

The Following is is my Masters project in Offender Profiling. because of copyright, and the risk of plagiarism there are some omissions.

## 1./ INTRODUCTION

Crime and criminals have long held the fascination of the public, from the shocking events in the East End of London in the 1880's to the fictional criminals and crime busters on the television. But, there is one distinguishing feature, the average person on the street does not actually get involved in the criminal justice system, does not know all the details of the case, and even on the TV does not get to see some of the background work done in basic detection.

Detective series of the 1960's were frequently looking for the criminals M.O. (Modus Operandi or method of operation). The M.O. holds that each criminal commits a crime in a certain way, suggesting that each time he commits a crime he does so in a similar manner. In modern detection a variety of methods may be used, such as crime scene analysis, and the emerging new science of "Offender profiling". Profiling may use a mix of psychological, sociological and socio-legal theories and concepts to try and establish something of the characteristics of an offender. The police and law enforcement agencies as a tool to aid investigation and possibly, open up a new line of enquiry can then use the resulting profile. In the past traditional clues were hard evidence such as fingerprints or bloodstains. But, profiling has suggested that there may be less visible clues at a crime scene, these may include; the choice of victim, the location, time of day, nature and type of assault, and, anything that may have been said to the victim. All of these unseen clues may help in some way to identify the offender.

The decision by police in this country, to use profiling was prompted by police after an enquiry into the handling of the Yorkshire Ripper case.

A report at the time, by the then chief constable, urged police to use all technologies available to them.

Statistical profiling, which means analysing details of crimes to give police possible lines of investigation, was first used in the 1980's when the country was beset by a series of child murders. A senior officer at the time asked if any clues could be found in past cases and the recollections of experienced police officers. The result was; C.A.T.C.H.E.M. (Central Analytical Team Collating Homicide Expertise and Management.) Up to 1994 over 4,000 cases had been examined. Forces throughout the country fill in questionnaires, with over 230 questions, thus using statistics rather than psychology to look at possible patterns in a crime. Profiling can be split into psychological profiling, criminal profiling, and offender profiling.

Psychological profiling will tend to use the expertise of a professional psychologist, who will draw on his knowledge of personality theory to attribute personality traits to the offender. Criminal profiling will tend to use crime scene analysis as the base for drawing conclusions about the offender. While offender profiling will use a mix of all available information, be it from crime scene analysis or from a psychiatrist.

Offender profiling is not a new concept, although only came to public attention in the 1970's. History is scattered with success's and failures in profiling. The start really happened in the mid 1950's when a psychiatrist, Dr. James Brussel was asked to help in the capture of the "Mad bomber of New York". The psychiatrist built up a profile by examining the crime scene and by looking at letters written by the bomber. The profile, detailing personality, likely residence and even type of clothing was so accurate that the police, using standard techniques were able to eliminate others from the list of suspects, and conduct a swift arrest of the bomber. Failures include the "Boston Strangler". Psychologists had suggested that the likely offenders were a pair of school teachers who may have been homosexual, and lived alone. In reality the true strangler, Albert DeSalvo was a heterosexual construction worker who lived with his family.

### **1.1./ Definition of Psychological Offender profiling**

For the policeman investigating murder, a psychological profile may help to give otherwise unobtainable information. There are many definitions of profiling;

*"... an educated attempt to provide investigative agencies with specific information as to the type of individual who committed a certain crime..." (Geberth 1981)*

The use of the words "educated attempt" may be disputed by some of the modern "profilers" who feel that theirs is closer to science than educated guessing.

Offender profiling holds that only hard clues are available at a crime scene, such as finger prints, blood stains etc. whereas offender profiling can give police officers a different line of enquiry that may help to reduce a list of suspects. The offender profile may be able to give information on the choice of victim, the location, anything that was said by the offender and the nature or style of the assault. These things may help to give the offender more of a personality, and thus help the police in their hunt for those who commit crime.

The psychologist can, by using the above, help to look at patterns of offending, and as Professor David Canter of Liverpool University (then at Surrey University) did, created items such as a map of offending, helping to give a clue as to the possible location of where the offender lived. Profiling must however, be used in a professional manner, the aborted case against Colin Stagg in the Rachel Nickell murder shows how Psychological Offender Profiling can be mis-used, misunderstood and misinterpreted if not conducted in a scientific way, using previous research rather than the "hunch" portrayed in TV's "Cracker".

Offender Profiling although seen as a recent phenomena, and a phrase only coined in the 1970's by the FBI, has in fact been used for many years, indeed it seems that it was used to look at the personality of Adolf Hitler during the second world war. The psychiatrist, William Wanger, actually predicted that Hitler's likely response to defeat would be suicide. Also, President Kennedy had a psychological profile done on Krushev during the cold war, so we can see that profiling is by no mean a recent advance, but rather has progressed and modified itself over many years.

### **1.2./ Purpose of Profiling**

The main purpose of Profiling is to assist the criminal justice system in the fight against crime.

Profiling needs to be able to provide the law enforcement and criminal justice systems with a psychological assessment of the offender. This assessment should contain information concerning the social and psychological attributes of the offender, and must consider such things as; race, age, gender, employment type, religion, marital status and education. The profile can help reduce the scope of any police investigation by helping the police towards a successful resolution, and by attempting to predict future attacks and possible victim types and locations.

The profile should also provide an evaluation of belongings kept by the offender. These include souvenirs kept by the offender from previous attacks, which may include items of clothing, photographs, personal belongings and on occasions even body parts, all these acting as a reminder of the attack. By attempting to predict the offender typology the profiler may also be able to suggest other items in the possession of the offender such as pornography, and or weapons and so on.

Profiling can also help the investigation by suggesting effective ways of interviewing, in relation to specific offender typologies. Not all offenders or suspected offenders will react to questioning in the same way. What is an effective way of questioning for one person may be totally inefficient for another, it is understood that not all serial killers kill for the same reason, equally they need different strategies towards interrogation.

Profiling is traditionally used in serious cases of assault, sexual crimes, and murder, particularly where the police believe the offence to be part of a series. Many serial rapists or killers tend to plan their crimes well, so leaving fewer clues at the crime scene than the more opportunist offender.

Profiling can give the police a new or different direction in their attempt to catch the offender.

This paper looks at the new "*Science*" of Offender Profiling while considering the background by looking at previous cases, as well as considering the offender typology, if indeed one does exist.

It must be remembered however, that not everyone is convinced by the importance of Psychological Offender Profiling. A leading psychologist has suggested that profiling gain no more information than could otherwise be obtained from the local shopkeeper or neighborhood busy body

Not all cases even those involving rape or murder will be eligible for profiling. The ones that are, are generally of a serial nature, extremely violent, and quite different in nature to other crimes. Although cases involving missing or abducted children may often use a profile. Basically, the more violent the crime the more likelihood that a profile will be used.

## 2./ History of Criminological Research in Crime & Personality

Are criminals born or made? And, how can we detect them? This question has baffled psychologists, sociologists and criminologists for many years, and is the very essence of trying to establish the nature of criminality. The born or made argument, known as the “Nature versus Nurture” debate, asks whether criminality is due to genetic factors, and therefore unavoidable, or whether it is the product of social situationalism, environmental surroundings and other external factors.

This study looks at that debate, and asks whether we can predict criminality by looking at factors of an individual's personality picked up at crime scenes, and then using psychological offender profiling.

### 2.1./ The Early Years

Lombroso, (1836 - 1909) the criminal anthropologist, regarded by many as the father of criminology, and heavily influenced by Darwin's “*The Descent of Man*” developed a theory that some people are genetically closer to their primate ancestors than others, he thus proposed that some people are born with an innate predisposition to criminality and anti-social behaviour.

Lombroso believed that the criminal was a separate species that had not evolved in the same way as “normal” humans. He believed that this species was genetically halfway between modern man and his primate ancestors, he called them “*Homo Delinquens*” and considered them to be mutations or natural accidents living amongst *Homo Sapiens* (Bartol 1991). Lombroso collected large amounts of data, using Italian prisoners and the military. He concluded that criminals had distinguishing physical features that set them apart from the non-criminal population.

It must be noted however that Lombroso did not use a “normal” control group, therefore the methodology can be seen to be questionable.

The features Lombroso identified were; Flat nose, large ears, fat lips, large jaw bone, and high cheek-bones, he claimed that the “born Criminal” also had a liking for tattoos and cruel and wicked games. He also suggested that they have their own language, through a primeval slang, again a throwback to their savage ancestry (Bartol 1991).

Lombroso modified his theory many times throughout his life, and after a level of criticism accepted that the environment may play a bigger part in criminal behaviour than he had first suggested, although he still maintained the genetic foundation to his theory. Lombroso had many followers, none more so than Goring (1913-1972), he conducted a study on over 3,000 convicts in English jails and a similar number of non-criminals, using Lombroso's theories he measured the physical features of his subjects, and to his surprise found that there were no grounds for the Lombrosian theory, it seems that he may not have considered cross cultural differences. Goring was criticised by Sutherland & Cressey (1978) he considered only a few environmental factors when in

reality there are many, he did not consider a cross range of offences, he did not look at females and considered crime to be a male predisposition.

This quickly saw the death of the genetics and crime debate and it is not until recently that the debate has re-emerged, although not with the physical features as a central pivot of the theory.

Lombroso was not alone in believing that there was a link between physical appearance and crime. Hippocrates had tried to link certain body types to personality as well as suggesting that body fluids may influence personality (Hall & Lyndsey 1970).

## 2.2./ Modern Psychological Theories of Crime

Sheldon followed on from the type of research undertaken by Lombroso, (Sheldon & Stevens 1942; Sheldon Hartl & MvDermott 1949) looking at body type and delinquency. Sheldon called this method, *Somatotyping*, and identified three basic body types; the *Endomorphic* (fat and rounded), the *Ectomorphic* (thin and fragile), and the *Mesomorphic* (hard and muscular).

He used a series of measurements to establish body size, a 7 indicated that the subjects was exclusively a specific body type, for example a true mesomorph would have a score of 1-7-1. an endomorph would be 7-1-1 and an ectomorph 1-1-7. thus a perfectly balanced person would be 4-4-4.

Sheldon claimed to have found a strong correlation between somatotype and personality, and thus linked certain body types with certain personality traits. The endomorph likes food and basic comforts, is affectionate and even tempered. The ectomorph is inhibited, reserved, shy, nervous with others and self-conscious. The mesomorph on the other hand seeks and needs vigorous physical activity, enjoys risk taking and is adventurous. We can perhaps see where some of our modern stereotypes on body shape come from. Sheldon argued that the mesomorph is likely to have a high pain threshold, will be aggressive and callous and may be ruthless. (Bartol 1991). Sheldon tested his theory on delinquent boys and "normal" college students over an eight year period, he found a strong connection suggesting a link between the mesomorph and crime.

The college students tended to cluster around the 4-4-4 while the delinquent boys were more likely to cluster around the mesomorph scale. Glueck & Glueck (1950, 1956) found that delinquent boys were proportionately more mesomorphic than non-delinquent boys - 60% mesomorphic and 30% endomorphic (Hall & Lyndsey 1970).

Later research showed little or no connection between crime and physique, McCandless, Person & Roberts (1972) found that on average delinquents tended to be smaller than non-delinquents and reached puberty at a later stage. More recently West & Farrington (1973) found no relationship between height, weight and or physical strength and criminality and delinquency.

Wilson & Herrnstein (1985) in the book "Crime & Human Nature" stated "... some of the evidence does suggest a relationship between body build and crime, but there is also evidence to suggest that there is no relationship ...".

In the early days of solid research into criminality, family trees were used in order to link an individual's criminal behaviour to that of his relatives and ancestors (Douglas 1877). Family studies were primarily done to examine the processes within a criminal family, and to see if they differ in their functioning from non-criminal families, and also to estimate the degree of similarity between the behaviour of the criminal and their biological families.

Later studies (Osborn & West 1979) compared criminal families with non-criminal families, it was suggested that in criminal families 40% of sons became criminal whereas in non-criminal families only 13% of the sons became criminal.

This and similar studies were intended to show that criminality was hereditary, but it can be seen that the criminal behaviour could easily have been learned from the families, or from the family environment.

Indeed the Osborn & West study identifies 40% of criminal who came from criminal families, but they do not mention the other 60%, only just over a third can hardly be seen as conclusive evidence.

A study by Robbins (1966) of children referred to a psychiatric clinic emphasised possible environmental factors. Only 36% of the sample had both parents at home, the percentage of fathers displaying a variety of problem behaviours thought to be associated with criminality were, drinking 32%, neglect 26%, desertion of wife and children 21%, poor work habits 21%, and physical cruelty 20%. This research shows that the environment and socialisation must not be disregarded when considering the nature of criminality. Perhaps the best way to view this dichotomy is to look at twin studies.

Twin studies assume that the two members of a twin pair experience on average the same environment and so any major differences between the members of a pair must be due to genetic variation.

Studies involving monozygotic (identical) and dizygotic (non-identical) twins (Lange 1929, Legras 1932, Rosenoff 1934, Rosenoff, Handy & Plesset 1941, Krantz 1936, Stumpf 1936, Borgstrom 1939) appeared to give support to criminality being genetically based, showing that on average 75% of identical twins were both criminal, whereas only 24% of non-identical twins were both criminal.

However, the criteria in these studies for identical twins, was that they were only identical in physical appearance, also some of the sample groups were very small, Legras (1932) and Borgstrom (1939) for example both only used 4 pairs of identical and five pairs of non-identical twins (Hollin 1992).

More recent twin studies have managed to identify true monozygotic twins, by blood typing, these studies report a concordance between identical twins although not as high as the earlier studies, on average 48% where both identical twins were criminal and 20% where both non-identical twins were criminal (Yoshimasu 1961, 1965, Hayashi 1967, Dalgard & Kringle 1976, Christiansen 1977).

From these studies we could say that criminal behaviour has a genetic basis, although many other factors have not necessarily been considered. It could be argued that twins share the same environment, may go to the same school, may be treated in a similar way, are more likely to share friends etc. Conversely, some identical twins may strive to be unlike so as to be distinguishable from each other (Eysenck 1964).

In an attempt to gain further insight into genetic influences on criminality, and to compensate for the shortcomings of twin studies, adoption studies have been used. Research carried out by Hutchings & Mednick (1975) and Mednick, Gabrielli & Hutchings (1984) compared the behaviour of adoptees to their biological parents, a genetic link may be made if such behaviour is similar. The studies showed that of the male adoptees who had criminal biological parents but non-criminal adoptive parents, 20% had a criminal record. This contrasted with 14% where male adoptees had neither biological nor adoptive parents that were criminal.

Of the adoptees with both biological and adoptive parents that were criminal, 25% had criminal records and where biological parents were not criminal but adoptive parents were, 15% had criminal records. These studies, do, to a certain degree, lend support to the origins of criminal behaviour being hereditary, but, the evidence is by no means conclusive or absolute.

For a period in the 1970's there was a school of thought that believed criminals were born with an extra Y chromosome, it was claimed that this extra chromosome was found in proportionately more prison inmates than in the non-criminal population (Jarvik, Klodin & Matsuyama 1977).

It was originally believed that this extra chromosome (normal males have one X and one Y) led to aggressive behaviour. However, Watkins et al (1977) found that of these men who were in prison, most were convicted for petty crime, rather than violent crimes. Further, the occurrence of an extra Y chromosome is so rare that its significance is negligible (Williams 1991)

In the 1950's it was thought that home life, upbringing, inconsistent affection, physical abuse and inconsistent discipline could result in criminality. Bowlby (1946) suggested that early maternal deprivation was related to delinquency, by comparing children who had stolen with children who had not. He found that the delinquent children were more likely to have had a history of separation from their mothers. This work was quite controversial and it has since been reported that any break of relationship or stable bond between an adult and a child can have damaging effects, not necessarily just separation from the mother.

Some of the most studied research into the origins of crime and personality has been that done by Professor Hans Eysenck.

Eysenck believes that sociological theory has nothing to offer society on the causes of crime, but instead insists that psychological theories hold all the answers (Eysenck & Gudjonson 1989). Eysenck suggests that criminal behaviour is not the product of either environment or biology alone, but rather is an interaction of both (Eysenck 1973).

This is a move on from his original belief that biology played the largest part in determining criminality when he first declared his theory on criminality in his book "*Crime and Personality*"

(1964). Eysenck suggests that some people are born with cortical and autonomic nervous systems that affect their ability to learn from their environment (Hollin 1989).

Eysenck & Eysenck (1968) defined three basic elements of personality, Extraversion (E), Neuroticism (N) and Psychoticism (P). Each of these dimensions runs from a high to a low scale, the extraversion scale runs from high (extravert) to low (introvert). Neuroticism runs from high (neurotic) to low (stable) and similarly with psychoticism. Eysenck claims that most people will fall in the middle of this scale (see appendix 6).

Eysenck suggests that children learn to control anti-social behaviour through the formulation of a conscience, this being a conditioned emotional responses

Eysenck further believes that the speed a person will be conditioned depends on an individual's personality, and particularly in terms of E and N. (Eysenck 1977). The theory predicts that high E and high N combinations lead to poor conditioning and thus such individuals will lack social control and will therefore be over represented in offender populations.

Conversely low E and low N would lead to effective control and socialisation and would therefore not be represented in offender populations. The high E individual is considered to be cortically under aroused, and is therefore constantly seeking stimulation to maintain cortical arousal. It can be seen from this that the extravert needs to be impulsive and needs to seek extra excitement so as to keep a balance within the cortex. The introvert, on the other hand, is cortically over aroused, and therefore must avoid stimulation and excitement to keep a balance, introverts are therefore characterised by quiet, reserved people.

In terms of conditioning, Eysenck argues that extraverts may condition less well than introverts, due to levels of neuroticism or emotionality, neuroticism is suggested to be related to the workings of the Autonomic Nervous System (ANS). High N individuals may have an unstable ANS and may show mood swings and anxious behaviour, while low N individuals have a stable ANS and therefore display calm even tempered behaviour. It is suggested that high N affects conditioning because of the effects of anxiety.

When combining the scores of E and N it can be seen that those that score high on both E & N will condition least well of all individuals, and these are the people who are likely to show criminal tendencies. It is claimed, however, that the high P, E, & N scores will depend on the type of crime, and that this model, of high scores on all three components only applies to violent criminals (Hollin 1991).

Critics of Eysenck's (Little 1963; Hoghughi & Forrest 1970) theory comment on the fact that he bases his theory on the genetic basis for personality traits, and takes his evidence from twin studies, which have been shown to be unreliable, as in the case of Goring. Little (1963) also comments that Eysenck did not consider recidivism (repeat offending) and any link between extraversion and introversion. Little's own study looked at three young offender institutions, this is reported to show that those that had been released, or recidivism rates could be related to either extraversion or introversion, this work not only questions Eysenck's work, but all work in relation to crime and personality (Williams 1991).



Another area that may, or may not suggest an individual's personality is likely to cause criminal behaviour is that of psychopathy.

The term psychopathy is used to describe people that display what is considered to be anti-social behaviour, and, as a word is frequently mixed up with terms such as sociopath or antisocial personality. DSM III -R (Diagnostic & Statistical Manual) defines antisocial personality as;

*“... Individuals who are basically unsocialised and whose behavior pattern brings them into conflict with society. They are incapable of loyalty to individuals, groups or social values. They are grossly selfish, callous, irresponsible, impulsive and unable to feel guilt or to learn from experience...”.*

Cleckley (1976) suggests that psychopathy is distinctively different from criminality in that,

*“...The majority of psychopaths are not criminal, and the majority of criminals are not psychopaths...”.*

It is argued that the typical psychopath is different from the criminal in that his actions are less purposeful, his goals are unclear and he tends to cause himself shame, and if he commits crime it tends not to be violent crime (Cleckley 1976). It is suggested that psychopathy originates in the personality, it is possible however, that there are causes other than personality for psychopathy and antisocial personality. Yablonsky (1970) argued that leaders of violent gangs were in fact sociopaths who led the gang so as to act out their own violence and aggression. It can be seen that such things as peer influence and pressure may cause a gang member to act in a violent way and not necessarily a violent or aggressive personality (Vold & Bernard 1986).

Guze (1976) suggested that sociopathy along with drug addiction and alcoholism were the only psychiatric conditions that were associated with criminality, Guze went on to consider whether sociopathy should or should not be considered a psychiatric condition. It is clear that a terminology problem exists around the whole area of descriptive words such as sociopath, psychopath and antisocial personality.

## **2.3 ./ The Sociological background to Crime**

What can sociological theories of crime actually tell us about crime, if anything?

Williams (1991) has suggested that crime has only become a problem as we have become industrialised, and that as a pre industrial nation, crime was committed in small enough amounts for it to be dealt with by their peers. It was only as people moved into the large towns and cities and thus created large urban areas that crime started to become a problem.

Places such as the large sprawling Manchester were for a time seen as areas of total lawlessness, and out of this was born a new social order, a new class, an almost under class of dangerous criminal content (Phillips 1977).

Frederick Engels had argued that crime was bound to increase as the working classes were brutalised by the profit hungry bourgeoisie, along with Karl Marx, Engels manipulated government figures to show their view.

Engles claimed, through government figures, that between 1805 and 1842 the number of arrests grew by a seven fold increase from 4,605 to 31,309. Most of the increases happening in large urban areas such as London, Manchester and Glasgow, caused by the sudden throwing in to large urban Areas of working class people who were then oppressed by the rich upper classes.

In more recent times the ideas of Marx and Engles have been taken up as conflict theories and have become absorbed into the "New Criminology". Conflict theories suggest that the only way to achieve social equality is for there to be, social breakdown and then the re-building and re-structuring of society. It seems that the conflict view of crime suggests that people in power define certain acts as illegal simply to oppress those that are powerless in society.

Each group with society commits crime, but, only those crimes that are committed by the poor are punishable under the law, a law overseen by the ruling classes, laws are then changeable, but only for the benefit of those in power.

The consensus view of crime believes that a crime is an act that meets with the disapproval of the majority. The definition of crime can therefore change, as the views of society changes. Although this theory does suggest that some acts such as rape or robbery are morally wrong and would not change.

The interactionist view of crime falls between these two other theories, and believes that those in power set the rules, but are prepared to move with public opinion. It is further suggested that an act can be morally wrong without being illegal, or the other way round.

The consensus view can be divided into two further schools of thought, the classical view and the positivist view. Classical theory is based on the idea that people commit certain acts or crimes of their own free will, they are making a choice, a conscious decision to break the law. It is suggested that if the rewards are greater than this risk of capture then crime is worth the "risk". This then would suggest that if punishment was extreme no one would commit crime. Jeremy Bentham one of the leading British philosophers has explained crime with a classical view.

Positivists on the other hand believe that individuals have no control over their actions, which are determined by things not in their control. Things such as genetics, social class, environment and peer influence, are considered. Instead of the punishment advocated by classical thinkers, the positivist view suggests social welfare reforms and individualistic treatment plans, as the best way of preventing crime.

Control theories take a totally different view on the forces that cause people to, or prevent them from committing crime. Piaget (1932) and Kohlberg (1964) have looked at moral development and applied this to criminal behavior. This theory suggests that people generally pass through a number of developmental stages. These stages are pre-mortality, conventional conformity and autonomous principles. Each of these then has various sub-stages. It has been argued that moral development progresses from the first sub-stage of punishment and obedience to the sixth sub-stage of universal ethical principles. The assumptions being that those who commit crime have had less moral

Development than those who do not commit crime. It can be argued however that theories of moral development have been inconclusive, as, differences in moral development between offenders and non-offenders have not shown conclusive results. It seems that moral development can be linked to the type of crime just as much as the differences between offenders and those that obey the law.

It seems that none of the theories can give us an exact answer to the problems of crime, and many have used moral judgement and social influences to try and explain this, none with any substance.

Family values and family background have been used by some, indeed Farrington (1979) claims that family values are associated with both offending and convictions in young people. Many studies have looked at parental attitudes and criminality. Studies in the 1980's by Rutter showed that parents who were erratic with their discipline, punitive, or were neglectful, all stood a risk of raising offending offspring.

Wells & Rankin (1988) suggested that either very strong or very weak parental involvement could increase the likelihood of offending behavior.

#### **4./ Profiling in action.**

One of the main problems with profiling as far as the public are concerned, is not only do the things identified in the profile seem obvious with hindsight, which is when most cases have come to the attention of the public, but they are quite often presented in a very simple format. But, profiling can be extremely sophisticated. Once you had seen the recorded video footage from the shopping centre you wouldn't have needed to be Freud to work out that the killers of 2 year old toddler James Bulger were in fact only children themselves, came from problem families, and often bunked off school. But A famous Forensic Psychologist, Dr. Paul Britton was able to tell the police straight after little Jammie's disappearance that in due course one of the two child killers would want to admit to the attack, while claiming they were the passive partner while the other was the active agent. Dr. Britton also provided the police with a list of insights into why the boys had committed their horrific crime, all of which turned out to be correct.

He advised police that the two had probably formed a club of two, had talked through their actions, and discussed how they could carry out the attack, where, when etc. He also suggested that they would have enjoyed so much what they were doing that they were not able to stop, the element of control they had over the toddler would far outweigh any Possible punishment.

A similarity can be drawn with the summer exploits of boys who hunt down and torture frogs or cats, it is intended and is enjoyable for the group, the victims becoming unimportant. After the attack on the animal, and it could be argued, in the Bulger case, fearfulness and anxiety may set in, the whole exercise being one in control and excitement with a certain amount of sadism, this, it could be argued is the early roots of sexual deviance.

None of this type of information was that obvious to the police, and it could be argued would not help catch an offender, but would be useful in confirming a suspect as the offender. Paul Britton's

predictions might seem to good to be true to the public, but they owe nothing to luck and everything to an understanding of both children and the criminal mind.

It is very common for one child to blame another once they have been caught doing something wrong. It is almost a straightforward response to try and distance yourself from a crime and to pass responsibility onto someone else, this could be true of a mass killer or naughty children playing in the back garden. It is also normally the one who cries loudest who is the leader, as he has become more skilled in passing the blame.

Forming a “club” is a normal way young boys relate to each other. Most children like to operate in a peer group, be it in the scouts or in a gang. The more anti-social children will often not be permitted to enter organised groups and may then form their own sub-group or gang, with their own set of rules and almost a whole new morality.

We must assume that when Dr. Britton says that the Bulger killers enjoyed the actions to much to stop, that he means the buzz that all children get from doing something naughty.

With all the reasonably obvious things in mind it is curious why the police never used this as a type of detection before the mid nineteen eighties. So, why in the 1970's were we watching programs on the television like “The Sweeney” where the police caught the criminals with a rush of adrenaline and violence, rather than watching the programs of the nineties such as “Cracker”??

In reality TV programs tend to reflect current trends just as psychology is at the mercy of fashion, for a long time Forensic psychology was very “Out of fashion”.

Just because a subject is not in fashion does not mean that it is not being discussed, thought about, or even worked on. There were early attempts at what we would now call offender profiling, for example, in a book about Jack the Ripper by Donald Rumbelow he cites a letter that was sent to the police in 1888 giving a detailed description of the sort of person that would commit such crimes.

## **4.1./ How is a Profile prepared?**

Profiling has developed into an organised “*science*”, that has undergone many changes. There are many terms used, and indeed different professional use different terminologies, but there are still common grounds used in generating a criminal profile. The first stage in compiling the profile involves the collection of investigative information such as crime scene evidence, victim characteristics, autopsy and lab reports, police reports, witness statements, photographs, of the victim and of the crime scene. All this data is put together to give a picture of the type of offender, risks associated with the type of victim and things that may have helped or hindered the crime. Next, the gathered data is used to reconstruct the crime and to create a series of hypotheses as to the behaviour of the victim and the offender, method of victim selection, sequence of the crime or Modus operandi (MO), motives, and typology of crime, for example, organised or disorganised. Through this whole process the hypothesis is constantly tested and reviewed. After the crime has been assessed a profile can begin to emerge in which hypotheses as to the demographic and physical characteristics, behavioural habit's, and personality aspects of the offender are generated.

Again the hypotheses are tested against previously derived hypotheses, and new evidence that may come to light. Once the profile is generated it is given to the team of investigators looking at the case, used to generate new leads and to narrow the investigation, and for interviewing techniques.

Most profiles end up looking like a typical psychological report, containing lots of information about a totally unknown individual.

The standard profile would normally contain the following;

- (1) Demographic information such as race, age range, marital status, socio-economic level, and, occupational ability.
- (2) Levels of educational achievement and an approximation of intellectual ability.
- (3) Any arrest or other legal history,
- (4) Military background,
- (5) Family characteristics,
- (6) Social interests and habits,
- (7) Home residence in relation to crime scene
- (8) Colour, age, type and make of vehicle,
- (9) Personality characteristics, and possible psychological disorders
- (10) Suggestion's for interviewing techniques.

(Vopagel 1982)

## 4.2./ Offender profiling in the UK

In this country Professor David Canter has dominated offender profiling, now at Liverpool University, but formerly of Surrey University. It was while at Surrey that the Metropolitan police approached him to see if psychology could tell them anything about a series of rapes, that later turned into a hunt for a serial killer. David Canter was able to give an incredibly accurate profile of the killer John Duffy who was subsequently arrested and charged with 2 murders and five rapes in 1988. Canter's approach to profiling owes more to psychology than that of the FBI. He (Canter) describes the FBI type of profiling as "...more of an art than a science..." (Canter 1995).

Canter further suggests that criminals, like all people act in a consistent way. And, that all actions are linked no matter the setting, and therefore an analysis of their behaviour can offer clues as to their lifestyle during a non-offending period, thus aiding possible detection. It is argued that people live in a social context and therefore there would be an implicit relationship between offender and victim, which could also help to offer clues to the offender's life.

Examination of any surviving witnesses testimony and statements can reveal clues in such things as speech patterns, interests, obsessions and ways of behaving which may carry into their normal, non-offending life. For example a rapist might treat his victim with some care and may be apologetic after the offence, this might be how he treats other women who he has regular contact with, in his social environment. Canter's methods are different from those seen in such films as *Manhunter*, and *Silence of the lambs*, and he suggests that interviews with this type of manipulative killer is not likely to be helpful.

Canter believes the way he can help police in investigations is by using sets of data to look at correlation's between things like time and location of offence, choice of victim, and analysis of speech. Through this Canter believes he can develop trends and patterns. Canter claims this method is more valid than sensational interviews whose validity is suspect. Hollin (1992) suggested that the British model of profiling is based on the principle of "bottom up" type processing, looking at cognitive behavioural models. The profile depends on analysis of existing evidence to identify specific similarities between offence and offender characteristics. In contrast the American model (discussed later) draws on "top down" processing, and is reliant on subjective conclusions that come from investigative experience of crimes and criminal interviews.

It is claimed that the model in the USA relies on what the offender does, and when. Rather than in psychology. However the aim of both the British and American processes is to identify areas that will help in the investigation leading to arrest of the offender.

## 4.3./ Offender profiling in the USA.

The FBI and its behavioural science unit have received much public attention over the years, especially through Agent Starling in "*Silence of the Lambs*". The unit known as NCAVC (National Center for the Analysis of Violent Crime) handles over 1,500 cases a year, from all round the

world, and was primary in convincing the British police to use a profile to catch the Yorkshire Ripper.

It was at Quantico in Virginia that under the auspice of NCAVC that VICAP was set up, (violent Criminal apprehension Program).

The FBI had reacted to a sudden increase in the number of killings, particularly serial killers, during the nineteen seventies. There was David Berkowitz , the freeway killer who raped and murdered over forty young boys. In 1978 John Wayne Gacey confessed to killing 31 young men, the “son of Sam killings in July 1976, Ted Bundy, and the list goes on. The USA had seen a huge rise in the homicide rate and a large reduction in the detection rate. In the 1940’s the detection rate for homicide was just over 90% but by the 1970’s it had fallen to 75%.

The team set up in Virginia, initially as a team of nine was officially known as the Behavioural sciences Unit (BSU) and who’s remit was to carry on the work pioneered by James Brussel.

They started by building up a library of recorded interviews with convicted serial killers around the country. Going into prisons they talked to such people as Emil Kemper, Charles Manson, and David Berkowitz. From this the officers gained a unique insight into the mind of the serial killer and thus became known as “*The Mind Hunters*”. Details of all murders in the USA are sent to the *mind hunters*, who then look for psychological clues in each case. From crime scene photographs, they have the ability to predict a suspects, age, marital status, type of car, area where he lives and his life style.

A lot of this is based on common sense. A body dumped in a difficult to reach location, over fields or the like, would suggest an outdoor type who probably drives a four-wheel drive such as a jeep.

The data collected from all these cases has helped investigators draw up very accurate profile’s for otherwise apparently clueless crime scenes. For example; in 1979 a woman’s body was found, badly mutilated, on the roof of a New York block of flats, the body turned out to be that of a teacher who had lived in the flats. It became apparent that the killer had spent a long time on the roof because the mutilations to the body were extensive, and because he even had time to defecate on the roof. When the FBI were called in, an instant profile was produced from information gathered at the crime scene, viewed in the light of previous cases. The wanted man was white, because the victim was white, and because killers nearly always strike within their own racial group, he lived or worked in the block of flats, because he spent so much time on the roof he must have felt safe, like being in his own territory. FBI agent John Douglas also felt they should be looking for an unmarried man of between twenty-five and thirty years of age, who collected pornographic and detective magazines. If the man had links with the building, then police had probably already interviewed him. So, they reviewed the people they had already spoken to, one man stood out from the rest, they interviewed him, an arrest was made and he was charged.

From talking to killers the FBI officers discovered that this type of offender all had one thing in common, they were all abused as children and had gone into a world of fantasy. The result of having FBI officers like this was that as they could think like killers they were able to predict any possible next move in a chain of events.

The BSU has also learnt that this type of killer is very intelligent and will offer alter his MO to avoid detection, this can be seen in this country in the case of the Yorkshire ripper, who in his early killings used a screwdriver, but later changed to using a ligature. They have also learnt that rape is not about sexual gratification, but about control and power over another person.

## 5./ The Future of Profiling

It can be seen that profiling is art, it is science, and it is a bit of intuition. It is also *none* of these. Profiling as an investigative tool is still in its infancy, and has undergone little field-testing. If this were a new wonder drug or a new type of car engine it would require years, possibly decades of testing before it was made accessible to the public. Yet profiling without exhaustive testing has been used around the world, with notable successes and failures. If profiling is to develop into a science it needs to pass through the scrutiny of the legal profession as well as mental health practitioners, while considering modern theories of personality.

It must be remembered that Profiling can fall into two distinct camps. There is the “Psychological Profile” that is based on theories of personality, and requires the professional and often academic guidance of a psychologist or psychiatrist. “Criminal Profiling” on the other hand combine behavioural clues gained from the crime scene itself with statistical probability, and a touch of intuitive judgement used by the police officers on the case, who can give years of valuable experience to a case.

The FBI in the USA is leading the way in profiling techniques. They have access to a large database on violent crime, based at the National Center for the Analysis of Violent Crime in Virginia. But, despite a center dedicated to the study of crime, there has been little research or academic research published in social and, or psychological and legal journals.

Ressler (1992) has stated that mental health professionals have taken an active interest in profiling, and have aided research in in the study of aggression, psychopathology and criminal psychology.

It is therefore suggested that local clinicians could be used to help local law enforcement agencies, including social services and probation in suggesting ways of not only profiling, but to give potential directions in treatment, across a multi agency platform.

While profiling has been growing very rapidly, a level of uncertainty has hampered it. Should it come under the control of a national body, local law enforcement agencies such as the police, local mental health professionals such as psychologists. or if somewhere like social services should have control of the new investigative tool. While this uncertainty continues the potential of profiling is never going to be fully realised.

The potential of profiling is challenging and needs to be tested and evaluated, before it can be fully integrated into an investigative framework.

It could be argued that it is experience that may lead profilers to be more accurate in a profile than a layperson. It would therefore be the case that the police and psychologists have further training in the area, as only through an understanding of each others role, and extensive experience can



profiling truly become part of the investigative process. The old fashioned detective following his hunch, does not work with the new types of serial killers that are appearing in the later half of this century, only by being a policeman, a psychologist, a sociologist and having a bit of Irish luck can today's modern policeman hope to keep us safe in our beds at night.

We now have in the UK a national DNA database, we also have the PNC (police National Computer), as well as HOLMES – Home Office Large Major Enquiry System. It cannot be long before these are all linked up to a centre similar to the FBI's Quantico , then we too can solve crimes by looking at a photo ? !!!

## Reference

**Terry Hayden 1996**

**Document References deleted.**