INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction:

- 1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.**
- 2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.**
- 3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.**
- 4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.**
- 5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.**

Xerox University Microfilms

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

73-26,769

BARTOLLAS, Clemens Lester, 1935-
RUNAWAYS AT THE TRAINING INSTITUTION, CENTRAL
OHIO.

The Ohio State University, Ph.D., 1973
Sociology, criminology

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

© Copyright by
Clemens Lester Bartollas

1973

RUNAWAYS AT THE TRAINING INSTITUTION

CENTRAL OHIO

DISSERTATION

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree Doctor of Philosophy in the Graduate
School of The Ohio State University

By

Clemens Lester Bartollas, B.A., B.D., S.T.M.

* * * * *

The Ohio State University
1973

Reading Committee:

Walter C. Reckless
Harry Allen

Approved by

Adviser
Department of Sociology

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author is indebted to those whose efforts have made this dissertation a reality. Mr. Howard Ware was especially kind in permitting the use of records in Classification and Assignment at a time when his facilities were so crowded that there was not even room to sit down.

Several thanks are due those members of the Ohio Youth Commission who went out of their way to answer questions. I am grateful to Dr. Craig Mosier, Mrs. Rosalind Bailey, and Mr. Dick Judy for their help on special problems, and to Mr. William K. Willis, Deputy Director of Correctional Services, and Mr. C. B. Hayslett, Research Director of the OYC, for their approval of the project and help whenever needed.

Many staff members at TICO provided invaluable assistance. Chief among these were Mr. Albert Harrington, Superintendent, and Mr. Charles Hill, Deputy Superintendent of Direct Services, for their approval and encouragement of the project. I will always be grateful to Mr. Harry Zibners, Director of Guidance, for his support and encouragement through four years of graduate school. Mrs. Sara Martin provided invaluable help in locating information, and

Mrs. Grace Pentz was extremely helpful in the secretarial services she offered. Miss Norma Dixon was always willing to give her opinion and to encourage the staff on her wing to cooperate in the research process. Mr. John Hall went out of his way to answer questions and to provide missing information. Finally, I frequently went to my mentor, Mr. James Roberts, when I was faced with a difficult problem, and in his quiet way, he would clarify the issues.

Two Ohio State University students, David Paris and Howard Young, worked long and diligently on the detailed but critical task of preparing the data for coding and statistical manipulation. Mr. Samuel Brown, who was incarcerated at TICO during this study, was also helpful on various aspects of the information.

There is no question, however, that without the help of the following this dissertation would still be in the doing. Dr. Stuart Miller was a constant guide and critic through the various stages of the dissertation. He was always helpful, regardless of the demands of his own schedule. Mr. Donald Smeltzer was the computer expert who always found ways to resolve the problems which I brought to him. My wife has been my greatest fan the past four years, which has been fortunate because graduate students need all the support they can get.

My sincere appreciation is also extended to the members of the Department of Sociology at The Ohio State University, who have provided encouragement and support over the years. Professors Russell Dynes and Simon Dinitz have been outstanding in their guidance, support, and patience. Finally, to Dr. Dinitz, my most grateful and sincere appreciation for the encouragement and support you have given over the years.

VITA

July 19, 1935 . . .	Born - Wheeling, West Virginia
1958	B.A., Davis and Elkins College, Elkins, West Virginia
1961	B.D., Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, New Jersey
1969	S.T.M., San Francisco Theological Seminary, San Anselmo, California
1972	Teaching Associate, Department of Sociology, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio
1972-1973	Instructor, Adult Education Division, Ohio Dominican College, Columbus, Ohio

FIELDS OF STUDY

Major Fields: Criminology, Complex Organizations, Social
Stratification, and Sociology of Religion

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
VITA	v
LIST OF TABLES	viii
 Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Early Studies	
Current Studies--European	
Current Studies--American	
II. METHODOLOGY	18
The Setting of this Study	
Selection of Sample	
Null Hypotheses	
Operationalization of Background	
Data	
Definitions of Variables	
Jesness Inventory	
Interviews	
Staff Evaluation of Exploitation	
Participant Observation	
Documents	
Statistical Analysis	
III. FINDINGS, DEMOGRAPHY AND CRIMINAL HISTORY	
ANALYSIS	53
Demographic Characteristics	
Criminal History Variables	
Adjustment before TICO	

Chapter	Page
IV. FINDINGS: ADJUSTMENT AT TICO	76
Adjustment at TICO	
Post-Institutional Adjustment	
Personality Dimensions	
Jesness Inventory	
The Runaway Reaction	
V. PROFILE OF A RUNAWAY	108
Two Types of Runners	
Profile of the Average Runaway	
Profile of the Average Attempted	
Runaway	
Interaction between Structural and	
Personality Variables	
Home Visits	
VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	136
Significant Variables	
Testing the Null Hypotheses	
Two Types of Runners	
Profile of a Runaway	
Interaction between Structural and	
Personality Variables	
Home Visits	
Contributions to Criminological Research	
Needed Research on Runaways in Juvenile	
Institutions	
Recommendations	
APPENDIX	
A. Superintendents and Runaways at TICO	161
B. Code Key of Final Schedule for Case	
Folders	163
C. Classification of Offenses	173
D. Psychiatric Diagnosis	178
E. Interview Schedule	180
BIBLIOGRAPHY	182

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Distribution of County Size of Controls, Runaways, and Attempted Runaway Subjects . . .	54
2. Distribution of Race of Controls, Runaways, and Attempted Runaway Subjects	55
3. Distribution of Family Status at Incarceration of Controls, Runaways, and Attempted Runaway Subjects	57
4. Distribution of Family Rejection of Controls, Runaways, and Attempted Runaway Subjects . . .	58
5. Mean Age at Commitment to TICO of Controls, Runaways, and Attempted Runaway Subjects . . .	59
6. Distribution of Siblings of Controls, Runaways, and Attempted Runaway Subjects	60
7. Mean Height and Weight of Controls, Runaways, and Attempted Runaway Subjects	62
8. Classification of Offenses by Seriousness of Controls, Runaways, and Attempted Runaway Subjects	63
9. Classification of Offenses which Culminated in Present Commitment to TICO of Controls, Runaways, and Attempted Runaway Subjects	64
10. Drugs and Alcohol Abuse Committed by Controls, Runaways, and Attempted Runaway Subjects . . .	65
11. Distribution of Suffixes of Controls, Runaways, and Attempted Runaway Subjects	67
12. Distribution of Number of Times Committed to the OYC of Controls, Runaways, and Attempted Runaway Subjects	69

Table	Page
13. Distribution of Runaway Behavior at Prior OYC Institutions of Controls, Runaways, and Attempted Runaway Subjects	70
14. Distribution of Months at Other OYC Institu- tions of Controls, Runaways, and Attempted Runaway Subjects	73
15. Mean Number of Months at TICO for Controls, Runaways, and Attempted Runaway Subjects . . .	77
16. Distribution of Home Visits Among Controls, Runaways, and Attempted Runaway Subjects . . .	78
17. Distribution of Disciplinary Meetings at TICO Among Controls, Runaways, and Attempted Runaway Subjects	79
18. Distribution of Completed Year in School at TICO Among Controls, Runaways, and Attempted Runaway Subjects	83
19. Distribution of Grades in School at TICO Among Controls, Runaways, and Attempted Runaway Subjects	85
20. Distribution of Outcome from Parole of Controls, Runaways, and Attempted Runaway Subjects	87
21. Mean IQ at TICO for Controls, Runaways, and Attempted Runaway Subjects	88
22. Distribution of Psychiatric Diagnosis Among Controls, Runaways, and Attempted Runaway Subjects	89
23. Mean Scores of the Jesness Inventory of Controls, Runaways, and Attempted Runaway Subjects	90
24. Distribution of Runaways from TICO Among Runaways and Attempted Runaway Subjects . . .	94
25. Distribution by Cottage of Runaways and Attempted Runaway Subjects	96

Table	Page
26. Distribution of Runaways and Attempted Runaway Subjects from School	97
27. Distribution by Month of Runaways and Attempted Runaways	99
28. Distribution of Days of Runaways and Attempted Runaways	100
29. Distribution of Time of Day of Runaways and Attempted Runaways	101

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This study concerns the problem of the runaway student at the Training Institution, Central Ohio--the maximum security institution of the Ohio Youth Commission located in Columbus. It is our central thesis that a boy becomes a runaway at this institution when he is faced with an unmanageable situation which he feels is unshareable. Before attempting to test this thesis, preliminary investigation at TICO revealed 145 runaway events involving 125 different boys in the period January of 1970 through October of 1972. In addition to the successful escapees, there were 39 other students who attempted to escape during the same period.

These 125 escapees, of whom a few then committed violent crimes, have made Columbus quite sensitive to and very intolerant of the runaway problem at the Training Institution, Central Ohio. As a result of public pressure, it is and has been vital for TICO to reduce the number of its runaways. Since the escapee threat has always hindered treatment programming at the institution, actions which

reduce this threat are likely to promote rehabilitative and innovative management practices.

In order to reduce the escapee problem, however, it will be necessary (1) to determine the special characteristics of runaways--those traits which differentiate them from non-runaways; (2) to ascertain what constellation of factors in institutional life serve as catalytic agents to those boys who have a propensity for running away; and (3) to design special treatment programs for boys who are prone to escape, so that they need to resort less frequently to this response.

The perennial institutional problem of runaways has not escaped the attention of previous researchers. There are over twenty major studies, mostly in the United States, which have attempted to examine the runaway phenomenon in juvenile and adult correctional settings. These studies, however, are generally at variance in their conclusions because the populations, methods, and approaches employed were different.

Early Studies

In one of the earliest attempts to deal with the problem of runaways, Zena O'Connor studied 119 runaways at the Children's Village in Dobbs Ferry, New York, in the late 1920's and early 1930's.¹ When she matched these runaways with 125 boys who had never run away, she

discovered that the only reliable difference between the runaway and control groups was chronological age.² Runaways tended to be significantly older than non-runaways.³

One of the most interesting and important aspects of O'Connor's research was the interviews she had with runaway boys who were returned to the institution. It was her impression, gleaned from these interviews, that most runaways were conditioned to this pattern of behavior before arriving at the institution and that they had more difficulty in adjusting to institutional life.⁴ In order of frequency, her respondents claimed that they had fled because of injustice in the institution, the desire to return home, boredom in school, conflict with cottage leaders, and their inability "to take it."⁵

In his article, "Escapees and Their Control: A Brief Study of Escape Data," Nelson Cochrane studied 60 escapes from the State Prison Colony in Norfolk, Massachusetts from 1928 to 1937.⁶ Cochrane found that all types of individuals had escaped from Norfolk. He concluded that the typical security risk faced a parole hearing in less than six months, was a first offender, was more than 35 years of age, had finished at least half his sentence, and had been a steady worker in the community prior to his incarceration.⁷

In a third significant early study, Cornelia Keogh examined the records of 200 boys who had absconded from the

Whittier State School between 1928 and 1933.⁸ This group was compared with a group of 400 consecutive admissions to the Whittier State School between 1928 and 1930. Although she found that there were only slight differences between the runaway and the total group of delinquents at the Whittier State School, the runaways' profile featured a greater percentage of broken homes, a more frequent history of running away from home and truancy from school, and a less satisfactory parole adjustment in the past.⁹

Following the publication of these studies, interest in the subject of escapes from institutions waned dramatically.¹⁰ But beginning again in the mid-1950's, interest revived in the problem of escape. One of the major reasons for this revival of interest in escape from institutions was the increased willingness of administrators in the 1950's to permit research within their institutions.¹¹ There is also no question that "joints" became less fortress-like, making escape easier and encouraging personnel to seek escape profiles of prisoners.

Current Studies--European

In an important study, Gunasekara investigated the problem of runaways in approved (training) schools in England and Wales.¹² He concluded that a boy ran away when he was unable to resolve his conflicts within the setting of the institution. Gunasekara saw the runaway as one who

arrived at the approved school confused and bewildered and whose running was a flight from conflict. It was his opinion that the runaway had a low frustration tolerance and would flee when confronted with slight irritations.¹³

While there has been some debate in Europe as to whether psychological disturbance contributes to runaway reaction in adolescence, D. N. Martin and R. V. G. Clarke have been the most articulate in denying that there are significant personality differences between runaways and non-runaways.¹⁴ In their article, "The Personality of Approved School Boy Absconders," they replicated other studies which assessed personality traits of absconders and non-absconders, using the Junior Maudsley Personality Inventory, the Spiral Maze, the Jesness Inventory, and the Junior-Senior High School Personality Questionnaire. Since absconders did not differ from non-absconders in their scores on the above tests, they concluded that runaways appeared to be a representative sample from the approved school population in terms of personality traits and emotional adjustment.¹⁵

J. O. Carter's article, "Absconding at Dover Borstal," has also been cited in the literature. Utilizing schedules completed by housemasters and other youth leaders as soon as possible after a runaway, this study failed to present any definitive conclusions but suggested that one

of the underlying reasons for runaways was that the boys did not perceive themselves as receiving any benefit from their time at the borstal.¹⁶

Current Studies--American

Importance of personality characteristics

Comparing 70 youths who had attempted to escape with a control group of 220 non-runaways, J. S. Aaron failed to discover any statistically reliable personality differences in his M.S.W. thesis, "A Study of Escapees: Their Sociometric Status and Personality." Instead of seeing the runaways as socially or emotionally maladjusted, Aaron felt that they were merely reacting "to a temporary maladjustment due to an abnormal social situation."¹⁷

But even more important was the study done by Herbert Beall and James Panton who administered the booklet form of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory to 413 male felons at the Reception Center in Central Prison, Raleigh, North Carolina. The 103 inmates who had escaped served as the "experimental group," and the "control group" was made up of 100 non-escapees chosen at random.¹⁸ Conclusions drawn from this study were that the propensity for escape derived, at least in part, from a constellation of personality variables and that these 42 MMPI items could serve as an index to escapism and could be used as a more

objective method to classify new prison admissions. These 42 items appeared to operate separately from any scale or group of scales of the MMPI.¹⁹

Since Beall and Panton's study, there have been several others which have validated the reliability of the Beall and Panton's Escapism scale.²⁰ One of the most interesting was David Pierce's attempt to assess the predictive effectiveness of the Beall and Panton's scale. In his study, he administered the booklet form of the MMPI to newly admitted inmates of the Iowa State Reformatory. He used a higher cut-off point than Beall and Panton had used, and discovered that he could identify an even higher percentage of individuals who had a propensity for escape.²¹

Profile of runaways

According to Renteria and Holt, the youth who is escape prone is white, was raised by a mother or grandmother alone, became known to the juvenile court for incorrigibility, has a history of failure, especially in school, has difficulty forming friendships, even with peers, and is unable emotionally to deal with failure.²²

Richard Hildebrand considered a wide range of variables in his article, "The Anatomy of Escape," and concluded that the typical Preston School of Industry escapee is a 17-year-old, white youth, who had completed four months in the institution. He escaped in July, on a Saturday, at

8 P.M., and probably was assigned to the farm. If he was not on the farm, then he more than likely was on a home visit or lived in a dormitory within the compound near the fence. He, no doubt, had tried to escape before.²³

In his study at the Illinois State Training School for Boys, Stanley Levine found that white boys, returnees, and rural boys were far more likely to run away than were Negro boys, urban youth, and boys committed for the first time. He also found that boys who were committed for assault were less likely to run away than were those committed for the use of alcohol or narcotics.²⁴

William Morrow discovered that male psychiatric inmates who had tried to escape from the maximum security building at the Fulton State Hospital in Missouri tended to be younger, more often penitentiary transfers, less often "criminal sexual psychopaths," more often had been convicted of several felonies, more often lacked job stability, and more often were the oldest siblings in their families.²⁵

In studying the 50 inmates who had tried to escape from the state's minimum security prison at Boykin, South Carolina, David Morgan found the following variables to be significant beyond the one per cent level of confidence: More inmates escaped who were single, were serving sentences of five years or less, had no one dependent on them for support, had attained a secondary education, were younger than

24.5 years, had an IQ above 96.5, had only been committed once to the South Carolina State Penitentiary, and had served less than half of their sentence.²⁶

J. O. Standley described a prediction table in his article, "Treatment Oriented Security Screening," which was being developed by the Texas Department of Corrections for minimum security programs. In developing this table, it was found that inmates likely to escape had contacts outside the institution, a record of two or more prior commitments to adult institutions, a tested educational achievement of 8th grade, one or more detainers on file, a high degree of geographic mobility, an IQ of 90 or better, committed offenses against persons, serving a sentence of ten years or more, and were 24 to 30 years of age.²⁷

In Ohio, John Canney has worked with the runaway problem for years. As Deputy Warden responsible for treatment at the London Correctional Institution, he has recently developed a profile of the young adult who tries to escape. If he is white, Canney has found that a profile including auto stealing, a weak father figure, extensive movement within the institution, and residence in foster homes prior to age 15 are major factors in predicting his escaping in the spring and summer. Minor factors predicting his escaping are a previous escape record, a second hearing pending, below age 33, and a nomadic existence outside the institution. According to Canney, whites who escaped during the

winter tended to be alcoholic isolates but were difficult to predict using the above major and minor factors. Blacks who escaped had assaultive and aggressive histories, had extensive movement inside the institution, were high in athletic participation, had a previous escape record, had a second hearing pending, were below age 33, and led a nomadic life outside the institution.²⁸

Interrelationships of variables

While Farrington, Shelton, and MacKay failed to discover any single causal factor to explain the runaway of 28 children at the Spaulding Youth Center in Tilton, New Hampshire, a number of significant constructs (crisis situations, withdrawal, attention-getting, and impaired family relationships) did emerge from their study. Their article pointed out that there was a strong likelihood that the youth would run away when one or more of these constructs was present.²⁹

W. S. Loving, F. E. Stockwell, and D. A. Dobbins studied 100 white male inmates of the Louisiana State Penitentiary who had escaped and discovered two clusters of four variables each which demonstrated interrelationships: Cluster 1--"Transient Criminality" which included the years of residence in Louisiana, mileage to home state, number of penitentiary commitments elsewhere, and size of community; and Cluster 2--"Early Criminal History" which included the

number of juvenile commitments, age at first arrest, number of dependents, and commission of property crimes.³⁰

In an interesting study done by the Research Division, California Department of Corrections, Arlene Baker and others have studied escapes from adult camps of California during 1959-1960. When this study is cited in the literature, it is usually because of their "Escape-Proneness Scale."³¹

In this "Escape-Proneness Scale," the authors included those variables which were statistically significant on the chi square tests. These were commitment for robbery, under 35 years of age, previous escape history, not committed for narcotics, white, paroled and returned at least once as a violator, one or more prior prison commitments, above normal intelligence, and grade placement of 7.5 or above. They then used these nine variables and found nine combinations of two variables which were statistically significant on the chi square test. Extending their analysis a step further, they were able to find eleven combinations of three variables which were significant on the chi square test.³²

The "Escape-Proneness Score" was tabulated by giving each inmate one point for each characteristic he possessed on items 1-9, two points for each of the combinations of two characteristics on items 10-18, and three

points for each of the combinations of three characteristics on items 19-29. Utilizing this scoring technique, they found that the mean score for the camp escapees was 16.95, while the mean score for the non-escapees was only 8.29. The difference between these two means was statistically significant at the .001 level.³³

Steven Lubeck and Lamar Empey have contributed one of the most valuable studies on runaways in their "Mediatory Versus Total Institution: The Case of the Runaway." This study was concerned with the prediction and control of runaways at two correctional settings for delinquent youths. The first institution was a "mediatory" institution which had 131 runaways from an experimental community program, but the second was an isolated "total" institution which had 93 runaways during this same period of 32 months. Statistical analysis indicated that there was a complex interaction effect among the organizational characteristics of the two programs, personality characteristics of inmates, and the occurrence of runaways. Employing by far the most rigorous research methods in the runaway literature, this study clearly pointed out the importance of organizational (structural) variables upon runaway behavior.³⁴

Resolution of the
runaway problem

John Cambareri, Paul Sagers, and Donald Tatton, who were then administrators at the Utah State Industrial School, decided to investigate the high number of runaways at their institution in January of 1954. To reduce the number of runaways, they made the decision for each of them to meet with a group of boys who had accounted for 61 per cent of all the runaways during the previous year. They discovered that runaways decreased by 75 per cent after they had met with the total of 17 boys in the three groups for some time.³⁵

Levine found that the Illinois State Training School for Boys was able to reduce the number of runaways by more carefully considering the cottages to which new students were assigned, intensifying the contacts of a boy during the first week in the institution, and increasing the number of home visits.³⁶

In his article, "The Anatomy of Escape," Richard Hildebrand pointed out that the addition of an observation tower was a significant factor in reducing escapes at the Preston School.³⁷ There is no question that making the physical characteristics of the institution more secure is a standard procedure for reducing runaways in correctional settings.

Two other standard solutions to the runaway problem are in-service training on control and security for staff and additional time placed on the returned runaway. Outside of these few efforts, however, there has been a paucity of innovative ideas in the literature on reducing the number of escapes in an institution.

To conclude this review, it should be noted that there is nothing definitive in the literature about the prediction, prevention, and control of the runaway. The only exception is that whites tend to be runaways and blacks do not tend to run from institutions. All other variables used have not been found to be particularly useful.

In the next chapter, the methodology of this study of runaway youths from the Training Institution, Central Ohio will be described and discussed in detail.

Notes

¹Zena C. O'Connor, The Runaway Boy in the Correctional School (New York City: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1938).

²The two groups were matched in chronological age, I.Q., educational quotient, Rogers Personality Adjustment Test Scores, emotional stability as measured by the Woodworth-Mathews Questionnaire, and social background.

³Ibid., p. 62.

⁴Ibid., p. 65.

⁵Ibid., p. 43.

⁶Nelson N. Cochrane, "Escapes and Their Control: A Brief Study of Escape Data," The Prison World, Vol. 10 (May-June, 1948), 3-5, 28-29.

⁷Ibid., p. 29.

⁸Cornelia R. Keogh, "A Study of Runaways at a State Correctional School for Boys," Journal of Juvenile Research, Vol. 19 (April, 1935), 45-61.

⁹Ibid., pp. 60-61.

¹⁰While there was a paucity of interest in running away from institutions during the 1920's-1930's, there was considerable interest at the time in running away from home.

¹¹In a conversation with the writer, Dr. Dinitz made the statement that the opening up of institutions is what contributed to the revival of interest in escapes.

¹²M. G. S. Gunasekara, "The Problem of Absconding in Boys' Approved Schools in England and Wales," The British Journal of Criminology, Vol. 4 (October, 1963), 145-151.

¹³Ibid., pp. 150-151.

¹⁴D. N. Martin and R. V. G. Clarke, "The Personality of Approved School Boy Absconders," The British Journal of Criminology, Vol. 9 (October, 1969), 366-375.

¹⁵Ibid., pp. 372-373.

¹⁶J. O. Carter, "Absconding at Dover Borstal," Prison Service Journal, found in Excerpta Criminologica (March-April, 1964), p. 252.

¹⁷J. S. Aaron, "A Study of Escapees: Their Socio-metric Status and Personality," M.S.W. thesis, University of Toronto, 1962, found in Excerpta Criminologica (January-February, 1965), p. 107.

¹⁸Herbert S. Beall and James H. Panton, "Use of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory as an Index to Escapism," Journal of Clinical Psychology, Vol. 12 (October, 1956), 392.

¹⁹Ibid., p. 394.

²⁰Donald R. Shupe and Paul R. Bramwell, "Prediction of Escape from MMPI Data," Journal of Clinical Psychology, Vol. 19 (April, 1962), 223-226; John C. Figura, "Validity of the Beall-Panton MMPI Index to 'Escapism' in a State Training School Population," masters thesis, Loyola University of Chicago, 1962.

²¹David M. Pierce, "The Escapism Scale of the MMPI as a Predictive Index," Correctional Psychologist, Vol. 4 (May-June, 1971), 231.

²²Rudy A. Renteria and Norman Holt, "The Anatomy of Escape," American Journal of Correction, Vol. 33 (January-February, 1971), 14-15.

²³Richard J. Hildebrand, "The Anatomy of Escape," Federal Probation, Vol. 33 (March, 1969), 65.

²⁴Stanley Levine, "Runaways and Research in the Training School," Crime and Delinquency, Vol. 8 (January, 1962), 40.

²⁵William R. Morrow, "Escapes of Psychiatric Offenders," Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, Vol. 60 (December, 1969), 471.

²⁶David I. Morgan, "Individual and Situational Factors Related to Prison Escape," American Journal of Correction, Vol. 29 (March-April, 1967), 31.

²⁷J. O. Standley, "Treatment Oriented Security Screening," American Journal of Correction, Vol. 31 (March-April, 1969), 24-25.

²⁸Interview with John Canney in June of 1972. He gave the writer this unpublished prediction table and profile of an escapee.

²⁹Donald Farrington, William Shelton, and James R. MacKay, "Observations on Runaway Children from a Residential Setting," Child Welfare, Vol. 62 (June, 1963), 287-289.

³⁰W. S. Loving, F. E. Stockwell, and D. A. Dobbins, "Factors Associated with Escape Behavior of Prison Inmates," Federal Probation, Vol. 23 (September, 1959), 50-51.

³¹Arlene Baker, "Escape Study," Research Division of the California Department of Corrections, June, 1961.

³²Ibid., pp. 91-92.

³³Ibid., pp. 92-93.

³⁴Steven G. Lubeck and Lamar T. Empey, "Mediatory Versus Total Institution: The Case of the Runaway," Social Problems, Vol. 16 (Fall, 1968), 243-245.

³⁵John D. Cambareri, Paul Sagers, and Donald Tatton, "The AWOL from a Juvenile Institution," Crime and Delinquency, Vol. 6 (July, 1960), 276-277.

³⁶Levine, p. 40.

³⁷Hildebrand, pp. 39-40.

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

The Setting of this Study

The Training Institution, Central Ohio is one of ten juvenile institutions administered by the Ohio Youth Commission. TICO is a maximum security institution for older male youths who are considered to be either security risks or too aggressive to be placed in other facilities of the OYC.¹

The physical plant of this juvenile institution is made up of thirteen interconnected buildings. Eight of these buildings are cottages; each cottage contains sixteen single rooms and two four-bed dormitories. The total capacity of the institution is 192 boys. There are also classrooms and shops available for academic and vocational training; a chapel which is utilized for Roman Catholic and Protestant religious services, and for general assembly purposes; and a gymnasium and a swimming pool which are used for physical education. In addition, there is a clinic where a full-time registered nurse takes care of the medical needs of the boys.²

The TICO program has as its objective the rehabilitation of delinquent boys. To accomplish this objective,

several different treatment modalities are utilized (academic and vocational education, physical education, religious services and counseling, group work, individual casework, coeducational activities, home visits, and off-campus privileges).

Nearly every boy, at least in his early months at TICO, is enrolled in the C. Arthur Wilson High School, a fully accredited high school. Since students go to school twelve months a year, they are able to earn a high school diploma much sooner than would be possible in the community. TICO also offers vocational training courses and experience in auto shop, barbering, woodshop, welding, machine shop, food service, custodial maintenance, and print shop skills. Unless a boy is medically restricted, he can also participate in an ongoing program of physical education in football, basketball, swimming, volleyball, and softball.

TICO has a full-time Protestant chaplain and a part-time Roman Catholic chaplain who conduct religious services and are available for counseling. Group interaction takes place in each cottage as boys are placed in reality therapy or transactional analysis groups. A group work-coordinator has an ongoing program of in-service training for group leaders which maintains a high quality of group work in the institution. Each cottage has a social worker who is responsible for setting and operationalizing treatment goals for the youths in the cottage. The social

worker is also the treatment coordinator for the cottage team. Two part-time psychiatrists assist the treatment teams through individual therapeutic intervention. TICO's boys enjoy a monthly dance with girls from Scioto Village and Riverview School for Girls. Pre-release students are eligible for home visits, and students who have been recommended for release can leave the institution daily for several hours with their parents.³

TICO has undergone a number of organizational changes in the past twelve years. These organizational changes have directly affected the type of services offered boys and thus the number of runaways from the institution.

In the first few years of its existence (1961-64), TICO was organized along traditional lines, with a number of semi-independent departments--cottage, school, social work, and recreation. The general climate of the institution was rather restrictive during this time. On the assumption that a few members of the cottage life department were unduly punitive with their students and that a more therapeutic milieu was needed, the Social Service and Cottage Departments were combined. In January of 1965, the two departments were placed under the authority of a social worker; and in June of 1965, the offices of the social workers were moved into the cottages to enable the social workers to interact more directly with students.⁴

Social workers became cottage directors in June of 1967, assuming full responsibility for both management and treatment in their cottages. It was also decided during the summer of 1967 to initiate a guided-group-interaction program in the cottage units. Each student was placed in a group which met five times a week and was under the direction of the youth leader. In time interest lagged and by the end of 1969, there were only a few groups still meeting in the cottages.⁵

In June of 1970, another organizational change was initiated. Social workers ceased to be cottage directors and became treatment coordinators. While the objective of this change was to strip the social worker of his managerial responsibilities, the end result was to attenuate the formal authority of the social worker. This authority was now invested in the offices of the Wing Directors and Assistant Wing Directors. Although this change precipitated a strike by the social workers and their assistants because the cottage units did not want to lose the formal authority delegated to them, the centralized authority of the Wing Director continued up to the summer of 1972.

A new superintendent initiated another organizational change in the summer of 1972 when he informed staff that his emphasis would be on the cottage team and that authority would return to the cottages. Since this change

is still in the process of being effected, it is very much on the minds of TICO staff at the present time.

In view of the fact that organizational change has usually been associated with a change in superintendents, it would appear that the type of leadership exerted by superintendents is directly related to the number of runaways from TICO. While the first superintendent, for example, had a low rate of runaways, the next three superintendents had a high rate of runaways.⁶ The present superintendent, however, has had a much lower rate of runaways than his predecessors; and, in fact, his rate is as low as that of the first superintendent.

Selection of Sample

As noted previously, this study concerns the problem of the runaways at the Training Institution, Central Ohio. The first step, therefore, involved compiling a roster of all boys who had attempted to run away and who successfully fled during the period of January 1970 through October 1972. In a painstaking review of all institutional records, it was discovered that there were 145 runaway events involving 125 different boys during this time. In addition, there were 39 attempted but unsuccessful runaways during this same time period.⁷

In this study, a boy was considered a runaway when he (1) left institutional property without permission,

(2) failed to return from a scheduled off-grounds visit or home furlough, (3) fled from assigned employee supervision, or (4) forcibly left the confines of the buildings and property of the institution.⁸

The criteria for an attempted runaway in this study were that the boy's cottage defined the incident as a runaway attempt and that the student was apprehended before he was able to escape very far from the institution. When there was some question whether the incident was a runaway attempt or a successful runaway, the superintendent made the final decision.⁹

Runaways and attempted runaways were compared on all relevant dimensions with comparison subjects. The latter were selected on the basis that each of the boys was the next admission after the runaway. After ascertaining the names of the runaways and attempted runaway subjects, it was necessary to discover when they were admitted to the institution, facts contained in the institutional roster. The names which were the next admission after the runaways and attempted runaways were utilized then as the control population.

While no attempt was made to control for other variables, such as IQ, height, weight, previous escapes, family backgrounds, or personality characteristics, it was found that the control sample compared favorably well to

the total population at TICO. The size of county of commitment, psychiatric classification, age, and criminal offenses, for example, were very similar for the control group and the total TICO population. The only major differences between the control sample and the total population were that the IQ of the controls was slightly higher and there was a greater percentage of blacks in the TICO population than there was in the control sample.

Whether the attempted runaways should be included with the actual runaways or be kept separate in the analysis was not a simple problem to resolve. On the one hand, there are at least two plausible reasons why they should be kept separate: (1) There is reason to believe that the youth who wants to abscond from TICO usually is able to accomplish his purpose, which is reflected in the high rate of successful runaway events (79.5 per cent) and the fact that some runaways were able to escape several times. This suggests that the 39 attempted runaways lacked the serious intent of the youths who made it. (2) Each cottage has its own standards for what constitutes a runaway event. While wearing a pair of street pants under state clothes, for example, would be considered a runaway attempt in some cottages, this definition would not be used in other cottages. But more serious than the lack of uniformity is the fact that the staff of a cottage could be wrong in their

accusation that a youth was involved in an attempt to run from the institution.¹⁰ This is especially true when a boy is apprehended before the attempt takes place, which assumes that a runaway plot or plan is the same as a runaway event. As a result, the possibility of the boy's changing his mind is ignored. He may, for instance, decide not to use the hack saw blades he has acquired.

On the other hand, a strong argument can be made for including the attempted runaways with the runaway sample in the analysis. (1) Many of the attempted runaways were able to escape from the confines of the institution and were able to avoid being apprehended longer than some of those who were counted as runaways. This occurred because one of the superintendents considered it a runaway attempt as long as a boy was in sight of someone, regardless of how far he was from the institution.¹¹ (2) It is also a fact that most of the attempted runaways were thwarted by the quick reaction of staff, which suggests that staff awareness rather than lack of serious intent is why they were apprehended. (3) Since almost all of the boys about whose runaway attempt there was some question were interviewed, it was possible to check the accounts of boys who denied their implication or involvement in runaway attempts.¹² If a boy denied his participation and there were not strong evidence to substantiate the judgment of staff, he was removed from the attempted runaway sample.¹³

The decision was finally made to keep the actual runaways separate from the attempted runaways in the analysis. In view of the difficulty of other studies of finding statistically significant differences between runaway and control populations, it was felt that it would be more reasonable to keep the research design as simple as possible.

Null Hypotheses

In this study, the following null hypotheses will be tested:

1. There is no personality constellation which defines the runaway population.
2. There is no relationship between organizational change and runaway behavior.
3. There is no relationship between cottage assignment and runaway behavior.
4. There is no relationship between race and runaway behavior.
5. There is no relationship between race and solo runaways.
6. There is no relationship between race and companionate runaways.
7. There is no relationship between criminal offense and runaway behavior.

Even though these null hypotheses will be tested, this study remains exploratory in nature. As a result, other variables above and beyond the ones needed to test the null hypotheses will be investigated. These additional

variables include height, weight, number of siblings, siblings in other correctional settings, family backgrounds, history of runaways, time in OYC institutions before TICO, time in TICO before runaway, intelligence, home visits, pre-release status before runaway, release status before runaway, psychiatric hospitalization, number of previous commitments to OYC institutions, post-institutional adjustment, year completed in school, type of school program, grades in school, month of runaway, day of runaway, and time of day of runaway. It is hoped that one or more clusters of variables will be found which will elucidate the runaway problem and be generalizable beyond this population.

Operationalization of Background Data

It was necessary to collect background data on both runaways and controls. Since there was personal familiarity with the case folders of TICO boys, it was possible to construct a preliminary schedule without spending any additional time surveying the materials found in the folders. Following the construction of the schedule, it was circulated to others who suggested additional modifications.¹⁴ Even after a final revised form was agreed upon, the actual process of going through the folders resulted in further modifications of the schedule.¹⁵

There were no problems with the case folders of boys who were still at TICO. Their folders were generally complete and well organized. It was more difficult, however, to gain the necessary data for boys who had been released from TICO. This was particularly true with boys whose serial numbers were under 7000. These files were placed in boxes more or less randomly at one of the buildings of the Juvenile Diagnostic Center. As a result, it was necessary to utilize the duplicate case folders at TICO of boys whose folders could not be located at the Juvenile Diagnostic Center. In these few cases, the duplicate folders at TICO contained anywhere from only three to four sheets to nearly as much information as was found in the original folder. Fortunately, cross-referencing of information resulted in fairly complete data recovery.

Nevertheless, accuracy was still open to question for several reasons: (1) It was possible for the coder to overlook information which was contained in the folder; (2) in view of the fact that the information included in the folders was sometimes written up by social workers and sometimes by psychiatrists, psychologists, court officers, parole officers, and cottage leaders, there were wide variations in the language and perspectives which were used; (3) the return of a student who was on parole to the Ohio Youth Commission sometimes resulted in the failure to bring

his records up to date; and (4) discrepancies occasionally arose from the transfer of information between institutions.

Gross discrepancies were found in the case folders on the following information: family backgrounds, number of institutions in which the youth had been incarcerated, nature of past crimes, runaways at OYC institutions, number of runaway attempts at TICO, adjustment at OYC institutions, and school performance at TICO. Some of the more important problems encountered in the data collection are discussed below.

Definitions of Variables

Boy's name and OYC number

While the original background information sheets contained the student's name, his OYC number was coded into all decks of the IBM cards. His TICO number was not used.

Suffix

The "R" and "E" suffixes, which are attached to the serial number of a student by a psychiatrist at the Juvenile Diagnostic Center, were included because they serve as a labeling device. When the judgment is made that the youth is aggressive and dangerous to himself and others, he is given an "R" suffix. The "E" suffix is given to a youth when it is thought that he evidences emotional disturbance which will interfere with his functioning in the community.¹⁶ Before he can be released, it is necessary that a

student be examined by a psychiatrist and have his suffix cleared. While there have been boys sent to TICO in the past who have both an "R" and an "E," the last suffix is the one which has to be cleared.

Upon being returned to the OYC from placement, a boy frequently has his "R" or "E" reinstituted. As a result, there are some in the sample who have had their suffix cleared two or three times, which makes it much more difficult to ascertain the impact of the suffix on the youth and its relationship to a runaway event.

County size

In view of the fact that home towns were not always known and boys sometimes lived in rural areas, the size of students' counties rather than home towns was used as a basic variable.

Status of natural parents

Following precedent, family status was divided into the following categories: (1) intact; (2) divorced, separated, or deserted; (3) one or both dead; and (4) multiple problems. The category of "intact" was used if the youth's parents were still together and there were no basic problems in the home. In addition to homes broken by divorce, category two was used if the child was illegitimate or one parent was out of the home in a total institution.

(mental hospital, prison, or rest home). The third category was utilized when one or both parents were deceased. If there was more than one problem in the home, then the "multiple problems" category was coded.¹⁷

Lived with mother under age 10

The difficulty arose in this question with those boys who had been in and out of the mother's home in order to stay with grandparents, relatives, or foster parents. If a boy was out of the home for more than a few weeks during the first ten years of his life, then this category was coded as "no."

Conflict in the home

Although it was hoped that rejection in the home was a variable which would discriminate between runaways and controls, it was discovered that the vast majority of the controls, runaways, and attempted runaway subjects had been rejected in one way or the other by parents. This rejection in the home was clearly reflected in the social histories found in the case folders.

Number of siblings in home

This category included both step-siblings and siblings who had ever been in the home. It was a precise category and one routinely found in the case folders.

Ranking in birth order of family

Outside of a few cases in which there was no information on the ages of the siblings, this category presented no problems.

Siblings in correctional institutions

Siblings were only included in this category who had actually been incarcerated in either juvenile or adult institutions. Being placed in a county or city jail for a few days, for example, was not included. One problem with this question was that it failed to pick up those siblings who were in frequent difficulty with the law but who had not been processed through the juvenile or criminal justice systems.

Height and weight

There were several problems with "height" and "weight" of boys. The most serious was that these were taken from the Juvenile Diagnostic Center's work-ups which sometimes were several years old. As a result, some boys were several inches taller and many pounds heavier than they were when first examined at JDC.

Most serious previous offense
and offense culminating in
present commitment to TICO

The question having to do with the "most serious previous offense" was interpreted to mean the most serious

one preceding the offense for which the boy was committed to the OYC and then transferred to TICO. The question having to do with the "offense culminating in present commitment to TICO" was interpreted to mean the offense in the community which resulted in the youth's being sent or returned to the OYC and transferred to TICO. In view of the fact that boys are sent to TICO from other institutions because of negative and sometimes assaultive behavior toward staff, the failure to note anti-social behavior in another institution could misrepresent the pattern of behavior of a delinquent.¹⁸ To illustrate, it is not uncommon for a youth to be committed to the OYC for incorrigibility and then be transferred to TICO for assault of a staff member in another facility of the OYC.

Delinquencies were classified in both of these questions as to whether they were "serious," "moderate," or "slight" in the eyes of the law. In deciding how the various offenses committed by juveniles should be classified, the decision was made to utilize the Reckless and Dinitz classification and its modification for juveniles used by Miller.¹⁹

Drugs and alcohol abuse

If a youth was ever involved in narcotics or arrested for drunkenness, this was noted as "drugs and alcohol abuse." Reporting appears to be a major problem in

this category, for there seem to be few delinquents who have never been involved with drugs or been intoxicated.²⁰

Group or loner delinquent

The paucity of information on this variable tended to limit its utility for discriminating between runaways and controls. Although it was decided to consider only the offenses which resulted in the last commitment to the OYC, court records referring to this offense frequently were not in the case folder, court records did not always indicate whether the particular boy was alone or with others, and this offense was sometimes deviant from the pattern of previous offenses.

Number of times committed to the institutions of the OYC

Even though the suffix following the serial number is supposed to represent the number of times the youth was committed by a county in Ohio to the OYC, there has been some tendency to change this suffix only on the return of the boy to Fairfield School for Boys. Consequently, it was necessary to refer to more than the suffix.²¹

Return to the institution as a runaway, however, was not counted because a boy usually was returned when he had been away from the institution for only a few days. Stays in other total institutions, such as mental hospitals and jails, also were not counted. But when a youth was

released and returned home, any return to OYC facilities was counted.

Number of runaways at OYC
institutions before TICO

The Youth Commission records tended to include as runaways only those boys who escaped from the Fairfield School for Boys. Runaways from honor camps, Cuyahoga School for Boys, and Juvenile Diagnostic Center were not always noted in the records. The records also failed to include runaway attempts from other OYC institutions.

Total time in OYC in months

Outside of the few folders in which dates were missing, there were no problems with this question. When dates were missing, this was recorded as "no information." Mental hospitals, detention homes, and non-OYC juvenile institutions were not included in the months spent in OYC institutions.

Age at commitment to TICO

This was a simple matter of tabulating the age and converting it into months. When more than fifteen days were involved, another month was added to the age of the youth.

Number of runaways from TICO

While space was left for coding up to six runaways (including attempted runaways), no one in the runaway population had more than five runaways.²²

Total months in TICO

July 31 was used as the deadline for those boys who had not been released from the institution and who were still involved in the study. When more than fifteen days were involved, another month was added to the length of stay. It also should be noted that the time a youth was away from TICO on runaway status was subtracted from his total time in TICO.

Number of runaways from different areas

Several problems arose in handling these data. The first was that no category initially was included for an outside job, but this was resolved by eliminating the "total number of runaways" category and placing those who ran from an outside job in this category. A second problem was the fact that a number of runaways took place when a student was on his way back to the cottage from the academic area or on his way to the academic area. Since the cottage is responsible for delivering the student to school and for picking him up after school, this was treated as a responsibility of the cottage. When a youth absconded from the

recreation field, this was charged against the cottage because the cottage staff retains responsibility for supervising students while they participate in athletic contests. A more difficult problem presented itself in coding the category "off campus (institutional staff)," for it was discovered that two types of runaways took place off campus with institutional staff. The first was when a boy ran from a dental clinic, hospital, or funeral home when he was being supervised by a staff member and was on progress status; the other was when a boy ran from an off campus trip, such as bowling, dance, track meet, state fair or softball game, when he was on pre-release status.²³ In view of the few cases involved, no effort was made to refine this category.

Month of runaway, day of runaway,
and time of day runaway took place

Although the records always contained the month and day of the runaway, they frequently lacked the information on the time of day the runaway took place, especially on runaway attempts. This was so because the only written record on runaway attempts was the disciplinary meeting, which frequently did not mention the time when the attempt took place.

It was possible, of course, to check this out with the staff who were in the cottage, but this was relying on

the memory of staff members on events which were sometimes a year or two old. In determining when a runaway event took place, a second problem became apparent in those instances when a student was in the process of sawing the bars on his window or cutting his way through the block wall in his room. Therefore, it was decided to code the time at which the student was apprehended in his runaway attempt, even though he could have been working on this task for several days.

Pre-release and release status
at time of first runaway

The only problem which arose here is that frequently the time when a student received pre-release or was placed on release status was not recorded in the case folder. In cases when there was some question about the status of a student at the time of his runaway, inquiry was made of staff in the student's cottage.

AWOL restriction time
at the time of runaway

A student receives seven additional months for a runaway attempt or successful runaway. It is possible for the social worker to have part of this seven months waived by the Administrative Review Board. The only problem in this question is found in those instances in which a student had received a time waiver which was not recorded in the

case folder and then participated in another runaway event.²⁴

IQ

There are few students who miss being given an IQ test during their stay at the Juvenile Diagnostic Center. It should be pointed out, however, that some boys had not taken an IQ test for several years before their admission to TICO, while other boys had taken an IQ test shortly before their admission to TICO.

Psychiatric diagnosis at JDC

There also are few students who fail to receive a psychiatric diagnosis during their stay at the Juvenile Diagnostic Center prior to their admission to TICO. The problem here is that certain psychiatrists seem to have an affinity for particular psychological labels. In a real sense, the label given to a youth sometimes says more about the psychiatrist than about the youth.²⁵

Suffix cleared before first runaway event

This refers to at least partial "R" or "E" clearance of the suffix. It is possible to receive partial clearance of the suffix before total community clearance is received.

Completed year in school
and average letter grade
in school at TICO

There was more information lacking in these categories than any other, primarily because students were either taken out of school, ran away before they could accumulate any academic credit in school, or the school records were incomplete. It also should be noted that 50 per cent of the grade at TICO consists of "attitude," which sometimes results in students with borderline intelligence doing well and students with high normal or superior intelligence doing poorly.

Disciplinary meetings at TICO

It was decided to include only those disciplinary meetings held for disruptive behavior. In addition, incident reports describing physical altercations between staff and students were included as disciplinary meetings, providing no other disciplinary meetings were held on these incidents.²⁶

Evidence of homosexual
behavior at TICO

The case folders rarely contained information about this type of behavior of students, unless a boy was blatantly homosexual.

Suicidal attempts at
other OYC institutions

Information also was lacking on this variable.

Suicidal attempts at TICO

While such attempts at TICO were fairly well documented, it was difficult to determine whether it was a serious suicide attempt, merely an attention-seeking device, a ploy to obtain a state hospital transfer, or an attempt to relieve the pressure of peers or staff upon the student.

Boy's outcome at time
of release from parole

When a boy was discharged from TICO, which usually happened because he was being discharged to the armed services or was joining his parents in another state, this was coded as "no parole."

Solo or companionate event

The first runaway was used to determine whether this category would be coded "solo" or "companionate" event. The only problem which arose was the fact that frequently later runaways evidence a different pattern from the first one. A boy, for example, who had run alone on his first runaway may run with others on his second escape.

Jesness Inventory

Outside of an IQ test, there are no standardized tests given at JDC. While the majority of the psychologists may give such projective tests as the TAT, the Bender Gestalt, and the Rorschach, these tests have not been standardized. Consequently, they could not be used to ascertain personality characteristics of TICO boys.

Since the majority of the runaway and control groups were no longer at TICO, ascertaining personality characteristics of these students presented a serious problem. The Jesness Inventory appeared to be the best solution to this problem because TICO has been administering the Jesness Inventory to new students in the intake cottage for several months and three psychologists at JDC have been using the Jesness Inventory for at least a year. Thus, it was possible to test the runaway and control populations who were still at TICO and to include the scores on file at JDC and TICO. Utilizing these resources, 91 Jesness scores were obtained.

Background and rationale of the Jesness Inventory

The Jesness Inventory was developed as part of the Fricot Research Project of the California Youth Authority. It is a measure which was designed to classify and indicate the treatment needs of disturbed youths. It was developed

because there appeared to be no available test which could provide a reliable indication of personality types.²⁷ The inventory met the following requirements:

1. The instrument should be responsive to changes of attitude so that it could be used as a valid measure of change over a relatively short time.
2. The items must be easily comprehended by persons as young as eight years of age.
3. The measure should be multidimensional to allow its use in classifying personality types.
4. It should provide a single index of asocial tendencies predictive of social and personality problems.²⁸

The objectives of the Jesness Inventory were to differentiate delinquent or disturbed youths from non-delinquent or non-disturbed and to include enough self and other items that it would be possible to construct a personality typology from the responses.²⁹

This instrument provides scores on 11 personality characteristics:

1. Social Maladjustment Scale--63 items. Social maladjustment refers here to a set of attitudes associated with inadequate or disturbed socialization, as defined by the extent to which an individual shares the attitudes of persons who demonstrate inability to meet environmental demands in socially approved ways.
2. Value Orientation Scale--39 items. Value orientation refers to a tendency to share attitudes and opinions characteristic of persons in the lower socio-economic classes.
3. Immaturity Scale--45 items. Immaturity reflects the tendency to display attitudes and perceptions of self and others which are usual for persons of a younger age than the subject.

4. Autism Scale--28 items. Autism measures a tendency, in thinking and perceiving, to distort reality according to one's personal desires or needs.
5. Alienation Scale--26 items. Alienation refers to the presence of distrust and estrangement in a person's attitudes toward others, especially toward those representing authority.
6. Manifest Aggression Scale--31 items. Manifest aggression reflects an awareness of unpleasant feelings, especially of anger and frustration, a tendency to react readily with emotion, and perceived discomfort concerning the presence and control of these feelings.
7. Withdrawal Scale--24 items. Withdrawal involves a perceived lack of satisfaction with self and others and a tendency toward isolation from others.
8. Social Anxiety Scale--24 items. Social anxiety refers to perceived emotional discomfort associated with interpersonal relationships.
9. Repression Scale--15 items. Repression reflects the exclusion from conscious awareness of feelings and emotions which the individual normally would be expected to experience, or his failure to label these emotions.
10. Denial Scale--20 items. Denial indicates a reluctance to acknowledge unpleasant events or aspects of reality often encountered in daily living.
11. Asocial Index. Asocialization refers to a generalized disposition to resolve problems of social and personal adjustment in ways ordinarily regarded as showing a disregard for social customs or rules.³⁰

Although the test was designed for younger children and adolescents, Dr. Jesness indicated in a letter to the author that it could be used with older, aggressive delinquents. According to Jesness, his manual for scoring goes

through eighteen years of age but that youths older than eighteen are scored as eighteen years of age.³¹

In terms of the interpretation of the scores, the non-delinquent mean is 50, and at every age level the means for delinquents are higher than those of non-delinquents. By using a cutting score approximately halfway between the means of the delinquent and non-delinquent groups, Jesness was able to classify correctly roughly 70 per cent of the male and female delinquents, with approximately 30 per cent false positives.³² Generally, subscale scores of 60 or above are likely to be characteristic of juvenile delinquents.

In California and in other institutional settings, the Jesness Inventory has been closely correlated with the I Level classification system, which has contributed to the credibility of this instrument.³³ More research is needed on this test, however, to substantiate its reliability.

Interviews

One of the major reasons for the interviews was to test the thesis that a boy becomes a runaway when he is faced with an unmanageable problem which he feels is unshareable.³⁴ In addition, it was the intent of the interviewing process to provide information upon which a typology of runaways could be constructed. To accomplish the above,

40 boys--of which 20 were controls and 20 were attempted and successful runaways--were interviewed.

There was a formal interview schedule and the interviews were structured, but interviewees were given some latitude if what they were saying appeared relevant to the analysis of runaway behavior.³⁵ Nearly all of the runaway and attempted runaway interviews and a few of the control interviews were fully taped. The remainder of the interviews were typed up as soon as possible after the interviews had taken place, in order to reproduce as closely as possible a verbatim account of these interviews.

It was the impression of the interviewer that the boys were honest the vast majority of the time. Since the interviewer had worked in the institution longer than the time period of the study, his knowledge of the TICO boy gave him a cross-reference check to what was said.

Staff Evaluation of Exploitation

Since the assumption was made that there is a close relationship between exploitation and escape, the staff of each cottage was asked to judge the degree of exploitation which was taking place in the cottages. It was projected that the more a boy is victimized by other peers, the more likely it is that he may perceive a need to escape from the stress of his environment.

The checklist which was given to each staff member listed various types of exploitation ranging from clothes to sex. Each cottage averaged four staff respondents out of a possible seven, and staff at least agreed on the students who were being exploited at TICO at the time of rating.

Participant Observation

In the past four years of working with TICO boys and staff, the author has received a great deal of insight which has been a valuable resource in this study. While there are some inherent dangers in the participant's attempting to be at the same time the observer of the organization, especially the danger of co-optation, this experience still has provided a wealth of information which would not be easy for the "outsider" to acquire. In addition, the "insider" has lines of communication available, which would be difficult for an "outsider" to obtain.

Documents

Finally, documents related to runaways and to security measures were utilized in this study. Some of the documents which were helpful in understanding more fully the runaway reaction at TICO were institutional directives; letters to Central Office, especially to Mr. William K. Willis who is Deputy Director of Correctional Services; memoranda from superintendents to staff; and memoranda from

Mr. Harry Zibners, who is Director of Guidance, to the Guidance Department.

Statistical Analysis

Nearly every variable in this study was subjected to chi square analysis. For the continuous data variables such as height and weight, the F-test, measuring the differences between the means was run. The Jesness Inventory was also analyzed using the F-test.

In order to develop a more accurate profile of the runaway, other variables were run against race which was a statistically significant variable. Other variables were also run against the 28 students who had failed to return from their home furloughs. This was done because runaways from home visits are an important concern in institutions.

Notes

¹Harry Zibners, "Toward Genuine Communication in a Training School," American Journal of Correction, Vol. 31 (May-June, 1969), 6.

²Stuart Miller, "Post-Institutional Adjustment of 443 Consecutive TICO Releases" (Ph.D. dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1971), pp. 18-19.

³A boy is given pre-release status when he has been in the institution for at least five months, has partial "R" or "E" clearance providing he has a suffix, is recommended for pre-release status by his cottage team, and has this recommendation approved by the Wing Director on his Wing.

To be recommended for release status means that the cottage team has made this recommendation and this recommendation was approved by the Wing Director, upon which the social worker took this student before the Administrative Review Board and presented the case for his release. If the Administrative Review Board approves, then the boy is placed on release status.

⁴Zibners, pp. 7-8.

⁵Ibid., pp. 9-13.

⁶See Appendix A.

⁷The superintendent's secretary keeps a roster of all runaways.

⁸Statement found in a letter Mr. Vejsicky, Superintendent of TICO, sent to Mr. William Willis, Deputy Director of Direct Services of the OYC, on April 15, 1968.

⁹The roster of attempted runaways was compiled by Youth Leader V's, who are presently supervisors of the cottage teams and who have been working in the institution far longer than the past three years. Other institutional staff also provided names. After names were suggested, they were then checked out in the case folders either at TICO or JDC.

¹⁰Several boys who were charged with a runaway attempt by their cottages denied this in a personal interview.

¹¹What really demonstrated the fallacy of this was that one youth was considered an attempted runaway because

a helicopter supposedly kept him in sight for the several hours he was being pursued by police and institutional staff.

¹²It was found that the most reliable way to verify the denial of a runaway attempt was through one's peers. If there was more than one person involved in an attempted runaway event, there appeared to be little problem in substantiating which account--staff or boy--was correct. But even when there was only one person involved, peers appeared to be willing to render judgment about the runaway attempt. Contrary to the adult prisoner code about "ratting" on peers, the juvenile does not appear to have this reluctance to the same degree.

¹³Out of six boys who denied their involvement in a runaway attempt, two were eliminated from the sample because there was some question about the interpretation of staff. Neither of these, however, was included in the control sample.

¹⁴Craig Mosier, Stuart Miller, and Simon Dinitz.

¹⁵Refer to Appendix B for the final schedule.

¹⁶These definitions of the "R" and "E" suffixes were supplied by Mrs. Bailey who is a Classification and Assignment Specialist at JDC and who is responsible for "R" and "E" clearances of students in the OYC.

¹⁷Miller, pp. 25-26. Other variables taken from Miller's dissertation were "conflict in the home," "number of siblings in home," "ranking in birth order of family," "most serious previous offense," and "offenses culminating in present commitment to TICO."

¹⁸Boys are usually transferred to TICO because of chronic runaway problems, assaultive behavior toward staff or peers, or prolonged inability to profit from other institutions of the OYC. When a direct commitment is made from the community, the offense is almost always a crime against the person.

¹⁹Miller, pp. 171-173. See Appendix C.

²⁰This is the impression the writer has gained from his work with students.

²¹Commitment to the OYC is a legal process, in which the judge of a county in Ohio commits the youth to the OYC.

Even when a youth is returned to the OYC because of parole violation, this is a process reserved to the jurisdiction of the courts.

²²While there were several boys in the study who had escaped in 1969 and who would have had more than four run-aways during their stay at TICO, runs previous to January 1, 1970 were not counted.

²³Until a student receives pre-release status, he is supposed to be handcuffed and supervised, but on pre-release status, a student is supposed to be responsible for his own movement. Pre-release students attending the Ohio State Fair, for example, did not see a staff member for several hours.

²⁴The only exception to this would be in those cases when a student had committed a serious crime in the community while he was on runaway status, and in these instances a student was given ten months of additional time upon his return to TICO.

²⁵See Appendix D for the classification scheme. This was taken from Craig Harlan Mosier's dissertation, "Delinquent Perceptions of Institutional Impact," p. 124.

²⁶It was anticipated that the number of disciplinaries would provide an indicator of the institutional adjustment of a youth to TICO. Thus, it was important to include all evidence of negative behavior.

²⁷Carl F. Jesness, Manual--The Jesness Inventory (Palo Alto: Consulting Psychology Press, 1966), p. 3.

²⁸Ibid.

²⁹Ibid.

³⁰Ibid., pp. 3-4.

³¹Letter was received on October 15, 1971.

³²Jesness, p. 7.

³³The Jesness Inventory can be computerized into an I Level prediction table. The Ohio Youth Commission, for example, has been converting the Jesness scores into I Level probabilities for some time.

³⁴This idea was taken from Donald Cressey's Other People Money (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1953).

³⁵See Appendix D for Interview Schedule.

CHAPTER III

FINDINGS: DEMOGRAPHIC AND CRIMINAL HISTORY ANALYSIS

In order to determine the relationship between demographic, criminal history, prior institutional variables and runaway behavior, it was necessary to gather information on the boys from the case folders which were on file at TICO and JDC. These data are described below.

Demographic Characteristics

Size of county of commitment

Although some information was available in the case folders on the home towns of TICO students, this information was too unreliable to include as a separate variable. Information on the county of commitment, however, was both available and reliable and was therefore used to determine the area from which TICO students came (see Table 1).¹

These data indicate that runaways, attempted runaways, and controls primarily came from highly urbanized areas. Thus, less than 8 per cent of the sample came from counties of under 50,000 population and over 70 per cent from counties of 500,000 persons and over.

TABLE 1
DISTRIBUTION OF COUNTY SIZE OF CONTROLS, RUNAWAYS, AND
ATTEMPTED RUNAWAY SUBJECTS

Size of County	Controls		Runaways		Attempted Runaways		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
25,000 - 49,000	4	2.4	3	2.4	1	2.6	8	2.4
50,000 - 99,000	8	4.9	14	11.2	1	2.6	23	7.3
100,000 - 249,000	21	12.8	12	9.6	3	7.7	36	11.0
250,000 - 499,000	14	8.5	7	5.6	6	15.4	27	8.2
500,000 +	117	71.3	89	71.2	28	71.8	234	71.3
Total	164	100.0	125	100.0	39	100.0	328	100.0

$$\chi^2 = 9.88 \quad df = 8 \quad P = N.S.$$

It is obvious from Table 1 that controls, runaways, and attempted runaway subjects did not differ significantly from each other in terms of county of commitment. The chi square value of 9.88 was not statistically significant.

Race

The 328 subjects were almost equally divided into 163 whites and 165 blacks. There was, however, a distinct difference between runaways and controls by race, with blacks constituting three-fifths of the controls and whites three-fifths of the runaways (see Table 2). This difference yielded a chi square value of 14.18 which was significant at the .01 level of confidence.

TABLE 2
DISTRIBUTION OF RACE OF CONTROLS, RUNAWAYS, AND
ATTEMPTED RUNAWAY SUBJECTS

Race	Controls		Runaways		Attempted Runaways		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Black	98	59.8	48	38.4	19	48.7	165	50.3
White	66	40.2	77	61.6	20	51.3	163	49.7
Total	164	100.0	125	100.0	39	100.0	328	100.0

$$\chi^2 = 14.18 \quad df = 4 \quad P = .01$$

Although many more whites than blacks were runaways, the attempted runaway subjects were almost equally divided racially. Nevertheless, this group still included over 10 per cent more whites than were found in the control group.

The statistical significance of race is not surprising because a number of authors have suggested that whites are more likely to attempt and to escape than blacks.² One explanation of recent origin appears to be the greater probability of the exploitation of whites in institutions which are usually black dominated, leading whites to flee from the stress of exploitation and therefore leading to the establishment of a runaway pattern for whites in institutions.³ There is surely also much to be said for the view that blacks are reluctant to flee because of the greater risk of detection in the rural areas in which

most institutions have been located. In the past, black runaways received stronger differential penalties.

Living with natural mother

Although family disorganization is generally considered a correlate of delinquency, the data indicate that approximately 80 per cent of all the controls, runaways, and attempted runaway subjects lived with their mothers the first ten years of their lives. The chi square value on this variable was only 2.07, which was not statistically significant. Before drawing any conclusions about living with the mother and runaway behavior, however, other operational definitions would need to be utilized.

Family status at incarceration

By the time the youths in this sample had been committed to the OYC, their family situations had become more disorganized. This is reflected in the fact that only 66, or 20.1 per cent, of the 328 boys had families which were intact at the time of incarceration.

There was little difference between the family status of the controls, runaways, and attempted runaways at incarceration. The chi square value was 6.68 which was not statistically significant (see Table 3).

TABLE 3

DISTRIBUTION OF FAMILY STATUS AT INCARCERATION OF CONTROLS,
RUNAWAYS, AND ATTEMPTED RUNAWAY SUBJECTS

Status of Family	Controls		Runaways		Attempted Runaways		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Intact	38	23.2	23	18.4	5	12.8	66	20.1
Divorced, separated, deserted	22	13.4	19	15.2	6	15.4	47	14.3
One or both parents dead	5	3.0	8	6.4	0	0.0	13	4.0
Multiple problems	99	60.4	75	60.0	28	71.8	202	61.6
Total	164	100.0	125	100.0	39	100.0	328	100.0

$$\chi^2 = 6.68 \quad df = 6 \quad P = N.S.$$

Rejection in the home

The data from the case folders indicate that the vast majority of the TICO boys were rejected at home. While 66.5 per cent of the controls were rejected by their parents, the runaway subjects were even more often rejected (71.2 and 79.5 per cent respectively). Chi square analysis, however, did not show these differences to be statistically significant (see Table 4).

TABLE 4

DISTRIBUTION OF FAMILY REJECTION OF CONTROLS, RUNAWAYS, AND
ATTEMPTED RUNAWAY SUBJECTS

Family Rejection	Controls		Runaways		Attempted Runaways		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	109	66.5	89	71.2	31	79.5	229	69.8
No	55	33.5	36	28.8	8	20.5	99	30.2
Total	164	100.0	125	100.0	39	100.0	328	100.0

$$\chi^2 = 2.72 \quad df = 2 \quad P = N.S.$$

Age at commitment to TICO

The boys' ages were calculated at the time of their entry into TICO and, generally, the sample averaged 16.8 years of age with a range from 14.1 to 18.9 years. More specifically, the data indicate that controls averaged 17.0 years of age and ranged from 14.1 to 18.9 years, runaways averaged 16.8 years of age and ranged from 14.6 to 18.5 years, and attempted runaway subjects averaged 16.6 years of age and ranged from 14.4 to 18.5 years.

While attempted runaways were, on the whole, younger than either runaways or controls and runaways were younger than controls, the F-test, measuring the difference between the means, yielded a value of 0.77 which was not statistically significant. (See Table 5.)

TABLE 5

MEAN AGE AT COMMITMENT TO TICO OF CONTROLS, RUNAWAYS,
AND ATTEMPTED RUNAWAY SUBJECTS

Group	Mean Age
Controls	17.0
Runaways	16.8
Attempted Runaways . . .	16.6
Total	16.8

Siblings

The data collected from the case folders indicated that TICO students generally came from large family units. While 6 boys, for example, were only children, 78 had 7 or more siblings.

In addition, when the numerical size of families of the controls were examined, they were found to be larger than the families of the runaway and attempted runaway subjects. The differences were not, however, statistically significant, and it does not appear that number of siblings is related to runaway behavior (see Table 6).

Ranking in birth order

In modal terms, the second child born in a family was represented more than any other order of birth among the controls, runaways, and attempted runaways. The first-born child had the second highest representation in the three groups. Thus, the first two children born to a family made

TABLE 6

DISTRIBUTION OF SIBLINGS OF CONTROLS, RUNAWAYS, AND
ATTEMPTED RUNAWAY SUBJECTS

Siblings	Controls		Runaways		Attempted Runaways		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Only child	2	1.2	3	2.4	1	2.6	6	1.8
One to three	47	28.7	46	36.8	15	38.5	108	33.2
Four to six	69	42.1	47	37.6	17	43.6	133	40.9
Seven and up	43	26.2	29	23.2	6	15.4	78	24.0
No information	3	1.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	.1
Total	164	100.0	125	100.0	39	100.0	328	100.0

$$\chi^2 = 4.51 \quad df = 6 \quad P = N.S.$$

up 49.3 per cent of the population of this study. This is not surprising because they have had more time to get into trouble.

It is obvious from examination of the data on birth order that controls, runaways, and attempted runaway subjects did not differ significantly from each other. The F-test on this variable yielded a value of 1.86 which was not statistically significant.

Siblings in correctional settings

As previously stated, there was some question as to whether the number of siblings in correctional institutions

could be adequately determined. According to the data available, only 57, or 17.4 per cent, of the total population ever had siblings in correctional settings. In analyzing these data further, it can be seen that 16.6 per cent of the controls, 18.4 per cent of the runaways, and 17.9 per cent of the attempted runaway subjects had siblings in correctional settings at one time or the other. The chi square value was 1.82 and was not statistically significant.

Height and weight

The average weight of boys in the three groups was 147.6 pounds, with the average height being 67.6 inches. When the groups were analyzed separately, little difference among them was found, with controls averaging 67.6 inches in height and 147.7 pounds in weight and ranging from 56 to 75 inches in height and 104 to 250 pounds in weight. Runaways averaged 67.6 inches in height and 146.5 pounds in weight and ranged from 60 to 74 inches in height and 100 to 192 pounds in weight. Attempted runaway subjects averaged 67.4 inches in height and 150.3 pounds in weight and ranged from 62 to 67 inches in height and 118 to 208 pounds in weight. (See Table 7.)

This analysis showed a similarity between the height and weight of the three groups and made it apparent that no statistical significance existed. The F-test value verified the lack of statistical significance for either height or

weight. Thus, the general impression formed by working in an institution of a close relationship among exploitation, size, and runaways must now be re-examined.

TABLE 7

MEAN HEIGHT AND WEIGHT OF CONTROLS, RUNAWAYS, AND
ATTEMPTED RUNAWAY SUBJECTS

Group	Mean Height	Mean Weight
Controls	67.6	147.7
Runaways	67.7	146.5
Attempted Runaways	67.4	150.3
Total	67.6	147.6

Criminal History Variables

Most serious previous offense

The criminal history of each student was determined from his case folder and was classified according to whether it was "serious," "moderate," or "slight."⁴ The "most serious previous offense" referred to the most serious one which had taken place prior to the one for which the student was committed to the OYC.

It is clear from Table 8 that the vast majority of the TICO population (80.2 per cent) had been involved in serious crimes before they were committed to the OYC. If the 64 youths in the three groups who had no serious crimes

reported in their records would have had all their anti-social behavior recorded, it is likely that many of them, too, would have had serious offenses listed.

TABLE 8

CLASSIFICATION OF OFFENSES BY SERIOUSNESS OF CONTROLS,
RUNAWAYS, AND ATTEMPTED RUNAWAY SUBJECTS

Offense	Controls		Runaways		Attempted Runaways		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Serious	132	80.5	98	78.4	34	84.6	263	80.2
Moderate	19	11.6	15	12.0	2	5.1	36	11.0
Slight	10	6.1	10	8.0	3	7.7	23	7.0
None	3	1.8	2	1.6	0	0.0	5	1.5
Total	164	100.0	125	100.0	39	100.0	328	100.0

$$\chi^2 = 10.04 \quad df = 8 \quad P = N.S.$$

There was little difference between the three groups in terms of their "most serious previous offense." The chi square value of 10.04 was not statistically significant.

Offense culminating in
present commitment to TICO

Since some youths had received several commitments to the OYC, this variable refers to the commitment which eventually resulted in the youth's being transferred to TICO. Classification on this variable also was made according to whether the offense was "serious," "moderate," or "slight."

The findings on this variable are consistent with those on the preceding one in that between two-thirds and three-quarters of the three groups had been involved in serious offenses for which they were committed to the OYC (see Table 9). The chi square value was 3.94, which was not statistically significant.

TABLE 9

CLASSIFICATION OF OFFENSES WHICH CULMINATED IN PRESENT COMMITMENT TO TICO OF CONTROLS, RUNAWAYS, AND ATTEMPTED RUNAWAY SUBJECTS

Offense	Controls		Runaways		Attempted Runaways		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Serious	109	66.5	94	75.2	28	71.8	231	70.4
Moderate	30	18.3	13	10.4	5	12.8	48	14.6
Slight	25	15.2	18	14.4	6	15.4	49	14.9
None	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	164	100.0	125	100.0	39	100.0	328	100.0

$$\chi^2 = 3.94 \quad df = 4 \quad P = N.S.$$

It is interesting, however, that slight offenses were reported more frequently for the "resulting in commitment to TICO" category than they were for the "prior to commitment" category. It may be that after a youth has committed a number of known delinquencies, it takes only a minor offense to process him back into the juvenile justice system.⁵

Drugs and alcohol abuse

As previously stated, it was anticipated that it would be the frequent user who would have drugs and alcohol abuse reported in his court record, rather than the occasional user.

In terms of the three groups, 103 boys, or 31.4 per cent, had been reported for these offenses. While this did not at first appear to be statistically important, analysis of the groups reflected important differences among them. Approximately 35 per cent of the runaways, 51 per cent of the attempted runaways, and 23 per cent of the controls had records involving drugs and alcohol abuse (see Table 10). These differences yielded a chi square value of 12.41 which was significant at the .01 level of probability.

TABLE 10

DRUGS AND ALCOHOL ABUSE COMMITTED BY CONTROLS, RUNAWAYS, AND ATTEMPTED RUNAWAY SUBJECTS

Offense	Controls		Runaways		Attempted Runaways		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	39	23.8	44	35.2	20	51.3	103	31.4
None	125	76.2	81	64.8	19	48.7	225	68.6

$$\chi^2 = 12.41 \quad df = 2 \quad P = .01$$

Although the exploration of the relationship between drugs and alcohol abuse has received little attention in the literature, it is not surprising that boys who were attempting to escape life's situations through the use of drugs and alcohol in the community would also try to escape the stresses and deprivations of institutional life.⁶ It would appear that these youths are attempting to deal with the pain in their lives by utilizing withdrawal as a coping mechanism.

Group or loner offense

As previously stated, the records were so incomplete in the case folders on this variable that conclusions drawn from the data must be regarded as extremely tentative.

The data indicate that 189, or 57.6 per cent, of the total sample were loners, compared to 138 or 42.2 per cent who were group delinquents. While controls were loners in 53.7 per cent of the cases, runaways were loners 61.3 per cent and attempted runaways were loners 64.1 per cent of the cases. The chi square value on this variable was 2.41 which was not statistically significant.

"R" and "E" suffix

As previously mentioned, the "R" and "E" suffixes were attached by a psychiatrist at the intake center of OYC, namely JDC, and meant that the youth had to undergo psychiatric evaluation before release to the community. Boys with

"R" suffixes were considered dangerous to themselves or to others, and boys who had been given "E" suffixes were considered to evidence emotional disturbance.

Whereas 185 subjects had "R's" and 37 had "E's," 106 boys were admitted to TICO without suffixes. Thus, two-thirds of the boys had stigmatizing suffixes assigned to them at the time of their TICO incarceration (see Table 11). In regard to the "R" and "E" suffixes in the three groups, there was a difference between the runaways and the others. This can be seen in the 42.4 per cent of the runaways without a suffix, which is much greater than the 27.4 per cent of the controls without a suffix. The chi square value for this variable was 11.34 and was significant at the .05 level of probability.

TABLE 11

DISTRIBUTION OF SUFFIXES OF CONTROLS, RUNAWAYS, AND
ATTEMPTED RUNAWAY SUBJECTS

Suffix	Controls		Runaways		Attempted Runaways		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	45	27.4	53	42.4	8	20.5	106	32.3
"R"	97	59.1	63	50.4	25	64.1	185	56.4
"E"	22	13.4	9	7.2	6	15.4	37	11.3
Total	164	100.0	125	100.0	39	100.0	328	100.0

$$x^2 = 11.34 \quad df = 4 \quad P = .05$$

It is thus apparent that there is some validity in this particular labeling system, but exactly what is unclear. Since the runaway literature has not dealt with the effect of labels on the behavior of escapees, considerable speculation must be involved in understanding why this relationship was statistically significant.

What is especially confusing about this variable is the fact that emotionally disturbed students were not more heavily represented in the runaway group. It may be that the 15.4 per cent of the attempted runaway students with "E" suffixes indicates that emotionally disturbed students want to escape from TICO but have more difficulty in successfully running away. It may be also that these boys are so wrapped up in personal problems that escape does not appear as a solution to their problems. Or it may be that many of the emotionally disturbed students were given "R's" rather than "E" suffixes at JDC and that their escapes were tabulated as runaways with "R" suffixes. It is apparent that more research is needed to determine the relationship between labeling and running away from institutionalization.

Adjustment before TICO

Number of times committed to OYC institutions

As stated in the last chapter, this variable only refers to those boys committed to the Ohio Youth Commission

and each commitment is counted as one. When a student, for example, has been released and returned to the OYC for committing another offense or for violation of parole, this is counted as a new commitment. In terms of the total population, 130 boys, or about 40 per cent, had only one commitment to the OYC, nearly as many had been returned once to OYC institutions, and 73, or 22.3 per cent, had returned two or more times to the OYC.

It is obvious from looking at Table 12 that controls, runaways, and attempted runaways did not differ significantly from each other in terms of number of commitments. The chi square value on this variable was 4.64 which was not statistically significant.

TABLE 12
DISTRIBUTION OF NUMBER OF TIMES COMMITTED TO THE OYC OF
CONTROLS, RUNAWAYS, AND ATTEMPTED RUNAWAY SUBJECTS

Number of Commitments	Controls		Runaways		Attempted Runaways		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
One	70	42.7	45	36.0	15	38.5	130	39.6
Two	61	37.2	48	38.4	16	41.0	125	38.1
More than Two	33	20.1	32	25.6	8	20.5	73	22.3
Total	164	100.0	125	100.0	39	100.0	328	100.0

$$\chi^2 = 4.64 \quad df = 8 \quad P = N.S.$$

Number of runaways before TICO

The 328 subjects were divided equally between those who had escaped from OYC institutions during prior commitments and those who had never escaped. While 35.4 per cent of the control group had escaped during prior commitments, 63.2 per cent of the runaways and 69.2 per cent of the attempted runaways had escaped during previous commitments. This difference yielded a chi square value of 25.53 which was significant at the .001 level of confidence. (See Table 13.)

TABLE 13

DISTRIBUTION OF RUNAWAY BEHAVIOR AT PRIOR OYC INSTITUTIONS OF
CONTROLS, RUNAWAYS, AND ATTEMPTED RUNAWAY SUBJECTS

Previous Runaway Behavior	Controls		Runaways		Attempted Runaways		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	58	35.4	79	63.2	27	69.2	164	50.0
No	106	64.6	46	36.8	12	30.8	164	50.0
Total	164	100.0	125	100.0	39	100.0	328	100.0

$$\chi^2 = 25.53 \quad df = 2 \quad P = .001$$

Although runaways during prior commitments have been generally overlooked in the literature, it is not surprising that runaways from other institutions, who usually also have a history of running away from home and truancy from school, should attempt to escape from TICO.⁷ Apparently, running

away is the pattern they have developed for dealing with stress and conflict.

In addition, the data indicate that there were 58 controls who had escaped before from OYC institutions but who chose not to escape from TICO. On the other hand, there were 58 runaways and attempted runaways who had not escaped before but who did choose to escape from TICO. In the following section, a closer examination of the 58 controls who had escaped before from OYC institutions but who chose not to escape from TICO will be made. And in Chapter V, the reasons why these 116 subjects deviated from their pattern of runaway behavior will be explored further.

Uncontaminating the comparisons

As noted in the analysis of previous runaway behavior among controls (see Table 13 above), 35.4 per cent of the controls had previous runaways at other OYC institutions. This contamination of the comparisons made it difficult to use the 58 subjects with previous runaway histories as controls unless it could be shown that they did not differ from uncontaminated controls. In order to make this determination, the 58 subjects were compared to the remainder of the control group on all relevant dimensions.

The results of this comparison indicate that on only three of the socio-demographic, criminal history, and personality variables did the contaminated boys differ very much

from the "pure" controls. These three dimensions included race, number of commitments, and length of commitment. With regard to race, the 58 subjects more nearly reflected the population of the institution (29 blacks and 29 whites); with regard to previous commitments, the number of previous commitments were greater for the contaminated subjects in that 65.5 per cent of the contaminated group had had two or more commitments to the OYC, compared to 52.8 per cent of the "pure" controls. And in regard to length of commitment, nearly twice as many of the contaminated group had stayed in OYC institutions "nine to eighteen months" and "over 18 months" as the "pure" control group. As a result of this analysis, it was felt that these differences should not exclude the contaminated subjects who had previously run from other OYC institutions as part of the comparison group.

Number of months at OYC
institutions prior to TICO

These data indicate that controls, runaways, and attempted runaway subjects usually had spent considerable time in the OYC before being transferred to TICO. Seventy per cent of the 328 subjects, for example, had spent more than eight months in other OYC institutions before their transfer to TICO.

While there were many similarities in the number of months which controls and attempted runaway subjects spent

in OYC institutions before TICO, the runaways deviated from the other two groups in having few subjects in the category "one to three months" and more subjects in the category "more than eighteen months" (see Table 14). These differences yielded a chi square value of 16.82 and were significant at the .02 level of probability.

TABLE 14
DISTRIBUTION OF MONTHS AT OTHER OYC INSTITUTIONS OF CONTROLS,
RUNAWAYS, AND ATTEMPTED RUNAWAY SUBJECTS

Months	Controls		Runaways		Attempted Runaways		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1 - 3	30	18.3	11	8.9	6	15.4	47	14.4
4 - 8	25	15.2	16	12.9	10	25.6	51	15.6
9 - 18	62	37.8	40	32.3	15	38.5	117	35.8
18 plus	47	28.7	57	46.0	8	20.5	112	34.3
Total	164	100.0	125	100.0	39	100.0	328	100.0

$$x^2 = 16.82 \quad df = 6 \quad P = .02$$

Although this variable concerning the number of months at other juvenile institutions has been largely ignored in the literature, its significance appears to be less difficult to explain than some of the other statistically significant variables. To begin with, the "one to three months" category was made up almost entirely of boys who had committed violent crimes in the community.⁸ Since

violent offenders generally are not security risks, it makes sense that there were only a few runaways in this category.⁹

In addition, boys who have been in the institutions of the Ohio Youth Commission longer than eighteen months tended to be runaways because they have apparently decided that it is easier to escape than to fulfill institutional expectations. As a result, they seem to have poor relationships with staff, altercations with peers, and acting-out problems in school. These problems, along with the additional time placed on them for their runaway behavior, explain why runaways spend more time in OYC institutions.

Suicide attempts at other OYC institutions

Only 12, or 3.7 per cent, of the 328 subjects were reported to have made suicide attempts at other OYC facilities. Although the small numbers made analysis difficult, it was found that five controls, five runaways, and two attempted runaway subjects had made suicide attempts at other institutions. The chi square value of 0.45 was obviously not statistically significant.

Notes

¹Stuart Jerome Miller, "Post-Institutional Adjustment of 443 Consecutive TICO Releasees" (Ph.D. dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1971), p. 41.

²Richard J. Hildebrand, "The Anatomy of Escape," Federal Probation, Vol. 33 (March, 1969), 62-64; Stanley Levine, "Runaways and Research in the Training School," Crime and Delinquency, Vol. 8 (January, 1962), 42; W. S. Loving, F. E. Stockwell, and D. A. Dobbins, "Factors Associated with Escape Behavior of Prison Inmates," Federal Probation, Vol. 23 (September, 1959), 49-50.

³Subjects interviewed at TICO specified a strong relationship between exploitation of whites in institutions and runaway behavior of whites.

⁴See Appendix C for classification of offenses.

⁵Miller, p. 46.

⁶Levine, p. 44; William R. Morrow, "Escapes of Psychiatric Offenders," The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, Vol. 60 (December, 1969), 465.

⁷Nearly every runaway and attempted runaway subject who was interviewed indicated this history of running away from home and truancy from school.

⁸Violent offenders in the community are sometimes directly committed to TICO from a county in Ohio or at other times they receive a rapid transfer through JDC to TICO. A rapid transfer means that the youth is at JDC only for a short period of time and does not receive the customary work-up.

⁹In recent years, for example, only one homicide student has attempted or successfully escaped from the institution.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS: ADJUSTMENT AT TICO

Chapter III was concerned with the social characteristics, criminal history background, and prior institutional adjustment of the boys in this sample. This chapter will be concerned with the adjustment at TICO, the personality characteristics as delineated by the Jesness Inventory, and the post-institutional adjustment of the three groups. In addition, the runaway reaction of TICO youths the past two and a half years will be examined in terms of when, where, and how.

Adjustment at TICO

Number of months in TICO

The mean number of months at TICO for the population of this study was 13.37 with a standard deviation of 6.97.¹ The three groups were very similar in the number of months spent at TICO, and it is obvious that length of time in the institution was unrelated to escape. The F-test was administered and the 0.73 value was not statistically significant. (See Table 15.)

TABLE 15

MEAN NUMBER OF MONTHS AT TICO FOR CONTROLS,
RUNAWAYS, AND ATTEMPTED RUNAWAY SUBJECTS

Group	Mean No. of Months at TICO
Controls	13.35
Runaways	13.75
Attempted Runaways	12.20
Total	13.37

Home visits

One of the best indicators of positive adjustment at TICO is the home furlough because home visits are only awarded to boys by the staff of a cottage when they are demonstrating positive behavior in all areas.²

In this study, there were 79 boys who had one successful home visit, 40 who had two, nine who had three, and three who had four successful home visits before they were released from TICO. Analysis showed that there was a distinct difference among the groups on this variable, since 49.4 per cent of the controls, 41 per cent of the attempted runaways, and 27.2 per cent of the runaway subjects had been given home visits. This difference yielded a chi square value of 26.15 which was significant at the .001 level of confidence.

In spite of the fact that the relationship between home visits and escapes has been almost entirely ignored in

the literature, it is apparently an important variable.³ It is not surprising that it should be statistically significant because boys who are adjusting well to the institution and whose progress is being reinforced by staff will feel less need to escape. Furthermore, their return to the community may well reduce some of the tension of being institutionalized.⁴ (See Table 16.)

TABLE 16
DISTRIBUTION OF HOME VISITS AMONG CONTROLS, RUNAWAYS, AND
ATTEMPTED RUNAWAY SUBJECTS

No. of Home Visits	Controls		Runaways		Attempted Runaways		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	83	50.6	91	72.8	23	50.0	197	60.1
One	48	29.3	16	12.8	15	38.5	79	24.1
Two	25	15.2	14	11.2	1	2.6	40	12.2
Three	5	3.0	4	3.2	0	0.0	9	2.7
Four	3	1.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	0.9
Total	164	100.0	125	100.0	39	100.0	328	100.0

$$\chi^2 = 26.15 \quad df = 8 \quad P = .001$$

This variable demonstrates the interaction between individual (personality characteristics of a boy) and structural (institutional characteristics) variables in explaining runaway behavior. While the relationship merits further

consideration in this study, there will also be an attempt to explain why certain students return from home visits and others fail to return. Chapter V will deal with both of these concerns.

Disciplinary meetings at TICO

One of the best indicators of negative behavior at TICO is the disciplinary action a boy has been involved in during his stay at the institution. While 101 of the 328 subjects were not involved in any disciplinary meetings, 131 were involved in one or two, 70 were involved in three to five, and 26 were involved in more than five disciplinary meetings. (See Table 17.)

TABLE 17

DISTRIBUTION OF DISCIPLINARY MEETINGS AT TICO AMONG CONTROLS,
RUNAWAYS, AND ATTEMPTED RUNAWAY SUBJECTS

No. of Meetings	Controls		Runaways		Attempted Runaways		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	55	33.5	37	29.6	9	23.1	101	30.8
One or Two	73	44.5	40	32.0	18	46.2	131	39.9
Three to Five	29	17.7	32	25.6	9	23.1	70	21.3
More than Five	7	4.3	16	12.8	3	7.7	26	7.9
Total	164	100.0	125	100.0	39	100.0	328	100.0

$$\chi^2 = 13.08 \quad df = 6 \quad P = .05.$$

When the three groups were compared, the controls had slightly more subjects who had not been involved in any disciplinary meetings and significantly fewer subjects who had been involved in "one or two," "three to five," and "more than five" disciplinary meetings. These differences yielded a chi square value of 13.08 and were significant at the .05 level of confidence.

Although this variable is another which has been largely ignored in the literature, it demonstrates the interaction between individual and structural variables in explaining runaway behavior. Students who are having problems in adjusting to the milieu of TICO are placed on restriction and are confined to their rooms when they have difficulties.⁵ Then, when they come up for review, it is likely that they will be kept at their present status because of these restrictions. This double punishment (being isolated in their rooms and being turned down at their reviews) increases the probability of their running away if only because they perceive themselves as being "picked on" by the institution.

Suicide attempts at TICO

If a boy feels under great stress, it is possible that he may physically harm himself. There have been two successful suicides in the history of TICO; and in addition, there have been many other attempts made by students to

injure themselves.⁶ Of the present population, 20, or 6.1 per cent, attempted to hurt themselves at some time during their stay at TICO. The distribution of these students who had hurt themselves was seven or 4.3 per cent of the controls, eleven or 8.8 per cent of the runaways, and two or 5.1 per cent of the attempted runaways. These slight differences yielded a chi square value of 2.62 which was not statistically significant.

Homosexual behavior at TICO

As previously stated, this information is rarely placed in the case folders unless a student is blatantly homosexual. The case folder data indicate that 33 boys included in this sample had participated in homosexual behavior during their stay at TICO.

When the three groups were analyzed, 17 or 10.4 per cent of the control group, 8 or 6.4 per cent of the runaway group, and 8 or 20.5 per cent of the attempted runaway group members were found listed in the case folders as homosexuals. This difference yielded a chi square value of 6.58 and was statistically significant at the .05 level of confidence.

Apparently, this statistical significance was created by the fact that 20.5 per cent of the attempted runaways were involved in homosexual behavior. This raises the concern whether there was something unique about the attempted runaway subjects. It may be that the small size of the

attempted runaway group could have skewed the results, or it may be a problem of reporting the homosexual behavior in the other two groups. A profile of the attempted runaway subject, facilitated by additional cross tabulation of data, will be delineated in Chapter V. This profile may resolve some of the confusion about the 39 attempted runaway subjects.

Completed year in school

The academic and vocational areas at TICO are where the majority of acting-out incidents take place in the institution. One of the basic reasons for this is that school teachers at C. Arthur Wilson High School at TICO are not able to control students as well as are youth leaders. Consequently, school adjustment is a good index of general institutional adjustment.

In terms of the total population of the study, 168 or 54.5 per cent completed less than ninth grade, 71 or 23.1 per cent completed ninth grade, 26 or 8.4 per cent completed tenth grade, 10 or 3.2 per cent completed eleventh grade, and 33 or 10.7 per cent graduated from high school at TICO.

In comparing the groups, the controls and runaways were similar and the attempted runaways were quite different. The latter had completed more school years than either of the former (see Table 18). These differences contributed to

a chi square value of 21.96 which was statistically significant at the .01 level of confidence.

TABLE 18
DISTRIBUTION OF COMPLETED YEAR IN SCHOOL AT TICO AMONG
CONTROLS, RUNAWAYS, AND ATTEMPTED RUNAWAY SUBJECTS

Completed Year	Controls		Runaways		Attempted Runaways		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Less than Nine	85	51.8	71	56.8	12	30.7	168	51.2
Nine	37	22.5	24	19.2	10	25.6	71	21.6
Ten	9	5.4	8	6.4	9	23.0	26	7.9
Eleven	4	2.4	3	2.4	3	7.6	10	3.0
Twelve	20	12.1	10	8.0	3	7.6	33	10.0
No information	9	5.4	9	7.2	2	5.1	20	6.0
Total	164	100.0	125	100.0	39	100.0	328	100.0

$$\chi^2 = 21.96 \quad df = 8 \quad P = .01$$

School program at TICO

In the school program at TICO, which is either academic or academic-vocational, 75 or 24.5 per cent of the 307 subjects for which information could be obtained were classified as "academic." The remaining 232, or 75.6 per cent, were classified as "academic-vocational."

Although 34.2 per cent of the attempted runaway subjects were taking academic courses, only 26 per cent of the controls and 18.2 per cent of the runaways were taking

academic courses. In addition, 81.8 per cent of the runaways, 74.0 per cent of the controls, and 65.8 per cent of the attempted runaway subjects were taking academic-vocational courses. These differences would appear to be significant, but the chi square value was only 6.09 which with four degrees of freedom was not statistically significant. It would appear, however, that some directionality was present and that perhaps a more refined measure of the type of school program the boys were in would yield a more significant result.

Average grade in school

As previously mentioned, attitude constitutes 50 per cent of the school grade. This grade, even more than the completed year, should represent positive behavior and adjustment in the school area.

Of the total school population, seven received A's, 87 received B's, 166 received C's, 32 received D's, and six received E's during their stay at TICO. In a distribution which approximates a normal curve, almost all of the attempted runaway subjects and controls made B's and C's. The controls, however, did make a few more A's and D's than the attempted runaway subjects. In addition, nearly one-fifth of the runaways made D's. (See Table 19.)

These differences yielded an F value of 7.11 which was significant at the .01 level of confidence. Although it

cannot be answered here, it is apparent either that runaways are poorer students and that this contributes to their running, or that because they ran, they missed more classes and therefore did more poorly in school.

TABLE 19
DISTRIBUTION OF GRADES IN SCHOOL AT TICO AMONG CONTROLS,
RUNAWAYS, AND ATTEMPTED RUNAWAY SUBJECTS

Average Grade	Controls		Runaways		Attempted Runaways		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
A's	3	1.8	4	3.2	0	0.0	7	2.1
B's	55	33.5	22	17.6	10	25.6	87	26.5
C's	81	49.4	60	48.0	25	64.1	166	50.6
D's	10	6.1	21	16.8	1	2.6	32	9.8
E's	1	0.6	5	4.0	0	0.0	6	1.8
Total	164	100.0	125	100.0	39	100.0	328	100.0

$$\chi^2 = 25.97 \quad df = 8 \quad P = .01$$

Post-Institutional Adjustment

Outcome from parole

Following release from TICO, boys are ordinarily placed on parole for a number of months and then given either a "satisfactory" or "unsatisfactory" release by their field counselors. When a youth is given a "satisfactory" release, this means that the adjustment of the youth to the community has been adequate and that he has been able to stay out of

serious trouble with the law. An "unsatisfactory" release, however, means that a youth is either in an adult correctional facility or totally uncooperative with his field counselor.

Of the total sample, 189 or 57.6 per cent of the subjects were listed as "no parole," 71 or 21.6 per cent were released from parole as "satisfactory," and 68 or 20.7 per cent were released as "unsatisfactory."⁷

While 46 or 28 per cent of the controls, 17 or 13.6 per cent of the runaways, and eight or 20.5 per cent of the attempted runaways were given "satisfactory" releases from parole, 30 or 18.3 per cent of the controls, 37 or 29.6 per cent of the runaways, and one or 2.6 per cent of the attempted runaway subjects were given "unsatisfactory" releases from parole. These differences yielded a chi square value of 21.27 which was statistically significant at the .01 level of confidence. (See Table 20.)

Although this high level of significance may in part be explained by bookkeeping procedures, it still does not fully explain why post-institutional adjustment was different among the three groups.⁸ It may be that the runaway student is more impulsive and has less control over his behavior, or that he is less able to hold a job so that he needs to resort more frequently to anti-social behavior; or finally, it may be that the type of offenses he commits makes him more visible, and therefore more likely to be harassed by the police.

Obviously, this variable must be analyzed more fully in order to understand better the relationship between runaway behavior and post-institutional adjustment.

TABLE 20
DISTRIBUTION OF OUTCOME FROM PAROLE OF CONTROLS, RUNAWAYS, AND
ATTEMPTED RUNAWAY SUBJECTS

Outcome from Parole	Controls		Runaways		Attempted Runaways		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
No Parole	88	53.7	71	56.8	30	76.9	189	57.6
Satisfactory	46	28.0	17	13.6	8	20.5	71	21.6
Unsatisfactory	30	18.3	37	29.6	1	2.6	68	20.7
Total	164	100.0	125	100.0	39	100.0	328	100.0

$$\chi^2 = 21.27 \quad df = 4 \quad P = .01$$

Personality Dimensions

IQ

Nearly every boy who is processed through the Juvenile Diagnostic Center is given an IQ test. In the population of this study, the mean was 91.12, the range was 60 to 126, and the standard deviation was 11.90. The mean IQ of the controls was 91.12, with a range of 60 to 126. The mean of the runaways was 91.40, with a range of 61 to 118; and finally, the mean of the attempted runaways was 90.23, with a range of 68 to 124. The F value for this variable was 0.15 which was not statistically significant.

This study is consistent with the literature in that IQ was not found to be a differentiating factor between runaways and non-runaways.⁹ Data in Table 21 demonstrate the lack of IQ differentiation across the three groups.

TABLE 21
MEAN IQ AT TICO FOR CONTROLS, RUNAWAYS, AND
ATTEMPTED RUNAWAY SUBJECTS

Group	Mean IQ
Controls	91.1
Runaways	91.4
Attempted Runaways	90.2
Total	91.1

Psychiatric hospitalization before TICO

Out of 328 subjects, 53, or 16.2 per cent had received psychiatric hospitalization before TICO. These 53 subjects were divided into 22 or 13.4 per cent of the controls, 22 or 13.4 per cent of the runaways, and 9 or 23.1 per cent of the attempted runaway subjects. The chi square value of this variable was 3.42 which was not statistically significant.

Psychiatric diagnosis at JDC

As part of the case study of a youth at the intake center of OYC, namely, the Juvenile Diagnostic Center, he is almost always given a psychiatric diagnosis. Thus, 102 or

31.4 per cent of the 328 subjects were labeled as "passive-aggressive," 62 or 19.1 per cent as "unsocialized," 45 or 13.8 per cent as "anti-social personality," 38 or 11.7 per cent as "dyssocial (sociopathic) behavior," and the remainder were divided in the other categories.¹⁰ It is interesting that there were no outstanding distinctions across the three groups in diagnosis (see Table 22).

TABLE 22
DISTRIBUTION OF PSYCHIATRIC DIAGNOSIS AMONG CONTROLS,
RUNAWAYS, AND ATTEMPTED RUNAWAY SUBJECTS

Psychiatric Diagnosis	Controls		Runaways		Attempted Runaways		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Mentally Retarded	11	6.7	4	3.3	3	7.7	18	5.5
Psychosis	2	1.2	3	2.5	1	2.6	6	1.8
Neurosis	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.6	1	0.3
Personality Disorders	14	8.5	3	2.5	0	0.0	17	5.2
Anti-social Personality	22	13.4	18	14.8	5	12.8	45	13.8
Passive-Aggressive	45	27.4	44	36.1	13	33.3	102	31.4
Passive-Dependent	1	0.6	2	1.6	2	5.1	5	1.5
Adjustment Reaction of Adolescence	4	2.4	5	4.1	0	0.0	9	2.8
Behavior Disorders	0	0.0	6	4.9	2	5.1	8	2.5
Group Delinquent	7	4.3	5	4.1	1	2.6	13	4.0
Unsocialized	36	22.0	20	16.4	6	15.4	62	19.1
Dyssocial	22	13.4	11	9.0	5	12.8	38	11.7
Other	0	0.0	1	0.8	0	0.0	1	0.3
Total	164	100.0	125	100.0	39	100.0	328	100.0

Jesness Inventory

The Jesness Inventory was selected to assess personality differences across the three groups. The scores on the Jesness Inventory which was administered to 91 subjects were remarkably similar (see Table 23). There were 41 controls, 30 runaways, and 20 attempted runaway subjects who were given the Jesness Inventory.

TABLE 23
MEAN SCORES OF THE JESNESS INVENTORY OF CONTROLS, RUNAWAYS, AND
ATTEMPTED RUNAWAY SUBJECTS

Personality Dimension	Controls		Runaways		Attempted Runaways		Total		F Scores	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Social Mal- adjustment	63.2	13.1	64.1	16.4	66.9	16.3	64.3	14.9	0.41	N.S.
Value Orientation	55.4	9.2	56.2	12.5	55.3	14.1	55.6	14.1	0.04	N.S.
Immaturity	49.7	12.1	56.3	11.0	55.1	12.6	53.1	12.2	3.06	N.S.
Autism	57.7	10.3	60.8	12.3	62.5	15.9	59.8	12.4	1.16	N.S.
Alienation	55.6	9.2	59.5	14.1	56.4	12.9	57.1	11.8	0.97	N.S.
Manifest Aggression	52.5	10.8	53.5	12.3	55.2	14.4	53.4	12.0	0.34	N.S.
Withdrawal	53.6	9.3	55.6	10.6	54.3	9.8	54.4	9.8	0.33	N.S.
Social Anxiety	47.8	11.3	43.9	11.2	45.6	10.6	46.0	11.1	1.10	N.S.
Repression	49.2	9.2	51.6	11.4	51.7	8.1	50.6	9.8	0.69	N.S.
Denial	50.0	10.1	46.2	13.0	46.7	11.5	48.0	11.4	1.10	N.S.
Asocial Index	69.7	0.6	65.8	12.3	70.4	10.3	68.6	10.8	1.57	N.S.

Initially, it can be noted that the only dimension of the Jesness which approached statistical significance on the F-test score was "immaturity." It is interesting, however, that the mean on "social maladjustment," "immaturity," "autism," "alienation," and "withdrawal" were all greater for the runaways and attempted runaways. In addition, these scores were all greater than the non-delinquent mean of 50. The directionality, therefore, of these personality characteristics tends to suggest that the runaway was an immature student and a loner--a youth who felt alienated and reacted by withdrawing from stressful situations. Thus, he tends to have problems with social adjustment in the community as well as in the institution.

Nevertheless, "withdrawal," which should be the most discriminating personality characteristic between runaways and non-runaways, was barely different for the runaway and attempted runaway subjects than for the control group.¹¹ Moreover, "social anxiety," which also should be considerably higher for the runaway than for the control, was larger for the controls than for the runaways. In addition, "manifest aggression" was lower for the controls than for the other groups, and the "asocial index" was lower for the controls than for the attempted runaway subjects. In view of the controls' generally being involved in more violent and aggressive crimes in the community, this is surprising.¹²

This lack of significant difference between controls, runaways, and attempted runaways on any of the Jesness mean subscale standard scores concurs with the findings of Martin and Clarke. They, too, utilized the Jesness Inventory to ascertain personality differences between runaway and non-runaway populations and did not find any significant differences.¹³ It would, thus, appear either that runaways do not differ from others in the institution or that the Jesness Inventory is at this point too unrefined to distinguish personality differences adequately. Or it may be that the 91 students taking the Jesness simply do not represent a random sample of the three groups.

The Runaway Reaction

The final section of this chapter is concerned with identifying when, where, and under what conditions runaways and attempted runaways took place at TICO in the past two and a half years beginning in 1970.

Age at first runaway

The age of the runaways ranged from 15.1 to 20.2 years and averaged 17.5 years. The age of the attempted runaways ranged from 14.8 to 18.6 years and averaged 17.0 years. Although attempted runaways were only two months younger than runaways when they arrived at TICO, they

attempted to escape within an average of four months, whereas it took the runaway seven months to escape.

Outside of three boys in the runaway group who made an unsuccessful attempt to escape during their first three or four months in the institution and then succeeded in escaping later in their stay at TICO, the boys who were apprehended in the process of escape were those who had only been at the institution for a short period of time.

It is interesting that TICO does not have the early runaways which characterize the escape patterns found in the majority of juvenile and adult institutions. What may explain this in part is that boys arrive at TICO quite fearful, having heard horror stories about the institution, but discover within a couple weeks that TICO is much better than they had anticipated. Consequently, they try to live up to institutional expectation, and it usually takes several months before they make the decision to escape from the institution.

Number of runaways from TICO

There were 120 youths who made one attempted runaway or successful runaway, 30 youths who made two, and 14 who made three or more. No boy made more than five attempted or successful runaways during the period of this study.

When the runaways were examined, it was found that 88 or 70.4 per cent of them made one successful escape; 25 or

20 per cent made two successful escapes; and 12 or 9.6 per cent made three to five successful escapes. In comparison, 32 or 82.1 per cent of the attempted runaways made one unsuccessful attempt to escape; 5 or 12.8 per cent made two unsuccessful attempts; and 2 or 5.1 per cent made three to five unsuccessful attempts to escape (see Table 24). The chi square analysis, however, was not statistically significant.

TABLE 24
DISTRIBUTION OF RUNAWAYS FROM TICO AMONG RUNAWAYS
AND ATTEMPTED RUNAWAY SUBJECTS

Runaway Event	Runaways		Attempted Runaways		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
One	88	70.4	32	82.1	120	73.2
Two	25	20.0	5	12.8	30	18.3
Three to Five	12	9.6	2	5.1	14	8.5
Total	125	100.0	39	100.0	164	100.0

$$\chi^2 = 3.15 \quad df = 5 \quad P = N.S.$$

Based on experience, the one-time runner seems to become institutionally adjusted upon his return to the institution, which is indicated by the number of runaways who were later granted home furloughs, off-campus privileges with staff and parents, and freedom of movement in the

institution. Another indicator of positive adjustment is that disciplinary action was rarely enforced against them. Multiple runaway boys, on the other hand, seem to be poorly adjusted to the institution right from the beginning and regardless of the number of returns, they never did settle into a satisfactory daily routine.

As previously noted, a subject was included in the runaway group providing he had one successful runaway during his stay at TICO. Nevertheless, there were a few cases in which an attempted runaway later became a successful runaway or a successful runaway later became an attempted runaway. The actual breakdown indicated there were three boys who attempted to escape in their first few months at TICO who later succeeded, and that there were 13 boys who attempted to escape but were apprehended after they had had at least one successful runaway. The majority of this latter group belonged in the category, "three to five runaways."

Number of runaways from cottage and academic areas

Out of the 164 runaway and attempted runaway subjects, there were 62 or 37.8 per cent who either attempted or successfully escaped from the cottages at TICO. Cottages A, J, and B had the greatest number of runaway or attempted runaway incidents, while Cottage C had the fewest runaway or attempted runaway incidents.¹⁴ The range of runaways was

one at C to 11 in B. Part of the difference lies in the assignment of students to the various cottages following their classification.

TABLE 25
DISTRIBUTION BY COTTAGE OF RUNAWAYS AND
ATTEMPTED RUNAWAY SUBJECTS

Runaway Event from Cottage	Runaways		Attempted Runaways		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Cottage A	9	7.2	4	10.3	13	7.9
Cottage B	11	8.8	1	2.6	12	7.3
Cottage C	1	0.8	3	7.7	4	2.4
Cottage D	3	2.4	4	10.3	7	4.3
Cottage E	3	2.4	4	10.3	7	4.3
Cottage H	6	4.8	0	0.0	6	3.6
Cottage I	5	4.0	2	5.1	7	4.3
Cottage J	9	7.2	3	7.7	12	7.3
None	78	62.4	18	46.0	96	58.6
Total	125	100.0	39	100.0	164	100.0

The academic and vocational area was also a major location from which boys attempted and successfully escaped. The 62 runaway and attempted runaway events matched the number from the cottages and, given the differing nature of the two areas, it would be interesting to analyze what it

was about each area that constituted the contributing factor to runaways. The chi square value, however, with two degrees of freedom was not statistically significant.

TABLE 26
DISTRIBUTION OF RUNAWAYS AND ATTEMPTED RUNAWAY
SUBJECTS FROM SCHOOL

Runaway Event from School	Runaways		Attempted Runaways		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
One or more	42	33.6	20	51.3	62	37.8
None	83	66.4	19	48.7	102	62.2
Total	125	100.0	39	100.0	164	100.0

Number of runs from home visits,
off campus, and outside jobs

Home visits represented another location from which escapes took place. Of the 125 runaways, 28 or 22.4 per cent failed to return from a home furlough. It is interesting that a TICO boy never ran from a home visit after he had already run away or attempted to run away from the institution. Since home visits were not generally given to students who had already escaped or attempted to escape, this is not too surprising.

When off-campus visits were analyzed, it was found that eight or 6.4 per cent of the 125 runaway students failed

to return from an off-campus visit.¹⁵ All of these escapes took place on the first runaway from the institution.

A little different pattern, however, was reflected in running away from staff off campus. There were 18 boys who escaped from staff off campus on their first runaway, one who escaped from staff off campus on his second runaway, and one who escaped from staff off campus on his fifth runaway.

Finally, four boys escaped from an outside job on their first runaway and one youth escaped from an outside job on his second runaway from the institution. This student who escaped on his second runaway had already escaped from the same job on his first runaway, but the staff of his cottage were able to get a waiver of the seven months additional time for running away and, following his apprehension, they returned him to the same job.

Months of runaway

The distribution of the months of the year when runaways or attempted runaways took place was also done.¹⁶ (See Table 27.)

Although the runaway literature suggests that runaways usually take place at certain times of the year, runaways and attempted runaways at TICO were fairly well distributed throughout the year.¹⁷ While it is not surprising that March would have the greatest number of escapes

because of the coming of spring, it is surprising that the month of December would have the smallest number. This may be attributed to the fact that additional security measures are adopted in December to keep the boys from escaping before Christmas. No such explanation is available for the month of July.

TABLE 27
DISTRIBUTION BY MONTH OF RUNAWAYS
AND ATTEMPTED RUNAWAYS

Month	Runaways		Attempted Runaways		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
January	14	8.2	4	8.9	18	8.3
February	16	9.3	4	8.9	20	9.3
March	27	14.3	5	11.1	32	14.8
April	15	8.8	4	8.9	19	8.8
May	10	5.8	3	6.7	13	6.0
June	15	8.8	5	11.1	20	9.3
July	8	4.7	4	8.9	12	5.6
August	18	10.5	4	8.9	22	10.2
September	13	7.6	3	6.7	16	7.4
October	10	5.8	4	8.9	14	6.5
November	17	9.9	5	11.1	22	10.2
December	8	4.7	0	0.0	8	3.7
Total	171	100.0	45	100.0	216	100.0

Day of runaway

The distribution was also done for the day the runaway or attempted runaway took place.

TABLE 28
DISTRIBUTION OF DAYS OF RUNAWAYS AND
ATTEMPTED RUNAWAYS

Day	Runaways		Attempted Runaways		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Sunday	15	8.8	1	2.2	16	7.4
Monday	52	30.4	6	13.2	58	26.8
Tuesday	32	18.7	8	17.6	40	18.5
Wednesday	25	14.6	13	28.6	38	17.6
Thursday	10	5.8	7	15.4	17	7.9
Friday	30	17.5	9	19.8	39	18.1
Saturday	7	4.1	1	2.2	8	3.7
Total	171	100.0	45	100.0	216	100.0

Other than on weekends, the runaways and attempted runaways were fairly well distributed throughout the week. It would appear that the high number taking place on Monday are a bookkeeping matter. Home visits are usually over on Monday at 6 P.M. Thus, a student failing to return from a home visit will be tabulated as a Monday runaway. In addition, the number is high during the week because school

is in session, and the academic area is the easiest one inside the institution from which to escape.

Time of day runaway took place

Finally, the distribution was done for the time of day the runaway or attempted runaway took place.

TABLE 29
DISTRIBUTION OF TIME OF DAY OF RUNAWAYS
AND ATTEMPTED RUNAWAYS

Time of Day	Runaways		Attempted Runaways		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Morning	47	27.5	12	48.9	59	27.3
Afternoon	52	30.4	22	26.7	74	34.2
Evening	50	29.2	7	1.5	57	26.4
Night	22	12.9	4	0.9	26	12.0
Total	171	100.0	45	100.0	216	100.0

All times, excluding the evenings, were popular for runaway events. In contrast to the runaways, however, attempted runaways chose the afternoons to try to escape from the institution.

Pre-release at time of first run

There were 51 boys who escaped or attempted to escape when they were on pre-release status. Forty-eight of these

were runaways and three were attempted runaway subjects. The chi square value was 11.6 and was significant at the .001 level of confidence.

In view of the fact that the majority of the attempted runaway subjects escaped in the early months of their stay before they had pre-release status, it is understandable why only three attempted runaway subjects had pre-release status. It is obvious that the statistical significance of this variable arose from the paucity of attempted runaway subjects who had pre-release status.

What emerges here is the important concept that escapes within the institution were made by boys still on progress status. It appears that boys intending to escape with pre-release status were willing to wait for a trip off campus or a home visit to abscond from the institution, which is reflected in the 36 or 75 per cent of the 48 runaways with pre-release status who failed to return from home furloughs and off-campus visits with their families.

AWOL restrictions at time of run

Of the 20 students involved in successful or attempted runaways when they still had AWOL restriction time, 17 were runaways and three were attempted runaway subjects.

In explaining why more students do not escape during these seven or ten months of restricted time from a previous runaway or attempted runaway event, the student is aware that

positive behavior on his part can result in a waiver of two or three months. He is also aware that additional escapes may result in a transfer to the Ohio State Reformatory in Mansfield.

Return status at time of first run

Only three students who were runaways chose to escape after they had been recommended for release. When this happens, it usually means that a student on release status had been sent home on a home visit and failed to return to the institution. Escaping while on release status, however, may be the student's way of postponing his return to the community.

Suffix cleared by psychiatrist
before first runaway event

There were 60 or 36.8 per cent of the boys in this study who either successfully escaped or attempted to escape when they had had at least partial "R" or "E" clearance from the psychiatrist. These were divided into 53 or 42.7 per cent runaways and seven or 17.9 per cent attempted runaway subjects.

Thus, four out of every ten runaways and one in every five attempted runaways escaped or attempted to escape when they had had partial clearance of their suffix. Part of the explanation for this difference is that the majority of attempted runaway subjects tried to escape before they

had been at the institution long enough to have their suffix cleared.

Solo or companionate
runaway event

On this final variable, there were 64 subjects or 39 per cent of the 164 who escaped or attempted to escape alone. The other 100 subjects or 61 per cent escaped or attempted to escape with one or more companions.

These two groups were further divided into 55 runaways and nine attempted runaway subjects who were "solo" and 70 runaways and 30 attempted runaway subjects who were companionate. Thus, it would appear that having a companion would make the possibility of running away more difficult.

Notes

¹Since July 31, 1972 was the cut-off date for the study, subjects still in the institution had their number of months computed from the date of admission in TICO to this date.

²In addition to positive behavior, students must have attained pre-release status, have partial "R" or "E" clearance, have a home in Ohio which wants them to visit for a weekend, have their visit approved by their field counselor in the Bureau of Juvenile Placement, and be trusted by the staff of their cottage to return to the institution.

³Study of escapes from the open setting of prison farms is the closest relationship to home visits which is found in the literature. See Nelson N. Cochrane, "Escapees and Their Control," The Prison World, Vol. 10 (May-June, 1948), 4.

⁴It should be noted also that once a boy tries to escape or is able to escape and is apprehended, he is not eligible for pre-release status for seven months, which means that he is not able to have home visits during this time. In addition, staff tend to remember this runaway event and are reluctant to trust the student in the future in high-risk situations, such as home visits.

⁵Contrary to the expectation that one is innocent until proven guilty, disciplinary meetings generally begin with the assumption that the boy is guilty unless he can prove otherwise. As a result, the decision of a disciplinary meeting usually places a boy on maximum or minimum restriction.

Maximum restriction involves taking everything from a student's room except his mattress. The student is confined to his room, eats all of his meals there, and is isolated from other students in the cottage.

While decisions are made in disciplinary meetings, there are certain normative standards, such as fighting receives seven days of maximum restriction. It depends upon the superintendent how much freedom disciplinary meetings have to deviate from these standards.

Minimum restriction is where the room is stripped of everything except the mattress, but the student is permitted to attend school during the day and usually eats his meals with other students. Outside of school and mealtime, however, he spends the rest of his time in his room.

⁶As previously mentioned, students hurt themselves for a variety of reasons. This is their way of handling an unmanageable problem.

⁷Being listed as "no parole" meant that the subjects were either still at TICO on July 31 or that they were still on parole at the end of August.

⁸To explain this level of confidence requires among other things the explication of the procedure for dealing with boys who run away from OYC institutions. When a boy runs away from TICO and has not been apprehended, the procedure is to drop him from the TICO rolls after six months and to place him on the rolls of the Bureau of Juvenile Placement. If his field counselor has had no contact with him for six months, he is generally given an "unsatisfactory" release from parole.

While there would be only a few of the 37 "unsatisfactory" runaways who were not apprehended, stayed in the community a year, and failed to contact their field counselor in that year, this may be enough to affect the level of confidence of this variable, which at the present is well beyond the .001 level.

⁹M. G. S. Gunasekara, "The Problem of Absconding in Boys' Approved Schools in England and Wales," The British Journal of Criminology, Vol. 4 (October, 1963), 149; W. S. Loving, F. E. Stockwell, and D. A. Dobbins, "Factors Associated with Escape Behavior of Prison Inmates," Federal Probation, Vol. 23 (September, 1959), 50; Zena O'Connor, The Runaway Boy in the Correctional School (New York City: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1938), pp. 17-19; Cornelia R. Keogh, "A Study of Runaways at a State Correctional School for Boys," The Journal of Juvenile Research, Vol. 19 (April, 1935), 47.

¹⁰Craig Harlan Mosier, "Delinquents' Perceptions of Institutional Impact: A Validation Study" (Ph.D. dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1972), pp. 124-125.

¹¹While this withdrawal refers to a lack of satisfaction with self and a tendency to isolate oneself from others, this is usually externalized in a withdrawal from stressful situations as well.

¹²In checking the types of offenses committed by the population of this study, it was discovered that non-runaways have more crimes against persons than do runaways.

¹³D. N. Martin and R. V. G. Clarke, "The Personality of Approved School Boy Absconders," The British Journal of Criminology, Vol. 9 (October, 1969), 370.

¹⁴What made the B and A cottages' count so high was the fact that both of them had had mass runaways.

¹⁵Until recently, a boy was permitted to go off campus with relatives; but now parents only are permitted to take a student off campus, unless the student is going to be placed in the home of a brother or sister who then is generally permitted to take the youth off campus for an afternoon.

¹⁶Tables 27, 28, and 29 include the runaway attempts of runaway subjects which is why the total is 171.

¹⁷Cochrane, p. 3; R. V. G. Clarke, "Seasonal and Other Environmental Aspects of Absconding by Approved School Boys," British Journal of Criminology, Vol. 7 (April, 1967), 196-198.

CHAPTER V

PROFILE OF A RUNAWAY

This chapter is concerned with the development of a profile of runaways. Topics discussed in this chapter include the types of boys who run from Training Institution, Central Ohio; a description of the runaway and the attempted runaway; the interaction between personality and structural variables at TICO; and the relationship between home visits and runaway behavior.

Two Types of Runners

In interviews conducted with TICO boys, it was found that the theoretical proposition--a boy becomes a runaway when he has what he considers to be an unmanageable and unshareable problem--could be documented in nearly every runaway and attempted runaway subject.¹

In addition, the interviews indicated that the two types of runaways were "impulsive runners" and "planners." Since there were substantial differences in the rationale of white and black students in each of these categories, it was necessary to differentiate the two types of runaways into white students who run on impulse, black students who run on

impulse, white students who plan their escapes, and black students who plan their escapes.

White students who escaped on impulse did so, they said, for the following reasons which reflected situations they found unmanageable and unshareable, in this order of frequency: desire to be free and to have the deprivations of institutional life removed; desire to get away from a dominant black peer culture in which the white tends to be exploited; dislike of the institution and the control which the black institutional staff have over them; and desire for peer approval.

Black students who escaped on impulse did so, they specified, for the following reasons which reflected situations they found unmanageable and unshareable, in this order of frequency: desire to be free from the unfairness of institutional staff; disappointed with the lack of satisfactory progress in the institution; emotionally upset about problems at home, especially illness or death in the family; and desire to be free and to have the deprivations of institutional life removed.

White students who planned their escapes did so, they said, for the following reasons which reflected situations they found unmanageable and unshareable, in this order of frequency: dislike of institution and the control which the black institutional staff have over them; desire to get

away from a dominant black peer culture in which the white tends to be exploited; desire to be free and to have the deprivations of institutional life removed; and disappointment with the lack of satisfactory progress in the institution.

Finally, black students who planned their escapes did so, they reported, for the following reasons which reflected situations they found unmanageable and unshareable, in this order of frequency: desire to be free and to have the deprivations of institutional life removed; disappointment with the lack of satisfactory progress in the institution; emotionally upset about problems at home, especially an illness or death in the family; and desire to be free from the unfairness of institutional staff.

In response to the question of why he had not taken his unmanageable problem to staff, a youth replied, "They could not really understand my problem." When a boy was faced with what in his perception was an unmanageable problem, whether it was being turned down for pre-release status or being refused permission to visit his sick mother, he often felt that staff could not really understand his problem. Part of the reluctance of TICO boys to share their unmanageable problems with staff is that unmanageable problems are usually only shared with significant others, and it takes many months before this type of relationship is

established between a staff member and student. Generally, TICO boys try to escape or successfully escape before they have had a chance to develop a sharing relationship with staff.

Whites, especially those who escaped on impulse, were influenced by the "desire to be free and to have the deprivations of institutional life removed." As one youth reported, "Jail is tougher on whites." One of the reasons institutional confinement appears to be more difficult for whites is that whites usually had a better life in the community than blacks. Therefore, they have lost more by the fact of their incarceration. This makes sense when it is remembered that ghetto blacks from large urban areas are so numerous at TICO. Institutionalization is frequently a fact of life for them and they may, in fact, gain status in their home community by being from TICO.

Another unmanageable problem for whites, which was quite influential in their escaping from TICO, was the dominant black peer culture which tends to exploit white students. In the language of TICO students, the peer culture at TICO makes whites feel "messed over." According to a black youth leader at TICO, blacks are in control at TICO because "blacks are just naturally more aggressive." In this interview, our respondent claimed that most of the black youths are from the ghetto and "they have to be more aggres-

sive to exist in the ghetto." He went on to say that whites permit this exploitation because they are "afraid of the retaliation from the other blacks throughout the institution."²

What made this exploitation such an acute problem with whites is that nearly all of the line staff are black also. In some instances, especially with white students from small counties, this may be their first real contact with blacks. As a result, the black sub-culture in TICO placed a great deal of stress on whites, who frequently could not find anybody with whom they could share this problem.³

Blacks, more than whites, however, were influenced to run when they were disappointed with their institutional progress. If they were turned down for "R" or "E" clearance, pre-release or release status, there was a tendency for blacks to react more strongly than whites. This was especially true when other members of the peer culture had received pre-release or release status in their review. It would appear then that the progress of others in the cottage (relative deprivation) was an important factor in how blacks dealt with disappointment in the institution.

Blacks, more than whites, also reacted more strongly to family problems in the community. In view of the contention of a youth leader at TICO that blacks have stronger ties with their families and that they return home much more

frequently after they escape from an institution, this reaction makes sense.⁴ It has been the experience of the author that blacks tend to feel less rejected and are less critical of their families than whites. In fact, it is interesting that blacks rarely if ever commit violent crimes against their parents, although whites often do so.

The controls, on the other hand, reported that they had not attempted to run away because they "did not want to be looking over my shoulder all the time," "no reason to do so because everything was going well," "made up my mind to stay," "staff were interested in me," "thought about it but the time bothered me," "thought about it, but I was tired of running," "knew that if I ran, they would send me to Mansfield," and "time has not been that hard for me at TICO." Even though some of the controls had run away before, they were saying that they had made up their minds not to run from TICO and that they were doing well enough so that they could stick to their intention. The controls, like the runaways and attempted runaway subjects, had come into the institution fearful, but had settled down and made an adequate adjustment to the institution.

Profile of the Average Runaway

The white runaway

Mean age at runaway--17.5 years of age
Mean height--5 feet 7 inches tall
Mean weight--150 pounds
Mean IQ--95

The white runaway is likely to come from a broken home and to have been rejected in the home. He probably comes from an urban environment, living either in a large city or near a large city. He comes from a large family, being one of the oldest children in the family.

He began his court record with a minor offense, such as incorrigibility, but has become involved in serious offenses, generally against property. He usually has stolen an automobile at least on one of his runaways. He frequently has drugs and alcohol abuse offenses on his record, and is more prone to be involved in narcotics than the black runaway. Finally, he tends to be a loner on his offenses.

The white runaway has developed a pattern of running away from stressful situations. This pattern includes a history of running away from home and truancy from school. He has usually escaped from OYC institutions at least once and, in fact, this is one of the chief reasons for his transfer to TICO. He was classified at JDC intake as a "passive-aggressive personality," and according to his Jesness score profile, he tends to be a loner who is somewhat immature, feels alienated, withdraws from stressful situations, and is quite socially maladjusted.

He arrived at TICO quite fearful, but this reduced after a few weeks when he realized that the stories he had heard about TICO were not true. Although he thought about

running away at times during his first few months in the institution, there was no concerted effort to plan an escape because he had made up his mind not to run from TICO. In addition, his positive behavior had been reinforced by staff in the institution since he had had his suffix cleared by the psychiatrist and he had been given pre-release. In fact, the only area in which he had any difficulty was the school area where he had completed less than ninth grade and was making C's.

Although he does not try to escape for seven months, he successfully escapes when he does try. His rationale for escaping involves the desire to be free and to get away from the dominant black culture of the institution. He sees this as an unmanageable problem which he feels is unshareable, especially with the staff of the cottage. He usually runs from a home visit or off-campus trip with parents or staff. He generally intends to return from this home visit or off-campus trip, but once he is outside the institution, he finds it difficult to return.

While he tends to run the first time he is outside the institution, it is not uncommon for him to fail to return from a home furlough after he already has had one successful home visit. He is usually apprehended and returned to the institution within a few days of his failure to return from the home visit or off-campus trip. His favorite time for

running is in the spring, especially during the month of March, but he is likely to escape any month. While Monday is his most popular day for escape, Tuesday and Wednesday are also popular days. His favorite time of the day to escape is in the morning, but he seems to avoid escaping after 6 P.M.

The black runaway

Mean age at runaway--17.5 years of age
Mean height--5 feet 7 inches tall
Mean weight--150 pounds
Mean IQ--86

The black student is not very likely to escape from TICO. Those who do, however, have been rejected less at home than white runaways, even though their home backgrounds are no more stable. The black runaway comes from an urban background and is likely to have grown up in a ghetto in Cleveland or Cincinnati.

He tends to have more offenses on his record than the white runaway, most of which are serious property crimes. His offenses, which usually began with stealing, generally include at least one serious offense against persons. He, more often than not, commits his crimes when he is with others.

While he may have run away from an OYC institution, flight from stressful situations is not a pattern with him. The black runaway, for example, does not have a history of

running away from home or truancy from school. It was his poor adjustment in other OYC institutions, rather than runaway behavior, which resulted in his transfer to TICO. He was classified at JDC intake as a "passive-aggressive" or as an "unsocialized" personality. According to his Jesness score profile, he tends to be an immature youth who feels alienated, withdraws from situations, and is socially mal-adjusted.

The black runaway, too, had heard a lot of intimidating stories about TICO, but he was not nearly as fearful as the white runaway when he arrived at TICO. In spite of his less traumatic initial adjustment, his overall adjustment has not been as good as the white runaway's; as a result, it takes him longer to have his suffix cleared and to be given pre-release status. He, like the white runaway, was doing marginal work in school.

He also successfully escapes when he has been at TICO for seven months. His rationale for escaping revolves around disappointment with his institutional progress and family problems. The black runaway sees these as unmanageable problems which are unshareable. He usually escapes from within the institution, frequently with others. He prefers to escape from either the academic or cottage areas.

The black runaway tends to be more difficult to apprehend following his runaway, even though he almost always

returns home. His favorite month for escaping is March, but he also may escape any month. While Monday is his most popular day for escaping, his second most popular day is Friday. Although he seems to avoid the 11 P.M. to 6 A.M. shift, he has no favorite time of the day to escape from the institution.

Profile of the Average
Attempted Runaway

The white attempted runaway

Mean age at runaway--17.0 years of age
Mean height--5 feet 7 inches tall
Mean weight--150 pounds
Mean IQ--90

The white attempted runaway appears to be similar to the runaway in many ways. In contrast, however, to the runaway, the white attempted runaway has apparently experienced more conflict and rejection in his home. Thus, he tends to be more of a confused personality who does not cope as well as the runaway with the stresses of institutional living.

He is much more likely to have been involved with drugs and alcohol in the community, and somewhat more likely than the runaway to be a loner in his offenses. In addition, his escapes from the Fairfield School for Boys, which are consistent with his pattern of running away from stressful situations, are largely responsible for his transfer to TICO. According to his Jesness scale scores, he is more socially

maladjusted, autistic, aggressive, and has a greater asocial index than the runaway, but he is not immature, alienated, or as much withdrawn.

Unlike the runaway, the white attempted runaway did not overcome his early fearfulness of TICO. He became aware, of course, that the intimidating stories he had heard before coming to TICO were not true, but this did not prevent him from developing escape plans. In fact, the white attempted runaway, unlike the runaway, never resolved to make it at TICO. He disliked the institution and was determined to escape. What contributed to both his desire to escape and his dislike of the institution was the fact that he was exploited, sometimes sexually, by black peers.

The white attempted runaway tries to escape within four months of his arrival at TICO. He always attempts to escape from either the cottage or school areas, usually with others. While he has no favorite time for escape as far as the month of the year is concerned, his favorite day is Wednesday. Unlike the runaway, the afternoons are his favorite time of the day to escape.

The black attempted runaway

Mean age at runaway--17.0 years of age
Mean height--5 feet 7 inches tall
Mean weight--150 pounds
Mean IQ--89

Since attempted runaway subjects are divided nearly equally on race, he is as likely to attempt a runaway as the

white attempted runaway student. He is different from the white attempted runaway, in that he has not received as much rejection at home and does not have the confusion to his personality characteristic of his white counterpart. Therefore, he is able to cope more adequately with institutional living.

He is not as likely as the white attempted runaway to be involved with drugs and alcohol in the community, and much more likely to commit his offenses with others. He also has more serious offenses on his record than either the runaways or the white attempted runaway.

He also has less tendency to run away from stressful situations than his three other counterparts. For example, he may not have a history of running away from home, truancy from school, or escapes from institutions. His Jesness scale scores are quite similar to those of the white attempted runaway, which is quite surprising considering the greater stability of the black attempted runaway.

Although he soon discovers that the stories he had heard before coming to TICO were not true, he still very much dislikes the institution. As a result of his dislike for the institution, he develops a negative attitude which makes him less amenable to institutional staff. It also results in his being involved in more disciplinary meetings than the other three groups. Consequently, this lack of

institutional progress brought closure to his trying to escape from the institution.

This youth, like the white attempted runaway, tries to escape within four months of his arrival at TICO. He almost always attempts to escape with other peers, and the escape attempt usually takes place from either the academic or cottage areas. While he has no preference concerning month of escape, his favorite day is Wednesday and the afternoons are his preferred time of the day to escape.

Interaction between Structural and Personality Variables

As previously noted, the Jesness Inventory failed to indicate any personality characteristics which statistically discriminated runaways from non-runaways. The directionality of certain runaway characteristics did suggest, however, a runaway personality which tended to be immature--a loner who felt alienated and withdrew from stressful situations.

Although there is the possibility that other personality measurements, such as the Panton scale, may more effectively demonstrate the importance of personality characteristics in runaway behavior, there is no question that the personal make-up of a young man--his background and experiences, his emotional well being, and the pattern of responses he has learned to make--influences how he responds to institutional confinement.

Instead of running away, for example, a boy can complain about his unmanageable problem to staff. If he is being exploited by peers, he can always go to staff and seek a resolution, or he can go to the wing director when he perceives staff unfairness. If institutional confinement has been bothering him and he does not feel that he will return from a home visit, he can warn staff of this fact.

Another alternative to escape is that a youth can always internalize his unmanageable problem. This, of course, can result in his being destructive to himself, developing psychosomatic problems, or becoming moody and depressed.

In addition to personality characteristics, the structural characteristics of an institution are also influential on runaway behavior. In their book on juvenile institutions, Street, Vinter, and Perrow found that the variation in runaway rates among six juvenile institutions tended to be related to the differences in the institutions studied. While the two institutions which placed the highest emphasis on security and control had low runaway rates, the two institutions which emphasized treatment practices had high runaway rates.⁵

This obviously makes conventional sense because institutional staff are constantly faced with decision-making which will affect the number of runaways. If an institution decides, for example, to place a high priority on security

and control, this will often involve erecting higher fences, installing more secure screens, and enforcing greater punishment for staff who violate security measures.

When a juvenile institution, however, decides to emphasize treatment, then more escape problems will generally follow. This is so because helping a person grow, which is what treatment means, requires that he be made responsible for his own behavior. This, in turn, requires that he be placed in more and more situations of trust. To illustrate, if you permit a boy to leave the institution without staff escort, you are gambling that he will exercise good judgment and return.

In addition to the overall goals of a correctional agency (custody-control or treatment), other constellations of factors in institutional life may serve as catalytic agents in promoting running away. The most important of these factors are centralization, formalization, job satisfaction, and cottage assignment.

Centralization refers to the distribution of power and decision-making in an organization.⁶ TICO has a high degree of centralization, which is reflected in the fact that the responsibility for decision-making rests with a few top administrators. In fact, the decision-makers, which includes the supervisors of the line staff, appear to feel that the line staff should not exercise much power in the organization. What also increases the centralization of this organization

is the assumption that line staff are deliberately failing to perform their responsibilities. This, in turn, creates a type of "punishment centered bureaucracy."⁷

The result of this centralized authority, which fails to trust the staff in the cottages, is an attenuation of the involvement of staff. Staff excuse their lack of involvement by saying that "the people 'down front' are making all the decisions." As a result of this lack of involvement, services to boys suffer, which increases the number of boys who want to escape from the institution.

Formalization is another structural variable related to runaway behavior in institutions. This refers to the number and organization of rules and how strictly they are enforced. TICO is characterized by a high degree of formalization because there are many rules, and workers are frequently reminded that they must go by the regulations. The top administration is quite concerned that directives are enforced in the daily activities of the institution.

In the last eight months of 1972 and the first three months of 1973, this formalization has greatly contributed to the decreasing number of youths escaping from TICO. This is so because a number of directives have been issued by the superintendent concerned with altering high-risk practices.⁸

Job satisfaction is another factor which has an effect on youths who have a propensity for running away. Job

satisfaction is low among staff at TICO, principally because it is not easy to realize a feeling of achievement when clients are marginal individuals who fail much more than they succeed. What further hinders this feeling of achievement is that staff have little feedback concerning the progress of boys after they are released to the community. In addition, working in a "punishment-centered bureaucracy" does not tend to make one feel appreciated. Praise is rarely given to employees at TICO who much more frequently encounter criticisms and reprimands. Thus, there is a lot of anger and resentment toward the system, which reduces job satisfaction.

This lack of job satisfaction, even more than centralization and formalization, results in line staff withdrawing from their involvements with students and increases their tardiness and absenteeism. As a result, there is a lack of predictability with the work of many staff, which makes it difficult for the boys to form a relationship with them. In view of the fact that delinquents seem to be more prone to act out when they have to deal with very much unpredictability and uncertainty, the lack of job satisfaction and the unpredictability of staff can have a direct effect on the behavior of boys.

Cottage placement is a structural variable which appears to have some influence on runaway behavior at TICO. Even though it was not statistically significant, there is

reason to believe that the cottage assignment of a student can affect his institutional adjustment.

To illustrate, Cottage A has housed emotionally disturbed students, most of whom have a runaway pattern and who fit nicely in the runaway profile developed in this chapter. Yet, the staff of this cottage work so well with these boys that, excluding one mass runaway, Cottage A's runaway rate is one of the lowest in the institution.

If a student is placed in a cottage which has a punitive leader, it is possible that this leader will tend to increase runaway plots and phantasies. TICO boys generally do not respond well to this type of leader. It is not unusual, therefore, for a runaway to be adjusting well to the institution until he has an altercation of some kind with a punitive leader in his cottage. As previously indicated, students blamed their runaway behavior quite frequently on the unfairness of staff, which included both the disappointment of being turned down for pre-release and release status and the feeling that the staff was pushing them around.

To move a step further than discussing the importance of personality characteristics and structural variables on runaway behavior at TICO, it would appear that the following proposition is more explanatory: Neither personality nor

institutional variables are as decisive in runaways as the interaction between them.

In the previous discussion, when it was suggested that boys with certain personality traits are predisposed to escape from one setting and not from another, this interaction between personality traits and structural characteristics was viewed as the determining factor in the runaway response of the student. This interaction between personality and structural variables is in reality an ongoing process which is constantly being created by a boy responding to his environment.

Therefore, a given personality responds to his environment in a certain way which brings forth a response from the environment. This, in turn, elicits a new response from the boy, bringing forth another response from the environment, and so forth until the sequence of responses is completed (release of student or runaway event).

Testing this proposition as a hypothesis would involve substantiating by statistical measures that the interaction between personality variables and structural variables in the institution is more important in creating runaways than either personality or structural variables. Unfortunately, methodology in organizational analysis still is unable to quantify such data.⁹

But to demonstrate this interaction between personality and structural variables, perhaps this case study would be helpful: A small and immature white boy was approached by several black students who wanted to sexually exploit him in a music class his first week at TICO. Since the teacher had left the classroom, they had an opportunity. This situation was initiated by one black student who said, "I want some ass." In response to this statement, three other black youths also began to approach this white student. The white student immediately picked up a chair, broke off a leg, and swung this leg at one of the approaching students. The three retreated at this point and watched the two circle each other. While the stronger and older black student was able to wrestle the leg away from the white student, he was unable to subdue him. The teacher finally returned and the altercation was ended.

Here then was a boy with a given personality style (experience--grew up on the streets of a large city, was used to gang fighting, and had no homosexual experiences; personality characteristics--impulsive, quick thinking under stress, capable of violent acting out, genuine fearfulness of being sexually exploited, and a tendency to respond to rather than withdraw from attack) who found himself in a structural situation (new in the institution, threat of being sexually exploited in a room without a teacher, chair

was available to defend himself, only one student pursued the attack, teacher returned and broke up the fight), and he responded in the indicated way.

Two consequences arose from this incident. First, although he was struck in the face several times and was the loser in the fight, he was never bothered by his black peers after this incident. In spite of his small size, he clearly demonstrated to his peers that he would try to hurt anyone who attempted to exploit him. Second, he was approached by a white peer in his cottage later that week with a request to help him work on his runaway plot. Since he was still fearful about his narrow escape in the music room, he decided to participate in the plan to escape from the institution. His special unmanageable problem was the fear of being sexually exploited, and he felt that there was no one with whom he could share this problem. Consequently, he became involved in this runaway plan, which was frustrated by the quick intervention of staff.

While this interaction between personality and structural characteristics of the institution has only been described in a very cursory way, it would appear to contain exciting possibilities for theoretical advancement in the understanding of escapes from institutions.

Home Visits

One of the most neglected areas in the study of runaway behavior from juvenile institutions is concerned with runaways from home furloughs. Adult institutions, however, have been concerned with this problem, especially with escapes from prison farms. In view of the increasing emphasis on community-based treatment in corrections today, it would appear that juvenile institutions will need to provide inmates with more opportunity for gradual return and reintegration into the community, rather than continuing the sudden shock of their release day. Home visits, along with outside jobs, will probably be the most effective vehicle in helping youths adjust again to community living.

In this study, there were 28 boys or 22.4 per cent of the runaways who failed to return from a home visit. But there were still 34 boys or 27.2 per cent of the runaways who returned from at least one home visit and 16 or 41.1 per cent of the 39 attempted runaway subjects who returned from at least one home visit.

In an effort to understand better those students who failed to return from a home visit, a more detailed examination of the home visit escapees was undertaken. Of the 28, there were 15 without a suffix, 12 with "R" suffixes, and one with an "E" suffix. While 20 came from counties over 500,000, none came from counties under 50,000 population.

Twenty of the runaways from home visits were white and eight were black.

Only four of the 28 came from intact homes, and only four of the 28 lived with other than their mothers the first ten years of their lives. Rejection in the home was indicated for 17 out of the 28 runaways. In terms of rank in birth order, nine were the first born, seven were the second born, four were the third born, five were the fourth born, and three were the eighth born. Nine had siblings in correctional institutions.

There were 20 whose most serious previous offense was listed as "serious," and 21 whose offense which resulted in present commitment to TICO was listed as "serious." Eleven of the 28 were involved in drugs and alcohol abuse problems, and 13 were loners in their violations of the law. Seven were committed to the OYC one time, 11 were committed two times, and ten were committed more than two times.

Of the 28, 17 had runaways before TICO. Fifteen of the 28 had spent more than 18 months at TICO and nine had spent from nine to 18 months. The mean age of commitment to TICO was 17.1 years of age, and the mean age at the first runaway was 18.1 years of age. Nineteen of the runaways from home visits had one runaway, six had two, and three had more than two runaways. The mean number of months at TICO for this group was 18.1 months.

March was the most popular month for runaways from home visits. Monday was the most popular day, and the evening was the most popular time.¹⁰ Of the 28, four had one successful home visit, five had two successful home visits, and one had three successful home visits.

Three of the 28 had had psychiatric hospitalization before TICO. The mean IQ was 92.46; and according to the classification scheme at JDC, nine were "passive-aggressive," four had "personality disorders," four were "unsocialized," and five had "dyssocial (sociopathic) behavior." Twenty-three of the 28 had completed at least ninth grade at C. Arthur Wilson High School, 25 were in a vocational program, and the mean grade was 2.7 out of a 4.0 system. In terms of disciplinary meetings, eight had none, ten had one or two, and ten had more than two. Only four out of the group had been involved in homosexual behavior at TICO, and two had made a suicide attempt at TICO. Nobody, however, had made a suicide attempt at other OYC facilities. Out of the 11 who had completed their parole period, three were listed as "satisfactory" and eight as "unsatisfactory."

In addition to the above, it is interesting that the majority of the 34 runaways and the 16 attempted runaway subjects who returned from at least one home visit did this after they had already escaped or attempted to escape from the institution, and no student escaped from a home visit

after he had already escaped or attempted to escape from TICO.

Although the small number in the cells of the tables precluded using a chi square test to determine how these 28 were different from the 125 runaways, it is to be noted that there was a higher percentage of white runaways from home visits than white runaways in general; runaways from home visits had less rejection in the home; their height and weight were a little less than runaways in general; and there were more runaways from home visits without suffixes. In addition, runaways from home visits had more OYC commitments, had a higher percentage of their group involved in prior runaway behavior, had a higher percentage of their group involved in homosexual behavior, had a higher IQ, and had a greater number who had been released "unsatisfactory" from parole. On the Jesness scale scores, runaways from home visits were higher in social maladjustment, value orientation, autism, alienation, manifest aggression, withdrawal, social anxiety, denial, and asocial index. Runaways from home visits were only lower in immaturity and repression.

In this chapter, the attempt has been made to provide some subjective evidence for our thesis that running away is a response to an unshareable and insoluble problem faced by the student in the institution. Special emphasis was placed

on presenting a profile of white and black escapees and also attempted escapees. Additional emphasis was given the relationship between individual attributes and organizational imperatives in TICO.

Notes

¹While no mention is made of the effect of a boy's sharing this problem with another peer, there are some situations known by the author where it helped to relieve the pressure of an unmanageable problem.

²These statements were made in an interview with Dr. Stuart Miller.

³It is interesting that interviewees never mentioned the names of their social workers. In the past three years, seven of the eight cottages had white social workers, but apparently, the social worker was not helpful in resolving the racial feeling that the white student was being "messed over" by black peers and staff.

⁴These statements were made to the author in an interview.

⁵Steven G. Lubeck and Lamar T. Empey, "Mediatory Versus Total Institution: The Case of the Runaway," Social Problems, Vol. 16 (Fall, 1968), 244-245.

⁶Jerald Hage and Michael Aiken, Social Change in Complex Organizations (New York: Random House, 1970), p. 38.

⁷Alvin Gouldner, Pattern of Industrial Bureaucracy (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1954), pp. 207-214.

⁸Since April of 1972, home visits have been limited to three for each wing, a checklist has been designed which the entire staff rather than only the social worker must sign before a student is permitted a home visit, off-campus visits with parents are only permitted for boys who have been granted release by the Administrative Review Board, and the staff-student ratio for off-campus trips has been lowered to one to one.

⁹Paul E. Lazarsfeld and Herbert Menzel, "On the Relationship between Individual and Collective Properties," in A Sociological Reader on Complex Organizations, ed. by Amitai Etzioni (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1961), pp. 499-516.

¹⁰Students on home visits must be back at the institution on Monday evening at 6 P.M. If they fail to return, this is when they are charged with their runaway.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to examine the problem of the runaway student at the Training Institution, Central Ohio. Investigation of institutional records revealed 145 consecutive and successful runaway events involving 125 different boys in the period January of 1970 through October of 1972. In addition to the successful escapes, there were 39 other students who attempted to escape during the same period.

These escapes have made Columbus residents (especially those living near TICO) sensitive to the runaway problem at TICO. In order to be able to pursue its treatment ideology, it is therefore vital for TICO to reduce the threat posed by runaways. To accomplish this goal without sacrificing the quality of its treatment program, it is necessary to determine those variables which differentiate runaways from non-runaways, to ascertain what constellations of factors in institutional life serve as catalytic agents to those boys who have a propensity for running away, and to design special treatment programs for boys who are prone to escape.

In reviewing the literature, it was found that the major studies on escapes from institutions, most of which were done on adult institutions, differ greatly in their conclusions but largely because the populations, methods, and approaches employed were different. While there are several significant variables related to escape in adult correctional facilities, race tends to be the only variable in juvenile institutions which has been found to be consistently useful in identifying and predicting runaways. White boys are very much more likely to escape than black students.

In order to study the runaway problem at TICO, a roster of runaways and attempted runaway subjects was compiled. Each escapee and attempted escapee was then paired with the next boy admitted to TICO. This latter group constituted the comparison or control subjects. Analysis indicated that the comparison students appeared to be a random sample of the TICO population between 1970 and 1972.

The escapees and comparison boys were compared on a broad spectrum of variables. Some of these variables include height, weight, number of siblings, siblings in other correctional settings, family backgrounds, previous runaways from OYC institutions, time in OYC institutions before TICO, intelligence, psychiatric hospitalization, number of previous commitments to OYC institutions, post-institutional adjustment, year completed in school, type of school program,

grades in school, time in TICO before runaway, month of runaway, day of runaway, time of day of runaway, home visits, pre-release status, and release status before runaway.

Data on these variables and others were gathered from boys' case folders, interviews with some of the boys in each of the (runaway, attempted runaway, and comparison) groups, the Jesness Inventory scale scores, institutional documents, and participation observation.

Significant Variables

In this study, there were eleven variables which statistically differentiated runaways from non-runaways. These were:

1. Race.--While the 328 subjects were almost equally divided between whites and blacks, the latter constituted three-fifths of the controls and the former three-fifths of the runaways. This difference was significant at the .01 level of confidence.

2. Drugs and alcohol abuse.--Approximately 35 per cent of the runaways, 51 per cent of the attempted runaways, and 23 per cent of the controls had a record of either narcotics or alcoholic abuse. This variable was significant at the .01 level of confidence.

3. "R" and "E" suffix.--Although 27.4 per cent of the control group was not assigned a suffix at JDC, 42.4 per cent of the runaway group did not have a suffix. This difference was significant at the .05 level of confidence.

4. Runaway pattern in other institutions.--While 35.4 per cent of the control group had escaped during prior commitments to the OYC, 63.2 per cent of the runaways and 69.2 per cent of the attempted runaways had escaped during previous commitments. This variable was significant at better than the .001 level of confidence.

5. Months at OYC institutions.--The runaways deviated from the other two groups in having few subjects in the category "one to three months" and more subjects in the category "more than eighteen months." These differences yielded a chi square value which was significant at the .02 level of confidence.

6. Home visits.--Analysis showed that there was a distinct difference among the groups on this variable. One half of the controls, 40 per cent of the attempted runaway subjects, and 30 per cent of the runaway subjects had been given home visits. This difference was statistically significant at the .001 level of confidence.

7. Disciplinary meetings.--When the three groups were analyzed, the controls were significantly under-represented in having disciplinary action brought against them at TICO. The chi square value on this variable was statistically significant at the .05 level of confidence.

8. Homosexual behavior.--In analyzing the three groups, 10.4 per cent of the control group, 6.4 per cent of the runaway group, and 20.5 per cent of the attempted runaway group were listed in the case folders as homosexuals. The chi square value on this variable was statistically significant at the .05 level.

9. Completed year in school.--There were distinct differences among the three groups on this variable. Controls, for instance, had a higher degree of graduates from high school, while attempted runaway subjects had over 40 per cent completed tenth grade or more, and runaways completed fewer years of school than the other two groups. These differences contributed to a chi square value which was statistically significant at the .01 level of confidence.

10. Average grade in school.--Although almost all of the attempted runaways and controls made B's and C's, over 20 per cent of the runaways made D's and E's. These differences yielded a chi square value which was statistically significant at the .01 level of confidence.

11. Outcome on parole.--Differences in the three groups were reflected in the fact that 28 per cent of the controls, 13.6 per cent of the runaways, and 20.5 per cent of the attempted runaway subjects were given "satisfactory" releases from parole. In addition, there were 18.3 per cent of the controls, 29.6 per cent of the runaways, and 2.6 per cent of the attempted runaway subjects who were given "unsatisfactory" releases from parole. These differences were statistically significant at the .001 level of confidence.

The Jesness Inventory which was used to differentiate personality differences between runaways and non-runaways failed to identify any significant personality characteristics unique to runaways. The scale scores did suggest that a runaway was an immature student and a loner--a youth who felt alienated and reacted by withdrawing from stressful situations.

Such variables as family rejection, age at commitment to TICO, height, weight, most serious previous offense, group or loner offense, suicide attempts at other OYC institutions, number of months in TICO, suicide attempts at TICO, IQ, and runaways from different areas were not found to be significant in this study.

Testing the Null Hypotheses

Hypothesis No. 1

There is no personality constellation which defines the runaway population.

To test this first null hypothesis, the Jesness Inventory was used to ascertain personality differences between controls, runaways, and attempted runaway subjects. As previously stated, no dimensions of the personality were statistically significant across groups and the only dimension which approached significance was "immaturity." Even "withdrawal" which should have been the most discriminating personality characteristic between runaways and non-runaways was one of the lowest of the F-scores.

There was then an attempt made to explore whether pathology in the personality was characteristic of the runaway type by examining such variables as suicide before TICO, suicide at TICO, psychiatric hospitalization before TICO and the "E" suffix. None of these was statistically significant between controls and runaways.

Consequently, unless the Jesness Inventory lacks the sophistication to measure subtle differences in personality characteristics, this null hypothesis must stand because there does not appear to be a personality constellation which separates runaways from non-runaways.

Hypothesis No. 2

There is no relationship between organizational change and runaway behavior.

Literature on the prison points out that bringing organizational change to a prison, regardless of how therapeutic that change may be, only results in increased incidents, acting-out behavior, and sometimes even riots.¹ This null hypothesis was postulated to see whether organizational change and runaway behavior were related in the same way at an institution for delinquent boys under 18 years of age.

As previously mentioned, TICO has gone through several periods of organizational change. The three changes which have brought the most conflict to TICO were when the Cottage Life and Social Service Departments were united to form the Department of Guidance under the leadership of a social worker in 1965; when it was decided to initiate a guided-group-interaction program in the cottage units in 1967; and when social workers ceased to be cottage directors in 1970. Part of the reason why these changes brought conflict to the organization is that each involved a shift in formal authority and resulted in changing the job descriptions of the youth leader series.

In 1965, which was the year of the first change, there were 48 runaways which was eight more than there had been in 1964. In 1967, however, there were 52 runaways which

was four fewer than in 1966, and in 1970 there were 64 runaways which was three fewer than in 1969 (see Appendix A for runaways each year). Thus, there were fewer rather than more runaways in two of the three years in which organizational change took place. As a result, this null hypothesis as it presently stands cannot be rejected.

It may be, however, that organizational change only directly affects runaways when it is on a cottage level. Therefore, when a punitive leader who mistreats students is placed in a cottage, then this may be organizational change to which boys can more directly relate and from which some will attempt to escape.

Hypothesis No. 3

There is no relationship between cottage assignment and runaway behavior.

To begin with, boys had been assigned to a cottage for most of the period under consideration either by size, aggressiveness, or degree of emotional disturbance. As a result, J Cottage ended up with large, aggressive black youths who were usually from urban ghetto settings and who usually do not escape. When J was filled, this same type of youth was sent to H and G. What is interesting is that J had 12 successful and attempted runaways compared to a combined figure of 13 for both H and G. Moreover, until they built the special screens on J's windows, this cottage led

by far the other cottages in number of escapes even though the types of boys held do not usually escape. When J is compared to C Cottage, which had four successful and attempted runaways without any special screens, the importance of structural variables in an institution becomes more evident. Nevertheless, none of the cottages had statistically significant chi square values which means that the null hypothesis cannot be rejected.

On a qualitative level, there is strong reason to believe that cottage placement is influential in runaway behavior. It was apparent, for instance, in the interviews that students who had done well in certain cottages were quite similar in personality construction and background experiences to boys who had had considerable difficulty in other cottages. Consequently, while the former students were willing to stay at TICO, the poor adjustment of the latter made them seek to escape from the institution.

Hypothesis No. 4

There is no relationship between race and runaway behavior.

The 328 subjects in the sample were nearly equally divided between blacks and whites. There was, however, a distinct difference between runaway and control populations by race, as three-fifths of the controls were black while three-fifths of the runaways were white. This difference

yielded a chi square value of 13.34 which was significant at the .01 level of confidence. As a result, the null hypothesis can be rejected.

Hypothesis No. 5

There is no relationship between race and solo runaways.

There were 54 of the 125 runaways who ran alone. Whereas only 15 or 27.8 per cent of the solo runaways were black, 39 or 73.2 per cent of the 54 solo runaways were white. Although it appeared that the difference between race and solo runaways would be greater than race and runaway behavior, the chi square value was 4.87 which was statistically significant at the .05 level of confidence. This means that the null hypothesis can be rejected.

Hypothesis No. 6

There is no relationship between race and companionate runaways.

Out of the 125 runaways, there were 71 who ran with others. Of these, 33 or 46.5 per cent were black and 38 or 53.5 per cent were white. This appears to suggest that blacks are more prone to escape with others than are whites. The chi square value for this variable was 4.87 which was statistically significant at the .05 level of confidence. This means that the null hypothesis can be rejected.

Hypothesis No. 7

There is no relationship between criminal offense and runaway behavior.

While this is true for the offense which was the most serious one committed before the one leading to the present commitment to the OYC, it was not true for the offense leading to the present TICO incarceration. In the latter case, there was a strong correlation between drugs and alcohol abuse and runaway behavior.

This is reflected in the fact that 39 or 23.8 per cent of the controls involved themselves in drugs and alcohol abuse, compared to 44 or 35.2 per cent of the runaways who involved themselves in this behavior. The chi square value for this variable was 12.41 which was statistically significant at the .01 level of confidence. Thus, the null hypothesis can be rejected.

Two Types of Runners

As previously mentioned, there are various explanations found in the literature to explain runaway behavior from institutions--normal response, personality differences, response inmates learned from others, disappointment either with the institution or progress toward release, and escapees are more prone to take risks--but this study has suggested the thesis that "a boy becomes a runaway from an institution when he has what he considers to be an unmanageable and unshareable problem."

In interviews conducted with TICO boys, it was revealed that this proposition could be documented in nearly every runaway and attempted runaway subject. In addition, the interviews indicated that the two types of runaways were "impulsive runners" and "planners." Since there were substantial differences in the rationale of white and black students in each of these categories, it was necessary to differentiate the two types of runaways into white students who run on impulse, black students who run on impulse, white students who plan their escapes, and black students who plan their escapes.

White students who escaped on impulse did so, they said, for the following reasons which reflected situations they found unmanageable and unshareable, in this order of frequency: desire to be free and to have the deprivations of institutional life removed; desire to get away from a dominant black peer culture in which the white tends to be exploited; dislike of the institution and the control which the black institutional staff have over them; and desire for peer approval.

Black students who escaped on impulse did so, they specified, for the following reasons which reflected situations they found unmanageable and unshareable, in this order of frequency: desire to be free from the unfairness of institutional staff; disappointed with the lack of satis-

factory progress in the institution; emotionally upset about problems at home, especially illness or death in the family; and desire to be free and to have the deprivations of institutional life removed.

White students who planned their escapes did so, they said, for the following reasons which reflected situations they found unmanageable and unshareable, in this order of frequency: dislike of institution and the control which the black institutional staff have over them; desire to get away from a dominant black peer culture in which the white tends to be exploited; desire to be free and to have the deprivations of institutional life removed; and disappointment with the lack of satisfactory progress in the institution.

Finally, black students who planned their escapes did so, they reported, for the following reasons which reflected situations they found unmanageable and unshareable, in this order of frequency: desire to be free and to have the deprivations of institutional life removed; disappointment with the lack of satisfactory progress in the institution; emotionally upset about problems at home, especially an illness or death in the family; and desire to be free from the unfairness of institutional staff.

Profile of a Runaway

In developing a profile of the runaway, it was discovered that race was an important variable and that there were important differences between runaways and attempted runaways. As a result, four profiles--white runaway, black runaway, white attempted runaway, and black attempted runaway--are contained in Chapter V.

The most salient characteristic of the white runaway is that he failed to return to the institution from a home visit or off-campus trip. His desire to be free of the deprivations of institutional living and from the pressure of a dominant black culture was so strong that he was unable to return to TICO. The black runaway tended to escape from within the institution because of a dissatisfaction with institutional progress. The white attempted runaway could be characterized as a confused personality who was fearful of TICO and wanted to escape from the time he was admitted to the institution. Finally, the most salient characteristic of the black attempted runaway was his acting-out behavior, arising from his dislike of the institution. (See Chapter V for a more extensive description of the four groups.)

Interaction between Structural and Personality Variables

It would appear that neither personality nor institutional variables are as decisive in escapes as the inter-

action between them. This interaction is helpful in clarifying how a youth develops an unmanageable problem which is unshareable.

To begin with, each boy's personality is the sum total of his background and experiences, his emotional make-up, and the patterns and responses he has learned to make. Each boy has developed his way of coping with his environment, which may include running away from home, school, and institution.

As previously mentioned, institutional variables are important in understanding runaway behavior, especially the variables of organizational goals (security-control or treatment), centralization, formalization, job satisfaction of staff, and cottage placement.

But what is more important than either of the above is the interaction between them. This is suggesting that a youth with a given personality structure is placed in a given environment, to which he responds in a characteristic way. This brings a certain response from those in his environment, which in turn elicits a characteristic response from the student. What is found here is an ongoing process between personality and environment, and it is the interaction between the two which creates reality. As a result, boys with certain personality traits may be predisposed to escape from one setting and not from another. This

interaction between personality and structural characteristics of an institution appears to contain exciting possibilities for theoretical advancement in understanding and dealing with escapes.

Home Visits

In view of the emphasis on community-based treatment in corrections today, juvenile institutions will need to provide inmates with more opportunity for gradual return to the community. Home visits, along with outside jobs, will probably be the most effective vehicle in helping youths adjust again to community living.

In an effort to understand better the 28 students who failed to return from a home visit, a more detailed examination of the home visit escapees was undertaken. While there were many differences between runaways in general and runaways from home visits, the small size of the runaways from home visit group made it uncomfortable to draw conclusions from these differences.

Contributions to Criminological Research

Over the years, Reckless and his students have explored various facets of institutional impact--from the optimal length of stay to the effects of inmate pressure on institutional behavior and post-institutional adjustments. Thus, Galway found that most delinquents perceived themselves

to have benefited from their institutionalization. Bright suggested that the longer the stay in institutions, the poorer the adjustment. Therefore, he argues for minimizing the length of stay whenever possible. Sabnis found that students derived a greater positive effect from the guidance of non-professional as opposed to professional staff. Moran found that the degree to which an institution is progressive in its policies is reflected in the extent to which inmates tend to think of themselves as students rather than as inmates. Zibners found that students were more optimistic about their outcome after institutionalization than were staff. Eynon--later Reckless, Eynon, and Allen--then Miller, and finally Mosier were all concerned with developing a schedule to measure institutional impact. A factor analysis revealed six major clusters of items which were named "interpersonal approach," "inmate code of acting," "rejection of the institution," "inmate pressure," "rejection of positive impact," and "self-labeling."

The present study is another part of this growing body of literature on institutional impact. The runaway is a special case and the most extreme case of institutional maladaptation. While there is some question in other studies whether running away is inimical to later community adjustment, the data gathered in this dissertation indicate

that runaways do tend to have poorer outcomes than institutionally better adjusted boys.

The central thesis is that a boy becomes a runaway at this institution when he is faced with an unmanageable problem which he feels is unshareable. This inability to communicate one's deepest feelings and concerns to others leads to a degree of social isolation which in turn may result in deviant solutions to common problems.

Needed Research on Runaways in Juvenile Institutions

This dissertation has suggested that there are some exciting possibilities for future research on runaways from juvenile institutions. Some of the areas which need additional exploration include the development of a prediction table for youths who are prone to escape from juvenile institutions, intensive study of the interaction between structural and personality characteristics in determining runaway behavior, the relationship between exploitation and runaway behavior in a juvenile institution, the discrimination between runaways and non-runaways from home visits, and the relationship in other settings between an unmanageable and unshareable problem and runaway behavior.

Recommendations

It is not difficult for an institution to resolve its runaway problem, for it is possible to make an institu-

tion so "fortress" like that it is nearly impossible to escape from it. What is challenging, however, is for institutions to work with youths in more open settings without runaways jeopardizing the program.

To be able to accomplish this more at TICO, the following strategy is suggested:

1. Intake cottage and counseling.--Since students come to TICO with considerable trepidation, effort should be extended to relieve their anxiety and to make them more at ease as soon as possible. It is important that this supportive counseling be done in the intake cottage the first month the youth is in the institution because it is then that he makes his decision on just how much effort he is going to expend trying to adjust to the institution. Instead of continuing his poor adjustment pattern characteristic of his behavior in other OYC institutions (which may have included an escape), the youth needs to make a conscious decision that he is going to make a good adjustment to TICO. Staff intervention is needed, not only in helping him become more comfortable which he sorely needs in order to make a positive decision, but also in supporting him once he has decided to involve himself constructively in institutional programming.

2. Assignment of student to proper cottage.--In this intake process, it is important to be certain that a student receives proper placement in a cottage. He needs to be placed in a setting where he feels the staff are concerned about him and where he can relate to them. If this student confronts an unmanageable problem, he needs to be able to share this problem with staff who are "significant others."² It is also important that the intake student be sent to a cottage where he will be exposed to as little exploitation as possible.

3. Matching and training of staff.--It is imperative that students are matched more closely with the abilities and personalities of staff. The first step in this "matching" program is to create a milieu in cottages where staff with similar abilities and needs are placed together. While the union contract at TICO militates against any rapid movement of staff, it is possible, over a period of time, to attain this goal of homogeneity of staff in the majority of the cottages.

As this "matching" takes place, the next objective would be to begin an ongoing series of "relationship seminars." The goals of these seminars would be to train staff to improve their interpersonal relationships with students. If the right leader could be found, it appears likely that these sensitivity experiences would be helpful

to staff in terms of understanding themselves and in improving their relationships with delinquents.

4. Increase number of positive rewards.--In view of the tendency for correctional settings to be quite "punishment-centered," it is important to begin to reinforce the positive behaviors of students. Consequently, efforts should be made to re-evaluate the TICO program and to remove as many negative reinforcers as possible. Maximum restriction does not seem to change behavior in a positive way. Dances, parties, staying up later, contact with groups from the community, awarding tokens which can be traded in on foodstuffs or to earn special privileges are techniques that can be utilized in this positive reinforcement program.

5. Create more decision-making among students.--One of the social workers recently said to the author, "Running away is the only area of free creative thinking a kid has at TICO."³ Contrary to what many of us anticipated, the reality of this lack of opportunity for decision-making can be found in the response of TICO boys to the Explorers Scout group which recently came into the institution. The popularity of the scouts is apparently attributable to the fact that the boys run the troop and are given opportunities to make decisions. In other areas of the institution, TICO boys should have more opportunities to participate in decision-making.

6. Create more contact with families.--It is the contention of another social worker at TICO that "Columbus kids get more visits from their families, therefore, they run less frequently from the institution."⁴ While no validation was done to check the accuracy of this statement, there is no question that visits from parents improve the morale of most students.

What is suggested here is that more programs be initiated similar to the one in Dayton in which a service club buses the parents of Dayton youths to TICO for a day with their boys. While this would require considerable coordination in the community, there is no reason why service clubs or other agencies in Cleveland, Cincinnati, and Toledo could not initiate similar programs.

7. Gradual extension of responsibility.--In order to help students handle the responsibility of a home visit, off-campus trip, or outside job, it is suggested that there be a gradual exposure to the community. This is especially true for boys who appear to be more prone to escape. Escape-prone youths, for example, could be sent to dances at Scioto Village, then to a work detail at Scioto Village or Juvenile Diagnostic Center, and finally to an outing in the community supervised by staff before they are sent on a home furlough. Such graduated release experiences can do

more than simply prevent escapes while on furlough. They can provide a much needed mechanism for the community reintegration of delinquent boys.

Notes

¹The clearest statement of organizational change in a prison is Richard H. McCleery's "Policy Change in Prison Management," in A Sociological Reader on Complex Organization, edited by Amitai Etzioni (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1961), pp. 200-222.

²It has been the experience of the author that juveniles are more receptive to forming relationships with staff than adult inmates would be in the prison. Even at TICO, there is not the rigid separation between staff and student that would be found in the social organization of the prison.

³He stated to the author.

⁴He stated to the author.

APPENDIX A

SUPERINTENDENTS AND RUNAWAYS AT TICO

SUPERINTENDENTS AND RUNAWAYS AT TICO

<u>Year</u>	<u>Superintendent</u>	<u>Runaways</u>
1961	William Balson	15 ^a
1962	William Balson	21
1963	William Balson 1-1-63 to 11-1-63 Anthony Catalino 11-4-63 to 12-31-63	8
1964	Anthony Catalino	40
1965	Anthony Catalino	48
1966	Anthony Catalino	56
1967	Anthony Catalino 1-1-67 to 2-9-67 Eugene Vejsicky 2-12-67 to 9-14-69	52
1968	Eugene Vejsicky	40
1969	Eugene Vejsicky 1-1-69 to 9-14-69 John Baumeister 9-15-69 to 12-31-69	67
1970	John Baumeister	64
1971	John Baumeister	57
1972	John Baumeister 1-1-72 to 4-10-72 Albert Harrington 4-17-72 to 12-31-72	29 ^b

^aThe institution was not opened until 5-15-61, and only 96 students were admitted in 1961.

^bThere were 19 runaways during the eight months of 1972 in which Mr. Harrington was superintendent.

APPENDIX B

CODE KEY OF FINAL SCHEDULE
FOR CASE FOLDERS

TICO PROJECT RUNAWAY

Researcher: Clemens Bartollas

C O D E K E Y

<u>Card #1</u>	<u>Item</u>	
Column		
1-5	Serial Number OYC	
6	Suffix:	
	a-no suffix	0
	b-"R" suffix	1
	c-"E" suffix	2
	d-no information	9
7-8	County	
9	Size of County:	
	a-rural, less than 25,000	1
	b- 25,000 - 49,000	2
	c- 50,000 - 99,999	3
	d-100,000 - 249,000	4
	e-250,000 - 499,000	5
	f-500,000 -1,000,000	6
	g-no information	9
10	Color:	
	a-white	1
	b-black	2
	c-no information	9
11	Status of Natural Parents in Relation to Child:	
	a-intact	1
	b-divorced, separated, deserted, one in prison or mental hospital	2
	c-one or both dead	3
	d-multiple problems	4
	e-no information	9
12	Did Child Live with Mother until Age of Ten?	
	a-yes	1
	b-no	2
	c-no information	9

<u>Card #1</u>	<u>Item</u>	
Column		
13	Is conflict indicated, i.e., rejection of the boy in the home?	
	a-yes	1
	b-no	2
	c-no information	9
14	Number of siblings in home:	
	a-only child	0
	b-one to three	1
	c-four to six	2
	d-seven and up	3
	e-no information	9
15-16	Ranking in birth order of family:	
	a-only and first	00
	b-second	01
	c-third	02
	d-fourth	03
	etc.	
	e-no information	99
17	Siblings in correctional institutions (juvenile and adult)	
	a-yes	1
	b-no	2
	c-no information	9
18-19	Height:	
	-no information is	999
20-21-22	Weight:	
	-no information is	999
23	Most serious previous offense:	
	a-serious	1
	b-moderate	2
	c-slight	3
	d-none	4
	e-no information	9
24	Offense culminating in present commitment to TICO:	
	a-serious	1
	b-moderate	2
	c-slight	3
	d-none (voluntary commitment)	4
	e-no information	9

<u>Card #1</u>	<u>Item</u>	
Column		
25	Number of narcotics or alcohol offenses:	
	a-yes	1
	b-no	2
	c-no information	9
26	Group or loner delinquent:	
	a-loner	1
	b-group	2
	c-no information	9
27	Number of commitments to the OYC:	
	a-one	1
	b-two	2
	c-more than two	3
	d-no information	9
28	Number of runaways at OYC institutions before being placed at TICO:	
	a-yes	1
	b-no	2
	c-no information	9
29	Number of months at OYC institutions before being placed at TICO:	
	a-none	0
	b-one to three	1
	c-four to eight	2
	d-nine to eighteen	3
	e-more than eighteen	4
	f-no information	9
30-31-32	Age at commitment to TICO:	
	-no information is	999
33-34-35	Age at first runaway:	
	-no information is	999
36	Number of runaways from TICO:	
	a-none	0
	b-one	1
	c-two	2
	d-three to five	3
	e-more than five	4
	f-no information	9

<u>Card #1</u>	<u>Item</u>	
Column		
37-38	Total months in TICO:	
	a-none	00
	b-one	01
	c-two	02
	d-three	03
	etc.	
	e-no information	99
	Number of runaways from cottage assignment:	
39	total	
40	Jefferson	0-6
41	Imperial	0-6
42	Hamilton	0-6
43	Glendale	0-6
44	Darby	0-6
45	Cedar	0-6
46	Balson	0-6
47	Auburn	0-6
	Number of runaways from different areas:	
48	outside job	0-6
49	off campus (institutional staff)	0-6
50	off campus (parents)	0-6
51	home visit	0-6
52	cottage	0-6
53	academic	0-6
	Months of runaway:	
54-55	Sixth runaway	
	January	01
	February	02
	March	03
	April	04
	May	05
	June	06
	July	07
	August	08
	September	09
	October	10
	November	11
	December	12
56-57	Fifth runaway (same as above)	

<u>Card #1</u>	<u>Item</u>	
Column		
58-59	Fourth runaway (same as above)	
60-61	Third runaway (same as above)	
62-63	Second runaway (same as above)	
64-65	First runaway (same as above)	
66	Day of runaway: Sixth runaway Sunday Monday Tuesday Wednesday Thursday Friday Saturday	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
67	Fifth runaway (same as above)	
68	Fourth runaway (same as above)	
69	Third runaway (same as above)	
70	Second runaway (same as above)	
71	First runaway (same as above)	
72	Time of day runaway took place: Sixth runaway Morning 6:01 - 12:00 Afternoon 12:01 - 6:00 Evening 6:01 - 11:00 Night 11:01 - 6:00	1 2 3 4
73	Fifth runaway (same as above)	

<u>Card #1</u>	<u>Item</u>	
Column		
74	Fourth runaway (same as above)	
75	Third runaway (same as above)	
76	Second runaway (same as above)	
77	First runaway (same as above)	
78	Home visit: (Number of home visits is included) -no information	9
79	Subfile list: a-controls b-runaways c-attempted runaways	1 2 3
80	Card Number	1
<u>Card #2</u>		
1-6	Serial Number and Suffix	
7	Pre-release at time of first runaway: a-not runaway, does not apply b-yes c-no d-no information	0 1 2 9
8	Release status at time of first runaway: a-not runaway, does not apply b-yes c-no d-no information	0 1 2 9
9	AWOL restriction time at time of runaway: a-not runaway, does not apply b-yes c-no d-no information	0 1 2 9

<u>Card #2</u>	<u>Item</u>	
Column		
10	Psychiatric hospitalization before TICO:	
	a-yes	1
	b-no	2
	c-no information	9
11-12-13	IQ:	
	-no information is	999
14-15	Psychiatric diagnosis at JDC:	
	-no information is	99
16	Suffix cleared by psychiatrist before first runaway event:	
	a-no suffix	0
	b-yes	1
	c-no	2
	d-no information	9
17	Completed year in school:	
	a-less than nine	1
	b-nine	2
	c-ten	3
	d-eleven	4
	e-twelve	5
	f-no information	9
18	School program at TICO:	
	a-academic	1
	b-academic-vocational	2
	c-no information	9
19	Average numerical grade in school at TICO:	
	a-A	1
	b-B	2
	c-C	3
	d-D	4
	e-E	5
	f-no information	9
22	Disciplinary meetings at TICO:	
	a-none	0
	b-one or two	1
	c-three to five	2
	d-more than five	3
	e-no information	9

<u>Card #2</u>	<u>Item</u>	
Column		
23	Evidence of homosexual behavior at TICO:	
	a-yes	1
	b-no	2
	c-no information	9
24	Suicidal attempts at other OYC facilities:	
	a-yes	1
	b-no	2
	c-no information	9
25	Suicidal attempts at TICO:	
	a-yes	1
	b-no	2
	c-no information	9
26	Boy's outcome at time of release from parole:	
	a-no parole	0
	b-apparently satisfactory	1
	c-unsatisfactory	2
	d-no information	9
27	Solo or companionate runaway event:	
	a-solo	1
	b-companionate	2
	c-no information	9
	Jesness scores:	
28-29	Social Maladjustment	
30-31	Value Orientation	
32-33	Immaturity	
34-35	Autism	
36-37	Alienation	
38-39	Manifest Aggression	
40-41	Withdrawal	
42-43	Social Anxiety	
44-45	Repression	
46-47	Denial	
48-49	Asocial Index	
50	Interviews:	
	a-no	0
	b-yes	1

<u>Card #2</u>	<u>Item</u>	
Column		
51-52	Number of runs from home:	
	a-never ran	00
	b-once	01
	c-twice	02
	etc. up to 50	
53-54	Number of times truant from school:	
	a-never truant	00
	b-once	01
	c-twice	02
	etc. up to 50	
55-56	Number of runs from OYC institutions:	
	a-never AWOL	00
	b-once	01
	c-twice	02
	etc.	
57-58	Self-evaluation:	
	a-lowest concept of self	
	(continuum up to 10)	01
	j-highest concept of self	10
59-60	Evaluation of father:	
	a-lowest evaluation	01
	etc.	02
		03
	j-highest evaluation	10
61-62	Evaluation of mother:	
	a-lowest evaluation	01
	etc.	02
		03
	j-highest evaluation	10
79	Subfile list:	
	a-controls	1
	b-runaways	2
	c-attempted runaways	3
80	Card Number	2

APPENDIX C

CLASSIFICATION OF OFFENSES

CLASSIFICATION OF OFFENSES

The materials in this section have been adapted from a previous study by Reckless and Dinitz, and are found in Stuart Miller's Ph.D. dissertation, pp. 171-173.

SERIOUS OFFENSES: Police contacts rated as serious by the Reckless Classification.¹ This rating includes any offense normally considered a Felony or Part I crime.

Reckless Classification

Aggravated assault	Molesting
Armed robbery	Murder
Arson	Purse snatching
Assault and battery	Receiving and concealing stolen property
Assault with a deadly weapon	Theft from the mail
Auto theft	Unarmed robbery
Breaking and entering	Vandalism
Burglary	Sodomy
Felonious assault	Embezzlement
Forgery, fraud	Rape
Hit and run	Grand larceny
Influencing a minor	Housebreaking

¹Walter C. Reckless and Simon Dinitz, Youth Development Project, An Experimental Program for Prevention of Delinquency in Vulnerable Seventh Grade Boys of the Inner City, Columbus, Ohio, May 31, 1971 (Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University, 1970), pp. 85-92.

Specific offense description in TICO sample also classified as serious:

Attempted rape	Breaking into coke machine
Attempted assault	Vending machine theft
Molesting younger sisters	Parking meter theft
Oral sodomy	Injury to person
Assault with knife	Unlawful entering and stealing
Driving stolen car	Physical assault on girl
High-speed auto chase	Assaultive behavior
Assault police officer	Bastardy
Chase man with knife	Chase boys with loaded shotgun
Assault on teacher	Sexual and assaultous behavior
Striking school teacher	Boat theft
Theft from person	Unlawful entry
Cutting episode	Helped girl get gun--she committed suicide
Threaten neighbors, throw knife at father (incorrigible)	

MODERATE OFFENSES: Police contacts rated as moderate by Reckless Classification. This rating includes any offense which does not clearly fit into the Serious or Slight offense category.

Reckless Classification

Any serious offense attempted or investigated	Attempted arson
Carrying a concealed weapon	Obscene literature
Impersonating a police officer or a member of the armed forces	Glue sniffing
Malicious destruction of property	Gasoline
Petit larceny	Shoplifting
Riding in a stolen car	Resisting arrest
Starting a careless fire	Illicit sex with consent
Car tampering or stripping	

Specific offense descriptions in TICO sample also classified as moderate:

Attempted arson	Soliciting for prostitute
Auto tampering	Shoplifting
Theft	Attempted suicide
Stealing	Auto trespass
Bicycle theft	Auto looting
Riding in stolen car	Sniffing gasoline, glue
Borrowing car without permission	Extortion
Abduction for immoral purposes	Extortion from children
Drunkenness, strike police	Homosexuality
Rock-throwing episode	Sex offense w/ young girl
Harboring two 14-year-old girls (runaway)	Sex w/ sister, with 11 year old
	Borrow motorbike without permission

SLIGHT OFFENSES: Police contacts rated as slight by Reckless Classification. These offenses are usually considered as minor misdemeanors or Part II crimes.

Reckless Classification

Curfew violation	Discharging firearms in city limits, BB gun
Disorderly conduct	False fire alarm, false report
Fighting	Incorrigibility
Improper language	Menacing threats
Intoxication	Possession of fireworks
Pointing firearms	Suspicious person
Obstructing justice	Truancy from home
Throwing missiles	Violating probation
Swimming in an unguarded area	Delinquency
Trespassing	Riding double on a bicycle
Truancy from school	Misrepresentation of minor status
Gambling	Unlawful assembly
Indecent exposure	
Failure to appear in court	
Shooting pool	

Specific offense description in TICO sample also classified as slight:

Parole violation

Sex offense

Exhibitionism

Window peeping

Immorality

Gave incorrect age for
driver's license

Threat to kill mother

Threat to kill teacher

Minor sex offense

Overt sex behavior

Note requesting sex

APPENDIX D

PSYCHIATRIC DIAGNOSIS

PSYCHIATRIC DIAGNOSIS

- 01 = Mentally retarded (borderline, mild, moderate)
- 02 = Psychoses (schizophrenic, paranoia, psychotic)
- 03 = Neuroses (anxiety, hysterical, obsessive-compulsive, depressive neuroses)
- 04 = Personality disorders (schizoid, explosive, obsessive-compulsive, inadequate, immature, sexual deviant, drug-dependent personalities)
- 05 = Antisocial personality
- 06 = Passive-aggressive
- 07 = Passive-dependent
- 08 = Adjustment reaction of adolescence
- 09 = Behavior disorders (hyperkinetic, withdrawing, over-anxious, runaway reactions)
- 10 = Group delinquent
- 11 = Unsocialized (aggressive or reaction)
- 12 = Dyssocial (sociopathic) behavior
- 13 = Other

APPENDIX E

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

1. What had you heard about TICO before you came here?
2. What were your impressions of TICO the first week or two you were here?
3. Did you plan to escape when you came to TICO?
4. What led up to your escape?
5. Whose idea was your escape?
6. Why did you decide to go when you did?
7. How else could you have handled this besides running away?
8. Have you made escape plans since you have been at TICO? (For boys who did not escape.)
9. Did disappointment or disciplinary action have anything to do with your escape?
10. Has the institution "messed you over"?
11. Is TICO a total waste of your time?
12. Why do students run away from TICO?
13. Why do more white than black students run away?
14. What can the institution do to cut down escapes?
15. How many times did you run away from home?
16. How many times did you run away from school?
17. How many times did you run away from other institutions of the OYC?
18. Rate your father on a 1 to 10 scale, your mother, yourself?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Articles

- Beall, Herbert S., and Pantou, James H. "Use of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory as an Index to 'Escapism.'" Journal of Clinical Psychology, Vol. 12 (October, 1956), 392-394.
- Cambareri, John D.; Sagers, Paul S.; and Tatton, Donald F. "The AWOL from a Juvenile Institution." Crime and Delinquency, Vol. 6 (July, 1960), 275-279.
- Carter, J. O. "Absconding at Dover Borstal." Prison Service Journal, Vol. 2 (August, 1963), 25-32.
- Catalino, Anthony. "A Prerelease Program for Juveniles in a Medium-Security Institution." Federal Probation, Vol. 31 (December, 1967), 41-45.
- Clarke, R. V. G. "Seasonal and Other Environmental Aspects of Abscondings by Approved School Boys." British Journal of Criminology, Vol. 7 (April, 1967), 195-202.
- Clarke, R. V. G. "Absconding and Adjustment to the Training School." British Journal of Criminology, Vol. 8 (July, 1968), 285-295.
- Clarke, R. V. G., and Martin, D. N. "The Personality of Approved School Boy Absconders." British Journal of Criminology, Vol. 9 (October, 1969), 366-375.
- Cochrane, Nelson N. "Escapes and Their Control: A Brief Study of Escape Data." The Prison World, Vol. 10 (May-June, 1948), 3-5, 28-29.
- Eynon, Thomas G.; Allen, Harry E.; and Reckless, Walter C. "Measuring Impact of a Juvenile Correctional Institution by Perceptions of Inmates and Staff." Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, Vol. 8 (January, 1971), 93-100.

- Farrington, Donald S.; Shelton, William; and MacKay, James R. "Observations on Runaway Children from a Residential Setting." Child Welfare, Vol. 62 (June, 1963), 286-291.
- Gunasekara, M. G. S. "The Problem of Absconding in Boys' Approved Schools in England and Wales." British Journal of Criminology, Vol. 4 (October, 1963), 145-151.
- Hildebrand, James A. "Reasons for Runaways." Crime and Delinquency, Vol. 14 (January, 1968), 42-47.
- Hildebrand, Richard J. "The Anatomy of Escape." Federal Probation, Vol. 33 (March, 1969), 58-66.
- Keogh, Cornelia R. "A Study of Runaways at a State Correctional School for Boys." Journal of Juvenile Research, Vol. 19 (April, 1935), 45-61.
- Lazarsfeld, Paul E., and Menzel, Herbert. "On the Relationship between Individual and Collective Properties." A Sociological Reader on Complex Organizations. Edited by Amitai Etzioni. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1961, pp. 499-516.
- Levine, Stanley. "Runaways and Research in the Training School." Crime and Delinquency, Vol. 8 (January, 1962), 40-45.
- Loving, W. S.; Stockwell, F. E.; and Dobbins, D. A. "Factors Associated with Escape Behavior of Prison Inmates." Federal Probation, Vol. 23 (September, 1959), 49-51.
- Lubeck, Steven G., and Empey, Lamar T. "Mediatory Versus Total Institution: The Case of the Runaway." Social Problems, Vol. 16 (Fall, 1968), 242-260.
- MacKay, James R., and Collins, Alice H. "Leaving the Training School." Federal Probation, Vol. 23 (December, 1959), 38-42.
- Morgan, David I. "Individual and Situational Factors Related to Prison Escape." American Journal of Corrections, Vol. 29 (March-April, 1967), 30-32.
- Morrow, William R. "Escapes of Psychiatric Offenders." Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, Vol. 60 (December, 1969), 464-471.

- Pierce, David M. "The Escapism Scale of the MMPI as a Predictive Index." Correctional Psychologist, Vol. 4 (May-June, 1971), 230-232.
- Renteria, Rudy A., and Holt, Norman. "The Anatomy of an Escape." American Journal of Corrections, Vol. 33 (January-February, 1971), 10-15.
- Shupe, Donald R., and Bramwell, Paul R. "Prediction of Escape from MMPI Data." Journal of Clinical Psychology, Vol. 19 (April, 1962), 223-226.
- Standley, James O. "Treatment Oriented Security Screening." American Journal of Corrections, Vol. 31 (March-April, 1969), 24-25.
- Zibners, Harry. "Toward Genuine Communication in a Training School." American Journal of Corrections, Vol. 31 (May-June, 1969), 6-13.

Books

- Clemmer, Donald. The Prison Community. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1958.
- Cressey, Donald R. Other People's Money. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1953.
- Cressey, Donald R., ed. The Prison: Studies in Institutional Organization and Change. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.
- Downie, N. M., and Heath, R. W. Basic Statistical Methods. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1970.
- Etzioni, Amitai, ed. A Sociological Reader on Complex Organizations. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1961.
- Garabedian, Peter G., and Gibbons, Donald C., eds. Becoming Delinquent: Young Offenders and the Correctional System. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1970.
- Glaser, Daniel. The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1964.
- Goffman, Erving. Asylums. Garden City: Anchor Books, 1964.

- Goffman, Erving. The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life. Garden City: Doubleday Anchor, 1969.
- Gouldner, Alvin. Pattern of Industrial Bureaucracy. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1954.
- Hage, Jerald, and Aiken, Michael. Social Change in Complex Organizations. New York: Random House, 1970.
- Jesness, Carl F. Manual--The Jesness Inventory. Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychology Press, 1966.
- O'Connor, Zena C. The Runaway Boy in the Correctional School. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1938.
- Street, David; Vinter, Robert D.; and Perrow, Charles. Organization for Treatment. New York: The Free Press, 1966.
- Sykes, Gresham. The Society of Captives. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1958.

Dissertations, Theses, and Monographs

- Aaron, J. S. "A Study of Escapees: Their Sociometric Status and Personality." Unpublished M.S.W. thesis, University of Toronto, 1962.
- Figura, John C. "Validity of the Beall-Panton MMPI Index to 'Escapism' in a State Training School Population." Unpublished masters thesis, Loyola University of Chicago, 1962.
- Friedland, D. M. "Group Counseling as a Factor in Reducing Runaway Behavior from an Open Treatment Institution for Delinquent and Pre-Delinquent Boys: The Evaluation of Changes in Frustration Tolerance, Self-Concept, Attitude toward Paternal Figures, Attitude toward Other Authority, and Reality Testing of Runaway Delinquent Boys." Unpublished masters thesis, New York University, 1960.
- Miller, Stuart Jerome. "Post-Institutional Adjustment of 443 Consecutive TICO Releasees." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1971.

- Mosier, Craig Harlan. "Delinquents' Perceptions of Institutional Impact: A Validation Study." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1972.
- Reckless, Walter C., and Dinitz, Simon. Youth Development Project: An Experimental Program for Prevention of Delinquency in Vulnerable Seventh-Grade Boys of the Inner City, Columbus, Ohio. Report to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University Research Foundation, May 31, 1970.
- Warrick, I. B. "A Study of Selected Characteristics of Runaway Boys from the Lancaster, Ohio, Boys' Industrial School during the Fiscal Year of 1960 to 1961." Unpublished M.S.W. thesis, University of Michigan, 1962.

Reports

- Baker, Arlene, et al. Escape Study. Report to State of California, Department of Corrections, Research Division, June 30, 1961. Sacramento: Department of Corrections, 1961.
- Commonwealth of Virginia. Report of Escapes during the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1964. Richmond: Department of Welfare and Institutions, Bureau of Research and Statistics, 1964.
- Commonwealth of Virginia. Report of Escapes during the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1971. Richmond: Department of Welfare and Institutions, Bureau of Research and Statistics, 1971.
- Seagoville Federal Correctional Institute, Research Committee. Research into Escape at Seagoville. Austin, Texas: Department of Corrections, 1960.