


Project Rationale & Goals

- Forensic scientists are often exposed to wide-ranging contextual information (e.g., suspect criminal history, victim race) regarding cases as they complete analyses.
- At the same time, research across forensic science disciplines has shown that irrelevant contextual information can bias analyses, even though examiners are generally unaware that such information is influencing their decisions (e.g., Dror & Charlton, 2006; Dror & Cole, 2010; Kukucka & Kassir, 2014).
- Based on this body of research, the National Commission on Forensic Science (2015) reported that “forensic science service providers should rely solely on *task-relevant* information when performing forensic analyses.”
- Scholars, government agencies, and national authorities increasingly caution courts about the effects of contextual bias on experts and have called for laboratories to implement context management procedures (e.g., President’s Council of Advisors on Science and Technology, 2016).
- However, no research has examined what types of information forensic examiners consider task-relevant and task-irrelevant. This distinction is necessary to help implement recommended procedures that limit exposure to task-irrelevant information.
- The present study surveyed forensic examiners regarding their opinions of what types of information commonly contained in evidence submission forms are “essential” versus “irrelevant” to the analysis of forensic evidence.
- Understanding what information forensic examiners consider essential versus irrelevant, and whether there is consensus among examiners, may play an important role in informing efforts to minimize contextual bias.

Materials & Methods

- We administered a survey to 183 forensic examiners at trainings in CO and CA.
- The survey presented trainees with a list detailing different types of information, including information commonly solicited on evidence submission forms (Gardner, Kelley, Murrie, & Blaisdell, 2018) and asked participants to indicate whether they consider each piece of information “essential,” not essential but something they “would review if available,” or “irrelevant” to their task of analyzing evidence as a forensic scientist in their primary discipline.


Gender	Percent	Ethnicity	Percent		
Male	31%	Asian	24%		
Female	65%	African American	2%		
No Response	4%	Caucasian	53%		
Level of Education		Latino	10%		
2-year college or less	2%	Multiracial	3%		
4-year college	42%	Prefer not to say	2%		
Master’s degree	47%	Other	1%		
Doctoral degree	5%	No Response	5%		
No Response	4%				
		Mean	SD	Min	Max
Age (years)		39.0	8.9	24	74
Experience (years in primary discipline)		9.9	7.4	0.5	34



Note: 40% of examiners endorsed multiple disciplines, the most common secondary discipline being crime scene investigation.

Results & Discussion

Perceptions of Task Relevance by Primary Discipline



Conclusions

- In certain disciplines, there was a lack of consensus regarding the relevance of some pieces of information.
- Moreover, in some disciplines, over 10% of respondents characterized certain suspect and victim characteristics as ‘essential’ that most respondents in their discipline and other disciplines characterized as ‘irrelevant.’
- The present study was intended to serve as an initial step toward understanding what information forensic examiners consider relevant to their analyses; accordingly, we did not ask respondents to provide explanations for their responses.
- Future work should explore *why* examiners find various types of information essential or irrelevant in order to gain insight into why examiners in the same discipline disagree on the relevance of certain information.
- Given human vulnerability to contextual bias, it is critical to determine which information is essential to forensic analyses and to limit exposure to extraneous information.
- The present study reveals a need for further work to understand what information is task-relevant versus task-irrelevant, in order to inform context management procedures.

Acknowledgements

Itiel Dror, Ph.D.
University College London

Karen Kafadar, Ph.D.
University of Virginia

References

Dror, I. E., & Charlton, D. (2006). Why experts make errors. *Journal of Forensic Identification*, 56(4), 600-616.

Dror, I. E., & Cole, S. A. (2010). The vision in “blind” justice: Expert perception, judgment, and visual cognition in forensic pattern recognition. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 17(2), 161-167.

Gardner, B. O., Kelley, S., Murrie, D. C., & Blaisdell, K. (February, 2018). Do evidence submission forms expose latent print analysts to task-irrelevant information? Paper presented at the annual scientific meeting of the American Academy of Forensic Sciences, Seattle, WA.

Kukucka, J., & Kassir, S. M. (2014). Do confessions taint perceptions of handwriting evidence? An empirical test of the forensic confirmation bias. *Law and Human Behavior*, 38(3), 256-270.

National Commission on Forensic Science. (2015). *Ensuring that forensic analysis is based upon task-relevant information*. Retrieved from: https://www.justice.gov/ncfs/files/1196/download?content_id=1196&context_id=1196

President’s Council of Advisors on Science and Technology. (2016). *Report to the President: Forensic science in criminal courts: Ensuring scientific validity of feature-comparison methods*. Washington, DC: Executive Office of the President of the United States.