Public enemies: A demographic analysis of federal fugitive wanted posters

by

Joseph Mark Calvert

A thesis submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
Auburn University
in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts

Auburn, Alabama
August 4, 2012

Keywords: wanted posters, fugitive, labeling, FBI, USMS, differential association theory

Approved by

Gregory Kowalski, Chair, Department of Sociology, Anthropology, and Social Work
Greg S. Weaver, Department of Sociology, Anthropology, and Social Work
Raj P. Mohan, Department of Sociology, Anthropology, and Social Work

Abstract

The primary purpose of this study is a determination of whether fugitives that comprise most wanted fugitive lists differ from those that make up wanted fugitive lists. Specifically, do federal law enforcement agencies adhere to the criteria set forth by them when adding offenders to most wanted lists? To address this question, an empirical analysis was performed using data retrieved from wanted posters published by the United States Marshal Service and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. According to law enforcement agencies, most wanted fugitives typically have histories of violence, extensive criminal records, pose a great risk to public safety, and are likely to be captured due to publicity gained from a most wanted status. The results confirmed this claim indicating that a significantly greater percentage of most wanted fugitives were charged with murder, were charged with more than one offense, had a higher mean number of charges, were considered armed, were affiliated with a street gang, employed multiple aliases, had a higher mean number of aliases, used false dates of birth, and were in the United States than wanted fugitives. Additionally, a binary logistic regression revealed that being considered armed and being born in the United Sates were both significantly positively correlated with placement on a most wanted list.

The secondary purpose of this study is a determination of whether federal fugitives differ from the population of federal arrestees with regard to crime type, race, and sex. To achieve this objective, an analysis was performed using data retrieved from wanted posters published by the United States Marshal Service and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The results indicate that

a greater percentage of the fugitive sample was charged with eight types of crime than the arrestee population. No significant differences with regard to race or sex were found. However, due to differences in sample size, statistical significance should not be assumed.

Acknowledgements

First, I would like to thank Dr. Kowalski for his guidance throughout this entire research process. His assistance and expert advice made possible the completion of this thesis. Additionally, I would like to thank Drs. Weaver and Mohan for serving as committee members and providing invaluable insight. I cannot express enough thanks to my friends and colleagues at Auburn University and within the Department of Sociology. Kristin Pitts, Stacie Moss, and Kandace Henry have helped me significantly at every stage of this process. Jennifer Martin, I am so grateful for your patience and encouragement. I will always be thankful for the love and support provided by my family. Dad, I am so thankful for the countless times you have proofread, edited, and offered suggestions for my work.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Abbreviations

INTERPOL	International Criminal Police Organization
FBI	Federal Bureau of Investigation
USMS	United States Marshal Service
RFJ	Rewards for Justice
USAPATRIOT	Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism
ATF	Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives
RSS	Really Simple Syndication
CNN	Cable News Network
AMW	America's Most Wanted: America Fights Back
BJS	Bureau of Justice Statistics
FJSP	Federal Justice Statistics Program
CBP	United States Customs and Border Protection
ICE	Immigrations and Customs Enforcement
ERO	Enforcement Removal Operations
HSI	Homeland Security Investigations

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The topic of wanted posters is likely to invoke imagery of notorious gun slinging bandits that wreaked havoc during the lawless Wild West era. Perhaps a battered poster proclaiming Jesse James to be an outlaw hanging in a dusty saloon comes to mind. While hard copies of wanted fugitive posters are rarely displayed in Post Offices and newspapers anymore, wanted lists are still considered extremely important tools used by law enforcement agencies nationwide. Currently, eight United States federal law enforcement agencies produce most wanted fugitive lists, while four other agencies produce wanted fugitive lists. Even the International Criminal Police Organization (INTERPOL), the world's largest international police organization, publishes a comprehensive list of wanted persons. Some agencies, including the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) and the United States Marshals Service (USMS), even produce multiple wanted fugitive lists. For example, the USMS, which will be the primary focus of this paper, also publishes a Major Case fugitive list. The FBI produces seven additional fugitive lists including Most Wanted Terrorists, Domestic Terrorism, White Collar Crime, and Crimes Against Children.

Such widespread use of fugitive lists by law enforcement agencies suggests that they are indeed effective tools of apprehension. Since its inception in 1983, the USMS has placed 226 individuals on the list of 15 Most Wanted fugitives. Of these, 211 have been successfully

apprehended. This indicates a 93.4% success rate ("Fugitive Operations," USMS Office of Public Affairs [USMSOPA], 2011). This figure is strikingly similar to the 93.7% success rate of the Federal Bureau of Investigation's Ten Most Wanted program. Of these captured offenders, the FBI reports that 32.8% were the direct result of citizen cooperation. While difficult to quantify, the FBI estimates that indirect publicity garnered from wanted posters accounts for a much greater percentage of apprehensions ("FBI's Ten Most Wanted fugitives 60th anniversary" [60th anniversary], FBI Office of Public Affairs [FBIOPA], 2010, p. 2-7). It is clear that the general public plays a substantial role in identifying the whereabouts of fugitives, legitimizing the use of wanted posters.

This paper aims to fill a substantial gap in scholarly literature regarding fugitive lists and wanted posters. Virtually no criminological or sociological research on wanted posters exists. A query of the Academic Search Premier journal database using the terms "fugitive" and "wanted posters" yielded a meager two articles. This corroborates Miles' (2008) conclusion that "social scientists and legal scholars have ignored the role of wanted posters and lists in law enforcement" (p. 276). For these reasons, this research will be exploratory in nature.

The author will perform a demographic analysis of the kinds of fugitives featured on USMS and FBI wanted lists. According to the USMS and the FBI, most wanted offenders are typically the "worst of the worst" with "histories of violence" which make them more of a threat to public safety than other fugitives ("Fugitive Operations," USMSOPA, 2011, n.p.). The researcher will test the claim that fugitives declared *most wanted* are significantly different than those that are simply *wanted*. The researcher will examine both demographic and criminal differences. The primary goal of this thesis is to determine whether or not federal law enforcement agencies actually adhere to the criteria they set forth to decide if a fugitive should

be placed on a most wanted or wanted list. This is a topic that has yet to be studied. The second goal is to identify whether most wanted fugitives of the USMS and the FBI are representative of the average federal arrestee. Again, the author will examine differences in demographic characteristics as well as criminal characteristics.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. *A Typical Wanted Poster*

Federal most wanted fugitive lists are made publicly available by the agency that produces them. They are literal rogues galleries of exceptionally nefarious fugitives. Generally these lists provide a poster that contains detailed information for each offender profiled. On this poster, a picture of the respective fugitive and their name is provided along with other variables. These include the charges against them, aliases used, and important notes such as a possible reward for providing information that directly leads to the fugitive's apprehension. These notes may include the existence of identifying tattoos or markings as well as whether the fugitive is considered armed and/or dangerous. Finally, demographic information is listed such as weight, height, hair color, eye color, date of birth, place of birth, nationality, race, and sex.

These lists are produced so that the American public can be aware of particularly dangerous fugitives and can possibly aid in their apprehension ("60th anniversary," FBIOPA, 2010). As noted above, monetary rewards are frequently offered to citizens who provide adequate information regarding a fugitive. These rewards are designed to encourage citizen cooperation with law enforcement. Regarding the USMS, rewards typically do not exceed $25,000. For comparison, the FBI offers a minimum reward of up to $100,000 for information that directly leads to the arrest of 10 Most Wanted fugitives ("Ten Most Wanted FAQ," FBIOPA, n.d.). In some cases, rewards can exceed $1 million. For example, the FBI recently

offered a reward of $25 million for information leading to the apprehension of Usama Bin Laden, the leader of the infamous al Qaeda terrorist organization.

In certain cases, mainly those in which the fugitive is a known terrorist, the Rewards for Justice program (RFJ) may offer a reward of up to $25 million, on top of that provided by the pursuing law enforcement agency for information leading to the location and capture of offenders (Rewards for Justice [RJF], n.d.). Specifically, the Secretary of State "may authorize rewards for information that leads to the arrest or conviction of anyone who plans, commits, or attempts international terrorist acts against United States persons or property, that prevents such acts from occurring in the first place, that leads to the location of a key terrorist leader, or that disrupts terrorism financing" (n.p.). For example, regarding the reward listed for Usama Bin Laden's apprehension, in addition to the $25 million offered by the FBI, the RFJ offered $2 million.

The RFJ was established in 1984 and has paid more than $100 million in rewards for information regarding wanted terrorists. Notable terrorists brought to justice featured on this program include Uday and Qusay Hussein, Sadam Hussein's sons, and Ramzi Ahmed Yousef, "the terrorist mastermind" who bombed the World Trade Center in 1993, an act which resulted in the deaths of six people and wounded more than one thousand others (n.p.). The RFJ paid a reward of $30 million to the individual that provided actionable intelligence regarding the whereabouts of Uday and Qusay Huessein.

2.2. *Effect of Wanted Posters on Memory*

McAllister et al. (2011) conducted an experiment that tested the impact of wanted posters on the viewer's prospective and retrospective memory with regard to the reporting of crime by the public. Regarding wanted posters, retrospective memory refers to searching one's memory

for a past encounter with or sighting of a fugitive depicted on the wanted poster currently being read. Contrarily, prospective memory involves remembering to "perform some future behavior without any explicit reminder" (p. 105). In this case, that future behavior might be alerting authorities if a wanted fugitive is encountered in the future.

Regarding prospective memory, the authors report that participants made significantly more correct identifications of the wanted individual than false positive identifications. Specifically, a prospective identification of the wanted person is 3.35 times more likely to be accurate than inaccurate (p. 107). For the retrospective group, those participants that viewed the wanted poster after the fact, no significant difference was found between the number of correct positive identifications and false positive identifications (p. 108). Overall, the authors report that prospective identification of a wanted person has more value than a retrospective identification (p. 104).

2.3. *Possible Social Functions of Wanted Posters*

This essay proposes that wanted posters and fugitive lists have three primary functions: to promote exposure of select offenders in order to expedite their apprehension, to announce a law enforcement agency's enforcement priorities, and to act as a deterrent to the future commission of similar offenses (Miles, 2008, p. 279).

2.3.1. *Expediting the Apprehension of Profiled Offenders*

The first possible social function of wanted posters is to increase the publicity of profiled fugitives in an effort to facilitate their capture. The FBI reports that more than sixty percent of the fugitives placed on its Ten Most Wanted list during the years 1989 to 2009 were captured within a single year, which suggests the essential role played by the public in the apprehension of criminals ("60th anniversary," FBIOPA, 2010, p. 9). By publicizing wanted fugitives, an agency

enlists the help of the American public in identifying and locating particularly dangerous fugitives. Each member of society is literally invited to enter into and perform the role of "law enforcer." This rationale can be stated simply as "the more people that know your face, the harder it is to hide" (p. 4). The publicity generated by wanted lists has an effect on the public as well as on the fugitive. First, the publicity that wanted posters create may have a variety of effects on the public. For example, persons in contact with a fugitive may be ignorant of their most wanted status (Miles, 2008, p. 279). In this case, upon viewing a wanted poster and realizing that their friend, relative, coworker, or acquaintance is a federal fugitive, these persons may then contact the appropriate authorities. In another scenario, persons interacting with a fugitive may be fully aware of their fugitive status, yet choose to do nothing. Examples of these persons may include "romantic partners," "criminal associates," or sympathetic family members (p. 279). Here, notoriety gained from a wanted poster may influence these persons to alert authorities out of a sense of guilt or a desire to receive reward money.

Consider the demise of the outlaw Jesse James as a real-world example of this point. In 1882, Missouri Governor Thomas T. Crittenden publicly issued a $10,000 reward for the capture of Jesse James (Trout, n.d.). This substantial sum of money was enough to persuade Robert Ford and his brother Charles, members of the James gang, to betray their famous leader. On April 3, 1882, Ford shot an unarmed James in the back of the head in his own home. Upon attempting to claim their reward money, the Ford brothers were indicted for first-degree murder, plead guilty, and "sentenced to be hanged on May 19" (The New York Times, 1882). However, on the very same day of their indictment and sentencing, Governor Crittenden granted the brothers an unconditional pardon for their crime and offered them a portion of the original $10,000 bounty (Trout, n.d.).

Secondly, notoriety gained from wanted posters may also have a significant effect on the fugitive's behavior (Miles, 2008, p. 279). Since wanted posters typically include one or several photographs of the offender as well as demographic information, the fugitive may change their appearance or modify their behaviors in an effort to continue evading apprehension. To illustrate, Eduardo Ravelo, current FBI 10 Most Wanted fugitive and Mexican cartel assassin, may have undergone plastic surgery to alter his appearance. Ravelo may have even modified or removed his fingerprints ("Ten Most Wanted," FBIOPA, n.d.). Other examples include changing residences, avoiding public places, abandoning current employment, or bribing others to remain silent (Miles, 2008, p. 279).

2.3.2. *Communicating Agency Priorities*

The second primary function of wanted posters proposed by Miles is to communicate a law enforcement agency's enforcement priorities. Wanted posters offer a unique glimpse into police decision-making at the institutional level, rather than the individual level (Miles, 2008, p. 277). This is significant because law enforcement agencies, especially federal ones, have the authority to enforce a wide range of statutes, and wanted lists provide the opportunity to announce which types of crimes most urgently need enforcing at a given time. Consider the FBI as an example. As a part of the Department of Justice, the FBI has the authority to investigate a broad array of criminal offenses including, among others, those related to terrorism, counterintelligence, civil rights, public corruption, violent crime, white-collar crime, and organized crime ("Frequently asked questions" [FAQ], FBIOPA, n.d.). Another example is the USMS, whose special agents have the authority to "make an arrest on all federal warrants" ("Fugitive Investigations," USMSOPA, n.d.). With such a wide assortment of crimes being

investigated, a most wanted list signals that certain high-priority crimes perhaps deserve a greater allotment of time and money to investigate (Miles, 2008, p. 280).

Miles astutely observes that these two purposes of wanted lists may clash with each other due to conflicting priorities within the bureaucratic structure of a law enforcement agency. This first occurs when the notoriety gained from an offender's wanted poster is likely to expedite their capture, but the crimes with which they are charged are not considered critical by the law enforcement agency (Miles, 2008, p. 280). Conversely, discord between the two functions of wanted posters also occurs when a fugitive is charged with crimes that an agency considers a high priority to combat, but there exists a low potential for the publicity gained from depiction on wanted poster to expedite their apprehension.

A recent example of the latter scenario involves Usama bin Laden's placement on the FBI's 10 Most Wanted list. To explain, Usama bin Laden was placed on this list in 1999 for crimes related to terrorism and national security ("60th anniversary," FBIOPA, 2010, p. 65). With the events of September 11, 2001 and the subsequent war on terror, terrorism became an issue of high priority in the United States. This is evidenced by the signing of the Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism Act of 2001(USAPATRIOT ACT) and the ensuing wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. Clearly, bin Laden's placement on the list announced to the nation that the FBI considered terrorism a significant threat, however the publicity afforded by doing so was unlikely to hasten his apprehension, at least in the United States. Since bin Laden hailed from the Middle East, it is extremely doubtful that anyone from the Western nations with access to his wanted poster would ever have the opportunity to alert authorities of his whereabouts. It appears, in this case, that the

FBI valued the signaling of enforcement priorities over apprehension rates because bin Laden's wanted poster was not likely to hasten his arrest in the United States (Miles, 2008, p. 281).

2.3.3 *Crime Deterrence through Citizen Awareness*

In *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation*, philosopher and utilitarian Jeremy Bentham (1879) suggests that the "general object" which all laws should have in common is "to augment the total happiness of the community" and to prevent that which subtracts from such happiness. Bentham also states that the primary objective of punishment is deterrence (p. 170-178). In the criminal justice field, deterrence is a philosophy of punishment that aims to prevent that offender and others from further criminality (Rush, 1986, p. 76). Deterrence differs from other philosophies of punishment, such as retribution that focuses on past behavior, because it attempts to influence future behavior. So, the primary goal of punishment is the prevention of future offenses. There exist two distinct forms of deterrence: general and specific (Rush, 1986, p. 76). Briefly, general deterrence refers to the punishment of one offender dissuading other members of society from committing a similar crime. On the other hand, the notion of specific deterrence is that, after being punished, an individual will be less likely to recidivate for fear of being punished again. Regarding wanted posters, one aspect of this punishment involves public shaming. A more thorough discussion of deterrence and its application to wanted posters follows.

In his treatise *On Crimes and Punishments*, Cesare Beccaria (1963) discusses deterrence at the general level. As noted above, the goal of general deterrence is to discourage other members of society from committing similar crimes. Echoing the sentiments of Bentham, Beccaria posits that the single goal of punishment is "to prevent the criminal from inflicting new injuries…and to deter others from similar acts" (p. 42). General forms of deterrence "should

immediately call up the associated idea of punishment… in crude, vulgar minds" (p. 57). Public forms of punishment function to strengthen "this important connection between a misdeed and its punishment." The offender is "made an example of," an act which communicates to potential offenders that specific crimes will not be tolerated. Examples from the time in which this essay was written include publicly viewed means of capital punishment such as "the gallows or the wheel" (p. 49). As the masses witness offenders being punished, they themselves are deterred from committing similar violations of the law because of the punishment that surely awaits them if they do. These examples of punished offenders make lasting impressions on the minds of the many.

Publishing the wanted posters of fugitives is a nonviolent, public form of general deterrence. They are a means for a law enforcement agency to very clearly and expressly state to society which types of crimes will be most vigorously combated. Upon viewing wanted posters, potential offenders may be discouraged from committing similar crimes upon coming to the realization that such crimes are strongly punished. As will be discussed in greater detail in the next section, being featured on a wanted poster may be discrediting and shameful to the fugitive. Potential offenders might also be discouraged from committing like criminal acts out of a fear of the labeled a fugitive.

Wanted posters might also be a form of specific, or individual, deterrence. Since wanted posters function to heighten a given fugitive's notoriety, he or she will most likely strive to avoid detection. Every stranger, especially law enforcement officer, poses the potential threat of recognizing the fugitive's face from a wanted poster. Avoiding detection includes limiting one's social interactions, living in seclusion or "lying low," and refraining from activities that draw attention to one's self. A rational fugitive would likely abstain from the commission of crime, as

it is an activity that is highly likely to draw unwanted attention from law enforcement. Specific deterrence is achieved when the fugitive desists from criminal activity in an effort to avoid detection.

2.4. *Labeling Theory*

Labeling theory provides insight into the impact of the publicity garnered from declaring an individual to be a most wanted fugitive. Central to labeling theory is the notion that deviance is created by society as the infraction of established rules (Becker, 1963, p. 8). Society creates deviance by defining certain actions as illegal. Not only are behaviors labeled as legal or illegal, so too are the people who commit infractions that constitute deviance. Societal reaction to deviant behavior plays a crucial role. As Becker (1963) states, the most important consequence of being "branded as deviant" is a change in the individual's public identity (p. 12).

Who in society creates these labels and controls which actions are deviant? Marxian conflict theory, for example, concludes that those in power make the labels and apply them accordingly. Official "labelers" in society include political and government officials, law enforcement officials, educators, psychiatrists and clinicians (Becker, 1963, p. 12). Specifically in this case, federal law enforcement agencies officially label these fugitives as most wanted. Those labeled are in conflict and competition with society's labelers. Since powerful members of society place these tags upon the individual, they cannot easily be removed.

Frank Tannenbaum (1938) outlined the process by which the definition of a specific act or behavior as evil transfers to the "description of the individual as evil" (p. 17). Tannenbaum originally used the term *tagging*, which was replaced by later theorists with *labeling*. Instead of the behavior itself being tagged deviant, the actor is also defined as delinquent. As a result, all of this individual's subsequent actions are regarded with suspicion. The individual is expected to

act in accordance with their label. This new classification of "wanted fugitive" causes the individual to develop a self-image reflective of this tag. The individual's very own self-definition changes (p. 19).

Howard Becker expanded the work of Tannenbaum by distinguishing between *master* and *subordinate statuses*. He posited that this is "one of the most important steps in the process of building a stable pattern of deviant behavior" (Becker, 1963, p. 31). According to Becker, a master status is one that overrides all the other statuses that one embodies (Becker, 1963, p. 13). Conversely, subordinate statuses are those that are superseded by a master status. The status of "most wanted fugitive" is also a master status. Because the deviant label takes priority over other labels such as scholar or athlete, they are treated as a delinquent first and expected to behave in accordance with this label.

By labeling an offender a "most wanted fugitive" and listing all criminal charges against them, federal law enforcement agencies attempt to decrease the American public's sympathy for these individuals. Attaching multiple, negative labels to a fugitive serves to further identify this individual as a threat in need of apprehension. The less sympathy a citizen has for a fugitive, the more likely that citizen is to turn in the fugitive if the opportunity arises. To illustrate the number of negative labels that most wanted fugitive profiles can attach to offenders, consider a fugitive's profile from the current USMS 15 Most Wanted list. This individual has the following negative labels attached to him: "federal fugitive," "armed robber," "kidnapper," "hijacker," "attempted murder," and "dangerous."

2.5. *A Brief History of Agency Fugitive Programs*

Even though the USMS is a significantly smaller agency with fewer criminal investigators than the FBI, it apprehends a greater number of fugitives than its sister agency. To

exemplify, the USMS has 5,675 total employs, 3,953 of which are deputy United States marshals and criminal investigators ("Fact Sheets," USMSOPA, 2011). In 2010, USMS investigators arrested more than 36,100 federal fugitives. At the same time, the FBI employs 39,569 people, 13,766 of which special agents ("FAQ," FBIOPA, n.d.). However, the FBI only holds federal arrest warrants for approximately 6,500 fugitives at any given time. Despite being almost seven times larger than the USMS, the FBI deals with about five times less fugitives. This is most likely to due to the fact that fugitive operations are one of the six primary functions of the USMS. The others are judicial security, asset forfeiture, prisoner operations, justice prisoner and alien transportation, and witness security ("Fact Sheets," USMSOPA, 2011).

The FBI pioneered the field of fugitive operations by launching the Ten Most Wanted program and, as a result, became viewed as a key agency in fugitive investigations by the public. For this reason, along with the fact that one of the primary functions of the USMS is fugitive operations, the researcher chose to construct a dataset of offenders wanted by these two agencies. A more comprehensive discussion regarding each agency's fugitive programs follows.

2.5.1. *USMS Fugitive Programs*

At any given time, the USMS is searching for tens of thousands of federal fugitives. In fiscal year 2010, United States Marshals apprehended approximately 36,100 federal fugitives, while United States Marshal-led task forces captured 81,900 state and local fugitives ("Fugitive Operations," USMSOPA, 2011). This amount is greater than all other law enforcement agencies combined. This is unsurprising given the fact that the USMS is the federal government's primary agency for fugitive investigations. Specifically, the agents of the USMS investigate escaped federal prisoners and probation, parole, or bond default violators. United States Marshals are granted the jurisdiction to arrest fugitives on all warrants. For example, a marshal

has the power to arrest individuals from the FBI's 10 Most Wanted Program, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives' (ATF) Most Wanted Program or any other agency's fugitive list.

The USMS 15 Most Wanted fugitive program began in 1983 out of a perceived need to prioritize the investigation and apprehension of particularly dangerous high-profile criminals. Offenders that are deemed most wanted by the USMS are usually "career criminals with histories of violence" or pose an immediate threat to public safety (n.p.). The occupiers of the USMS 15 Most Wanted list comprise a veritable pantheon of criminal titans. In other words, these individuals are the "worst of the worst" ("Fugitive Operations," USMSOPA, 2011, n.p.). Fugitives on this list can be cases from various law enforcement agencies. For example, these fugitives may be USMS cases, task force cases from other federal agencies, state/local cases adopted by task forces, or cases from the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children ("Fugitive Investigations," USMSOPA, n.d.). These fugitives represent a diverse array of criminal activity from homicide to organized crime to white-collar offenses.

Since its inception, the program has declared 226 fugitives to be most wanted. Approximately, 93.4% of these fugitives have been apprehended. The success of the 15 Most Wanted program led to the implementation of other USMS fugitive programs ("Fugitive Investigations," USMSOPA, n.d.). Only two years later, the Major Case Fugitive Program was introduced in an effort to apprehend other high-profile offenders. The Major Case fugitive list includes a significantly larger number of offenders at any given time than the 15 Most Wanted. For example, as of November 28, 2011, forty-one offenders were listed as major case fugitives. As stated previously, the primary objective of this study is to test this claim that most wanted fugitives are actually different from wanted fugitives.

2.5.2. *FBI Fugitive Programs*

While the FBI produces many most wanted fugitive lists, the original and most popular is the Ten Most Wanted Fugitives program. The Ten Most Wanted list made its first public appearance on February 7, 1949 after a reporter for the International News Service contacted FBI officials and asked for a list of the "toughest guys" currently being hunted ("60th anniversary," FBIOPA, 2010, p. 2; Miles, 2008, p. 281). In hopes that a news story would garner publicity and aid in the apprehension of some particularly dangerous criminals, the FBI obliged to the request and provided the names of ten fugitives. True to the FBI's wishes, the article garnered abundant public interest prompting FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover to launch a permanent Ten Most Wanted Fugitive program little more than a year later on March 14, 1950.

Of the first twenty fugitives to occupy the Ten Most Wanted Fugitive list, nine were arrested as a direct result of citizen cooperation. Among these was the very first "Top Tenner," Thomas James Holden. The success of this program led to the inception of other programs within the FBI and other law enforcement agencies. Other fugitive lists published by the FBI include a Most Wanted Terrorists, Crimes Against Children, Criminal Enterprise Investigations, Cyber Crimes, Domestic Terrorism, and White Collar Crimes.

Additionally, the FBI produces wanted posters for missing persons and victims of kidnappings. These posters are identical to fugitive posters in that they provide a picture and demographic information. Often, an age-progressed picture will accompany the photograph of the person at the time they went missing. However, these individuals are not criminals, so there are no charges listed on the posters. It can be safely inferred that, in part, the same functions of fugitive wanted posters apply to missing persons' posters. Specifically, these posters most likely

serve the primary function of increasing an individual's visibility in the community so that they may be located as quickly as possible.

Since the FBI's "number one priority" is the protection of "the United States and United States persons and interests around the world from terrorist attack," they place a greater emphasis on international law enforcement than other law enforcement agencies ("FAQ," FBIOPA, n.d.). The FBI occasionally operates on foreign soil and its fugitives often reside outside of the United States. When the host country and Congress give consent, FBI agents may make arrests in foreign countries.

2.5.3. *Selection and Removal Criteria*

An examination of other most wanted fugitive programs will provide insight into the selection process. Of the eight federal law enforcement agencies that publish most wanted fugitive lists to be examined in this study, only three provide the subjective criteria for fugitive selection. These are the FBI, the USMS, and the ATF. Typically, an agency's field offices will forward the names of candidates to its Criminal Investigations Division ("60th anniversary," FBIOPA, 2010, p. 3; Miles, 2008, p. 281; ATF Office of Public Affairs [ATFOPA], n.d.). Personnel in this division correspond with those representing the Office of Public Affairs to narrow down the list and forward it to the Assistant Director of the Division and the Deputy Director of the agency who give final approval. During selection, the length and severity of a candidate's criminal record is taken into consideration. An individual's potential to be a dangerous menace to society is also evaluated. Finally, it must be believed that the publicity afforded by placement on the most wanted list can be of assistance in apprehending the offender.

The FBI also provides the criteria necessary for an offender to be removed from a most wanted list. Fugitives typically are not removed from a list unless they have been taken into

custody or "credible physical evidence is obtained, which proves with 100% accuracy, that they are deceased" ("Most Wanted Terrorists," FBIOPA, n.d.). Although rare, at-large offenders may also be removed from a most wanted list if they meet one of the two following criteria. First, a fugitive may be removed if the federal process pending against them is dismissed ("60th anniversary," FBIOPA, 2010). The second option is if an offender no longer fits the criteria necessary to be deemed most wanted. Of the nearly five hundred fugitives that have been added to the FBI's Ten Most Wanted list since its inception, only fifteen were removed because the federal case pending against them was dismissed. Additionally, only six were removed because they "no longer fit the criteria of a 'Top Ten' fugitive" (p. 44).

2.5.4. *Role of Technology*

Wanted posters were traditionally hung on the walls of government buildings such as post offices and courthouses. Wanted fugitive lists were also published in magazines and newspapers ("FAQ," FBIOPA, n.d.; Simon, 2009). This practice has become increasingly less prevalent in recent years. According to Nancy Pope, an historian at the Smithsonian Institution's National Postal Museum, the decision to stop displaying wanted posters was a "move of economy" (Simon, 2009). Like any business, the Postal Service is in need of money and is viewing post offices less as community centers and more as "a place for merchandise and marketing."

Since hard copies of wanted posters are largely becoming a dying breed, technology plays an increasingly important role in fugitive apprehension. The USMS relies heavily on the Internet as a means of publishing digital copies of the 15 Most Wanted list and other wanted posters. The invention of the Internet provided law enforcement agencies with the opportunity to reach millions of potential viewers worldwide. This is an important fact because, sometimes,

federal fugitives flee across state and national borders. In addition to publishing the current list, the USMS also provides 15 Most Wanted news releases online. Internet users can even subscribe to Rich Site Summary (RSS) news feeds that relay fugitive news and information. The public also has the option to sign up for free email updates that are sent automatically when additions or subtractions are made to the 15 Most Wanted list. As technology advances, so does the ease with which an individual can access the latest fugitive information.

The FBI currently offers more online most wanted tools than any other law enforcement agency. Since the FBI first began publishing wanted posters online in 1996, it has developed a most wanted widget for third-party websites and produces free Internet podcasts that can be downloaded to a variety of digital devices ("60th anniversary," FBIOPA, 2010, p. 2 & 64). These podcasts are entitled "Wanted by the FBI" and "Inside the FBI." Another example is the recently developed "Top Ten Most Wanted" mobile phone application that can be acquired for free. Reportedly, over half a million people living in 670 countries have downloaded it. The FBI is also active on social networking sites such as Facebook and Twitter, providing followers the opportunity to "instantly receive information about the latest fugitives on the list" (p. 2). One of the most unconventional techniques of generating publicity for wanted posters involves displaying the images of fugitives on large, electronic billboards. This tactic exposes countless commuters to imagery and information pertaining to current fugitives.

Law enforcement agencies also cooperate with various televised news channels, such as the Cable News Network (CNN), to profile most wanted fugitives. According to Geoff Shank, the Assistant Director of Investigative Operations, the USMS is "constantly looking to exploit other media outlets" (Martin, 2011). One of the most effective TV programs in aiding fugitive apprehension is "America's Most Wanted: America Fights Back" (AMW). This show appears on

the Fox Television Network and profiles most wanted federal fugitives. Viewers of AMW television and radio shows are encouraged to submit anonymous or confidential tips via a nationwide toll-free hotline (1-800-CRIME-TV) or an online submission form (America's Most Wanted [AMW], n.d.; Miles, 2005, p. 285). While the pursuing law enforcement agency might offer a reward, it is the policy of AMW to never offer rewards for tips. Extolling the efforts of AMW, Shank reports that the USMS has "arrested so many heinous people and saved so many lives because of America's Most Wanted" (Martin, 2011). Since its premier episode, ten of the FBI's most wanted fugitives have been captured as a direct result from tips submitted by viewers.

Fugitives featured on AMW are not randomly selected, but chosen through a careful, yet informal process similar to that employed by the FBI and the USMS (AMW, n.d.; Miles, 2005, p. 285). Miles outlines several factors that are considered during selection. First, the law enforcement agency that issued the original arrest warrant must be willing to work with AMW. Next, similar to the criteria necessary to be deemed most wanted, a fugitive most pose a significant enough threat to public safety to merit being profiled on national television. Third, cases submitted by the program's staff members are given priority. Fourth, photographs or video of the candidate must be provided. Fifth, the crime with which the fugitive is being charged must make for an entertaining reenactment. Finally, the victims of the crime must usually not be criminals themselves. For example, a case involving a murdered drug dealer is a weaker candidate than one involving a kidnapped child.

Miles (2005) examined the effect of AMW on the duration of federal and local fugitives' flights from justice. Miles reports the existence of a relationship between being featured on AMW and the likelihood of being apprehended (p. 288). His findings indicate that fugitives

profiled on AMW are more likely to be captured and have shorter flight durations than those not featured on the program. For example, when profiled on AMW, the flight of a 30-year-old, white fugitive charged with murder is shortened by approximately three years (p. 302). These findings give credence to the first function of wanted posters that is to increase a fugitive's publicity in an effort to hasten their apprehension.

2.6. *Debunking Cesare Lombroso*

In his classic work *Criminal Man*, Italian physician and psychiatrist Cesare Lombroso (2006) presents the notion of the *born criminal*. According to Lombroso, "criminals are born with evil inclinations" (p. 48). His theory states that born criminals have different physical traits than healthy, law-abiding citizens, which on appearance, would seem to conflict with other theories of crime that attribute criminality to sociological phenomena. According to Lombroso, while not all criminals appear sinister, "there is nearly always something strange about their appearance" (p. 51). For instance, he claimed that, in general, criminals have "jug ears, thick hair, thin beards, pronounced sinuses, protruding chins, and broad cheek bones" (p. 53). These physical abnormalities were not limited to the cranium. Lombroso also contended that, "Compared with healthy men in the army, criminals appear to be taller than the average Italian….Robbers and murderers are taller than rapists, forgers, and especially thieves" (p. 50). In one of his studies, he concluded that the criminals' average weight exceeded that of noncriminal men. He referred to these physical anomalies as signs of *atavism,* or a regression to an earlier stage in human evolution (p. 91).

Lombroso frequently compared the physical traits of criminals to other races and those of primitive, "savage" societies (p. 62). He also believed that "One of the most singular characteristics of primitive men and those who still live in a state of nature is the frequency with

which they undergo tattooing…It occurs only among the lower class – peasants, sailors, workers, shepherds, soldiers, and even more frequently among criminals" (p. 58). According to Lombroso, the art of tattooing was a primitive practice and its popularity among criminals only strengthened for him the relationship between offenders and prehistoric humans. He believed that a fondness "for something as painful as tattooing" is evidence that criminals have less sensitivity to pain and underdeveloped morality in comparison to law-abiding citizens (p. 63).

Using Lombroso's logic, it stands to reason that most wanted USMS fugitives should exhibit more of these qualities than wanted fugitives. Since they are allegedly the worst of the worst criminals, most wanted fugitives should be taller, heavier, and more tattooed than wanted offenders. There should also be a variation in the distribution of race across the two groups of fugitives. Of course, the author does not actually expect to find these differences. However, obtaining results that retain the null hypothesis may serve to further debunk Lombroso's theory of atavistic criminals.

Lombroso's theory has already been challenged on numerous occasions. A chief example is the work of C. B. Goring (1913). He performed a statistical analysis of the physical attributes of three thousand English prisoners from various prisons. Goring concluded, "no evidence has emerged confirming the existence of a physical criminal type, such as Lombroso and his disciples have described" (p. 173). In a scathing review of Lombroso's work, Goring referred to his criminology as "dead as a science" (p. 18). He accused Lombroso of having no understanding of the scientific method or precise measurement stating that his desire to adjust fact to fit theory was akin to alchemy and astrology. (pp. 13-14).

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

First the research hypotheses will be discussed. Next will follow a discussion of the variables used for the study. This discussion separates the variables into two categories based on their nature: demographic and criminal. Definitions and coding strategies used by the researcher are also addressed. Third, the researcher will explain how the fugitive dataset was constructed. This chapter will conclude with an overview of the quantitative analyses that will be performed to identify statistically significant differences between the USMS/FBI most and wanted fugitives as well as differences between the author's federal fugitive sample and the federal criminal arrestee population.

3.1. *Research Hypotheses*

As previously stated in the introduction, this study is an empirical analysis of the kinds of fugitives profiled on wanted lists of the USMS and the FBI. Federal law enforcement agencies claim that most wanted offenders are different than wanted fugitives because they meet specific criteria. Specifically, most wanted fugitives have histories of violence, lengthy criminal records, pose a significant threat to public safety, are generally considered "the worst of the worst," and are likely to be captured as a result of the publicity gained from being deemed most wanted ("Fugitive Operations," USMSOPA, 2011, n.p.). For this reason, the author expects to find that a significantly greater number of USMS most wanted fugitives will be charged with murder and other violent crimes as well as have a higher average number of charges levied against them than

USMS wanted fugitives. The researcher also expects that the most wanted fugitives will exhibit a higher level of criminal involvement as indicated by the use of multiple dates of birth, multiple places of birth, multiple aliases, and affiliation with street gangs. Finally, the researcher predicts that a significantly greater percentage of most wanted fugitives will be born in the United States than wanted offenders. The author will test this claim by examining differences between offenders profiled on USMS most wanted lists compared to those on USMS wanted lists. This will also be tested by examining USMS and FBI most wanted offenders with USMS and FBI wanted fugitives. Therefore, the primary hypothesis for this study may be stated: USMS/FBI most wanted fugitives differ significantly from USMS/FBI wanted fugitives with respect to criminal characteristics. This hypothesis can be stated symbolically as

$$H_1: \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$$

Where μ_1 = mean of USMS/FBI most wanted fugitive population

μ_2= mean of USMS/FBI wanted fugitive population

On the other hand, the null hypothesis can be symbolized as

$$H_{Null}: \mu_1 = \mu_2$$

Where μ_1 = mean of USMS/FBI most wanted fugitive population

μ_2= mean of USMS/FBI wanted fugitive population

Secondly, the author plans to identify whether most wanted fugitives of the USMS and the FBI are representative of the average federal arrestee. To achieve this objective, the researcher will compare data gained from wanted posters with national crime statistics published by the Bureau of Justice Statistics' (BJS) Federal Justice Statistics Program (FJSP). As with the first objective, the author hypothesizes that differences regarding the fugitives' criminal characteristics do exist. This hypothesis can be stated symbolically as

$$H_2: \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$$

Where μ_1 = mean of federal most wanted fugitive population

μ_2= mean of federal criminal arrestee population

Conversely, the null hypothesis can be symbolized as

$$H_{Null}: \mu_1 = \mu_2$$

Where μ_1 = mean of federal most wanted fugitive population

μ_2= mean of federal criminal arrestee population

The researcher expects to find that the composition of USMS and FBI wanted lists combined will more accurately reflect national crime rates than FBI lists alone. Miles reported that the average FBI "Top Tenner" is not representative of the typical federal criminal defendant (p. 291). For example, during the decade of the 1990s, approximately 70% of FBI "Top Tenners" were charged with murder, yet only 6.6% of crimes investigated by the United States Attorney's Offices were violent in nature (p. 291). Miles also found that the average "Top Tenner" differed from the average federal criminal defendant regarding demographic characteristics. Specifically, his results indicated that his fugitive sample was "overwhelming white males." For this study, the author expects that no significant differences regarding sex or race will be observed.

From time to time USMS wanted lists feature fugitives from other federal law enforcement agencies ("Fugitive Investigations," USMS, n.d.). For example, these lists occasionally overlap the FBI's Ten Most Wanted and the ATF's Most Wanted list. These agencies have limited jurisdictional authority and hence, are restricted in the types of crimes for which they may arrest offenders ("FAQ," FBIOPA, n.d.). On the other hand, the USMS has the power to arrest a fugitive for charges on any federal warrant; therefore those individuals featured

on its wanted lists should represent a broader range of criminal infractions. For this reason, the author expects that the composition of the USMS and FBI wanted lists will more accurately reflect national crime rates than the FBI's wanted lists alone.

3.2. *Variables*

There exist forty-five variables in this study. The researcher constructed these variables based off of data retrieved from wanted posters published by the USMS and the FBI. These variables will either be categorized as independent or dependent variables. ALIAS, ALIAS_2, ALIAS_3, SEX, RACE, YOB, YOB_2, MDOB, POB, POB_2, POBS, MPOB, HEIGHT, HEIGHT_2, WEIGHT, WEIGHT_2, EYECOL, HAIRCOL, SKIN, TAT, TAT_2, TATLOC, SCAR, SCAR_2, SCARLOC, CHARGE, CHARGE_2, MURD, VIOL, PROP, SEXCRIM, CYBER, TERROR, DRUG, ESCP, WEAP, WHITE_ORG, POW, YOW, REWARD, SGANG, and ARMED are considered independent variables. LIST, LIST_2, and LIST_4 are considered to be the dependent variables in this study. Each variable was recorded from information provided by their wanted poster. For this reason, it is possible that some variables, including HEIGHT, WEIGHT, YOB, and HAIRCOL among others, might not be reflect a fugitive's true measurements and characteristics.

3.2.1. *Demographic Variables*

Demographic characteristics will primarily be coded as nominal, interval, and ratio variables. For instance, SEX will be dichotomous, while EYECOL, HAIRCOL, RACE, and SKIN will be categorical. Although, most of the demographic characteristics are nominal data, some categories are ratio data. These include HEIGHT, WEIGHT, and YOB. All demographic variables are independent variables.

SEX refers to the fugitive's biological sex. This nominal data was recorded dichotomously with "0" for male and "1" for female.

RACE denotes the fugitive's race. Data was nominally coded: 0) White/White Hispanic, 1) Black/African American, 2) American Indian/Alaska Native, 3) Asian, and 4) Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander.

YOB refers to the year in which the fugitive was born. For this interval data, the year according to the Gregorian calendar was recorded.

YOB_2 divides the fugitives into separate categories based on decade in which they were born. The categories for this nominal data were as follows: 2) 1920-1929, 3) 1930-1939, 4) 1940-1949, 5) 1950-1959, 6) 1960-1969, 7) 1970-1979, and 8) 1980-1989.

POB denotes the country in which the fugitive was born. The categories for this nominal data were as follows: 0) United States, 1) Mexico… 41) Rwanda, 42) South Vietnam, and 43) Germany.

POB_2 is a dichotomous variable that indicates whether a fugitive was born in the United States. This data was recorded with "0" for yes and "1" for no.

POBS refers to the state in which the fugitive was born, if he or she was born in the United States. Data was nominally coded: 1) Alabama, 2) Alaska, 3) Arizona… 51) Puerto Rico, 52) Washington, District of Columbia, and 53) United States Virgin Islands.

HEIGHT refers to a vertical measurement of the fugitive's body. This ratio data was recorded in inches.

HEIGHT_2 divides the fugitives into separate categories based on their height measured in inches. This nominal data was coded as follows: 0) 60-64, 1) 65-69, 2) 70-74, and 3) 75-79.

WEIGHT indicates the amount that the fugitive weighs. This ratio data was recorded in pounds.

WEIGHT_2 divides the fugitives into separate categories based on their weight measured in pounds. This nominal data was coded as follows: 0) 11-149, 1) 150-199), 2) 200-249, 3) 250-299, and 4) 300-349.

EYECOL denotes the color of the fugitive's eyes. Data was coded nominally: 0) brown, 1) green, 2) blue, 3) hazel, and 4) black.

HAIRCOL indicates the color of the fugitive's hair. It was noted if the fugitive is bald or has a shaved head. Similar to EYECOL, the data was coded nominally as follows: 0) blonde, 1) black, 2) brown, 3) gray, 4) red, 5) bald/shaved, 6) white, and 7) Sandy.

SKIN refers to the complexion or tone of the fugitive's skin. Once again, data was recorded nominally: 0) light/fair, 1) medium, 2) dark, 3) ruddy, and 4) olive.

TAT denotes the number of known tattoos or indelible ink-based markings the fugitive is reported to have. Being ratio-level data, the total number was recorded.

TAT_2 is a dichotomous variable that indicates whether a fugitive has any known tattoos. This data was recorded with "0" for yes and "1" for no.

TATLOC refers to the physical location of any known tattoos on the fugitive's body. This nominal data was coded in the following manner: 0) face, 1) head/neck, 2) torso, 3) arms/hands, 4) legs/feet, 5) back, and 6) groin/buttocks.

SCAR indicates the number of known physical scars the fugitive is reported to have. This is ratio-level data.

SCAR_2 is a dichotomous variable that indicates whether a fugitive has any known scars. This data was recorded with "0" for yes and "1" for no.

SCARLOC denotes the physical location of any known scars on the fugitive's body and was coded in the exact same fashion as TATLOC.

3.2.2. *Criminal Variables*

The next set of variables used in this study is criminal variables. These all relate to crime and range from the number of charges for which the fugitive is wanted, to the year of the fugitive's indictment, and to the law enforcement agency by which the fugitive is pursued. With the exception of LIST, LIST_2, and LIST_4, the study's only dependent variables, all criminal variables are independent.

ALIAS refers to the total number of alternate names, false names and monikers used by the fugitive. Being ratio data, the total number of aliases was recorded.

ALIAS_2 is a dichotomous variable that denotes whether the wanted poster indicated the fugitive has used an alias. This was recorded with "0" for yes and "1" for no.

ALIAS_3 is a dichotomous variable that indicated whether a fugitive has more than one alias listed for them. This was recorded with "0" for yes and "1" for no.

MDOB indicates whether or not the wanted poster provides multiple dates of birth for the fugitive. This nominal data was coded dichotomously with "0" for yes and "1" for no.

MPOB indicates whether or not the wanted poster provides multiple place of birth for the fugitive. This nominal data was coded dichotomously with "0" for yes and "1" for no.

CHARGE refers to the number of formal criminal charges listed for the fugitive. Being ratio data, the total number was recorded.

CHARGE_2 is a dichotomous variable that denotes whether a fugitive has more than one charge listed against them. This data was recorded with "0" for yes and "1" for no.

MURD indicates whether or not the fugitive is charged with murder; the "unlawful killing of a human being" (Schmalleger, 2005, p. 44). For the purposes of this research, this category includes, but is not limited to any type of murder, homicide, or manslaughter. This also includes conspiracy or the attempt to commit any of the former acts. This, along with the next ten variables that deal with types of crime, was recorded dichotomously. Yes was coded as "0" and no was coded as "1."

VIOL indicates whether or not the fugitive is charged with a violent crime. For the purposes of this study, this category includes but is not limited to murder, rape, robbery, and any form of assault (p. 43). Additionally, sex crimes that involve rape, sexual assault, or molestation will be considered sex crimes as well as violent crimes. Arson will be considered a violent crime as well as a property crime if the charge indicates that the property in question was occupied. Finally, any violent crime that involves the use of a weapon will also be considered a weapons-related offense.

PROP indicates whether or not the fugitive is charged with a property-related crime. This includes but is not limited to burglary, any form of theft, destruction of property and arson (p. G-18). For the purposes of this study, robbery is also considered a property-related offense. Additionally, any property-related offense that involves the use of a weapon will also be considered a weapons-related crime.

SEXCRIM denotes whether or not the fugitive is charged with a sex crime. Schmalleger (2005) defined a sex crime as any of various "offenses against chastity, common decency, morals, and the like" (p. G-21). For the purposes of this research, this specifically includes but is not limited to any form of rape, prostitution, sexual assault, sexual molestation, possession and

distribution of child pornography, commercialized vice, failure to register as a sex offender, and conspiracy to commit any of the former acts.

CYBER refers to whether or not the fugitive is charged with a cyber-related crime; "any crime perpetrated through the use of computer technology" or "any violation of a federal or state computer-crime statute (p. 78). For the purposes of this study, any crime that involves child pornography being converted, viewed, possessed, or sold in a digital format will fall into this category as well as the sex crime category.

TERROR denotes whether or not the fugitive is charged with a terrorism-related offense. Schmalleger defined this category as any "violent act or an act dangerous to human life in violation of the criminal laws of the United States or of any state committed to intimidate or coerce a government, the civilian population, or any segment thereof, in furtherance of political or social objectives" (p. 736). For the purposes of this study, a fugitive's crimes will be considered terrorism related if they are on found on the FBI's Most Wanted Terrorist List or if the crime is related to the destruction of government property. The destruction of government property will also be considered a property-related crime.

DRUG denotes whether or not the fugitive is charged with a drug-related crime. This includes but is not limited to illegal or controlled drug distribution, manufacture, use, possession, sale, purchase, transport or conspiracy to commit any of the former acts (p. G-8).

ESCP refers to whether or not the fugitive is charged with an escape-related offense. This includes but is not limited to failure to appear on criminal charges, fleeing and evading, failure to surrender to custody, unlawful flight to avoid prosecution, failure to self-report to the Bureau of Prisons, outstanding warrants, violations of parole or probation, and bond jumping.

WEAP indicates whether or not the fugitive is charged with a weapons-related offense. This includes but is not limited to the "unlawful sale, distribution, manufacture, alteration, transportation, possession, or use, or the attempted unlawful sale, distribution, manufacture, alteration, transportation, possession, or use, of a deadly or dangerous weapon or accessory" (p. G-25). For the purposes of this study, any property-related or violent crime that involves the use of a weapon will also be considered a weapons-related crime.

WHITE_ORG indicates whether or not the fugitive is charged with a white-collar or organized crime-related offense. According to Schmalleger, white-collar crimes are those "committed by a person of respectability and high social status in the course of his or her occupation. Also, nonviolent crime for financial gain utilizing deception and committed by anyone who has special technical and profession knowledge of business and government, irrespective of the person's occupation" (p. 74). For the purposes of this study, any form of fraud and bank robbery will fall into this category. It should be noted that certain white-collar offenses, such as fraud, embezzlement, and counterfeiting will not also be considered property-related crimes. Additionally, organize crime-related offenses are crimes committed by "members of a highly organized, disciplined association engaged in supplying illegal goods and services" (p. 75). This includes but is not limited to any form of racketeering, witness intimidation, gaming violations, extortion, loan-sharking, and conspiracy to commit any of the former offenses.

POW refers to the state in which a federal written order was issued for the arrest of the fugitive, the state in which the fugitive allegedly committed a crime, or the state in which a task force or field office is listed as the point of contact. This data was coded nominally in the exact

fashion as POBS. In the event that multiple warrants were issued for a fugitive, the state in which the earliest warrant was issued was recorded. This was a rare occurrence.

REWARD denotes whether or not the poster indicates that a sum of money is being offered by the arresting agency for information leading to the discovery of a fugitive's location or his or her capture. For the purposes of this study, this includes instances in which a poster indicates that a reward may be offered. This was coded dichotomously as "0" for yes and "1" for no.

SGANG refers to whether or not the poster indicates that the fugitive is affiliated with a street gang. This does not include terrorist organizations, drug cartels, *La Cosa Nostra* or any other mafia. Data were dichotomously coded as "0" for yes and "1" for no.

ARMED denotes whether or not the poster indicates that the fugitive is considered to be carrying weapon or any objects that may be used as weapons. This was recorded in a dichotomous fashion with "0" for yes and "1" for no.

YOW refers to the year in which a federal arrest warrant was issued for the offender, the year that the offender was declared a fugitive by the law enforcement agency, the year in which the offender escaped from custody, the year in which the criminal acts were committed, or the year in which the fugitive failed to appear in court or to surrender his or herself. This interval variable was coded in the exact same manner as YOB. Similar to POW, in the event that multiple warrants were issued for an offender, the date of the earliest warrant was recorded.

LIST refers to the list on which the fugitive was featured. This was nominally coded as follows: 0) USMS- 15 Most Wanted, 1) USMS- Wanted, 2) FBI- 10 Most Wanted, and 3) FBI- Other Most Wanted.

LIST_2 is a dichotomous variable that indicates whether the offender was profiled on a USMS wanted list or a USMS most wanted list. This was coded with "0" for USMS Most Wanted and "1" for USMS Wanted.

LIST_4 is a dichotomous variable that indicates whether the offender was profiled on either a most wanted or wanted list. This was coded as follows: 0) Most Wanted and 1) Wanted.

3.3. *Quantitative Analysis*

3.3.1. *Preparing the Data Set*

Upon contacting the USMS Office of Archives, the researcher was informed that no comprehensive record of 15 Most Wanted fugitives is maintained. This is consistent with previous research on the subject. In his analysis of wanted posters published by the FBI, Miles (2008) reports that federal law enforcement agencies that he contacted were "unwilling to provide any sources of information, such as copies of old wanted posters" (p. 282). It should be noted that the senior archivist with whom the researcher contacted would have been willing to provide information, had it been available.

The researcher built a sample of $N = 287$ federal fugitives from wanted posters appearing on the websites of the USMS and the FBI between 2004 and 2012. The distribution of the wanted posters by program is as follows: FBI Ten Most Wanted ($n = 38$), FBI Other ($n = 64$), USMS 15 Most Wanted ($n = 43$), USMS Major Case ($n = 42$), and USMS Wanted ($n = 100$). On any given day, current fugitive listings can be found online at each agency's respective website. Wanted posters for each specific offender can also be accessed from these websites. The researcher collected currently profiled wanted posters from the USMS Major Case program, the USMS wanted list, and other FBI fugitive programs from their respective websites.

Access to past wanted posters is generally not provided by these websites. For this reason, the researcher utilized an Internet archive service that allows users to view a webpage as it appeared on specific dates in the past (Internet Archive, n.d.). Using this tool, the researcher accessed wanted posters for offenders that occupied the USMS 15 Most Wanted list from 2004 to 2011. To gather wanted posters for offenders that occupied the FBI's 10 Most Wanted list during that same timeframe, the author relied on data from the agency's website, a published history of the program, a list of every "Top Tenner" published by the FBI, and various news and media outlets (Swierczynski, 2004; "60th Anniversary," FBIOPA, 2010).

Initially, the USMS website provided 155 posters for wanted offenders. These fugitives are wanted by the USMS, however they have not met the criteria to be declared most wanted. Systematic random sampling was applied to this population of wanted posters to draw a sample of n =100 posters. Specifically, the researcher saved these posters and sorted them by file size. Next the researcher randomly selected a starting point and selected every second poster until a sample of one hundred was achieved.

3.3.2. *Frequency Distribution and Crosstabulation*

Descriptive statistics will be used to describe basic features of the data. The researcher will run descriptive statistics on the dataset as a whole, including USMS and FBI most wanted and wanted fugitives. This will be used to construct a portrait of federal fugitives based off of demographic and criminal variables. The data gathered from the fugitive sample will be compared against the data provided by the FJSP regarding national crime statistics.

The researcher will also run descriptive statistics of USMS most wanted and USMS wanted fugitives to construct a similar portrait of strictly USMS fugitives. Since the sample of USMS wanted posters is approximately the same size as the sample of USMS most wanted

posters, frequency data will be useful in making "comparisons between the groups" (Levin & Fox, 2006, p. 31). Crosstabulations will be used to identify the distribution of LIST_2, the dependent variable, across the independent demographic and criminal variables. This will be useful in identifying the "presence or absence of a relationship between any two variables" (p. 329). As one example, this can essentially give the researcher a frequency distribution of number of aliases used among most wanted fugitives compared with a frequency distribution of number of aliases use among wanted fugitives (pp. 52-53). These statistical procedures will highlight the existence of any relationships between variables for the researcher. However, frequency distributions and crosstabulations do not provide any indication of whether or not a given relationship is statistically significant, or merely the product of sampling error (p. 329).

3.3.3. *Statistical Tests of Significance*

The next step will involve using nonparametric Chi-Square tests, Mann-Whitney *U* tests, and a binary logistic regression to determine whether any differences between the wanted and most wanted samples are statistically significant. Since the research hypothesis involves examining the differences between wanted fugitives and most wanted fugitives, the next statistical procedure involves two-sample comparisons. The type of variables being tested will determine the type of procedure performed. For example, the researcher will perform Pearson's Chi-Square tests to determine the statistical significance of relationships found between categorical variables. The researcher chose this test for significance for the following reasons: the variables to be tested are categorical, it does not require normality, and the sample size is relatively small (p. 293).

Also, the researcher will conduct Independent-Samples Mann-Whitney *U* tests to determine statistical significance for relationships found involving interval variables (Elvers,

2011, n.p.). The Mann-Whitney *U* test is "useful for determining if the mean of two groups are different from each other" but does not require the same assumptions as an independent-samples *t*-test. Essentially, it is a nonparametric version of an independent-samples *t*-test that does not require the data to meet the normal distribution or homogeneity assumptions. Normal distribution will not be assumed for the interval variables used in this study due to a relatively small sample size. It is for these reasons that the researcher has chosen to use this test rather than an independent-samples *t*-test.

A binary logistic regression on the significant differences observed between most wanted and wanted fugitives of the USMS and the FBI can show strengths of the relationships between the dependent variable and independent variables. This parametric test will allow for greater exploration into observed relationships between variables than crosstabulations and produce more accurate results than the nonparametric tests. The analysis is appropriate because the dependent variable is dichotomous.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

In this chapter, the author presents the statistical results for the study. For the primary research objective, the descriptive statistics are set forth followed by the results for the frequency distributions and crosstabulations. These results highlight any differences found between USMS most wanted fugitives and USMS wanted fugitives. Next the researcher reports the results for Pearson's Chi-Square and Independent-Samples Mann-Whitney *U* tests for any differences observed between the two groups. These tests determine whether any observed differences are statistically significant. The researcher also reports the results of the binary logistic regression performed on the statistically significantly variables related to placement on USMS and FBI wanted lists. Next, the researcher will present results in the same order for the secondary researcher objective. The only difference is that, due to the nature of the data for the federal arrestee sample, the only statistical test for significance used was Chi-Square tests.

4.1. *Quantitative Analysis-Primary Objective*

4.1.1. *Descriptive Statistics*

4.1.1.1. *Demographic Characteristics*

The subsample was comprised of $n = 185$ federal fugitives from USMS most wanted and wanted lists. It should be noted that details might not sum to the total number of fugitives due to missing data. The sample population overwhelmingly consisted of male fugitives. Specifically, 94.1% ($n = 174$) of offenders were male while 5.9% ($n = 11$) were female. Additionally, 61.3%

(n = 103) of fugitives were born in the United States, 38.7% (n = 65) were foreign-born. For those not born in the United States, Mexico was the most common birthplace, or 41.5% (n = 27). The rest of the countries were each the birthplace of 6 or fewer fugitives. The percentage breakdown of offenders by race was as follows: 78.3% (n = 144) of fugitives were White/White Hispanic; 18.5% (n = 34) were Black/African American; 0.5% (n = 1) were American Indian/Alaska Native; 0.5% (n = 1) were Asian; and 2.2% (n = 4) were Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander. The number of tattoos listed for the fugitives ranged from 0 to 6 with a mean of 0.52. Additionally, the number of scars listed for the fugitives ranged from 0 to 4 with a mean of 0.44.

The percentage breakdown of fugitives by eye color was as follows: 77.0% (n = 141) of fugitives had brown eyes; 4.9% (n = 9) had green eyes; 10.9% (n = 20) had blue eyes; and 7.1% (n = 13) had hazel eyes. The breakdown of fugitives by hair color was as follows: 3.3% (n = 6) of offenders had blond hair; 54.1% (n = 99) had black hair; 36.1% (n = 66) had brown hair; 3.8% (n = 7) had gray hair; 1.6% (n = 3) had red hair; 0.5% (n = 1) had white hair; and 0.5% (n = 1) had a shaved head or were bald. The breakdown of offenders by complexion was as follows: 24.2% (n = 15) of fugitives had a light skin tone; 61.3% (n = 38) had a medium skin tone; 9.7% (n = 6) had a dark skin tone; 3.2% (n = 2) had a ruddy skin tone; and 1.6% (n = 1) had an olive skin tone.

Years of birth of the fugitives ranged from 1924 to 1989 with a mean of birth being 1963. The percentage breakdown of this variable was as follows: 0.5% (n = 1) of fugitives were born between 1920 and 1929; 3.3% (n = 6) were born between 1930 and 1939; 9.8% (n = 18) were born between 1940 and 1949; 20.2% (n = 37) were born between 1950 and 1959; 32.2% (n =

59) were born between 1960 and 1969; 26.2% (*n* = 48) were born between 1970 and 1979; and 7.7% (*n* = 14) were born between 1980 and 1989.

The height in inches of the offenders ranged from 62 to 76 with a mean of 69.14. The percentage breakdown of this variable was as follows: 6.0% (*n* = 11) of fugitives were between 60 and 64 inches tall; 49.2% (90) were between 65 and 69 inches tall; 41.5% (*n* = 76) stood between 70 and 74 inches tall; and 3.3% (*n* = 6) were between 75 and 79 inches tall. The weight in pounds of fugitives ranged from 102 to 300 with a mean of 178.86. The percentage breakdown of this variable was as follows: 15.4% (*n* = 28) of fugitives weighed between 100 and 149 pounds; 55.5% (*n* = 101) weighed between 150 and 199 pounds; 24.7% (*n* = 45) weighed between 200 and 249 pounds; 3.8% (*n* = 2) weighed between 250 and 299 pounds; and 0.5% (*n* = 1) weighed between 300 and 349 pounds.

4.1.1.2. *Criminal Characteristics*

The wanted posters indicated that 84.86% (*n* = 157) of USMS fugitives used at least one alias in the past. For those that used aliases, the number used ranged from 1 to 31 with a mean of 2.95. The percentage breakdown was as follows: 21.7% (*n* = 34) of fugitives used a single alias; 21.0% (*n* = 33) used 2 aliases; 31.8% (*n* = 50) used 3 aliases; 3.8% (*n* = 6) used 4 aliases; 5.7% (*n* = 9) used 5 aliases; 5.7% (*n* = 9) used 6 aliases; and 10.2% (*n* = 16) used 7 or more aliases. This indicates that, of the alias users, 78.3% (*n* = 123) used more than one. Also, 11.9% (*n* = 22) fugitives used multiple dates of birth and 0.5% (*n* = 1) used multiple places of birth.

As indicated by the wanted posters, 6.5% (*n* = 12) of USMS fugitives were affiliated with a street gang, 61.4% (*n* = 113) were considered armed, and for 20.5% (*n* = 38) of offenders, a reward was offered for information leading to their capture. The data also indicate that a majority, specifically 55.68% (*n* = 103), of fugitives' warrants came from ten states. The

percentage breakdown of the ten most popular states was as follows: 11.7% (n = 21) of USMS fugitives had a warrant in Pennsylvania; 7.8% (n = 14) had one in Wisconsin; 6.1% (n = 11) had one in Florida; 5.6% (n = 10) had one in New York; 5.0% (n = 9) had one in California; 5.0% (n = 9) had one in Hawaii; 4.4% (n = 8) had one in Louisiana; 3.9% (n = 7) had one in Oregon; 3.9% (n = 7) had one in Texas; and 3.9% (n = 7) had one in Illinois.

Descriptive statistics indicate that 73.0% (n = 135) of USMS fugitives were charged with more than one crime. The number of charges listed against the fugitives ranged from 1 to 45 with a mean of 2.75. The percentage breakdown of fugitives by number of charges was as follows: 27.6% (n = 50) of offenders were charged with a single crime; 41.4% (n = 75) were charged with 2 crimes; 16.0% (n = 29) were charged with 3 crimes; 8.3% (n = 15) were charged with 4 crimes; 3.3% (n = 6) were charged with 5 crimes; and 5.5% (n = 10) were charged with 6 or more crimes.

The percentage breakdown of fugitives by crime type was as follows: 20.3% (n = 37) of offenders were charged with murder; 36.3% (n = 66) were charged with a violent crime; 7.7% (n = 14) were charged with a property crime; 47.8% (n = 87) were charged with a drug offense; 15.4% (n = 28) were charged with a sex crime; 1.1% (n = 2) were charged with a terrorism-related offense; 0.54% (n = 1) were charged with a cyber-crime; 62.6% (n = 114) were charged with an escape-related crime; 14.3 (n = 26) were charged with a weapons offense; and 12.3% (n = 23) were charged with a white-collar or organized crime-related offense.

4.1.2. *Crosstabulation*

The researcher performed crosstabulations to identify the distribution of LIST_2, the dependent variable, across the independent demographic and criminal variables. These crosstabulations indicated the presence of a relationship between the following demographic

variables and LIST_2: POB_2, SCAR_2, SCAR, HEIGHT, and YOB. According to the data obtained from the wanted posters, a greater percentage of most wanted fugitives were born in the United States. Specifically, 70.7% (n = 58) were born in the United States, while only 52.3% (n = 45) USMS wanted fugitives were. Also, 35.3% (n = 30) of USMS most wanted offenders had scars, while only 18.0% (n = 18) of USMS wanted fugitives did. Of those with scars, 60.0% (n = 18) of most wanted offenders had only one scar, while 50.0% (n = 9) of wanted fugitives had a single scar. The most common height range for most wanted fugitives was 70-74 inches (54.2%). However, the most common height range for wanted fugitives was 65-69 inches (58.0%). The most common decade of birth for both groups was the 1960's. The percentage breakdown was as follows: most wanted (29.4%) and wanted (34.7%).

Additionally, relationships were found between the following criminal variables and LIST_2: MURDER, CHARGE, CHARGE_2, SGANG, ARMED, ALIAS_3, ALIAS, MDOB, POW, and YOW. Only one major relationship was discovered regarding a fugitive's crime type and the list on which they were featured. Most wanted fugitives were wanted for murder more frequently than wanted fugitives. Approximately 30.6% (n = 26) of USMS most wanted offenders were charged with murder. Compare this to only 11.3% (n = 11) of USMS wanted fugitives that were charged with murder. In addition, 82.2% (n = 69) of most wanted fugitives were charged with more than one offense while 68% (n = 66) of wanted offenders were.

Crosstabulations also indicated a difference USMS most wanted offenders and USMS wanted fugitives regarding being affiliated with a street gang. Specifically, 12.9% (n = 11) of most wanted offenders were reportedly affiliated with a street gang, while only 1.0% (n = 1) of wanted fugitives were. Also, 96.4% (n = 81) most wanted fugitives were considered armed and only 32.0% (n = 32) of wanted fugitives were. The mean number of aliases for most wanted

fugitives was 4.01 and for wanted offenders was 2.04. In addition to a higher mean, more most wanted fugitives used more than one alias. Approximately 75.3% (n = 64) used more than one alias while 59.0% (n = 59) wanted offenders did so. Also, a greater number of most wanted offenders employed multiple dates of birth than wanted offenders. Specifically, 24.7% (n = 21) of most wanted fugitives used more than one date of birth while only 1.0% (n = 1) of wanted fugitive did. The mean year of warrant for most wanted fugitives was 1998.44 and for wanted fugitives it was 2001.04. Finally, the two states in which the greatest number of most wanted fugitives had a warrant were Florida (10.6%) and New York (10.6%). However, the two states in which the greatest number of wanted fugitives had a warrant were Pennsylvania (20.0%) and Wisconsin (10.5%).

4.1.3. *Pearson's Chi-Square Test*

Since the crosstabulations indicated a relationship between the dichotomous demographic variables SCAR_2 and POB_2 and the dichotomous criminal variables MURDER, CHARGE_2, SGANG, ALIAS_3, MDOB, ARMED, and POW with the dependent variable LIST_2, the researcher performed a Pearson's Chi-Square test on each relationship to determine statistical significance.

First, the researcher will report the p-values for statistically significant relationships between the demographic independent variables and the dependent variable. For the relationship between SCAR_2 and LIST_2, a p-value of 0.007 was reported. Since this p-value is less than 0.01, the association between these variables is statistically significant at the 0.01 level. Also, the Pearson's Chi-Square test performed on the relationship found between POB_2 and LIST_2 yielded a p-value of 0.014. This is smaller than 0.05, therefore this relationship is statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

Second, the researcher will report the p-values for statistically significant relationships between the criminal independent variables and the dependent variable. For the relationship between MDOB and LIST_2, a p-value of 0.000 was reported. This indicates that the association between these variables is statistically significant at the 0.001 level. In addition, the relationship between ALIAS_3 and LIST_2 yielded a p-value of 0.019. This is smaller than 0.05, therefore this association is statistically significant at the 0.05 level. The Pearson's Chi-Square test performed on the relationship found between ARMED and LIST_2 reported a p-value of 0.000, therefore the association between the variables is statistically significant at the 0.001 level. The p-value of 0.001 reported for the relationship between SGANG and LIST_2 indicates that the relationship is statistically significant at the 0.01 level. For the relationship between MURDER and LIST_2, a p-value of 0.001 was reported. This is smaller than 0.01, so the association between these two variables is statistically significant at the 0.01 level. Finally, the Pearson's Chi-Square test performed on the relationship between CHARGE_2 and LIST_2 yielded a p-value of 0.030. This is smaller than 0.05, therefore this relationship is statistically significant at the 0.05 level. For the relationship between POW and LIST_2, a p-value of 0.000 was obtained. This indicates a statistically significant difference between groups regarding POW at the 0.001 level. Since less than 20% of the cells have an expected count less than five, the large sample condition is satisfied and the Pearson's Chi-Square test is adequate for each of the statistically significant relationships except POW.

4.1.4. *Independent-Samples Mann-Whitney U Test*

Since the crosstabulations indicated a relationship between the interval demographic variables YOB, HEIGHT, and SCAR and the interval criminal variables ALIAS, CHARGE, and

YOW with the dependent variable LIST_2, the researcher performed an Independent-Samples Mann-Whitney *U* test on each relationship to determine statistical significance.

First, the researcher will report the p-values for statistically significant relationships between the demographic independent variables and the dependent variable. For the relationship between YOB and LIST_2, a p-value of 0.031 was reported. Since this p-value is less than 0.05, the difference between groups for this variable is statistically significant at the 0.05 level. Also, the Mann-Whitney *U* test performed on the relationship found between HEIGHT and LIST_2 yielded a p-value of 0.001. This is smaller than 0.01, therefore the groups differed statistically significantly regarding HEIGHT at the 0.01 level. Finally, for the relationship between SCAR and LIST_2, a p-value of 0.010 was reported. The groups differed significantly with regard to SCAR.

Second, the researcher will report the p-values for statistically significant relationships between the criminal independent variables and the dependent variable. For the relationship between ALIAS and LIST_2, a p-value of 0.000 was reported. This indicates that the association between these variables is statistically significant at the 0.001 level. In addition, the relationship between CHARGE and LIST_2 yielded a p-value of 0.005. This is smaller than 0.01, therefore the groups differed significantly with regard to CHARGE at the 0.01 level. The Independent-Samples Mann-Whitney *U* test performed on the relationship found between YOW and LIST_2 reported a p-value of 0.038, therefore the association between these variables is statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

4.1.5. *Binary Logistic Regression*

The sample on which the binary logistic regression was performed was comprised of N = 287 fugitives. The breakdown of fugitives by list is as follows: 42.9% (n = 123) were

USMS/FBI most wanted fugitives and 57.1% (*n* = 164) were USMS/FBI wanted fugitives. The binary logistic regression yielded two independent variables that were statistically significant at the 0.001 level. ARMED and POB_2 showed the strongest relationship to placement on a law enforcement wanted list. When controlling for street gang affiliation, using multiple dates of birth, being charged with murder, employing more than one alias, being charged with more than one crime, fugitives considered armed were 20.3 times more likely to placed on a most wanted list than a wanted list. Also when controlling for the previously mentioned variables, being born in the United States increases a fugitive's odds of placement on a most wanted list 3.3 times. Additionally, there were two independent variables that approached statistical significance but yielded a high odds ratio. If a fugitive was affiliated with a street gang, they were 1.5 times more likely to be placed on a most wanted list, and fugitives who used more than one date of birth were 1.6 times more likely to be placed on a most wanted list.

4.2. *Quantitative Analysis-Secondary Objective*

4.2.1. *Descriptive Statistics of Fugitive Sample*

4.2.1.1. *Demographic Characteristics*

The sample was comprised of *N*= 287 federal fugitives from the wanted and most wanted lists of the USMS and the FBI. Once more, details for both the fugitive sample and arrestee sample might not sum to the total number of fugitives due to missing data. Similar to the subsample used in the primary objective, this sample population overwhelmingly consisted of male fugitives. Specifically, 92.3% (*n* = 265) of offenders were male while 6.7% (*n* = 19) were female. Additionally, 56.2% (*n* = 141) of fugitives were born in the United States and 43.8% (*n* = 110) were foreign-born. For those not born in the United States, Mexico was the most common birthplace. Specifically, 31.8% (*n* = 35) of fugitives not born in the United States were

born in Mexico. The rest of the countries were each the birthplace of 7 or fewer fugitives. The percentage breakdown of offenders by race was as follows: 78.9% (*n* = 202) of fugitives were White/White Hispanic; 18.4% (*n* = 47) were Black/African American; 0.4% (*n* = 1) was American Indian/Alaska Native; and 0.8% (*n* = 2) were Asian; 1.6% (*n* = 4) were Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander.

The breakdown of fugitives by eye color was as follows: 76.2% (*n* = 211) of fugitives had brown eyes; 5.4% (*n* = 15) had green eyes; 10.8% (*n* = 30) had blue eyes; 6.9% (*n* = 19) had hazel eyes; 0.4% (*n* = 1) had black eyes; and 0.4% (*n* = 1) had gray eyes. The breakdown of fugitives by hair color was as follows: 4.3% (12) of offenders had blond hair; 52.9% (*n* = 147) had black hair; 36.7% (*n* = 102) had brown hair; 3.2% (*n* = 9) had gray hair; 1.4% (*n* = 4) had red hair; 0.7% (*n* = 2) had white hair; and 0.7% (*n* = 2) had a shaved head or were bald. The breakdown of offenders by complexion was as follows: 29.6% (*n* = 28) of fugitives had a light skin tone; 50.6% (*n* = 41) had a medium skin tone; 8.6% (*n* = 7) had a dark skin tone; 2.5% (*n* = 2) had a ruddy skin tone; and 8.6% (*n* = 7) had an olive skin tone.

Years of birth of the fugitives ranged from 1924 to 1989 with a mean of 1964.36. The percentage breakdown of this variable was as follows: 0.7% (*n* = 2) of fugitives were born between 1920 and 1929; 2.6% (*n* = 7) were born between 1930 and 1939; 8.8% (*n* = 24) were born between 1940 and 1949; 19.0% (*n* = 52) were born between 1950 and 1959; 31.5% (*n* = 86) were born between 1960 and 1969; 27.5% (*n* = 75) were born between 1970 and 1979; and 9.9% (*n* = 27) were born between 1980 and 1989. The number of tattoos listed for fugitives ranged from 0 to 16 with a mean of 0.61. Also, the number of scars listed for fugitives ranged form 0 to 4 with a mean of 0.43.

The height in inches of the offenders ranged from 62 to 79 with a mean of 69.15. The percentage breakdown of this variable was as follows: 5.4% (n = 15) of fugitives were between 60 and 64 inches tall; 48.6% (n = 136) were between 65 and 69 inches tall; 41.4% (n = 116) stood between 70 and 74 inches tall; and 4.6% (n = 13) were between 75 and 79 inches tall. The weight in pounds of fugitives ranged from 102 to 300 with a mean of 176.62. The percentage breakdown of this variable was as follows: 17.4% (n = 48) of fugitives weighed between 100 and 149 pounds; 55.8% (n = 154) weighed between 150 and 199 pounds; 23.2%% (n = 64) weighed between 200 and 249 pounds; 3.3% (n = 9) weighed between 250 and 299 pounds; and 0.4% (n = 1) weighed between 300 and 349 pounds.

4.2.1.2. *Criminal Characteristics*

The wanted posters indicated that 83.6% (n = 240) of fugitives used at least one alias in the past. The number of aliases used ranged from 0 to 31 with a mean of 3.39. For those that used an alias, the percentage breakdown was as follows: 20% (n = 48) fugitives used a single alias; 19.2% (n = 46) used 2 aliases; 27.1% (n = 65) used 3 aliases; 7.5% (n = 18) used 4 aliases; 5.8% (n = 14) used 5 aliases; 4.6% (n = 11) used 6 aliases; 2.5% (n = 6) used 7 aliases; 2.1% (n = 5) used 8 aliases; 2.1% (n = 5) used 9 aliases; 2.1% (n = 5) used 10 aliases; and 7.1% (n = 17) used 11 or more aliases. This indicates that of the alias users, 80.0% (n = 192) used more than one. Also, 15.9% (n = 45) fugitives used multiple dates of birth and 0.4% (n = 1) used multiple places of birth. As indicated by the wanted posters, 7.4% (n = 20) of fugitives were affiliated with a street gang, 69.6% (n = 199) were considered armed, and for 35.5% (n = 102) offenders, a reward was listed for information leading to their capture. The seven most common states for fugitives to have warrants were as follows: 10.4% (n = 25) had a warrant in Pennsylvania; 7.9% (n = 19) had one in California; 7.1% (n = 17) had one in New York; 6.6% (n = 16) had one in

Florida; 5.8% (n = 14) had one in Wisconsin; 5.0% (n = 12) had one in Illinois; and 4.1% (n = 10) had one in Oregon. The rest of the states had warrants for less than ten fugitives each. The years of warrants listed for fugitives ranged from 1981 to 2011 with a mean of 2000.89.

Descriptive statistics indicate that 77.0% (n = 221) of fugitives were charged with more than one crime. The number of charges listed against the fugitives ranged from 1 to 69 with a mean of 3.51. The percentage breakdown of fugitives by number of charges was as follows: 21.4% (n = 60) of offenders were charged with a single crime; 33.1% (n = 93) were charged with 2 crimes; 19.2% (n = 54) were charged with 3 crimes; 11.0% (n = 31) were charged with 4 crimes; 3.9% (n = 11) were charged with 5 crimes; 2.5% (n = 7) were charged with 6 crimes; 2.1% (n = 6) were charged with 7 crimes; 1.1% (n = 3) were charged with 8 crimes; 1.4% (n = 4) were charged with 9 crimes; 1.4% (n = 4) were charged with 10 crimes; and 2.8% (n = 8) were charged with 11 or more crimes.

The percentage breakdown of fugitives by crime type was as follows: 29.1% (n = 82) of offenders were charged with murder; 40.8% (n = 115) were charged with a violent crime; 14.9% (n = 42) were charged with a property crime; 35.1% (n = 99) were charged with a drug offense; 15.6% (n = 44) were charged with a weapons offense; 14.9% (n = 42) were charged with a sex crime; 6.7% (n = 19) were charged with a terrorism-related offense; 1.8% (n = 5) were charged with a cyber-crime; 51.4% (n = 14) were charged with an escape-related crime; and 16.3% (n = 46) were charged with a white-collar or organized crime-related offense.

4.2.2. *Descriptive Statistics of Suspects Arrested for Federal Offenses*

The data provided by the FJSP were gained from a population of N = 183,986 suspects arrested for federal offenses and booked by the USMS from October 1, 2008 to September 30, 2009. For the FJSP data, offenses are broken down into eight general categories: violent

offenses, property offenses, drug offenses, public-order offenses, weapon offenses, immigration offenses, supervision violations, and material witness offenses. These broad categories differed from those created by the researcher. For example, the FJSP considered murder to be a violent offense, rather than a standalone category. Also, since the FJSP did not include a white-collar category, white-collar offenses such as embezzlement, fraud, and forgery were considered property offenses. In this case, the researcher subtracted the number of white-collar offenses from the property offense category to obtain new percentages and create categories of crime that more accurately reflected those created for the fugitive sample. Additionally, FJSP data regarding terrorism-related offenses and cyber-crimes was not provided. Therefore, comparisons regarding crime type can only be made for eight the ten original categories of offenses created for this study. These are murder, violent offenses, property offenses, sex crimes, drug offenses, escape-related offenses, weapons offenses, and white-collar or organized crime-related offenses.

The only demographic variables provided the FJSP for the federal arrestee sample that can be compared to the fugitive sample are SEX and RACE. The percentage breakdown of the sample by sex was as follows: 86.9% (n = 159,842) of arrestees were male and 13.1% (n = 24,142) were female. The sample primarily consisted of white offenders. Specifically, the percentage breakdown of the sample by race was as follows: 79.6% (n = 144,929) of arrestees were white; 18.1% (n = 32,872) were Black/African American; 1.3% (n = 2,291) were American Indian/Alaska Native; and 1% (n = 1,883) were Asian/Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander. It should be noted that FJSP data do not provide information for the Hispanic/Latino race.

The three most common types of crime for all United States federal arrestees to be charged with were immigration offenses (46.3%), drug offenses (16.9%), and supervision

violations (13.6%). The percentage breakdown of offenders by crime type was as follows: 0.2% (n = 336) of offenders were charged with murder; 2.5% (n = 4,555) were charged with a violent crime; 1.33% (n = 2,452) were charged with a property crime; 16.9% (n = 30,928) were charged with a drug offense; 1.74% (n = 3,208) were charged with a sex crime; 13.58% (n = 24,980) were charged with an escape-related crime; 8.49% (n = 15,618) were charged with a white-collar or organized crime-related offense; 5.2% (n = 9,491) were charged with public-order offenses; and 46.3% (n = 84,749) were charged with immigration offenses.

4.2.3. *Crosstabulation of Fugitive Sample and Federal Arrestee Population*

A comparison of the descriptive statistics for the fugitive sample with those for the federal arrestee sample reveals several differences. Regarding demographic characteristics, both groups were predominately composed of males. However, the percentage of males for the fugitive sample (92.3%) was slightly higher than that of the federal arrestee sample (86.9%). The author performed a Chi-Square test on this data that yielded a χ^2 value of 10.25. Since this is greater than 6.635, which is the critical value of a Chi-Square with one degree of freedom, the difference is statistically significant at the 0.01 level (Levin & Fox, 2006, p. 474). Also, both samples were primarily comprised of White offenders. The percentage of White offenders for the fugitive group (78.9%) was slightly lower than that of the arrestee sample (79.6%). A Chi-Square test of this relationship generated a χ^2 value of 0.09, revealing that the difference is not statistically significant. However, a Chi-Square test for the variable RACE produced a χ^2 value of 10.0, indicating that the differences found between groups regarding the distribution of race is statistically significant at the 0.05 level. This conclusion was drawn because the χ^2 value of 10.0 is higher than 7.85, which is the critical value of Chi-Square with three degrees of freedom for the 0.05 level.

Regarding criminal characteristics, the fugitive sample exhibited higher percentages for all eight categories of crime. Chi-Square tests indicated the differences between groups for all eight categories are statistically significant at the 0.01 level. Each test generated a χ^2 value greater than 6.635, which is the critical value for a Chi-Square with one degree of freedom. The most profound differences were found for murder and violent crime. Specifically, the fugitive sample had much higher percentages of murder and violent crime than the arrestee sample. To explain, 28.6% (n = 82) of the fugitives were charged with murder, while only 0.2% (n = 336) of the arrestee sample was. For this difference, a χ^2 value of 10,382.32 was produced. Also, 40.1% (n = 115) of the fugitive sample was charged with violent crimes, while 2.5% (n = 4,555) of the arrestee sample was similarly charged. A Chi-Square test yielded a χ^2 value of 1,674.27. The values for the remaining offense categories were as follows: property crime (χ^2=387.44), escape-related offenses (χ^2=343.03), sex crime (χ^2=281.28), weapons offenses (χ^2=80.02), drug crime (χ^2=67.33), and white-collar or organized crime-related offenses (χ^2=22.16). It should be noted that for each the previous tests, at least one cell (25%) had an expected count less than five, therefore this result should be interpreted with caution.

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

5.1. *Primary Objective*

The primary objective of this study is an empirical examination of whether federal most wanted fugitives are different from federal wanted fugitives. Specifically, the researcher analyzed whether USMS most wanted fugitives exhibited significantly different demographic and criminal characteristics than USMS wanted fugitives. The results of the study confirm the claim by the USMS that its most wanted offenders are different than its wanted fugitives with respect to traits that indicate histories of violence, lengthy criminal records, a significant threat to public safety, and that placement on a most wanted list is likely to expedite apprehension. Specifically, the results indicate that USMS most wanted fugitives differed significantly with USMS wanted fugitives with regard to the following fifteen variables: SCAR_2, SCAR, POB_2, YOB, HEIGHT, MURDER, CHARGE, CHARGE_2, SGANG, ALIAS, ALIAS_3, YOW, POW, MDOB, and ARMED. This confirms the hypothesis that most wanted fugitives differ significantly from wanted fugitives.

5.1.1. Discussion

The author did not expect to observe any differences regarding physical demographic variables. These include sex, race, height, weight, eye color, hair color, and complexion. This was the expectation of the researcher because the USMS has not reported that fugitives exhibiting any one particular demographic characteristic are more likely to be selected

as most wanted. Also, according to Goring (1913), a typical criminal anatomy does not exist (p. 173).

Overall, the two subsamples did not differ greatly with regard to demographic variables. For instance, the ratio of males to females was not significantly different between the two groups. Also, the distribution of race was not significantly different. This may indicate that no race was significantly more likely to be most wanted rather than wanted. The same can be said for eye color, hair color, and complexion. This finding defies the theory proposed by Lombroso regarding atavistic anomalies. As stated earlier, he posited that offenders are likely to be taller and heavier than law-abiding citizens. If this were true, then it follows that being the worst of the worst criminals; the most wanted offenders should exhibit significantly greater weights than wanted fugitives. Yet, this was not the case. However, most wanted fugitives had a higher average height than wanted offenders. The author does not believe that this finding confirms Lombroso's theory.

The results indicate that the most wanted subsample did not differ significantly from the wanted subsample with regard to the presence of tattoos. Lombroso (2006) also stated that tattooing occurs more frequently among criminals because they are less sensitive to pain and less moral than law-abiding citizens (pp. 58-63). According to his logic, a greater number of the most wanted subsample should have tattoos than the wanted subsample. Again, this was not the case, which might suggest that crime is more of a sociological phenomenon than a biological theory. It was discovered that a greater percentage of most wanted fugitives had at least one scar. They also exhibited a higher mean number of scars than did wanted offenders. One explanation for this difference is that it is simply a reflection of their histories of violence. The scars could be caused by injuries sustained from their violent pasts. It stands to reason that one

who engages in violence more often is therefore more likely to be injured with greater frequency. Future research should investigate further the causes of scars exhibited by fugitives.

A final difference regarding demographic characteristics involves the fugitives' years of birth. The mean year of birth significantly differed between the two groups. For the most wanted subsample it was 1961.44 and for the wanted subsample it was 1964.8. This difference could possibly be due to the fact that fugitives only get added to that list when a vacancy opens up, which could potentially be a long time since most wanted fugitives are typically only removed from the list when they are captured, killed, or found dead. On the other hand, fugitives get added to the wanted list automatically. A greater number of younger fugitives are added to the wanted list at a faster rate than the most wanted list, therefore their mean year of birth is higher.

Regarding criminal variables, the author did expect to observe differences. Because of claims made about its most wanted fugitives by the USMS, the author expected to find specific differences with regard to criminal characteristics. Each claim will be discussed along with an explanation as to why the researcher expected to see certain differences. First, the USMS contends its most wanted fugitives are the worst of the worst offenders that have histories of violence and pose an immediate threat to public safety. Therefore, the author expected to find that a greater percentage of these fugitives were charged with murder, violent crimes, with more than one crime, and were considered armed.

Second, the criteria set forth by law enforcement agencies to be deemed most wanted generally requires one to have a lengthy criminal record. Because repeated instances of criminality may be indicative of a high involvement in the criminal subculture, the author expected to find that a greater percentage of most wanted fugitives would engage in other

practices that might suggest a higher degree of involvement in the criminal subculture than wanted fugitives. These include an affiliation with other criminals, specifically street gangs, and the use of multiple dates of birth, multiple places of birth, and multiple aliases.

Third, the federal law enforcement agencies state that, in order to be selected as a most wanted offender, it must be believed that the publicity afforded by placement on the most wanted list can be of assistance in apprehending the offender. As stated previously in reference to Usama bin Laden's wanted poster, the publicity afforded by declaring fugitives that live outside the United States to be most wanted is unlikely to expedite their apprehension. For this reason, the author expected that a significantly greater percentage of most wanted offenders would be born in the United States than wanted fugitives.

Now that the researchers expectations have been reviewed, a discussion of the significant criminal variables follows. The only crime for which a statistically significant difference was found between most wanted and wanted fugitives was murder. 30.6% of most wanted fugitives were charged with murder while only 11.3% of wanted fugitives were. Additionally, 96.4% of most wanted fugitives were considered armed while only 32% of wanted fugitives were. Interestingly, most wanted offenders did not differ significantly than wanted fugitives with regard to being charged with a violent crime. Overall, these findings lend credence to the claim that most wanted offenders have histories of violence and pose greater or more immediate threats to public safety than wanted fugitives.

Also, supporting the contention that fugitives are selected as most wanted fugitives on the assumption that their publicity will assist in their capture is the finding that a greater percentage of the most wanted subsample was born in the United States than that of the wanted subsample. Also, the mean year of warrant significantly differed between the two groups. For the most

wanted subsample it was 1998.44 and for the wanted subsample it was 2001.04. This is most likely caused by the same factors that resulted in a difference between groups for year of birth.

As expected, a significantly greater percentage of most wanted fugitives were affiliated with a street gang, employed multiple aliases, used false dates of birth, and had multiple charges levied against them than wanted fugitives. They also reported higher mean numbers of aliases and charges. These results confirm the suspicions of the researcher and possibly indicate that most wanted offenders have a greater involvement with the criminal subculture than wanted fugitives.

In terms of how affiliation with a street gang may be indicative of a greater involvement in the criminal subculture for most wanted fugitives and how it relates to the other criminal variables, the following may be stated. To begin, the fact that a greater percentage of most wanted offenders were affiliated with a street gang than wanted offenders demonstrates that they interact with other criminals. This is significant because, according to the theory of differential association, criminal behavior is learned through interaction with others (Sutherland, Cressey, & Luckenbill, 1992, p. 89). In this case, street gangs might expose most wanted offenders to "definitions favorable to violations of the law over definitions unfavorable to violations of the law" (p. 92). According to Sutherland, Cressey, and Luckenbill, "the principal part of the learning of criminal behavior occurs within intimate personal groups" (p. 89). Street gangs are indeed intimate personal groups and provide an excellent opportunity for fugitives to learn criminal behavior. Vigil (1988) illustrates this point by stating, "the gang norms, its functions, and its roles help shape what a person thinks about himself and others, and the gang provides models for how to look and act" (p. 421). Gangs provide support and peer affirmation for their members. In addition to learning new techniques of committing crime, affiliation with a criminal

group gives a fugitive the opportunity learn new tactics that can reduce one's chances of detection by law enforcement officers as well as rationalizations and motives for committing crime (Sutherland, Cressey, and Luckenbill, 1992, p. 89). As stated previously, these tactics may include the use of aliases, false dates of birth, and the brandishing of weapons, all three of which occur with significantly greater frequency among the most wanted subsample. Differential association theory states that crime is most likely to occur when a fugitive is exposed to an excess of favorable definitions to violation of the law over those unfavorable to violation of the law.

In an effort to determine whether or not the techniques of using aliases, false dates of birth, and brandishing weapons might be ones employed more frequently by gang-affiliated fugitives, the researcher performed crosstabulations for those variables across the USMS subsample according to SGANG. According to the data, of the three criminal techniques mentioned, only one was employed with significantly greater frequency among gang members. A greater percentage of gang-affiliated USMS fugitives were considered armed than those that were not gang members. Specifically, 100% (n = 11) of fugitives affiliated with gangs were considered armed while only 59% (n = 102) that were not affiliated with a street gang were considered armed. A Pearson's Chi-Square test indicates that this difference is significant at the 0.01 level.

The researcher also tested whether street gang-affiliated USMS fugitives were charged with violent crime or murder more frequently than unaffiliated fugitives. The results confirm that a significantly greater percentage of gang-affiliated fugitives were charged with these two types of offenses. Specifically, 58.3% (n = 7) of gang members were charged with murder compared to 17.6% (n = 30) of unaffiliated members who were so charged. Similarly, 66.7% (n

= 8) of gang-affiliated fugitives were charged with a violent crime as opposed to only 34.1% (*n* = 58) of fugitives who were not gang members. The observed differences for these variables were significant at the 0.01 and 0.05 levels, respectively. It should be noted that for each the previous tests regarding street gang affiliation, one cell (25%) had an expected count less than five, therefore this result should be interpreted with caution. This is an important relationship because significantly more armed USMS fugitives were charged with murder than those not considered armed. Future researchers should further explore the role that gang membership plays with respect to most wanted fugitive status.

The results of the binary logistic regression seem to further confirm that the USMS and FBI do indeed adhere to two of the three criteria they propose fugitives must meet to be considered most wanted. The fact that being considered armed is significantly positively correlated to placement on a most wanted list coincides with the criterion that stipulates most wanted fugitives pose an immediate threat to public safety. Additionally, fugitives born in the United States are significantly more likely to be placed on a most wanted list. This corresponds with the requirement that the publicity garnered from placement on a most wanted list should expedite a fugitive's apprehension.

Law enforcement agencies place a major emphasis on capturing those fugitives that pose a significant threat to public safety in the United States as evidenced by the results of this study. Being armed could be dangerous to an unaware public. Placement on a most wanted list serves to inform the public that there are dangerous fugitives in their midst. It also functions to enlist their help in capturing these dangerous offenders. These results suggest that law enforcement agencies generally follow their own proposed guidelines when choosing which fugitives should be placed on most wanted lists.

5.2. *Secondary Objective*

The secondary research objective is an empirical examination of whether federal fugitives are different from federal arrestees. To achieve this, the researcher examined whether USMS and FBI fugitives exhibited significantly different demographic and criminal characteristics than suspects arrested on federal charges in 2009. Given the limited data regarding demographic characteristics for federal arrestees, the researcher can only make comparisons of race, gender, and type of offense.

5.2.1. Discussion

No significant differences with regard to race were observed between the two samples. This may indicate that no specific race of federal arrestee is more likely to become a fugitive than any other. However, the fugitive sample was comprised of a significantly greater percentage of males than was the arrestee population. This is consistent with Miles (2008) finding that the FBI most wanted fugitives differed "demographically from the typical federal defendant" with his list overwhelmingly consisting of males (p. 291). Significant differences were also observed with regard to criminal charges. The results show that a greater percentage of the fugitive sample was charged with eight types of crime than the arrestee population. These include murder, violent crime, property crime, escape-related offenses, sex crime, weapons offenses, drug crime, and white-collar or organized crime-related offenses.

The most likely explanation for this finding is that the fugitive sample was drawn solely from agencies within the Department of Justice while the federal arrestee population includes suspects arrested by agencies representing nine agencies. These include the departments of Agriculture, Defense, Homeland Security, the Interior, Justice, State, the Treasury, the Federal Judiciary, and the United States Postal Service (Motivans, 2012, p. 5). These agencies combined

have a much broader jurisdiction than a single agency or department. Therefore, the crimes for which this population was charged were also much more varied. For instance, immigration offenses accounted for 46.3% of the entire arrestee group, while no member of the fugitive sample was charged with such offenses.

5.3. *Limitations*

One limitation of this study is that the two law enforcement agencies from which the researcher drew the sample typically do not investigate immigration offenses. These offenses are investigated by the following federal law enforcement agencies: United States Customs and Border Protection (CBP) and United States Immigrations and Customs Enforcement (ICE). This is significant because "illegal immigration was the fastest growing federal arrest offenses between 2005 and 2009, increasing an average rate of 23 percent each year" (Bureau of Justice Statistics [BJS], 2012, n.p.). In 2009, immigration-related crime was the largest category of offense for which federal suspects were arrested. Specifically, 46.3% of suspects arrested for federal offenses and booked by the USMS were charged with immigration offenses (Motivans, 2012, p. 4). This is more than twice the amount charged in 2005, which was 38,041 arrestees (BJS, 2012, n.p.).

A second limitation encountered by the author was data accessibility. As previously stated in Chapter Three, the author experienced difficulty collecting past wanted posters from the USMS. The author was informed that a comprehensive listing of all fugitives featured in the USMS 15 Most Wanted program does not exist. Another limitation is that the author did not include a "Miscellaneous" or "Other" category for offenses that did not fit into the ten crime categories. Although rare, some offenses went uncategorized. This happened in fewer than ten cases. Examples of these types of crimes include the following charges: contempt of court, child

custody deprivation, aiding and abetting, and reckless endangerment. Along these same lines, the author combined white-collar crimes and organized crime-related offenses into a single category.

Another limitation the researcher experienced while gathering data was that wanted posters made no distinction between the "White" and " White Hispanic" races. This is significant because it prevents the researcher from studying the "White" and "White Hispanic" races separately. Since wanted posters usually contain a picture of the fugitive, the author could have determined whether the fugitive was "White" or "White Hispanic" based on their picture. However, the researcher decided against this because he did not want to introduce a subjective component that might compromise his objectivity.

5.4. *Suggestions for Future Research*

The present study primarily examined the differences, both demographic and criminal, between most wanted and wanted fugitives. The following section presents seven areas of interest that may be explored relating to this topic but fell outside the parameters of the present study. First, through the lens of differential association theory, future researchers should further explore the significant relationship observed between street gang affiliation and most wanted status. It would also be beneficial to expand the SGANG variable to include all criminal organizations, not just street gangs. For example, this revised variable would include foreign and domestic terrorist organizations, drug cartels, and organized crime such as the mafia. This would give the researcher a more detailed picture of federal fugitive affiliation with criminal organizations.

Second, obtaining specific dates of capture for fugitives would allow future researchers to calculate the exact durations of flight for those offenders that have been apprehended. This

number should be significantly high considering both the USMS and FBI report success rates of over ninety percent ("Fugitive Operations," USMSOPA, 2011; "60th Anniversary," FBIOPA, 2010, p. 2). Access to this information might allow for the investigation of a host of research questions. For example, researchers could explore the role that monetary rewards play in facilitating fugitive apprehension. Additionally, researchers might examine whether fugitives accused of certain particularly heinous crimes, such as violent or sexual ones involving children, have shorter durations of flight. Another question that might be addressed is whether the public is more motivated to aid law enforcement agencies for these types of crimes. Another possible research question regarding duration of flight asks whether fugitives that take active measures to avoid detection by law enforcement personnel have significantly longer flights from justice than those that do not? These measures may include using multiple aliases, places of birth, and dates of birth or altering one's physical appearance. For one final example, researchers could examine the role that a fugitive's social capital plays in their duration of flight. Specifically, do those fugitives with greater social resources such as high educational attainment, monetary assets, and social networks have shorter or longer durations of flight?

Third, future researchers should consider gender issues with regard to fugitive lists and posters. Females were greatly outnumbered by males in the present study. Specifically, 92.3% of the fugitives were male. Future researchers might probe the reasons such fugitive lists are dominated by male criminals.

Fourth, future researchers should also consider including wanted posters from a broader range of federal law enforcement agencies than just the USMS and FBI. These two agencies accounted for only 27.6% of all federal arrests in 2009 and represent only the Department of Justice (Motivans, 2012, p. 5). Since immigration-related offenses were the largest crime

category in 2009, it would be prudent to include wanted posters from CBP and ICE. ICE breaks down into two smaller branches, each of which publishes its own most wanted list. These are Enforcement and Removal Operations (ERO) and Homeland Security Investigations (HSI). Together, CBP and ICE accounted for 43% of all federal arrests in 2009. By adding wanted posters from these agencies, the researcher would have a sample drawn from agencies that represent the Department of Homeland Security and the Department of Justice and accounted for a combined 80.3% of all federal arrests in 2009. Including posters from these agencies would also provide researchers with much larger fugitive samples. A larger sample might allow the researcher to make more accurate comparisons with FJSP data, which usually comes from large samples.

Along the same lines, the fifth suggestion is that future researchers should also expand the offense categories to include a broader range of crimes and allow for greater specificity. For example, the researcher could include immigration-related offenses as a category. Also, the terrorism-related category could be broken down into two subcategories: domestic terrorism and foreign terrorism. It would be best to employ the exact same categories utilized by the FJSP. This, also, would allow for more accurate comparisons.

Wanted posters typically include a paragraph or two that details miscellaneous information about the fugitive. This section is usually entitled "Miscellaneous Information" or "Remarks." For one fugitive, the poster indicated that he is known to drive a moped and frequently spends time at the beach. In another example, the poster stated that the fugitive frequently visited libraries, often exercises in parks, loves animals, uses disguises to alter his appearance, and has a violent temper. Additionally, this section indicates whether or not a

fugitive has taken measures to alter their physical appearance. Examples include, undergoing plastic surgery, changing hairstyles, or mutilating fingerprints.

The sixth suggestion to future researchers is that they should include a qualitative aspect to their studies that take into account this added background information provided by the poster. This would provide greater insight into the true identity. For instance, the researcher could gain better understanding as to the frequency with which other tactics aimed at avoiding detection are used.

And finally, regarding the use of subjective components, future researchers should use a fugitive's photograph to distinguish between the White and White Hispanic races. This would permit further exploration into the distribution of race between wanted and most wanted fugitives.

5.5. *Conclusion*

This study presents a demographic analysis of federal fugitive wanted posters. Primarily, the research sought to determine whether or not federal most wanted fugitives are significantly different than wanted fugitives with regard to demographic and criminal characteristics. To address this research question, crosstabulations were run to identify any differences between the most wanted and wanted subsamples. Pearson's Chi-Square tests, Independent-Samples Mann-Whitney *U* tests, and a binary logistic regression were performed to determine statistical significance for observed differences.

Regarding criminal characteristics, in support of the claim that most wanted offenders have histories of violence; the results indicated that a significantly greater percentage of most wanted offenders were charged with murder. Likewise confirming the claim that most wanted fugitives have extensive criminal records, the results indicate that the significantly more of the

most wanted subsample was charged with more than one crime and exhibited a higher mean number of charges. In support of the claim that most wanted fugitives pose an immediate threat to public safety, the results indicated that being armed was significantly positively correlated with placement on a most wanted list. Next, the author proposed that most wanted fugitives have a greater involvement in the criminal subculture than wanted fugitives as evidenced by the use of tactics aimed at evading detection by law enforcement. This notion was supported by findings that significantly more most wanted offenders used more than one alias, exhibited a higher mean number of aliases, and employed multiple dates of birth. And finally, fugitives that were born in the United States were significantly more likely to be placed on a most wanted list. This supports the idea that law enforcement agencies select most wanted fugitives on the basis that subsequent exposure is likely to facilitate their capture. Overall, these results seem to confirm that federal law enforcement agencies, specifically the USMS and FBI, do adhere to their proposed tenants when placing fugitives on their most wanted lists.

Regarding demographic characteristics, the researcher found no statistically significant differences for the fugitives' physical characteristics. The distribution of race, eye color, hair color, height, and weight did not differ significantly between the two groups. These results indicate that offenders are indeed deemed most wanted according to the criteria proposed by the USMS. It appears that they are selected primarily according to their criminal characteristics and not according to any demographic factors such as race or sex.

The secondary aspect of this study was to determine whether a sample of federal fugitives differs significantly from the federal arrestee population. As with the primary objective, crosstabulations were performed to highlight the existence of any differences between the two groups. Next, Pearson's Chi-Square tests were performed to determine the statistical

significance any discovered relationships. Other than the fugitive population consisting of significantly more males, no significant differences were found with regard to demographic characteristics. That is, the distribution of race was similar between the groups. However, a significantly greater number of fugitives were charged with murder, violent crime, escape-related offenses, weapons crimes, drug offenses, and white-collar or organized crime-related offenses. These results support the findings of Miles (2008) that the fugitive sample differed significantly in terms of criminal charges from the federal arrestee sample. However, contrasting the findings of Miles, no significant differences were observed with regard to race or sex.

REFERENCES

America's Most Wanted [AMW] (n.d.). FAQ. Retrieved from http://www.amw.com/about_amw/faq.cfm

Beccaria, C. (1963). *On Crimes and Punishments.* (Paolucci, H., Trans.). Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill Educational Publishing. (Original work published 1764).

Becker, H. S. (1963). *Outsiders*. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.

Bentham, J. (1879). An introduction to the principles of morals and legislation. Amen Corner, E.C.: Oxford University Press Warehouse. (Original work published 1789).

Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives Office of Public Affairs [ATFOPA] (n.d.). ATF Most Wanted. Retrieved from http://www.atf.gov/most-wanted/

Bureau of Justice Statistics [BJS] (2012, March 1). Federal immigration arrests increased along U.S.-Mexico border between 2005 and 2009. Retrieved from http://bjs.gov/content/pub/press/fjs09pr.cfm

Elvers, G. C. (2011). Using SPSS for Ordinally Scaled Data: Mann-Whitney U, Sign Test, and Wilcoxon Tests. Retrieved from http://academic.udayton.edu/gregelvers/psy216/spss/ordinaldata.htm

Federal Bureau of Investigation Office of Pubic Affairs [FBIOPA] (2010, March). *FBI's Ten Most Wanted fugitives 60th anniversary.* Retrieved from http://www.fbi.gov/stats-services/publications/ten-most-wanted-fugitives-60th-anniversary-1950-2010-pdf

FBIOPA (n.d.). Frequently asked questions. Retrieved from http://www.fbi.gov/about-us/faqs

FBIOPA (n.d.). Most Wanted Terrorists. Retrieved from http://www.fbi.gov/wanted/wanted_terrorists

FBIOPA (n.d.). Ten Most Wanted. Retrieved from http://www.fbi.gov/wanted/topten

FBIOPA (n.d.). Ten Most Wanted fugitives program frequently asked questions. Retrieved from http://www.fbi.gov/wanted/topten/ten-most-wanted-fugitives-faq/ten-most-wanted-fugitives-faq

Glaser, B. G., & Holton, J. (2004). Remodeling grounded theory. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 5*(2), Art. 4. Retrieved from http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/viewArticle/607/1315

Goring, C. B. (1913). The English convict: A statistical analysis. London: His Majesty's Stationary Office. Retrieved from http://ia700306.us.archive.org/16/items/englishconvictst00goriuoft/englishconvictst00goriuoft.pdf

Internet Archive (n.d.). Internet Archive Wayback Machine. Retrieved from http://www.archive.org/web/web.php

Levin, J., & Fox, J. A. (2006). *Elementary statistics in social research*, 10th Ed. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Lombroso, C. (2006). *Criminal man.* (Gibson, M., & Rafter, N. H., Trans.). Durham, NC: Duke University Press. (Original work published 1876).

Martin, C. (2011, July 29). The end of "America's Most Wanted": good news for criminals, bad news for the FBI. *Time.* Retrieved from http://www.time.com/time/arts/article/0,8599,2085343,00.html

McAllister, H. A., Baiamonte B. A., Ory, J. H., & Scherer, J. H. (2011). The effect of wanted posters on prospective and retrospective memory." *Journal of Law and Human Behavior.* 35, 104-109.

Miles, T. J. (2005). Estimating the effect of America's Most Wanted: A duration analysis of wanted fugitives. *Journal of Law and Economics*, *48*, 281-306.

Miles, T. J. (2008). An empirical analysis of the FBI's Ten Most Wanted. *Journal of Empirical Legal Studies, 5*(2), 275-308.

Motivans, M. (2012, January 26). Federal justice statistics 2009- statistical tables. Retrieved March 9, 2012 from http://bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/fjs09st.pdf

Rewards for Justice [RFJ] (n.d.). Home. Retrieved from http://www.rewardsforjustice.net/index.cfm

Rush, G. E. (1986). *The dictionary of criminal justice*, 2nd Ed. Guilford, CT: Dushkin Publishing Group, Inc.

Schmalleger, F. (2005). *Criminal justice today: An introductory text for the 21st Century,* 8th Ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ; Prentice Hall.

Simon, S. (2009, December 5). Wanted posters not wanted by post office. Retrieved September 02, 2011 from http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=121097002

Stern, P. N. (1995). Grounded theory methodology: its uses and processes. *Grounded Theory 1984-1994, 1,* 29-39. (Glaser, B. G., Ed.). Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

Sutherland, E. H., & Cressey, D. R., & Luckenbill, D. F. (1992). *Principles of criminology.* 11th Ed. Lanham, MD: General Hall. (Original work published 1924).

Swierczynski, D. (2004). *The encyclopedia of the FBI's Ten Most Wanted list: 1950 to present.* New York: Checkmark Books.

Tannenbaum, F. (1938). *Crime and the community*. New York: Columbia University Press.

The New York Times (1882, April 18). The Ford brothers indicted, plead guilty, sentenced to be hanged, and pardoned all in one day. *The New York Times.* Retrieved from http://query.nytimes.com/mem/archive-free/pdf?res=9D04E3DB113EE433A2575BC1A9629C94639FD7CF

Trout, C. (2011, December 2). Robert Ford. Retrieved from http://shs.umsystem.edu/famousmissourians/folklegends/james/jamesford.html

United States Marshals Office of Public Affairs [USMSOPA] (2011, February 25). Fugitive operations. Retrieved from http://www.usmarshals.gov/duties/factsheets/fugitive_ops-2011.html

USMSOPA (2011, April 14). Overview of the U.S. Marshals Service. Retrieved from http://www.usmarshals.gov/duties/factsheets/general-2011.html

USMSOPA (2011, April 15). Fact Sheets. Retrieved from http://www.usmarshals.gov/duties/factsheets/facts-2011.html

USMSOPA (n.d.). Fugitive investigations- 15 Most Wanted. Retrieved from http://www.usmarshals.gov/investigations/index.html

Vigil, J. D. (1988). Group processes and street identity: Adolescent Chicano gang members. *Ethos, 16*(4), 421-445. Retrieved from http://homepage.smc.edu/preciado_christina/Current/Sociology%2031/Readings/Gangs.pdf

Appendix A

Tables

Table 1

Frequency distribution of demographic study variables of USMS subsample

	%	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	n
Sex		0.06	0	1	185
Male	94.1				174
Female	5.9				11
Race		0.3	0	4	184
White/White Hispanic	78.3				14
Black/African American	18.5				34
American Indian/Alaska Native	0.5				1
Asian	0.5				1
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	2.2				4
Eye Color		0.48	0	3	183
Brown	77				141
Green	4.9				9
Blue	10.9				20
Hazel	7.1				13
Black	0				0
Gray	0				0
Hair Color		1.5	0	6	183
Blonde	3.3				6
Black	54.1				99
Brown	36.1				66
Gray	3.8				7
Red	1.6				3
Bald/Shaved	0.5				1
White	0.5				1
Complexion		0.97	0	4	62
Light	24.2				15
Medium	61.3				38
Dark	9.7				6
Ruddy	3.2				2
Olive	1.6				1

Presence of any tattoos			0.78	0	1	185
	Yes	21.6				40
	No	78.4				145
Presence of any scars			0.74	0	1	185
	Yes	25.9				48
	No	74.1				137
Born in the U.S.			0.39	0	1	168
	Yes	61.3				103
	No	38.7				65
Height			69.14	62	76	183
Weight			178.86	102	300	182
Year of Birth			1963.23	1924	1989	183

Table 2

Frequency distribution of criminal study variables of USMS subsample

	%	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	n
Charge					182
Murder	20.3		0	1	37
Violent Crime	36.3		0	1	66
Property Crime	7.7		0	1	14
Sex Crime	15.4		0	1	28
Cyber Crime	0.5		0	1	1
Terrorism	1.1		0	1	2
Drug Crime	47.8		0	1	87
Escape	62.6		0	1	114
White Collar/Organized	12.6		0	1	23
Weapons	14.3		0	1	26
Use of Alias			0	1	185
Yes	84.9				157
No	15.1				28
Multiple Dates of Birth			0	1	185
Yes	11.9				22
No	88.1				163
Multiple Places of Birth			0	1	185
Yes	0.5				1
No	99.5				184
Reward Offered			0	1	185
Yes	20.5				38
No	79.5				147
Street Gang Affiliation			0	1	185
Yes	6.5				12
No	93.5				173
Considered Armed			0	1	184
Yes	61.4				113
No	38.6				71
More than One Charge			0	1	181
Yes	74.6				135
No	25.4				46
Number of Aliases		27.3	1	52	185
Number of Charges		2.75	1	45	181
Year of Warrant		1999.45	1983	2010	132

Note: The offense categories are not mutually exclusive; a fugitive may be sought for more than one category of offense.

Table 3

Comparison of demographic study variables according to USMS list

	USMS Most Wanted or Wanted					
	Most Wanted			Wanted		
	n	%	Mean	n	%	Mean
Sex	85			100		
Male	81	95.3		93	93	
Female	4	4.7		7	7	
Race	84			100		
White/White Hispanic	65	76.5		79	79	
Black/African American	18	21.2		16	16	
American Indian/Alaska Native	0	0		1	1	
Asian	1	1.2		0	0	
Native Hawaiin/Other Pacific Islander	0	0		4	4	
Eye color	83			100		
Brown	59	71.1		82	82	
Green	4	4.8		5	5	
Blue	13	15.7		7	7	
Hazel	7	8.4		6	6	
Black	0	0		0	0	
Gray	0	0		0	0	
Hair color	83			100		
Blonde	3	3.6		3	3	
Black	42	50.6		57	57	
Brown	34	41		32	32	
Gray	2	2.4		5	5	
Red	1	1.2		2	2	
Bald/Shaved	1	1.2		0	0	
White	0	0		1	1	
Complexion	43			19		
Light	10	23.3		5	26.3	
Medium	27	62.8		1	57.9	
Dark	3	7		3	15.8	
Ruddy	2	4.7		0	0	
Olive	1	2.3		0	0	
Presence of any tattoos	85			100		
Yes	20	23.5		20	20	
No	65	76.5		80	80	
Presence of any scars*	85			100		
Yes	30	35.3		18	18	
No	55	64.7		82	82	

Born in the U.S.*		82			86		
	Yes	58	70.7		45	52.3	
	No	24	29.3		41	47.7	
Height**		83		69.5	100		68.47
Weight		83		181.27	99		176.84
Year of birth*		85		1961.44	98		1964.8
Number of scars*		85		0.59	100		0.32
Number of tattoos		85		0.61	100		0.44

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

Table 4

Comparison of criminal study variables according to USMS list

	USMS Most Wanted or Wanted					
	Most Wanted			Wanted		
	n	%	Mean	n	%	Mean
Charge	85			97		
Murder**	63	30.6		11	11.3	
Violent Crime	7	43.5		29	29.9	
Property Crime	9	10.6		5	5.2	
Sex Crime	10	11.8		18	18.6	
Cyber Crime	1	1.2		0	0	
Terrorism	1	1.2		1	1	
Drug Crime	44	51.8		43	44.3	
Escape	57	67.1		57	58.8	
White Collar/Organized	51	17.6		8	8.2	
Weapons	61	18.8		10	10.3	
Use of Alias	85			100		
Yes	74	87.1		83	83	
No	11	12.9		17	17	
More than One Alias*	85			100		
Yes	64	75.3		59	59	
No	21	24.7		41	41	
Multiple Dates of Birth***	85			100		
Yes	21	24.7		1	1	
No	64	75.3		99	99	
Multiple Places of Birth				100		
Yes	1	1.2		0	0	

		8				
	No	4	98.8		100	100
		8				
Reward Offered		5			100	
		2				
	Yes	0	23.5		18	18
		6				
	No	5	76.5		82	82
		8				
Street Gang Affiliation**		5			100	
		1				
	Yes	1	12.9		1	1
		7				
	No	4	87.1		99	99
		8				
Considered Armed***		4			100	
		8				
	Yes	1	96.4		32	32
	No	3	3.6		68	68
		8				
More than One Charge*		4			97	
		6				
	Yes	9	82.1		66	68
		1				
	No	5	17.9		31	32
		8				
Number of Aliases***		5		4.01	100	2.04
		8				
Number of Charges**		4		3.42	97	2.16
		8				
Year of Warrant*		1		1998.44	51	2001.04
Place of Warrant***						

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

Note: The offense categories are not mutually exclusive; a fugitive may be sought for more than one category of offense.

Table 5

Frequency distribution of demographic study variables of entire fugitive sample

	%	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	N
Sex		0.07	0	1	284
Male	93.3				265
Female	6.7				19
Race		0.28	0	4	256
White/White Hispanic	78.9				202
Black/African American	18.4				47
American Indian/Alaska Native	0.4				1
Asian	0.8				2
Native Hawaiin/Other Pacific Islander	1.6				4
Eye Color		0.51	0	5	277
Brown	76.2				211
Green	5.4				15
Blue	10.8				30
Hazel	6.9				19
Black	0.4				1
Gray	0.4				1
Hair Color		1.5	0	6	278
Blonde	4.3				12
Black	52.9				147
Brown	36.7				102
Gray	3.2				9
Red	1.4				4
Bald/Shaved	0.7				2
White	0.7				2
Complexion		1.1	0	4	81
Light	29.6				24
Medium	50.6				41
Dark	8.6				7
Ruddy	2.5				2
Olive	8.6				7
Presence of any tattoos		0.78	0	1	287
Yes	22.3				64
No	77.7				223
Presence of any scars		0.74	0	1	287
Yes	25.8				74
No	74.2				213
Born in the U.S.		0.44	0	1	251
Yes	56.2				141

	No	43.8			110
Height		69.15	62	79	280
Weight		176.2	102	300	276
Year of Birth		1964.36	1924	1989	273

Table 6

Frequency distribution of criminal study variables of entire fugitive sample

	%	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	N
Charge					282
Murder	29.1	0.71	0	1	82
Violent Crime	40.8	0.59	0	1	115
Property Crime	14.9	0.85	0	1	42
Sex Crime	14.9	0.85	0	1	42
Cyber Crime	1.8	0.98	0	1	5
Terrorism	6.7	0.93	0	1	19
Drug Crime	35.1	0.65	0	1	99
Escape	51.4	0.49	0	1	145
White Collar/Organized	16.3	0.84	0	1	46
Weapons	15.6	0.84	0	1	44
Use of Alias		0.16	0	1	287
Yes	83.6				240
No	16.4				47
Multiple Dates of Birth		0.84	0	1	283
Yes	15.9				45
No	84.1				238
Multiple Places of Birth		1	0	1	283
Yes	0.4				1
No	99.6				282
Reward Offered		0.64	0	1	287
Yes	35.5				102
No	64.5				185
Street Gang Affiliation		0.93	0	1	269
Yes	7.4				20
No	92.6				249
Considered Armed		0.3	0	1	286
Yes	69.6				199
No	30.4				87
More than One Charge		0.21	0	1	281
Yes	78.6				221
No	21.4				60
Number of Aliases		3.339	0	31	287
Number of Charges		3.51	1	69	281
Year of Warrant		2000.89	1981	2011	196

Note: The offense categories are not mutually exclusive; a fugitive may be sought for more than one category of offense.

Table 7

Comparison of study variables for fugitive sample and federal arrestee population

	Fugitive Sample or Federal Arrestee Population			
	Fugitive		Arrestee	
	N	%	N	%
Charge**	282		183,986	
Murder	82	29.1	336	0.2
Violent Crime	115	40.8	4,550	2.5
Property Crime	42	14.9	2,452	1.3
Sex Crime	42	14.9	3,208	3
Drug Crime	99	35.1	30,928	1.7
Escape	145	51.4	24,980	16.9
White Collar/Organized	46	16.3	15,618	13.6
Weapons	44	15.6	8,308	8.5
Sex**	284			4.5
Male	265	92.3	159,842	86.9
Female	19	6.7	24,142	13.1
Race	256	100		
White	202	78.9	144,929	79.6
Black/African American	47	18.4	32,872	18.1
American Indian/Alaska Native*	1	0.4	2,291	1.3
Asain/Native Hawaiin/Other Pacific Islander*	6	2.4	1,883	1

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

Note: The offense categories are not mutually exclusive; a fugitive may be sought for more than one category of offense.

Table 8

Binary Regression of ARMED, POB_2, ALIAS_3, MDOB, SGANG, MURD, CHARGE_2, CHARGE, and ALIAS on most wanted list placement

Variable	n	S.E.	Wald	Exp(B)
Considered Armed	286	0.632	23.222***	20.341
Born in the U.S.	251	0.329	12.469***	3.306
More than One Alias	287	0.368	1.787	1.366
Multiple Dates of Birth	283	0.415	1.917	1.618
Street Gang Affiliation	269	0.592	0.519	1.547
Murder	282	0.358	0.313	1.222
More than One Charge	281	0.450	0.259	1.257
Number of Charges	281	0.027	0.890	1.026
Number of Aliases	287	0.051	0.452	0.967

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001