

Basic Acknowledgement format of AI tool use

I acknowledge the use of Grammarly <https://www.grammarly.com/> on 2 November 2024 to check my work by using the following prompt.

I used the prompt(s):

1. Please check the following text for readability and grammar.

I confirm that I have not presented any AI generated text as my own work. I confirm I have copies of my drafts, notes, and other resources I used before, and after the use of AI tools which I may be asked to provide in evidence.

I acknowledge the use of Google scholar <https://scholar.google.com/> on 29 October 2024 to access reliable and suitable papers for my work by using the following prompts:

I used the prompts:

1. Literature review of the effectiveness of the two approaches in offender profiling.
2. Case studies supporting the geographical approach.
3. Overview of psychological theory of crime.

I confirm that I have not presented any AI generated text as my own work. I confirm I have copies of my drafts, notes, and other resources I used before, and after the use of AI tools which I may be asked to provide in evidence.

Critically discuss the contribution of psychological theory and evidence in aiding our
understanding of judicial processes

The psychological theory of crime can be used to determine which cognitive and emotional factors can result in criminal activity (Byrne, 2010). Within the courtroom, the judge is responsible for ensuring a fair trial and concluding the trial, resulting in either a punishment or not (Courts and Tribunals Judiciary, 2023). However, to help the judge make the decision, there are certain processes that could be used including: offender profiling, eyewitness testimony and Jury selection. Furthermore, this essay will focus on the contribution of offender profiling in locating suspects and resolving crimes.

Criminal profiling, sometimes referred to as behavioral profiling or offender profiling, is an investigative technique used by law enforcement to identify traits of offenders based on their behaviour (Petherick & Brooks, 2020). To find patterns in the offender's behaviour, it involves looking at both the crime scene and what happened in the event (Petherick & Brooks, 2020). A psychological profile of the criminal will be created using this data, which could help in reducing the number of potential suspects (Petherick & Brooks, 2020). The idea behind offender profiling is that criminals have a modus operandi (MO) or criminal signature, that enables profilers to determine aspects of the offender's personality from the evidence found at the crime scene (Petherick & Brooks, 2020). However, there are two main types of offender profiling, which are the top-down approach and the bottom-up approach.

The bottom-up approach to offender profiling, also known as the British approach, is a data-driven approach that predicts the offender's attributes and builds a criminal profile using statistical data from similar crimes (Jedrzejewska, 2018). A common technique used in the bottom-up approach would be the geographic approach (Taylor et al., 2011). This technique examines patterns of the time and place of crimes to determine connections between the crimes and to provide suggestions regarding the offender's homes and places of employment of the criminals (Texas State University, 2020).

The geographic approach was developed by Criminologist Kim Rossmo and Investigative Psychologist David Canter (Chamikara et al., 2015). Carter distinguished between two categories of criminals: a commuting Criminal, an offender who would travel to commit crime in an area that they are still familiar with, and a marauder, who lives near to where the crime was committed (Chamikara et al., 2015).

Similarly, Brantingham and Brantingham developed the distance decay theory (1969). This theory suggests that the offenders are more likely to commit crimes closer to their homes as it requires less effort (Chen, 2015). This is due to the fact that travelling further requires more work, both financially and physically (Chen, 2015). Geographic offender profiling is supported by distance decay theory (1969), as it suggests explanation to why criminals are less likely to select victims that are further away from where they live.

For instance, if an international crime group formed together with the intention of breaking into the tower of London for the crown jewels, each person would have to travel. However, if the crime was successful, the reward of the crown jewels would outweigh the traveling aspect. This would argue against the distance decay theory (1969), and support the Rational choice theory (1987) developed by Derek Cornish and Ronald Clarke, as they suggest that the offender weighs up the costs and benefits before committing the crime, as they are more likely to carry out the crime if the rewards are higher than the risks (Beaudry-Cyr, 2015). Therefore, the reward would make it worthwhile, and the offender would be prepared to travel.

Alternatively, it is more likely that a group based in England would attempt this crime compared to a group based in the US. The Crime Pattern theory (1993) would support this as according to the theory of crime patterns (1993), criminals are more likely to commit crimes in places they visit often or are familiar with (Van et al., 2021). Therefore, the group based in England would be more familiar with the surroundings as they would be more likely to know the routine of the tower guards and possible escape routes. Having said that, an offender who lives near London would know how secure the Tower of London is and that there is CCTV everywhere, therefore, in support of the rational choice theory (1987), the local offender would

weigh up that the target was too secure to attempt such a crime, and would be likely to be unsuccessful.

In addition, the theory of Buffer Zones (1976) suggests that criminals are less likely to conduct crimes surrounding their home or place of employment (Górski, 2018). This is either for geometrical reasons or because of a higher chance of recognition (Górski, 2018). Therefore, this would argue against the distance decay theory (1969) as the offender would be more likely to be recognized if they lived near the Tower of London and did attempt to break into the building to steal the crown jewels.

Additional support for the distance decay theory (1969) would be lack of transportation. For example, if an offender has no vehicle or limited public transport choices, they will only be able to commit crimes in places that are within walking distance (Keren, 2019). This supports the distance decay theory (1969) as the offender is more likely to commit a crime within their area, as it involves less effort (Keren, 2019). However, this would not support larger crimes such as attempting to break into the tower of London, this would be more likely for smaller crimes such as robbery of nearby housing. Additionally, the offender would be more likely to rob houses nearer to them as the offender would be familiar with the area and possibly know the neighbor's daily routine. This would support the Crime Pattern theory (1993) as the offender would know the best time and route to break into the houses as they are familiar with the surroundings and they would know where to store, transport and sell the stolen goods.

However, the geographical approach has been shown to be reliable in practice, as David Canter caught John Duffy, the “railway rapist”, by using offender profiling (Canter, 2004). Between 1982 and 1986, Duffy committed three murders and twenty-four acts of sexual assault (Bolland, 2002). Canter became a part of the investigation and created a profile from the details of the crime, which he ended up matching thirteen out of seventeen characteristics developed by Canter (Canter, 2004). The investigative psychologist predicted the offender’s personal characteristics including age, his connection to the railway, where he lived, previous criminal behavior and domestic traits (Canter, 2004). Canter used the circle theory (1993) to come to these conclusions (Kocsis et al., 2002). The circle theory (1993) suggests that the offender lives

and where the crime was committed would be located within a small circle, which suggests the offender was a marauder (Kocsis et al., 2002).

Overall, the geographical approach does seem to be a useful tool for aiding the police in investigations and predicting the offender's characteristics and residential home, based on details from the crime scene (Kocsis et al., 2002). Similarly, the theories mentioned in the proposed scenario describe and provide examples of the different types of offenders, commuters and marauders, which is determined by the details in the crime. However, there are also some limitations regarding this approach.

One limitation of the geographical approach would be that it relies heavily on detailed information, meaning that having insufficient data may lead to inaccurate results (Knabe-Nicol & Alison, 2024). Additionally, this approach assumes that the offender would have a criminal signature, but this might not always be the case. For example, the offender may only target certain areas once and change their routine, which would make it difficult to predict their next move (Knabe-Nicol & Alison, 2024). Furthermore, the geographical approach is better suited for certain types of serial crimes that involve spatial elements, including murder and burglary (Canter & Hammond, 2007). Therefore, crimes where the offender's behaviour does not link to a specific location, such as crimes of passion and financial crime, the use of the offender profiling would not be successful (Canter & Hammond, 2007).

Moreover, another frequently used technique for offender profiling would be the top-down approach. The top-down approach, also known as the American approach, was developed by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) in the 1970's. It is a process that involves building an offender profile that uses pre-existing information about the criminal's behaviour and personality (Fox & Farrington, 2018). To create a general profile of those who commit these kinds of crimes, the FBI investigated and interviewed thirty-six victims of horrifying crimes including rape murders and serial killings (Fox & Farrington, 2018).

Within the top-down approach, typologies are used to create the offender's profile. Typology is the process of categorizing individuals into groups based on their characteristics (Francis et al., 2004). Based on the information at the crime scene, the FBI determined that the offenders

could be split into one of two groups, organized or disorganized, as certain characteristics enabled them to make predictions of which group they would fall into (Fox & Farrington, 2018).

The construction of an FBI profile consists of four main stages (Bumgarner, 2008). Data assimilation consists of investigators collecting data from all possible sources including police reports and the crime scene. Crime scene classification is the process of deciding whether the crime represents an organized or disorganized offender. Crime reconstruction is the process of developing a hypothesis in terms of the behaviour of the offender, victim and crime sequence. Profile generation is when the investigator creates a 'sketch' of the likely offender (Bumgarner, 2008).

Organized offenders would show that planning had taken place before committing the crime, they have a specific type of individual that they would target, they are above average in intelligence and ensure that no clues or evidence is left at the crime scene (Sammons, 2019). However, a disorganized offender would display that little planning had taken place prior to the crime, their crime scene reflects impulsivity, they are below average in intelligence, they lived alone and nearby to the crime scene, and it shows that the incident happened spontaneously (Sammons, 2019).

An example of an organised offender would be the serial killer, Ted Bundy. In the 1970s, the American serial killer conducted several acts of sexual assaults, kidnaps and murders of innocent young women. According to research, Ted Bundy was considered an intelligent and charming man who graduated in the University of Washington with a Psychology degree (Sastry, 2020). This would support the organized offender profile, as he was clearly an intelligent individual for graduating with a Psychology degree. The level of Bundy's intelligence was showcased in court when he represented himself. Additionally, it is clear to see that Bundy had a specific type when it came to targeting his victims as he targeting young college female students with similar features (Sastry, 2020). This would also support an organized offender as he had a specific type of person that he would deliberately target.

Furthermore, Bundy would entice his victims by convincing them he needed assistance, such as having his arm in a sling or his leg in a fake cast, which would lead to him taking his target to a

rural area where he would conduct his intended crime (Sastry, 2020). Likewise, this would support the organized offender profile as he demonstrated a routine, which he would use with each victim, that had been planned prior to the crime. Lastly, when he was arrested in 1978, he confessed to thirty murders (Sastry, 2020). However, many of these victims were never found, therefore, the true number of murders is unknown (Sastry, 2020). This also demonstrates his intelligence and the planning before and after the crime, to ensure there was no evidence to be traced back to him. Despite Bundy's intelligence, offender profiling was still successful in identifying and facilitating his arrest.

In addition, Ted Bundy displayed consistency within his behaviour when it came to committing his crimes, as he followed the same routine for all his victims. This would support the offender consistency hypothesis, as this hypothesis suggests that offenders will act in a somewhat consistent manner while committing several similar crimes (Bouhana et al., 2014). David Canter (1996) conducted a study to compare the relationship between behaviors of offenders that have committed multiple sexual offences. The smallest space analysis was used to identify correlations between the offender's behaviors (Canter, 1996). The study found that offenders demonstrated behaviors that consisted across multiple crimes, which in turn supports the crime consistency hypothesis.

Alternatively, an example of a disorganized offender would be Richard Chase, also known as 'The Vampire of Sacramento' (Nel & Naidoo, 2014). In support of the disorganized profile, studies state that he was an unstable individual, as he was in and out of mental institutions, he did not have social life, he lived alone, and he also abused drugs and alcohol. Additionally, Chase did not have a type when it came to selecting his target. His victims varied from an elderly woman to a middle-aged man and a twenty-two-month-old baby. This would also support the disorganized profile, as he did not have a specific victim in mind, unlike Ted Bundy. Therefore, his attacks were opportunistic, which suggests that no planning had taken place prior to the murder (Nel & Naidoo, 2014).

Moreover, he made no effort into clearing the crime scene, as he would leave the scene with his clothes covered in the victim's blood and would often leave the corpse as it was (Sullivan,

2014). This would support the disorganized profile as his crimes were spontaneous and he displayed low intelligence. His DNA was all over the crime scene and his clothes were covered in the victim's blood, this shows that the offender had low intelligence as he did not attempt to clear his DNA from the scene (Sullivan,2014). In addition, he was identified by someone he went to school with, showing that he did not venture too far from home, which would also support the disorganized profile. The FBI aided the police when tracing down Richard Chase by creating a sketch of the potential offender. They predicted that he was a white male in his twenties and suffered severely with mental health issues, due to the amount of evidence left behind at the murder scene (Sullivan,2014).

Evidently, both serial killers were traced down using the top-down approach, which demonstrates its aid in helping identify offenders. However, the top-down approach does have some limitations, one being that the characteristics that categories the offenders as either organized or disorganized, was based on the responses from the thirty-six murderers that they interviewed, which is not very reliable due to small quantity of data (Fox & Farrington, 2018). Similarly, this approach is only applicable to sex related murders, unlike the geographical approach. The bottom-down is not limited to one type of crime, which makes this approach more generalizable (Fox & Farrington, 2018).

To conclude, offender profiling in both top-down and bottom-up approaches have been proven to be effective when it comes to aiding the judicial process, as offender profiling has directed the investigators in the correct direction and led to the arrests of several offenders. The bottom-down approach is based on psychological theory and data rather than hypothesis and instincts, which suggests it is more scientific and objective than top-down profiling approach. To summarize, offender profiling is a vital tool in the judicial system aiding in the arrest and prosecution of offenders.

Reference list

Bolland, L. (2002). The Railway Murders: R v John Duffy and R v David Mulcahy. *Medicine, Science and the Law*, 42(1), 2–9. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002580240204200102>

Beaudry-Cyr, M. (2015, December). *Rational Choice Theory*. ResearchGate. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/314837382_Rational_Choice_Theory

Bouhana, N., Johnson, S. D., & Porter, M. (2014). Consistency and specificity in burglars who commit prolific residential burglary: Testing the core assumptions underpinning behavioural crime linkage. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, 21(1), 77–94. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lcrp.12050>

Bumgarner, J. (2008). Icons of Crime Fighting: Relentless Pursuers of Justice. https://books.google.co.uk/bookshl=en&lr=&id=dETPEAAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PA437&dq=construction+of+fbi+profile&ots=H16mQBMUty&sig=GqBVVyADYYQtN2dX3MpeOG95xDU&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=construction%20of%20fbi%20profile&f=false (P,437-449).

Byrne, J. (2010). *An Overview of Psychological Theories of Crime Causation Lecture Graduate Criminology Seminar*. <https://faculty.uml.edu/jbyrne/44.521/documents/AnOverviewofPsychologicalTheoriesofCrimeCausation.pdf>

Canter, D. (2004). Geographical Profiling of Criminals. *Medico-Legal Journal*, 72(2), 53–66. <https://doi.org/10.1258/rsmmlj.72.2.53>

Canter, D., & Hammond, L. (2007). Prioritizing Burglars: Comparing the Effectiveness of Geographical Profiling Methods. *Police Practice and Research*, 8(4), 371–384. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15614260701615086>

Chamikara, M., & Jayathilake, A. (2015). *Geographic Offender Profiling*. 2(1), 49–52. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/301552192_GEOGRAPHIC_OFFENDER_PROFILING

Chen, Y. (2015). The distance-decay function of geographical gravity model: Power law or exponential law? *Chaos, Solitons & Fractals*, 77, 174–189.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chaos.2015.05.022>

Courts and Tribunals Judiciary. (2023). *Criminal*. Courts and Tribunals Judiciary.

<https://www.judiciary.uk/about-the-judiciary/our-justice-system/jurisdictions/criminal-jurisdiction/>

Fox, B., & Farrington, D. P. (2018, December). *What have we learned from offender profiling? A systematic review and meta-analysis of 40 years of research*. ResearchGate; American Psychological Association.

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/329341074_What_have_we_learned_from_offender_profiling_A_systematic_review_and_meta-analysis_of_40_years_of_research

Francis, B., Soothill, K., & Fligelstone, R. (2004). Identifying Patterns and Pathways of Offending Behaviour. *European Journal of Criminology*, 1(1), 48–87.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1477370804038707>

Górski, M. (2018). Buffer zone and circle theory on the example of Burglaries and robberies. *Problems of Forensic Sciences*, 113, 51–66.

https://arch.ies.gov.pl/images/PDF/2018/vol_113/113_Gorski_m.pdf

Jedrzejewska, D. (2018, August). (PDF) *Review of literature on the effectiveness and utility of two approaches to offender profiling in the UK and the US*. ResearchGate.

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/331474224_Review_of_literature_on_the_effectiveness_and_utility_of_two_approaches_to_offender_profiling_in_the_UK_and_the_US

Keren, G. B. (2019). *The Journey to Crime & Distance Decay*. Bostonkravmaga.com.

<https://www.bostonkravmaga.com/blog/criminology/environmental/the-journey-to-crime-and-distance-decay.html>

Knabe-Nicol, S., & Alison, L. (2024). Existing understanding of geographic profiling principles within UK policing. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 10(1).

<https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2024.2313275>

Kocsis, R. N., None Rayw.Cooksey, Irwin, H. J., & Allen, G. (2002). A Further Assessment of “Circle Theory” for Geographic Psychological Profiling. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 35(1), 43–62. <https://doi.org/10.1375/0004865022012>

Petherick, W., & Brooks, N. (2020). Reframing criminal profiling: a guide for integrated practice. *Psychiatry, Psychology and Law*, 28(5), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13218719.2020.1837030>

Sammons, A. (2019). *Criminological psychology Typological offender profiling Typological offender profiling*.

http://psychotron.org.uk/newResources/criminological/A2_AQB_crim_typoProfiling.pdf

Sastry, V. (2020). The Serial Killer: Ted Bundy. Google Books.

https://books.google.co.uk/books?hl=en&lr=&id=n03sDwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&dq=ted+ Bundy+biography&ots=vJmJVtRfci&sig=eQROB8WhF94DiLaHI9Ubdk35AmU&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false

Taylor, S., Lambeth, D., Green, G., Bone, R., & Cahillane, M. A. (2011). Cluster Analysis Examination of Serial Killer Profiling Categories: A Bottom-Up Approach. *Journal of Investigative Psychology and Offender Profiling*, 9(1), 30–51. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jip.149>

Texas State University. (2020, June 12). *Overview of Geographic Profiling*. www.txst.edu. <https://www.txst.edu/gii/geographic-profiling/overview.html>

Van Sleeuwen, S. E. M., Ruiter, S., & Steenbeek, W. (2021). Right place, Right time? Making Crime Pattern Theory time specific. *Crime Science*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40163-021-00139-8>

