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Abstract
The purpose of the current study was to assess the needs regarding preparation for field work practicum of Taiwanese interns in criminal justice settings. The Delphi method was used to collect information on interns’ perceived needs regarding preparation for practicum, including academic courses, selection, the application process, and expectations regarding practicum in criminal justice settings. Thirty-six Taiwanese undergraduate interns completed three rounds of questionnaires. The results identified seven priorities for preparation of academic courses, three apex superiorities for selection of fieldwork practicum, 11 shared needs for application, and 13 common items for expecting practicum for interns from four groups of agencies. Implications and future studies for course development, professional development, and self-awareness in the fieldwork practicum of criminal justice were also discussed.
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1. Introduction
Field education is an experiential learning method that provides students with opportunities for firsthand learning about the process of criminal justice and the roles of practitioners (Breci & Martin, 2000), using active learning techniques (Sims, 2006). Fieldwork is crucial in the academic training process, and some undergraduate programs also require preparation courses in order to be eligible for fieldwork (McBride, 2017; Stichman & Farkas, 2005).

In the United States, the terms fieldwork, practicum, and internship are often used interchangeably (McBride, 2017; Taylor, 2012). In social work education, field work has been required for
baccalaureate programs and master’s programs (Council on Social Work Education, 2015). Students in psychology must complete practicum hours prior to attending an APA-accredited internship (American Psychological Association, 2013). Criminal Justice programs may have elective internship opportunities available to graduate students (Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, 2018).

In Taiwan, the fieldwork practicum used to ensure for the criminology major is one of the strengths of the program in higher education. However, empirical studies have seldom focused on how students find their field placements, or how the field placements match their needs (Baird & Mollen, 2018). Thus, the purpose of the current study was to assess the needs regarding preparation for field work practicum of Taiwanese interns.

Nowadays, academic institutions and field placements may use various models to conduct field education (Baird & Mollen, 2018). The educational goals of field education in criminal justice are for students to understand the procedures of the criminal justice profession, to apply theories presented in the classroom to actual practice in the field, to enhance self-understanding and professional identity development, and to achieve successful transitions to employment in criminal justice (McBride, 2017; Taylor, 2012).

Before beginning a field work practicum, students need a certain level of preparation in order to meet the educational goals of the practicum and to progress through the placement process. Thus, knowledge acquisition, knowledge application, skills development, personal development, and professional development are essential criteria for field placement (McBride, 2017).

In Taiwan, students in their junior year must complete a minimum 200 hours of unpaid, full-time agency practice placement, earning one credit. Before students reach the practice placement, they must take 10 prerequisite courses and complete a preparation course known as Practicum (I). After taking Practicum (I) for one credit in the fall semester of their junior year, students begin the ongoing process of obtaining a field placement, progressing through interviewing and reapplication, if necessary. Then, they complete the actual placement, known as Practicum (II) over the summer after the junior year. After completing the field work practicum, students go on to take additional courses for the senior year before graduating.

During Practicum (I), students engage in roles and activities to help them develop practice skills and knowledge and to help them prepare for the process of applying for and obtaining a placement. Basic topics in Practicum (I) include choosing an internship site, résumé writing techniques, interviewing skills, and the importance of developing goals (Baird & Mollen, 2018). In the classroom, students learn about their own strengths, capabilities, and limitations; professional skill development; stress management; use of resources; and use of supervision in the field work practicum. Students then make a tentative plan for selecting a field site. The field site should best match one’s interests, skills, and needs, in areas such as type of setting, type of clients, treatment approach, supervisor qualities, location, compensation, hours, and flexibility (Baird & Mollen, 2018).
For Taiwan’s students, information about available placement resources is often obtained from field presentations, conversations with peers, and field work practicum reports of schoolmates, which are provided by a faculty instructor. Moreover, through visiting local agencies in the criminal justice settings, students get an overall picture of each agency’s functioning and missions. They submit the fieldwork placement form before the end of the fall semester and then go through the process of placement.

The placement process includes choosing an appropriate site, completing the internship interview, and obtaining insurance (McBride, 2017). Interviewing is seen as a two-way communication process in which students and field agencies negotiate and set the goals of the field work practicum. Students have the responsibility to prepare for internships and actively participate in preparation (Side & Mrvica, 2017). Students also need to be aware that field placements seek interns who are properly qualified (Baird & Mollen, 2018).

The present study primarily examined the needs of Taiwanese junior year students regarding preparation for field work practicum in criminal justice settings. Criminal justice agencies may include police agencies, prosecutor’s office, courts, and prisons (Sanders & Young, 2007). Albanese (2012) notes that the field of criminal justice may be defined as including law enforcement, courts, and corrections; however, training of police officers is not considered to be part of academic education in Taiwan.

Criminal justice field placement sites considered in the current study were grouped into four subgroups, based on their functioning and missions: (a) court agencies (district prosecution offices, adjudication courts, and juvenile courts); (b) correction agencies (jails, prisons, drug treatment facilities, and detention facilities); (c) adult probation agencies (after care services, probation service agencies); and (d) protection agencies (domestic violence centers, shelters, juvenile guidance committees, and victim services).

1.1 Method

The Delphi method was adopted to collect information on the interns’ perceptions of the preparation needed for field work practicum in criminal justice settings. As Linstone and Throff (2002) have proposed, the Delphi method is a useful tool to gather a rich collection of opinions. This structured communication method seeks input from a panel of participants in three rounds to gain refined information in a short period of time. Cost, convenience, and time considerations made the Delphi method valuable in the current study. Two research questions were proposed:

1) What contents should be included in preparation for field work practicum in criminal justice settings?

2) What were the priorities for the process of field placement among interns who served at the four different groups of agencies?

A purposive sampling method was used to select interns with sufficient field work practicum experience. The inclusion criteria included having a field work practicum experience in criminal justice,
and being willing to participate in three rounds of written questionnaires. A total of 40 interns were recruited, representing the four groups: court agencies, adult probation agencies, correction agencies, and protection agencies. Participants were recruited through e-mail solicitation from a list of all interns at a Taiwan university which is well known for its criminal justice major.

Data collection for Rounds 1, 2, and 3 lasted 3, 2, and 2 weeks respectively. The return rates were high: 90% for Round 1 (n =36), 94% for Round 2 (n =34), and 97% for Round 3 (n =33). Round 1 included 29 females and 7 males, 19 of whom reported that they were willing to stay in the professional discipline after their fieldwork was completed.

To meet the requirement of completing field work in time for graduation, the timeline of the sequence for field work practicum during the third academic year is split into three stages: Selecting Placement (fall semester), the Application Stage (the initial phase of spring semester), and then Expecting Placement (the middle phase of spring semester). Before the end of the third academic year, the practicum placement must be chosen in order to start the field work practicum in the coming summer. Students who fail to adhere to the sequence would not be able to graduate after the fourth academic year.

The Round 1 questionnaire asked opened-questions regarding three areas: (a) academic coursework needed in preparation for the placement; (b) perceptions regarding the help needed in selecting, applying, and expecting field work practicum; and (c) demographic information.

This study used the content analysis approach to analyze all statements obtained from the Round 1 questionnaires administrated to interns from the four groups of agencies. The goal was to find consensus items that could be used in later rounds of questionnaires. The definition of consensus must be considered based on the number of participants and the purpose of the study (Hasson, Keeney, & McKenna, 2000). In the current study, for each item across the four groups, consensus was defined as being endorsed by four or more interns. The consensus items were then used in constructing the Round 2 questionnaire.

The items on the Round 2 questionnaire were rated using a five-point Likert scale (very unimportant = 1, unimportant = 2, neither unimportant nor important = 3, important = 4, and very important = 5). All participants were required to rank the degree of importance of each item for every type of agency.

The Round 3 questionnaire was constructed considering the ratings of items for four groups of agencies; any added new item was based on the results of Round 2. The mean score, standard deviation, mode, and median of the results of the Round 2 questionnaire were presented on the first column of the questionnaire for each item, thus demonstrating the rated importance of each item to the respondents. Interns were asked to re-rate the items using the five-point Likert scale described above.

1.2 Results

Tables 1 to 4 summarize the interns’ ratings of importance for each item identified in Rounds 2 and 3 for the four groups, including items covering academic course preparation, selecting a placement, applying, and anticipating field work practicum. The mean scores for all items were high. Especially
for items covering selecting, applying, and anticipating fieldwork, the majority of items were rated above 4.00 by the four groups.

1.3 Academic Course Preparation

In Round 1 (see Table 1), 36 interns identified a total of 54 items, and 17 of these items were endorsed by more than four interns. Results of Rounds 2 and 3 for the four groups showed that the mean scores of most academic courses were rated above 3.5 (see Table 2), indicating that the participants felt that these courses were important in preparing for fieldwork practicum. The Round 3 results indicated that the highest rated course was Counselling Theories and Techniques ($M = 4.61; SD = 0.61$). The other high-priority courses included Criminology ($M = 4.58; SD = 0.61$), Practicum (I) ($M = 4.15; SD = 0.76$), Social Work ($M = 4.12; SD = 0.60$), Criminal Law ($M = 4.67; SD = 0.54$), Juvenile Case Procedure Law ($M = 4.09; SD = 0.72$), and Criminal Psychology ($M = 4.00; SD = 0.83$).

1.4 Selecting a Placement Site

In Round 1, the 36 interns identified 10 items as important for selecting a placement in court agencies. These were then rated in Rounds 2 and 3. The five highest rated items in Rounds 2 and 3 were Fieldwork Presentation ($M = 4.67; SD = 0.54$), Visiting Local Agencies ($M = 4.58; SD = 0.56$), Enhancing Self-Understanding ($M = 4.48; SD = 0.62$), Symposium with Practitioner ($M = 4.42; SD = 0.66$), and Introduction to Potential Field Placements ($M = 4.36; SD = 0.78$). Fieldwork Presentation and Visiting Local Agencies received the highest ratings in both Rounds 2 and 3.

For selecting a placement in correction agencies, the interns identified 10 items in Round 1. The items rated the highest in Round 3 were Visiting Local Agencies ($M = 4.79; SD = 0.49$), Fieldwork Presentation ($M = 4.64; SD = 0.55$), Enhancing Self-Understanding ($M = 4.52; SD = 0.57$), Symposium with Practitioner ($M = 4.42; SD = 0.66$), Looking up Reports of Fieldwork ($M = 4.33; SD = 0.74$), and Introduction to Potential Field Placements ($M = 4.33; SD = 0.74$). Visiting Local Agencies and Fieldwork Presentation received the highest ratings in both Round 2 and Round 3.

The interns identified 10 items as important for selecting a placement in adult probation agencies in Round 1. Those rated the highest in Round 3 were Fieldwork Presentation ($M = 4.64; SD = 0.55$), Visiting Local Agencies ($M = 4.61; SD = 0.56$), Enhancing Self-Understanding ($M = 4.48; SD = 0.67$), Introduction to Potential Field Placements ($M = 4.30; SD = 0.77$), and Looking up Reports of Fieldwork ($M = 4.30; SD = 0.81$). Fieldwork Presentation, Visiting Local Agencies, and Enhancing Self-Understanding received the highest ratings for both Rounds 2 and 3.

For protection agencies, the interns identified 10 items in Round 1. Those rated the highest in Round 3 were Fieldwork Presentation ($M = 4.67; SD = 0.48$), Visiting Local Agencies ($M = 4.64; SD = 0.55$), Enhancing Self-Understanding ($M = 4.61; SD = 0.56$), Introduction to Potential Field Placements ($M = 4.45; SD = 0.67$), and Looking up Reports of Fieldwork ($M = 4.45; SD = 0.71$). In Rounds 2 and 3, both Fieldwork Presentation and Visiting Local Agencies were rated as the same priority. However, Enhancing Self-Understanding became top-rated item in Round 3.

Ten common needs for selecting placement were categorized across the four groups of agencies. The
three most important items for selecting placement, regardless of type of agency, were Fieldwork Presentation, Visiting Local Agencies, and Enhancing Self-Understanding. However, Symposium with Practitioner, Introduction to Potential Field Placements, and Looking up Reports of Fieldwork had variable rankings across the different settings.

1.4 Application for Field Work Practicum Placement

In Round 1, the interns identified many items as important for the application process for court agencies (11 items), correction agencies (9 items), adult probation agencies (10 items), and protection agencies (12 items; see Table 3).

For court agency interns, the mean scores of the top three priorities did not change much from Round 2 to Round 3. For correction agencies, the top three priorities remained the same from Rounds 2 to 3, and Offering Professional Information Related to Field Placement moved up to the fourth place from Rounds 2 to 3. Of the 10 items identified by interns for adult probation agencies, in Round 3, Problem-Solving Skills Training was a new choice, which was rated as the fifth most important. For protection agency interns, both Advocate for Quantities of Interns and Offering Professional Information were rated as more important in Round 3 than in Round 2.

Court and correction agency interns rated Sending Application Form to Potential Agency in Time for Interviewing highest. However, adult probation agency interns ranked Update Approval of Placements (M =4.70; SD =.053) at the top, and then Sending Application Form to Potential Agency in Time for Interviewing (M =4.64; SD =0.65).

Interestingly, for the four groups of interns, the top four priorities all included Sending Application Form to Potential Agency in Time for Interviewing, Advocate for Quantities of Interns, Update Approval of Placements, and Offering Professional Information Related to Field Placement, although they were rated with different degrees of importance.

Comparison of the results of Rounds 3 and 2 highlighted four common needs, Sending Application Form to Potential Agency in Time, Advocate for Quantities of Interns, Update Approval of Placements, and Offering Professional Information Related to Field Placement, although they were graded differently, they were the top four. Preparing for Interviewing and Problem-Solving Skills Training were identified for both courts and protection agencies.

1.5 Anticipating Field Work Practicum

The interns identified 12 items as important for anticipating field work practicum for court agencies in Round 1. The top six priorities based on ratings given in Round 3 were Clarify One’s Job Description of Fieldwork (M =4.70; SD =0.47), Learn Problem-Solving Skills (M =4.55; SD =0.67), Refine Professional Attitude (M =4.48; SD =0.62), Refine Professional Behavior Training (M =4.45; SD =0.62), Coping Skills with Unexpected Events (M =4.39; SD =0.56), and Clarify What the Placement Expect from the Intern (M =4.39; SD =0.56). A new priority, Learn Problem-Solving Skills, was rated as second most important in Round 3.
The interns identified 13 items as important for anticipating field work practicum for correction agencies in Round 1. The priorities receiving the highest ratings in Round 3 included Clarify One’s Own Job Description of Fieldwork (\( M = 4.70; SD = 0.47 \)), Personal Safety Training (\( M = 4.61; SD = 0.66 \)), Coping Skills with Unexpected Events (\( M = 4.52; SD = 0.62 \)), Clarify What the Placement Expect from the Intern (\( M = 4.42; SD = 0.56 \)), and Refine Professional Attitude (\( M = 4.42; SD = 0.71 \)). In Round 3, both Clarify One’s Own Job Description of Fieldwork and Clarify What the Placement Expect from the Intern were rated as more important than in Round 2.

The interns identified 13 items as important for anticipating field work practicum for adult probation agencies in Round 1. The priorities receiving the highest ratings in Round 3 were Clarify One’s Own Job Description of Fieldwork (\( M = 4.67; SD = 0.48 \)), Ability to Find and Use Social Resources (\( M = 4.64; SD = 0.70 \)), Learn Problem-Solving Skills (\( M = 4.48; SD = 0.71 \)), Refine Professional Attitude (\( M = 4.42; SD = 0.71 \)), and School Need for Close Contact with Placement (\( M = 4.39; SD = 0.66 \)). Comparing the results of Rounds 2 and 3, Learning Problem-Solving Skills moved into the third highest place. Clarify One’s Own Job Description of Fieldwork and Ability to Find and Use Social Resources were graded the same as for Round 2.

The interns identified 14 items as important for anticipating field work practicum for protection agencies in Round 1. The priorities rated the highest in Round 3 were Clarify One’s Own Job Description of Fieldwork (\( M = 4.73; SD = 0.45 \)), Ability to Find and Use Social Resources (\( M = 4.61; SD = 0.75 \)), Learn Problem-Solving Skills (\( M = 4.58; SD = 0.66 \)), Refine Professional Attitude (\( M = 4.5; SD = 0.62 \)), and Coping Skills with Unexpected Events (\( M = 4.48; SD = 0.57 \)). In Round 3, Clarify One’s Own Job Description of Fieldwork was ranked as the top priority, but this item was ranked just seventh in Round 2.

The results of Rounds 2 and 3 showed two common priorities across the different types of agencies: Clarify One’s Own Job Description of Fieldwork and Refine Professional Attitude. Clarify One’s Own Job Description of Fieldwork was always rated as the top priority for the four groups.

2. Discussion

The current findings, including those for academic coursework as well as selecting, applying, and anticipating field work practicum, provide more information on the process of preparation for practicum in criminal justice settings. The present study identified seven priorities in terms of academic coursework, including Counselling Theories and Techniques, Criminology, Practicum (I), Social Work, Criminal Law, Juvenile Case Procedure Law, and Criminal Psychology, respectively. These courses signify unique features of the criminology major in Taiwan. Field education provides students with opportunities to practice classroom theory in the field. Interns also gain valuable work experience and relevant knowledge which will add to their overall understanding of the field of criminal justice.
On one hand, interns needed to be familiar with the social contexts and theories that apply to criminal behaviours. At the same time, interns need to take actions and to deal with the impact of criminal behaviours on clients and offenders. It appears that multidisciplinary training is vital and helpful.

With regard to courses required for graduation, interns in this study did not rate Research Methods for Social and Behavioral Sciences or Behavior Statistics and Computer Application as essential for their fieldwork experiences. The process of performance feedback for field work practicum requires individuals to pay attention to how well they are able to describe how they have been thinking about what they do, what they know, and the result they have achieved (Thomlison, 2008). Perhaps interns did not see the pragmatic application of these research-oriented courses, or did not figure out how to apply them to the specific setting. Further empirical studies may be needed to examine the practical meanings of these courses for students.

The current results indicate that interns perceive three top priorities for selecting placements for the four groups of agencies: Fieldwork Presentation, Visiting Local Agencies, and Enhancing Self-Understanding. The academic institution in this study offers Fieldwork Presentation and Visiting Local Agencies as part of the preparation course for fieldwork every academic year. These findings reflected the necessity of this preparation course.

Placing students in field sites involves complicated procedures embracing structural characteristics, pragmatic agency concerns, agency goals, and even social system affiliations (Taylor, 2012). Students who are selecting field placements also rely on peers and campus resources, as well as their needs and interests (Baird & Mollen, 2018). Campus resources may be another area where work is needed, such as providing consulting or counselling about career development.

Selecting field placement also involves the intern’s role, agency supervision, faculty supervision, and values and ethical standards (Taylor, 2012). The importance of Enhancing Self-Understanding in the present study calls attention to these issues. Being a practitioner is actually different from the roles played by a college student. Enhancing Self-Understanding requires ongoing internal and external effort, as well as academic coursework and life experiences.

Unexpectedly, interns rated Symposium with Practitioners crucial for three of the four types of placement agencies. This suggests that interns want to know more about potential field sites and to make a good choice for field work practicum. Academic institutions may make more administrative effort to establish good connections with practitioners and agencies. Alumni may also be useful resources for developing such connections.

The current findings indicated 11 shared needs for the application process for the four groups, as well as two more items, Professional Confidence and Writing Fieldwork Plan, for court and protection agencies. The four common needs for the application process were Sending Application Form to Potential Agency in Time, Advocate for Quantities of Interns, Update Approval of Placements, and Offering Professional Information Related to Field Placement. The findings suggest that interns need more help with the administrative aspects of the application process. The earlier they know about the...
results of their applications, the less anxiety they will have. Furthermore, offering professional information related to field placement may also reduce their anxiety about the unknown.

For the application process for the four types of agencies, Problem-Solving Skills Training was seen as important for corrections agencies, adult probation agencies, and protection agencies, but not for court agencies. Court agencies usually require interviewing and written tests as a way to recruit qualified interns; these different needs are reflected in the relative importance of Preparing for Interviewing and Problem-Solving Skills Training. Baird and Mollen (2018) claimed that two crucial elements to applying successfully are the preparation of letters of application and practice for the interview. During the application process, as Barden Mollen suggested, peers can work together to provide review of resumes, practice interviews, and emotional support.

For protection agency interns, the results of Round 1 indicated that Preparing for Interviewing and Refer Students to Agency were seen as important to the application process. However, they were not ranked as essential in Rounds 2 and 3. Students may initially rely on school, but the later ratings indicate that they have different opinions about the application process for these agencies that provide mandated services or victims’ advocacy.

Regarding findings for anticipating practicum, the present study identified 13 common items for four groups. Two more items, Ability to Find and Use Resources and Practice and Demonstration of Practical Skills, were classified as important for both court and protection agencies. The current results indicated that Clarify One’s Own Job Description of Fieldwork was rated as the most important priority for the four groups in regard to anticipating field work practicum. As Side and Mrvica (2017) pointed out, a well-developed internship job description helps students adapt to the internship site quickly.

For court agencies, Learn Problem-Solving Skills received the second highest ratings. If students have greater capacities for dealing with difficulty, they may be able to cope with challenges during practicum. Thus, Refine Professional Attitude, Refine Professional Behaviors Training, and Coping Skills with Unexpected Events may also be needed. Student interns needed to understand that most of their clients were involuntarily placed in the area of criminal justice before they entered the field practicum; developing more professional skills and confidence will help them to survive in court agencies, including district prosecution offices, adjudication courts, and juvenile courts.

For correction agencies, interns perceived more importance for Personal Safety Training. The security of the working environment and personal safety were big concerns before practicum. Similarly, the third priority, Coping Skills with Unexpected Events, also indicated the significance of resources for safety in agencies such as jails, prisons, drug treatment facilities, and detention facilities.

The findings identified a unique feature of protection agencies, the need for working to find social resources. As expected, interns asked for more training regarding Ability to Find and Use Social Resources when working with protection agencies (domestic violence centers, shelters, juvenile guidance committees, and victim services).
For adult probation and protection agencies, interns rated the top needs for anticipating field work practicum as Clarify One’s Own Job Descriptions, Ability to Find and Use Social Resources, Learn Problem-Solving Skills, and Refine Professional Attitude. These two types of agencies have some similar characteristics in providing services, and more training in those areas will help interns quickly adapt to practicum.

Limitations in the current study may reflect the one-shot nature of field work practicum experience and the limited experience of interns. Interns obtained specific field experience, but the experience may not easily apply to other field placements. For this reason, the needs identified by the interns regarding preparing for practicum may not truly represent the actual needs of future interns.

The current study suggests that a series of courses that are important in preparation for field work practicum may include Counselling Theories and Techniques, Criminology, Preparation for Practicum (Practicum I), Social Work, Criminal Law, Juvenile Case Procedure Law, and Criminal Psychology. This reflects the idea that applying theories to practical settings and gaining acknowledgement of new techniques from working experiences is the strength of practicum in criminal justice settings (Stichman & Farkas, 2005). Indeed, with practicum, interns learn about the reality of processes, tasks, and the criminal justice environment (Beard & Wilson, 2006).

Regarding functioning of academic institutions, the process of placement needs more administrative effort. Despite the fact that interns were able to select placement based on presentations, visiting local agencies, and self-understanding, the present findings also indicate that students see a need for more updated information about the approval process, requirements for sending the application form in time, and professional information about the placement agencies. Interns also see a need for advocacy regarding the number of internship positions.

The current results highlight the importance of exploring needs of students in preparation for field work practicum and the impact of practicum on their future professional identity development. For future studies, special attention may be paid to details of the practicum job description and development of professional attitudes. Cross-cultural studies may further explore these features of the field work practicum in criminal justice settings.
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Table 1. Importance Ratings for Round 2 and Round 3 Academic Preparation Courses for Fieldwork

| Order | Round 3 (N=33) | Items                              | Round 2 (N=54) |
|-------|----------------|------------------------------------|----------------|
| 1     | 4.61 (.61)     | Counseling Theories and Techniques | 2              | 4.59 (.70)    |
| 2     | 4.58 (.61)     | Criminology                        | 1              | 4.68 (.54)    |
| 3     | 4.15 (.76)     | Practicum (I)                      | 8              | 4.12 (.73)    |
| 4     | 4.12 (.60)     | Social Work                        | 6              | 4.15 (.74)    |
| 5     | 4.12 (.74)     | Criminal Law in General Part       | 4              | 4.26 (.83)    |
| 6     | 4.09 (.72)     | Juvenile Case Procedure Law        | 7              | 4.15 (.86)    |
| 7     | 4.00 (.83)     | Criminal Psychology                | 3              | 4.26 (.67)    |
| 8     | 3.88 (.74)     | Juvenile Delinquency               | 5              | 4.18 (.90)    |
| 9     | 3.88 (.82)     | Social Casework                    | 9              | 3.94 (.98)    |
| 10    | 3.64 (.86)     | Criminal Justice                   | 12             | 3.65 (.92)    |
| 11    | 3.61 (.70)     | Psychology                         | 13             | 3.65 (.95)    |
| 12    | 3.48 (.83)     | Corrections                        | 10             | 3.85 (.82)    |
| 13    | 3.42 (.87)     | Sociology                          | 15             | 3.47 (1.13)   |
| 14    | 3.30 (.64)     | Law of Criminal Procedure          | 11             | 3.65 (.92)    |
| 15    | 3.30 (.69)     | Criminal Policy                    | 14             | 3.65 (.95)    |
| 16    | 2.79 (.89)     | Research Methods for Social and Behavioral Sciences | 16 | 2.85 (.89) |
| 17    | 2.48 (.83)     | Behavior Statistic and Computer Application | 17 | 2.29 (1.00) |
### Table 2. Selecting Placement

| Order | Court agencies | Correction agencies |
|-------|----------------|----------------------|
|       | Court agencies | Correction agencies |
|       | M (SD)         | M (SD)               |
| 1     | Fieldwork Presentation | Visiting Local Agencies |
| 2     | Visiting Local Agencies | Fieldwork Presentation |
| 3     | Enhancing | Self-Understanding |
| 4     | Self-Understanding | Symposium with Practitioner |
| 5     | Fieldwork | Looking up Reports of Fieldwork |
| 6     | Fieldwork | Introduction to Potential Field Placements |
| 7     | Exploration of Career Interests | Exploration of Career Interests |
| 8     | Understand the Mission of Agencies | Discuss with Field Faculty |
| 9     | Discuss with Field Faculty | Understand the Mission of Agencies |
| 10    | Practice and Demonstration of Practical Skills | Lectures |
| 11    | Lectures | |
### Table 2. Selecting Placement (Continued)

| Order | Adult probation agencies | Round 2 | Round 3 | Protection agencies | Round 2 |
|-------|--------------------------|---------|---------|---------------------|---------|
|       | M (SD)                   | Order   | M (SD)  | Order               | M (SD)  |
| 1     | 4.64 (.55)               | 4.44 (61)| 4.67 (.48)| Fieldwork Presentation | 1.459 (.56) |
| 2     | 4.61 (.56)               | 4.35 (.73)| 4.64 (.55)| Visiting Local Agencies | 2.453 (.62) |
| 3     | 4.48 (.67)               | 4.32 (.73)| 4.61 (.56)| Enhancing Self-Understanding | 3.435 (.73) |
| 4     | 4.30 (.77)               | 4.18 (.72)| 4.45 (.62)| Fieldwork Presentation | 4.41 (.74) |
| 5     | 4.30 (.81)               | 4.24 (.102)| 4.45 (.67)| Visiting Local Agencies | 5.426 (.62) |
| 6     | 4.24 (.66)               | 4.12 (.95)| 4.45 (.71)| Enhancing Self-Understanding | 5.438 (.85) |
| 7     | 4.21 (.78)               | 4.21 (.85)| 4.36 (.65)| Fieldwork Presentation | 5.438 (.85) |
| 8     | 4.15 (.80)               | 3.91 (.79)| 4.33 (.60)| Symposium with Practitioner | 4.403 (.76) |
| 9     | 4.15 (.88)               | 4.18 (.72)| 4.27 (.67)| Exploring Career Interests | 5.403 (.76) |
| 10    | 3.61 (.79)               | 3.18 (.80)| 4.12 (.78)| Discuss with Field Faculty | 9.400 (.92) |
|       |                          | 10.80   | 10.78   | Practice and Demonstration | 9.338 (.85) |
|       |                          | 11.87   | 10.87   | Understand the Mission of Agencies | 10.85 |
Table 3. Application for Field Placement

| Order | M (SD) | Court agencies | Correction agencies |
|-------|--------|----------------|---------------------|
|       |        | Round 3 | Round 2 | Round 3 | Round 2 |
| 1     | 4.76 (0.50) | Sending Application Form to Potential Agency in Time | Sending Application Form to Potential Agency in Time | 1 | 4.68 (.59) |
| 2     | 4.73 (.52) | Advocate for Quantities of Interns | Update Approval of Placements | 2 | 4.68 (.64) |
| 3     | 4.70 (.53) | Update Approval of Placements | Advocate for Quantities of Interns | 3 | 4.24 (.96) |
| 4     | 4.52 (.57) | Offering Professional Information related to Field Placement | Offering Professional Information related to Field Placement | — | — |
| 5     | 4.48 (.62) | Preparing for Interviewing | Problem-Solving Skills Training | 5 | 3.97 (.90) |
| 6     | 4.42 (.75) | Interpersonal Communication Training | Writing Personal Statement and Resume | 6 | 4.21 (.74) |
| 7     | 4.39 (.66) | Professional Confidence Communication Training | Interpersonal Communication Training | 7 | 3.94 (.81) |
| 8     | 4.36 (.65) | Writing Fieldwork Plan | Sharing Experiences of Application | 8 | 4.06 (.83) |
| 9     | 4.36 (.65) | Problem-Solving Skills Training | Preparing for Interviewing | 9 | 4.00 (.87) |
| 10    | 4.30 (.59) | Sharing Experiences of Application | Making Contract with Field Placement | 10 | 3.85 (.91) |
| 11    | 4.24 (.75) | Writing Personal Statement and Resume | Refer Students to Agency | 11 | 3.73 (1.01) |
| 12    | 3.94 (.83) | Making Contract with Field Placement | Refer Students to Agency | 12 | 3.76 (1.13) |
| 13    | 3.85 (.87) | Refer Students to Agency | | 13 | 4.03 (.87) |
Table 3. Application for Field Placement (Continued)

| Adult probation agencies                      | Protection agencies                     |
|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| Order  | M (SD) | Order  | M (SD) | Order  | M (SD) | Order  | M (SD) |
| Round 3 |        | Round 2 |        | Round 3 |        | Round 2 |        |
| 1      | 4.70 (0.53) | 4.62 (0.65) | 4.69 (0.49) | 4.68 (0.59) |
|        | Update Approval of Placements | Sending Application Form to Potential Agency in Time | |
| 2      | 4.64 (0.65) | 4.65 (0.60) | 4.76 (0.50) | 4.74 (0.57) |
|        | Sending Application Form to Potential Agency in Time | Update Approval of Placements | |
| 3      | 4.61 (0.66) | 4.21 (0.95) | 4.73 (0.52) | 4.38 (0.74) |
|        | Advocate for Quantities of Interns | Offering Professional Information related to Field Placement | |
| 4      | 4.42 (0.66) | 4.24 (0.86) | 4.52 (0.57) | 4.35 (0.81) |
|        | Offering Professional Information related to Field Placement | Preparing for Interviewing | |
| 5      | 4.39 (0.66) | —      | 4.52 (0.62) | 4.59 (0.66) |
|        | Problem-Solving Skills Training | Training | |
| 6      | 4.30 (0.77) | 4.21 (0.85) | 4.48 (0.67) | 4.41 (0.82) |
|        | Interpersonal Communication Training | Interpersonal Communication Training | |
| 7      | 4.27 (0.76) | 4.00 (1.02) | 4.45 (0.62) | 4.35 (0.73) |
|        | Preparing for Interviewing | Preparing for Interviewing | |
| 8      | 4.21 (0.78) | 4.00 (0.99) | 4.42 (0.61) | —      |
|        | Writing Personal Statement and Resume | Professional Confidence | |
| 9      | 4.18 (0.77) | 4.12 (0.88) | 4.39 (0.66) | 4.21 (0.85) |
|        | Sharing Experiences of Application | Writing Fieldwork Plan | |
| 10     | 3.82 (0.95) | 3.71 (0.91) | 4.33 (0.60) | 4.32 (0.77) |
|        | Refer Students to Agency | Sharing Experiences of Application | |
| 11     | 3.79 (0.86) | 3.71 (1.09) | 4.27 (0.76) | 4.12 (0.91) |
|        | Making Contract with Field Placement | Writing Personal Statement and Resume | |
| 12     | 4.00 (0.87) | 4.00 (1.08) | 3.74 (0.87) | 3.74 (1.08) |
|        | Making Contract with Field Placement | Refer Students to Agency | |
| 13     | 3.88 (0.89) | 3.88 (1.09) | 4.00 (0.89) | 4.00 (1.09) |
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## Table 4. Expecting Fieldwork

| Round 3 | Court agencies | Correction agencies |
|---------|----------------|---------------------|
| Order   | M (SD)         | Order  | M (SD)   | Order | M (SD)   | Order  | M (SD)   |
| 1       | 4.70 (0.47)    | 2      | 4.41 (.70) | 1      | 4.70 (0.47) | 5      | 4.32 (.73) |
| 2       | 4.55 (0.67)    | —      | 4.61 (.66) | 2      | 4.52 (0.62) | 1      | 4.62 (.60) |
| 3       | 4.48 (0.62)    | 1      | 4.50 (.62) | 3      | 4.52 (0.62) | 2      | 4.44 (.75) |
| 4       | 4.45 (0.62)    | 5      | 4.26 (.83) | 4      | 4.42 (.56)  | 9      | 4.18 (.94) |
| 5       | 4.39 (0.56)    | 3      | 4.38 (.70) | 5      | 4.42 (.71)  | 4      | 4.35 (.77) |
| 6       | 4.39 (0.56)    | 4      | 4.35 (.81) | 6      | 4.39 (.61)  | 3      | 4.38 (.74) |
| 7       | 4.36 (0.65)    | 6      | 4.26 (.93) | 7      | 4.39 (.61)  | 8      | 4.24 (.89) |
| 8       | 4.30 (0.59)    | 7      | 4.21 (.69) | 8      | 4.39 (.79)  | —      | —        |
| 9       | 4.30 (0.59)    | 8      | 4.18 (.76) | 9      | 4.30 (.64)  | 6      | 4.24 (.65) |
| 10      | 4.24 (0.90)    | —      | 4.30 (.64) | 10     | 4.30 (.64)  | 7      | 4.24 (.74) |
| 11      | 4.15 (0.83)    | 9      | 4.18 (.90) | 11     | 4.09 (.77)  | 10     | 4.09 (.97) |
| 12      | 4.12 (0.78)    | 10     | 4.18 (.97) | 12     | 4.03 (.85)  | 11     | 4.00 (.99) |
| 13      | 4.12 (0.82)    | 12     | 4.08 (.92) | 13     | 3.91 (.81)  | 12     | 3.94 (.81) |
| 14      | 4.09 (0.72)    | 11     | 4.03 (.80) | 14     | 3.88 (.89)  | 13     | 3.76 (.96) |
| 15      | 4.06 (0.83)    | —      | —        | —      | —        | —      | —        |
## Table 4. Expecting Fieldwork (Continued)

| Order | Adult probation agencies | Round 2 | Order | Protection agencies | Round 2 |
|-------|--------------------------|---------|-------|---------------------|---------|
|       | M (SD)                   | M (SD)  |       | M (SD)              | M (SD)  |
| 1     | 4.67 (.48)               | 4.38 (.70) | 4.73 (.45) | Clarify One’s Own Job Description | 4.32 (.81) |
| 2     | 4.64 (.70)               | 4.56 (.61) | 4.61 (.75) | Ability to Find and Use Social Resources | 4.68 (.59) |
| 3     | 4.48 (.71)               | 4.58 (.66) | 4.58 (.66) | Learn Problem-Solving Skills | 4.65 (.60) |
| 4     | 4.42 (.71)               | 4.29 (.80) | 4.52 (.62) | Refine Professional Attitude | 4.53 (.56) |
| 5     | 4.39 (.66)               | 4.21 (.91) | 4.48 (.57) | Coping Skills with Unexpected Events | 4.47 (.71) |
| 6     | 4.36 (.55)               | 4.21 (.81) | 4.45 (.56) | Clarify What the Placement Expect from the Intern | 4.32 (.84) |
| 7     | 4.36 (.60)               | 4.15 (.93) | 4.42 (.66) | Refine Professional Behaviors | 4.29 (.84) |
| 8     | 4.33 (.60)               | 4.24 (.70) | 4.36 (.65) | School Need for Close Contact with Placement | 4.29 (.84) |
| 9     | 4.33 (.65)               | 4.21 (.81) | 4.33 (.60) | Clarify One’s Own Goal of Fieldwork | 4.32 (.68) |
| 10    | 4.30 (.64)               | 4.15 (.74) | 4.33 (.60) | Clarify One’s Expectation of Fieldwork | — |
| 11    | 4.21 (.86)               | 4.12 (.81) | 4.24 (.75) | Personal Safety Training | 4.35 (.69) |
| 12    | 4.09 (.84)               | 3.94 (1.01) | 4.18 (.68) | Discuss with Faculty Instructor | 4.09 (.75) |
| 13    | 4.09 (.84)               | 4.00 (1.07) | 4.15 (.76) | Offering Students Fieldwork Manual | 4.15 (.96) |
| 14    | 3.91 (.88)               | 3.94 (.81) | 4.15 (.87) | Symposium for Each Field Practice and Demonstrate of Practical Skills | 4.12 (.95) |
|       |                          |         |       |                     | 4.00 (.84) |
|       |                          |         |       |                     |        |