

Chapter 16

*Contemporary Problems in Criminal Profiling**

Richard N. Kocsis and George B. Palermo

Summary

Despite the apparent popularity of criminal profiling among the law enforcement community, scrutiny of its merits does not appear to have occurred to any substantial extent. This chapter identifies and assesses 10 significant problems surrounding the theoretical literature and the professional practice of criminal profiling. It highlights many shortcomings in both the research and the practice of profiling and serves to demonstrate that a disparity exists between the perceptions and the realities of what criminal profiling can reliably achieve. Suggestions for how the research and practice of profiling may be advanced are discussed.

INTRODUCTION

There are few investigative techniques that can rival the notoriety of and public interest in criminal profiling. The concept of the enigmatic profiler who possesses a genius-like insight into the mind and actions of a serial killer has become a common and well-recognized hallmark of contemporary media and crime fiction (1–3). The degree of parity that exists, however, between the reputation generated by such depictions and the realities of profiling in aiding

* This chapter is a slightly re-worked version of an article originally published in the *American Journal of Forensic Psychiatry*, Volume 26, issue 2, 2005 that was entitled “Ten major problems with criminal profiling”. The Journal is a publication of the American College of Forensic Psychiatry, PO Box 5870, Balboa Island, CA 92662, USA.

police investigations is an issue that seldom attracts equivalent critical scrutiny. Given the numerous true-crime biographies on the topic (4–12), one can be forgiven for thinking that profilers have done little to counter the often fanciful image of their activities. Indeed, it is arguable that the practice and development of profiling has benefited greatly from such romanticized portrayals (13).

The purpose of this chapter is to offer some critical assessments of the profiling technique, its practice, and the developed research underpinning its use. It should be noted, however, that the issues raised herein are not presented in any order reflective of their priority.

WHAT IS PROFILING?

Profiling is a process of observation and reflection during which an attempt is made to reassemble the collected pieces of a criminal puzzle as the investigating profiler tries to answer the basic questions: Why, where, when, how, and who? It may be well served by typologies of past crimes that are useful in the investigation of present crimes. Specifically, it is a technique aimed at identifying and interpreting crime behavior or actions for the purpose of predicting the personality of the offender, his/her *modus operandi*, and, possibly, the motivation for the crime. These factors are derived from an attentive examination of the crime scene, which often yields information valuable to the criminal investigator. The purpose of profiling, however, is not only that of a possible identification of important offender characteristics but also to prevent the repetition of a crime. The practice of criminal profiling thus far has been relegated to major felonies, such as murder, rape, and arson, especially those that are serial in type.

DOES PROFILING WORK?

In view of the renown of criminal profiling, it seems somewhat trite to question the efficacy of the technique given its status alongside other well-established forensic investigative adjuncts (14–17). Surprisingly though, the empirical evidence to support profiling, unlike other forensic techniques, is remarkably scarce (18,19). In the attempt to answer the basic investigative questions mentioned above, various approaches to profiling have been used, including criminal investigative analysis (CIA), investigative psychology (IP), and crime action profiling (CAP). These methods, however, although contributing to reducing the number of suspects in a crime, often fall short of being successful in definitive offender identification. This may be due to a lack of sufficient data for interpretation or to the inadequate interpretive capacity

of the profiler, but perhaps more so to the uniqueness of each offender and situational variables of his *modus operandi*.

In assessing the efficacy of profiling, it is important that two distinct but integral concepts be considered. First, the “validity” of a profile is related to its accuracy in correctly predicting the characteristics of an unknown offender. Second, efficacy is also related to the utility of the information yielded by a profile. Assuming that the profile is reasonably accurate, one must consider whether this information actually assists investigators in practical terms.

Validity

Possibly the earliest documented evidence to support profiling emerges from an internal report produced by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) (20). This report, as an internal document, has not been made available for public scrutiny to date. Even so, this report appears to be the source of a claim that profiles, as composed by the FBI Behavioral Science Unit, possess an approximately 80% degree of accuracy. This appears to have been first promulgated in the public domain by Pinizzotto (21). However, to date it has not been independently verified as is dictated by the scientific method, and until that is done it remains a tantalizing assertion (22).

Putting aside such unilateral claims, the largest publicly available source of information attesting to the accuracy of profiles appears to be in the nature of anecdotal accounts (23). Although anecdotal accounts may be useful in illustrating a particular issue, such information cannot be confidently relied on to confirm the validity of the technique (24,25). To complicate matters further, a large proportion of these accounts originate in true-crime biographies often co-authored by profilers themselves (7,10), which in turn raises issues surrounding the objectivity of the testimonials. Social scientists have often observed that the human psyche typically focuses on success rather than failure (26), so the scope of such chronicles in providing an objective representation must be also considered. Indeed, an illustration of this point can be gleaned from any number of biographies that report cases where the input of profiles was considered valuable in assisting investigations. High-profile cases, however, where profiles were not viewed as having assisted, or were perceived as being detrimental to the course of an investigation (27–30), seldom receive equal coverage.

Empirical studies that directly test the abilities of profilers and that are open to public scrutiny are remarkably scarce (31). Possibly the first was undertaken by Pinizzotto and Finkel (32), who compared small groups (four to six participants) of trained profilers with non-profilers such as detectives and university students on various profiling experiments using a closed murder and rape case. Perhaps the most pertinent of these experiments required participants

to construct a profile of the offender through responses on a multiple-choice questionnaire. This procedure is important as it provides a quantifiable means by which profile predictions can be objectively scored for their accuracy. The results of this experiment were not, however, entirely supportive, with the sampled profilers demonstrating a superior degree of accuracy in predicting the characteristics of the rapist, but not the murderer. Indeed, in contrast to popular culture depictions, the sampled profilers achieved the lowest descriptive score in profiling the characteristics of the murderer.

Following the general design of Pinizzotto and Finkel's (32) research with respect to the use of an objectively quantifiable questionnaire to measure the accuracy of a profile, Kocsis (33) published the results of a series of studies (34–37) that involved testing participants' abilities to profile the probable offender in a murder and arson case. The results of this research yielded some tentative support for the abilities of the sampled profilers in that they surpassed all other groups in their abilities to accurately predict the characteristics of the unknown offender(s). Although these findings are encouraging, two notable limitations emerge. First, the sample pool of profilers for this research (i.e., 11 profilers) was modest. Consequently, further replication with larger samples is required. Second, a high degree of statistical variance was found among the profilers, indicating that their capabilities were not uniform. This finding suggests that simply because an individual operates with the title of "profiler" does not necessarily imply that the individual will possess a superior capacity to predict the characteristics of an unknown offender.

Numerous critiques have been made against the present-day psycho-investigative techniques used in criminal profiling. They have focused on the blurred borderlines between instinct/intuition and the scientific procedures adopted by the profiler, which may influence the entire scientific validity of the process (lack of systematic work; lack of real empirical research; simply reassessment of old theories or criticism of the same). Furthermore, the presence of cultural baggage passed from one profiler to another with little or minimal exposure to actual crime scenes, the stress on psychodynamics, and the poor application of in-depth psychology to the crime scene evidence offer little information about those socio-cultural characteristics, lifestyles, and patterns of criminal behavior of an offender that are basic to a thorough investigation.

Utility

The material in support of the utility of profiling unfortunately appears to be little better than the material in support of its validity. It should be recognized, however, that the concept of utility is, in all probability, more

difficult to quantify, as the usefulness of a profile to an investigation may not manifest itself in a directly tangible manner. Once again, the largest source of material in support of the utility of profiles is in the form of anecdotal accounts. For essentially the same reasons previously articulated in the context of validity, too much reliance cannot be placed on such material.

What presents as an interesting source of material for the utility of profiles, however, are various consumer satisfaction surveys administered to police personnel who have used a profile in the course of an investigation (21,38,39). Clearly, these surveys are not representative of the contribution of a profile but, rather, seek to survey the perceived value of a profile to the personnel who have used one. One common theme seems to emerge from these surveys in that while police personnel genuinely seem to favor and derive some sense of satisfaction from the use of profiles in investigations, when the specific issue of how a profile was of assistance is raised, the responses seem less conclusive. One example of this trend comes from Pinizzotto (21), who found that while 77% of the surveyed police regarded a profile as useful in focusing their investigation in some context, only 17% considered that the profile actually assisted in the identification of the offender. This pattern is not entirely surprising, given that some debate exists as to whether profiles have ever truly assisted investigators in actually apprehending an offender.

Although there are many anecdotal examples where, in retrospect, the characteristics described in a profile are found to resemble those of the apprehended offender (40), there is little evidence to indicate how this information directly assisted the investigation. Indeed, many profilers admit that, to the best of their knowledge, a profile has yet to actually solve a single case or pinpoint the individual concerned (9,10).

One final issue related to evaluating the utility of profiles involves the breadth of their application. Profiling is generally touted as being useful for the investigation of crimes of an aberrant predatory nature where no identifiable suspect(s) seem apparent (41–43), the archetypal circumstance being in the investigation of a serial killer. However, even within this context, there are circumstances where the use of a profile is limited or simply irrelevant, for example, where an offender hoards the corpses of his victims, providing little or no evidence of the murders until the discovery of the bodies and the apprehension of the perpetrator, as in the case of the American serial killer Jeffrey Dahmer (44).

It needs to be questioned, then, whether the amount of resources invested in the development of specialist profiler training programs/units and research is justified, given the low volume of crimes where profiling may prove to be applicable (45,46).

DISCUSSION

Although some tentative findings have emerged to suggest some limited support for profiling, considerably more work is required to replicate and thus test and bolster the robustness of such findings. In this respect, perhaps the most reliable conclusion that can be drawn concerning the accuracy of profiles is that a significant disparity exists between the reputation of profiling in terms of its accuracy and the reliable evidence that exists to substantiate that reputation. With respect to the utility of profiles, what seems apparent is that, among the law enforcement community at least, there is a general belief that profiles can contribute to an investigation. Quantifying the basis of this contribution however is problematic. Importantly, too, it is crucial to appreciate that satisfaction with a technique must not be confused with equating to proof of its utility or accuracy (47–49). Given the paucity of evidence to support either the validity or utility of profiles, there is still ample reason to question whether profiling really works.

Brilliant Insights, Common Sense, or Just Cold-Reading?

In considering the utility of profiles, one needs to consider the insight they actually provide. One of the oldest criticisms of profiles is that the information they contain is no better than what can be derived through common knowledge or what the local bartender might guess (50). An illustration of this point comes from the study by Snook et al. (51), which examined the abilities of students to predict the location of an offender's residence in comparison with the predictions made by a geographic profiling computer program (52–54). Despite the sophistication of the computerized system, the areas predicted by the program differed little from the predictions of the students following some rudimentary instruction on crime offense patterns.

Another aspect concerning the insight of profiles relates to the parallels between the content and nature of profiles, and the predictions that can be made by, for example, psychics. The area of parapsychology has for some time studied individuals who have attempted to feign extra sensory perception by engaging in a technique that is commonly referred to as "cold-reading" (55). By providing semi-ambiguous statements that relate to items of information that possess a statistically high level of frequency, an individual can make statements that appear remarkably insightful (56). It remains to be seen, therefore, to what extent the information typically contained in profiles represents true insight regarding the probable offender's characteristics, or some manifestation, conscious or otherwise, of the cold-reading technique.

Mountains of Conclusions From Molehills of Research

One problem that appears to haunt the practice of profiling is a proclivity by some of its practitioners to over-generalize the application of existing research. This problem typically manifests itself in over-generalizations concerning the type of crime profiled, or the applicability of demographic variables to foreign populations. A case that illustrates over-generalization relating to crime modality involves the 2002 “Beltway serial sniper” shootings that occurred in the eastern United States. Many profiles were generated following this series of random shootings (57). When the individuals accused of these crimes were later apprehended, little congruence emerged between the profiles and the accused persons (58,59). Incidents where profiles have been found to bear little similarity to the identified perpetrator(s) are not unique (30,60); however, the issue of significance here is the suitability of a profile for this type of crime given that research undertaken in the area of profiling has predominantly focused on crimes of interpersonal violence such as sexual murder or serial rape (61–65). Indeed, the authors are unaware of any scientifically vetted, published research on the profiling of snipers. Consequently, it appears that profiles in this case were most likely based on suppositions derived from research developed in respect of different types of crime.

An example of over-generalization for foreign demographics can be seen in the 1989 case in Sydney, Australia, of the “Granny killer.” Confronted by a series of violent murders, Australian police consulted a foreign law enforcement agency renowned for its work in the area of profiling. The key features of the supplied profile characterized the offender as a young male possibly of African descent. When apprehended, the offender was found to be an elderly man of Anglo-Saxon heritage (66). The incongruity between the profile and the offender is not the pertinent issue but rather the imprudence of the profilers to consider the differing demographics between their country and that of Australia, especially given that the Australian population contains less than 1% of people who can be classified as being of African descent. Although the consulted profilers were undoubtedly familiar with the relevant crime statistics for their country, which included a sizeable population of individuals of African descent, the use of these demographics in the Australian context made it highly unlikely that the predictions of the probable offender would be valid.

Research With Limited Application

Another development in the field of profiling has been the proliferation of research of limited practical application. In this respect, it would appear that the problems that brought about the development of profiling have been overlooked.

That is, profiling evolved to aid in the investigation of aberrant crimes that were difficult to solve through conventional police methods (15,16,67,68). Consequently, the development of profiling theories and techniques for circumstances where the offender is readily apparent, or likely to be identified through conventional police methods, seems something of a redundant exercise. The study by Salfati (69), for example, presents an analysis of crime scene behaviors matched with offender characteristics in domestic homicides. Although this research certainly contributes to the scholarly literature on the topic of homicide, its value in terms of profiling can be questioned given that domestic homicides seldom require profiling as the perpetrator (i.e., the spouse/partner) in most instances is readily apparent (70,71).

Allied to this problem of research with limited application is the circumstance of research that assumes a level of understanding from the reader when reporting its findings, thereby reducing its potential utility. For example, the study by Canter and Heritage (72) presents a model for how rape behavior patterns may be interpreted for the purpose of profiling but fails to articulate how any offender characteristic can be associated with these patterns for the purpose of actually composing a profile. As a consequence, although the study serves to demonstrate the work undertaken by its authors and their capacity to profile such crimes, it limits others from independently and practically applying the findings of this study.

How Reliable is the Data?

The fundamental premise of profiling is that through the study of past crimes, predictions can be made concerning similar offenses in the future. Profiling in effect is a form of retro-classification whereby typologies are developed from past crimes to provide some understanding of present crimes (73). In order for this paradigm to be valid, it is paramount that the information (i.e., past crimes) from which these typologies are developed is reliable. Herein lies a problem, as the literature in the field of criminology is replete with discussion concerning the unreliability of information surrounding both the reporting and the recording of crime (74–76). There are numerous manifestations of this problem, but two distinct aspects seem particularly pertinent to profiling. First, there are limitations concerning sample representation. Second, there are problems relating to the accuracy of the data itself.

The problem concerning sample representation is illustrated by one of the most renowned pieces of research in the field of profiling, the organized/disorganized behavior dichotomy as proposed by Ressler et al. (77). Data for this study were obtained by researchers interviewing a very small number of incarcerated sexual murderers and reviewing their archival records.

Whether the organized/disorganized dichotomy represents a behavioral typology genuinely representative of sexual murderers in general or merely a typology of sexual murderers who were incarcerated and willing to participate in an interview program is open to debate. This issue appears even more pronounced when one considers examples of infamous sexual murderers who would have been suitable for such research but in all likelihood would have declined to cooperate (78).[†]

The second major problem surrounding the type of data used in profiling research is the reliability of the information contained in the various archival records often used as source material. A sizeable amount of literature exists in the fields of psychology and criminology that considers the unreliability of information sourced in the recollection of facts from eyewitness testimony (80) and the methods for formally reporting and recording offenses in police catalogues and statistics (76). It must therefore be queried how valid profiling is likely to be, given the limitations of the available data sources on which some research is based and principles espoused.

Uniform Definitions: An Absence of Parity

Part of the motivation for developing the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual for Mental Disorders* (81) and the *ICD-10* (82) was to provide uniformity in the terminology and classification of mental disease. The general acceptance of these lexicons over the decades has rendered the problems of miscommunication among the psychiatric/psychological communities almost obsolete (83). Profiling does not, however, enjoy the benefits of a *DSM* or *ICD*.[‡] Instead, substantial disparity exists with regard to the use of language that in turn arguably stifles the progression of profiling as a discipline.[¶]

Possibly the most obvious example of this lack of uniformity is in the nomenclature adopted to describe profiling itself. “Offender profiling,” “criminal profiling,” “criminal psychological profiling,” “sociopsychological criminal profiling,” “criminal personality profiling,” CIA, and IP are all terms variously used to describe the practice of profiling. However, the source of this problem is deeper than semantic differences in terminology, as such disparities are often reflected in differing methodological procedures and the end

[†] We suggest that the above dichotomy be amended with the addition of a mixed type or even a non-categorical continuum (79), because of the frequency of disorganized features in the organized type of offender.

[‡] In the context of creating a uniform lexicon of terminology to avoid miscommunication.

[¶] It should be noted that Douglas et al. (84) did publish a text modeled on the *DSM*. However, this manual does not appear to have gained any significant degree of universal acceptance.

product of the research. One of the best illustrations of this concerns the debate surrounding what constitutes serial murder. Some authors argue that “serial” in this context can be defined by a numerical body count, for example, the murder of a minimum of three victims (84,85). Others have suggested a minimum of four (86) and some have suggested the possibility of five (87). Also, it should be noted that, at times, apprehended after one or two murders, an offender may indicate that he/she had had the intention to continue the killings (88). Based on this intention, these offenders could be considered serial killers. Presented with the varying criteria used to sample these populations, it comes as little surprise then that disparities arise between the research findings of studies that all claim to examine serial murder (63,77,86,87).

Inductive Versus Deductive Profiling: Does Such a Distinction Exist?

One recent development has been the suggestion that two distinct forms of profiling exist. The premise for this distinction is based on differing reasoning processes (i.e., inductive or deductive) that are argued to be in use by an individual when composing a profile. Inductive criminal profiling uses inductive reasoning, which in this context is defined as “reasoning involving broad generalizations or statistical reasoning, where it is possible for the premises to be true while the subsequent conclusion is false” (89, p. 686). Deductive criminal profiling, on the contrary, involves deductive reasoning, which is defined as “an argument where, if the premises are true, then the conclusions must also be true. In a deductive argument, the conclusions flow directly from the premises given” (89, p. 682). These distinctions form the basis of a method of profiling, referred to as behavior evidence analysis (BEA), which exclusively favors the use of deductive reasoning in combination with an understanding of the forensic sciences for the composition of a competent profile (90).

The problem with such distinctions is that it transposes philosophical paradigms onto the functional processes of the mind. Although the distinction between inductive or deductive reasoning is a well-established concept in the literature pertaining to critical thinking (91), there is debate in the cognitive psychology/psychiatry literature as to whether the mind functions in such a categorical fashion, that is, whether cognitive functions akin to inductive or deductive reasoning can be undertaken to the exclusion of one another (92,93). Unlike the autonomic functions of a computer, it is unlikely that the human mind is truly capable of engaging in such a discrete process of reasoning. Indeed, the brain itself, as a complex and highly active neuronal synaptic system, may subconsciously process diverse and/or intrusive thoughts that may increase the difficulty of full engagement in one or the other method. If the

cognitive processes of the mind are incapable of engaging in this fashion, the suggestion of a method of profiling premised on the issue of one form of reasoning to the exclusion of the other is rendered highly problematic.

Who Owns Profiling?

In the mid-1990s, profiling was examined by a subcommittee of the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) in the United Kingdom. It concluded that although the technique had not yet been scientifically validated, it should be accepted in faith as being viable, as its validation would eventually be achieved. The committee went on to comment that the practice and work in the area of profiling should be “owned” by the police service (94). Although perhaps not explicitly stated, similar sentiments regarding the acceptance of profiling and its ownership have been echoed in other countries (95–97). The basis for this view appears to be related to a desire to avoid divulging operational information concerning profiling techniques to potential criminals (7,98).

The concern in divulging operational information presumably arises from the publication of research in scientifically peer-reviewed mediums that by virtue of this process can be scrutinized by others. Although there is some merit to the contention that through the publication of literature potential offenders may be alerted to the techniques of police, such concerns need to be weighed against the low level of readership that scientific journals and texts enjoy generally. Additionally, the degree of sophistication such literature typically involves, coupled with the often poorer standard of education found among offenders who are the source of such research (85–87,99), makes the usefulness of this material to such offenders questionable. The scientific development of profiling is likely to be most reliant on social science research methods that are oriented toward the production of scholarly research. This, however, is arguably not the focus of policing agencies that are primarily dedicated to maintaining public order and the apprehension of offenders (100). Although profiling is unquestionably a forensic investigative technique used in the course of criminal investigations primarily conducted by police personnel, its development and practice is not necessarily best achieved by the exclusive efforts of police personnel. Contentions of ownership are counterproductive and likely to impede the genuine scientific advancement of profiling.

Professionalism

Correct professional behavior implies respect among colleagues and scientific communication without any ivory-tower attitude that impedes objectivity and the search for truth (27,31,101). In the field of profiling, there should

be more communication among the proponents of the various theoretical and methodological schools of thought (102), opening avenues of healthy communication and creating an arena for an objective, sound exchange of ideas. Although critical debate (19,27) is a valuable component of scientific development and, as in other disciplines, constructive criticism is essential for the advance in the understanding of profiling, in the literature, disputes over new concepts or new terms appear with disheartening frequency (7,10,101–106). Indeed, it seems that there is a peculiar form of myopia among profilers who are unable or unwilling to cite, acknowledge, or build on the research of colleagues, or may be unaware of it at all. This phenomenon is an impediment to the scientific development of profiling because, without the integration of all research, the field is in serious danger of remaining a fragmented practice, with repetitious errors, duplication, failure to test theories, and a lack of exposure to differing scientific approaches (107).

An Absence of Regulation

From a research, clinical, and practical point of view, one can assume that profiling is in a budding state and has yet to define an objective credentialing process. This is probably the reason why many unreliable statements are made in the various media by self-appointed profilers. The presence of sound credentials, as in any other field, should be paramount in the field of profiling. Unfortunately, credentials offered as qualifications to engage in profiling range from a familiarity with the published literature, employment with a law enforcement agency, qualifications in a mental-health discipline, authorship of a true-crime novel, the publication of scholarly research, or any combination of the above. The problems that arise from this are obvious and analogous to all other disciplines that have lacked regulation in ensuring common professional standards among individuals who identify themselves as practitioners within a defined area of expertise. Without regulation, gross disparities in the level of skill among practitioners can occur and the quality of the services rendered may vary considerably. In the context of police investigations, such disparities in the quality of the professional services rendered can have potentially disastrous results for the course of justice (23).

Unfortunately, the solution of introducing some form of regulation is equally problematic. At present, differing proponents, who advocate one approach of profiling over another, have introduced self-styled accreditation programs. However, these programs may exclude and tend to discredit other practitioners within the field who offer different approaches or perspectives, and they create even more divisiveness among profilers.

CONCLUSIONS

What does the future hold for the practice of profiling and the research underpinning it? Unfortunately, the prognosis for the near future at least is less than encouraging. It seems that, as in any new field, the various participants are too absorbed in their own research and find themselves in an isolationist mode of operating.

Unquestionably, the research and practice associated with profiling needs further development and this needs to be undertaken in the form of original, data-driven studies that are subject to scientific scrutiny (108–110). What is not required are simplistic claims accompanied by little more than a fresh lexicon of newly coined terms and phrases (111). It is often debated whether profiling represents a science or an art (112). At this juncture, the practice of profiling crimes seems to be more of an art (113). However, it must strive to become a science.

In promoting this view, research in the field needs to focus on the development of practical techniques that make use of profiling that will serve to assist in the investigation of crimes and not just the promulgation of literature based on whatever data may be available. Additionally, future research needs to fully articulate its conclusions so that other researchers may replicate, build, and ultimately advance the knowledge gained in the area. In this context, therefore, researchers will need to communicate with one another, because this is the basis of the scientific method.

Because profiling is still in a developing phase, its regulation and credentialing must be developed through better communication among the various schools of profiling and the investigative agencies concerned. This will take some time. Perhaps the best compromise is for the practice of profiling to be incorporated into an existing professional body that does not hold any specific interest in profiling *per se* but would nonetheless serve to regulate its practitioners and promote its scientific development. Any of the regulatory bodies that govern the accreditation and practice of psychologists or psychiatrists, for example, may be appropriate. Such bodies would not be exclusively concerned with the practice of profiling but would have the benefit of being allied to the disciplinary origins of the technique. This proposition is not aimed at removing profiling from the province of law enforcement. There are many police personnel who, for example, have formal psychological qualifications and who are already affiliated with such bodies. Arguably, it simply makes sense to have an independent body that governs its membership according to recognized, regulated qualifications most suited to the skills for profiling and not only as membership with a particular employer *per se* such as a policing or

investigative agency. No doubt the scientific basis to profiling will need to be advanced before such professional bodies would be prepared to entertain such a proposition, but once again, this arguably would be a positive development.

In the future, better trust will have to develop between profilers and investigative agencies for the success of their common purpose: the identification of the offender. Both will have to overcome their narcissistic tendencies and recognize that they are complementary in the practice of profiling (114). As for the differing approaches to profiling presently used by various methodological schools, it is to be hoped that their exponents will overcome their respective biases and see that they are all contributors to the definition of a larger puzzle and that no school of profiling holds the final answer. Their continued divisiveness only benefits the offender.

In conclusion, it is hoped that this chapter will inspire debate and encourage original data-driven research that will ultimately serve as the best solution to the problems discussed herein.

REFERENCES

1. Harris, T. (1981). *Red Dragon*. New York: Putnam.
2. Harris, T. (1988). *The Silence of the Lambs*. New York: St. Martins.
3. Harris, T. (1999). *Hannibal*. New York: Delacorte.
4. Britton, P. (2002). *Picking Up the Pieces*. London: Bantam Press.
5. Canter, D. (1994). *Criminal Shadows*. London: Harper Collins.
6. DeNevi, D. & Campbell, J.H. (2004). *Into the Minds of Madmen*. New York: Prometheus Books.
7. Douglas, J.E. & Olshaker, M. (1995). *Mindhunter*. New York: Scribner.
8. Douglas, J.E. & Olshaker, M. (1996). *Journey Into Darkness*. New York: Scribner.
9. McCrary, G.O. & Ramsland, K. (2003). *The Unknown Darkness: Profiling the Predators Among Us*. New York: Harper Collins.
10. Ressler, R.K. & Shachtman, T. (1992). *Whoever Fights Monsters*. London: Simon and Schuster.
11. Ressler, R.K. & Shachtman, T. (1997). *I Have Lived in the Monster*. New York: St. Martin Press.
12. Vorpagel, R.E. & Harrington, J. (1998). *Profiles in Murder*. New York: Plenum.
13. Jenkins, H. (1994). *Using Murder: The Social Construction of Serial Homicide*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
14. Dietz, P.E. (1985). Sex offender profiling by the FBI: a preliminary conceptual model. In M.H. Ben-Aron, S.J. Hucher & C.D. Webster (Eds.), *Clinical Criminology* (pp. 207–219). Toronto, Canada: M and M Graphics.
15. Geberth, V.J. (1983). *Practical Homicide Investigation: Tactics, Procedures and Forensic Techniques*. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.

16. Geberth, V.J. (1996). *Practical Homicide Investigation: Tactics, Procedures and Forensic Techniques* (3rd ed.). Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.
17. Teten, H.D. (1989). Offender profiling. In W.G. Bailey (Ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Police Science* (pp. 365–367). New York: Garland.
18. Oleson, J.C. (1996). Psychological profiling: does it actually work? *Forensic Update*, 46, 11–14.
19. Risinger, D.M. & Loop, J.L. (2002). Three card monte, Monty Hall, *modus operandi* and “offender profiling”: some lessons of modern cognitive science for the law of evidence. *Cardozo L Rev*, 24, 193–285.
20. Institutional Research and Development Unit, FBI Academy: evaluation of the psychological profiling program. Unpublished manuscript, 1981.
21. Pinizzotto, A.J. (1984). Forensic psychology: criminal personality profiling. *J Police Sci Admin*, 12(1), 32–40.
22. Muller, D.A. (2000). Criminal profiling: real science or just wishful thinking? *Homicide Studies*, 4(3), 234–264.
23. Innes, B. (2003). *Profile of a Criminal Mind*. Leicester, UK: Silverdale Books.
24. Aron, A. & Aron, E.N. (1994). *Statistics for Psychology*. White Plains, NJ: Prentice Hall.
25. Gravetter, F.J. & Wallnau, L.B. (2004). *Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences* (6th ed.). New York: Wadsworth.
26. Baron, R.A. & Byrne, D.E. (2002). *Social Psychology* (10th ed.). New York: Prentice Hall.
27. Crace, J. (1995). Inside the criminal mind. *New Statesman and Society*, February 17, 29–30.
28. Jeffers, H.P. (1991). *Who Killed Precious? How FBI Special Agents Combine Psychology and High Technology to Identify Violent Criminals*. New York: Pharos Books.
29. U.S. House of Representatives. (1990). U.S.S. Iowa Tragedy: An Investigative Failure. Report of the investigations subcommittee and the defense policy panel of the committee on armed services. U.S. House of Representatives 101st Congress, 2nd Session.
30. Wilson, P. & Soothill, K. (1996). Psychological profiling: red, green or amber? *Police J*, 1, 12–20.
31. Wineman, L. (2004). Does profiling actually work? *Mon on Psychol*, 8, 32.
32. Pinizzotto, A.J. & Finkel, N.J. (1990). Criminal personality profiling: an outcome and process study. *Law & Hum Behav*, 14, 215–233.
33. Kocsis, R.N. (2003). Criminal psychological profiling: validities and abilities? *Int J Offender Ther Comp Criminol*, 47(2), 126–144.
34. Kocsis, R.N., Irwin, H.J., Hayes, A.F. & Nunn, R. (2000). Expertise in psychological profiling: a comparative assessment. *J Interpers Violence*, 15(3), 311–331.
35. Kocsis, R.N., Hayes, A.F. & Irwin, H.J. (2002). Investigative experience and accuracy in psychological profiling of a violent crime. *J Interpers Violence*, 17(8), 811–823.
36. Kocsis, R.N. (2003). An empirical assessment of content in criminal psychological profiles. *Int J Offender Ther Comp Criminol*, 47(1), 38–47.

37. Kocsis, R.N. (2004). Psychological profiling in serial arson offenses: a comparative assessment of skills and accuracy. *Crim Justice Behav*, 31(3), 341–361.
38. Copson, G. (1995). *Coals to Newcastle? Part I: A Study of Offender Profiling (Paper 7)*. London: Police Research Group Special Interest Series, Home Office.
39. Jackson, J.L., Van Koppen, P.J. & Herbrink, C.M. (1993). *Does the Service Meet the Needs? An Evaluation of Consumer Satisfaction with the Specific Profile Analysis and Investigative Advice as Offered by the Scientific Research Advisory Unit of the National Criminal Intelligence Division (CRI)*. The Netherlands: NISCALE Report NSCR 93-05.
40. Brussel, J. (1968). *Casebook of a Criminal Psychiatrist*. New York: Bernard Geis.
41. Holmes, R.M. & Holmes, S.T. (1996). *Profiling Violent Crimes: An Investigative Tool* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
42. Rossi, D. (1982). Crime scene behavioral analysis: another tool for the law enforcement investigator. *Police Chief*, 18(4), 152–155.
43. Vorpapel, R.E. (1982). Painting psychological profiles: charlatanism, coincidence, charisma or new science. *Police Chief*, 3(8), 156–159.
44. Palermo, G.B. (2004). *The Faces of Violence* (2nd ed.). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas Publishers.
45. Langevin, R. & Handy, L. (1987). Stranger homicide in Canada: a national sample and a psychiatric sample. *J Crim L & Criminology*, 78, 398–429.
46. Maguire, K. & Pastore, A.L. (Eds.). (1999). *Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics 1998*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, Government Printing Office.
47. Kocsis, R.N. & Hayes, A.F. (2004). Believing is seeing? Investigating the perceived accuracy of criminal psychological profiles. *Int J Offender Ther Comp Criminol*, 48(2), 149–160.
48. Kocsis, R.N. & Heller, G.Z. (2004). Believing is seeing II. Beliefs and perceptions of criminal psychological profiles. *Int J Offender Ther Comp Criminol*, 48(3), 313–329.
49. Kocsis, R.N. & Middeldorp, J.T. (2004). Believing is seeing III. Perceptions of content in criminal psychological profiles. *Int J Offender Ther Comp Criminol*, 48(4), 477–494.
50. Godwin, J. (1978). *Murder USA. The Ways We Kill Each Other*. New York: Ballantine.
51. Snook, B., Canter, D. & Bennell, C. (2002). Predicting the home location of serial offenders: a preliminary comparison of the accuracy of human judges with a geographic profiling system. *Behav Sci Law*, 20, 109–118.
52. Rossmo, D.K. (1997). Geographic profiling. In J.L. Jackson & D. Bekerian (Eds.), *Offender Profiling: Theory, Research and Practice* (pp. 159–176). London: Wiley.
53. Levine, N. (2000). *Crimestat: A Spatial Statistics Program for the Analysts of Crime Incident Locations (Version 1.1)*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

54. Young, G. (2003). Mapping mayhem: the geography of crime. *Computeredge*, August.
55. Randi, J. (1982). Atlanta child murderer: psychics' failed visions. *Skep Inq*, 7(1), 12–13.
56. Irwin, H.J. (2004). *An Introduction to Parapsychology* (4th ed.). UK: McFarland.
57. Davis, P. & Morello, C. (2002). Tarot card's message is a killer's cry for respect, experts say. *The Washington Post*, October 10, A22.
58. Farhi, P. & Weeks, L. (2002). With the sniper, TV profilers missed their mark. *Washington Post*, October 25, C01.
59. Holloway, J.D. (2003). The perils of profiling for the media. *Mon on Psychol*, 34(1), 30.
60. Springer, J. (2003). For profilers missing the mark is common. *Court TV Online*, June 1. Available at http://news.findlaw.com/court_tv/s/20030601/01jun2003112521.html.
61. Godwin, M.G. (Ed.). (2000). *Criminal Psychology and Forensic Technology: A Collaborative Approach to Effective Profiling*. New York: CRC Press.
62. Jackson, J.L. & Bekerian, D. (Eds.). (1997). *Offender Profiling: Theory, Research and Practice*. London: Wiley.
63. Holmes, R.M. & DeBurger, J. (1988). *Serial Murder*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
64. Kocsis, R.N., Cooksey, R.W. & Irwin, H.J. (2002). Psychological profiling of sexual murders: an empirical model. *Int J Offender Ther Comp Criminol*, 46(3), 532–553.
65. Kocsis, R.N., Irwin, H.J. & Cooksey, R.W. (2002). Psychological profiling of offender characteristics from crime behaviors in serial rapists. *Int J Offender Ther Comp Criminol*, 46(2), 144–169.
66. Kennedy, L. & Whittaker, M. (1992). *Granny Killer: The Story of John Glover*. Sydney: Harper Collins.
67. Ault, R.L. & Reese, J.T. (1980). A psychological assessment of crime: profiling. *FBI Law Enf Bull*, 49, 22–26.
68. Douglas, J.E. & Burgess, A.W. (1986). Criminal profiling: a viable investigative tool against violent crime. *FBI Law Enf Bull*, 55(12), 9–13.
69. Salfati, C.G. (2000). The nature of expressiveness and instrumentality in homicide for criminal profiling. *Homicide Studies*, 4(3), 265–293.
70. Daly, M. & Wilson, M. (1988). *Homicide*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
71. Polk, K. (1994). *When Men Kill: Scenarios of Masculine Violence*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
72. Canter, D. & Heritage, R. (1989). A multivariate model of sexual offence behavior: developments in offender profiling. *J Forensic Psychiatry*, 1, 185–212.
73. Turco, R.N. (1990). Psychological profiling. *Int J Offender Ther Comp Criminol*, 34, 147–154.
74. Goldsmith, V., McGuire, P.G., Mollenkopf, J.H. & Ross, T.A. (Eds.). (2000). *Analyzing Crime Patterns: Frontiers of Practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
75. Maguire, M., Morgan, R. & Reiner, R. (Eds.). (1997). *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

76. Pease, K. (1998). *Criminal Statistics: Their Use and Abuse*. Aldershot, UK: Dartmouth.
77. Ressler, R.K., Burgess, A.W., Douglas, J.E., Hartman, C.R. & D'Agostino, R.B. (1986). Sexual killers and their victims: identifying patterns through crime scene analysis. *J Interpers Violence*, 1, 288–308.
78. Keppel, R. & Birnes, W. (1995). *The Riverman*. New York: Pocket Books.
79. Kocsis, R.N., Irwin, H.J. & Hayes, A.F. (1998). Organized and disorganized behavior syndromes in arsonists: a validation study of a psychological profiling concept. *Psychia Psychol Law*, 5, 117–130.
80. Gudjonsson, G.H. (1992). *The Psychology of Interrogations, Confessions and Testimony*. London: Wiley.
81. American Psychiatric Association. (1994). *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (4th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.
82. World Health Organization. (1992). *The ICD-10 Classification of Mental and Behavioral Disorders. Clinical Descriptions and Diagnostic Guidelines*. Geneva: World Health Organization.
83. First, M.B. & Tasman, A. (Eds.). (2004). *DSM-IV-TR Mental Disorders: Diagnosis, Etiology and Treatment*. London: Wiley.
84. Douglas, J.E., Burgess, A.W., Burgess, A.G. & Ressler, R.K. (1992). *Crime Classification Manual*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
85. Ressler, R.K., Burgess, A. & Douglas, J.E. (1988). *Sexual Homicide: Patterns and Motives*. New York: Lexington Books.
86. Hickey, E.W. (1997). *Serial Murderers and Their Victims* (2nd ed.). Fresno, CA: Wadsworth.
87. Egger, S.A. (1998). *The Killers Among Us: An Examination of Serial Murder and Its Investigation*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
88. Kocsis, R.N. & Irwin, H.J. (1998). The psychological profile of serial offenders and a redefinition of the misnomer of serial crime. *Psychia Psychol Law*, 5(2), 197–213.
89. Turvey, B. (2002). *Criminal Profiling: An Introduction to Behavioral Evidence Analysis* (2nd ed.). London: Academic Press.
90. Turvey, B. (1999). *Criminal Profiling: An Introduction to Behavioral Evidence Analysis*. London: Academic Press.
91. Aik, K.C. & Edmonds, S. (1986). *Critical Thinking: Selected Topics for Discussion and Analysis*. White Plains, NY: Longman.
92. Lynn, S.J. & McConkey, K.M. (Eds.). (1998). *Truth in Memory*. New York: Guilford.
93. Tulving, E. & Craik, F.I.M. (Eds.). (2000). *The Oxford Handbook of Memory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
94. Copson, G. & Marshall, N. (1999). Mind over matter. *Police Rev*, 7, 16–17.
95. Beck, J.P., O'Sullivan, B.J. & Ogilvie, A.B. (1989). *An Australian Violent Criminal Apprehension Programme: A Feasibility Study*. Adelaide: National Police Research Unit.
96. Rayment, M. (1995). Inside the mind of a criminal. *NSW Police News*, 75, 15–18.
97. Wilson, C. & Seaman, D. (1992). *The Serial Killers*. London: Cox and Wyman.

98. Stevens, J. (1996). Profiling criminals. *Police Rev*, 8, 22–23.
99. Kocsis, R.N. & Cooksey, R.W. (2002). Criminal psychological profiling of serial arson crimes. *Int J Offender Ther Comp Criminol*, 46(4), 631–656.
100. Findlay, M. & Zvekic, U. (1993). *Alternative Policing Styles: Cross Cultural Perspectives*. Deventer, The Netherlands, and Cambridge, MA: Kluwer.
101. Hazelwood, R.R. & Michaud, S.G. (1998). *The Evil That Men do*. New York: Longman.
102. Ainsworth, P. (2001). *Offender Profiling and Crime Scene Analysis*. London: Willan.
103. Canter, D. (2003). *Mapping Murder*. London: Virgin Books.
104. Rossmo, D.K. (2000). *Geographic Profiling*. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.
105. Britton, P. (1997). *The Jigsaw Man*. London: Bantam Press.
106. Edwards, C. (1998). Behavior and the law reconsidered: psychological syndromes and profiles. *J Forensic Sci*, 43(1), 141–150.
107. Kocsis, R.N. & Coleman, S. (2000). The unexplored ethics of criminal psychological profiling. In M.G. Godwin (Ed.), *Criminal Psychology and Forensic Technology: A Collaborative Approach to Effective Profiling* (pp. 323–338). New York: CRC Press.
108. Kocsis, R.N., Middledorp, J.T. & Try, A.C. (2005). Cognitive processes in criminal profile construction: a preliminary study. *Int J Offender Ther Comp Criminol*, 49(6), 662–681.
109. Kocsis, R.N. & Irwin, H.J. (1997). An analysis of spatial patterns in serial rape, arson, and burglary: the utility of the circle theory of environmental range for psychological profiling. *Psychia Psychol Law*, 4, 195–206.
110. Kocsis, R.N., Cooksey, R.W., Irwin, H.J. & Allen, G. (2002). A further assessment of “circle theory” for geographic psychological profiling. *Aust N Z J Criminol*, 35(1), 43–62.
111. Hormant, R.J. & Kennedy, D.B. (1998). Psychological aspects of crime scene profiling: validity research. *Crim Justice Behav*, 25, 319–343.
112. Holmes, R.M. & Holmes, S.T. (2002). *Profiling Violent Crimes: An Investigative Tool* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
113. Palermo, G.B. (2002). Criminal profiling: the uniqueness of the killer. *Int J Offender Ther Comp Criminol*, 2, 383–385.
114. Palermo, G.B. & Kocsis, R.N. (2005). *Offender Profiling: An Introduction to the Sociopsychological Analysis of Violent Crime*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas Publishers.