Central Washington University

Assessment of Student Learning

Department and Program Report

Please enter the appropriate information concerning your student learning assessment activities for this year.

Academic Year of Report: 2011-2012 College: College of the Sciences
Department ___Law and Justice_______ Program: _______________

This assessment report covers the assessments of two areas: The CWU college reading assessment and the department’s research course assessment (legal research and research methods in criminal justice) and internships co-operative learning. The two assessments are reported separately, as follows:

The CWU College Reading Assessment

1. What student learning outcomes were assessed this year, and why?

Our department assessed four learning outcomes specified by the CWU reading rubric. The outcomes include reading rate, summary-details, summary-discipline specific vocabulary, and summary-author’s intent. In particular, we assessed the four learning outcomes by giving each of the participants a packet which contained: (1) a set of directions, (2) a 640 word selection from John Braithwaite’s Crime, Shame, and Reintegration (1989)(see Appendix I), and (3) a blank sheet of paper:

   1. Student readings will demonstrate the element of reading rate measured by words-reading per minute. To perform the task, the reviewer used a key which contained the cumulative words per sentence for the reading selection. Reviewers simply added all completed sentence with the number of words read in the last sentence to compute the words per minute.

   2. Student readings will demonstrate the element of detail contained in the summary. This learning outcome was measured by assessing the amount of detail in the summary. Reviewers looked for a variety of information including figures, facts, examples, specific arguments or any other indication of detail that came from the reading. Reviewers used a five-point scale to rank the amount of detail in each summary. A score of 0 indicated that the student did not answer this section (these were excluded for
analysis), a 1 indicated that there was no detail in the summary, 2 indicated that there were very minor details in the summary, 3 indicated that some details were used in the writing of the summary, and a 4 indicated that significant details were used in the summary. This scale was then collapsed to create a dichotomous outcome variable. Scores of 1 (the samples with no details) were coded as 1 (fail) and scores of 2, 3 and 4 (the samples that included little, some, or significant detail) were coded as 2 (considered passes).

3. **Student readings will demonstrate the element of discipline specific vocabulary.** In order to calculate the discipline specific vocabulary used by students in the summaries, reviewers employed a five-point scale: 0 indicated the field was left blank (these data points were excluded from analysis), 1 indicated that no discipline specific vocabulary was used, 2 indicated that a small or minor amount of discipline specific vocabulary was present, 3 indicated that some discipline specific vocabulary was present, while 4 indicated a significant usage of discipline specific vocabulary was present in the summary. Similar to the detail measure, this scale was then collapsed to create a dichotomous outcome variable. Scores of 1 (the samples that had no vocabulary usage) were coded as 1 (fail) and scores of 2, 3 and 4 (the samples that included little, some or significant vocabulary usage ) were coded as 2 (considered passes).

4. **Student readings will demonstrate the element of understanding author’s intent.** To assess this area, reviewers looked for the author’s intent in the summaries, with the focus on any discussion or referencing to the author’s purpose or intent in writing the passage. This was measured on dichotomous measure where 1 indicated the summary did not include any mention, reference, or illusion to the author’s intent, where as a score of 2 indicated that the summary did—in some way—include a reference or illusion to the author’s intent for the passage.

These learning outcomes were measured because as stated in the university instruction on reading assessment, research has consistently demonstrated a strong correlation between a college student’s academic reading skills and his/her academic success, for the reasons that poor comprehension leads to poor class participation, dismal test scores, low-quality papers, and the inability to thoroughly understand course material and that educators and students may often overlook the important role student reading plays in their academic successes.

**2. How were they assessed?**

**A) What methods were used?**
1. During the academic year, the LAJ assessment committee first developed the reading assignment appropriate for assessing LAJ student reading performance and decided that the reading assessment was to be implemented in the course LAJ 451 (Crime in America) for classes on the Ellensburg and Yakima campus, and in LAJ 400 (Research Methods) for classes on the Des Moines, Lynnwood, and Pierce campuses.

2. The committee then identified the faculty members who taught them and informed them about how to perform the reading assessment according to the CWU college reading assessment guideline.

3. At each of the class settings, students were provided with a packet which contained: (1) a set of directions, (2) a 640 word selection from *John Braithwaite’s Crime, Shame, and Reintegration* (1989), and (3) a blank sheet of paper. Proctors for the assessment informed students that they were to open the packet to the reading selection and start reading. After one minute, students were asked to stop reading and circle the word that they were reading when time was called. Then, they were asked to turn the page to the blank sheet and write a summary of what they just read for three minutes. Once the time was up, the assessments were collected for analysis.

4. Consistency in coding. Because assessing concepts such as the amount of detail, the use of vocabulary, and the presence of author’s intent could potentially be seen as a subjective assessment, two coders (one primary and one secondary) were used for this assessment. The primary coder’s values were used for assessment purposes (and all descriptive statistics included in this report) while the secondary coder was simply used as a comparison to assess inter rater reliability for the assessment constructs. Rates of matching between the primary and the secondary coder were generally high. The matching values are contained in the chart below. However, for the five point scales, matching rates were between 80% and 89%. For dichotomous measures, reviewers matched close to 90% of the time. These high matching rates indicate that the core concepts used to create the scales used in the subsequent data analysis have a generally high reliability. It is also worth noting that none of the coders were allowed to collaborate or discuss the measures between the two. Thus, the each reviewer was to interpret the coding guidelines independently.

**B) Who was assessed?**

According to the COTS’ guideline for reading assessment and related law and justice department’s assessment schedule, we implemented the assessment of the artifacts (reading assignments) from students attending LAJ 451 (Crime in America) at Ellensburg campus and Yakima Center, and for students attending LAJ 400 (Research Methods) at the Pierce County Center, Des Moines Campus, and the Lynnwood Campus during the 2010-2011 academic year. In particular, a total of 112 students enrolled in the appropriate
classes (LAJ 451 for east side campuses and LAJ 400 for Westside campus) during this period took the assessment. Three students’ artifacts were excluded for further analysis because they did not do the summary of the reading. The final artifacts for analysis account for 109. The committee decided to use the whole set, instead of selecting a sample from it, to increase the validity of the evaluation. Although it is impossible to identify all transfer and native students within the entire set, we used one class on the Ellensburg campus as a sub-sample (N= 29 students) to compare the two groups, including 11 (37.9%) students who started CWU as Freshmen and 18 (62.1%) students who transferred in from other institutions.

C) When was it assessed?

The reading artifacts were collected during the academic year and the data assessment took in the appropriate Law and Justice courses during the Winter and Spring 2012 quarters.

3. What was learned?

Table 1 and Table 1A below give a summary about the student performance in reading:

Table 1.

Analysis of Pass/No-Pass for all students (Sample Size: N=109)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELEMENTS</th>
<th>PASS</th>
<th>No PASS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading Rate</td>
<td>49/45%</td>
<td>60/55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary-Details</td>
<td>34/31.2%</td>
<td>75/68.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary-Discipline Specific Vocabulary</td>
<td>58/53.2%</td>
<td>51/46.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary- Author’s Intent</td>
<td>54/49.5%</td>
<td>55/50.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* N/% refers to the number of students/percent of the total sample.

Table 1A.

Analysis of Pass/No-Pass for transfer vs. Native students (Sample Size: N=29)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELEMENTS</th>
<th>PASS Native</th>
<th>PASS Transfer</th>
<th>Non-PASS Native</th>
<th>Non-PASS Transfer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading Rate</td>
<td>2/16.7%</td>
<td>5/27.8%</td>
<td>10/83.3%</td>
<td>13/72.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary-Details</td>
<td>7/63.6%</td>
<td>10/55.6%</td>
<td>4/36.4%</td>
<td>8/44.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary-Discipline Specific Vocabulary</td>
<td>5/45.5%</td>
<td>9/50%</td>
<td>6/54.5%</td>
<td>9/50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary- Author’s</td>
<td>6/54.5%</td>
<td>9/50%</td>
<td>5/45.5%</td>
<td>9/50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
* N/% refers to the number of students/ percent of the total sample.

Interpretation of Table 1:

1) Regarding the reading rate, we find that more than half of Law and Justice students (55%; N = 60) fall into the non-pass category, whereas 45% (n = 49) fall into the passing category. The non-pass involved the reading speed that was below the 190 words per minutes, whereas the pass meant that the reading speed was at or above the 190 words per minutes. However, it should be noted that overall, students taking the assessment scored an average of 200.46 words per minute during the reading assessment with a standard deviation of 78.31. This indicates that the departmental average is over the 190 words per minute threshold defined as passing by the College Reading Rubric. However, the high standard deviation, as well as a minimum score of 93 and a maximum of 591, indicates that there is a large amount of variation in departmental reading speeds for students.

2) The analysis of the details measure data is categorical. In the sample of Law and Justice students, about 31% failed to include any details from the reading section in their summary. About 69% passed with some form of detail—of these students, 48.6% included a minor amount of detail where as 20.2% included some detail from the reading.

3) The analysis of the vocabulary measure showed that about 53% used discipline specific vocabulary in their summary of the reading (including 43% of the sample that incorporated a minor amount of vocabulary and 15% used some discipline specific vocabulary). About 47% did not use discipline specific vocabulary in the reading summary.

4) The author intent measure tries to capture the students understanding of the author’s message. In the sample of Law and Justice students, 49.5% passed by mentioning or alluring to the author intent, whereas 50.5% failed to incorporate any mention or indication of the author’s intent in their summary.

5. In addition, the assessment has a limitation that excludes 14 students with the online major because there was no way to implement the reading assessment for them. Considering that more students would select the online major in the coming years, the department needs to figure out solutions to include them in assessment.

Interpretation of Table 1A

1) For the 29-student sub-sample (including 11 (37.9%) native students and 18 (62.1%) transfer students), we performed a series of comparisons between them in the four
dimensions of reading outcomes. However—none of the analyses revealed any significant differences in all outcome elements of the assessment.

2) The results of the comparison, however, should not be interpreted as representing the situations for all LAJ students cross five locations because students at Ellensburg involve the typical traditional students and the sample may not represent the non-traditional students typically found at the centers.

**The Assessment of LAJ Research Courses**

1. **What student learning outcomes were assessed this year, and why?**

Two types of research skills were assessed according to the department’s schedule: LAJ 400 (research methods in criminal justice) and LAJ 303 (legal research—library assignment). Internships (co-operative learning) were also assessed.

For LAJ 400, our department assesses six skills: (1) demonstrate communication skills (writing), (2) clearly states the research problem and a specific research hypothesis, (3) clearly articulated the research methods utilized in the study or research design, (4) demonstrates the ability to complete a brief literature review of scientific studies related to the research problem, (5) data analysis and display, and (6) use of appropriate references and consistent referencing style.

For legal research library assignment, the assessment focuses on: (1) demonstrate communication skills (writing), (2) demonstrate the ability to locate primary sources, (3) demonstrate the ability to locate secondary sources, (4) develop a research strategy to address a legal problem, (5) use of appropriate references and consistent referencing style.

Reviewers of the artifacts used four-point scale to determine pass or fail for both rubrics, with zero presenting non-pass and 1, 2, 3 representing the score of pass.

These learning outcomes were measured because sound research skills are required by all criminal justice and legal agencies for employees. In addition, sound research skills prepare students to pursue advanced academic degrees, engage in research, presentations at conferences and publications. These learning outcomes are related to department goal 1 - Assure the presentation of high quality program; and college goals 1, 2 and 7 - Provide for an outstanding academic experience in COTS; provide for an outstanding academic and student life in college programs and courses at the university centers; college programs and courses at university and create and sustain productive, civil, and pleasant learning environments. These outcomes are also supportive of university goal 1.1 & 3.1—Enhance student success by continually improving the curricular, co-curricular, and extracurricular programs; increase the emphasis on and the opportunities
for students, faculty and staff to participate in research, scholarship, and creative expression activities.

In regard to internships, the learning outcome was that students will exhibit professionally appropriate behavior. The outcome was assessed this year based on our rotation schedule, which is part of our assessment implementation plan. This outcome was last assessed in 2007-2008. The outcome is related to department goal number one to assure presentation of high quality programs and goal six to serve as a center for services in the community and region; college goals one, two and five to maintain and strengthen an outstanding academic and student life at all sites and build partnerships with private, professional, academic, government, and community based organizations; University goals one and two of maintaining and strengthening an outstanding academic and student life on Ellensburg and University Center campuses.

2. How were they assessed?

A) What methods were used?

1. During the academic year, the LAJ assessment committee informed the faculty members who taught LAJ 400 on the west side and LAJ 303 both online and at Ellensburg to collect the research artifacts and to turn them to the committee for assessment at the end of each quarter.

2. We randomly selected 35% of the 48 artifacts collected from LAJ 400 for assessment, resulting in 17 artifacts for research methods in criminal justice. In addition, the sample for legal research includes 15 artifacts, representing 17% of the 88 artifacts collected from LAJ 303.

3. For the internships, a supervisor evaluation form was sent out to the employer for each student who completed an Internship in the 2011-2012 school year by Career Services with copies of those returned sent to the department. Responses to these surveys were reviewed by the assessment committee for fall, winter and spring quarters. In fall 2011, there were 9 students enrolled in internships and the supervisor return rate was 89%. In winter 2012 there were 18 students enrolled in internships and the supervisor return rate was 33%. In spring 2012, 26 students were enrolled in internships and the supervisor return rate was 73%.

B) Who was assessed?

For research methods in criminal justice, the artifacts were collected from students enrolled in the course at Lynnwood Center (N=21), Des Moines Center (N=19) and Pierce County Center (N=8).
For legal research, the artifacts were collected from students enrolled in the course online (N=30) (composed primarily of Des Moines students since that is the group this online course was directed toward) and at Ellensburg campus (N=58).

There was no attempt to identify native and transfer students for the two samples because of the unique geographic situation for the department where most students were transfer students.

For LAJ 490 co-operative internships, all employer final evaluations that were returned were assessed for fall, winter and spring quarters. These included all students who were doing internships and were not broken down by Ellensburg or center locations.

C) When was it assessed?

The course assessment artifacts were collected during the 2011-2012 academic year. The analysis of the assessments was performed in November 2012.

For the internships, fall 2011, winter and winter 2012 were assessed.

3. What was learned?

Tables 2 & 3 below show the percent of the students who passed the two research courses, respectively.

Table 2.
Analysis of Pass/Non-Pass for Students in Three locations in Course LAJ 400
(Sample Size: N=17)
Interpretation of Table 2.

1) The results show that the students at Des Moines and Lynnwood demonstrated higher pass rates in research methods than the students at Pierce on five of the six elements, including (1) demonstrate communication skills, (2) clearly states the research problem and a specific research hypothesis, (3) clearly articulated the research methods utilized in the study or research design, (4) demonstrates the ability to complete a brief literature review of scientific studies related to the research problem, (5) data analysis and display, except the last element about referencing. These discrepancies may have resulted from different requirements for the research projects. At Lynnwood and Des Moines, the students were required to turn in independent research projects whereas at Pierce Center, the research project consisted of four mini research projects in class, which did not include some of the elements (e.g., literature review and data analysis). In addition, there is no SPSS software installed at Pierce Center for student use, which may create some limitation for data analysis.

2) No students were judged as pass for the sixth element (use appropriate references and consistent referencing style) because of the department’s suggestion about the use of APA style as the criteria but none of the artifacts were based on the APA style cross the three centers. However, it should be noted that all the students at Des Moines and Lynnwood did include their references (including the journal titles, abstract, the relevant issues) in the mid-section of their research papers, though they were not presented in accordance with the APA style.

Table 3.
Analysis of Pass/Non-Pass for Students both in online course and at Ellensburg--LAJ 303 (Sample Size: N=15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rubric Element</th>
<th>Ellensburg (N=10)</th>
<th>Online (N=5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication skills</td>
<td>10/100%</td>
<td>0/00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locate primary sources</td>
<td>10/100%</td>
<td>0/00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locate secondary sources</td>
<td>0/00%</td>
<td>10/100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research strategies to Address a legal problem</td>
<td>6/60%</td>
<td>4/40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate references and Referencing style</td>
<td>6/60%</td>
<td>4/40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interpretation of Table 3.

1) All students got passing scores on the communication skills and the ability to locate primary sources.

2) The Ellensburg section did not get passing scores on the ability to locate secondary sources because the artifact used did not require the students to exhibit that skill. This contrasts with the online section of the course where all students passed on that skill because locating a secondary source was part of the library research assignment.

3) In the ability to address a legal problem and exhibit research strategies, those who did not pass were in a section that did not have that as part of the assigned task in the artifact submitted for review. The sections of the course which had that as part of the assigned shows that the students did pass on that skill.

4) Regarding the last skill assessed, use of appropriate references and referencing style, this is an area where students did not successfully complete that skill even though it was part of the assigned task.
5) Overall students received passing scores on those areas where the assignment they completed covered. The gap that we are seeing is lack of consistency in the artifact assignment that is being assessed. There were 3 sections of the course assessed and each section had very different artifacts submitted which makes it more difficult to assess the learning of that skill for the department as a whole.

6) An area for improvement would be regarding the skill of appropriate referencing where more emphasis on proper legal citations in the course would be recommended.

Table 4. Employer Evaluation of Co-op Student Interns (N=33)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Productivity</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparedness</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependability</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of work</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity/problem solving</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal skills</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall rating</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All questions are based on 5-point scale with number 5 representing highest rating.

Interpretation of Table 4

Table 4 presents the average performance levels of LAJ Student Interns as assessed by their employment supervisor on a 1-5 likert scale (with 1 = poor, 2 = marginal, 3 = average, 4 = good, and 5 = excellent).

These results indicate that our students are doing well in their internship placements. Law and Justice students are displaying high levels of professionalism, responsibility and
knowledge of the field. The criterion of mastery was exceeded for each of the items measuring Learner Outcome X: Exhibit professionally appropriate behavior with all performing in the good to excellent range.

An area of improvement would be for better response rates from employers. Also, it would be good to see more students take advantage of the internship experience.

4. What will the department or program do as a result of that information?

1) The LAJ assessment committee will meet with all faculty members and share and discuss the findings.

2) Further agreements among LAJ faculty at different locations may be needed regarding the research project for LAJ 400 and other courses in order to reach more consistency across campus locations.

3) Further discussions will be held among the faculty that teach LAJ 303 so that more consistency can be achieved in the assignment given for assessment as well as ways to put more emphasis on proper legal citation style.

5. What did the department or program do in response to last year’s assessment information?

1) Faculty members furthered their efforts to encourage students to take advantages of services offered by the reading centers and library staff in all the CWU locations to improve student communication, library and information literacy skills.

2) Faculty members discussed and explored active learning strategies and other teaching methods and other ways of assessing outcomes at department meetings.

3) Faculty continued to consistently turn in artifacts for assessment.

4) Plans are set up for a spring retreat to discuss the creation of a pre-test post-test of the core courses in the LAJ Curriculum. Prior to that retreat faculty who teach in those subject areas will create questions to be included a pre-test post-test. The plan is for the pre-test post-test to cover some of those areas covered by the artifacts and reduce the number of artifacts reviewed by the committee and take less subjective approach in the evaluation of student learning. The pre-test post-test also will give our assessment more breadth.

6. Questions or suggestions concerning Assessment of Student Learning at Central Washington University:

1) The Law and Justice Department Assessment Committee would be interested in more university support for assessment especially with the expansion of the
university general education assessment which has been tasked to departments. Additional resources either economically through additional staff or through release time should be considered for those working on departmental assessment committees.

2) There is also a need at the university level to look at assessment of the online courses as more departments such as ours move into that area especially in regard to the university assessment and with assessments like the reading test, which did not convert well to be used for online delivery.

3) There continues to be a need at the university level to assess transfer students in order to get a baseline of their learning. The LAJ Department has around 60% transfer students and having the university assess students as they enter the university at a university level and not a departmental level would be helpful in further assessment and for student success.

4) The Law and Justice Department Assessment Committee would be very interested in learning about best practices in assessment from other departments.
Appendix I: The Text for Law and Justice Reading Assessment

Shaming and Subculture

In Chapter 2 it was argued that subcultures that provide various degrees of social support for illegal behavior do exist in all societies. Even Japan has some 2,500 highly organized criminal gangs, as well as many motorcycle gangs and other groups which transmit criminal subcultures (Clifford, 1976: 117-24). Sometimes these subcultures are in opposition to the mainstream culture in the sense of promoting values which are the antithesis of mainstream values; sometimes they provide a social environment which is merely more tolerant of deviations from societal norms when opportunities arise to choose between gratification and compliance; sometimes they foster a 'drift' between the conventional and the deviant.

Even when all these levels of subculturalism are incorporated into the analysis, groups with strong and visible commitment to subcultural behavior patterns are numerically weak in most societies. This means that subcultural groups are not readily on tap with recruitment centers in each suburb as are the armed forces. Most citizens would know how to make contact with the army should they want to join up, but most Americans would have no idea of how to become an associate of the Mafia or to join the Hell's Angels. Consequently, even when life circumstances make criminal subcultures very attractive to individuals, more often than not those life circumstances have changed by the time the individual is exposed to an opportunity to be recruited into a subcultural group which engages in activities attractive to the individual.

If individuals were not choosy about the kind of deviant subculture they would find gratifying, subcultures would of course be more accessible in practical terms than they are. If I could imagine my own circumstances of life changing so that I would be attracted to participation in a deviant subculture, I might imagine first confronting an opportunity to participate with others in illicit drug use. But since I once had a frightening experience with marijuana interacting with alcohol, even soft drug use would not appeal to me in the least. An opportunity to smash things does not appeal either, so a vandalism opportunity would be a bore; an opportunity to rape a woman would overwhelm me with disgust rather than pleasure. On the other hand, the prospect of being $1,000 richer and my bank $1,000 poorer sounds like a result which would please me, so maybe if my life circumstances rendered me amenable to crime, fraud would appeal to my taste. The point is that criminological theory, like economic theory, systematically forgets that people have different tastes. Just because my social controls are loosened and I encounter an illegitimate opportunity, I will not take it unless it appeals to my taste. Thus, if subcultural groups are numerically weak to start with, I will not experience opportunities to associate with many of them during my periods of suspended commitment to conventional society, and I will encounter even fewer opportunities to share in a subculture which offers those particular kinds of satisfactions which appeal to my tastes.
Stigmatization is the most important of those life circumstances that increase the attraction of individuals to criminal subcultures. As Albert Cohen (1955) told us, when a student is rejected by the status system of the school - is labeled incorrigible or a failure - he has a status problem and is in the market for a solution. Cohen suggests that he solves it collectively with other students who have similarly been rejected by the school. The outcasts band together and set up their own status system with values the exact inverse of those of the school.

Such extreme oppositional criminal subcultures as Cohen's or the Hell's Angels do not need to be invoked, though they are part of the scene, for the stigmatization hypothesis to be relevant.

Instructions: Without looking back at the previous page, write a summary about what you just read.