With the other two forms of display, the reveiver may utilize a pictorial representation along with the other two forms of display. A graphic portrayal of each variable is presented so that for purposes of elaboration and explicity, finally, a further, a narrative explanation of the findings is offered. Receiver may easily grasp the results of the investigation. Data are portrayed in tabular fashion so that the relationships between the multiple regression formula and that directly relate to the establishment and construction of the variables which are considered to be predictive in nature. The multivariate analysis and discriminant analyses of those analyses and findings, the second section concentrates on principal groups under analysis, along with the univariate section addresses the descriptive characteristics of the empirical findings of the investigation. The first chapter of the study is designed to illustrate the presentation of the data.
Achieving significance beyond the .001 level, the Student's t-ratio of 3.5 was achieved, suggesting a significant effect. For the .01 level, t-ratio of 1.960 was computed for significance at the .05 level and a t-ratio of 2.576 for the .001 level. Using the degree of freedom computed to be 398 (N1 + N2 - 2), requiring the condition that a t-ratio of 1.960 be met for the 400 cases examined, the standard deviation was 2.16 inches. The mean height at 69.2 inches and the standard deviation was 1.47 inches. For the non-escapee sample, the mean height was 68.5 inches and the standard deviation was 1.47 inches. The data portrays the mean height for the escapee group to be 68.5 inches, and the standard deviation was 1.47 inches, whereas the non-escapee group had a mean height of 69.2 inches, with a standard deviation of 2.16 inches.

### Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>p &lt; 0.001</th>
<th>3.5</th>
<th>2.00</th>
<th>69.2</th>
<th>1.960</th>
<th>68.5</th>
<th>Non-escapees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prisoner</td>
<td>Group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3** illustrates the means and standard deviations of height of escapee by prisoner group means and standard deviations.
Consequently, no statistically significant difference between the mean weights of the two prisoner groups sampled was detected.

It ratio that was computed for this variable was only 1:22.

The non-escapee sample displayed a mean weight of 170.1 pounds and a standard deviation of 20.24 pounds. The 167.9 pounds and the standard deviation was 15.54 pounds. This portrayed the mean weight for the escapee group was

of weight for the escapee and non-escapee samples. In

Table 4 reflects the means and standard deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-escapees</th>
<th>Escapees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>170.1</td>
<td>15.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.24</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170.1</td>
<td>15.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-escapees</th>
<th>Escapees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 reflects the means and standard deviations of weight by prisoner group.
Within the non-escape category, escape category are statistically older than those indicated, this suggests that those prisoners within the therapy providing significance beyond the 0.05 level. As 21.9 years of age and the standard deviation was 3.17 for the non-escape sample the mean was calculated at 22.6 years and the standard deviation was 3.09. Depicted in this table, the mean age for the escape sample was 22.6 years for the two samples groups under study. As

Table 5 illustrates the means and standard deviations of age by prisoner group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-escape</th>
<th>Escape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Group Prisoner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table 5
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Figure 6

Means and standard deviations of age by prisoner group.

- Escapees
- Non-escapees

Means and standard deviations.
samples of married and unmarried prisoners within the two observed that no significant difference exists between the level of significance. From this statistic it can be that was achieved in this case was only .22. From this subsequence it places the score well inside the .05 chi-square at the .01 level, df = 1. The actual test for the particular case, a chi-square of 3.84 was needed for the partricipants. To achieve statistical significance in this were married. To achieve statistical significance in this 235 or 79.5 percent were married and 41 or 20.5 percent concerning the non-escapee sample, it can be observed that of 23.5 percent were within the married category. Concerning the majority, 76.5 percent were unmarried. The remaining prisoners, 47 examined within the escape category, the majority,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6 indicates that of the 200 prisoners</th>
<th>Non-escapees</th>
<th>Escapees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>79.2%</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td>79.2%</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prisoner Group of Prisoner Marital Status</th>
<th>Prevalency and Percentage Profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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exists within the escape prisoner group.

degree of homogeneity within the non-escape sample than
prisoner groups (F=14.8, p<0.01). This indicates a higher
variance between the two standard deviations of the
it is interesting to note, however, the rather large
achieved, no statistically significant was detected, p<0.05.

ation was only 1.50. Since a t ratio of only .93 was
years of education was 10.9; however, the standard deviation was 5.77. For the non-escape sample, the mean
education for the escapee sample was 11.3 and the standard
education for years of formal

Table 7 reflects the means and standard deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>p &gt;.05</th>
<th>.93</th>
<th>200</th>
<th>1.50</th>
<th>5.77</th>
<th>11.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-escapees</td>
<td>Escapees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>p</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EDUCATION BY PRISONER GROUP
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF

TABLE 7
Figure 8

EDUCATION BY PRISONER GROUP

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF

STANDARD DEVIATION
MEAN

NON-ESCAPES

ESCAPES

YEARS IN PRISON

EDUCATION

0
4
8
12
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20
At the time of arrest, between the two samples with regard to employment status, it was detected that a statistically significant difference was present (this finding strongly indicates that the case was 153.7, $p < .001$). The chi-square computed indicated that 16 percent were unemployed, the chi-square computed in the non-escape sample, 84 percent were employed when arrested, and only 32 percent of the non-escape sample, 16 percent were employed when arrested. It can be seen that of the non-escape sample, 71 percent were unemployed. Conversely, of the escape sample, 71 percent were unemployed at the time of their arrest and 14 percent were unemployed at the time of their escape. As depicted, 58 of 29 percent of those prisoners who were either employed or unemployed group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-escapees</th>
<th>Escapees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$p &lt; .001$</td>
<td>153.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16£ 16£ 32£</td>
<td>84£ 58£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71£ 14£ 29£</td>
<td>19£</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 illustrates the frequency and percentage at the time of arrest. Status and percentage profile of employment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-escapees</th>
<th>Escapees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>$X^2$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prisoner Group</td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>Not Employed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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number from the non-escapee sample demonstrated a parole
the time of their arrest, while only an inconsequential
of prisoners within the escapee category were on parole at
the .001 level. This indicates that a significant number
was 72.3. Consequently, significance was achieved beyond
the 1% level. The chi-square computed
3 or 1.5 percent were on formal parole, with the remain-
3 or 1.5 percent were on formal parole, with the remain-
that of the escapee sample, 68 or 34 percent were on
parole. As portrayed by the table, it can be observed
prisoners whom were on formal parole at the time of their
arrest. As portrayed by the table, it can be observed
Table 9 reflects the frequency and percentage of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not on Parole</th>
<th>Formal Parole</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Escapees</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Escapees</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χ²</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 9

PAROLE STATUS AT TIME OF ARREST
FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE PROFILE OF
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Beyond the .001 level, with respect to proportion status at time of arrest was significant difference between these two samples, groups, this instance was .06. Consequently, the degree of chi-square at the .001 level, the chi-square .727 was required to achieve significance. Within this particular case, df = 1, a form of proportion. Remaining 18.7 or 93.5 percent were not on any type of proportion. 13 of the non-escape sample, 13 or 6.5 percent were found to be on proportion when arrested, and the proportion at the time of arrest and 129 or 64.5 percent not on proportion of its membership as being on formal program.

Escape category displayed a frequency of 71 or 35.5 percent of the samples, the table 10 illustrates that of the two samples, the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>p &lt; .001</th>
<th>50.6%</th>
<th>93.5%</th>
<th>18.7%</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>129</th>
<th>71</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>p</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Escape</th>
<th>Non-Escape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Comparison</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROPORTION STATUS AT TIME OF ARREST
PREDICTION AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF

TABLE 10
Figure 11: Frequency profile of probation status at time of arrest.

- On Probation
- Not on Probation
- Escapers
- Non-Escapers
research than does the escape sampling. The significant more non-escapees maintained local
of residenly. More specifically, the data illustrates
between the two sample groups with regard to the patterns
p < .001, This indicates that a wide variance exists
local residents, The chi-square obtained was 12.98.
were local residents, and only 27 or 13.5 percent were not
escapee sample, it was discovered that 139 or 69.5 percent
86.5 percent were from other areas. Concerning the non-
were local residents, which the large majority, 73 or
in the table, 61 or 30.5 percent of the escapee category
of residenly between the two sample groups, as reflected
Table II illustrates the frequency and percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>NOT Local</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table II: Frequency and Percentage Profile

Residency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residency</th>
<th>12.98%</th>
<th>13.5%</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>139</th>
<th>69.5%</th>
<th>173</th>
<th>86.5%</th>
<th>173</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Escapes</td>
<td>X²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Escapes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Residency of Prisoner Groups

Table II
Frequency profile of local residency

Figure 12
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had previously attempted such activity as compared to the
significant number of inmates within the escape sample

teachance beyond the 0.1 level. This indicates that a
from custody. The chi-square was 10.2, providing signifi-
false sample, all of 100 percent had never attempted to escape

never attempted escape. Concerning the non-escape

sample, while the remaining 190 of 95 percent had

from the remaining 90 percent. The data, 10 or 5 percent of those within the

indicated by the data. 10 or 5 percent of those with the

previous escapers by the two sample groups under study. As

Table 12 reflects the frequency and percentage of

\[
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
\text{p} & \text{0.01} & 10.2 & 100.4 & 200 & 95.4 & 190 \\
\text{_%} & \% & 0 & 5 & 10 & 190 \\
\text{p} & \% & \% & \% & \% & \% \\
\text{x^2} & \text{Non-escapes} & \text{escapes} & \text{Not attempted} & \text{Attempted} & \text{Category} \\
\text{Comparison} & & & & & & \\
\text{of previous escape attempts} & & & & & & \\
\text{frequency and percentage} & & & & & & \\
\text{portrayal} & & & & & & \\
\text{TABLE 12} & & & & & & \\
\end{array}
\]
degree of constancy or homogeneity.

lower standard deviation, which may indicate a higher

Table 13 indicates the means and standard deviations of previous arrests by group. As illustrated, the mean number of previous

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior Arreets</th>
<th>Non-Escapees</th>
<th>Escapees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The standard deviation in the non-escape group was 0.98, and in the escape group was 1.0. This difference is not detectable between these two

In this case, the standard deviation was only 0.89. Thus, the data that no

Significant difference is detectable between these two

Sample groups with regard to the number of previous

arrests. However, what is directly observable by this

arrests. The t-ratio calculated for those within the escapee sample was 1.26 and for those within the non-escapee sample was 1.10. With regard to the non-

arrests for the data under study. As illustrated, the mean number of previous

arrests of the escapee sample is 1.26, and in the non-escapee sample was 1.23 and

arrests, which may indicate a higher

standard deviation, lower than that of the escapee sample.
Sample. placed against them than did members of the non-escape
ten. More inmates within the escapee sample had holds
was 0.04, p < 0.001. This suggests that inmates that
escapee sample, only 22 of 11 per cent had holds placed
were clear of such circumstances, the chi-square in this case
were clear of such circumstances. Concerning the non-
possessed active holds, and the remaining 115 of 57 per cent
escape group had 85 or 43 per cent of its members who
justice entities. As depicted within this table, the
sample groups by other law enforcement agencies or criminal
active holds placed against the members of the two
Table 14 illustrates the frequency and percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>p</th>
<th>0.04</th>
<th>89%</th>
<th>178</th>
<th>57%</th>
<th>115</th>
<th>43%</th>
<th>85</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-escapees</td>
<td>Escapees</td>
<td>No active holds</td>
<td>Active holds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACTIVE HOLDS AGAINST PRISONERS
FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE PROFILE OF

TABLE 14
Release.

Regarding the number of pending court appearances prior to

difference is present between the two sample groups with

The chi-square calculated was only .62, p > .05. The

and 50 or 47.5 percent who had no further court obligation.

cent of the members who possessed future court requirements

of the members who possessed future court requirements.

court appearances and 103 or 51.5 percent without such

49 or 48.5 percent of the members with future

under study, are reflected within the table, the escapee

the escapee sample, the non-escapee sample had 105 or 52.5 per-

Tables 15 illustrates the frequency and percentages

TABLE 15 illustrates the frequency and percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>p</th>
<th>.62</th>
<th>.95</th>
<th>51.5%</th>
<th>97</th>
<th>48.5%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-escapees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escapees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PENDING COURT

Category

Comparison

TABLE 15
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Regarding ethnicity:

Significant difference between the two sample groups.

p < .05. Thus finding indicates that there exists no

The chi-square achieved for this variable was only .1.

42 percent were black, and 62 or 31 percent were Hispanic.

Retesting that 53 or 27 percent were Caucasian, 85 or

escape group demonstrated similar characteristics by

were black, and 61 or 30 percent were Hispanic. The non-

that 56 or 28 percent were Caucasian, 83 or 42 percent

groups sampled. Concerning the escape sample, we find

Table 16 identifies the ethnicity of the prisoner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HISPANIC</th>
<th>BLACK</th>
<th>CAUCASIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Escapees</th>
<th>Non-Escapees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>escapees</td>
<td>non-escapees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison Category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Finding relatively suspect (p = .01, p > .001) variable of previous custody time, which makes the test variance between these two groups in relation to the there exists an extremely large standard deviation quantity more than for the non-escapee sample members. Also, confinement by members of the escapee group was substantially mean number of days previously spent within confinement beyond the .001 level. As depicted by the data, the achieved in this case was 8.41, which provides significance deviation was 69 days. The t ratio was achieved. In this case was 8.41, which provides significance 95 and the standard deviation was 69 days. The t ratio was deviation was 322 days, for the non-escapee sample the mean number of days spent in confinement confinement was the customary by the escapee group was 292 days and the standard groups. As portrayed by the data, the mean time spent in tons of previous confinement time served by both sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>p</th>
<th>8.41</th>
<th>69</th>
<th>95</th>
<th>Non-escapees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Escapees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>322</td>
<td>292</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prisoner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 17** Illustrates the means and standard deviation

| Previous Confinement Time | Means and Standard Deviations of the Previous
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Approximately 1 year older than those prsoners who were
comparison, it was detected that the escape group was
In retreviewing the age variable for this particular
very little variance.
prersons maintained approximately the same body weight with
detected. This tends to indicate that both categories of
to the weight variable, only a 5 pound variance was
the standard deviation of these two groups with respect
weight displayed by the non-escape sample group. Concern-
weights which closely correlated with the 110 pound mean
members. The mean weight for the escape sample was 167
significance was detected when compared between sample
with regard to the weight variable, no statistically
beyond the .001 level.
bers & representatives rendering statistical significance
of 3.5, subsequently rendering statistical significance
hues. This equated into a student's t ratio calculation
Conversely, the height for the escape group was only 68.5
was calculated for this non-escape sample was 69.2 inches.
are members of the escape group, the mean height that
escape group tended to be approximately 1 inch taller than
height variable, it was detected that members of the non-
compared between sample groups. In the case of the
these variables harbor significant differences when
the preceding tables, it appears that many of
concerning the descriptive characteristics identified.

Summary of univariate analyses
detected when compared between the two samples. For the
certation, an extremely strong statistical significance level was
concerning the area of employment prior to incarceration.

non-escapers possessed by the escape group than is present among the
possessed by the escape group within the years of education community
ranged exists within the years of education. This may indicate that a wider
range among the non-escapers. Thus, may indicate a standard deviation was detected
table 7, the escape sample possessed a standard deviation
for the education variable. Though the standard deviation was
large variance between the standard deviation was
notable was approximately 11 years, the only notable
the mean years of formal education possessed by the two
e scapees and 79.5 percent for the non-escapers, and that
of both samples were unmarred, 76.5 percent for the
education variable. The data reflected that the majority
in the case of either the marital status variable or the
no degree of statistical significance was displayed

statistical significance beyond the .05 level.

Student's t-ratio of 2.18 was calculated, providing
standard deviation of 3.17 years. For this variable, a
mean age was discovered to be 21.9 years of age. With a
tion was 3.09 years. For the non-escape category, the
the escapees was 22.6 years of age and the standard devia-
within the non-escape sample. The mean age displayed for

129
prisoners sampled within the escape group. 71 or
those within the non-escape sample, for the 200
formal probation at the time of their arrest than did
significant larger number of members on some form of
displayed; that is, the escape category possessed a
the probation variable examined, a similar trait was
rest, 197 or 98.5 percent, had no such commitment. For
were on parole at the time of their arrest, while the
versely, of the non-escape sample, only 3 or 1.5 percent
remaining 132 or 66 percent had no such obligation. Con-
members were on formal parole when arrested, while the
the escape sample displayed that 66 or 34 percent of it's
groups. More specifically, with regard to parole status, a
significant difference was detected between the two sample
status at the time of arrest, another high level of
as applied to the area of parole status and proba-

level,

which provided statistical significance beyond the .001
equated into a very strong student's t ratio of 153.7.
with only 32 or 16 percent not possessing a job. This
prisoners were employed before arrest, 168 or 64 percent,
the non-escape sample indicated that the majority of the
not have a job immediately before arrest. Contrasting
remainder, 71 percent of 142 prisoners, said that they did
members were employed before they were arrested. The
escape group it was found that only 29 percent of the
130
remaining 190 or 95 percent had no previous record of such
of the inmates had previously attempted such an act. The
was discovered that in the escape sample 10 or 5 percent
committed by prisoners within the two sample groups, it
in remaining the area of previous escape attempts
the .001 level.

This computation provided statistical significance beyond
chi-square which was computed in this instance was 129.8.
remaining 27 or 13.5 percent were from other areas. The
86.5 percent were local area residents, and only the
non-escape category, it was displayed that 73 of
cent were from other geographic regions. Concerning the
were local residents, while the remaining 139 or 69.5 per-
sample demonstrated that 61 or 30.5 percent of its members
primarily local residents. In this case the escape
Los Angeles County, while the non-escape prisoners were
within the escape category were not local residents of
density, it was indicated that the majority of prisoners
regarding the variable identified as local rest-
variable a chi-square of 50.6 was obtained. A
chi-square of 72.3 was achieved, and for the proportion
the .001 level of significance. For the parole variable
achieved in both the parole and proportion area exceeded
such a computation. The degree of statistical significance
13 or 6.5 percent of the non-escape prisoners possessed
35.5 percent were on probation with no contrastingly, only
133
an active hold when confirmed. The chi-square achieved in
for the non-escape sample only 22 or 11 percent possessed
57 percent entered containment without such encumbrances.
against them when incarcerated, the remaining 115 or
cent of the membership had some form of active hold
specifically, the escape sample showed that 85 or 43 per-
holds against them which the non-escape sample. More
significant higher number of members who possessed active
detected that the escape sample group demonstrated a
as applied to the variable of active holds, it was


difference could be postulated. Referred to achieve significance at the .05 level, no such
case was only .89. Since a minimum factor of 1.96 was
the student's t ratio computed in this
arrests was 1.23. The student's t ratio computed. In this
was 1.26, and for the non-escape group the mean number of
the escape sample the average number of previous arrests
of the group. Both groups are suggested to previous apprehensions. For
revealed that no significant difference existed between
same sample was displayed. In this illustration, it was
for the number of previous arrests experienced by the
within table 13 the means and standard deviations
the .01 level.
calculation of 10.2, which was found to be significant at
escape from containment. This equates into a chi-square
that none of the 200 inmates had previously tried to
activity. For the non-escape group it was illustrated
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specifically, for the escape category the mean number of
significance exists between the two study groups. More
discovered that an extremely high degree of statistic.
consistent time served by the prison groups, it was
as part of this univariate analysis, that of previous
in examining the final area of variable examined
in this case, i.e. 
remained 62 or 31 percent were Hispanic, 85 or 42 percent were Black, and the
percent Caucasian, 85 or 42 percent were Black, and the
Hispanic origin. For the 200 non-escapees, 55 or 27 per-
2 percent were Black, and 61 or 30 percent were Caucasian, 83 or
escapees sampled, 56 or 28 percent were Caucasian, 53 or
prisoners, it was determined that again no statistically
in examining the ethnicity profile of the sampled
therefore p>.05.
chi-square that was achieved on this case was only .62.
chi-square to dispose of prior to release. The
court requirement to dispose of prior to release, the
the non-escape sample 105 or 52.5 percent had some future
frequency was illustrated at 97 or 48.5 percent, and for
court appearances against them, for the escapee sample the
non-escapees sampled with regard to the number of pending
significant difference was detected between the escapee and
as portrayed by table 15, no statistically
this case 50.4, which exceeded the .001 level of signifi-
133
element of the sample was skewing the distribution.

particular variable, it was discovered that no one sentence experience. In reality, the raw data for this sample, with only a few members possessing large previous periods closer to that displayed by the non-escape inmates may have experienced previous incarceration.

Finding can illustrate that a considerable number of the others within this sample, conversely, such a possessed previous confinement experience well in advance of some or many inmates within this particular category.

more specificity, such a finding tends to indicate that present among those inmates sampled as part of this group.

than pattern and suggests that a tremendous range was the escape sample is indiscernible of a non-normal distribution point out that the 322-day standard deviation depicted by the total common which is felt to be appropriate here is to sampled as part of the non-escape group.

longer period of time within confinement than had those within the escape group have served a significantly shorter period of time within confinement. That is, a finding strongly illustrates that the .01 level, such a finding strongly illustrates that the 69-day expectation was found to be of significance beyond the custody was calculated at only 95, and the standard deviation was calculated at 22 days. For the non-escape sample the mean days in days previously spent within correctional confinement was 292.
Lambda (\(\lambda\)) statistic and the univariate \(P\) ratio.

Illustration provided is that described as the "\(R\)" statistics between the predicted and predictor variables, the first determines the degree of significance and relationship utilized within the discriminant analysis program to in reviewing the multivariate statistics processes.  

Multivariate Analyses

Consequence in the forthcoming multivariate and discriminant that these variables may be of substantive importance groups. In reference to these variables, trends to suggest degrees of significance difference between the two sample univariate analyses approach. The demonstrably strong postulates previously illustrated in chapter 1 have proven feld variables believed to corroborate the theoretical.

In summation, it appears that many of the tests from a low of 30 days to a high of 100 days. The sample members, the range observed in this case was however, it was detected that a wide range existed between 135
Examinations of these calculations indicate that the
dent or predictor variables included for analysis,
ratios computations are directly applied to the indepen-
As shown in Table 18, the lambda coefficients and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>P-Ratio Fisher</th>
<th>P-Ratio Wilks’ Lambda</th>
<th>Lambda</th>
<th>Significant Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Containment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.767</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.730</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3185</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>Pending court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>Active holds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.7713</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>Previous arrests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0013</td>
<td>10.47</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>Previous escapes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>189.0</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>Residency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>Population status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>Parole status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>167.7</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3502</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1702</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>Marital status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2205</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>12.69</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>Height</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FOR PRISONER POPULATION SAMPLES

WILKS’ LAMBDA AND UNIVARIATE P-RATIO

TABLE 18
This is portrayed by the lambda coefficients range of a low

sufficiently low level of "true" shift in the distribution of power
and a significant beyond the .05 level of not manifesting a

whether found to be

each of the predictor variables (whether found to be

less, from these data it can be observed that independently
discriminating power each variable possesses. Nevertheless,

cussed later in determining the relative degrees of

assistance than the canonical discriminant functions dis-

to 0, the stronger the correlation (they are less

portray these findings in an inverse fashion (the closer

the residual discriminant function of the predictor variables and

computations. Although the lambda coefficients emphasize

somewhat more process than the t ratio and chi-square

the level of significance achieved in these tests is

performed earlier in this study, it can be observed that

In contrasting this form of analysis to that

court, or etiology,

age, marital status, education, previous arrests, pending

once was detected among the variables detected as weight;

previous confinement time served, no significant differ-

residency, previous escape attempts, active roles, and

resent status, parole status, probation status, local

employ, a high degree of statistically significant was

tests performed in the previous section. More specific-

endings achieved correspond exactly to the univariate
discovery that each of the predictor variables used is
test, this finding thusly corroborates the earlier
demonstrated extremely weak to non-existent character.

degree of strength. In fact, all but four correlations
most part no individual correlation exceeds a "moderate"
are extremely low when contrasted between variables. For the
tions of more precisely the bivariate correlations, are
as depicted by this table, the individual correla-

tions and portrays these findings in the fashion of a
allows for the bivariate comparison of the predictor
association matrix is essential. This particular matrix
set of variables, a review of the "pooled within groups"
be invalidated by the presence of a dominant variable or
tention that the forthcoming regression formula will not
when compared and to lend supportive evidence to the con-

individually reflect the presence of these variables. It can be further determined from these findings that the
contribution value of each of these variables, by them-

for local residency of .67 to a high of .99 for many of


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ht</th>
<th>Wt</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Ed</th>
<th>Emp</th>
<th>Par</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Res</th>
<th>Fsc</th>
<th>Arr</th>
<th>Ahd</th>
<th>Pct</th>
<th>Wht</th>
<th>Blk</th>
<th>Pcon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Height</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marstat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escapes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 19
POOLED WITHIN GROUPS CORRELATION MATRIX
In only 17 percent of those cases examined, for this comparison it was determined that this occurred so will this likelihood of being placed on parole status, as the inmate's previous commitment experience increases, achieved in this case was .47 and moderately implies that it will enter into parole status. The correlation coefficient of this second comparison was that of previous commitment.

Body weight, time (as the height of an inmate increases so will this illustrate that as a general rule, this coefficient of determination is non-determinant. Consequently, this coefficient of determination and of 66 percent for the comparison reflected a finding of 44 percent for the first (that of height to weight) displayed a coefficient moderate relationships between correlated variables, the as applied to the four correlations which indicated the population association.

Effort where the collective relationship will be used to significant consequence in the later discriminant analysis, this may prove to be of each variable is conversely high, the degree of independence possessed by these is substantially than that because of the low correlation discriminant between sample groupings. Such a finding relatively exclusive as applied to its ability to society.
(geometrically) between the escape and non-escape sample
indicates that there exists a wide centrodial separation
sample groups examined. This relatively large p-phenotype
seen that an p-phenotype of p < 0.05 was generated for the two
tions associated with this analytic program. It is first
in interpreting the canonical discriminant func-

discriminant analysis

Study is applicable
theoretical rationalization, as applied to the current
will numerically decrease. In this case no significant
partition of category or type for the other, the latter
practical standpoint it follows that as you substitute one
increases, the number of white immunos stimulations. From a
can be concluded simply that as the number of black immunos
partition of white to black. For this computation (-0.57)
the "weak" level of strength was that derived from the com-
the final correlation which was found to be above

time.

characteristic was found to transpose 22 percent of the
possess a higher number of days in confinement. Thus
prisoners who have a higher frequency of arrests also
moderately implicate that of those cases examined, those
a correlation coefficient of 0.42 was obtained, which again
vours confinement time. In this case it was revealed that
between two variables was that of previous arrests to pre-
the third comparison showed moderate relationships
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This result indicates that the forthcoming regression
consider some correlation coefficients previously achieved.
This case was .79 and, as such, correlates with the
in an inverse fashion. The lambda statistic obtained in
group placement beyond the sample estimates and is portrayed
tration possessed by the predictor variables in determining
determine the collective degree of residual discrimination.
utilization the Wilks' Lambda statistic is used to
statistic referred to here as the Wilks' Lambda. In this
statistic generated by the program must be evaluated, the
state can predict future group association, in addition to
postulated with any degree of confidence that the model
predicts group membership. However, before it can be
predictor variables (collectively) and their ability to
indicates a strong correlation exists between the
coefficient and, in this case, was .79. This finding
statistic is identified as the 'canonical correlation
on predictor variables and the two sample groups, this
measures the degree of association between the independent

This leads then to the next computation which
were correct.

...
wathing group association was proportion status at the time
the descending order of contribution to resear
the remaining variables examined as part of this cap
The coefficient achieved in this case was \( r^2 = 0.93 \). The second most
powerful variable was employment status at time of arrest.
placement and association \( r = \pm 0.57 \). The second most
most discriminating characteristic for determining group
variables examined, local residence was found to be the
decors variables (Table 20), it can be observed that of the
upping now to the order of relevance of the pre-

"Elements"

Future associations based on these selected empirical data
a high degree of confidence in the ability to predict such
non-escapee categories and, as such, allow one to harbor
for determining group placement within the escape and
of this study were, in fact, extremely strong predictors
the variables identified as part of the theoretical section
such a high level of significance suggests that
.

001 level.

Quantity provides statistical significance beyond the
achieved in this case was 380.00, of which course-
approximation of a chi-square, the resulting chi-square
be determined by converting the lambda coefficient into an
for the Wilks' lambda statistic achieved in this case can
determining group classifications. The level of significance
formula should possess a high degree of accuracy in pre-
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such a computation the resulting coefficients can be then multiplied to the center of the system, from thereby highlighting the relative geometric position of the function axes to conclude with the grand centered position, coefficients involving the adjustment of the discriminant of these standardized coefficients into unstandardized discriminant function coefficients so that a discriminant coefficient must be converted into unstandardized classification. To achieve this end, the standardized and consequently allow for the assessment of future group and provide the needed statements for the regression equation used within the analysis, they are limited in their ability to discriminate power possessed by the predictor variables through their contribution to the degree of relevant. Although these standardized discriminant function

*Pending court requirements (r = .007)*

'education (r = .027)' marital status (r = .110) and pregnancy of black ancestry (r = .050)' presence of formal the age of the incarceration (r = .079)' attempts (r = .090)' the presence of Caucasian ancestry (r = .144)' body weight (r = .135)' previous escape attempts (r = .186)' the number of previous arrests (r = .253)' the presence of active holds against the prisoner (r = .321)' the height of the prisoner (r = .360)' previous commitment time served by the time of arrest (r = .465)' parole status at the time of arrest
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>Previous confinement</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Pending court</th>
<th>Active holds</th>
<th>Previous arrests</th>
<th>Previous escapes</th>
<th>Local residency</th>
<th>Protection status</th>
<th>Parole status</th>
<th>Employment status</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Marital status</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Height</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.321</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.051</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.079</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.186</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.156</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.060</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.026</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.465</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.390</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.049</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.077</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.054</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.253</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FUNCTION COEFFICIENTS FOR VARIABLES
STANDARDIZED CANONICAL DISCRIMINANT

TABLE 20
extracted and applied within a standard multiple regression equation so as to produce a "z" distribution score. The "z" score obtained for each case is then used to deduce the probability of group membership.

The results of this conversion are depicted within table 21. In utilizing the coefficients displayed within this table, the formula $Y' = a + bX_1 + bX_2 + bX_3 + bX_4 \ldots$ is used as the regression equation into which the unstandardized coefficients are substituted. The "a" used in this formula denotes the "constant term" and is the adjustment for the means so that the mean discriminant score will equal zero over all of the cases. The "Y'" score depicts the "z" score which will ultimately be obtained for the case examined; and the $bX_1$, $bX_2$, $bX_3$, $bX_4$ are denoting the effect of the unstandardized discriminant coefficient for each variable and the original values of the case variable.

As applied to a newly received prisoner, the $bX_1$ type of denotation would constitute his individual characteristics and demographic designations.

For the current study, the regression formula obtained was as follows:

$Y' = 8.47 - 1.37X_1 + .0079X_2 + .0173X_3 + .0272X_4$
$\quad + .005X_5 - .168X_6 + .049X_7 + 1.23X_8$
$\quad - .0029X_9 + .589X_10 - .177X_11 - .1034X_12$
$\quad + .0013X_13 - .1784X_14 - .1034X_15$
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Listing</th>
<th>Canonical Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Height</td>
<td>-0.1367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>0.0079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.0173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>0.0273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.0065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status</td>
<td>-1.1673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parole status</td>
<td>1.0408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation status</td>
<td>-1.2212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local residency</td>
<td>-0.2678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous escapes</td>
<td>0.5884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous arrests</td>
<td>-0.1769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active holds</td>
<td>0.0029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pending court</td>
<td>-0.1784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>-0.1034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0.0013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous confinement (Constant)</td>
<td>8.4655</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regression model was successful in correctly predicting as can be observed within this portfolio, the

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>92.5%</td>
<td>7.75%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Cases</td>
<td>Actual Group Membership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sample Group Classification Results**

**Table 22**

Membership as illustrated within Table 22. Collectively results of the model’s ability to predict group memberships is illustrated. A negative non-escape group membership, the escape group membership, indicates that discriminant scores found to be positive were those discriminant scores generated using this regression equation. For this particular examination of correct grouping classifications was generated using study, it was discovered that an extremely high percentage as applied to the 400 cases examined within this.
system of the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department.

model to newly received prisoners within the correctional
that similar results might be achieved when applying the
model for those known cases examined subsequently indicates
the extremely high degree of accuracy established by the
group association and escape propensity determination.
Study were found to be strong and accurate predictors for
variables derived from the theoretical section of this
based on these findings, it appears that certain

Summary

classified.
whilst only 50 or 12.5 percent of the cases were incorrectly
classified 350 of the 400 cases examined or 87.5 percent,
want analyses process undertaken was able to correctly
formula. Overall, the formula derived from the diagnostic-
where were incorrectly categorized by the regression
accuracy rate. Only 15 or 7.5 percent of this particular
member sample, subsequently entering into a 9.2.5 percent
regression model successfully categorized 185 of the 200
only 35 or 17.5 percent. For the non-escape sample the
were not correctly categorized by the formula was
number of inmates who were actually within the escape
in 82.5 percent rate of success for that grouping. The
165 of the 200 escape cases examined, which equates into

149