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ABSTRACT

UNDERSTANDING CAPTIVE-TAKERS MOTIVATIONS, METHODS AND TARGETS

by Jean Garner Larned

December 2011

Understanding Captive-Takers Motivations, Methods and Targets is the ultimate goal in order to help those who train, manage and prevent hostage taking events which include police officers, negotiators, recovery personnel, academics and psychologists. The overall lack of literature relating to the topic of captive-taker motivations is another impetus for this dissertation. There is a dearth of scholarly material in any of the main areas of understanding kidnapping/captive-taking/hostage-taking from the perspective of the perpetrator within law enforcement, psychology, private sector or academia. It is anticipated that this research study and the data garnered from it will assist academics, psychologists, private corporations, and law enforcement agencies in developing strategies for preventing, identifying, understanding perpetrator motivations, solving crimes, and future training for situations involving captive-taking. It is clear that there is an increasing problem of captive-taking specifically in or around large urban cities close to the U.S./Mexico border. Law enforcement professionals have a need of such information and intelligence so they can learn from and understand the perpetrator, their purpose and motivations to respond accordingly to effectively combat the growing threat of captive-taking through research, education, prevention, and detection, both internationally and domestically. The assessment process began with evaluating the protocol questionnaires, interviews and the subsequent data that followed. Utilizing the
hypotheses and data analysis the information was evaluated, documented and interpreted to make recommendations for future research through an individual case study format. This was identified from the results of the Pilot Project and the ensuing data retrieved from the subject interviews. The interviews were evaluated according to the Global Hostage-Taking Research and Analysis Project (GHost-RAP) parameters and from this; case studies were performed of each subject in the study with the final individual subject evaluations highlighting patterns, trends, and significance therein. This process utilized primary and secondary data interpretation and evaluation as part of the overall dissertation process.

It was apparent from the captive-taker interviews that the criminal captive-taker is anti-social, lacking in opportunities to succeed, raised or taught by criminals, associated with criminals, had criminal tendencies, somewhat mentally challenged, had substance abuse issues, wanted to be a criminal, or forced into criminality, had experienced a traumatic event, had a physiological chemical imbalance and more importantly, came from a dysfunctional background. As exploratory research, this dissertation was conducted to describe the motivations of captive-takers, to determine and assist future responses by law enforcement, psychologists, and academics. A general review of the existing literature indicates that there is an increasing problem of captive-taking specifically along the U.S. / Mexico border. Mindful that there is possible encroachment from individuals within Mexico with regards to captive-taking, making it a sensitive bureaucratic issue. The majority of individuals that were taken captive in the United States came from Phoenix, Arizona or San Diego, California and were involved in some
way with illegal border crossings, human smuggling, kidnapping or the inexorable narcotics business.

Along with captive-taking, increasing violence has consumed the southwest border in recent years which includes the metropolitan area of Phoenix, Arizona. With this said, this study was conducted primarily in the qualitative research tradition, using the grounded theory method proposed by Strauss and Corbin (1998). The study involved the initiation of interviews during a pilot test of the protocol questionnaires (instruments) of captive-taker subjects who were incarcerated. The pilot test was initiated and conducted by members of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), Behavioral Science Unit (BSU), and other federal agencies, state, and local law enforcement personnel, as interviewers, from the different agencies at a correctional facility in the greater Phoenix, Arizona area. This dissertation and subsequent research will continue to locate, identify and interview captive-takers with the eventual goal of having a large sample size of subjects to better understand captive-taking in order to help all those involved in the prevention of this phenomenon. Prevention would constitute pre, during and post captive-taking scenarios.

Each case study was the direct result of the interviews, which highlighted interesting paradigms of motivations, reasoning, circumstance and geographical significance. Moreover, the motivations of the primary participants concerning captive-taking was the primary focus of this dissertation. A demographic questionnaire and personality assessment instruments (Appendix A) were administered to participants in order to make a baseline point of reference for the case studies.
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*GHosT-RAP*- According to Vecchi (2009, 4), “Global captive-taking is visualized and structured by the various contexts in which it occurs. There are two primary areas of
interest that being domestic and international. Domestically, captive-taking is on two levels based on known perpetrator motivations where the captive is held for instrumental (cognitive) or expressive (emotional) purposes. Captives who are held for instrumental reasons are considered “hostages” and are used as leverage to influence a separate third party. Conversely, captives held for expressive or emotional reasons are considered “victims” and used as object of distaste by the captive-taker with the overall intent to avoid any third party contact. Domestic captive-taking is generally handled by law enforcement entities. Within the international environment, captive-taking is based on expected motivations where the captive is held for instrumental reasons or “hostage.” International captive-taking is investigated by U.S. law enforcement, the U.S. intelligence community, and the U.S. military” and international organizations like INTERPOL. As an example, within the domestic arena were initially determined based on the environmental constructs and known motivations; compared to the known contexts within the international arena which were initially determined based on country, culture, group dynamics, and expected motivations (Vecchi 2009).

Subject – captive taker. “Captive” here refers to either hostage-captive or victim-captive, defined below (Vecchi 2009).

Captive- individual who being held against his/her will by another. This term includes both hostage-captive and victim-captive (Vecchi 2009).

Hostage-Captive – an individual who is being held against his/her will is used as leverage to achieve the subject’s substantive demand, something that the subject cannot attain without extorting authorities or a third party through the act of hostage-taking. This is the appropriate term in instrumental-hostage takings (Vecchi 2009).
*Victim-Captive* – an individual who is being held against his/her will by another without the intent to use the victim-captive as leverage. This is the appropriate term in expressive-hostage takings (Vecchi 2009).

*Third Party* – anyone involved in the resolution of the physical or emotional captive-taking incident: negotiators, tactical operators, military operators, mental health professionals (Vecchi 2009).

*Barricade* – obstacle (though not necessarily tangible) between the subject and the *negotiator or 3d parties* (Vecchi 2009).

*Instrumental Taking* - characterized by substantive demands and clearly recognizable objectives that, if attained, will benefit the subject (Noesner 1997).

*Expressive Taking* - designed to communicate the subject’s frustration, outrage, passion, despair, anger, or other feelings which stems from the need to ventilate (Vecchi 2009).

*Barricade Hostage Situation* - (BHS): a situation consisting of a subject(s), a hostage-captive(s), and a barricade. Due to the “hostage” component, this is necessarily an instrumental taking. The subject views these circumstances as triadic (having three parties – the subject, the hostage-captive, and the authorities or third party who grant the subject’s demand) (Vecchi 2009).

*Barricade Crisis Situation* - (BCS): a situation involving a subject(s), perhaps a captive(s), and a barricade. This is necessarily an expressive taking where the subject views this situation as dyadic (having two parties – the subject and the victim-captive). The subject does not wish to have authorities or other third parties involved (Vecchi 2009).
*Single Barricade Situation* – subject has barricaded himself without any hostages being present, as well as attempted suicides or suicide in progress situations (Vecchi 2009).

*Abduction* – a situation where a captive (either hostage-captive or victim-captive) is held illegally against his/her will at an unknown location. The situation consists of: subject(s) and captive(s), but no barricade. (Vecchi 2009)
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

In recent years, captive-taking has become a major problem in the United States, especially in the southwest border region. The purpose of this dissertation, along with the overall research goal of GHosT-RAP, a nationally recognized program, conceived by Dr. Greg Vecchi, was to describe and understand the motivation paradigms of captive-takers. Within law enforcement, little has been studied from the point of view of the perpetrator.

GHosT-RAP. This dissertation was undertaken to address this gap in the literature.

A 911 call from a cell phone early one January morning brought police to a home in a Phoenix suburb. Inside, they found more than 30 half-naked and shivering men—prisoners, police say, of a gang that had smuggled them in from Mexico. Beaten and threatened with a 9-mm Beretta pistol, a local detective’s report said, the men were being shaken down for as much as $5,000 a piece. Such cases are increasingly common in Phoenix, which is gaining notoriety as the kidnapping capital of America. Authorities blame forces ranging from Mexico’s rising drug violence to a gang takeover of the immigrant-smuggling business. Another factor: the volatile housing market in the city, which has left it strewn with thousands of rental houses on sometimes sparsely populated suburban blocks, places for smugglers to store either drugs or people. The police call these “drop houses.” They say federal, state and local authorities discovered 194 such houses in 2007, then 169 last year and dozens more in 2009. While most of Phoenix’s abduction cases relate to the drug trade, as dealers snatch rivals to demand ransom or settle debts, increasing numbers involve undocumented migrants. The Phoenix area also was affected because tougher enforcement at the border focused on traditional routes in Texas and California—funneling more traffic through Arizona along desert corridors controlled by Mexico’s Sinaloa drug cartel. Given the recent falloff in immigration resulting from U.S. job losses helps to fuel kidnapping, some authorities believe. They say that as border crossings decline, gangs earn less money directly from smuggling fees than from holding some of their clients for ransom, before delivering them to their destination farther inside the U.S. (Millman 2009, 1).

The above example illustrates the necessity of understanding the motivation of captive-takers to assist law enforcement in the training and prevention of such debilitating, contentious, and dangerous crimes. With that said, this dissertation focuses
on the problem of global captive-taking and aims to explore, analyze, and understand the motivations of captive-takers. The first iteration of GHosT-RAP will involve the southwest border area of the United States, primarily the region between Mexico and the United States. Within this region, the areas bordering the southwestern United States and Mexico, Phoenix, Arizona, which is second in captive-taking to Mexico City (see section 1.3), has the highest rates of captive-taking and kidnapping\(^1\) in the world (Vecchi 2009, 4). Because of its close proximity to Mexico, Phoenix has had more incidents of captive-taking than any other United States city. In addition, probably twice that number of captive-takings goes unreported. Most captive-takings usually center around other crimes such as burglary, assault, drugs, and human smuggling, sometimes of fellow captive-takers. Many times, when someone is taken captive, for instance a relative of a rival gang member, money is available given the lucrative nature of the drug trade and the ransom can be paid quickly. When you think of captive-takings, generally you think of Iraq, Afghanistan, and Colombia, not the southwestern United States or Phoenix, Arizona.

Figure 1 shows the many types of captive-taking that take place on both sides of the U.S.–Mexico border. This means that the southwest border region has become one of the most dangerous and violent areas in the United States. One of the glaring problems is that the United States is intent on combating Islamic fundamentalism and terrorism overseas but has almost ignored a more dire threat from our neighbor to the south, Mexico. This is a more relevant threat to the citizens of the United States. In fact, kidnappings and other crimes connected to Mexican drug cartels are quickly spreading along the border, from Texas to California.

---

1. For the purpose of this research project, the terms hostage-taking and kidnapping can be grouped under the title captive-taking
The ongoing problem of captive-taking is researched through a partnership of both law enforcement and academia from data obtained through GHosT-RAP, which is being sponsored by the FBI to research captive-taking motivation in order to assist law enforcement. This dissertation examines this problem. Eventually, the findings of this dissertation will be utilized to assist law enforcement domestically and eventually on a global scale to assist countries that have problems with hostage-taking. According to Vecchi (2006, 4), “anytime someone is taken against their will be it internationally or domestic that is a problem that needs to be addressed.” This dissertation will not only benefit law enforcement in the training and prevention of hostage-taking, but society as a whole.
There has never been a comprehensive study of the primary motivations of the captive-taker themselves with the development of a legitimate, concrete or useable means of identifying possible perpetrators who have been arrested and incarcerated for captive-taking who could help in the understanding of motivations that could possibly assist law enforcement in future incidents. In the past, hostage-taking or captive-taking has focused on the hostages themselves and not the perpetrator. This dissertation examines the actual perpetrator, their methods, and motives to understand what the perpetrator is looking for in a victim. Ostensibly, this dissertation will add to the limited existing literature by focusing directly on the perpetrator and the reasoning, methods, motivations, and thought processes involved in taking a person against their will.

In essence, this dissertation, in coordination with Ghost-RAP, will focus directly on the captive-taker in keeping with the founders vision to “describe hostage-taker values and paradigms, their motivations for taking hostages, and the development of theoretical constructs for improving mitigation, preparedness, response, and recovery activities” (Vecchi 2009, 2). Ultimately, this dissertation and research will help those who manage hostage-taking events (police officers, negotiators, recovery personnel, academics and psychologists) to improve their ability to perform their jobs. In the end, captive-taking is a domestic and international security problem that directly affects the interests of the United States. Captive-taking has been a problem since time immemorial and the victim has always paid the price, now, the results of this dissertation will help from the standpoint of having the perpetrator explain to us why, how, what, when they decide to take someone captive.
Baseline Example of Captive Taking/Kidnapping

Statistics and numbers are a major component to how we gauge trends and patterns. To this end, According to Brandt and Sandler (2008, 1), “hostage events have been some of the most spectacular and newsworthy attacks during the modern era of international terrorism.” For example, in 2008, Mexico witnessed an average of 65 abductions every month, roughly two a day (Vecchi 2009, 4). Because of its close proximity to Mexico, Phoenix has had more incidents of captive-taking than any other United States city and second globally to Mexico City. According to Ross (2009, 4), there were “over 370 cases last year alone.” In addition, probably twice that number of captive-takings goes unreported. Most of the captive-takings are secondary to crimes like burglary, assault, drugs and human smuggling, sometimes fellow captive-takers.

According to Michael Webster (2008, 1), who is an investigative reporter for American Chronicle, “Dozens of U.S. citizens have been kidnapped, held hostage and killed by their captors in Mexico and many cases remain unsolved. Moreover, new cases of disappearances and kidnap-for-ransom continue to be reported.”

Kidnapping for ransom is a common occurrence in various parts of the world. As an example, worldwide, 12,000 to 25,000 individuals are taken captive (Webster 2008, 1). Within Mexico, it is roughly 3,000 a year, but quantifying the captive-taking numbers in Mexico is difficult because of the constant fear of corrupt police involvement in the captive-taking and the fear of reprisals for reporting the captive-taking (Webster 2008, 1). In 2009, the Los Angeles Times named Phoenix, Arizona America’s kidnapping capital, reporting that hundreds of ransom (mercenary motivations) kidnappings are reported. Most of the time, these captive-takings have a nexus to human and drug smuggling from Mexico, most notably, a means of collecting unpaid debts (instrumental motivation).
According to eGlobalHealth Insurers “kidnapping is a Billion Dollar business around the globe. It is often run by carefully trained teams whose mission is simply to ransom people for money. These kidnapping rings have decision makers, a negotiation team, and an implementation team. It is a worldwide problem, and Americans traveling outside the US are preferred targets.” The BSU has been studying this phenomenon for some time and established GHosT-RAP as an answer to this problem. “a comprehensive research and analysis project that is being conducted in cooperation with academic and other public and private stakeholders to determine the motivations of captive-takers” (Vecchi 2009, 1).

This dissertation reviewed existing literature in the field of captive-taking, hostage-taking and/or kidnapping that have been conducted to illuminate the lack of any significant data or research project involving hostage-taking. With the given lack of background information on hostage-taking, captive-taking and/or kidnapping, the information attained from this dissertation can bridge that gap by empirically and longitudinally examining captive-taker motivations through analyses of captive-taker interviews, questionnaires and understanding personality protocols for the purpose of preventing, mitigating, and preventing incidences of global captive-taking through the development of behavioral-based, interview driven methods for improving training and operations through examination of the resulting data.

The current research design will help in developing a comparative study among captive-takers around the southwest border of the United States. Even within the same region, captive-takers can have varied motives for captive-taking. With that said, this dissertation, in conjunction with Vecchi’s research, will help to augment and “examine the motives of captive-takers through empirically based research, interviews with
captive-takers, data collection, examination and production of findings for utilization by public and private entities” (Vecchi 2009). For example, most captive-takings generally occur to get ransom money, consequently “the average percentage of deaths following a kidnap is 9%” (eGlobalHealth Insurers 2010, 1). Trying to bring an end to a traumatic captive-taking is important to everyone. “Demands can be huge, with more than 14 countries recording cases of $25 million or more in recent years, kidnappers usually settle at between 10 and 20 percent of the demand” eGlobalHealth Insurers, (2010, 1).

It is important to understand the background and history of GHosT-RAP as it was conceived by Dr. Vecchi. “There are three main reasons for this research[:] to elicit and describe the motivation of captive-takers through the administration of vetted, interview protocols, to provide evidence why the method would, or should yield the claimed outcome and to develop relevant training and education deliverables for use by the relevant individual and organization” (Vecchi 2009, 3). Moreover, more knowledge is needed to help law enforcement in understanding what the perpetrator looks for in a victim. This will have a profound effect on the way law enforcement, academia and psychology can benefit from this research. Vecchi (2009, 3) contends that this research:

could be applied toward the development and enhancement of education, training for individual agencies involved in prevention and counter-captive-taking activities and missions with regards to mitigation and prevention, preparedness, response and recovery measures. It is expected that this research project will fill an existing gap in the literature, existing theoretical and practical frameworks of captive-taking activities through creative approaches to effectively address this specialized type of crime (3).

Captive-taking would be considered a crime in any country and taking any person against their will could never be considered a benevolent act regardless of the cause. Not many persons would consider being taken captive an act of a “freedom fighter,” just a criminal act. If, for example, people rise in an effort to end colonialism they take
captives, that would still be considered a crime in the court of international opinion. For the International Criminal Court any type of captive-taking would be considered a crime, even if it is not considered a crime to the captive-takers. It is still a crime against humanity, which is recognized in most of the civilized world. Knowing the primary reasons for the captive-taking and underlying motivations and backgrounds of captive-takers can assist authorities in responding to and preventing such acts in the future. This should include understanding how captive-takers and kidnappers target their hostages and/or victims. Captive-taking is an alarming trend especially in areas along the U.S. and Mexico border that threatens all those who are unknowing of the risk. An alarming and new trend is to take a victim captive in Mexico who has American relatives living in the United States and demand exorbitant ransoms with the belief that Americans have more money to pay.

Internationally, captive-taking poses a danger to those involved in law enforcement, diplomatic missions, military operations, intelligence gathering and civilians employed in Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO). The OCO was initiated after al Qaeda’s September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center in New York and Pentagon in Arlington, VA. The stated objectives for the OCO are first and foremost to protect U.S. citizens and their allies both at home and abroad, to protect American business interests both foreign and domestic and finally to defeat terrorist groups both in the United States and abroad that involve terrorist activities, international networks, and terrorist organizations. Part of that involves the protection of U.S. citizens from being taken captive for instrumental, expressive, religious, ideological, mercenary, vendetta, economic, accidental, secondary and political reasons. Most terrorist groups have resorted to captive-taking for one or more of the aforementioned reasons.
The focus of this dissertation is the southwest border region of the United States and to understand the concept of captive-taking means fully understanding the concept and definitions of terms. Many definitions have been used to explain captive-taking and/or kidnapping. Captive-taking is a spectacular and immediate occurrence committed in a public domain to force action or change. Generally speaking, the demands of a captive-taker are usually personal in nature against a member of a family, mostly involving children. Moreover, motive for this form of action is more often reactive or expressive than premeditated or instrumental. Actual motives for hostage-taking will be further explained going forward (Vecchi 2006, 7).

Understanding the motivations of the perpetrators is key to preventing or mitigating captive-taking. We as researchers have the duty to develop ways in which to reduce or eliminate the horrifying criminal act of captive-taking. With that said, the primary research objective of this dissertation is to understand the “motivations of captive-takers in both the domestic and international domains” (Vecchi 2009, 7). Also, understanding what the captive-takers look for in victims will help in determining motivation. Once one can understand the reasons for captive-takings, one can begin to address each of them in-turn through legislation, training, and proactive law enforcement.

Law enforcement along the border of the United States and Mexico continues to experience an extremely high level of crime to include captive-taking. A majority of crime along the border is in some way always narcotics related...murder and kidnapping its manifestations. Similar to statistics put forth by Ross in 2008, Goldston in 2009 reported that “Phoenix, Arizona, reported 370 captive-takings in 2008, the second highest for a single city in the world, behind Mexico City (Goldston 2009, 4).” This figure only takes into account Phoenix, because of its nexus to Mexico making it the focus of the
pilot project. Captive-taking is a nationwide problem, but specifically pronounced in the southwest region of the United States because of its close proximity to Mexico. Over the past few years since the Mexican governments crack down on the drug cartels in December 2006, the murder rate in Mexico, especially near the U.S. border has risen exponentially. With that comes a similar increase in kidnapping (Vecchi 2009, 4).

As far back as 2005, captive-taking specifically has been a persistent problem. According to Richard Boucher, a State Department spokesman, “at least 27 Americans have been abducted along the border with Mexico in the past six months because of increased violence among drug traffickers, prompting the U.S. State Department to issue a warning to travelers.” This is more proof of the seriousness of the problem that has plagued the U.S. border region with Mexico. [Note: captive-taking is a universal term to better understand the language within the paradigm of hostage-taking, kidnapping, victim-taking falling under this definition.]

Grounded Theory Process

In this dissertation, “grounded theory” involved examining the data from the interviews of captive-takers who have been incarcerated for captive-taking either as the primary offense or secondary offense. From that, we were able to developing theories from observing a group of subjects. Basically, the theories are “grounded” in the subject’s or interviewees experiences and subsequently researchers contribute their own insight or belief of why those experiences exist. To that end, the incarcerated subjects previously had been identified as possible interview subjects and interviewed by a team of law enforcement professionals who utilized the captive-taking protocol questionnaires to glean information about captive-takers and their individual events for research purposes. Once completed, this data became the focal point in a case study centered on
captive-taking. The “grounded theory” method attempts to develop a conceptual understanding of motivations utilizing an inductive process that starts with the interview of the actual captive-taker perpetrator.

Objective of Dissertation

Ultimately, the intent of this dissertation as with GHosT-RAP, would be to assist law enforcement, military, academics, psychologists at the national and local levels in the understanding and prevention of captive-taking. Realistically, enforcement measures are focused on the identification, apprehension and intelligence collection of groups or individuals intent on taking innocent people captive. Additionally, the focus of this dissertation will be on one specific domain within the global-captive-taking conceptual array, namely, the U.S.-Mexico border region in Arizona.

The international nexus to the United States involves the high number of captive-takers identified as foreign nationals, primarily from Mexico. The close proximity of Phoenix to Mexico is why it is generally considered an important part of the southwest border region. Moreover, a by-product of this being a large metropolitan American city perfect for kidnapping and other crimes that is close enough to the Mexican border for possible escape. To that end, this research dissertation involves captive-taking, kidnapping and hostage-taking on or near the U.S.-Mexico border. Moreover, the pilot project involved interviewing captive-takers who are currently incarcerated in prisons here in the United States (Phoenix, AZ) and subsequently in Mexico (Vecchi 2009, 16).

With regard to the completed pilot project in Phoenix, Arizona, researchers had direct interaction with the interview subjects. In the end, this dissertation hinges on the “interpretations and presentations of the researchers as much as that of the participants” (Vecchi 2009, 4). More importantly, the relationship between the interview subjects and
the interviewer/researcher is vitally important. The results will be written in qualitative terms with an emphasis on understanding the meaning of captive-taking and defining these terms based on the results of the interviews involving actual captive-takers instead of the perspective of the interviewer/researcher or victim. This research will be applying “grounded theory” to accomplish its goals in answering the research question and validating one or all of the hypotheses and producing deliverables in keeping with the goals and vision of GHosT-RAP.

Explanatio of Terms

Vecchi’s research has helped in the development of the stated hypotheses for the purpose of this dissertation, which will be quantified through the captive-taker interviews.

The *domestic* environment involves captive-taking on two levels based on known motivations where the captive is held for *instrumental* or *expressive* reasons. Captives held for *instrumental* reasons are termed “hostages” and are held as leverage in order to influence a third party. Captives held for *expressive* reasons (e.g., kidnapping) are termed “victims” and are held as an object of distaste by the captive-taker usually with the intent to avoid any third party interactions. Domestic captive-taking is almost always handled by law enforcement entities.

The international environment involves captive-taking on only one level based on expected motivations where the captive is held for *instrumental* reasons, thus being termed a “hostage.” International captive-taking is handled in part by U.S. law enforcement, the U.S. intelligence community, and the U.S. military, as well as other international entities (Vecchi 2009, 7).

A prime example of an “international entity” would be Interpol. Interpol is a valuable resource when dealing with international captive-taking. The international captive-taking component will be conducted at a later date. Within the parameters of this research study, understanding the motivations of the perpetrator is vitally important in dealing with captive-taking near the United States and Mexico border. Within this

---

2. A majority of captive-takings that occur along the U.S./Mexico involve drug trafficking organizations, crimes against persons and crimes against property as primary crimes.
dissertation, as with GHosT-RAP, the evaluation of the data depends on the amount and type of information collected. Once motivations are annotated, researchers can then relate why, how, who, when and what of captive-takers by incorporating aspects of both description and type of captive-taking and developing individual case studies of the participants. This will be readily apparent upon completion of the interviews of incarcerated captive-takers.

Background and History of the U.S. / Mexico Region

The history of the United States and its southern neighbor has been problematic since before the Mexican-American War of 1846 to 1848. Prior to that time, geography played a major role in the relationship of U.S. and Mexican affairs as it does today with regard to border violence including kidnapping and murder. Before the signing of the “Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo” in 1848, which ended the Mexican-American War, giving the United States most of what is now the southwestern portion of the country (Texas, New Mexico, Colorado Arizona, Nevada, Utah, Wyoming and California), the area was open, untamed, lawless with vast stretches of land. After the signing of the treaty, the course of history changed forever between the United States and Mexico. The United States now had a defined border that spanned 2,000 miles with many places and porous landscape for illegal activity to ebb and flow into and out of the United States and Mexico.

Since that time in 1848, there has been a continual difficulty for law enforcement to police the border and control crime. When large metropolitan centers (e.g., Phoenix, San Diego) started to develop to the north and within a close proximity of the border, it eventually became a haven for the criminal element to commit crimes and slip back across the border. Even during the early part of the 20th century, the United States was
unable to stop the lawlessness as evidenced by the revolutionary leader Francisco “Pancho” Villa’s encroachment onto U.S. soil to commit crime. A broadly comparable scenario exists today, but now it involves narcotics crimes, kidnapping and murder in major U.S. cities like Phoenix, El Paso, San Diego, Tucson, Brownsville and other border regions.

Today it seems as though the Mexican-American War never ended. According to Jim Kouri, writing for the *Law Enforcement Examiner*, stated in a recent article that “the governor of Arizona is requesting a deployment of up to 250 National Guard troops to that state’s border with Mexico, while the Texas governor is considering a similar action. The escalating violence occurring at the US-Mexico border is causing enormous concern within both states. In an effort to pre-empt expected criticism from a growing number of Americans, President Barack Obama has indicated to the Pentagon that he’s considering these deployments, according to sources in Washington, D.C.” This has been tried before and has been an ongoing source of problems for law enforcement entities along the border. Kouri reports that “back in 2006, under President George W. Bush, 6,000 National Guard soldiers were sent to the US-Mexican border in Arizona, California, New Mexico and Texas. However, Guard members were prohibited from enforcing the immigration laws. Their missions included engineering, aviation surveillance, and other support.” GHoST-RAP addresses one of these major criminal acts, that being captive-taking and/or kidnapping. Literature on the subject was not as pronounced or available. The literature review was of existing material that concentrates on captive and/or kidnapping related to the pilot project.
Captive Taking from Across the Border

According to Altegrity Risk International (2010, 1), “kidnap-for-ransom crimes are widespread in Mexico, having become commonplace in Mexico’s most dangerous areas, primarily along the northern border, where drug trafficking cartels routinely clash with rival groups and security forces to secure trafficking routes into the United States. Today, kidnapping rates have reached critical levels in Mexico, where there were some 1,028 incidents reported in 2008.” The problem inherent with the kidnapping trend in Mexico is bound to continue into the United States along with drug trafficking and murder. More recent trends show that captive-taking and/or kidnapping is not resigned to only Mexico, but the United States, eventually overwhelming law enforcement authorities. “Authorities in the United States have warned against a potential spillover of kidnapping operations connected to the heightened risk of Mexican organized crime. When the war against drug cartels led by Mexican President Calderon accelerated in 2008, U.S. officials increased warnings of the spillover potential” (Altegrity Risk International 2010, 1).

The United States, primarily Phoenix and San Diego is prime ground for kidnapping because of the wealthier status of U.S. citizens and the close proximity to Mexico for quick escape. If you focus on the drug cartels, you can find a majority of the captive-taking perpetrators. “Mexican cartels have moved into more than 230 U.S. cities in the past several years, setting up drug trafficking hubs and pushing local drug gangs out of business” (Altegrity Risk International 2010, 1). Altegrity Risk International submits that “the presence of criminal gangs significantly increases the chance for secondary crimes like kidnapping.” To that end, “the most affected U.S. city thus far has been Phoenix, where authorities report that all crime levels have fallen in recent years,
except kidnapping and home invasions. After kidnapping rates continued to climb in 2009, with at least 101 kidnappings reported during the first three months of the year, Phoenix was named the kidnapping capital of the United States. At that rate, the city was poised to report a higher rate in 2009 than in 2008, when some 328 kidnappings were reported” (Altegrity Risk International 2010, 1).

It seems as if the “propinquity effect” takes affect when evaluating and explaining crime, especially captive-taking and/or kidnapping. The premise behind the “propinquity effect” is that individuals (in this case captive-takers) deal with those closest to themselves, mainly in geographic terms. For example, “cities located directly along the border with Mexico face an elevated risk of kidnapping. The problem of captive-taking is not only resigned to Phoenix, Arizona, officials in southern California say at least 200 kidnappings each year are tied to Mexican organized crime groups, while authorities reported that between November 2007 and August 2008 at least 30 U.S. nationals were abducted in San Diego, California and taken to Mexico” (Altegrity Risk International 2010, 1).

Conclusion

In a brief synopsis of the overall research project, the majority of information and data comes from the literature review, historical records, archives, news outlets, and actual interviews of convicted captive-takers and kidnappers who are incarcerated in an individual case study basis. The end goal was to evaluate each as a case study in captive-taking and perform a qualitative data analysis annotated in chapter V. A summary of the research by chapter is found below.

Chapter I introduces this research study and provides an overview of the problem of captive-taking (which is synominous with hostage-taking) and kidnapping. The
Chapter explains “grounded theory” and the significance of this dissertation which centers on the understanding of captive-taker motivations and methods as the main objective. Finally, the chapter describes the content of this research dissertation and covers the problem/objective of what is needed to be examined (research question) and the contentious history of the relations between the U.S. and Mexico leading up to the politically sensitive topic of captive-taking of U.S. citizens by Mexican nationals.

Chapter II contains a literature review which includes prior research in the area of captive-taking and/or kidnapping and involves the search for all existing literature on the subject leading to this dissertation being all the more relevant. Prior research in this area is sparse which supports the need for more research related to captive-taking. The literature review also falls under distinct symbolic interaction of individuals, social construction, group dynamics, and hostage-taking paradigms. The literature review starts from the beginning of understanding captive-taking from the standpoint of older models dealing with hostage-taking and negotiations. From there, it transitions to “new model” of hostage-taking experience, reputation and negotiation strategies to hostage-taker motivations, profiles and contrasting dynamics of crisis negotiations. Finally transitioning to current research on captive-taking within the FBI and the use of the Perpetrator-Motive Research Design (PMRD).

Chapter III describes the research design/method used in this dissertation which is based on qualitative research methods which will be the linchpin for the dissertation involving a research design based on the PMRD, interviews and case studies. Moreover, the researchers role, data sources (interviews), data collection, data analysis, the verification process, ethical considerations, IRB, and the overall success of the pilot project depends on the research design and analysis of interviews.
Chapter IV covers the actual research samples and findings from each captive-taker interview, interpretation of these interviews (S1-S8) under the PMRD format and conclusions about the data.

Chapter V concludes this dissertation by presenting the results and propositions that summarize the research and examines the research findings (1–10) from the PMRD interviews and possible implications for the future and baseline trends of captor-takers. The chapter recapitulates with the explanations of key findings (1–10) and implications of the case studies and overall research, putting forth specific recommendations for improving the prevention, training, and understanding of captive-taking. Moreover, specific tactics and methods for reducing the potential threat of captive-taking and/or kidnapping.
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

An initial overview of the literature related to captive-taking is examined in the next few pages. The formal literature review contains three main sections: Old Model vs. New Model of Captive-Taking and Hostage Experience, Behavioral Models, and the Current Paradigm for Interviewing Perpetrator-Motive Research Design (PMRD)

A review of the literature reveals a scarcity or dearth of research about or relating to general captive-taking, hostage-taking and/or kidnapping, especially from the perspective of the captive-taker. Moreover, the literature that exists reveals a disparity about the differing reasons that people take other people captive and how to effectively deal with it. The literature does not cover empirically effective methods or interventions to deal with captive-taking. This dissertation is the first of its kind to explore the motivations of the perpetrator. This dissertation focuses on getting into the mind of the perpetrator and learning from them. The pilot study involved the interviews of captive-takers and/or kidnappers that has laid the groundwork for developing training in the understanding of the techniques, tactics, procedures, awareness and prevention of future captive-taking and/or kidnapping situations (Research related to barricaded hostage situations was not fully researched within this literature review because of the separate nature of barricaded hostage scenarios).

How This Literature Review Is to Be Interpreted, Read, and Understood

The beginning of the literature review examines captive-taking, hostage-taking, and kidnapping research that is available. Moreover, an examination is conducted of older models of captive-taking research, hostage experiences, negotiation implications, contrasting dynamics of crisis negotiation, understanding captive-taking and comparisons
among the different typologies of captive-taking situations. It then transitions to newer models and techniques to understanding captive-taking. Following that is a section on Behavioral Models and ending with the Perpetrator-Motive Research Design developed by the FBI and utilized in the Global Hostage-Taking Research Analysis Project and this dissertation. Furthermore, how the PMRD will assist law enforcement in preventing future incidents of captive-taking through understanding the motives of the captive-taker themselves.

What Is the Purpose of This Literature Review?

The purpose of this literature review is to flush out any and all material related to captive-taking and/or kidnapping that is current and relevant. As stated earlier, the literature review found a limited amount of existing work overall on the subject of global hostage-taking. Conversely, there is a “growing” body of work related to hostage-taking, captive-taking, kidnapping and barricaded situations, especially in the regions that border the United States. Defining the topic, from a literature review perspective is helpful to get a broad understanding of the current situation of captive-taking/ hostage-taking or kidnapping, focusing on most hostage-taking scenarios and incidents relating to Mexico and the southwest border region that follow predictable patterns based on the country’s proximity to the United States. The literature review also revealed geographic patterns and kidnapping trends. This literature review and analysis as it relates to global hostage-taking is a joint project involving multiple agencies and bureaus with the lead being taken by the FBI’s Behavioral Science Unit. The purpose of the review was to identify, annotate, and synthesize research studies, projects, and interventions related to global hostage-taking to serve as a tool for the FBI and other agencies in combating the scourge
of hostage-taking that has become a global problem. The review is being done in coordination with members of GHosT-RAP.

An exhaustive literature search on the topic of captive-taking was completed of available current captive-taking publications in English through standard academic search engines, literature, and archival information. These were both published and unpublished materials and included articles, reports, research studies, surveys, scholarly books and programmatic interventions related to global hostage-taking. The following few pages gives an insight to what literature exists relating to captive-taking. Beginning the literature review was Nax, who covered hostage-taking utilizing a comparative model between older and newer paradigms. According to (Nax, 2008, 158), “over the last decades, the world has experienced a tremendous increase in hostage-takings. Not only has the number of incidents of hostage-taking increased but also has hostage-taking changed in style.” In the old model of hostage-taking, the hostage-taker always linked a specific claim or ransom to the threat of harming the hostage (Schelling 1960, 20).

According to Schelling, if that ransom is paid, the hostage is returned. If the ransom is not paid, the hostage may be hurt. Nax states that essentially, the hostage-taker would have then preferred not to have taken the hostage. In the new model, it is the reputation of the parties involved that affects the captive-taking scenario (first-mover advantage).

Defining the Literature Review Topic

Victims tend to fall into two categories in the literature review: those of kidnappers and hostage-takers. “Kidnapping is defined as the criminal abduction of a person, where the location of both abducted and abductor are not known. Hostage-takings, on the other hand, classically reveal their location. Recently, however, hostage-takers have begun to obscure their location” (Nax 2008, 159). According to Nax, there
are two parties involved in the kidnapping and/or hostage-taking scenario, the
government, (law enforcement) and the terrorist (captive-taker). “Both parties have two
strategies available. The government chooses between negotiating and not negotiating,
whereas the terrorist decides whether to take or not to take hostages. Although the
government prefers to negotiate once hostages are taken, it would rather not negotiate
with terrorists when they have not taken hostages. The hostage-takers themselves prefer
to take hostages, whenever the government negotiates, but traditionally prefer not to take
hostages, whenever the government does not” (Nax 2008, 159). This means that the
hostage-takers would not have chosen to take the hostages if it would have been clear that
the government would surely not have negotiated. Therefore, there are two parts to this
scenario, either the government negotiates and the terrorist takes hostages or they both do
not.

In the “new model”, there are several studies that look at a specific aspect of
global hostage-taking. Earlier, Nax, (2008, 162), cited studies involving examples of
“game theory” whereas “the two parties involved are the government and the terrorist.
Both parties have two strategies. The government can either negotiate or not negotiate
with the terrorists. The terrorists can either decide to take a hostage or not take a
hostage.” Another example that Nax cited was the first-mover advantage and whoever
acts first in relation to a hostage situation has the upper hand. The “new model”
introduces a new look and possibly improved approach to hostage negotiations and
understanding the perpetrator. According to Nax (2008, 162), the “new model” describes
the same two players (government and the terrorist) and the related strategies involved in
getting the first-mover advantage. Basically, the first to act or “move” with regard to their
intentions has the “advantage” in negotiations. Commitment and reputation of both
entities is very important and a key component in the “new model” that was not present in the “old model” of negotiation. The “new model” accounts for reputation in the process.

This study intended to relate the hostage experience to hostage negotiation strategies from a clinical and social psychological perspective. Giebels, Noelanders and Veraeke performed multiple in-depth and semi-structured interviews with victims of two types of hostage-taking. Those two types of hostage-taking scenarios were sieges and kidnappings. According to Giebels et al. (2005, 241), the results showed that “all hostages reported feelings of helplessness.” These included feelings of uncertainty and isolation were strong for victims of kidnapping, but not the same for victims of sieges. Giebels et al., go on to state that researchers need to be cautious when labeling the “positive bond that is likely to develop between hostages and their captors as some sort of psychological artifact” Giebels et al. (2005, 242), and end with listing some guidelines for estimating and promoting the psychological well-being of hostages during their captivity.

Faure (2004) provides a good overview of hostage negotiations. Faure draws and analyzes several of these historical cases. According to Faure, situational factors are studied to include the profiles and motivations of the hostage-taker and/or kidnapper and the subsequent negotiations that follow. This dissertation is intended to help in the understanding of these motivations to assist authorities. To this end, Faure analyzes the process of negotiation with its different phases to include information gathering, hostage attitudes, media and public opinion. According to Faure (2004, 469), “a hostage-taking situation has very specific attributes: Dramatic stakes to manage: namely, human lives; Positions on both sides of an abyssal gap reflecting the extremely conflicting values of
the parties; The impossibility of officially recognizing the hostage-taker as a legitimate counterpart; Trust as a mechanism that normally has no place in such a setting and cannot be established and implemented during the negotiation process; The safety of the negotiators themselves when they work within a hostile context; and, Third-party intervention from, for example, the media or the families of the hostages‖ (Faure 2004, 469).

GHosT-RAP, similar to Faure, contends that in general, captive-takers fall into three categories, those being the mentally ill, political militants and criminals. Faure states that the criminal could be a felon, gangster or extortionist primarily motivated by money. Hostages are generally taken by the hostage-taker as a means for escape from a criminal situation. Kidnapping, on the other hand, is more of a business transaction with the overall same goal of getting money but, their whereabouts are unknown and it was not a means of evading capture. Hostage-takers can be motivated by religious, monetary, political or even mental, emotional or personality disorders. This leads one to the next form of hostage-taker that being the political militant. According to Faure, “the political militant is most often motivated by power, influence, fame, political recognition, political trade-offs such as the freeing of prisoners of his own group, or the acquisition of resources for his cause.”

According to Dolnik, “the FBI has identified certain conditions that need to be present for a situation to be negotiable (McMains and Mullins 2001, 496).” Moreover, “The desire to live or stay alive on the part of the hostage-taker; The threat of force by the police; The hostage-taker must present demands for release of hostages; The negotiator must be viewed by the hostage-taker as someone who can hurt but desires to help; The negotiator needs time to develop trust with hostage-takers; The location must be
contained and stabilized to support negotiations; The hostage-taker and negotiator must have a reliable means of communication, either by phone or face to face; The negotiator must be able to deal with the hostage-taker who controls the hostages and makes the decisions” (McMains and Mullins 2001, 496). Understanding the motivations of captive-takers can allow researchers and authorities to have an advantage during captive-taking negotiations and scenarios.

The literature review revealed interesting dynamics involving hostage-taking, the hostage experience, negotiating with terrorists, risk of escalation, repeat offending and hostage situations. The majority of the literature reviewed related to the issue of kidnapping and/or hostage-taking, and captive-taking. Furthermore, the literature demonstrates an increasing awareness of the complexities involved when addressing the phenomenon and effects of global hostage-taking and the need to design appropriate law enforcement, social and governmental responses to include understanding the difference between kidnapping and hostage/captive-taking. A second and just as important area of literature that was reviewed was in the area of hostage negotiations. Most of the reviewed documents related to global hostage-taking and the secondary subject areas of negotiating with the hostage-taker or terrorist.

Motivation Typologies of Captive-Takers Definitions

Instrumental Motivations

“Motivations based on cognitive reasons, through the taking of an individual(s). Captives held for instrumental reasons are termed "hostage-captives" and are held as leverage to influence a third party” (Vecchi 2006, 8).
Expressive Motivations

“Motivations based on the desire to achieve an expressive or emotional objective through the taking of an individual(s). Captives held for expressive reasons are termed "victim-captives" and are held as an object of distaste by the captive-taker usually with the intent to avoid third party interactions” (Vecchi 2006, 8).

Captive-Taking

Is defined as “the act of taking an individual(s), against their will, and holding them either for instrumental or expressive reasons. Captive-taking occurs in both domestic and international environments. The domestic environment involves captive-taking on two levels based on known motivations where the captive is held for instrumental or expressive reasons. The international environment involves captive-taking on one level based only on instrumental reasons” (Vecchi 2006, 8).

Instrumental Captive-Taking (Hostage-Taking)

Is defined as “the act of taking an individual(s) from a domestic or international environment for instrumental reasons with the intent to use them as leverage to influence a third party, in the domestic arena, it is generally handled by law enforcement entities, while in the international arena it is handled by U.S. law enforcement, the U.S.
intelligence community, and the U.S. military, as well as international entities” (Vecchi 2006, 8).

Expressive Captive-Taking (Victim-Taking)

Is defined as “the act of taking an individual(s) from a domestic environment for expressive reasons with the intent to avoid third party involvement, strictly handled by local law enforcement because it is a domestic phenomena and not an international one” (Vecchi 2006, 8).

Captive

Is defined as “an individual(s) taken against their will and held for a period of time by another individual or group for a certain purpose. Motivations occur on a spectrum of reasons ranging from instrumental (cognitive) to expressive (emotional)” (Vecchi 2006, 8).

Hostage-Captive

Is defined as “an individual(s) taken domestically or internationally based on instrumental motivations and used as leverage to influence a third party. Typical motivations in hostage-captive abductions involve economic gain and/or political or religious ideologies” (Vecchi 2006, 8).

Victim-Captive

Is defined as “an individual(s) taken domestically based on expressive motivations with the intent to avoid third party involvement. Typically, victim-captive situations involve expressive motivations that are personal and emotionally charged” (Vecchi 2006, 8).
Abductor

Is defined as “a perpetrator who takes another individual against his or her will and holds them for instrumental, expressive, economical, or ideological reasons” (Vecchi 2006, 8).

Hostage-Abductor (Hostage-Taker)

Is defined as “a perpetrator who takes an individual(s) as leverage to influence a third party for instrumental reasons. Hostage-abductors are present in both domestic and international environments” (Vecchi 2006, 8).

Victim-Abductor (Victim-Taker)

Is defined as “a perpetrator who takes an individual(s) for expressive reasons with the intent to avoid third party involvement. Victim-abductors are only present in domestic environments” (Vecchi 2006, 8).

The literature review revealed geographic patterns and kidnapping trends. With this said, captive-taking is a threat to our individual and collective security domestically and overseas, as it poses a clear and present danger to those involved in law enforcement, diplomatic, military, and intelligence efforts in both their daily missions and in the Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO). There is a need to continually address ways in which to improve methods to defeat captive-taking; therefore, one of the primary objectives of GHosT-RAP is to understand the motivations of captive-takers in both the domestic and international domains. Most hostage-taking scenarios based solely on incidents relating to Mexico and the southwest border region follow predictable patterns based on the country’s proximity to the United States.

According to (Vecchi 2009, 4), “Domestically, law enforcement is experiencing numerous problems with criminal captive-takings near the U.S.-Mexico border,
especially in Arizona and California, which often involves torture, maiming and death.”

As stated earlier, for example, Phoenix, Arizona, experienced 370 reported captive-takings in 2008, which placed it as the captive-taking capital of the world, second only to Mexico City (Goldston 2009). Also in 2008, there were 26 reported captive-takings in San Diego, California (Manolatos 2008). The subsequent literature review which includes prior research in the area of captive-taking and/or kidnapping and involves the search for all existing literature on the subject making this dissertation all the more relevant. Prior research in this area is sparse and supports the need for more research related to captive-taking. The literature review also falls under distinct symbolic interaction of individuals, social construction, group dynamics, and hostage-taking paradigms. To reiterate, the literature review starts at the seminal beginning, understanding captive-taking from the standpoint of older captive-taking models dealing with hostage-taking and negotiations. From there, the literature review transitions to the hostage-taking experience and negotiation strategies to hostage-taker motivations, profiles and contrasting dynamics of crisis negotiations. Finally transitioning to the latest and most current research on captive-taking within the FBI and the use of the Perpetrator-Motive Research Design (PMRD). There are two primary areas that need to be examined for it to be the most beneficial to law enforcement. The two areas are expressive and instrumental captive-taking motivations.

Interest Area 1

The majority of the literature reviewed related to the issue of kidnapping and/or hostage-taking, and captive-taking itself. Furthermore, the literature demonstrates an increasing awareness of the complexities involved when addressing this phenomenon and the effects of global hostage-taking and the need to design appropriate law enforcement,
social and governmental responses. Most of the time, these captive-situations are generally considered “expressive motivations” where third party involvement is avoided.

Interest Area 2

A second and just as important area of literature that was reviewed was in the area of hostage negotiations. Hostage negotiations are secondary to the initial captive-taking event. Hostage negotiation situations are always complex. There is the captive-taker, the victim, and the negotiator. Generally speaking, these situations are considered “instrumental motivations” where the victim is used as leverage to influence a third party, compared to expressive motivations where third party involvements are avoided at all costs.

Introduction of Captive-Taking Research

A literature search was done of available publications in English from 1979 to present. These were both published and unpublished materials and included articles, reports, research studies, surveys, and programmatic interventions related to global hostage-taking. Many lessons can be learned if we only take the time to understand what we are dealing with. Hostage-taking can mean: A person delivered into the possession of a public enemy in the time of war or as a security for the performance of a contract entered into between the belligerents. Hostages are frequently given as a security for the payment of a ransom and if they should die, their death would not discharge the contract. Within the captive-takers mindset: They feel that human lives must be endangered for their demands to be met. Generally speaking, most if not all victims are released alive.

With regard to prevention, the following proactive measures are a sample of how this dissertation and the information garnered from it can help authorities. For example; Hostage takers usually “stake out” (premeditated/instrumental) a location before making
a captive-taking attempt. As a preventive measure, report suspicious activities to authorities, maintain communications with the authorities, avoid routines, know your surroundings, employees of businesses must be trained to remain calm and not attempt "heroic" actions. If taken captive, follow instructions, avoid arguments, and appear sympathetic with kidnapper's view to prevent death or injury. Most kidnappers are intelligent; do not attempt to fool them if there is even the slightest chance they will see through you. Understand that captive-takers believe that human lives must be endangered for their demands to be met, but usually all victims will be released alive. During pre-captive, captive and post-captive situations, the dynamic changes and with that, understanding what to do in each phase is critical in surviving the captive-taking scenario. The following is a current workable sample of specific information gleaned from interviews of captive-takers that can help facilitate understanding, training and prevention of future captive-taking events:

Pre-captive: (Captive-takers usually “stake out” areas before attempting a captive-taking)

- Know the area prior to travel
- Avoid routines
- Stay in well traveled regions
- Reduce the appearance of having wealth
- Report suspicious activities

Captive:

- Show gratitude for: food, comfort, hygiene
- Remain calm; no need for heroics
- Follow instructions
• Avoid arguments
• Appear sympathetic
• Do not try of fool them, they can see through it
• Be compliant and appear understanding
• Communicate with captor
• Collect information: tire sounds, terrain features, outside noises, distinctive odors, distinguish voices, differences in motors, names, descriptions
• Look for daily patterns or rituals of the captive-taker
• Always look to escape if at all possible

Post-captive:

• Understanding captive-taking, especially in the regions that border the United States.
• Understanding and learning from the hostage experience, negotiating with terrorists, risk of escalation and eventual conclusions of a hostage situations.
• Speak with authorities (Vecchi 2006, 11)³

Section 1: Old Model versus New Model of Captive-Taking and Hostage Experience

*Modeling Hostage-Taking: On Reputation and Strategic Rationality of Terrorists*

*(Heinrich Harald Nax 2008)*

Most of the reviewed documents related to global hostage-taking and secondary subject areas of negotiating with the hostage-taker or terrorist. According to Nax (2008, 158), “over the last decades, the world has experienced a tremendous increase in hostage-

---

³ Captive-Taking Literature: A lot has been written on global hostage-taking. The following literature review spotlights specific scholarly work related to the phenomenon of hostage-taking.
takings. Not only has the number of incidents of hostage-taking increased but also has hostage-taking changed in style.” Nax (2008) covers hostage-taking from several models that include old and new models of hostage-taking. This article distinguishes kidnapping from hostage-taking through its pure ransom-orientation. Political hostage-taking can, but need not, be pure ransom-oriented (Nax 2008). In the following sections, “terrorist” would be synonymous with captive-taker.

An Old Attempt to Model Hostage-Taking (Nax 2008)

The review found that within the old model of hostage-taking, the hostage-taker always linked a specific claim or ransom to the threat of harming the hostage (Schelling 1960). According to Schelling, if that ransom is paid, the hostage is returned. If the ransom is not paid, the hostage may be hurt. Nax states that essentially, the hostage-taker would have then preferred not to have taken the hostage.

The Old Model

Victims tend to fall into two categories in the literature review: Kidnapping and hostage-takers. “Kidnapping is defined as the criminal abduction of a person, where the location of both abducted and abductor are not known. Hostage-takings, on the other hand, classically reveal their location. Recently however, hostage-takers have begun to obscure their location” (Nax 2008, 159).

According to Nax, there are two parties involved in the kidnapping and/or hostage-taking scenario, the government and the terrorist as mentioned earlier. “Both parties have two strategies available. The government chooses between negotiating and not negotiating, whereas the terrorist decides whether to take or not to take hostages. Although the government prefers to negotiate once hostages are taken, it would rather not negotiate with terrorists when they have not taken hostages. The hostage-takers
themselves prefer to take hostages, whenever the government negotiates, but traditionally prefer not to take hostages, whenever the government does not” (Nax 2008, 159). This means that the hostage-takers would not have chosen to take the hostages if it would have been clear that the government would surely not have negotiated.

According to Nax (2008, 162), “the “first-mover advantage” is crucial within this relationship. The taking of hostages and the reaction to it by the government are sequential decisions, and in this case, produce a “first-mover advantage.” In the one-shot commitment scenario, whichever player is able to make the first move will be able to enforce his preferred outcome.”

If the hostage-taker moves first and enforces the socially undesirable outcome with hostages being taken and the ransom being paid, then the hostage-takers have succeeded. Conversely, for a government to move, a policy decision has to be made and/or in place before any potential hostage-taking situation has happened so as to have a plan of action before and after a hostage or kidnapping situation giving the government the edge.

_A New Model to Hostage-Taking (Nax 2008)_

There are several studies that look at a specific aspect of global hostage-taking. Earlier, Nax, (2008, 162), cited studies involving “examples of “game theory” whereas the two parties involved are the government and the terrorist. Both parties have two strategies. The government can either negotiate or not negotiate with the terrorists. The terrorists can either decide to take a hostage or not take a hostage. Another example that Nax cited was the _first-mover advantage_ and how whoever acts first in relation to a hostage situation has the upper hand. The “New Model” introduces a new look and possibly improved approach to hostage negotiations.”
The New Model

According to Nax (2008, 162), “the “new model” describes the same two players (government and the terrorist) and the related strategies involved in getting the first-mover advantage. Commitment and reputation of both entities is very important and a key component in the “new model” that was not present in the “old model” of negotiation. The “new model” accounts for reputation in the process.” Nax submits that there are two government types: negotiator and committer. Both types contend that they in no way will negotiate with hostage-takers. “The negotiator, after hostages are taken or not, can choose which policy to pursue. The committer, however, really reduces the available strategy set to non-negotiation” (Nax 2008, 162).

Conversely, the terrorist has two ways to approach hostage-taking. The first relates to the traditional hostage-taking terrorist, trying to negotiate. The second involves publicized violence or killing to get what they want. Nax calls these two types the kidnapper and the killer. “Both types either choose to take hostages or not to take hostages. The kidnapper will prefer to take hostages whenever governments negotiate, and prefer to not take hostages whenever they do not negotiate. The killer will take hostages irrespective of governments” decisions” (Nax 2008, 162-163).

To this point, Nax has explained and defined different models involving dealing with hostage-takers. To sum up the “new model”, the following example or scenario shows how this paradigm would work. Nax provides the following example: “The government announces first that it will stick to a strict non-negotiation policy. The terrorist does not know of which type the government is but know his own type. The government does not know the terrorist’s type but knows its own type and observes the hostage-taker’s move, that is, whether the terrorist takes hostages or not. The government
chooses its action according to its own type and the terrorist’s move. While the committer always exhibits strict non-negotiation, the negotiator prefers to negotiate, whenever the kidnapping terrorist has taken hostages, and does not, whenever the terrorist has not or is of the *killer* type. This determines the ordinal payoff structure for the two types of the respective two players” (Nax 2008, 163).

In the end, both sides have their core beliefs and know their type and have an idea of the other side’s core beliefs or type. It is how each side uses that knowledge to their advantage which is critical leading up to the “first-mover advantage.” Nax has developed a formula that corresponds to how this system would work, similar to an algorithm, formula or decision matrix. The two types or entities (the government or the kidnapper/captive-taker) would be set-up as such:

*Killer-* For the *killer* preferences are hostage-taking with negotiation (c) > hostage-taking with no negotiation (b) > no hostage-taking with negotiation (f) > no hostage-taking with no negotiation (e) against both types of governments.

*Kidnapper-* For the *kidnapper* preferences are hostage-taking with negotiation (c) > no hostage-taking with negotiation (f) > no hostage-taking with no negotiation (e) > hostage-taking with no negotiation (d) against both types of governments.

*Committer-* For the *committer* preferences are non-negotiation with no hostage-taking (E) > non-negotiation with hostage-taking (D) against both types of terrorists.

*Negotiator-* For the *negotiator* preferences are non-negotiation with no hostage-taking (E) > non-negotiation with hostage-taking (B) > negotiation with no hostage-taking (F) > negotiation with hostage-taking (A) against the *killer* and non-negotiation with no hostage-taking (E) > negotiation with hostage-taking (C) > negotiation with no hostage-taking (F) > non-negotiation with hostage-taking (D) against the *kidnapper*.
O: in the center of the model specifies *nature's initial chance move* and thereby models the incomplete information as imperfect information.

HT: denotes *taking hostages*.

No-HT: denotes *not taking hostages*.

No-Neg: denotes that the government does not negotiate.

Q: with $0 < Q < 1$ denotes the probability in a mixed strategy with which Neg is chosen by the negotiator.

K: with $0 < K < 1$ denotes the belief probability that the terrorist is a *killer*.

N: with $0 < N < 1$ denotes the belief probability that the government is a *negotiator*.

$K(t)$: denotes $K$ at time $t$, such that $K$ is a function of the terrorist’s play in earlier rounds with…

$$K(t) = f[K(t-1)]$$

$$= \{K(t) > K(t-1) \text{ if } \text{HT in the preceding round; }$$

$$K(t) < K(t-1) \text{ if } \text{No-HT in the preceding round}\}$$

$N(t)$: denotes $N$ at time $t$, such that $N$ is a function of the outcomes in earlier rounds with…

$$N(t) = f[N(t-1)]$$

$$= \{N(t) \text{ if } \text{No-HT was played in the preceding round; }$$

$$N(t) > N(t-1) \text{ if Neg followed HT in the preceding round; }$$

$$N(t) < N(t-1) \text{ if No-Neg followed HT in the preceding round}\}” \text{ (Nax 2008, 163)}$$

In conclusion, Nax’s article was attempting to put forth a system in identifying, understanding and subsequently responding to hostage-taking situations.
In the “new model,” Nax (2008, 162) spoke about the importance of reputation of both governments and the terrorists or captive-takers. If one side commits to a course of action (COA) then they are held to it or their reputation will suffer. Furthermore, Nax developed an algorithm to help predict the actions within a hostage-taking scenario. According to Nax (2008), politically motivated hostage-takings can take various forms, which in-turn, allows for a clear policy recommendation by a government, especially when the government learns to distinguish between ransom-oriented hostage-takings or kidnappings and political hostage-takings.

*Hostage Experience: Implications for Negotiation Strategies (Ellen Giebels, Sigrid Noelanders and Geert Vervaeke 2005)*

This study intended to relate the hostage experience to hostage negotiation strategies from a clinical and social psychological perspective. Giebels, Noelanders and Vervaeke performed multiple in-depth and semi-structured interviews with victims of two types of hostage-taking. Those two types of hostage-taking scenarios were sieges and kidnappings. According to Giebels, Noelanders and Vervaeke (2005, 242), the results showed that “all hostages reported feelings of helplessness.” These included feelings of uncertainty and isolation which were strong for victims of kidnapping, but not the same for victims of sieges. Giebels, Noelanders and Vervaeke (2005, 242), go on to state that researchers need to be cautious when labeling the “positive bond that is likely to develop between hostages and their captors as some sort of psychological artifact.” Giebels, Noelanders and Vervaeke end with listing some guidelines for estimating and promoting the psychological well-being of hostages during their captivity.
Psychological Reactions to Being Held Captive

According to Giebels et al, (2005, 242), “law enforcement tends to utilize an open-communication format instead of a direct tactical approach when dealing with hostage incidents to lower the chances of casualties.” Giebels et al (2005, 242), contend that the focus should not only be on the physical well-being of the victims, but the psychological well-being of the victims. “Notwithstanding the importance of physical survival, the psychological consequences of hostage-taking are substantial.” For example, Giebels et al, (2005, 242), submits that “research shows that approximately one-third of ex-hostages still suffer from symptoms associated with Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) many years after their hostage-taking.”

According to Giebels et al, (2005, 242), there are “three categories of hostage-takers to include the emotionally disturbed, the criminal and the ideologically motivated hostage-taker.” Giebels et al, explains that the main characteristic of all hostage-taking is that the life of hostages is used as leverage to achieve their end goal or demands. The feeling of helplessness on the part of the hostage or kidnapping victim can be overwhelming. These feelings become worse when the kidnapper or hostage-taker threatens or intimidates the hostage to gain even more leverage over the victim. The uncertainty that comes with being a hostage is probably as bad as when they were taken hostage.

According to Giebels et al, (2005, 243), “from the hostage’s perspective, an important distinction has to be made between sieges and kidnapping situations.” First, in sieges, the hostage-takers barricade themselves with the hostages in a location known to and surrounded by the police with a lot of attention especially from the media (e.g. S6). Contrast that with a kidnapping victim, where they are isolated, unknown to the
authorities with no contact to the outside. This can increase the anxiety and fear because of the isolation can lead to the victim to become favorable to their kidnapper or hostage-taker (S7). Kidnapping situations tend to last longer than sieges.

The beginning stage of a kidnapping can lead to “acute stress reaction” (Giebels et al 2005, 243). Acute stress reaction can be explained as an immediate reaction to a traumatic situation like getting kidnapped. This can lead to chronic stress reaction which is a sustained stress that results from the continued stressor from a kidnapping situation. This could be from many reasons, but primarily from not being released. The longer a hostage is in captivity the more they adapt to the situation. Coping mechanisms are utilized by the hostage-taking victim to regain some sense of control of the situation which at times can lead to favorable feelings toward the hostage-takers or kidnappers plight. Sometimes these sympathetic feelings can lead the kidnapping victim to actually assisting their captors to the point that a bond is developed between the victim and their captor posing a problem for law enforcement.

*The Relationship Between the Hostages and Their Captors*

The relationship that can occur between the hostages and their captors is unique. It is as if the hostage and the captor become dependent on the other presuming that they spend a lot of time together. “With the passage of time, after much interaction and communication, a bond will form coming from the need to belong to others” (Giebels et al. 2005, 243). This positive bond is better known as the “Stockholm Syndrome.” The “Stockholm Syndrome” term was coined in 1973 after a long siege after a failed bank robbery in Stockholm Sweden. During the hostage-taking both the hostage and the hostage-takers formed a friendship actually leading to one of the hostages falling in love with the hostage-taker. The hostage subsequently refused to testify against the hostage-
This strong emotional bond is regarded as an irrational act caused by tremendous stress and dependency, resulting in a form of gratitude toward the hostage-taker for keeping the hostage alive” (Giebels et al. 2005, 243). The danger with this is the implications for the mental well-being of the hostage and the ability of law enforcement to negotiate with the hostage-taker. Because of the bond that is formed between the hostage and the hostage-taker, the hostage can form a negative view of the police leading to a more difficult scenario for police both during and after the siege.

Section 2: Behavioral Models

Negotiating with Terrorists: The Hostage Case

Faure (2004) contends that within a hostage negotiation the psychological and intercultural issues are important. Faure provides an overview of negotiation that is involved with hostage-taking from an analytical perspective. The negotiator is important within this complex meeting with the hostage-taker. Sometimes even the hostage’s play a role as well as they can be prominent personalities. Conversely, “hostage-takers can be political militants or people suffering from psychological problems or simply bank robbers who are trying to escape from the site of their crime. The target of the whole operation of hostage-taking may be a government, a company, or a wealthy individual, basically, whoever is in possession of a resource coveted by the hostage-takers” (Faure 2004, 469).

Hostage-Takers’ Motivation and Profile

According to Faure (2004, 469), “a hostage-taking situation has very specific attributes:

- Dramatic stakes to manage: namely, human lives;
• Positions on both sides of an abyssal gap reflecting the extremely conflicting values of the parties;

• The impossibility of officially recognizing the hostage-taker as a legitimate counterpart;

• Trust as a mechanism that normally has no place in such a setting and cannot be established and implemented during the negotiation process;

• The safety of the negotiators themselves when they work within a hostile context; and,

• Third-party intervention from, for example, the media or the families of the hostages” (Faure 2004, 469).

Faure (2004) submits that there are three types of hostage-takers that can be identified depending on the overall motivation. “The three prototypes are the criminal, the political militant, and the mentally ill person, from (Pearce 1977; Stratton 1978; Goldaber 1979). Finally, “the mentally ill hostage-taker includes those who can be considered psychopaths, paranoid-schizophrenics, maniacs, or suicidal persons, and is motivated by releasing anxiety or satisfying some perverse need” (Faure 2004, 469). A majority of offenders have some form of mental, emotional or personality disorder that is either realized or unrealized that affects their judgment and rational thinking process. This phenomenon is further examined in chapter IV.

The Negotiators’ Objectives and What Is Negotiable

The overall main objective of the negotiator is to free the hostages or kidnapping victims. Faure contends that negotiators have to deal with two main goals: freeing the hostages and preventing more hostages from being taken or harmed. The negotiators first step is to understand the real objectives of the hostage-takers which will determine the
next sequence of events. According to (Faure, 2004, 470), “there are a number of options that have to be addressed during the negotiation phase. The hostages are not only a currency of exchange but also a shield against any physical intervention from the police, army, or specialized units. The hostage-takers manage a kind of “hostage capital”.”

The Negotiation Process

Faure (2004, 470), utilizes “Zartman’s three-phase model of hostage negotiation: pre-negotiation, formula and details are very useful in these situations.” The pre-negotiation phase consists of accepting the idea of negotiation or making contacts. Next, a formula of agreement is a difficult stage in that the hostage-takers generally have outrageous demands. According to (Faure, 2004, 270), “one of the most effective tools in speeding the search for a formula of agreement is applying the most feared threat that underlies the hostage situation, killing one or several hostages.”

Lastly, the details phase of the negotiation process is crucial to the outcome of the situation. Most of the time, the demands have not been met and impatience begins to take hold. At this point, there have been exchanges between the two parties. If one side gives something, the other side must reciprocate. “Like the authorities, terrorist groups have closely studied the negotiation techniques used by these authorities and have a precise plan to control the ultimate phase” (Faure 2004, 470). According to Faure, this is the most antagonistic part of the whole hostage-taking process. Uncertainty rules the days and weeks in these situations and the longer the hostage or kidnapping episode goes on, the more challenging it will be for the authorities.

Contrasting Dynamics of Crisis Negotiations: Barricade versus Kidnapping Incidents

Crisis intervention and negotiation has become ever more important in dealing with a hostage and/or kidnapping situation. Adam Dolnik analyses this topic of
negotiation to provide a comparison to the more prevalent scenario of barricaded individuals versus kidnapping incidents. According to Dolnik (2004, 495), “the primary difference between the two scenarios is that the location of the victim(s) as well as that of the perpetrator(s) is unknown in kidnappings. As a result, many of the components of crisis negotiation that have been so successful in resolving barricade situations are inapplicable to kidnappings.” Dolnik attempts to illuminate the differences between the two areas and examines the likelihood of success of different crisis negotiation strategies.

With that said, Dolnik seeks to determine whether negotiation is the right approach to resolve a hostage crisis. According to Dolnik (2004, 495), “the Federal Bureau of Investigation has developed a set of conditions that need to be present for a situation to be negotiable” (Dolnik 2004, 495), cited the following list or characteristics of a “negotiable situation according to the FBI:

1. The desire to live on the part of the hostage-taker
2. The threat of force by the police
3. The hostage-taker must present demands for release of hostages
4. The negotiator must be viewed by the hostage-taker as someone who can hurt but desires to help
5. The negotiator needs time to develop trust with hostage-takers
6. The location must be contained and stabilized to support negotiations
7. The hostage-taker and negotiator must have a reliable means of communication, either by phone or face to face
8. The negotiator must be able to deal with the hostage-taker who controls the hostages and makes the decisions” (Dolnik 2004, 495).
Crisis Negotiations: Managing Critical Incidents and Hostage Situations in Law Enforcement and Corrections

Elements of negotiations: Kidnappings versus barricade situations. According to Dolnik (2004, 496), “the FBI’s Hostage Barricade Database System (HOBAS), reported that about 80% of incidents are resolved peacefully with no injuries to hostages or perpetrators.” Moreover, “unlike barricade incidents, kidnappings are used much more frequently by organizations with a political or criminal intent.” (Dolnik 2004, 496), states that “many entities have a political agenda and are forced to find financing and kidnapping has become a major funding source for this.” Consequently, “kidnappings worldwide have risen 70% over the last 10 years” (Royal and Sun Alliance Insurance Group 2002, 1). According to (Dolnik, 2004, 496), “it is estimated that every year that between 10,000 to 15,000 kidnapping incidents occur worldwide, 80% of these are in Latin America.” Dolnik states that kidnapping has become a disturbing trend internationally because of its increasing sophistication. “Kidnappers often research the financial capabilities of the victims by studying their bank information and tax returns. The ransom demand is then designed to be high enough to be profitable, but reasonable enough to be affordable” (Dolnik 2004, 496).

What Lewis (2009, 2) found was that “hostage scenarios usually are grouped into instrumental events, in which hostages are utilized as leverage, thought out (cognitive), premeditated to accomplish specific goals (financial, political, societal, etc.), and expressive events, in which captive-takers (emotions) react to their own impulses and internal emotions.” In other words, these events are considered an affective, expressive motivation (which was the majority of captive-takers) and most often related to kidnapping and can be considered domestic in nature in which subjects express power,
frustration, rage, etc. Lewis (2009). These expressive motivations are generally intended to avoid third party intervention. As many in law enforcement know firsthand, most domestic incidences occurred during disputes within families, one parent will take a child captive to keep them from the other parent (Lewis (2009). The aforementioned scenarios were apparent from the data retrieved during the pilot project from the interview protocols. The majority of test subjects were expressive in their motivations (Lewis 2009).

According to Lewis (2009, 3), as defined in the GHosT-RAP research is instrumental motivations. “Instrumental hostage-taking for political gains is often referred to as “political terrorism” and can take on a slightly theatrical form within the light of media attention and publicity; some individuals believe their actions will reveal the inherent evils of a given political state, whereas others hope the violent hostage situations will cost the state significantly (Corsi 1981, 1).” Lewis goes on to say that “because of their attempts to obtain as much publicity as possible, the demands of the political terrorist often extend beyond the role of local authorities and require federal attention (Fuselier 1988). Furthermore, because of their meticulous planning, uncompromising commitment, and capacity to effectively manipulative [sic] power, these terrorist hostage-takers are often the most difficult groups with which authorities must negotiate (Stratton 1978 as found in Fuselier 1988, 1).”

Lewis does a masterful job in elaborating the inner world of captive-taking and for the purposes of this review of captive-taking. Lewis explains the differences between the hostage-taker, hostage and the “third parties” that mediate these situations: “The triadic interaction between hostage taker, hostage, and communicative third party (law enforcement officials, negotiators, etc.) reflects the complications of the instrumental use
of the hostages.” In the case of political captive-takings, the third party involved is usually a government or large private organization with access to significant monetary resources” (Lewis, 2009, 3).

**Captive Taking versus Hostage Barricade**

Captive-taking of individuals usually involve the families or relatives of the hostages. Unplanned (i.e. criminally-motivated) hostage situations usually have an originally indistinct target group that becomes more apparent as the incident progresses. According to Lewis (2009, 4), “mentally-disturbed captive-takers lack the triadic dynamics found in other instrumental hostage-takings, as the disturbed individuals may have no demands, may neglect a relationship to the third parties involved, may suffer from paranoid delusions (Wesselius and DeSarno 1983), or may even be depressed and suicidal captive-takers preparing for both their own death and their captive’s death (Soskis and Van Zandt 1986).” This necessitates the understanding of mental, emotional, or personality disorders of offenders that could precipitate the captive-taking (addressed later in chapter IV).

Although hostage barricade situations are entirely different in scope to captive-takings, Lewis (2009, 3) examines this particular typology nonetheless with a comparison between captive-taking situations and siege situations:

Captive-takers span a variety of techniques and locations (i.e. hostage/barricade incidents, kidnappings). Victims of kidnapping are often brought to unknown and isolated locations away from media and police attention. Furthermore, kidnappings typically last much longer than siege incidents, leaving captives feeling isolated and deserted for extended periods of time. Conversely, sieges involve a form of hostage barricade, in which the hostage-takers’ locations are known and surrounded by the police. Media intervention in siege cases is common; attempts to interview the hostages or hostage-takers often occur even while the incident is still in progress (Giebels, Noelanders and Vervaeke 2005). Despite the revelation of location as a characteristic often used to distinguish
Kidnappings from hostage-taking/barricade incidents, hostage-takers have been increasingly hiding their locations in recent years (Nax 2008, 158).

To this point, not knowing where you have been taken or being unfamiliar with your surroundings can be very intimidating and fearful. In-turn, this can prevent the victims from actually attempting an escape. Isolation is one tactic or advantage that the captive-taker has over their victims. Captors use this unknown to their advantage along with other techniques to develop an intimidating, fearful, confusing situation with the implied threat of harm if escape is attempted in-turn producing both fear and compliance in their victims (Goddard and Stanley 1994). Secretive locations and being mobile to move the victims at a moment’s notice enables hostage-takers to elude law enforcement. Lewis (2009) submits that several other paradigms for captive-takers have been identified such as emotionally or mentally disturbed individuals (chapter IV), and criminally motivated individuals (Fuselier 1988). Different types of captive-takers creates differing motivations and the necessity of dealing with these different captive-takers and scenarios making law enforcement negotiations all the more difficult. With this said, a common theme with captive-takers is to leverage the lives of their hostages to fulfill their demands, whether expressive or instrumental” (Giebels et al. 2005, 241).

**Mental, Emotional, and Personality Disorders**

In addition, mental illness, emotionally disturbed individuals and individuals with personality disorders affect a majority of captive-takers. The individual’s emotions may range from feelings of worthlessness and powerlessness to hallucinations and delusions.

Estimates of mental disorders suggested that up to 59% of hostage-takers within a sample of 245 from 1976 to 1983 offenders suffered from some form of mental illness (Daniels et al. 2007; Soskis and Van Zandt 1986). [According to the FBI Academy, approximately 52% of hostage incidents involved mentally disturbed individuals (Fuselier 1981; Strentz 1985 as found in Fuselier 1988).] Mental and emotional problems and antisocial personality disorders are quite prevalent. Most
solitary offenders suffer from mood and thought-affecting disorders, and substance abuse can co-occur with many hostage situations (Lewis 2009, 6)

Law enforcement needs to recognize the seriousness of mental illness, emotional and personality disorders within the captive-taking environment. Knowing that these individuals are more prone to drastic and radical measures is important. Lewis continues, “captive situations involving mentally disturbed individuals, the potential for suicide and harm to captives must be considered carefully along with other factors (Soskis and Van Zandt 1986).” Mental, emotional and personality disorders make dealing with captive takers much more tenuous and sensitive. In-turn, this makes captive-taking negotiations all the more difficult for law enforcement to deal with. Although captive-taking and hostage-barricade situations involve taking a victim against their will, the dynamics of each situation are entirely different. More significant, according to Lewis (2009, 7):

domestically, the most common hostage situation usually involves criminals trapped while attempting to commit a crime commonly referred to as a hostage barricade situation (Hassel 1975 as found in Fuselier 1988; Soskis and Van Zandt 1986). With an opposite motivation from terrorist hostage-taking, criminally-motivated kidnappings involve individuals who take hostages to escape alive (Fuselier 1981; Soskis and Van Zandt 1986)

Across all types of captive-takers, the main reason for the captive-taking is still about economics, that being money or mercenary motivations. Overall, Lewis (2009, 7) submits that “kidnapping threatens more than 10,000 people per year (with many more unreported) and has been estimated to cost the United States as much as $500 million annually in ransoms alone (Richardson, Voss, Flood and Jones 2007). Money and economics underscores captive-taking, as evidenced by the back and forth exchanges that occur during hostage situations which are ruled by an economic system based on supply and demand between law enforcement (negotiators), the hostages, and the hostage-takers” (Tzanelli 2006).
Lewis contends that these differences between economic, political, criminal captive-taking can actually lead to a type of business of sorts, as perverse and repugnant as it may seem. This evidenced by the rise of opportunist criminal gangs and/or organizations kidnapping individuals at a high rate only to take them to an ATM for a withdrawal of cash. This is called an “express kidnapping” which are much more difficult to investigate. Ransom demands are another traditional method of monetary gain from a captive-taking. Killing and personal violence toward the hostage is not often the goal of kidnapping; financially-motivated hostage-takers usually aim to gain cooperation from the family to obtain a ransom without legal repercussions (Yang et. al 2007).

Lewis (2009, 3) states, “Law enforcement entities differentiate between materially-motivated (economic/criminal) kidnappings and political (politically-motivated) kidnappings, but kidnapping often becomes a form of business in both cases, where ransom demands (based on economics and the status of the hostage) provide a source income for certain organizations and individuals (Turner 1998; as found in Tzanelli 2006).”

As stated in a recent CNN article, “The motivation for the kidnappings is usually money, not politics, as gangs will abduct individuals and sell them to the largest and highest-bidding organizations” (Williams 2001, 1). Depending on the area or geographical location of the captive-taker, poor socio-economic situations of the area can greatly affect captive-taking. Poorer regions have a higher propensity for crime, especially those involving money and drugs. Captive-taking is more than a criminal act, it is a disregard for human life and moral order. In Mexico, for example, the kidnapping situation reflects the poor economic infrastructure, narcotics trafficking, gangs, organized crime, and lack of significant law enforcement, austere and isolated regions.
Psychologists have coined a term that relates to relationships or interactions occurring within a close proximity of each other. The “propinquity effect” states that what we are routinely exposed to is that which we typically are going to interact with. Criminal captive-takers are no different given that scenario. For example: “a systematic analysis of kidnappings in Taiwan indicated that most victims were found in close proximity to their kidnappers, and they were not randomly chosen (Yang et al. 2007). Kidnap victims are not necessarily targeted for inordinate wealth, but can include ordinary citizens with little money, selected usually by the ringleader of a gang. Victims of extreme wealth (apparent either from flashy clothing or through news and the media) were sometimes targeted for larger ransoms” (Lewis 2009, 4).

Captive-Taking Models

Lewis (2009) states, captive-taking models have been developed along with personality assessments to determine the likelihood of success on any given hostage negotiation situation, a form of predictive analysis. Understanding the captive-taking situation before it ever occurs greatly increases the hostages chance of surviving the event.

Lewis (2009, 4) explains through the work of Fritzon et al. (2001): “the difference between adaptive, expressive, integrative, and conservative forms of functioning of hostage-barricade situations.” One of the several stated hypotheses centered on the concept of expressive motivations of captive-takers (Vecchi 2006), which eventually were identified as the primary motivations of the majority of captive-takers during the pilot project and subsequent interviews of captive-takers.

Similar to what was found during the pilot project, Fritzon et al. (2001) suggested four different modes of functioning for terrorists in hostage-barricade incidents: adaptive,
expressive, integrative, and conservative. In the adaptive mode, noted as the most sophisticated form of functioning, perpetrators are more likely to successfully negotiate with authorities, typically resulting in a mutual compensation. In this case, hostages are often specifically targeted by highly-organized and motivated captive-taking groups, but the groups are most open to negotiation and the safe release of hostages. Conversely, hostage-takers often utilize expressive motivations to release internal forces and emotions, often resulting in failed interaction and little communication with external authorities. To that end, expressive motivation was the primary explanation of behavior of the captive-takers during the interviews and instrumental motivation was second. The integrative mode of functioning involves individuals compelled by psychological and emotional disturbances who often behave erratically and irrationally, frequently resulting in violent outcomes. “In these incidents, authorities and hostages alike are often killed and injured, often leading to destructive outcomes” (Lewis 2009, 13).

Nax (2008), as mentioned earlier, uses “game theory” to explain the weighing of situational outcomes to predict hostage-taker behaviors. He distinguishes the kidnapper from the killer in his paradigm within the construct of a developed algorithm. Conversely, in the case of the kidnapper, the hostage-taker prefers to take hostages when dealing with governments willing to negotiate but not when dealing with non-negotiable governments. Killers will take hostages “irrespective of governments’ decisions. Lewis (2009) also identified from the literature review “scripts” or roles that can assist and identify situations involving captive-taking scenarios. More specifically, it is a form of predictive identification of actions on the part of the perpetrators. In essence, it’s a way of targeting the captive-taker prior to captive-taking or kidnapping events.
Scripts, or behavioral schema used to predict and describe interactions between people and the environment, can also be used to explain some hostage-taking behaviors (Wilson 2000). Applying the information integration theory to a blame/credit schema can enable negotiators and authorities to understand these non-random actions (Wolf and Walters 1996). At the height of the incident, the captive-takers’ mental states are rigid and un receptive, forcing an “exorbitant price in terms of publicity, money and release of compatriots … in exchange for release of hostages” (p. 40). Unlike the socially normal individual’s disposition “to avoid blame and fulfill responsibilities for consequences of his/her acts” (p. 41), captive-takers function within a normative and seemingly guiltless role before, during, and after the incident. (Lewis 2009, 15)

More importantly, because captive-takers, hostage-takers or kidnappers, lack a sense of guilt and culpability for their actions (psychopathy/sociopathy), negotiators often attempt to exaggerate the offenders’ responsibility and blameworthiness for whatever undesirable consequences result from the incident. Lewis (2009) explains the blame/credit schema aims to understand hostage-takers assignment of importance to social relationships (family, religious, etc.) and mea culpa, morality or sensibility to evaluate the roles and motivations of specific offenders (Wolf and Walters 1996). Authorities stress “negotiating against the kidnappers,” not “negotiating with the kidnappers,” utilizing an adversarial role against captive-takers (Richardson et al. 2007).

In an article related to recidivism rates and the risk of crime after a hostage-taking or kidnapping arrest, Liu, Francis, and Soothill (2008, 164) performed a study of serious crime offenders and suggested that “a previous conviction for kidnapping was a statistically significant risk factor for murder or serious sexual assault among both general offenders and violent offenders.” According to Liu et al (2008, 164), “Kidnapping is a rare crime compared with other crimes of violence, and few studies kidnapping have been published in either the U.K. or U.S.A.”
The study goes on to examine kidnapping through the various motives and methods among the hostage-taker and/or kidnapper. Liu et al (2008, 164), cite in their article a study by E.K Alix, (1978, 1) *Ransom Kidnapping in America* “15 types of kidnapping were distinguished, such as classic ransom kidnapping, developmental ransom kidnapping, skyjacking, ransom hoaxes, conspiracy to kidnap for ransom, and kidnapping as extortion threat.” Alix submitted three basic motives for kidnapping and/or hostage-taking, those being:

1. Intent to exchange the victim for ransom or other benefits such as escape
2. Intent to harm the victim
3. Intent in child abductions, to keep the victim indefinitely

Liu et al (2008, 164), contend that the “time from first conviction for kidnapping to some specific subsequent serious crimes, kidnappers are more likely to be convicted of another kidnapping offense than be convicted of a more serious offense of homicide or rape.” Liu et al (2008, 164), go onto state “One can estimate that five out of every 100 kidnapping offenders convicted of first-time kidnapping will be reconvicted for this offense within 20 years. In contrast, one in every 100 kidnapping offenders will be convicted of homicide within 20 years.” The source for this information came from the England and Wales Offenders Index all 7362 offenders (93% males and 7% females) who were convicted of kidnapping from 1979 to 2001 (P.64). The illustrated graphs (p.62-64) reconfirm the main premise of Liu et al (2008, 164), utilizing a “survival analysis model” to represent the probabilities of not being reconvicted of kidnapping, homicide, or rape and the length of a sentence on the first conviction for kidnapping.

Recently, hostage-taking has taken a prominent role in crime especially around the Southwest border region of the United States and Mexico. Internationally, hostage-
taking and kidnapping have become a problem in places like Iraq, Afghanistan, United Kingdom, Colombia and other parts of South America. In this article the Anatomy of a Hostage Situation Cassie Wesselius, and James DeSarno, attempted to explain the interplay between the hostage-taker and the hostage by focusing on individual case studies involving many incidents in which the hostage taker acts alone and has no support. Wesselius et al (1983, 33) examined this through several individual cases of hostage-taking and kidnapping episodes in part “because it is often perpetrated in the name of political terrorism and/or involves public figures or public events.” Wesselius et al, found that the individual hostages suffered many common emotions and reactions. The authors wanted to show that each experience was “determined in part by preceding events and dynamics and in part roles they assumed within the hostage situation” (Wesselius et al. 1983, 33). Wesselius et al, found only one instance of the “Stockholm Syndrome” throughout the seven cases.

This article studies hostage-taking from point where clinicians and law enforcement are intertwined in the understanding and prevention of kidnapping and hostage-taking. The increase of hostage-taking has resulted in a permanent collaboration between psychologists and police in an interdisciplinary effort of research, enforcement and prevention. In the end, this collaboration between these two powerful entities will have a significant impact on the resolution of kidnapping and hostage-taking (Wesselius 1983). In the case studies, Wesselius et al. reviewed records and files, listened to recordings from the interview with the hostage-taker, interviewed the negotiator, tactical personnel, and the hostages to get “an understanding of the hostage-taker’s motivations and psychopathology, as well as the hostages’ psychological responses” (p.33).
According to Dawe (1979), hostage-taking occurs during prison takeovers, aircraft hijacking wealthy and important individuals who have the ability to pay their way out of a kidnapping or hostage situation. Dawe (1979, 44) submits that “although the international community cannot agree on its causes or control, terrorism’s characteristics can be defined as violence, persuasion, selection of victims allowing maximum publicity, surprise, maintenance of public fear, and the exclusive group loyalty of perpetrators.”

It seems according to Dawe’s article, that in fact, much of what he spoke of years ago has come to fruition. Every aspect hostage-taking, kidnapping and violence that Dawe put forth years ago remains the same today. Dawe contends that terrorists may be professional criminals, psychotics, or rebels claiming to seek social justice, but according to Dawe (1979, 44), contrary to this belief, “studies of hostage-takers in prisons reveal that they are young, poorly educated, have inadequate personalities, low intelligence, violent prison records, and inadequate family relationships.”

In the end, Dawe (1979, 45) believes there to be three acceptable conclusions to hostage-takings and they occur when captors realize the futility of their actions: “Hostages affect their own release, or hostages are rescued and captors apprehended. Techniques successful in hostage-taking events require the coordinated work of teams of trained people and great patience under captor abuse.” Dawe recommended having a central data base of information related to hostage-taking situations, training programs for police and the further study of hostage-takers methods. Many if not all of these recommendations have in fact become part of law enforcement since Dawe first published the article.

As an example, professionals moving to Mexico have had to resort to a comprehensive security plan to protect themselves and their families from kidnappers
and/or hostage-takers. When an expatriate relocates to Mexico or other less secure countries, the need for security becomes paramount. Graeme (2005) contends that corporate security for business professionals and their families is essential. Corporate security is the latest in protection for Americans relocating to a foreign country.

According to Graeme (2005, 1), “new corporate security strategies go beyond bodyguards and bulletproof cars for the CEO. Proactive in a new, innovative way, they now include plans designed by security advisers and special training, with courses in topics as security awareness and evasive driving.” Companies in Mexico like Sony Electronics and Johnson and Johnson trained both the executive and their families. One of the techniques is a swift response to all emergencies incurred by the expatriate or their family. It is a security and emergency response 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Also, there are security seminars covering crime avoidance and security awareness.

According to the Citizen Council for Public Safety, “Mexico has overtaken Colombia to become the world leader in reported kidnappings. In the first half of 2005, there were 194 reported kidnappings in Mexico, versus 172 in Colombia and 169 in Brazil” (Graeme 2005, 1). Another protective measure according to Thomas W. Harvey, an international risk management expert and CEO of Assurex International, is for the employer to purchase kidnap and ransom (KandR) insurance for their executives prior to them going into high-risk countries like Colombia and Mexico (Graeme 2005).

This study examined kidnapping and hostage-taking utilizing a method developed from cognitive psychology called “script theory” and how it explains human behavior through roles we play. According to Yun, and Roth (2008), the study examines whether there is a consistent pattern to hostage-taking and kidnapping. Yun and Roth contend that human behavior, whether benevolent or nefarious, has a certain pattern to it because
every human is programmed to an extent by learned experiences and episodic memories. Moreover, Yun and Roth examined 764 cases involving terrorist hostage-taking and kidnapping in which 234 of these were used specifically for this study.

These learned experiences or “scripts” determine how a person will respond to a particular stimulus or situation. The person in this situation would be the kidnapper or hostage-taker and the situation would be the kidnapping or hostage-taking. “This study hypothesizes that script theory can be applied to cases of terrorist hostage-taking and kidnapping to determine the fate of a hostage—either to execute or to release” (Yun and Roth 2008, 2).

Section 3: Current Paradigm for Interviewing
Perpetrator-Motive Research Design

Global Hostage-Taking Research Analysis Project, Federal Bureau of Investigation, FBI Academy, Quantico, VA

PMRD protocol and questionnaire format.

- Background
- Perceptions of Captive-Taking
- Planning and Preparation
- Execution
- Holding
- Daily Treatment
- Hostage Behavior
- Event Outcome
- Media
• Interaction with Authorities
• Negotiations and Third Party Intermediaries
• Group/Organization Involvement
• Situational Introspection
• Attitudes Toward Government (Vecchi 2009)

PMRD is a tool, a process to help identify the motivations of offenders and in-turn can flush out the hypothesis and each captive-taker is critical (case studies) to the success of this research. Understanding what motivates individuals to take others is best achieved by interviewing the actual perpetrator as compared to the investigative standard of interviewing the victim. The FBI has had great success with interviewing the offender of crimes and the Perpetrator Motive Research Design is one component within this dynamic. Moreover, (Vecchi 2009, 12) contends that:

PMRD comprises three main salient points: 1) understanding motivation as the first step to understanding human behavior; 2) the meaning behind behavior as the sum of individual or group values, needs, and desires that are perceived to be blocked; and 3) understanding the values, needs, and desires of an individual or group provides the basis from which to develop strategies and tactics for mitigation and prevention, preparedness, response, and recovery activities (12)

More to this point, the FBI has had experience in the utilization of PMRD in the past with a different target or type of investigation. According to Vecchi (2009, 12), “the FBI and the BSU has been successful in using the PMRD approach in research involving serial killers, serial rapists, child molesters, cop killers, juveniles who kill, arsonists, spies, and cyber criminals. These research endeavors focused on analyzing perpetrator motivations and using the resulting analyses to type or classify behavior, which resulted in the development of tactics, techniques, and procedures that continue to assist law enforcement in solving violent crime (e.g., development and use of victimology, crime
scene analysis, and behavioral profiles of unknown offenders).” More specifically, the PMRD is a unique approach of how inquiry should proceed (Schwandt 2001).

The overall goal of this study is to improve the ability of the law enforcement, military, academia, psychology and intelligence communities to perform anti- and counter-captive-taking training (Vecchi 2009). To this point, it is important to select a methodology that is plausible (utilizing the grounded theory research method) from the interviews and research participants themselves (primary and secondary data collection) will extract vital information that can lead to a hypothesis. In the end, this dissertation, as with GHoST-RAP “will be used to form descriptions and theoretical constructs to form an integrated framework that can be used to explain the values, paradigms, and motivations of captive-takers in order to develop educational, training” (Vecchi 2009, 3). The intent of the pilot study is also to understand who, what, how, when and where captive-takers target their victims. The BSU has established a PMRD center at the BSU at the FBI Academy to further research on the motivations of criminals.

Reliability and Validity

The consistency of the research is paramount to its success. It needs to measure what you intend to research each time you test it and under the same condition with the same type of subjects. Basically, being able to replicate the same study utilizing the same methods every time is reliability. Even though the individual subjects may be different, the method for testing that is utilized is the same as is the result or validity. It was our responsibility as researchers to ensure this consistency. Test/Retest is a good tool to estimate reliability. Validity on the other hand is the strength of your conclusions or results. Validity tells us if we were correct in our assumptions within the framework of our research.
Rigor

GHoST-RAP maintains accurate and rigorous research using the appropriate instruments to meet the stated objective of the research. The data collection tools (interview protocols) provided the majority of information for the study. The data collection techniques are sound and can generate the information needed to understand captive-taking. The interview protocols were crafted in such a way as to identify themes, commonalities and/or relationships among captive-takers. The most challenging portion was determining what questions to ask, which was developed over a long period of time. It was important to ensure that this research was transparent in a way that it could be explained or described to others what was performed and the subsequent results.

Limitations

Given the format of this research (interviewing captive-takers) there were limitations that could not be ignored. For example, researcher bias can affect the design, data collection or overall method of the study. The credibility of the subjects is important and that they are what we need for the study, making sure to not make the study fit for our purposes. There also could be problems with missing data or not truly representative of the larger group of subjects. Our analysis of the interviews can be biased, but knowing this ahead of time helps the researchers remain objective. According to the Heisenburg Uncertainty Principle, any research or study of a group is altered to some degree by the presence of the researcher themselves and in-turn, the research can be skewed. Lastly, the researcher needs to develop rapport with the subject before or during the interview process. It takes time to gain the trust of the research subject that in the end will facilitate truthful and full disclosure to questions asked.
Conclusion

In summary, the literature on captive-taking reveals distinct patterns of captive-taking techniques, tactics, procedures, methods, motivations and responses in locations/areas affected by kidnapping. The preceding graph (figure 3) indicates the survival probabilities for not being reconvicted of kidnapping, homicide, and rape. The following graph (table 1) indicates the length of sentence on the first conviction for kidnapping. In table 2, it shows a regression model for kidnapping sentence length for those receiving a custodial sentence. Figure 4 gives an example of conviction rates per 100,000 population in England and Wales. Finally, in Table 3, it compares the number of persons in captivity as direct victims and family members.
Table 1

Length of Sentence on the First Conviction for Kidnapping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of custodial sentence</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No immediate custody sentence</td>
<td>1641</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>1079</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year to less than 5 years</td>
<td>3020</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>3194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years to less than 10 years</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10 years</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life imprisonment</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6822</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>7362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 2

Regression Model for Kidnapping Sentence Length in Years for Those Receiving a Custodial Sentence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>4.940</td>
<td>0.1558</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-0.139</td>
<td>0.0649</td>
<td>0.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log (age)</td>
<td>0.540</td>
<td>0.0477</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log (No. of prior convictions)</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.0137</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidnap</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False imprisonment</td>
<td>-0.186</td>
<td>0.0288</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4. The rate per 100,000 population of those convicted of kidnap and false imprisonment in England and Wales, identifying the two subcategories of kidnapping. From Liu, Jiayu, Brian Francis, and Keith Soothill. 2008. Journal of Forensic Psychiatry and Psychology 19, no. 2 (June): 164–179.

Table 3

Number of Persons in Each Group of the Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Captivity</th>
<th>2−4</th>
<th>5−8</th>
<th>9−15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct victims</td>
<td>(18)a</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family members</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


a With no data because they were in captivity.
This includes older and newer models of captive-taking, the captive experience, negotiations with captors, psychological reactions to being held captive, relations between captives and their captors. Moreover, understanding the captor’s motivation, objectives and overall negotiation process in dealing with a captive-taker is paramount. With this in mind, Lewis examined the difference in negotiations between barricaded vs. kidnapping incidents and the different typologies involved and the mental, behavioral models associated with captive-takers. Lewis observed, a vast majority of captive-taking research has focused on conflict initiation, resolution, and subsequent victim trauma and emotional response, including the Stockholm Syndrome (Fuselier 1988; Strentz 1979), but additional empirical and quantitative research in the area is needed (Yun 2007).

Moreover, recent global changes in the frequency and style of hostage-takings (Nax 2008) suggest, however, that transitioning previous research into investigations of underlying motivations may provide greater insight into minds of captive-takers, thus enabling law enforcement agencies to both combat and prevent such incidents more efficiently. According to Lewis (2009, 5) “crisis management organizations have only occasionally attempted to utilize knowledge of captive-takers” As mentioned earlier, mental, emotional, and personality issues effect how a captive-taker goes about kidnapping individuals. To this end, coordination with psychologists and negotiators may enable authorities to utilize an understanding of offender intentions, demands, and motives to combat captive situations with greater success (Fritzon, Canter, and Wilton 2001).

In summation, the pressing need for an understanding of captive-taking necessitates the need for increased research and action in this area. With this dissertation, there is a chance for better understanding of the individual captive-taker to
help mitigate, train, defend, and understand captive-taking/kidnapping situations so that individuals can survive. In the beginning of the literature review, Nax explained his theory of “Modeling Hostage-Taking” from the “old model” of negotiations to a “new model” of reputations and putting forth an algorithmic system to help understand and respond to captive-taking situations. Nax, Giebels, Noelanders, and Veraeke delved into the hostage experience and the implications for negotiation strategies which is why it ostensibly worked well with Nax’s research. Giebels et al. and Faure went further and talked about negotiating with individuals who take captives (or in this case, anyone who takes another captive). The literature review then transitions to Dolnik, who compares and contrasts the dynamics of crisis negotiations and the scenarios of barricaded subjects versus kidnapping situations.

Liu et al. (2008), talks about the kidnapping offenders, the incidences and the inherent risk of escalation to repeat offending by perpetrators including other serious crimes that are a part of kidnapping. Wesselius et al explained the anatomy of a hostage-taking situation and what can be learned from them. Dawe focused on the problem that police will face in the future and trends in hostage-taking and violence. Stewart et al, talked about creating a corporate shield and how companies are now investing more money to protect their assets, particularly their executives who live and work in dangerous areas. Yun et al. looks into the future of hostage-taking and kidnapping, using “script theory” to predict the fate of hostages. Lastly, the transition to current research being conducted by the FBI’s Behavioral Science Unit on “Perpetrator-Motive Research Design” and how PMRD is the latest in cutting edge techniques and research on understanding the captive-takers themselves to develop models for dealing with pre-captive, captive, and post-captive scenarios. In this literature review, it started from an
older model of dealing with hostage-taking and transitioned to current research of understanding the perpetrators to prevent future captive-taking situations.

Organizations Involved with Prevention of Captive-Taking

Organizations involved with the prevention of Captive-Taking, Hostage-Taking and Kidnapping. According to the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), the following list of organizations is an integral part of hostage and human rights action

- **Amnesty International (AI)** was founded in 1961 and has a large research staff based in its International Secretariat in London, England. AI’s researchers work on a country-by-country basis to expose a broad range of human rights abuses and produces reports that directly address issues such as hostage-taking and kidnapping. Web site [http://www.amnesty.org](http://www.amnesty.org)

- **Human Rights Watch** is the largest United States-based human organization, with more than 150 staff worldwide. Its researchers monitor human rights developments in more than 70 countries and produce reports that document patterns of abuse of internationally recognized human rights and press for changes in policies and practices that promote these violations. Web site [www.hrw.org](http://www.hrw.org)

- **International Committee of the Red Cross** based in Geneva, Switzerland, works to assist all victims of war and internal violence to include victims of kidnapping. The International Committee of the Red Cross can be accessed online. Web site [www.icrc.org](http://www.icrc.org)

- **International Rescue Committee** is a Non-Governmental Organization founded in 1933 by the United States that assists people worldwide from an
array of needs. It is currently active in 28 countries and, among other things, provides emergency protection and psycho-social care to victims of conflict and other traumatic events to include abductions. Web site www.theirc.org

- **International Peace Research Institute** is an independent and international research institute based in Oslo, Norway. Founded in 1959, the Institute concentrates on the driving forces behind violent conflict and on ways in which peace can be built. The underlying assumption was that conflict interventions will be more effective when policymakers have a better understanding of the effects of these interventions. Web site www.prio.no

- **The Transnational Crime and Corruption Center (TraCCC)** was founded in 1995. Its goal is to improve understanding of the causes and scope of transnational crime and corruption and to propose well-grounded policy. TraCCC works with the public, media, law enforcement, policy-making, legislative, judicial, academic, and business communities. To undertake this kind of collaborative work, the center has partnered with the best scholars and practitioners. TraCCC also advises numerous American and multilateral governmental and NGO’s engaged in studying and combating transnational crime, including human trafficking. Web site www.unicrit.it/TraCCC

- **United Nations Development Programme** has programs dealing with crisis recovery, democracy, and governance among 166 programs. Web site www.undp.org

- **United Nations Interregional Crime and Justice Research Institute (UNICRI)** is mandated to contribute to the formulation and implementation of improved policies in the field of crime prevention and control through research, training,
and field activities and the collection, exchange, and dissemination of information. The Institute assists intergovernmental, governmental, and nongovernmental organizations. Web site www.nicri.it

- *eGlobalHealth Insurers Agency, LLC.,* A Kidnap and Ransom Insurance Organization. Web site info@eglobalhealth.com

- *Core Group Security Consultants (CORE)* was formed to protect personnel and salvage possessions and citizens ravaged by political unrest. Web site www.coregroup.org

**Stakeholders**

- FBI Behavioral Science Unit (BSU)
- West Virginia University
- Serious Organized Crime Agency (SOCA)
- FBI Personnel Recovery Coordination Group (PRCG)
- FBI San Diego Division
- FBI Phoenix Division
- DoD Joint Personnel Recovery Agency (JPRA)
- U.S. Department of State (DOS)
- U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA)
- Defense POW/Missing Personnel Office (DPMO)
- U.S. Joint Special Operations Command (JSOC)
- National Geospatial-intelligence Agency (NGA)
- Phoenix (Arizona) Police Department
- Nova Southeastern University (NSU)
Florida Institute of Technology (FIT)
Joint Forces Staff College (JFSC)
Center for Personal Protection and Safety
Private Consultants

Other federal agencies involved in captive-taking prevention and resolution:

- Critical Incident Response Group (CIRG)
- Joint Personnel Recovery Agency (JPRA)
- Joint Personnel Recovery Group (JPRG)
- Crisis Negotiation Unit (CNU)
- Hostage Response Team (HRT)

Current Trends

Recent events on the international stage have brought global hostage-taking to the forefront of public awareness. There has been an increasing recognition among humanitarian organizations, law enforcement organizations and nation-states that this issue is a problem for all involved. Research on global hostage-taking is increasing. Two specific areas of global hostage-taking and kidnapping are listed below:

Mexico

Crime in Mexico is at all time highs, specifically when it comes to violent crime like kidnapping and hostage-taking. Along the border with the United States, crime is even more alarming. Areas that border Mexican cities like Tijuana, Ciudad Juarez, Nuevo Laredo and other smaller border cities are vulnerable to crime specifically kidnapping. United States citizens and Mexican nationals should always be aware of their surroundings even when they are in open and populated areas. Recent kidnappings of
Americans who are taken into Mexico are the latest bold attempts by captive-takers to intimidate, control and extort money from wealthier Americans. Kidnapping victims tend to be alone, unaccompanied, female and traveling during the night time hours. Many of these female victims have become victims as a secondary crime to an initial crime like rape and robbery. Some of the abductors perform “express kidnappings” to force the kidnapped victim to withdraw money from Automated Teller Machines (ATMs) or held by another kidnapper while the victim’s credit cards are used to purchase items.

Kidnapping, to include the abduction of United States citizens and Mexican citizens is increasing to crisis levels. “Express kidnappings” are the latest in methods which involve getting cash quickly in exchange for the release of the kidnapped individual. Most of these “express kidnappings” have occurred in the larger cities in Mexico and border cities in the United States. Border cities specifically, have become prime hunting grounds to this phenomenon where kidnappers target anyone appearing to have money or the ability to get money. Kidnapping in Mexico has become a lucrative business either through traditional means of abduction or through the use of technology or “virtual kidnapping.”

“Virtual kidnappings” or “telephone kidnappings” typically involving a distraught voice immediately when the phone is answered that serves as a ploy to get information about a potential victim. The kidnapper uses this new information to demand a certain amount of money or ransom, a political move, or to exact a vendetta for the release of the supposed victim. A majority of these scams are false, but all too often, they are very real. Driving to and from work, school or home can put a potential kidnapping victim in harm’s way. Kidnapping or abductions on the open roads, especially at night, can be dangerous in Mexico.
According to law enforcement officials, knowing your area and changing your route of travel is essential in lowering the chances of being a victim of kidnapping. Also, keeping doors locked and windows up in crowded areas lowers the chance of random kidnapping or abduction. To that point, always leave an opening or a point of exit for your vehicle to maneuver or escape. To lessen the chances of being a victim of kidnapping, stay away from less traveled roads in backcountry areas. Always have someone with you and carry a form of communication. Never walk alone or go to places sparsely populated. Research has shown that when in a foreign country, specifically one prone to violent criminal acts such as hostage-taking or kidnapping, it is imperative not to be too trusting and to have good judgment when it comes to traveling. To reduce the chances of becoming a victim of random kidnapping or hostage-taking, never accept rides from strangers or offer a ride to strangers.

“Virtual kidnappings” have become more common place especially in Mexico. Extortionists or potential kidnappers call prospective victims on the telephone, sometimes posing as police or other legitimate government officials, to demand money in return for the release of a possible family member or to prevent a possible kidnapping. The southwest border region that include cities in Mexico that border the United States are Matamoras, Nuevo Laredo, Ciudad Juarez, Nogales, Tecate, Tijuana and even interior cities like Monterrey and Veracruz are dangerous areas for visiting United States citizens or even Mexican nationals for kidnapping or hostage-taking given the proximity to the United States. These aforementioned cities have seen an increase in kidnapping and hostage-taking against United States citizens.

As recent as 2006, the Mexican government has mobilized federal law enforcement to assist local law enforcement in these areas. Local law enforcement has
been ineffective in maintaining security for tourists and Mexican citizens alike. Foreign visitors in these border cities in Mexico have been at a higher risk for kidnappings and hostage-taking situations. Adding to the problem of kidnapping and hostage-taking in Mexico are the lack of arrests and prosecution of the perpetrators of these violent crimes. Local police forces lack the financial backing and training to effectively deal with this growing problem.

Moreover, the judicial system is weak, overworked and ineffective. Adding to this problem, the perpetrators of these crimes will stop at nothing to get what they want, be it money, drugs, revenge, vendetta, political, expressive, or instrumental reasons. This can include using police uniforms and vehicles to kidnap their victims. Kidnappers and/or hostage-takers can go to extremes to get their victim to include utilizing vehicles to collide with the victim’s car to get the victim to stop and exit the vehicle. In some instances, the kidnapper or hostage-taker can use a combination of the aforementioned methods to ensnare their victims. For people who routinely frequent or travel to these high risk areas, they should consider personal security insurance (kidnapping insurance) to have some means of bargaining with those who want only money.

United States

The results of the data analyses will be applied toward the development and enhancement of education and training of individuals and agencies involved in Anti- and Counter-Hostage-Taking activities and missions with regard to mitigation and prevention, preparedness, and response and recovery measures. The FBI, military personnel, the intelligence community, academics, psychologists, other government agencies, and additional stakeholders will benefit from captive-taking research effort to introduce and refine training techniques. This research will provide a unique look at the captive-takers’
values, tactics and techniques, which will subsequently determine their motivations for taking captives.

Understanding captive-takers will allow experts to develop theoretical constructs designed to improve Anti- and Counter-Hostage-Taking measures in which intelligence-driven methods will help prevent and mitigate hostage situations throughout all aspects of captive-taking. Three aspects or areas of captive-taking: 1) Pre-Capture, 2) Capture, and 3) Post-capture:

“Pre-Capture – encompasses procedures that minimize the chances of individuals initially being taken captive and other actions that limit the potential threat of becoming a captive (i.e. prevention of incidents, pre-deployment briefings and trainings, in-country behaviors, surveillance/intelligence-gathering on captive takers).

Capture – refers to the techniques and procedures that can minimize the risk of injury, increase chances of survival, and increase the factors that contribute to the hostage being released (i.e. survival, evasion, resistance, and escape).

Post-Capture – pertains to the recovery and response measures that can be taken to ease a captive back in to society as well as the operational procedures for detaining the captive-taker (i.e. reintegration, debriefings, interviews, interrogations)” (Vecchi 2009, 10)

Each of the following areas can be used to develop training and prevention methods according to each individual stakeholders needs.

Anti-Hostage-Taking

According to Vecchi (2009, 1), “Anti-Hostage-Taking (AHT) is a pre- and post-development psycho-education briefing and training program for those who are at risk for being taken captive. Anti-Hostage measures can be used to prepare stakeholders for the three areas of captive-taking.”

Pre-Capture: AHT

“AHT in the Pre-Capture stage is when precautionary measures are taken in regards to mitigation and prevention. This pertains to procedures that can both minimize
individuals’ chances of being taken captive and monitor actions that affect potential threat of becoming a captive (i.e. limit exposure to high-risk circumstances, reduce danger through traveling behaviors).” (Vecchi 2009, 1)

*Capture: AHT*

“AHT in the Capture phase refers to the physical actions and psychological “tools” that can be utilized by the hostage, special operation groups, negotiators, and any agency trying to alleviate the hostage situation. Preliminary training and knowledge will be applied to minimize the risk of injury during the incident, increase survival, and increase the factors contributing to hostage release.” (ibid)

*Post-Capture: AHT*

“AHT in the Post-Capture phase is designed to enhance the immediate procedures for the recovery process after the captive has been released, enabling captives to improve both psychologically and physically. Research devised by this study will strengthen the current recovery and response measures.” (ibid)

*Counter-Hostage-Taking*

“Counter-Hostage-Taking (CHT) is a program of techniques, tactics, and practiced measures used to provide governments, militaries, police departments, and corporations with the necessary information to prevent, mitigate, and defeat aspects of global hostage-taking through behavioral-based, intelligence driven “tools” for operational purposes. Counter-Hostage measures can be used to prepare stakeholders for the three areas of the captive-taking.” (ibid)
Pre-Capture: CHT

“CHT in the Pre-Capture phase refers to the program of counter-measures and tactics that can be taken to operationally eliminate, deter, or minimize the opportunity for individual captive-takings.” (ibid)

Capture: CHT

“The CHT training will provide enhanced tactical operational measures to governments, militaries, police departments and other agencies. These enhanced techniques will maximize both the hostage’s odds of survival and the likelihood of a successful release. Primarily, CHT in the Capture phase utilizes the interactions between operational groups and the captive taker(s) and tactics to neutralize their actions while still stressing the importance of safe recovery of the hostage.” (ibid)

Post-Capture: CHT

“Data analyses will provide knowledge about the most effective way to recover a captive through operational means. In this phase, CHT will be able to discern the most applicable procedures of retrieving information from the captive-takers, thus providing a continuous feed of information to help prevent future captive taking in both immediate and long-term abductions.” (ibid)

This dissertation has the potential to produce results for the stakeholders (p.69) of strategic, operational, and tactical value for years to come. The ramifications for what will be learned are significant. The results of the interviews and subsequent data will potentially be applied towards further education and training of individuals and agencies involved in anti- and counter-hostage-taking activities and missions regarding mitigation and prevention, preparedness, response, and recovery measures. In furtherance of the overall goal of GHosT-RAP, the resulting data from the interviews of captive-takers will
enhance current practices in the following three aspects of captive-taking: Pre-capture, capture and post-capture training and education.
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHOD

In keeping with the overall methodology of this dissertation, the qualitative aspect of this dissertation comprises a data retrieval method put forth by (Bogdan and Biklen 2003) which involves semi-structured interviews of the captive-taker perpetrators themselves. This involves an in-depth description of captive-taker values, paradigms, motivations, and patterns of conflict behavior through the use of the Captive-Taker Background Protocol questionnaire “PMRD” (Sudman and Bradburn 1982). Although time consuming, for the purposes of this dissertation, qualitative data analysis will be utilized and based somewhat on the “grounded theory” method to flush out a stated hypotheses.

The “grounded theory” is most accurately described as a research method in which the theory or research direction will be developed from the data and/or interviews, which in-turn can accept or reject the prevailing hypotheses. In essence making this research more inductive then deductive. Moreover, “grounded theory” is comprised of several areas involving the categories, propositions and concepts which can develop and/or answer the stated hypotheses. According to Strauss and Corbin (1998), “the grounded theory approach is a qualitative research method that uses a systematic set of procedures to develop an inductively derived grounded theory about a phenomenon” (Vecchi 2009, 14).

The main objective of this research dissertation as it relates to “grounded theory” is to assist the researcher explain a phenomenon or research question by going from
general information (interviews) to the specific of the resulting data to hopefully answer or defend a hypotheses. With this said, utilizing the PMRD approach, it allows researchers to ask the specific questions and make comparisons which can guide and inform the analysis to the eventual theorizing process. This in-turn will allow the development of the qualitative research within this dissertation utilizing individual case studies of each captive-taker perpetrator/offender/participant. PMRD will play a major role and be expected to highlight possible paradigms or similarities of activity and motivations from the subjects of the protocols. It is anticipated that the interview subjects will describe motivations, intent, techniques, tactics, procedures, and methods of captive-taking incidents, that will help explain the actual process of captive-taking with real life examples. The steps involved with the PMRD specific to the interviews have distinctive subject areas that are asked and explained within the literature review.

Research Question

Why do individuals take captives?

Hypotheses

- H1-Captives taken for instrumental or cognitive, premeditated reasons will be held for leverage against a third party.
- H1a-Captives taken for mercenary/economic reasons will be held for leverage against a third party.
- H1b-Captives taken for vendetta or revenge reasons will be held for leverage against a third party.
• H1c-Captives taken for political or ideological reasons will be held for leverage against a third party.
• H1d-Captives taken for expressive or emotional, reactive reasons (e.g. kidnapping) will be held as an object of distaste with the intent to avoid third parties.
• H1e-Captives taken for accidental or secondary or by chance reasons will be held for leverage against a third party or to prevent capture

Researcher’s Role

There are many steps involved in research, not least of all, coordination of personnel, logistics, location, budget considerations, questionnaire design, revision, sampling, data collection, data processing, data analysis, IRB, research participants, evaluation and coding. For the purposes of this dissertation, the focus is on the data collection, processing and analysis. During the interview protocols, the research teams coordinated the interviews utilizing a primary and secondary interviewer with one to two observers and a guardian maintaining inter-rater reliability. The interview team are facilitators during the process and assist the actual interviewers in the preparation and execution of the pilot study.

As Qualitative research goes, the methodology within the pilot project, and for this dissertation emphasized the interviews as its base. From there, research team members worked with individuals incarcerated for captive-taking, in close environments for extended periods of time to gain actionable primary and secondary data. To that end, the pilot project this past Fall 2010 and Spring 2011 were successful with regard to the
captive-taker interviews that involved open-ended and semi-structured questioning, interviewing and data analysis procedures initially put forth by Spradley (1979) as a means to gleaning information. The actual interview process lasted around 4-6 hours with each subject being videotaped and audio-recorded with subsequent debriefings of each interview at the end of each day to provide inter-rater reliability. Each interview continued without interruption until it was determined by the interviewers that each question in the interview protocol has been thoroughly answered and a complete narrative description of the extent of captive-taker values, paradigms, motivations, and descriptions of the event had been obtained. During the interviews, if any one element of the protocol questionnaire was not fully answered or understood, it would be clarified by either the primary or secondary interviewer by repeating the question again (Vecchi 2009).

In April 2011, a second round of interviews was performed gaining even greater insight into the minds of captive-takers. After each interview session, the research team met to debrief (inter rater reliability) making sure nothing was overlooked. In the end, this ensures complete accuracy and understanding between all participants. During the debrief periods, each team member had the opportunity to clarify any points or responses that were recorded. The formal recorded interviewers were required to agree in writing to keep the contents of the interviews confidential. All media, both video and audio type were marked and interviews transcribed.

Inter-Rater Reliability and Validation

Inter-rater reliability is a valuable and integral component to academic research and within this dissertation. validating one another’s work to assure sound accurate and
dependable research. After each interview session, a full comprehensive debrief of the interviews were performed, they were reviewed and compared to each team member’s account for accuracy. If any discrepancies, missing data, or need for further explanation was needed, then that was addressed accordingly. Furthermore, confidentiality was paramount by assigning an individual alphanumeric number for each subject instead of a name. Participation by the captive-takers was voluntary.

Data Sources, Collection and Analysis

The primary form of data retrieval and analysis for the purposes of this dissertation were individual subject interviews that included both primary and secondary data retrieval, evaluation and examination commensurate to the protocols from the individual interviews utilizing the questionnaires.

Secondary Data Collection

Secondary data analysis is valuable within academic research when the researcher was not the primary or secondary interviewer and you are intending to perform data analysis. Secondary data allows the researcher a large, reliable and valid data source than what could have been achieved on their own. As an example, common sources of secondary data could be surveys, public records, qualitative interview methods, censuses and protocol interview questionnaire research like those used in the recent pilot project completed in the Fall 2010 and again in Spring 2011 in Phoenix which centered around captive-taker motivations. Secondary data analysis is less obtrusive, fast, inexpensive and provides a basis for comparison and avoids major data collection problems. Similar to
primary research, secondary research is found within both qualitative and quantitative methods.

Obviously, a main benefit of using secondary data is much of the data collection has been performed. Our job as researchers is to analyze, interpret, utilize, and disseminate the findings. With this said, if the secondary data is from a trusted source (well-documented and accurate) then the interpretation and results of that data can lead to well produced conclusions. According to Moore (2006), secondary data, specifically qualitative, “can be understood, not so much as the analysis of pre-existing data; rather as involving a process of re-contextualizing, and re-constructing, data” (Vecchi 2009, 15).

More importantly, audio/visual assistance during the captive-taker interviews is essential as a tool to review the interviews again and for transcribing purposes as well, and a necessary factor in developing strategies and recommendations in the prevention, training and management of future captive-taking events through understanding captive-taker values, paradigms, and motivations. Moreover, understanding who captive-takers and kidnappers target is extremely valuable for law enforcement. Primary data retrieval according to Stringer (1999) is necessary because most of the data collected is large amounts of information that needs to be reduced, condensed, and distilled so that the significant features of the research subjects’ experience will be in a readily accessible form.

Statistically speaking, quantitative analysis is necessary within the constructs of qualitative research, but within this dissertation and format, quantitative research data will not be utilized as much. Qualitative research will document the interviews
demographic information, education, occupation, military service, criminal record, captive-taking event information, mental factors, childhood, violence history, and social relationship characteristics. The end goal is to have enough information and data that case study comparisons can be made involving the perpetrators to show patterns, concentrations, focus, reasoning’s, and logistics. Moreover, the results of the protocol questionnaire are analyzed through a case study format which will be completed for each captive-taker and comparisons will be made and analyzed between and within the captive-takers.

More importantly, elements and themes of the protocol questionnaires will be reviewed, defined, and refined, as well as the results of the captive-taker background protocol questionnaires, the researchers will combine and describe them in a detailed narrative form. From the resulting data, case studies will highlight each subject to get an overall idea of the perpetrator and/or captive-taker. This will be accomplished in coordination with the volunteer research subjects, academics, law enforcement and other subject matter experts. In the end, the interview questionnaires are critical for law enforcement in comprehending the depth, and understanding the scope of captive-takers motivations and who they target (Vecchi 2009).

Verification Process

The actual interviews were held in a secure setting at the Arizona Department of Corrections (Lewis complex) in the greater Phoenix area. The interview participants were interviewed by primary and secondary investigators/interviewers in an open-ended and semi-structured format. The overall questions were designed in such a way that they
could glean the maximum amount of information about the subject’s motives, designs, techniques, tactics, procedures and overall explanations of the captive-taking event and who they targeted. To that end, each interview continued until it was determined by the interviewers that each question in the interview protocol had been thoroughly answered. The subjects could refuse to answer any one question during the interview and still remain in the study. The interview subjects were allowed to stop at anytime without negative consequences as well as the interviewers (Vecchi 2009).

For the purposes of this research project, the subjects were not reimbursed, compensated or their citizenship or incarceration altered in anyway. The test subjects were previously identified as a research subject because of their involvement in captive-taking. To some individuals, it is seen as a catharsis by discussing past events, hearing it from “their” viewpoint and in-turn relieving some of their angst or guilt for what they’ve done in addition to a welcomed break of their daily routines in prison. Their willingness to be interviewed is instrumental within this research project which could benefit others in the future.

In the end, it is intended for the information from these interviews to help understand people who commit similar acts in the future. With that said, Reliability and Validity are vitally important features for this project to work as it is intended. The inherent risk is that the participants in the interview process (captive-takers) could change their minds or backout at the last minute. The only caveat to the actual interviews is the internal motivation of the participants. Other than talking about themselves (narcissism), and having a break from the normal grind of prison life, there is no incentive.
Researchers know this all too well and have planned accordingly by identifying a larger number of subjects that could be interviewed for an extended period of time.

**Ethical Considerations**

There are always are risks when one deals with human subjects and possible negative issues when dealing with human research subjects. There could be a chance that the interviewee may experience distress as a result of their recollection of previous experiences relating to hostage-taking incident(s) during the interview (similar to episodic memories). If these interviewed subjects are under the control of a correctional facility there could be an additional risk of being identified by other inmates as assisting law enforcement authorities. Lastly, there could be threats to their privacy in the unlikely accidental disclosure of their identity from information obtained from the hostage-taker interview protocols, interview recordings and/or transcripts. The security and personal well-being of the interview participants is of paramount importance in this dissertation (Vecchi 2009).

**Confidentiality**

To this end, every effort was made by the research team to assure that none of the subjects’ identities or information was disclosed or disseminated beyond the research teams. Principal investigators (identified prior to the interviews) were assigned to be primary interviewers with a secondary interviewer taking notes with two observers. The principal investigator is the only person on the research team who has access to their information, if needed, pseudonyms would be utilized for purposes of carrying out the research with other members of the research team and in later publications to assure
anonymity. The researcher/investigator will keep their information secured at their office to safeguard confidentiality for the protection of the research subjects and the data (Vecchi 2009). No remuneration of any form was given to the participants.

Institutional Review Board Process

It is important to remember that the research itself is a systematic investigation which includes testing, development, evaluation and findings that develop and/or contribute to generalized body of knowledge involving the motivations of captive-takers for future preparation, response and training of law enforcement. For this reason, Institutional Review Boards (IRB) are in place to prevent the unethical treatment of human beings. This research project has been submitted and approved through the IRB process both at the FBI and USM for formal academic research.

To be sure, before and during this research, researchers will strive to protect the rights and privacy of the research subjects with regards to confidentiality, as well as being sensitive to their individual, collective cultural values and organizational protocols. According to Vecchi (2009), the captive-takers involvement in the interviews is entirely voluntary. The researcher will maintain a record of the volunteer interview subjects, to include the questionnaires, interviews, transcripts, assessments, or other information-gathering media during the research study. Consequently, this information is considered classified and the identity of the subjects will remain anonymous and protected (e.g. pseudonyms, if needed, to protect the identity of the subjects).
Protocol Initiation

Pilot Study

The initial pilot study was conducted primarily to develop, refine and deploy the interview protocols and background questionnaires in keeping with the overall vision of the GHosT-RAP research model. The pilot project was meant to understand the captive-takers, test the process and the possibility of further interviews. Purposive sampling was used to further identify other potential subjects for captive-taker interviews. Furthermore, the success of purposive sampling is based on the experience of the researchers and subject matter experts to locate other research subjects and then use them to assist in identifying other research participants (Vecchi 2009).

This captive-taking research project subject sampling was taken from participants from geographic concentrations close to the U.S.-Mexico border areas (criminal gang, vendettas, revenge and drug trafficking) and areas within the U.S. primarily Phoenix, AZ which is considered a border region given its close proximity to Mexico. All research subjects volunteered for the interviews after being identified as a captive-taker.

Analysis of Interviews

As mentioned earlier, purposive sampling, or snowball sampling was utilized as a referral system, which can get other potential participants involved in the interviews. In this setting, it will be beneficial to identify others who are currently incarcerated in correctional facilities near the U.S.-Mexico border (Phoenix, AZ). Moreover:

All the potential research subjects will be vetted, via a preliminary interview that ensures they meet specified selection criteria, which comprises the following: 1) be a member or former member of a criminal group on either side of the U.S.-Mexico border; 2) have voluntarily participated in at least one captive-taking; and 3) can read, write, and speak Spanish or English. Once the researchers determine that the prospective volunteer
research subject meets the selection criteria, the participant will be invited to partake in the research study. An “Informed Consent” form will be provided to each prospective volunteer participant and each participant will be afforded the opportunity to review and sign the Informed Consent form before being allowed to participate in this research study (Vecchi 2009, 16)

The analysis of the interview data during the debriefing sessions started immediately after the interviews had been completed. It is anticipated that in the future, more interviews will be scheduled in continuance of the GHosT-RAP. In chapter four, the interview data is transcribed, reviewed, processed, evaluated and determinations made, utilizing a case study format. Each subject interview is thoroughly reviewed and themes, patterns, relationships are identified from their responses.
CHAPTER IV

CASE STUDIES

Mental Issues, Emotional Problems, and Personality Disorders of Offenders

Any study of captive-takers would be incomplete without understanding the behavioral, emotional or personality types, overall mental status of captive-takers and examining the physiological, psychological and psychopathology of offenders. With this said, according to the DSM-IVTR, (2000), pathological conditions like depression, bipolar disorder, psychosis, and personality disorders affect a large proportion of offenders. Understanding psychopathological disorders and identifying the signs and symptoms is especially important when interfacing/interviewing a captive-taker. For example, one in seventeen adults has a mental illness (National Alliance on Mental Illness 2007). By 2020, major depressive illness will be the leading disability in the world. 24% of state prisoners and 21% of local prisoners have a mental disorder. 70% of youth in juvenile justice systems have at least one mental disorder, and 20% suffer from significant functional impairment from serious mental illness. (National Alliance on Mental Illness 2007).

In most criminal episodes, the offender has been abused physically, mentally, sexually and emotionally. This manifests at times in various forms of personality disorders. First and foremost it is important to predict dangerousness when talking about individuals involved in major crimes like captive-taking. Consequently, there are at least four major factors that cause symptoms of emotional disturbance: Anxiety disorders, affective (mood) disorders, psychotic disorders, and personality disorders. Anxiety is an
abnormal sense of fear, nervousness, and/or apprehension about something that might happen in the future. Anxiety disorders are categorized as the following:

- Characterized by high tension or nervousness, edginess, jumpiness
- Generalized
- Panic
- Phobias
- Obsessive-compulsive
- PTSD (DSM-IV-TR 2000)

Subsequently, mood disorders are characterized as an emotional disorder by episodic emotional fluctuations such as major depression (unipolar) which is an abnormal degree of sadness and melancholy. This can be experienced as an episode (lasting two weeks or longer) or long-term condition caused by psychological, biological, and environmental factors. Major depression can significantly interfere with thoughts, mood, activity, and physical health, which impair judgment that could lead to criminality. Major depressive symptoms would include being persistently melancholy or irritable with pronounced changes in sleep, appetite, and energy, difficulty thinking, concentrating, and remembering. In addition, having physical slowing or agitation, feelings of guilt, worthlessness, hopelessness, emptiness and persistent physical conditions or ailments that do not respond to treatment. Bipolar disorder on the other hand is a brain disorder that causes unusual shifts in mood, energy, activity levels, and the ability to carry out day-to-day tasks. Also known as manic-depressive disorder, it is characterized by a period of depression followed by a manic period where there is a euphoric high and high energy.
Long-term mood disorder can last for months or years with symptoms in the depressed phase similar to those associated with depression. In the manic phase, the symptoms include feelings of euphoria and increased physical activity, rapid speech and racing thoughts, poor judgment and recklessness, inability to concentrate, decreased need for sleep, and excessive involvement in pleasurable activities that have high potential for painful or serious consequences (DSM-IV-TR 2000).

Conversely, psychosis can be a mental state in which thoughts and perceptions are severely impaired. Some of the characteristics of psychosis include the loss of contact with reality, creation of elaborate inner world that is illogical and fantastic with nonsensical speech, psychotic disorders and delusional disorders. Moreover, psychosis is where an illness is characterized by the presence of non-bizarre delusions in the absence of other mood or psychotic symptoms. Psychotic disorders like schizophrenia are characterized by the inability to differentiate between reality and non-reality. Furthermore, paranoid schizophrenia is identified by increased suspiciousness and severe difficulties in interpersonal relationships, persecutory delusions with violence directed at specific persons seen as persecuting the individual and experiences delusions of grandeur like those of captive-takers (DSM-IV-TR 2000).

Personality disorders are also among the most recognized problems among people, especially within the criminal population to include captive-takers. Personality disorders are categorized into three clusters: Cluster A (odd or eccentric disorders), Cluster B (dramatic, emotional, or erratic disorders), Cluster C (anxious or fearful disorders) (DSM-IV-TR 2000).
Cluster A:

- Paranoid Personality Disorder- suspicious, hypersensitive, expects to be taken advantage, bears grudges
- Schizoid Personality Disorder- “loners” who don’t like people, like to be alone, show emotional coldness, indifferent to praise or criticism of others
- Schizotypal Personality Disorder- acute discomfort with close relationships, odd beliefs, odd thinking and speech, odd behavior

Cluster B:

- Anti-Social Personality Disorder- (aka sociopath/psychopath) violates the rights of others without remorse
- Borderline Personality Disorder- angry outbursts, fear of abandonment, pattern of unstable relationships, suicidal
- Histrionic Personality Disorder- immature, attention seeking, self-centered, shallow, insincere
- Narcissistic Personality Disorder- exaggerated sense of self-importance, lacks empathy, arrogant
- Sociopathy is common among criminals, being able to manipulate people is critical to their success. While only 1% of the general population is sociopathic, 15-25% of all prisoners are sociopaths. Over 80% of officers killed in the line of duty were killed by individuals with a personality disorder –56% of these killers had antisocial personality disorder –44% had some characteristics of sociopathy
- 23% had a dependent personality disorder

- Age of onset for children with sociopathic characteristics is 12.1 years for violent crimes

Cluster C:

- Avoidant Personality Disorder - trouble forming attachment, social inhibition, feelings of inadequacy, hypersensitivity to negative evaluations

- Dependent Personality Disorder – pervasive and excessive need to be taken care of, leads to submissive and clinging behavior and fears of separation

- Obsessive-Compulsive Personality Disorder - preoccupation with orderliness, perfectionism, and mental and interpersonal control (DSM-IV-TR 2000)

Case Studies of Captive-Takers

During the interviews, it was evident that every subject had some form of personality disorder, if not a diagnosed mental illness. Moreover, people commit the crime of captive-taking for several reasons, but the most apparent reasons highlighted from the resulting data of the interviews appears to be money, narcotics, debts, gangs and revenge. Other factors were apparent, but to a lesser degree such as ideology, culture and/or vendetta reasons. Another salient finding was their environment and upbringing was dysfunctional. Every subject had witnessed crime early on in their life and saw it as the only way to survive and generally their role model (parent) was the primary influence. Lower socioeconomic conditions were present as well. A majority of captive-takings occurred during “crimes against property” like burglary, robbery, theft and “crimes against persons.” To this end, the data retrieved from the interview
protocols/questionnaires of former kidnappers and captive-takers, helped in better understanding of what precipitates taking another person captive.

The initial data collection involved eight volunteer research subjects. Once the interviews were completed the information from the individual subjects of the pilot study were compiled into case studies. The interview protocols enabled the subjects to answer questions about their intent, past history, outlook, character, situational awareness and overall motivations. The two salient motivations along the “Motivation” paradigm were “Instrumental” and “Expressive.” “Instrumental” or cognitive based motivation is seen as premeditated, or the perpetrator had thought out his plan of action.

Conversely, “Expressive” motivation can be viewed as reactive and emotional in nature. After each interview, the primary and secondary interviewer went over portions of the questionnaire to ensure the validity, veracity and appropriate language usage. To this point, there have been several versions of the interview questionnaires so that researchers have a plausible set of questions that can accomplish the overall goal of the researchers. Moreover, the in-depth briefings of the interviews by all members of the interview teams performed after every interview session were critical in making sure all pertinent information was collected. Vecchi states that in keeping with the tenets of GHosT-RAP:

in the domestic domains, access to the research participants will be obtained from law enforcement sources and correctional institutions, as required. The interviewers will be selected from law enforcement and academic researchers, preferably those who have a background in psychology or a related field, and trained by the researchers on using the questionnaires and instrument correctly. The researchers will supervise the interviews until inter-rater reliability has been established. The researchers will collaborate with the interviewers and research subjects to further refine and vet the questionnaires. (Vecchi 2009, 16)
Interviews with the captive-takers has shown that kidnapping incidents primarily involved gangs, narcotics, monetary debts, crimes against persons, crimes against property, revenge or vendetta related crimes. Many kidnappings go unreported for fear of retaliation or retribution, but most revolve around money and drugs. The research shows that for a majority of the captive-takers, the captive-taking appeared to be secondary to the primary crime or offense like murder, burglary, robbery, sexual assault or narcotics.

To this end, captive-taking is an increasing trend that shows no signs of letting up or stopping and it is even more important that we understand how to reverse this trend. Altegrity Risk International (2010, 1) submits that “Kidnappers operate in the United States each day, conducting abductions on rival criminals and illegal immigrants, and if the U.S. authorities neglect the threat, as was seen during the early stages of Mexico’s kidnapping epidemic, these groups could deepen their roots in the country and expand the scope of their targets.” This statement encapsulates the need to understand who, what, why, how and where of captive-takers. The evaluation of the research samples from the interviews of the pilot project in November 2010 (S1 to S4) and the second set of interviews in April 2011 (S5 to S8) showed the following patterns of motivations, desires, and outcomes. There was one major finding throughout the interview process that was considered significant enough to change the “Motivation” model which previously included “Instrumental” and “Expressive” motivations. This finding was labeled “Transitory” motivation. “Transitory” motivation happens during the captive-taking episode when the perpetrator starts out on one side of the “Motivation” paradigm and moves to the other side. “Transitory” cases are unique in that both areas of the
### Table 4

*Data from Individual Interview with Subject 1: Expressive Motivation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Background</strong></td>
<td>White male in his thirties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youngest child of five</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raised by mother and step-father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Father was always in and out of jail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parents never married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mother was the boss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mother and step-father split when he was 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mother was a nurse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Step-father was a painter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dropped out in the 11th grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History of expulsion from school and fighting with authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Claimed to have ADHD, took Ritalin in school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Was disciplined by spanking and loss of privileges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worked in construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No formal religion, claimed to be Catholic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knows what he did was wrong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has a girlfriend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has three children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History of alcohol abuse by parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drinks on occasions just to feel good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brother uses cocaine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brother has history of domestic abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has used methamphetamines, ecstasy, heroin, cocaine, crack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No history of psychiatric problems, only ADHD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Treated for ADHD with Ritalin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sober when conducting kidnapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Committed crimes before kidnapping (burglary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceptions of captive-taking</strong></td>
<td>Captive-taking not planned, but part of a robbery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Driver for the rest of the crew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never planned on doing the captive-taking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shocked when realized that they had victim tied-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friend influenced eventual decision to get involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning and preparation</strong></td>
<td>The plan was to commit robbery, not to be a captive-taker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intent was to leave captive for someone to find later</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Execution</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holding</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily treatment</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Hostage behavior             | Partner broke their rule which was to run  
Partner pointed gun at victim to get compliance  
Partner might have assaulted the victim  
Planned intimidation of victim and tying up of victim  
Rapport established, victim stated won’t call police and that they could take everything they wanted  
Stated that gender made a difference in treatment (female) treated better  
Stated that he sympathized with victim  
Victim was attractive, no thoughts of sexual assault  
Blamed captive-taking on victim, if she had not answered the door  
Victim claimed she would not call the police  
Stated he burglarized for the excitement of it |
| Event outcome                | N/A                                                                                                                                           |
| Media                        | N/A                                                                                                                                           |
| Interaction with authorities | N/A                                                                                                                                           |
| Negotiations and third party intermediaries | N/A                                                                                                                                 |
| Group/organization involvement | Loose affiliation, not considered a gang  
Was considered the leader of group  
When things went well, they spent the money they acquired |
| Situational introspection    | N/A                                                                                                                                           |
Table 4 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes toward government</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Motivation” paradigm are utilized. For example, the offender could start out reacting emotionally (expressive) to a situation and in-turn, become premeditated or cognitive (instrumental) to escape. “Transitory” examples will be explained and further identified by subject. The following individual subject interviews were evaluated in a case study format.

(S1) was a white male in his thirties who was the youngest of five children whose parents separated. (S1) was raised by his mother and step-father. (S1)’s biological father was always in and out of jail. (S1) dropped out of school during the 11th grade with a history of expulsion for fighting, especially with authorities. (S1) claimed to have a history of ADHD and took medicine for the condition. (S1) worked as a laborer in construction jobs with a history of alcohol abuse and narcotics to include methamphetamines, heroin, cocaine and crack cocaine. (S1)’s siblings also used narcotics. (S1) stated that he was sober during the time of the kidnapping. (S1) admitted to other crimes (burglary) prior to the captive-taking event.

On the day of the incident, (S1)’s perception of the captive-taking event was secondary to the primary motivation of robbery. (S1) stated he was the driver for the rest of the group and never had planned on performing a kidnapping. (S1) stated that he was shocked when the group arrived at the location, taken the victim captive, tied up the victim and continued the intended crime. (S1) stated he was influenced by peer pressure
to get involved in the planning and preparation once it occurred. During the planning and preparation stage, the plan was to commit robbery, not to take someone captive. (S1) stated that once it happened, the intent was to leave the captive for someone else to find later.

According to (S1), the behavior of the hostage was one of compliance. (S1) stated the reason for this was that one member of the group pointed a gun at the victim to get compliance. (S1) was not certain that his partner might have assaulted the victim, but stated that the gender of the victim (female) made all the difference. (S1) stated that part of the intimidation was tying up the victim. (S1) stated that rapport was developed with the victim and according to the victim, she would not contact the police and they could take whatever they wanted. (S1) stated that he sympathized with the victim. (S1) stated that the victim was attractive, but there were no thoughts of sexual assault. (S1) stated that in the end, the captive-taking was blamed on the victim, because she answered the door. (S1) stated that there was a loose gang affiliation, but he was not officially considered part of a gang. (S1) stated that the group spent all the money that was taken and things were going well, until they got caught. In the end, as an investigator, you must discern whether it is remorse for the crime or for being caught. In order for the information from the interview to be helpful to others in the future, it would be important to find out by asking the perpetrator how he thinks his actions have affected others. How does he think the kidnapping episode makes the victim feel? How would he feel if someone kidnapped him? If he expresses empathy, he is probably remorseful about the crime; if he says, “Serves them right,” or “doesn’t bother me,” he is probably remorseful
Table 5

*Data from Individual Interview with Subject 2: Expressive Motivation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Background                   | Hispanic male in his thirties  
Has one step-brother and one step-sister  
Was raised by mother and had a step-father  
Mother and step-father still married  
Biological parents separated from each other at his birth  
Work in the construction field  
Tenth grade education applied to community college  
Made C’s and D’s as a student  
Would fight with other students as early as elementary school  
English was not his primary language  
Step-father would discipline harshly as a child  
Still prays at night  
Step-father would drink heavily  
Stated he was addicted to methamphetamines  
Step-father would beat him when he was drinking  
Beat his girlfriend before he took her captive  
Witnessed physical violence as a child  
Was physically and emotionally abused as a child  
Currently on medications for a bi-polar disorder (lithium)  
Abused meth and used cocaine and marijuana  
Stated he drank alcohol  
Diagnosed with psychological problems |
| Perceptions of captive-taking| Never wanted to be involved with captive-taking  
His victim’s actions upset him |
| Planning and preparation     | Two others took victim until he went to the house where victim was at  
Knew they were holding victim captive |
| Execution                    | Had a car, pistol, cell phone, residence, rope, brick, and rock  
Received an order by cousin to go with him to residence where victim was being held |
| Holding                      | Never wanted to be involved in kidnapping  
Did not chose captive, cousins took captive  
Taking victim was revenge and to get information on who shot their cousin |
Table 5 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily treatment</strong></td>
<td>Captive-taking location was two houses split into one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hostage behavior</strong></td>
<td>Assaulted victim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victim’s age played a factor in treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Believed victim got what they deserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Event outcome</strong></td>
<td>Got information he was seeking from victim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Was arrested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Media</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interaction with authorities</strong></td>
<td>Phoenix Police Dept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negotiations and Third Party Intermediaries</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group/organization involvement</strong></td>
<td>Was part of a gang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relatives and friends all participated in gangs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Captive-taking incident occurred as a result of a prior shooting of a family member and not solely as a gang related kidnapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Situational introspection</strong></td>
<td>No enjoyment from incident, cannot see family because of incarceration, changed his life completely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wished he would never have taken anyone captive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Should never have got involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Did not want to go back to jail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thinks about his kids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knew he was going to face the consequences of his actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>States captive was scared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>States that victims should remain calm and comply to stay alive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitudes toward government</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
about being caught. In this case, it appears that (S1) was truly remorseful and would
never commit such an act again. (S1) is currently incarcerated for KIDNAPPING.

(S2) is a Hispanic male in his thirties who came from a broken home. (S2) was
raised by his mother, but had a step-father in his life. (S2)’s biological parents were
separated from each other at his birth. (S2) stated that he dropped out of school during the
10th grade and started working in construction. (S2) stated that his step-father would
drink heavily and soon he started using methamphetamines. (S2) stated that he had taken
his girlfriend captive once before the actual captive-taking event that he was arrested for.
Before serving his current sentence, (S2) had four prior felony convictions as well as a
number of misdemeanors. Two of the felony sentences were probation which ended with
revocation and imprisonment. He has self-identified as being a member of a criminal
gang. (S2) has been in trouble with the law since he was a juvenile. His first arrest, in
1988, was for burglary; in the next eight years he was again arrested for burglary,
shoplifting, disorderly conduct, attempted vehicle theft, curfew violation, and for
prohibited possession of a weapon. A string of domestic violence incidents culminated in
the 2004 arrest of (S2) for KIDNAPPING, aggravated assault with a weapon, and
resisting arrest.

On the day of the incident, the victim, (S2’s) girlfriend, and her one-year-old son
were taken captive by (S2) bound with tape and assaulted while (S2) held a gun on them.
While they were in his custody, (S2) placed limes in the victims’ mouths, which were
held in place by electrical tape, and would beat them with a wooden stick and baseball
bat. In addition, he stabbed his girlfriend with a knife in the thigh. Also during their
captivity, (S2) masturbated to a pornographic magazine. When the police arrived, (S2) released his captives and hid in the attic, later escaping the house and hiding under a vehicle, where he was eventually captured. Officers at the scene used a taser to arrest him. Previous to this incident, (S2) broke the victims’ windshield when he perceived she wasn’t interested in a story he was telling and later disabled her vehicle and took her keys. On one more occasion, he shot at her, saying he would “keep shooting closer until she tells the truth.” In the end, as an investigator, you must discern whether it is remorse for the crime or for being caught. In order for the information from the interview to be helpful to others in the future, it would be important to find out by asking the perpetrator how he thinks his actions have affected others. How does he think the kidnapping episode makes the victim feel? How would he feel if someone kidnapped him? If he expresses empathy, he is probably remorseful about the crime; if he says, “Serves them right,” or “doesn’t bother me,” he is probably remorseful about being caught. In this case, it appears that (S2) was not remorseful and would probably commit such an act again.

(S2) is currently serving time for KIDNAPPING and assisting a criminal syndicate.

(S3) is a white male in his thirties who came from a broken home with his mother leaving at age two. (S3) has one older sister and a step-father who works in construction. (S3) was involved in narcotics as a youth and was molested by adults as a child. (S3) stated that his biological father and sister were bi-polar and both committed suicide when he was a teenager. (S3) stated he has a history of schizophrenia and has taken
Table 6

*Data from Individual Interview with Subject 3: Expressive Motivation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Background</td>
<td>White male, in his thirties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Had one sister that was older than him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mother left him when he was two years old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has a step-father who works in construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mother was a long haul trucker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has a Bachelor’s Degree completed while in prison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fought frequently with others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disciplined by his step-dad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wanted to go into military, but incarcerated for assault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worked construction and sold narcotics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Was married, but separated now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has one girl and one boy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Step-dad was an alcoholic and mother a drug addict (Meth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Was molested by uncle and other men as a child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Became a prostitute at age 14 and used meth and cocaine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biological dad and sister were bi-polar, both committed suicide when he was a teenager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has history of schizophrenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has taken medications since age 14 for schizophrenia and bi-polar disorder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Was kidnapped by a rival gang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other crimes committed include arson, assault, drug items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prior to incarceration in AZ, was in county jail in Nebraska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of captive-taking</td>
<td>Was a teenager when first learned about captive-taking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stated revenge was the motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developed familiarity with controlling captives from previous involvement in captive-taking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has been involved in captive-taking since his teens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Involvement stemmed from family being involved in captive-taking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Best friend’s father introduced him to captive-taking first</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and preparation</td>
<td>States captive-taking was secondary to intent of murder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prepared for captive-taking incident (scouting area, vehicle, materials, clothes, shoes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planning for captive-taking was planned at his house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others were compensated from items stolen at scene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concerned about getting caught, leaving evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Used rental or stolen vehicles to commit crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Used gun, cell phone, car to commit crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guns were provided by friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grew up with guns and hunting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>States cell phones were used to communicate with others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cell phone was primary communication means during episode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Network of friends were the support or back-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other friends arrived to burglarize location prior to episode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary target of group was younger men, no chance of dying of heart attack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Captives were target of opportunity, initially went there to murder individual captive-taking was a secondary purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Most important motive for taking victim was victim arrived at location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stated that taking the captive was accidental pursuant to seeking revenge against the man he wanted to murder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stated that the reasons for taking the captive changed over time, he thought he was in the right home and waited for the intended victim, once realizing he was in wrong home he had to flee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stated that captive taking was opportunistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stated that it was important to maintain control of situation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Execution**

- Took victim while waiting for intended target of murder
- Early morning was the best time, few people, knew victim would have been out partying all night, also people are less violent in morning
- Used friend to get victims address and location
- Stated that drugging the victim was normal
- Surveillance was performed two hours prior to incident
- Entry plan to location was hatched at that time

**Holding**

- Captive was held in the living room of location
- Forceful at first until dominance was established
- Captive restrained in chair with phone cord
- Captive was controlled through physical dominance and restraints
- Provided food and water for victim, asked about medication
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily treatment</td>
<td>Stated food and water was offered numerous times to victim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victim was allowed to use the restroom in private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostage behavior</td>
<td>Stated rules for victim was to comply with instructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stated that they scared victim to gain compliance at first</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victim was elderly, reminded him of his grandmother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event outcome</td>
<td>Left location and victim went to neighbor’s house and contacted the police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Was arrested a few days later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surveillance on neighborhood to see police activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>Watched news and used internet to determine if he was a suspect, contacted parole officer to see if he was wanted by authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitored internet to see if arrest warrant was issued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with authorities</td>
<td>Was arrested by Phoenix police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stated release of victim led to his arrest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Was careful not to leave forensic evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiations and third party intermediaries</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group/organization involvement</td>
<td>Was involved with a drug organization (sales)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Money was the primary motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family received money from drug sales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Was taught how to sell and deliver drugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stated that group depended on money from drug sales</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Situational introspection</strong></td>
<td>Successful captive-taking needed good leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Everything went wrong because of wrong location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Was fearful of captive-taking because of victim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Had second thoughts about captive-taking, but would have still committed the murder of intended victim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nothing worked out as planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Most difficult time was when victim arrived</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor execution of plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Justified incident because of opportunistic situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family maintained contact with him, was remorseful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advice for captives, do what captors say, build rapport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advice for captives, maintain control all the time, trust no one, use a narcotic to incapacitate, shave arms and legs, burn crime scene, not to look like arson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitudes toward government</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

medications since the age of 14. (S3) stated that he had been kidnapped by a rival gang when he was younger and committed many crimes including arson, assault and narcotics violations. (S3) stated that he was a teenager when he first learned about captive-taking and revenge was the primary motivation. (S3) stated that he developed familiarity with controlling captives from previous involvement in captive-taking. (S3) stated that he has been involved in captive-taking ever since those teenage years and it stemmed from his family being involved in captive-taking and his friend’s father initially introducing him to captive-taking from planning to preparation.

On the day of the incident, (S3) went to the location with the intent to murder another male subject. During the ensuing criminal episode, the intended victim was not at the target location because (S3) and his accomplice went to the wrong residence. (S3)
continued to monitor the location and eventually entered the residence through a back
door of the location. During the burglary of the residence, an elderly lady arrived at the
same location and (S3) was forced to take her captive. The captive-taking lasted almost
six hours to determine what to do next until (S3) departed location. (S3) was later
identified by the victim as the captive-taker/assailant and was arrested. In the end,
regarding this case, you must discern whether it is remorse for the crime or for being
captured. In order for the information from this interview to be helpful to others in the
future, it would be important to find out by asking the perpetrator how he thinks his
actions have affected others. How does he think the kidnapping episode makes the victim
feel? How would he feel if someone kidnapped him or his mother or grandmother? If he
expresses empathy, he is probably remorseful about the crime; if he says, “Serves them
right,” or “doesn’t bother me,” he is probably remorseful about being caught. In this case,
it appears that (S3) was truly remorseful and would never commit such an act again.
(S3) is currently incarcerated for KIDNAPPING.

(S4) was a Hispanic male in his forties who came from a single parent household
(parents were divorced when he was eight) and has a history of child abuse, domestic
abuse, drug abuse, molestation and suicidal ideation. (S4) has minimal education and did
not complete high school, although he eventually received his GED in prison. (S4) stated
that his family was involved in narcotics sales when he was young. (S4) stated that he
worked as a laborer and other odd jobs. (S4) stated that he initially went to prison for
attempted kidnapping and had been involved in kidnapping prior to the incident for
which he was incarcerated that being bank robbery. (S4) was involved in other crimes to
Table 7

*Data from Individual Interview with Subject 4: Instrumental, Mercenary, and Economic Motivation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Background                   | Hispanic male, 40 years of age  
Has two siblings both older  
Abused as a child (spanked with cords and branches)  
Parents got divorced at age eight, dad was a mechanic and mother worked odd jobs  
Was molested at age seven by mother’s boyfriend, tried to overcompensate for that with violence later on in life  
Was involved in gangs  
Dropped out of high school, got GED in prison  
Abused alcohol, heroin, cocaine and marijuana as a teenager  
Family sold drugs from home/history of drug sales in family  
Tried to overdose six times in his life  
Worked as a landscaper, dishwasher, and janitor  
Has four children  
Initially went to prison for attempted kidnapping / sexual assault  
In prison now for bank robbery  
Raped his spouse prior to prison  
Has history of molestation in family  
Joined Mexican Mafia in prison |
| Perceptions of captive-taking | N/A                                                                                                                                         |
| Planning and preparation     | N/A                                                                                                                                         |
| Execution                    | Attempted kidnapping                                                                                                                        |
| Holding                      | N/A                                                                                                                                         |
| Daily treatment              | N/A                                                                                                                                         |
| Hostage behavior             | N/A                                                                                                                                         |
| Event outcome                | Charged with sexual assault instead of kidnapping charge                                                                                   |
| Media                        | N/A                                                                                                                                         |
Table 7 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with authorities</td>
<td>Arrested for the attempted kidnapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiations and third party intermediaries</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group/organization involvement</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational introspection</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes toward government</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8

_Data from Individual Interview with Subject 5: Instrumental, Accidental, and Secondary Motivation_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Background</td>
<td>White male, 46 years of age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has two siblings both older</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has seven siblings, one younger sister drowned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parents got divorced at age nine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Had a step-father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Was involved in gangs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dropped out of high school, got GED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abused alcohol, marijuana, cocaine, methamphetamine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History of alcohol abuse in family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History of child abuse, molestation by father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wanted to enter the military, never could</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worked in sheet metal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has two children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Went to prison for kidnapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Believed in Christianity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Separated from wife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Had juvenile criminal history</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has anxiety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of captive-taking</td>
<td>Never wanted to be involved in captive-taking, believes it is wrong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and preparation</td>
<td>Was attempting to escape from rival drug dealers and looked for a means to effect that escape when (S5) came across victims home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Execution</td>
<td>Kidnapping of residents of a home to assist in his escape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holding</td>
<td>Held victims in a bathroom within a home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily treatment</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostage behavior</td>
<td>Utilized weapon (pistol) to make victims compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event outcome</td>
<td>Was unable to escape situation and surrendered to police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with authorities</td>
<td>Arrested for the kidnapping of four individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiations and third party intermediaries</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group/organization involvement</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational introspection</td>
<td>Would have never become hooked on drugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes toward government</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
include sexual assault. (S4) stated that he was involved in gang activity prior to the captive-taking event and eventually joined a prison gang. No further information was attained on (S4) who terminated the interview. (S4) is currently incarcerated for KIDNAPPING.

(S5) background indicated being abused by his father, his sister drowned when (S5) was five years of age. (S5) was married by common-law and separated. (S5) indicated that he had two children and had a history of domestic violence between him and his wife. (S5) has a history of depression since childhood, was hospitalized for hyperactivity as a child and first attempted suicide at age 17. (S5) has made two additional attempts on his life to escape his depression. (S5) has some indication of memory loss from the past drug abuse. (S5) showed from recent testing, a reading ability at the sixth grade level and had been taking prescription medication for depression. (S5) began drinking at age 13, with periods of heavy consumption with daily use of marijuana as a teenager and cocaine and methamphetamine use. (S5) reported experimental use of heroin and valium. (S5) had a prior occupation as a sheet metal installer as employment. (S5) is currently serving time for kidnapping, theft, aggravated assault, burglary, drug violations, armed robbery and escape. (S5) had previous offenses as a juvenile included arson. (S5) prisoner conduct prior to the interview showed a history of disciplinary infractions including disobeying orders, group conspiracy, drug possession, disrespect, bartering, disorderly conduct, escape, staged obstruction and threatening harm.

On the day of the incident, (S5) was involved in a narcotics transaction that went bad. (S5) and an accomplice went to a location to purchase narcotics from some
individuals that they had known only briefly. (S5) and his associate (driver) arrived at the location. As soon as (S5) and the driver stopped, the two suspects started coming toward their vehicle. The driver got out to meet them and immediately was accosted by the two men. One of the men grabbed the driver from behind and slit his throat with the driver falling to the ground. (S5) immediately got out of the vehicle and started running away as fast as he could. (S5) ran to a nearby neighborhood and attempted to enter a dwelling but was run off by several people living there. At that point, (S5) was paranoid and desperate to find a way out of that area not knowing if the individuals were still after him. (S5) came upon an open garage door of another house that had a vehicle parked inside. (S5) attempted to get in and start the vehicle, but to no avail. At that same moment, a resident of the home was walking with groceries from the kitchen and observed (S5). The resident ran back into the home and upstairs to the bathroom. As (S5) entered the home attempting to stop the resident, three other family members came into the kitchen area to see what was going on. (S5) took them captive by brandishing his pistol and moving them all to an upstairs room. (S5) demanded the keys to the vehicle that was in the garage. (S5) ran back downstairs to the garage to leave with the vehicle, but was unable to start the vehicle. (S5) ran back upstairs to the group he had held captive to ask how to start the vehicle and they told him to press the “clutch” twice. (S5) went back downstairs to the garage and observed two police officers at the entrance to the garage. (S5) ran back into the house and back to the upstairs bathroom where the captives had remained. At that point, a standoff ensued for about an hour. During that time, (S5) could see the police
outside the door who were telling him to come out with his hands up and to let the captives go.

Eventually (S5) released the captives and came out of the bathroom and was arrested. (S5) states that he never intended to take anyone captive and that he was high on narcotics and was not thinking straight. (S5) states that he regrets what transpired and blamed the episode on his search for narcotics and the need to get high. (S5) found out later that his friend had died from the initial confrontation and attack earlier in the day, which has bothered him to this day. (S5) states that his main motivation for taking the captives was to elude the authorities which was an “instrumental motivation” secondary to the main purpose of the crime. In the final summation of this incident, (S5) was very remorseful during and after the kidnapping. In this case, (S5) was caught in a bad situation of drug addiction, which in the end, clouded his judgment and actions. It appears that (S6) was truly remorseful not for being caught, but for putting himself in that inescapable predicament of needing narcotics which ultimately lead to the crime for which he was arrested, charged, convicted and incarcerated for. (S5) is currently incarcerated for KIDNAPPING.

On the day of the incident, (S6) was returning from an early morning shift as a security manager at a local department store in the greater Phoenix area. When (S6) arrived at his apartment he noticed that his wife was not at the location. (S6) attempted to locate her by walking throughout the apartment complex. After a few minutes of walking, (S6) heard some laughter coming from another apartment. As (S6) got close to the apartment he heard two individuals talking, one was a male voice and the other was his
### Table 9

*Data from Individual Interview with Subject 6: Instrumental, Expressive, Vendetta, and Revenge Motivation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Background</strong></td>
<td>White male, 52 years of age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has two siblings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physically and emotionally abused as a child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parents still married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Domestic violence in family growing up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Was involved in gangs as a youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has two grown children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Had history of mood/anxiety problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grew up in a difficult neighborhood in Baltimore, MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worked as a dock manager for a large department store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prior criminal history (manslaughter) adjudicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prior medical problems (bi-polar, multiple personality disorder)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Went to prison for kidnapping and murder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceptions of captive-taking</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning and preparation</strong></td>
<td>None, went looking for wife, found wife and male victim together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Execution</strong></td>
<td>Captive-taking and murder occurred at same location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Holding</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily treatment</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hostage behavior</strong></td>
<td>Stated hostages at department store were compliant because of weapon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Event outcome</strong></td>
<td>Released captives slowly and eventually surrendered to police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Media</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interaction with authorities</strong></td>
<td>Arrested for the murder of two individuals and kidnapping of five</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negotiations and third party intermediaries</td>
<td>Negotiated with police on the phone during the captive-taking event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group/organization involvement</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational introspection</td>
<td>Thinks of event often, blames others for the situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes toward government</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10

*Data from Individual Interview with Subject 7: Instrumental, Vendetta, and Revenge Motivation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Hispanic male, 31 years of age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has two siblings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has two step-siblings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parents got divorced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suspended for fighting in school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Was involved in gangs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dropped out of high school, got GED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abused alcohol, narcotics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sexually abused as a child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History of drug use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manager of a restaurant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worked odd jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Currently has four children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has history of bi-polar disorder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prior criminal history and gang membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Had been kidnapped as a youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Went to prison for murder/kidnapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of captive-taking</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning and preparation</td>
<td>Received orders over phone to take victim to undisclosed location to murder her, accomplices were involved in criminal episode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Execution</td>
<td>Kidnapping and murder with accomplices, two vehicles involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holding</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily treatment</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostage behavior</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event outcome</td>
<td>Drove victim to location of murder, assisted in the control of victim (tied hands), fled state and was eventually arrested by police for kidnapping and murder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>Local news cast of murder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with authorities</td>
<td>Arrested for the kidnapping and murder returned to state in which it occurred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiations and third party intermediaries</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group/organization involvement</td>
<td>Was involved with the Mexican Mafia, who ordered the Kidnapping and murder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational introspection</td>
<td>Regrets his actions and thinks of it all the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes toward government</td>
<td>Was indifferent towards government</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

wife’s. At that point, (S6) knocked on the door and the male answered the door. As the door opened, (S6) observed his wife sitting on the couch in the living room. An argument ensued between (S6) and the male subject to the point where (S6) pulled a gun from his
waistband and shot the male subject once. (S6) then ordered his wife to her knees while he was yelling at her. (S6)’s wife was begging for her life at that point, but to no avail, (S6) shot her once in the head. Both victims died at the scene. (S6) departed the crime scene and went back to his place of employment to attend a managers meeting. Upon arrival, (S6) calmly sat down with the other managers as the meeting started. At that point, unbeknownst to the rest of the managers at the meeting, (S6) was wanted by the police for the double murder. A short while later, the police located (S6) at the department store and called the office phone looking for him. At that point, (S6) took all five managers in the room hostage. (S6) focused on one of the female hostages as a reason that his late wife ended up in an affair. Eventually all hostages were released except for the female hostage. After several hours of negotiating, (S6) released the last remaining hostage and turned himself over to police. In the final summation of this incident, (S6) stated he had no memory of the incident and expressed some remorse at the loss of his wife only after committing the kidnapping, murder and being caught. In order for the information from the interview to be helpful to others in the future, it would be important to find out information by asking the perpetrator how he thinks his actions have affected others. In this case, we will never know how the first two victims were affected since they were murdered. Only the subsequent five kidnapping victims can answer that question. It appears that (S6) had no remorse and claimed to have no memory of the incident. (S6) is currently incarcerated for KIDNAPPING and murder.

On the day of the incident, (S7) was a documented member of the “Mexican Mafia” prior to the incident in question. (S7) had been dating the victim prior to the
murder. (S7) was informed by higher ranking members of the “Mexican Mafia” that his girlfriend (victim) was skimming money from narcotics proceeds that was intended to go to the organization. (S7) was ordered to kill his girlfriend and dispose of the body. On the day of the murder, (S7) went to the victim's apartment to meet with her about another individual. The victim told (S7) that she could take (S7) to this individual and introduce them. At that point, (S7), the victim and three other accomplices got into a vehicle driven by (S7) and proceeded to the home of the victim’s friend. While on route, (S7) was told by one of the accomplices to pull into a vacant field and stop the car. The one accomplice received a phone call from a higher ranking member of the Mexican Mafia to “take out” the victim. (S7) stated he exited the vehicle and pulled the victim out by her hair and used “zip-ties” to bind her hands. The victim became hysterical and started begging for her life. One of the accomplices who had been in the back seat of the vehicle got out of the vehicle and told the victim to go to the rear of the vehicle. The victim was told to get on her knees where the accomplice proceeded to shot her in the head. At that point, the shooter was told by another accomplice to “hit her again” and the victim was shot once more in the head. (S7) and the accomplices got back into the vehicle and fled the scene. The victim’s body was found the next morning still bound and lying in the field. (S7) fled the area and was located in another state. In the final summation of this incident, (S7) may have expressed remorse only after committing the captive-taking and assault and after being caught. As an investigator, you must discern whether it is remorse for the crime or for being caught. In order for the information from the interview to be helpful to others in the future, it would be important to find out by asking the perpetrator how he
Table 11

*Data from Individual Interview with Subject 8: Expressive, Vendetta, and Revenge Motivation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Background                    | Native American male, 26 years of age  
Has four siblings  
Abused as a child  
Parents got divorced  
Suspended in high school  
Was involved in gangs  
Dropped out of high school, got GED  
Abused alcohol  
History of drugs and alcohol in family  
Worked at fast food restaurant  
Has no children  
Criminal history (underage drinking) and prior jail terms  
Went to prison for kidnapping and assault |
| Perceptions of captive-taking | N/A                                                                                                                                          |
| Planning and preparation      | N/A                                                                                                                                          |
| Execution                     | Kidnapped, held victims at location and assaulted them with weapon                                                                      |
| Holding                       | Held victims at location during incident until he fled                                                                                   |
| Daily treatment               | N/A                                                                                                                                          |
| Hostage behavior              | Stated they were compliant because of his weapon and threats                                                                             |
| Event outcome                 | N/A                                                                                                                                          |
| Media                         | N/A                                                                                                                                          |
| Interaction with authorities  | Arrested for the kidnapping and assault of the two individuals after being in hiding for several hours at a park                          |
Table 11 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negotiations and third party</td>
<td>Would have never become involved in an argument or fight if it were not for being under the influence. (S8) states he never wanted or expected to be put in a situation where trouble was possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intermediaries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group/organization involvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational introspection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes toward government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

thinks his actions have affected others. In this case, we will never know how the victim was affected since they were murdered. It appears that (S7) was only remorseful about being caught. (S7) is currently incarcerated for KIDNAPPING and murder.

On the day of the incident, (S8) was invited to a house party in his local area in which he lived. When he arrived there were roughly nine to twelve individuals at the party. After a little while, (S8) became embroiled in an argument with two other individuals. (S8) stated that everyone was intoxicated to some degree. Subsequently, words were exchanged when one of the two males pushed (S8) and another pulled a knife out and was threatening (S8). At that point a scuffle ensued in which (S8) was able to retrieve the knife from the one individual and proceeded to use that knife to cut both males several times. (S8) told the two males to sit on a couch and not move while he determined what to do at that point. (S8) stated the two subjects were being held there against their will. (S8) stated he did not know what to do at that point and was just buying
time. Other individuals at the party tried stopping the altercation including the owner of the apartment, but to no avail. (S8) eventually decided to leave the location and warned the two males not to leave or call the police. (S8) ran to a park not far from the crime scene and was eventually apprehended by the police. (S8) stated that he only held the two males against their will to determine how to get out of this predicament. (S8) stated that he was not in his right mind because he had been drinking prior to the party at his acquaintances apartment. (S8) stated that he did not want to have any problems at the party, but was responding to the continued verbal taunts from the two individuals at the party. (S8) felt he was slighted personally at the party and that he was being picked on because of his heritage and culture. (S8) stated that once he was apprehended by the police, he admitted to the incident and was arrested and charged.

In the final summation of this incident, (S8) expressed remorse during and after committing the kidnapping and assault. In the end, as an investigator, you must discern whether it is remorse for the crime or for being caught. In order for the information from the interview to be helpful to others in the future, it would be important to find out by asking the perpetrator how he thinks his actions have affected others. How does he think the kidnapping episode makes the victim feel? How would he feel if someone kidnapped him? If he expresses empathy, he is probably remorseful about the crime; if he says, “Serves them right,” or “doesn’t bother me,” he is probably remorseful about being caught. In this case, it appears that (S8) was truly remorseful and would never commit such an act again.

(S8) is currently incarcerated for KIDNAPPING.
CHAPTER V
GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

Findings and Implications of the Study

In the end, this research study and the data garnered from it will eventually assist law enforcement agencies in developing strategies for the overall prevention of future captive-taking situations, solving current captive-taking cases, understanding why captive-taking occurs, educating and training first responders involved in captive-taking situations. It is clear that law enforcement has a need of such intelligence, understanding and assistance so they can respond and effectively combat the growing threat of captive-taking both internationally and domestically. The interview development assessment process began with creating questions then evaluating the protocol questionnaires, pilot study and the subsequent data evaluation that followed. Utilizing the hypotheses, primary and secondary data analysis, all the information was evaluated, documented and interpreted. The research question: Why do individuals take captives? was the reason and basis for this dissertation and motivation for eventual evaluation of data from the interviews of captive-takers.

Throughout the case studies of each individual involved in the interviews, some of the following hypotheses stood out more than others. First was H1, captives were taken for instrumental reasons and were held for leverage against a third party. H1a, captives were taken for mercenary/economic reasons and held for leverage against a third party. H1b, captives were taken for vendetta or revenge reasons and held for leverage against a third party. H1c, captives were taken for political or ideological reasons and
held for leverage against a third party. H1d, captives were taken for *expressive* reasons (e.g. kidnapping) and held as an object of distaste with the intent to avoid third parties. Finally, H1e, captives were taken for *accidental or secondary* reasons and held for leverage against a third party or to prevent capture.

More importantly, the captive-takers varied widely in their backgrounds, motives, characteristics, and behaviors, but finding consistencies among offenders was achieved across all types and paradigms. As evidenced during the pilot project and second round of interviews of incarcerated captive-takers, they “generally come from dysfunctional backgrounds, involving the loss of a parent which accounted for (one-quarter of offenders), legal issues including juvenile court convictions (one-third of offenders)” (Lewis 2009, 5). Moreover, narcotics involvement, robbery, organized crime (gangs), abusive parents, assault and murder seemed to be a common theme with the interviewed subjects.

Moreover, personality dynamics of the captive-takers showed signs of social problems to include lack of empathy, narcissism, self-centered and self-absorbed personalities, low self-esteem, and a lack of value placed on human life (Post 1987 as found in Goddard and Stanley 1994). Prior criminal backgrounds, specifically kidnapping and assault were prevalent. Because the type of captive-taking incident (kidnapping, hostage-taking etc.) is largely predictive of perpetrators success in the incidents, investigators have suggested that government authorities should attempt to protect specific kidnap targets. It appears, with regard to the southwest border region, that most known kidnapping cases were domestic rather than foreign, where hostages are usually
captured in their own countries as opposed to foreign nations (Yun 2007). Most kidnapping is committed by relatives, but stranger abductions receive more media attention. Internationally, because of the sensational nature of the events like terrorism, many victims are unrelated to the captive-takers cause; the target for the act is actually the audience or public witnessing the violence of the attack (Soskis and Van Zandt 1986). Sensationalism and hyper-media attention is the overall goal; they need an audience for their cause. In the end, being aware of your surroundings (international or domestic) is critical. Understanding what happens once you become a captive is even more important.

From the research, it appears that there are many commonalities among captive-takers (demographics, upbringing, family structure, sexual abuse, substance abuse, crime, gangs etc). Expressive motivations have been identified as majority motivation of interviewed captive-takers. Additionally, it was apparent that the captive-taking event at times was secondary to the initial crime against person or crime against property. After grouping and categorizing each subject and their responses, it is clear that each subject in the case studies had dysfunctional childhoods to include molestation, drug use, crime involvement, financial problems, dropping out of school, physical abuse, gangs, and no supervision by parents. Each subject came from a single parent household with the mother being the caretaker and the step-father the male influence. Every subject had limited education and low socio-economic means, had dropped out of school, incurred physical and sexual abuse and had a pattern of anti-social behavior, violence and psychological problems.
Again, with regard to the captive-taking event, it was more often than not, secondary to the primary purpose, reason or motivation of the perpetrators, that being assault, murder, theft, burglary, sexual assault, drugs, and money. As for the victims, they were treated well for the most part and there was constant communication with the captive-taker which was good for the victim. To this end, it made the victim appear human, having worth or value in the eyes of the captive-taker (in one case, the victim reminded the captive-taker of his grandmother). It seems that communication with their captive-taker was essential in not being harmed. The captive-takers always tied-up their victims and kept them within view. At times, there was a threat of violence, but once the victim engaged the captive-taker in conversation, it was minimized. Communicating with the captive-takers humanized the victims and made it less likely they were going to be harmed. Interestingly, most of the captive-takings happened during the day when there would be the highest chance of being caught, which seemed counterintuitive.

The following are the main implications of the study regarding several key areas that were identified as being critical to the prevention of captive-taking.

*Finding 1*

Regarding the motivation model with its dichotomous categories of “Instrumental” and “Expressive” motivations was a benefit in helping understand overall perpetrator motivations with one caveat. During the interviews, it was determined that further explanation of these concepts was needed. “Instrumental” motivation has been determined to be *cognitive* in nature, thought out and even *premeditated*. The perpetrator has thought about what they were doing and made plans or organized their full act to
fruition. Conversely, “Expressive” motivation centered on emotion and is reactive in nature based on revenge or vendetta reasons.

Finding 2

During the interviews while utilizing the protocol questionnaires and subsequent examination of case studies, most subjects fell into either “instrumental” or “expressive” motivation categories. However, there were a couple of subjects that fell under both categories. These were identified and/or labeled “Transitory” cases, in that during the subject’s criminal episode they went through both domains of the motivation paradigm.

Finding 3

Utilizing the PMRD (P. 58) as an interview tool was found to be extremely beneficial as a means to gain information or intelligence for research purposes in an orderly and organized manner. Each PMRD category was developed to extract every nuance, thought, or motivation of the perpetrator that occurred in their captive-taking event and/or criminal episode.

Finding 4

During the interviews of the perpetrators and subsequent case studies, it became apparent that there were similarities or commonalities with regard to captive-takers dysfunctional backgrounds. Most, if not all of the subjects came from broken homes, were physically, sexually, and emotionally abused. Most were involved with drugs, gangs, had limited education, dropped out of school, had prior criminal histories, divorced and worked manual labor jobs. There was evidence of mental, emotional or personality disorders.
Finding 5

Most subjects were taking some form of anti-depressant or anti-psychotic medication prior to and after the captive-taking episode. Behavioral medications were prevalent within their medical histories and during incarceration.

Finding 6

It was interesting to note that several of the perpetrators stated that the attitude of the victims, sex and age during the captive-taking episode made all the difference on how the captives were treated. The interview subjects stated that when the captives were compliant they were treated less harshly. The sex of the captives affected or altered the way they were treated by the captive-takers. According to a majority of the captive-takers, being female lessened the chances of physical injury. [Note: This did not exclude a sexual assault motivation]. The age (mainly elderly) of the victim appeared to be a universal factor in being treated better or even released.

Finding 7

Captive-takers stated that they had been exposed to captive-taking prior to the chargeable offense for which they had been incarcerated through gang affiliation and other kidnapping incidents. To identify possible perpetrators or captive-takers prior to a captive-taking scenario, a database could be generated in conjunction with criminal history databases that specifically target captive-takers by juvenile records, narcotic databases, kidnapping offenses, domestic assault, and sexual assault crimes. This repository of information could be in the form similar to that of a sex offender registry.
Finding 8

Motivations can change during a captive-taking scenario. This was identified from the interviews of the subjects during the case studies and research conducted for this dissertation. A subsequent third motivation was identified after the protocols were disseminated. The finding was in addition to the existing “Instrumental” and “Expressive” motivations within the motivation paradigm. The new “Transitory” motivation stems from a change of motivation along the motivation paradigm during the same captive-taking criminal episode.

Finding 9

It was apparent that learning, understanding training methods, adjusting response and inculcating stakeholders on the latest captive-taking research is an ongoing, needed and growing body of knowledge. As law enforcement, academics, psychologists, military and private business entities, it is vital that we continue to learn from the captive-taking perpetrators to prevent it as best possible in the future.

Finding 10

Specific learning points from the interviews that were not known prior or readily understood included knowing your surroundings, being hypervigilant, lessening the appearance of wealth when traveling, getting kidnapping insurance, GPS “chips” for your cell phone (turtle application), personal locating beacons or getting acquainted or familiar with your local law enforcement agencies, self-defense training, personally owned protective devices, geographical familiarity of the area, creating escape plans,
hypervigilence, and understanding captive-taker motivations with the overall intent of reducing your chance of becoming a victim.

Training

Predictive analytics, (knowing type of captive-takers, methods, tactics, techniques, procedures) and utilizing electronic GPS devices to monitor an individual’s location are important if they are in a high risk area. Also, formal training like Survival, Escape, Resistance, Evasion (SERE) training, SURVIVAL training from the U.S. military and familiarity of region to assist in escape. Knowing your location or whereabouts at all times, recognizing locations, alternating driving routes, and knowledge of the closest law enforcement agency. [Note: Reference U.S. Army Survival Manual FM 3-05.70 for more specific survival techniques and training]

Enforcement

Most importantly, communication with authorities like the FBI’s Hostage Response Teams, Rapid Deployment Teams, and information sharing with state and local law enforcement agencies is vital. To that end, electronic monitoring systems, enacting stricter legislation similar to sex offenders requiring the captive-taker to register their permanent location and daily activities is a start. Know and interact with your local law enforcement before anything ever happens.

Prevention

Understanding and utilizing hypervigilance, training, geographical intelligence, knowing your surroundings, and constant counter-surveillance should be standard operating procedure and as part of your everyday life. Captive-taking is a crime of
opportunity for the perpetrator. In many cases, people who are aware of their surroundings and take minimal extra precautions can avoid being a target, just by being aware and understanding the geographical area of travel. More importantly, buying time during a captive-taking event increases the chance of survival and the possibility of switching the captive-taker from an expressive to instrumental mindset in order to communicate logically with them. Let them vent as long as it takes, then get the captive-taker to think about what they are doing.

Understanding why the captive-taker is at a location, how to survive it once it happens, and what to do afterwards. The captive-taker interviews helped in fulfilling this need through the protocol questionnaires. Captive-takers look for targets of opportunity like tourists, foreigners, expatriates and government employees. Once an individual is taken captive, it is vital to have the knowledge of how to survive a captive/hostage ordeal. For one, talking to the captive-taker seemed to be key to keeping them at ease and giving them what they wanted. Learn how to act as hostages (compliant) remaining under the captive-takers radar and leaving clues while at a location like touching everything possible to leave identifying latent fingerprints.

More importantly, once the captive-takers have left, preserve the crime scene, biometrics, evidence and contact authorities if possible. It is vital, to make sure to go to the authorities for help, they are the experts and know how to deal with kidnappers and can track them down especially with your help. The authorities can help get the captive back, the sooner the victim contacts the authorities the better. The victim should keep track of what is transpiring (mentally if possible) like names, clothing/dress, language,
size/build, race, tattoos, scars and other identifying features. Writing down what you remember is critical in recalling as much detail of the perpetrators as possible. Another point in prevention is to be aware of your milieu/location/surroundings, noises, never leaving yourself unprotected. A salient point that came from the interviews is the chances of surviving go up exponentially when the victim engages, communicates or talks to the captive-taker. This will humanize the victim and cause the captive-taker to view the victim as a person rather than an object. In the worst case scenario, this will make it more difficult for the captive-taker to harm or kill the victim. Another training point is to never argue or fight with the captive-taker; this will only make matters worse.

While it is important for the victim to remain passive and non-confrontational, always look for a chance to escape. After the first few hours, the captive-takers may become careless or distracted if the victim shows no signs of trying to escape, this will become the best opportunity to make an escape from the captors. One danger as time goes on would be that captives tend to start seeing their captors in a favorable light and start to bond with them (e.g. Stockholm Syndrome), in-turn; victims need to defend against this at all costs. The longer the captive-taking event goes on, the better chance for survival for the captive. A victim’s chance of survival increases with every passing hour, so try to maintain hope and stay calm. If you are within a group of hostages, it is important to remain with that group if at all possible. Do not stand out or make an easy target or get singled out by the captive-takers. If the situation becomes critical and you know that captive-takers are threatening to harm captives, you should seriously consider escaping the captors and if that is not an option, remain as far from what is going on at all
possible, out of sight, out of mind. Remember that the victim is worth more to the
captive-taker alive than deceased. Buying time is another survival technique in that it
gives the authorities time to locate you.

It is important to remember that a captive-taking situation is at its worst at the
very beginning of the event. Everyone is nervous, jumpy, unsure, hesitant, irrational, and
violence may be used in the beginning, but the victim needs to remain calm and
compliant. Remain passive and cooperative, think clearly and let time pass. Try to
establish some kind of rapport with your captors. Captive-takers can identify and
empathize with family. Stay away from religious or political conversation, and be
interested in what the captive-takers are talking about. As a captive, you are really not
sure how long you will be held, make sure you understand this and to not get despondent.
Try to identify your captor’s routines, speech, habits, entry and exit points, time of day,
sounds, smells and any other identifying feature that can help you. If you are held captive
for indefinite periods of time try to build relations with the captors (develop and anchor
with the captors like sports, music, movies) if possible or devise ways to communicate
with other captives and above all, try to maintain your physical health to stay strong for
that one moment that you may need to fight or escape your captors. Resilience both
mentally and physically is one of the best survival techniques that can help you survive.

Further legislation is needed within this crime category as a way of reducing
captive-taking events. This legislation can be the same as sex offender legislation and as
invasive, requiring the convicted captive-taker to register in a national database for
continual monitoring. Harsher judicial punishments like hate crimes or civil rights
violations, making it a federal crime not just a state crime. Most importantly, better cooperation and communication amongst all law enforcement entities (e.g. federal, state, local, county) including information sharing and utilization of the latest tools like GPS chips, locator applications on phones (e.g. Turtle) or personal alarm systems/locator beacons needed to prevent captive-taking. An increase expansion and response (including reward for information) of the AMBER alert system. If you know that you will be vulnerable because of your work or geographical area, having personal security, kidnapping consultants or personal recovery groups (e.g. Rescue International) available to help you in case there ever becomes a captive-taking situation.

In the end, captive-takers have definitive commonalities in their backgrounds, but most significant is an impaired recognition/indifference of consequences. There is a learned behavior that has developed from adolescence into adulthood, a possible cultural component to this learned behavior with forged intimate social bonds to help explain why they commit these desperate crimes. What this means is that the captive-taker commits the crime because they learned it from others, being in close association with them, or through family, mentors or an authority figures. Captive-takers could have learned their criminal ways due to society and environmental factors. From the interviews it was apparent that every captive-taker felt as if they were “unlucky” in life or had been “screwed” in some fashion. The captive-taker in-turn, sees themselves as the victim.

In the final summation, the main intent of this research project was to assist law enforcement, academia, negotiators, psychologists, military, recovery personnel, businesses, and individuals who are at risk of being a captive and understanding what to
do once they are taken captive. Remember the acronym SURVIVAL created by the United States Army for their personnel who are trained in surviving life threatening situations including captive-taking scenarios. S = sizing up the situation (surroundings, physical condition, equipment), U = use all your senses, undue haste makes waste, R = remember where you are, V = vanquish fear and panic, I = improvise, V = value living, A = act like the natives, L = live by your wits, but learn basic skills, SURVIVAL (U.S. Army 2002). You may never know when you could become a victim, but you have a much better chance of surviving or making it to safety with as much knowledge possible about how captive-takers operate.
APPENDIX

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL QUESTIONNAIRES (INSTRUMENTS)

(Developed by all members of the GHosT-RAP team in accordance with the overall research goal and vision of Dr. Greg Vecchi, founder of GHosT-RAP)

Primary Interviewer Protocol

1. Background

1.1 “Describe growing up with respect to your family.”

1.2 Describe your parents’/guardian’s relationship.

1.3 “Tell me about your parents/guardians occupation(s).”

1.4 “Describe your formal education and performance in school.”

1.5 “Did/do you have any learning disability or ever participate in a special education program?”

1.6 “Tell me about any discipline you received growing up and by whom.”

1.7 “Tell me about any military or law enforcement experience you have including what you did and your rank.”

1.8 “Tell me about your employment before the captive-taking.”

1.9 “Describe your political affiliation.”

1.10 “Tell me about any religion you practice and your involvement in it.”

1.11 “What is your current relationship status?”

1.12 “What was your relationship status at the time of the incident?”

1.13 “Do you have any children?”

1.14 “Is there any history of drug or alcohol abuse in your family (parents/brothers/sisters, etc.)?”

1.15 “Is there any history of domestic violence in your family?”

1.16 “Were you ever witness to physical or sexual violence within your family/home as a child/adolescent?”

1.17 “Growing up, were you physically, sexually, emotionally abused and by whom?”

1.18 “Have you ever used or abused drugs or alcohol and if so did you ever receive any treatment?”
1.19 “Does anyone in your family currently or in the past have any history of medical or psychiatric conditions or problems?”

1.20 “Do you currently or in the past have any history of medical or psychiatric conditions or problems?”

If NO - SKIP to question 1.23:

↓

1.21 “Were you diagnosed and treated for these?”

1.22 “At the time of the last captive-taking, were you taking any prescriptions for a psychiatric condition/problem?”

1.23 “Have you ever been kidnapped?”

1.24 “Have you ever committed a crime?”

If NO, SKIP to section 2.

↓

If YES, continue:

Tell me about them.

2. Perceptions of Captive-Taking

2.1 “When did you first consider becoming involved in captive-taking, how did you learn about captive-taking, and what role did you want?”

2.2 “How long did you have to think about it before becoming involved and was the choice easy and what made it so?”

2.3 “How long have you been involved in actions related to captive-taking?”

2.4 “Was there anyone who influenced your decision to become involved in actions related to captive-taking?”

2.5 “Did you have any concerns about being involved in captive-taking operations?”

3. Planning and Preparation

3.1 “Did you plan before the incident?”

IF NO - SKIP to question 3.3:

↓

IF YES then continue:

3.2 “Tell me about any planning and preparation procedures and if they were documented.”

3.3 “Tell me how long planning took and whether anyalternative plans were made.”

3.4 “Explain the roles of everyone involved in the capture operation.”

Probe: “Who were the abductors and did they use anything to disguise their identity or intentions?”
3.5 “Describe the role any individuals outside the group played and how they were selected and compensated.”

3.6 “Tell me how the abduction site was selected and any factors that were considered.”

3.7 “Explain if the captives were intended to be released and the plans for this. Was there a backup plan?”

3.8 “Did the procedures of law enforcement influence the planning or preparation?”

3.9 “Were there any plans to follow if the victim resisted the capture?”

3.10 “Were group or individual casualties planned for?”

3.11 “What was the plan if the leader was killed or captured?”

3.12 “What was the plan if the wrong person was captured?”

3.13 “How many captives could be handled in one event?”

3.14 “By who and how was approval given to execute the plan?”
   Probe: “Were there any signals during the operation to initiate and to abort?”

3.15 “What equipment would be used for an operation and why was it selected?”

3.16 “What type of equipment did the group have and how was it selected, obtained and used?”

3.17 “What type of weapons was selected/used?”

3.18 “Was body armor used and how was it selected, obtained, and used.”

3.19 “Were you taught by someone how to use the equipment?”

3.20 “Describe the types of communication used within the group during an operation?”

3.21 “What is the ideal captive and what makes a person an attractive or unattractive target?”

3.22 “Tell me how you learned about and selected targets.”
   If applicable, probe: “Was the internet or the media used to gather information?”

3.23 “What was the MOST important factor in choosing a target?”

3.24 “Describe how the nationality, religion, political affiliation, wealth or language influenced their selection as a captive”

3.25 “Explain what if any illegal activity the captive was involved in and how did this involvement influence their selection as a target”

3.26 “Did the captive owe the group/organization money?”
3.27 “Did you know the captive prior to the incident?”

3.28 “Tell me what the reason(s) was for taking the captive(s) and if this changed over time.”

3.29 “Is there any advantage to taking the same person multiple times?”

3.30 “Who gave the approval regarding a captive?”

3.31 “How was it determined where the captive would be held and who would be responsible?”

3.32 “Describe the place/structure where the captive would be held and any precautions taken to insure they would not escape or be detected.”

3.33 “Did you try to obtain anything directly from the captive?”

3.34 “Did you document the operation?”

3.35 “Did you have to follow any standard directions for taking captives and is consistency important?”

3.36 “Do you know about kidnapping insurance?”

4. Execution

4.1 “Tell me about the abduction and capture operation and describe the transportation used and was it modified in any way.”

4.2 “Was there a specific day and / or time of day for the capture operation?”

4.3 “Tell me about any informants or type of deception used to get close to the captive.”

4.4 “Tell me about any surveillance used?”

4.5 “What security measures were used during the operation?”

4.6 “Did you have to dress any particular way?”

4.7 “Were chokepoints used and if so how were they selected?” Note: Define chokepoints

4.8 “Was violence used during the abduction and were non-captives harmed?”

5. Holding

5.1 “Where was the captive(s) held?”

5.2 “Tell me how you communicated with the captives.”
   Probe: “What language was used?”
   “Would they talk to you, what did they say about themselves?”
5.3 “Tell me if there was a concern about the captive escaping and what measures were used to prevent it.”

5.4 “Explain how captives were searched and any use of restraints on them.”
   Probe: If restraints were used, “What type and how were these types determined?”

5.5 “Was the captive(s) moved and what safeguards were used in the transportation?”

5.6 “Discuss whether or not the moves (including number) were predetermined.”
   Probe: include day/time, a set number of times, method, etc.

5.7 “What factors were considered when moving a captive?”

5.8 “Tell me how the captives were controlled.”

5.9 “Were drugs/alcohol used during an incident?”

5.10 “Who guarded the captives?”

5.11 “How were the captives guarded?”

5.12 “Were captives watched by same gender guards and what was the rotation for guards?”

5.13 “Was a captive given to anyone?”

5.14 “Did guards have any rules they had to follow?”
   Probe: Consequences for not following orders?

5.15 “Was discretion used in the treatment of the captive(s)?”

5.16 “Tell me if the captives were threatened and why and when this would occur.”

5.17 “Did the captives ever physically resist?”

5.18 “Explain any attempts to get information from the captive.”

5.19 “Was interrogation used on the captive(s)?”

**If NO – SKIP to question 5.22**

↓ If YES, continue:

5.20 “Tell me about the interrogation of the captives.”

5.21 “Was gender a factor in interrogation?”

5.22 “Tell me when and why physical force would be used on a captive.”
   Probe: make sure description of types and amount of force is given by subject

5.23 “Does the gender of the captive determine the type and amount of punishment?”

5.24 “Were any captives raped?”
5.25 “Was the decision to remove part of a captive(s)’s body ever made?”

If NO – SKIP to question 5.28
↓
If YES, continue:

5.26 “How and why was the decision to remove a captive(s) body part made?”

5.27 “Who would remove the captives body part and explain the procedure used?”

5.28 “During the incident did anyone at the holding site ever consider or attempt suicide?”
   Probe: group/organization members or the hostage

5.29 “Were you prepared to kill the captive(s) if they resisted capture?”

5.30 “Were any captives killed?”

If NO – SKIP to question 5.36
↓
If YES, continue.

5.31 “What would be the circumstances for killing a captive? (resist, demands not met, etc)”

5.32 “Could the captive(s) have done anything to stay alive?”

5.33 “Was there ever a plan to release the captive(s) alive?”

5.34 “Describe how captives would be killed and what would happen to their body?”

5.35 “How did the death of the captive affect you?”

5.36 “Were the threats made public and followed through?”
   Probe: To any non law-enforcement and non government agency

5.37 “Explain if the negotiations influenced the treatment of the captives.”

5.38 “Was there a time limit on how long the captives would be kept before it was determined to be no longer cost effective?”

5.39 “What was the best way of releasing a captive without getting caught?”

6. Daily Treatment

6.1 “Tell us about the living conditions of the captive. How were food handled and what food was provided?”

6.2 “Explain what would be done to keep the captive healthy and what would happen if they became ill and needed medical attention?”

6.3 “Explain any restrictions the captives had including when and how they used the toilet. (often, blindfolded, restrained, cleanup)”
6.4 “Tell me if they could communicate with anyone including amongst themselves. Did interactions amongst themselves influence the situation?”

6.5 “Describe if/when the captives had time for prayer or religious service.”

6.6 “Did the captives take or were they forced to use drugs/alcohol?”

6.7 “What would cause one captive to be treated differently from others?”

7. Hostage Behavior

7.1 “Were there rules of behavior for captive(s)?”

If NO- SKIP to question 7.4
↓

If YES, continue.

7.2 “How did they know of the rules, who decided if the rules were broken and what the consequences would be for breaking them?”

7.3 “Who administers the consequences and what actions by the captives would cause punishment?

7.4 “What did you do in order to obtain the captives’ compliance?”

7.5 “Did the captives ask and receive anything?”

7.6 “What actions by captives would result in positive treatment?”

7.7 “Did you find any of the captive(s) behavior irritating?”

7.8 “Did the captive(s) offer to assist you and what if any services did they offer?”

7.9 “Could the captive(s) have done anything to be less burdensome?”

7.10 “Would you have ever wanted a different captive?”

7.11 “Tell me about any rapport established with the captive and if their gender influenced their treatment.”

7.12 “Did you ever feel any sympathy for the captive?”

7.13 “Tell me if any behavior by the captive made you feel closer to the captive.”

7.14 “Were you ever attracted to any of the captives?”

7.15 “Tell me about any similarities between you and the captive.”

7.16 “Did the captive say or do anything to indicate their opinion of you.”

7.17 “Discuss any attempts to convince the captive of the justness of your actions and how the captive responded to these attempts.”
7.18 “As a result of your interaction with the captives, discuss how this changed your impression of them.”

7.19 “What was the captive(s) opinion of the authorities?”

8. Event Outcome

8.1 “Were the goals achieved by taking the captive(s)?” *(If not already answered above.)*
Probe: Your goals or the group’s goals?

8.2 “Tell me the criteria in deciding to release the captive and who decided this?”

8.3 “Tell me about any exchange of the captive for demands.”
Probe: “Tell me about any ransom received and any captives that were released because the demands were met.”

8.4 “Who was selected to receive the ransom and how were they chosen?”

8.5 “What did you do with the money (ransom)?”

8.6 “Did you ask the captive to do a specific activity after release?”

8.7 “Did you give the captive(s) anything when released? (Cell phone, Directions, etc.)”

8.8 “Did you contact the captive(s) after releasing him or her?”

8.9 “Explain how the incident ended.”

8.10 If DID NOT Surrender – “What would’ve made you give up?”

9. Media

9.1 “Did the media play any role in this event?”

If NO – SKIP to question 9.6
↓ If YES, continue.

9.2 “Were you monitoring the media reports as the incident was occurring?”
Probe: Describe the type of media.

9.3 “Tell me how the media reports affected your actions and did you use them for your benefit?”

9.4 “Did you provide any media reports to the captive or allow them to follow the events?”

If NO – SKIP to question 9.6.
↓ If YES, continue.

9.5 “Was this everything or selected reports/aspects and how did the captive react to this?”
9.6 “Did you use the internet during the operation and how was it utilized?”

10. Interaction with Authorities

Define ‘Authorities’ for subject:
“Authorities” concerns any person or entity with legal ability to disrupt the activities of the captive-taker – i.e. negotiator, investigator, police officer, military, etc.

10.1 “Were there any authorities involved?”

If YES – SKIP to question 10.5
↓ If NO, continue here.

10.2 “Did you think they were aware of the incident?”

10.4 “Tell me if having a child or woman captive would make you feel safer from authorities.”

If Authorities Were Involved, continue here.

10.5 “What authorities were involved?”

10.6 “Were any actions taken to deter or monitor police activities?”

10.7 “Did the procedures of law enforcement influence the execution of the captive-taking?”

10.8 “Was there any action the authorities took that threatened or bothered you as well as anything they did that calmed/assured you?”

10.9 “Describe any fear of the authorities forcibly entering your site or killing you.”

10.10 “Tell me if having a child or woman captive would make you feel safer from authorities.”

10.11 “Describe what tactics worked best to get concessions from the authorities and what could they have done to have been more successful to hinder your operation.”

11. Negotiations and Use of Third Party Intermediaries (TPIs)

11.1 “Did you or your group communicate with someone to achieve demands?”

If YES – SKIP to question 11.3
↓ If NO, continue.

11.2 “How did you let your demands be known?” Then skip to section 12 in there is not a negotiator or TPI

If Communication Was Used, continue here.
11.3 “Tell me about the negotiation process.”

If not part of a group, skip to question 11.5
If part of the group continue:
11.4 “Tell me who was used to communicate (be the spokesperson) for the group for the captives release?”

11.5 “Tell me about the communication process.”

11.6 “How was the specific time to make contact chosen?”

11.7 “Did you provide proof of possession or proof of life?”

11.8 “Tell me about any concerns for messages being accurate and what did you do to insure their accuracy?”

11.9 “Was there any criteria to determine if a communication was received and successful.”

11.10 “To what extent were your demands negotiable?”

11.11 “Describe what you did to get the third party to meet the demands.”

11.12 “What was your opinion of the negotiator or TPI?”

11.13 “Did the negotiator listen to your side and understand your perspective?”

11.14 “Tell me your impression of the negotiator?”

11.15 “Did you trust the negotiator, why or why not?”

11.16 “Describe any surveillance used during the negotiation process.”

11.17 “Describe any circumstances when you would use intimidation or harm towards anyone during negotiations.”

11.18 “Did you have any involvement with the captive’s family?”

If NO, SKIP to section 12.

↓ If YES, continue.

11.19 “Do you remember any behavior by the captive(s)’s family?”

11.20 “Did the captive’s family ever change your perception of the captive?”

12. Group/Organization Involvement

**Define “organization” to the subject:**
A criminal organization (gang, group) is a social arrangement which pursues collective goals, controls its own performance, and has a boundary separating it from its environment pulling together to commit an illegal activity.

**Define “gang” to the subject:**
A gang is a group of three or more people who, through the organization, formation, and establishment of an assemblage, share a common identity. In current usage it typically denotes a criminal organization or else a criminal affiliation.
12.1 “Have you ever been involved with any gang, group, or organization related to or involved in captive-taking?”

**GO TO NEXT SECTION IF NOT INVOLVED WITH ANY GROUP, GANG, OR ORGANIZATION**

If Involved with a Group/Organization, continue here.
12.2 “Tell me how and why you got involved with this group.”

12.3 “How was the group structured and how would they describe themselves at the time of the captive-taking?”

12.4 “Tell me about the leadership in the group.”

**REPEAT QUESTIONS FOR EACH LEADER**
(If Interviewee is the Leader, modify questions to appropriate ‘You’ format:)
(Have the subject identify each leader’s characteristics)

**LEADER 1:**
12.5 “What concerns did the leader have?”

12.6 “What did you like and dislike about this leader?”

12.7 “How did this leader respond when the operation went well and when it did not go as planned?”

12.8 “What would make this leader angry and how would the person respond to this anger?”

**LEADER 2:**
12.9 “What concerns did the leader have?”

12.10 “What did you like and dislike about this leader?”

12.11 “How did this leader respond when the operation went well and when it did not go as planned?”

12.12 “What would make this leader angry and how would the person respond to this anger?”

**LEADER 3:**
12.13 “What concerns did the leader have?”

12.14 “What did you like and dislike about this leader?”

12.15 “How did this leader respond when the operation went well and when it did not go as planned?”

12.16 “What would make this leader angry and how would the person respond to this anger?”

12.17 “What was your position and rank in the group?”

12.18 “If there was a spokesperson for the group how was this person selected?”
12.19 “Tell me how decisions were made in the organization and how orders were given out.”
12.20 “What would happen if you would not follow through with your assigned duties?”
12.21 “Were you loyal to anyone inside or outside of the group/organization?”
12.22 “How did captive-taking help the group achieve its goal?”
12.23 “Was there any sponsorship and, if so, who and what did they sponsor?”
12.24 “Describe how the group recruits new members.”
12.25 “Tell me about the appeal, benefits and any disadvantages about joining or being involved with a group/organization.”
12.26 “Did you or your family receive money or other benefits for being a member of the group?”
12.27 “Describe how the other members were paid and did their role/rank in the group affect their compensation?”
12.28 “After you joined the group/organization describe the training you were given where at and by whom.”
12.29 “Did you, were you required to, and how did you recruit new members?
12.30 “When you joined the group did you know you would be involved in captive-taking and how long this would occur?”
12.31 “Did you have any friends or relatives in the group and if so explain how you knew or were related to them and what role did your relatives play in the group?”
12.32 “Have you ever kidnapped any members of your own group?”
12.33 “Were there any problems in the group and was there disagreement?”
12.34 “Concerning the group, what was the largest concern, the largest threat and their greatest weakness?”
12.35 “Were there any concerns about the group?”
12.36 “Did you have any concerns about the operation that were different from the group’s concerns?”
12.37 “Did the structure of the group ever change during a captive-taking?”
12.38 “Was there any group you modeled your procedures after?”
12.39 “Was there another group that your group reported to or worked for?”
12.40 “Tell me if you met or associated with other groups/organizations?”
12.41 “Did any group, person, or factor have influence over the group?”
    Probe: who and what influence?

12.42 “Did the group depend upon anything (financial/political, etc. support)?”

12.43 “Did the group have any involvement with any foreign governments or law enforcement?”

12.44 “Tell me about any infiltration of the government or law enforcement.”

12.45 “Was the group trying to influence any entity (government, public, military, etc) and what method of communication would they use?”

12.46 “Describe the groups’ relationship with surrounding governments and surrounding authorities and authorities where it operated.”

12.47 “What other methods than captive-taking were used to influence these?”

12.48 “What did the group do well and what did it not do well?”

12.49 “Describe how you and the group would blend into society.
    Probe: How would you be identified as associated with the group?”

13. Situational Introspection

13.1 “What roles are needed for a successful captive-taking operation?”

13.2 “Is captive-taking an effective way to achieve demands?”

13.3 “What were your thoughts or opinions about being involved in a captive-taking operation(s)?”

13.4 “Explain your expected benefits from a successful capture and the actual benefits from one.”

13.5 “How long did you think the incident would last and how long were you prepared for it to?”

13.6 “Tell me if the operation went as planned or what aspects did not go as planned?”
    Probe: address strengths and weaknesses of the operation

13.7 “Looking back what would you have done differently or to do it all over what would be changed?”

13.8 “Describe any effect the incident had upon you during the incident.”
    Probe: “Tell me about any fear you experienced and what you did to deal with this and were you able to relax or let your guard down?”

13.9 “Did the amount of time involved affect your outlook on this?”
13.10 “How did the incident affect your ability to sleep and were you affected by any lack of sleep?”

13.11 “Did you ever have second thoughts or think it would not work out?”

13.12 “During the incident, describe the most difficult/frustrating time and the most exciting/rewarding time.”

13.13 “Describe your satisfaction with your actions and justification of them.”

13.14 “Of the significant people in your life what was their opinion about captive-taking and you being involved?”

13.15 “What would you say to them about you being involved in captive-taking?”

13.16 “Were you worried your family would be taken captive?”

13.17 “How did the timeframe involved effect the captive’s treatment?”

13.18 “Tell me your opinion about the captive(s).”

13.19 “What is your opinion now about the incident and what would you say to the family of the captive?”

13.20 “What advice would you offer to a captive in a similar situation?”

13.21 “What would have dissuaded you from participating in captive-taking operations?”

13.22 “What advice would you give others who plan to take captives?”

13.23 “Is there anything else you would like to say about the incident?”

14. Attitudes Toward Government

14.1 “What type of government and country is most likely to pay ransom?”

14.2 “What are your thoughts about the U.S.?”

14.3 “What is the United States’ policy towards captive-taking and who responds to the captive-taking?”

14.4 “Would the United States meet the demands for a safe return of a captive?”

14.5 “What would you say to the U.S. Government or the U.S. people?”
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