvement. He also concluded that students who experienced a sense of self-efficacy are a primary mediating factor between experiential education and social engagement (Stelljes, 2008). With research suggesting personal and interpersonal (social) empowerment having some sort of “mediating” effect on applied learning, it leads to one being curious about the affected areas. Before discussing the effects, the outcome areas of an experiential education must be defined.

**Applied Learning Outcomes and Benefits**

Research suggests that an experiential education program’s learning outcomes are categorized by these five areas: personal, interpersonal, academic, employment, and civic
(Baird, 1998; Conway, Amel, & Gerwein, 2002; Knapp, Fisher, & Levesque-Bristol, 2010; Raman & Pashupati, 2010). Personal outcomes are focused on an individual’s thoughts, skills, and values. A pre and post test survey was conducted by Conway, Amel, and Gerwein (2002) and they concluded that personal outcomes can change as of the result of service learning. They found that students who participated in applied learning programs had greater volunteer motivation and moral development than students who did not participate in an applied program (Conway, Amel, & Gerwein, 2002). Similarly, a meta-analysis on existing literature in the field of experiential education was conducted by Gysbers (1988) and suggested that societal conditions can contribute to the growth of human knowledge and development. With this in mind, applied experiences in society can contribute to our personal and intellectual development. Interpersonal outcomes focus on relationships with others and also our own personal beliefs and thoughts about individuals with whom we have relationships with. Research has shown that there is support that social outcomes are increased by service learning (Conway, Amel, & Gerwein, 2002), specifically that students who participate in service learning demonstrate greater positive beliefs, knowledge and attitudes toward those served in relation to those that do not participate.

Academic outcomes focus on the educational achievement and knowledge gained from the applied learning experience. Markus, Howard, and King (1993) found that students who participated in an applied learning program received higher grades than students who only received classroom instruction. Mpofu (2007) concluded that “superior learning outcomes for service-learning as compared to classroom instruction for tasks requiring critical thinking and application of skills, while not detracting from fact
acquisition learning” (p. 51). Employment outcomes focus on the job skills attained by students and also the career clarification it provides. Carla Howery (1983) defines the primary objective of internships is "to provide students with an opportunity to test abilities and attitudes toward particular material or career possibilities for the future" (p. 336). Internships and cooperative education programs provide students with the opportunity to apply learned ideological frameworks to potential career settings in the real world. Students who choose to participate in experiential learning can broaden their future career opportunities through networking and establishing positive working relationships with their employers. These relationships cannot be created solely from taking college courses, but they can be constructed by combining the knowledge gained from these courses with practical applications in a real life setting.

Civic outcomes of an experiential education program focus on community engagement, civic awareness, social responsibility, and one’s sense of citizenship. Myers-Lipton (1998) reported that students who participated in applied learning programs demonstrated higher scores on the Civic Responsibility Scale (measured items include personal motivation for community engagement, voting, personal responsibility for others, and one’s sense of communal enhancement) than students who did not experience an active learning program. Seon-Young, Olszewski-Kubilius, and Weimholt (2007) found that students who participated in applied learning had a greater awareness of local community issues and in society in general. Another study found that when students volunteer during an applied learning experience, they combine to enhance student civic engagement after they leave college (Misa, Anderson, & Yamamura, 2005).
Since “personal” and “interpersonal” are outcome categories from previous research, how do researchers link personal and interpersonal empowerment with these categories? It would seem that these categories may in fact have some influence on the other outcome categories. But do they exert a dual impact? Knapp, Fisher, and Levesque-Bristol (2010) found that “service learning provides students with opportunities to work with others to improve community development, and that it is this sense of social empowerment that strengthens their commitment to future civic engagement… that self-efficacy and social empowerment are related, but distinct, constructs” (p. 7). This suggests that students who participate in experiential learning not only benefit from empowerment, but also the effect that these characteristics have on the other outcomes of an applied program. Another indicator for measuring the effectiveness of an internship program comes from the amount of community service one is involved in, as it is a primary benefit of an internship program (Conference on Undergraduate Internships, 1976). Wilson et al. (2006) conducted a survey at the University of Maryland and concluded that respondents indicated that they were interested in opportunities that involved personal growth and life-long learning, participation in a purposeful social network that was working toward a clearly-defined goal, and service in a well-designed, meaningful role. This study suggests that, when students have the motivation and drive to undertake community service, personal growth can be greatly increased.

Research has also identified other benefits that students receive from participating in an applied learning program. According to The Conference on Undergraduate Internships (1976), there are four primary benefits of applied experiences: vocational development, intellectual development, personal growth, and community service. These
benefits are also similar to the benefits of career development and life-long learning. According to Lynne Bezanson of the Canadian Career Development Foundation, “The aims of lifelong learning are ‘promoting active citizenship’ and ‘employability’ and that a comprehensive strategy is needed for implementing lifelong learning at both the individual and institutional levels...and lifelong learning is much more than up-skilling and schooling; it is about ‘purpose’ in people’s learning and its goals are both social and economic—citizenship and employability” (p. 3). Thus, it seems plausible to suggest that an applied experience is a life-spanning phenomenon with career development firmly and identifiably embedded within it, involving both social and economic processes.

**Effective Design of Program**

Designing an effective internship program involves many different factors. When a program coordinator is developing a potential model, he or she must first develop the program goals. Program goals should be developed from an academic- and community-based ideological framework.

According to Robert Kelly (1986), “In order to achieve goals set forth in an internship program design, the internship program must adapt to its environment by maximizing its assets and limiting its liabilities in competitive and cooperative relationships with other departments and organizations” (p. 236). He suggests that the most effective way of employing this concept is by building internships around existing faculty strengths, because it then becomes possible to assure interns and their employers that support services would be available.

Keeping in mind all of the functions and potential benefits of internships, everyone involved in an internship program should have specified roles and
responsibilities. The parties involved in an internship program and process include students, employers/supervisors, program coordinators, and the sponsoring university. In order to assess the effectiveness of an internship program, we must acknowledge existing guidelines and evaluate how well these guidelines are adhered to by the parties involved. For the purposes of this project, we will adhere to the roles and responsibilities set forth by Western Kentucky University’s Career Services Center and its Department of Sociology. A copy of these roles and responsibilities is provided in Appendix B.

The expectations of an internship vary among students, departments, employers, and universities. A student expects an internship to be intellectually stimulating and beneficial for building the skills needed for future employment. The participating department intends for the internship to be an opportunity for the student to employ classroom knowledge in a real-world setting. The employer expects the program partnership to be a way to identify, hire, and retain talented students seeking full-time employment after graduation. The university expects an internship to create a community partnership with a potential new employer, or to maintain an existing partnership through productive and effective work by its student interns (Santariano & Rogers, 1979).

Students need to realize and understand the potential value of applied learning before they actually experience it firsthand. To learn how to respond to these conditions, guidance is often recommended. Some internship programs do provide a mandatory seminar that students take before they start their placement. This course is normally an overview of the internship program and its associated processes. Students can experience the relevance of classroom learning through the situations that confront them during their placement. The pre-placement seminar provides the training and skills that students need
to learn in order to correctly respond to situations they could potentially encounter during their placement. The way they respond to these situations can have a major impact on their employment prospects after graduation (Santariano & Rogers, 1979).

If a training seminar is not required before participating in an applied placement, other possible techniques for gaining insight about internship-related experiences and values can include faculty members sharing their past internship experiences, interviews with graduates of the same major, or even self-reflection by reading literature on intellectual development. Each of these techniques can help a student to assess the benefits of experiential education.

Potential employers who wish to employ interns must go through a thorough screening by the university and its program coordinator in order to clarify intended expectations of job duties for student interns. One effective placement technique for program coordinators is to establish a list of job requirements and duties for each participating organization. This is easily completed by having the student’s university host a seminar for all organizations wishing to establish a partnership with the department. This seminar could include topics on supervising interns, potential benefits, and the risks and liabilities to everyone involved. Potential student interns should also participate in a pre-placement survey that identifies expectations, outcomes, and skills that they would gain from an internship experience.

The supervision and assessment of potential interns is another factor to consider when designing an effective internship program which lead the researcher to ask these questions:

- Will the student need constant supervision and consultation?
• How will the student respond to encouragement and/or criticism by someone outside the realm of academia?
• How will student assessments be conducted?
• Will the student’s existing priorities interfere with the listed job duties of the potential employer?

These questions must be considered when implementing a new program design. The amount of supervision a student requires will be determined by how many hours are worked per week, the job type, and the amount of specialized skills required to complete the work.

Potential Problems

Potential problems and difficulties is another area of significance to consider when designing an effective internship program. Dr. Tom Spann of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln addresses one of the most common problems regarding internship programs: student dissatisfaction (Spann, 1994). Spann suggests that student dissatisfaction mainly stems from negative attitudes the intern has once they begin work. This can result from a lack of adequate job skills or erroneous initial expectations that the student had before being placed. Much of Spann’s research, however, focuses on the blame that the program coordinator receives from the student.

Providing students with pre-training could allow them time to reflect on what obstacles they may encounter in the future during their placement period. After a student has developed a mindset for understanding the values of an internship program, he must also realize that he could possibly face many new challenges and barriers during his applied placement. If not properly dealt with, these challenges could result in anger,
depression, or burnout (Levine et al., 2006). Using learned knowledge to make rational judgments when addressing these challenges is determined by personal growth. Levine et al. (2006) concluded that internship experiences provide many potential triggers for personal growth, and that the balance between facilitators and barriers helps to determine whether personal growth is more or less likely to occur.

Robert Kelly (1986) addresses other potential difficulties that arise after the initial placement. He notes student compensation and time constraints as two of the main problem areas for student interns. Paid and unpaid internships are mostly determined by whether the participating organization is a non-profit or for-profit entity. Most non-profit organizations do not possess the resources to adequately train an intern that they only employ for a short period of time. This in turn makes it very hard for a non-profit organization to persuade and entice a potential intern to work for them; it is then the responsibility of the program coordinator to ensure that the student possesses adequate skills required to work for a non-profit organization.

Time constraints are another factor to consider when placing a student into an organization (Palmer & Savoie, 2002). The student must be informed beforehand of the responsibilities and tasks they will have to perform once they have gone through the initial placement phase. If a student has a full course load, then he will most likely not have sufficient time to dedicate to his internship experience. Keeping tabs on time constraints is also the role of the department and program coordinators. The department will need resources and dedication from faculty in order to establish an effective program. Program coordinators are normally full-time faculty members that already have existing priorities, such as meeting publication deadlines, teaching classes, or
participating in university committees. A formidable technique to ensure that a program coordinator can allot the necessary time and resources to a program is to incorporate their research into existing community partnerships and organizations (Kelly, 1986).

**Research Model for the Current Study**

Independent variables in the current study are composed of three characteristics that accompany all internship programs as derived from available literature pertaining to the topic of experiential education (Deuster, 2009, Kelly, 1986, Neapolitan, 1992, Santariano & Rogers, 1979, & Spann, 1994). These include: **student background characteristics** (socio-demographic controls), and **time constraints** (i.e., marital status, number of adults and children in household, outside employment, # of hours worked), **characteristics of the internship** (i.e., course identification, # of hours, payment, "type" of organization/internship), **prior training and availability** provided by the **site supervisor and program coordinator**, and the mediating effects that respondents received from their “personal and interpersonal” enhancement on all enhancement areas. These were included so that the researcher could attempt to analyze the connection between personal and interpersonal empowerment received by the respondent at the outcome of their internship and determine whether the effects by the characteristics of the internship were superseded by these benefits. Regarding these specific variables’ influence on the predicted learning outcomes (i.e., benefits) of an internship program, the following research model was proposed.

First, (H1) the research model proposed that student intern demographics, "time constraints", and internship characteristics will independently predict the amount of enhancement (i.e., benefit) that a student intern receives at the end of the program.
Further, (H2) the model suggests that student intern demographics, "time constraints", and internship characteristics will combine with the mediating effects that respondents received from their “personal and interpersonal” enhancements to predict the effectiveness of the students attaining the intended enhancements of the program. The following illustration is a replica of the researcher’s proposed model:

Figure 1. Researcher’s Theoretical Model
CHAPTER III
RESEARCH METHODS

The current chapter is divided in three sections. The first section discusses respondent selection and the methodological research design (including a word about response rate). The second section describes the survey instrument design and how it was constructed. The final section discusses the research timeframe and data collection.

Respondent Selection

This study was conducted at Western Kentucky University through the Department of Sociology. The Department of Sociology at Western Kentucky University offers an Internship in Criminology course at either three or six hours of credit, and a Co-op in Sociology course, also at either three or six hours of credit. The amount of credit-hours is determined by the amount of time spent working for a placement organization. The Department of Sociology determines grades for student interns according to several criteria, including self-reflection on daily experiences, successful completion of all necessary paperwork and evaluations (Appendix C), and successful completion of either an intern project or an extensive report on some topic of interest to the intern. Further, evaluations are conducted in the form of surveys given to the employer supervisor, rating an intern’s job performance and effectiveness, and a survey completed by the intern, meant to evaluate the experiences he had while participating in the internship.
The internship program in this specific department had a relatively small number of participants in the program due to the lack of a mandatory requirement for undergraduate Sociology majors and Criminology minors to take this course. The Department of Sociology at Western Kentucky University offered an Internship in Criminology course at either three or six hours of credit and a Co-op in Sociology course also at either three or six hours of credit. The number of participants per semester varied greatly and was designed to function on a semester-long basis. Students had the option to enroll in this course at the beginning of the fall, spring, or summer terms. All students (i.e., the whole population) who participated in the sociology co-op or criminology internship from the fall semester of 2000 to the fall semester of 2010 were included in the study.

Research Design

For the academic terms from Fall 2000 to Fall 2010, a total of 429 students participated in the Internship in Criminology course(s) or Co-op in Sociology course(s) in the Department of Sociology at Western Kentucky University. To critically assess the internship program for effectiveness, a mixed method was implemented using both qualitative and quantitative approaches. A survey was developed (see Appendix D), following the examination of available literature on this topic, and distributed to all former interns within the selected period (i.e., from the fall of 2000 to the fall of 2010). Further, to reach as many former interns as possible, two different modes of survey distribution were used (postal mail and email). Respondent mailing addresses and e-mail addresses were acquired from Western Kentucky University’s Office of Alumni Relations. The addresses requested were the most recent information provided to the
Alumni Relation’s Office by the respondents themselves. The data sent to the researcher by the Alumni Relations Office was composed of all 429 internship participants from the fall of 2000 through the fall of 2010. Of the total sample of 429, only 200 provided both their mailing address and their e-mail address. The remaining 229 respondents in the sample provided solely their e-mail addresses. Therefore, the 229 with only email addresses were approached via email while the remaining 200 were approached via postal mail.

Before survey distribution, the researcher conducted a focus group. This focus group was comprised of students who were presently enrolled in the Internship in Criminology and Co-op in Sociology courses for Spring 2011, as to identify any possible areas for survey improvement. The surveys completed in the focus group were not included in the analysis. Further, to enhance participation, a personalized cover letter from the student’s former internship coordinator accompanied both versions of the survey instrument.

Regarding survey distribution, for the 200 respondents who received the survey via post, a stamped return envelope was included. Also included in this mailing was an incentive in the form of a $2.00 bill. Following Dillman’s Total Design Method (1978), a sixty day time period was allotted for a response, as this time frame was the maximum allowed time the electronic survey software provided for, thus the same allotment of time was given to both distribution methods. Of the total 200 surveys distributed by this mode of distribution, the researcher received a total of 71 completed surveys. The researcher also received 24 returned envelopes that were designated “unknown address” or “undeliverable.” The remaining 105 surveys were not returned to the researcher. After
accounting for the “unknown” or “undeliverable” addresses, a response rate for the postal
distribution approach was tabulated at 40.34%.

The remaining 229 former interns were sent the online version of the survey due
to the nonexistence of updated mailing addresses for these respondents. The researcher
used the online survey software Qualtrics to design and distribute this version. Again,
following Dillman’s *Total Design Method* (1978), two reminders were sent out with one
being dispersed after one week and another after three weeks. An advantage of using this
software distribution technique was the ability of allowing a respondent to partially
complete a section and then return at a later time to complete the unfinished portions of
the survey.

Due to the possibility that previous students cannot be contacted and the well-
known fact that online surveys have a lower response rate than other modes of survey
distribution, the researcher employed the use an incentive. Ten $50.00 Wal-Mart gift
cards were distributed to on-line participants via a drawing.

Of the total 229 possible respondents approached solely via email, the researcher
received 94 completed surveys. A total of 58 surveys were returned “undeliverable
address,” thus excluding them from the tabulation of the response rate. After the sixty day
time period allotted for respondent completion, 77 were not returned. Tabulation for the
response rate for this method, after the exclusion of the “undeliverable addresses,” was
54.97%.

When the results of both methods of distribution were combined, 165 completed
surveys were received out of 429 approached. A total of 82 former interns had
“unknown” or “undeliverable” addresses which prevented their response. As such, this
number was excluded from the final response rate calculation. With this exclusion, the response rate was tabulated using a total of 347 possible respondents. The final response rate for the mixed mode distribution was 47.55%.

Variables

Basic demographic characteristics belonging to each student in the population was acquired from Western Kentucky University’s Office of the Registrar. Student information was provided to the researcher with permission granted by both Western Kentucky University’s Institutional Review Board along with Western Kentucky University’s Office of the Registrar using an exception to disclosure polices as stated in the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA). Citing 34 CFR 99.31, “School officials with legitimate educational interest,” the researcher received the necessary institutional clearance to initiate an educational related study and received the requested educational records needed for the analysis. Individual student data records were assigned a unique reference number in order for the researcher to link this data with the completed surveys.

These basic respondent characteristics were included: (a) age, (b) ethnicity (White, Non-Hispanic=1; all other ethnicities (African American, Hispanic, and Asian Pacific Islander)=0). Dummy coding was used for ethnicity because of the large proportion of White, Non-Hispanics represented in the sample. (c) sex (female=0; male=1), (d) the grade point average from the academic semester preceding the internship and (e) the grade point average following the internship,

Additional demographic data was needed in order to properly evaluate the program. This data, which was unavailable from the Registrar’s office, was included on
the survey instrument. Specific questions to assess "student time constraints" were: (f) their employment status during their placement period (employed for wages=1; not employed for wages=0), (g) number of hours worked weekly at outside job (1=one to fifteen hours; 2=sixteen to twenty-five hours; 3=twenty-six to thirty-six hours; 4=thirty-seven hours or greater (h) marital status (married=0; single=1), (i) number of adults living respondent’s household (1=alone; 2=one adult; 3=two adults; 4=three adults), and (j) the number of children living in the respondent’s household (1=one or more kids; 0=no kids).

Questions used to identify characteristics of the internship included: (k) whether or not they were compensated during their placement (yes=1; no=0), (l) the course identification subject category listed as either a Criminology or Sociology classification, (Internship in Criminology SOCL 439=1; Co-op in Sociology SOC 494=2), and (m) the name of the organization/company that sponsored their placement with the researcher creating four dummy variables for each category (corrections=1 and all others=0; courts=1 and all others=0; law enforcement and emergency responders=1 and all others=0; all other services (education, social services, community programs)=1 and all others=0), (n) the approximate number of hours in a typical week they dedicated to their internship (zero to five hours=1; six to ten hours=2; eleven to fifteen hours=3; sixteen to twenty hours=4; twenty or more hours=5). Research suggests the availability of the placement site supervisor and internship program coordinator to the student intern is a critical factor when evaluating service learning (Kelly, 1986, Palmer & Savoie, 2002). Thus, in order to evaluate the involvement of the internship coordinator and site supervisor, the following questions were asked: (o) Rate the availability of the placement
site supervisor and (p) internship coordinator (choices to these two questions were measured in the form of a five point Likert scale rating their availability from “Not at all” = “1”, to “A great deal” = “5.” Finally, respondents were asked whether or not they received any form of training or preparation before they participated in the program with this variable being measured using a dichotomous variable (yes=1 or no=0).

The second part of the survey was divided into five separate sections. These categories served as the dependent measures in the analysis of the experiential experience, with two also serving as the mediating influences (Personal and Interpersonal). The first five sections were adapted from a survey created by Barbara Baird of Brevard Community College (Baird, 1998) where she served as a curriculum specialist at the Center for Service Learning in Cocoa Beach, Florida. The five component sections included in her survey design were used to evaluate the experiences of students who completed an internship. These areas of impact were chosen specifically to be measured because they represented the primary benefits of an internship program (Conference on Undergraduate Internships, 1976). These areas of enhancement are also related to the intended outcomes of Western Kentucky University’s Department of Sociology’s internship program (Appendix A).

These sections were comprised of statements that corresponded with the areas that an internship program is supposed to enrich for the participating student. The five categories included were personal, interpersonal, academic, occupational, and civic characteristics. Each of these headings contained five to ten statements that gave certain skills or characteristics that were supposed to be gained from their internship experience. The respondent, using a five point Likert scale, was to indicate the degree to which
participation in their internship experience increased or strengthened their abilities, attitudes, and awareness or understanding in each of the areas identified. The five-point scale ranged from “not at all” (coded as 1) to “a great deal” (coded as 5). These five components were factored to combine to form indices to represent the aggregate section.

A factor analysis was performed for all five component sections in order to guide the researcher to construct various indices that included only positively correlated statements. Principal component analysis was conducted using a varimax rotation. All indices were tested for internal reliability using Cronbach’s Alpha test.

Component 1, Personal Impact, showed, after factor analysis, that items q18, q19, q20, q21, q22, q23, q24, and q25 had a Cronbach’s Alpha = .954, which demonstrated high internal consistency between individual statements. After this result, an index variable was created using all statements items. Table 1.1 shows the factor loadings for Personal_I.

Table 1.1
Component Loadings for Personal Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18) I have a sense of satisfaction in doing something worthwhile.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19) I believe in my ability to make a difference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20) I am open to new experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21) I have gained the capacity to be more productive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22) I can recognize my personal strengths.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23) I can recognize my personal weaknesses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24) I have a sense of personal achievement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25) I have the ability to persevere in difficult tasks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Component 2, Interpersonal (Social) Impact, showed, after factor analysis, that items q26, q27, q28, q29, q30, and q31 had a Cronbach’s Alpha = .910, which demonstrated high internal consistency between individual statements. After this result,
an index variable was created using all statements items. Table 1.2 shows the factor loadings for \textit{Interpersonal}_I.

\textbf{Table 1.2}  
\textit{Component Loadings for Interpersonal (Social) Impact}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26) I demonstrate concern for the welfare of others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27) I can be understanding and appreciative of people with diverse backgrounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28) I have the ability to work cooperatively with others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29) I have the ability to communicate effectively (listen and articulate ideas).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30) I have increased my ability to be a leader.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31) I feel more connected to my community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Component 3, \textit{Academic (Learning) Impact}, showed after factor analysis that items \textit{q32}, \textit{q33}, \textit{q34}, \textit{q35}, \textit{q36}, \textit{q37}, and \textit{q38} had a Cronbach’s Alpha = .897, which demonstrated high internal consistency between individual statements. After this result, an index variable was created using all statements items. Table 1.3 shows the factor loadings for \textit{Academic}_I.

\textbf{Table 1.3}  
\textit{Component Loadings for Academic (Learning) Impact}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32) I have acquired knowledge from the job duties I performed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33) I have broadened my critical thinking skills (reasoning, problem solving).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34) My GPA improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35) I desired to stay in college or complete degree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36) I have the ability to work and learn independently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37) I felt my classroom learning was enriched.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38) I have the ability to connect academic subject matter to the “real world.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Component 4, Employment (Job Specific) Impact, showed after factor analysis that items q39, q40, q41, q42, q43, and q44 had a Cronbach’s Alpha = .908, which demonstrated high internal consistency between individual statements. After this result, an index variable was created using all statements items. Table 1.4 shows the factor loadings for Employment_I.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component Loadings for Employment (Job Specific) Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39) I developed specialized technical skills for a specific job function(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40) I feel my vocational development was enhanced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41) I broadened my future employment possibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42) I received an opportunity to explore a specific career.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43) I developed realistic ideas about the work world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44) I narrowed my future possible career choices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Component 5, Civic Impact, which included items q45, q46, q47, q48, q49, q50, q51, and q52, demonstrated that after initial factorization a different result than originally inferred by the researcher. The factor analysis demonstrated that within the section of statements, there were two unique components. After prolonged reflection, it was determined that Civic Impact would be most efficiently analyzed if separated into two categories within the topic, thus Civic Engagement and Civic Awareness indices were created. The theoretical logic behind this decision was due in part to the way that the statements within the section were possibly perceived by the respondents. Some statements demonstrated a “physical” contribution to being a positive and responsible citizen, to where as some statements were categorized in a sense that they personified
more of a mental awareness of “civic-ness” rather than a physical contribution by the respondent to be an actively engaged citizen.

*Civic Engagement* included items q45, q46, q47, q48, q49, and q50 and had a Cronbach’s Alpha = .889, which demonstrated high internal consistency between individual statements. After this result, an index variable was created using all statements items. Table 1.5 shows the factor loadings for *Civicengage_I*.

**Table 1.5**
*Component Loadings for Civic Engagement Impact*

| Loading |  
|---------|---|
| 45) I developed a belief in becoming a better citizen. | .918 |
| 46) I developed an awareness of community problems or social concerns. | .912 |
| 47) I developed a commitment to making a difference in my community. | .834 |
| 48) I have gained the capacity to contribute to society. | .799 |
| 49) I have the intention to work on behalf of social justice. | .798 |
| 50) I dedicate more time to volunteer work. | .608 |

The newly created Component 6, *Civic Awareness*, which included items q51 and q52, had a Cronbach’s Alpha = .940, which demonstrated high internal consistency between individual statements. After this result, an index variable was created using all statements items. Table 1.6 shows the factor loadings for *Civiceaware_I*.

**Table 1.6**
*Component Loadings for Civic Awareness Impact*

| Loading |  
|---------|---|
| 51) I stay current with local political news. | .971 |
| 52) I stay current with national political news. | .971 |
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS

This chapter analyzes the effectiveness of an internship program. It is divided into three different sections. The first section describes how the researcher constructed the multiple indices for the dependent and independent variables and tested their individual reliability. The second section reports the execution of the regression analyses. The third section discusses the qualitative findings from the content analysis of certain open ended response questions.

Descriptive Statistics

Even though the researcher acquired basic characteristics for all of 429 potential respondents, the analysis focused solely on the respondents who completed the survey. Following this premise, the analysis focused on the 165 respondents who returned a completed survey instead of the original 429 in the cohort.

Of the 165 respondents, 115 (70%) were female and 48 (29%) were male (2 respondents failed to identify their sex). Regarding sex, the responding cohort is a close match to the overall population of past interns as 294 (68%) were female and 133 (31%) male (again, no information existed regarding the sex of 2 prior interns). While the ethnic composition of the cohort contained 139 (84%) self-identified whites, 21 (13%) self-identified African-Americans, and less than 1% "ethnic other" (again, 2 individuals
failed to identify themselves ethnically). The cohort's ethnic composition closely represented the total population as 353 (82%) of former interns were white, and 77 (12%) ethnic minorities (a more specific breakdown of former interns by ethnicity was not available). The average age of respondents during their placement was 27 years old, with a standard error of .588 years ($SD=7.51$). One percent of the cohort did not identify their age. The range of the age of respondents was between the youngest at 20 years old and the eldest in the sample at age 59.

Respondent academic information included the “letter” grade the student received from the internship program coordinator as of the result of his performance during his placement, the grade point average the student received for the semester prior to his internship experience, and the grade point average the student received after his participation in the program, which included the grade the student received for the internship.

The majority of respondents 157 (95%) received an “A” for their participation in the program. Three students, or 2% received a “B”, a single student received (<1%) received a “C” as their final letter grade. Again, a single student (<1%) received an “F” as their final letter grade for the program. No students received the letter grade designated “D.” Also one student received an “X”, or “incomplete” due to their withdrawal from the program at some point during its occurrence. Two students’ grades were not reported or were unknown. Non-respondents who received an “A” were the same as those of respondents (95%). Due to the lack of variation in this variable, it was excluded from the analysis.
The mean grade point average of the semester preceding the respondents participation in the internship program was 2.96, with an error of plus or minus .05 ($SD= .579$). Before semester grade point averages ranged from 2.00-4.00. The grade point average for the semester following the cohort’s participation increased slightly with a mean of 3.01, with a standard error of +/- .04 ($SD=.550$). These results indicated a preliminary positive effect on student academic achievement, which portrays to be due to the high number of respondents who received a letter grade of an “A.” The average after GPA for non-respondents was slightly less than those who completed the survey (mean=2.92).

**Time Constraints**

During the actual time period in which the respondents participated in his/her internship, 122 (74%) informed the researcher he/she was employed for wages outside of the program. Those who were not employed for wages were represented by 43 (26%) of respondents. For the respondents who were employed for wages, they worked on average 27 hours in a typical week, plus or minus 1.01 hours ($SD=11.701$), with a range from zero to sixty hours.

Respondents were asked to report whether they were married or single during their internship. Thirty-seven (23%) respondents reported they were married during their internship. One hundred and twenty-eight (77%) respondents reported being not married during their placement. Respondents were also asked to report how many adults and children lived in their household during their placement period. Forty-eight (29%) respondents reported that they lived alone in their household. Forty-nine percent or eighty-two respondents reported that one other adult lived in their household during this
that time. Twenty-three respondents (14%) reported living with two other adults during their placement period. Eleven respondents (7%) reported living with three or more other adults during their placement period. Seventy percent or one hundred and seventeen respondents reported that there were no children living in their household during their placement. Forty-eight (30%) respondents reported that one or more children lived in their household during their placement.

**Internship Characteristics**

Respondents were asked “During a typical week, approximately how many hours did you dedicate to your internship.” Thirteen (8%) reported working an average of 0-5 hours weekly. Thirty-two (19%) indicated they performed 6-10 hours of labor weekly. Thirty-two (19%) worked an average of 11-15 hours a week. Forty-one (25%) worked 16-20 hours weekly. Forty-three (26%) worked an average of 20 or more hours a week. Four (2%) respondents did not report how many hours they dedicated weekly to their internship.

Respondents were asked whether they enrolled in the Internship in Criminology course or the Co-op in Sociology course. Sixteen (10%) respondents reported enrolling in the Co-op in Sociology course while one hundred and forty-seven (89%) respondents reported enrolling in the Internship in Criminology course.

One hundred and ten respondents, 67%, received no monetary compensation for duties performed for their internship. Forty-seven or 29% of those who completed the survey indicated that they received compensation for their efforts. Again, 8 (5%) did not respond to this survey question. Of the 165 respondents who completed the survey, 160 (97%) reported the name of the organization/company that sponsored their internship.
Since this survey question was open-ended, the researcher categorized the placement sponsors nominally by type of sponsoring institution. Eleven (7%) respondents were under the supervision of a corrections entity. Sixty-four (39%) respondents were under the supervision of the court system. Thirty-six (22%) of respondents were under the supervision of law enforcement and emergency responders. Forty-nine (30%) respondents were under the supervision of all other agencies (such as education, social services, and community programs). Five (3%) of respondents did not report their type of sponsoring organization.

When respondents were asked to rate the availability of their past site supervisor, 98% of the sample answered, with the remaining 2% not answering this inquiry. The majority of the sample, 61% reported that the site supervisor was available to meet “a great deal” of the time period. Twenty-nine percent of the cohort indicated that the site supervisor was available to meet “quite a bit” during the placement time frame. Seven percent of the total sample reported that the site supervisor was available “moderately”, and less than one percent reporting that the site supervisor was “not at all available.” No respondent reported the “slightly” category. The availability of the internship program coordinator also received a majority positive rating with 53% of respondents indicating he/she was available to meet “a great deal” of the time. Another 35% indicated that the internship program coordinator was available to meet “quite a bit.” Ten percent of the respondents indicated the coordinator was available “moderately”, and <1% indicated he/she was available only “slightly” during their placement period. None of the cohort reported that the internship program was “not at all” available to meet during their internship. Respondents were then asked whether or not they received any
training/preparation prior to the start of their internship. Ninety-nine (60%) respondents they did not receive prior training. Sixty (36%) respondents reported that they received training prior to the start of their placement. Six (4%) respondents did not answer this survey item.

**Multivariate Analysis**

The following discussion will present the multivariate analysis beginning with simply correlation matrices and followed by a multiple regression to test the researcher’s model assumptions. Table 1.7 showed the inter-correlations for the indices *Personal_I*, *Interpersonal_I*, *Academic_I*, *Employment_I*, *Civicengage_I* and, *Civicaware_I*. The strongest correlations between the indices were for *Personal_I* and *Interpersonal_I* (.872) demonstrating a very strong positive association, *Academic_I* and *Personal_I* (.794), *Academic_I* and *Interpersonal_I* (.794), *Employment_I* and *Academic_I* (.793), and *Civicengage_I* and *Interpersonal_I* (.791), all of which demonstrated a strong positive association between one another. Collectively, all correlations between all indices were significant at the $p<.01$ level using a 2-tailed test for statistical significance.
Table 1.7

*Correlation Matrix Showing Mediating and Enhancement Indices*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Personal Impact Index</th>
<th>Interpersonal Impact Index</th>
<th>Academic Impact Index</th>
<th>Employment Impact Index</th>
<th>Civic Engagement Index</th>
<th>Civic Awareness Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Impact Index</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Impact Index</td>
<td>.872**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Impact Index</td>
<td>.794**</td>
<td>.794**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Impact Index</td>
<td>.730**</td>
<td>.732**</td>
<td>.793**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Engagement Index</td>
<td>.763**</td>
<td>.791**</td>
<td>.732**</td>
<td>.668**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Awareness Index</td>
<td>.430**</td>
<td>.462**</td>
<td>.445**</td>
<td>.430**</td>
<td>.533**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Correlation is significant at the p < .01 level (2-tailed)*
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Table 1.8
Correlation Matrix Showing Student Demographics and Internship Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Whites</th>
<th>GPA After Comp.</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Single</th>
<th>Adults in Home</th>
<th>1+ Kids in Home</th>
<th>Held Outside Job</th>
<th>Hours Worked at Job</th>
<th>Hours Worked at Intern</th>
<th>Crim. Course</th>
<th>Hours Worked in Corr.</th>
<th>Paid Intern</th>
<th>Worked in Courts</th>
<th>Worked in Law En/Other</th>
<th>Worked in Other Services</th>
<th>Received Prior Training</th>
<th>Avail. of Site Sup</th>
<th>Avail. of Prg Coord</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA After Comp.</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults in Home</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1+ Kids in Home</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Held Outside Job</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours Worked at Job</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>.72**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crim. Course</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours Worked at Intern</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.16*</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid Intern</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked in Corr.</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked in Courts</td>
<td>-0.19*</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.22**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked in Law En/Other</td>
<td>0.21**</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.44**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked in Other Services</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.19*</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>-0.18*</td>
<td>-0.54**</td>
<td>-0.36**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received Prior Training</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.19*</td>
<td>-0.20*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avail. of Site Sup</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.20*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avail. of Prg Coord</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
Next, another bi-variate correlation matrix was constructed that contained respondent characteristic variables (including time constraints) and all internship characteristics. Table 1.8 showed the internal consistency between these variables.

Collectively, Table 1.8 indicated several significant correlations between the demographic indicators and the internship characteristics. Males were more likely than females to work in law enforcement and emergency responders (.209). Females were more likely than males to work in the courts (-.194). Whites were more likely than all other minorities to work in the court system (.192) and have a higher GPA after completing their internship (.257). All other minorities were more likely than white to work in other services (.197). Older interns were more likely than younger interns to have a higher GPA after completing their internship (.160) and having one or more kids living with them (.245). Younger interns were more likely to be single (-.35) than older interns. Respondents who have a higher GPA after their placement were more likely to have more adults in their home (.168) and work in the court system (.160). Single respondents were more likely to have no kids in their home (-.32) and work in corrections (.209). Respondents who have a higher number of adults living with them were more likely to be paid during their internship (.172). Respondents who had one or more children in their home were more likely than those who lived with none to work in corrections (.204). Respondents who held an outside job were more likely than those who did not hold outside employment to work more hours at that job (.723), receive pay for their internship (.255), and received prior training (.182). Inversely, respondents who did not have an outside job were more likely to dedicate more time working at their internship (-.160). Interns who worked more hours at their outside job were more likely to be enrolled in the
Criminology course (.244) and have a paid placement (.351). Respondents who enrolled in the Criminology course were more likely to have greater availability to the internship coordinator (.26) than those who took the Sociology course. Respondents who dedicated more hours to the internship were more likely to be paid (.195) and work in corrections (.161). Respondents who were paid were more likely than those who were unpaid to work in other services (.304) and received prior training (.166). Respondents who worked in other services were more likely to receive prior training (.203) than other placement sites. Respondents who had more access to their site supervisor also had greater access to the internship coordinator (.395).

Next, a third bi-variate correlation matrix was constructed to test internal consistency between all enhancement indices and all variables that represented student demographics and the characteristics of an internship. Table 1.9 shows all significant correlations at the \( p<.05 (*) \) and \( p<.01(**) \) levels.

Collectively, Table 1.9 demonstrates a very broad and diverse type of association between learning outcomes and characteristics. Respondents who received a greater “personal” enhancement were more likely to work more hours at the internship (.279), be paid (.221), received prior training (.266), and have greater access to the internship coordinator (.295). Respondents who received great “interpersonal” enhancement were more likely to be paid (.172), work more hours at their internship (.189), received prior training (.224), and have more access to the internship coordinator (.248). Respondents who benefited more “academically” were more likely to work more hours at their internship (.233), be paid (.176), received prior training (.222), and have greater access to the internship coordinator. Respondents who received more “employment” enhancement
were more likely to be female (-.183), work more hours at their placement (.332), be paid
(.237), work in corrections (.174), received prior training (.246), and have greater access
to the internship coordinator (.260). Respondents who became more “civically engaged”
were more likely to have received prior training (.222) and have greater access to the
internship coordinator (.209). Respondents who gained greater “civic awareness” were
more likely to be male (.183), be married (-.166), received prior training (.161) and have
greater access to the internship coordinator (.172).
Table 1.9  
Correlation Matrix Showing Student Demographics, Internship Characteristics, Mediating, and Outcome Indices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Personal Impact Index</th>
<th>Interpersonal Impact Index</th>
<th>Academic Impact Index</th>
<th>Employment Impact Index</th>
<th>Civic Engagement Index</th>
<th>Civic Awareness Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>-0.096</td>
<td>-0.077</td>
<td>-0.086</td>
<td>-0.183*</td>
<td>-0.061</td>
<td>.183*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites</td>
<td>-0.054</td>
<td>-0.121</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td>-0.081</td>
<td>-0.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.043</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
<td>-0.033</td>
<td>-0.115</td>
<td>-0.033</td>
<td>0.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA After Comp.</td>
<td>-0.115</td>
<td>-0.134</td>
<td>-0.096</td>
<td>-0.062</td>
<td>-0.084</td>
<td>-0.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>-0.095</td>
<td>-0.078</td>
<td>-0.032</td>
<td>-0.018</td>
<td>-0.049</td>
<td>-1.166*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults in Home</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>-0.045</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1+ Kids in Home</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed at Outside Job</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>-0.054</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours Worked at Job</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>-0.049</td>
<td>0.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crim. Course</td>
<td>-0.121</td>
<td>-0.104</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td>-0.114</td>
<td>-0.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours Worked at Intern</td>
<td>.279**</td>
<td>.189*</td>
<td>.233**</td>
<td>.332**</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid Intern</td>
<td>.221**</td>
<td>.172*</td>
<td>.176*</td>
<td>.237**</td>
<td>0.129</td>
<td>0.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked in Corrections</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>.174*</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>0.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked in Courts</td>
<td>-0.091</td>
<td>-0.095</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>-0.122</td>
<td>-0.105</td>
<td>-0.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked in Law En/Other</td>
<td>-0.052</td>
<td>-0.026</td>
<td>-0.039</td>
<td>-0.027</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked in Other Services</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received Prior Training</td>
<td>.266**</td>
<td>.224**</td>
<td>.222**</td>
<td>.246**</td>
<td>.222**</td>
<td>.161*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avail. of Site Supervisor</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>.170*</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avail. of Prg Coord</td>
<td>.295**</td>
<td>.248**</td>
<td>.234**</td>
<td>.260**</td>
<td>.209**</td>
<td>.172*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
The matrices discussed thus far have marginally supported the researchers proposed model. Table 1.9 reports that only eight variables representing student characteristics and internship characteristics are positively associated with the enhancement areas (sex, marital status, hours worked at internship, intern pay, worked in corrections, prior training received, and availability of site supervisor and internship coordinator). This data partially undermines the first step in the model as the researcher expected student and internship characteristics to have more significant associations than the eight identified.

The second branch of the model has more support than does the first phase. Table 1.9 supported the model expectations that certain characteristics are helpful in assessing an internship program for effectiveness. Preparation received prior to the internship and availability of the internship coordinator was positively associated with all areas of enhancement which supported the model. With partial support for both phases of the proposed model, the predictability of the correlated variables will be tested using an OLS regression analysis.

**OLS Regression**

This section discusses the linear regression run to test the researcher’s program effectiveness model. As previously stated, the following model was tested:
A total of 10 OLS regression models were tabulated to determine the individual predictive effects of student background (socio-demographic controls), student time constraints (i.e., marital status, number of adults and children in household, outside employment, # of hours worked), characteristics of the internship (i.e., course classification, # of hours, payment, "type" of organization/internship), prior training and availability provided by the site supervisor and program coordinator, and mediating effects that respondents received from their “personal and interpersonal” enhancements on all enhancement areas. To test the researcher’s model, the following imputation methods were followed for the analyses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regression 1: Model 1: All Characteristics ↔ Personal Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression 2: Model 1: All Characteristics ↔ Interpersonal Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regression 3: Model 1: All Characteristics ↔ Academic Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regression 3: Model 2: All Characteristics ↔ Mediating Effects ↔ Academic Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regression 4: Model 1: All Characteristics ↔ Employment Impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.1 presents a synopsis of all regression analyses performed and shows both the standardized and non-standardized beta coefficients along with the standard error of each variable. Table 2.1 also shows the $R^2$ values for each individual model. Significant beta values are signified by asterisks (*=$p<.05$, **=$p<.01$, and ***=$p<.001$). All models included only the correlated characteristics with each individual enhancement area as identified in Table 1.9.

In summation, the following characteristics were identified as correlates with each individual “impact area” and were included in the regression on each enhancement area:

“Personal Impact” was correlated with number of hours worked weekly at placement site, internship paid (yes), preparation/training (yes), and availability of internship program coordinator. “Interpersonal Impact” was correlated with number of hours worked weekly at placement site, internship paid (yes), preparation/training (yes), availability of site supervisor, and availability of internship program. “Academic Impact” was correlated with number of hours worked weekly at placement site, internship paid (yes), preparation/training (yes), and availability of internship program coordinator.

“Employment Impact” was correlated with sex (males), number of hours worked weekly at placement site, worked in corrections, internship paid (yes), preparation/training (yes), and availability of internship program coordinator. “Civic Engagement Impact”
was correlated with \textit{preparation/training (yes)} and \textit{availability of internship program coordinator}. “Civic Awareness Impact” was correlated with \textit{sex (males), marital status (single), preparation/training (yes)} and \textit{availability of internship program coordinator}.

Next, the mediating effects from the indices representing “personal” and “interpersonal” impacts were included in the second blocks of all models except for those regressed on \textit{Personal\_I} and \textit{Interpersonal\_I}. These were included so that the researcher could attempt to analyze the connection between personal and interpersonal empowerment received by the respondent at the outcome of their internship and determine whether the effects by the characteristics of the internship were superseded by these benefits.
Table 2.1 *Betas and Coefficients of Determination Showing the Effects of Correlated Characteristics and Mediating Effects on Impact Outcomes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlated Characteristics</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Hours Worked Weekly at Internship</td>
<td>1.025</td>
<td>0.399</td>
<td>0.204*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intern Pay</td>
<td>1.892</td>
<td>1.065</td>
<td>0.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation/Training Received</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.042</td>
<td>0.202*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of Program Coordinator</td>
<td>2.137</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.242**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R-Square</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * = p < .05, ** = p<.01, *** = p<.001

Table 2.1 Cont’d *Betas and Coefficients of Determination Showing the Effects of Correlated Characteristics and Mediating Effects on Impact Outcomes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlated Characteristics</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Hours Worked Weekly at Internship</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>0.303</td>
<td>0.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intern Pay</td>
<td>1.109</td>
<td>0.815</td>
<td>0.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation/Training Received</td>
<td>1.691</td>
<td>0.792</td>
<td>0.178*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of Site Supervisor</td>
<td>0.617</td>
<td>0.572</td>
<td>0.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of Program Coordinator</td>
<td>1.018</td>
<td>0.567</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R-Square</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * = p < .05, ** = p<.01, *** = p<.001
Table 2.1 Cont’d Betas and Coefficients of Determination Showing the Effects of Correlated Characteristics and Mediating Effects on Impact Outcomes

### Academic Impact Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>$SE$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Correlated Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Hours Worked Weekly at Internship</td>
<td>0.618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intern Pay</td>
<td>1.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation/Training Received</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of Program Coordinator</td>
<td>1.461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Impact</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Impact</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R-Square</strong></td>
<td><strong>Value</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* $* = p < .05$, $** = p<.01$, $*** = p<.001$

---

Table 2.1 Cont’d Betas and Coefficients of Determination Showing the Effects of Correlated Characteristics and Mediating Effects on Impact Outcomes

### Employment Impact Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>$SE$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Correlated Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>-1.369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Hours Worked Weekly at Internship</td>
<td>0.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intern Pay</td>
<td>2.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked in Corrections</td>
<td>2.515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation/Training Received</td>
<td>1.587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of Program Coordinator</td>
<td>1.424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Impact</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Impact</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R-Square</strong></td>
<td><strong>Value</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* $* = p < .05$, $** = p<.01$, $*** = p<.001$
Table 2.1 Cont’d Betas and Coefficients of Determination Showing the Effects of Correlated Characteristics and Mediating Effects on Impact Outcomes

Civic Engagement Impact Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Correlated Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation/Training Received</td>
<td>2.004</td>
<td>0.901</td>
<td>0.187*</td>
<td>0.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of Program Coordinator</td>
<td>1.239</td>
<td>0.603</td>
<td>0.173*</td>
<td>-0.248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Impact</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Impact</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R-Square</strong></td>
<td>Value 0.07</td>
<td></td>
<td>Value 0.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* * = p < .05, ** = p<.01, *** = p<.001

Table 2.1 Cont’d Betas and Coefficients of Determination Showing the Effects of Correlated Characteristics and Mediating Effects on Impact Outcomes

Civic Awareness Impact Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Correlated Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>0.983</td>
<td>0.446</td>
<td>0.186*</td>
<td>1.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>-0.724</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>-0.131</td>
<td>-0.476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation/Training Received</td>
<td>0.682</td>
<td>0.412</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>0.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of Prg Coordinator</td>
<td>0.519</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td>0.158</td>
<td>0.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Impact</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Impact</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R-Square</strong></td>
<td>Value 0.11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Value 0.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* * = p < .05, ** = p<.01, *** = p<.001
To ascertain if any assumptions for OLS regression were breached, the following investigative techniques were executed on each of the OLS regression models: scatter plots examining the independent and dependent variables and a normality plot were constructed and also examined. No breach of any OLS regression assumptions was the final determination.

Regression diagnostics were tabulated in order to test for multi-collinerarity. All Variance Inflation Factors (VIF) values for all variables included in all models ranged from 1 to 2, and incurred tolerance levels below 1 which indicated that multi-collinerarity was not an issue.

In Table 2.1, the first model of the regression analysis executed showed the effects of all correlated characteristics on the “personal impact” outcome. Block 1 ($R^2=.215$, $F=8.912$, $p<.001$) showed three significant relationships between all variables. After this addition, the predictive findings were noted for number of hours worked at placement internship ($\beta=.204$), respondents who received preparation or training prior to the initiation of their internship ($\beta=.202$) and respondents who reported availability to the program coordinator ($\beta=.242$). This suggested that those students who received prior training were more likely to be impacted “personally” than those students who did not receive any prior training to the start of their placement and as the number of hours worked at placement and availability of the program coordinator increases, so does the personal enhancement area.

For the second analysis performed, “personal impact” was replaced with “interpersonal impact.” Block 1 ($R^2=.136$, $F=4.056$, $p<.01$), presented one significant finding. This notable finding was for students who received preparation or training prior
to the initiation of their internship ($\beta = .178$). This suggested that those students who received prior training were more likely to emulate a positive “social” enhancement than those students who did not receive any prior training to the start of their placement.

For the remaining analyses, the mediating effects from the indices representing “personal” and “interpersonal” impacts were included in the second blocks of all models. These were included so that the researcher could attempt to analyze the connection between personal and interpersonal empowerment received by the respondent at the outcome of their internship and determine whether the effects by the characteristics of the internship were superseded by these benefits.

When inputting the index measure for “academic impact”, the results showed two significant relationships existed for the independent measures in block 1 ($R^2 = .141$, $F = 5.318, p < .01$). This showed that respondents who received prior training ($\beta = .181$) and had greater access to the internship coordinator ($\beta = .201$) benefited from greater “academic” enhancement than did those who did not receive prior training and those who lacked access to the program coordinator. When the mediating effects representing “personal and interpersonal” empowerment were added to block 2 ($R^2 = .678$, $F = 44.922$, $p < .001$), two predictive findings were noted for “personal” ($\beta = .368$) and “interpersonal” ($\beta = .46$) empowerment. These results indicated that respondents who demonstrated more personal and interpersonal empowerment from their applied experience were more likely to benefit academically than those who did not experience empowerment.

The “employment impact” regression showed three significant findings in block 1 ($R^2 = .239$, $F = 6.703$, $p < .001$). The results suggest that as the number of hours worked at the internship increases, the more “employment” and career enhancement the student
received ($\beta=.216$). Paid internships also promoted more “employment” benefits than did unpaid internships ($\beta=.188$). Also, as the availability of the internship coordinator increases, so does the “employment” benefit to the student ($\beta=.20$). Block 2 ($R^2=.611$, $F=24.710$, $p<.001$) showed four significant positive findings. First, there were significant findings for the number of internship hours worked ($\beta=.118$) and intern pay ($\beta=.117$), whose influence levels were lowered with the inclusion of the additional variables suggesting that the mediating effects are overwhelming the internship characteristics. The next finding suggested that students who worked in corrections were more likely to benefit from “employment” enhancement in relations to students who did not work in corrections ($\beta=.152$). The last finding showed that students who received more “interpersonal” empowerment were more likely to experience “employment” benefits than those who did not ($\beta=.561$).

When the researcher analyzed the “civic engagement impact” with the independent measures again, block 1 ($R^2=.071$, $F=5.069$, $p<.01$) presented two significant findings. This suggested that those students who received prior training ($\beta=.187$) were more likely to be impacted “personally” than those students who did not receive any prior training to the start of their placement and as the availability of the program coordinator increases ($\beta=.173$), so does the personal enhancement area. Block 2 ($R^2=.668$, $F=65.498$, $p<.001$) again showed two significant findings, but they were for the “personal” ($\beta=.286$) and “interpersonal” ($\beta=.559$) rather than the two previously noted. This suggests those “personal and interpersonal” empowerments are stronger predictors of civic engagement than the characteristics of the internship and the students.
The final set of analyses performed by the researcher showed the effects of the independent measures on the outcome of “civic awareness.” Block 1 ($R^2=.114$, $F=4.181$, $p<.01$) showed that males were more likely than females to be aware of local and national political and civic issues ($\beta=.186$). Block 2 ($R^2=.278$, $F=8.209$, $p<.001$) showed that, while controlling for mediating empowerment effects, again males were more likely than females household to be aware of local and national political and civic issues ($\beta=.215$). Surprisingly, with the addition of the mediating empowerment effects neither were reliable predictors of civic awareness.

After utilizing OLS regressions for analysis on all respondent demographics, internship characteristics, mediating empowerment effects, and indices for all intended learning outcomes, the following summarizes the best predictors for student interns achieving a positive enhancement for each learning outcome: three variables for “personal” enhancement (number of hours worked at internship, received prior training, and availability of internship coordinator), one variable for “interpersonal” enhancement (received prior training), two variables for “academic” enhancement (Personal and interpersonal empowerment), four variables for “employment” enhancement (hours worked at internship, paid internship, work in corrections, and interpersonal empowerment), two variables for “civic engagement” enhancement (Personal and interpersonal empowerment), and one variable for “civic awareness” enhancement (males).
CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS

This final chapter is separated into three sections: Summation of Project, Project Limitations and Implications, and Future Research. In section one, a synopsis of the project is presented with detailed reflection given to the study’s hypotheses. Section two addresses the research limitations the researcher was exposed to during the execution of the study and also the possibilities for future research in service learning. The last section describes the practical implications and recommendations as to how this project enhances the realm of experiential education research.

**Summation of Project**

The primary purpose of this study was to examine the student’s internship experience and determine whether it helped to enhance his ability to achieve the predicted outcomes of the internship program. A quantitative methodological approach was deemed appropriate for empirical analysis.

**Hypotheses Reflection**

This project focused on studying the learning outcomes for a service learning program. To do this, the levels of enhancement each student received as a result of his/her participation in the program was empirically analyzed.
After reviewing relevant literature, the researcher proposed the following model and hypotheses: First, (H1) the research model proposed that student intern demographics, "time constraints", and internship characteristics will independently predict the amount of enhancement (i.e., benefit) that a student intern receives at the end of the program. Further, (H2) the model suggests that student intern demographics, "time constraints", and internship characteristics will combine with the mediating effects that respondents received from their “personal and interpersonal” enhancements to predict the effectiveness of the students attaining the intended enhancements of the program.

Both hypotheses presented in this study (H1, H2) were initially tested using a bi-variate analysis to detect any significant associations. First, the bi-variate analysis evaluating H1 was summarized in Table 1.9, which showed the internal consistency between student demographics, “time constraints,” internship characteristics, and all enhancement areas. All associations mentioned were the variables chosen to be included in the regression analysis. But these correlations do not necessarily prove causation.

Table 2.1 showed the results of the regression analysis that tested H1 for predictability. Student characteristics, “time constraints,” and internship characteristics were analyzed and the results indicated that certain correlated variables can independently predict the amount of enhancement (i.e., benefit) that a student intern receives at the end of the program.

*The number of hours worked weekly at internship, prior training received, and the availability of the internship coordinator* all proved to reliable predictors of student personal enhancement. For interpersonal enhancement, only *prior training received* demonstrated reliable predictability. For academic enhancement, there were only two
significant predictors, prior training received and the availability of the internship coordinator. Next, employment enhancement showed to have three predictors of student enhancement, the number of hours worked weekly at internship, paid internship, and the availability of the program coordinator. For civic engagement enhancement, both prior training received and the availability of the internship coordinator demonstrated reliable predictability. Finally, civic awareness enhancement showed only one variable to be a predictor of student enhancement, males.

The results suggest that the characteristics of the internship program are the most consistent predictors of students effectively achieving the learning outcomes of the program. This finding is consistent with past research that suggests greater duration at the internship site and access to supportive entities is likely to influence the amount of learning that occurs at the placement site (Ngai, 2009). Intern pay was only significant with employment enhancement. This falls in line with past research suggesting that extrinsic motivators (i.e. rewards, compensation) are not directly linked to improving behavior (Waterman, 1997). This is supported by other research that found clarification of career choice as being a benefit of applied experiences (Neopolitan, 1992). Since narrowing down career choices is often a result of the type of work performed, it seems employment enhancement is not so much related to behavior, but rather the result of the environmental stimuli the student was exposed to during the placement period. Finally, males were more likely than females to experience greater civic awareness. Although current research does not designate sex as an important factor when assessing an experiential program for effectiveness, this finding suggests the need for future research on gender difference in service learning.
Further, *Males* were expected to experience more civic awareness than females as supported in the bi-variate analysis and block 1 of the regression. However, with the inclusion of the internship characteristics into the analysis (block II of the regression analysis), males no longer experienced increased civic awareness relative to females. Current research does not designate sex as an important factor when assessing an experiential program for effectiveness.

Next, H2 was tested for predictability between all student and internship characteristics, the mediating empowerment effects (personal and interpersonal outcomes), and enhancement areas (Table 2.1). The variables included in this model were the same correlated measures that were used in the testing of H1. The sole exception was for the outcome areas of personal and interpersonal enhancement. Research suggests applied experiences are influenced by societal and personal conditions (Gysbers, 1988). These personal conditions can include relationships with family, co-workers, friends, etc. that can influence one’s learning ability (Kolb, 1984). The model proposed that the mediating effects from the personal and interpersonal enhancements experienced by the students would supersede the effects given by the student and program characteristics variables. To do this, the researcher included the indices for personal and interpersonal enhancement as control mechanisms for the other enhancement areas (academic, employment, civic engagement, and civic awareness).

Table 2.1 shows that the mediating effects from students who experienced greater personal and interpersonal empowerment were overtaking the effects from the student and program variables from the majority of the outcome areas. For academic enhancement, the inclusions of the empowerment variables showed vast differences from
block one. Students who experienced more personal and interpersonal empowerment as a result of their applied experience also demonstrated more academic enhancement than those students who did not. These two variables accounted for a very large increase in the models overall R2 value (.14 à .68), suggesting that these measures can account for almost seventy percent of the overall change in academic enhancement. For employment enhancement, the mediating effects again strengthened the variance explained by overall model (.24 à .61). Students who experienced more interpersonal enhancement also experienced greater employment enhancement. Civic engagement enhancement also experienced a dramatic increase in the model’s overall variance (.07 à .67). Again, the mediating effects from empowerment are stronger influences on civic engagement than the correlated variables. Finally, when the empowerment effects were controlled for in the second block of the civic awareness enhancement, they were found to not be reliable predictors. But, it is important to note that the mediating effects, while not significant, did increase the effects demonstrated by males and the overall model’s variance (.11 à .28).

It seems that these mediating empowerment effects do play a large role when determining if students benefited from their applied experience. The mediating effects overpowered the effects of the variables in the majority of the regression analysis. This supports previous research (Conference on Undergraduate Internships, 1976; Bezanson, 2003) that concluded more time spent working in an applied learning setting promotes citizenship, community service, personal growth, and intellectual development.

The cause of these mediating effects is seen in the way they were constructed. The correlated variables that were combined to form personal empowerment (number of hours worked at internship, inter pay, prior training received, availability of program
coordinator) and interpersonal empowerment (number of hours worked at internship, inter pay, prior training received, availability of program coordinator and site supervisor) included the most consistent program characteristic predictors in their make-up. Previous studies conclude that these components are important factors when creating and implementing an effective applied learning program (Howery, 1983; Kelly, 1986; Levine et al., 2006; Palmer & Savoie, 2002; Spann, 1994), thus reinforcing the results of the study.

Each individual model demonstrated a unique strength in measuring the variance between the areas of enhancement and the independent variables. For all multivariate analyses performed, the inclusion of only the student characteristic, “time constraints,” and internship characteristic variables demonstrated relatively low R2 values (personal=.22, interpersonal=.14, academic=.14, employment=.24, civic engagement=.07, civic awareness=.11). With the addition of the mediating empowerment effects, the R2 values improved greatly (academic=.68, employment=.61, civic engagement=.67, civic awareness=.28). The differences in variance measured by each model demonstrate the need for more research on this topic. Even though these values are not strong enough to explain all the variance in the enhancement areas, this study has provided some guidance on what to analyze when a program evaluation is needed.

Research Limitations and Future Efforts

This project encountered several limitations during its execution. First, there was the overwhelming proportion of a single ethnicity and gender, with the majority of respondents categorized as White, Non-Hispanic females. While the sample generalizability was internally reliable, it was limited in its ability to generalize to
population beyond this group. A broader spectrum of respondents in terms of gender and ethnicity would greatly enhance the population validity of the research.

A second limitation of this research was the inclusion of only one educational institution. Still, with 429 possible respondents who were initially contacted, only 165 were included in this study. The response rate for this project was low when compared to other studies that used Dillman’s *Total Design Method*, which normally yields a 70%-80% response rate for mail and email surveys (Dillman, 1978). The use of incentives seemed to help increase the response rate, but other routes should be examined. The use of a personalized letter to each individual respondent seemed to also increase the response rate. The mixed mode distribution (email and postal mail) was limited by the time frame put into practice. Dillman’s method called for 7-9 weeks as a reasonable response period, to where as this project was limited to 60 days that was due to the maximum timeframe allowed by the electronic software. Other methods could be used to increase the response rate such as telephone interviews, which yield a much higher response rate, but takes additional resources to implement this strategy. Future research should include more time allocated for responses and also the use of personalized invitations.

A third limitation of this project pertained to the research methodological design. Instead of just surveying past intern all at one point in time, the inclusion of a pre and post survey would serve as a more reliable measure of internship effectiveness. Data could be analyzed with more longitudinal analysis rather than just a single “point in time” assessment measure. Future research could include time-series forecasting which could address both the before and after effects of the internship program.
Practical Implications and Recommendations

In the third chapter, the researcher presented a theoretical model for predicting internship effectiveness, and this model was tested using the proposed research design. One implication from using this type of research design was its limited generalizability to Western Kentucky University. Even if this model holds partially true for this individual institution, it does not necessarily hold true for other educational institutions. Individual research projects such as this is needed to replicate the findings this study has produced.

The use of a mixed mode methodological approach was employed so that the response rate for past interns would be increased. The use of a personalized cover letter and the incentive allowed the respondents to feel a legitimate connection to the research as it was supposed to invoke a sentimental awareness for the project which would hopefully lead to more respondents completing the survey instrument.

Based on the findings from the regression analysis, an applied learning program could be more effective when it adheres to the following recommendations:

- The sponsoring university department and placement organization should provide some sort of training program and/or classroom preparation preceding the student’s participation at the placement site.

- Internship program coordinators should be available to meet as needed by the student intern.

- Students should dedicate more work time to the duties of their internship program. This could be accomplished through more offerings with the six hour course credit option.
• Endorse the Internship in Criminology course specifically towards those students wanting to work in corrections as this sponsoring entity predicts effective employment enhancement.

• Emphasize the number of hours worked at the site, prior preparation, and access to the program coordinator as the most important factors when assessing a program to be effective as these factors are not only the most consistent predictors throughout this study, but also when they combine with the empowerment effects, they influence all outcome areas even more.

A service learning program is designed to allow students to connect what they learned in the classroom to the “real world.” This practical implication allows students to be engaged in all realms of their education and also their chosen career fields. These opportunities are very diverse. With a cloud of uniqueness surrounding every individual student’s experience, evaluating applied learning can prove challenging. Thus, the outcomes of experiential learning demonstrate a more plausible approach to critically assessing an applied experience. This is because the internship program itself is designed to positively benefit all parties involved. The mutually beneficial nature of the service learning curriculum is why its outcomes are intended to be enhanced. But with applied learning programs expanding into more diverse disciplines, there may be a future need to investigate the outcome areas themselves and determine if changes are needed. For now the intended areas of enhancement are pre-determined by available research. This research has provided the field of Sociology and experiential education with a list of identifiable variables that predict internship program effectiveness, and possibly in the future these measures will serve as a foundation for future service learning designs.
APPENDIX A

INTERNERSHIP IN CRIMINOLOGY

Western Kentucky University
Sociology 439

The internship in Criminology course is designed to bridge the gap between the academic and the "real" world. The reason why the Department of Sociology includes internships in its curriculum is to provide students with enhanced learning experiences. These experiences will often help students to 1) explore potential careers; 2) develop job-related skills and knowledge; and 3) help students find employment following graduation. Since its first use here at Western, many students have derived a wide range of benefits from engaging in an internship experience.

Internships in Criminology are offered each semester (Fall, Spring, and Summer). The conventional intern earns three hours credit (requiring 150 hours of work), yet more hours may be earned where circumstances merit such consideration. Student Interns are not constrained by the academic calendar. Periods of involvement may begin and end at times convenient for the Intern as well as for the cooperating agency.

Unfortunately, most Internship experiences are unpaid. This does not mean that they are of no value. Instead, this fact simply reflects the exigencies of the internship-coop marketplace. Paid placements are most often available when the cooperating agency has had a long-standing program and a well-established relationship with the academic community.

Requirements:

1. Students who anticipate enrolling in the Internship in Criminology must complete a Request for Internship Placement* form.

2. Students are encouraged to identify their own potential placements. To this end, qualified students must have completed at least twelve credit hours in the Criminology Minor.

3. When a placement site is located, the student must have the agency complete a Cooperating Agency Data Sheet*. This form is to be returned to the Internship Advisor.

4. Before enrollment may be completed the potential Intern must complete a Course Contract* in conjunction with the Internship Advisor. Additionally, the Intern must be cleared for registration by the Intern Advisor.
5. The student-intern will receive a grade for the Internship just as he or she would receive in any other academic course. The course grade for the Internship is based on the following three factors:

A. **Weekly Journal**
   Each Intern must maintain a weekly journal or log of his or her experiences. Taken as a whole the entries in the journals should indicate 1) what the Intern accomplished during the week; 2) when specific activities were performed; and 3) the Intern’s thoughts and/or analysis of his or her activities. The journal evaluation will constitute thirty percent (30%) of the final grade.

B. **Academic Paper or Project**
   Each student enrolled in the Internship in Criminology course is required to produce a relevant product associated with his or her experiences. In many cases, the cooperating agency will ask the Intern to complete some relevant project. However, if this is not the case, Interns are required to complete a research-based term paper. In any event, a one page written proposal or explanation of the paper or project must be submitted to the Internship Advisor no longer than four weeks after initiating the Internship experience. Approval of the proposal is required before the paper or project is begun. The evaluation of the paper or project will constitute thirty percent (30%) of the final grade.

C. **Supervisor’s Evaluation**
   When the student nears completion of the requisite hours for the Internship in Criminology he or she must obtain an Internship/Co-op Evaluation Report* form from the Internship Advisor. This form must be completed by the Intern’s immediate supervisor and be returned by mail to the Internship Advisor. This supervisor’s evaluation will constitute forty percent (40%) of the final grade.

6. All material – Weekly Journal, Academic Paper or Project, and the Supervisor’s Evaluation – must be submitted as hard copy one week prior to final exams to allow for review and evaluation by the Internship Advisor.

   ❖ This and all other required forms may be obtained from the Internship Advisor. The instructor currently serving in this capacity is Dr. Bohlander, 118 Grise Hall, 745-2299.

---
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Internships & Cooperative Education (Co-ops)

Internships & cooperative education (co-ops) are referred to by many titles, such as: internship, co-op, experiential education, volunteer work experience, practicum, field experience, curricular practical training and optional practical training. The following are some shared elements of internships/co-ops:

- Internships and co-ops involve some form of work that is career-related in nature. Internships may involve a special research project, substituting for a full-time vacationing staff member, or performing a variety of regular staff functions within an organization.
- Internships and co-ops have an educational element. They provide an opportunity for an individual to learn about an organization or a career area and apply the knowledge they've gained from their academic coursework while on the job.
- Internships or co-ops can be full-time positions or may only require a few hours a week. Work experiences may vary in length of time and duration, but many are associated with a semester or summer term.
- Internship/co-ops typically have defined starting and ending dates, and, or a set number of “hours on the job,” such as 150 hours, that need to be completed.

Internships

Internships help students learn first-hand whether a career of interest is a “good fit.” It is important to participate in an internship experience to gain understanding of what careers interest you. In other words, internships can help you decide if a particular career is something you're interested in or not. They also provide exploratory students the opportunity to clarify career objectives and verify career choices. Internships usually last one semester or longer and sometimes take place during the summer. Internships may be paid or unpaid, but when paid, may pay anything from a token amount or stipend, to a substantial salary. Internship work schedules may involve working on a part-time or full-time basis. While many full-time, professional positions often require a person have experience when starting out, internship and co-op positions help you gain that critical experience and often, but not always, can lead to a full-time job offer at the end of the experience or after graduation.

Even if an internship is unpaid, gaining that "real world" work experience can be quite beneficial. If you are designing your own internship, consider that an employer may ask you to volunteer your services initially. Be realistic in seeking an internship and know the expectations of an employer prior to accepting a position. WKU Career Services Center hopes that students can find internships/co-ops that result in paid experiences, but we also realize that some organizations aren't able to provide a salary to interns, but would gladly provide the experience. The following are some thoughts on paid vs. non-paid experiences:

- Demonstrate your initiative and eagerness to learn; employers may be happy to accept you as a volunteer intern. Be open to the opportunities that afford you the most/best experience, and try not to limit yourself to only paid opportunities.
- If you are looking for a business-related internship and have no business background, it may be difficult to find a paid internship opportunity starting out.
Don’t underestimate a volunteer internship experience. If the quality of the job responsibilities and projects are substantially more than the minor tasks that you would be doing in a paid position, then consider the "value added" through the superior experience gained in the volunteer experience. Gaining career-related skills and experience may be more important than the size of the paycheck.

If you are a permanent Kentucky resident, you might be eligible for the KHHEA Work-Study Program (KWSP). The program reimburses Kentucky employers who hire KWSP eligible students, up to $2 per hour on their wages. If you are eligible, you can present this program as another benefit to employers offering you an internship with their organization. To apply for the KWSP program and find out if you are eligible, print the KWSP student application, fill out the top portion and drop off the form at the Career Services Center, Downing University Center (DUC) A-230. The staff will provide you with additional information at that time.

Cooperative Education (Co-ops)

Cooperative Education experiences are usually paid experiences and involve extended work periods beyond a semester in length, typically following one of two traditional types of work schedules:

- **Parallel Schedule** - You will work part-time while attending school full-time, possibly for several semesters, with graduated levels of responsibility.

- **Alternating Schedule** - You will alternate periods of full-time work with periods of full-time school enrollment. (For instance you might work full-time in the fall semester, return to school during the spring semester, and return to work during the summer, etc.).

Under both work schedules, it is expected that your level of responsibility, or work assignment, will be increased/adjusted over time. Sometimes students can gain a full year of practical work experience in their field prior to graduation through either of these types of schedules. The opportunity to learn new career-related skills and receive verbal/written feedback on your progress from a mentor/supervisor in a workplace related to your career path can be extremely helpful when interviewing for full-time positions and highlighting accomplishments. A co-op experience also allows students the opportunity to establish new professional network contacts. Why is this important? It increases future job opportunities. An additional plus in being involved in a co-op is that, while you may have little related experience when you start out, you will come out with the type of experience employers are looking for, perhaps even leading to a full-time job after graduation from the employer who hired you for the co-op position. While there's no guarantee this will happen, a co-op can definitely be a real plus on your resume for future job opportunities. More and more employers are looking for those students who've experienced a co-op.

The Career Services Center suggests students seriously consider participating in a co-op experience early in their college career (Freshman or Sophomore), as many co-op employers prefer to have students work extended or repeated work periods. When searching for a co-op, there are many online resources available as well as in-house resources located in the Career Services Center. In addition, you should schedule an appointment with a counselor in the Career Services Center who can assist you in locating a co-op experience and who can provide you information on any paperwork requirements. Contact our office by dialing (270) 745-3095 or by stopping in the Downing University Center (DUC) A-230 to schedule an appointment.

Practicum or Field Experience
A practicum or field experience is often completed within the parameters of, and tied directly to, a specific academic course. It is a supervised work experience for a specific period of time. Students must have met any other course prerequisites prior to enrolling in a practicum experience. It is important that students check with their academic departments for specifics. For additional information on disciplines offering practicum experience, consult the Undergraduate course catalogue, your academic department, or your career counselor in the Career Services Center. Anyone enrolling in a practicum course should schedule an appointment with a counselor in the Career Services Center to discuss any paperwork requirements. Contact the Career Services Center at (270) 745-3095, Downing University Center (DUC) A-230.

Curricular Practical Training (CPT for International Students)

After a student has been given permission by the Office of International Student and Scholar Services (ISSS) to seek a CPT or OPT work experience, the Career Services Center can assist international students by helping them locate possible employment positions. In order to adhere to all Immigration and Naturalization Services (INS) regulations, it is necessary that each student complete paperwork with ISSS before seeking assistance in locating CPT or OPT work arrangements from the Career Services Center.

Listed below are a few of the CPT/OPT requirements; however, for complete information, visit the ISSS Office (location provided below), or review material provided on their website at http://www.wku.edu/isss/current/employment.

- To be eligible for any off-campus employment, the student must do the following:
  - Be enrolled for one academic year;
  - Be in good status with DHS;
  - Be in good academic standing; and
  - Receive written permission from ISSS!

The ISSS Office is located in the Sophia-Downing International Center, 1536 State Street, (270) 745-4857. Once you are approved to work, schedule an appointment with a counselor in the Career Services Center to discuss paperwork requirements and/or course enrollment. Co-op 200, a non-credit/non-graded course is available through the Career Services Center for those students who are unable to receive credit through their department. Contact the Career Services Center (270) 745-3095, Downing University Center A-230.
REQUEST FOR INTERNSHIP PLACEMENT

Criminology Program

Student's Name __________________________ Date ____________

WKU ID __________________________ Birth Date __________________________

Local Address __________________________

City __________________________ State __________________________ Zip Code __________________________

Permanent Address __________________________

City __________________________ State __________________________ Zip Code __________________________

Cell Phone __________________________ Home Phone __________________________

Is there anything which may limit your activity? __________________________

Are you presently working? __________ If yes, where? __________________________

Position __________________________ Business Phone __________________________

Days which you work __________________________

Will you have a car at your disposal for your internship assignment? __________________________

The Spirit Makes the Master.
Do you have a valid driver’s license?

Person to be notified in case of emergency

Relationship

Address

Phone —— Alternate Phone

Write a brief autobiographical sketch which includes pertinent information about your life, work, volunteer and educational experience.

Mark the area which you wish to be placed. (For your first choice, place #1, for second choice, #2, etc.)

Probation and Parole

Corrections

Drug Program

Youth Program

Group Program

Prettrial Release

Alcohol Program

Police

Adult Institution

Juvenile Institution

Community Action

Courts
Specific Agency Contacted for Possible Placement:

Please describe as specifically as possible the learning opportunities you would hope to experience in your field placement.

Academic Preparation

The prerequisite requirements for eligibility for the Internship in Criminology (SOCL 439) have been met by the above named student as follows:

Major

Overall Grade Point Average

Grade Point Average in Criminology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deviant Behavior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Delinquency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology of Criminal Law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Corrections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Courses (relevant electives)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I hereby authorize release of this information to appropriate agencies considering me for internship placement.

__________________________
Student Signature

__________________________
Date

**DEADLINES** for submission of Application
Fall Semester – April 15
Spring Semester – November 15
Summer Semester – February 15

Return a copy of your completed application to the Criminology advisor, 118 Grise Hall, Department of Sociology.
COOPERATING AGENCY DATA SHEET

Name of Intern: ____________________________________________

Name of Agency: __________________________________________

Address: __________________________________________ Telephone: _______________________

Job Description of Internship Student:

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

The following person(s) will be supervising Western Kentucky University students:

Name:

__________________________________________________________________________

Previous supervisory experience with practicum students or interns:

__________________________________________________________________________

Will the intern have any special assignments (need a car, specific work hours, etc.)?

__________________________________________________________________________

Have discussions taken place with the intern? Is the intern familiar with his/her responsibilities?

__________________________________________________________________________

Supervisor’s Endorsement:

(signature) ____________________ (date)

(position or title) ______________________________________________________________________

Please return this form to: Edward Bohlander

Criminology Advisor, Department of Sociology, Western Kentucky University, Bowling Green, KY 42101-1057
INTERNSHIP / CO-OP EVALUATION REPORT

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

We are asking for your help in evaluating the performance of the Intern who has been working with your agency. Current date:

I. Student’s Name:

II. Supervisor’s Name:

Organization or Agency:

Address:

Phone:

III. Please describe the value of the internship to your agency.
IV. Please evaluate the student's performance during the internship (e.g., ability to communicate, willingness to learn and contribute, adaptation to organizational norms, etc.).


V. Performance Characteristics
(1 = excellent, 2 = very good, 3 = good, 4 = fair, 5 = poor)

A. Skills and knowledge necessary for job
   1  2  3  4  5

B. Quality of work done
   1  2  3  4  5

C. Amount of work done
   1  2  3  4  5

D. Reliability in meeting deadlines
   1  2  3  4  5

E. Working relationship with members of organization and/or community
   1  2  3  4  5

F. Ability to communicate clearly
   1  2  3  4  5

G. If you were to assign a grade for your Intern's performance what would it be?
   1

Any other comments:

This report has been reviewed and discussed with the student.

Yes________ No________

Supervisor______________ (signature) ____________ (date)
APPENDIX D

Student Service-Learning Survey

Background Information

The following questions address your personal characteristics during your actual internship experience. Please circle the answer or fill in the blank when necessary.

1. During your internship what was your marital status?
   Married   Widowed   Divorced   Separated   Never Married

2. During your internship placement, how many adults lived in your household? _____________

3. During your internship placement, how many children lived in your household? _____________

4. During your internship, what was your employment status?
   Employed for Wages   Self-Employed   Out of Work and Looking for Work
   Out of Work but Not Looking for Work   A Homemaker
   Retired   Unable to Work

5. If you were employed during your internship, approximately how many hours did you work per week? _____________

6. If you were employed during your internship, what was your employer type?
   (Check the category that BEST describes your type of work)

   ______ Employee of a for-profit company, business, or individual, for wages, salary, or commissions
   ______ Employee of a not-for-profit, tax-exempt, or charitable organization
   ______ Local government employee (city, county, etc.)
   ______ State government employee
   ______ Federal government employee
   ______ Self-employed in own not-incorporated business, professional practice, or farm
   ______ Self-employed in own incorporated business, professional practice, or farm
   ______ Working without pay in family business or farm
Characteristics of your internship

7. During a typical week, approximately how many hours did you dedicate to your internship? (Include time allotted for writing, actually performing job duties, commute time, etc.)

0-5 6-10 11-15 16-20 20+

8. Was your internship paid? YES NO

9. If YES, approximately how much did you get paid per hour? ________________

10. Was your internship placement in the type of job field in which you currently work? YES NO

11. Please list the name(s) of the organization/company at which you participated in your internship(s): __________________________

12. Did you receive any preparation and/or training before your placement? YES NO

13. If YES, what kind of preparation and/or training did you receive? ________________

14. Did you join any civic or social organizations as a result of your internship? YES NO

15. If YES, please list the name(s) of organizations: __________________________

16. Was your site supervisor available to meet when needed?

Not at all Slightly Moderately Quite a bit A great deal

17. Was your internship coordinator available to meet when needed?

Not at all Slightly Moderately Quite a bit A great deal
Impacts of your Internship

Next we would like to know how you were affected by your internship. This section contains five areas of potential “impact.” Though you have likely had many more experiences which have also impacted the areas below, please consider whether your internship experience ALSO contributed to these specific areas.

Using the scale below, please indicate the degree to which participation in your internship experience increased or strengthened your abilities, attitudes, awareness or understanding in each of the areas identified.

1 = Not at all  
2 = Slightly  
3 = Moderately  
4 = Quite a bit  
5 = A great deal

Not at all ................................................................. A great deal

1                      2                      3                      4                      5

Personal Impact

As a result of my participation in the sociology/criminology internship,

18) I have a sense of satisfaction in doing something worthwhile.  1 2 3 4 5
19) I believe in my ability to make a difference.  1 2 3 4 5
20) I am open to new experiences.  1 2 3 4 5
21) I have gained the capacity to be more productive.  1 2 3 4 5
22) I can recognize my personal strengths.  1 2 3 4 5
23) I can recognize my personal weaknesses.  1 2 3 4 5
24) I have a sense of personal achievement.  1 2 3 4 5
25) I have the ability to persevere in difficult tasks.  1 2 3 4 5

**Interpersonal (Social) Impact**

As a result of my participation in the sociology/criminology internship,

26) I demonstrate concern for the welfare of others.  1 2 3 4 5
27) I can be understanding and appreciative of people with diverse backgrounds.  1 2 3 4 5
28) I have the ability to work cooperatively with others.  1 2 3 4 5
29) I have the ability to communicate effectively (listen and articulate ideas).  1 2 3 4 5
30) I have increased my ability to be a leader.  1 2 3 4 5
31) I feel more connected to my community.  1 2 3 4 5

**Academic (learning) Impact**

As a result of my participation in the sociology/criminology internship,

32) I have acquired knowledge from the job duties I performed.  1 2 3 4 5
33) I have broadened my critical thinking skills (reasoning, problem solving).  1 2 3 4 5
34) My GPA improved.  1 2 3 4 5
35) I desired to stay in college or complete degree.  1 2 3 4 5
36) I have the ability to work and learn independently.  1 2 3 4 5
37) I felt my classroom learning was enriched.  1 2 3 4 5
38) I have the ability to connect academic subject matter to the “real world”.  1 2 3 4 5
Employment (Job Specific) Impact

As a result of my participation in the sociology/criminology internship,

39) I developed specialized technical skills for a specific job function(s). 1 2 3 4 5
40) I feel my vocational development was enhanced. 1 2 3 4 5
41) I broadened my future employment possibilities. 1 2 3 4 5
42) I received an opportunity to explore a specific career. 1 2 3 4 5
43) I developed realistic ideas about the work world. 1 2 3 4 5
44) I narrowed my future possible career choices. 1 2 3 4 5

Civic Impact

As a result of my participation in the sociology/criminology internship,

45) I developed a belief in becoming a better citizen. 1 2 3 4 5
46) I developed an awareness of community problems or social concerns. 1 2 3 4 5
47) I developed a commitment to making a difference in my community. 1 2 3 4 5
48) I have gained the capacity to contribute to society. 1 2 3 4 5
49) I have the intention to work on behalf of social justice. 1 2 3 4 5
50) I dedicate more time to volunteer work. 1 2 3 4 5
51) I stay current with local political news. 1 2 3 4 5
52) I stay current with national political news. 1 2 3 4 5
Open Ended Questions on Student Satisfaction

In this final section, you have the opportunity to more deeply reflect on your internships experience by describing important/helpful aspects of your experience not asked in the standardized format above.

53. Which aspect of the internship was the most valuable experience for you?

54. How did the site for the project affect your learning?

55. Was this internship different from any of your other service-related experiences (church, Peace Corps etc)? If, YES please describe.

56. Was your internship experience unique? Why?
57. Please indicate if this course has had an impact on your career choice/career development.

YES   NO

If YES, please explain how

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

58. Please indicate if this course has had an impact on your personal development

YES   NO

If YES, please explain how

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

59. Did this class make a unique contribution to your overall education?

YES   NO

Why?

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

60. Do you have any other comments regarding your internship experience?

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________
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Greetings Scholars,

I hope all of you are doing well. The reason for me contacting you today is that I am in need of your assistance. A research study is being conducted which examines a students’ internship experiences in an effort to determine whether it helped to enhance their ability to “succeed” after college. Because of your past participation in the Department of Sociology’s internship program, you have been selected to participate in this survey regarding certain aspects of your internship/co-op experience. In this questionnaire, you are asked a number of questions about things that are important regarding your internship/co-op experience such as:

- basic demographics
- internship/co-op characteristics
- career enhancement
- satisfaction of experience
- academic ability
- civic engagement

Should you agree to participate, you will spend approximately 10-15 minutes answering questions. When you complete your survey, you will be entered to win one of 10 Wal-Mart gift cards, each with a $50 value (with a 1 in 20 chance of winning a card). Your participation is strictly voluntary, and you are not required to answer any questions you feel uncomfortable about. All responses will be kept strictly confidential. None of your individual answers will be made public, nor will answers be shared with anyone. You also have the choice not to participate at all. This project has been approved and reviewed by WKU’s Human Subjects Review Board (270) 745-4652. If you have any questions, please contact my graduate assistant, Daniel Jackel, at daniel.jackel709@topper.wku.edu.

Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

Edward Bohlander
Department of Sociology Internship Coordinator
Greetings Scholars,

I hope all of you are doing well. The reason for me contacting you today is that I am in need of your assistance. A research study is being conducted which examines a students’ internship experiences in an effort to determine whether it helped to enhance their ability to “succeed” after college. Because of your past participation in the Department of Sociology’s internship program, you have been selected to participate in this survey regarding certain aspects of your internship/co-op experience. In this questionnaire, you are asked a number of questions about things that are important regarding your internship/co-op experience such as:

- basic demographics
- internship/co-op characteristics
- career enhancement
- satisfaction of experience
- academic ability
- civic engagement

You have been randomly selected to participate in this study, and we would like your permission to take the survey. Should you agree to participate, you will spend approximately 10-15 minutes answering questions. The packet you received includes a copy of the survey, a pre-paid return envelope, and also a $2.00 bill that is yours to keep. The return of a completed survey will indicate your informed consent. Your participation is strictly voluntary, and you are not required to answer any questions you feel uncomfortable about. All responses will be kept strictly confidential. None of your individual answers will be made public, nor will answers be shared with anyone. You also have the choice not to participate at all. This project has been approved and reviewed by WKU’s Human Subjects Review Board (270) 745-4652. If you have any questions, please contact my graduate assistant at daniel.jackel709@topper.wku.edu.

Thank you for your help.
Sincerely,
Edward Bohlander
Department of Sociology Internship Coordinator
APPENDIX G

Daniel Jackel

c/o Dr. Drummond
Sociology
WKU

Daniel Jackel:

Your research project, Evaluating the Effectiveness of an Internship Program, was reviewed by the IRB and it has been determined that risks to subjects are: (1) minimized and reasonable; and that (2) research procedures are consistent with a sound research design and do not expose the subjects to unnecessary risk. Reviewers determined that: (1) benefits to subjects are considered along with the importance of the topic and that outcomes are reasonable; (2) selection of subjects is equitable; and (3) the purposes of the research and the research setting is amenable to subjects’ welfare and producing desired outcomes; that indications of coercion or prejudice are absent, and that participation is clearly voluntary.

1. In addition, the IRB found that you need to orient participants as follows: (1) signed informed consent is not required; (2) Provision is made for collecting, using and storing data in a manner that protects the safety and privacy of the subjects and the confidentiality of the data. (3) Appropriate safeguards are included to protect the rights and welfare of the subjects.

This project is therefore approved at the Exempt from Full Board Review Level.

2. Please note that the institution is not responsible for any actions regarding this protocol before approval. If you expand the project at a later date to use other instruments please re-apply. Copies of your request for human subjects review, your application, and this approval, are maintained in the Office of Sponsored Programs at the above address. Please report any changes to this approved protocol to this office. A Continuing Review protocol will be sent to you in the future to determine the status of the project. Also, please use the stamped approval forms to assure participants of compliance with The Office of Human Research Protections regulations.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Paul J. Mooney, M.S.T.M.
Compliance Manager
Office of Research
Western Kentucky University

cc: HS file number Jackel HS11-215
May 16, 2011

Dear Ms. Eggleton,

Dr. Holli Drummond, Mr. Daniel Jackel, and I are currently performing an evaluation of our SOCL 439: Criminology Internship and SOCL 494: Cooperative Education in Sociology programs. The IRB has approved this research (IRB# HS11-215).

We request access the records of students enrolled in these courses back to the Fall 2000 semester. Accessing these records will provide us accurate information for each individual who participated in these courses while simultaneously allowing us to shorten the questionnaire we will be sending out.

We would like the following information for each student:

- Name
- Mailing address
- Date of birth
- Race
- Grade received in SOCL 439 or SOCL 494
- Email address
- Number of hours enrolled in the course (SOCL 439 or SOCL 494)
- Gender
- Term enrolled in SOCL 439 or SOCL 494
- GPA – both for the semester before they took the course and the semester in which they took the course.

It is my understanding that Mr. Jackel has already met with you and with Amy Wirth this past semester concerning ASA reports, but needed me to make an official request for access.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

Douglas Clayton Smith
Professor and Head
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