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This report aimed to provide an overview of “offender profiling” and its current situation in Japan. For this purpose, it first outlined offender profiling by mentioning its origins, definitions, and the various terms and processes associated with offender profiling as it is prevalent in Japan. Following this, four case examples were introduced to explain the history of offender profiling. Moreover, with respect to the various offender profiling approaches, the outlines of both the FBI and Liverpool approaches, were discussed along with three other types of approaches regarding offender profiling, which have been classified from the psychological viewpoint. Subsequent to this, the development of the offender profiling process in Japan, the main persons, and the operational agencies involved in the process, the various activities of the study team, and the actual application of this process to real investigations were reported in the main chapter. Further, Japanese studies regarding offender profiling were introduced for each specific crime. In conclusion, the future prospects for the application of investigative psychology, which constitutes a new research area in the criminal investigation involving offender profiling in Japan, was discussed.
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Introduction

Until recently, Japan was regarded as a country with a low crime rate and abundant water. However, due to the deterioration of security in 1990s, the Japanese government and the National Police Agency have determined that offender profiling should be utilized in actual criminal investigations. According to David Canter (2004), offender profiling originated from the advice and brief outline provided by police medical advisors and other experts to help solve criminal investigations, and the words “offender profiling” became popular because they were extensively used by the special agents of the FBI. The FBI initiated offender profiling in the US in the early 1970s, while Canter and his colleagues started it in the UK in the 1980s.

As regards the meaning of profiling, the report by the FBI Academy and National Center for the Analysis of Violent Crime (FBI, 1990) have defined the process of profiling as pertaining to the process of identifying personality traits, behavioral tendency of an offender based on characteristics of the crime. Further, Canter—who was eventually involved in the investigation of the serial rapes and murders of the so-called Railway Rapist—described it as “an approach in which facets of an offence can be used to infer facets of the offender” in the Surry University report (Canter et al., 1991). Therefore, profiling is regarded as a criminal investigation technique that involves constructing offender profiles on the basis of behavioral science as typified by psychology.

The term “offender profiling” is generally used to denote this; however, for analytic and methodology purposes, the words criminal profiling, psychological profiling, criminal personality profiling, crime scene analy-
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sis, and geographic profiling are also used (e.g., Ainsworth, 2001; Turvey, 2001). In this report, this term is fundamentally expressed as offender profiling.

In Japan, the words “offender profiling” became famous in the 1990s. This criminal investigation technique was first introduced in the 1990 movie “The Silence of the Lambs.” Furthermore, the book “Whoever Fights Monsters,” written by the famous FBI special agents Robert K. Ressler and Tom Shachtman (1992), was published in 1994. In this way, the term profiling came to be widely known through the mass media. Moreover, when the serial murder cases occurred in Kobe city in 1997, the mass media was responsible for creating various controversial profiling reports from the accounts of specialists or critics about crime. As against this, police psychologists continued with their various steady researches. In recent times, offender profiling has certainly permeated criminal investigation in Japan.

This report aims to review the outline of offender profiling in terms of the history and techniques; further, it aims to review the current situation in Japan in terms of study and practice.

**The history of offender profiling**

According to Ainsworth (2001), offender profiling has a relatively short history. It is only in the last 30 years or so that serious attempts have been made to develop the techniques that we now associate with the term “profiling” (Ainsworth, 2001). However, before the present offender profiling techniques were established, there have been attempts—mainly by psychiatrists in the UK and the US—that were similar to offender profiling. Based on examples from Holmes & Holmes (1996), Rossmo (2000), and Turvey (2001), this report discusses four incidents that are often referred to in the history of offender profiling.

The first incident, called the Whitechapel murders, involved serial murders that occurred in the second half of the nineteenth century in Great Britain; these are still unsolved. In this incident, five prostitutes were violently attacked and killed in the Whitechapel area of London between August and November 1888. The attacker’s modus operandi was to kill the victim by deeply stabbing her in the neck region with a knife, and after killing, to extract the internal organs before destroying the body. Hence, the attacker came to be known as Jack the Ripper. Dr. Thomas Bond, a surgeon and a lecturer in forensic medicine who advised the police, conducted an inquest over the body of one victim and recorded detailed observations of the murder situation. His report, which was submitted to the London Metropolitan Police Department, later suggested a “profile” that included—other than the attacker’s physical appearance or occupation—his abnormal tastes regarding sex, the state of his mental health, etc.

Another example of an attempt to apply behavioral science to the purpose of profiling an objective person’s behavior was recognized during World War II in the Office of Strategic Services (OSS), which is the present US Central Intelligence Agency (CIA). When the German Nazis were being defeated at the end of World War II, the OSS ordered psychiatrist William Langer to predict Adolf Hitler’s behavior. Dr. Langer analyzed many of Hitler’s behavioral possibilities in detail, which included the possibility of his committing suicide if he was defeated in the war. Subsequently, the results of these predictions emphasized by the psychodynamics model were reported in the book “The Mind of Adolf Hitler” (Langer, 1972).

Although this case only involved predicting the behavior about of an objective person, applying such psychological profiling techniques to actual incidents began in the US in the 1950s. A very famous example of a successful case of profiling was the Mad Bomber case, in which the attacker planted bombs in public institutions in New York over a period of 16 years; additionally, the offender sent threatening letters that jeered at the police. The New York City Police, who were investigating this case, requested
psychiatrist James A. Brussel to predict the offender profile of the bomber who was threatening the civil population. Dr. Brussel also analyzed the offender according to the base model of psychoanalysis. After a while, the real offender, George Metesky, was finally arrested. The actual profile of Metesky almost matched that provided by Brussel and this surprised people. At that time, a systematic profiling technique was not established, so this psychological method grabbed all the limelight.

However, in the Boston Strangler case in which 13 sexual strangulation murders occurred from 1962 to 1964 in the city of Boston, the team consisting of psychiatrists and psychologists supposed that two offenders—including one homosexual—separately killed more than ten women. Despite this, the real offender, Albert DeSalvo, was arrested in an unrelated incident. All the murders had been committed by him alone, and he was not a homosexual. In short, the results of the reported profiling significantly differed from DeSalvo's actual profile.

The approaches associated with offender profiling

As described above, the history of offender profiling has consisted of several ups and downs, and at present, profiling is characterized by two main approaches. One of them is the method of used by the FBI, and the other is that developed by the research group featuring the environmental psychologist David Canter, a professor at Liverpool University. As reference, Canter was attached to the University of Surry till 1995; consequently, his researches were published by that university till 1995. In Japan, the method used by the FBI is simply called the "FBI approach"; similarly, the method developed by Canter’s group is referred to as the "Liverpool approach" (Tamura, 1996).

The outline of the FBI approach pertains to the typological aspects that emphasize the personality or motivation of offenders. The analysts are mainly investigators with specialized qualifications in behavioral science or psychology. The basic method of its research depends on interviewing offenders who have served time in prison, and the research, on the whole, is influenced by both clinical psychology and psychiatry. A typical crime that the FBI studied is lust murder. The FBI interviewed 36 lust murderers in prison, and divided these criminals into two categories: the organized offender and the disorganized offender. The organized offender committed their crimes in a precise ordered manner; furthermore, they followed a pattern in their search for victims and controlled their criminal acts. Accordingly, they left few evidences at the crime scenes. However, most of the disorganized offender impulsively attacked the victims who happened to be nearby and left the bodies and weapons at the attack spots. It is supposed that the organized offender mainly consists of psychopath, while the disorganized offender also includes people with schizophrenia.

In contrast, the Liverpool approach regards crime as a personal action; it also considers the interpersonal relationships between offenders and victims to be common features in the general social actions of offenders. Therefore, multi-faceted correlations between the items pertaining to the crime, for example—the geographical or time factor of the crime, and those pertaining to the offender, for example—age or occupation, are simultaneously considered. In contrast to the FBI approach, which has developed the intuitive discernment of investigators, the researches using the Liverpool approach has converted the crime information generated in the past into survey data. Moreover, statistical techniques, such as a multi-variable analysis, are often used in order to secure objectivity. Therefore, the main persons involved in the Liverpool approach are psychologists, and it attaches a greater importance to systematic techniques than to experience. A classic study of serial rapists by Canter & Heritage (1990) extracted 33 variables of criminal behaviors from 66 data regarding the actions of 27
serial rapists. These variables were subsequently analyzed using a multi-variable analysis and classified into crime "themes" corresponding to the contents of the crime, such as sexuality, violence, impersonality, and intimacy. Finally, each theme was analyzed based on its statistically high offender items, such as criminal history and age group.

In another approach, Tamura & Watanabe (2001) offered three methods for offender profiling—clinical profiling, statistical profiling, and geographical profiling. These approaches are performed solely from the psychological viewpoint; however, certain expressions that were similar to these approaches are also accepted in Ainsworth (2001), Farrington & Lambert (2000), Jackson & Bekerian (1997), etc.

In fact, clinical profiling is considered to be a method by means of which psychiatrists or clinical psychologists, based on their clinical knowledge for analyzing the meanings of criminal behaviors or conversations, come up with criminal profiles. The method used in the previously mentioned Mad Bomber case can be considered as a typical example of clinical profiling. Statistical profiling, on the other hand, is based on a database of similar incidents that have occurred in the past. Using statistical analyses, the researchers extract various criminal action patterns from the database and construct criminal profiles by analyzing the features of criminal groups showing patterns that are similar to the criminal actions of the incident. Furthermore, geographical profiling is a method that predicts the locations of serial incidents, such as a residential area, by analyzing the geographical information of a crime scene in serial incidents.

Both clinical profiling and statistical profiling are aimed to predict various characteristic features of offenders such as their age bracket, employment status, residential information, and criminal history. Undoubtedly, geographical profiling places emphasis on the geographical information regarding a crime. These three expressions are regarded as methodological names that emphasize the main technique for the presumption of a criminal profile.

Generally, the FBI approach is regarded as being influenced by clinical profiling, while the Liverpool approach is considered to be a typical method of statistical profiling (Tamura, 1996). According to Tamura (1996), it was preferable to apply the Liverpool approach in Japan because it was based on behavioral science and was systematic; moreover, as the analytic objective of research, this approach imposed no restriction in crimes. Therefore, in Japan, the National Research Institute of Police Science (NRIPS) has mainly emphasized the statistical technique from 1990s (Tamura & Watanabe, 2001).

**The development of offender profiling in Japan**

The Japanese offender profiling study was formally introduced in 1995 by a research team headed by Masayuki Tamura, who was the former director of Prevention of Crime and Delinquency of the NRIPS. The 33rd conference of the Japanese Association of Criminal Psychology, held in 1995 at Tokushima Bunri University, was a significant initiation for the subsequent Japanese studies in offender profiling. At that time, several police technicians associate with psychology and belonging to forensic science laboratories around the country participated in the conference. Their meeting with Tamura and his colleagues represented the commencement of a study group of Japanese offender profilers comprising police psychologists. This study group held a small meeting in the early autumn of 1996; furthermore, the first conference on offender profiling took place on a nationwide scale at the NRIPS in November in that year. Ever since, periodic conferences have been conducted every year.

In addition, under Tamura’s supervision, the study group also reviewed “Criminal Investigative Analysis Sexual Homicide” from the FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin and “A
Facet Approach to Offender Profiling", Canter's report from Surry University.

Real studies on offender profiling are continually conducted by both the NRIPS and the volunteering police psychologists belonging to forensic science laboratories. These study results have been announced in multiple academic circles, and in the 1999 37th conference of the Japanese Association of Criminal Psychology, also the first workshop in Japan, the issue discussed was "What is offender profiling? Its various techniques and potential possibilities" (Watanabe & Kiriu, 1999).

The next year, 2000, was a special year in the history of Japanese offender profiling for two reasons. The first reason was the establishment of a specialized offender profiling team in the Forensic Science Laboratory, Hokkaido Police Head Quarters, and the second was professor Canter's visit to Japan. His main purpose of visiting was to evaluate the Japanese study on offender profiling; moreover, he attended and delivered a lecture in the 7th conference on offender profiling. Subsequently, in January 2001, he invited the Japanese researchers to the 6th conference on international investigative psychology, which was held in Liverpool University.

In this manner, while Japanese offender profiling was advancing in a fair manner, in January 2002, Tamura passed away in his prime. After his demise, his successors carried on with his work.

Besides the Hokkaido Police Head Quarters, it was applied to actual criminal investigations at an early stage by the NRIPS, the Yamagata Police Head Quarters, the Fukushima Police Head Quarters, the Toshima Police Head Quarters, and the Kumanobu Police Head Quarters, among others. Offender profiling has not yet been conducted in all prefectures. Now, the application of this approach is certainly permeating all over the country. The main contents of analysis in real criminal investigations include the prediction of the forthcoming crime information of serial incidents, such as time and place, and the inferences drawn from the residential area and the various characteristic features of offenders.

As regards the approach in Japan, geographical profiling is effectively used as a practical technique. Further, predictions regarding the characteristic features of offenders are mainly analyzed through statistical profiling. However, case analyses conducted from clinical viewpoints are also effective. These analyses are performed from very practical viewpoints, and have been applied to the actual criminal investigations. The future prospects of Japanese offender profiling in real criminal investigation are mainly determined by the way in which experienced investigators and psychologists cooperate to analyze incidents.

In Japan and in general, offender profiling is applied to serial incidents in many cases; occasionally, it may help in finding solutions to several incidents. Therefore, it probably plays an important role in improving of the arrest rate in Japan. Since this Japanese technique is not restricted to analyzing particular crimes, it can focus on not only crimes such as sex crimes and arsons but also various types of crime such as homicides, robberies, and burglaries. This also applies to the study regarding crimes in Japan.

In fact, as regards past study in Japan, Kazunobu Yamaoka, was a police psychologist of the NRIPS had engaged in a set of researches called "Patterns of Criminal Behaviors," which resembled offender profiling in their methodology. His first research was published in 1962, though all the crimes that were continuously researched and reported in 1960s were homicide (Yamaoka, 1962, 1963a, b, 1964a), robbery (Yamaoka, 1964b), and sex crimes (Yamaoka, 1968).

In general, it was in the first half of the 1970s—when the FBI began to address this issue—that the study of offender profiling started (Canter, 2004). At that time, Yamaoka was conducting research on burglary (Yamaoka, 1971; Yamaoka & Watanabe, 1971), while his final research on offender
profiles dealt with arson (Yamaoka, 1978). At the same time, Atushi Ueno, a police psychologist of the Kanagawa Police Head Quarters, also performed systematic researches on arson (Ueno, 1978ab). Ironically, Yamaoka’s completion of his series of offender profiles researches overlapped with the establishment of the FBI methodology. Unfortunately, Yamaoka’s researches were insufficiently applied to solving actual criminal investigations conducted in Japan at the time. Therefore, it was largely unknown that study similar to offender profiling existed in Japan before its popularization by the FBI or Canter. However, had Yamaoka’s researches been applied in actual criminal investigation technique, Japan would have figured as an advanced country in offender profiling.

As mentioned before, recently in Japan, various crimes have been analyzed in real criminal investigations; their studies also present diversity and are highly suggestive. The primary researches regarding crimes that have been addressed at an early stage involve criminal homicide (Tamura, 1983), mutilation-murder case (Watanabe & Tamura, 1999ab), “torima” (nonspecific-motive attacking) (Tamura, Watanabe, Suzuki, Sano, Watanabe, & Ikegami, 1998ab), arson (Kiriu, 1995; Suzuki & Tamura, 1998), serial rape (Taguchi, 2001), child molestation (Watanabe & Tamura, 1998bc), sexual molestation (Nagawa, 2003), robbery (Takamura & Yokoi, 2004), burglary (Iwami, 1999; Takamura & Tokuyama, 2003, 2006), stalking (Yokoi, 1998), and so on.

Many of these researches compile numerous similar incidents that have previously occurred in Japan and employ statistical viewpoints. Moreover, researchers have also been exploring the geographical profiling method for predicting the base of the crime or the habitation area of serial offenders (Mimoto & Fukada, 1999; Tamura & Suzuki, 1997). Mimoto and Fukada (1999) have developed a technique of geographical profiling called “Suspicion Area Model,” and its practical software “Power Plot Professional” is a very important tool in actual offender profiling.

In addition, apart from the police, many researchers also contributed to the development of offender profiling in Japan. There also exist researches on offender profiling from the standpoint of psychiatry; these offer helpful insights. For example, psychiatrist Jinsuke Kageyama supervised the translation of Holmes & Holmes (1996). Besides the contribution of psychiatrists, environmental psychologist Kazunori Hanyu verified the validity of one technique of geographical profiling (Hanyu, 2006).

The results of these researches are not only applied real criminal investigations, but also are announced every year in academic conferences held by organizations such as the Japanese Association of Psychology, the Japanese Association of Criminal Psychology, and the Japanese Association of Forensic Science and Technology. Furthermore, police psychologists and researchers from universities have often conducted workshops on criminal events, including offender profiling, in some academic conference meetings.

**A future view**

It has been stated that in the last decade, the practice of offender profiling has also rapidly progressed in the Japanese criminal investigations. A comparison of the Japanese approach with other approaches reveals that the Japanese approach differs somewhat from both the FBI approach, which is mainly analyzed by investigators, and the Liverpool approach, which is mainly analyzed by psychologists. Thus, as regards organization of practice in Japan, the expansion of the approach system involving the cooperation of experienced investigators and psychologists in nationwide may one feature. Moreover, with regards to the approach, the originality of Japanese offender profiling is demonstrated by the emphasis on statistical techniques with case analyses conducted from clinical viewpoints. With regard to study, Japanese offender profiling
has been based on statistical profiling. However, the development of clinical profiling technique, which is adapted for the criminal situation of Japan, is preferred.

At present, leading countries in offender profiling such as the US and the UK have refined the application of behavioral science, such as psychology to criminal investigations; this application is not restricted to the field of offender profiling. Thus, the aspect of psychology that is employed in actual investigations worldwide is referred to as "investigative psychology" (Canter & Alison, 1999). Canter and Alison (1999) suggested that investigative psychology drew upon a range of psychological principles to contribute to the carrying out of criminal or civil investigations.

In addition, Canter (1995) identified three areas of investigative psychology as follows: (1) police decision making and associated skills and culture of detection, (2) interviewing and information assessment, and (3) the psychology of criminal behavior. These areas are closely related to many of the activities of investigators in actual criminal investigation. Therefore, following the introduction of offender profiling, the most important view for the future is to expand the application of the fields of investigative psychology to criminal investigations in Japan.

According to Canter (2004), by the early 1970s, investigators in both the US and the UK were often provided with psychological advice regarding offenders. In Japan, however, the provision of psychological techniques has mainly involved developing polygraph examination techniques for detecting deception. The polygraph was first introduced to Japan in 1953; after its introduction, approximately 5,000 practical polygraph examinations were conducted each year (Nakayama, 2003). Moreover, according to Fukumoto (1980), the Japanese Supreme Court has admitted expert opinions regarding polygraph examination as evidence in 1968; since then, many cases have been admitted as evidence. Therefore, polygraph examination has been the main focus for the application of investigative psychology in Japan.

Following the settlement of polygraph examination, offender profiling has certainly permeated criminal investigation in Japan in recent times. Thus, the next prospective areas for applying investigative psychology in Japan are likely to be hostage taker (Yokota, Watanabe, & Watanabe, 2002), facilitating confession from denying suspect (Watanabe & Yokota, 1999a, b), cognitive interview (Ochi & Masuda, 2000; Takamura, 2005), etc. In this way, there are steadily increasing expectation from psychology in contemporary criminal investigation in Japan.
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