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| **Unit 3: Forensic Psychology – Offender profiling** |
| Explain the top-down approach to offender profiling. (up to 6 marks)  Explain the bottom-up approach to offender profiling. (up to 6 marks)  Outline what is meant by geographical profiling in forensic psychology. (up to 6 marks)  Discuss the effectiveness of offender profiling (16 marks)  **NB: essays could only ask for one method or could ask to compare and contrast** |
| **AO1 (AO2 if need to apply to text) (up to 6 marks) – Top down**  **USA – developed by FBI in 1970s:** data gathered from in-depth interviews with 36 sexually motivated serial killers including Ted Bundy and Charles Manson.  **Murderers or rapists are classified in one of two categories: Organised and Disorganised**  **Organised definition:**  ***Characteristics of offenders -***  **Disorganised definition:**  ***Characteristics of offenders –***  **Process of developing a profile:**   * ***Data assimilation*** * ***Crime scene classification*** * ***Crime reconstruction*** * ***Profile generation*** |
| **AO1 (AO2 if need to apply to text) (up to 6 marks) – Bottom-up**  **UK** – developed by **David Canter (1980s and 1990s)**  The **aim** of the **Bottom-up approach** is to generate a picture of the offender (e.g. likely characteristics, routine behaviour and social background) through **systematic analysis of evidence** at the crime scene.  **Smallest space analysis…**  **Investigative Psychology:** Investigative psychology attempts to apply statistical procedures, alongside psychological theory, to the analysis of crime scene evidence. The aim is to establish patterns of behaviour that are likely to occur or co-occur across crime scenes. This is in order to develop a statistical 'database' which then acts as a baseline for comparison…  **interpersonal coherence:** the way an offender behaves at the scene, including how they 'interact' with the victim, may reflect their behaviour in more everyday situations. For example…..  **Geographic profiling: Circle theory**   * *Marauder* * *Commuter* |
| **AO3 – Top Down** (up to 10 marks): |
| **P)** Only applies to certain crimes  **E)**  **E)**  **L)** This means that it can be argued to be a limited approach to identifying a criminal. |
| **P)** Having two categories of a criminal is very simplistic. It is likely that criminals do not fit neatly into either category, therefore making the prediction of their characteristics difficult  **E)**  **E)**  **L)** |
| **P)** The Top-down approach could be seen as a more intuitive approach to offender profiling,  **E)**  **E)**  **L)** this method of profiling could be criticised in terms of its credibility as it can be considered less scientific than the Bottom-up approach. |
| **P)** Original sample is small and unrepresentative  **E)**  **E)**  **L)** meaning there could be issues with the validity of the data gathered from the interviews, weakening the external validity of the top-down approach |
| **AO3 – Bottom up (up to 10 marks)** |
| **P)** Bottom-up profiling can be seen as more objective and scientific than the Top-down approach  **E)**  **E)**  **L)** This enhances the scientific credibility of offender profiling. |
| **P)** Evidence supports geographic profiling  **E)**  **E)**  **L)** This supports Canter's claim that spatial information is a key factor in determining the base of an offender. |
| **P)** Evidence supports investigative psychology  **E)**  **E)**  **L)** This supports the usefulness of investigative psychology as it shows how statistical techniques can be applied |
| **P)** Mixed results for profiling  **E)**  **E)**  **L)** The lack of consistency in the effectiveness of profiling to catch criminals may have implications for this approach for the future in terms of further research and funding |