



***Eastern State Penitentiary Historic Site
Visitor Evaluation Study
Final Report***



Prepared by:

Jill K. Stein
Jes A. Koepfler

Institute for Learning Innovation
Edgewater, MD

July 2008

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Eastern State Penitentiary Historic Site Visitor Evaluation Study Final Report

Prepared by:
Jill K. Stein
Jes A. Koepfler

In July 2007, Eastern State Penitentiary Historic Site (Eastern State) located in Philadelphia, PA, requested proposals for a comprehensive visitor study that would help inform a master and interpretive planning process for the site, which originally opened to the public in 1994. As part of these planning efforts, Eastern State seeks to better understand their audiences and the nature of the visitor experience at the site—including their motivations and expectations for visiting Eastern State, how they utilize the site and its offerings, and what they take away from the visit.

The Institute for Learning Innovation (ILI), a learning research and evaluation organization located in Edgewater, MD, was contracted to conduct the visitor evaluation study in support of these objectives. The study took place during two time periods—Fall 2007 and late Spring 2008—in order to obtain a more representative sample across the seasons. The goal of the study was to provide comprehensive information on the motivations, interests, visitor experience, and learning outcomes of four key audiences identified by Eastern State: 1) walk-in visitors (adult only); 2) walk-in visitors (groups with children); 3) prearranged adult tour groups; and 4) school groups. Specifically, the report focuses on the following evaluative questions:

Who are the visitors to Eastern State and why do they come? (e.g., entry conditions such as demographics, motivations for their visit, expectations, and prior knowledge and interest)

What is the nature of visitors' experiences at the site? (e.g., how do they move through the space and what programs/tours do they utilize? To what extent are they engaged in different programs, areas, components, and/or exhibits? How satisfied are they with the experience and what would make it a better experience for them?)

What do visitors take away from their experiences at Eastern State? (e.g., cognitive and affective outcomes, shifts in attitudes/awareness/knowledge, increased interest in a topic)

Walk-in visitors experience at Eastern State

Overall, data suggested that both adult and family groups have an extremely positive experience at Eastern State. They spend a great deal of time at the site, are highly engaged in its offerings, talk with each other about what they see and do, and walk away with a sense of having learned something new about the penitentiary, American history, and social/criminal justice issues specifically. Following are key themes that emerged from general, walk-in visitors:

Orientation and wayfinding – Walk-in visitors feel that they can navigate the site easily and find what they are looking for, although observational data suggests that visitors do get lost and disoriented at times, often needing to consult their map or ask for directions. General visitors were particularly positive about the audio tour experience, which they felt allowed them some amount of flexibility and control over their visit. While some visitors felt the narrative was too long, most appreciated the useful information, interpretation, and archival audio clips included on the tour.

Authentic, “real” experience – Visitors greatly appreciated the opportunity to walk through a “real” penitentiary, as they felt this gave them a sense of what it would have been like to live at Eastern State. They repeatedly emphasized the value of being in an authentic, “real” space, in contrast to seeing a movie, reading books, or even going to a museum. In fact, the museum exhibit at Eastern State may be less visited, in part, than other areas of the site because visitors may not view it as an “authentic” part of the penitentiary.

Unique, different experience - Visitors feel that Eastern State offers a unique experience they cannot have elsewhere. They often suggested that the site offers a perspective on American History not available at Philadelphia’s many other historic sites, and they value this unique and different view of a city well-known for its early American History and plethora of historic sites. While some visitors were interested in the “haunted” and “ghostly” aspects of Eastern State (predominantly in the Fall season), visitors saw the site as having unique value that extends far beyond the paranormal.

Personal stories and daily life – Visitors were especially drawn to personal stories of inmates, wardens, and others associated with the site. They appreciated specific stories, such as those about escape attempts, Al Capone’s time at Eastern State, and what life was like for inmates over time – from solitary confinement to the era of socialization, in which sports, crafts, and other activities were instated.

Educational value – For the most part, walk-in visitors see Eastern State as an educational experience, in addition to being “fun” and “cool.” Both adult and family visitors consistently rated their learning outcomes very high, conveying a sense that they walked away with new knowledge and understanding about the site itself, and social/criminal justice history more broadly. While some focused on new historical facts they learned (such as the origin of the term “penitentiary”), others reflected on how and why the philosophy of Eastern State changed over time, and how historical issues of treating inmates connects to similar issues today.

Interpretive approaches – Visitors appreciated the audio tour, for the most part, and felt this was a useful and engaging way to learn about the site. Observational data also indicated that visitors make great use of the main audio tour, and that the tour may even encourage higher engagement and social interaction. On the other hand, some visitors felt they wanted more diverse ways of interacting with the site, either through more immersive experiences (e.g. walking into cells), hands-on and interactive exhibits (e.g. more video and audio, and the ability to see or touch objects), or archival/historic materials.

Access to the site – Visitors simply wanted more of what they had experienced. Many talked about wanting more access to closed areas of the site, such as the hospital, kitchens, and guard towers; as well as a wider variety and more frequent guided tours. Further, some visitors wanted to see more of the site in a renovated state, noting that this would give them a better sense of what the site really looked and felt like. However, other visitors strongly appreciated the atmosphere of the “stabilized” ruin and did not want that to change.

Suggestions for improvement – Walk-in visitors offered a few key suggestions for improving the experience at Eastern State: 1) more diverse forms of interpretation, including hands-on, interactive, and immersive components; 2) even more focus on personal stories and aspects of everyday life; 3) more orientation to the content of the site, such as through an introductory video; 4) access to more areas of the site; 5) more refurbished cells, cell blocks, or other areas; and 6) some additional creature comforts, including bathrooms, heat and air-conditioning, and more places to sit down and rest throughout the site.

Prearranged adult tour groups

Data indicated that participants in prearranged adult tour groups were highly satisfied with their experience. They valued the knowledge and enthusiasm of the tour guide, felt that they had a unique experience, and learned a great deal about Eastern State, its development, philosophy, history, and architecture. They enjoyed visiting the site as a group, spending valuable time with each other in an educational setting, and sharing a unique experience. Following are key findings from this portion of the study:

Logistics and orientation – Group tour participants felt the tours were easy to arrange, well-organized, and overall easy to access. They felt details were taken care of without their having to do a lot of work, and appreciated the professionalism of both the administrative and educational staff. However, some wanted to have more of an orientation to the site upon arriving, perhaps through an introductory video, which they felt would better prepare them for absorbing the information conveyed on the tour.

Authentic and unique experience – Similar to walk-in visitors, group tour participants appreciated the authentic nature of the site (particularly because many of them were history buffs), the unique nature of being able to see a historic penitentiary, and the impressiveness of the architecture. Many groups came because they perceived this to be a unique site that they could not experience elsewhere, and were not disappointed.

Educational value – Group tour participants felt this was a rich opportunity to learn about a unique site and its impact on social and prison history in the US and beyond. In general, participants felt they learned a great deal about the site and its broader social and historical context, as well as interesting facts and ideas they had not thought about before. They particularly enjoyed learning about specific individuals, and what life was like for inmates and wardens.

Interpretive approaches – Also similar to general visitors, group tour participants wanted to engage in more diverse ways with the site. While they appreciated the knowledge of the docent, they suggested more hands-on, interactive, and participatory modes of learning, rather than what they saw to be a largely lecture-style tour. They wanted to walk into cells, see and touch objects, and have more discussions along the way. In particular, many wanted to spend some time exploring the site on their own rather than spending the whole time with a guide. (It is possible, however, that this was limited due to the focus group session scheduled for just after the tour).

Suggestions for improvement – Tour group participants offered several key suggestions for improving the experience: 1) more orientation to the site up front, such as through a brief film or video; 2) access to more areas of the site, such as what some received on a “behind the scenes” tour; 3) more diverse ways of engaging with the site, whether through audio, video, archival documents, or objects – in short, as one participant put it,

“bringing the place to life”; 4) more personal stories of individuals, inmates, wardens, or groups of people such as women; 5) an opportunity to explore the site on their own; and 6) more opportunities to stop and discuss issues, such as a post-tour reflection or Q & A; and 7) more attention to creature comforts, such as toilets and benches, particularly as many of the participants interviewed were senior citizens.

School tour groups

Data from this study suggested that school tour groups from all levels (elementary, middle school, high school, and college/university) have enjoyable, meaningful, and educational experiences at Eastern State. From the teachers’ perspectives, students are able to make connections between the visit and classroom learning, experience a unique historic site, and reflect upon criminal justice issues to some degree. The visit to Eastern State also provides some students with a better sense of their community (for those coming from the city and surrounding areas) and a side of Philadelphia and American history that they are not likely to see elsewhere. Key findings are as follows:

Support classroom teaching – Many teachers valued the Eastern State visit because they felt it helped support ideas they were trying to convey in the classroom. Ranging from English, history, social studies, art, sociology, psychology, and criminal justice, these teachers appreciated the opportunity to bring their students to a historic site that brought to life ideas they had only talked about. Several noted that textbooks and films could never replace the experience of actually being at Eastern State. Some felt that their classroom teaching could be even better supported if Eastern State provided pre/post activities, reading lists, and other ways of extending the experience beyond the field trip itself.

Unique, different experience – As with the other audiences, teachers valued the unique opportunity that a trip to Eastern State affords. Some teachers simply wanted their students to get out of the classroom, or a certain neighborhood, and experience something interesting and unique in their own backyards. Others emphasized that Eastern State provides an experience – whether through the architecture, history, or content – different from other historical sites in the area.

Educational value – Across the board, teachers felt their students learned something new from the visit to Eastern State. They articulated learning outcomes to include: simply that the place existed, the fact that it was the first penitentiary and had great influence throughout the world, the different approaches to dealing with criminal issues, how philosophies have changed over time, the relationship between the architecture and the purpose/philosophy of the institution, and questions about reform vs. punishment (largely for college/university students).

Interpretive approaches – Similar to other audiences, teachers felt that there should be a broader diversity of interpretive approaches in order to keep students engaged – particularly for elementary, middle, and high school students. These teachers felt that students would get more out of the experience if they could see and do more, participate in “immersive” experiences, engage in more discussion, or even do a scavenger hunt of some kind to keep them attentive and engaged. They felt that the largely lecture-style mode was not as engaging, even though they felt students still learned a great deal from the tour.

Personal stories and daily life – Teachers generally felt students most enjoyed stories of specific individuals, including Al Capone and Willie Sutton, and “unusual” or “surprising” stories like Pep the Dog and

the child who was born at Eastern State. They also enjoyed stories of escape attempts and other personal anecdotes that helped students connect to the site and the experiences of people who had lived there.

Suggestions for improvement – Teachers offered several suggestions for improving the school visits: 1) providing more ways of engaging with the site, including hands-on experiences, discussions, audio and video components, or a scavenger hunt for younger kids; 2) focusing more on personal stories and details of daily life; 3) providing an opportunity to discuss ideas during and after the tour, so that it is more interactive than didactic; and 4) offering pre and post classroom materials, or online resources, to help prepare teachers and students, and to help them extend the experience beyond the visit.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vi
LIST OF TABLES.....	viii
INTRODUCTION	1
Project Background.....	1
Evaluation Framework.....	1
METHODS	2
Timing and Tracking.....	2
Exit Interviews.....	2
Focus groups.....	3
Telephone interviews.....	3
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.....	4
General walk-in visitors.....	4
Description of samples.....	4
Timing and Tracking.....	4
Exit Interviews.....	4
Why do visitors come to Eastern State?	6
What is the nature of visitors’ experience at Eastern State?.....	9
Where did visitors go and how long did they stay?.....	9
Main audio tour.....	9
Other indoor areas.....	10
Outdoor areas.....	10
Hit rates by stop.....	11
How do visitors engage at stops?.....	15
Use of Audio.....	21
Use of Docent-Led Tours.....	22
Use of Museum Exhibition.....	22
Frequency of social interaction.....	23
What do visitors take away from their experience at Eastern State Penitentiary?.....	27
Visitor enjoyment and satisfaction.....	27
Visitor learning outcomes.....	28
Suggestions for improvement.....	30
Prearranged Adult Group Tours.....	31
Description of sample.....	31
Motivations and expectations.....	33
Enjoyment and satisfaction.....	34
Learning outcomes.....	35
Suggestions for improvement.....	36
School Groups.....	37
Description of sample.....	37
Motivations for coming to Eastern State.....	38
Student enjoyment of their visit to Eastern State.....	39

Perceived value and benefits of the visit for students.....	39
Perceived learning outcomes for students.....	41
Value of Eastern State visit for teachers.....	43
Suggestions for better supporting teacher needs.....	44
Suggestions for improving school tours.....	44
CONCLUSIONS.....	46
Walk-in visitors.....	46
Access and wayfinding.....	46
Interpretation and engagement.....	47
Learning outcomes.....	47
Prearranged adult group tours.....	48
School Tours.....	48
RECOMMENDATIONS.....	50
APPENDIX A: TIMING AND TRACKING PROTOCOLS.....	52
APPENDIX B: EXIT INTERVIEW INSTRUMENT & PROTOCOL.....	58
APPENDIX C: FOCUS GROUP INSTRUMENTS & PROTOCOL.....	62
APPENDIX D: TEACHER PHONE INTERVIEW INSTRUMENT & PROTOCOL.....	68

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Methods, audiences, and sample sizes	3
Table 2: Sample Characteristics by data set	5
Table 3: How visitors heard about Eastern State	7
Table 4: Why visitors decided to come to Eastern State	8
Table 5: What visitors expected to do, see, or experience	9
Table 6: Where visitors went and how much time they spent.....	11
Table 7: Hit rates by “stop”	12
Table 8: Stops by category (“hot”, “warm”, and “cool”).....	14
Table 9: Average engagement scores for individual stops.....	16
Table 10: Engagement levels by category (“hot”, “warm” and “cool”).....	19
Table 12: Use of Audio Guide.....	21
Table 13: Average engagement scores for individual stops in the museum exhibition....	23
Table 14: Average number of social interactions by area (Groups Only).....	24
Table 15: Social Interactions by Type	24
Table 16: What visitors enjoyed most about Eastern State	28
Table 17: Main themes that visitors walked away with.....	30
Table 18: Suggestions for improvement from general visitors	31
Table 19: Characteristics of Group Tour sample	33
Table 20: Satisfaction levels for adult tour groups	34
Table 21: Satisfaction and learning scales for tour group participants	36
Table 22: Teacher/school group sample characteristics.....	38
Table 23: Teacher ratings of learning outcomes for students	41
Table 24: Teacher satisfaction with Eastern State visit.....	43

INTRODUCTION

Project Background

In July 2007, Eastern State Penitentiary Historic Site (Eastern State) located in Philadelphia, PA, requested proposals for a comprehensive visitor study that would help inform a master and interpretive planning process for the site, which originally opened to the public in 1994. As part of these planning efforts, Eastern State seeks to better understand their audiences, both general walk-in visitors and pre-arranged tour groups, and the nature of the visitor experience at the site—including their motivations and expectations for visiting Eastern State, how they utilize the site and its offerings, and what they take away from the visit.

The Institute for Learning Innovation (ILI), a learning research and evaluation organization located in Edgewater, MD, was contracted to conduct the visitor evaluation study in support of these objectives. The study took place during two time periods—Fall 2007 and late Spring 2008—in order to obtain a more representative sample across the seasons. This report summarizes the results of the Fall 2007 and Spring 2008 complete data sampling.

Evaluation Framework

The Eastern State visitor study uses a naturalistic, exploratory approach to provide a rich, detailed picture of key audiences and the nature of their experiences at the site. Eastern State staff and board members identified key audiences as walk-in visitors, including families and adult-only groups; prearranged adult tour groups; and school tour groups. Three overarching evaluative questions inform the study:

1) Who are the visitors to ESPHS and why do they come? (e.g., entry conditions such as demographics, motivations for their visit, expectations, and prior knowledge and interest)

2) What is the nature of visitors' experiences at the site? (e.g., how do they move through the space and what programs/tours do they utilize? To what extent are they engaged in different programs, areas, components, and/or exhibits? How satisfied are they with the experience and what would make it a better experience for them?)

3) What do visitors take away from their experiences at ESPHS? (e.g., cognitive and affective outcomes, shifts in attitudes/awareness/knowledge, increased interest in a topic)

METHODS

Multiple methods were used to capture a broad, multi-faceted perspective on the target audiences (walk-in visitors, prearranged adult group tours, and school groups): 1) Tracking and Timing; 2) Exit interviews; 3) Focus groups; and 4) semi-structured, in-depth phone interviews. For the general visitors in particular, mixed methods were used (Timing/Tracking and Exit Interviews) in order to triangulate observed and self-reported data. For each portion of the study, data was collected in both the Fall of 2007 (October and November) and Spring of 2008 (May and June) for two reasons: 1) to capture a broader range of audience perspectives based on season; and 2) the site does not offer some of its regular programming (including the self-guided audio tour) during the winter months. (See Table 1 below for a breakdown of methods by audience and time period.)

Timing and Tracking

Seventy general visitors (including those from adult-only groups and families) participated in the Timing and Tracking study. Researchers used a combination of random and stratified sampling (in an attempt to get larger numbers of family groups than is typical for the site) to select visitors for the study. Ultimately, however, low family visitation made it difficult to create a stratified sample. Visitors were approached just after they had purchased tickets to enter the site, and asked if they were willing to have a researcher keep an eye on where they went and what they did while at Eastern State, as well as fill out a demographic information sheet. (See Appendix A for protocol). Researchers approached the first person in the group to cross an “imaginary line” to be the target of the tracking; for family groups, researchers selected a child to be the target, though gathered demographic information from the whole family. No thank-you gifts or incentives were offered.

Using a detailed map of the site, researchers noted multiple components, including the time the visitor spent at the site and in specific areas or cell blocks; the path that visitors took around the site, noting where they went and what areas were skipped; visitors’ level of engagement at audio stops, images, displays, and interpretive materials; and the frequency of social interactions observed between visitors or between visitors and staff members. Researchers then coded the maps, and entered and analyzed the data using SPSS 15.0, a statistical software program.

Exit Interviews

A total of 100 general walk-in visitors were interviewed for this portion of the study. Researchers used a combination of random and stratified sampling (in an attempt to get larger numbers of family groups). Ultimately, however, low visitation of family groups at times made it difficult to create a stratified sample. Visitors were approached as they exited the site, and were interviewed in or near the gate house. Researchers approached the first adult in a group to cross an “imaginary” line as the target for the interview. For adult-only groups, the researcher focused the interview on the target; for family groups, the researcher attempted to include the perspectives of children as well as adults. Researchers used a semi-structured interview that consisted of open-ended, closed-ended, and scaled questions (See Appendix B for instrument and protocol). Interviews lasted approximately 10-15 minutes each, and visitors were given a small thank-you gift (an Eastern State magnet or

pencil) at the end of the interview. Quantitative data were entered and analyzed in SPSS 15.0, as statistical software program; open-ended responses were coded and analyzed using a standard content analysis approach.

Focus groups

Focus groups were conducted with a total of five pre-arranged adult tour groups. Because of the large size of the tour groups, some groups were split into two focus groups of approximately 8-10 people each. Groups were facilitated by an ILI researcher, either Susan Foutz or Jill Stein. Participants were invited to discuss their tour experience in a room reserved at a nearby restaurant, where snacks and drinks were served. The facilitator then led a semi-structured discussion focused on the group’s motivations and expectations for coming to Eastern State; what they enjoyed most about the experience; what they feel they took away from the experience; and how the tour might be improved. Focus group participants were also asked to fill out a two-page survey that included demographic data and scaled ratings of learning outcomes and overall satisfaction. (See Appendix C for instruments and protocols). The discussions lasted approximately 35-45 minutes, and each participant received a small thank-you gift (Eastern State magnet) in compensation for their time. The discussions were then transcribed and analyzed using a standard content analysis approach. Data from the surveys were entered and analyzed using SPSS 15.0.

Telephone interviews

Feedback on school tours was captured through semi-structured, in-depth phone interviews with teachers (see Appendix D for instrument and protocols). In consultation with Eastern State staff, ILI researchers selected a range of teachers from elementary through university level, based on their willingness to do the interview and the researchers’ success in reaching the teachers by phone. A total of 21 teacher interviews were conducted. Interviews took approximately 20-25 minutes and focused on the teacher’s motivations for bringing students to Eastern State, what they felt the students got out of the visit, how they as teachers benefited from the visit, to what extent they might incorporate the experience into their classroom teaching, and the ways in which the tour experience could be improved for school groups. Researchers took detailed typed notes during each phone call, and then analyzed the open-ended responses using content analysis. Quantitative data (closed-ended and scaled questions) were entered and analyzed in SPSS 15.0.

Table 1: Methods, audiences, and sample sizes

Method	Audience	Sample Size (N)	Time period
Timing and Tracking	General walk-in visitors (adults and family groups)	70	October and November 2007, April-June 2008
Exit Interviews	General walk-in visitors (adults and family groups)	100	October and November 2007, April-June 2008
Focus Group discussions	Pre-arranged adult tour groups	92	November 2007, May-June 2008
In-depth phone interviews	School groups (teachers)	21	October and November 2007, May and June 2008

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The following section documents results based on data collected during Fall 2007 and Spring 2008. It is designed to provide an overview the Eastern State Penitentiary visitor study, including descriptive information of study participants (the samples), results, and discussion of the findings. This final report builds on the preliminary report dated March 2008 and accounts for the larger patterns that have emerged across both seasons of data collection.

General walk-in visitors

Description of samples

Timing and Tracking

Seventy individuals participated in the Timing and Tracking study. Over the two data collection seasons, about half (47%; n=33) of the data points were collected in Fall 2007, and half (53%; n=37) were collected in Spring 2008. Forty-three percent (n=30) of the groups were tracked on a weekday, and 57% (n=40) on a weekend. (See Table 2 below for a detailed characterization of the tracked visitor sample).

The demographics of the tracked sample reflected the typical visitorship to the site in terms of gender, age, race/ethnicity, residence, and prior visitation to Eastern State. Roughly half of the visitors tracked were female (48%; n=33) and half male (52%; n=35). Forty percent of tracked visitors (n=28) were younger than twenty years of age, in part due to the fact that researchers intentionally targeted groups with children. More than a quarter (27%; n=19) were between 20 and 29 years old; 10% (n=7) were in their 30s; 13% (n=9) in their 40s; 7% (n=5) in their 50s; and two people were in their 60s. The vast majority of the participants identified as White/Caucasian (85%; n=58).

More than three-fourths of the tracked visitors (77%; n=54) were first-time visitors to Eastern State; only one person tracked was a member of Eastern State. The majority were visiting from areas outside the region (43%; n=30), but within the US. About one-fifth (18%; n=13) visited from within Philadelphia and surrounding areas in Pennsylvania; one third (34%; n=24) were from neighboring states of New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, and New York. Study participants were moderate to frequent visitors to historic sites. About 40% of the tracked visitors (n=27) visit 2-3 times a year on average, nineteen percent (n=13) visit historic sites four or more times a year, and 27% (n=18) said they visited other historic sites about once a year. Overall, visitors felt they were fairly knowledgeable about American history, on average rating themselves 3.78 on a scale of 1 to 6.

Due to the stratified sampling method, the percentage of groups with children was slightly higher than is typical for the site (based on 2005 data provided by Eastern State), with 29% (n=20) being part of a group that included children, compared to 20% reported for 2005. Almost two-thirds of the tracked visitors (60%; n=42) were visiting with all adults, and 11% (n=8) visited the site alone.

Exit Interviews

One hundred visitors participated in the exit interview. The sample reflects the typical visitorship of the site in terms of gender, age, race/ethnicity, residence, and prior visitation to Eastern State. Over the two data

collection seasons, half of the data points (50%; n=50) were collected in Fall 2007 and half were collected in Spring 2008. Forty-three percent (n=43) were interviewed on a weekday, and 57% (n=57) on a weekend. (See Table 2 for a detailed description of the exit interview sample characteristics.)

Just over half the visitors were female (54%; n=53), and 47% (n=46) were male. One third of the visitors interviewed (33%; n=32) were between 20 and 29 years of age; 19% (n=19) were in their 30s; about a quarter (24%; n=23) in their 40s; 13% (n=13) were in their 50s; and nine people (9%) were in their 60s. The vast majority (89%; n=89) identified as White/Caucasian.

The majority (78%; n=78) of visitors had not been to Eastern State before; and five visitors were members of Eastern State. The majority of visitors interviewed came from states outside the region (41%; n=39). Almost one quarter (23%; n=21) visited from within Philadelphia and areas in Pennsylvania beyond the city limits; and one-third (31%; n=29) visited from neighboring states of New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, and New York. About 41% (n=39) said they visited other historic sites two to three times a year; more than one-third (36%; n=34) visit four or more times a year; and 16% (n=15) of participants visit other historic sites once a year. Overall, visitors interviewed rated their knowledge of U.S. history moderately high—on average, 4.19 on a scale of 1 to 6.

Despite efforts to include more groups with children through stratified sampling methods, the exit interview sample was ultimately representative on this measure. This was likely due to low visitation from families at times, and the possibility that groups with children were less likely to agree to stay longer for an interview. The majority of visitors interviewed (73%; n=73) were adult-only groups; 8% (n=8) were adults visiting alone; and 18% (n=18) were groups with children. Children in these family groups fell into two age categories: 7-12 year olds (57%; n=13) and 13-19 year olds (43%; n=10). The majority of these young visitors were male (83%; n=19).

Table 2: Sample Characteristics by data set

Characteristic	Timing/Tracking	Exit Interviews	Group Tours (Focus Groups)
Type of group	n=70	n=99	n=56
Groups with children	28%	18%	n/a
Adult-only groups	60%	73%	n/a
Visiting alone	11%	8%	
Gender	n=68	n=99	n=52
Male	52%	47%	31%
Female	48%	54%	69%
Race/ethnicity	n=68	n=100	n=52
Caucasian	85%	89%	94%
African American	4%	3%	2%
Latino/Hispanic	4%	4%	0%
Asian, Indian, or Pacific Islander	3%	3%	
Other	3%	1%	4%
Age	n=70	n=98	n=53
Younger than 20 yrs	40%	2%	2%
20-29 yrs	27%	33%	25%
30-39 yrs	10%	19%	19%
40-49 yrs	13%	24%	23%

50-59 yrs	7%	13%	2%
60-69 yrs	3%	9%	0%
70 yrs and older	0%	0%	30%
Visitation of Eastern State	n=70	n=99	n=53
First-time visitor	77%	82%	91%
Been once in past 5 years	12%	9%	4%
2-3 times in past 5 years	3%	3%	2%
4-5 times in past 5 years	1%	2%	0%
Not at all in past 5 years	7%	4%	4%
Visiting from	n=70	n=95	n=53
City – Philadelphia	7%	10%	91%
State – Pennsylvania	11%	13%	4%
Region – NJ, DE, MD, NY	34%	31%	2%
US – beyond regional states	43%	41%	0%
International	4%	6%	4%
Visitation of other historic sites or history museums (per year)	n=68	n=96	n=53
None	15%	8%	8%
Once	27%	16%	9%
2-3 times	40%	41%	38%
4-5 times	10%	24%	21%
6 or more times	9%	12%	25%
Eastern State membership	n=70	n=100	n=49
Yes	1%	5%	0%
No	99%	95%	100%

* Exit interviews were not conducted with visitors under 18.

** Some cells may not add up to exactly 100% as a result of rounding and total n varies due to missing data.

Note that the three samples are not equivalent on every measure. These groups were not meant to be compared to one another as they each provide a different angle to the overall “story” of Eastern State’s visitorship. The specific differences can be explained in two ways: 1) Group tours have a different composition than walk-in visitors as they tend to contain a larger percentage of older adults; and 2) Tracking/Timing and Exit Interview samples differ in their composition primarily because exit interviews could not be conducted with minors (visitors under the age of 18), while youth were tracked within the context of their family unit in an effort to capture the behavior of young visitors to the site.

Why do visitors come to Eastern State?

Exit interviews provided information on how visitors heard about Eastern State, what motivated them to visit, and what they expected to do, see, or experience while there. Not surprisingly, many visitors (28%; n=28) had heard about the site through someone else (“word of mouth”) or were specifically recommended to visit. This finding suggests that visitors tend to have a positive experience at Eastern State and are inclined to tell others about it. Another 25% (n=25) had heard about the site on a TV show, such as “Ghost Hunters,” the History Channel, or the Travel Channel. Eighteen percent (n=18) of visitors mentioned seeing an ad or brochure related to Eastern State, including the Philadelphia City Pass booklet. Sixteen percent (n=16) of visitors said that they

lived in the area, had driven by the site many times, or just simply “knew about it” from growing up in Philadelphia. Another 16% (n=16) attended “Terror Behind the Walls” or went on a “ghost tour” and wanted to return to the site during the day for a different experience. (See Table 3.)

Table 3: How visitors heard about Eastern State

Responses	Percentage of visitors (n=100)
Word of mouth, someone recommended it	28%
Television show	25%
Advertisement	18%
Lives nearby, has driven by many times	16%
“Terror Behind the Walls”, ghost tours	16%
Internet/website/e-news	9%
Other media coverage (reviews, radio stories, etc.)	8%
In the area, on the bus/trolley tour	8%
Been to the site before	5%
Professional interest (historian, academic, criminal justice)	4%
Other	5%

Note: Total equals more than 100% because visitors gave multiple responses (1.4 on average)

Visitors chose to visit Eastern State for a variety of reasons. Almost one-quarter (22%; n=22) were personally interested in the site because of their associated interest in history, architecture, and/or prisons. Twenty-one percent (n=21) simply said they were in the area and were looking for something interesting to do. Another 21% (n=21) stated that they were interested in visiting a “unique” site or having a “different” kind of experience than they felt they would get at other venues. Twelve percent (n=12) of the visitors came to Eastern State for “Terror Behind the Walls,” but decided to come back to see it during the daytime and/or were given free passes to come back for a daytime visit. (Naturally, all of these were visitors interviewed during the Fall season.) This finding suggests that TBTW, and particularly offering free daytime passes, can be an effective way to encourage people to return and experience Eastern State as a historic site during the day. Some other motivations for visiting Eastern State included it being “on the list” of things to do in Philadelphia (10%; n=10); someone else in their group wanted to visit (9%; n=9) or they were bringing someone from out of town (7%; n=7); and/or they wanted to see the “real thing” (7%; n=7). Other motivations for coming included seeing art installations; coming to take photos; working in a profession related to the prison; or coming specifically for Al Capone’s cell. (See Table 4).

Table 4: Why visitors decided to come to Eastern State

Responses	Percentage of visitors (n=100)
Personal interest (history, architecture, prisons)	22%
In the area, something interesting to do	21%
Different, unique place	21%
Have always wanted to see the site	13%
“Terror Behind the Walls”	12%
“On the list” – agenda	10%
Another person in their group wanted to visit	9%
To see the “real thing”	7%
Bringing someone else	7%
Recommended by someone else	6%
Been here before, wanted to return	6%
“Creepiness” or haunted aspects	5%
Other	14%

Note: Total equals more than 100% because visitors gave multiple responses (1.5 on average)

In general, visitors’ expectations of what they would see or do at Eastern State were aligned with the actual experience. More than one-quarter of the visitors (27%; n=27) perceived Eastern State as a place to look at interesting architecture and/or see historical ruins and go into cells. Another quarter (23%; n=23) were expecting to learn about the history of Eastern State in general; and 20% (n=20) were expecting to learn about what life was like for prisoners in the penitentiary. However, 15% (n=15) of the visitors were hoping to hear ghost stories or learn about the “paranormal” aspects of the site, which is not what the site in fact focuses on. Other expectations cited by visitors include visitors who have been to Alcatraz expecting Eastern State to provide a similar experience (6%; n=6); visitors who wanted to learn the general history of penitentiaries (5%; n=5); and/or to see a real historic prison (5%; n=5). About 11% (n=11) of the visitors gave reasons categorized as “other” because they were mentioned by three or fewer individuals. These expectations include seeing art installations; seeing “something new”, unique, or different; and seeing the site where movies were filmed. (See Table 5). About one-quarter of visitors either did not know what to expect (9%; n=9), or responded in a way that indicated they were pleasantly surprised by a number of things they had not initially expected (16%; n=16). The list of unexpected positive experiences includes:

Audio Guide – the availability of an audio guide; an audio guide narrated by Steve Buscemi; being able to “customize” the audio guide and explore only what interested them

Size – the grand size of the prison; so much to do and see at the site; so many places to go inside

Significance – the fact that the site was so significant in social and architectural history; that the design was copied by so many other sites; and that the site was so old

Content – unexpected or surprising facts, such as penitence as a form of punishment; the origin of the term “penitentiary”; and the story of Pep the Dog

Table 5: What visitors expected to do, see, or experience

Responses	Percentage of visitors (n=100)
Architecture, ruins, cells	27%
History of Eastern State	23%
Daily life of prisoners	20%
Do/see something specific (Al Capone's cell, go on a tour)	16%
Ghosts or paranormal activity	15%
Compare to Alcatraz	6%
Learn about the history of penitentiaries	5%
See the "real thing"	5%
Other	11%
Didn't know what to expect	9%
Unexpected positive experiences (e.g. audio guide, size of site, interesting historical facts)	16%

Note: Total equals more than 100% because visitors gave multiple responses (1.5 on average)

What is the nature of visitors' experience at Eastern State?

Timing and Tracking data provide detailed information on: 1) where visitors went and how long they stayed, at the site overall and in specific areas (e.g. cell blocks), 2) visitors' level of engagement at specific stops; 3) visitors' use of the audio tour; 4) visitors' use of docent-led tours; and 5) the extent to which the experience sparked social interaction within visiting groups and between visitors and staff.

Where did visitors go and how long did they stay?

On average, tracked visitors spent 83 minutes at Eastern State (with the shortest visit being 29 minutes and the longest 154 minutes). Exit interview data validate this information, with 37% (n=37) reporting stay times between 60-90 minutes; and more than half of the visitors reporting even longer stay times, with one-third (33%; n=33) visiting the site for more than 2 hours. Researchers recorded where visitors went during their visit both by cell block/area and by specific "exhibits" or stops, including audio stops, images, models, and art installations. Results are reported here in the following categories: 1) which cell blocks/areas they visited on the Main Audio tour; 2) other indoor areas; 3) outdoor spaces; and 4) stops at specific "exhibits" throughout the entire site.

Main audio tour

Not surprisingly, the cell blocks located along the Main Audio Tour (1, 4, and 7) were the most frequently visited overall. Ninety-seven percent (n=68) of the tracked visitors went to Cell Block 1; 94% (n=66) went to Cell Block 4; and another 94% visited Cell Block 7. The majority of these visitors (89%; n=62) appeared to listen to most or all of the Main Audio tour, which specifically directs visitors to these cell blocks. (See Table 6 below.)

Similarly, the longest stay times were also noted for the cell blocks included in the Main Audio tour. This is likely because of the high utilization of the audio tour and the fact that stay times are likely influenced by the

length of the audio segments. Visitors spent the most time in Cell Block 1 (mean=10 minutes, 47 seconds), followed by Cell Block 7 (mean=8 minutes, 53 seconds)¹, and Cell Block 4 (mean=7 minutes, 46 seconds).

Other indoor areas

Commonly visited cell blocks or areas not on the Main Audio Tour include “Park Avenue” (which includes Al Capone’s cell), visited by 90% (n=63) of participants; Cell Block 9 (89%; n=62); Cell Block 10 (77%, n=54), and Cell Block 15 or “Death Row” (76%; n=53). The least visited area was Cell Block 13 (36%, n=25), likely because it is located “off the beaten path” and no signage directs visitors there.

Interestingly, visitors spent nearly as much time in “Park Avenue” (mean=7 minutes, 20 seconds) and Cell Block 9 (mean=7 minutes, 1 second) as they did in the cell blocks included on the Main Audio Tour. Visitors spent the least amount of time in Death Row (mean=3 minutes, 13 seconds), Cell Block 14 (mean=2 minutes, 33 seconds), and Cell Block 13 (1 minute, 20 seconds)—in part due to the fact that these cell blocks are much smaller than the others, or are only partially accessible to visitors. (See Table 6 below.)

Outdoor areas

Overall, data suggested that visitors spend less time in outdoor areas than they do inside. On average, visitors spent about two-thirds of their time inside the buildings (51 minutes, 52 seconds on average) and one-third of their time outside (31 minutes, 5 seconds, on average), seemingly regardless of weather as data was collected in both cold winter conditions and extreme heat.

Time spent outside is likely a bit lower than reported, as it was calculated by subtracting time spent in the Main Cell Blocks (1, 4, 7, 9, and 10) from overall time spent at the site; whereas there were some indoor areas, notably the Hub, that were not timed. Researchers had difficulty calculating time spent in the hub, as visitors cross through this area so many times, making it difficult to take accurate notes. Visitors were also not timed in the gift shop, as this was not the focus of the study, but this area was still included in the overall stay time at the site because some visitors then went to the museum exhibition, which was included in the study.

¹ Note that visitors are only directed to part of Cell Block 7 during the main audio tour, so some of this time is accounted for by visitors exploring other parts of CB 7 on their own. Also, part of CB7 was closed for renovations during the Spring 2008 season, thereby shortening the amount of time some visitors could spend in there.

Table 6: Where visitors went and how much time they spent

Area	Percentage of Visitors (n=70)	Mean mins:secs	Std. Dev. mins:secs	Min	Max
Main Audio Tour					
Platform	79%				
Cell Block 1	97%	10:47	3:34	1	18
Cell Block 7*	94%	8:53	7:44	2	33
Cell Block 4	94%	7:46	3:07	2	19
Other Indoor Areas					
Park Avenue	90%	7:20	3:49	1	17
Cell Block 9	89%	7:01	4:52	1	20
Cell Block 10	77%	5:53	4:04	1	18
Cell Block 13	36%	1:20	0:29	1	2
Cell Block 14	70%	2:33	1:23	1	6
Cell Block 15 (Death Row)	76%	3:13	1:23	1	7
The Hub	99%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Museum Exhibition	30%	5:00	4:04	1	18
Total Indoor Time		51:52			
Total Outdoor Time**		31:05			

* The time for the entire sample of visitors for Cell Block 7 is lower as a result of multiple closures in the Spring 2008 data collection season.

**This includes some indoor areas not timed by researchers (i.e. the hub and the gift shop)

Hit rates by stop

Data from the Timing and Tracking study indicate the frequency at which specific stops were visited—or “hit rates”—including audio stops on the Main Audio tour, additional audio stops, and non-audio stops, such as panels, images, models and other displays not associated with an audio option². (See Table 7). In addition, while researchers attempted to note whether visitors used each audio stop on the Main Audio Tour within cell blocks 1, 7, and 4, it was more logical to record which objects, images, or areas the visitor went to that related to the narration of that stop.

Overall, the most frequently visited stops were the photographs in Cell Block 4, with 100% (n=66) viewing at least one of them; the Refurbished Cell in Cell Block 1 (96%; n=65); the Staircase/Audio Stop 7 in Cell Block 7 (94%; n=61); and Al Capone’s Cell in Park Avenue (95%; n=60). The drawings and images in Cell Block 1 were also well utilized, with 91% of visitors (n=62) viewing at least one of the images.

² Note that visitors were recorded as stopping at an audio stop even if they did not use the audio, but rather read the panel information or looked at the exhibit.

Table 7: Hit rates by “stop”

Stop	Percentage of Visitors (n=70)
Main Audio Tour	
Platform	n=55
Cell Block 1	
	n=68
Model of prison	88%
Refurbished cell	96%
Open cell #1	87%
Open cell #2	82%
Pictures/images (at least one)	91%
Cell Block 7	
	n=66
Audio stop 7/Staircase	94%
Audio stop 8 (The New York System)*	56%
Stop 15 (“Slick Willie Sutton”)* (n=43)	19%
Stop 23 (1945 Tunnel Escape)* (n=43)	42%
Stop 35(1) Recollection Tableaux panel* (n=43)	23%
Stop 35(2) Recollection Tableaux panel* (n=43)	>1%
Tableaux (at least one)* (n=43)	56%
Stop 43 (Women at Eastern State)* (n=43)	23%
Stop 49 (film on tunnel archeology of 1945 escape)** (n=43)	28%
Cell Block 4	
	n=66
Photographs (at least one)	100%
Other Indoor Areas	
Park Avenue (plus corridor)	
	n=63
Stop 18 (Synagogue)	35%
Synagogue Restoration Panel* (n=35)	1%
Stop 19 (Religion)	71%
Stop 20 (Al Capone’s Cell)	95%
Stop 21 (Al Capone’s Release)	49%
Stop 29 (Barbershop)	76%
Stop 34 (Ghost Cats: art installation)* (n=28)	29%
Stop37 (End of the Tunnel: art installation)	35%
Stop 41 (Al Capone’s Intake)	38%
Cell Block 9	
	n=62
Stop 14 (“Pep the Dog”)	68%
Stop 40 (Born at Eastern State)	66%
Stop 44 (Prison Riots)	37%
Stop 47 (Living Space: art installation)* (n=33)	29%
Stop 50 (1929 Silent Movie)** (n=60)	53%

Cell Block 10 (including part of CB2 open to public)	n=54
Stop 27 (Movies at Eastern State)	39%
Stop 28 (Why don't you fix this place up?)	30%
Stop 31 (Sexuality in the 19 th Century)	26%
Stop 32 (Sexuality in the 20 th Century)	26%
Stop 39(1) Alexa Hoyer installation panel	32%
Stop 39(2) Alexa Hoyer installation panel	22%
Alexa Hoyer video installation (at least one)	82%
Stop 48 (GTMO – art installation)	57%
Cell Block 13	n=25
Cell Block 14	n=49
Stop 26 (Ghosts at Eastern State)	94%
Stop 38 (Juxtaposition: art installation)	90%
Cell Block 15 (Death Row)	n=53
Stop 17 (Notable Inmate Elmo Smith)	47%
Stop 22 (Death Row intro panel)	43%
Hub	n=69
Model of Eastern State Penitentiary	61%
Veteran's plaque	36%
Cell Block 12 Panel** (n=26)	19%
Wall Map of Eastern State (n=36)**	22%
Outdoor Areas	
Outside stops	n=70
Stop 11 – (Sports Field)	26%
Stop 12 – (Cell Block 14)	43%
Stop 16 (Clarence Klinedinst)	31%
Stop 24 (Leo Callahan Escape)	26%
Stop 25 (The Hole)	61%
Stop 30 (Greenhouse)	40%
Stop 33 (Kitchen)	30%
Stop 34 (Ghost Cats: art installation)	63%
Stop 36 (Midway of another day: art installation)	39%
Stop 37 (The End of the Tunnel: art installation)	34%
Stop 42 (Solitary Exercise Yard)	73%
Stop 46 (My Glass House: art installation)	36%
Hospital panel (CB 3)	16%

*Due to construction, filming, and other reasons, stops in cell blocks 7, 9, 10 and Park Avenue were not available to all visitors in the tracking study. Percentages are based on the number of visitors who could possibly have visited those stops.

**This elements were added to the site during the study, and thus not available during all tracks

In order to better visualize the extent to which stops are utilized by visitors, researchers then categorized all stops into “hot” (when 75% or more of visitors stopped); “warm” (25-74% of visitors stopped); and “cool” (less than 25% of visitors stopped). (See Table 8.) These percentages are based on the actual number of visitors tracked in the study and not on the number of visitors who passed by the stop. Therefore, some stops are rated lower because visitors never passed by the stop (e.g. by not entering that cell block), while some visitors passed by the exhibit but chose not to stop there.

Data suggest that visitors were more likely to stop at areas that addressed aspects of daily life, such as the archival photos (and accompanying audio clips) in Cell Block 4, the refurbished cell in CB 1, the barbershop, exercise yard, and the stop that addresses religion at Eastern State in the 21st century. Visitors were also drawn to unusual stories, such as Pep the Dog and Born at Eastern State; “immersive experiences,” such as the two open cells that visitors could walk into, and the staircase, which allows visitors a different view of the site; and the paranormal—namely stop 26, which addresses the question of whether or not Eastern State is haunted.

Table 8: Stops by category (“hot”, “warm”, and “cool”)

HOT stops (75% or more visited) N=70	WARM stops (25-74% visited) N=70	COOL stops (Less than 25% visited) N=70
Photographs in CB4 (94%)	Stop 29 – Barbershop (69%)	Stop 39(1) – Alexa Hoyer installation panel (24%)
Refurbished cell (93%)	Stop 26 – Ghosts at Eastern State (66%)	Stop 28 – Why don’t you fix this place up? (23%)
Audio stop 7/Staircase (87%)	Stop 19 – Religion (64%)	Stop 31 – Sexuality in the 19th Century (20%)
Stop 20 – Al Capone’s Cell (86%)	Stop 38 – Juxtaposition: art installation (63%)	Stop 32 – Sexuality in the 20th Century (20%)
Pictures/images in CB1 (86%)	Alexa Hoyer video installation (63%)	Stop 49 – film on tunnel archeology of 1945 escape (17%)*
Model of prison (86%)	Stop 34 – Ghost Cats: art installation outside (63%)	Stop 39(2) – Alexa Hoyer installation panel (17%)
Open cell #1 (83%)	Stop 25 – The Hole (61%)	Hospital panel (CB3) (16%)
Audio Stop 1 (81%) Open cell #2 (79%)	Model of Eastern State Penitentiary (60%)	Stop 35(1) – Recollection Tableaux panel (14%)*
Platform (79%)	Stop 14 – “Pep the Dog” (60%)	Stop 34 – Ghost Cats: art installation in Park Ave (11%)*
Stop 42 – Solitary Exercise Yard (73%)	Stop 40 – Born at Eastern State (59%)	Stop 15 – “Slick Willie Sutton” (11%)*
	Stop 22 – Death Row intro panel (50%)	Wall Map of Eastern State (11%)*
	Stop 36 – Midway of another day: art installation (49%)	Synagogue Restoration Panel (4%)*
	Stop 50 – 1929 Silent Movie (46%)*	Stop 35(2) – Recollection Tableaux panel (1%)*
	Stop 48 – GTMO (44%)	Stop 45 – Waiting at Eastern State (1%)*
	Stop 21 – Al Capone’s Release (44%)	
	Stop 12 – Cell Block 14 (43%)	
	Stop 30 – Greenhouse (40%)	
	Veteran’s plaque (36%)	
	Stop 46 – My Glass House: art installation (36%)	

HOT stops (75% or more visited)	WARM stops (25-74% visited)	COOL stops (Less than 25% visited)
------------------------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------------

- Stop 37 – End of the Tunnel: art installation outside (34%)
- Tableaux (34%)*
- Stop 41 – Intake (34%)
- Stop 44 – Prison Riots (33%)
- Stop 43 – Women at Eastern State (33%)*
- Stop 37 – End of the Tunnel: art installation in Park Avenue (31%)
- Stop 16 – Clarence Klinedinst (31%)
- Stop 27 – Movies at Eastern State (30%)
- Stop 33 – Kitchen (30%)
- Stop 47 – Living Space: art installation (29%)*
- Stop 24 – Leo Callahan Escape (26%)
- Stop 11 – Sports Field (26%)
- Audio stop 8 (26%)
- Stop 23 – 1945 Tunnel Escape (26%)*

*Due to construction, filming, and other reasons, stops in cell blocks 7, 9, 10 and Park Avenue were not available to all visitors at all times in the tracking study.

How do visitors engage at stops?

Researchers rated visitors’ level of engagement on a scale of 1 to 4 for select stops throughout the site, including objects and images related to the Main Audio Tour, all audio stops (including those not on the Main Tour), art installations, and a few additional exhibits or panels. A score of 1 indicated just a “glance” at an object, display, or interpretive material; 2 meant a “brief or cursory” engagement, such as stopping briefly to look at something and then moving on; 3 indicated “moderate” engagement, such as reading a fair amount of text, looking relatively closely, and possibly using the accompanying audio; and a score of 4 meant “extensive” engagement, such as reading all of a panel, looking very intently at something, and listening to part or all of the audio clip if available.



Figure 1: Visitors engaging with exhibits in Cell Block 7

Overall, engagement scores for specific stops and exhibit components at Eastern State are quite high, ranging on average from 1.67 to 3.69 (on a scale of 1-4) for a single stop. (See Table 9 below.) Stops with the highest levels of engagement include Pep the Dog (mean=3.69); the Staircase/Audio Stop 7 (mean=3.64); Al Capone’s Cell (mean=3.60); the film on the tunnel archeology of the 1945 escape (mean=3.58); the “Is Eastern State Haunted?” panel (mean=3.47); and the Guantanamo Bay installation *GTMO* (mean=3.26). This data suggests that visitors are most drawn to the unusual, celebrity, or “surprising” aspects of Eastern State, as well as the paranormal. It is also interesting to note that the staircase is quite engaging to visitors, likely because it offers a different physical view of the site, plus the use of the audio tour may increase overall engagement.

Data suggests that visitors were least engaged in the panel on Cell Block 14 (mean=1.67); the pictures and images in Cell Block 1 (aggregate mean=1.90); Audio Stop 8, which focuses on the New York State penal system (mean=2.00); and some of the art installations, including *My Glass House* (mean=2.13), the Susan Hagen tableaux (aggregate mean=2.13), and the End of the Tunnel (mean=2.17).

Table 9: Average engagement scores for individual stops

Stop	Visitors who Engaged	Mean	Std. dev.	Min	Max
Main Audio Tour					
<i>Platform area</i>	55	3.13	.968	1	4
Cell Block 1					
Model of prison	60	3.17	.960	1	4
Refurbished cell	65	3.18	.967	1	4
Open Cell #1	58	3.10	1.02	1	4

Open Cell #2	54	2.74	.994	1	4
Pictures/Images (aggregate)	63	1.90	.631	0	3.4
Cell Block 7					
Audio stop 7/Staircase	44	3.64	.650	2	4
Audio Stop 8 (The New York System)	18	2.00	1.03	1	4
Stop 15 ("Slick Willie Sutton")*	9	2.56	1.13	1	4
Stop 23 (1945 Tunnel Escape)*	19	3.18	.931	1	4
Stop 35(1&2) (Recollection Tableaux panels)*	8	2.25	1.04	1	4
Tableaux (art installation - aggregate)*	21	2.13	.825	1	3.75
Stop 43 (Women at Eastern State)*	10	3.10	.876	2	4
Stop 49 (Film on Tunnel Archeology of 1945 Escape)*	12	3.58	.900	1	4
Cell Block 4					
Cell Block 4 photographs (aggregate)	65	2.36	.645	1	4
Other Indoor Areas					
Park Avenue (plus corridor)					
Stop 18 (Synagogue)	22	2.50	1.06	1	4
Synagogue Restoration Panel*	3	3.67	.577	3	4
Stop 19 (Religion)	44	2.91	.936	1	4
Stop 20 (Al Capone's Cell)	60	3.60	.694	2	4
Stop 21 (Al Capone's Release)	31	3.06	.964	1	4
Stop 29 (Barbershop)	48	2.71	1.01	1	4
Stop 34 (Ghost Cats: art installation)*	8	2.25	1.17	1	4
Stop 37 (The End of the Tunnel: art installation)	22	2.32	.780	1	4
Stop 41 (Al Capone's Intake)	24	2.83	1.17	1	4
Cell Block 9					
Stop 14 ("Pep the Dog")	42	3.69	.715	1	4
Stop 40 (Born at Eastern State)	41	2.95	1.07	1	4
Stop 44 (Prison Riots)	21	2.76	1.14	1	4
Stop 47 (Living Space: art installation)**	20	2.85	1.14	1	4
Stop 50 (1929 Silent Movie)	31	2.74	1.09	1	4
Cell Block 10					
Stop 27 (Movies at Eastern State)	20	2.10	.968	1	4
Stop 28 (" Why don't you fix this place up?")	15	2.07	1.03	1	4
Stop 31 (Sexuality in the 19 th Century)	14	2.93	1.14	1	4
Stop 32 (Sexuality in the 20 th Century)	14	2.50	1.16	1	4
Stop 39(1) Alexa Hoyer installation panel	13	2.00	.707	1	4
Stop 39(2) Alexa Hoyer installation	11	1.82	.982	1	4

panel					
Alexa Hoyer video installation (aggregate)	42	2.78	.878	1	4
Stop 48 (GTMO – art installation)	31	3.26	.855	1	4
Cell Block 13	21	3.19	.750	2	4
Cell Block 14					
Stop 26 (Ghosts at Eastern State)	43	3.47	.735	1	4
Stop 38 (Juxtaposition: art installation)	42	2.67	1.07	1	4
Cell Block 15 (Death Row)					
Stop 17 (Notable Inmate Elmo Smith)**	24	2.92	1.18	1	4
Stop 22 (Death Row intro panel) **	26	2.62	1.10	1	4
Hub					
Model of Eastern State Penitentiary	24	2.42	.830	1	4
Veteran's plaque	24	2.71	1.08	1	4
CB12 Panel*	5	2.00	1.00	1	3
Wall Map of Eastern State*	8	2.88	1.25	1	4
Outdoor Areas					
Stop 11 – Sports Field	17	2.65	1.12	1	4
Stop 12 – Cell Block 14	30	1.67	.844	1	4
Stop 16 – Clarence Klinedinst	20	2.80	1.11	1	4
Stop 24 – Leo Callahan Escape	16	2.75	1.07	1	4
Stop 25 – The Hole (“Klondike”)	43	2.81	1.08	1	4
Stop 30 – Greenhouse	26	2.19	.981	1	4
Stop 33 – Kitchen	21	3.10	1.04	1	4
Stop 34 – Ghost Cats (art installation) - Outside	43	2.63	1.16	1	4
Stop 36 – Midway of Another Day (art installation)	34	2.38	1.18	1	4
Stop 37 – The End of the Tunnel (art installation)	24	2.17	1.01	1	4
Stop 42 – Solitary Exercise Yard	51	2.84	.987	1	4
Stop 46 – My Glass House (art installation)	24	2.13	.992	1	4
Hospital panel (CB3)	10	2.90	1.20	1	4

*The sample sizes for some stops in Cell Block 7, Cell Block 10, the Hub, and Park Avenue are lower as a result of closures or for other reasons that specific stops were not available to visitors on a given day.

**The sample sizes for some stops in Death Row are lower as a result of researchers being unable to accompany a visitor into the cell due to low visitation and an effort to not interrupt or negatively affect the visitor experience.

Similar to the hit rates, researchers categorized individual stops into “hot” (mean=3.25 and above), “warm” (mean=2.25 to 3.25) and “cool” (mean=2.25 and below) based on engagement scores. (See Table 10.) The vast majority of stops fall into the middle or “warm” category, which is quite positive. As there are so many stops available to visitors, the fact that so many are still able to capture moderate attention from visitors is very encouraging.

Table 10: Engagement levels by category (“hot”, “warm” and “cool”)

HOT stops (engagement mean of 3.25 and above)	WARM stops (engagement mean of 2.26 to 3.24)	COOL stops (engagement mean of 2.25 and below)
Stop 14 – “Pep the Dog” (3.69)	Cell Block 13 w/Panel (3.19)	Stop 30 – Greenhouse (2.19)
Synagogue Restoration Panel (3.67)*	Refurbished cell (3.18)	Stop 37 – End of the Tunnel (art installation) Outside (2.17)
Audio stop 7/Staircase (3.64)	Stop 23 – 1945 Tunnel Escape (3.18)*	Tableaux (art installation – aggregate) (2.13)*
Stop 20 – Al Capone’s Cell (3.60)	Model of prison (3.17)	Stop 46 – My Glass House (art installation) (2.13)
Stop 49 – Film on Tunnel Archeology of 1945 Escape (3.58)*	Platform area (3.13)	Stop 27 – Movies at Eastern State (2.10)
Stop 26 – Ghosts at Eastern State (3.47)**	Open Cell #1 (3.10)	Stop 28 – “Why don’t you fix this place up?” (2.07)
Stop 48 – <i>GTMO</i> (3.26)	Stop 43 – Women at Eastern State (3.10)*	Audio Stop 8 – The New York System (2.00)
	Stop 33 – Kitchen (3.10)	Stop 39(1) – Alexa Hoyer Installation Panel (2.00)
	Stop 21 – Al Capone’s Release (3.06)	CB12 Panel (2.00)*
	Stop 40 – Born at Eastern State (2.95)	Pictures/Images CB1 (aggregate) (1.90)
	Stop 31 – Sexuality in the 19 th Century (2.93)	Stop 39(2) – Alexa Hoyer Installation Panel (1.82)
	Stop 17 – Notable Inmate Elmo Smith (2.92)**	Stop 12 – Cell Block 14 (1.67)
	Stop 19 – Religion (2.91)	
	Hospital panel (CB3) (2.90)	
	Wall Map of Eastern State (2.88)*	
	Stop 47 – Living Space (art installation) (2.85)**	
	Stop 42 – Solitary Exercise Yard (2.84)	
	Stop 41 – Intake (2.83)	
	Death Row Panels (aggregate) (2.82)**	
	Stop 25 – The Hole (2.81)	
	Stop 16 – Clarence Klinedinst (2.80)	
	Alexa Hoyer video installation (aggregate) (2.78)	
	Stop 44 – Prison Riots (2.76)	
	Stop 24 – Leo Callahan Escape (2.75)	
	Open Cell #2 (2.74)	
	Stop 50 – 1929 Silent Movie	

(2.74)

Stop 29 – Barbershop (2.71)

Model of Eastern State
Penitentiary (2.42)

Stop 38 – Juxtaposition (art
installation) (2.67)**

Stop 11 – Sports Field (2.65)

Stop 34 – Ghost Cats (art
installation) – Outside (2.63)

Stop 22 – Death Row intro panel
(2.62)**

Stop 15 – “Slick Willie Sutton”
(2.56)*

Stop 18 – Synagogue (2.50)

Stop 32 – Sexuality in the 20th
Century (2.50)

Veteran’s plaque (2.71)

Stop 36 – Midway of Another Day
(art installation) (1.18)

Cell Block 4 photographs
(aggregate) (2.36)

Stop 37 – The End of the Tunnel
(art installation) in Park Avenue
(2.32)

Stop 35 – Recollection Tableaux
panels (2.25)*

Stop 34 – Ghost Cats (in Park
Avenue) (2.25)*

*The sample sizes for some stops in Cell Block 7, Cell Block 10, the Hub, and Park Avenue are lower as a result of closures or for other reasons that specific stops were not available to visitors on a given day.

**The sample sizes for some stops in Death Row are lower as a result of researchers being unable to accompany a visitor into the cell due to low visitation and an effort to not interrupt or negatively affect the visitor experience.

Researchers also analyzed engagement in relationship to frequency or “hit rate” for each stop, which resulted in four basic categories: 1) stops with high visitation, or hit rate, and high engagement; 2) stops with high visitation but low engagement; 3) stops with low visitation but high/moderate engagement; and 4) stops with low visitation and low hit rates. Stops with high hit rates and high average engagement include: “Pep the Dog” (mean=3.69, n=42); Audio Stop 7 with the Staircase (mean=3.64, n=44); Al Capone’s Cell (mean=3.60, n=60); and Stop 48 - *GTMO* (mean=3.26, n=31). These areas are clearly successful, in that they draw large numbers of visitors while also holding their interest. On the other hand, the stop with the highest visitation but with the lowest engagement score is the illustrations area lining Cell Block 1 (mean=1.9, n=60). This suggests that the site has an opportunity to better engage the many visitors that come through this cell block.

Stops with low visitation but high or moderate engagement include Stop 23 – Tunnel Escape 1945 (mean=3.18, n=18); Stop 33 – Kitchen (mean=3.10, n=21); Stop 31 – Sexuality in the 19th century (mean=2.93, n=14); and the Hospital panel (mean=2.90, n=11). This data suggests that the site may want to more clearly direct

visitors to these stops, as they are clearly of high interest to visitors but are difficult to find. Finally, stops with low engagement scores and accompanying low visitation, excluding those stops that were either closed during different points of the study or only available during one season of data collection, include the panels for the Alexa Hoyer art installation (Panel 1: mean=2, n=13; Panel 2: mean=1.82, n=11), although the art installation itself received “warm” engagement and higher visitation by comparison; Stop 28 - “Why don’t you fix this place up?” (mean=2.07, n=15); the New York System panel which accompanies Audio Stop 8 (mean=2, n=18); and Stop 27 - Movies at Eastern State (mean=2.1, n=20).

Use of Audio

Researchers documented audio use by Cell Block rather than individual stop, as it was often too difficult to know whether or not a visitor was actually listening to the audio at any given stop. (See Table 11). Not surprisingly, data suggested that audio was most frequently used in the cell blocks included on the Main Audio tour, which specifically directs visitors to cell blocks 1, 7, and 4. The vast majority of tracked visitors (89%; n=62) were observed using audio in CB1; 80% (n=56) in CB7; and 76% (n=53) in CB4. These results are validated by exit interview data, in which 93% (n=93) said they had listened to at least part of the Main Audio guide. Visitors were less likely to use the audio guide in cell blocks/areas not on the Main Audio tour. However, of these, the most popular were Park Avenue (39%; n=27), Death Row (36%; n=25), and Cell Block 9 (31%; n=22).

Table 11: Use of Audio Guide

Area	Percentage of Visitors * (n=70)
Main Audio Tour	
Platform	n/a
Cell Block 1	89%
Cell Block 7	80%
Cell Block 4	76%
Other Indoor Areas	
Park Avenue	39%
Cell Block 15 (Death Row)	36%
Cell Block 9	31%
Cell Block 14	26%
Cell Block 10	14%

Note: It was difficult for researchers to identify if visitors were using the audio guide or simply wearing the headphones, unless the researcher had line of site when the visitor pushed an audio guide number, or overheard the visitors discuss using the audio guide. It was particularly difficult to identify in cell blocks 14 and 15. Thus, these percentages may be slightly higher in reality than what is reported here.

While researchers did not document whether or not audio was used at individual stops throughout the site, engagement scores were used as a proxy for understanding the extent to which the Main Audio tour increased engagement compared to areas not on the main tour. Data indicated that visitors were significantly more engaged in stops along the main audio tour than they were in those they visited on their own, or in more of a “free-choice” environment where they were not directed where to go by the audio narrative (t=2.297, df=69, p=0.25). This may be due to the fact that audio clips for the main tour were longer than for other stops (though

researchers did not directly consider time as an indicator for engagement); that visitors tended to do the main audio tour first, so were possibly more tired and less focused when they visited other stops; or simply because the narrative of the main tour tended to engage visitors more. Data also showed that visitors who were highly engaged during the main audio tour were also more likely to be highly engaged at other stops—possibly because they enjoyed the main audio and thus found value in the audio guide as an interpretive tool, or because this mode of learning appealed to them in general.

Use of Docent-Led Tours

Data indicated that docent-led tours are not widely utilized by visitors. Only 14% (n=10) of tracked visitors went on a guided tour. This figure is validated by exit interview data, in which 12% (n=12) said that they went on a docent-led tour. However, visitors who had the opportunity to go on a topic tour during the tracking study showed a moderately high level of engagement with the experience (mean=3.33). According to exit interview data, some visitors even went on more than one tour in a given visit. Of those who said they went on a tour, eight people went on the Escape tour, three each on Life Behind the Walls and Prison Uprisings, and one person reported going on the Left Behind topic tour. Qualitative responses in the exit interviews suggest that 13% (n=13) of visitors would like to see more tours offered, particularly during the week.

Use of Museum Exhibition

Researchers collected data for the museum exhibition in the timing and tracking component of the study, as well as during exit interviews. Thirty percent (n=21) of tracked visitors were observed visiting the museum exhibition at the end of their visit to Eastern State. In contrast, 68% (n=68) of visitors interviewed reported that they had gone to the museum exhibition. There are a number of possible reasons for this disparity. Based on the tracking protocol, researchers approached visitors after the admissions area, and visitors may have gone to the exhibition prior to beginning their paid experience. Further, in order to reach the quota for the timing/tracking study (which was challenging due to extremely long stay times and some low visitation periods), the protocol suggested that researchers end the track if the visitor spent more than five minutes in the gift shop at the end of their experience. (The rest of the track was still included in the study.) Therefore the percentage of visitors attending the museum exhibition might be slightly higher in reality than reported in the timing/tracking study. On the other hand, visitors in the exit interviews may have been more likely to report that they stopped at the exhibition out of “social desirability” or if they quickly looked in, resulting in a lower percentage than what is reported in the exit interview study.

For the tracked visitors who were observed visiting the museum exhibition (30%; n=21), the most popular stops were the Inmate-Made Weapons display (57%; n=12), the videos (50%; n=10) and the “A Controversial Vision” panel (43%; n=9). Least popular were the “Game Over” panel (visited by just one person), the “Battle of Prison Systems” panel (visited by two people), and the “If Reform is Possible” panel (visited by three people). (See Table 12 below). However, these results should be interpreted with caution because the data sample is relatively small, even after two seasons of data collection. If there is interest in better understanding the visitation patterns in the museum exhibition, a separate observation study focusing on this aspect of the overall Eastern State experience is recommended.

In general, engagement scores for specific components of the exhibition are quite high, ranging from 2.4 to 4.0 on a scale of 1-4. (See Table 12 below). The Weapons display had one of the highest engagement scores

(mean=3.23), along with high visitation. Other stops with high engagement include Battle of Prison Systems (mean=4.00), First Model Building (mean=3.5), Door Display (mean=3.83), Reform Panel (mean=3.33), and Other Prison Models (mean=3.33). These scores should be considered with caution, however, due to low visitation numbers to each individual spot within the exhibition.

The museum exhibition had relatively low stay times (mean=5 minutes), with a minimum time spent of 1 minute and maximum of 18 minutes. This may be due to the fact that people tended to go to the exhibition at the end of their visit and thus may have suffered from “museum fatigue” by this point. Also, since being inside a “real” historic penitentiary is a large draw for visitors, the museum exhibition may not have as strong an appeal as other areas of the site, which may be perceived to be more “authentic.”

Table 12: Average engagement scores for individual stops in the museum exhibition

Stop	Percent of Visitors (n=21)	Mean	Min	Max	Std. dev.
Weapons Display	62%	3.23	1	4	1.01
Videos (aggregate)	52%	2.91	1	4	1.04
Controversial Vision	43%	2.78	1	4	1.20
Impact Across the Globe	43%	2.56	1	4	1.13
Door Display	38%	3.38	2	4	.744
Tourist in Model Prison	29%	3.17	3	4	.408
Other Prison Models	29%	3.33	2	4	1.03
Penn System Fails	29%	3.17	2	4	.753
Visitation Room Panel	29%	2.67	2	4	.816
Cell Block 7 Display	25%	2.40	1	4	1.14
Key Display	24%	2.80	2	4	.837
First Model Building	19%	3.50	3	4	.577
Reform Panel	15%	3.33	3	4	.577
Battle of Prison Systems	1%	4.00	4	4	.000
Game Over	<1%	3.00	3	3	n/a

Frequency of social interaction

During the timing and tracking study, researchers noted the number of social interactions visitors engaged in throughout the site, excluding those interactions that appeared unrelated to the content of the site (e.g., conversations about how to use the audio guide, what to do afterwards, where to go for lunch, where to find the bathroom, etc.). Interactions included verbal comments as well as gestures, such as pointing something out to another visitor in the group. While individuals visiting alone occasionally interacted with staff or other adults, this section includes data from groups only.

Data indicated that visitors, on average, interacted the most in Cell Block 1 (2.85 interactions on average), followed by interactions visitors had while outside (mean=2.46), Cell Block 7 (mean=1.89), the Museum Exhibit (mean=1.76), and Cell block 4 (mean=1.38). This is interesting because cell blocks 1, 4, and 7 are where the Main Audio tour takes place, suggesting that the audio may actually spark conversation rather than detract from it. The

exit interviews validate these findings, with visitors rating the statement “The visit sparked conversation between me and members of my group” an average of 7.5 out of 10. Fewer social interactions took place in Cell Block 13 (mean=0.36), Cell Block 14 (mean=0.42), and Cell Block 15 (mean=.55), likely because these areas are smaller and there is not as much to see or do in them, as well as a difficulty on some days for researchers to follow visitors into those cells and physically observe their interactions without directly affecting the visitor experience. (See Table 13 below.)

Table 13: Average number of social interactions by area (Groups Only)

Area	n (visitors)	Mean	Min	Max	Std. dev.
Platform	55	0.31	0	1	.505
Cell Block 1	68	2.85	0	11	2.76
Outdoor Stops (aggregate)	70	2.46	0	9	2.46
Cell Block 7	66	1.89	0	12	2.80
Museum exhibit	21	1.76	0	11	2.72
Cell Block 4	66	1.38	0	6	1.37
Cell Block 9	62	1.24	0	10	1.72
Park Avenue	63	1.11	0	9	1.57
Cell Block 10	54	1.09	0	4	1.34
The Hub	69	0.74	0	9	1.36
Cell Block 15 (Death Row)	53	0.55	0	3	.879
Cell Block 14	49	0.42	0	3	.767
Cell Block 13	25	0.36	0	2	.638

Researchers also noted the frequency of who visitors were interacting with—that is, whether it was Adult to Adult, Adult and Child, Adult and Staff, or Child and Staff. (See Table 14). Data indicated that there is much more in-group interaction between adults, or between adults and children, than there is with staff members at Eastern State. This suggests an opportunity for staff members to become more involved in the visitor experience, and to do so more proactively.

Table 14: Social Interactions by Type

Area	N (visitors)	Mean (interactions)	Min	Max	Std. dev.
Main Audio Tour					
Platform (n=55)					
Adult to Adult	11	1.00	1	1	.000
Adult and Child Interactions	1	2.00	2	2	---
Child to Child	2	1.00	1	1	.000
Adult to Staff	none	---	---	---	---
Child to Staff	none	---	---	---	---
Staff to Adult	none	---	---	---	---
Staff to Child	none	---	---	---	---
Cell Block 1 (n=68)					

Adult to Adult	37	3.49	1	10	2.13
Adult and Child Interactions	6	5.50	4	8	1.64
Child to Child	5	2.60	1	4	1.14
Adult to Staff	<i>none</i>	---	---	---	---
Child to Staff	<i>none</i>	---	---	---	---
Staff to Adult	<i>none</i>	---	---	---	---
Staff to Child	<i>none</i>	---	---	---	---
Cell Block 7 (n=66)					
Adult to Adult	27	2.85	1	11	2.54
Adult and Child Interactions	2	4.00	4	4	.000
Child to Child	5	2.00	1	4	1.41
Adult to Staff	4	1.50	1	3	1.00
Child to Staff	<i>none</i>	---	---	---	---
Staff to Adult	4	1.25	1	2	.500
Staff to Child	1	1.00	1	1	---
Cell Block 4 (n=66)					
Adult to Adult	34	2.00	1	5	1.07
Adult and Child Interactions	3	3.33	3	4	.577
Child to Child	3	2.00	1	3	1.00
Adult to Staff	1	1.00	1	1	---
Child to Staff	<i>none</i>	---	---	---	---
Staff to Adult	<i>none</i>	---	---	---	---
Staff to Child	<i>none</i>	---	---	---	---
Other Indoor Areas					
Park Avenue (n=63)					
Adult to Adult	24	2.00	1	9	1.84
Adult and Child Interactions	2	3.00	3	3	.000
Child to Child	2	1.00	1	1	.000
Adult to Staff	2	1.50	1	2	.707
Child to Staff	<i>none</i>	---	---	---	---
Staff to Adult	3	1.00	1	1	.000
Staff to Child	<i>none</i>	---	---	---	---
Cell Block 9 (n=62)					
Adult to Adult	27	2.15	1	10	1.92
Adult and Child Interactions	2	2.00	2	2	.000
Child to Child	1	1.00	1	1	---
Adult to Staff	1	1.00	1	1	---
Child to Staff	<i>none</i>	---	---	---	---
Staff to Adult	1	1.00	1	1	---
Staff to Child	<i>none</i>	---	---	---	---
Cell Block 10 (n=54)					
Adult to Adult	21	1.86	1	4	1.11
Adult and Child Interactions	3	2.67	2	4	1.16
Child to Child	1	4.00	4	4	---
Adult to Staff	<i>none</i>	---	---	---	---
Child to Staff	<i>none</i>	---	---	---	---

Staff to Adult	<i>none</i>	---	---	---	---
Staff to Child	<i>none</i>	---	---	---	---
Cell Block 13 (n=25)					
Adult to Adult	3	1.00	1	1	.000
Adult and Child Interactions	1	2.00	2	2	---
Child to Child	1	1.00	1	1	---
Adult to Staff	1	1.00	1	1	---
Child to Staff	<i>none</i>	---	---	---	---
Staff to Adult	1	1.00	1	1	---
Staff to Child	<i>none</i>	---	---	---	---
Cell Block 14 (n=49)					
Adult to Adult	12	1.50	1	3	.798
Adult and Child Interactions	<i>none</i>	---	---	---	---
Child to Child	1	1.00	1	1	---
Adult to Staff	<i>none</i>	---	---	---	---
Child to Staff	<i>none</i>	---	---	---	---
Staff to Adult	<i>none</i>	---	---	---	---
Staff to Child	<i>none</i>	---	---	---	---
Cell Block 15 (Death Row) (n=53)					
Adult to Adult	16	1.44	1	3	.727
Adult and Child Interactions	1	3.00	3	3	---
Child to Child	<i>none</i>	---	---	---	---
Adult to Staff	<i>none</i>	---	---	---	---
Child to Staff	<i>none</i>	---	---	---	---
Staff to Adult	<i>none</i>	---	---	---	---
Staff to Child	<i>none</i>	---	---	---	---
The Hub (n=69)					
Adult to Adult	14	1.43	1	3	.646
Adult and Child Interactions	<i>none</i>	---	---	---	---
Child to Child	3	1.33	1	2	.577
Adult to Staff	7	1.00	1	1	.000
Child to Staff	<i>none</i>	---	---	---	---
Staff to Adult	2	1.00	1	1	.000
Staff to Child	<i>none</i>	---	---	---	---
Museum exhibit (n=21)					
Adult to Adult	10	3.40	1	11	3.20
Adult and Child Interactions	<i>none</i>	---	---	---	---
Child to Child	<i>none</i>	---	---	---	---
Adult to Staff	<i>none</i>	---	---	---	---
Child to Staff	<i>none</i>	---	---	---	---
Staff to Adult	<i>none</i>	---	---	---	---
Staff to Child	<i>none</i>	---	---	---	---

Outdoor Areas

Outdoor Stops (aggregate) (n=70)

Adult to Adult	37	3.00	1	9	1.80
Adult and Child Interactions	9	3.33	3	2	1.58
Child to Child	3	1.33	1	2	.577
Adult to Staff	5	1.40	1	3	.894
Child to Staff	<i>none</i>	---	---	---	---
Staff to Adult	11	1.00	1	1	.000
Staff to Child	1	1.00	1	1	---

What do visitors take away from their experience at Eastern State Penitentiary?

Data from the exit interviews provides detailed information on: 1) visitor enjoyment and satisfaction; 2) learning outcomes, or what visitors felt they got out of their visit to Eastern State; and 3) suggestions for improving the experience. Despite efforts to stratify the sample to capture more family perspectives of Eastern State, the sample of groups with children was ultimately too small to draw any significant conclusions. However, it is interesting to note that little if any differences were apparent in the responses of adults and children., which suggests that children experience and enjoy the site in many of the same ways as adults do. For the purposes of this study, then, responses from adults and children were analyzed together.

Visitor enjoyment and satisfaction

Overall, visitors were extremely satisfied with their experience at Eastern State. On a scale of 1 to 10 (with 10 being “very much” and 1 being “not at all”), visitors rated their likelihood of recommending Eastern State to others 9.54 on average. They also felt that their expectations were met (mean=9.15), and rated Eastern State extremely high as a site overall (mean=9.16). Visitors were fairly likely to say they would return to Eastern State, rating this item 7.37 on average. However, it is important to note that visitors may feel they have “seen it all” after one visit and that another trip would not necessarily add to the experience. The site may need to consider ways of providing new and different experiences for visitors in order to increase repeat visitation.

When asked to describe what they enjoyed most about their visit to Eastern State, respondents gave a variety of answers. On average, visitors gave an average of 1.9 responses to what they enjoyed about their visit (See Table 15 below). Four predominant trends emerged: Over one-third (35%; n=35) of the visitors mentioned the architecture and/or design of Eastern State as the most enjoyable aspect, including the hub/spoke layout, the impressive size of the site, the gothic looking exterior, the intricate architectural details, and the fact that it was a model for others penitentiaries. Another one-third (31%; n=31) of visitors said they enjoyed learning about the daily lives of the prisoners the most, including the personal stories of inmates, what life was like during different time periods, and various events that occurred at the site (such as escape attempts). Twenty percent (n=20) of visitors most enjoyed learning about the history of Eastern State, how it changed over time, and/or why it is historically significant. Another one-fifth (19%; n=19) mentioned Al Capone’s cell as their favorite aspect of the visit. Ten percent of the responses fell into the category of “other”, because less than three people mentioned it. These “other” reasons for enjoyment include learning about the archeology of the Tunnel and about Pep the Dog, being able to go on a tour, and having a “unique” experience. (See Table 15).

Table 15: What visitors enjoyed most about Eastern State

Responses	Percentage of visitors (n=100)
Architecture, design, layout	35%
Learning about the daily life of inmates	31%
Learning about the history of Eastern State	20%
Al Capone's Cell	19%
Audio tour, interpretive approaches	13%
Experiencing a stabilized ruin	12%
Learning about penal systems, different philosophies	11%
The atmosphere (general)	10%
Authenticity, experience of being inside a "real" prison	8%
Spooky, haunted atmosphere	6%
Death Row	6%
Upstairs, second level	4%
Art Installations	4%
Other	10%

Note: Total equals more than 100% because visitors gave multiple responses (1.9 on average)

These results indicate a great deal of alignment between what visitors enjoy most and key components of the site's mission – such as its architectural design, historical context, and interpretation about the lives of prisoners, wardens, and others connected to Eastern State.

Visitor learning outcomes

Data also indicated that visitors felt they were learning something from their visit to Eastern State. Specifically, visitors rated the item "I realized or learned something new during this visit" 8.77, on average, on a scale of 1 to 10. Visitors also felt the experience sparked conversation among their group (mean=7.5). To a lesser degree, data suggested that visitors were relatively able to make connections between the past and the present (mean=6.74); were inspired to think about criminal justice issues and/or the U.S. penal system (mean=6.12); and became more curious about criminal justice history and wanted to learn more (mean=5.94). However, these averages should be interpreted with some caution as visitors tend to rate items towards the high end of a scale, often out of "social desirability," or the need to please the interviewer. In this light, it is possible that these outcomes are not top of mind for visitors and that Eastern State would need to find ways of supporting visitors in these areas if they are considered important goals for the institution. Finally, though not a learning outcome, visitors indicated they could easily find their way around the site, rating this item 8.90 on average.

When asked in an open-ended question what visitors felt were the key messages or themes of Eastern State, visitors were able to articulate some important messages about the site, its history, what life was like for inmates imprisoned there, and the philosophy behind various penal systems and approaches to criminal justice. On average, visitors gave 1.6 responses to this question. (See Table 16.) More than one third (39%; n=38) felt that the main message or purpose of Eastern State is to convey the history and philosophy behind the penal systems used there, the various practices and ideologies (such as the Quaker notion of "penance" and reform), and how and why this changed over time. The following comments from visitors help illustrate this trend:

“[One of the main themes was the] history of the actual system and what it was trying to do at the time.” (male, 30s)

“The whole concept that what they did back then (isolation) was not appropriate and didn't work, and then how it slowly changed.” (male, 50s)

“What stands out to me is...how society has changed in regards to punishment, retribution-how [the solitary approach] became archaic soon after it opened.” (male, 20s)

“Just trying to reform prisoners, how this was first penitentiary, how it was a good idea.” (female, younger than 20)

Another third (34%; n=33) felt the main message related to what life was like for inmates of Eastern State, including personal stories, how they lived, and the difficult and harsh conditions (e.g. solitary confinement) they experienced. Following are a few representative quotes:

“Just to see how it used to be, how people lived in prisons then compared to what it is now.” (female, 20s)

“How it used to be, what prisons and prison life was like, putting you back in the time.” (male, 20s)

“About how they lived, what they went through, how prison life was back in the 1800s, early 1900s.” (male, 20s)

“It was a philosophy when it started-what life was like at several periods of time...for certain people – 1800s, early 1900s, etc.” (female, 40s)

Almost one-quarter of visitors (22%; n=22) thought that Eastern State was primarily trying to get visitors to think about the various philosophies of criminal justice (such as isolation vs. socialization, reform vs. punishment), and current systems beyond just the walls of Eastern State. The following quotes help illustrate this point:

“The whole idea of rehabilitation and reform, what works, does any incarceration work? What kind works?” (female, 60s)

“The difference between this and other prisons, and how it was revolutionary, and why it was important.” (female, 20s)

Son: “Started out as religious prison with theories, over time became more of a prison.”

Dad: “Interesting to learn that there were "competitive" prisons, like New York.” (male 40s, with son 7-12)

Additional themes and messages that visitors walked away with include the importance of Eastern State in the development of prisons worldwide and as the first penitentiary in the U.S. (16%; n=16); the comparison of past to present systems (10%; n=10), the history of Eastern State in general (10%; n=10); to see and appreciate the architecture (6%; n=6); and to learn a personal or moral lesson about not committing crimes (5%; n=5). These results are encouraging as these messages exhibit a fair amount of alignment with what the site is hoping to communicate to its visitors. Surprisingly, a very small sample of visitors (4%; n=4) indicated that the spooky or

haunted atmosphere was the main theme or message. Another 10% (n=10) could not identify a main theme or message.

Table 16: Main themes that visitors walked away with

Responses	Percentage of visitors (n=50)
History and philosophy behind the penal system at Eastern State, how it changed over time	39%
Daily life of prisoners	34%
Reflecting on different criminal justice systems	22%
Importance of Eastern State	16%
Comparing past to present-day prisons	10%
History of Eastern State (general)	10%
To see and appreciate the architecture	6%
Personal/moral lesson	5%
Spooky, haunted atmosphere	4%
No theme or message	10%
Other	6%

Note: Total equals more than 100% because visitors gave multiple responses (1.6 on average)

Suggestions for improvement

When asked what they would change about Eastern State to make it a better experience for them, visitors gave 1.4 suggestions on average. (See Table 17 below). The most common suggestion (29%: n=27) was to allow visitors access to more areas of the site, either in general or a specific area, such as the infirmary, lookout towers, or Cell Block 12 (which has been featured on the TV show “Ghost Hunters”). Some visitors recognized that this was probably not possible due to safety reasons, but still expressed interest in seeing more of the site. One-quarter of the visitors answering this question (20%; n=19) recommended improvements related to “creature comforts,” such as adding indoor plumbing or cleaner port-a-potties, heating or air conditioning depending on the season, food concessions, and more opportunities to sit down. Fifteen percent of the respondents (n=14) suggested more diversity in interpretive approaches, such as more objects, videos, interactives, live interpreters or guides. (It is unclear whether or not these visitors were aware of the docent-led tours offered by Eastern State.) Thirteen percent (n=12) wanted more live tours offered throughout the day, particularly on weekdays when tour times are less frequent, and 12% (n=11) suggested that Eastern State renovate or refurbish more cells or areas of the site, as they wanted to get a better idea of what the site would have looked like across different periods of time. Another 10% (n=9) suggested more ghost stories; and a full 13% had no suggestions or felt the experience was fine the way it was. Suggestions for improvement that fell into the category of “other” include incorporating more personal stories of the prisoners, making the site more kid friendly, and removing the art installations.

Table 17: Suggestions for improvement from general visitors

Responses	Percentage of visitors (n=100)
More access, fewer barriers	29%
Creature comforts (indoor plumbing, heating, etc.)	20%
Diversity of interpretation approaches	15%
More tours and events	13%
Renovate or refurbish more cells, areas	12%
More ghost stories	10%
Better wayfinding, orientation	6%
Additional content	6%
Nothing, no suggestions, good the way it is	13%
Other	9%

Note: Total equals more than 100% because visitors gave multiple responses (1.4 on average)



Figure 2: Visitors would like the opportunity to go into more areas of Eastern State, such as the Guard Tower, Hospital, and Kitchen

Prearranged Adult Group Tours

This section summarizes results from the focus groups conducted after hour-long prearranged adult tour groups visiting Eastern State. The purpose of this portion of the study was to document and understand general trends of the tour group experience; therefore results are reported together and not analyzed by each individual group.

Description of sample

Five pre-arranged adult tour groups were included in this study: 1) two groups of Questers, an international hobbyist group interested in antiques, collectibles, and history; 2) the East Strausbourg Veterinarian Clinic, a professional group who chose to have their annual holiday party at Eastern State; 3) a group of friends from

Maryland and New Jersey who decided to come to the site as a special outing together; and 3) the Lutheran Home at Topton, a retirement/senior citizen residence.

Looking across all five groups, almost three-quarters were female (72%; n=61) and 28% male (n=24). While this distribution is different than for other data sets, in that the number of females is much higher, we cannot draw any generalizable conclusions about participants in adult tour groups; rather, the difference is likely due to the specific make-up of these five groups. Nearly half of the participants (44%; n=38) were over 70 years old and 13% (n=11) were in their 60s, mostly because the two Questers groups, and naturally the retirement group, were comprised almost solely of senior citizens; 15% (n=13) were in their twenties; another 15% (n=13) were in their forties; and 12% (n=10) were in their thirties. One person was in their 50s and one person was under 20 years old. Similar to general walk-in visitors, the vast majority (94%; n=80) identified as White/Caucasian.

Only 7% of focus group participants (n=6) had been to Eastern State before, while the majority (93%; n=80) had not. Only three of those had visited in the past five years. None of the group tour participants were members of Eastern State. However, data showed that the tour group participants were frequent visitors of historic sites, partly due to the fact that two of the groups were Questers, an organization focused on exploring history and historic sites. It also makes sense that a group arranging a special tour to a historic site would naturally have a relatively high interest in history. More than a quarter of the participants (27%; n=23) said they visit historic sites 6 or more times per year; one-fifth (20%; n=17) said they visit other historic sites/museums 4-5 times a year; more than one third (38%; n=33) visit 2-3 times a year, and 10% (n=9) said they visited a historic site once a year on average. Only 5% (n=4) reported that they do not generally visit any historic sites. (See Table 18 below.)

Table 18: Characteristics of Group Tour sample

Characteristic	Group Tours
Gender <i>n=85</i>	
Female	72%
Male	28%
Race/ethnicity <i>n=85</i>	
Caucasian	94%
Native American	4%
Asian, Pacific Islander	1%
African American	1%
Age <i>n=87</i>	
Under 20 yrs	1%
20-29 yrs	15%
30-39 yrs	12%
40-49 yrs	15%
50-59 yrs	1%
60-69 yrs	13%
70 yrs and older	44%
Visited Eastern State before? <i>n=86</i>	
Yes	7%
No	93%
Visitation of other historic sites or history museums (per year) <i>n=86</i>	
None	5%
Once	10%
2-3 times	38%
4-5 times	20%
6 or more times	27%
Eastern State membership <i>n=81</i>	
Yes	0%
No	100%

* Note that Ns are lower than total due to missing data

** Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding

Motivations and expectations

Participants were interested in visiting Eastern State for several reasons, including a personal interest in history and historical architecture, to see something unusual or out of the ordinary, to experience an interesting and educational place, and because they were intrigued by the “creepiness” or “haunted” aspects of the site – although this last motivation was only expressed by groups coming in the Fall, around the Halloween holiday. Some participants also noted that they had been to other prison sites and wanted to compare Eastern State to those experiences. Participants generally chose to come as a group rather than on their own in order to do something fun together, bond with each other outside of normal contexts (such as work), share an experience, and/or because they feel they gain more by experiencing the site with others – for example, several participants noted that other group members asked questions they found interesting but would not have thought of otherwise.

Facilitators also prompted participants to talk about what they expected or hoped to experience at Eastern State. Few had been to Eastern State before, so were relying on what they had read in books, seen on TV, or heard from others who had been there. They generally expected to learn something about the history of the site, as well as the history of penitentiaries and prisons more broadly; to experience a “real” prison, even if no longer functioning as one; to see a beautiful old building with unusual architecture; and to hear stories about the “haunted” nature of the site. In the Fall focus groups, quite a few participants specifically expected that the issue of ghosts and hauntings would be part of the tour; and some others thought there would at least be “dark” stories about the inmates who had lived at Eastern State. This issue did not come up during the Spring focus groups, likely due to seasonality (i.e. not taking place near Halloween) and perhaps the nature of the groups themselves – that is, largely comprised of senior citizens and/or history buffs, neither of whom are as likely to be focused on the paranormal.

Enjoyment and satisfaction

Data from the focus group survey showed that group tour participants were very satisfied with their visit to Eastern State, rating their enjoyment 8.83, on average, on a scale of 1 to 10, and their likelihood of recommending Eastern State to a friend or family member 8.64 on average. However, they were not as likely to say that they would personally visit Eastern State again, rating this item 7.19 on average. (See Table 19). This suggests that some group tour visitors feel there may not be enough to come back for, or that they have experienced everything the site has to offer the first time.

Table 19: Satisfaction levels for adult tour groups

Statement (1 to 10)	n	Min	Max	Mean	Std. dev.
I enjoyed my visit to Eastern State today	90	2	10	8.83	1.41
I would recommend visiting Eastern State Penitentiary to a friend or family member	90	1	10	8.64	1.95
If possible, I would visit Eastern State Penitentiary again	88	1	10	7.19	2.63

When asked to talk about what they found most enjoyable or interesting about the Eastern State visit, group tour participants offered a variety of responses, as indicated below:

Knowledgeable, friendly tour guides. Overall, the groups were very pleased with the tour guide they had. They repeatedly made comments about how knowledgeable, friendly, and interesting the tour guide was; and sometimes contrasted them to other tour experiences at museums or historic sites. Some noted the enthusiasm of their guide, and appreciated how they shared their passion about the site with the group. The veterinarian group in particular felt that the tour guide tailored the experience for them, such as by highlighting the stories of “Pep the Dog” and the “Ghost Cats.” Participants also generally felt that the tour was engaging and interesting—holding their attention while not lingering too long in any one place.

Architecture and design of Eastern State. Many tour participants particularly enjoyed the architectural design of the building. They were amazed by the size, detail, and beauty of the building, which came as a surprise

to many. Most also appreciated the fact that it was a “stabilized ruin,” though some wanted to see more of the site as it would have appeared in the past.

Experiencing a “real” penitentiary. Some participants noted that they enjoyed being able to experience a “real”, authentic site. This allowed them to get a sense of what life would have been like for inmates, and offered them a more visceral experience. One participant enjoyed “just seeing the actual conditions – which I guess you can imagine, but to actually see them is [different.]”

Learning about the historical context of Eastern State and how it developed over time. The tour groups, many of whom had a specific interest in history, felt that the tour allowed them to learn and reflect about the penal philosophy of the site and how it changed over time. During the focus groups, participants talked a great deal about the original philosophy of the penitentiary’s founders, its ultimate failure as a system, alternate systems of reform and rehabilitation, and comparisons between past systems and modern day prisons. For example, one participant noted: “I think it was interesting how humanely the original people who started [Eastern State], how humane their theories were. It didn’t turn out to be that way, but they really were trying to do something better for these people and to convert them and bring them back to society better than when they left.”

Personal stories and daily lives of prisoners. Tour group participants also greatly appreciated any references to stories of inmates and their daily lives. They enjoyed learning about the famous prisoners, such as Al Capone, but also learning about what life would have been like for ordinary inmates, wardens, and others involved in the penitentiary. In fact, many participants noted that they wanted to learn more about these aspects of the penitentiary during the tour. (See Suggestions for Improvement).

Learning outcomes

On the written survey, focus group participants were asked to rate four learning outcome statements on a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 being “not at all” and 10 being “very much.” Overall, participants rated these outcomes moderately high, ranging from 7.00 to 8.90, on average. (See Table 20).

The highest ranked item was “learning something new” (mean=8.90), suggesting that the tours do offer participants new information and ideas related to the site. Though the other items were still ranked quite high, tour group participants were less likely to feel that the tour increased their curiosity about criminal justice history and issues (mean=7.00), helped them think about criminal issues or the penal system in new ways (mean=7.52), or encouraged them to connect the past to the present (mean=7.69).

Table 20: Satisfaction and learning scales for tour group participants

Statement (1 to 10)	n	Mean	Std. dev.	Min	Max
I realized or learned something new during this visit	90	8.90	1.57	2	10
The visit helped me think about criminal issues and/or the U.S. penal system in new ways	89	7.52	2.38	1	10
I was able to make connections between the past and the present	88	7.69	2.11	1	10
The visit made more curious about criminal justice history and issues and I want to learn more	89	7.00	2.65	1	10

When asked to talk about what they gained from visiting Eastern State, focus group participants gave a variety of responses. These include:

Historical and philosophical context of Eastern State. Many tour group participants conveyed that they learned a lot about the history of Eastern State, the philosophy behind the penitentiary, how it influenced other sites throughout the world, and how the prison and its philosophy changed over time. For example, one participant commented: “I thought it was interesting to see the evolution of the prison, how it went from solitary, and then they learned that this was not a good way to keep prisoners, but they needed to have more (social interaction).”

Criminal justice issues. The tour also prompted some participants to think about how we treat prisoners today, what is right or wrong, and the complexities of finding a system that works. These participants felt they were able to make comparisons between the past and the present, with some noting that we are still struggling with some of the same questions and issues today. Clearly, the tours sparked thoughts about how crime should be dealt with, what works and what doesn’t, and how the history of Eastern State is relevant to issues we are facing today.

Experience of being a prisoner. Many tour group participants also felt they learned something of what it was like to be an inmate at Eastern State, particularly mentioning the harsh conditions of the earlier days (i.e. solitary confinement), the escape attempts, and what they felt were extreme sentences given the nature of the crimes (i.e. stealing a horse or loaf of bread).

Historical facts related to Eastern State. Some group tour participants mentioned specific facts they had learned during the tour, such as the origin of the term “penitentiary”; the fact that there was plumbing and indoor heating at Eastern State before it existed in most homes, including the White House; the meaning of the “god’s eye” skylights; and how philosophically advanced Eastern State was for its time.

Suggestions for improvement

While the tour group participants generally had a positive experience at Eastern State, they offered many suggestions as to how to improve the experience for other visitors. These included the following:

Add more personal stories. One of the strongest trends was the suggestion to add more personal stories and details of individual lives (such as those of inmates or wardens)—before, during, and after their time at Eastern State. Participants were curious about such topics as what sentences were given for specific crimes, to

what extent released inmates were successful in reintegrating into society, and what life was like for women at Eastern State. Some participants noticed exhibits about individuals as they walked through the site, but felt that the tour did not focus enough on these individual stories. They emphasized that learning about specific individuals would be a powerful way to connect to the site and get a better sense of what life was like at Eastern State. As one participant put it, “the architecture is great, but people really want to know more about living there.”

Create an immersive, experiential tour. Some tour group participants wanted a more “immersive” experience in which they could actually feel what it would have been like to be an inmate – such as by having more opportunities to walk inside cells and/or the exercise yards, to walk through the motions of intake, being put in a cell (though they also recognized the legal implications of this idea), having audio clips of what the prison sounded like, or even taking on the identity of a specific person and following their story throughout the visit, citing the Holocaust Museum and the *Titanic* exhibit as examples of this approach. One participant suggested an audio track in which you could “hear the banging on the bars...the sounds of the dining room. I think what everyone is saying is ‘bring the place alive.’”

Increase access to site, more renovation. Many participants wanted to have access to more of the site, such as the hospital, guard towers, upper levels, or “haunted” areas. Similarly, some suggested renovating more of the site, such as a refurbished cell other than Al Capone’s, for comparison purposes, or renovating cells or cell blocks to show what the penitentiary would have looked like during different time periods.

Provide an orientation or introduction video. Several participants suggested an orientation video of some kind. While they enjoyed the personal interactions with the tour guide, they felt that a brief overview of the site and its history would prepare them better for the tour.

Offer multiple ways of interacting with the site. Some tour group participants wanted more variety of interactions on the tour, rather than a mostly didactic, lecture style. Instead, they wanted multiple ways of experiencing the site—such as more use of hands-on activities, archival photos and documents, films and video. In addition, some suggested allowing more time for unstructured exploration of the site.

Creature comforts. Particularly because many of the tour group participants in the study were seniors, some suggested having opportunities to sit down during the tour. One hour was simply too long for many of them, and they would have enjoyed the tour more if it were broken up by periods of resting, or sitting and watching a video or having a discussion.

Finally, other suggested included adding more of the “haunted” stories to the tour (this was suggested only in the Fall focus groups); having smaller groups or splitting up large groups so that individuals could see and do more during the tour; and offering specialized tour topics in addition to the general tour, which they felt might encourage repeat visitation.

School Groups

Description of sample

A total of 20 teachers who had brought students to Eastern State were interviewed by phone as part of the school group study. One teacher represented elementary school students; 8 represented middle school students (including one home school group); 5 teachers had brought high school students; 5 were representing college or

university students; and 1 teacher brought a group of adults training for careers in police, corrections, or fire emergency fields. Subjects taught included English, language arts, social studies, history, sociology, psychology, and criminology. More than half (55%; n=11) of the teachers interviewed had brought students to Eastern State in the past, and 11 had also been to Eastern State on their own as a visitor (though there was not necessarily a correlation between bringing students and having been on their own). The teachers interviewed were relatively experienced professionally. About one third (35%; n=7) had taught for 20 or more years; two teachers had been teaching for 15-19 years; three for 10-14 years; five for 5 to 9 years; and three for less than five years. (See Table 21 below).

Table 21: Teacher/school group sample characteristics

Characteristic	
Grade level	
	n=20
Elementary (up to grade 5)	5%
Middle school (6-8)	40%
High school (9-12)	25%
College or university (undergrad, grad)	25%
Technical/professional	5%
Teacher brought students to Eastern State in the past	
	n=20
Yes	55%
No	45%
Teacher had been to Eastern State on their own	
	n=20
Yes	55%
No	45%
Number of years teaching	
	n=20
Less than 5 years	15%
5 – 9 years	25%
10 – 14 years	15%
15 – 19 years	10%
20 or more years	35%

Motivations for coming to Eastern State

Teachers articulated a variety of reasons for bringing students to Eastern State. One of the most common motivations was that they felt the visit would support and enhance their curriculum and/or classroom teaching, such as by addressing issues of social history, criminal justice, prison reform, or psychology. This tended to be more common among high school teachers and college professors, who likely have more focused courses. Teachers also felt the visit would 1) offer a hands-on approach to history; 2) provide a “real” or authentic experience of the past; 3) help students understand their community better and/or give them a better sense of Philadelphia history; 4) offer a unique, fun, and different experience from other field trip options; 5) experience an important architectural site; and 6) to instill a sense of morality, why it’s important to be a “good person,” and the consequences of breaking the law.

Student enjoyment of their visit to Eastern State

Data suggested that teachers perceived students as highly interested and engaged in their tour of Eastern State. When asked to rate their students' interest/engagement level on a scale of 1 to 10 (with one being "not at all" and 10 being "very much"), teachers gave an average rating of 9.16. The aspects they felt students enjoyed the most included:

The experience of being in a "real" or authentic prison, being able to go inside of the cells, and getting a more immersive sense of what it would have been like to be an inmate at Eastern State. Some teachers contrasted this experience to what students may have read about or seen on TV, emphasizing that students enjoyed being able to have a real, visceral experience of the historic site. For example, one middle school teacher commented: "They enjoyed the fact that they could be inside a prison – they'd heard about prisons, but it gives them a chance to actually go inside, see how it functions."

Personal stories of inmates and others connected to the penitentiary, including the man who took care of the "ghost cats" after the prison shut down, inmates who attempted escape from the prison, Pep the Dog, and the boy who was born at Eastern State. Teachers felt that students were able to connect better to what life was like at the prison through these stories, which better captured their attention than more general discussions of history or the site itself.

Celebrity or "pop culture" topics, such as the movies that were filmed at Eastern State, the TV show "Ghost Hunters," and Al Capone's prison cell. For example, a community college counselor noted, "They did want to see the celebrity part of it...like Al Capone's cell."

The perceived "creepy" or macabre aspects of the site, such as Death Row and an association with ghost sightings – largely from the Halloween program ("Terror Behind the Walls") and television shows that mention paranormal activity at the site.

The architecture and physical layout of the site, including the fact that it is an old, historic structure, and that it has been maintained as a "stabilized ruin" rather than completely renovated.

Learning about the philosophy of reform versus punishment, and comparing past treatment of inmates to the present.

Perceived value and benefits of the visit for students

Teachers were able to articulate many specific benefits of bringing students to Eastern State. While some of the value they saw in the visit naturally overlapped with what they felt students enjoyed about the visit, they generally talked about the benefits to students in the following ways:

Giving students an authentic, immersive experience of a "real" prison and a sense of what it would have been like to be imprisoned at Eastern State. Some teachers described the value of this further – such as the fact that students get a more realistic view of prison life than they do on TV or in movies, that it helps them step out of their own daily life and perspective, and that experiential or "in situ" learning may have a stronger impact on students' learning. Following are a few comments to help illustrate this point:

"It was beneficial because the students have a glorified vision of what prison is like – this was a realistic vision; it's not an easy thing." (high school teacher)

“Being able to see and imagine what it must have been like to be locked away in solitary confinement with an injunction to reflect upon your sins.” (university professor)

“It was an actual prison, so they got to understand that you have a limited amount of space, even using the restroom is not a private thing. It gave them a more realistic feel for a prison than what you see in movies.” (high school teacher)

“Having the same conversations in the classroom with each other and having them in the structure is most valuable, and that’s what they will remember...They were asking questions they might have asked in the classroom, but this will stick with them the longest...It’s a very different thing going to a museum versus going to an actual site...When you stand in the cell and look at this little window, the eye of god, it’s a very different thing (than reading about it). That kind of experiential learning is not comparable to what you do in a classroom or an artificial environment like a museum.” (university professor)

Reinforcing ideas or material they are covering in class by having a more tangible, concrete experience at a historical site. For example, one high school teacher commented: “I think the value is that it makes what we’re doing in class more valid or memorable. This is something that now when we talk about the prison system, I can constantly refer to the trip. It gives them a concrete base for concepts that we talked about in class.”

Helping students gain understanding or awareness of different philosophies of imprisonment (such as the Quaker isolation approach to reform), and how and why those philosophies shifted over time. For example, one community college professor noted, “I think that just to be able to...see how something developed, the motivations for how it developed...Like Eastern State started with the philosophy of isolation and then evolved into a congregate philosophy because the isolation model didn’t work...They watch a lot of TV, they see prisons in a certain way, and probably don’t normally think about what purpose they serve, whether there could be other models of thinking about dealing with prisons. Sociologically, it was consciousness-raising.”

Giving students a sense of how a local, Philadelphia site played a much broader role in the United States and worldwide in shaping the way prisons were structured, both architecturally and philosophically. The following comments illustrate this point:

“I think it’s good that they know things that are in Philadelphia...(to see places) of historic importance that’s not the Constitution Center but things of everyday life. Eastern State tells a lot about our society and that’s what we’re trying to increase awareness of.” (middle school teacher)

“What I find most valuable is that (the students) are able to see how Philadelphia played a part in shaping (prisons), not only in the United States but worldwide...They are able to see how the ideas that originated during the Revolution shaped world history.” (high school teacher)

Deterring students from breaking the law. Some teachers felt that part of the value of bringing students to the site was to encourage students to reflect on their own lives and morality, and to hopefully deter students from breaking the law. One middle school teacher noted the experience might “scare [her students] a bit”; and a high school teacher who worked with at-risk youth felt that being inside a real prison, even if a historic site, might help prevent her students from engaging in delinquent behavior.

Perceived learning outcomes for students

Teachers were asked to rate five learning outcomes on a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 being “not at all” and 10 being “very much”. Data indicated that teachers felt students gained a lot from their visit to Eastern State, with ratings ranging from 6.89 to 9.16 on average. (See Table 22).

Table 22: Teacher ratings of learning outcomes for students

Statement (1 to 10)	n	Mean	Min	Max
My students were interested and engaged in the tour/visit to Eastern State	19	9.16	8	10
My students realized or learned something new during the visit	19	9.16	7	10
The visit sparked conversation among my students (during or after the visit)	18	7.83	4	10
The visit helped my students think about criminal justice issues and/or the US penal system	18	6.89	1	10
My students were able to connect the past to the present	16	8.38	4	10

Data suggested that teachers felt students were highly engaged and interested during their visit to Eastern State, rating this statement 9.16 on average. Teachers were also asked to describe why they felt students were engaged and interested. Following are a few representative comments:

“They were totally psyched to go – they were absorbed and wanted to learn more.” (high school teacher)

“They planned it, they wanted to go. I think they really enjoyed it, they asked all kinds of questions. It kept their attention. [We] had a hard time getting them back to the bus.” (middle school teacher)

“They had never experienced this before, and it pertained to their potential careers. Most people prefer the hands-on experience vs. a textbook.” (post-secondary tech school teacher)

Teachers were equally positive about the learning they felt occurred for their students during the visit, rating this statement 9.16 on average. Based on open-ended probes, following are a few representative comments that help illustrate what teachers felt students learned:

“They asked questions, remembered things, and talked about it...[they got] a lot out of learning about the baseball field, how exercise and interaction were integrated into the system.” (middle school teacher)

“Some kids took more away from it than others, some explored more, listened more than others. It just depends on the student...(but I think they learned anything) from the way the building was put together, the escapes, and the experience for prisoners. (high school teacher)

“I don’t think [the students] had an awareness that this existed at all...so they had no idea what to expect. Some thought it was a haunted house, they didn’t realize [there was more to it.] The individuals who stayed there – Al Capone, the man who was a mason and dug out the tunnel, feats of human will.” (middle school teacher)

Teachers also felt that the tour helped students connect the past to the present, rating this statement 8.38 on average. Some example comments on this outcome include:

“Some [students] have been inside prisons of today, and they compared the rules and regulations of the past to the present.” (middle school teacher)

“[The students] asked a lot of questions comparing the modern prisons that you see in movies, or if they’d been [to a real prison], to Eastern State.” (high school teacher)

“Some of these kids are on probation, so they talked about just how they have to do community service, and then it was different...Back then there wasn’t probation or community service; they wanted to humiliate you for your crimes.” (high school teacher)

Data suggested that teachers were less likely to feel the visit sparked conversation among their students, although they still rated this outcome relatively high (7.83 on average). In some cases, this was due to the fact that the teacher being interviewed did not regularly see the students they chaperoned on the trip, so were not able to judge beyond conversations they heard on site or on the bus ride home. Following are a couple of quotes that help illustrate this trend:

“They said they enjoyed it, but I haven’t had the opportunity [to see them] since” (high school teacher)

“I wasn’t around them since they’ve been back; on the trip home they really weren’t discussing it. I’m sure they went back to their homerooms and talked about the trip, but I wasn’t around, so I can’t really say one way or the other.” (high school teacher)

For teachers who did note conversations about Eastern State among their students, following are a few example comments:

“Going back to the school, [we] discussed the idea of how to balance out discipline with the needs of society.” (middle school teacher)

“The first couple of days after was when they talked about it. They had two different tour guides, so they were saying “did this one tell you that,” “did that one show you this?” They told each other what they found interesting. They talked about for a while the weapons the prisoners made...like how they made weapons out of butter knives.” (middle school teacher)

“Starting with the wall, this kind of separation from the community. What if any communication was there across that wall? Were any incarcerated criminals allowed contact, even after breakdown of the confinement era? And then the cutaway model that gives you a sense of how they maintained the isolation elicited a lot of questions of the practical (means of isolation).” (university professor)

Some teachers felt the tour did not encourage students to think as much about criminal justice issues and/or the US penal system, rating this statement 6.89 on average. Following are a couple comments from teachers on this issue:

“We didn’t really go over criminal justice issues (on the tour). We didn’t go over how they go there, what their term was, and so on. We just went over what life was like in the prison.”
(home school teacher)

“Because of their age, I’m not sure they were thinking about [criminal justice issues] in depth beyond what they were experiencing.” (middle school teacher)

Value of Eastern State visit for teachers

Data indicated that teachers perceive a great deal of value in bringing students to Eastern State through the school program. Teachers highly rated statements pertaining to satisfaction (including whether or not they would recommend the program to another teacher, the likelihood of their bringing a class back to Eastern State, the degree to which their expectations were met, and their overall perception of Eastern State as a place to bring students), with average ratings between 9.00 and 9.82 on a 10-point scale (See Table 23).

Table 23: Teacher satisfaction with Eastern State visit

Question (rate from 1 “not at all” or “poor” to 10 “very much” or “excellent”)	n	Mean	Min	Max
How likely is it that you would recommend a colleague bring a class to Eastern State?	17	9.76	8	10
How likely is it that you would bring a class back to Eastern State?	17	9.82	8	10
To what degree were your expectations met?	16	9.00	7	10
How would you rate Eastern State Penitentiary overall as a place to bring your students?	17	9.41	7	10

Note that Ns are lower than total due to missing data

Not surprisingly, there was some overlap between what teachers saw as benefits to students and what they valued themselves about the visit. From a professional standpoint, they are most concerned with what students get out of the visit and how it connects to their own teaching goals and curriculum. Teachers talked about the value of the Eastern State visit to themselves as follows:

Reinforces important ideas that they are trying to teach in the classroom, including different views of punishment, rehabilitation, social issues; comparing current to past penal systems; and, for one art teacher, how art “really connects the situation and the expression of the situation.” In addition, teachers were able to talk about the ways they could integrate the experience into their classroom teacher later, such as through discussions about the visit, referencing Eastern State as an example in their lessons, or through follow-up writing and reflection activities.

Logistical aspects of the field trip, such as the tours were well-organized and well thought-out; the length was the right amount; and a good ratio of docents to students. Some teachers also commented that the docents were knowledgeable, engaging, and knew how to engage with students “at their level,” without talking down to them.

Contributing to their understanding of Philadelphia’s role in social history. A couple of teachers also felt it was valuable to bring students to a historic site that is not the “typical” Philadelphia story, but is still an important part of it.

Teacher learns or experiences something new, either personally or professional. For example, some teachers talked about the value of learning more about the history of Eastern State, new facts and perspectives on the role of the site in US history more broadly, the history of the prison system, nationally and globally, and how that changed over time, and being able to better compare the past to the present in terms of criminal justice practices and philosophy.

Makes history more lively and interesting. A couple of history teachers felt the Eastern State visit benefited them by showing students that learning about history is not necessarily “dry and boring,” as it’s sometimes viewed by students, but can instead be exciting, interesting, and engaging. Similarly, one middle school teacher felt the trip allowed her to appeal to her students’ interest in the “macabre” or “creepy” aspects at Halloween time, while providing them with an educational experience focused on history.

Learning more about their students, or being able to experience the site through their student’s eyes. For example, one teacher felt that the visit helped her make more personal connections with her students

Suggestions for better supporting teacher needs

Researchers asked teachers how Eastern State might better support teachers, offering them possibilities of pre/post activities, website resources, and teacher workshops. Overall, teachers were highly interested in having pre/post activities or materials to enhance the visit and to help them better incorporate the visit into their classroom teaching. Specific suggestions included: 1) a list of books or articles that students and teachers could read prior to the visit; 2) a fact sheet or orientation sheet that would provide some basic history of the site in advance, so that both students and teachers would be more prepared; 3) specific lesson plans tied into the site, focused on such topics as art, architecture, criminal justice, social history, or journalism; and 4) an orientation video to look at in advance or back in class after the trip.

Teachers were also somewhat interested in website resources for similar reasons—mostly to provide opportunities for them to better prepare themselves and their students for a visit. A couple teachers suggested having reading lists and other resources online, such as images of the site, so as to reinforce the learning onsite.

There was mild interest in teacher workshops. These teachers felt the workshops could help them to better integrate the Eastern State visit into their classroom teaching, apply the visit across the experience, and meet the state professional development requirements (Act 48) in a fun and interesting way.

Suggestions for improving school tours

While teachers were overall highly satisfied with the Eastern State school tour, they were able to offer numerous ways in which they felt the experience could be improved. These recommendations included the following:

Make the tours more hands-on, interactive, and “immersive.” Some teachers felt there was too much didactic teaching involved, and not enough opportunity for students to engage in multiple ways. A couple of

teachers suggested having a “scavenger” hunt of sorts, in which students could be looking for certain objects or themes as part of the tour; and a couple felt that providing primary source materials or archival documents to look at, such as warden’s diaries or records, would enhance the experience. One teacher suggested allowing students to operate a prison door in order to “feel” what that would be like or to somehow show what a lock-down was like; another suggested a mock intake experience or something akin to the Holocaust museum in which visitors are given an “identity” that they follow throughout the visit. Teachers felt these more hands-on and kinesthetic experiences would provide a more visceral and engaging experience for students.

Add more personal stories of individuals who were inmates, wardens, or in some other way connected to Eastern State. Some teachers felt that stories of individual lives captured students’ attention and interest the most. As one teacher commented, “these are what they will remember.”

More engaging, dynamic tour guides. A couple teachers felt that the tour guides could be even more dynamic and engaging for kids, such as in their style and mannerisms, or by having students participate more.

Keep students moving at a quicker pace, rather than staying in a few places for longer periods of time, where some students might get bored and disengage.

Give students more orientation to the site and its history, such as through a video they could watch in the classroom before coming to Eastern State or once they arrived.

Offer more specific, topic-based tours. A couple teachers were interested in a more specific, topic-based tour rather than a general tour. These teachers felt the experience could be even more connected to their curriculum if the tour could be more customized. One suggested a tour that focused on youth and how juvenile criminals were dealt with, suggesting that the students might connect well to this topic.

Additional suggestions included showing what the prison looked like at different periods of time (such as through renovated areas or cells); facilitating a discussion or Q&A after the tour, so that students can better process the information and experience of the tour: and having more time to explore the site on their own after the tour.

Overall, data suggested that the school tours could benefit from more variety and different modes of interacting and engaging, particularly through more hands-on components, experiences and/or stories that put students “in the shoes” of inmates to get a better sense of what this life was like, and more opportunities to have engaging discussions about what students see and experience at Eastern State.

CONCLUSIONS

Overall, Eastern State Penitentiary provides a unique, engaging, and educational experience for its visitors, whether for family and adult walk-in visitors, prearranged tour groups, or school tours. As data from this study suggest, visitors of all types are highly satisfied with their experience at Eastern State and walk away with a better understanding of the site's history and philosophical framework, its connections to social history more broadly, as well as a sense of what life was like for inmates at Eastern State across different periods of time. In general, they spend a significant amount of time at the site (regardless of inclement weather), and leave with a positive feeling about Eastern State and a high likelihood of recommending a visit to others.

While results from the visitor study raise several pertinent themes which are relevant across all visitor groups included in the study, this section draws conclusions based on the three key audience groups: 1) *walk-in visitors*, both families and adult-only groups; 2) *prearranged adult tour groups*; and 3) *school tour groups*, including elementary, middle, high school, and college/university level.

Walk-in visitors

Results from the Eastern State Penitentiary Historic Site Visitor Study suggest several pertinent themes in relation to walk-in visitors: 1) access and wayfinding, or the ways in which visitors navigate the physical site; 2) interpretation and engagement, or the ways and extent to which visitors make meaning out of what they see and do; and 3) learning outcomes, or what visitors take away from their experience at Eastern State. As the study revealed no significant differences between family groups and adult-only groups, conclusions about both groups are included together.

Access and wayfinding

Walk-in visitors tend to visit the site very thoroughly – that is, most areas were visited by a high percentage of participants in the study. The most visited Cell Blocks were those included on the Main Audio Tour, which suggest that audio guides can influence visitor choices and can be used to manage visitor flow and visitor attention.

One of the strongest messages from walk-in visitors is that they want to have more access to the site. While they recognize the challenges Eastern State faces in making areas of the site safe for visitors, they consistently wanted more access to specific areas, such as the hospital and kitchen, or to different “views” of the site, such as upper level cell blocks and the guard tower.

Similarly, visitors wanted to see more renovated portions of the site. While many appreciate the feeling of the “stabilized ruin,” and do not want that to change, they also value getting a better sense of what the space looked like when it was in use. For example, some visitors suggested renovating more cells to show how they looked at different periods of time in the penitentiary's history.

Most visitors felt they could find their way around the site relatively easily. However, observational data suggest that some areas and stops were little visited due to lack of signage, and that many visitors became lost – even during the main audio tour – because they could not readily figure out which direction to go in to continue

the self-guided tour. Visitors often consulted their maps, backtracked, and asked staff for directions. It is interesting to note, though, that visitors did not *feel* they were lost, or that they were missing important areas of the site.

The Museum Exhibition is the least visited area of the site, likely because of its location and lack of signage directing visitors there. In addition, visitors seem to cherish the “authentic” and “real” and may view the exhibition as an add-on, rather than an authentic part of the site.

Interpretation and engagement

Overall, walk-in visitors were very pleased with the way in which the site was interpreted, and particularly enjoyed the self-guided nature of the audio tour, the depth and types of information provided, and the inclusion of personal stories, such as through archival photos and audio clips. They felt they were able to access useful information about the site, but also make choices about what interested them the most.

Walk-in visitors demonstrated relatively high engagement in many areas of the site, especially areas that offer some kind of exploration or unique view of the penitentiary, such as the open cells in Cell Block 1, or the Staircase going up to the second level of Cell Block 7. Visitors were also drawn to displays that gave them a sense of what life was like for inmates, such as the refurbished cell in Cell Block 1 and the photographs in Cell Block 4. Also popular were stops related to the “macabre” (including Ghosts at Eastern State and The Hole).

However, some visitors wanted to experience more diversity of interpretive modes. Specifically, they wanted more hands-on, interactive, and immersive experiences, such as by being able to see or touch objects/artifacts, walk into more cells, or have more video clips available. They felt the diversity of interpretation could give them a better sense of what life was like at Eastern State in a more visceral, experiential way; similarly, many also wanted to hear even more personal stories related to daily life in the prison.

Visitors who experienced a docent-led tour were generally very engaged and satisfied with the experience. However, data from the study suggest that very few of Eastern State’s visitors actually take a docent-led tour; perhaps because the tours are not advertised enough, do not fit into visitors’ time schedules, do not convey a clear sense of what they’re about (such as “Left Behind”), and are offered infrequently during the weekdays.

Learning outcomes

Walk-in visitors strongly feel that they learn something new by visiting Eastern State, especially in terms of the history of the site, new and interesting historical facts, the architecture, and the evolution of the penitentiary system at Eastern State and in the US more broadly. While many visitors enjoy the “celebrity” (Al Capone, Willie Sutton) and more “haunted” or “macabre” aspects of Eastern State, these interests did not prevent them from absorbing messages about the site’s history, philosophy of reform, and the experience of “ordinary” prisoners. Overall, Eastern State provides walk-in visitors with new insights into how and why the penitentiary was built, some of the issues founders and other leaders struggled with, and how inmates experienced life at Eastern State during different periods of time.

However, walk-in visitors are slightly less likely to feel that the visit helped them think about the criminal justice system in new ways, inspired curiosity in them about criminal justice issues, or helped them connect the past to the present.

Prearranged adult group tours

Participants in pre-arranged tour groups are also highly satisfied with their experience and are likely to recommend it to others. They feel the tour guides are extremely knowledgeable and enthusiastic about the site, and that the tour offers them a valuable learning experiences. Participants feel that they are getting something special and unique through the guided tour, sometimes noting that it felt customized to their needs and interests.

Similar to walk-in visitors, however, tour group participants wanted more diverse ways of engaging with the site. While they learned a lot from the tour guide, they felt that the tour involved too much lecturing and not enough interaction and discussion. Further, they wanted more hands-on and immersive experiences, such as being able to touch or look at more objects, walk into more areas, and generally get a more visceral feeling for what life would have been like at Eastern State. In short, they wanted the building to “come alive” more and, in particular, to hear more personal stories about inmates and wardens, and gain an even better understanding of what daily life was like at the penitentiary.

Finally, as with walk-in visitors, tour group participants would like to see more of the site and to experience more renovated areas. Some also feel the time was too short, and that they needed more time to explore on their own. On the other hand, some tour participants – particularly the elderly – become tired and would like more opportunities to rest throughout the tour.

Overall, however, tour group participants feel they gain a great deal from the visit to Eastern State. They experience something unique, and learn about the history of Eastern State, how and why it was built, the underlying philosophy of the site, and what life might have been like for inmates of Eastern State. The tour also inspires them to think about issues of criminal justice and how society deals with criminal behavior today.

School Tours

Teachers who bring students to Eastern State through the school program are highly satisfied with the experience and likely to recommend it to others. Across all levels (middle school, high school, community college, and university), teachers and professors are able to articulate what the value of the experience is for their students. Specifically, they appreciate the opportunity for their students to experience a “real” prison, strengthen their understanding of concepts addressed in the classroom, learn more about local history (“what’s in their own backyard”), and to put the history of the prison in a broader social, cultural, and historical context.

While teachers are generally pleased with the school program, some feel that the tour would benefit from more interactive, participatory approaches to learning; more hands-on opportunities; and a quicker pace in order to keep students engaged. Some also emphasize the importance of including personal stories to help students better connect to the site and content.

Teachers also feel they could use more support in preparing for the trip – such as through reading lists, resource lists, pre-activities, or an orientation video – and in better incorporating the experience into their classroom teaching after the visit.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The results of the *Eastern State Penitentiary Historic Site Visitor Study* indicate that the site is highly successful in engaging a broad range of audiences in unique, educational, and enjoyable experiences. For the most part, all visitor groups included in the study (walk-in, adult tour groups, and school tours) were extremely satisfied with their experience at Eastern State.

Results indicate that Eastern State should continue offering self-guided tour options, docent-led tours, and opportunities for visitors to explore on their own. Data suggest that other important elements to keep are the use of archival audio, video, and photos; refurbished areas to convey a sense of what the site looked like when it was in use; and any elements that focus on individual lives and experiences at Eastern State.

However, data from the study also point to numerous suggestions for improving the visitor experience³. These include:

Provide more orientation for visitors, both in terms of content and wayfinding. While the main audio tour provides an introduction to the site, visitors (particularly those on group or school tours) desired more preparation for experiencing the site. Eastern State might consider a brief introductory video that would orient visitors to the site and what to expect. Further, the site should consider providing a more user-friendly map, and placing more directional signage on site, particularly for areas and stops with low visitation, such as the museum exhibition.

Allow more access to Eastern State, either through “behind the scenes” tours or through renovating more areas of the site. Similarly, provide more examples of refurbished cells or areas, which would allow visitors to gain a better understanding of what the site looked like when it was in use. It would be particularly useful to interpret different periods of time more clearly, as visitors were sometimes confused about the timeline of Eastern State and what was happening during different time periods.

Create more opportunities for connecting visitors to individuals’ lives and what daily life was like at Eastern State. This may include additional audio clips, videos, more personal objects, archival documents, or possibly a means of “taking on” the identity of a historical individual whose story visitors’ could follow throughout their visit.

Offer greater diversity of learning modes, including hands-on, interactive, and immersive experiences. While visitors greatly enjoy the audio tour, and the flexibility it provides, it is important to provide as many ways as possible to access and engage with the site – not only to accommodate different learning styles, but to keep the experience dynamic and engaging. This suggestion is particularly important for adult and school tour groups, who felt their experience of the site was mostly limited to a lecture-style tour.

Provide opportunities for visitors to discuss issues and engage in conversation. While social interaction was relatively high for walk-in visitors, this could be increased for all groups by providing thought questions, spaces for discussing ideas, or a “debrief” session following a guided tour.

³ Note that recommendations apply to all audiences included in the study, unless otherwise noted

Give visitors reasons to come back to Eastern State. While visitors of all types were highly likely to recommend visiting Eastern State to others, they were significantly less likely to say they would return to the site themselves. In order to develop repeat visitation, the site will need to consider ways to help visitors feel that they will experience something new. Possibilities include changing exhibitions and programs, additional and more frequent topic tours, or offering different “identities” to follow (similar to the Holocaust Museum), so that visitors can experience the site from a different angle on future visits.

Utilize staff more to engage visitors in discussions and learning more about the site, including wayfinding. Data suggested that staff to visitor interaction was quite low, while visitors talked about wanting more interpretation and diversity of learning modes. Those who did interact with staff had a very positive experience, so encouraging more of this type of interaction may enhance the visitor experience.

Emphasize some of the site’s key messages more. Visitors from all audiences were only moderately likely to think about criminal justice issues or connect the past with the present. If Eastern State wants visitors to engage more deeply in these issues, they will need to consider more direct ways of encouraging visitors to do so, such as by posing thought questions on panels or through audio. In addition, some visitors seem to walk away with “misconceptions” about the site – such as that its main goal is to deter criminal behavior.

Consider other technologies or ways of getting groups to interact. Even though social interaction among walk-in visitors was higher than expected, providing more ways to spark conversations and moving beyond didactic approaches may help encourage visitors to engage with the content more deeply.

Provide a few more “creature comforts” for visitors, especially for the elderly. While the site may be limited in offering indoor plumbing, heating, air conditioning, etc., adding benches to indoor spaces would go along way towards helping visitors feel comfortable and giving them a chance to take a break during a visit or tour.

Finally, if Eastern State is interested in more deeply understanding specific experiences, such as the museum exhibition, art installations, or docent-led topic tours, a separate observation study focusing on these aspects of the overall Eastern State experience is recommended.

APPENDIX A: TIMING AND TRACKING PROTOCOLS

EASTERN STATE PENITENTIARY HISTORIC SITE VISITOR EVALUATION STUDY

PROTOCOLS FOR VISITOR TRACKING

Overview

Tracking is a type of unobtrusive observation where data are collected about how visitors naturally use an exhibition and/or specific components within an exhibition. In this study, we will track approximately 100 individual visitors (from both family and adult-only groups). Approximately 50 will be conducted in Fall 2007, and 50 in Spring 2008. Visitors will be tracked from the point where they purchase tickets until they leave the site, including the main audio tour, audio stops, docent-led topic tours, etc. Data collectors will record general information, such as the pathway that the visitor takes through the site, as well as their level of engagement at specific stops and social interactions with each other and with staff members as applicable. The total time spent at the site and in certain areas or “stops” (such as videos) will also be recorded.

Materials needed

Clipboard

Pencils/pens

Watch or stopwatch

Tracking Maps

Demographic sheets

How to select a visitor to track

Visitors will be selected and approached randomly at the exit of the museum shop, before the audio tour begins. Draw an “imaginary” line and approach every 3rd visitor that crosses the line (if visitation is low, select the next visitor to cross the line once you are ready to begin tracking; if visitation is very heavy, you can select every 10th visitor; the point is to develop a system that ensures randomness of approach.) Approach only people who are approximately 14 years or older (determine visually) unless they appear to be part of an organized group (i.e., a school group or bus tour), in which case do not include them in your sample and recruit another visitor.

Tracking will be conducted with two types of visitors: 1) Adult-only groups; and 2) Families with children. For adult-only groups, select one adult to track but ask permission from the whole group to “keep an eye on them” throughout their visit. For family groups, approach the whole family to get permission, but focus on the child for tracking purposes.

How to initiate the tracking

Once a data collector has randomly selected a visitor, she will approach the visitor. The following script will be used to introduce data collectors and seek permission from the visitor for their participation in the tracking study:

“Hi, my name is _____. I am working with Eastern State today and we’re trying to better understand what people do while they’re here and where they go. Would you mind if I kept an eye on you [or your group, if the visitor is part of a larger group] throughout your visit and made some notes about where you go and what you do? You

should just do what you normally would do, and we will only use this information to better understand how the site is utilized.”

If the visitor refuses, the data collector will thank him/her for her time and record the refusal on the “Refusal log.” If the visitor declines, do not take it personally. It is often useful to try to gauge any initial hesitation by visitors as they are debating about whether to participate. There are myriad reasons why visitors might not want to participate, but some of these reasons we can try to anticipate and proactively acknowledge to make the visitor feel more comfortable. Our goal is to give the visitor every reason to participate. For example, if the visitor says they are only planning to stay for a short period of time, tell them that’s fine and that it doesn’t matter how long they stay. If the visitor simply appears reluctant to participate, make it clear that their participation will help Eastern State make the experience even better for visitors like them.

If the visitor agrees to participate, thank them, and ask them to answer a few quick questions about themselves, just so that we know who exactly participated in the study. At this point, have your “Background/Demographic sheet” (Appendix A) handy – use the regular sheet for adult-only groups, and the family sheet for families with children, then ask the visitor the questions on that sheet. For questions such as ethnicity, which are often times more controversial for visitors, you might want to simply show the visitor the sheet, and ask him/her to point to the category that best reflects who they are. Alternately, you can have the visitor fill out the entire sheet themselves. Just quickly double check to make sure they’ve filled in everything.

Once you have collected the necessary demographic information from the visitor, thank them, and encourage them to begin their visit, just as they would if you were not watching them.

How to actually track a visitor through the site

Staying “incognito”

The goal in visitor tracking is to strike a balance between the visitor’s comfort level (i.e., not getting too close to them) and your need to collect detailed data on their interactions with the various components of the site. After a few minutes, the visitor will likely forget that you’re even keeping an eye on them. This is especially true when data collectors are careful to remain out of sight of the visitor, so as not to interfere with his/her natural exhibition experience. Data collectors should naturally engage with the exhibition themselves, often appearing as if they are taking notes about a specific exhibition component, and not the visitor. It is not necessary to stay right with the visitor at all times, or watch them at every moment. Keep a comfortable distance between yourself and the visitor, and be as natural as possible.

Recording tracking data

Data collectors will use a scaled-down map of Eastern State Penitentiary to record tracking data (See Appendix A). Note that the permanent exhibition (near the gift shop) has its own separate map (See Appendix B) Record the time the visitor enters the site (i.e., passes by the staffed booth), and later record the time they leave the site (i.e., exits the main door by the permanent exhibition). Researchers will also record “in” and “out” times for the various cell blocks, plus “Park Avenue,” where Al Capone’s cell is located; in this way, we will be able to calculate average stay times in those areas, in addition to the overall stay time for the site as a whole. You may either record a “running” time with a stop watch (i.e., start at 0) or use actual time (i.e., start at the time of day the individual enters the site) and researchers will calculate the stay times later.

As the visitor moves through the site, the data collector will record the visitor's pathway through the space. Specifically, the data collector will draw a line corresponding to the visitor's movement throughout the corridors and cell blocks, with particular attention paid to the visitor's interest paid to the stops located on the map. The data collector will mark the line with directional arrows, to record the direction of the visitor's movement throughout the space. When a visitor makes a stop at a particular stop, exhibit, or video, the data collector will draw the path line to touch that component and place a circle on that spot on the map. The circle reflects the focus of the visitor's attention more so than where his or her feet are planted in the gallery.

Note that the audio tour has two parts – 1) the Main audio tour (stops 1-10) and 2) random access stops, which are placed throughout the site, both indoors and outdoors, including art installations.

Visitors' engagement with interactive experiences/materials

Each time the visitor stops at one of the components on the map, the data collector will record the quality of engagement with that component. On the map, the researcher will assess and record visitor engagement for two types of components: 1) specific, single objects (e.g. posters, illustrations, models, an art installation which may or may not be associated with an audio stop; and 2) "holistic" areas, such as Al Capone's cell, the restored cell, or the area on Religion (#19) – these all receive one engagement score even though there are multiple components included. The researcher will not give an engagement score to stops not indicated on the map, but will draw a line to that area (e.g., a wall, a closed prison door, etc.) to show that the visitor walked or looked intently at something not on the map.

Although the amount of time spent at a component can be a useful indicator of visitors' use of a gallery, it often inadequately reflects the quality of the visitors' experience. What if the visitor spends 5 minutes in front of an exhibition component, but is talking with their partner about what to have for lunch? Therefore, ILI uses a quality ranking scale, developed to assess the quality of interactions that visitors have with specific exhibition components. Researchers will use the following scale to determine the visitor's level of engagement with a particular component.

- 1= MINIMAL/GLANCE - visitor stops, pauses and/or glances briefly at a component/area, but displays no apparent interest in any particular element or information; if applicable, visitor does not appear to press the audio button for this stop, and does not engage with anyone in relation to it. If applicable, visitor does not enter a space (such as a cell) even when it is open and accessible. Visitor only glances at any written materials (panels, labels).
- 2= CURSORY/SUPERFICIAL - visitor stops, watches or views one or more elements of the component/area with slight interest; if applicable, they appear to push the audio, but walk away quickly. Visitor may read some of a panel/label; and they may engage briefly with another visitor or staff member in relation to the component/area, such as through verbal comments or pointing. If applicable, they may peek their head into a space, such as a prison cell, but do not go in all the way, or step in only briefly.
- 3= MODERATE - visitor stops, watches or views one or more elements of the component/area with apparent interest; appears engaged and focused; presses audio and seems to listen fairly closely; reads part of any panel/label available; visitor may

engage in some conversation related to the component/area, or they may point out certain elements. If applicable, visitor enters the space and explores it fairly thoroughly.

- 4= EXTENSIVE - visitor stops, watches or views elements of the component/area very intently; appears extremely engaged and focused; presses audio and seems to listen intently to it; they may read most or all of a panel/label, engage in a fairly extended conversation with others about the area/component, or point out many aspects of the component/area. If applicable, the visitor enters the space and explores it in depth and with apparent focus and concentration.

Visitors' social interactions related to the stops

In addition to recording visitors' engagement with the components and "stops" on the map, data collectors will record evidence of social interaction as it is relevant to each of these experiences. Of course, this will only be relevant if the visitor being tracked is part of a larger social group or interacts with other groups or staff members during their visit. Specifically, the data collector will record instances where an individual is overheard talking to a member of their group about a particular aspect of an experience, is collaborating with someone else to use an interpretive space or material, or is pointing out something to another visitor. It is important that the conversation is relevant to the exhibit or site. However, if the visitor's comment relates only to wayfinding or logistics (i.e. "What number are you on?" or "Where is the bathroom?"), this should not be recorded as social interaction. Following are a few examples:

Do record: "Look at this model over here – isn't that cool?"
"Did you hear the story about the X-mas celebration they had here?"
(Visitor pointing to a ghost cat on the roof of a building)

Do not record: "When do you want to get lunch?"
"I'm going to the next section now."
"Are you still on part 1?"
"I can't get the audio to work."

The following codes will be used to record social interaction, and will be written directly next to the relevant space/material on the map:

C → A = Child to adult interaction (child initiates)
A → C = Adult to child interaction (child initiates)
A → A = Adult to adult interaction
C → S = Child to staff interaction (child initiates)
S → C = Staff to child interaction (staff initiates)
A → S = Adult to staff interaction (adult initiates)
S → A = Staff to adult interaction (staff initiates)

Crowdedness Level

At the end of the tracking, assess the overall crowdedness level of the site during the visitor's stay. There are four levels as follows:

1 – empty (there are hardly any other visitors on site; the visitor you are observing is often part of the only group in particular cells; it is very easy to access all components and audio stops)
2 – sparsely visited (there are other visitors around, but the visitor you are observing still has easy access to any audio stops or exhibit components they may wish to look at. They do not have to wait or crowd around areas.)

3 – moderately crowded (the cell blocks and other areas are relatively crowded; visitor may have some difficulty seeing everything or may have to wait to look at panels, listen to specific audio stops, etc.)

4 – very crowded (the site is very full; visitors have to pause and wait to look at certain components, listen to audio stops, etc. The crowdedness may impact their ability to explore everything they would like to and to the extent that they might if it were less crowded.)

How to end the tracking

When the visitor exits the site at the main entry/exit (after the permanent exhibition), the tracking is completed. Remember to note the time, so that we can calculate overall stay times for visitors. If you “lose” a visitor in the middle of tracking, try to find them again and make note of the amount of time you missed. If you are truly unable to find them again, make a note of that on the tracking sheet, mark the data sheet “incomplete,” and go back to the entrance to approach your next visitor.

The last step in tracking is to provide any necessary context about the visitor in the NOTES section. For instance, you might write something like “Dad and daughter, and daughter led most of the interactions/experiences; Dad just followed.” Take this section to tell us whatever you think will be important for us to fully understand this visitor’s experience at Eastern State Penitentiary.

APPENDIX B: EXIT INTERVIEW INSTRUMENT & PROTOCOL

Eastern State Penitentiary Historic Site Visitor Exit Interview (Adults)

Interviewer: _____

Visitor #:

Date: _____ Weekday Weekend Time of day:
_____ AM/PM

Review purpose of study.

Remind the visitor of the purpose of this exercise, so that they are very clear about what we want from them. You can use the script below, or just paraphrase. Even though we provide you with scripts throughout the guide, feel free to use your own words as long as you convey the same information. You can say something like:

Thanks again for agreeing to help us. Now that we're settled, let me tell you again why we're here. We are interested in learning more about who are visitors are, why they come, and what they think of their experiences at Eastern State. All of your responses will remain confidential, and will only be used for the purposes of improving our exhibits and programming here. We are really interested in getting people's honest feedback—good or bad—so you cannot possibly offend me by anything you say. Do you have any questions so far? Great, let's begin...

Part I.

The first couple of questions relate to what you were thinking before your visit today.

1. How did you first hear about Eastern State Penitentiary?
2. Why did you come to Eastern State today? (Probes: Why did you choose this particular site?)
3. What were you expecting/hoping to do, see, or experience here?

Part II.

The next set of questions relate to what you did at Eastern State today, and what you thought about those experiences.

4. Approximately how much time did you spend at the site? Less than 30 minutes
 30-60 minutes 60-90 minutes 90-120 minutes More than 2 hours

5. Which of the following did you do at Eastern State today? (*check all that apply*)

- Audio tour
 - Docent-led topic tour:
 - Left Behind*
 - Escape!*
 - Life Behind the Walls*
 - Prison Uprisings*
 - 30-minute guided tour (general)
 - Stopped at the museum exhibition (near the gift shop)
 - Stopped at an artist's installation (*list options from brochure, if needed*)
 - Walked around on our own, without a guide or audio tour
 - Other (please describe) _____
-

6. What did you find most enjoyable/interesting about your visit? Why?

7. If you had to describe the Eastern State experience to a friend or family member who hadn't been here, what would you tell them?

Part III.

The next questions focus on what visitors take away from their experience at Eastern State.

8. First, what main themes or ideas did you feel the museum was trying to convey to visitors? (Probe: What do the staff want visitors to get out of the experience?)

9. To what extent are the following statements true for your visit today, with 1 being "not at all" and 10 being "very much." (circle one)

Statement	Not at all										Very much
I realized or learned something new during this visit.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
The visit sparked conversation between me and others in my group.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
The visit helped me think about criminal issues and/or the U.S. penal system.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	

I was able to make connections between the past and the present.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
The visit made me more curious about criminal justice history and issues and I want to learn more.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
I/we could easily find our way around the site	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Part IV.

The next questions relate to your overall enjoyment and satisfaction with your visit today. (circle one)

How likely is it that you would recommend visiting Eastern State Penitentiary to a friend or family member?	Not at all likely (Definitely not)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Very likely (Definitely)
If it were possible, how likely is it that you would return?	Not at all likely (Definitely not)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Very likely (Definitely)
To what degree were your expectations met today?	Not at all	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Completely
How would you rate Eastern State Penitentiary overall?	Boring	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Fascinating

10. If you could change one thing about the Eastern State Penitentiary to make it a better experience for you and/or your family, what would it be?

11. Do you have any other thoughts or comments about your visit here that you weren't able to share?

*Great! Thank you for sharing all of your thoughts. Now I would just like to get a little bit of information about who you are. (Use **Demographic Sheet**). While you fill out this form, I'll get your thank-you gift.*

Interview notes:

APPENDIX C: FOCUS GROUP INSTRUMENTS & PROTOCOL

**EASTERN STATE PENITENTIARY HISTORIC SITE
VISITOR EVALUATION STUDY**

**DATA COLLECTION PROTOCOLS & INSTRUMENTS
FOR ADULT TOUR FOCUS GROUPS**

Overview

The purpose of this portion of the study is to better understand the nature of adult tour group experiences at Eastern State Penitentiary Historic Site. Eastern State staff will recruit 2-3 adult groups who have pre-registered for a tour for Fall 2007, asking if they would be willing to extend their visit to participate in a discussion group. Food and drinks will be provided, along with a small incentive for each participant. Larger tour groups (over 15) will be split into two discussion groups, so that everyone will have a chance to participate and give feedback. In this case, either two groups will be facilitated simultaneously, or half the group will take a special “behind the scenes” tour while the other participates in the discussion; then the groups will switch, so that everyone gets to participate in both the “behind the scenes” tour and the focus group.

This document summarizes the protocols for conducting focus groups with adult tour groups. The discussions will focus on their entry conditions (motivations, expectations, prior knowledge and interest), what they found to be most enjoyable and valuable about the tour, what they feel they got out of the experience, and what Eastern State could do to better support their needs and interests. All focus groups will take place in October and November 2007, and will last approximately 45 minutes. The groups will be facilitated by an ILI researcher, with logistical support from Eastern State staff.

Focus Group Discussion

- 1) **Set up** – Before the focus group begins, Eastern State staff will have arranged for one or two rooms (depending on size of the group). The room should include a large table and chairs for roughly 10-15 adults. Two tables can be used if necessary, but should not allow for participants to spread out over a large area. Drinks and snacks should also be set up in advance of the focus group. The ILI researcher (facilitator) will set up a digital recorder and omni-directional microphone to ensure that everyone’s responses are captured. The facilitator should test the tape recorder from various distances and adjust the position of the microphone if needed. At the entrance to the meeting room, there will be a sign-in sheet (see below) to ensure that we know exactly how many individuals are represented.
- 2) **Getting settled** (5 minutes) – ESP staff and ILI researchers will greet the tour group as they enter the room. Each person will be asked to sign the sheet provided at the entrance to the meeting room, and will be offered a place to sit around the table.
- 3) **Introduction** (5 minutes) – The facilitator will first thank everyone for coming, followed by a brief explanation of the purpose of the study. The facilitator will ask participants for permission to tape-record the conversation. If they agree, the facilitator will remind the visitors to speak loudly and clearly so that the microphone can pick up everyone’s comments, as they are all extremely valuable to us and we don’t want to lose anything they’ve said. If someone is uncomfortable with being tape-recorded, the facilitator will take notes instead.

- 4) **Discussion** (30-40 minutes) – As the participants are eating, the ILI researcher will facilitate a focus group discussion, in order to gather feedback on their perceptions of the Eastern State tour they have just experienced. The facilitator will ask participants to briefly introduce themselves and say where they are from (or some other small, non-threatening piece of information), and then lead a discussion based on the list of discussion questions (included below). The specific focus group protocol is detailed below.

Introduction

The facilitator will use/paraphrase the following script, questions, and prompts to guide the discussion. Feel free to use additional prompts as needed to get the type of information needed to answer the evaluation questions. (Such as: Can you tell me more about that? Can you give me an example? What do you mean by that?)

Now that you're all settled, we want to make sure we've accounted for everyone. Did each of you have a chance to sign in? Also, please feel free to get up at any point during the discussion to get more food or to use the restrooms. We want to thank you again for being willing to extend your stay at Eastern State to participate in the focus group, and to share your thoughts and feelings with us. The staff is really interested in why you decided to come here today, what you thought about the tour, and what you think you got out of coming here. Our goal is to make these experiences better, so we want you to be as honest as possible about what you think. There is no chance that you'll offend me.

This discussion is going to be very casual, so please feel free to ask any questions at any time. We'd like to tape record the conversation, as well as take notes, so that we don't miss anything you've said. Is anyone uncomfortable with that? Great! I'd also like to remind you to speak as loudly and clearly as possible, so that we can capture everything you say, as all of your comments are very important to us. So let's begin...

First, just by a show of hands, how many of you had been to Eastern State Penitentiary before today? (count and record). Now, of those of you who have been here before, how many of you were on an arranged group tour, similar to this one? (count and record).

Great, thanks – now let's quickly go around the room and tell everyone your name and where you're from. I'll start: My name is _____, and I'm from _____.

Focus group questions

A. Motivations/expectations

- 1) First, we'd like to get a sense of what motivates people to visit Eastern State. So, why did you decide to come here?
→ What in particular about this site made it appealing?
- 2) What did you hope/expect to do, see, or experience here?
→ What did you want to get out of the visit?
- 3) What other types of experiences or activities do you do together as a group?
→ What do you find beneficial about visiting as a group, rather than on your own?

B. Site experience

- 4) How would you describe Eastern State to another group of visitors similar to yours who hadn't been here before?
- 5) What did you find most interesting/enjoyable about the visit/tour? Why?
- 6) How could Eastern State make this a better experience for groups like yours? (What is one thing you would change about the experience to make it better?)

C. Outcomes

- 7) What do you think you got out of (or took away from) the visit to Eastern State today?
→ How was it valuable or beneficial to you/your group? (e.g. did you realize or learn something new? Think more or differently about criminal justice issues or the U.S. penal system?)
- 8) Did you talk with each other about anything during the visit? Can you give examples?
→ Do you think you'll talk about the visit with each other or others (family, friends) later? If so, what?

Great! Thank you so much for your thoughtful comments and feedback. Now I just have a brief survey I'd like each of you to fill out before you leave. It should just take a few minutes. When you have finished, you can hand it to me and I'll give you a small thank-you gift from Eastern State.

Eastern State Penitentiary Historic Site

Please share your thoughts on your experience at Eastern State today. Your comments will help to enhance the programs we offer and help us to plan future programs for visitors.

For each statement below, circle the number that best applies to your visit today and explain your answer.

Statement	Not at all.....	Very much (Definitely)
	(Definitely not)											
I enjoyed my visit to Eastern State today.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		
Please explain:												
I realized or learned something new during this visit.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		
Please explain:												
The visit helped me think about criminal issues and/or the U.S. penal system in new ways.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		
Please explain:												
I was able to make connections between the past and present.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		
Please explain:												
The visit made me more curious about criminal justice history and issues and I want to learn more.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		
Please explain:												
I would recommend visiting Eastern State Penitentiary to a friend or family member.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		
Please explain:												
If possible, I would visit Eastern State Penitentiary again.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		
Please explain:												

APPENDIX D: TEACHER PHONE INTERVIEW INSTRUMENT & PROTOCOL

**EASTERN STATE PENITENTIARY HISTORIC SITE
VISITOR EVALUATION STUDY**

**DATA COLLECTION PROTOCOLS & INSTRUMENT
FOR TEACHER POST-INTERVIEWS**

Overview

The purpose of this portion of the study is to better understand teacher and student experiences of pre-arranged tours at the Eastern State Penitentiary Historic Site (Eastern State). Feedback from teachers will focus on the nature of their visit, overall enjoyment and satisfaction, what they and their students got out of the tour, and how the tour might be improved to better suit teacher and student needs. All student data will be captured through teachers' perceptions of their students' experience.

Teachers will be recruited by Eastern State in advance of their visit, either when they initially register or shortly thereafter. Eastern State and ILI will work together to select a cross-section of schools, including public and private middle schools, high schools, and college or university groups.

Teacher feedback will be gathered through a semi-structured phone interview lasting approximately 15-20 minutes (see instrument below), and will take place 1-2 weeks following the site visit. The interviewer will type notes during the conversation, recording the teachers' responses verbatim as much as possible. All of the interviews will be completed by December 15, 2007.

Recruitment script

Director of education, Andrea Reidell, will contact each of the selected teachers in advance of their visit to ask their willingness to participate in the study. The recruitment script is as follows:

“Eastern State is currently trying to better understand the experiences that teachers and school groups have on our tours. As part of that, we are interested in talking to teachers by phone a week or two after the tour to get their feedback on what worked, what didn't, and what they and their students got out of coming to the site. Would you be willing to participate in this? [If yes...] Thank you so much. I'll just need to get your contact information and the best times/days to reach you by phone. Then someone from ILI, an organization we are working with on this study, will contact you for a brief interview (15-20 minutes). To thank you for your time, we have a small thank-you gift, which we'll send to you by mail.”

Eastern State will then provide ILI with a list of teachers who have agreed to be contacted, including the best time(s)/day(s) and phone number to reach them at. Eastern State will send teachers their thank-you gift once the interview has been completed.

Eastern State Penitentiary Historic Site Teacher Post-Interview

Teacher name: _____ School: _____ Date of visit: _____

Interviewer: _____ Date: _____

Time start/stop: _____ / _____ Total time: _____

Introduction

“Hi, my name is _____, and I’m working with the Eastern State Penitentiary Historic Site to help them better understand what teachers think about their site tours. They indicated that you’d agreed to participate in this study, so I’m just following up on that. Would now be a good time to talk?”

[If yes...] Great, thank you! The interview takes about 15-20 minutes, but please let me know if you need to go at any time. Also, I do not actually work for Eastern State or design any of their programs, so feel free to be honest in your responses. All of your responses will be kept confidential and are only used to help Eastern State better serve teachers and students. Do you have any questions before we get started?

[If no...] No problem. Is there a more convenient day or time I could call you back?”

Part I

First, I’d like to start off with some general questions about your visit to Eastern State on (insert date).

1. Can you briefly describe the class you brought on this visit? (grade, subject, number)
2. What motivated you to bring your class to Eastern State for this visit? (Probe: What did you hope/expect your students to get out of the experience?)
3. If you had to describe the overall experience at Eastern State to a friend or colleague, what would you say?

Part II

The next set of questions relate to your perception of your students’ experience at Eastern State.

4. What do you think your students enjoyed most about visiting Eastern State?

5. What do you think was most valuable/beneficial about the visit for your students?

6. Please rate the following statements from 1-10, with 1 being “not at all” and 10 being “very much.”

My students were interested and engaged in the tour/visit to Eastern State.	Not at all	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Very much
---	------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	-----------

Please explain:

My students realized or learned something new during the visit.	Not at all	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Very much
---	------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	-----------

Please explain:

The visit sparked conversation among my students (during or after the visit)	Not at all	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Very much
--	------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	-----------

Please explain:

The visit helped my students think about criminal justice issues and/or the US penal system.	Not at all	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Very much
--	------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	-----------

Please explain:

My students were able to connect the past to the present.	Not at all	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Very much
---	------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	-----------

Please explain:

Part III

The next set of questions relate to [your own](#) experience as a teacher bringing students to Eastern State.

7. What aspect did you find most valuable/beneficial about the visit for you as a teacher? Why?

8. Please rate the following statements from 1 to 10:

How likely is it that you would recommend a colleague bring a class to Eastern State Penitentiary?	Not at all likely (Definitely not)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Very likely (Definitely)
--	---------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	-----------------------------

How likely is it that you would bring a class back to Eastern State?	Not at all likely (Definitely not)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Very likely (Definitely)
To what degree were your expectations met?	Not at all	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Completely
How would you rate Eastern State Penitentiary overall as a place to bring your students?	Poor	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Excellent

9. In what ways did you/do you plan to integrate the visit into your classroom teaching? (discussions, activities, assignments, etc.)

10. How could Eastern State better support your needs as a teacher?

Pre/post activities (in class)

Please explain:

Website resources

Please explain:

Other materials

Please explain:

Teacher workshops

Please explain:

Covering specific topics/content

Please explain:

Other

Please explain:

11. Could you provide one suggestion for making the visit/tour a better experience for you and your students?

12. Do you have any other thoughts you'd like to share about your Eastern State visit?

Part III.

Finally, I just have a few demographic questions so we know more about who's utilizing the site.

Grade level: _____

Subject/course: _____

How many years have you been teaching? less than 5 5-9 10-14 15-19 20 or more

Have you brought a class to Eastern State before? YES NO

→ If so, how many times in the past five years? Once 2-3 4-5 More than 5

Have you ever come to Eastern State on your own, as a visitor? YES NO

Thank you so much for your time and input. We really appreciate it – you should receive your thank-you gift in the mail shortly.