DNA: What Professionals Know and Believe about Forensic DNA

Analysis of Data from 2007 and 2012 Surveys of Criminal Justice Professionals

In 2007, the National Center for Victims of Crime launched a unique initiative to study how victim service providers and other criminal justice system professionals work with victims whose cases had the potential to involve forensic DNA evidence. The results of the focus group and original survey were surprising: many professionals knew very little about DNA evidence and were ill-equipped to work with victims, much less maximize the potential of the most important type of forensic evidence since the discovery of the fingerprint. In 2012, the National Center surveyed criminal justice professionals a second time. This report details the results, including comparisons from 2007 to 2012. Most importantly, the 2012 survey also examines beliefs and attitudes about DNA testing that will help guide policy and advocacy efforts to maximize the potential of forensic DNA.
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Introduction

DNA technology has revolutionized the criminal justice system and holds the potential for dramatic advances in solving and preventing crime. In recent years, we have witnessed the expansion of DNA databases to include profiles of persons arrested for certain crimes and the use of DNA to solve crimes such as burglary and carjacking. These advances are of great significance to crime victims and the victim-serving community as we are able to bring more answers to victims, sometimes in cases that are decades old. Nevertheless, DNA evidence could be collected and used in many more cases and different types of crimes, leading to more apprehensions and convictions of perpetrators and ultimately safer communities.

In 2007, the National Center for Victims of Crime began a partnership with Applied Biosystems—now Life Technologies—to increase understanding of forensic DNA among professionals who work with victims of crime. Our first step was to measure what those professionals know about the use of forensic DNA in the criminal justice arena. The National Center conducted a national online survey in February 2007 and a multidisciplinary focus group in June 2007 to explore how professionals in the victim services field understand, think about, and use information related to DNA and its use as evidence in criminal cases.
Through the focus group and survey, we found that victims, victim service providers, and law enforcement personnel lack accurate information about DNA technology and its uses, and harbor misconceptions about forensic DNA. Some members of the victim assistance community have concerns about privacy issues related to widespread DNA collection that are based on both a lack of knowledge and acceptance of misleading myths.

Over the past five years, and with Life Technologies/Applied Biosystems’ support, the National Center has worked to create a well-informed community of professionals who can competently assist crime victims with DNA issues while advocating for improved and expanded use of forensic DNA in their communities. We have worked toward this goal by providing 9 no-cost webinars, 11 free in-person trainings, educational materials for law enforcement and victim-serving professionals (online at www.VictimsofCrime.org/dna), and technical assistance. In the last six months, we have also created a Twitter account through which we provide updates on forensic DNA-related news and information about our trainings and resources.

As part of our 2012 agreement, Life Technologies requested that we update the survey we produced in 2007. Our goal was to report on support for any new trends in forensic DNA and to measure what the knowledge level of the field is at this time.

The survey yielded important information about the knowledge level of professionals who work with victims of crime and conduct crime investigations. Our survey found that misconceptions still exist about forensic DNA and DNA databases, and participants lacked confidence in their ability to adequately explain forensic DNA to victims. Survey respondents are aware that they have more to learn, and they show a desire to become more informed through free training. They also support continued innovation in DNA technology; the 2012 respondents overwhelmingly supported maximizing the potential of DNA through advancements in technology and policy. They strongly supported wider DNA collection laws, familial searching, and rapid DNA testing.

This report comprises six sections: Part I, “Methodology,” explains the methodology for both surveys. Part II, “The Respondents,” describes respondents’ years of service, professions, and community type. Part III, “Testing DNA Knowledge,” examines the DNA-related knowledge base of our respondents. Part IV, “Working with Forensic DNA and Victims,” explores respondents’ experience working with victims and how much and what kind of information victims get about forensic DNA. Part V, “Knowledge and Training,” describes respondents’ confidence in professionals’ knowledge and their interest in further training. Part VI, “Attitudes and Support for Advances in DNA Technology,” examines respondents’ support for several advances in DNA testing and practices, as well as respondents’ greatest concerns about the potential misuse of forensic DNA.
Part I: Methodology

This study was conducted with two surveys—one in 2007 and the second in 2012. Both surveys were administered through Survey Monkey, an online survey service that allows respondents to complete questionnaire items confidentially through a web-based interface. Respondents for both surveys were recruited through announcements sent to the National Center’s direct membership and victim service provider and allied professionals\(^1\) databases\(^2\). Key individuals were asked to share the survey link with their professional networks to obtain a wider respondent pool for the survey. Because the 2012 survey was longer, respondents were offered an opportunity to enter to win an Amazon gift card as an incentive to participate.

The 2007 survey had 1,191 respondents, while 1,198 criminal justice system professionals participated in the 2012 study. In both cases, not all respondents answered all questions. However, in both surveys, most respondents did answer most items in full and reported results do not include the proportion of missing data.

While the surveys were announced in fundamentally similar ways, the potential respondent pools were not identical. The two sets of respondents differed from 2007 to 2012 in three important ways. The 2012 sample included more respondents from law enforcement agencies, and included a slightly lower proportion of respondents from rural communities. In addition, the 2012 respondents were overall more experienced, with a higher proportion of respondents indicating that they had worked in their field for more than ten years. This final difference, however, may be partially explained by the passage of time because the 2012 survey included many of the same individuals in the respondent pool five years earlier.

The two surveys also differed in their measurement approach. First, many of the 2007 questions were asked as simple yes/no questions or as three-item Likert measures. While this approach does make the survey faster and easier to complete, the results are coarse and prohibit a more nuanced understanding of respondents’ answers. The 2012 survey utilized an unlabeled 11-item Likert scale wherever possible. This means that respondents could choose the number best representing the strength of their attitude or belief on an unlabeled 0-10 scale, with a true neutral. However, because of this difference, some 2012 results cannot be evaluated in a direct comparison to 2007 results. We do not believe that any of the richness of the 2012 data was lost due to this change.

Second, the 2012 survey asks several questions about support for DNA testing that were not asked in 2007. There have been important advances in forensic DNA since the original survey, such as significant policy debate on arrestee testing, local DNA databases, familial matches, and the possibility of rapid DNA testing. We hope that this survey will guide efforts to maximize the

---

\(^1\) While the National Center’s database of criminal justices system and allied professionals includes federal employees, it should be noted that such professionals are generally prohibited from participating in this type of survey.

\(^2\) In both 2007 and 2012, the National Center’s mailing list included approximately 7,000 individuals.
use of forensic DNA by engaging criminal justice system professionals in policy and practice changes.

Part II: The Respondents

The 2012 survey received responses from 1,198 professionals. While the dissemination strategies were essentially the same for the 2012 survey as for the 2007 version, the pool of potential respondents this time included those that answered our previous 2007 survey and attended our webinars, and in-person trainings. Because our webinars and in-person trainings draw a large law enforcement audience, our pool for this survey included more law enforcement professionals. There are several differences between the respondents in 2012 and in 2007, primarily based on respondents’ professions and job functions. Significantly more law enforcement professionals answered the 2012 survey: in 2007, only 8% of the respondents identified themselves as working for a law enforcement agency; in 2012, 30% identified as such. In 2012, 38% identified their primary job function as law enforcement; in 2007, only 3% chose law enforcement as their primary job function. In 2007, victim advocates constituted 53% of respondents; in 2012, only 21% identified as a victim advocate. The difference in respondents between 2012 and 2007 shows that the National Center is even more connected to the law enforcement community than we were in 2007.

Another change from 2007 to 2012 is that in 2012 our survey respondents reported having more experience in the field. More than 72% of 2012 respondents reported having more than 10 years’ experience in the field, whereas in 2007, only 38% had such experience.
In the 2012 survey, more urban professionals answered the survey (47%) than in 2007 (37%) and fewer rural professionals responded in 2012 (24% versus 38% in 2007).
Our 2012 survey shows that the number of respondents who have worked (in the previous two years) with victims whose cases had the potential to involve DNA evidence rose from 2007: in 2012, more than 75% report that they have had such cases. The majority of cases respondents handled in 2012 were sexual assault cases (17%), followed by home invasion/burglary cases (11%); child sexual abuse (10%); assault (10%); and homicide (5.7%). Very few respondents had handled sexual assault home/invasion, sexual assault homicide, kidnapping, or stalking cases that involved DNA evidence in the last two years.
Based on what we know about the potential benefits of forensic DNA evidence, it is clear that DNA is relevant to the daily work of many criminal justice system professionals. However, their perceptions regarding the relevance of DNA do not always reflect this reality. In 2012, 52% of respondents indicated that forensic DNA is not relevant to their work; and of those people, more than a quarter (27%) believe it is “not at all” relevant. These responses demonstrate a strong need to educate the field regarding not only the broad implications of forensic DNA for the criminal justice field, but also the specific ways in which DNA may affect individuals’ work. Future trainings should incorporate learning objectives that will help professionals understand how forensic DNA relates to their cases. Fortunately, those who believe that forensic DNA is relevant to their daily work strongly believe in its relevance. Of all respondents, 27.3% recorded a score of 11 (very much) on an 11-point scale to indicate the relevance of DNA to their daily work.
2012: Relevance of DNA to Respondents' Daily Work

2007: Respondents' Views of DNA's Relevance to Their Daily Work
Part III: Testing DNA Knowledge

In 2007, the National Center’s forensic DNA survey showed that victim-serving professionals had misconceptions about forensic DNA, particularly regarding the types of information contained in DNA profiles and the criteria that determine whose profiles are stored in state DNA databases. We had originally intended to measure any gain in knowledge on these issues from 2007 to 2012, but our respondent pool is so different that a comparison of knowledge levels is not entirely accurate or useful. However, in 2012, we asked many of the same questions, including basic questions about DNA profiles and DNA databases, where DNA can be found at crime scenes.

In both surveys, respondents were asked to agree or disagree with the statement that “each person has a unique DNA profile.” Knowledge levels in 2012 were about the same as in 2007, though in 2012 we included the option to answer “not sure,” and 3% of respondents chose that answer. Overall, our survey respondents understand this most basic fact, that each person has a unique DNA profile.

![Bar chart showing the percentage of respondents agreeing or disagreeing with the statement that each person has a unique DNA profile. In 2007, 93.4% agreed, and 6.6% disagreed. In 2012, 88.1% agreed, and 8.8% disagreed. The chart also shows that 0.0% of respondents were unsure in 2007, and 3.2% were unsure in 2012. The note indicates that “not sure” was not presented as an answer choice in 2007.]

* "not sure" was not presented as an answer choice in 2007
We asked respondents to select potential sources of forensic DNA. While almost half of the respondents knew that “all of the above” was the right answer, it would be beneficial to crime scene investigations if the overwhelming majority of professionals working in the field are versed in these potential sources.
When asked about where DNA may be found at a crime scene, the majority of respondents (64%) knew the correct answer is “all of the above.” However, this number, we believe, should be higher. In addition, the small number of respondents who know that DNA can be found on a windowsill (14%) or on ligature objects (19%) points to the need for more education and training about basic crime scene collection, and more specifically, touch DNA. Clearly, more basic crime scene collection training could be useful in increasing knowledge in this area.
Respondents were asked to select which actions a victim should not take if they hoped to ensure the preservation of DNA evidence after an assault. Overall, our 2012 respondents were very knowledgeable on this question. In fact, in almost every category, knowledge levels were significantly higher than that of the respondent pool in 2007. Most respondents knew that victims should not shower, bathe, wash, clean up the crime scene, or change clothes. A fair number knew that victims should not comb hair (48%) or go to the bathroom (44%). Considering how important it is for those who interact with victims to have correct information about preserving evidence, forensic DNA trainings should include information on this topic.

To Preserve Evidence, Victims Should Not:

- shower, bathe, or wash: 27.4% (2012), 59.5% (2007)
- clean up crime area: 26.6% (2012), 59.2% (2007)
- change clothes: 22.6% (2012), 54.0% (2007)
- comb hair: 17.7% (2012), 48.9% (2007)
- go to the bathroom: 16.1% (2012), 43.9% (2007)
- eat anything*: 10.8% (2012), 37.8% (2007)
- smoke: 4.5% (2012), 32.5% (2007)
- victims MAY do all of the above: 1.3% (2012), 4.5% (2007)

* question not asked in 2007
While in 2012, the majority of respondents (53%) knew that DNA can be collected up to 72 hours after an assault, more than 21% were not sure and 23% said that it must be collected within 24 hours. It is very important that victims receive correct information about preserving DNA evidence. As the window for collection of evidence continues to expand (even past the previous 72-hour limit), more training is needed for those professionals who interact with victims.

Questions about old and degraded DNA showed that knowledge levels in 2012 were about the same as those in 2007. The overwhelming majority of respondents in both surveys knew that small or degraded samples of DNA can be tested and decades-old DNA can be valuable.
When asked which profiles may be included in state DNA databases, knowledge levels stayed about the same from 2007 to 2012. Respondents still had some misconceptions about DNA databases, including the belief that victims’ DNA profiles are entered into state DNA databases. In addition, 36% of respondents chose “all of the above” concerning what DNA profiles may be included, showing that more work is to be done training law enforcement professionals and victim service professionals about what is and what is not included in forensic DNA databases.
We asked respondents what information the DNA profiles in CODIS (Combined DNA Index System) can tell us about a person. Overall, 2012 respondents knew more than 2007 respondents about what CODIS can tell us about a person. In 2012, more respondents knew that CODIS cannot tell us a person’s sex, race, genetic abnormalities, HIV status, hair color, and height. However, slightly more respondents said that DNA profiles in CODIS can tell us all of these things (increased from 15% in 2007 to 21% in 2012).
We asked respondents what types of profiles can be entered into CODIS. In this category, knowledge levels stayed about the same from 2007 to 2012. Also, unfortunately, but not surprisingly, we found that 8% of respondents do not know what CODIS is.

### What Can CODIS Link DNA Profiles To?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>all of the above</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>convicted offenders' DNA profiles</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNA profiles from other crime scenes</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arrestees' DNA profiles</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>victims' DNA profiles</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know what CODIS is*</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none of the above</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* question not asked in 2007

### Part IV: Working with Victims and Forensic DNA

We asked respondents a series of questions aimed at learning who they thought was responsible for providing DNA-related information to victims in their most recent cases, they or someone else. Respondents then answered a series of questions about the information victims received.
In 2012, more respondents (45% vs. 26% in 2007) reported having been the person responsible for talking to victims about DNA. The majority of respondents (53%) said that law enforcement professionals are responsible for talking to victims about DNA. Other responses included: medical personnel, 14%; prosecutors, almost 12%; victim advocates, 11%, and some other professional, 9%.

![Who Is Most Responsible for Talking to Victims about DNA?](image1)

![Which Professionals Discuss DNA with Victims?](image2)
Respondents were fairly evenly split on their views about whether victims receive adequate information about how potential forensic DNA might affect their cases. A little more than 40% of respondents said that victims do not receive adequate information about how DNA might affect their case, while about 45% indicated that victims do receive adequate information. However, when asked about forensic DNA testing, respondents had less confidence that victims receive adequate information. More than one-half of the respondents (55%) said that victims do not receive adequate information about DNA testing. Just more than 40% of respondents said that victims do not receive adequate information about the collection of forensic DNA, while nearly one-half (49%) agreed that victims do receive adequate DNA collection information. The remaining respondents were neutral.

*This question was asked differently in 2007, so a side-by-side comparison is not possible.
We asked respondents to tell us if they thought that victims’ questions were answered respectfully and adequately. The majority of respondents (70%) felt that victims’ questions about forensic DNA are answered respectfully; almost 28% felt strongly so. Respondents (57%) were slightly less confident that victims’ questions were being answered adequately.

![Are Victims Questions Answered?](image)

*This question was asked differently in 2007, so a side-by-side comparison is not possible.

We asked respondents if victims are receiving written materials about DNA evidence. Surprisingly, in 2012, more respondents (67%) reported that victims do not receive written information about DNA, up from 53% in 2007.

![Written Materials on DNA Evidence?](image)
Respondents were asked about the written materials victims receive, including the brochures that the National Center created in 2007 with Life Technologies support. These included “DNA & Crime Victims: What Victims Need to Know,” “DNA & Crime Victims: What Victim Service Providers Need to Know,” and “DNA & Crime Victims: Cold Case Notifications.” A small numbers of respondents reported that victims have received our brochures. Almost 12% said that they did not know what materials victims receive, and 2% said that victims received a document that was created internally. The survey numbers showed that increased marketing of these materials to the field would be beneficial to victims. While we no longer provide the materials in print form, they are downloadable from our DNA Resource Center web page at www.VictimsofCrime.org/dna.
Part V: Respondents’ Knowledge and Training about Forensic DNA

To better serve victims of crime and effectively maximize the use of DNA evidence, criminal justice system providers must be knowledgeable about forensic DNA. However, many professionals attended school, post-secondary programs, and professional certification programs before the advent of DNA as a major forensic tool. In addition, rapid changes in the science of forensic DNA, as well as emerging policies and practices, can quickly render previous training less useful. Our survey asked respondents to tell us about their sources of learning about DNA, their knowledge level about DNA, and their interest in additional training.

Respondents were fairly evenly split regarding their own knowledge about DNA and their ability to answer victims’ questions about the impact of DNA evidence on their cases. Of the respondents, 48% said they have enough knowledge to answer victims’ questions, and 14% of these said they definitely” had enough knowledge. Respondents (59%) were more confident (than in 2007?) that they could explain the issues to victims, but it is clear that there is room for improvement in the number of respondents who feel confident about their knowledge base.

*This question was asked differently in 2007 so a comparison is not available.
Our 2012 respondents are learning more about forensic DNA from trainings and less from television crime shows. In 2007, more than 31% said they were learning about DNA from television; in 2012, less than 17% said that TV was a source of information for them. Almost one-half of the respondents in 2012 said that they get information about forensic DNA from trainings, while in 2007, that number was 35%. In 2012, more people have had informal conversations about DNA (37% vs. 28% in 2007) and more respondents (32% vs. 18%) have used the Internet to learn about DNA.
Respondents overwhelmingly believe (85%) that professionals who work with crime victims need more training on forensic DNA, and most would attend a free training about DNA. In 2012, respondents strongly believed that professionals need more training; 41% of respondents agreed with this statement at the highest point on the 11-point scale. When asked about attending a free or low-cost training, 91% of respondents said they would attend a free DNA training in their area.

Among those respondents who showed interest in DNA training, the interest in free training was stronger than it was for low-cost training. Almost two-quarters (65%) of respondents choose the highest point on the scale in answer to the statement that they would attend free training. Sixty-five percent of respondents said they would attend a low-cost training, but 25% said they would not. And only 26.5% of respondents choose the highest point on the 11-point scale in regards to attending low-cost trainings.

*This question was asked differently in 2007, so a side-by-side comparison is not possible.
Part VI: Attitudes and Support for Advances in DNA Technology

In the years since our 2007 survey, DNA technology and the human identification industry have continued to progress. At the same time, it has become increasingly clear that the potential for forensic DNA use as a criminal justice system tool is far from fully realized. There are many barriers to the effective use of DNA evidence. Attitudes about DNA testing, as well as concerns about its potential misuse, are crucial for understanding and overcoming these challenges. We asked respondents a series of questions related to these advances, which include rapid DNA testing, familial/close match searching, local DNA databases, and collection of DNA from arrestees. These questions were not asked in 2007 because these issues had not yet become mainstream for the media, law enforcement, and victim-serving professionals. We also asked about respondents’ top concerns regarding the use of forensic DNA in the criminal justice system.

When asked about their greatest concerns regarding the use of DNA evidence in criminal cases, the highest number of respondents (42%) indicated that DNA backlogs are a major concern for them. Respondents (41%) cited “time to receive results” as the next highest concern. Respondents also cited concerns about DNA not being collected often enough (33%), DNA not being tested enough (30%), and the prohibitive costs of DNA testing (25%).
Greatest Concerns about DNA in Criminal Cases

- DNA backlogs
- Time to receive results
- DNA not collected often enough
- DNA not tested often enough
- Cost of tests
- Victim privacy
- DNA lab errors
- Storage processes
- Destruction of evidence
- Collection processes
- Sample integrity over time
- DNA for non-evidence uses
- Testing of all arrestees
- Misuse of databases by those with access
- Civil liberties
- Due process violations
- Racial profiling
- Local DNA databases
- Expunging DNA from databases
- Familial searches/close matches
- Disproportionate minority impact
- Offender rights
- Post-conviction testing
- Discovery of medical conditions

*Question not asked in 2007
Expanded DNA Collection

We inquired about respondents’ support for a range of DNA collection programs. Participants in the survey demonstrated support for collection from an expansive list of offenders. They overwhelmingly showed support for collection of DNA from all violent crime arrestees. More than 85% support the idea; more than 70% strongly support it. Just 5% said they don’t “at all” support it. When asked about DNA collection for all felony arrests, almost 85% of respondents supported such a program. Almost 67% chose the highest point on the 11-point scale, indicating that they strongly supported the idea. Less than a quarter of respondents said that they are not in support of taking DNA from felony arrestees, and only 7.1% of those were strongly against it.

More than half of respondents (58%) stated support of the more restrictive program of taking DNA from only violent felony arrestees. Fewer respondents, yet still close to one-half (47%), demonstrated support for taking DNA from all persons arrested for a crime. In the open-ended comments, a few respondents cited concerns over racial disparities in arrest rates for persons of color and the lack of resources as a barrier to supporting collection of DNA from all arrestees.

Respondents also showed support for collection of DNA from those arrested for misdemeanors. Forty-nine percent of respondents said that they support the idea, and 32% of those respondents said they support it ‘very much.”

Respondents were more split on the idea of limiting DNA collection to only persons convicted of a crime. Almost 45% of respondents said that they did not believe that this collection scheme is a good idea, and 30% of those felt strongly so.

Overall, our survey demonstrates that among criminal justice and victim-serving professionals, there is high support for increasing DNA collection to even more types of offenders, and in particular that collecting from persons arrested for certain crimes is widely supported.
Rapid DNA

New technology is now being used to create “rapid DNA” analysis machines that have the potential to provide DNA testing results to law enforcement in less than two hours, and potentially in as few as 90 minutes. This new technology can help law enforcement personnel quickly analyze a suspect’s DNA and link it to a crime scene, or eliminate the suspect from suspicion while he or she is still in law enforcement custody. Rapid DNA technology has the potential to dramatically change the way law enforcement can conduct investigations.

When respondents were first asked if they had heard of rapid DNA testing, only 37%, or just over one-third, said yes. Among law enforcement, 33% of respondents had heard of rapid DNA, and about one-third (33%) of victim advocates and 35% of prosecutors had heard of it. The survey yielded similar results from respondents in other professional categories: 37% of those in administration were familiar with rapid DNA; 43% of education and outreach professionals; 37% of medical professionals; and 36% of mental health professionals.
These numbers show that a minority of criminal justice and allied professionals are familiar with the potential of Rapid DNA technology, suggesting a need for more training and awareness-raising.
Respondents were next provided with a short definition of rapid DNA testing, and asked both how important it is for police departments to receive rapid DNA results, and how much they think that rapid DNA testing could change the criminal justice system. Overall, after learning about rapid DNA testing, 90% of participants strongly agreed that rapid DNA results are important to police. Fifty-nine percent chose the highest point on the 11-point scale, indicating that they believe that rapid DNA testing is “very important” to police. Respondents overwhelmingly (91%) said they believe that rapid DNA could change the criminal justice system, and 55% believe this very strongly.

![Potential Impact of Rapid DNA](image)

**Local DNA Databases**

We asked respondents several questions related to local DNA database to assess the level of awareness of these databases, their prevalence in communities, and the level of support for such databases. More than one-half of survey respondents have heard of local DNA databases, and the vast majority of those believe that local DNA databases are a good idea. In fact, 46% chose the highest point on the 11-point scale to show the strength of their support. Less than 20% said they believe local DNA databases are not a good idea. A surprisingly high number of respondents (19%) reported that their community has a local DNA database, but more than 44% said that they are not sure.
**Heard of Local DNA Databases**

- Yes: 53.0%
- No: 47.0%

**Presence of a Local DNA Database**

- Yes: 44.3%
- No: 36.9%
- Not sure: 18.7%

**Are Local DNA Databases a Good Idea**

- Good idea
- Neutral
- No
**Familial Searching**

We asked respondents two questions about familial searching to understand the level of awareness and support of the practice. A large percentage of respondents (64%) said that they have heard of familial searching and about the same percentage (65%) believe that it is a “good idea.” Less than 20% said they do not think it is a good idea and only 3% said that they don’t “at all” think it is a good idea. While support for the practice is relatively high, the numbers demonstrate that more awareness is needed about the crime-solving potential of familial searching.

![Heard of Familial Searching](image1)

![Is Familial Searching a Good Idea](image2)
We asked respondents about funding for forensic DNA testing and whether funding is a barrier to testing. The majority of respondents agreed that funding is a barrier to forensic DNA testing. More than 85% said they funding is “very much” a barrier, while less than 1% said, “not at all.”

![Bar chart showing funding as a barrier](image)

When asked about good ways to pay for forensic DNA testing, the majority of respondents chose fines on convicted offenders (55.6%). Almost 55% said that drug forfeiture funds are a good way to pay; 46% said that the federal government should provide grants; 34% said that states should provide support; and 13% believe local tax dollars should be used for forensic DNA testing.

![Bar chart showing good ways to pay](image)
When asked about the usefulness of forensic DNA as it relates to non-violent crimes, respondents overwhelmingly (68%) said that DNA is very useful in non-violent crimes. In response to open-ended questions about what types of non-violent crime investigations should use DNA evidence, more than 281 respondents said “Burglary, Theft, Robbery, and Property Crimes.” Twenty-two percent of respondents felt that DNA is not useful in non-violent crime, and 4% of those respondents said that it is “not at all” useful. About 10% of respondents were neutral on the question. While the majority of respondents were informed about why DNA is useful in solving non-violent crimes, it is clear that nearly one-third of respondents need to be more informed about how DNA can be useful in solving non-violent crimes.
**Missing Persons and Unidentified Remains**

The majority of survey participants, almost 70%, know that DNA can be useful in cases in which remains are unidentified. Fewer respondents (66%) were knowledgeable about DNA being used in missing persons cases. While a substantial number of respondents were aware of these two important uses of forensic DNA, awareness-raising is necessary to maximize the use of DNA in missing persons and unidentified remains cases.

![Familiarity with DNA Use in Missing Persons and Unidentified Remains Cases](image)

**DNA Backlog**

When asked whether respondents know if there are untested sexual assault kits in their jurisdiction, a third (33%) said “definitely yes,” and a little less more than one-quarter (27.9%) said “probably.” Nearly one-quarter of respondents didn’t know, and only 7.6% said “definitely not.” We asked how important it is to analyze all untested kits. The overwhelming majority (91%) said it is “important,” and 58% of those respondents chose the highest point on the 11-point scale signifying that it is “very important.” Only about 5% said it is not important to test all the backlogged or untested kits, while only a little less than 4% remained neutral on the question. For those who were unsure or opposed to testing all kits, the main issue was that testing all kits might burden already-strained lab resources.
### Existence of Untested Sexual Assault Kits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definitely yes</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably not</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely not</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Importance of Analyzing Backlog or Untested Kits

- Reduce backlogs
  - Not at all
  - Neutral
  - Very important
Conclusion

The National Center for Victims of Crime’s 2012 survey yielded important information about the DNA knowledge level of professionals who interact with victims of crime. It also informed us about support among these professionals for advancements in DNA technology and DNA analysis. The majority of survey respondents have more experience in their field than they did in 2007, and many respondents demonstrated solid basic knowledge about DNA and DNA databases. However, many of them seem to be less confident about their ability to discuss DNA with victims. And they still have misconceptions about forensic DNA, especially related to collection of evidence and DNA databases.

The majority of respondents voiced support for maximizing the crime-solving and crime-prevention potential of DNA technology through collecting DNA from arrestees, as well as using DNA in non-violent crimes, familial searching, and rapid DNA technology. Still, our survey revealed that the respondents could benefit from more information to decrease misunderstandings about privacy concerns and increase understanding of the benefits of increased DNA testing. Overall, the survey revealed a need to keep providing accurate information about forensic DNA and DNA technology to those who interact with victims. Doing so will allow the National Center for Victims of Crime to continue to create a well-informed community of professionals who can competently assist crime victims with DNA issues while advocating for improved and expanded use of forensic DNA in their communities.
Appendix 1

Special Analyses: Predicting Support for Rapid DNA as Important to Police

We performed a quick regression analysis based on the available interval-level variables in the data set to get a rough idea of which variables will predict support for believing that rapid DNA results are important to police. It should be noted that this model is far from properly specified, and is only intended to give a rough estimate. Important variables, such as profession and length of time in field, were not included in the model. This model had an adjusted R square of .46.

**Variables Significant at .20 and Lower**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belief that rapid DNA could change the criminal justice system</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support for DNA testing for all misdemeanor arrestees</td>
<td>.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for all violent crime arrestees</td>
<td>.002*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for familial searching</td>
<td>.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief that DNA is useful in nonviolent crimes</td>
<td>.027*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at the .05 level, please remember model is not fully specified

Overall, these results suggest that those who believe that rapid DNA could change the criminal justice system, that DNA is useful in nonviolent crimes, that all violent crime arrestees should be DNA tested, and who support familiar searching are those who also believe that it is important for police to receive rapid DNA results.

We performed the same analysis with belief that rapid DNA could change the criminal justice system as the dependent variable. Again, this model is just a quick estimate and is not properly specified. This model had an adjusted R square of .455

**Variables Significant at .20 and Lower**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support for DNA testing of all violent crime arrestees</td>
<td>.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for DNA testing of all felony arrestees</td>
<td>.041*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support DNA testing of only violent felony arrestees</td>
<td>.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief that lack of funding is a barrier to using DNA effectively</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at the .05 level, please remember model is not fully specified

Overall, these results suggest that those who support DNA testing of all felony arrestees (but not all or only violent crime arrestees), and who believe that funding is a barrier to effective use of

---

1 The standard for accepting a variable as statistically significant is 0.05. In cases of exploratory research, or when the model is known to be poorly specified, it may be valuable to consider variables significant at the .20 level and lower.
forensic DNA are those who also believe that rapid DNA could change the criminal justice system.

**Factor Analysis**

Factor analysis is a data analysis or data reduction technique that can be used to determine underlying structures in the data. While this report is interested primarily in rapid DNA and what kinds of opinions are likely interconnected, the factor analysis provides additional information that helps understand how groups of individuals think about DNA.

The following table displays the eight broad concepts composed of individual items that come together\(^2\) to form a factor. Together, these eight factors explain 71% of the model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Interacting with Victims</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2</td>
<td>Arrestees and Non-Violent Crimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3</td>
<td>Personal Knowledge of DNA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 4</td>
<td>Effective Use of DNA (Rapid)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 5</td>
<td>Unidentified/Missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 6</td>
<td>Belief in Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 7</td>
<td>Resistant to DNA Testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 8</td>
<td>Searching and Backlog</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examining each factor helps to explain which beliefs and attitudes are related to one another. Many of these factors are sensible groupings. However, it is also worthwhile to note those items which appear with items that do not share a surface similarity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Interacting with Victims</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do victims receive adequate information about:</td>
<td>Collecting DNA evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Testing DNA evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How DNA evidence might affect a case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are victims questions answered</td>
<td>Adequately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Respectfully</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor 1 centers on respondents’ work with victims. These individual items—that address whether victims receive adequate information and how victims’ questions are answered—measure a larger concept related to how professionals interact with victims.

\(^2\) Varimax rotation was used, and factors required a load of at least .400 to appear in a factor. All items are discrete and do not overlap from one factor to another.
In factor 2, the first set of questions (support for all arrestee DNA testing) is a logical grouping. Interestingly, though, support for all arrestee testing is also strongly connected to belief that DNA is useful in non-violent crimes. It is likely that increasing belief in the utility of DNA in non-violent crime would increase support for all arrestee testing.

Factor 3 is a logical grouping: those who agreed that DNA was relevant to their work also believed that they had enough knowledge to explain DNA issues to victims and answer victims’ questions.

In factor 4, items about rapid DNA are grouped with the belief that funding is a barrier to effective use of forensic DNA. It is likely that strengthening belief that funding can lead to better use of DNA will also support belief in rapid DNA as an effective tool for law enforcement and to change the criminal justice system.

The most interesting aspect of factor five is that these items did not group with other items about respondent knowledge ability of forensic DNA.

In factor 6, we can see that those who believe that professionals need more training are also those who would be most likely to actually attend free or low-cost training.
In factor 7 we can see that those who support forensic DNA testing only after conviction most closely resemble those who support DNA testing only for violent felony arrestees. It is important to note which variables are not present in this factor—namely, support for other kinds of arrestee testing, such as all violent offenders. Thus, opposition to DNA testing is not connected to concerns about differences between misdemeanors and felonies, or violent crimes vs. nonviolent crimes. Instead, opposition to broad use of forensic DNA testing is specific to those believe that it should be used in only these two narrow categories. This suggests that it may be very difficult to convince those who support only violent felony arrestee, or post-conviction, testing to support additional uses of DNA testing.

In the final factor, we can see that support for local DNA databases is linked both with support for familial searching and reducing the backlog. Conversely, those who are most concerned with the backlog, may be the most likely allies in any effort to develop local DNA databases or to support familial searching.
We are trying to learn more about what criminal justice system professionals know about DNA and how it might affect their work.

Many of your colleagues have already taken the survey, but we are interested in your opinions.

The survey only takes about eleven minutes, and your answers remain completely anonymous.

* In the past two years, have you worked with any victims whose cases involved potential DNA evidence? By "potential DNA evidence," we mean that the case involved DNA evidence, regardless of whether it was collected or tested.

的选择：
- Yes
- No

* In the last 2 years, how many of your cases have involved DNA evidence? Please list each case under only one category. Your best guess is fine if you don't remember exactly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sexual assault</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>child sexual abuse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sexual assault/abuse and homicide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sexual assault/abuse and home invasion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>homicide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>home invasion/burglary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kidnapping/abduction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assault</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stalking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Thinking about the person who is most responsible for talking to the victim about DNA in most of your work, was that person

的选择：
- You
- Someone else
- No one talks to the victim about DNA
- Not sure
*Whether it was you or someone else, is the person most responsible for talking to the victim about DNA a

- Defense attorney
- Judge or magistrate
- Law enforcement officer
- Medical personnel
- Prosecutor
- Victim advocate
- Not sure
- Someone else

Do you think victims receive adequate information about:

- Collecting DNA evidence
- Testing DNA evidence
- How DNA might affect a case

Are victims' questions answered:

- Adequately
- Respectfully

*Do victims receive written materials on DNA evidence?

- Yes
- No
- Not sure
**Have victims received any of these materials? Please check all that apply.**

- [ ] DNA and Crime Victims: What Victims Need to Know
- [ ] DNA and Crime Victims: What Victim Assistance Professionals Need to Know
- [ ] DNA Hits in Cold Cases: Notifying Crime Victims
- [ ] A brochure created by your organization
- [ ] Not sure
- [ ] Some other written material

---

**Even if you don’t currently work with victims, do you feel that you have enough knowledge about DNA to:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>not at all</th>
<th>not at all</th>
<th>not at all</th>
<th>not at all</th>
<th>not at all</th>
<th>not at all</th>
<th>definitely</th>
<th>definitely</th>
<th>definitely</th>
<th>definitely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>explain the issues to victims</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>answer all of victims’ questions about DNA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Have you learned about DNA and criminal cases from any of these sources?**

- [ ] Informal conversations
- [ ] Internet
- [ ] Medical examiner/coroner
- [ ] Newspapers, magazines, or other popular print media
- [ ] Police
- [ ] Prosecutors
- [ ] Other

**In general, do professionals who work with crime victims need more training on forensic DNA?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>not at all</th>
<th>definitely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>additional training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**If there were DNA training seminars in your area, would you attend if they were:**

- [ ] free
- [ ] low-cost

**How much do you support DNA testing under these circumstances?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>all arrestees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all misdemeanor arrestees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all violent crime arrestees (misdemeanors and felonies)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all felony arrestees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>only violent felony arrestees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>only after conviction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Can you tell us more?
What are your **greatest** concerns about the use of DNA in criminal cases? Please check as many as you like, but not all of the responses. We would like to know which issues are the **most important** to you.

- Civil liberties violations
- Disproportionate impact on minorities
- Offender rights
- Storage processes
- Discovery of medical conditions through DNA testing
- Integrity of samples over time
- Racial profiling
- Destruction of evidence
- Use of DNA for purposes other than evidence
- Victim privacy
- Length of time to receive DNA test results
- Due process violations
- Process for expunging DNA from databases
- DNA backlogs

Other (please specify)

Do you have any other concerns not already mentioned?

In this section we would like to know what you already know about DNA. Please do not look up any answers!

*Each person has a unique DNA profile, other than identical siblings.*

- True
- False
- Don't know

*DNA may found in*

- Blood
- Bone
- Earwax
- Fingernails
- Hair
- Saliva
- Skin tissue
- Urine
- All of the above
- None of the above
At a crime scene, DNA may be found in or on

- A condom
- Cigarette butts
- Clothing
- Furniture
- Item used as ligature or binding, like rope, tape, phone cords
- Rim of glass
- Stamp or envelope
- Windowsill
- All of the above
- None of the above

To preserve evidence after an assault, victims should not

- Change clothes
- Clean up the area where the crime occurred
- Comb hair
- Drink anything
- Eat anything
- Go to the bathroom
- Shower, bathe, or wash
- Smoke
- Victims may do all of the above
- Victims may do any of the above

In sexual assault cases, DNA collected up to ____ hours after the assault has potential to yield an accurate DNA profile of the offender

- 24
- 36
- 48
- 72
- Not sure

Very small samples and partially degraded DNA samples can be tested for a DNA profile.

- True
- False
- Not sure

DNA found on evidence that is decades old can be valuable.

- True
- False
- Not sure
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*State criminal DNA databases, depending on state law, may contain DNA profiles from:

- Convicted offenders
- Persons arrested for crimes
- Relatives of deceased victims
- Victims
- All of the above
- None of the above

*In addition to a unique forensic profile, the DNA profiles stored in CODIS can tell us a person's:

- Genetic abnormalities
- Hair color
- Height
- HIV status
- Race
- Sex
- All of the above
- None of the above

CODIS can link DNA profiles found at crime scenes to:

- Arrestees' DNA profiles
- Convicted offenders' DNA profiles
- DNA profiles from other crime scenes (do we need to specify at the national level?)
- Victims' DNA profiles
- All of the above
- None of the above
- I don't know what CODIS is

*If DNA test results indicate strong evidence that the DNA came from a particular suspect, it means that suspect is **guilty** of a crime.

- True
- False

*If DNA test results indicate strong evidence that DNA did not come from a particular suspect, it means that suspect is **innocent** of the crime.

- True
- False
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*How would you describe your agency or organization?

- Crime lab
- Community corrections (probation, parole, or others)
- Law enforcement
- Prosecutor's office
- Other (please specify)

*How many years have you been in the criminal justice or allied professionals field?

*Is your community

- Urban
- Suburban
- Rural

*Is your primary job function best described as

- Administration
- Civil litigation or representation of crime victims
- Education or outreach
- Law enforcement
- Medical Services
- Mental Health
- Policy
- Prosecution
- Victim advocate
- Other (please specify)

*Is DNA relevant to your daily work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>not at all</th>
<th>very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>daily work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Have you heard of rapid DNA testing?**

- Yes
- No

**DNA testing instruments that can provide DNA matches within 90 minutes are being developed for use in police departments. They are not available yet, but how important do you think it will be to have police receive DNA results this fast?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Important</th>
<th>not at all</th>
<th>extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How much do you think rapid DNA could change the criminal justice system?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change</th>
<th>not at all</th>
<th>very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A local DNA database is a database that is managed at the local level by local criminal justice agencies. Some jurisdictions have started their own databases, which they can search immediately without waiting to send DNA samples to the federal DNA database system (CODIS).

**Have you ever heard of local DNA databases before now?**

- Yes
- No

**Does your community have a local DNA database?**

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

**Do you think local DNA databases are a good idea?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good Idea</th>
<th>no</th>
<th>yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Can you tell us more?

Familial searching involves searching a DNA database for close matches that suggest a close relation. For example, a close match to someone's DNA profile already in the database could indicate that a brother is the actual suspect in the case.
**Have you ever heard of familial searching before now?**

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

**Do you think that familial searching is a good idea?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>not at all</th>
<th>very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional comments

**Do you think that lack of funding is a barrier to using forensic DNA effectively?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>not at all</th>
<th>very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional comments

**There are many different ways to pay for forensic DNA. Which of these do you think are a good idea?**

- [ ] drug forfeiture funds
- [ ] federal grants
- [ ] fines on convicted offenders
- [ ] local tax dollars
- [ ] state funding
- [ ] none
- [ ] other
- [ ] state funding
- [ ] none
- [ ] other

Additional comments

**Do you think DNA is useful in non-violent crimes?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>not at all</th>
<th>very useful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional comments

**What kinds of non-violent crimes should use DNA evidence? (please explain)**

Additional comments
**Do you know if there is a backlog of untested sexual assault kits in your jurisdiction?**

- [ ] definitely yes
- [ ] probably
- [ ] probably not
- [ ] definitely not
- [ ] don't know

**How important is it to analyze all the backlog or untested kits?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>very important</th>
<th>not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>reduce backlogs</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional comments

**How familiar are you with how DNA can be used in **missing persons** and **unidentified remains** cases?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>very familiar</th>
<th>not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>missing persons</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unidentified remains</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional comments

**Have you ever attended any of our trainings?**

- [ ] 2008 Boston, Massachusetts
- [ ] 2008 Portland, Oregon
- [ ] 2008 Reno, Nevada
- [ ] 2009 Chicago, Illinois
- [ ] 2009 Washington, DC
- [ ] 2010 Indianapolis, Indiana
- [ ] 2010 Raleigh, North Carolina
- [ ] 2011 Las Vegas, Nevada
- [ ] 2011 Columbia, South Carolina
- [ ] 2011 Oklahoma City, Oklahoma
- [ ] Webinars
- [ ] No
- [ ] Other (please specify)

Please enter your email address below if you’d like to be added to our mailing lists.
Is there anything else you would like to tell us?