



National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file - Votre référence

Our file - Notre référence

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.


Canada

***FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH
INMATE ESCAPES
FROM
CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS***

Robert C. Sturrock

1993

***Submitted to the Department of Criminology,
University of Ottawa, in partial fulfilment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts (M.A.)***

 Robert C. Sturrock, Ottawa, Canada, 1993



National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file *Votre référence*

Our file *Notre référence*

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-89698-1

Canada



UNIVERSITÉ D'OTTAWA
UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA

Dedicated to my wife Bessie
and my parents Gordon and Annie Sturrock

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT i-ii

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS iii

LIST OF TABLES iv

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION 1-4

 i) Purpose of Study 3

 ii) Organization of Thesis 4

CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW 5-49

 i) Escape Research - General Overview 5-10

 ii) Empirical Perspectives - Escape Risk Factors
 and Predictors 11-36

 a) Static Factors 10-24

 Age 12-13

 Type of Offence 13-14

 Prior Institutional Escapes 14-15

 Prior Confinements 15-16

 Sentence Served 16-18

 Criminal History 18-19

 Marital Status 19-20

 Length of Sentence 20-21

 Prior Parole Failure 21-22

 History of Alcohol and Drug Use
 and/or Abuse 22-23

 Institutional Misconduct 23-24

 b) Dynamic/Situational Factors 24-36

 Family Problems 24-27

 Parole Problems 27-29

 Drug/Alcohol Consumption
 at the Time of Escape 29

 Problems with other Inmates 30-31

 Problems with Staff 32

 Institutional Administrative Problems 32-33

 Outstanding Charges 33-34

 Transfers 34-35

 Temporal Factors 35-36

 iii) Theoretical Perspectives 36-49

 a) Prisonization 37-46

 Deprivation and Importation Models 40-44

 Inmate Social Roles 44-46

b) Rational Choice Theory	46-47
c) Moral Self-Transcendence	47-48
d) Cognitive Model	48-49
CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY	50-62
i) Research Design	50-51
ii) Sampling and Subject Selection	51-52
iii) Operational Definitions	52
iv) Independent Variables	52-57
a) Static Variables	53-57
b) Dynamic/Situational Variables	57-60
v) Dependent Variable	60
vi) Research Hypotheses	60-61
vii) Data Collection and Analysis	61-62
CHAPTER 4. RESULTS	63-73
i) Static Factors	63-70
Major Offence	63
History of Parole Revocation	64
History of Escape	64-65
Previous Federal Term	65-66
History of Drug/Alcohol Abuse	66
Previous Institutional Misconduct	67
Marital Status	67-68
Length of Sentence	68
Age	69
Number of Previous Criminal Convictions	69-70
Length of Sentence Served Prior to Escape	70
ii) Dynamic/Situational Factors	71-73
Factors Precipitating Escape Behaviour	71
Other Factors	71-72
Temporal Factors	72
iii) Summary of Findings	72-73

CHAPTER 5. DISCUSSION	74-109
i) Limitations of Findings	102-103
ii) Policy Implications	103-109
iii) Recommendations for Future Research . . .	109-110
BIBLIOGRAPHY	111-129
APPENDIX 1130-136
APPENDIX 2137-140

ABSTRACT

For the protection of society, one of the most important responsibilities of correctional staff is to prevent escapes from correctional institutions. In most instances, correctional authorities know how and when an inmate escaped, but what precipitated or motivated the inmate to escape is often unclear.

The objective of this study is to examine the factors which might be related to escapes from correctional institutions. Static and dynamic/situational factors were analyzed. Data were collected on escapees and non-escapees. The escapee sample consisted of 35 inmates who had escaped from federal (medium and maximum security) correctional institutions between 1990-04-01 and 1992-03-31. The escapee sample was compared to a random sample of inmates (N=35) who did not escape during the same period, so that static variables which might differentiate the two groups could be identified. In regards to the circumstances surrounding the escape incidents, dynamic/situational variables were examined to ascertain the prevalence of such variables among escapees.

Analyses of the results of static factors showed that significant differences were found between escapee and non-escapee groups. Escapees were more frequently found to have had a history of the following: property offences as the major offence, parole revocation, escape, federal term, drug/alcohol abuse, and institutional misconduct. Escapees were serving significantly longer

sentences, were younger, and had more previous criminal convictions. They served an average length of sentence of 5.7 years prior to escape.

Among some cases in which escapees and/or staff did identify the factors precipitating the escapes, the following factors were noted: family problems, parole problems, problems with other inmates, outstanding criminal charges, or institutional administrative problems. Moreover, approximately one-quarter of all escapees were under the influence at the time of escape. Slightly over one-quarter had recent parole revocations. Almost one-third had received recent transfers prior to escape. The majority of escapes were planned. Approximately three-quarters of the escapees fled with 1 or more other inmates. Most of the escapees absconded during the evening hours.

Findings from this study showed that both static and dynamic/situational factors should be taken into account when explaining escape behaviour. Moreover, an multi-discipline approach of various theoretical paradigms are essential to provide a better understanding of this multi-faceted phenomenon. Escape behaviour can be best explained by a combination of prisonization theory, rational choice theory, moral self-transcendence, and the cognitive model. Policy implications emphasize the need to adopt a proactive, rather than a reactive, approach to identifying inmates who are prone to escapes. Recommendations for future research have been provided.

I would like to offer my sincere appreciation to Dr. Thomas Gabor for his continuing support, advice, and direction. His persisting encouragement and guidance were indispensable to the completion of this thesis.

Special thanks to Dr. Michael Petrunik who has provided valuable advice and support. I am greatly indebted to the Correctional Service of Canada (CSC) for granting me the opportunity to carry out this study. Very special thanks to staff from the Institutional Operations Division, Case Management and Community Corrections Division, and Research and Statistics Branch, as well as those case management officers and preventive security officers from various CSC institutions, for their considerable support and assistance. Of special note are Linda McMahon, Alex Burnett, Marc Belanger, and Sonya Ellefsen who work at National Headquarters, CSC. In particular, I would like to thank Linda for her continual encouragement and support, Alex for his ideas and his openness in our discussion on this study, and to Marc and Sonya for their support and assistance in french translation.

Special recognition to Bessie Pang, my wife, for her patience, persistent encouragement, and considerable support.

LIST OF TABLES

iv

Table 1:	Types of Major Offence	63
Table 1a:	All Major Offences	129
Table 2:	History of Parole Revocation	64
Table 2a:	Number of Parole Revocations	130
Table 3:	History of Escape	65
Table 3a:	Number of Escapes	130
Table 4:	Previous Federal Term	66
Table 4a:	Number of Previous Federal Terms	130
Table 5:	History of Drug/Alcohol Abuse	66
Table 6:	Previous Institutional Misconduct	67
Table 6a:	Number of Previous Institutional Misconducts	131
Table 7:	Marital Status	68
Table 8:	Length of Sentence	68
Table 8a:	Type of Sentence	131
Table 9:	Age Groups	69
Table 9a:	Age	131
Table 10:	Number of Previous Criminal Convictions by Groups	70
Table 10a:	Number of Previous Criminal Convictions	132
Table 11:	Length of Sentence Served Prior to Escape (in years)	70
Table 12:	Reasons Precipitating to Escape Behaviour	133
Table 13:	Other Factors	134
Table 14:	Temporal Factors	135

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of incarceration has centred on the important principles of retribution, deterrence, and rehabilitation. The primary notion of incarceration is to isolate and provide secure confinement, as well as safe and humane control of convicted offenders who pose a risk or threat to society. For the protection of society, the single most important responsibility of correctional administrators is to prevent escapes.

While not all offenders pose an equal threat to society, and security measures differ between some institutions, the occurrence of escapes is a cause of serious concern among both correctional administrators and the public (see Carlson, 1990). From the view of correctional administrators, an escape incident can jeopardize the operation and performance of an institution (see O'Connell, Bosarge, and Wyen, 1991). If a correctional institution cannot prevent the occurrence of escape, the objectives of incarceration cannot be fully realized. From the perspective of the public, escapees are sometimes seen as highly dangerous offenders who pose a potential threat to the community. This is often the case when wide media coverage is given to high-profile escapees who have committed serious offences in the past, and particularly when a new serious offence was committed while

such offenders were at large. These sensationalized escape incidents can create a profound effect on the public. Although the introduction of the Perimeter Intrusion Detection Systems (PIDS) into CSC federal medium and maximum security institutions during the early 1980's has reduced escapes to some extent (see Roberts, 1986; Correctional Service of Canada, 1991a), escapes from these institutions have not decreased dramatically in the last decade (see Correctional Service of Canada, 1992a).

It is easy to conclude that escapes occur because offenders do not want to be confined. This, however, is only one explanation. Although most incarcerated offenders would like to be free, the majority of them do not escape or attempt to escape, not even from minimum security level institutions (see Correctional Service of Canada, 1992a; Davis, 1991). A principal objective of this thesis is to identify the factors that motivate some offenders to escape.

The phenomenon of escape behaviour from correctional institutions has baffled correctional authorities for some time. In most instances, correctional authorities know how and when an inmate escaped, and measures deemed appropriate are put forward accordingly. On the other hand, the precipitating or motivating factors of escapes often remain obscure.

i) Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study is to analyze the background characteristics of inmates who escape from correctional institutions and the relating circumstances surrounding their escape. In order to gain a better understanding of the phenomenon of institutional escapes, it is necessary to examine the factors associated with escape, as well as the related theoretical underpinnings of escape behaviour. Findings from this study can expedite the search for developing policies which can provide effective escape preventive measures and direct future research. For the protection of society, it is imperative that correctional administrators take all possible steps to prevent inmate escapes.

In an attempt to promote further understanding of escape behaviour, the following factors are investigated: 1) static factors (social, criminal, and demographic history) and 2) dynamic/situational factors (e.g., family problems, outstanding charges, parole problems) associated with escape behaviour. This study also reviewed various theoretical models which can explain institutional escapes. Existing escape prevention policies in Correctional Service of Canada (CSC) were examined, and appropriate escape prevention interventions were identified. Directions for future research were suggested.

ii) Organization of Thesis

This thesis is organized into five major chapters. Chapter 1 is the Introduction which outlines the background and purpose of this study. Previous studies which examined factors related to escape from correctional institutions are reviewed in Chapter 2. It provides a general overview of escape research and empirical perspectives on escape risk factors and predictors. Theoretical perspectives which could be applied to escape behaviour are also examined. Chapter 3 outlines the methodology of the study, while Chapter 4 presents the results. Finally, in Chapter 5, findings from this study are discussed in light of previous research on escape, and relating the present findings to the theoretical models which have been explored in Chapter 2. Generalizations and limitations of findings, policy implications, and recommendations for future research are also discussed in this concluding chapter.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

"Escapers can be broadly divided into two categories: those comprising a comparatively small number who are determined at all costs to get out of prison if they can find any opportunity and those men who, as a result of the circumstances at a particular time, make an escape bid which they might not attempt if pressures acting on them could be removed or at least reduced" (Home Office, 1966:3).

i) Escape Research - General Overview

Despite the importance of understanding the phenomenon of escape behaviour, there has been a paucity of empirical research addressing factors which are related to escape from correctional institutions. While most research available has been American, there have been relatively few Canadian studies (e.g., Basu, 1983; Smyrnew and Reid, 1980; Guenther, 1983; Wharry, 1972; and most recently, Johnston and Motiuk, 1992a and 1992b; Correctional Service of Canada, 1991; and Sturrock, 1992).

In general, studies on escape have been carried out for the purpose of generating statistical reports, security articles,

and policy/procedural papers, while other studies have been produced in order to develop instruments for objective classification assessments or prediction assessments of potential escapees (see Stone, 1975; McNeil, 1978; Campbell, 1983; Holt, 1974; Murphy, 1984).

Studies on escapes vary widely with respect to methodology. Most research on escapes have been retrospective studies. Escape studies have adopted different operational definitions, analyzed escapes from different institutional security levels (i.e., minimum, medium, and maximum), and examined the propensity to escape for different types of inmates from various criminal justice systems (i.e., young offenders, male adult offenders, and female adult offenders). Two commonly used methods are: 1) the quasi-experimental design which focuses on archival data, comparing non-escapees to escapees; and 2) the simple descriptive analysis of escapees. There is also some research which used case studies of escapees (see Renteria and Holt, 1971). The majority of escape studies have been descriptive or anecdotal in nature, providing at most, statistics on profiles of escapees. Most studies on escapes examined adult inmates who escaped from minimum security level institutions. The probable reason for this is that, presently, escapes from correctional institutions are rare, except from minimum security institutions (see Davis, 1991). However, the frequency of escapes from minimum security institutions is low in comparison to the total inmate population

that is at risk.

It should be noted that some escape research is outdated and sometimes inadequate in their methodology. The few studies that are available are not readily disseminated (e.g., internal government documents). Besides research studies on escape behaviour, there have been some biographies of distinguished escapees such as "Papillon," "Cool Hand Luke," and "Jack Sheppard," some of which became major novels and/or films (see Charriere, 1979, Pearce, 1965; Phillip, 1972). In their respective accounts, these escapees were viewed by their fellow inmates as heroes who fled from the harsh conditions of prison confinement.

Four categories of factors can be delineated from the research which has examined factors related to escapes: 1) static; 2) dynamic/situational; 3) psychological; and 4) security. Studies which examined static factors investigated individual demographic, background, and/or social/criminal history factors of escapees (see Anson and Hartnett, 1983; Basu, 1983; Metzler, 1979; Cowles, 1981; Holt, 1974; Kentucky Bureau of Corrections, 1978 and 1980; Loving et al., 1959; McNeil, 1978; Morgan, 1967; Banks et al., 1975; Shuster, 1969; Gorta and Sillavan, 1991; Campbell, 1983; Johnston and Motiuk, 1992a and 1992b; Williams, 1980; Porritt, 1982; Murphy, 1984; State of New York Department of Correctional Services, 1981, 1982, 1983,

1986a, 1987, 1989, 1990, and 1991; Scott et al., 1977; Shaffer et al., 1985; Stone, 1975; Thornton and Speirs, 1985; Virginia Department of Corrections, 1975, 1978, 1979, 1980, 1981, and 1982; Wilson, 1983; Martin, 1973; Wharry, 1972). Other studies have examined dynamic/situational factors (see Anson and Hartnett, 1983; Basu, 1983; Sturrock, 1992; Johnston and Motiuk, 1992a; Hilbrand, 1967; Kentucky Bureau of Corrections, 1978 and 1980; Nguyen Da Huong, Gorta, and Thompson, 1989; Gorta and Nguyen Da Huong, 1988; Porritt, 1987; Gorta and Sillavan, 1987; Bartollas, 1973; Wilson, 1983; State of New York Department of Correctional Services, 1989; Thompson, 1992; Smith and Sabatino, 1990; Duncan and Ellis, 1973; McNeil, 1978; Morgan, 1967; Wharry, 1972; Murphy, 1984). Some studies focused on the psychological characteristics of inmates (e.g., impulsiveness, frustration, fear, intelligence) who have escaped from correctional institutions. These studies have usually used psychometric tests or personality assessments to analyze escape behaviour (e.g., Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) scores) (see Chase, 1973; Fisher, 1977; Green and Martin, 1973; Loving et al., 1959; Morrow, 1969; Stump and Gilbert, 1972; Wilson, 1983; Murphy, 1984; Johnston and Cooke, 1973; Panton, 1979; Pierce, 1971; Scott et. al., 1977; Shaffer et al., 1985; White, 1979). Finally, there is a body of literature which examined the security components of prison environment and how it relates to escape prevention (Camp and Camp, 1987; Guenther, 1978; United States Department of Justice, 1980; Roberts, 1986; United States

Department of Justice, 1987; Home Office, 1966; Levinson and Williams, 1979; Capano, 1987; Hilbrand, 1969; Smyrnew and Reid, 1980; Shuster, 1968; Ingram, 1987; Wharry, 1973; Harvey, 1981; Anson and Hartnett, 1983; Duncan and Ellis, 1973; Landon, 1984; Libolt, 1991; MacDougall, 1989; Correctional Service of Canada, 1984, 1987b, 1991, 1992a, 1992b, 1992c and 1992d; Lynch, 1987; Johnson, 1990; Martinez, 1990; Coates, 1984; Robb, 1984 and 1985; Denny, 1980; Sheridan, 1990). Security factors can be divided into two sections: static security and dynamic security. Some of the static security components which have been examined are: types of fences, perimeter security systems/perimeter intrusion detection systems, walls, alarm system, locks, and towers. Dynamic security components consider areas of staff supervision and interaction, institutional programs, operational procedure, information sharing, and mobile patrol systems. Furthermore, security investigations or inquiries of escape incidents (see Correctional Service of Canada, 1987a; Home Office, 1966; Solicitor General Canada, 1973a and 1973b; Fielding and Fowles, 1987; Joint Legislative Committee on Prison Construction and Operations, 1983) and the media play an important role in examining security practices and procedures associated with escape (see Noel and Baker, 1992; Pemberton, 1991; Tyler, 1992; The Banner, 1992). Generally, escape investigations or inquiries are concerned with the circumstances surrounding the escape incidents and the security imperfections that might have been conducive to escapes.

In sum, static factors have been investigated in the escape literature more often than dynamic/situational factors. Most studies emphasize the need for further research on the dynamic/situational factors.

While most escape studies have been descriptive, only a few studies have included a theoretical proposition(s) in their analyses, using psychological and/or sociological explanations of escape behaviour. Some psychological interpretations of escape include personality theory (Fisher, 1977; Chase, 1973; White, 1979; Wilson, 1983), trait theory (Chase, 1973; Stump and Gilbert, 1972; McNeil, 1978; Basu, 1983), and locus of control theory (McNeil, 1978). Some sociological underpinnings include prisonization theory and the deprivation and importation models of the inmate criminal subculture (Wharry, 1972; Basu, 1983; McNeil, 1978; Morgan, 1967; Bartollas, 1973; Cowles, 1981, Campbell, 1983) and social control theory (Jensen, 1977). Finally, social-psychological interpretations of escape behaviour include learning theory (Green and Martin, 1973; Stone, 1975; Lowenstein; 1979; Brown, Druce, and Sawyer, 1978; Clarke and Martin, 1971a and 1971b; Campbell, 1983; McNeil, 1978). Some of these theoretical perspectives are discussed later in this chapter.

ii) Empirical Perspectives - Escape Risk Factors and Predictors

With respect to identifying characteristics of escapees, research has demonstrated that demographic variables are good predictors of escape behaviour (see Stone, 1975; Cowles, 1981). As well, situational or dynamic variables are useful, since these are subject to change, and can be used to identify situations for appropriate preventive interventions for escape (see Duncan and Ellis, 1973).

In order to obtain a clearer understanding of the phenomenon of escapes, a literature review on the static and dynamic/situational factors is provided in the following. While many factors have been found to play a role in explaining escape behaviour, only factors which demonstrated consistent relationships with this behaviour are discussed in this section.

a) Static Factors

Static factors appear to be the most frequently examined variables in the prison escape literature. These static factors include demographic variables (e.g., factors such as age, sex), prior criminal history variables (e.g., criminal record) and social history (e.g., marital status).

Age

Most studies have shown that there is a strong relationship between the age of the inmate and likelihood of escape. These studies demonstrate that "escapees" tend to be a younger group of inmates compared to "non-escapees" (Anson and Hartnett, 1983; Basu, 1983; Gorta and Sillavan, 1991; Johnston and Motiuk, 1992b; Guenther, 1983; Holt, 1974; Kentucky Bureau of Corrections, 1980; Correctional Service of Canada, 1991a; Jensen, 1977; State of New York Department of Correctional Services, 1981, 1982, 1983, 1986a, and 1991; Wharry, 1972; Morgan, 1967; Scott e. al., 1977; Stone, 1975; and Virginia Department of Corrections, 1981 and 1982). More specifically, most of these studies have indicated that the average age of an escapee tends to be under 30 years of age. The State of New York Department of Correctional Services (1986a) pointed out that 79% of escapees from correctional services facilities were under 30 years of age. They showed that the average age of an escapee was 26.1 years. Similarly, the Virginia Department of Corrections (1981) indicated that 78.4% of escapees were under 30 years of age. In another study, Johnson and Motiuk (1992b) found that the escapee group were significantly younger than the non-escapee group, and the average age difference was approximately 9 years. The mean age of the escapee group was 27 years of age.

The studies of Cowles (1981) and Campbell (1983), however,

found that escapees tend to be older than non-escapees. Cowles showed that escapees are more likely to be over 30 years of age. Cowles' inmate sample consisted of 401 escapees and 425 non-escapees from the Missouri Division of Corrections.

Type of Offence

A number of studies have indicated that inmates who have escaped from correctional institutions have been serving sentences for property offences rather than offences against the person (Correctional Service of Canada, 1991a; Basu, 1983; Cowles, 1981; Holt, 1974; Kentucky Bureau of Corrections, 1980; Ministry of Solicitor General (British Columbia), 1991; Gorta and Sillavan, 1991; Johnston and Motiuk; 1992a and 1992b; Murphy, 1984; Porritt, 1982; Stone, 1975; Thornton and Speirs, 1985; State of New York Department of Correctional Services, 1986a, 1987, and 1991; and Virginia Department of Corrections, 1979 and 1981). In one study, it was found that 94% of the inmates from the escapee group were property offenders compared to 68% of the inmates from the non-escapee group (Holt, 1974). In another study, Gorta and Sillavan (1991) found that 91.2% of their escapee group were serving sentences for property offences, while only 28.4% of the total inmate population were serving sentences for such offences. Murphy (1984) observed that 68% of escapees were property offenders compared to 48% for the non-escapees. By analyzing the number of previous property offences committed by

escapees, Johnston and Motiuk, (1992) observed that escapees had more than double the number of convictions for break and enter offences than did non-escapees.

Holt's (1987) research, however, found that escapees were more likely to be serving sentences for crimes against the person rather than for property offences. In that study, approximately 70% of the escapees were serving sentences against the person.

Prior Institutional Escapes

Escapees are more likely to have had a record of prior prison escapes than did non-escapees (Cowles, 1981; Holt, 1974; Murphy, 1984; Stone, 1975, Thornton and Speirs, 1985; Correctional Service of Canada, 1991a; Virginia Department of Corrections, 1979; Sturrock, 1992; Ministry of Solicitor General (British Columbia), 1991; Johnston and Motiuk, 1992a and 1992b; Campbell, 1983; and Wharry, 1972). When comparing escapees with non-escapees, Murphy (1984) noted that escapees were three times more likely to have escaped from a correctional institution as a juvenile than were non-escapees. In Johnston and Motiuk's (1992b) study, the escapee group had a significantly larger proportion of previous convictions for escape or being unlawfully at large than did the non-escapee group. In another study, Holt (1974) pointed out that 38% of the escapee group had escape histories compared to 17% of the control group of non-escapees. Moreover, Holt

suggested that the time period since the inmates' previous escape is important. He reported that the inmates who had escaped had a record of more recent escapes compared to the non-escapee group.

In contrast, Kentucky Bureau of Corrections (1978), Gorta and Nguyen Da Huong (1988), and Nath (1975) found that escapees tend not to have a history of escape behaviour. In Gorta and Nguyen Da Huong's (1988) research, in-depth interviews with escapees revealed that 86% of them had never escaped previously.

Prior Confinements

Another consistent finding in the literature is that escapees have a more frequent history of confinements than non-escapees (Basu, 1983; Holt, 1974; Kentucky Bureau of Corrections, 1978 and 1980; Murphy, 1984; Scott et al., 1977; Virginia Department of Corrections, 1978; State of New York Department of Correctional Services, 1986a and 1987; Ministry of Solicitor General (British Columbia), 1991; Metzler, 1979; Williams, 1980; Wilson, 1983; Campbell, 1983; and Wharry, 1972). Most of these studies define prior confinements as including both juvenile and adult periods of imprisonment. In the escape study of Kentucky Bureau of Corrections (1980), it was observed that escapees were significantly more likely to have been previously incarcerated as both juveniles and adults. Similarly, Wilson (1983) compared non-escapees with escapees and reported that the number of

previous prison terms and juvenile commitments were significant variables related to escape behaviour. The State of New York Department of Correctional Services (1987) found that 76% of the escapees were incarcerated previously in either local jails or prisons. In Murphy's (1984) research, escapees were significantly more likely to have had a juvenile commitment than did non-escapees. A study conducted by the Virginia Department of Corrections (1978) observed that escapees had more prior incarceration terms than did inmates from the general population. Nevertheless, some studies found no relationship with prior confinements and escape behaviour (Johnston and Motiuk, 1992b; Morgan, 1967). Johnston and Motiuk (1992b) observed no significant differences between escapees and non-escapees in terms of number of previous incarcerations or jail terms (defined as 30 days or more). Similarly, within Morgan's (1967) sample of escapees, significantly more inmates had only one prior commitment. He also observed no significant difference between the escapee and non-escapee groups with respect to number of prior juvenile commitments. It was not clear, however, whether the sample Morgan used was representative of the inmate population. It can be speculated that inmates who had only one previous commitment turned to escape due to institutional adjustment problems.

Sentence Served

Time served in confinement before escaping has been

identified as a significant variable in the escape research literature. It has been postulated that some offenders will escape as soon as possible in order to avoid a lengthy period of confinement.

In one study, about 65% of escapees had served less than one year of their local jail or prison terms before they escaped (State of New York Department of Correctional Services, 1986). Johnston and Motiuk (1992a) found that the average number of days spent between admission and subsequent escape was approximately one year. McNeil (1978) reported that most escapees in his sample were recent arrivals at the institution. Wharry (1972) examined escapes from Canadian medium and maximum security institutions. He found that inmates who had served less than 25% of their sentence were more prone to escape than those who had served more than 25% of their sentence. Moreover, Morgan's research (1967) observed that among the escapees, there were significantly more inmates who had served less than half of their sentence. Finally, several studies have shown that the majority of escapees have served only between three to four months before they escaped (Hilbrand, 1969; Kentucky Bureau of Corrections, 1978 and 1980; Canadian Penitentiary Service, 1973; Gorta and Sillavan, 1991).

Despite the above evidence which points to the significant relationship between escape and time served, other studies

reported contrary findings. Holt (1974) found that there was no significant relationship between time served prior to escape and escape behaviour. Likewise, the Virginia Department of Corrections (1981) reported that approximately 24% of escapes occurred before one year of confinement, while the remaining 76% of escapes occurred between 1 and 3 years of confinement.

Criminal History

Several studies pointed out that escapees tend to have extensive criminal adult and/or juvenile records (Metzler, 1979; Williams, 1980; Johnston and Motiuk, 1992a and 1992b; Holt, 1974; Bank et al., 1975; Martin, 1973; Johnson, 1984; Virginia Department of Corrections, 1982; Hyler and Labbe, 1970; State of New York Department of Correctional Services, 1981; Nath, 1975; McNeil, 1978; Murphy, 1984; Shaffer et al., 1985). These records included arrests, charges, and convictions. Murphy (1984) and Shaffer et al. (1985) reported that juvenile criminal history is a significant variable related to escape. They identified that escapees are more likely to have had an extensive juvenile criminal background than non-escapees. Escapees also tend to be more likely to have had a criminal record early in life. Johnston and Motiuk (1992a) noted in their study that relatively few escapees had 10 or fewer previous criminal convictions. As many as 65.4% of the escapees had more than 20 previous criminal convictions. Moreover, in their second study, they observed that

their escapee sample had an average number of 10 criminal charges per offender; this was more than double than that for the non-escapee group (Johnson and Motiuk (1992b). In another study, it was observed that offenders with 9 or more criminal convictions had a significantly higher escape rate than those offenders with 8 or less convictions (Wilson, 1980). Campbell (1983), however, found no significant relationship between the number of previous arrests and escape behaviour among the escapee and non-escapee groups.

Marital Status

Conflicting results were found with regards to the relationship between marital status and escape. Marital status can be viewed as having a measurable influence on the stability of inmates within the environment of the institution (see Standley, 1969). Within the escapee group, the Kentucky Bureau of Corrections (1978), Hyler and Labbe (1970), and Morgan (1967) noted that there were more inmates who were single than those who were married. Similarly, Metzler (1979) and Wilson (1980) found that there was a higher escape rate among single offenders than married ones. However, Cowles' (1981) research observed an opposite relationship. That is, inmates who escaped were more likely to be married than single. Still, other studies have reported no significant relationship between marital status and escape behaviour (Johnston and Motiuk, 1992b; Campbell, 1983;

Correctional Service of Canada, 1991a; Virginia Department of Corrections, 1981 and 1982).

Length of Sentence

A number of studies have demonstrated that escapees tend to have longer sentences compared to non-escapees (Scott et al., 1977; Stone, 1975; Virginia Department of Corrections, 1981 and 1982; Banks et al., 1975; Krohn and Petersen, 1973; Correctional Service of Canada, 1991a; Kentucky Bureau of Corrections, 1978; Wilson, 1980; Standley, 1969). The Virginia Department of Corrections (1981) noted that roughly 74% of the escapees were serving sentences between 5 and 20 years. The Correctional Service of Canada (1991a) observed that the average sentence length which the escapees were serving was 9.4 years; this was compared with the general inmate population, in which over 50% of all inmates were serving sentences of less than 6 years. It should be noted that this average of 9.4 did not include escapees who were serving indeterminate or life sentences. Furthermore, Wilson (1980) reported that the escape rate was higher among offenders who were serving sentences of 5 years or more. According to these studies, it is probable that offenders who escape are unwilling to spend a lengthy period of time incarcerated. Morgan (1967), however, reported that, compared to inmates who were serving lengthy sentences, significantly more inmates who escaped were serving sentences of 5 years or less.

This was also reflected in the study by Campbell et al. (1985), who found that inmates with shorter remand sentences (2 years) were more likely than long term offenders (serving 20 years or more) to have escaped. Moreover, in the study of Gorta and Sillavan (1991), it was noted that 50% of the escapees were serving an aggregate sentence of two years or less. Finally, Holt (1974) and Johnson and Motiuk (1992b) found sentence length to be a insignificant predictor of escape.

Prior Parole Failure

Some studies have examined prior parole violations and/or revocations as being related to escape (Basu, 1983; Murphy, 1984; McNeil 1978; Wilson, 1980, Kentucky Bureau of Corrections, 1978; Metzler, 1979; Wilson, 1983, McNeil, 1978; and Holt, 1974). These studies showed that escapees tend to have had a higher number of breach of parole or general parole violations than non-escapees. Murphy (1984) reported that escapees had twice as many parole violations as non-escapees. Wilson (1980) noted that offenders who had one or more parole violations had almost three times the escape rate as offenders who never had any parole violations. Basu (1983) indicated that escapees had significantly more breaches of parole and probation than non-escapees. Conversely, Johnston and Motiuk (1992b) observed that there was no significant difference between the escape and non-escape group in terms of previous failed supervision of

conditional release. Similarly, both Nath (1975) and Virginia Department of Corrections (1982) have shown in their studies that around 90% of their escapee group never violated parole.

History of Alcohol and Drug Use and/or Abuse

Some research indicated that histories of alcohol and/or drug use and/or abuse are associated with escape (Basu, 1983; Murphy, 1984; Metzler, 1979; McNeil, 1978, Morrow, 1969; State of New York Department of Correctional Services, 1989; Stone, 1975; Johnston, 1984; Virginia Department of Corrections, 1981 and 1982; Nath, 1975; Johnson and Motiuk, 1992a; Krohn and Petersen, 1973; Wilson, 1980; Kentucky Bureau of Corrections, 1978). The Virginia Department of Corrections (1982) reported that, from their sample of 85 escapees, almost 95% had a history of alcohol and drug use. In McNeil's (1978) study, one third of the escape group were prior alcohol abusers. This was statistically significant when compared to the non-escapee group. Morrow (1969) found an alcoholism rate of 42% for escapees, compared to 25% for non-escapees. Other studies have shown that prior alcohol abuse was significantly related to escape, but prior drug abuse was not found to be significant (Murphy, 1984; Smith, 1971). In these studies, escapees were found to have had a higher occurrence of alcohol abuse, while a higher occurrence of drug abuse was found among non-escapees.

With respect to drug abuse, only a few studies have reported a significant relationship. McNeil (1978) indicated that prior drug abuse was significantly related to first-time escapers. The State of New York Department of Corrections (1989) found that 72% of escapees in their 1987 sample were prior drug abusers. Johnston and Motiuk (1992a) showed that 56% of escapees were identified to have had drug problems and 44% were noted as having a heavy addiction. Furthermore, Basu (1983) observed that prior drug use was significantly related to escape, but prior alcohol use was not. On the contrary, Stone (1975) found that history of drug abuse was not a significant factor. Kentucky Bureau of Corrections (1980) and Holt (1974) also reported no significant differences between the escapees and non-escapees with regards to use of alcohol or drugs. These two studies reported that base rates for alcoholism and drug use were high within the inmate population. It is possible that these conflicting findings may be related to differing definitions of drug and alcohol problems and drug and alcohol abuse.

Institutional Misconduct

There has been some support in the literature that involvement in institutional misconduct is related to escape (Hilbrand, 1969; Murphy 1984, Johnston and Motiuk, 1992(a) and 1992(b); McNeil, 1978; Kentucky Bureau of Corrections, 1978; Duncan and Ellis (1973); Correctional Service of Canada, 1991a;

and Stone, 1975). Murphy (1984) identified that escapees were more likely to have been involved in an incident of serious misconduct than non-escapees. Johnston and Motiuk (1992b) noted that escapees were significantly more likely to have had security incidents than non-escapees. Furthermore, they found that escapees were involved in three times as many security incidents as non-escapees. The Correctional Service of Canada (1991a) reported that about 90% of the escapee group had committed at least one previous institutional security incident. Also, 55.2% of the sample had committed five or more previous institutional incidents. Finally, Stone (1975) found that the number of times an inmate was put in solitary confinement was also a strong predictor of escape. His sample of escapees had been placed in solitary confinement more often than non-escapees. Kentucky Bureau of Corrections (1980) and Cowles (1981), however, found no significant difference in the number of incident reports (institutional rule infractions) between escapees and non-escapees.

b) Dynamic/Situational Factors

Family Problems

Most escape research has analyzed static factors, but only a few studies have investigated dynamic/situational factors. Generally, in escape studies, dynamic/situational factors are

considered to be precipitating factors, and they often comprise of opportunities and stresses (e.g., personal crisis, peer pressure, intoxication) in on-going situations.

From the studies that analyzed these factors, one finding has been prevalent: a disruptive or unstable family situation has been associated with escape (Basu, 1983; Hilbrand, 1969; Kentucky Bureau of Corrections, 1978 and 1980; Thompson 1992; Renteria and Holt, 1971; Johnston and Motiuk, 1992a; Nguyen Da Huong, Gorta, and Thompson, 1989; McNeil, 1978; Gorta and Nguyen Da Huong, 1988; Duncan and Ellis, 1973; State of New York Department of Correctional Services, 1989; Sturrock, 1992; Porritt, 1987; Shuster, 1968; Smith and Sabatino, 1990; Smyrnew and Reid, 1980; Bartollas, 1973; Johnson, Lewis, and Young, 1974; Wilson, 1983; Wharry, 1972). Family problems which have been measured include: divorce, separation, illness or death in the family, economic difficulties, and problems with relatives and significant others. It is hypothesized that inmates escape in order to go home and attempt to alleviate family problems. Thompson (1992) found that 31% of the escapees fled prison because of "chronic family problems". She also reported that 21% of the escapees said that they escaped due to "bad news from the outside". In other words, over half the escapee group said that they had escaped because of problems related to family or to the outside. Gorta and Nguyen Da Huong (1988) found that "bad news" from outside (e.g., sick relative, marriage problems) was reported by almost half (44%) of

the recaptured escapee group. They also noted that 24% of the escapees had chronic family problems. McNeil (1978) reported that escapees tend to have significantly more problems with their wives or steady girlfriends than non-escapees. McNeil also found that escapees received less visitors monthly compared to non-escapees. Johnston and Motiuk (1992a) found that 34.4% of the escapees stated "family problems" as the main reason for their escape. Moreover, the study reported that the "main thing" on the minds of escapees was family/marital relations (42.1%).

A sample of escapees examined by Duncan and Ellis (1973) found that these inmates tended to have family difficulties. Such cases include: an inmate who was not permitted to attend a relative's funeral; an inmate who was not permitted to visit sick relatives, and an inmate who was not able to deal with family problems at home. Although these often reflect administrative sanctions, they are at least indirectly related to escape. In Wharry's (1972) study, it was indicated that 11 of the 15 escapees who were surveyed had personal problems, mainly related to family. Moreover, Basu's (1983) research showed that escapees have poor family ties and frequent marital difficulties. Finally, Hilbrand (1969) found that inmates who escaped were most often experiencing personal and family problems, and that they did not receive much mail or visits. Hilbrand referred to this as rejection from the family. He noted that some escapees simply wanted to return to their wife or girlfriend in the community to

participate in sexual activity. Hilbrand also believed that some inmates wanted to go home and work things out when the their wives or girlfriends had ended their relationship (e.g., receiving a "Dear John" letter from their wife or girlfriend). Hilbrand emphasized that inmates have responsibilities at home, therefore they escape.

Interestingly, some studies noted that the majority of recaptured escapees did not have a record of illegal activities while they were at large (see Murphy, 1984; Sturrock, 1993; Gorta and Sillavan, 1991). It is possible, however, that they might have been involved in crimes which were undetected, or it is possible that the majority of escapees simply wanted to go home.

Parole Problems

Another frequently reported factor found in the literature related to escape is that of parole denial (Duncan and Ellis, 1973; Kentucky Bureau of Corrections, 1978 and 1980; Holt, 1974; Smyrnew and Reid, 1980; McNeil, 1978; Virginia Department of Corrections, 1981 and 1982; Gorta and Nguyen Da Huong, 1988; Wharry, 1972; Porritt, 1987; Thompson 1992; Renteria and Holt, 1971; Johnston and Motiuk, 1992a; Nguyen Da Huong, Gorta, and Thompson, 1989). Parole variables include: no parole review scheduled, no parole date set, and parole date deferred. It is suspected that offenders who are denied conditional release have

a greater potential to escape. It was found that 34.3% of escapees had their parole date deferred (Kentucky Bureau of Corrections, 1980). Porritt (1987) identified that 7% of recaptured escapees in his sample expressed that parole denial and uncertainty were their reasons for escape. Johnston and Motiuk (1992a) found that 10.5% of their recaptured escapee group claimed that they escaped mainly because they did not receive a temporary absence pass. Wharry (1972) observed that inmates who had not been granted previous temporary absences were more prone to escape than those who had received temporary absences. In Holt's escapee group, only 17% of escapees had parole dates set, which was a significantly lower figure than that of the inmates from the general prison population. Moreover, Holt's (1974) research indicated that, of the escapees who were from direct transfers (i.e., inmates transferred from a reception unit to an institution of suitable security level), 10% had parole hearing dates set, but most of these dates were more than a year away at the time of their escape.

The Virginia Department of Corrections (1981) indicated that 30.7% of escapees were not eligible for parole at the time of their escape, and 52% of escapees had been denied parole prior to escape. Furthermore, Hilbrand (1969) showed that escapees had their parole hearings a lengthy time away from the time they escaped.

On the Contrary, Allen (1969) reported that one third of his escapee group escaped within one month of their parole review date, and all were being recommended for parole by the institution. Allen suggests that stress is a factor in escape behaviour. The expectation of leaving an institution and returning to the community is "stressful".

Drug/Alcohol Consumption at the Time of Escape

There have been only a few studies which investigated whether or not the offender was under the influence of intoxicants at the time of escape, or whether the use of drugs/alcohol was related to escape (Johnston and Motiuk, 1992a; Smyrnew and Reid, 1980; Porritt, 1987; Smith and Sabatino, 1990; Nguyen Da Huong, Gorta and Thompson, 1989; State of New York Department of Correctional Services, 1989; McNeil, 1978; Gorta and Nguyen Da Huong, 1988; Sturrock, 1992, Duncan and Ellis, 1973; Kentucky Bureau of Corrections, 1978 and 1980; Holt, 1974; Thompson, 1992). Johnston and Motiuk (1992a) found that 26.3% of the escapees indicated that they were intoxicated at the time of their unlawful departure. Similarly, McNeil found that 25% of the escapees in his sample reported that they were drunk when they escaped. Finally, Thompson (1992) noted that 10% of the escapees admitted to having been under the influence of alcohol or drugs at the time of escape, while 9% of the escapees reported that they escaped in order to obtain alcohol or drugs.

Problems with other Inmates

Several studies have indicated that sexual assault and physical assault or confrontation with other inmates are related to escape (McNeil, 1978; Murphy, 1984; Loving et al., 1959; Kentucky Bureau of Corrections, 1980 and 1978; Wharry, 1972; Hilbrand, 1969; Shuster, 1968; Gorta and Sillavan, 1991; Johnston and Motiuk, 1992a; Nguyen Da Huong, Gorta, and Thompson, 1989; Smyrnew and Reid, 1980; Bartollas, 1973; Johnson, Lewis, and Young, 1974; Porritt, 1987; Hartmann, 1978; Reich and Gutierrez, 1979; McNeil, 1978; Gorta and Nguyen Da Huong, 1988; Sturrock, 1992; Duncan and Ellis, 1973; Kentucky Bureau of Corrections, 1978 and 1980; Holt, 1974; Thompson, 1992). These factors are described as crisis situations that motivate the offender to escape. It is argued that threats of violence by other inmates contribute to a stressful situation which the inmate feels compelled to avoid by escaping. Murphy (1984) found sexual pressure and physical assault significantly related to escape. He concluded that, compared to non-escapees, escapees are more likely to have been involved in crisis situations (within 6 months prior to placement). However, he indicated that only a limited number of crisis situations were reported in his sample. In Johnston and Motiuk's (1991a) study, the following reasons for escape was found among the recaptured escapees: 13.8% were harassed by other inmates, 15.8% were threaten by other inmates, and 21.1% had conflict with other inmates. In another study, 21%

of the escapees stated that they escaped due to threats from other inmates and pressures from other inmates (Thompson, 1992). Likewise, 25% of the escapees in Gorta and Nguyen Da Huong's study (1988) stated that they escaped due to threats from other inmates. Gorta and Sillavan (1991) examined the files of approximately 150 escapees and found that a high number of them had requested protection. Hilbrand (1969) indicated that juvenile inmates are more prone to escape from sexual pressures and physical aggression. He also pointed out that, in some cases, inmates might escape because they have a vindictive motive to retaliate against someone on the outside. Several studies showed that owing money (e.g., drug debts) and/or lending of money sometimes play a major role in escape (Gorta and Nguyen Da Huong, 1988; Porritt, 1987; Thompson, 1992; Hilbrand, 1969; Duncan and Ellis (1973). It is believed that many offenders will escape to avoid a crisis or a stressful situation (e.g., being assaulted for not paying money back). This view concurs with McNeil's (1978) observation that escapees had salient fears about other inmates, often related to owing money. Finally, Kentucky Bureau of Corrections (1980) pointed out that staff believed that the large turnover in the prison population in a short period of time might have influenced the escape rate. They suggested that the turnover had upset the stability of inmate relationships in the institution.

Problems with Staff

Some research noted that escapees tend to have problems or difficulties with staff (e.g., conflict with guards) and reported that communication with staff was a problem (Duncan and Ellis (1973); Bartollas, 1973; Kentucky Bureau of Corrections (1980 and 1978); Thompson, 1992; Johnston and Motiuk, 1992a; Coates, 1984; Gorta and Nguyen Da Huong, 1988; Porritt, 1987; and McNeil (1978). Johnston and Motiuk (1992a) also reported that 21.1% of the escapees had problems with staff. McNeil (1978) showed that escapees seem to perceive most people as unfriendly. Anson and Hartnett (1983) pointed out that positive relationships between inmates and staff and between inmates can be important in reducing escape. Allen (1968) focused on an array of stress indicators which might contribute to the inmate's motivation to escape. They include: staff turnover, institutional adjustment, and staff stability.

Institutional Administrative Problems

Relatively few studies have identified institutional administrative problems as contributing factors in escape incidents (Thompson, 1992; Johnston and Motiuk, 1992a; Gorta and Nguyen Da Huong, 1988; Duncan and Ellis, 1973; Porritt, 1987; Hilbrand, 1969; Nguyen Da Huong, Gorta and Thompson, 1989; Gorta and Sillavan, 1991). Institutional administrative problems

generally include sanctions or loss of privileges (e.g., use of the telephone, a day pass, transfer, or work release, see the psychologist), Institutional administrative problems can also be indirectly related to family problems and parole problems.

Gorta and Nguyen Da Huong (1988) found that some inmates escaped to avoid loss of privileges after recent rule breach. Hilbrand (1969) mentioned that juveniles are more likely to escape when they receive a reprimand for misconduct, when they perceive such action as being unjustified or unwarranted. Duncan and Ellis (1973) indicated that reasons for escape given by 42.6% of the escapee group may be classified as administrative action or inaction. Some of these included not being permitted to visit a sick relative, not being able to have visitors, not able to use the phone, and parole problems. Generally, in Duncan and Ellis' study, some escapees received administrative sanctions (i.e., loss of privileges) for misconduct behaviour. It is hypothesized that, by escaping, the inmate is avoiding or rebelling against certain aspects of institutional disciplinary action.

Outstanding Charges

Some studies have reported that escapees tend to have detainers on their file at the time of escape (Wilson, 1968; Shuster, 1968; McNeil, 1978; Campbell, 1983; Sturrock, 1992; Thompson, 1992; Gorta and Nguyen Da Huong, 1988; Porritt, 1987; Standley, 1968; and Wharry, 1972). Detainers include outstanding

charges or impending trials for other offences. In these cases, escape may be one method of avoiding further convictions that could result in more time in prison. Wilson (1983) found that significantly more inmates within the escapee sample had "active holds" (i.e., detainers) placed against them than did inmates of the non-escapee sample. Similarly, Wharry (1972) and Standley (1968) reported that significantly more inmates who escaped had one or more outstanding charges.

Transfers

It has been speculated that receiving a transfer or being denied a transfer to another institution is related to escape (Murphy, 1984; Holt, 1987; Wharry, 1972; Thompson, 1992; Gorta and Nguyen Da Huong, 1988; Porritt, 1987; Shuster, 1968; Nguyen Da Huong, Gorta, and Thompson, 1989). Murphy (1984) suggested that inmates are more likely to escape if they have been transferred to a higher security institution from a minimum security institution. It is also believed that inmates who discover that they will be transferred to a higher institutional security level will tend to escape in order to avoid the transfer. Wharry (1972) indicated that inmates are more prone to escape during the first five months after transfer to a medium security institution. Almost two-thirds of escapees from medium security institutions escaped during the first five months after transfer to the institution. Holt (1987) found that 36% of

escapes occurred within one month of transfer to the facility. Thompson (1992) found that 5% of the escapee group escaped because they did not want to be transferred, or because their request for transfer had been denied. Some reasons given by inmates for their escape include the following: wanted to be nearer to their family; disliked their present institutional placement; missed their previous institution; and threatened by staff to be transferred to higher security level. However, Gorta and Sillavan (1991) argued that escaping from custody is also another way of being transferred. For example, if a request for transfer is denied, an escape will ensure placement to another institution (preferably higher security) when recaptured.

Temporal Factors

It has been shown in the literature that escapes tend to occur in the warmer spring and summer months (Dahlem, 1974; McNeil, 1978; Murphy, 1984; Virginia Department of Corrections, 1979, 1980, 1981, and 1982; Smyrnew and Reid, 1980; Canadian Penitentiary Service, 1973; State of New York Department of Correctional Services, 1989; Shuster, 1968; Guenther, 1983; Wharry, 1973; Correctional Service of Canada, 1980; Johnson and Motiuk, 1992a; Sturrock, 1992; Pettigrew, 1985; Hilbrand, 1969; and Kentucky Bureau of Corrections, 1978 and 1980). In these studies, higher rates of escapes were most likely to occur between the months of April and September. June and July have

been identified as particularly high risk months for escapes (Virginia Department of Corrections, 1979, 1980, 1981, and 1982; Smyrnew and Reid, 1980; Canadian Penitentiary Service, 1973; Murphy, 1984; Hilbrand, 1969; Wharry, 1973; Johnson and Motiuk, 1992a; Guenther, 1983). Evening hours (16:00 hours - 24:00 hours) have been preferred for escape (Shuster, 1968; Sturrock, 1992; Smyrnew and Reid, 1980; Morrow, 1969; Laverack, 1974; Murphy, 1984; Kentucky Bureau of Corrections, 1980 and 1978; and Hilbrand, 1969). Sturrock (1992) found that almost 75% of escapees had absconded in the evening hours. However, some studies found that escapes were more frequent during the day time hours (08:00 hours to 16:00 hours) (Virginia Department of Corrections, 1981 and 1982; McNeil, 1978; Wharry, 1973). Weekends have been indicated as the period when inmates are most likely to escape (Dahlem, 1974; Sturrock, 1992; Hilbrand, 1969; Virginia Department of Corrections, 1975; Murphy, 1984). Conversely, some studies shown that escape was more frequent during week days (Shuster, 1968; McNeil, 1978; State of New York Department of Correctional Services, 1989).

iii) Theoretical Perspectives

Prison escape is a complex phenomenon. No single factor can account for this type of behaviour; thus, many elements of escape must be considered. In order to examine the research problem

presented in this study, a major obstacle encountered was to identify a theoretical paradigm. In essence, no overall theoretical paradigm has been developed to explain escape behaviour from correctional institutions. Moreover, no single theoretical framework has evolved specifically to guide and carry out research on prison escape. As a means of establishing a theoretical framework for research on escape, many elements of psychological and sociological effects must be taken into account. Congruent with my research design and in accordance with the objectives in this study, factors relating to escape behaviour will be explored in light of several theoretical paradigms. An eclectic, integrative approach is taken to examine the following: (1) the primary notion that escape behaviour is learned behaviour (subcultural deviance). This type of learned behaviour can be explained by examining the prisonization theory and the deprivation and importation models of the inmate criminal subculture; and (2) other paradigms which offer explanations of other components of escape behaviour, such as rational choice theory (opportunity reduction), moral self-transcendence, and the cognitive model.

a) Prisonization

The cornerstone of the learning perspective is that deviance is a form of learned behaviour. Deviance is learned through the process of association, interaction, and communication in the

person's immediate social group (Akers, Hayner, and Gruninger, 1977; Akers, 1985; Berk, 1966; Burgess and Akers, 1966; Sutherland and Cressey, 1978). Accordingly, criminal behaviour and values are learned through close and intimate relationships and associations with criminal peers.

Congruent to the learning theory is the concept of prisonization or prison socialization (Peat and Winfree, 1992; Beck, 1966; Wheeler, 1961). As described by Clemmer (1940), prisonization is the assimilative process by means of which inmates take on, in greater or lesser degree, the customs, mores, folkways, and other aspects of the general culture of the prison. Offenders who enter prison are exposed to the inmate code¹ of conduct and criminal subculture - which constitute the inmate social system. Through the process of prisonization, some inmates may adapt to incarceration, relate to the inmate code, and adopt social roles, norms, and values oriented towards the inmate criminal subculture. Inmates who have been assimilated into the inmate criminal subculture develop anti-social attitudes, values, and beliefs which are in direct opposition to the prison administration, policies, programs, staff, and conventional society in general (Clemmer, 1940). Other consequences of prisonization include increased criminal

¹ The inmate code represents an organization of criminal norms and values which are opposite to the values of prison administration and conventional society. Some of the major tenets of the code include: prohibiting any type of supportive or non-exploitive liaison with staff; stressing group loyalty and solidarity against prison administration and conventional society; prohibiting exploitation of inmates and interference with inmate interests (e.g., "ratting" on an inmate) (see Sykes and Messinger, 1960; Ohlin, 1956).

contacts, involvement in crime, and alienation (see Clemmer 1940; Thomas and Petersen; 1977; Thomas, 1970, 1975, and 1977; Thomas and Poole, 1975; Thomas and Foster, 1972). A significant proportion of inmates are aligned with the inmate code which controls and guides their behaviour. Clemmer (1940) argued that every offender who enters prison undergoes the process of prisonization to some extent and degree. He noted that the longer and more intense the exposure to the influences of the inmate criminal subculture in prison, the more one becomes prisonized.

Clemmer (1940) pointed out that the function of prisonization was related to pre-prison factors and the deprivational aspects of imprisonment. He noted that some of these factors which influence the degree of prisonization are: criminality, age, race, offence, length of sentence, personality, relationship with family and friends outside of prison walls, acceptance of the inmate code, and affiliations and loyalties with a primary group inside the institution, and institutional work placement (Clemmer 1940 and 1950).

Both the deprivation and importation models are needed to explain the development of the inmate criminal subculture and the process of prisonization (Thomas, 1977; Thomas and Foster, 1972; Thomas et al, 1978). Taken together, these two models advocate a complementary integrative model. Coupled with the negative

impact of the inmate code and criminal subculture, prisonization is directly related to criminalization (Clemmer, 1940). In an attempt to seek how the inmate criminal subculture develops and why prisonization occurs, the following section examines the concepts of deprivation and importation.

Deprivation and Importation Models

Explanations for the development of the inmate criminal subculture are advanced by the deprivation and importation models. These two models provide the theoretical backbone to identifying the determinants and consequences of the degree of prisonization (Thomas, 1970 and 1975; Cline, 1968; Thomas and Foster, 1972 and 1973; Thomas and Zingraff, 1976; Smith and Hepburn, 1979).

The deprivation model suggests that, the inmate criminal subculture and inmate code develop as a result of "structural stresses", which refers to organizational characteristics and deprivations from institutional life (Sykes and Messinger, 1960; Sykes, 1958 and 1978; Tittle, 1972; Goffman, 1961; Garfinkel, 1956; Wheeler, 1961; Toch, 1977; Toch et al., 1989). Sykes (1958) identified five deprivational components of pains of imprisonment which inmates experience. They include: the deprivation of goods and services, the deprivation of liberty, the deprivation of heterosexual relationships, the deprivation of

security, and the deprivation of autonomy or ability to make choices concerning one's life. Goffman (1961) argued that when an offender enters prison, the civilian identity of that offender is stripped away by a process referred to as "mortification." This involves a degradation process which entails humiliation, frustration, isolation, and submission of the inmate to the authorities of prison. He pointed out that prisoners experienced loss of privacy, autonomy, sense of security, and personal belongings. Cohen and Taylor (1972) found that fear of mental deterioration was a common concern shared by the inmates. The fear of losing contacts with family and friends created another source of anxiety, aroused by doubts about how long those relationships would last during a lengthy sentence. Such anxieties were coupled with frustrations over letter censorship and restrictions on the number of outgoing letters (Cohen and Taylor, 1972). In Toch's prison study (1977), various "environmental concerns" were identified as physical safety and security, emotional feedback, lack of privacy, no emotional support, lack of activity, lack of freedom, and lack of structure. Finally, Zamble et al. (1984) found that inmates who lacked contact with relatives and friends had expressed major frustration.

The method in which inmates attempt to reduce or overcome many of the deprivations of institutional life determines the development of social structures and patterns of inmate behaviour

in prison. Sykes (1958) pointed out that there are several methods of mitigating the pains of imprisonment. Escape, psychological withdrawal, and rebellion are examples of such methods, but these are infrequently used, due to the structural constraints of imprisonment. However, alienative and cohesive responses are predominant modes of inmate behaviour, through which attempts are made to relieve the pains of imprisonment. An alienative response is an individualistic adaptation through which inmates pursue their own needs and interests without regard for other inmates (e.g., an inmate who uses violence to obtain scarce resources). This type of behaviour violates the major tenets of the inmate code. A cohesive response represents an adaptation to a system of values that reflects group cohesion, loyalty, and solidarity among inmates who oppose the staff normative system. This response supports the major tenets of the inmate code. Sykes (1958) provides the following view in regard to a cohesive response:

"The greater the extent of cohesive responses, the greater the degree to which the society of captives moves in the direction of inmate solidarity - the greater is the likelihood that the pains of imprisonment will be rendered less severe for the inmate population as a whole. A cohesive inmate society provides the prisoner with a meaningful social group with which he can identify himself and which will support him in his battle against his condemners." (Sykes, 1958: p.107)

Through the collective-oriented response, inmates confront deprivations of imprisonment as a united group. Nevertheless, the norms of the inmate code are frequently violated despite the

ardent proclamations of solidarity expressed by inmates (Sykes, 1978).

The level of deprivation in prison influences the degree of structurally-generated alienation, quality of adaptation, and adjustment in prison. Consequently, with increasing deprivation, the inmate criminal subculture emerges with increased criminal values and norms which are in opposition to prison administration.

The pains of imprisonment could never be eliminated but could lessen, depending on the balance of the alienative and cohesive responses (Sykes and Messinger, 1960). Therefore, the development of the inmate social system serves as a function to alleviate or lessen the pains of imprisonment. Studies have indicated that the level of deprivation experienced by inmates was the highest in higher security level institutions (Bowker, 1982).

The importation model suggests that the inmate code and inmate criminal subculture are imported into the prison by offenders from their criminal careers on the outside. Offenders import their pre-prison experiences (e.g., socio-background and demographic factors) and extra-prison characteristics (e.g., post-prison expectations, family and criminal contacts) into the prison. These experiences and characteristics can lead to the

development of the criminal values, attitudes, and behaviour of the inmate code and inmate criminal subculture (Tittle, 1972; Thomas, 1970 and 1975; Thomas and Foster, 1972; Clemmer, 1958; Schrag, 1961; Garabedian 1963; Petersen and Thomas, 1977; Irwin and Cressey, 1962; Irwin, 1970). These factors influence the impact of imprisonment which affects the inmate's quality of institutional adjustment and adaptation, social relations, and behaviour (Irwin and Cressey, 1962; Wheeler, 1961; Petersen and Thomas, 1973). The inmate code in prison is viewed as modification of the criminal normative system on the outside.

Inmate social role adaptations are a central component of prisonization and inmate criminal subculture (Schrag, 1961; Garabedian, 1963, 1964 and 1970; Poole et al, 1980). The following section examines this relationship.

Inmate Social Roles

Within the inmate criminal subculture, a variety of social roles are developed among inmates. Thus, prison can be viewed as a heterogenous community. These social roles are characterized as alternative modes of adjustment to the problems encountered in the prison environment.

Schrag (1961) and Garabedian (1963, 1964, and 1970) described five social role types. First, the "square john" is

isolated, has little involvement in crime, and is identified with conventional pro-social norms and values. Second, the "politician" is involved in both illegitimate and legitimate activities; this role is viewed as "pseudo-social" and is exploitative towards staff and inmates. Third, the "right guy" is viewed as "anti-social". This person is considered to be: a career criminal (recidivist); involved in extensive criminality; dedicated to the inmate code and heavily involved in the inmate social system; committed to illegitimate means and rejects conventional norms; and loyal to criminal associates. Moreover, the "right guy" has been involved in crime at an early age, is incarcerated frequently for traditional property offences, has previous confinements, and has deep involvement in prison rackets. Finally, the "outlaw" is similar to the "right guy", but this role is viewed as "asocial" and rebellious. This person rejects both the legitimate and illegitimate normative systems; acts on impulse; is manipulative and uses violence to achieve immediate gratification of self-oriented interests; is involved in high incidences of prison rule infractions including escape; and has prolonged difficulties of prison adjustment. Furthermore, the "outlaw" has the most prolonged career in criminal behaviour, has been incarcerated frequently for traditional property offences, and has previous confinements. This role is considered to be a trouble-maker and poses a serious escape risk in institutions. Cloward (1959) views this role as "double failure" in both legitimate and illegitimate activities.

Cressey and Irwin (1962) and Irwin (1970) are strong supporters of the importation model. They argue that three prison subcultures are found in the prison community: the thief, convict, and legitimate subcultures. The thief subculture promotes the values of the "right guy". They are career criminals with high recidivism rates, and they view prison as a temporary inconvenience to their criminal career. The convict subculture is similar to the values of the "outlaw." They have higher recidivism rates compared to the other two subcultures and have a long history of incarceration. This subculture is viewed as hard core criminals with values such as utilitarianism and manipulation. The legitimate subculture is the largest subculture that forms the prison culture. This subculture is similar to the values of the "straight john" which focus on legitimate channels. They reject the "thief" and "convict" subculture, and they present on a small disciplinary problem in institutions. In sum, "antisocial" and "asocial" roles reflect high levels of prisonization, while pro-social roles reflect low levels of prisonization (Thomas and Foster, 1972; Poole et al., 1980; Schrag, 1961; Garabedian, 1963, 1964 and 1970).

b) Rational Choice Theory

With regard to rational choice theory, the determination of whether or not to commit a crime is based on a calculated

assessment of its benefits and costs. The rewards from a crime are viewed as having outweighed the cost of risks. In addition, committing a crime is assisted through decision-making, rational choice selection, planning, and most importantly, opportunity (see Clarke and Cornish, 1985; Clarke 1980; Cornish and Clarke, 1986). Criminal behaviour can be the result of some opportunistic factors in the immediate surrounding of a physical environment which, in turn, facilitates one to commit a criminal act. Thus, one way to reduce criminal opportunities is to "target harden", i.e. reduce opportunities, such as manipulating the physical environment (e.g., surveillance, environmental design) (see Mayhew, 1990; Clarke and Cornish, 1985; Clarke, 1980; Cornish and Clarke, 1986). It is postulated that taking a physical design approach (i.e., manipulation of the physical environment) can modify human behaviour depending on the situational measures that are adopted.

c) Moral Self-Transcendence

The existentialism theory views individuals as being radically free in making choices for solutions to their problems; these choices may interact with emotional states (Dostoevsky, 1965; Satre, 1966). Like existentialism, the theory of moral self-transcendence focuses on the dynamic nature of criminal behaviour. When a criminal event occurs, criminal behaviour can be analyzed as being influenced and compelled by "sensual

dynamics", or "phenomenal foreground factors", of the surrounding circumstances (Katz, 1988). The central component of sensual dynamics in such circumstances is moral emotions. These include humiliation, defilement, ridicule, rage, shame, and vengeance (Katz, 1988). For example, Katz pointed out that, in a case of committing a crime of murder, an impassioned individual may turn humiliation into rage. Murder might be a method to overcome a personal challenge to moral integrity. Through this criminal act, the individual attempts to eliminate a humiliating situation.

The sensual dynamics which are involved in the immediate experience of committing a crime can be perceived by the offender as "sensible", "seductive", and "attractive" (Katz, 1988). The major attraction to committing a crime is the quality of the deviant experience, and the offender's rational, emotional, and moral processes.

d) Cognitive Model

The cognitive model of delinquency prevention and offender rehabilitation is currently adopted by the Correctional Service of Canada (CSC). The Cognitive Skills Training Program is a core component of the Living Skills Programming (Fabiano, Robinson, and Porporino, 1990). The cognitive model maintains that an offender's cognition plays an important role in criminal deviance

(Ross and Fabiano, 1985; Ross, 1980 and 1981; Fabiano, Robinson, and Porporino, 1990; Correctional Service of Canada, 1990 and 1991). It is asserted that some offenders lack a number of cognitive skills which are necessary for pro-social and non-criminal adaptation. There are a variety of functions to which cognitive skills refer including: reasoning, understanding social rules and social obligations, self-evaluations, thinking processes, decision-making, critical thinking, expectations, planning, and inter-personal problem-solving. Consequently, deficiency in cognitive skills contributes to criminal behaviour (Ross, 1980 and 1981; Ross and Fabiano, 1985).

CSC, following the premises of the cognitive theory, considers some offenders to be cognitively inadequate in decision-making, in that they do not stop to think when faced with a problem (Correctional Service of Canada, 1990 and 1991; Fabiano, Robinson, and Porporino, 1990; Porporino, Fabiano, and Robinson, 1991). It is suggested that when offenders commit crimes, they have inadequately analyzed the situation and consequences of their actions. Their involvement in criminality is related to impulsive behaviour as they have inadequate problem-solving skills to solve their problems and decisions are made ineffectively. The CSC Cognitive Skills Training Program of the Living Skills Programming attempts to train offenders in those skills and values which are required for pro-social adaptation (Fabiano, Robinson, and Porporino, 1990).

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

i) Research Design

A review of the literature on escape behaviour indicates that some variables have been found to be related to escape. In essence, from the literature, escape behaviour can be viewed as being attributed to: 1) problems encountered within the institution; and/or 2) problems outside the institution; and/or 3) inmate background characteristics. This study examines some variables which have demonstrated a fairly consistent relationship with escape behaviour.

This study is exploratory and eclectic in nature. In general, it provides a retrospective analysis of escapes from CSC federal (medium and maximum security level) correctional institutions. Both qualitative and quantitative analyses were conducted. In order to observe the factors associated with escape, a comparative study between escapees and non-escapees was conducted. A group of offenders who had escaped from CSC federal medium and maximum security institutions is compared to a matched sample of similarly situated offenders who did not escape. Comparisons of various variables were made between escapees and non-escapees to determine whether or not any variables can be

identified to differentiate the two groups in terms of static factors, such as, demographic, criminal, and social history variables. In regards to the circumstances surrounding the escape incidents, frequency distributions of dynamic/situational variables (e.g., family problems, parole problems, outstanding charges) were examined to ascertain the prevalence of such variables in escape incidents.

ii) Sampling and Subject Selection

Two samples were employed in this study: 1) a group of escapees; and 2) a group of non-escapees (control group). All male inmates who have escaped from Correctional Service of Canada (CSC) federal medium and maximum security level correctional institutions between April 1, 1990 and March 31, 1992 were included in the escapee group, which comprised 35 inmates.² This time-frame was chosen because the information available on the escapees is the most current. A group of recent escapees would be more similar to future escapees than would a sample of escapees from the previous 30 years. Furthermore, information on federal escape incidents prior to 1983 is unavailable. In general, the use of a current sample selection can ensure a higher degree of authenticity and reliability of up-to-date record keeping. Although the present study focused on escapes,

² During the period between April 1, 1990 and March 31, 1992, there were 20 escape incidents were recorded involving 35 inmates. Twenty-six escapees were from medium security institutions, and 9 were from maximum security institutions (Correctional Service of Canada, 1992).

attempted escapes would also be equally important to examine. However, due to the lack of qualitative information on attempted escapes, these were not examined in this study.

A control group of 35 non-escapees were selected through the use of a computerized random selection program on SPSS/PC (Statistical Package for Social Sciences). The control group was selected from the population of male inmates who were at CSC medium or maximum security level institutions and who were incarcerated during the same two year period as the escapee group, but who did not escape. Both groups were matched according to security level and time of incarceration.

iii) Operational Definitions

The following operational definitions are used in this study: 1) an **escape** is the unauthorized departure of an inmate from the confines or property of an institution of medium or higher security level; 2) an **escapee** is an inmate who had an official escape recorded between April 1, 1990 and March 31, 1992 in a security incident report; and 3) a **non-escapee** is an inmate who had no official escape report recorded between 1990-04-01 and 1992-03-31.

iv) Independent Variables

The independent variables included in this study provide a descriptive profile of the general characteristics of the subjects. With the exception of the variable "sentence served prior to escape", which is applicable to only the escapee group, data on independent variables were collected on both the escapee and non-escapee groups. The types of independent variables that were collected and analyzed are as follows:

a) Static variables provide information on demographic characteristics of inmates and previous social and criminal history:

Major offence - For the escapee group, major offence refers to the most serious offence for which an escapee was serving his sentence at the time of escape during the period under study (April 1, 1990 to March 31, 1992). For the non-escapee group, major offence refers to the most serious offence in the most current term which was being served during the period under study (April 1, 1990 to March 31, 1992). Major offence is broken down into 3 categories: (1) **property offence** (includes robbery, break and enter, fraud, and theft); (2) **offence against a person** (includes murder, manslaughter, sexual assault, kidnapping, aggravated assault, and conspiracy to commit murder); and **other offence**

(includes narcotic offences and possession of weapon).

History of parole revocation - For the escapee group, history of parole revocation refers to revocation of day parole, full parole, or mandatory supervision before the time of escape during the period under study. For the non-escapee group, history of parole revocation refers to revocation of day parole, full parole, and mandatory supervision before and/or during the period under study.

History of escape - For both the escapee and non-escapee groups, history of escape refers to escape from minimum level, medium level, and/or maximum security level institutions. It includes prison breach, escape from lawful custody, unlawfully at large, and attempted prison breach which occurred before April 1, 1990.

Previous federal term - For both the escapee and non-escapee groups, prior federal term refers to a previous term which was served at a CSC institutional facility before April 1, 1990.

History of drug/alcohol abuse - For both the escapee and non-escapee groups, history of drug and/or alcohol abuse refers to having had a record of substance abuse before and/or during the period under study.

Previous institutional misconduct - For both the escapee and non-escapee groups, previous institutional misconduct refers to involvement in a federal institutional incident(s) before and during the period under study³. Federal institutional incidents are reported by CSC staff and recorded in the inmate's file and the Offender Record System (ORS). For the purpose of this study, previous institutional misconduct is defined as an incident involving any of the following: a) contraband - possessing material or objects which are prohibited by the institution (e.g., weapons, drugs); b) damage to government property (e.g., vandalism); c) behavioural problems (e.g., disrespectful towards staff, refusing staff orders, displaying inappropriate or unacceptable behaviour); d) escape (escape from unescorted temporary absence (UTA) or escorted temporary absence (ETA), unlawfully at large, escape from minimum security level institution (walkaway), escape or attempted escape from medium or higher security level institution); d) violence (e.g., assault on staff or inmate, murder, hostage-taking, attempted suicide, self-mutilation, major or minor disturbance); and 5) other (e.g., extortion, drug trafficking, intelligence).

³ For the escapee group, this excludes the count of misconduct which was recorded as a result of the escape during the period under study.

Marital status - For both the escapee and non-escapee groups, marital status refers to whether the inmate was single (not married) or married/common-law during the period under study.

Length of sentence - For the escapee group, total length of sentence refers to the aggregate sentence (in days) of the term for which the inmate was serving at the time of escape during the period under study. For the non-escapee group, total length of sentence refers to the aggregate sentence (days) of the most current term for which the inmate was serving during the period under study. For offenders serving determinate sentences, length of sentence was calculated from the sentence commencement date to the warrant expiry date. For offenders serving indeterminate sentences (life sentences), length of sentence was calculated from the sentence commencement date to the parole eligibility date.

Age - For the escapee group, age refers to the inmate's age at the time of escape during the period under study. For the non-escapee group, 5.7 years was added to the inmate's age at sentence commencement date in the most current term which was served during the period of study. 5.7 years was used because this was the average amount of time served by the escapee group prior to escape.

Number of previous criminal convictions - For both the escapee and non-escapee groups, criminal history refers to the total number of criminal convictions before April 1, 1990.

Length of sentence served prior to escape - For the escapee group, length of sentence served prior to escape refers to the time served from current sentence commencement date until the time of escape during the period under study.

Of these variables, major offence, history of parole revocations, history of escape, previous federal term, history of drug/alcohol abuse, previous institutional misconduct, and marital status are nominal variables. The variables length of sentence, age, number of previous criminal convictions, and length of sentence served prior to escape are continuous variables.

b) Dynamic/situational variables were collected from the escapee group only (these data were not available on the non-escapee group). These variables were either self-reports by inmates, or were observations made by staff, and were recorded in the escape incident and/or investigation reports. Most of these variables are concerned with the types of situations that inmates experienced shortly before and/or at the time of escape. Specifically, the variables in category 1 below have been

identified as reasons precipitating escape in the escape incident and/or investigation reports. It is important to note that the categories below are not mutually exclusive. That is, an escapee could have had multiple reasons for escape (e.g., a family problem, a parole problem, and an outstanding criminal charge). Dynamic/situational variables are recorded as dichotomous variables. They are broken down into 3 sub-categories:

Factors Precipitating Escape Behaviour

Outstanding criminal charge(s) implies that the inmate had an outstanding criminal charge(s) at time of escape.

Parole problems include: 1) an inmate's parole application had been recently denied or refused prior to escape, or 2) the inmate's parole revocation or suspension was viewed by himself as unjustified.

Problems with other inmates include being threatened, having experienced a recent physical assault, and having conflicts/problems with inmate peers.

Family problems include disruptive or unstable family situation, family crisis, divorce, separation, illness or death in the family, and problems with relatives or girlfriends.

Institutional administrative problems include transfers, punitive segregation for poor behaviour, judicial/legal problems, and medical assistance problems.

Other Factors

Under the influence implies that the inmate was under the influence of intoxicants (drugs/alcohol) at the time of escape.

Recent (within 60 days prior to escape) parole revocation implies that parole (Day Parole, Full Parole, or Mandatory Supervision) was revoked due to technical violation of parole conditions, and new indictable offence(s).

Recent (within 60 days prior to escape) transfer - the inmate was transferred from lower security institution to higher security due to various behavioural problems and/or parole revocation/suspension.

Planned or unplanned escape

Multiple escape - the escapee fled with 1 or more other inmates.

Method of escape - escape by vehicle, scaling the fence,

penetrating through the fence, and escape while outside the exterior perimeter during supervision in a work group.

Temporal Factors

Time of escape - morning (24:00 hours to 08:00 hours); day (08:00 hours to 16:00 hours); or evening (16:00 hours to 24:00 hours).

Day of escape - week days (Monday to Friday); or weekends (Saturday and Sunday).

Season of escape - spring (March 21 to June 20), summer (June 21 to September 20), fall (September 21 to December 20), or winter (December 21 to March 20).

v) Dependent Variable

The act of escape by the escapee group is considered the dependent variable. Escape is recorded as a dichotomous term (yes/no).

vi) Research Hypotheses

First, escapees and non-escapees are expected to differ significantly on some static variables. Second, within the

escapee group, some dynamic/situational variables are expected to be found more frequently than others.

vii) Data Collection and Analysis

Data which were collected for this study were gathered from a variety of sources. The variables under examination were obtained from automated inmate record systems and case file reviews. Only secondary data were used in the analysis on medium and maximum security level inmates. The data used for analysis in this research are current. The automated Offender Record System (ORS) of CSC provided general demographics (e.g., age, marital status), current offence characteristics (e.g., major offence, length of sentence) and correctional process variables (e.g., sentenced served, institutional misconduct). The Canadian Police Information Centre (CPIC) system was used to extract the inmates' criminal offence record. The inmates' Progress Summary Report, Community Assessment Report, and Penitentiary Placement Report were examined to collect social history variables (e.g., drug/alcohol abuse). Finally, the inmates' escape incident reports and investigations (narrative accounts) were used to analyze all circumstances surrounding the escape in order to obtain dynamic/situational variables. Whenever possible, data validation was conducted by the researcher through contacting Institutional Preventive Security Officers (IPSOs) and Case Management Officers (CMOs) in the field (i.e., from various

institutions).

All data were coded and analyzed using SPSS/PC computer program. Frequency distributions, cross-tabulations, and tests of significance (Chi-Square and t-test) were used for univariate analyses on most of the static factors⁴. Frequency distributions and cross-tabulations were carried out on dynamic factors. Confidentiality of all data was maintained throughout this study.

⁴ As stated earlier, only descriptive frequency was analyzed for the variable, "sentence served prior to escape", because data was not available for the non-escapee group.

CHAPTER 4**RESULTS****i) Static Factors****Major Offence**

Major offences were categorized into three main types: property offence, offence against a person, and other offence. Within the escapee group, 71.4% of the major offences were property offences and 28.6% were offences against a person. Among the non-escapee group, 40.0% of the major offences were property offences, and 42.8% were offences against a person (see Table 1). Frequencies of all major offences are shown in Table 1a in Appendix 1. There was a significant difference between the two groups with regard to their types of major offence, in that compared to non-escapees, escapees were more frequently found to have committed property offences ($X^2 = 7.005, p \leq 0.008$).

Table 1. Types of Major Offence

	TYPES OF MAJOR OFFENCE		
	PROPERTY OFFENCE*	OFFENCE AGAINST A PERSON**	OTHER OFFENCE***
ESCAPEE GROUP (N=35)	25 (71.4%)	10 (28.6%)	0
NON-ESCAPEE GROUP (N=35)	14 (40.0%)	15 (42.8%)	6 (17.1%)

* (includes robbery, break and enter, fraud, and theft).

** (includes murder, manslaughter, sexual assault, kidnapping, aggravated assault, and conspiracy to commit murder).

*** (includes narcotic offences, conspiracy to traffic narcotics, and possession of weapon).

History of Parole Revocation

Of the escapees, 85.7% had a record of parole revocation, compared to 34.3% of non-escapees (see Table 2). This shows that escapes were almost 2.5 times more likely than non-escapees to have had a record of parole failure. Almost 60% of the escapee group had 2 or more prior parole revocations compared to 5.7% of non-escapees (see Table 2a in Appendix 1). Escapees were significantly more likely to have had a history of parole revocation than were non-escapees ($X^2 = 19.286, p \leq 0.000$).

Table 2. History of Parole Revocation

	HISTORY OF PAROLE REVOCATION	
	YES	NO
ESCAPEE GROUP (N=35)	30 (85.7%)	5 (14.3%)
NON-ESCAPEE GROUP (N=35)	12 (34.3%)	23 (65.7%)

History of Escape

Within the escapee group, 82.9% had a record of institutional escape, compared to 14.4% of non-escapees (see Table 3). This demonstrates that escapees were almost 6 times more likely than non-escapees to have had a record of institutional escape. Over 45% of the escapee group had 2 or

more previous escapes compared to 5.7% of non-escapees (see Table 3a in Appendix 1). Escapees were significantly more likely to have had a history of escape than non-escapees ($X^2 = 32.941$, $p \leq 0.000$).

Table 3. History of Escape

	HISTORY OF ESCAPE	
	YES	NO
ESCAPEE GROUP (N=35)	29 (82.9%)	6 (17.1%)
NON-ESCAPEE GROUP (N=35)	5 (14.3%)	30 (85.7%)

Previous Federal Term

Within the escapee group, 62.9% had served a previous federal term compared to 34.3% of non-escapees (see Table 4). This implies that escapees were almost twice more likely than non-escapees to have served a previous federal term. Over 33% of the escapee group had served two or more previous federal terms compared to 14.3% of non-escapees (see Table 4a in Appendix 1). Escapees were significantly more likely to have served a previous federal term than non-escapees ($X^2 = 5.719$, $p \leq 0.017$).

Table 4. Previous Federal Term

	PREVIOUS FEDERAL TERM	
	YES	NO
ESCAPEE GROUP (N=35)	22 (62.9%)	13 (37.1%)
NON-ESCAPEE GROUP (N=35)	12 (34.3%)	23 (65.7%)

History of Drug/Alcohol Abuse

Within the escapee group, 82.9% had a history of drug/alcohol abuse compared to 51.4% of non-escapees (see Table 5). Escapees were significantly more likely to have had a history of drug/alcohol abuse than non-escapees ($X^2 = 7.835$, $p \leq 0.005$).

Table 5. History of Drug/Alcohol Abuse

	HISTORY OF DRUG/ALCOHOL ABUSE	
	YES	NO
ESCAPEE GROUP (N=35)	29 (82.9%)	6 (17.1%)
NON-ESCAPEE GROUP (N=35)	18 (51.4%)	17 (48.6%)

Previous Institutional Misconduct

Within the escapee group, 85.7% had a record of institutional misconduct compared to 57.1% of non-escapees (Table 6). Almost 70% of the escapee group had a record of 5 or more institutional misconducts compared to 8.7% of non-escapees (see Table 6a in Appendix 1). Escapees were significantly more likely to have been involved in a previous institutional misconduct than non-escapees ($\chi^2 = 7.000, p \leq 0.008$).

Table 6. Previous Institutional Misconduct

	PREVIOUS INSTITUTIONAL MISCONDUCT	
	YES	NO
ESCAPEE GROUP (N=35)	30 (85.7%)	5 (14.3%)
NON-ESCAPEE GROUP (N=35)	20 (57.1%)	15 (42.9%)

Marital Status

Within the escapee group, 65.7% were single compared to 68.6% of non-escapees (see Table 7). There was no significant difference in marital status between the escapee and non-escapee groups.

Table 7. Marital Status

	MARITAL STATUS	
	SINGLE	MARRIED/COMMON LAW
ESCAPEE GROUP (N=35)	23 (65.7%)	12 (34.3%)
NON-ESCAPEE GROUP (N=35)	24 (68.6%)	11 (31.4%)

Length of Sentence

The total length of sentence served by escapees was significantly longer (mean= 5071.6 days or 13.9 years) than that served by non-escapees (mean= 3060.5 days or 8.4 years; $t=-3.05$, $p \leq 0.003$; see Table 8). Within the escapee group, 20% were serving indeterminate sentences (life sentences), compared to 11.4% of non-escapees (see Table 8a in Appendix 1).

Table 8. Length of Sentence

	LENGTH OF SENTENCE (DAYS)		
	MEAN	S.D.	MEDIAN
ESCAPEE GROUP (N=35)	5071.65	2804.55	4441
NON-ESCAPEE GROUP (N=35)	3060.57	2706.86	1825

Age

Within the escapee group, 74.3% were aged 29 years or younger compared to 31.4% of non-escapees in the same age group (see Table 9). The mean age of the escapee and non-escapee groups were 28.4 years and 37.4 years respectively. Analysis of the t-test revealed that this was significantly different ($t=4.30$, $p \leq 0.000$), in that escapees were significantly younger than non-escapees (see Table 9a in Appendix 1).

Table 9. Age Groups

	AGE GROUPS (YEARS)	
	29 YEARS OF AGE AND YOUNGER	30 YEARS OF AGE AND OLDER
ESCAPEE GROUP (N=35)	26 (74.3%)	9 (25.7%)
NON-ESCAPEE GROUP (N=35)	11 (31.4%)	24 (68.6%)

Number of Previous Criminal Convictions

Within the escapee group, 71.4% had 20 or more previous criminal convictions compared to 22.8% of non-escapees (see Table 10). It was found that escapees had 2.5 times more criminal convictions than non-escapees. Escapees were significantly more likely to have had more criminal convictions (mean=32.51) than

non-escapees (mean=12.71) ($t = -5.09$, $p \leq 0.000$, see Table 10a in Appendix 1).

Table 10. Number of Previous Criminal Convictions by Groups

	NUMBER OF PREVIOUS CRIMINAL CONVICTIONS BY GROUPS	
	LESS THAN 20	20 OR MORE
ESCAPEE GROUP (N=35)	10 (28.6%)	25 (71.4%)
NON-ESCAPEE GROUP (N=35)	27 (77.1%)	8 (22.8%)

Length of Sentence Served Prior to Escape

Escapees served an average length of sentence of 5.7 years prior to escape (See Table 11).

Table 11. Length of Sentence Served Prior to Escape (in years)

	LENGTH OF SENTENCE SERVED PRIOR TO ESCAPE (IN YEARS)			
	MEAN	S.D.	RANGE	MEDIAN
ESCAPEE GROUP (N=35)	5.70	4.27	0.61 to 20.92	5.53

ii) Dynamic/Situational Factors

With respect to dynamic/situational factors, the following reasons precipitated escape (N=35)⁵ according to staff and/or inmates and were recorded in the incident/investigation reports.

Factors Precipitating Escape Behaviour

- 34.3% of the escapees had outstanding criminal charges;
- 25.7% of the escapees had parole problems;
- 25.7% of the escapees had problems with other inmates;
- 25.7% of the escapees had family problems;
- 22.9% of the escapees had institutional administrative problems (not including parole problems); and
- 40.0% of the escapees had institutional administrative problems (including parole problems) (see Table 12 in Appendix 1 and Appendix 2).

Other findings on the escapees were as follows:

Other Factors

- 22.9 % of the escapees were under the influence (substance use) at the time of escape;
- 25.7% of the escapees had a recent parole revocation (within 60 days prior to escape);
- 31.4% of the escapees had a recent transfer within 60 days prior to escape: transferred from lower to higher security level due to various behaviour problems (e.g., parole revocation or suspension);

⁵ Although the analysis focuses on the frequency of dynamic/situational factors reported in escape, some escapees had more than one reason precipitating escape (see Appendix 2).

- 80% of the escapees planned their escape, while 20% of the escapees did not plan their escape; they were considered impulsive acts (spur of the moment);
- 71.4% of the escapees fled with one or more other inmates (multiple escape);
- 34.3% of the escapees fled by vehicles; and
- 42.9% escaped by scaling the perimeter fence (see Table 13 in Appendix 1).

Temporal Factors

The findings observed in the temporal factors were as follows:

- almost all escapees (94.3%) absconded on weekdays, the majority (51.4%) of them fled during the evening hours (16:00-24:00); and
- the majority of escapees (68.5%) absconded during spring and summer seasons (see Table 14 in Appendix 1).

iii) Summary of Findings

Analyses of the results of static factors showed that significant differences were found between escapee and non-escapee groups. Escapees were more frequently found to have had a history of the following: property offences as the major offence, parole revocation, escape, federal term, drug/alcohol abuse, and institutional misconduct.

Compared to their non-escapee counterparts, escapees were also found to be serving significantly longer sentences; were younger; and had more criminal convictions. Escapees served an

average length of sentence of 5.7 years prior to escape. Differences in marital status between the two groups were not significant.

Among some cases in which escapees and/or staff did identify factors precipitating the escapes, the following factors were noted: family problems, parole problems, problems with other inmates, outstanding criminal charges, or institutional administrative problems. Moreover, other notable results showed that approximately one-quarter of all escapees had consumed drugs/alcohol at the time of escape. Slightly over one-quarter had recent parole revocations. Almost one-third had received recent transfers prior to their escape. In the majority of these cases, the reasons for transfer were mainly related to behavioural problems.

The majority of escapees had planned their escapes. Almost three-quarters of the escapees fled with one or more other inmates. Over one-third of the escapees absconded by vehicles, and approximately two-fifths of the escapees scaled the perimeter fence. Results from temporal factors showed that the majority of escapees absconded during the evening hours. Most escaped on weekdays. Escapees frequently fled during spring and summer seasons.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

This study explored the static and dynamic/situational factors associated with escape from correctional institutions. In this section, the relationships between these factors and escape behaviour are analyzed in light of various theoretical models. Specifically, these models are: prisonization theory, rational choice theory, moral self-transcendence theory, and cognitive theory.

In this study, data on escapees and non-escapees were analyzed. The escapee sample consisted of 35 inmates who had escaped from CSC federal (medium and maximum security) correctional institutions between April 1, 1990 and March 31, 1992. The escapee sample was compared to a random sample of 35 inmates who did not escape during the same period. The relationships between static factors and escape were examined among the escapee and non-escapee groups. These factors included: major offence, history of parole revocations, history of escape, previous federal term, history of drug/alcohol abuse, previous institutional misconduct, marital status, age, and number of previous criminal convictions. Length of sentence served prior to escape was applicable for only the escapee group.

Data on dynamic/situational factors were available on the escapee group only. The analysis of these factors included: under the influence (substance use) at time of escape, outstanding criminal charges, parole problems, problems with other inmates, family problems, institutional administrative problems, recent parole revocation, recent transfer, planned or unplanned escape, multiple escape, method of escape, and temporal factors (time, day, and season of escape).

In this study, escapees were found to be significantly more likely to be serving their sentences for property offences than non-escapees. This is consistent with findings from other studies (e.g., Basu, 1983; Cowles, 1982; Kentucky Bureau of Corrections, 1980; Johnston and Motiuk, 1992a and 1992b; Murphy, 1984; State of New York Department of Correctional Services, 1986a; Thornton and Speirs, 1985). It was found that the non-escapee group tended to be serving sentences for offences against a person or other offences. There seems to be no clear explanation in the literature as to why the relationship between property offences and escapes persists. It is speculated that property offences might be an indication of offenders committed to a criminal lifestyle, whereas offences against a person are more situational and spontaneous in nature (see Holt, 1974, Basu, 1983, Glaser, 1974). Moreover, it is generally assumed that property offenders are more prone to trouble-making, parole violations, and escapes (see Basu, 1983).

Another finding in this study was that escapees were significantly more likely to have had a history of parole revocations than did non-escapees. This is similar to findings from other studies (e.g., Basu, 1983; Wilson, 1983; Murphy, 1984; McNeil, 1978, Holt, 1974). Moreover, it was observed that 26% of the escapees had received a parole revocation within 60 days prior to their escape. Parole revocation can be viewed as an indication of continued misbehaviour of breaching rules and trust, and disregard for societal expectations of law-abiding behaviour while they were under community supervision.

Like other studies (e.g., Campbell, 1983; Johnston and Motiuk, 1992a and 1992b; Murphy, 1984; Holt, 1974; Stone, 1975), escapees in this study were also found to be significantly more likely than non-escapees to have had a history of escape. It can be argued that offenders who had an escape history showed a disregard for societal mandates as well as a disinclination to fulfil the societal requirements of punishment for committing criminal offences.

This study found that escapees were significantly more likely to have served a previous federal term than non-escapees. The general pattern of prior confinements being associated with escape seems fairly well-established (see State of New York Department of Correctional Services, 1987; Campbell, 1983; Murphy, 1984; Basu, 1983; Wilson, 1983; Holt, 1974). Offenders

with a previous federal term can be viewed as a sign of continued criminal lifestyle of habitual criminals. Escapees in this study have been repeatedly incarcerated for persistent criminal behaviour. It is palpable that offenders who have entered the correctional system before, are devoted to criminal behaviour and are willing to flee prison when opportunities arise.

Escapees in this study were significantly more likely to have had a history of drug/alcohol abuse than non-escapees. This finding is consistent with results from other studies (e.g., Basu, 1983; State of New York Department of Correctional Services, 1989; Johnston, 1984; Murphy, 1984; McNeil, 1978, Johnston and Motiuk, 1992a). Research has consistently demonstrated a high degree of correlation between substance use and criminal behaviour in general (Hunt, Lipton, and Spunt, 1984; Harrison and Gfroerer, 1992; Motiuk and Porporino, 1989). Moreover, substance use has been found to be correlated with institutional misconduct among inmates (see Flanagan, 1983). However, it is important to note that substance abuse problems are widespread among incarcerated inmates. For example, approximately 70% of inmates in CSC have substance abuse problems and need treatment (see Correctional Service of Canada, 1991b).

Escapees were significantly more likely to have been involved in a previous institutional misconduct than non-escapees. This supports findings from other studies (e.g.,

Correctional Service of Canada, 1991; McNeil, 1978; Johnston and Motiuk 1992a and 1992b; Stone, 1975; Murphy, 1984).

Institutional misconduct is an example of rule-breaking and disruptive behaviour. Escape, as an example of rule-breaking behaviour, exemplifies why escapees are involved in institutional misconduct. Involvement in institutional misconduct can be viewed as adjustment problems within institutions (see Mackenzie and Goodstein, 1986; Goodstein, 1979; Ramirez, 1984; Stone, 1975; Goetting and Howsen, 1986; Toch and Greene, 1987; Wolfe et al., 1966). In most instances, the punishment for involvement in institutional misconduct is punitive dissociation or solitary confinement. In Stone's escape study (1975), it was found that the number of times an inmate was put in solitary confinement was also a strong predictor of escape. He argued that some escapees used solitary confinement as a mechanism to escape institutional stress.

There is no significant difference in marital status between the escapee and non-escapee groups. This supports the findings from other studies (Cowles, 1981; Campbell, 1983; Virginia Department of Corrections, 1981 and 1982, Johnston and Motiuk, 1992b).

Escapees were significantly more likely to be serving longer sentences than non-escapees. This finding is consistent with results from other studies (e.g., Scott et al., 1977; Stone,

1975; Virginia Department of Corrections, 1981 and 1982; Kentucky Bureau of Corrections, 1978). The escapee group can be classified as long-term offenders (i.e., serving indeterminate and indeterminate sentences of 10 years or more, see Weekes, 1992). Several studies have identified that the effects of the prison environment causes many problems, such as mental deterioration, lack of privacy and freedom, and isolation among inmates serving long sentences (Cohen and Taylor 1972; Flanagan, 1982 and 1980; Sabbath and Cowles, 1990). It is likely that inmates who escape are unwilling to face lengthy incarceration under such negative effects.

Escapees were found to be significantly younger than non-escapees. The general pattern of age being associated with escape seems fairly well-established (see Anson and Hartnett, 1983; Scott e. al., 1977; Basu, 1983; Gorta and Sillavan, 1991; Johnston and Motiuk, 1992b). Age is correlated with criminal behaviour (see Hartnagel, 1987). Age also has an inverse relationship with rule-breaking behaviour in institutions (see Jenson, 1977; Johnson, 1966; Flanagan, 1983; Goetting and Howsen, 1986). It is suggested that as the offender becomes older, he or she slowly desists from criminal involvement. This might explain why escapees tend to be younger inmates.

In the present sample, escapees were observed to be significantly more likely to have had more criminal convictions

than non-escapees. This is consistent with findings from other studies (e.g., Holt, 1974; Williams, 1980; McNeil, 1978; Johnston and Motiuk, 1992a and 1992b; Murphy, 1984). A relatively high number of criminal convictions is correlated with prison misconduct (see Goetting and Howsen, 1986). In this study, escapees had, on average, approximately 33 criminal convictions, which denotes a significant criminal history. These offenders who have an extensive criminal history are recidivists and can be described as career criminals (see Petersilia and Honig, 1980; Petersilia et al., 1978). Moreover, it is speculated that even during incarceration, their criminal behaviour persists, and escaping from an institution presents yet another challenge for their rule breaking behaviour.

Escapees served an average length of sentence of 5.7 years prior to escape. Compared to their average length of sentence (i.e., approximately 14 years), escapees fled their confinement almost at the midpoint of their sentence. Although this finding does not match the results from other studies, it is believed that some offenders will escape as soon as possible in order to avoid a lengthy period of confinement. Sentence served is correlated with prison misconduct, in that the highest number of misconducts is reached when inmates are at the middle stages of their sentences (see Wooldredge, 1991; Flanagan, 1980). It is therefore more likely that escape, which is also a type of institutional misconduct, will occur at the midpoint of a

sentence.

As stated earlier, the analysis in this study identified one or more reasons precipitating some of the escapes. It was observed that approximately 35% of the escapees had outstanding criminal charges at the time of escape. Other studies have reported similar findings (e.g., Campbell, 1983; McNeil, 1978; Thompson, 1992; Sturrock, 1992). It is postulated that these offenders escaped in order to avoid possible additional sentences for the outstanding criminal charges.

In this study 26% of the escapees experienced parole problems prior to escape. That is, the inmate's parole application had been recently denied or refused prior to escape, or the inmate's parole revocation or suspension was viewed by himself as unjustified. This is consistent with findings from other studies which indicate that parole problems contribute to escape behaviour (Thompson, 1992; McNeil, 1978; Holt, 1974; Gorta and Nguyen Da Huong, 1988; Johnston and Motiuk, 1992a). It is suggested that some escapees were frustrated because their expectations for parole were not fulfilled, and because they perceived injustice in the decision-making process of their parole. Having had parole revoked or denied, these offenders might have viewed escape as their only route to freedom.

This study showed that 26% of the escapees experienced

problems with other inmates prior to escape. This is consistent with findings from other studies which indicate that some escapes are associated with problems between inmates (Thompson, 1992; Johnston and Motiuk 1992a; Murphy, 1984; Gorta and Nguyen Da Huong, 1988; Porritt, 1987). Previous research found that personal security has been a concern among inmates in prison (Toch 1977; Sykes, 1958). It should be pointed out that there have been instances in the United States where the appellate courts have responded sympathetically to inmates who have escaped to avoid the threat of physical violence or sexual assault (Fletcher, 1979; Gleysteen, 1976; Gold, 1979; Thompson, 1976; Lesser, 1972; Dolinko, 1979; Jeffries, 1978; Farina, 1979; Schermer, 1977; Gardner, 1975; and Gilman, 1976). The defence of necessity and duress have been used in these situations (i.e., intolerable conditions and cruel and unusual punishment). It is speculated that some escapees could not cope or adjust with the surrounding prison environment, because they are vulnerable to a potential assault. Therefore, escape can be viewed as one mechanism to avoid conflict with inmate peers.

The present finding that 23% of the escapee group were reported to have experienced some family problems at time of escape is consistent with results from other studies (Thompson, 1992; Johnston and Motiuk, 1992a; Duncan and Ellis, 1973; McNeil, 1978; Gorta and Nguyen Da Huong, 1988). The structural constraints of prison already make it difficult for inmates to

maintain family or social contacts on the outside (see Zamble et al., 1984). Escapees who incur family problems are likely to have faced additional stress, because they cannot offer direct assistance to the family. They might have perceived escape to be their only available opportunity to directly alleviate their family problems. Their goal is to maintain social contact on the outside world, and if they are successful, they are avoiding the negative outcome of further isolation and alienation.

It was observed that 23% of the escapee group were reported to have experienced some type of institutional administrative problem at time of escape. This percentage would be higher (40%) if parole problems were included. This supports other research which found that some inmate escape are associated with administrative problems of the institution (Thompson, 1992; Duncan and Ellis, 1973; Johnston and Motiuk, 1992a; Gorta and Nguyen Da Huong, 1988). Administrative problems usually involve sanctions and the loss privileges.

This study found that 23% of the escapees were under the influence of intoxicants (drugs/alcohol) at the time of escape. This finding is similar to results found in escape studies conducted by Johnston and Motiuk (1992a) and McNeil (1978). They identified that approximately 25% of the escapee group was under the influence at the time of fleeing prison. As mentioned earlier, substance use is related to criminal behaviour.

Intoxicants produce desired physiological or psychological effects (Correctional Service of Canada, 1991). Harlow (1991) and Correctional Service of Canada (1993) reported that a substantial number of inmates were under the influence of intoxicants when they committed the offence for which they were incarcerated. It is speculated that some inmates who escaped while under the influence did not plan their escape. In these cases, the inmates' judgement could have been impaired as a result of intoxicants and they escaped impulsively.

It was observed that 31% of the escapee group were recent transfers from lower to higher security level institution. This supports other research which found that some inmate escapes are related with transfers (Holt 1974; Wharry, 1972; Murphy, 1984). Transfers in this study were due to disciplinary reasons or revised security needs because of various behaviour problems. It is speculated that a transfer might have contributed to increased anxiety since the inmate must re-establish his familiarity with staff and inmates in the new institution. Escape might have been perceived as a solution for those inmates who had difficulty establishing themselves after a recent transfer.

This study revealed that most of escapees (80%) planned their escapes. Some of the escapees (20%) did not have an escape plan in advance, but escaped spontaneously. With respect to

planned escapes, it is believed that these inmates were waiting for the best time and opportunity to carry-out their escape. Relatively few studies have analyzed whether or not escapes were planned. This variable is usually examined in security investigations on a case by case basis, as opposed to aggregated data. This present finding supports the results of Smyrnew and Reid (1980) that most escapes from medium and maximum security are planned events. On the contrary, Johnston and Motiuk (1992a) found that most escapes are unplanned. The conflicting findings reported by the latter study might have been due to sampling differences, in that Johnston and Motiuk focused on escapes from minimum security institutions, which require little sophistication.

The present findings showed that 71% of the escapees fled with one or more other inmates. Except through security investigations, there is a lack of research which examined factors relating to multiple escapes. Contrary to the finding in this study, Johnston and Motiuk (1992a) and Sturrock (1992) observed that most escapes were single or solo escapes. It is important to note that both of these studies focused on escapes from minimum security institutions. In contrast, medium and maximum security inmates appear to be hard-core offenders and more sophisticated in committing offences - including escapes. It is speculated that peer pressure or peer influence and opportunity factors play an important role in multiple escapes.

Escapees might be those who feel the need to affirm themselves with other inmates.

This study found that 34% of escapees fled by vehicles and 42.9% escaped by scaling the perimeter fence. Some other research reported similar results (Guenther, 1978; Wharry, 1973; Canadian Penitentiary Service, 1973; Correctional Service of Canada, 1984 and 1991; Smyrnew and Reid, 1980). The method of escape is usually influenced by opportunistic factors. In some incidents, for instance, inmates escaped by hiding in garbage trucks. In another incident, an inmate escaped by seizing a vehicle to which he was authorized to have access. In one incident, inmates commandeered a cement truck, took the driver as hostage, and escaped by ramming the truck through the perimeter fence.

It was observed in this study that almost all escapees (94%) absconded on weekdays. The majority of them (51.4%) fled during the evening hours. Most of the escapees (68.5%) absconded during spring and summer seasons. These findings support results from other studies (State of New York Department of Correctional Services, 1989; McNeil, 1978; Murphy, 1984; Kentucky Bureau of Corrections, 1978 and 1980; Sturrock, 1992; Smyrnew and Reid, 1980; McNeil, 1978; Murphy, 1984; Guenther, 1983; Dahlem, 1974). With regards to escape during evening hours, it is speculated that when the work day is completed the security measures of the

institution are considerably reduced, because programs are over and inmates are resting or confined to their living-units. It is suggested that escape is frequent during spring and summer because of the more favourable weather conditions in these seasons.

The profile of escapees in this study indicates that they tend to be committed to a criminal lifestyle of law-breaking behaviour and are repeat offenders. They have a history of escape and institutional misconducts. Their extensive criminal history indicates that they have spent a substantial portion of their lives in correctional institutions. These inmates have been serving lengthy sentences. They tend to be young adults, property offenders, and most have had substance abuse problems. Compared with non-escapees, escapees are more likely to breach their parole conditions, as was reflected in the significantly higher number of parole failures among them.

As aforementioned, aside from employing empirical evidence to examine the factors related to escape, this study also attempts to analyze these factors in the light of various theoretical perspectives. The following discussion will turn to how the various models might explain the relationships between the above factors and escape behaviour.

As stated in Chapter 2, prisonization is related to the

learning theory, in that criminal behaviour and values are learned through associations with criminal peers (Peat and Winfree, 1992; Beck, 1966; Wheeler, 1961). Clemmer (1940) explained that prisonization is an acculturation process. He argued that every inmate undergoes the process of prisonization to some extent and degree. Offenders who enter prison are assimilated into the inmate criminal subculture and acquire anti-social attitudes. These offenders adopt criminal values and norms which are in direct opposition to the prison administration and society in general (Clemmer 1940 and 1950). The inmate criminal subculture affects the prisoners' adaptations and patterns of response to imprisonment. The development of, and involvement in, the inmate criminal subculture have been identified as main reasons for inmate criminality (Thomas, 1977; Smith and Hepburn, 1979; Thomas and Foster; 1972 and 1973; Peat and Winfree, 1992; Thomas and Zingraff, 1976; Bowker, 1977). Prisonization focuses on criminalization and advocates increased involvement in criminal behaviour (see Clemmer 1940; Garabedian, 1963; Thomas and Petersen; 1977; Thomas, 1970 and 1975; Thomas and Foster; 1972). Criminal behaviour includes escape. Moreover, prisonization and the traditional inmate criminal subculture are viewed as the antithesis to the goals of rehabilitation (Bondeson, 1990; Clemmer, 1940; Peat and Winfree, 1992). They are counter-productive to successful rehabilitation programs in prison (Thomas and Poole, 1975; Zingraff, 1980; Thomas and Zingraff, 1976; Thomas, 1975).

The deprivation and importation models help explain how the inmate criminal subculture develops, as discussed in Chapter 2. These two models shed light on how this subculture relates to the determinants and consequences of prisonization (Thomas, 1970 and 1975; Cline, 1968; Thomas and Foster, 1972 and 1973; Thomas and Zingraff, 1976; Smith and Hepburn, 1979). The deprivation model proposes that the inmate code and criminal subculture develop as a result of the structural constraints or deprivations of the institutional environment (Sykes and Messinger, 1960; Sykes, 1958 and 1978; Tittle, 1972; Goffman, 1961; Garfinkel, 1956; Wheeler, 1961; Toch, 1977; Toch et al., 1989). The level of deprivation in prison influences the degree of an inmate's quality of adaptation and behaviour in prison. With increasing deprivation, the inmate criminal subculture emerges with increased criminal values and norms which are in opposition to prison administration. The importation model suggests that offenders import their pre-prison experiences and extra-prison characteristics into the prison leading to the development of the inmate criminal subculture (Tittle, 1972; Thomas, 1970 and 1975; Thomas and Foster, 1972; Schrag, 1961; Garabedian 1963; Petersen and Thomas, 1977; Irwin and Cressey, 1962; Irwin, 1970). These pre-prison and extra-prison factors influence the inmate's quality of adjustment, adaptation, and behaviour in prison (Irwin and Cressey, 1962; Wheeler, 1961; Petersen and Thomas, 1973).

In light of both importation and deprivation models,

previous studies demonstrate that some of the intra-prison deprivational factors, and pre-prison and extra-prison factors influence the degree in which inmates assimilate into the prison criminal subculture. In turn, assimilation into the inmate criminal subculture is related to the degree of prisonization. In several studies, some of the intra-prison deprivational factors which have been found to be associated with prisonization include: degree of alienation (Thomas, 1975; Thomas and Poole, 1975; Thomas, 1977; Goffman, 1961; Sykes, 1958; Tittle, 1969; Thomas and Zingraff, 1976); length of sentence (Thomas, 1970; Wheeler, 1961; Garabedian, 1963 and 1964; Schwartz, 1971; Zingraff, 1980; Coe, 1961); number of institutional rule infractions or misconduct (Ramirez, 1984; McLaren, 1973; Olson, 1974; Barak-Glantz, 1983; Mackenzie and Goodstein, 1986; Goodstein, 1979); and sentence served (Ramirez, 1984; Olson, 1974; Garabedian, 1963; Atchley and McCole, 1968; Wheeler, 1961). In regard to sentence served, prisonization has the greatest impact on inmates at the middle phase of imprisonment (Wheeler, 1961; Garabedian, 1963). Some of the pre-prison factors found to be associated with prisonization include: social class (Thomas, 1973 and 1975); employment record (Coe, 1961; Kennedy, 1970); education level (Wilson and Snodgrass, 1969; Kennedy, 1970; Pool et al, 1980); age (Wilson and Snodgrass, 1969; Kennedy, 1970; Thomas and Foster, 1973; Schwartz, 1971, Coe, 1961; Grapendaal, 1990; Poole et al, 1980; Thomas, 1975 and 1973); marital status (Coe, 1961); current offence or major offence (Kennedy, 1970;

Wilson and Snodgrass, 1969; Coe, 1961; Peat and Winfree, 1992); number of previous arrests or criminal convictions (Schwartz, 1971; Alpert et al., 1977; Thomas and Foster, 1973); and prior confinements (Schwartz, 1971, Wheeler, 1961; Kennedy, 1970). In regard to extra-prison factors, several studies have found that prisonization was mediated by the level of post-prison expectations, which refer to expectations upon release (Thomas, 1977; Wheeler, 1961; Thomas and Zingraff, 1976; Irwin and Cressey, 1962; Thomas and Foster, 1972 and 1973; Thomas, 1975), and contact between the inmate, community, and family (Thomas and Poole, 1975; Thomas and Foster, 1972 and 1973).

It can be argued that escapees in this study are inmates who have been exposed to a high degree of prisonization, in that they support the inmate code and inmate criminal subculture, reject prison policies and rules, reject the condemner, and are apt to rule-breaking behaviour. This speculation can be supported by findings from the present study. Specifically, the findings showed that static factors such as major offence, history of parole revocation, history of escape, previous federal term, number of previous criminal convictions, history of institutional misconduct, age, history of alcohol/drug abuse, and length of sentence were found to be related to escape. These criminal and social factors of escapees can be also viewed as pre-prison experiences which were imported by them into prison which, in turn, facilitate their involvement in the inmate criminal

subculture (see also: Clemmer, 1940 and 1958; Thomas and Foster, 1972; Thomas, 1970 and 1975; Irwin and Cressey, 1962; Schrag, 1961; Schwartz, 1971; Kennedy, 1970). In particular, factors related to criminal history, such as length of sentence, sentence served, and previous institutional misconduct, support the deprivation model of the inmate criminal subculture.

On average, escapees in this sample absconded after serving almost half of their sentences. Previous research has indicated that the effect of prisonization has the largest impact at approximately midpoint of sentence (Garabedian, 1963 and 1964; Wheeler, 1961). In view of this latter observation, it is suggested that inmates who have been highly prisonized at midpoint of their sentence are more likely to escape. Moreover, in this study, some escapees had outstanding criminal charges, some were recent parole failures, and others had been recently transferred before their escape. These factors lend further support to the importation model.

The present findings which have been discussed above strongly suggest that escapees in this sample are extensively prisonized. These inmates are apt to rule-breaking behaviour, and are committed to a criminal lifestyle. Therefore, static factors related to escape appear to be a significant aspect of the prisonization process.

Previous studies have noted that prisonization promotes a negative impact on post-release behaviour (Thomas, 1970; Thomas and Foster, 1972; Irwin, 1970; Grapendaal, 1990). These researchers suggested that post-release recidivism is related to prisonization. This might explain why escapees had significantly more parole revocations than non-escapees, as was found in this study.

Clemmer (1940) pointed out the longer and more intense the exposure to the influences of the inmate criminal subculture in prison, the more one becomes prisonized. This is similar to the theory of differential association which, in turn, concurs with the learning theory. The differential association theory proposes that criminal behaviour is influenced by frequency, duration, priority, and intensity of contact with criminal patterns (Sutherland and Cressey, 1978). Escapees in the present sample were found to be significantly involved with criminal behaviour, and had been imprisoned more often than non-escapees. These results suggest that escapees are individuals who have frequented the prison system, and have been exposed to the inmate criminal culture to a much larger extent.

In relation to the deprivational model, some of the major stresses confronted by prison inmates, which were discussed in Chapter 2, include: deprivation of goods and services, deprivation of liberty, deprivation of heterosexual

relationships, deprivation of security, and deprivation of autonomy or ability to make choices concerning one's life (Sykes, 1958). This study found that some escapes were precipitated by personal crises: family problems, parole problems, problems with other inmates, outstanding criminal charges, and institutional administrative problems. These findings shed light on the stressful and unpleasant prison situations which adhere to the pains of institutional life (Sykes, 1958 and 1978; Tittle, 1972; Goffman, 1961; Toch, 1977; Wheeler, 1961). Consequently, such additional pressures might be circumstantial provocation of escape behaviour. It is suggested that escape might be perceived as a means or solution to relieve the structural stresses of prison or pains of institutional life. Sykes (1958:65) argued that within prison, "the average inmate finds himself in a harshly spartan environment which he defines as painfully depriving". These situational factors affect the satisfaction of human needs and adjustment in prison. Escape can be viewed as an effort to cope with a problem (Gorta and Sillavan, 1989). From the learning perspective, escape can be viewed as a "stress avoidant response" or "anxiety reducing response" to stressful situations that are punitive, restrictive, and isolative. Escape from such situations represents a positive reinforcement to an inmate - "a healthy response" (Green and Martin, 1973).

Criminal and social histories of escapees can be also viewed as factors related to social role adaptations in prison. Social

role adaptations are a central element of prisonization, as discussed in Chapter 2 (see Schrag 1961; Garabedian, 1963, 1964; and 1970; Bowker, 1982; Pool et al, 1980). Within the inmate criminal subculture, the type of social role adopted by an inmate reflects the position which he occupies in that subculture. These social roles are alternative modes of adjustment in prison, and have been developed as a response to the deprivational aspects of imprisonment and other factors. These social roles are associated with background factors, such as demographic characteristics, criminal history, admitting sentence, and sentence length (Schrag, 1961; Hayner, 1964; Irwin and Cressey, 1962; Garabedian, 1963, 1964 and 1970; Poole et al, 1980; Thomas and Foster, 1972; Bowker, 1982). Escapees in this study can best be viewed as an example of the social role, "the outlaw", as described by Schrag (1961) and Garabedian (1963 and 1964), and/or the "convict", as described by Cressey and Irwin (1962) and Irwin (1970). These types of inmates are career criminals. They are involved in extensive criminality, opposed to staff and administration, committed to illegitimate means, exhibit anti-social behaviour, and are involved in high incidences of prison rule infractions, which includes prison escape. Antisocial roles reflect high levels of prisonization (Thomas and Foster, 1972; Poole et al., 1980; Schrag, 1961; Garabedian, 1963, 1964 and 1970).

In light of the learning perspective, the criminal

history of escapees (e.g., parole failure, escaping lawful custody, criminal convictions, involvement in institutional misconduct) delineates that escapees have learned to breach rules and have been socialized with deviant values. It is speculated that the learning theory partially illustrates why, compared to inmates without prior history of escape behaviour, inmates with prior history of escape behaviour are more likely to escape.

It should be pointed out that criminal history and demographic variables such as major offence, length of sentence, previous incarceration, number of criminal convictions, history of escape and parole failure, and age have been used as risk predictors of recidivism in objective risk assessments such as the Statistical Information for Recidivism Scale (SIR) (see Correctional Service of Canada, 1989b). Moreover, some of these variables are believed to be good indicators, or predictors, for classifying inmates at various institutional security levels (Correctional Service of Canada, 1989; National Institute of Justice, 1987).

The rational choice theory posits that involvement in committing crimes is based on costs and benefits. This involves the process of rational judgement and choice selection on part of the offender, and the presence of situational factors related to opportunity, which influence the decision to carry out the criminal act (Clarke and Cornish, 1985; Clarke 1980; Cornish and

Clarke, 1986). Cornish and Clarke (1986) pointed out that an offender who targets a home for burglary will make a judgement on whether or not the occupants are in the house, whether or not an alarm system has been installed, and whether or not the properties in the house are profitable.

Escape behaviour appears to be the result of some opportunistic factors. These factors may be present in the immediate physical environment of the institution and/or temporal situation. Such opportunistic factors can facilitate the inmate to commit the act of escape. Opportunity factors can be viewed as accessibility, attractiveness, ease, and risks (Clarke and Cornish, 1985). In considering the escape opportunity, an inmate may make rational judgements with respect to the i) risks - being detected and recaptured, and ii) rewards - "freedom" from incarceration. Opportunity factors may provide a condition to commit a crime and can also provoke it (Mayhew, 1990). For instance, an inmate who has access to an institutional vehicle for landscaping work on institutional premises, may target this as an opportunity to escape. Another example of opportunistic escape can be demonstrated in cases where offenders assist each other to seize the most favourable opportunity to escape. In this study, escape by vehicle, scaling the fence, escape with another inmate, and escape during evening hours, weekdays, spring, and summer can be viewed as opportunistic aspects in such escape incidents. The rational choice model would advocate that

escape opportunities may be reduced by target hardening or reducing opportunities within the institutional environment, such as focusing on effective static and dynamic security (e.g., effective electronic monitoring and staff supervision).

As mentioned in Chapter 2, the theory of moral self-transcendence corresponds to existentialism. Moral self-transcendence posits that involvement in criminal deviance may be the result of "sensual dynamics", or "foreground factors", which influence and compel criminal acts to occur in various situations (Katz, 1988). These sensual dynamics include moral emotions and feelings: rage, humiliation, frustration, and ridicule. Committing a particular crime can be viewed as "seductive", "sensible", and "attractive". The crime can be a response to the type(s) of sensual dynamics which is/are experienced by the individual at the time of the criminal act. Through the criminal activity, the crime can provide a means to filter moral emotions and feelings.

Katz (1988) pointed out that escape behaviour can be analyzed as a rational emotional process: an act of resistance or protest to imprisonment in order to preserve the assertive self-being. In this study, family problems, parole problems, problems with other inmates, outstanding criminal charges, and institutional administrative problems were found among some inmates as precipitating factors in escape. These factors can be viewed as sensual dynamics triggering the act of escape. For

example, parole problems may facilitate frustration, uncertainty, and despair. In turn, this may challenge the personal existence of the inmate, and escape is perceived as a method to neutralize the problematic situation. The aforementioned precipitating factors interact with inmates' experiences in the institution and, in turn, impact upon their conduct and behaviour. In their attempt to resist the negative effects which emerge from their problems, some inmates might view escape as the solution. By doing so, they can preserve their assertive self-being.

As discussed in Chapter 2, the cognitive model postulates that an offender's cognition plays a major role in his or her criminal conduct (Ross and Fabiano, 1985; Ross, 1980 and 1981; Fabiano, Robinson, and Porporino, 1990; Porporino, Fabiano, and Robinson, 1991). Cognition refers to: what and how one thinks; how one reasons; understanding social rules and social obligations; self-evaluating one's immediate environment; and how one attempts to solve inter-personal problems. It is asserted that deficiencies in the development of cognitive skills of some offenders can affect their social adaptation which, in turn, can influence criminal deviance. Due to a number of developmental factors (e.g., poverty, insufficient and inadequate education), offenders fail to acquire a number of cognitive skills which are necessary for them to function in a pro-social manner (Ross and Fabiano, 1985). Some of the cognitive deficiencies include: limited inter-personal problem-solving skills, lack of self-

control (impulsivity), weak critical reasoning skills, failure to consider the long-term and short-term consequences of one's behaviour, and an inability to plan for the future.

In light of the cognitive model, it can be argued that unplanned escapes in this study are the result of inadequate analysis of alternative solutions to problems. First, the offenders failed to consider the negative, long-term consequences of escapes⁶. Second, their action reflects impulsivity. Similarly, inmates who escaped while under the influence did not anticipate the negative effects of substance abuse, which can further affect their decision-making. Ross and Fabiano (1985) argued that, due to cognitive deficiencies, when some offenders deal with problems, they respond immediately without adequate decision-making. Such individuals have inadequately analyzed their actions and consequences of their behaviour, reflecting impulsivity and poor judgement. In general, from the perspective of the cognitive model, escapees are viewed as individuals who would seize short-term gratification at the expense of long-term consequences.

As reflected by the results in this study, escape is a complex phenomenon. Escape is viewed as a multi-faceted phenomenon of behaviour. This study showed that both static and

⁶ Some consequences of escape include: receiving a lengthier sentence, transferred to higher security level, more restrictions on movement within the prison, less privileges, and denial of conditional release or temporary release.

dynamic/situational factors must be taken into account in explaining escape behaviour. A combination of theoretical models can offer a better understanding of this phenomenon. Factors contributing to escape are as follows: 1) inmate background characteristics - most escapees were committed to a criminal lifestyle with a history of escape and other breaches of trust; this profile denotes that they will escape if and when an opportunity arises; 2) circumstantial provocation - problems encountered within the institution (e.g., parole problems, problems with other inmates; institutional administrative problems) and/or problems outside the institution (e.g., family problems); and 3) situational opportunistic factors (e.g., escape by vehicle, temporal factors). The interaction of the above factors plays an important role in explaining escape from correctional institutions.

1) Limitations of Findings

Caution needs to be expressed in generalizing the present results to provincial prison settings in Canada and prisons in other countries. The data were drawn from the Correctional Service of Canada (CSC) and Canadian Police Information Centre (CPIC) databases. There are technical problems with updating and maintaining a national database, such as data entry errors, and inconsistencies and subjectivity on the part of staff in reporting information. It is possible that information has been under-reported. For example, it is likely that less serious incidents are not recorded in the CSC security incident database. Due to lack of information in the databases which were used in this study, no control group was employed to compare the effects of dynamic variables on a non-escapee group. Owing to time constraint and difficulties in accessing other sources of information (e.g., interviews with inmates), some of the data available on dynamic variables among the escapee group have not been validated in this study. Caution is thus called for when analyzing these data, because the information recorded in the incident reports/investigations was self-reported by inmates and/or was noted by staff through subjective observations. Only limited generalizations can be expected in view of the small sample size of this study. There are differences with respect to historical developments of the various institutions, financial, structural and security provisions, and wide variations in

management policies between institutions.

Another source of limitation is that this study involved only male escapees. In view of the possible gender differences in escape behaviour, generalization of findings from the present study to female escapees should be treated with caution.

Notwithstanding these limitations, this exploratory study has attempted to highlight specific factors which have been shown to be related to escapes.

ii) Policy Implications

Legislative mandates, such as the Criminal Code of Canada (Revised 1992), Corrections and Conditional Release Act (see paragraphs 3 and 4, 1992), and the Penitentiary Service Regulations (1992) which govern the operations, regulations, and policy in CSC, outline the criminal provisions of escape behaviour and the reactive punitive actions for escape. These mandates, however, do not identify any pro-active escape prevention strategies. Similarly, CSC policy and procedure manuals such as the Mission Document (including its Core Values) (1990), Corporate Objectives (1992), Commissioner Directives (1981), Operational Security Manual (Part 1, 1992), Regional Instructions (1992), Institutional Contingency Plans (1992), and

Case Management Manual (1989), do not highlight escape prevention policies or appropriate preventive intervention methods for escape. Some policy documents do not mention anything about escape. Nevertheless, the CSC has adopted the Custody Rating Scale as a classification tool for assessing the risk of escape. The Penitentiary Placement Report is another classification tool which is used to determine the security level of offenders for initial penitentiary placement. Despite the significant contributions of these two security risk assessment instruments, however, inmates' needs and risk (including potential to escape) are evaluated only at the time of admission to the institution. In view of the findings of the present study, the risk level of escape can change over time, such as when additional stress emerges as a result of dynamic factors. The risk level of offenders can thus fluctuate after admission. One might suggest that, in addition to these initial assessments, CSC can also consider assessment of inmates on an ongoing basis throughout placement. By doing so, risk levels of inmates can be monitored during the entire period of incarceration. This can allow for more effective information-sharing among staff as well as effective inmate placement and containment. It is suggested that inmates' social and criminal history can be used as an aid to identify offenders who are prone to escape behaviour.

When high risk inmates have been identified, the following measures can be taken to reduce the risk of escapes: 1) increase

temporary surveillance of high risk inmates. For example, inmates who are recent transfers, parole failures, and/or have outstanding criminal charges should be monitored closely; and 2) limit access of high risk inmates to certain areas of the institution (e.g. perimeter of institution). Temporary surveillance of high risk inmates can imply more costly human and financial resources. Nevertheless, it is speculated that the financial cost of static security, such as constructing additional fences or towers, can entail a much higher financial cost. In short, increased static security should be minimized where possible.

Inmates may enlighten staff and give intelligence on inmates who are incompatible, troublesome (e.g., threatening/violent), and/or escape-prone. The Inmate Committee can be a good source of such information. Intense supervision and possible intervention can be provided, where applicable, for incompatible inmates, so that the general population will not be affected. For instance, violent inmates should be temporarily segregated in order to reduce their threat to other inmates.

Staff, especially Case Management Officers (CMOs), should be apprised when inmates receive bad news, such as that relating to parole problems or family problems. Further, correctional officers, through communication with other inmates, may be made aware of the means by which the bad news was received (e.g.,

through phone calls, letters, or visits). Staff can provide temporary surveillance of those particular inmates until the problems subside or are resolved. Moreover, counselling services can be provided by CMOs and psychologists in cases where inmates experience problems. It is possible that, by discussing the problems experienced by inmates, some alternative solutions can be provided to alleviate such problems, thereby reducing the risk of inmates seeking escape as a solution. When inmates encounter disappointment at their parole hearing, counselling should be provided immediately, so that escape risk can be assessed. The CSC Unit Management Correctional model (see CSC, 1992) might consider addressing the above issues. The model focuses on extensive inmate and staff interaction and improved dynamic security. Its goal is to allow staff to get to know the inmates better through positive personal interaction, centering on pro-social values. The model can enable inmates to become law-abiding citizens and, at the same time, it can provide staff with the opportunity to monitor any unusual changes in an inmate's behaviour and to become aware of potential personal problems and crises. Increased communication and contact between staff and inmates may improve relationships. It can provide an outlet for inmates to air their frustrations. Staff can be aware of inmate needs and feelings and identify disruptive or unusual behaviour. It is also essential that correctional administrators alleviate stress or frustrations of inmates so they do not have to use escape as a solution to elude the intolerable levels of "pains of

imprisonment". It should be noted, however, that there is a limitation for staff in visiting and correspondence to intercept or monitor in-coming mail or telephone communication. This can be a violation of Section 8 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms for unreasonable search and seizure (see Regina v. Rodney, 1984, Vienneau, 1990). Usually, this type of monitoring has to be authorized by the Warden of the institution for a limited 30 day period and has to be based on probable and reasonable grounds that a criminal offence will take place.

It is interesting that approximately 25% of escapees were under the influence at the time of escape. Although alcohol/drugs have been a problem in institutions (see Correctional Service of Canada, 1987c), staff should be more vigilant in searches. There should be temporary intensive supervision of inmates under the influence.

It is vital that inmates maintain positive relationships with members of their family and the community. The Solicitor General should review its mandate with regard to temporary absences, work releases, family visits, and phone accessibility to enable close familial and social contact between inmates and the "outside world". Through doing so, more accessibility to the "outside" will be available to inmates to resolve their interpersonal problems. The only limitation for such family contacts should be for security or safety reasons.

Another measure which can be taken to reduce escapes is to ensure the safety, health, and personal dignity of the inmate. CSC should adhere to Section 28 of the Corrections and Conditional Release Act in all circumstances where an inmate is placed at or transferred to an institution. Section 28 states that:

the Service shall take all reasonable steps to ensure that the penitentiary in which the person is confined is one that provides the least restrictive environment for that person, taking into account (a) the degree and kind of custody and control necessary for (i) the safety of the public, (ii) the safety of that person and other persons in the penitentiary, and (iii) the security of the penitentiary; (b) accessibility to (i) the person's home community and family, (ii) a compatible cultural environment, and (iii) a compatible linguistic environment; and c) the availability of appropriate programs and services and the person's willingness to participate in those programs.

Understanding the potential risk factors of escape prone is important. In order to reduce escapes, a proactive approach in identifying potential escapes is thus needed. Correctional staff must identify the precursors of escape and introduce appropriate preventive intervention methods. In doing so, safe and secure containment for convicted offenders can be provided to a greater extent, and potential threat to institutional staff and community can be further minimized.

In sum, effective escape prevention must rely on the following: 1) proficiency and competency of dynamic security skills among correctional staff; this would also include practical intelligence gathering and analysis, routine

procedures, and non-intrusive searches. For example, staff should reduce the accessibility of vehicles to inmates on institutional property and emphasise strict key control of vehicles; and 2) proficient static security devices (e.g., Perimeter Intrusion Detection Systems).

iii) Recommendations for Future Research

In this study, it was found that various background and dynamic/situational factors played a vital role in explaining escape behaviour. These findings provide an impetus for future research to offer a better picture of the factors related to escape behaviour. Nine areas of future research are suggested: 1) escapes should be examined at all security levels -- minimum, medium, maximum; 2) institutional security factors should be examined in addition to static and dynamic situational factors; 3) a larger sample size should be employed; 4) further data on reasons for escapes can be collected from structured interviews with recaptured escapees; 5) the inmates' institutional program involvement should be examined along with escape behaviour; 6) a research design should include multivariate analyses on escape data so an escape prediction model can be developed; 7) first-time escapees should be compared with habitual escapees to identify key differences; 8) studies should also examine females and young offenders who escape; and 9) in order to assess the

applicability of moral self-transcendence theory and the cognitive model in relationship to escape behaviour, quantitative and qualitative data should be collected (e.g., through interviews and questionnaires).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Akers, R.L. Deviant Behaviour: A Social Learning Approach (3rd ed). Belmont, California: Wadsworth, 1985.

Akers, R.L., Hayner, N.S., and Gruninger, W., "Time Served, Career Phase and Prisonization". In R. Leger and J. Stratton (eds.), The Sociology of Corrections. New York: Wiley, 1977.

Allen, T.E., "Patterns of Escape and Self-Destructive Behaviour in a Correctional Setting." Journal of Social Therapy and Correctional Psychiatry, 15, 1969, pp. 50-58.

Alpert, G., Noblit, G., and Wiorkowski, J., "A Comparative Look at Prisonization: Sex and Prison Culture," Quarterly Journal of Correction, 1/3, 1977, pp. 29-34.

Anson, R.H., and Hartnett, C.M., "Correlates of Escape: A Preliminary Assessment of Georgia Prisons." Criminal Justice Review, 8/1, 1983, pp. 38-42.

Atchley, R.C., and McCole, P.M., "Socialization in Correctional Communities: A Replication," American Sociological Review, 33, 1968, pp. 774-785.

Banks, C., Mayhew, P., and Sapsford, R.J., Absconding From Open Prisons, Great Britain Home Office, research and Planning Unit, 1975.

Bartollas, C.L., Runaways at the Training Institutions, Central, Ohio. (Dissertation) Ann Arbor, 1973.

Barak-Glantz, I., "Pattern of Prisoner Misconduct: Toward a Behavioural Test of Prisonization," Sociological Focus. 16/2, 1983, pp. 129-146.

Basu, S., Models of Escape Behaviour of Minimum Security Inmates in Ontario: The Use of Routine Administrative Data For Risk Assessments. Cornell University, Doctoral Dissertation, 1983.

Berk, B. "Organization Goals and Inmate organization," American Journal of Sociology, 71, 1966, pp. 522-531.

Bondeson, U., "Criminal Careers in Corrections," International Annals of Criminology, 28/1-2, 1990, pp. 135-150.

Bowker, L.H., Corrections - The Science and the Art. New York: Macmillan., 1982.

Bowker, L.H., Prison Subcultures. Lexington Books, D.C. Heath Company, Toronto, 1977.

- Brown, B.J., Druce, N.R., and Sawyer, C.E., "Individual Differences and Absconding Behaviour," British Journal Of Criminology, 1978, 18/1 Jan. 1978. pp. 62-70.
- Burgess, R.L., and R.L., Akers. "A differential Association-Reinforcement Theory of Criminal Behaviour." Social Problems, 14, 1966, pp. 128-147.
- Camp, G., and Camp, C., "Stopping Escapes: Perimeter Security." National Institute of Justice, Construction Bulletin, August 1987.
- Campbell, H.G., Analysis of Prisoner Escape Potential: A Predictive Modelling Profile. Clermont University, Doctoral Dissertation, 1983.
- Campbell, G., Porporino, F., and Wernick, L., " Characteristics of Inmates involved in Prison Incidents" Phase 1, no. 1985-53, User Report, Secretariat, Ministry of Solicitor General, 1985.
- Canadian Penitentiary Services, Incidence of Escapes from Medium Security Institutions, Security Branch, 1973.
- Capano, T.J., et. al., Final Report of the Delaware Governor's Task Force on Corrections Security, United States, 1987.
- Carlson, K.C., "Prison Escapes and Community Consequences: Results of a Case Study." Federal Probation, June 1990, pp. 36-41.
- Charriere, H., Papillon, William Morrow and Company, Inc., New York, 1970.
- Chase, M.M., A Profile of Absconders. New York: New York Division for Youth Research, Program Evaluation, and Planning, 1973.
- Clarke, R.V. and Cornish, D.B. (1985). "Modelling Offenders' Decisions: A Framework for Research and Policy." p.p. 147-185, in M. Tonry and N. Morris (eds.), Crime and Justice: An Annual Review of Research, Volume 6. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Clarke, R.V., and Martin, D., "Absconding," Community Schools Gazette, (London, England), 64/12, 1971a, pp. 702-706.
- Clarke, R.V., and Martin, D., Absconding From Approved Schools, Home Office Research Unit, Great Britain, London, Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1971b.
- Clemmer, D. The Prison Community. Boston, 1940.

Clemmer, D. "Observations and Imprisonment as a Source of Criminality," Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 41, 1950, pp. 311-319.

Clemmer, D., Some aspects of Sexual Behaviour in the Prison Community, in Proceedings of the 88th Annual Congress in Correction (American Correctional Association), 1958.

Cline, H., "The determinants of Normative patterns in Correctional Institutions". Scandinavian Studies in Criminology, 2nd edition, Oslo: University of Forlaget. 1968.

Cloward, R., "Illegitimate Means, Anomie, and Deviant Behaviour," American Sociological Review, 24, 1959, pp. 164-189.

Coates, B.R., Impact of Differing Staffing Rations on Prison Environments, U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice, 1984.

Coe, R.M., "Characteristics of Well-adjusted and Poorly Adjusted Inmates," Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, 52/2, 1961, pp. 178-184.

Cohen, S., and Taylor, L., Psychological Survival, the Experience of long term Imprisonment, New York: Random House, 1972.

Comptroller General of the United States, Better Management Need For tighter Security at Lorton Correctional Institutions, District of Columbia Government, 1976.

Cornish, D.B., and Clarke, R.V., The Reasoning Criminal - Rational Choice Perspectives on Offending, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1986.

Correctional Service of Canada, Basic Facts on Corrections: 1991-1992, 1993.

Correctional Service of Canada, Annual Report on Major Security Incidents in Federal Institutions, Custody and Control Division, 1992a.

Correctional Service of Canada, Twelfth Annual Report 1991-1992 Audit and Investigations Sector, September 1992b.

Correctional Service of Canada, Positive Initiatives: Moving Forward.. Staying Ahead, Audit and Investigations Sector, vol. 1, no. 1, December 1992c.

Correctional Service of Canada, Security Bulletin, Institutional Operations Division, 1992d.

Correctional Service Canada. Unit Management: an Orientation,

Institutional Operations. 1992e.

Correctional Service of Canada, Major Security Incidents In Federal Institutions: A Comparison of 1990-1991 and 1991-1992, Institutional Operations, May 1992f.

Correctional Service Canada. "Escapes" . Perspectives In Security. Institutional Operations Division, Draft, 1991a.

Correctional Service of Canada, Task Force Report on the Reduction of Substance Abuse, 1991b.

Correctional Service of Canada, Research Design of the Cognitive Skills Training Program, Research and Statistics Branch, 1990.

Correctional Service of Canada, Effectiveness of the Cognitive Skills Training Program: From Pilot to National Implementation, Research Brief, No. B-07, Research and Statistics Branch 1991c.

Correctional Service of Canada., Pilot Implementation of a Custody Rating Scale: Interim Report, Research Branch, Communications and Corporate Development, February 1989a.

Correctional Service of Canada, Statistical Information on Recidivism Scale, Research Branch, no- B-01, 1989b.

Correctional Service of Canada, Board of Inquiry of an Escape of Offender from Edmonton Institution, September 1987. 1987a.

Correctional Service of Canada, Perimeter Intrusion Detection System (PIDS), Management Advisory Services, March, 1987b.

Correctional Service of Canada, Legislative Solutions for the Reduction of Contraband related Violence in Canadian Penitentiaries, Custody and Control Division, Correctional Operations Branch, 1987c.

Correctional Service of Canada, Analysis of Incidents at CSC Institutions 1976-1983, Telecommunications and Electronics, March 1984.

Correctional Service of Canada, Briefing to the Honourable Robert Kaplan Solicitor General of Canada, 1980.

Cowles, E.L. A study to Explore Race as it relates to Correctional Institution Escape Behaviour, The Florida State University, Doctoral Dissertation, 1981.

Dahlem, G.G., Escapes and Escapees at Colorado State Penitentiary- Some Speculations and Statistics, Colorado Springs, Colorado: Colorado Department of Corrections, 1974.

Davis, S.P., "Survey: Inmate Populations Up - But Escapes Down." Corrections Compendium, XIV/5, May 1991, pp. 8-12.

Denny, G., "Graham-Young County Jail A Joke After 16 Escapes in two Years," Corrections Digest, March, 1980, p. 8.

Dolinko, D., "Intolerable Conditions as a Defence to Prison Escapes," UCLA LAW REVIEW, 26/5, 1979, pp. 1126-1182.

Dostoevsky, F., Crime and Punishment, C. Garnett, tr. New York, 1965.

Duncan, D.F., and Ellis, T.R., " Situational Variables Associated with Prison Escapes." American Journal of Corrections, May-June 1973, pp. 29-30.

Fabiano, E., Robinson, D., and Porporino, F., A preliminary Assessment of the Cognitive Skills Training Program: A Component of Living Skills Programming, Program Description, Research Findings, and Implementation Strategy, Correctional Service of Canada, 1991.

Farina, C.R., " Escape From Cruel and Unusual Punishment- A Theory of Constitutional Necessity," Boston University Law Review, 59/2, 1979, pp. 334-371.

Fielding, N., and Fowles, T., "The Escape of Alan Richard Knowlden," The Howard Journal, vol. 26, no. 3, August 1987, p. 232.

Fisher, K.L., Determination of some Personality Characteristics of Women Who Escape From Prison, University of Washington, Doctoral Dissertation. 1977.

Flanagan, T.J., "The Pains of Long-term Imprisonment. A comparison of British and American Perspectives," British Journal of Criminology, 20/2, 1980, pp. 148-156.

Flanagan, T., "Time Served and Institutional Misconduct: Patterns of Involvement in Disciplinary Infractions among Long Term and Short Term Inmates," Journal of Criminal Justice, 8, 1980, pp. 357-367.

Flanagan, T., "Correlates of Institutional Misconduct among State Prisoners, A Research Note," Criminology, 21/1, 1983, pp. 29-39.

Flanagan, T., "Lifers and Long-termers: Doing big time," in R. Johnson and H. Toch (eds.), The Pains of Imprisonment. Sage Publishing Co., U.S.A., 1982.

Fletcher, G., "Should Intolerable Prison Conditions Generate a Justification for Escape?" UCLA Law Review, 1979, 26/6 pp. 1355-

1369.

Gardner, M.R., "Defence of Necessity and the Right to Escape from Prison," Southern California Law Review, 49/1, 1975, pp. 110-152.

Garabedian, P., "Social Roles and Processes of Socialization in the Prison Community," Social Problems, 11, 1963, pp. 139-152.

Garabedian, P., "Social Roles and in a Correctional Community," Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, 55, 1964, pp. 338-347.

Garabedian, P., "The Natural History of an Inmate Community in a Maximum Security Prison," The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, 61/1, 1970, pp. 78-85.

Garfinkel, H., "Conditions of Successful Degradation Ceremonies", American Journal of Sociology, 61, 1956, pp.420-424.

Gilman, D. "Courts and Corrections." Corrections Magazine, 2/5, 1976, pp. 51-53.

Glaser, D., Handbook of Criminology, Rand McNally College Publishing Company, Chicago, 1974.

Gleysteen, N., "A Re-examination of Justifiable Escape," New England Journal of Prison Law (Boston), 2/2, 1976. pp. 205-259.

Goetting, A., and Hansen, R., "Correlates of Prison Misconduct," Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 2/1, 1986, pp. 46-67.

Goffman, E. Asylums: Essays on the Social Situation of Mental Patients and Other Inmates. Garden City, New York, 1961.

Gold, J.Z., "Prison Escape and Defence Based on Conditions - A theory of Social Preference," California Law Review, 67/5, 1979, pp. 1183-1204.

Goodstein, L., "Inmate Adjustment to Prison and the Transition to Community Life." Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 16/2 1979, pp. 246-272.

Gorta, A. and Sillavan, T. "Escapes from New South Wales Gaols: Placing the Risk In Perspective". ANZJ Crim., 24, 1991.

Gorta, A., and Nguyen Da Huong, M., An Analysis of Interviews with Recaptured Escapees: Some Suggestions of Reasons for Escape, Research and Statistics Division, N.S.W. Department of Corrective Services, Australia, 1988.

Grapendaal, M., "The Inmate Subculture in Dutch Prisons," British Journal of Criminology, 30/3, 1990, pp. 341-357.

Green, J.R., and Martin, D.N. "absconding from Approved Schools as Learned Behaviour." Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency January, 1973, pp. 73-86.

Guenther, P., Analysis of Escapes From Provincial Correctional Facilities - April 1, 1979 to August 31, 1983. 1983.

Guenther, A., "Escapes and Escape Attempts," In From Justice and Corrections, Norman Johnston and Leonard Savitz, John Wiley and Sons, Inc. U.S.A., 1978.

Harlow, C.W., Drugs and Jail Inmates, United States department of Justice. Washington, D.C., U.S.A., 1991.

Harrison, L., and Gfroerer, J., "The Intersection of Drug Use and Criminal Behaviour: Results from the National Household Survey on Drug Abuse," Crime and Delinquency, 38/4, Oct. 1992, pp. 422-434.

Hartmann, C., Escape from Prison: An Empirical Study of Runaways from Open Correctional Centres. Criminology Department, University of Kohn, West Germany, 1978.

Hartnagel, T.F., "Absent without Leave - A Study of the Military Offender," Journal of Political and Military Sociology, 2/2, 1974, pp. 205-220.

Hartnagel, T.F., and Gillan, M.E., "Female Prisoners and the Inmate Code", Pacific Sociological Review, 23/1, 1980, pp. 85-104.

Hartnagel, T., "Correlates of Criminal Behaviour," in Rick Linden, Criminology: A Canadian Perspective, Holt, Rinehart, and Winston of Canada, Ltd., Toronto, 1987, pp. 74-101.

Harvey, J. L., Escapes Relative to Staffing and Training at the Dutchman Correctional Institution and the South Carolina Department of Corrections Overview and Analysis, National Institute of Justice, 1981.

Hayner, N.S., and Ash, E., "The Prison as a Community," American Sociological Review, 5, 1940, pp. 577-583.

Hayner, N., "The Prison Community," Canadian Journal of Corrections, 6, 1964, pp.320-324.

Hilbrand, R.J., "The Anatomy of escape." Federal Probation, 33/1, 1969, pp. 58-66.

Holland, T.R. and Holt, N., "Correctional Classification and the Prediction of Institutional Adjustment." California Department of Corrections. Criminal Justice Behaviour. 7/1, 1980, pp. 51-60.

Holt, L.K., Statistical Bulletin on Escapees for 1986: A Profile of Escapees and Returns From Escape during 1986 and Individuals on Escape Status on December 31, 1986, Massachusetts Department of Correction, December, 1987.

Holt, N., "Escape From Custody." Research Report No. 52, California Department of Corrections, May 1974.

Home Office, Report of the Inquiry into Prison Escapes and Security. (Mountbatten Report) London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 3175, 1966.

Hromas, S., Institutional Escape Report, California Department of Corrections, Office of Research, 1979.

Hunt, D., Lipton, D., and Spunt, B., "Patterns of Criminal Activity among Methadone Clients and Current Narcotic Users not in Treatment," Journal of Drug Issues, Fall 1984, pp. 687-701.

Hylar, M. and Labbe, J., An analysis of Massachusetts Forestry camp Escapees, Massachusetts Department of Correction, 1970.

Ingram, G., "American Federal System: Control and Classification," In A. E. Bottoms and R. Light, eds. Problems of Long-Term Imprisonment, United States, p. 200-213, 1987.

Irwin, J., and Cressey, D., "Thieves, Convicts, and the Inmate Code." Social Problems, 10, 1962, 142-155.

Irwin, J., The Felon. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall. 1970.

Jeffries, R.B., "Intent, Duress, and Necessity in Escape Cases, United States v. Bailey, 585 F.2d 1087 (D.C. Cir. 1978), cert. granted, 99 S. Ct. 1497 (1979)." Georgetown Law Journal, 68/1, 1979, pp. 249-266.

Jensen, G.F. "Age and Rule-breaking in Prison. A test of Socio-cultural Interpretations." Criminology, 14/4, February, 1977.

Johnson, R., Lewis, J., and Young, P., "The Training School Absconder: A Preliminary Assessment of Antecedent Problems and Motives." Juvenile and Family Court Journal, 29/3, 1978, pp. 3-8.

Johnson, P.M., "Michigan Report available on Minimum Security Escapees," Corrections Digest, January 5, 1984, pp. 5-6.

Johnson, E. H., "Handling Difficult Inmates in the Land of Order," Corrections Today, July 1990, pp. 128-131.

Johnson, E.H., "Pilot Study: Age, Race, and Recidivism as Factors in Prison Infractions." Canadian Journal of Corrections, 8, 1966,

pp. 268-283.

Johnston, J. and Motiuk, L. Factors Related to Unlawful Walkaways from Minimum Security Institutions. Research and Statistics Branch, Communications And Corporate Development, Correctional Service Canada. 1992a.

Johnston, J. and Motiuk, L. Unlawful Departures from Minimum Security Institutions: A Comparative Investigation. Research and Statistic Branch, Communications And Corporate Development, Correctional Service Canada. 1992b.

Johnston, N., and Cooke, G., "Relationship of MMPI Alcoholism, Prison Escape, Hostility Control, and Recidivism Scales to Clinical Judgements," Journal of Clinical Psychology, 29/1, 1973, pp. 32-34.

Joint Legislative Committee on Prison Construction and Operations, Conclusions and Recommendations: Investigation and Hearing into the Escape of Kevin Cooper From Chino Institution for Men on June 2, 1983. Sacramento, U.S.A., 1983.

Katz, J. Seductions of Crime: Moral and Sensual Attractions in Doing Evil. Basic Books, Inc., Pub. New York, 1988.

Kentucky Bureau of Corrections, The Blackburn Escape Study, Final Report, Research and Evaluation Section, 1980.

Kentucky Bureau of Corrections, The Blackburn Correctional Complex Escape Study, Research and Evaluation Section, 1978.

Kennedy, W., Prisonization and Self Conception: A Study of a Medium Security Prison. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of California, Los Angeles, U.S.A., 1970.

Krohn, C. and Peterson, A. R., Escapes from Correctional Facilities. Institute of Criminology, University of Stockholm, Sweden, 1973.

Landon, R., "Virginia Takes Steps to Avert New Prison Breakouts," Corrections Digest, August 1, 1984, pp. 4-5.

Laverack, K., "Absconding from Kneesworth House." Community Schools Gazette, (Exeter, England), 68\1, 1974, pp. 5-23.

Laycock, G.K., Absconding from Borstals, London, Her Majesty's Stationary Office, Home Office, Research Study, No. 41., Great Britain, 1977.

Lesser, J.R., "Duress and the Prison Escape: a New Use for an Old Defence," South California Law Review, 45/4, 1972, pp. 1062-1082.

Levinson and Williams, "Inmate Classification - Security/Custody Considerations," Federal Probation, 43\1, March 1979, pp. 37-43.

Libolt, A.L. "Technology Cannot Be a Replacement For Creative Planning and Programming". Corrections Today, July, 1991.

Loving, W., Stockwell, F.E., and Dobbins, D.A., "Factors Associated with Escape Behaviour in Prison Inmates." Federal Probation, 23/3, 1959, pp. 49-51.

Lowenstein, L.P., "Dealing with the Habitual Absconder and Offender," Community Home Schools Gazette, (United Kingdom), 72/12, 1979, pp. 519-526.

Lubeck, S.G., and Larmer, T.E., "Case of the Runaway," Social Problems, 16/2, 1974, pp. 242-260.

Lynch, E., "Inmate Who Escaped on Chopper Accuses Warden, Alleged Prison Mismanagement," Corrections Digest, May 13, 1987, p. 9-10.

Mackenzie, D.L., Goodstein, L., and Blouin, D., "Personal Control and Prisoner Adjustment: an Empirical test of a Proposed Model." Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 24/1, 1987, pp.49-68.

Martin, J., Analysis of Escapes From Youth Training Centres, Research and Statistics Division, Melbourne Youth Corrections, Australia, 1973.

MacDougall, E.C. "Effective Perimeter Security: A Challenge for Security Designers." Corrections Today, April, 1989.

Martinez, B., "Florida Toughens Prisoner Classification Guidelines," Corrections Digest, July 11, 1990, p. 5.

Mayhew, P., "Opportunity and Vehicle Crime", in D.M. Gottfredson and R.V. Clarke Policy and Theory in Criminal Justice, Avebury, Brookfield, USA, 1990.

Mclaren, D., "Cons, Hacks, and Educated Screws - Prison Politics of Discipline and Rehabilitation," Canadian Journal of Criminology and Corrections, 15/1, 1973, pp. 25-38.

McNeil, M., Multivariate Study of Dynamic and Static Factors Associated with Prison Escapes, University of North Carolina, Doctoral Dissertation, 1978.

Metzler, C., 1978 Yearly Statistical Report of the Furlough Program, Massachusetts Department of Correction, 1979.

Ministry of the Solicitor General (British Columbia), Inmate Escapes - Trends and Patterns, Corrections Branch, 1992.

Morgan, D., "Individual and Situational Factors Related to Prison Escape." American Journal of Correction, March-April, 1967, pp. 30-31.

Morrow, W.R., "Escapes of Psychiatric Offenders." Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, 60, 1969, pp. 464-471.

Motiuk, L., and Porporinc, F., "Field Test of the Community Risk/Needs Management Scale: A Study of Offenders on Caseload," Correctional Service of Canada, No. R-06, Research Branch, 1989.

Murphy, T. H., Prediction of Minimum Security Walkaways. Michigan Department of Corrections, 1984.

National Institute of Justice., Guidelines For Developing, Implementing, and Revising an Objective Prison Classification System, Research Report, 1987.

Nath, S.B., An Offender Profile - Escape: A Statistical Study, State of Florida, Florida Parole and Probation Commission, 1975.

Nguyen Da Huong, M., Gorta, A., and Thompson, B., Reasons For Escape: Extent of Knowledge of Institutional Officers, Research and Statistics Division, N.S.W., Department of Corrective Services, Australia. No. 6, March 1989.

Noel, A., and Baker, G., "Jailbreak was easy Killer, Kidnapper just walked away." Montreal Gazette, May 5, 1992, A1.

O'Connell, R., Bosarge, B., and Wyen, N. "Florida Governor Fires Orison Officials After Escapee Murders Woman." Corrections Digest, 21/13, p.10, 1990.

Olson, S., "Patterns of Infractions and Official Reactions to Institutional Regulations," Social Science Quarterly, 54/4, 1974, pp. 814-826.

Ohlin, L.E., Sociology in the Field of Corrections. New York: Russel Sage, 1956.

Panton, J.H., "Longitudinal Post-Validation of the MMPI Escape (Ec) and Prison Adjustment (Ap) Scales," Journal of Clinical Psychology, 35/1, 1979, pp. 101-107.

Pemberton, K., " Flawed Security Helps Prisoners Fly: Police have Trouble Keeping Score as Jailbreaks Climb, Records Show," Vancouver Sun, September 16, 1991, p. 1.

Petersen, D., and Thomas, C.W., Prison Organization and Inmate Subcultures. Indianapolis, Ind.:Bobbs-Merrill, 1977.

Petersen, D. M., and Thomas, C., "Review of Relevant Research in Correctional Rehabilitation", pp. 135-151 in J. Cull and R. Hardy (eds.), Fundamentals of Criminal Behaviour and Correctional Systems (Springfield, Il: C. Thomas, 1973).

Petersilia, J., Greenwood, P., and Lavin, M., Criminal Careers of Habitual Felons, National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, July 1978.

Petersilia, J., and Honig, P., Prison Experience of Career Criminals, National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice, and Rand Corporation, May 1980.

Pettigrew, C. G., "Seasonality and Lunacy of Inmate Behaviour," Southern Psychologist, 2\3, 1985, pp. 41-46.

Pearce, D., Cool Hand Luke, 1st Signature Edition, New York: Scribner's, 1965.

Peat, B., and Winfree, L., "Reducing the Intra-Institutional Effects of Prisonization: A Study of a Therapeutic Community for Drug-using Inmates", Criminal Justice and Behaviour, 19/2, 1992, pp. 206-225.

Pierce, D., "The Escapism Scale of the MMPI as a Predictive Devise." Correctional Psychologist, 4/6, 1971, pp. 230-232.

Poole, F., Regoli, R., and Thomas, W., " The Measurement of Inmate Social Role Types: An Assessment," Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 71/3, 1980 pp. 317-324.

Porritt, D., "The Threat From Escapes: Some Facts About Prison Escapes". Research Bulletin. N.S.W., Australia, Department of Corrective Services. No. 6, March 1982.

Porritt, D. "Reasons for Escape: Reported by Recaptured Escapees." Research and Statistics Division, N.S.W. Department of Corrective Services, Australia, 1987.

Porporino, F., Fabiano, E., and Robinson, D., Focusing on Successful Reintegration: Cognitive Skills Training for Offenders, Research report No. 19, Research and Statistics Branch, Correctional Service of Canada, 1991.

Price, E.T., "Open Prisons and Public Safety," Australian and New Zealand Criminology Journal, 4/3, 1971, pp. 163-167.

Ramirez, J., "Prisonization, Staff, and Inmates. Is it Really us versus them?" Criminal Justice and Behaviour, 11/4 1984. pp. 423-460.

Regina v. Rodney (1984), 12 C.C.C. (3d) 195

- Reich, J.W., and Gutierrez, S.E., "Escape/Aggression Incidence in Sexually Abused Juvenile Delinquents." Criminal Justice Behaviour. 6/3, 1979, pp. 383-402.
- Renteria, R.A., and Holt, N., "The Anatomy of an Escape," American Journal of Correction, 33/1, 1971, pp.10-15.
- Rinald, I.F., "Escaping from Prison", Criminal Law Journal, 2/2, 1978, pp. 69-71.
- Robb, C., "Virginia Escapes Drop: Corrections Officials Pleased," Corrections Digest, July 17, 1985, p. 5-6.
- Robb, C., "Virginia Corrections Board Warns Governor to Remedy Mecklenburg Security Problem," Corrections Digest, November 21, 1984, p. 8-9.
- Roberts, Jim. Report on the Perimeter Intrusion Detection System (PIDS), CSC, Custody and Control Division, Offender Policy and Program Development Branch, 1986.
- Rook, A., and Verhagen, J. "Leave From Prison," In Studies on the Dutch Prison System, M.J. Brand-Koolen, ed., Kugler Publications, Netherlands, 1987.
- Ross, R.R., Cognition and Crime: In Search of a Link, University of Ottawa, 1981.
- Ross, R.R., and Fabiano, E. Time to Think: A Cognitive Model of Delinquency Prevention and Offender Rehabilitation. Institute of Social Sciences and Arts, Inc. 1985.
- Ross, R., Socio-Cognitive Development in the Offender: An External Review of the UVIC Program at Matsqui Penitentiary, Department of Criminology, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Ottawa, August, 1990.
- Sabbath, M.J., and Cowles, E.L., "Using Multiple Perspectives to Develop Strategies for Managing Long-term Inmates," The Prison Journal, LXX, 1, 1990, pp. 58-72.
- Sartre, J., "Existentialism is a Humanism," in W. Kaufmann, ed., Existentialism from Dostoevsky to Sartre. New York, 1966.
- Schermer, R.L., "From Lovercamp to a Prisoner's Right to Escape - an Inescapable Conclusion," Buffalo Law Review, 26/2, 1977, pp. 413-434.
- Schrag, C. "A Preliminary Criminal Typology." 4 Pacific Sociological Review, 1961, pp.11-16.
- Scott, N., Mount, M., and Duffy, P., "MMPI and Demographic

Correlates and Predictors of Female Prison Escape." Criminal Justice Behaviour, 4/3, 1977, pp. 285-300.

Schwartz, B., "Pre-Institutional vs. Situational Influence in a Correctional Community," Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, 62/4, 1971, pp. 532-542.

Shaffer, C.E., Bluoin, D., and Pettigrew, C.G., "Assessment of Prison Escape Risk." Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology, 1/1, 1985, pp. 42-48.

Shover, N. A Sociology of American Corrections. Georgetown, Ontario, 1979.

Shuster, S.A., A Report of a Study of Escapes from Penitentiaries, 1966-67 to 1968-69, Correctional Research, Canadian Penitentiary Services, 1969.

Smith, C., and Hepburn, J.R. "Alienation in Prison Organizations: A comparative Analysis." Criminology, 17:2, 1979, pp. 251-262.

Smith, R., and Sabatino, D.A., "American Prisoner Home Furloughs," Journal of Offender Counselling, 10/1, April 1990, pp. 18-25.

Smith, R.W., A Study of Escapes from Washington State Adult Correctional Facilities, Olympia, Washington: Washington State Department of Corrections, 1971.

Smyrnew, E. and Reid, K. Escapes and Escape Attempts for the Period 1970 to 1978 (August), Research Project, Canadian Penitentiary Service, 1980.

Solicitor General Canada, The Escape of Nine Inmates in Five Separate Incidents At Cowansville Institution Between 14 April - 1 May, 1973, Commission of Inquiry on Penitentiary Security Within the Quebec Region, 1973a.

Solicitor General Canada, Preliminary Report By The Commission On the Escape Of Five Inmates, On 13 May 1973, From The Correctional Development Centre (Quebec), In The City Of Laval, Province of Quebec, Commission of Inquiry on Penitentiary Security Within the Quebec Region, 1973b.

Standley, J.O., "Treatment Oriented Security Screening," American Journal of Correction, 32/2, 1969, pp. 22-25.

State of New York Department of Correctional Services, Facility Escape Incidents, 1986-1990, 1991.

State of New York Department of Correctional Services, Facility Escape Incidents, 1985-1989, 1990.

State of New York Department of Correctional Services, Temporary Release Absconders 1984 through 1987: A Profile, March 1989.

State of New York Department of Correctional Services, Escapes From Department of Correctional Services Facilities, 1982 through 1986, Jan. 1987.

State of New York Department of Correctional Services, Escapes From Department of Correctional Services Facilities, 1981 through 1985, Jan. 1986a.

State of New York Department of Correctional Services, Profile of 1985 Absconders From Temporary Release, December 1986b.

State of New York Department of Correctional Services, Escapes From Department of Correctional Services Facilities: 1978, 1979, 1980, 1981, and 1982, 1983.

State of New York Department of Correctional Services, Escapes From Department of Correctional Services Facilities: 1977, 1978, 1979, 1980, and 1981, 1982.

State of New York Department of Correctional Services, Escapes From Department of Correctional Services Facilities: 1976, 1977, 1978, 1979 and 1980. Feb. 1981.

Stone, W., Factors Related to Escape Prediction, Sam Houston University, Doctoral Dissertation, 1975.

Stump, E.S., and Gilbert, W.W., Experimental MMPI Scales and Other Predictors of institutional Adjustment, Ohio Penitentiary, 1972.

Sturrock, R., Mid-year Report on Walkaways from Minimum Security Institutions (1991-04-01 to 1991-09-30). Institutional Operations, Correctional Service Canada, 1992.

Sturrock, R., "Recidivism among Walkaways While at Large", Forum on Corrections Research, Sept. 1993.

Sutherland, E.H., and Cressey, D.R. Principles of Criminology, 10th ed., Philadelphia, 1978.

Sykes, G. The Society of Captives: A study of a Maximum Security Prison. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University, 1958.

Sykes, G., and Messinger, S., "The Inmate Social System." In Leonanard Orland (Ed.) , Justice, Punishment, Treatment: The Correctional Response. New York: The Free Press, 1973.

Sykes, M.G., and Messinger, S.L., "The inmate Social System," in Richard A. Cloward et al., Theoretical Studies in Social

Organization of the Prison, Social Science Research Council, U.S.A., 1960.

Sykes, G., Criminology, New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1978.

The Banner, "Beaver Creek Institution: What About Success Stories," Wednesday, September 23, 1992 p. A2.

Thomas, C., "Prisonization or Resocialization? A study of External Factors Associated with the Impact of Imprisonment," Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 10, 1973, pp. 13-21.

Thomas, C., "Theoretical Perspectives on Alienation in the Prison Society", Pacific Sociological Review, 18, 1975, pp. 483-499.

Thomas, C., "Toward a More Inclusive Model of the Inmate Contra-Culture," Criminology, 8, 1970, pp. 251-262.

Thomas, C., "Prisonization and its Consequences: An examination of Socialization in a Coercive Setting," Sociological Focus, 10/1, 1977, pp. 53-68.

Thomas, C., and Foster, S., "Prisonization in the Inmate Contraculture," Social Problems, 20, 1972, pp. 229-239.

Thomas, C., and Foster, S., "The Importation Model of Inmate Social Roles: An Empirical Test," The Sociological Quarterly, 14, 1973, pp. 226-234.

Thomas, C., Petersen, D., and Zingraff, R., "Structural and Social Psychosocial Correlates of Prisonization," Criminology, 16/3, 1978, pp. 383-393.

Thomas, C., and Poole, C., "The Consequences of Incompatible Goal Structures in Correctional Settings," International Journal of Criminology and Penology, 3, 1975, pp. 27-42.

Thomas, C., and Zingraff, M., "Organizational Structure as a Determinant of Prisonization," Pacific Sociological Review, 19, 1976, pp. 98-116.

Thompson, B. "Reasons for Escape: Interviews with Recaptured Escapees". Research Bulletin. Department of Corrective Services. No. 17, June, 1992.

Thompson, E.E., "Prison Escape - Justification As A Defence - People v. Lovercamp," Capital University Law Review, 5/5, 1976, pp. 293-325.

Thornton, D., and Speirs, S., "Predicting Absconding from Young Offenders Institutions." In: Prediction in Criminology, edited by D.P. Farrington and R. Tarling. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1985. pp. 119-134.

Tittle, C., "Inmate Organization: Sex Differentiation and the Influence of Criminal Substructures," American Sociological Review, 34, 1969, pp. 492-505.

Tittle, C.R., Society of Subordinates: Inmate Organization in a Narcotic Hospital, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1972.

Toch, H. Living in Prison: The Ecology of Survival. New York: The Free Press, 1977

Toch, H., and Greene, R. "Ethnicity, Disruptiveness, and Emotional Disorders among Prison Inmates". Criminal Justice Behaviour, 14, 1987, pp. 93-109.

Toch, H., Adams, K., and Grant, J.D., Coping: Maladaptation in Prisons. New Brunswick, N.J.,: Transaction, 1989.

Trotti, T.C., A Survey of AWOL Management in Southwestern Juvenile Correctional Agencies, Columbia, S.C., 1981. pp.68-74.

Tutt, N.S., "Towards Reducing Absconding," Community Schools Gazette. England, Association of Heads and Matrons of Community Schools, 65/2 pp. 65-68, 1971.

Tyler, T., " Sex Offender was Raised in Jails," Toronto Star, Wednesday October 1992, p. A9.

United States Department of Justice, Federal Prison System - Facilities, 1980, Federal Bureau of Prisons, Washington, DC, 1980.

United States Department of Justice, Guidelines for the Development of a Security Program National Institute of Corrections, 1987.

Vienneau, D., "Police Eavesdropping Powers Curbed - Consent not enough to proceed without Warrant, Court Says", Toronto Star, October 7, 1990, p.3.

Virginia Department of Corrections. Report of Felon Escapes: Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1981, 1982.

Virginia Department of Corrections. Report of Felon Escapes: Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1980, 1981.

Virginia Department of Corrections. Report of Felon Escapes: Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1978, 1979.

Virginia Department of Corrections. Report of Felon Escapes: Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1977, 1978.

Virginia Department of Corrections. Report of Felon Escapes: Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1975, 1976.

Wharry, J.D., A Study of the Nature and Frequency of Crimes Committed by escapees of Maximum and Medium Security Institutions and Some characteristics of Escapes, Canadian Penitentiary Services, 1972.

Wharry, J., Escapes: A Report of Research Conducted by Canadian Penitentiary Service Dealing with Escapes and Escapees in 1972, Canadian Penitentiary Services, 1973.

Weekes, J., "Long Term Offenders: Who are they and where are they?" Forum on Corrections Research, 4/2, June 1992, pp. 3-7.

Wheeler, D. "The Role Conflict in Correctional Communities." In Donald R. Cressey (ed.), The Prison: Studies in Institutional Organization and Change. New York: Holt, Rhinehart and Winston. 1961.

White, R.B., "Relationship of scores on the Escapism Scale of the MMPI to escape from Minimum Security Federal Custody." Journal of Clinical Psychology, 35/2, 1979, pp. 467-470.

Williams, L.T., 1980 Yearly Statistical Report of the Furlough Program, Massachusetts Department of Correction, 1981.

Williams, L.T., 1979 Yearly Statistical Report of the Furlough Program, Massachusetts Department of Correction, 1980.

Wilson, C.G., Factors Associated with Escape from Custody of North Carolina Department of Correction, Unpublished Master's Thesis, North Carolina State University at Raleigh, 1968.

Wilson, G.P., An Analysis of the Relationship of MMPI and Demographic Factors for Escapees in a Minimum Security Environment. Michigan State University. Doctoral Dissertation, 1983.

Wilson, J.M., and Snodgrass, J.D., "The Prison Code in a Therapeutic Community," Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, 60, 1969, pp. 472-478.

Wooldredge, J., "Correlates of Deviant Behaviour among Inmates in U.S. Correctional Facilities," Journal of Crime and Justice, 14/1, 1991, pp. 1-25.

Wolf, S., Freinek, W., and Shaffer, J., "Frequency and Severity of Rule Infraction as a Criteria of Prion Maladjustment," Journal

of Clinical Psychology, 22, 1966, pp. 244-247.

Zamble, E., Porporino, F., and Kalotay, J., An Analysis of Coping Behaviour in Prison Inmates. Ottawa: Solicitor General of Canada. 1984.

Zingraff, M., "Prisonization as an Inhibitor of Effective Resocialization." Criminology, 13/3, 1980, pp. 366-387.

APPENDIX 1**STATIC FACTORS****Table 1a. All Major Offences**

TYPE OF MAJOR OFFENCE	ESCAPEE GROUP (N=35)	NON-ESCAPEE GROUP (N=35)
MURDER	7 (20.0%)	4 (11.4%)
ROBBERY	15 (42.9%)	10 (28.6%)
BREAK AND ENTER	8 (22.9%)	3 (8.6%)
FRAUD	1 (2.9%)	0
MANSLAUGHTER	3 (8.6%)	1 (2.9%)
THEFT	1 (2.9%)	1 (2.9%)
DRUG TRAFFICKING	0	3 (8.6%)
SEXUAL ASSAULT	0	6 (17.1%)
POSS. OF WEAPON	0	2 (5.7%)
KIDNAPPING	0	2 (5.7%)
CONSP. TO MURDER	0	1 (2.9%)
CONSP. TO TRAFFIC NARCOTICS	0	1 (2.9%)
AGG. ASSAULT	0	1 (2.9%)

Table 2a. Number of Parole Revocations

	NUMBER OF PAROLE REVOCATIONS	
	1 PRIOR REVOCATION	2 OR MORE REVOCATIONS
ESCAPEE GROUP (N=35)	10 (28.6%)	20 (57.1%)
NON-ESCAPEE GROUP (N=35)	10 (28.6%)	2 (5.8%)

Table 3a. Number of Escapes

	NUMBER OF ESCAPES	
	1 PRIOR ESCAPE	2 OR MORE ESCAPES
ESCAPEE GROUP (N=35)	13 (37.1%)	16 (45.7%)
NON-ESCAPEE GROUP (N=35)	3 (8.6%)	2 (5.7%)

Table 4a. Number of Previous Federal Terms

	NUMBER OF PREVIOUS FEDERAL TERMS	
	1 PRIOR FEDERAL TERM	2 OR MORE FEDERAL TERMS
ESCAPEE GROUP (N=35)	10 (28.6%)	12 (34.3%)
NON-ESCAPEE GROUP (N=35)	7 (20.0%)	5 (14.3%)

Table 6a. Number of Previous Institutional Misconducts

	NUMBER OF PREVIOUS INSTITUTIONAL MISCONDUCTS	
	1 PREVIOUS MISCONDUCT	5 OR MORE PREVIOUS MISCONDUCT
ESCAPEE GROUP (N=35)	3 (8.6%)	24 (68.6%)
NON-ESCAPEE GROUP (N=35)	8 (22.9%)	3 (8.7%)

Table 8a. Type of Sentence

	INDETERMINATE SENTENCE (LIFE SENTENCE)	DETERMINATE SENTENCE
ESCAPEE GROUP (N=35)	7 (20.0%)	28 (80.0%)
NON-ESCAPEE GROUP (N=35)	4 (11.4%)	31 (89.6%)

Table 9a. Age

	AGE (YEARS)		
	MEAN	S.D.	MEDIAN
ESCAPEE GROUP (N=35)	28.42	5.43	26.85
NON-ESCAPEE GROUP (N=35)	37.35	11.0	34.98

Table 10a. Number of Previous Criminal Convictions

NUMBER OF PREVIOUS CRIMINAL CONVICTIONS			
	MEAN	S.D.	MEDIAN
ESCAPEE GROUP (N=35)	32.51	21.24	32.00
NON-ESCAPEE GROUP (N=35)	12.71	8.89	6.00

DYNAMIC\ SITUATIONAL FACTORS (ESCAPEE GROUP N=35)**Table 12. Factors Precipitating Escape Behaviour**

	NUMBER OF ESCAPEES	PERCENTAGE %
OUTSTANDING CRIMINAL CHARGES	12	34.3
PAROLE PROBLEMS	9	25.7
PROBLEMS WITH OTHER INMATES	9	25.7
FAMILY PROBLEMS	8	22.9
INSTITUTIONAL ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS (NOT INCLUDING PAROLE PROBLEMS)	8	22.9
INSTITUTIONAL ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS (INCLUDING PAROLE PROBLEMS)	14	40.0

Table 13. Other Factors

	NUMBER OF ESCAPEES	PERCENTAGE %
UNDER THE INFLUENCE (SUBSTANCE USE) AT TIME OF ESCAPE	8	22.9
RECENT PAROLE REVOCATION (WITHIN 60 DAYS PRIOR TO ESCAPE)	9	25.7
RECENT TRANSFER (WITHIN 60 DAYS PRIOR TO ESCAPE); TRANSFERRED FROM LOWER TO HIGHER SECURITY LEVEL DUE TO VARIOUS BEHAVIOUR PROBLEMS AND PAROLE REVOCATION/SUSPENSION	11	31.4
PLANNED ESCAPE	28	80.0
MULTIPLE ESCAPE (ESCAPEE FLED WITH 1 OR MORE OTHER INMATES)	25	71.4
ESCAPE BY VEHICLE	12	34.3
ESCAPE BY SCALING THE PERIMETER FENCE	15	42.9
ESCAPE BY PENETRATING THE PERIMETER FENCE	5	14.3
ESCAPE WHILE OUTSIDE THE EXTERIOR PERIMETER (SUPERVISED ON WORK GROUP)	3	8.6

Table 14, Temporal Factors

	NUMBER OF ESCAPEES	PERCENTAGE %
ESCAPE IN MORNING (24:00 HOURS TO 08:00 HOURS)	6	17.1
ESCAPE IN DAY (08:00 HOURS TO 16:00 HOURS)	11	31.4
ESCAPE IN EVENING (16:00 HOURS TO 24:00 HOURS)	18	51.4
ESCAPE ON WEEK DAYS (MONDAY TO FRIDAY)	33	94.3
ESCAPE ON WEEKENDS (SATURDAY AND SUNDAY)	2	5.7
SEASON OF ESCAPE - SPRING	11	31.4
SEASON OF ESCAPE - SUMMER	13	37.1
SEASON OF ESCAPE - FALL	6	17.1
SEASON OF ESCAPE - WINTER	5	14.3

APPENDIX 2REASONS PRECIPITATING ESCAPE (N=35)**CASE 1**

- opportunity presented itself;
- inmate heard about the escape plot and took the chance.

CASE 2

- opportunity presented itself;
- inmate heard about the escape plot and took the chance.

CASE 3

- inmate was under influence of intoxicants at the time of escape.

CASE 4

- mother was ill.

CASE 5

- inmate's day parole was suspended by NPB, and the inmate was to be transferred to another institution;
 - inmate was under influence of intoxicants at the time of escape.

CASE 6

- inmate's wife was physically threatened by someone on the outside;
- inmate was under 'protected custody;' he was an informant and had problems with inmate peers - both inmate and wife had been crown witnesses in a murder case.

CASE 7

- inmate considered for detention - no M.S.;
- had problems with relationship with girlfriend;
- he was depressed.

CASE 8

- full parole denied and review date was set for a later date;
 - inmate was under influence of intoxicants at the time of escape.

CASE 9

- inmate was depressed and bored;
- he could not assimilate with other inmates - had problems with them.

CASE 10

- girlfriend was pregnant and threatened to leave him;
- inmate had outstanding criminal charges;
- had problems with inmate peers (drug debts, under protected custody).

CASE 11

- heard about the escape plan from other inmates;
 - opportunity presented itself.

CASE 12

- co-accused threatened him;
 - he was stabbed by the co-accused several months before the escape;
- opportunity presented itself.

CASE 13

- inmate was under influence of intoxicants at the time of escape.

CASE 14

- inmate had outstanding criminal charges - afraid of getting longer sentence.

CASE 15

- wanted to see girlfriend due to relationship problems;
- inmate was under influence of intoxicants at the time of escape.

CASE 16

- inmate had outstanding criminal charges (robbery).

CASE 17

- denied transfer to minimum security; and denied temporary absences (passes) and day parole;
- inmate had outstanding criminal charges.

CASE 18

- inmate was under influence of intoxicants at the time of escape;
- day parole denied;
- problems with inmate peers (he was under protective custody).

CASE 19

- full parole denied;
- he was depressed - recently held in segregation due to behavioural problems, and was threatened by staff to be returned to segregation because of continued poor

behaviour.

CASE 20

- inmate wanted to go out to celebrate St. Jean Baptist holiday and "get drunk".

CASE 21

- inmate witnessed his friend's murder by other inmates in the institution and was subsequently threatened by them for being the crown witness in that murder;
- inmate had an outstanding criminal charge;
- he was in segregation for behavioural problems.

CASE 22

- inmate had outstanding criminal charges (murder).
- he was in segregation for behavioural problems.

CASE 23

- inmate had outstanding criminal charges.

CASE 24

- inmate's friend was experiencing family crises on the outside.

CASE 25

- did not accept the recent decision of the court of appeal for his current sentence.

CASE 26

- unhappy about NPB decision to revoke his M.S.

CASE 27

- inmate had outstanding criminal charges (robbery) - afraid of getting longer sentence.

CASE 28

- nurse would not give inmate treatment/care;
- heard about escape plan from other inmates - opportunity presented itself.

CASE 29

- heard about escape plan from other inmates - opportunity presented itself.

CASE 30

- inmate had outstanding criminal charges (robbery).

CASE 31

- inmate was in segregation due to behavioural problems;
- heard about escape plan from other inmates - opportunity presented itself.

CASE 32

- inmate was under influence of intoxicants at the time of escape.

CASE 33

- wanted to help girlfriend who was experiencing problems;
- inmate had outstanding criminal charges;
- he was having problems with other inmates (he was under protective custody).

CASE 34

- inmate was rejected by peers - received threats from other inmates;
- inmate had outstanding criminal charges;
- parole suspended and temporarily detained.

CASE 35

- inmate felt that his day parole revocation was unjustified;
- his brother was having serious drug abuse problems in the outside;
- inmate was under influence of intoxicants at the time of escape;
- had problems with inmate peers (drug debts, informant, protective custody case).