Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology

Volume 60 | Issue 4

Article 4

1970

Escapes of Psychiatric Offenders

William R. Morrow

Recommended Citation

William R. Morrow, Escapes of Psychiatric Offenders, 60 J. Crim. L. Criminology & Police Sci. 464 (1969)

ESCAPES OF PSYCHIATRIC OFFENDERS

WILLIAM R. MORROW*

Dr. Morrow has been Professor of Social Work at the University of Missouri, Columbia since 1966. Previously he was Director of Research at Fulton (Missouri) State Hospital, where he collected the data reported here. He has held several other teaching and research positions since receiving his Ph.D. in Psychology from the University of California at Berkeley in 1949.

Time and place characteristics of escape behavior are summarized for 40 escapees from a state hospital maximum security unit for psychiatric offenders. Also, escapees are compared with unselected security unit admissions and with a matched non-escapee sample as to criminal and psychiatric record and other background characteristics. The findings are discussed in relation to results of previous studies of non-psychiatric prison escapees.

Despite security measures, a small percentage of inmates try to escape from penal-correctional facilities and from facilities for psychiatric criminal offenders. What characteristics distinguish such men from those who do not try to escape? Does their escape behavior show systematic trends with respect to whether it is individual or collective, temporally patterned as to time of day or season, early or late in the man's stay, etc? The present report presents data on these questions for male psychiatric inmates of a 280-bed, statewide maximum security building located on the grounds of a midwestern state hospital.

A bibliographical search revealed no previous empirical studies of escape attempts by psychiatric criminal offenders. Six research reports on escapes of non-psychiatric prison inmates were located. Findings of these six studies are summarized in a later section for comparison with results of the present study.

METHOD

Subjects

A roster was compiled of all patients who had tried to escape from the statewide maximum security building at Fulton (Missouri) State Hospital during the period 1956 through mid-1966 (N = 40). The four-story inner building, which housed eight wards with 280 beds plus educational, recreational, and other areas, was

entered through a sally port outside of which administrative offices were located.

The escapee sample was compared first with *unselected security-building admissions* from 1 July 1961 (when a centralized patient IBM-card file was established by the state mental health division) through March 1966 (N = 815) with respect to three background variables: (a) type of security-unit admission; (b) age at that admission; and (c) race. Age and type of admission differentiated sharply between the two groups (see Results section); race did not differentiate.

The escapee sample was then compared with a *matched control group* of 80 patients (two matches for each escapee) admitted to the unit after 1 July 1961. (These 80 patients were also part of the unselected admissions comparison group of 815 patients.) No control patient had a record of an escape attempt from the maximum security building or from the security unit annex, located in a minimum security building to which "good" patients were in time usually transferred as a step toward ultimate release. Each control patient was randomly selected (using a table of random numbers) from the subset of 1961–66 admissions who matched the corresponding escapee on the following three variables:

1. *Type of security-building admission,* with eight categories: pretrial; incompetent to stand trial; not guilty by reason of insanity; criminal sexual psychopath; adult penal transfer from a state penitentiary; behavior problem transfer from the juvenile state training school, from another state hospital, or from another building on the grounds of Fulton State Hospital, respectively.

2. *Age at admission to the security building;* identical age in years to last birthday, except for eight instances in which a match of identical age was not available. Of these eight, five were matched within two years, two were matched within four years, one was matched within eight years.

3. *Date of admission to the security building,* selected so that the control inmate's potential period at risk (from date of admission through March 1966) was as long or longer—in most instances much longer—than the time from the corresponding escapee's admission to his (first) escape attempt. (There was one exception in which the escapee made his escape attempt seven years and one month after admission. His two matches were admitted in August and September, respectively, in 1961.)

Procedure

The following characteristics were coded from the clinical folder of each inmate in the escapee and matched control samples:

1. *Psychiatric hospitalization record:* diagnosis; number of previous psychiatric admissions; age at first psychiatric admission; history of alcoholism; history of drug addition; history of overt homosexuality.

2. *Criminal record:* type of current offense (assaultive, including homicide; rape, attempted rape, or threatened rape; child molestation; theft, burglary, larceny, armed robbery, etc.; checkwriting, forgery, embezzlement, fraud, etc.; other); record of one or more assaultive offenses, present or past; record of one or more economic offenses, present or past; number of previous felony convictions; number of previous misdemeanor convictions; number of previous institutionalizations (psychiatric and/or felony-type-correctional combined); age at first offense; record of previous escape from other penal institution(s).

3. *Demographic background variables:* type of county of prior residence (major metropolitan, small metropolitan—about 100,000, other counties in state, or out-of-state); occupational status; job stability; father's occupational status; education; intelligence; religion; marital status; with whom living prior to current institutionalization (parents, spouse, other relatives, non-relatives or alone); sibling position; height; weight; overweight vs. underweight vs. normal weight.

In addition, information was coded on the fol-

lowing aspects of the *escape behavior:* number of co-escapees in each escape attempt; number of security building escape attempts by each escapee; months from current security building admission to first escape attempt; shift on which each escape attempt occurred; season of year during which each escape attempt occurred; duration of time free on escape status.

For each background variable on which group comparisons were made between escapees and matched controls, appropriate statistical procedures were used to evaluate the reliability of differences. In addition, coded characteristics of the escape behavior itself were summarized statistically.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Time and Setting Characteristics of Escape Behavior

Table 1 summarizes time and setting characteristics of escape behavior both for the present psychiatric sample and for six *non*-psychiatric prison samples: Massachusetts minimum security state prison farm at Norfolk, 1928–47 (N = 60);[1] Virginia penal system, 1964 (N = 151) (plus some data for 1963, N = 141);[2] Seagoville, Texas, minimum security Federal correctional institution, 1945–59 (N = 102);[3] Louisiana state penitentiary, 1955–57 (N = 100);[4] South Carolina minimum security state prison farm at Boykin, years not stated (N = 50);[5] and New Zealand penal institutions, 1954–58 (N = 195).[6]

For the present psychiatric offender sample, the total number of security building escape *episodes* involving one or more of the 40 men was 15. The number of episodes that involved a lone escapee was six; two escapees, three; three escapees, one; five escapees, one; seven escapees, three; eight escapees, one. Thus most of the escape at-

---

[1] Cochrane, *Escapes and Their Control,* 10 PRISON WORLD 3 (No. 3, May–June 1948).
[2] Loving, Stockwell & Dobbins, *Factors Associated with Escape Behavior of Prison Inmates,* 22 FED. PROB. 49 (No. 3, September 1959); Dobbins, Stockwell & Loving, *Individual and Social Correlates of Prison Escapes,* 24 J. CONSULT. PSYCHOL. 95 (1960).
[3] Morgan, *Individual and Situational Factors Related to Prison Escape,* 29 AM. J. CORR. 30 (1967).
[4] *Seagoville Federal Correctional Institution—Research Committee, Research into Escape at Seagoville, Texas* (1960).
[5] *Virginia Department of Welfare and Institutions—Bureau of Research and Statistics, Report of Escapes* (1964).
[6] *New Zealand Department of Justice, Absconders from Penal Institutions* (1961).

TABLE 1
TIME AND SETTING CHARACTERISTICS OF OFFENDER ESCAPE BEHAVIOR IN SEVEN STUDIES

Characteristic[a]	Mo. (Psych.)	Mass.	Virginia	Texas (Fed.)	Louisiana	S. Car.	New Zealand
Places "Favored" [b]	Strict Wards	(Outside Wall)	(Highway)	(Dark Areas)	—	—	Less Sec.
Season "Favored" [b]	Warmer Mos.	NS	Warmer Mos.	NS	—	—	NS
Hours "Favored" [b]	3 pm–11 pm	1 pm–9 pm	9 am–5 pm	7 pm–9 pm	—	—	2 pm–4 pm
Time Served: (Cum. %)							
Less than 6 mos.	50%	71%	—	76%	—	—	56%
Less than 1 yr.	63%	87%	40%	92%	—	—	83%
Less than 2 yrs.	88%	100%	69%	—	—	—	95%
Time Left to Max.:							
More than 3 yrs.	—	85%	48%		—[c]	—	—
More than 1 yr.	—	99%	86%	44%	—	—	—
Over half of term	—	82%	—	—	—	Maj, (p < .01)	85%[d]
Time Free on Escape: (Cum. %)							
Less than 1 day	65%	32%	42%	46%	—	—	46%
Less than 2 days	(92%/week)	48%	57%	61%	—	—	62%
Less than 6 mos.	—	70%	87%	—	—	—	94%
Less than 1 yr.	100%	78%	—	—	—	—	—

[a] A dash in any cell indicates that data on the specified variable were not reported for that study.

[b] For this variable results are summarized by listing: (1) places or times where escapes occurred statistically (p < .05) more often than at other places or times; (2) places or times where escapes reportedly occurred with disproportionately high frequency but with no statistical evaluation (enclosed in parentheses); and (3) statistical comparisons yielding non-significant results (indicated by "NS").

[c] Louisiana escapees had longer sentences than matched non-escapees (p < .10).

[d] Estimated from the reported data (see text at note 6, *infra*) Table 62, page 51.

tempts were *group* rather than individual episodes. Six of the 40 escapees participated in two escape attempts from the security building; three of these six made a third attempt. Much later, 10 of the 40 also made an escape attempt from another (minimum security) hospital building after having been transferred out of the maximum security building.

As to temporal patterning: (a) The majority of the present escapees made their first attempts relatively *early in their stay* in the security building—50 per cent during their first six months, 12½ per cent in their second six months, 12½ per cent in their second year, 12½ per cent in their third year, the remaining 12½ per cent in their fourth through eighth years. (b) Two-thirds of the escape attempts were made during the *afternoon shift* (3:00 p.m. to 11:00 p.m.). During most of this shift (after 5:00 p.m.) all professional staff were generally absent and off-ward activities (educational, recreational, etc.) for inmates were usually at a minimum. (c) Seasonally, escape attempts occurred predominantly (12 of 15 episodes) during the 5-month period of warm weather from *May through September*. The exceptions were lone-wolf attempts in mid-November and in mid-February, respectively, and a group attempt at the end of February. No attempts occurred from mid-November to mid-February.

Most (89 per cent) of the escapees were residing on one of the three *strictest security wards* (with tightest restrictions, least privileges, highest aide-inmate ratios) at the time of their escape attempts. Nearly half were on the admission ward; over one-fourth were on a strict "discipline" ward; one-sixth were on the next strictest ward; the remainder was scattered on the other five wards.

Most escapees were *free only briefly* before recapture or voluntary return. Considering all 49 (initial plus repeat) escape attempts, 27 per cent of the escapees failed to get out of the building. An additional 39 per cent got outside but were returned the same day. Only four (8 per cent) remained out longer than a week; all had been recaptured within a year.

Findings for our psychiatric offenders on these time and setting variables are generally similar to findings for *non*-psychiatric prison samples, where comparable data are available (see Table 1). The pattern of results for *all escapee samples* might be *summarized interpretively* by the following statements: (a) Escape attempts were more likely to be made at places and times offering greater *op-portunity* for escape (outside or poorly lighted or less secure areas, during warmer months allowing easier survival, during hours when outside on work details or when fewer staff were on duty for surveillance). One apparently contradictory finding of the present study, *viz.*, that escapes were more often launched from tighter-security wards, may reflect goal-distance factors suggested in (b) below. Patients usually began their security building career on these wards, might by "good" behavior progress to lower wards with greater privileges, and thence to official release or transfer—or might by "bad" behavior return to the tighter-security, "discipline" wards. (b) Escape attempts were more likely to occur in the earlier part of a man's confinement, *i.e.* at a time when he might be expected to experience *greater frustration* over his sudden loss of freedom, when regaining freedom legitimately via "serving time" was a *more distant goal*, and when he had *less investment* to protect in the form of "time" already served toward that goal. (c) *Most escapees were soon recaptured.*

Differences Between Escapees and Non-Escapees

Our psychiatric escapees did not differ in racial composition from *unselected security building admissions*, but did differ sharply as to type of admission (p < .001) and age at admission (p < .001). Moreover, age and type of admission each differentiated significantly when the other was controlled (although these two variables were also positively associated with each other).

Table 2 presents data comparing these two samples as to *type of security building admission*. The escapees included many more adult *penitentiary transfers* than would be expected by chance from their proportionate representation in the unselected admissions sample (although most penitentiary transfers did *not* try to escape). Nontransfer presumed psychotics (pretrial, incompetent for trial, and not guilty by reason of insanity), as well as criminal sexual psychopaths tried to escape less often than would be expected by chance. Behavior problem transfers (from the state training school, other state hospitals, and other buildings at the same hospital) were represented in equal proportions in escapee and unselected admissions samples.

Table 3 presents data for the same two samples on *age* at admission to the security building. The escapees were distinctly *younger*, on the average, than were unselected admissions. Seventy per cent

TABLE 2

ESCAPEES (1956–66) VERSUS UNSELECTED ADMISSIONS (1961–66), BY TYPE OF ADMISSION
TO PSYCHIATRIC SECURITY BUILDING[a]

Type of Admission	Escapees		Unselected Admissions	
	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
Non-Transfer Presumed Psychotics:				
Pretrial..	2	(5%)	155	(19%)
Incompetent for Trial...........................	3	(8%)	45	(6%)
Not Guilty by Reason of Insanity...............	5	(13%)	225	(28%)
"Criminal Sexual Psychopaths"..................	2	(5%)	123	(15%)
Adult Penal Transfers............................	18	(45%)	88	(11%)
Behavior-Problem Transfers from:				
Juvenile Training School.......................	2	(5%)	29	(4%)
Other State Hospitals..........................	6	(15%)	109	(13%)
Same State Hospital (Other Units).............	2	(5%)	41	(5%)
Total.......................................	40	(100%)	815	(100%)

[a] Chi-square = 44.79 (df = 3, p < .001), computed from a 4 × 2 table combining admission categories as follows, in order to avoid low expected cell frequencies: non-transfer presumed psychotics, criminal sexual psychopaths, adult penal transfers, behavior problem transfers.

TABLE 3

ESCAPEES (1956–66) VERSUS UNSELECTED ADMISSIONS (1961–66), BY AGE AT ADMISSION TO PSYCHIATRIC SECURITY BUILDING[a]

Age	Escapees		Unselected Admissions	
	Fre-quency	Per cent	Fre-quency	Per cent
14–19	12	(30%)	188	(25%)
20–24	16	(40%)	150	(18%)
25–29	8	(20%)	110	(13%)
30–34	3	(8%)	96	(12%)
35–39	1	(3%)	75	(9%)
40–49	0	(0%)	99	(12%)
50+	0	(0%)	97	(12%)
Total	40	(100%)	815	(100%)

[a] Chi-square = 22.97 (df = 4, p < .001). Computed from a 5 × 2 table combining age-category 30–34 with 35–39, and 40–49 with 50+, in order to avoid low expected cell frequencies.

of the escapees but only 41 per cent of unselected admissions were under 25; 90 per cent of the escapees but only 54 per cent of unselected admissions were under 30. Only 3 per cent of the escapees (one man age 36) but 33 per cent of unselected admissions were over 35.

When escapees and unselected admissions were compared within each type of admission separately as to the relative frequency of men under 30 or over 30, the differences remained significant for adult penal transfers ($\chi^2 = 8.6$, p < .01) and for non-transfer presumed psychotics ($\chi^2 = 6.1$, p < .01), respectively, though not for behavior problem transfers ($\chi^2 = 1.4$, p < .20). Since only two escapees were criminal sexual psychopaths, no statistical test was performed for this category; however, both were in the lowest age-group (14–19), whereas only 12 of the 123 unselected criminal sexual psychopath admissions were in that age-group—the rest being scattered evenly over the remaining age categories.

When the comparison between escapees and unselected admissions as to type of admission was repeated for men under 30 separately, the variation again remained highly significant ($\chi^2 = 34.6$ with Yates' correction, df = 3, p < .001). When this comparison was further repeated with the small category of criminal sexual psychopaths excluded, in order to avoid expected frequencies below 5 in two of the eight cells, the difference remained highly significant ($\chi^2 = 31.78$, df = 2, p < .001).

When escapees were compared with the *matched control group*, four additional case-history variables significantly differentiated between the two groups: number of previous felony convictions (p < .01), job stability (p < .001), history of alcoholism (p < .05), and sibling position (p < .01). With respect to *number of previous felony convictions*

(data missing for seven escapees and six controls), 39 per cent of the escapees but only 16 per cent of the controls had four or more previous felonies; only 36 per cent of the escapees but 61 per cent of the controls had one or none. With respect to *job stability*, 82 per cent of the escapees but only 47 per cent of the controls had been usually unemployed; only 18 per cent of the escapees but 34 per cent of the controls had been irregularly employed; and no escapees but 19 per cent of the controls had been regularly employed. A recorded history of *alcoholism* was present for 42 per cent of the escapees, 25 per cent of the controls. As to *sibling position* (information missing for two escapees and ten controls), 39 per cent of the escapees but only 17 per cent of the controls were oldest children, whereas only 5 per cent of the escapees but 23 per cent of the controls were youngest children; the two groups had equal proportions of only children and of middle children.

To what extent might a *composite index* of the above differentiating variables *predict* the likelihood that an individual patient will make an escape try? Such prediction assumes that the samples and situational conditions of the present study are representative of samples and conditions to which prediction is made, and that the relationships found in the present study would obtain on cross-validation. The following statements need to be evaluated in the light of these tenuous assumptions.

(a) The risk of an escape attempt is *low* for a psychiatric offender in his latter thirties or older, following admission to a psychiatric maximum security building. The risk goes *up* if he is under 30, more so if he is under 25 (but the vast majority of men under 30, or under 25, are *not* likely to make an escape attempt).

(b) The risk goes *up* further if the man is a penitentiary transfer (but the vast majority of penitentiary transfers are *not* likely to make an escape attempt). The risk goes *down* a little if the man is admitted as a pretrial evaluation case, as not guilty by reason of insanity, or as a criminal sexual psychopath.

(c) The risk goes up or down further according to the man's score on a composite index based on further additional variables which differentiated between the present escapees and their matched controls as follows: A score of −1 each was assigned for four or more previous felony convictions, being usually unemployed, a history of alcoholism,

and oldest sibling position, respectively. A score of +1 each was assigned for no previous felony convictions or only one, being regularly employed, and youngest sibling position, respectively. On this basis (given relative youth and disregarding type of admission—both controlled by matching), composite arithmetic sum scores of −3 or −4 would correctly identify 25 per cent of the escapees, while falsely identifying only 2 per cent of the controls. Scores of −2, −3, or −4 would correctly identify 58 per cent of the escapees while falsely identifying only 14 per cent of the controls.

(d) If a composite index is based on only three variables, excluding sibling position as a non-behavioral variable and because of its obscure rationale, the sum scores of −2 or −3 would correctly identify 43 per cent of the escapees, while falsely identifying only 9 per cent of the controls. Scores of −1, −2, or −3 woud correctly identify 78 per cent of the escapees while falsely identifying 29 per cent of the controls.

How do the present findings *compare* with those for *non-psychiatric prison escapees?* Table 4 summarizes findings regarding background characteristics of escapees versus non-escapees in the present study and in six prison studies cited above. The discussion below also compares findings regarding criminal record variables.

The present findings regarding escapee characteristics are clearly consistent with those of the prison studies for the variable of age (all studies); partially consistent for number of prior felonies (three studies consistent, one mixed, in two no significant difference); and consistent with respect to job stability and alcoholism, respectively (consistent with one study each, data not available in the other studies). None of the prison studies investigated the variable of sibling position. Our variable, type of security building admission, was not applicable to the prison settings.

Additional variables found to distinguish escapees in the *prison studies* were: race (whites—three studies, though not significant for present psychiatric sample and New Zealand study); education (slightly greater education on the average—two studies, though no significant difference in two other prison studies or in the present study); intelligence (slightly higher intelligence—two studies, though not significant in three other prison studies or in the present study); geographic residence (farther from the prison—one study, though not significant in another study; communities

TABLE 4

BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS OF ESCAPEES IN SEVEN STUDIES[a]

	Mo. (Psych.)	Mass.	Virginia	Texas (Fed.)	Louisiana	S. Car.	New Zealand
Type of Control Group	Matched[b]	None	Resident pop.	Random adm.	Matched[b]	Matched[b]	Random Adm.
Identifying Factors							
Age	<30; <25[c]	(63% <31)	<30; <25	<30; <25	<30 (p < .10)	<25	<21
Race	NS		Whites	Whites	Whites	—	NS
Education-Occupation							
Education	NS	—	6th grade+	—	NS	Some H.S.+	NS
Intelligence (I.Q.)	NS	—	90+	NS	NS	96.5+	NS
Occupational Status	NS	—		—	—	—	Unskilled
Job Stability	Unstable	(Unstable)		NS		—	
Military Veteran?				NS	NS		
Geographic Residence							
Distance from Prison	NS	—		—	Farther	NS	
Rural-Urban-Metro.	NS	NS[d]	—	—	Pop. < 100,000	—	NS
Geographic Stability	—				<2 yrs./La	NS	—
Parental Family							
Home Broken Early?	NS	—	—	(58%)	NS	—	
Father's Occup.	More oldest	—	—	—	NS	NS	
Sibling Position	Less youngest				—		
Current Family Status							
With Whom Living?	NS	—	Single	—			
Marital Status	NS	—		Unmarried		Single	Single
No. of Dependents	—		—	—	None	None	—
"Good Family Ties"	—	(Lack of Ties)		Lack of Ties			

[a] Results are summarized in terms of characteristics found significantly (p < .05) more often among escapees than among non-escapees, *except* for findings: (a) for which another p level is specified, or (b) listed as NS (not significant), or (c) enclosed in parentheses to indicate the absence of any control group comparison. A dash indicates that data on the specified characteristics were not reported.

[b] Matching variables were: Missouri—type of admission and age at admission (on which escapees were first compared with unselected admissions), and date of admission (see text); Louisiana—race (whites only), date of admission, and custody level; South Carolina—race (whites only), date of admission, custody level, and work assignment. See also footnotes c and d to this Table, *infra*.

[c] On the variable of age the Missouri escapees were found to be distinctly younger than a large unselected admissions sample; age was then used as one matching variable in forming a matched control group for subsequent comparisons.

[d] On the variable of geographic stability Massachusetts escapees were compared with 299 consecutive admissions classified by the same geographic-stability categories in an earlier study.

below 100,000 population in one study, though community size not significant in another prison study or for present sample; geographic instability as indexed by residence less than two years in state—one study, though not significant in another study); single (or separated or divorced) (four studies, though not significant in present study); lack of positive family ties (two studies); lack of any dependents (two studies); property offenses (three studies, though not significant in two other studies or in the present one); prior escape or military AWOL record (three studies, though not significant in present study); (New Zealand study) unhappy and defiant reactions in prison noted in official reports.

How can this seeming hodgepodge of escapee characteristics found in one or more studies be integrated in terms of *statistical clustering* of variables and/or in terms of hypothesized *social-psychological meaning?*

In the Louisiana study,[6] variables differentiating escapees from matched non-escapees were statistically intercorrelated and the matrix of correlation was cluster-analyzed. Two clusters (four variables each) emerged. One, labeled (geographically) *"transient criminality,"* included number of out-of-state penitentiary commitments, less than two years residence in state, greater distance to home state, and smaller (under 100,000) community of residence. The second cluster, labeled *"early criminal history,"* included a record of juvenile commitments, younger age at first arrest, property offenses, and fewer dependents.

In the present study, within the escapee sample, penitentiary transfer type of admission, more previous felonies, greater age (but still young) at admission, and alcoholism formed a cluster of interrelated (p < .05) variables. This cluster might be labeled *"chronic criminality."*

Certain characteristics distinguishing escapees suggest two additional factors which may contribute to escape-proneness: (a) physical, intellectual, and social *competence* above some minimum required to escape, as indexed by the characteristics of relative youth (significant in all six studies), near-normal or higher intelligence (significant in two of five studies), sixth-grade education or higher (significant in two of four studies), and some minimal interpersonal skills (not directly evaluated in any of the six studies); (b) *weak status anchorage in the legitimate community* (single, lacking dependents, lacking positive family ties, job instability), hence lack of incentive to "serve out time" as a path to resuming legitimate status in the community, and instead a readiness to escape to a fugitive, rootless status; and (c) *prison defiance.*

Further clarification of factors predictive of escape attempts might be sought by relating such attempts to measures of individual adjustment and to indicators of situational stress. Given the relative infrequency of escape attempts and the small percentage of inmates involved, investigation of such factors must usually depend on ex post facto searches of routine records kept for other purposes. This is a very restrictive limitation, which may help to account for the almost complete lack of pertinent published data.

SUMMARY

Time and place characteristics of escape behavior were summarized statistically for 40 escapees from a statewide maximum security building for psychiatric offenders located on the grounds of a midwestern state hospital. In addition, the escapees were compared first with unselected admissions as to type of admission, age at admission, and race; the first two variables sharply differentiated—race did not. Then the escapees were compared, as to a number of background characteristics and criminal and psychiatric record variables, with a sample of non-escapees matched individually for type of admission, age, and date of admission.

Escapes were attempted more often early in the man's stay in the security building, on the evening shift when professional staff were absent and off-ward activities were limited, and during the warmer months. Most escapees were soon returned.

Escapees, as compared with non-escapees: were distinctly younger; were more often penitentiary transfers, less often "criminal sexual psychopaths" or non-transfer presumed psychotics (not guilty by reason of insanity, judged incompetent for trial, or assigned for pretrial observation); more often had been convicted of several previous felonies; more often had a record of chronic unemployment or irregular employment; more often had a history of alcoholism; and were more often oldest siblings, less often youngest siblings (equally often only children or middle siblings).

On the basis of these findings, a composite scoring index (not cross-validated) was developed which may have moderate predictive value in identifying potential escapees.