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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 implicitly contained within the premise, where 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 a matter of probability, by offering supporting documentation.

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

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

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

Short Course: Any truncated pathway to education or information that is offered in an intensive mode, often without the enforcement of educational standards or assessment.

Socratic Method: An approach to knowledge building and problem solving based on discussion and debate.
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**Trial Phase:** A stage of criminal profiling that involves providing information about a crime or series of crimes for which there is a suspected offender.

**Victim Exposure:** The amount of exposure to harmful elements experienced by a victim.

**Victimology:** An examination of all aspects of a victim’s life, including lifestyle, hobbies, habits, friends, enemies, and demographic features.

One of the more widely recognized and practiced subspecialties within forensic criminology is that of criminal profiling. It has a long history, as detailed in Turvey (2008a). It also boasts a small library of distinct literature, with different methods and subspecialties all its own.

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 McGrath, 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
studying specific cases, and issues with undertaking short courses. We will also
discuss those areas in which the criminologist may be able to provide profil-
ing 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 investi-
gative tool that discerns offender characteristics from the crime scene and the
behavior of the offenders. It is an 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 lon-
ger 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 remains 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 uti-
лизed, 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 Muller (2000) notes that the profile
will rarely be so accurate as to suggest a certain individual as being responsible.
Nor 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 fantasy and motivations
4. Develop insight into offender motive and intent before, during, and after the commission of a crime (i.e., levels of planning, evidence of remorse, precautionary acts, etc.)
5. 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; Geberth, 1981; Palermo, 2002; Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 2005; Strano, 2004). It has also been used in hostage negotiations and threats (Davis, 1999; Douglas and Hazelwood, 1986) 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, Ressler, 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 failing to narrow the suspect
pool or failing to discriminate from the general public, thus not allowing for new avenues of inquiry to be proposed. However, Turvey (2008b) notes that although only four characteristics are relevant to determining a suspect, after that person is located (during the trial phase), there will be additional questions of forensic interest regarding the crime scene and offender that may be of further value to the court.

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:

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
14. Mannerisms and personality
15. 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

This list is consistent with Ault and Reese (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.
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 (2008b).

Logic and Reasoning
Before considering the different methods of criminal profiling, we need to canvass 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:

Logic 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 sea 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 90% 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 used to make the inductive argument that an offender in a given case is *more likely*, or *even probably*, a male, all else being equal. That is, a profiler using an inductive method may state “the offender in this case is most likely male.” 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, 1985) 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 (Vorpagel 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. The information provided is based upon reviewing, analysing, and researching criminal cases similar to the case submitted by the requesting agency. The final analysis is based upon the probabilities, noting, however, that no two criminal personalities are exactly alike, and therefore the offender at times may not always fit the profile in every category.

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). Nebblett (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 premise, 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 Miller, 2002, p. 65):

- It is not 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 Douglas (1988); 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 nonsocial and disorganized asocial in “The Lust Murderer” in 1980 (see Hazelwood and Douglas, 1980). 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 suggest that protagonists of the FBI method do not adhere strictly to all steps or stages. Furthermore, many FBI employed and trained “profilers” are generally not qualified to perform certain analyses proposed as part of the method (for example, crime scene reconstruction; see Chisum, 2000; 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 perhaps owing to) its widespread use, this method of profiling has suffered the most criticisms, including:

- The mythology of the FBI profiling unit has led some to suggest the hype is ill deserved (Jenkins, 1994) and enjoys little in the way of a scientific framework or scrutiny (Canter, Alison, Alison, and Wentink, 2004).

- Its popularity may be a function of simplicity in that it requires little or no training or knowledge to apply the prefabricated offender templates to current cases (Petherick, 2005; Turvey, 2008a).

- A number of case dynamics might influence the level of organization or disorganization evident in a case. This includes evidence dynamics, an offender under the influence of controlled substances, an interrupted offense, anger-motivated offenses, or staged crimes (Turvey, 2008a).

- The method simply reduces offender behavior to a few observable parameters (Turvey, 2008a).
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 (Homan 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, Poythress, and Starr, 1993; Fox and Levin, 1996; Investigations Subcommittee and Defense Policy Panel of the Committee on Armed Services, 1990; Kopel and Blackman, 1997; Thompson, 1999; Turey, 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 psychologists 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 (Canter, 1989).

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, 2% of the total monthly workload of in-house psychologists was spent profiling, and that 3.4% 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. 79),

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 idiosyncratic 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 in their work 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 given 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 normality. 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.

Turco (1990), in a widely cited article, provides his own adaptation of the diagnostic approach through psychodynamic theory. Turco is critical of anyone without clinical experience (p. 151):

The experienced clinician has an underlying 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 behaviors.
- 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: