CHAPTER 5 Criminal Profiling

Wayne A. Petherick and Claire E. Ferguson

KEY TERMS
Criminal Profiling: An investigative tool that infers offender characteristics from the analysis of offenders' behavior, their interaction with the crime scene and victim, and their choices during the crime.

Deductive Argument: An argument in which the conclusion is explicitly contained within the premises, whereas offender characteristics are a direct extension of the available physical and behavioral evidence.

Evidence Dynamics: Influences that change, relocate, obscure, or obliterate physical evidence regardless of the person or circumstance that brought about the change.

Inductive Argument: An argument that provides a conclusion which is made likely, or at a matter of probability, by offering supporting documentation.

Inter-rater Reliability: Consistency between different individuals rating the same offender.

Inferential Phase: A stage of criminal profiling that involves discerning features of the unknown offender for the known crime.

Psychological Autopsy (a.k.a. equivalent death analysis): An evaluation of a decedent's mental state prior to death.

Socratic Method: An approach to knowledge building and problem solving based on discussion and debate.
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Summary
Criminal profiling is a practice that has seen increasing popular and media attention over the past several decades. It has been depicted in popular fiction such as films like Silence of the Lambs (1991) and television programs like Criminal Minds (2005–present). It has also been applied in a number of high profile cases, including the “Washington Snipers” (see Turvey and McGray, 2005, for an extended discussion of profiling and the media in the D.C. Sniper case). As a result, students of criminology commonly express an interest in studying criminal profiling with a view to becoming profilers themselves.

At the same time, many professionals, including criminologists and psychologists, have rather abruptly entered the field by hanging out shingles proclaiming related areas of expertise. The resulting student push and practitioner pull have made it a subject of keen interest, but confusion remains among many. So while advances have been made in the field and interest is high, there is still much debate about the efficacy of profiling and even fundamental educational standards.

It is the purpose of this chapter to present an overview of criminal profiling and what it involves in relation to the forensic criminologist. First, we will examine what criminal profiling is, what its goals are, what is necessary to complete a profile, as well as the ways in which a profile may assist with investigations. Second, we will discuss the logic and reasoning utilized by profilers, including the basic theories behind practical approaches to profiling, the differences between inductive and deductive logic, and the methods that use them. Next, we will address the main types of profiling, discuss their strengths and criticisms, and touch on the background knowledge required by the profiler to use each of these methods. Finally, we will address the educational requirements of the profiler and comment on the appropriate pathways necessary within university, the importance of the Socratic method as it relates to.

Victimology: An examination of all aspects of a victim's life, including lifestyle, habits, friends, enemies, and demographic features.
studying specific cases, and issues with undertaking short courses. We will also discuss those areas in which the criminologist may be able to provide profiling advice, as well as the perils and pitfalls doing so may present. First, we turn to a broad introduction of profiling, examining definitional issues, goals, and the like.

WHAT IS CRIMINAL PROFILING?

Although the practice of criminal profiling has been documented for centuries in different forms (Turvey, 2008a), the term offender profiling was first put into regular use by a small group of FBI analysts. They used it to describe the process of making inferences about offenders' characteristics from their actions during a crime (Canter, 1995). In its most basic form, criminal profiling is an investigative tool that discerns offender characteristics from the crime scene and the behavior of the offender. It is a inferential process that involves the analysis of offender behavior, their interactions with the crime scene and the victim, and their choices during the crime (Petherick, 2003).

Despite its appearing in many of the early works on profiling, the FBI no longer uses the term criminal profiling. This term and others like it, such as criminal personality profiling and psychological profiling, have been deliberately replaced by the general term criminal investigative analysis (CIA). This newer term covers profiling and a number of other services: indirect personality assessments; equivocal death analysis (otherwise known as psychological autopsy, meaning determining from information and evidence gathered whether a death was accidental, natural, suicide, or homicide); and trial strategy. Regardless of the change in labeling, the FBI’s methods in this regard remain unchanged. The process of criminal investigative analysis will be discussed in more detail in the inductive methods section later.

Goals of Criminal Profiling

Irrespective of the nomenclature used to describe it, or the actual processes utilized, all methods of profiling have a similar goal. Throughout its application across time, profiling has been designed to help law enforcement develop a viable suspect pool in unsolved crimes, either by narrowing an extensive list of suspects to a small and more manageable group, or by providing new areas of inquiry (Homant and Kennedy, 1998). As noted by Napier and Baker (2005, p. 615), “the purpose of offender profiling is to supply offender characteristics to help investigators narrow the field of suspects based on the characteristics of the crime scene and initial investigative information.” It is not the goal of profiling to identify a particular person or to give his or her identity (Douglas, Ressler, Burgess, and Hartman, 1986), and Müller (2000) notes that the profile will rarely be so accurate as to suggest a certain individual as being responsible.

Not should it, as determining guilt or innocence of any individual is the task of the trier of fact, not the profiler.

Petherick and Turvey (2008a) identify two main phases of profiling, divided by their goals and priorities. The first is the investigative phase, which involves discerning features of the unknown offender for the known crime. It is this phase that will be most aligned to stereotypical notions of profiling. In the investigative phase, there are seven primary goals (p. 138):

1. Evaluate the nature and value of forensic and behavioral evidence to a particular crime or series of related crimes
2. Reduce the viable suspect pool in a criminal investigation
3. Prioritize the investigation into remaining suspects
4. Link potentially related crimes by identifying crime scene indicators and behavior patterns (i.e., modus operandi [MO] and signature)
5. Assess the potential for escalation of nuisance criminal behavior to more serious or more violent crimes (i.e., harassment, stalking, voyeurism)
6. Provide investigators with investigatively relevant leads and strategies
7. Help keep the overall investigation on track and undistracted by offering fresh insights

The second phase identified is the trial phase, which involves providing information about a crime or series of crimes for which there is a suspected offender. A profile can be useful at this stage of an investigation because it can assist in developing proper interview and interrogation strategies among other things; further, a profile may be used in court as expert evidence to argue for aggravating circumstances and the like, sometimes meaning the difference between life-imprisonment and death penalty cases. Therefore, during the trial phase of an investigation, a profiler’s goals are to (Petherick and Turvey, 2008a, p. 138):

1. Evaluate the nature and value of forensic and behavioral evidence to a particular crime or series of related crimes
2. Develop interview or interrogation strategies
3. Help develop insight into offender motive and intent before, during, and after the commission of a crime (i.e., levels of planning, evidence of remorse, pre-conviction acts, etc.)
4. Link potentially related crimes by identifying crime scene indicators and behavior patterns (i.e., MO and signature)

The goals of profiling may also be dictated in part by the type of crime being profiled and by the needs of the investigative team requesting help.
Also, some crimes are more suited to profiling than others. Therefore, it is also necessary to consider the types of crimes that profiling might assist in and whether a case requires the use of what may be an expensive and time-consuming tool.

Generally, it is noted that profiling is most suited to crimes involving psychopathology, or where there is some evidence of psychological dysfunction (McCann, 1992; Pinizzotto, 1984), or in crimes of a sexual nature because they involve more interaction between the offender and the victim (Nowikowski, 1995). Such crimes typically involve murder, rape, arson, and bombing but may also include anonymous letter writing (Davis, 1999; Homant, 1999; Strano, 2004) and other crimes of an unusual, bizarre, violent, sexual or repetitive in nature (Cook and Hinman, 1999; Geibert, 2001; Palermo, 2002; Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 2005; Strano, 2004). It has also been used in hostage negotiations and threats (Davis, 1999; Douglas and Harelwood, 1996) and assessing suicidality (see Canter, 1999; Homant and Kennedy, 1998; La Fon, 2002). Teten (1989, pp. 366-367) provides this poignant commentary, summing up the issue nicely:

Therefore, while it is theoretically possible to prepare an accurate profile of the perpetrator in any type of crime, it is not feasible. Psychological profiling should be utilised only in those types of crimes where the crime-scene investigation is as complete and thorough as possible.

As a practical matter, this procedure can be expected to provide usable data in only a few highly specific types of crimes. Even then, it is totally dependent upon the psychological value of the evidence collected.

Most of the offences, to be appropriate for profiling, must feature some form of overt sexual activity or a loss of contact with reality. Generally speaking, the types of crimes in which profiling has been most successful include:

- Homicides that involve sexual activity, or appear to be sex related
- Forcible rapes
- Sexual molestations
- Indecent exposures
- Some forms of arson
- Homicides involving the parents, children or a majority of the members of a family
- Deaths by hanging

These are not the limits of the application of profiling, however, and it has also been applied to more esoteric areas, such as intrusion management in computer security (see Schlarman, 1999), threat management in stalking (see Petherick, 2008), and premises liability in civil actions (see Kennedy and Homant, 1997; explained further in Chapter 8). Regardless of the fact that profiling can be and has been used to understand a broad range of criminal behaviors, it should be noted that the goals of profiling remain consistent—to narrow the suspect pool, provide new areas of inquiry, keep the investigation on track and undistracted, and understand the behaviors more completely.

Inputs and Outputs of Criminal Profiling
To successfully complete a profile in a given case, a variety of information may be required, depending on the method used. This ranges from statistical data regarding past crimes, to physical evidence and witness statements, to the reconstruction and interpretation of offender behavior. Ostensibly, the more complete this information, the more accurate profiling inferences can be. If the information is incomplete or incorrect, depending on the profiling method used, certain characteristics may be impossible to determine; at the very least it may seriously undermine the veracity of the conclusions. Therefore, it is generally true that more information is better.

For example, the first stage of the FBI method is profiling inputs, and describes those elements necessary to compile the assessment (see Douglas, Resler, Burgess, and Hartman, 1986). These elements include a complete synopsis of the crime, location, weather conditions, and complete victim information including domestic setting, employment, reputation, and criminal history. Forensic information relevant to the crime is also necessary; autopsy reports, photographs and toxicology, as well as crime scene photographs of the area and crime scene sketches to help provide an overall picture.

However, it may not be said that a limited amount of evidence will produce a limited profile in every case. Some profilers show constraint with the information or outputs they provide in their profiles, whereas others are considerably more liberal in their estimates. This liberalism is typical of inductive methods which focus more on offense generalizations, and not necessarily on the available evidence, resulting in a broader range of characteristics offered. Inductive methods will be discussed thoroughly later.

Turvey (2008b) is an example of someone who is more conservative in his approach. He argues that in most cases, during the investigative phase only about four relevant offender characteristics can be deductively inferred from crime scene behavior. These are Criminal Skill, Knowledge of the Victim, Knowledge of the Crime Scene, and Knowledge of Methods and Materials. Although other characteristics are potentially inferable, they are considered less relevant to investigative needs by virtue of falling to narrow the suspect
This list is consistent with Ault and Rees (1980) and O’Toole (2004), who provide exhaustive lists of inferable offender traits and emotional states, covering almost every facet of their past, present, and future. It should be noted, however, that the means for inferring these broader and less investigatively relevant traits is typically through comparison to past offenders who committed similar crimes, and not through a process of case-based deduction. The problems inherent in this process will become clear in the following section discussing how profilers may render their findings.

1. Name
2. Age
3. Sex
4. Race
5. Height and weight
6. Marital status
   a. Children, ages and sex
   b. Wife, pregnant and recent birth
7. Education level
8. Socioeconomic status
9. History of, and type of, sexual problems
10. Physical abnormalities and/or defects such as
    a. Acne, speech impediment, obese, walks with a limp, etc.
11. Residence, condition of, etc.
12. Automobile, condition of, etc.
13. Behavior including any noticeable change recently and describe
    a. Mannerisms and personality
    b. Employment, recently laid off? Skills associated with job?
16. Day or night person?
17. Users of drugs or alcohol, recent increase?
18. Dress, sloppy or neat? Type of clothing!
19. Known to carry, collect, or display weapons? What type?
20. Rigid versus flexible personality

At the other end of the spectrum is Geberth (1996), who provides an exhaustive list of those things he believes can be determined from the crime, including:

- Name
- Age
- Sex
- Race
- Height and weight
- Marital status
  - Children, ages and sex
  - Wife, pregnant and recent birth
- Education level
- Socioeconomic status
- History of, and type of, sexual problems
- Physical abnormalities and/or defects such as
  - Acne, speech impediment, obese, walks with a limp, etc.
- Residence, condition of, etc.
- Automobile, condition of, etc.
- Behavior including any noticeable change recently and describe
  - Mannerisms and personality
  - Employment, recently laid off? Skills associated with job?
- Day or night person?
- Users of drugs or alcohol, recent increase?
- Dress, sloppy or neat? Type of clothing!
- Known to carry, collect, or display weapons? What type?
- Rigid versus flexible personality

The following sections will briefly introduce readers to the logic and reasoning used within profiling before covering the major approaches to profiling that are available. Far from being an in-depth exposition, these sections seek to provide readers the necessary and relevant points of each. For a more in-depth treatment of these matters, readers should consult Petherick (2003), Petherick (2005), and Petherick and Turvey (2006).

**Logic and Reasoning in the Methods of Criminal Profiling**

The following sections will briefly introduce readers to the logic and reasoning used within profiling before covering the major approaches to profiling that are available. Far from being an in-depth exposition, these sections seek to provide readers the necessary and relevant points of each. For a more in-depth treatment of these matters, readers should consult Petherick (2003), Petherick (2005), and Petherick and Turvey (2006).

**Logic and Reasoning**

Before considering the different methods of criminal profiling, we need to canvas some fundamental issues related to logic and reasoning. The reason is that, regardless of profiling method used, they differ most according to the way in which the final conclusion is rendered. It could be said that there are predominantly two types of logic used: the first is inductive and the second is deductive. Inductive methods are those relying on statistical or correlational reasoning, and these methods will be discussed forthwith. The final method, Behavioral Evidence Analysis, is deductively oriented and will be discussed in "Deduction: The Suggested Approach" section later.

The science of logic is variously defined, and in the broadest sense it is the process of argumentation. As Farber (1942, p. 41) argues, logic is "a unified discipline which investigates the structure and validity of ordered knowledge." According to Bhattacharyya (1958, p. 326):

"Logic is usually defined as the science of valid thought. But as thought may mean either the act of thinking or the object of thought, we get two definitions of logic: logic as the science (1) of the act of valid thinking, or (2) of the objects of valid thinking."

Stock (2004, p. 8) suggests:

Logics may be declared to be both the science and the art of thinking. It is the art of thinking in the same sense in which grammar is the art of speaking. Grammar is not in itself the right use of words, but a knowledge of it enables men to use words correctly. In the same way a knowledge of logic enables men to think correctly or at least to avoid incorrect thoughts. As an art, logic may be called the navigation of the seas of thought.

It is the purpose of logic to analyze the methods by which valid judgements are obtained in any science or discourse, which is met by the formulation of general laws that dictate the validity of judgements (Farber, 1942). Without a solid foundation in logic and reasoning, the criminologist cannot proceed competently.
Inductive Criminal Profiling

An inductive argument provides a conclusion (or offender characteristic) that is made likely, or a matter of probability, by offering supporting argumentation. In profiling, this support often includes things like physical and behavioral evidence, research findings, or even profiler experience and expertise. A good inductive argument will provide strong support for the conclusion offered, but this still does not make the argument necessarily correct. In reality, even the best inductive argument is a generalization, hypothesis, or theory awaiting verification through testing (Turvey, 2008a). Although inductive generalizations may be true in some—even many—cases, there is no way to guarantee that they will apply to the case being profiled.

A key identifying feature of inductive profiles is the use of qualifiers, such as probably, may be, or typically, among others, highlighting the probabilistic nature of the assessment. For example, crime figures from the United States (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2002) provide that approximately 50% of offenders who committed murder in that year were male. Even though this relationship is relatively strong, it still does not mean that a male will have committed every homicide in that year. As it stands, this statistic could be evidence, research findings, or even profiler experience and expertise. A good justification through testing (Turvey, 2008a) still does not make the argument necessarily correct. In reality, even the best inductive argument is a generalization, hypothesis, or theory awaiting verification through testing (Turvey, 2008a). Although inductive generalizations may be true in some—even many—cases, there is no way to guarantee that they will apply to the case being profiled.

However, this argument based on nationwide statistics could very easily be wrong. This happens because in the examination of individual cases, all things are not equal. The likelihood of an offender being male changes based on a variety of factors, including the type of offense, the type of weapon used, and the sex of the victim, to name but a few, and even taking these things into account does not guarantee the accuracy of the predicted characteristic (in this case, the sex). Therefore, looking narrowly at just the issue of male versus female homicide offenders doesn’t accurately reflect the complexity that will exist in the context of a real case.

Apart from context, two of the issues which may seriously impact on the generalizability of any statistical data used to generate inductive theories are sample size and research methodology. This is perhaps best illustrated by a specific FBI study (Burgess and Ressler, 1983) that originally set the stage for the subsequently developed method of profiling. The study, which was the basis for the FBI’s entire profiling method, involved only 36 offenders (not all of whom were serial offenders). Furthermore, the methodology of the study was heavily criticized by the peer reviewers who noted, among other things, small sample size (Burgess, 2003) and a lack of inter-rater reliability (consistency between different individuals rating the offender) (Fox, 2004). Others have been critical of this study as well, with Canter (2004, p. 6) noting that “the FBI agents conducting the study did not select random or even a large sample of all offenders.”

The FBI, being very much aware of the limitations of its inductive profiling methods, provides more than a qualifier with its criminal investigative analysis reports (profiles). It actually goes so far as to provide a broad disclaimer at the beginning of each investigative profile. While the wording may vary, the theme is consistent, with the following example being representative (Vonjage and Harrington, 1998, p. 62):

It should be noted that the attached analysis is not a substitute for a thorough and well-planned investigation and should not be considered all inclusive. An inductive argument is a generalization, hypothesis, or theory awaiting verification through testing (Turvey, 2008a). Although inductive generalizations may be true in some—even many—cases, there is no way to guarantee that they will apply to the case being profiled.

This standard FBI disclaimer signals the weakness of purely inductive profiling methodologies.

### Deductive Criminal Profiling

Deductive profiling relies on a more scientific and systematic process whereby offender characteristics are a direct extension of the available physical and behavioral evidence (Turvey, 2008a). If the premises are true, then the conclusions must also be true (Bevel and Gardiner, 1997) (recall in inductive arguments if the premises are true, the conclusion is possible but not necessarily true). Neblett (1985, p. 114) goes further, stating, “If the conclusion is false, then at least one of the premises must be false.” For this reason, it is incumbent on the profiler to establish the veracity and validity of each and every premise before attempting to draw conclusions from them.

Because a deductive argument is structured so that the conclusion is implicitly contained within the premises, and unless the reasoning is invalid, the conclusion follows as a matter of course. A deductive argument is designed so that it takes us from truth to truth. That is, a deductive argument is valid if (Alexandra, Matthews, and Millet, 2002, p. 65):

- It is logically possible for its conclusion to be false if its premises are true.
- Its conclusions must be true if its premises are true.
- It would be contradictory to assert its premises yet deny its conclusions.

In profiling, deduction draws on the scientific method which is a “reasoned step by step procedure involving observations and experimentation in problem solving” (Bevel, 2001, p. 154). Unlike induction, then, deduction takes
The possible hypotheses garnered from statistics and research (the inductive conclusions) and tests them against the physical evidence present in each case. This is undertaken with a view not to prove the hypothesis, but rather to disprove it. That is, each possible characteristic of the offender is tested against the evidence with the goal of falsifying it or proving it to be untrue. If falsified, the inductive hypothesis is dropped or restructured, while those hypotheses that consistently and repeatedly fail to be disproved survive. It is only after this rigorous testing that we can be certain an analysis is complete and truths are arrived at. Once a hypothesis has consistently withstood falsification, it can be presented in a deductive fashion. It is under this strict procedure of testing and retesting that deductive profiling operates. From an analysis of case inputs, theories are formed inductively and tested against the evidence. After numerous and repeated attempts to disprove the theories, a deductive conclusion can be put forth.

However, the profile that results from this process is by no means static and may be updated in light of new information. New physical evidence may be incorporated into the decision process to update the conclusion. Also, new advances in science and understanding may challenge long-held assumptions and question the current hypothesis. Although it may appear as such, this is not a problem with the process because a deduction can operate only within the realm of established laws and principles. This tenet of argumentation is made clear by Farber (1948, p. 48):

Every "logical system" is governed by principles of structure and meaning. A system that claims to be a "logic," i.e., which operates formally with one of the various definitions of implication, possibility, etc., is subject to the laws of construction of ordered thought, namely, to the fundamental principles of logic. This requirement imposed on all systems cannot amount to a law that there shall be law. The specific application is provided by the rules in each system.

When these laws or principles change because of new knowledge, so too must the nature of the deduction made.

Armed with an understanding of logic, let us now turn to the inductive methods.

Inductive Methods of Criminal Profiling

The following is a basic primer on the major forms of inductive profiling methodology.

Criminal Investigative Analysis

Without doubt, the best known method of criminal profiling is that of the FBI, known variously as criminal investigative analysis (CIA) and crime scene analysis. This approach arose primarily from the study mentioned previously, which was conducted between 1979 and 1983, with the research focus on the development of typologies from an examination of various features of crimes perpetrated by incarcerated sexual murderers (see Burgess and Ressler, 1985). The goal was to determine whether there are any consistent features across offenses that may be useful in classifying future offenders (Petherick, 2005). A number of publications have arisen from this original research, including Burgess, Hartman, Ressler, Douglas, and McCormack (1986); Ressler and Burgess (1985); Ressler, Burgess, and Douglass (1986); Ressler, Burgess, Douglas, Hartman, and D'Agostino (1986); and Ressler, Burgess, Hartman, Douglas, and McCormack (1986).

The study resulted in an organized/disorganized dichotomy, which became the FBI profiling method. This dichotomy classifies offenders by virtue of the level of sophistication, planning, and competence evident in the crime scene. An organized crime scene is one with evidence of planning, where the victim is a targeted stranger, the crime scene reflects overall control, there are restraints used, and aggressive acts occur prior to death. This suggests that these offenders are organized in their daily life with the crime scene being a reflection of their personality, meaning they will be average to above average in intelligence, be socially competent, prefer skilled work, have a high birth order, have a controlled mood during the crime, and may also use alcohol during the crime. A disorganized crime scene shows spontaneity, where the victim or location is known to the offender, the crime scene is random and sloppy, there is sudden violence, minimal restraints are used, and there are sexual acts after death. These characteristics are again suggestive of the personality of these offenders, with disorganized offenders being below average in intelligence, being socially inadequate, having a low birth order, having an anxious mood during the crime, and involving the minimal use of alcohol during the offense. Despite having these mutually exclusive classifications, it is generally held that no offender will fit neatly into either category, with most offenders being somewhere between the two; these offenders are called "mixed."

Despite suggestions that the organized and disorganized terminology was an outgrowth of the study conducted in the late 1970s and early 1980s and published in 1985, it had actually been in use for some time. The terminology first appeared in its original form of organized nonsexual and disorganized sexual in "The Lust Murderer" in 1990 (see Hazelwood and Douglas, 1988). As such, the study is best thought of as further developing an existing concept rather than generating a new one.

Like virtually all the profiling methods, CIA is composed of a number of steps or stages in which information about the offense is gathered, and determinations are made about its relevance and meaning. Despite the fact that an
articulated methodology is available, there is much anecdotal evidence to sug-
ggest that protagonists of the FBI method do not adhere strictly to all steps
or stages. Furthermore, many FBI employed and trained "profilers" are gener-
ally not qualified to perform certain analyses proposed as part of the method
(for example, crime scene reconstruction; see Christie, 2005; Superior Court of
California, 1999).

In theory, CIA is a six-step method, though in reality it is five steps with the
sixth step involving the arrest of an offender if one is identified. These first
five steps are profiling inputs, decision process models, crime assessment,
criminal profile, and investigation. The final phase (ostensibly the sixth) is
apprehension.

Douglas and Burgess (1986, p. 9) suggest a seven-step process that is "quite
similar to that used by clinicians to make a diagnosis and treatment plan.
These seven steps are:

- Evaluation of the criminal act itself
- Comprehensive evaluation of the specifics of the crime scene(s)
- Comprehensive analysis of the victim
- Evaluation of preliminary police reports
- Evaluation of the medical examiner's autopsy protocol
- Development of profile with critical offender characteristics, and
- Investigative suggestions predicated on the construction of the profile

The FBI method is one of the most prevalent today; however, despite (or per-
haps owing to) its widespread use, this method of profiling has suffered the
most criticism, including:

- The original study on 36 offenders was considerably flawed and
criticized heavily by the peer reviewers (Fox, 2004).
- The classifications were seemingly made on the basis of information
about the offenders and the crime scene involved (Homant and
Kennedy, 1998) according to the offenders themselves.
- Most offenders will be neither organized nor disorganized, but will
fall somewhere between the two extremes (Ressler and Schachtman,
1992) although this "mixed" category is less helpful to investigators
because this decreases discrimination between types of offenders
(Baker, 2001) and presents a problem because the two categories are
supposedly discrete.
- The casework of FBI profilers has been heavily criticized in individual
cases (see Darke, Otto, Pychowski, and Stas, 1993; Fox and Levin,
1995; Investigations Subcommittee and Defense Policy Panel of the
Committee on Armed Services, 1990; Koppel and Blackman, 1997;
Thompson, 1993; Turvey, 2008a).

As a conclusion to criminal investigative analysis, let us consider the skills
required in various domains to be able to apply this model. The following
chart outlines possible background knowledge and experience which may be
necessary to profiling, and whether it is required for this method specifically.

A similar chart will be used to describe the background knowledge necessary
to apply each method, to assist in conceptualizing and comparing the abilities
and strengths of profilers using various types of profiling:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Unnecessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law enforcement affiliation</td>
<td>Helpful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Helpful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigative</td>
<td>Helpful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forensic knowledge</td>
<td>Helpful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical logic</td>
<td>Unnecessary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Diagnostic Evaluations**

Diagnostic evaluations (DEs) do not represent a single profiling method or
approach, but instead are generic descriptions of the services offered by psy-
chologists and psychiatrists relying on clinical judgment in profiling offenders
(Bradley, 2003). These evaluations are done on an as-needed basis (Wilson,
Lincoln, and Kocsis, 1997) usually as one part of a broad range of psychological
services offered by that individual. Historically, some of the earliest examples
of profiling available are diagnostic evaluations, and prior to the formation of
the FBI's Behavioral Sciences Unit, police sought the advice of psychologists
and psychiatrists on particular crimes with varying results (Towl and Crighton, 1996). In modern terms, the contribution of mental health experts to investigations took shape when various police forces asked if clinical interpretations of unknown offenders might help in identification and apprehension (Cantor, 1980).

Even though other profiling methods have come to the fore, Copson (1995) claims that over half of the profiling done in the United Kingdom is conducted by psychologists and psychiatrists using a clinical approach. In a study of the range of services offered by police psychologists, Bartol (1996) found that, on average, 26% of the total monthly workload of in-house psychologists was spent profiling, and that 34% of the monthly workload of part-time consultants was spent criminal profiling. It is not these results that are of particular interest, however, but that 70% of those surveyed did not feel comfortable giving this advice and felt that the practice was extremely questionable. Furthermore (Bartol, 1996, p. 75),

One well-known police psychologist, with more than 20 years of experience in the field, considered criminal profiling "virtually useless and potentially dangerous." Many of the respondents wrote that much more research needs to be done before the process becomes a useful tool.

Without a clear and identifiable process, these evaluations are a little more kibyscopic and rely to a large degree on the background of the individual compiling them. One's education, training, and experience dictate the approach taken at a given point in time, with the profile being an outgrowth of the clinician's understanding of criminals and criminal behavior, personality, and mental illness (Gudjonsson and Copson, 1997). Developmental and clinical issues play a considerable role in DE profiles, and Jackson and Bekerian (1997) dedicate a discussion to these areas, focusing heavily on the application of personality theory to profiling.

Boon (1997) describes how psychoanalytic/psychodynamic, learning, dispositional/trait, humanist/cognitive, and alternative/Eastern philosophies affect case assessment. To illustrate how personality theories apply to profile compilation, Boon supplies several cases of extortion to which specific personality characteristics are applied. He concludes that the feedback gained in the profile will always be reflective of the psychological framework employed by the clinician, with those employing a psychoanalytic background offering advice typical of the Freudian paradigm and so on.

Badcock (1997, p. 10) similarly discusses some of the background issues to offender development (i.e., developmental issues) and clinical issues (such as the prevalence of mental illness in offending populations):

Where developmental issues are great enough and begin early enough they can change the entire concept of what is "normal" for an individual. Everyone tends to assume that what they are used to must be normal and some people grow up with what most others would consider abnormal ideas of the meaning of normalcy. People who have been seriously abused from an early age, for example, can grow up believing that abuse is the basis of normal relationships. They may have great difficulties in relating to others in ways that do not include abuse and some of them will become abusers themselves.

The implication is that, as these issues have the potential to impact on later behavior by the individual, it is necessary for profilers to have the capacity to understand how these manifest in behavior. Specific issues cited include jealousy, envy, control, power, sadomasochism, fantasy, and paraphilias.

Turoc (1996), in a widely cited article, provides his own adaptation of the diagnostic approach through psychodynamic theory. Turoc is critical of anyone without clinical experience (p. 151):

The experienced clinician has an unyielding inherent understanding of psychopathology, experience with predictability, a capacity to get into the mind of the perpetrator and a scientific approach without moral judgement or prejudice. The most productive circumstance likely to arise is when the profiler has both clinical (as opposed to academic) training and law enforcement experience. One cannot expect to obtain a graduate degree and make accurate predictions in the absence of a sound theoretical basis or clinical experience.

In examining the role of forensic psychiatrists, McGrath (2000, p. 321) provides the following reasons why they may be particularly suited to providing profiles:

- Their background in the behavioral sciences and their training in psychopathology place them in an enviable position to deduce personality characteristics from crime scene information.
- The forensic psychiatrist is in a good position to infer the meaning behind signature behavior.
- Given their training, education, and focus on critical and analytical thinking, the forensic psychiatrist is in a good position to "channel" their training into a new field.

Although these may seem obvious areas in which forensic mental health specialists can apply their skills, McGrath also notes that any involvement in the profiling process should not revolve around, or focus on, treatment issues. It is here that we shall turn to the criticisms of diagnostic evaluations:
The following chart provides a list of the necessary background knowledge and experience required to perform a diagnostic evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Helpful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law enforcement affiliation</td>
<td>Unnecessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigative</td>
<td>Unnecessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forensic knowledge</td>
<td>Unnecessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical logic</td>
<td>Unnecessary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Investigative Psychology**

The main advocate of investigative psychology (IP) is David Canter, a British psychologist who promotes a scientific-research-based approach to the study of offender behavior. Investigative psychology is an inductive approach and is dependent on the amount of data collected (McGrath, 2000). Although sample size is a problem for some inductive methods, Canter is constantly carrying out research to improve the samples on which conclusions are based, and rigorous social scientific methods to expand knowledge are employed (Egger, 1998; Petherick, 2003). As a result, the conclusions are still inductive but based on more empirically robust evaluations.

As with the FBI approach, investigative psychology identifies profiling as only one part of an overall methodology. This is explained in Canter (2000, p. 101):

The domain of investigative psychology covers all aspects of psychology that are relevant to the conduct of criminal and civil investigations. Its focus is on the ways in which criminal activities may be examined and understood in order for the detection of crime to be effective and legal proceedings to be appropriate. As such, investigative psychology is concerned with psychological input to the full range of issues that relate to the management, investigation and prosecution of crime.

It is further explained in Canter (2004, p. 7):

The broadening and deepening of the contributions that psychology can make to police investigations, beyond serial killers and personality profiles, to include the effective utilisation of police information, through interviews and from police records, as well the study of police investigations and decision support systems has lead to the identification of a previously unnamed domain of applied psychology... called...Investigative Psychology.

According to the program's Web site, investigative psychology provides the following:

[A] scientific and systematic basis to previously subjective approaches to all aspects of the detection, investigation and prosecution of crimes. This behavioral science contribution can be thought of as operating at different stages of any investigation, from that of the crime itself, through the gathering of information and on to the actions of police officers working to identify the criminal then on to the preparation of a case for court.

Canter (1998, p. 11) has also gone to great pains to differentiate IP from "everyday" profiling:

So should psychologists be kept out of the investigation of crimes? Clearly as the Director of the Institute of Investigative Psychology I do not think that psychologists have much to offer to criminal and other investigations. My central point is to make a distinction between "profiling" and Investigative Psychology.

Further, to distinguish between IP and those idiosyncratic profiling approaches, the following is noted (Canter, 1998, p. 11):

Investigative psychology is a much more prosaic activity. It consists of the painstaking examination of patterns of criminal behavior and the
testing out of those patterns of trends that may be of value to police investigators... Investigative psychologists also accept that there are areas of criminal behavior that may be fundamentally enigmatic.

This method, commonly referred to as the five-factor model, has five main components that reflect an offender's past and present. These are interpersonal coherence, significance of time and place, criminal characteristics, criminal career, and forensic awareness. These components will be addressed in turn.

Interpersonal coherence refers to the way people adopt a style of interaction when dealing with others, where crime is an interpersonal transaction involving characteristic ways of dealing with other people (Canter, 1995). Canter believes that offenders treat their victims in a similar way to that in which they treat people in their daily lives; that is, criminals carry out actions that are a direct extension of the transactions they have with other people (Wilson and Soutiball, 1976). For example, a rapist who exhibits selfishness with friends, family, and colleagues in daily life will also exhibit selfishness with victims. Similarly, an offender may select victims who possess characteristics of people important to him or her (Muller, 2003). This belief is not unique to IP; and most profiling approaches rely on the notion of interpersonal coherence in developing offender characteristics (Bitterick, 2003).

As "interpersonal processes gain much of their psychological nuance from the time and place in which they occur" (Canter, 1989, p. 14), time and space considerations should also be reflective of some aspects of the offender. That is, the time and place may be specifically chosen by the offender and so provide further insight into his or her actions in the form of mental maps. The implication is that "an offender will feel more comfortable and in control in areas which he knows well" (Ainsworth, 2001, p. 193). Two considerations are important: the first being the specific location, and the second being the general spatial behavior which is a function of specific crime sites (Canter, 1989). Canter (2003) dedicated a whole work to these aspects that are largely based on the foundational theory of environmental criminology.

Next, criminal characteristics provide investigators with some idea about the type of crime they are dealing with. The idea is to determine "whether the nature of the crime and the way it is committed can lead to some classifications of what is characteristic... based upon interviews with criminals and empirical studies" (Canter, 1989, p. 14). This is an inductive component of the approach and, as it stands, is similar to attempts made by the FBI in applying an organized/disorganized typology.

Studying a criminal career provides an understanding of the way offenders may modify behavior in light of experience (Nowikowski, 1995). There is room for adaptation and change, with many criminals responding to victim, police, or location dynamics owing to learning and experience. This adaptation and change may be reflective of past experiences while offending. For example, a criminal may bind and gag a current victim, based on the screams and resistance of a past victim (Canter, 1989). This may reflect the evolution of MO displayed by many offenders who learn through subsequent offenses and continue to refine their behavior. Additionally, the nature and types of precautionary behaviors may provide some insight into whether the offender has experience with or exposure to investigative practices.

Finally, forensic awareness may show an increase in learning based on past experience with the criminal justice system. Perpetrators may be sophisticated in that they will use techniques that hinder police investigations, such as wearing a mask or gloves or through attempts to destroy other evidence (Ainsworth, 2000). A rapist may also turn to using condoms to prevent the transfer of biological fluids for DNA analysis.

Further, five characteristics utilized in the IP method may be instructive to investigators. They are self-explanatory and include residential location, criminal biography, domestic/social characteristics, personal characteristics, and occupation/education history (Ainsworth, 2000). While there is not necessarily any greater weighting placed on any of these profile features, Beon and Davies (2003) suggest that research from the United Kingdom identifies residential location and criminal history as the most beneficial, whereas domestic, social, occupational, and educational characteristics are of least value (again highlighting the emphasis IP places on crime geography).

The following criticisms could be made of investigative psychology:

- The rigorous reconstruction of offender behavior is not undertaken, so the meaning of behavior may be questionable.
- The generalization of past cases to the current case is dangerous and potentially misleading.
- Offender characteristics are only a possibility, and nothing concrete or specific about the current case is offered.
- IP assumes that the research on a particular crime type is valid to the crime type (general research on murder versus specific research on domestic homicide) and to the crime under consideration (that the probabilities within the research apply to the extent case).

The following chart provides the background requirements necessary for those practicing investigative psychology.
Background | Requirement
---|---
Research | Required
Law enforcement affiliation | Helpful
Psychology | Helpful
Investigative | Unnecessary
Forensic knowledge | Unnecessary
Analytical logic | Unnecessary

**DEDUCTION: THE SUGGESTED APPROACH**

In profiling terms, Behavioral Evidence Analysis (BEA) is in the most recent of the individual profiling methods. The method was developed by Brent Turvey in the late 1990s. It is based on forensic science and the collection and interpretation of physical evidence, and by extension what this means about an offender. BEA is primarily a deductive method and, as a result, will not make a conclusion about an offender unless specific physical evidence exists that suggests the characteristic. This means that, instead of relying on averaged offender types, BEA profilers conduct a detailed examination of the scene and related behaviors and argue from this what offender characteristics are evidenced in the behavior and scene.

The strength of BEA lies in the fact that the profiler works only with what is known; nothing is assumed or surmised. In an attempt to provide this insight, the FBI agents used a technique known as Equivalenced Death Analysis (EDA) to examine Hartwig. While the EDA was not responsible for first bringing attention to him as the person responsible, it was most certainly responsible for cementing this opinion in the minds of investigators and the naval executive. What followed was a series of events that perpetuated bad judgment and showed just how dangerous it can be to accept at face value information that has not been observed or collected first hand. Investigators from

We are interested in physical evidence because it may tell a story. Physical evidence—properly collected, properly analyzed, and properly interpreted—may establish the factual circumstances at the time the crime occurred. In short, the crime may be reconstructed. Our principal interest is ultimately in the reconstruction, not the evidence per se. Also, along with the ethos is an ethic—a moral obligation to maintain the integrity of the processes by means of which the reconstruction is accomplished. In short, the ethics of crime reconstruction represents an imperative to ‘get it right.’ ‘Getting it right’ involves more than guessing correctly. It necessitates a systematic process. It involves the proper recognition of the evidence, the winnowing of the relevant wheat from the irrelevant chaff, and the precise application of logic, both inductive and deductive. The process is not trivial. Because this stage relates to the examination of physical evidence, profilers who are not familiar with or qualified to interpret physical evidence should not undertake this task. Instead, they should work with trained professionals whom they trust to examine the evidence on which they are basing their conclusions. The importance of establishing a set of given facts from information given during an investigation should be apparent, but this information is all too often assumed as correct without question. Two cases that exemplify the pitfalls of working with information that has been gathered and interpreted by others are the investigation of the explosion aboard the USS Iowa and the homicide of Joel Andrew Shanbrom, for which brief explanations are provided next.

**USS Iowa**

Early one morning in 1989, Turret Two on board the USS Iowa exploded, killing 47 of the ship’s crew (Thompson, 1999). The explosion sent shockwaves throughout the U.S. Navy, with the subsequent investigation revealing dangerous practices, incompetence, cover-ups, and investigative failures, only some of which were related to the explosion and deaths. Given the magnitude of the disaster, the Navy consulted agents from the FBI’s Behavioral Sciences Unit to provide some insight into what they felt were the actions of a suicidal homosexual by the name of Clayton Hartwig stationed on the ship.

In an attempt to provide this insight, the FBI agents used a technique known as Equivalenced Death Analysis (EDA) to examine Hartwig. While the EDA was not responsible for first bringing attention to him as the person responsible, it was most certainly responsible for cementing this opinion in the minds of investigators and the naval executive. What followed was a series of events that perpetuated bad judgment and showed just how dangerous it can be to accept at face value information that has not been observed or collected first hand.
the Naval Investigative Service (NIS) started by assuming Hartwig's guilt and then provided this information to the FBI profilers, whose assessment fed this line of thinking back to the NIS and the Navy.

With regards to their analysis, a report of the Investigations Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services House of Representatives noted two important issues with the FBI's analysis (pp. 6-7):

- The procedures the FBI used in preparing the EDA were inadequate and unprofessional. As a matter of policy, the analysis do not state the speculative nature of their analyses. Moreover, the parameters that the FBI agents used, either provided to them or chosen by them, biased their results toward only one of three deleterious conclusions. Further biasing their conclusions, the agents relied on insufficient and sometimes suspect evidence. The FBI agents' EDA was invalidated by 10 of 14 professional psychologists and psychiatrists, heavily criticized even by those professionals who found the Hartwig possibility plausible.

- The FBI analysis gave the Navy false confidence in the validity of the FBI's work. If the Navy had relied solely on the work of the NIS's own staff psychologists—which emphasized that such psychological autopsies are by definition "speculative"—the Navy would likely not have found itself so committed to the Hartwig thesis.

Despite the questionable nature of the EDA process and its methodology, there were more fundamental concerns about the material on which the analysis was based. The following concerns were also raised by the Investigations Subcommittee about the process and results:

- Richard Ault (working for the FBI) admitted that the Navy had only provided him with fragments of the evidence assembled against Hartwig.
- Ault was asked who wrote the poem "Disposable Heroes," a key piece of information on which Hartwig's alleged homosexuality hinged, and he didn't know.
- Asked whether the agents were aware that another sailor's mate told Admiral Milligan that another sailor had written the poem, Hazelwood stated that this was immaterial because Hartwig had the potential to see it.
- The agents were asked if they were aware that David Smith had recanted the testimony used in their EDA, and they claimed they weren't sure what he had recanted.
- The agents had relied entirely on the information provided to them by the NIS and had not done any interviews themselves.

There were further concerns about the veracity of the information on which the profile was based (Investigations Subcommittee and Defense Policy Panel of the Committee on Armed Services, 1990, p. 42):

The preponderance of material came from interviews conducted and provided to the FBI by the NIS. As the subcommittee found earlier, various questions were raised about the leading nature of bias introduced in the interviews by the NIS interviewing agents. Some witnesses denied making statements to NIS that are significant to the profile...in at least one instance, the witness recanted several portions of his testimony, but was still considered a valuable witness.

Joel Andrew Shanbrook

Another example stressing the importance of not only establishing a set of facts for oneself, but also in assessing evidence dynamics, is the homicide of Joel Andrew Shanbrook, a school district police officer in California. Shanbrook's wife, Jennifer, claimed that she was upstairs bathing their son when she heard an altercation downstairs between her husband and some [black] men. A profile of the alleged offender was compiled by Mark Safarik of the FBI's Behavioral Analysis Unit.

Safarik's assessment gave considerable weight to the apparent ransacking of certain rooms in the house, including that of the son Jacob:

The dresser and night stands in the master bedroom, Gisondi's room, and Jacob's bedroom had been disturbed...In Jacob's bedroom, a room clearly identified as a child's bedroom, the dresser drawers were pulled out to give the appearance they were searched. Such a room would not be expected to contain any valuables and this would have been passed over by officer(s) looking for valuables.

While police had trouble with Jennifer Fletcher's story from the outset, particularly after discovering significant life insurance policies on her husband, the profile remained steadfast to its assessment of someone ransacking the bedroom in an attempt to stage a burglary. It wasn't until later that an expert profiler, in providing trial assistance to the defense, was able to establish through consideration of evidence dynamics that the scene had in fact been altered by a police officer. In her search for clothing for Jacob Shanbrook, who was naked and cold from hiding in a bedroom closet with his mother since the alleged homicides. In a postscript to this case, Jennifer and her new husband, Matthew Fletcher, were both charged with the 1998 murder of Shanbrook after facing counts of fraud and conspiracy (Association Press, 2002; Blankstein, 2002).

It is also necessary to establish the accuracy and quality of the information which serves as the basis of the profile because of evidence dynamics. This refers
to influences that change, relocate, obscure, or obliterate physical evidence, regardless of the intent of the person or circumstance that bring about the change (Chisum and Turvey, 2008). So, evidence dynamics may be the result of the offender moving from one room to another during an offense, a bleeding but not yet deceased victim crawling down a hallway, paramedics attending the scene of a violent crime, or firefighters attending a fire scene. However, evidence dynamics is important in the case far beyond the exact circumstances of the crime scene, playing a role from the time the evidence is deposited until the final adjudication of the case (Chisum and Turvey, 2000). To provide some context to the way that evidence dynamics may alter the physical presence of crime scene actions, consider the following example from Chisum and Turvey (2000, p. 9):

A youth was stabbed several times by rival gang members. He ran for a home but collapsed in the walkway. A photo of the scene taken prior to the arrival of the EMT team shows a blood trail and that the victim was lying face down. Subsequent photos show the EMT’s working on the body on his back. He had been rolled over onto the blood pool. It became impossible for bloodstain patterns interpretation to be used to reconstruct the events leading to the death of the youth.

Given these examples, the importance of the forensic analysis and establishing a set of facts for oneself should be clear. Although only three cases have been used as examples, there are numerous others with a similar lack of critical appraisal of the presenting evidence (see also Superior Court of California, 1999). The other aspect of the forensic analysis that is important and factors in evidence dynamics is crime reconstruction, which is “the determination of the actions surrounding the commission of a crime” (Chisum, 2002, p. 81). Popular conceptions of crime reconstruction abound, with some believing the process involves the physical rebuilding of the crime scene in another location. Saferstein (2004) suggests that “reconstruction supports a likely sequence of events by the observation and evaluation of physical evidence, as well as statements made by witnesses and those involved with the incident.” Rymeson (2002) incorporates “common sense reasoning” and its use with forensic science to interpret evidence as it resides at the crime scene. Cooley (1999, p. 1). In an excellent paper written while a graduate student at the University of New Haven, suggests that crime scene reconstruction is the foundation of the BEA method:

Deductive reasoning, via crime scene reconstruction, can aid and will provide the profiler with the appropriate information allowing him or her to construct the most logical profile of an unknown offender. This will enable the profiler to supply the requesting agency with investigatively relevant information.

The second stage of the BEA process, victimology, examines all aspects of the victim including lifestyle, hobbies, habits, friends, enemies, and demographic features. The information derived through the victimology can help to determine the existence or extent of any relationship between the victim and the offender. Two other related components of the victimology are victim exposure and offender exposure. Victim exposure refers to the possibility of suffering harm or loss by virtue of an individual’s personal, professional, and social life (Petherick and Turvey, 2008c). This risk is further partitioned into overall exposure (lifestyle exposure) and the exposure present at the moment of victimization (incident exposure). As a general rule, exposure can be low, medium, or high, indicating that a person is at a low exposure by virtue of personal, professional, and social life and so forth. In BEA just as much time should be spent examining the victim’s personal and behavioral characteristics as would be spent assessing the offender.

In the third stage, crime scene analysis, the profiler determines such factors as the method of approach and attack, method of control, location type, nature and sequence of any sexual acts, materials used, type of verbal activity, and any precautionary acts the offender engaged in (Petherick and Turvey, 2008b), such as wearing gloves or a balaclava, altering one’s voice, or wearing a condom. This stage also sets out to determine what types of crime scenes are involved in a criminal event. They include the point of contact; primary, secondary, and tertiary scenes; and the dump or disposal site. For example, a victim with extensive wounds that would have produced a substantial amount of bleeding is found in an area devoid of bloodstains. This suggests the victim was killed elsewhere (a primary crime scene) and then moved to the scene where the body was found (the dump or disposal site).

The final stage is the actual offender profile, known as offender characteristics. All the information from the previous stages is integrated and assessed through deductive reasoning to determine what the physical evidence, victimology, and crime scene characteristics collectively argue about the offender. Turvey (2008b) argues against offering the profile characteristics of age, sex, race, and intelligence because they are typically assessed inductively and not based on physical evidence. As mentioned in the “Inputs and Outputs of Criminal Profiling” section earlier, it is argued that the following four conclusions can be offered deductively and posited with a high degree of confidence:

- Knowledge of the victim
- Knowledge of the crime scene
- Knowledge of methods and materials
- Criminal skill

While BEA is a method relying on deductive logic, it could not, however, be characterized as purely deductive. The reason is that the process of deduction
relies in part on induction, which produces theories that may be tested against
the evidence. This is confirmed by Stock (2004, p. 5), who writes, "in the natu-
ral order of treatment inductive logic precedes deductive, since it is induction
which supplies us with the general truths, from which we reason down in our
deductive inferences."

Because of the reliance on physical evidence and the reconstruction of the
behavior involved in the criminal event, many inductive generalizations will
be employed. Wound patterns and victimology are two such examples in which
inductions may be used to form the basis of a later deduction. The type of
knife used, its width, the length of the blade, and other characteristics of edged
weapons have typically been determined through a study of known weapons
and their features. However, the application of this knowledge to the partic-
ular features of a set of wounds present on a victim’s body involves the deduc-
tive application of this knowledge. Petherick (2003, p. 186) presents another
example of the application of the reasoning:

If a prostitute is murdered, a principally inductive approach suggests
that because of her profession she was at high risk of victimisation.
However, a more in depth deductive approach may determine that
she had a small select clientele, was naturally cautious, had taken self
defense training, and worked only in established premises. All of these
factors work to reduce her risk.

There are no direct criticisms of BEA in the literature, though there is some
minor discussion of deductive approaches in general. Most seem to be quite
confused by the application of the reasoning (Center, 2004; Godwin, 1999),
whereas others provide some cursory discussion of it but seem unsure of
how the overall process operates. Holmes and Holmes (2007, p. 7) note that
"much care is taken from the examination of forensic reports, victimology,
and so forth and the report will take much longer to develop using only this
approach." These authors seem largely unaware of the finer points of logic,
such as induction being a component of and important to the overall process
of deduction. Readers are also left with the distinct impression that the thor-
oughness of the approach (and the subsequent time involved) is prepotent.
A final deductively rendered opinion will rely on inductively derived knowl-
edge, though Holmes and his colleague tend to treat both processes as being
dichotomous and largely exclusive. This suggests a fundamental lack of overall
knowledge of the processes involved in reasoning.

McCrath (2000) has however identified one critical observation of this method,
and that is if the initial premises on which conclusions are based are wrong,
then the subsequent conclusions will also be wrong. Given that one of the
primary purposes of the BEA is to establish the veracity of the premises, this is
not necessarily a problem as long as profilers are aware that it is incumbent on

*While it is noted that BEA is a largely deductive method and does not rely on research in developing the final conclusion, research is employed to


The following chart breaks down the background knowledge necessary to use
a deductive approach to profiling:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Helpful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law enforcement affiliation</td>
<td>Unnecessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigative</td>
<td>Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forensic knowledge</td>
<td>Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical logic</td>
<td>Required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CRIMINAL PROFILING EDUCATION

The issue of profiler education has not been touched upon in any significant
way in the literature on profiling, with most discussions revolving around the
theoretical paradigm offered by respective authors. That is, those psychologists
engaged in the process argue for an educational experience including advanced
study in psychology; law enforcement officers engaged in profiling (mostly the
FBI and those they train) argue that law enforcement experience is a neces-

ty; those who approach profiling from the perspective of physical evidence
argue that a broad-based understanding of physical evidence, its relevance,
and meaning is important. The following sections of this chapter will discuss the
issues relevant to profiler education, what is required, and where to get it.

Tertiary Education

A tertiary education typically involves formal and structured classes in a vari-
ety of areas as dictated by the degree program students enroll in. Those taking
psychology will be educated in aspects of human behavior and cognition, from
introductory courses on the history of psychology through to abnormal psy-
chology, the neuropsychological basis of behavior, and treatment and assess-
ment. Those taking criminalology or criminal justice programs will be exposed to
the role, structure, and function of the police, courts, and prisons. Depending
on the program, they may also get extensive training in the behavioral sciences
in areas that have traditionally been the province of psychology (human behav-
ior and psychological disorders, among others). For those taking accounting or
business, students will be taught business administration, entrepreneurship,
account and book-keeping, and other business-related activities.
The point is this: not all educational experiences are equal, and the degree of instruction one receives in any area related to profiling differs based on a variety of factors. This may be owing to the educational institution or degree program at a broad level, there being critical differences not only among the institutions, but also between two programs even of the same name. Consider the following example: Two universities in the same general location both offer Criminology and Criminal Justice degrees. One is housed within a social science faculty, and the other is located within a law school. In the first program, there is a degree of overlap between criminological offerings and psychological offerings, exposing students to a range of issues relating to human behavior and cognition. The students in this program will develop a healthy understanding of behavioral science and how this applies to the profiling endeavor. In the latter program, students are taught primarily by legal professionals and theoretical sociologists in such a way that they develop a healthy understanding of policy and procedure as it relates to the legal system. It should be clear that students in the first program would be better placed to consider a career in profiling than students in the second.

It is also noted that the quality of a given program, with those staff undertaking research or casework in a given area perhaps being more equipped to provide a holistic education than those approaching any given topic from a purely theoretical point of view. The reason is that they will be better able to understand the nuances of casework, evidence, examination, and report writing.

Interested students should seek out a program that not only has a sufficient level of education in the behavioral sciences, but also one that is taught by staff who understand the theory of what they are teaching, why it is important, and how it applies.

With regards to specific areas of study, the following discrete areas of study are suggested:

- Criminology
- Psychology
- Forensic Science
- Law

The areas of criminology and psychology should be self-explanatory and have been covered elsewhere within the chapter. Forensic science is suggested because it will provide a fundamental understanding of the nature of physical evidence, its identification, limitations, benefits, and interpretation. Because profiling is based on an assessment of behavior, and the behavior is often determined through the lens of the physical evidence, students seeking work in the area would be best wanting in an education that did not encompass some aspect of forensic science. Law, or at least some understanding of the criminal justice system, expert evidence, and procedure, will be required because profilers are members of either private or government employed, forensic examiners. As such, there is an expectation that they may have to provide evidence in a court of law before a trier of fact.

It should also be noted that the subject area under which one decides to study is not the only thing to think about when preparing for a career in profiling. Similar to the issues of institutions and programs, all things are not created equal when it comes to studying criminal profiling. Unlike many courses in the criminology field, such as theories of crime courses which have an fairly predictable and consistent curriculum across teachers and universities, not all courses related to profiling are created equal. That is, depending on what school the profiling course is run from, and who teaches it, which aspects of profiling are important, which methods should be utilized, and which issues one student will differ. Students should seek out those courses that compare and contrast different methods that study actual profiles and real cases; and that endorse the scientific method, analytical logic, and critical thinking.

As an adjunct to these forms of tertiary study, it is also suggested that profilers engage in short courses. However, there are a number of perils and pitfalls evident in such a practice, as outlined next.

### Bricks, Mortar, and the Socratic Method

For those who are already working in the criminal justice system or outside it, there is often a desire to return to university to acquire a new or round out an existing education. It has been the authors’ experience over the years that there are a variety of reasons why students may return to university, including change of a career, promotion or advancement, interest, or simply to increase their knowledge base.

Aside from choosing the right university, program, and staff, students are further presented with a number of other options in terms of full-time or part-time degrees, on-campus, or external programs. Which option to take will be dictated largely by the requirements of the prospective student, availability and commitments to work and family, motivation, and financial means. However, students should not choose a university simply because it meets their time commitments or is affordable. Doing so may mean that, in the grand scheme of things, the quality of the program is sacrificed for expedience of completion or because it doesn’t fully stretch the purse strings. The net result is that they spend a given amount of time and energy on a program that means little if anything in terms of their vocational prospects or the quality of the information they receive and bring to bear at a later time.
For busy professionals, their choices may be limited to those programs that offer classes at night or via an external-only option where students are sent class materials, furnished with deadlines in which to submit their work, and contact their instructors through a variety of electronic means. Some distance programs also employ an on-campus option during the semester, often titled a "residential school," where students attend the university for lectures and tutorials and face time with teaching staff.

While this is true in some instances, it does not apply to all distance programs. Unfortunately, in today's competitive educational market, some institutions have watered down their approach to education such that students are never seen, feedback on assessment is scarce, and they are not given the opportunity to engage in any meaningful way with their peers. The Socratic Method is an approach to knowledge building and problem solving based on discussion and debate (Chism and Tuvey, 2007, p. 100). It is a process oriented in that it seeks to identify weak assumptions in an argument and, through repeatedly interrogating these assumptions, arriving at a more valid conclusion or answer. It is what the first author refers to as "Intellectual Darwinism"—a reference to Darwin's theory of evolution whereby weak theories are systematically culled.

The Socratic Method is an approach to knowledge building and problem solving based on discussion and debate (Chism and Tuvey, 2007, p. 100). It is a process oriented in that it seeks to identify weak assumptions in an argument and, through repeatedly interrogating these assumptions, arriving at a more valid conclusion or answer. It is what the first author refers to as "Intellectual Darwinism"—a reference to Darwin's theory of evolution whereby weak theories are systematically culled.

As a pedagogical tool, the Socratic Method involves interaction between two or more people where one (usually a lecturer or instructor) asks a question of another (a student or participant). The responses are then queried within a general or specific theoretical framework and any flaws identified. Further questions are then tailored to incorporate the new arguments, and the process goes on. This step-wise procedure for the Socratic Method is identified by Pedersen (2006, p. 1) as it applies to legal reasoning:

Students study cases before class.

In class, the professor calls on a student, with no advance notice.

The student gives a recitation of the facts and the procedural history.

The professor questions the student, probing underlying legal issues, thus forcing the student to identify relevant facts, question assumptions, take a position and argue its defense.

Meanwhile the rest of the class remains attentive by answering the professor’s questions in their own mind.

The same process may be applied to the process of profiling and crime analysis in the following way regarding motive (the following is hypothetical, but follows general discussions that take place in both authors’ classes regarding Criminal Profiling and Behavioral Evidence Analysis):

Q: With regards to the case study, let’s discuss the motive or motives that are evident in the offender’s behavior.

A: I think that the motive for the crime was murder.

Q: But murder is a term that describes a behavior or penal classification. A motive is a physical or psychological need. So what would you suggest the motive would be?

A: (Another student) The motive might be profit, as the offender didn't do anything sexual with the victim.

Q: So what evidence do we have that the motive was profit? What would you expect to find in a profit offense?

A: You would expect to see something stolen: money, jewelry, computers, or something of value. There is no evidence that anything has been stolen.

Q: If nothing has been stolen, is it likely the motive was profit?

A: It might be possible that the offense was interrupted, and that the offender didn’t have the chance to actually take anything.

If an acceptable answer is reached, then a new question is developed and the process begins again. For a more detailed or complex problem, the process may take minutes or hours, or may even span multiple sessions.

It should be noted that the process follows along similar lines to the use of the scientific method as a form of inquiry, which is a "way to investigate how something works, or how something happened, through the development of hypotheses and subsequent attempts at falsification through testing and other
accepted means" (Petherick and Turvey, 2008b, p. 47). Furthermore, the process works in much the same way as dissecting a case for which a criminologist's opinion has been sought. In this way, by utilizing the scientific method, we are essentially teaching students how to pull a case apart, put it back together, and infer conclusions from it.

With both authors working in the tertiary education environment, our recommendation to students is that they seek out a relevant education that will better equip them to understand the range of issues they will face in the analysis of crime and criminal behavior. They should seek out instructors who are actively working, researching, or publishing in the areas they teach, and they should seek this out in an actual institution, with staff who can mentor and challenge them, students with whom they can engage, and educational requirements that will provide them with the theory and practice that will enable them to become tomorrow’s practitioners.

**Short Courses: Perils and Pitfalls**

There is an inherent attraction in that which requires the least effort; anything that demands less of our time and attention is seen as being of greater significance regardless of the fact that whatever it is may be of lesser value. Because of this tendency toward the path of least resistance, short courses offer a significant attraction for many.

A short course is any truncated pathway to education or information that is offered in an intensive mode, often without the enforcement of educational standards or assessment. Before going any further, we need to point out that both authors are advocates of short courses, given the right context and framework.

Perhaps one of the best discussions of short courses comes from Chisum (2007, pp. 314–317). While this discussion relates specifically to short courses in bloodstain pattern analysis, the juxtaposition to general criminology should be easy to see:

In addition to reading the recommended publications, it is advised that anyone interested in crime reconstruction take a course in bloodstain analysis from a qualified forensic scientist. These courses can be useful for providing certain basic overviews of fundamental concepts. However, depending on the scientific background of the instructor, they may be lacking in certain crucial areas. A true scientist will find that a majority of the short bloodstain classes are lacking with regard to a discussion of accuracy, precision, and significant numbers. Appreciating these deficiencies is the difference between the technician's pedantic understanding of bloodstains and the forensic scientist's interpretive role in the reconstruction of the crime.

The preceding passage is useful and captures both the benefit and dangers of short courses: they are useful in providing overviews of certain basic concepts, but many such courses are not taught by qualified instructors, and they are by no means a holistic approach to education in any given domain.

But don't let us get wrong. Many authors in this volume run short courses in many different countries around the world, and these courses do have value. It is the authors' opinion that short courses are useful for a variety of reasons, including the following:

- They provide an overview of certain fundamental concepts.
- They keep students and professionals abreast of new theories and techniques.
- They give potential students an insight into a discrete area so they can make informed choices about future streams of study.
- Short courses can be invaluable for teaching process-oriented tasks.
- Students and professionals can learn a variety of valuable skills through a case study approach that is not always practical in formal tertiary environments.

The main point is that a short course, while offering a number of benefits, should be considered only one small part of an overall educational approach; they should not be taken as a standalone. That is, taking one short course on profiling does not qualify a person to represent himself or herself as a profiler, or to actively profile ongoing cases; this would be considered dangerous, irresponsible, and dishonest.

**CRIMINAL PROFILING AND THE CRIMINOLOGIST**

The argument for the involvement of criminologists in profiling is relatively straightforward on its face. Criminologists are those who, by definition, are involved in the study of crime, so it would seem a natural extension of their other responsibilities. However, the reality is far from this clear. Some criminologists are involved only in research activities, an endeavor that may leave them ill equipped to understand the foibles of human behavior in a practical sense. Some criminologists are involved in other discrete areas, such as crime prevention, victimology, policy and procedure, or purely theoretical areas that will similarly leave them ill equipped in the evaluation of specific criminal acts. Recall from the first chapter, criminologists by their nature come from an array of similarly vast and diverse backgrounds including sociology, anthropology, psychology, psychiatry, law enforcement, or medicine, among others. Some will be able to lay legitimate claim to a stake in the profiling community; some would never even make the attempt; whereas others still will lack the acumen but jump on the bandwagon. So to speak, of an area
that is popular among the media, other professionals, and students. Given this, it is necessary to explore a more concrete foundation for education and background requirements for criminologists who want to "try their hand" at profiling.

The main suggestion we would offer for criminologists involved in profiling is to ensure that their knowledge is as well rounded and holistic as possible. Just because one is an "expert" in "crime" does not mean that one is an expert in all areas of crime, regardless of what he or she thinks. As such, the criminologist-profiler should make every effort to educate himself or herself in the areas of behavioral science, physical evidence, and the law.

Criminologists should have as detailed knowledge as possible in the different areas in which they will analyze evidence as profilers. This means acknowledging that different kinds of analysis require different experience, education, and training. It also means knowing their own limits and where their work stops and that of another should start. It means not going beyond their own qualifications and abilities, and knowing when to raise their hands for help. It means being cognitively aware enough to understand the limits of what they can—and can't—do.

As suggested by the discussion on profiling inputs earlier, the range of material criminologists-profilers may be expected to deal with is considerable. From autopsy reports, to first response police reports, to crime reconstructions, to witness statements and crime scene photographs, criminologists-profilers need to know what they are looking at, what they are looking for, how to interpret it, and what it means within the global context of the crime. Lacking in any of these areas will result in nothing less than an incomplete examination of the facts, which will lead to a dangerously incomplete assessment and possible flawed conclusions.

So what does all this mean? The answer is simple, but lost on a few overzealous individuals who fail to appreciate what and where their limits are. This doesn't mean that one has to be a forensic pathologist to read an autopsy report, but it does mean that one should know the difference between cause, mechanism, and manner of death. It doesn't mean that one has to be a bloodstain pattern analyst, but it does mean one knows what an angle of impact is, the difference between high and low velocity spatter, and how the surface of an object will effect the bloodstain pattern. It doesn't mean one has to be a forensic scientist, but it does mean one needs to understand the difference between a positive result, a negative result, and an inconclusive result.

So, based on this, criminologists-profilers should work with other professionals they know can be trusted who produce valid work. They need to know enough of the language to ask educated questions and to understand what a response means in both a theoretical sense and an applied one (that is, how the answer to their questions impacts their analysis and conclusions).

If nothing else, this highlights the multidisciplinary and often team-based approach that profilers should take. It also warns us that short course education is not enough and that every person has limits—even though we don't often like to admit them.

**SUMMARY**

Criminologists may be well suited to the practice of criminal profiling, provided their education is complete in the sense that it has equipped them to understand the intricacies of offender behavior, including an assessment of the physical evidence that creates the record of it. They may be further suited to profiling because their training and education often involved instruction not only in social sciences, but also in law, so that they understand the limits of expert witnesses and reports. Furthermore, they may be suited to the task of profiling by virtue of the analytical processes they employ in other aspects of their work.

This chapter provided students and practicing criminologists with an overview of criminal profiling, the "inputs" and "outputs" of the process, the nature of logic and reasoning, and the major paradigms involved in profiling. These have included the inductive methods of criminal investigative analysis, investigative psychology, and diagnostic evaluations. The authors have also suggested a preferred theoretical/practical approach in Behavioral Evidence Analysis, a predominantly deductive method of profiling involving the detailed analysis and reconstruction of physical evidence, victimology, and crime analysis.

As criminologists, we have also been warned not to be carried away with our own abilities, but to know the limits of our own analysis and when to seek help. In this way, criminologists-profilers will be able to provide more accurate and forensically oriented assessments of crime and criminal behavior and to assist the police in their investigative decision processes and the trier of fact in their determinations of culpability.

**Review Questions**

1. Describe the goals of criminal profiling and how they differ between the investigative and trial phases.
2. What are profile inputs? Why are they crucial to any profiling effort?
3. Name and explain the two types of logic used to produce profiles.
4. T/F Deductive profiles are static.
5. Describe the organized/disorganized dichotomy which makes up the FBI method of profiling. What are some of the criticisms leveled at this dichotomy?
6. T/F Diagnostic evaluations may be doubly helpful in investigations because they can also provide treatment advice.
7. T/F Forensic knowledge is not necessary to practice investigative psychology.
8. Describe Behavioral Evidence Analysis and how it differs from the other three profiling methods.
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