

COMMUNITY WORK CENTERS (CWC): OKLAHOMA'S EXPERIMENT IN PUBLIC WORKS¹

L. M. Hynson, Jr., Oklahoma State University

Abstract

As an alternative to incarceration, Oklahoma Community Work Centers (CWCs) from their beginning have been a cooperative venture in which legislators and local communities and their leaders play a significant role. Based on interviews with Department of Corrections professionals, the researcher found that higher level of professional commitment and innovative structures kept the costs down. CWCs cost less to operate because the host DOC facilities provide many administrative services that are not then duplicated at the community level. Thus organizational clusters require fewer professionals to operate them. CWCs do alleviate overcrowding in prisons and jails and provide jobs within Oklahoma communities. These facilities showed cost savings, benefited the communities economically, and provided an overall economic benefit to Oklahoma. In an era of increased accountability, scarcity of resources, and prison overcrowding, state legislators and the public welcome cost savings. Thus CWCs allowed for a win-win situation where all the players win—professionals, communities, inmates, and the public. From a regional and national perspective, the researcher found a cross-fertilization of new ideas that has implications for others. Oklahoma now has enough working CWCs to attract national attention. CWC staff often get requests from other states, as well as Oklahoma communities, inquiring about CWC programs asking about how well they work, how much they cost, how they operate. As this study shows: CWCs are not only effective programs, they are also cost effective. What we find is that *Community Work Centers (CWCs) are indeed Oklahoma's experiment in public works.*

The community work center concept first emerged as taxpayers became frustrated with the failure of prisons to rehabilitate inmates. The ground swell grew more urgent; however, when 15 years ago Oklahoma faced a growing population of long-term convicts and an imbalance of facilities. Those most directly affected—judges and correctional officers—fully endorsed community corrections because it gave them more alternatives. Through these alternatives “hard beds” in the state’s main prisons were kept available for violent and career criminals. Both Oklahoma Advisory Commission (1973) and the National Advisory Commission (1973) on Criminal Justice Standards advocated three criteria of implementation: community-based (humanitarian), work-related (restorative), and shared-costs (inexpensive) arrangements.

The first criterion addressed the public’s frustration (U.S. National Advisory Commission, 1973) over prisons’ “inhumane” treatment of inmates. Could those serving time stay better connected to their com-

munities and families? That issue was partly solved by moving low-risks inmates into community-based facilities. As for the second criterion, it was also addressed. Since work-related projects promote public health and/or welfare, inmates reintegrate not only into former communities but also gain community acceptance. One example occurred ten years ago after a severe Oklahoma storm. After that storm a private Oklahoma chicken farm was a public health hazard (dead chickens). Oklahoma inmates disposed of them and won public support for their deeds. Whether community work is private or public does not matter. The assumption is that through their work inmates give something tangible back to Oklahoma communities.

Finally, the Oklahoma model required shared-costs of incarceration. During the sixties and seventies penologists suggested that inmates in community corrections live in already existing facilities. This practice would save not only construction costs but also on program demands. Most Okla-

homa communities share costs of CWC start-up (an old building or money) as incentives. Because Altus paid \$120,000 for a renovated building, the Oklahoma Department of Corrections (DOC) located a facility in there. The start-up price for community work centers is approximately \$200,000, which includes food, clothing, vehicles, furniture, facility renovation, and kitchen equipment. The community that deposits \$20,000 is able not only to house 100 inmates but also to get top listing on DOC's priority list. With a backlog of interested communities, only those who have the money will likely have their own CWC.

The purpose of the research was to conduct an historical and qualitative analyses of professionals most directly involved. After notification of project funding the researcher selected the Western Oklahoma Region as the most representative place for the study. At the time of this study only one public and one private CWC existed outside this geographical region. Initially, he set up interviews with Administrative Officers, Correctional Officers, Wardens, Regional Administrators, former Administrative Officers, and others (PIO officer, Administrative Assistants, Researcher). Interview sites included Weatherford, headquarters for the Western half of Oklahoma Department of Corrections, and the Oklahoma City metropolitan area. Additionally, the researcher collected and evaluated articles and other documents in order to examine community program effectiveness and efficiency.

HISTORY OF COMMUNITY WORK CENTERS

The basic concept of community work centers began at Lake Murray in January 1989. The first renovation project on the State Park extended into a second project (February through April). By September Waurika established the first CWC prototype. Inmate work crews at Lake Murray State Park continued working through May 1990. They worked at the State Park until the second site, the Ardmore Industrial Airport, established the second CWC prototype.

From its beginnings the CWC concept has been a cooperative venture in which

legislators and local communities played a significant role. Early in CWC developments, legislators became involved by legislating where inmates could work. In 1989 legislators authorized CWC crews to work on projects not previously addressed by amending Title 57 authorizing the establishment of community work centers, as money became available (Oklahoma DOC, 1989).

What still remained, however, was an implementation procedure for the next community applicant, Waurika. Neither this legislation nor government-lease procedures provided specific guidelines about cooperative arrangements. Although Waurika wanted to start a private prison, they did not have money for renovation. This dilemma forced DOC administrators to consider alternatives. Thus they wanted to purchase materials for renovation or lease the structure for the amount needed. At that particular time, however, the Standard Government Lease contract made no such provisions. When, however, the Attorney General ruled that a one-year DOC lease could substitute for renovation costs, the implement stage of this and other CWCs began.

Although the basic concept began at Lake Murray and Ardmore, the prototype that later followed began at Waurika, a 45,000-foot structure that would house 75-80 inmates. By housing the inmates in a room just behind City Hall and having a reasonably free work force, citizens of Waurika received the equivalent of a half million-dollar grant each year in labor costs. The inmates have worked with the Oklahoma Department of Transportation, various county commissioners, and other regional city government officials. They were able to extend their 25 full time employees to include those 80 inmates housed at the CWC. Such an arrangement gave the community a return on their investment.

From the beginning local community leaders asked DOC professionals to house inmates in their facilities so they could employ inmates in public works projects. The process of extending the CWC Model to other communities had begun. In the

years following DOC staff never engaged a community unless that particular community asked them to come. Many city leaders (city managers, mayors, commissioners, and sheriffs) were quite enthusiastic because legislators promoted the CWC model.

The CWC legislation allowed inmates to work in communities where they had never lived. On the one hand public projects sounded great; on the other hand, people worries. Free laborers and community improvements versus risky business and security issues. Communities became polarized over these issues. Not surprisingly, many community town hall meetings lasted several hours. Some communities endorsed the CWC Model; others did not. In communities with strong constituency-based correctional philosophy, leaders took these initiatives. Upon request DOC staff visited privately with key community leaders. Depending upon the interests, these community leaders established a town hall meeting. Only later did DOC staff attend these meetings to answer questions.

These creative interactions between professional officers and local citizens produced an unintended consequence. Popular images of DOC changed from negative to positive. Perceptions of corrections changed from those perceptions of the sixties and seventies. During these years people ranked corrections and prison sites as undesirable much lower than hazardous waste sites or landfills or sewage systems. So too in Oklahoma citizens thought of DOC professional as having "cool hands" and potbellies. They knocked unruly inmates over the head with clubs. They were overweight and fat. According to correctional officers these perceptions changed. As local citizens became aware of Public Works Crews who worked for county commissioners or sheriffs, they supported these and their own projects. As one correctional officer stated: "Before we had miles of guard rails and few workers. We not only supplemented our crews with CWC inmates; we also changed public perception of correctional officers as well." From the original three sites in 1989

the number of communities participating has grown six times as shown in the section below.

LOCATIONS IN OKLAHOMA

Although one facility is in Oklahoma City (private), the Oklahoma DOC has placed most of the public facilities in the least populated areas of the states (primarily the southwestern and western areas of the state). Currently 15 CWCs exist in Oklahoma: Two CWCs—1. Carver (66 inmates located in Oklahoma City), 2. Idabell (80 inmates)—are located in the Central and Southeastern Regions. The other 13 CWCs are located in the Western Region. 3. Healdton (37 inmates), 4. Ardmore (86), 5. Madill (45 inmates, Host at Lexington CCC), 6. Walters (67 inmates), 7. Waurika (77), Lawton CCC, Host Facility), 8. Frederick (30), 9. Altus (93), 10. Hollis (40), 11. Mangum (50), 12. Hobart (49), 13. Sayre (55), 14. El City (17), (Host Oklahoma State Reformatory), and the newest is 15. Beaver CWC (19 inmates, Host, William Key Minimum Security at Fort Supply, Oklahoma)

Most of the CWCs listed above are located in small towns with limited resources. These communities see this Model as providing some type of economic transfusion by providing jobs, increasing the resident base, funneling wages into the local economy, and providing service projects that otherwise would cost the community money. The support of these and surrounding communities has been positive. These community experiments captured the attention of legislators and community leaders.

UNIQUE APPROACH TO COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS

What is unique about Community Work Centers? Based on the researcher's investigation and interviews, these are the nine categories of collective responses. 1) Many communities view CWCs as types of economic development, especially true in the small town and isolated counties where economic disparity works the greatest. 2) CWCs are an entirely new venture with Oklahoma communities. Oklahoma

Department of Corrections (ODOC) can personalize corrections in a favorable light. 3) CWCs represent a trend line pattern of moving from institutions. Now inmates are living in the community. 4) CWCs are cooperative ventures in which the communities own the buildings and control the work assignments. 5) CWCs mean good DOC public relations. The department has gone from being the "bad" people to being the "good" people who have a worthwhile service to offer. 6) This approach means that, for the first time, taxpayers get some return on their investments. It is also a tax benefit for those communities that get involved and form partnerships. 7) Where else but with CWCs do communities get a tangible service where needed. DOC has had work crews, but this is different. Work crews from a facility work where the community directs. This is different from road crews where inmates pick up beer cans and trash. 8) CWCs cause community leaders to look at inmates as a resource. And that fact, in turn, puts inmates back into the system. Now decisions are evaluated based on how beneficial inmates are to communities. 9) CWCs create healthy dialogue between DOC and community leaders. DOC has a chance to talk about inmate families, their kids and wives. Once personalized, inmates get jobs at the police station, a mayor's office, and city hall. And it is hoped that they find employment once they return to their communities, like the one who afforded them dignity.

Community involves social interaction of people living within a geographical region. Those citizens hope that business and industrial groups occupy their community and provide jobs, which, in turn produce strong community organizations and health and welfare councils with strong social work emphasis. Needless to say community development projects could include prisons especially in regions suffering economic depression. Those who advocate this approach believe that new correctional institutions can revive economically failing communities. Thus prisons have become an alternative to more traditional means of economic de-

velopment. Prisons do offer plentiful of long-lasting jobs because once located correctional facilities are not likely to move. Thus they are stable source of employment.

Not everyone in the community, however, sees prisons as a community development Mecca.

Several issues emerge. These include but are not limited to issues surrounding property values, crime rates, limited public resources, and public safety issues, especially because some of the old images of prison workers as marginal. Neither these newcomers nor inmate family members are wanted in these isolated rural communities. Community opponents believe those inmates' spouses, girlfriends, boyfriends, and children too often become involved in criminal activities themselves.

Pragmatically speaking, professionals saw CWCs as cost effective housing alternatives to overcrowded prisons. The CWCs allow inmates to work and reduce inmate idleness in the system. In turn, work centers enhance understanding and support of corrections in their community. They also allow for the completion of many worthwhile projects that benefit the local community and state. According to interviews such meaningful work give inmates a sense of pride and improved self-esteem, and dignity that they never achieve in warehouse operations making leather belts. In communities an inmate carpenter works with his tools on public facilities. They often work side-by-side with local carpenters who supervise them. It's a more normal, community life atmosphere where rehabilitation is more likely to occur. Finally, CWCs impact both the community and state economies.

Based on community studies, the economic impact of the CWC on Altus totaled \$1.5 million. It is estimated that for every 100/inmates the economic impact totals one million dollars. As a precaution, working inmates never replace city workers. Rather, they work along side them and increase their capacity for work. The relations are straightforward: the more inmates involved, the more work gets accomplished. Each community has a garri-

son of inmates who can be mobilized to remodel the old city hall at a fraction of the labor costs than would otherwise be the case.

COMPARATIVE COSTS

According to seven interviewed state legislators and 17 DOC staff, the driving force behind the CWCs comes from their lower costs. On several scales the CWCs costs less than is the case for other institutional operations. The evidence for that claim comes from evaluating the comparative costs per year. The average annual cost for housing inmates at CWCs in comparison with other incarceration costs is lower. CWCs cost \$11,000 per inmate compared with \$12,032 for Community Corrections Centers (e.g., Kate Barnard CCC, Oklahoma City CCC and Lawton CCC), with \$12,032, Minimum Institutions (e.g., William S. Key, Jess Dunn, Eddie Warriors), with \$12,829, Medium Institutions (e.g., Mabel Bassett, O.S.R., Lexington A & R) \$12,784, Maximum Institution \$20,361 (Department of Corrections, Research Division, 1996).

Just as the average annual inmate costs for each type of incarceration vary, so do the average per diem costs. The average CWC per diem costs amount to \$30.14 per day. That same figure for the Community Corrections comes to \$32.96 per day. For Minimum Institutions, the average inmate per Diem costs equal \$35.15 per day. For Medium Institutions, the figure equals \$35.03 per day. And finally, for the Maximum Institution the per diem figures equal \$55.78 per inmate per day. Each of these figures comes from the actual costs divided by the average inmate count per year (Department of Corrections, Research Division, 1996).

Based on conducted interviews, the researcher found five advantages to these CWCs. First, as is evident from above, CWCs cost the taxpayers less money whether calculated on an annual total cost basis or on a per diem basis. Second, the community receives something in return. They receive free labor for community and county projects, ones controlled by the local community. Third, a cross sectional

representation of community organizations requests inmate services. Based on DOC staff interviews, requests have come from local politicians, State representatives and senators, the parole board for DOC, service organizations (Rotary, Lions, Salvation Army), Oklahoma Historical Society, church groups, Chambers of Commerce, museums, public and county schools, and others. Inmates have taken on special projects: Special Olympics, Run Against Child Abuse, and other similar organizationally or community based projects. Fourth, CWCs can alleviate overcrowding. It is an alternative to total confinement, especially for those low risk inmates. Fifth, and finally, it can be argued that CWCs provide more jobs within the communities. As inmates work along side the community leaders and workers, they have, in working with community residents, better role models and guidance than would otherwise be the case in the prison system.

In summary, then, while the costs compared to other community-based or institutional-based facilities are cheaper, the benefits seemingly are greater. Yet the American Civil Liberties Union and their attorneys argue that by not paying the inmates for the work done dehumanizes them. It is true that this cost could be a repayment for the damage to society, not for their work. However, if CWCs can be viewed as an attempt to reintegrate inmates back into the community, it might make sense to pay them some salary, perhaps minimum wage. As communities make decisions about using inmates as resources, will they forget inmates' needs? They need employment at a minimum wages. A Southwest Iowa trailer-manufacturing firm recently hired 160 inmates. They opened a factory near Clarinda State Prison where inmates are paid an average starting wage of \$9.50 per hour. That money then can help pay for taxes, victim restitution, child care/support, and personal items (Harry, 2000).

EXPRESSED CONCERNS

During interviews with DOC professionals, several classifications of concerns

came up. These fell into two categories: 1. Facility concerns 2. Community concerns. The first item concerned where these communities are located and how far it is to staff meetings and training functions. Since professional officers and staff are required to attend staff meetings with counter parts and supervisors in Oklahoma City, they must travel long distance. Moreover, even between communities the distances are often several hundred miles. Staff members wondered why something could not be done about the frequency of these required meetings and training events.

Another facility concern dealt with personnel. Just about everyone agreed that working at one of the CWC sites required a certain type of professional. When asked about job requirements, interviewees gave the following rankings for Administrative Officer: Public Relations (75 percent) to include presentation of self, people skills, public speaking, expressing opinions), Administrative Rapport with the staff and Operational Concerns—Security, Food Supervision and Case Management (25 percent).

The facilities did not contain secure quarters for troubled inmates. Ideally, these sites should not house high-risk inmates those who had a troubled past. Practically speaking, though, questionable inmates came through these facilities. When that happened, neither the facilities nor those responsible could cope with them. Not having confined quarters created community problems. Since CWCs profiles of inmates have high visibility, violations affect community residential security. As a result of having inadequate quarters, staff wanted Restricted Housing Units (RHU) on CWC site. Were there areas of confinement for escapees, drunkard, and those not willing to work the facilities would work better.

Then there were community concerns. Community relations have a high priority and profile with the staff at CWCs. They work directly with the public, answer to an Advisory Committee, and form cluster groups around certain geographic regions. CWC professionals need to train commu-

nity leaders as they take responsibility for inmate workers. They certainly need good public relations and people skills.

They should be tactful, articulate, and confident. They present a "new face" to citizens of Oklahoma. At the same time they are on their own, isolated somewhat from the main facilities of DOC. Their territory is new; their clusters are remote satellites from major facility operations.

SIX RECOMMENDATIONS

It was only after extensive interviews with 57 DOC staff (those at CWC sites) and examining 113 documents (articles, reports, and DOC documents), that the researcher formulated the seven recommendations listed below:

1. When possible, reduce travel time. Since the CWCs are isolated satellites often located in remote geographic areas, meetings should both be limited to significant issues or located at half way sites. Perhaps remote phones would be a worthy investment for these roaming CWC professionals. It takes time and energy to drive to regional or state meetings that often have agendas not relevant to them.

2. Hire professionals who can promote CWCs. Just about everyone agreed that working at a CWC site demands unique skills. When asked about job requirements, DOC interviewees gave the following rankings for Administrative Officers job requirements: Skills in Public Relations (75 percent) to include presentation of self, people skills, public speaking, expressing opinions), Skills in Administrative Rapport with the staff and Operational Concerns—Security, Food Supervision and Case Management (25 percent). Since few women serve as correctional officers, staff wanted to have more women employees. Perhaps, according to those interviewed, they relate better with local citizens many of who are women.

3. Develop a philosophy of community security. For some, the ability to override classification systems has created serious security problems. Why put troubled, high-risk inmates in these facilities, especially when there is no segregated housing. It could be argued that the real issue

might be overcrowded facilities. Overcrowding leads to early release of many first-time offenders and those with less than two years to serve. These were classifications of inmates that CWCs typically received. Things have changed in just a few years. Some DOC staff believe that security develops from relationship and trust officers have with inmates and community. They believe correctional officers should not carry weapons, wear no uniform, and worry about rulebooks and more about interpersonal relations and communications.

4. Train community volunteers and supervisors to assume more responsibility. Since community relations has such a high priority and profile, training skills of DOC professionals are crucial for these professionals work directly with the public, answer to Advisory Committees, and form geographic clusters. These clusters of CWCs could be the forces for more constructive community dialogue about crime and the prevention of crime, about inmate's families—their kids and wives, about how the community could empower inmate families so that they succeed in spite of the odds against them.

5. Train the trainers. Train CWC administrative and correctional officers in the refinement of communication skills, of interpersonal skills, and of the art of being tactful, articulate, and confident. Then they will be more able to present a "new face" to community residents. This is especially important since these professionals are on their own, isolated somewhat from the main facilities of DOC. Training of these key DOC staff should be given a high profile and priority in the DOC training budget. As several Correctional Officers said, "Dealing with both the community and inmates is more difficult at CWCs than it is at other more secure DOC facilities. Consequently, it seems imperative to give more time to training these CWC staff in the use of community development skills.

6. Finally, Oklahoma legislators and DOC staff could implement more CWC arrangements. Oklahoma's resources are limited. CWCs cost less to operate. They

reduce overhead and related service costs. They require fewer professionals to operate them. And finally, many Oklahoma communities now view inmates as resources.

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

The community work centers began in 1989 with a renovation project at Lake Murray State Park. Former DOC Director Gary D. Maynard advocated establishing work center in each of Oklahoma's 77 counties. Whether that happens, implementation for such facilities has already begun. Since the majority of the communities with work centers are located in the Western half of Oklahoma, this regional was the focus of study. Based on qualitative and historical research findings, the researcher found that CWCs offer not only a unique approach of community involvement but also a cheaper way of housing inmates. Yet here as elsewhere it is necessary to balance community projects against security issues and inmate control.

From a practical perspective, this alternative approach to incarceration allows for a win-win situation in a professional field that offers few of these opportunities. All players win—DOC professionals, participating communities, and inmates. As this method of inmate incarceration evolves, the researcher expects a cross-fertilization of new ideas leading to other innovations. Perhaps communities will, in time, take on greater responsibility for criminals as they find more humane ways of extracting retribution for crimes, while, at the same time, they find ways to rehabilitate and re-integrate inmates back into their own communities once released from these Oklahoma CWCs.

Oklahoma has established CWCs. The staff often gets requests from other states inquiring about how the CWC Model works, and about what the program evaluations suggest. In an era of increased accountability, scarcity of resources, and prison overcrowding, the CWC Model should get wide publicity. State legislators and the public welcome prisons cost savers. The topic of CWCs is certainly both timely and worthy of continued fund-

ing. No other state has any correctional approach similar to the Oklahoma CWC Model; it is truly unique and innovative.

From their beginnings CWCs have been a cooperative venture in which legislators and local communities and their leaders play a significant role. Many communities (city managers, mayors, commissioners, and sheriffs) have been quite enthusiastic about the CWC model because legislators such as Senator Roberts (Ardmore) promoted CWCs. By amending Oklahoma Title 57 legislators authorized the establishment of Community Work Centers that allowed inmates to work in communities. This had never been done before. Even more encouraging, communities shared the up front costs with the Oklahoma Department of Corrections.

Based on interviews with DOC professionals, the researcher found that higher level of professional commitment and innovative structures kept the costs down. CWCs cost less to operate because the host DOC facilities provide many administrative services that are not then duplicated at the community level. Thus organizational clusters require fewer professionals to operate them.

CWCs do alleviate overcrowding in prisons and jails and provide jobs within Oklahoma communities. It is believed, however, that inmates who work beside community leaders have better role models than would otherwise be the case in the state's prison system. These community role models raise the level of decision making and skill development for community offenders. It is believed that as communities assume greater responsibility for offenders they will practice more humane ways of extracting retribution for crimes and rehabilitating inmates back into communities once released from CWCs. These facilities showed cost savings, benefited the communities economically, and provided an overall economic benefit to Oklahoma. In an era of increased accountability, scarcity of resources, and prison overcrowding, state legislators and the public welcome cost savings. Thus CWCs allowed for a win-win situation where all the players win—professionals,

communities, inmates, and the public.

In summary, then, the researcher concludes that CWCs have legislators' support, community commitment, cost sharing, professional commitment, and organizational resourcefulness. They provide both community benefits and state economic benefits. From a regional and national perspective, the researcher found a cross-fertilization of new ideas that has implications for others. Oklahoma now has enough working CWCs to attract national attention. CWC staff often get requests from other states, as well as Oklahoma communities, inquiring about CWC programs asking about how well they work, how much they cost, how they operate. As this study shows: CWCs are not only effective programs, they are also cost effective. What we find is that *Community Work Centers (CWCs) are indeed Oklahoma's experiment in public works.*

END NOTE

¹ This project required the cooperation of key Oklahoma Department of Corrections' staff, including Western Regional Director—Gary Parsons and his Deputy Director, Justin Jones. Jones arranged meetings. Others included these units: Research Division, PIO, Accounting, The Oklahoma Criminal Justice Consortium, and Host Facility Wardens.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS AND DISCLAIMER

This research was conducted under a grant from the Criminal Justice Consortium and Oklahoma State Legislators. This three-year study (1993-96) awarded to Oklahoma State University (Department of Sociology) provided funding for a policy assessment of Oklahoma's Community Work Centers (CWCs). The findings reflect neither the opinions of the Oklahoma Department of Corrections nor those of the Oklahoma State Legislators. Although some departmental procedural adjustments followed the initial report, this article highlights the findings of only a portion of that total research project alone.

REFERENCES

Abrams, K. and W. Lyons. 1987. Impact

- of correctional facilities on land values and public safety.
- Miami. Fla: Florida Atlantic U. Ctr. Env. and Urban Problems.
- Carlson, K. 1992. Doing good and looking bad: A case study of prison community relations. *Crime and Delinquency*, 38 1 56-69.
- Clark, O. 1991. Salem and state prisons: A case for community relations. *Humboldt J. Social Relations*, 17 1 197-210.
- Daniel, W. 1991. Prisons and crime rates in rural areas: The case of Lassen County. *Humboldt J. Social Relations*, 17 1 129-170.
- Farrington, K. and R. P. Parcells. 1991. Correctional facilities and community crime rates: Alternative hypotheses and competing explanations. *Humboldt J. Social Relations*, 17 1 171-28.
- Fitchen, J. 1991. Endangered species, enduring places: Change, identity and survival in rural America. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press.
- Harry, Jennifer. 2000. Iowa firm to hire 160 inmates. *Corrections Today* 62 5 12.
- Oklahoma Dept. of Corrections. Planning and Research Division. 1973. Evaluation of the Division of Planning and Research. Oklahoma City : Oklahoma Dept. of Corrections.
- Oklahoma Dept. of Corrections. Planning and Research Division. 1996. Evaluation of the Division of Planning and Research. Oklahoma City : Oklahoma Dept. of Corrections.
- Oklahoma Dept. of Corrections prisoner public works program. 1989. Oklahoma City, Okla.: Oklahoma Dept. of Corrections.
- Sechrest, D. K. 1991. Understanding the corrections and community response to prison siting. *Humboldt J. Social Relations*, 17 1 1-16.
- Sechrest, D. K. 1992. Locating prisons: Open versus closed approaches to siting. *Crime and Delinquency*, 38 1 88-104.
- Shichor, D. 1992. Myths and realities in prison siting. *Crime and Delinquency*, 38 1 70-87.
- Smykla, J. et al 1984. Effects of a prison facility on economy. *J. Criminal Justice*, 12 6 521-540.
- Thies, J. M. 2000. Prisons and communities: Debunking myths and building community relations. *Corrections Today*, 62 2 136-139.
- United States National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals. 1973. Criminal justice system. Washington, D.C. U.S. Govt. Print. Office.