Exploring the Perception of Economic Impact of State Correctional Institutions in Rural Pennsylvania*

Michael J. Hannan, Ph.D.
School of Business, 112 Wiley Arts & Sciences Center
Edinboro University of Pennsylvania
Edinboro, PA 16444
USA

Kevin E. Courtright, Ph.D.
Department of Political Science & Criminal Justice
146 Hendricks Hall
Edinboro University of Pennsylvania
Edinboro, PA 16444
USA

Abstract

This paper identifies variables of importance in predicting the perception of economic benefit of state correctional facilities located in four different rural communities in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Returned mail surveys (N=3160) from residents residing in rural communities provide data which, in addition to contributing to the scholarly literature in this area, should assist both state Departments of Corrections and rural communities who are either presently considering prison development or looking to improve their existing relationship between themselves and the correctional institution. An ordered logit methodology is employed showing several variables to be significant predictors of resident perception of a prison's overall economic impact. These include distance from facility, perception of local job creation resulting from the prison, and resident safety concerns, among others.

Keywords: prison siting, community perception, economic impact, ordinal regression

1. Introduction

This paper examines the perception of economic impact of state correctional facilities located in several rural communities in Pennsylvania using an ordered logit model to determine what demographic and other factors explain residents' perceptions of a prison's economic impact. While the magnitude of actual economic impact may be important, perceptions of such an impact are critical in shaping prison-community relationships over time. Research on the economic impact of prisons is often inconclusive, making the perceptions thereof particularly important (Turner &Thayer, 2003). The results of the present analysis will be useful to state officials charged with siting new institutions and to prison administrators and community leaders working to develop realistic public expectations of a prison's economic impact.

Although the overall size of correctional populations on a national basis has shown slight reversals of late, the primary factors contributing to this decline are decreases in the probation, parole, and jail populations (Glaze, 2010). As is the case in several other states, prison populations in Pennsylvania continue to grow and reach record numbers ("Prison inmate count highest in history," 2003; Pew Center on the States, 2010).Twelve new state prisons opened between 1990 and 2000, and, as of 2009, the state's Department of Corrections was operating 27 prisons and supervising more than 51,000 inmates (Commonweath of Pennsylvania, Department of Corrections, 2009). Pennsylvania's prison population grew more in 2009 than did that of any other state in the country, with an increase of 2,122 inmates in that year alone (Pew Center on the States, 2010, cited in Wagner, 2011).

_____

The state's annual expenditures on its corrections system, of which prison operations are the largest component, totaled $1.84 billion (Pew Center on the States, 2010). Often located in rural areas, prisons are viewed as a panacea by some and as an enemy by others. Securing the construction of a new prison can be particularly attractive and potentially important in rural areas, where communities often struggle economically. On the downside, prisoners represent one of the fastest growing segments of Pennsylvania's rural population (Center for Rural Pennsylvania, 2001). With more than two dozen correctional institutions located across the state, the Pennsylvania Department of Corrections (PADOC) provides myriad employment opportunities for more than 15,000 residents (Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Department of Corrections,2009). As is true nationally, the majority of Pennsylvania's state correctional institutions (SCIs) are located in rural communities (Beale, 1998), often in economically depressed areas (Shichor, 1992). Hoping for economic revitalization, many rural residents see the siting of a local prison as desirable. According to Calvin Beale, senior demographer at the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Economic Research Service, during the last decade, 245 prisons were built in 212 of the nation's 2,290 rural counties and an average of 25 new rural prisons opened each year in the 1990s (cited in Doyle, 2002). This trend is also evident in Pennsylvania, where, according to a recently retired superintendent and long-time PADOC employee, all except two or three of the state'sprisons were originally constructed in rural or remote areas of the commonwealth (E. T. Brennan, personal correspondence, January 21, 2006).

Explanations abound as to why prisons are often built in rural communities. Despite the popular perception that prisons are placed in rural areas to improve the local economy, especially with regard to creating jobs, researchers have noted that more likely reasons may be that real estate prices are more reasonable in rural communities, and, perhaps more importantly, opposition to such a facility is less than in more urban areas (Marquart, 2004; Schlosser, 1998). As Marquart (2004, p. 489) points out, "Prison siting in rural areas is as old as the prison itself." Historically, prison siting in rural areas has indeed had more to do with cheap and available land than with the politics of job creation. Additionally, opposition to prison construction is often lessened in rural communities mainly as a result of the perceived positive economic impact the prison will have on the local, often struggling, economy (Dickinson, 2003; Imhoff, 2002; Marquart, 2004). Prison jobs are thought to have the potential to slow the exodus from small towns, allowing at least some young people to remain in the area (Schlosser, 1998).

There are downsidesto placing correctional facilities in remote areas, however. Remote sites can make it difficult to attract qualified personnel, hinder the ability of family members to visit inmates, and create problems in treating medical emergencies (Abrams & Lyons, 1992). In the case of PADOC, the lack of adequate infrastructure in rural areas and the difficulty in attracting and retaining qualified persons of color as employees could be added to this list (Courtright, Packard, Hannan, & Brennan, 2010). Siting a prison in a community continues to generate lively debate. Among other variables, proponents tout job creation, increased local business, tax benefits, and increased home values as points that favor having a prison in the community. Opponents, however, often cite their perceptions that crime will increase as a result ofan influx of visitors (sometimes referred to as "camp followers" and other "undesirables") and thatthere will be a negative impact on local infrastructure, increased traffic, and noise and light pollution from the prison. Observers soon realize that there is no shortage of issues surrounding this topic and that perhaps the biggest question relating to prison siting is whether the institution actually contributes positively to the local economy.

2. Literature Review

The literature addressing the views and perceptions of community members like those in this study follows the "locally unwanted land use" (LULU) and "not in my backyard" (NIMBY) models for understanding the views and reactions of affected communities (Martin, Champion, &Gibney, 2002). LULU facilities are regionally needed such as power plants, toxic waste dumps, homeless shelters, and prisons that are often unwanted locally because of their feared impact on the community (Krause as cited in Martin et al., 2002). Although recognizing the need for such facilities, citizens often have a NIMBY response (i.e., build it somewhere else). However, because of the belief that prisons can stimulate economic recovery and growth, competition between predominantly rural counties for a prison or state correctional institution can be fierce. For example,residents ofa town in Illinois wrote a rap song and purchased television ad time as part of a public relations campaign directed at state legislators who were considering where to locate a new prison (Donziger, 1996); in a Texas town, students in a Sunday school class got on their knees and prayed that a new prison would open in their community (Lotke as cited in Hooks, Mosher, Rotolo, &Lobao, 2004).

This type of competition, often involving aggressive solicitation by select groups, citizens, and community leaders, appears to be typical. It is clear that such competition to obtain prisons in rural areas also exists in Pennsylvania.[1]

2.1 Economic Impact of Prisons

Government officials in rural communities often adhere to the belief that a prison is a good long-term investment (Marquart, 2004), and many rural communities have looked to prison construction as a way to bring about an economic revival (Doyle, 2002). As Martin, Champion, Gibney, and Radakovic (1999) write, arguments for prison siting have most often been framed in economic terms. Officials often promote a new prison as the centerpiece of a plan of cluster-based economic development whereby the facility acts as an "engine of economic growth, spinning off industries that would compete with one another to provide services necessary to operate the prison" (King, Mauer, &Huling, 2004, p. 473).

Several studies have found that prisons can make, or have made, positive economic contributions to their host communities (see, e.g., Doyle, 2002; Imhoff, 2002; Shichor, 1992; Swanson, 1993), while other studies report that the presence of a prison has had nosignificant impact upon the local economy (see, e.g., Smykla et al., 1984; Abrams & Lyons, 1992). For example, a study funded by the National Institute of Corrections found that "correctional facilities have no negative effects on property value, public safety, or the quality of life. Conversely, the study found that correctional facilities had important positive effects on the local economies" (Abrams & Lyons, 1992, p. iv). The concern that property values will decline once a prison moves into a community seems persistent, yet objective indicators often suggest that such a concern is unfounded. For instance, Imhoff (2002) notes, "One of the main concerns of prospective host communities is declining property values, but property values in Somerset [Pennsylvania] are stable and appear to be unaffected by the presence of the prisons" (p. 71).

Historically, although few studies have examined the issue with methodologically sound research (McShane& Williams, 1992), to date, the majority of studies examining the impact of prisons on local areas have concluded that building a prison results in an inevitable economic boost to the surrounding community (Hooks et al., 2004; Imhoff, 2002; Abrams & Lyons, 1992). Some more recent research endeavors, however, have found little evidence of either a positive or a negative economic impact on the surrounding host community (Dickinson, 2003; Hooks et al., 2004; King et al., 2004; Shichor, 1992). Using objective (versus subjective, or perception-based) measures, two research efforts have yielded evidence of particularly negative outcomes in this regard.

Studying the economic impact of several prisons placed in rural counties in New York using county-level data, King et al. (2004) measured the impact of prison siting on unemployment and income levels in several counties in rural New York State from 1977 to 2000. The researchers found that prisons had no significant economic impact on their host counties. Of particular relevance are the following findings from King et al. (2004, pp. 469–474): (a) correctional officers do not live in the host county; (b) local residents might not qualify for employment (e.g., due to lack of skills); (c) local residents may not be able to compete for corrections jobs; (d) local business may not stock the necessary materials (to support the prison); (e) limited multiplier effect (i.e., no "spin-off" jobs created); and (f) inmates performed the low-wage jobs that might have gone to local unskilled labor. The authors conclude that "the apparent cost of prison siting, even if considered conservatively, appears to exceed any potential economic benefits offered to the host county" (p. 476).

Analyzing the economic impact of all new and existing prisons in the U.S. since 1960, Hooks and his colleagues (2004) measured public, private, and total employment growth in U.S. counties from 1969 to 1994. The first longitudinal study of the economic impact of prison construction on local communities in the United States, their work revealed no evidence that prison construction in these counties had stimulated economic growth. In fact, the authors found that the presence of a prison actually impeded economic growth in host counties. Because they examined counties both with and without prisons, perhaps most notable is their finding that counties without a prison had the highest rates of earning and employment growth; this was true for both urban and rural counties.

---

[1]One example of this occurred during the siting of SCI Albion—one of the prisons selected for our study. During an interview with the Albion-area focus group on August 11, 2004, the group revealed that when they were initially exploring the possibility of the prison being constructed there, they quickly learned that they were one of 17 counties vying for the project. When the Albion group participants were asked if they believed that they were in competition with other counties, one focus group participant replied, "I think we felt that we were competing against all 17."

The study ultimately concluded that "neither established nor newly built prisons made a significant contribution to employment growth in rural counties" (Hooks et al., 2004, p. 51). The research team also found that among slow-growing counties (arguably the counties in greatest need), new prisons seemed to do more harm than good. Using other dependent (i.e., outcome) variables, the researchers found no evidence that the presence of a prison helped to lower the unemployment rate, raise the median family income, or raise earnings. In attempting to explain these rather surprising results, the authors speculated that building or hosting a prison may crowd out alternative economic activity by taxing existing infrastructure at the expense of other potential employers.

Glasmeier and Farrigan (2007) offer perhaps the most methodologically sound study to date of the economic impact of prison development in rural America.Using objective indicators and a quasi-experimental design with a control group, they examined the economic impact of state-run prisons in rural counties across America between 1985 and 1995. Examining county earnings by employment sector, as well as population, poverty rate, and overall degree of economic health, Glasmeier and Farrigan (2007) found evidence that prisons had:(a) a limited economic effect in rural places in general, (b) a possible positive impact on poverty rates in persistently poor rural counties (as measured by diminishing transfer payments and increasing state and local government earnings in places with relatively good economic health), and (c) little evidence of significant impacts fostering structural economic change).They thus conclude that "the economic impacts of the prison development boom on persistently poor rural places, and rural places in general, appear to have been rather limited" (p. 295).

Given the conflicting conclusions, different measures, and the variety of methods used to assess this area of inquiry, determining whether or not prisons contribute positively to their host communities is difficult and may depend more on one's *perspective* than anything else. As Marquart (2004) notes, these issues, like many other issues in criminal justice and/or corrections, are influenced greatly by one's personal perspective:

> Does a rural prison enhance economic development? It depends on your perspective. If you believe prisons "don't work" to begin with, then the economic development theory is on thin ice. On the other hand, if you are a mayor or county official in some remote area of the state, a prison, like a military base, makes good economic sense. (p. 491)

Marquart's comment also reminds us that prison siting is a political process and that a legislator who obtains a prison in his/her jurisdiction personally benefits, irrespective of whether the facility makes a substantial contribution to the local economy.

Evidence suggests that residents of New York State are among those who harbor the perception that prisonshave a positive economic impact on their host communities.Beginning in about 2000, the state of New York embarked on a prison bed reduction plan, citing a drop in inmate population statewide. Although opposed by employees and at least some state lawmakers (Confessore, 2007; Lee &Kaufman, 2008), by the end of 2008, closures impactedfive correctional facilities and six annexes, thereby eliminating 2,454 beds (Fischer, 2011). Opposition to closing these prisons did not rest solely on the issue of job losses, as new assignments awaited the 584 employees of those facilities; instead, other factors seemed to have been behind the opposition, for example, the possible loss of small business revenue and the loss of sometimes substantial amounts of free labor that prison work crews complete in their host communities on a regular basis (Santos, 2008).

As of 2011, New York State was considering approximately three additional prisons for closure because of an excess of 3,500 prison beds among its 67 facilities (Virtanen, 2011). One of a handful of states that has been able to reduce its prison population between 2005 and 2010 (Pew Center on the States, 2010), New York State now findsitself in a situation that is politically heated andcomplicated, as well as being foreign to most lawmakers. According to news reports in April 2011, Governor Andrew Cuomo planned to announce within 30 days which prisons would close (Mann, 2011). Cuomo's decision followed the release of recommendations by the Prison Closure Advisory Task Force, comprised of experts and legislators. Among other pressing factors the task force would have to consider was the impact closureswould have on host communities and the workforce. Closure would come with proposed financial assistance ($10 million per location), which the state would provide to host communities as economic development aid (Fischer, 2011). An irony exists here: there can be, and often is, opposition to siting (i.e., locating) a prison in a community and there can be equally fierce opposition to its proposed elimination. The fact that the latter can be more fierce may speak volumes as to the economic health of a given community or at least residents' perceptions of the prison's contribution in that regard.

Abrams (1988) suggests that *subjective* considerations, rather than objective information, influence the many issues related to prison siting. Because many prison siting issues are influenced by subjective rather than objective information, various perceptions of residents become important and should be taken into consideration (K. Carlson, personal communication, August 7, 2003; Shichor, 1992). Thus, there is a need to assess community *perceptions;* after all, a social phenomenon that is perceived to be real can become real in its consequence (Thomas & Thomas, 1929). We hypothesize that, like the issues of prison siting and prison capacity expansion (see, e.g., Robertson & Ray, 1994), the community's level of satisfaction with a prison is strongly related to resident perception of the economic benefit of the prison. In this study, we examine a number of specific variables that may influence this perception.

2.2 Variables of Importance in NIMBY Research

There are several variables that may influence residents' perceptions of impact of a correctional institution in their community. Martin et al. (1999) report that "distance from the facility" is one of the most powerful control variables in the measurement of individual and neighborhood perceptions. "The rule is simple," they report: "The closer residents are to an unwanted facility, the more likely they are to oppose it" (p. 20). Other variables of importance in measuring residents' perceptions of the prison include household size, income level, educational level, occupation, employment status, marital status, home ownership, and facility size and type (Dear, 1992; Myers & Martin, 2004). The prison's security level has also been found to influence community satisfaction and reaction to prison siting (Carlson 1992, as cited in Myers & Martin, 2004), as have demographic variables such as age and gender (Halstead, Luloff, & Myers, 1993; Swanson, 1993).[2]

A regression analysis performed by Robertson and Ray (1994) involving a sample of 606 Mississippi residents revealed that the presence of an existing prison facility, perceived economic benefits, race, and education were significant predictors of attitudes toward prison expansion. According to Martin et al. (2002) and Maxim and Plecas (1983), persons with higher levels of education, younger persons, and residents in higher income brackets are generally more likely to oppose LULU facilities. Regarding economic considerations, according to Martin et al. (2002), those who depend less on a facility for employment are more likely to oppose it and/or view the facility negatively. The perception of the degree to which the facility provides jobs for members of the immediate local community also influences receptivity to a prison.

In a more recent publication utilizing their previous data set, Myers and Martin (2004) examined the perceptions of prison impact on *economic factors* specifically and found that concerns about the influx of inmate visitors to the community and their potentially negative effect on future crime rates and safety issues had the strongest impact on predicting economic perceptions. Myers and Martin also conclude that proximity to the prison and variables such as gender, income, time at residence, residence location, perception of the prison's security level, and perception of inmate visitors causing problems in the community were significant determinants of economic expectations. Once again, proximity to the prison seems to be the most critical variable: "Compare to those living farther away, site respondents were more likely to expect that property values would decrease" (Myers & Martin, 2004, p. 135). The overall level of opposition was not exceedingly high, however, even in the area immediately surrounding the prison.

Martin and Myers (2005) found that survey respondents' views of *crime* and *safety* were among the most important factors in determining residents' overall satisfaction with the prison. Predictably, residents living closest to the prison were significantly more likely to expect crime to increase and to report higher safety concerns generally, although it is important to note that only 15% of the respondents reported that the new prison would cause crime to increase (Martin et al., 2002). This finding is not an anomaly. Shichor (1992) reports that several studies concerning the effects of prisons on the local crime rate (post-siting and using more objective indicators) show, with few exceptions, no higher crime rates in communities with prisons. In fact, at least one research effort found lower crime rates in prison communities (see, e.g., Abrams, 1989; Abrams & Lyons, 1987). Moreover, Young (1998) reported a total absence of a NIMBY syndrome in a community and found that residents did not see the prison as a threat to public or personal safety.

---

[2] In terms of residents' overall satisfaction with prisons in their communities, there may be differences in satisfaction with state versus federal facilities and public versus private prisons, although researchers have yet to adequately address this issue; most of the research consists of case studies of one facility. This may be an important variable of economic consideration, particularly given the fact that private prisons must pay real estate taxes (Yanarella& Blankenship, 2006).

In discussing variables that determine perceived safety concerns, Martin and Myers (2005) found that females, respondents who were married, those with lower incomes, and those who resided closest to the proposed prison (SCI Pine Grove, in Pennsylvania) had greater safety concerns. Surprisingly, many other variables that previous studies had identified as important control variables (including age, education, number of children in the household, employment status, residence time, and knowledge of the prison's security level) were not significant.

To summarize, researchers have identified several variables that are important in determining levels of residents' perceived satisfaction with prisons in their communities, including the economic impact dimension. The majority of studies suggest that crime and safety factors, although perceived to be a concern by at least some residents at the time of siting, are generally not a concern among the majority of residents, either at the time of siting or once the prison becomes operational, with most residents reporting either neutral or favorable views. Respondent perceptions of economic impact seem to follow a similar trend (i.e., they express neutral or positive perceptions of a prison's economic impact), although some recent research endeavors have questioned this finding via the use of objective measures of economic conditions. Also of interest is the fact that the most critical studies do not take into account or measure resident perception of the free inmate labor that prisons regularly provide to their host communities. As Santos (2008) notes, the perception of this dimension of economic contribution is often positive among many residents.

Few research efforts have examined the ongoing health of the relationship between the prison and the community once a prison becomes operational in its host community. What is lacking in the research literature are data measuring more subjective factors, including how they evolve over time once prisons become operational. We believe that resident perception is important in determining the health of this ongoing relationship, as well as having some influence in siting additional prisons or expanding additional facilities. Although some perception-based studies of the impact of prisons do exist, many of these research efforts have involved case studies of one prison, often conducted at the time of siting or shortly thereafter (see, e.g., Abrams &Lyons, 1987; Carlson, 1992; Myers &Martin, 2004; Smykla et al., 1984). Using perception-based measures, the study presented here attempts to identify variables critical to explaining the degree of economic satisfaction among residents in four prison communities located in a sample of different geographical areas of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

3. Methodology

A total of four state correctional institutions (SCIs) and their respective communities were selected for inclusion in the study (SCIs at Albion, Cambridge Springs, Dallas, and Houtzdale, Pennsylvania). The prisons were selected for inclusion in the sample based on the following criteria: geographic diversity; a period of operation sufficient to assess prison-community relations; diversification of economic conditions as measured by five-year average regional unemployment rates; and a time frame since prison siting brief enough for community leaders and residents to have recall of the siting history and process.[3] A community satisfaction survey was developed and implemented to measure the extent of community satisfaction with the local prison in terms of safety and public service factors, and perception of the economic impact of the prison. The present study drew heavily on the previous work of Martin et al. (2002) for the construction of the survey instrument. A pilot survey was conducted to test the validity of the instrument using regional community members; our statistical reliability tests yielded favorable results (see Courtright, Hannan, Packard, & Brennan, 2006). The survey was administered to a random sample of more than 13,000 local (community) residents across the four study areas. The overall response rate of 24% resulted in more than 3,000 usable responses (see the Appendix for the survey instrument).The mailed survey included a self-addressed stamped envelope for return and a letter from the Secretary of PADOC encouraging recipients to participate in the study. In addition, a follow-up postcard reminder was administered within a month of the initial mailing, and local newspaperspublished articles providing background on the study in order to raise public awareness of and interest in the study.

---

[3] With regard to the last criterion, informal conversations with local borough officials in some of these areas revealed significant differences as to how the PADOC sited the institutions and the extent to which local communities/boroughs pursued and welcomed these facilities. These differences areparticularly relevant because researchhas shown that the most significant factors affecting adverse prison-community relations are the siting process and subsequent public relations (see e.g., Carlson, 1992).

A second mailing of the survey instrument was provided to residents as needed.[4] Because this research focused on the impact of state prison facilities within local communities, we restrictedthe community impact survey region to the areasin greatest proximity to the prison. The literature suggests that the immediate surrounding area—that area closest to the prison—is where the majority of problems and subsequent negative attitudes are likely to be found (Maxim &Plecas, 1983). For local residents, interest in, or awareness of, the prison quickly declines to the point of indifference the farther people reside from the prison facility (Dear, 1992). Understanding that the closer residents are to a LULU, the more likely they are to oppose it, the research team measured the levels of resident perception in all townships within a two-mile radius of the prison.

The survey yielded a large quantity of rich qualitative data, some of which we include in the analysis of the present study. It should be noted, however, that the demographic makeup of respondents was not entirely consistent with the demographic profile for these communities as generated by the 2000 census data. In general, relative to census results, respondents tended to be older individuals, homeowners, and individuals with a higher level of education; a larger proportion of the respondent group was male, but this result was not unexpected given that the survey was directed to the head of household. The results presented here should thus be viewed in the context of these demographic factors.[5]

4. Model Variables

Our primary focus in the present analysis is the identification of variables that explain resident perceptions of overall economic impact. This is done using a series of demographic control variables along with additional explanatory test variables, as described below. These variables are summarized in Table1.

<div align="center">**Insert Table 1 about here**</div>

The dependent variable we have termed *Economic* is a Likert response format variable that measures residents' perceptions of the regional SCI's overall impact on the local economy. On the survey instrument, residents were able to choose a rating of "1" through "5," where "1" represented a negative impact and "5" represented a positive impact. Residents were also able to select a "Don't Know" option; this option relieved participants of the need to provide an indefinite response (e.g., "3") when in fact they were unable to make a rating determination. The data from this ordinal variable were aggregated to form a 3-point ordinal scale in order to satisfy statistical modeling requirements. Thus, original ratings of "1" and "2" were combined to form a "Negative" aggregated score, coded "1"; the original rating of "3" for "No Impact" was recoded "2"; and the original ratings of "4" and "5" were aggregated to form a "Positive" rating, recoded as "3." Using the aggregated scale, the mean rating of 2.48 indicates a somewhat positive overall view of the impact of the regional prison on the local economy. Of those providing a rating response, 60.5% of the responses were positive, 26.9% indicated no impact, and 12.5% indicated that the prison had a negative economic impact.

A series of demographic control variables are included in the model to determine their importance in explaining economic impact perception. Since the community survey included four prison regions, three dummy variables were created to measure whether there was a significant difference by region in terms of perceived economic impact. These three dummy variables were *Albion*, *Cambridge*, and *Houtzdale*, representing the most recently sited of the four prisons.[6] The mean values for these variables measure the proportion of the total data set associated with each survey region. Albion comprised 17.5% of the responses, Cambridge Springs 14.6%, Dallas33.7%, and Houtzdale 34.2%. As discussed in Courtright et al. (2010), varied issues arose in the siting of these prisonsthat could manifest themselves in terms of differences in the perception of prison impact on the local economy. The educational level of respondents was also included as a demographic control variable,*Education*, defined dichotomously to distinguish respondents with more than a high school education from those with a high school diploma or less.

---

[4] The study's funding agency required that the analysis include four communities. Budgetary limitations precluded the use of a telephone survey for this study, although the quantity and quality of data generated from the mailed survey wereadequate for use in our statistical analysis.

[5] For each community studied, the authors have and can provide copies of a full comparison of demographic characteristics between survey respondents and census results.

[6] A dummy variable for the Dallas region was not included in order to avoid problems of multicollinearity between the locational dummies.

Although the potential direction of the relationship is unclear theoretically, we hypothesized that more highly educated residents may work in occupations that would provide a different perspective on economic impact than would those with less formal education. The results showed that close to 60% of respondents had some post–high school education. More highly educated residents may view the prison's economic impact more favorably and anticipate greater linkages with other regional businesses; alternatively, their assessment may be more negative if they rationalize that the presence of the prison may inhibit other businesses from locating in the region.

The variable for residential distance(*Distance*) from the site of the prison was included as a four-point ordinal variable, as defined in Table1. The most common residential distance from the prison was four to 10 miles, representing 53.5% of total respondents. Fifteen percent lived within one mile of the prison, while 18% and 13.3% lived between two to three miles and more than 10 miles, respectively. The employment status of the resident, *Employed*, was used as a dichotomous demographic control variable with the expectation that employed residents may naturally have a more favorable economic perspective toward the prison compared to those not employed. Among the respondents, 62% were employed; however, given that the median age of all respondents was 55, it is likely that some of those "not employed" were retirees. *Gender* was another control variable included in the model, and approximately 62% of respondents were male. There was no *a priori* expectation regarding the potential direction of effect of this variable on perceived economic impact. However, a related study by Myers and Martin (2004) found males to have significantly higher expectations regarding the effect of a prison on the local economy.

Two additional demographic control variables were included. *Income* is a four-point ordinal variable with categories as defined in Table1. The mean rating was 2.99, corresponding to the upperend of the $10,000–$24,999 income category. The home ownership variable, *Own*, was also included in the model as a dichotomous variable, where more than 88% of respondents were homeowners as opposed to renters.[7] As the literature affirms, the ability of a prison to generate local jobs is an important component of desired prison impact on the regional economy. In this study, *Job-Creation* was a three-point ordinal variable measuring resident perception of the prison as a source of job creation in the community. Originally, a 5-point scale was used for this variable in the community survey (question 31), for this variable, but aggregated following the same method used for the dependent variable *Economic*. The mean rating for this variable was 2.13, indicating on average a somewhat stronger than "no impact" response from community residents in terms of job creation by the prison. Specifically, 27.1% indicated a negative impact on jobs, 32.8% perceived no impact, and 40.1% believed there was a positive impact on job creation. It is hypothesized that a more favorable perception of the job-generating ability of the prison would translate to a stronger perception of overall economic impact.

In this study we also wished to assess the effect of being a prison employee, identified by the variable *PrisonEmploy*, or knowing a prison employee, identified as *KnowEmploy*, on economic impact perception. Only 3.1% of respondents were prison employees, but 71.2% of respondents indicated knowing one or more prison employees in the community. It may be hypothesized that being employed by the prison may provide a more favorable perception of community economic impact, although more direct exposure to prison operations may temper such a perception.One possible example of this effect may be seen in the residential dispersion of prison employees and the realities of local purchase arrangements by state prisons. Alternatively, we hypothesized that *KnowEmploy* would be positively related to the perception of economic impact. Knowing prison employees in the community may give the perception to residents that the prison is a provider of jobs and income, thus instilling a more favorable economic viewpoint. The perception of the prison as a *Neighbor* may also influence economic impact perceptions. The community survey (question 16) asked residents to rate the prison on an ordinal scale of 1 through 10, where "1" indicated the prison was a poor neighbor and "10" indicated the prison was an excellent neighbor. The mean rating on this scale was 7.27, indicating a generally favorable view of the prison as a neighbor; 56% of respondents provided a rating of 8 or higher.

---

[7] Because the age of respondents was severely skewed (average age of our respondents was 55) and because Myers and Martin (2004) did not find age to be a significant variable in most of their models, we did not include the age variable in our model. Likewise, because of questionable theoretical significance to our economic-related dependent variable, marital status and number of children in household were also not included in the model. We hypothesize that these variables would have more theoretical relevance in a model explaining crime and safety issues. Additionally, Myers and Martin (2004) found these variables to be insignificant predictors in their perception-based economic impact study.

The variable *Reside* measures whether the respondent resided in the township at the time of prison siting, and we included it to determine whether local residency during the siting process influences later perceptions of economic impact. The data show that 61% of respondents resided in the community at the time of the prison siting. Additionally, the survey asked community residents whether they had ever done any volunteer work at the local prison (the variable *Volunteer*). It was hypothesized that direct experience with the prison on a voluntary basis may influence perception of prison impact on the local community and the economy; however, the rate of volunteering at the prisons was just 5% among survey respondents.

Lastly, the variable *Safety* was included to measure the influence of such concerns by residents on their perceptions of economic impact. A summated safety variable was created that included ratings by residents on six dimensions of safety: personal safety, family safety, ex-offenders/parolees in the community, inmate visitors, crime, and inmate escape concerns. Higher ratings on the summated variable correspond to greater concern for "safety". With a maximum summated value of 30, the mean rating of 13.14 indicates a relatively low level of safety concern on average across the four communities studied. Following the results from Myers and Martin (2004), we hypothesized that higher levels of concern for safety would correspond to a more generalized negative perception of economic impact. This negative perception may relateto concerns regarding the prison's negative impact on property values or the idea that safety concerns might drive out existing businesses and deter new businesses from locating in the community.

5. The Model

The purpose of this study is to identify variables which may assist in explaining the perception of economic impact held by residents proximate to a state correctional institution years after siting. This perception is measured using a three-point ordinal variable, *Economic*, representing the concepts of "negative impact," "no impact," and "positive impact." The ordered logit methodology was selected to perform the analysis and is appropriate for cases in which distances between the adjacent ordinal categories are unknown (Long 1997).[8]

The ordered logit model assumes that there exists a latent continuous variable, y^*, that is being measured by the ordinal variable, y, such that larger values of the ordinal variable correspond to higher outcomes (Feijten&Mulder, 2005). In the present application, this latent variable would represent a continuum of residents' perceptions of the overall economic impact of the prison on their communities. Following the notation used by Long (1997) and Feijten and Mulder (2005), the structure of the ordered logit model is as follows:

(Equation 1)

$$y_i^* = x_i\beta + \varepsilon_i$$

or

$$y_i^* = Z_i + \varepsilon_i$$

where x_i is a matrix of independent variables and β is a vector of coefficients. Likewise, we can determine the probability of observing a particular outcome for the latent variable as follows:

(Equation 2)

$$Pr(outcome_j = i) = Pr(\tau_{i-1} \leq \beta_1 X_{1j} + \beta_2 X_{2j} + \cdots + \beta_k X_{kj} + \varepsilon_j < \tau_i)$$

or

$$Pr(outcome_j = i) = Pr(\tau_{i-1} \leq y^* < \tau_i)$$

where the τvalues are referred to as threshold values and the continuous latent variable, y^*, is estimated as a linear function of explanatory variables, the $X_j$values. The model is estimated using maximum likelihood, and the error, ε_j, is assumed to be logistically distributed. The observed ordinal variable, y, is related to the latent continuous variable based on the threshold values. In our example of perceived economic impact of the prison, the threshold values would relate the underlying continuous perception variable, y^*, to the observed ordinal variable (y or *Economic*) in the following way:

---

[8] The validity of the ordered logit model rests on the parallel regression assumption, also known as the proportional odds assumption (Long 1997). This condition assumes that the relationship between all pairs of categories is the same, such that only one set of coefficients is necessary to estimate the model relationships. A chi-square test is applied to examine this assumption under the null hypothesis that the slope coefficients are the same across the ordinal response categories. In general, failure to accept the null hypothesis suggests that a multinomial logit methodology may be more appropriate for analysis than the ordered logit method (Orme& Buehler, 2001).

(Equation 3)

$$y_i = \begin{cases} 1 \to Neg & if & y^* < \tau_1 \\ 2 \to NI & if & \tau_1 \le y^* < \tau_2 \\ 3 \to Pos & if & \tau_2 \le y^* \end{cases}$$

where the possible ordinal values for *Economic* were: 1=negative impact, 2=no impact, and 3=positive impact. Therefore, if a respondent's score from the ordered logit, as estimated by the linear equation for y^*, is less than threshold value τ_1, then the respondent would be predicted to have had a negative perception of the prison's economic impact on the community. Likewise, an estimated score value between τ_1 and τ_2 would lead us to predict that the respondent perceived that the prison had no economic impact.

The coefficients on the independent variables, the β values, can be interpreted like those for a dichotomous logit model as log odds values, in this case being ordered log odds. Exponentiating the coefficients also allows for interpretation as proportional odds ratios, as is done with dichotomous logit models.

6. Results

To identify factors significant in explaining resident perceptions of the economic impact, an ordered logit model was estimated with an equation of the following form:
(Equation 4)

$$\begin{aligned} Economic_i = \ & \beta_1 Albion_i + \beta_2 Cambridge_i + \beta_3 Houtzdale_i + \beta_4 Education_i + \\ & \beta_5 Employed_i + \beta_6 Gender_i + \beta_7 Distance_i + \beta_8 Income_i + \\ & \beta_9 Own_i + \beta_{10} Job\text{-}Creation_i + \beta_{11} KnowEmploy_i + \beta_{12} Neighbor_i \\ & \beta_{13} PrisonEmploy_i + \beta_{14} Reside_i + \beta_{15} Safety_i + \beta_{16} Volunteer_i + \varepsilon_i \end{aligned}$$

A Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square test was performed to determine the general usefulness of the model. Specifically, we tested the null hypothesis that all of the slope coefficients, except for the threshold coefficients, are jointly zero. For the present model, the chi-square statistic was 664.817, with 16 degrees of freedom. The statistic was significant at the .001 level, indicating model usefulness. Additionally, following the work of Kim and Kim (2004), a correlation matrix was generated to test for possible collinearity between the independent variables. These correlations are shown in Table2, where the largest correlation (.425) indicates minimal issues with multicollinearity. Contingency tables (not shown) were also calculated between the dependent variable and each independent variable to ensure that there were not a large number of zero cells, which would impact the estimation properties of the model.

Insert Table 2 about here

Table 3 shows the results of the ordered logit model. The first column reports the ordered log odds (logit) regression coefficients, while the last column shows the exponentiated coefficients, or proportional odds ratios. The reported pseudo-R^2 values indicate that the model has a reasonable fit, with between 26.6% and 45.2% of the "variation" in overall economic impact perception accounted for by the individual variables.[9] The parallel regression assumption was tested to ensure the appropriateness of the ordered logit methodology for this application. A chi-square value of 20.674 was obtained with 16 degrees of freedom. With a significance level of.191, the null hypothesis was accepted, supporting the appropriateness of this model.

Insert Table 3 about here

Among the demographic control variables, we find that the Cambridge Springs locational dummy (*Cambridge*), *Distance*, and *Gender* are statistically significant in explaining residents' perceptions of economic impact. The positive coefficient on *Cambridge* indicates that the likelihood of having a more positive perception of the prison's impact on the local economy is greater in this community relative to the other communities included in the analysis. The odds ratio (2.29) for this variable shows that the odds of indicating a positive economic impact, versus the combined "negative" and "no impact" ratings, is 2.29as great for *Cambridge* residents as for non-*Cambridge* residents. The coefficients for Albion and Houtzdale were not significant.

---

[9] It should be noted that the ordered logit model does not have a counterpart to the R^2 measure used in linear regression, and the pseudo-R^2 values should be interpreted with caution. See Long and Freese (2005) for a discussion of these measures.

This result is not surprising, based on the results from the broader study by Courtright et al. (2006), which showed that residents of the Cambridge Springs area were generally more positive on multiple dimensions of the prison's effect on the community. Although Cambridge Springs' residents appeared to be the most negative about the initial siting of the prison, their more positive post-siting perspective may have been due to the realization of some perceived economic benefits in later years or at least that earlier concerns appeared to have been unfounded.

Residential *Distance* from the prison was also significant, implying that a respondent's perception of the prison's economic impact becomes more positive the farther from the prison a person resides. The odds of perceiving a positive economic impact, relative to no impact or a negative impact, increased by 31% for each unit increase in the *Distance* categories. This result shows that residents who were most proximate to the prison had a lower assessment of economic impact on the community relative to those who lived farther away. This outcome may be due in part to the fact that those living closest to the prison came to realize that there was little new economic development near the prison site. Those living farther away would not have had such regular direct exposure to this fact. This result may also be due in part to the significant residential dispersion of prison employees, as found in Courtright et al. (2006), where average residential distances from the prison varied from 10.7 miles for SCI Dallas employees to 19.7 miles for SCI Albion employees.

The *Gender* of the respondent was also significant in explaining perceived economic impact, with the positive coefficient showing that male respondents had a greater likelihood of providing a higher economic impact rating compared to females, a finding consistent with that of Myers and Martin (2004). Equally important is the result that educational level (*Education*), employment status (*Employed*), income level (*Income*), and home ownership (*Own*) were not significant in the model. Thus, these four demographic characteristics failed to explain differences in the likelihood of perceiving a greater or lesser economic impact from the prison. The coefficient on *Job-Creation* was significant and showed that a more positive rating on the prison's perceived impact on job creation corresponded to an increased likelihood that the resident would be positive about the prison's overall economic impact. The influence of this variable can be seen from its exponentiated coefficient, which shows that the odds of having a more positive perception of overall economic impact would be more than five times as great for each point increase in the *Job-Creation* rating. As discussed earlier, this finding helps confirm that residents' perceptions of job creation are very important in assessing their overall perception of economic impact.

The coefficient on the 10-point ordinal *Neighbor* rating variable was also significant and in the expected direction. More positive feelings regarding the prison as a "neighbor," in general, positively influence perceptions of economic impact. Specifically, the odds of perceiving a positive economic impact (versus a negative or no impact result) are 16% higher for each one-point increase in the *Neighbor* rating scale.

Also significant in explaining perceived economic impact was residential location, that is, whether the respondent resided in the township at the time of the initial prison siting (identified by the variable *Reside*). The coefficient on this variable was negative, indicating that those residents residing near the prison at the time of siting were less likely to have a positive perception of overall economic impact. As discussed above and in the literature, many residents have unrealistic economic expectations regarding the effect of a new prison at the time of siting. Many residents believe that the prison will directly generate new jobs and will indirectly generate othersby way of new spin-off business (e.g., restaurants, hotels, service firms). Many of these expectations are not borne out in reality because many prison employees tend to livein areas well removed from the prison, state purchasing laws limit local direct purchasing, and local service industry providers see little increased demand. In effect, residents who were present at the time of siting later find that their expectations were unfulfilled and are thus more likely to have significantly lower perceptions of economic impact compared to residents who were not present at the time of siting.

The summated *Safety* variable is also shown to be significant in explaining the perception of economic impact. In this case, the sign of the coefficient is negative, showing that residents with greater concerns for their safety were more likely to provide a lower assessment of the overall economic impact of the prison. This result implies that negative feelings regarding prison safety may generalize to other areas of prison effect, in this case perceived economic impact. Residents concerned about safety may have negative views regarding the prison in general; this is partly confirmed by the -.427 correlation between *Neighbor* and *Safety* in Table 2. Thus, concerns over safety may lead to a more negative view of the prison as a neighbor in general and may, consequently, negatively influence one's view of the prison's economic impact.

Likewise, greater concerns over safety may also lead residents to consider their community less desirable, not just as a place of residence but also as a place that will attract or retain businesses. In either case, safety concerns appear to translate into more pessimistic perceptions of economic impact. The odds ratio (.956) shows that the odds of a "positive impact" rating (versus a "no impact" or "negative impact" rating) are 4.4% lower for each point increase in the summated safety rating.

Other variables tested in the model were not found to be statistically significant. These included knowing a prison employee in the community (*KnowEmploy*), being an employee of the prison (*PrisonEmploy*), and doing volunteer work at the prison (*Volunteer*). We originally hypothesized that knowing a prison employee in the community might translate to a more positive perception of the prison's economic impact. Although more than 70% of respondents indicated knowing one or more prison employees in the community, this association did not translate into more favorable feelings regarding the prison as an economic stimulus. These findings are both interesting and surprising. We had hypothesized that familiarity with the prison on any level (employees, inmates, etc.) would place residents in a better position to form a positive perception of the prison's economic impact on the community. The fact that these variables were not significant (either positively or negatively) refutes the importance of this personal knowledge in influencing resident perception, at least in our study.

7. Conclusions

The majority view among respondents across the four studied communities is that the SCIs in their communities do contribute in positive ways to the local economy, primarily through job creation. As stated above, more than 60% of respondents to the community survey perceived a positive economic impact from the local prison.

This study has shown that several variables are significant predictors of perceptions of overall economic impact. These include distance from the facility, gender, job creation, the perception of the prison as a "neighbor," whether residents resided in the township at the time the SCI was sited, and safety issues/concerns. Perhaps most striking are the results of the *Distance* and *Reside* variables in the model. Respondents residing near or very near the prison were less likely to have a positive perception of overall economic impact, similar to Dear's (1992) "closer proximity, more resistance" finding of prison resistance and opposition. Apparently, this relationship also holds true for economic impact perception and could certainly be related to resident opposition and overall feelings of negativity. An alternative explanation, however, is that local residents residing near the prison have more of an opportunity to see the prison as a neighbor and as a consumer of goods and services; they are therefore in a better position to judge the SCI's economic contributions, or lack thereof, to the community.

It could also be argued that residents residing near the prison at the time of its siting represent a population that can more accurately gauge the SCI's economic contribution to the community, can compare reality with expectations at the time of siting, and, in short, separate reality from perception. As new prison facilities are sited, the importance of this finding should not be underestimated. Correctional facility administrators and community residents themselves need to be realistic in their claims or perceptions of economic benefit to host communities. In addition, these results suggest that it is important for SCI administrators to hire local residents, make local purchases, and make these practices more public so as to improve community perceptions of economic impact. The improvement of these perceptions may not only help existing prison-community relationships but could also assist state correctional leadersin promoting realistic economic expectations among community residents when siting future prisons.

8. References

Abrams, K. S. (1988). Prisons as LULUs: A sequel, part 2. *Environmental and Urban Issues, 15*, 24–27.

Abrams, K. S. (1989). Wise decisions about controversial facilities.*Environmental and Urban Issues, 16*, 19.

Abrams, K.S., & Lyons, W. (1987).*Impact of correctional facilities on land values and public safety* (National Institute of Corrections Report No.R-84-P-02). North Miami: Florida Atlantic University/Florida International University Joint Center for Environmental and Urban Problems.

Abrams, K.S., & Lyons, W. (1992).*Issues in siting correctional facilities*(Informational Brief, National Institute of Corrections, U.S. Department of Justice). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Beale, C. (1998). Rural prisons: An update. *Rural Development Perspectives, 11,* 25–27.

Carlson, K. (1992). Doing good and looking bad: A case study of prison/community relations. *Crime and Delinquency, 38,*56–68.

Center for Rural Pennsylvania.(2001, November/December). Just the facts: Prison population growth. *Newsletter.* Retrieved from http://www.ruralpa.org/news1101.html.

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Department of Corrections.(2009). *Annual statistical report, 2009.*Retrieved from http://www.cor.state.pa.us/portal/server.pt/ community/department_of_corrections/4604.

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Office of Administration.(2011). 2011 Annual workforce statistics. Retrieved from http://www.portal.state.pa.us/portal/server.pt/

Community/governor%E2%80%99s_annual_workforce_statistics/2034.

Confessore, N. (2007, February 5). Spitzer seeks panel to study prison closing. *The New York Times*.Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com.

Courtright, K. E., Hannan, M. J., Packard, S. H., & Brennan, E. T. (2006).*Prisons andrural communities: Exploring economic impact and community satisfaction* (Final Report). Harrisburg, PA: Center for Rural Pennsylvania.

Courtright, K. E., Packard, S. H., Hannan, M. J., & Brennan, E. T. (2010). Prisons and rural Pennsylvania communities: Exploring the health of the relationship and the possibility of improvement. *The Prison Journal, 90,* 69–93.

Dear, M. (1992). Understanding and overcoming the NIMBY syndrome.*Journal of the American Planning Association, 58,* 288–300.

Dickinson, C. J. (2003). Group: Rural prisons don't provide economic boost. *Business Journal –Central New York, 17,*4–6.

Donziger, S. (1996).*The real war on crime.*New York: HarperCollins.

Doyle, Z. (2002). Does crime pay? Pros and cons of rural prisons.Retrieved from http://www.nado.org/pub/july021.html.

Feijten, P., & Mulder, C.H. (2005).Life-course experience and housing quality.*Housing Studies,20*(4), 571–587.

Fischer, B. (2011, February 9). Testimony of New York State Department of Correctional Services Commissioner Brian Fischer on Governor Andrew M. Cuomo's 2011–12 executive budget before the Senate Finance and Assembly Ways and Means Committees. Retrieved from http://www.docs.state.ny.us/ Commissioner/Testimony/11Budget.html.

Glasmeier, A. K., &Farrigan, T. (2007). The economic impacts of the prison development boom on persistently poor rural places. *International Regional Science Review, 30*(3), 274–299.

Glaze, L.E. (2010).*Correctional populations in the United States.* (NCJ231681). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Halstead, J. M., Luloff, A. E., & Myers, S. D. (1993). An examination of the NIMBY syndrome: Why not in my backyard? *Journal of the Community Development Society, 24*(1), 88–102.

Hooks, G., Mosher, C., Rotolo, T., &Lobao, L. (2004). The prison industry: Carceral expansion and employment in U.S. counties, 1969–1994. *Social Sciences Quarterly, 85,* 37–57.

Imhoff, E. C. (2002). *Determining the socioeconomic impacts of prison construction on rural communities: A case study of Somerset, Pennsylvania*.(Unpublished master's thesis).Pennsylvania State University, University Park.

Kim, H.S., & Kim, E. (2004).Effects of public transit on automobile ownership and use in households of the USA.*Review of Urban & Regional Development Studies,16*(3), 245–262.

King, R. S., Mauer, M., &Huling, T. (2004).An analysis of the economics of prison siting in rural communities.*Criminology and Public Policy, 3*, 453–480.

Lee, T., & Kaufman, L. (2008, January 12). Citing drop in inmate population, Spitzer plans to close four prisons upstate. *The New York Times*.Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com.

Long, J.S. (1997). *Regression models for categorical and limited dependent variables.*Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Long, J.S., &Freese, J. (2005).*Regression models for categorical outcomes using Stata*(2nd ed.). College Station, TX: Stata Press.

Mann, B. (Producer). (2011, April 5). *Budget knife is aimed at prison system in N.Y.* [Radio broadcast].National Public Radio.Available from http://www.npr.org.

Marquart, J. (2004). Economic development is in the eye of the beholder. *Criminology and Public Policy, 3,* 489–492.

Martin, R., Champion, D., &Gibney, T. (2002). Community perceptions about prison construction: A case study. In R. L. Gido& T. Alleman (Eds.), *Turnstile justice: Issues in American corrections*(2nd ed., pp. 176–207). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Martin, R., Champion, D., Gibney, T., &Radakovic, G. (1999).*SCI Pine Grove community impact survey descriptive analyses and report: Pine Grove project annual report 1998–1999*. Submitted to the Pennsylvania Department of Corrections.

Martin, R., & Myers, D. L. (2005). Public response to prison siting: Perceptions of impact on crime and safety. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 32,* 143–171.

Maxim, P., &Plecas, D. (1983). Prisons and their perceived impact on the local community: A case study. *Social Indicators Research, 13,*39–58.

McShane, M. D., & Williams, F. P., III. (1992). Prison impact studies: Some comments on methodological rigor. *Crime & Delinquency, 38,* 105–120.

Myers, D. L., & Martin, R. (2004). Community member reactions to prison siting: Perceptions of prison impact on economic factors. *Criminal Justice Review,29,* 115–144.

Orme, J.G., & Buehler, C. (2001). Introduction to multiple regression for categorical and limited dependent variables. *Social Work Research,25*(1), 49–61.

Pew Center on the States. (2010). One in 31: The long reach of American corrections – Pennsylvania. Retrieved from http://www.pewcenteronthestates.org.

Prison inmate count highest in history. (2003, January 27). *Erie Times-News*, p. B2.

Robertson, C.T., &Ray, M.C. (1994).Public attitudes toward prison capacity expansion inMississippi.*American Journal of Criminal Justice, 19,* 99–115.

Santos, F. (2008, January 27). Plan to close prisons stirs anxiety in rural towns. *The New York Times*.Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com.

Schlosser, E. (1998, December). The prison-industrial complex.*The Atlantic Monthly, 282*, 51–77.

Shichor, D. (1992). Myths and realities in prison siting. *Crime & Delinquency, 38,* 70–87.

Smykla, J.O., Ferguson, C.E., Cheng, D.C., Trent, C., French, B., and Waters, A. (1984).Effects of a prison facility on the regional economy.*Journal of Criminal Justice, 12*, 521–539.

Swanson, C. (1993). Citizens' perceptions of prison effects on their community.*State and Local Government Review, 25*(2), 107–116.

Thomas, W.I., & Thomas, D. (1929).*The child in America*(2nd ed.). New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Turner, R., &Thayer, D. (2003, November).*Are prisons a sound economic development strategy for New York? The views of rural policy makers.* Paper presented at the meeting of the Northeast Political Science Association, Philadelphia, PA.

Virtanen, M. (2011, February 10). Cuomo orders NY prison closing recommendations. Associated Press.Retrieved from http://www.ap.org.

Wagner, J. (2011). *Fiscal and structural reform:Solutions to Pennsylvania's growing inmate population* (Special Report). Pennsylvania Office of Auditor General.Retrieved from http://www.auditorgen.state.pa.us.

Yanarella, E.J., &Blankenship, S. (2006). Big house on the rural landscape: Prison recruitment as a policy tool of local economic development. *Journal of Appalachian Studies, 12,* 110–139.

Young, M. G. (1998). Rethinking community resistance to a prison siting: Results from a community impact assessment. *Canadian Journal of Criminology, 40*(3), 323–327.

Table 1: Variable Summary

Variable	Mean	*SD*	Min	Max	*n*	Description
Albion	.175	.380	0	1	3,160	1=SCI Albion region; 0=otherwise
Cambridge	.146	.353	0	1	3,160	1=SCI Cambridge Springs region; 0=otherwise
Distance	2.65	.894	1	4	3,115	1=less than 1 mile; 2=2–3 miles; 3=4-10 miles; 4=more than 10 miles
Economic	2.48	.707	1	3	2,190	1=negative impact; 2=no impact; 3=positive impact
Education	.599	.490	0	1	3,006	1=more than high school education; 0=high school education or less
Employed	.623	.485	0	1	3,132	1=employed; 0=not employed
Gender	.622	.485	0	1	3,146	1=male; 0=female
Houtzdale	.342	.474	0	1	3,160	1=SCI Houtzdale region; 0=otherwise
Income	2.99	.900	1	4	2,924	1=less than $10,000; 2=$10,000–$24,999; 3=$25,000–$50,000; 4=more than $50,000
Job-Creation	2.13	.810	1	3	2,693	1= negative impact; 2=no impact; 3=positive impact
KnowEmploy	.712	.453	0	1	3,138	1=know 1 or more prison employees; 0=do not know prison employees
Neighbor	7.27	2.36	1	10	2,878	1=prison is very poor neighbor; 10=prison is excellent neighbor
Own	.884	.320	0	1	3,131	1=own; 0=rent
PrisonEmploy	.031	.174	0	1	3,152	1=employed by prison; 0=not employed by prison
Reside	.610	.488	0	1	2,922	1=resided in township when prison was sited; 0=otherwise
Safety	13.14	4.78	6	30	2,467	Summated safety ratings
Volunteer	.050	.218	0	1	3,145	1=prison volunteer; 0=otherwise

Table 2: Correlation Coefficients

Variables	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)
(1) Economic	1.00																
(2) Albion	-.141**	1.00															
(3)Cambridge	.134**	-.200**	1.00														
(4) Distance	.100**	-.276**	-.339**	1.00													
(5) Education	.024	-.078**	-.004	.084**	1.00												
(6) Employed	.006	-.053**	.011	.061**	.256**	1.00											
(7) Gender	.005	.025	-.044*	-.009	.012	.055**	1.00										
(8) Houtzdale	-.004	-.344**	-.313**	.139**	-.141**	-.054**	.004	1.00									
(9) Income	.047*	-.062**	-.026	.105**	.408**	.425**	.220**	-.105**	1.00								
(10) Job-Creation	.602**	-.184**	.155**	.076**	-.034	-.029	-.069**	.022	-.001	1.00							
(11) Know Employ	.110**	.017	.060**	-.165**	.012	.054**	.064**	.118**	.060**	.151**	1.00						
(12) Neighbor	.384**	-.099**	.100**	.036	-.070**	-.074**	-.022	-.025	-.045*	.377**	.071**	1.00					
(13) Own	-.019	.013	.017	.032	.032	.021	.180**	.007	.230**	-.024	.084**	-.046*	1.00				
(14) Prison Employ	.077**	.027	-.010	-.059**	-.007	.068**	.038*	.016	.081**	.094**	.104**	.051**	.021	1.00			
(15) Reside	-.071**	.184**	.148**	-.259**	-.158**	-.130**	.030	.056**	-.112**	-.031	.158**	-.001	.136**	.003	1.00		
(16) Safety	-.290**	.056**	-.193**	.056**	.025	.012	-.023	-.006	-.028	-.299**	-.092**	-.427**	.015	-.085**	-.042*	1.00	
(17) Volunteer	.013	-.037*	.079**	-.066**	.060**	.034	.036*	-.041*	.052**	.015	.023	.026	.021	.001	.021	-.055**	1.00

Note: two-tailed significance levels are indicated by double asterisks(**) to signify the .01 level and a single asterisk(*) to signify the .05 level.

Table 3: Ordered Logit Model Results

Variable	Coefficient	SE	Wald χ^2	Exp(β)
Demographic Variables				
Albion	.395	.212	3.489	1.484
Cambridge	.829	.244	11.54**	2.291
Distance	.277	.081	11.826**	1.319
Education	.152	.145	1.107	1.164
Employed	.140	.146	0.915	1.150
Gender	.337	.144	5.467*	1.400
Houtzdale	.290	.176	2.708	1.336
Income	-.035	.093	0.139	0.966
Own	-.215	.250	0.741	0.807
Test Variables				
Job-Creation	1.676	.100	281.394**	5.344
KnowEmploy	.307	.158	3.789	1.359
Neighbor	.147	.032	20.994**	1.158
PrisonEmploy	-.051	.342	0.023	0.950
Reside	-.318	.150	4.523*	0.728
Safety	-.045	.015	8.981**	0.956
Volunteer	-.250	.249	1.010	0.779
Thresholds				
Economic=1.00	2.087	.595	12.310**	
Economic=2.00	4.507	.609	54.848**	
Pseudo-R^{2}values				
Cox &Snell	.375			
Nagelkerke	.452			
McFadden	.266			

N = 1415

Note: two-tailed significance levels are indicated by double asterisks(**) to signify the .01 level and a single asterisk (*) to signify the .05 level.*SE* is the standard error.

APPENDIX

S.C.I. _____ HOUSEHOLD SURVEY

I. About You
Please answer the questions below by either writing your response on the line or checking the appropriate box.

1) What year were you born?

  _____

2) What is your gender?

☐ Male
☐ Female

3) What is your race?

☐ White
☐ Black or African American
☐ Asian
☐ American Indian or Alaska Native
☐ Native Hawaiian or Other
      Pacific Islander
☐Other

4) What is your ethnicity?

☐ Hispanic or Latino
☐ Not Hispanic or Latino

5)Including yourself, how many people are currently living in your household?
  _____

  a) How many are under age of 18?
    _____

6) How long have you lived at your present address?

☐ 0–1 years
☐ 2–5 years
☐ 6–10 years
☐ 11–20 years
☐ more than 20 years

7) Do you own or rent the property at this address?

☐ Own
☐ Rent

8) Please estimate your annual household income for 2003.

☐ less than $10,000
☐ $10,000–$24,999
☐ $25,000–$50,000
☐ over $50,000

9) Which category best describes the highest level of education that you have completed?

☐ Less than high schooldiploma
☐ High school diploma or equivalent
☐Technical or trade school
☐Some college
☐ Bachelor's degree
☐ Graduate degree

10) Are you currently employed?

☐ Yes
☐ No (go to question 11)
If yes:
      a) Is your job
☐ Permanent
☐ Temporary/seasonal

b) Do you work
☐ Part-time
☐ Full-time
11) What is your occupation?
  _____
Please continue to the next page. ⇒

II. Community Impact and Satisfaction
Please answer the questions below by either writing your response on the line or checking the appropriate box.

12) Are you or anyone in your household employed by the prison?

☐Yes
☐ No

13) Not counting yourself, do you know any people who reside in your community who are employed at the prison?

☐Yes, 1 or 2 people
☐Yes, more than 2 people
☐No

14) As accurately as you can, estimate how far you live from the State Correctional Institution at _____.

☐less than 1 mile
☐2–3 miles
☐4–10 miles
☐more than 10 miles
☐ cannot estimate, do not know where it is at all.

15) What level of security best describes this prison?

☐ Minimum security
☐ Medium security
☐ Maximum security
☐Don't know

16) On a scale of 1 to 10 (with "1" signifying a poor neighbor and "10" signifying a great neighbor), in your opinion, how good of a neighbor has the prison been in your community?

17) Based on your answer to question #16, what one factor was most important in determining your rating of the prison as a neighbor?

18) Did you reside in the township or borough when the prison first opened?

☐Yes
☐No
☐Don't know

   (a) If yes, were you in favor of the prison being built/established there?

☐Yes
☐No
☐Undecided

19) Are you involved presently, or have you ever been involved in any volunteer work at the prison?

☐Yes
☐ No

  (a) If yes, please briefly explain.

III. Community Impact and Satisfaction (cont.)

For the following statements, please mark your agreement or disagreement level by placing a mark in the corresponding box, where "1" indicates strong disagreement,"3" indicates neutrality (no positive or negative feelings),and "5" indicates strong agreement.

	Disagree		Neutral		Agree	No Opinion
	1	2	3	4	5	
Safety Factors						
20. Having the prison in my community makes me worry about *my* personal safety.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
21. Having the prison in my community makes me worry about the safety of my *family* or those residing with me.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
22. I am *not* concerned about ex-offenders or parolees	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

livinginmy community.						
23. Inmate visitors have caused problems (e.g., increased crime, increased traffic, vandalism, loitering, etc.) in my community.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
24. Crime is a problem in my community as a result of the prison.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
25. I am worried about an inmate escaping from the prison.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Public Service Factors						
26. As a result of the prison being here, current fire and emergency response (e.g., ambulance and paramedic services) should be increased.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
27. Current police services should be increased as a result of the prison being here.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
28. The prison has strained the water and sewer systems in my community.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Please continue to the next page. ⇒

	Disagree	Neutral		Agree		No Opinion
	1	2	3	4	5	
29. Local media coverage has portrayed the prison in a positive way.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

For the following questions, please mark whether the prison has had a positive or negative impact on your community, where 1 indicates a very negative impact; 3 indicates no impact; 5 indicates a very positive impact; D/K indicates that you do not know the answer or have no opinion about the question.

	Negative	No Impact		Positive		D/K
	1	2	3	4	5	
Economic Factors						
30. What has been the impact of the prison on local residential property values?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
31. What has been the impact of the prison in terms of creating jobs for community residents?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
32. What has been the impact of the prison as a consumer of local goods and services?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
33. What has been the impact of the prison on local tax rates (e.g., income, school, property, etc.)?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
34. What has been the impact of the prison on the local economy overall?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐