International Journal of Social Science Research and Review

http://ijssrr.com
editor@ijssrr.com
Volume 8, Issue 2
February, 2025
Pages: 74-95

The Role and Importance of Forensic Documents Examination in Making a Court Decision in Kosovo

Sedat Krasniqi

PhD Candidate, Faculty of FKKSS, Forensic Sciences Institute and Criminalistic Expertise, University of Sarajevo, BiH, Prizren, Kosova

http://dx.doi.org/10.47814/ijssrr.v8i2.2566

Abstract

Among the forms of international criminal assistance, document expertise has its place, as one of the acts of evidence whose results, in the form of expert findings and opinions, contribute greatly to the establishment of legally relevant facts in the proceedings and provide the basis and guarantee for an adequate adjudication of the criminal matter. Defining and unifying the criteria that are the assumption and guarantee of the reliability of the results of expertise is of crucial importance for the relevance and probative value of expert findings and opinions in criminal proceedings, both at the domestic and international levels. When talking about forensic examinations, it is a process that involves defining and applying appropriate standards, or rather the process of accreditation of forensic laboratories. Material evidence, in this case, arises from laboratory analyses through appropriate findings and opinions of competent experts employed in forensic laboratories, and permanent court experts. Regardless of the differences between them, modern criminal proceedings necessarily develop through the acceptance and assessment of evidence derived from laboratories that have a permit and are licensed to operate. This, on the other hand, implies standardization of equipment, validation of applied methods, as well as adequate education and training of laboratory staff and forensic experts, i.e. their accreditation and licensing.

Keywords: *Judicial Procedures in Kosovo; Expert Examination; Court Proceedings; Standardization; Basic Courts of Kosovo*

The work is the result of the implementation of a scientific research project entitled *The role and importance of forensic examination of documents in making a court decision.* The project was managed and realized by Sedat Krasniqi, doctoral student of FKKSS, University of Sarajevo, Forensic Questioned Document Examination – Judical Expert, Kosovo Judical Council.

Introduction

Document (manuscript) expertise is a work that is rarely published in domestic professional and scientific literature. There is a noticeable disproportion between, on the one hand, the neglect of this topic when writing papers in the field of criminalistics, and its topicality, on the other hand, given that the expertise of documents and manuscripts appears relatively often in court practice. The field of document expertise implies a very wide range of knowledge that an expert must possess, the application of various methods from the field of criminal traceology, physics and chemistry (physical chemistry), as well as the use of various instruments, apparatus and tools during expertise. The significance of the expert's testimony is of exceptional or crucial importance. The reason for this is clear. An expert is the only person who has the professional knowledge to give an opinion on whether a document is forged, how it was forged, what are the characteristics of that forgery, and accordingly the court forms its opinion and makes a final decision.

The subject of research in this paper will be further narrowed down to the analysis of court cases in which this type of expert opinion was conducted at the Basic Courts in Kosovo, and the analysis of the manner in which the expert opinions were conducted, and their role and importance in making a court decision, i.e. the manner in which expert and of scientific standards of a general character that are provided for this type of expert examination[1].

Given that this is a "living" matter, one that is constantly evolving as we have stated, the above can significantly contribute to the improvement of the detection and presentation of methods of forgery of documents of all types encountered in judicial practice and all the difficulties in their expert examination and communication with the court, as well as their importance for the court. Considering all of the above, especially if we take into account the modest research opus, the scientific research work can justifiably be considered a dissertation, very current and scientifically interesting.

When in a judicial procedure, we have a contested manuscript or document, in order to obtain a meritorious verdict, it would be good for the determination to be made scientifically. In order to know how things stand in these cases, do the judges of the general department practice forensic examination of documents, how do these types of examinations affect the judges' decision-making in judicial processes?

Methodology

The methodology chapter presents the research methodological construct, which will serve to understand methodologically and statistically the relevance of the obtained results. The research methodology section describes the selected research design and how the research proceeded within this structured design.

The elements that make up the research methodology are: research design, study population, research participants, measurement instruments, instrument reliability, method of administering research instruments (pilot testing), data collection, data analysis, and scientific ethics.

[1] The work is the result of the implementation of a scientific research project entitled *The role and importance of forensic examination of documents in making a court decision.* The project was managed and realized by Sedat Krasniqi, doctoral student of FKKSS, University of Sarajevo, Forensic Questioned Document Examination – Judical Expert, Kosovo Judical Council.

Study Design

A research design is the arrangement of conditions for data collection and analysis in a way that aims to combine relevance with the purpose of the research. In fact, research design is the conceptual framework within which research is conducted, and constitutes the plan for data collection, measurement, and analysis.[2]

Research design aims to provide an appropriate framework for a study. A very significant decision in the research design process is the choice to be made regarding the research approach, as it determines how the relevant information for a study will be obtained; however, the research design process involves many interrelated decisions.[3]

In this research, a quantitative approach was used. The quantitative study consists of using questionnaires to judges of the general department, which questionnaires measure the implementation of expertise in cases of forged documents. The values obtained were used to express frequency, differences, correlational relationship, etc. In the research of this study according to the quantitative or structured research approach, everything that forms the research process - objectives, model, samples, questions that you plan to ask the respondents is predetermined.

Study Population

The study population is the totality of individual cases that make up the mass and produce the mass phenomenon, or the total number of cases that are included as the object of research.[4]

The population of this study consists of all judges of the general department of the Basic Courts of the Republic of Kosovo . Based on data provided by the courts of the Republic of Kosovo, within the general department, in the Republic of Kosovo, there are 125 judges.

Participants

When the number of individual cases is small, it is easy and preferable to conduct research in the population.[5]

Considering that the number of general department judges in the Basic Courts in Kosovo is relatively small, we decided to organize the research in the population. Therefore, we submitted 117 questionnaires to the relevant courts for the realization of this research.[6]

Of the 117 judges of the general department, only 66 of them have completed the questionnaires, while 51 others have not completed the questionnaires at all, citing workload. Therefore, it has not been possible to organize the research in the population, but a sample has been formed from the judges who have been willing to participate in the research. We believe that the sample has characteristics similar to the rest of the population and is representative of it.

Of the 66 judges included in the research, 25 or 37.9% are female, while 41 or 62.1% are male.

[2] Claire Selltiz and others, *Research Methods in Social Sciences* , 1962, 50 .
[3]Aaker A, Kumar VD, George S. 2000. Marketing Research. NewYork: John Wiley & Sons Inc.

[4]Azemi, Bashkim & Remzi Bujari. 2003. Basics of research in education, ISP, Prishtina.
[5]Right there.
[6]Because the instrument was piloted with 8 judges, these judges were not included in the final research, therefore the number of questionnaires submitted is smaller than the population.

Based on age, 11 or 16.7% of judges are aged 31-40 years, 23 or 34.8% of them are aged 41-50 years, 25 or 37.9% are aged 51-60 years and 7 are over 60 years.

Based on educational background, 52 or 78.8% of the judges participating in the research have completed a university degree, while 14 or 21.2% of them have completed a master's degree.

The judges participating in the research work in the five Basic Courts of Kosovo. From the Basic Court in Pristina, there are 17 judges, from the Basic Court in Prizren, there are 17 judges, from the Basic Court in Ferizaj, there are 14 judges, from the Basic Court in Gjilan, there are 12 judges and from the Basic Court in Gjakova, there are 5 judges.

Table 1. Gender of participants

Gender				
	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
WOMAN	25	37.9	37.9	37.9
Male	41	62.1	62.1	100.0
Total	66	100.0	100.0	

Table 2. Age of participants

Age				
	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
31-40	11	16.7	16.7	16.7
41-50	23	34.8	34.8	51.5
51-60	25	37.9	37.9	89.4
Over 60 years	7	10.6	10.6	100.0
Total	66	100.0	100.0	

Table 2. Educational background of participants

Educational preparation				
	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Faculty	52	78.8	78.8	78.8
Master	14	21.2	21.2	100.0
Total	66	100.0	100.0	

Table 3. Basic Court where participants work

Basic Court				
	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Prizren	17	25.8	25.8	25.8
Pristina	18	27.3	27.3	53.0
Gjakova	5	7.6	7.6	60.6
Ferizaj	14	21.2	21.2	81.8
Gjilan	12	18.2	18.2	100.0
Total	66	100.0	100.0	

Research Instruments

To conduct the research, a structured questionnaire was used on the application of document expertise in judicial proceedings. The questionnaire was designed and dedicated to this study, trying to ensure, as Bob Mathews and Liz Ross say, that the questions will collect the data we need, once the questionnaire has been designed, the questions and answers will be defined and you cannot go back and get further information. [7]After designing the questionnaire, it was given to two forensic experts, who also have experience in scientific research. These experts were asked to provide their instructions and suggestions regarding the design and suitability of the questions in the questionnaire, in relation to the study issue.

The questionnaire is Likert-scale and consists of three parts. The first part contains the data of the research participants (gender, age, etc.). The second part provides instructions for completing the questionnaire. The third part presents 12 Likert-scale questions related to document expertise, with 5 scales: 5. I completely agree, 4. I agree, 3. I agree to some extent, 2. I disagree, 1. I disagree completely and 5. Almost always, 4. Often, 3. From time to time, 2. Rarely, 1. Almost never.

For the purposes of the study, all variables related to document expertise have been grouped into one variable, named: Forensic document expertise in judicial proceedings.

How to Administer Research Instruments?

In order to eliminate any shortcomings and ambiguities in the research instrument, measure the time required to complete the instrument, and test the reliability and validity of the instruments, a pilot test of the research questionnaire was initially conducted. From the results of the pilot test, the researcher can identify errors that need to be corrected, differences observed by some respondents, and changes that need to be made to the final instrument.[8]

To pilot the instruments, a sample of judges from the general department was selected. The pilot study was conducted with 8 judges from the general department in May 2019. The pilot study of the instrument was conducted using a lottery method, where the names of all judges from the general department were placed in a vase. From the names of all judges, 8 cards were drawn by lottery, with the name of the judge. The judges who were involved in the pilot process were not included in the final research of the study.

After piloting the instrument, it was found that completing the questionnaire took about 10-15 minutes.

During the piloting of the instruments, the researcher was present and participants were asked about any ambiguities. After piloting the instrument, in the parts of the instrument that were found to be incomprehensible, we tried to adjust and adapt them.

The questionnaires were designed so that participants could complete them themselves. Each questionnaire also had simple instructions to facilitate its completion. To ensure the most complete participation and response from judges, the questionnaires were distributed in paper format, through the administration of the court where the research was organized.

[7]Mathews, Bob & Liz Ross. 2010. Research Methods: A Practical Guide for the Social Sciences and Humanities, CDE, Tirana.
[8]Azemi, Bashkim & Remzi Bujari. 2003. Basics of research in education, ISP, Prishtina.

Instrument Reliability

Reliability testing ensures that a research instrument produces the same results across repeated surveys with the same measures or within the same or a similar population.[9]

A reliable study is generalizable and is therefore expected to reproduce similar results across settings. Reliability reflects consistency and repeatability over time. Furthermore, reliability is seen as the degree to which a test is free from measurement errors, as the more measurement errors occur, the less reliable the test is. [10]Reliability testing is necessary for any measurement made because reliability expresses the consistency between the questions that participate in a test or survey and the extent to which the measure used reflects the question.[11]

The analysis of the metric characteristics of the measuring instrument used was carried out through the Chronbach's Alpha internal consistency analysis method.

Regarding the reliability of the instrument, based on Chronbach's Alpha coefficient, the authors have similar opinions.

According to Cohen and colleagues, the interpretation of the reliability of the measure in relation to the Alpha coefficient (α) can be done as follows:

a<0.60-the reliability of the measure is low and unacceptable

a=0.60-0.69-the reliability of the measure is marginally/minimally reliable

a=0.70-0.79-the meter is reliable

a=0.80-0.90 - the meter has high reliability

a>0.90-the reliability of the measure is very high.[12]

In the first part of the reliability analysis results, descriptive statistics are provided, which consist of: means, variances, and variance-covariance matrices, which show the relationship between variances and questions.

The mean of the scale, M=47.78 and the standard deviation, SD=6.424. The overall mean is 3.98 , the average variance is 1.029, the range of the mean is 1.778, and the range of the variance change is 1.416 . The overall mean of the inter-item correlations is 0.208, the minimum correlation is -0.193, and the maximum correlation is 0.549.

In the Item-total statistics section, when a question is removed from the scale, the mean of the scale and the variance from the remaining questions (Scale Mean if Item Deleted and Scale Variance if Item Deleted) are calculated, as well as the correlation between the question removed from the scale and the total of the other questions on the scale (Corrected Item-Total Correlation). The multiple correlation coefficients (Squared Multiple Correlation) and the reliability value for the remaining questions (Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted) are also reported.

[9]TELL Delaware Survey. 2013. Validity and Reliability Report. Santa Cruz.
[10]Fraenkel, JK, & Wallen, NE (Eds.). (2003). How to design and evaluate research in education. The McGraw-Hill Company, Inc. New York.
[11] Kalayci, Şerif (Editor). 2014. SPSS Uygulamalı Çok Deşıkkenli İstatistik Teknikleri, 6. Baskı, Ankara.
[12]Cohen, L., Lawrence, M. & Marrison K. 2007. Research Methods in Education, sixth edition, London and New York: Routledge/Falmer.

From the results, it is observed that the question-total correlations are between 0.212 and 0.605.

In the first reliability test, there were 13 questions, but because the second question had indications that it was damaging the reliability of the instrument (a =0.715), the same question was removed from the instrument. In the final analysis of the reliability of the instrument (after removing the second question), the reliability of the instrument increased. The overall Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of the reliability of the measure is 0.765, which is a higher value than the predicted value, which is 0.759. From this result, based on Cohen and colleagues, we can conclude that the measure is reliable [13]and meets the condition for use in practice.

According to the obtained value (Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted), the order of the questions from the smallest to the largest value is: Q11, Q7, Q6, Q10, Q1, Q2, Q3, Q9, Q4, Q8, Q5, Q12.

Based on the analysis of variance, we can say that the difference between the measurements, p=0.000, is statistically significant, and the value of the nonadditivity characteristic, p=0.004, is also statistically significant.

Hotelling's $T^{2\ test}$, which tests the equality of question means, was calculated as p=0.000. This result indicates that there is at least a statistically significant difference between the two question means.

Table 4. Instrument reliability

Item Statistics		
	Mean	Std. Deviation
Do you require document expertise in court proceedings when there is a manuscript or document that is contestable in court proceedings?	4.16	1,035
If the expert report says that the document or signature is forged, do you base your decision on that expert report?	4.03	1.107
Forensic examination of documents and manuscripts in judicial proceedings is important	4.33	1,063
Expertise of documents and manuscripts can play a dominant role in the procedure	4.37	.789
If the expert report shows that the document or signature is forged, we do not need any further evidence regarding the documents.	3.16	1,035
Forensic document examinations are indisputable evidence that is very important in creating free and professional conviction for decisions in judicial processes in Kosovo.	4.16	1,050
In Kosovo, there are formal procedures regarding professional questions in the field of document expertise, which are adhered to by registered court experts.	3.59	1,072
Poorly conducted – low-quality – expert opinions are not recognized within judicial procedures in Kosovo.	3.33	1,000
The court's decisions within the analyzed judgments are consistent with the opinions provided by the experts on the documents.	4.41	1,072
The level and quality of research of documents and manuscripts follows modern international standards.	3.56	1,228
The findings of manuscript expertise were not used as the sole means of evidence in the analyzed court cases.	3.75	1.107
I think that document expertise has an important role in judgments and judicial procedure in Kosovo.	4.94	.304

[13] Cohen L., Lawrence, M. & Marrison K. 2007, work cited.

Scale Statistics			
Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	N of Items
47.78	41,272	6,424	12

Summary Item Statistics

	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Range	Maximum/ Minimum	Variance	N of Items
Item Means	3,981	3.159	4,937	1,778	1,563	.266	12
Item Variances	1,029	.093	1,509	1,416	16,282	.127	12
Inter-Item Covariances	.219	-.220	.724	.944	-3.285	.036	12
Inter-Item Correlations	.208	-.193	.549	.743	-2.838	.023	12

Item-Total Statistics

question	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Squared Multiple Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
P1	43.62	35,014	.424	.315	.746
P2	43.75	34,709	.409	.390	.747
P3	43.44	35,509	.366	.568	.752
P4	43.41	37,956	.277	.342	.760
P5	44.62	36,885	.264	.205	.764
P6	43.62	33,756	.525	.381	.734
P7	44.19	32,866	.590	.591	.725
P8	44.44	36,896	.278	.279	.762
P9	43.37	35,590	.354	.491	.754
P10	44.22	33.111	.471	.361	.740
P11	44.03	32,418	.605	.571	.723
P12	42.84	40,361	.212	.157	.766

ANOVA with Tukey's Test for Nonadditivity

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Betheen People			213,241	62	3,439		
Within People	Beteen Items		184.185	11	16,744	20,676	.000
	Residual	Nonadditivity	6.614 [a]	1	6,614	8.253	.004
		Balance	545,701	681	.801		
		Total	552,315	682	.810		
	Total		736,500	693	1,063		
Total			949,741	755	1.258		

Grand Mean = 3.98

a. Tukey's estimate of power to which observations must be raised to achieve additivity = 2.421.

Hotelling's T-Squared Test				
Hotelling's T-Squared	F	df1	df2	Sig.
360,910	27,518	11	52	.000

Reliability Statistics		
Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.765	.759	12

Data Collection Procedure

Before applying the questionnaires, permission was sought from the Basic Courts of Kosovo, where the research was organized. After obtaining consent from the Basic Courts, in cooperation with the heads of the general department and court administrators, the research was organized. The application of the questionnaires with judges was carried out in May, June, and October 2019 , as well as September-October 2021. The structured questionnaires were distributed to the judges, but before they started filling out the questionnaires, they were informed and received the necessary instructions on how to fill out the questionnaire. The implementation of the questionnaires also has its difficulties, since in many cases, the participants do not want to cooperate, are not honest in their answers, fill out the questionnaires without any interest or commitment, etc. To overcome these problems, we have tried to ensure that participants are instructed in writing, but also verbally, on how to complete the questionnaire, and are asked verbally to provide as honest answers as possible and to be careful in providing their answers.

The participation of the judges was voluntary. During this time, great care was taken to respect the dignity of the participants and to ensure their anonymity. All participants completed the questionnaires while we were present. During the completion of the questionnaires, the researcher was available to provide any clarification that was needed.

To the judges , but 51 questionnaires were not completed at all.

Data Analysis

After receipt, the questionnaires were registered in the SPSS 21 program, with which the data from the judges' questionnaires were processed and analyzed. The questions were entered into the SPSS program and transformed into relevant variables. In addition to the general data, the questions related to the issue were coded with a five-level Likert scale.

To test the internal consistency of the instrument, Cronbach's Alpha was used, taking a value above 0.7 as a value that proves whether or not the questionnaire has internal consistency.

For the evaluation of the results of all statistical tests, a statistical significance level of 0.05 was set.

To test whether the data are normally and symmetrically distributed, several tests were used: Skewness, Kurtosis and Kolmogorov-Smirnov. Because the data turned out to have a non-normal distribution, hypothesis testing was performed through non-parametric tests: Mann Whitney U and Kruskal Wallis.

To compare differences between judges based on their gender, the non-parametric Mann Whitney U test was used, which is an alternative to the parametric T-test.

To measure differences between judges based on age, education, and court affiliation, the Kruskal Wallis test was used, which is an alternative to the one-way ANOVA parametric test.

To test the relationship between variables, the Pearson correlation coefficient was used.

According to Patrick Schobar and colleagues, the coefficient values are:[14]

0.00-0.10- Insignificant correlation;

0.10-0.39- Weak correlation

0.40-0.69- Moderate correlation

0.70-0.89- Strong correlation

0.90-1.00- Very strong correlation.

Scientific Ethics Considerations

Whatever the specific nature of their work, researchers must consider the effects of research on participants and act in a way that preserves their dignity as human beings: responsibility to participants. This is ethical behavior. Indeed, ethics has been defined as a matter of principled sensitivity to the rights of others and that while truth is good, respect for human dignity is better. [15]It has been considered that the ethics of science are concerned with what is wrong and what is right when conducting research. For this reason, all researchers, regardless of research design, sampling, instruments and choice of methods, are subject to ethical considerations. [16] The term ethics in research usually refers to the moral principles, guidelines for research, made by a group or even a profession.[17]

Whatever research design, sampling techniques, and choice of methods you choose to adopt, you will also need to consider the ethical issues surrounding the research, that is, whether your research design is socially and ethically acceptable. The issue of fraud is a complex one. The main argument for fraud is that if the subject is aware of the nature of the investigation, then this can affect the results. The argument against it is that fraud is inherently unethical in society.[18]

Bell and Bryman, in their paper, have presented eleven areas of ethical principles that the researcher should keep in mind, while we will present only a part of them:

- The researcher must avoid harm to the participant;

- To ensure the participant's consent;

- Respect the participant's privacy;

- Avoid fraud;

- Respect Anonymity;

[14] Schobar, Patrick, Christa Boer& Lothar A. Sch ë arte . 2018. Correlation Coefficients: Appropriate Use and Interpretation, Anesthesia&Analgesia, 126 (5):1, pp: 1762-1768.
[15]Cavan, S. (1977) Review of JD Douglas's (1976) Investigative Social Research: Individual and Team Field Research. American Journal of Sociology, 83 (3), 809–11.
[16]Gratton, C. and I. Jones. 2010. Research methods for sports studies (second edition), by Routledge, USA and Canada.
[17]Wellington, J. 2000. Educational Research: contemporary issues and practical approaches, London: Continuum.
[18]Gratton, C. and I. Jones. 2010. Research methods for sports studies (second edition), by Routledge, USA and Canada.

- Respect the dignity of participants;

- Maintain privacy;

- Confidentiality;

- Honesty and transparency, etc.[19]

In this research, these ethical principles were respected, as the participants were informed about the purpose and objectives of the research, their consent was obtained, consent was obtained from the Basic Courts of Kosovo, for the development of the research and after permission, the research was organized. The participants were informed that the data would be used only for the purpose of the study and this data was used only for the purpose of the study, their dignity and privacy were respected. The participants were assured that they would remain anonymous. Great care was taken to ensure the dignity of the participants. Throughout the time we have collaborated with the participants, but also with other persons, through whom we have provided the necessary data for the study, we have been correct and at no time have we committed any fraudulent or incorrect actions.

The research was conducted in accordance with ethical requirements to report findings in a comprehensive and honest manner.

Research Results

This chapter of the paper describes the results obtained from the processing of the quantitative data of the study. For the clearest and most logical presentation of the results from the statistical analyses, the data will be presented through tables and graphs. Appropriate explanations are also provided for each table and graph.

1. Descriptive Results

This section will present descriptive results, including frequencies, percentages, means, standard deviations, skewness values, kurtosis, etc. Skewness and kurtosis can be used to assess normality, which can be relatively accurate in both small and large samples. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was also used, which is a nonparametric test of continuous, one-dimensional probability equality that can be used to compare a sample with a reference probability distribution, or to compare two samples. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistic determines a distance between the empirical distribution function of the sample and the cumulative distribution function of the reference distribution, or between the empirical distribution functions of two samples.[20]

Do You Require Document Expertise in Court Proceedings When There Is a Manuscript or Document That Is Contestable in Court Proceedings?

When in a court proceeding, we have a contested manuscript or document, in order to obtain a meritorious verdict, it would be good for the determination to be made scientifically. In order to know how things stand in these cases, do the judges of the general department practice document expertise, a special question has been posed.

[19]Bell, E. and A. Bryman. 2007. The Ethics of Management Research: An Exploratory Content Analysis, British Journal of Management, Vol. 18, 63-77.
[20]Tomšik, Robert. 2019. Power Comparisons of Shapiro-Wilk, Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Jarque-Bera Tests, Scholars Journal of Research in Mathematics and Computer Science, 237-243.

In table no. 6 we note that, about 53% or 35 out of 66 participating judges, have stated that they almost always request the expertise of contestable documents, 15.2% or 10 judges, have stated that they often request the expertise of contestable documents, 21.2% or 14 of the participating judges, have stated that they occasionally request the expertise of contestable documents, while 10.6% or 7 participants, have stated that they rarely request the expertise of contestable documents.

In table no. 7, descriptive statistics are presented, regarding the request for document expertise. Based on the results, we note that the arithmetic mean is 4.11, the median has a value of 5.00 and is higher than the arithmetic mean, the standard deviation is 1.083, while the minimum values are 2 and the maximum values are 5.

This table also shows the values with the lower and upper limits of the confidence interval for the 95% level, which are 3.84 and 4.37. The average of judges requesting expert examination of the contested document, in the population of judges of the general department, has a 95% chance of being somewhere between 3.84 and 4.37.

The results also found values for the skewness measure -0.741 and kurtosis -0.925. When the Fisher coefficient of skewness is divided by the standard error of skewness 0.295, we obtain the value of skewness which is -2.52. When the kurtosis coefficient is divided by the standard error of skewness 0.582, then the value of 1.589 is found.

Test was also performed , which tests whether the distribution is normal or not.

The null hypothesis for this situation is: The data distribution follows a normal distribution.

HA: The data distribution does not follow the normal distribution.

According to the 5% significance level, the value p=0.000<0.05 is an indication that the data are non-normally distributed.

From the skewness, kurtosis and Kolmogorov-Smirnov test data, we can conclude that the data regarding the request for document expertise in judicial processes do not have a normal distribution in the population of judges of the general department. The results of kurtosis, skewness, as well as the Kolmogorov-Smirnov significance level, suggest that they exceed the critical values by 0.05.

In Figure 1, we notice that the curve is asymmetric and is skewed to the left. Based on the skewness, kurtosis, and Kolmogorov-Smirnov test data and the curve, we conclude that the data distribution is non-normal and negative.

Table 5. Frequency and percentage of results of the request for document expertise

Do you require document expertise in court proceedings when there is a manuscript or document that is contestable in court proceedings?				
	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
infrequently	7	10.6	10.6	10.6
From time to time	14	21.2	21.2	31.8
Often times	10	15.2	15.2	47.0
Almost every time	35	53.0	53.0	100.0
Total	66	100.0	100.0	

Table 7. Descriptive statistics for the request for document expertise

Descriptive statistics			
Do you require document expertise in court proceedings when there is a manuscript or document that is contestable in court proceedings?		Statistics	Std. Error
Mean		4.11	.133
95% Confidence Interval for	Lower Bound	3.84	
Mean	Upper Bound	4.37	
5% Trimmed Mean		4.17	
media		5.00	
Variance		1.173	
Std. Deviation		1,083	
Minimum		2	
Maximum		5	
Range		3	
Interquartile Range		2	
Skewness		-.741	.295
Kurtosis		-.925	.582

Table 8. Normality test for the request for document expertise

Tests of Normality			
	Kolmogorov-Smirnov [a]		
	Statistics	df	Sig.
Do you require document expertise in court proceedings when there is a manuscript or document that is contestable in court proceedings?	.326	66	.000
a. Lilliefors Significance Correction			

If the Expert Report Says That the Document or Signature is Forged, Do You Base Your Decision on That Expert Report?

Empirical results presented, showed that about 40.9% or 27 judges, claim that they almost always form a decision on the expert report if the expert says that the document is forged, 33.3% or 22 participating judges, claim that they do this action often, 18.2% or 12 judges, form a decision on the expert report from time to time, 1.5% or 1 judge forms the place rarely, while 6.1% or 4 participating judges, almost never form a decision if the expert report says that the document or signature is forged. From these results, it is observed that over 70% of judges have a greater care in forming decisions regarding expert reports when they claim that the document or signature is forged, over 18%, have an average care, while over 7%, have a more negligent attitude regarding the formation of the decision on this issue.

Table 10 presents descriptive statistics regarding the decision on the expert report. Based on the results, we note that the arithmetic mean is 4.02, the median is 4 and is close to the arithmetic mean, and the standard deviation is 1.102.

This table also shows the values with the lower and upper limits of the confidence interval for the 95% level, which are 3.74 and 4.29. The average of judges who form a decision when the expert in his report notes that the document or signature is forged in the population of judges of the general department, has a 95% chance of being somewhere in the interval 3.74 and 4.29.

The minimum values are 1, while the maximum values are 5, while the skewness value is -1.239 and the kurtosis is 1.258.

When the skewness coefficient is divided by the standard error of curvature 0.295, we obtain the value of curvature which is -4.2, while if we divide the kurtosis coefficient of 1.258 by the standard error of curvature 0.582, then the value of 2.16 is found.

Test was also performed , which tests whether the distribution is normal or not.

In this situation, Ho: The data distribution follows the normal distribution.

HA: The data distribution does not follow the normal distribution.

According to the 5% significance level, the value p=0.000<0.05 is an indication that the data are non-normally distributed.

From the skewness, kurtosis, and Kolmogorov-Smirnov test data, we can conclude that the data regarding the formation of the decision regarding the expert report does not have a normal distribution in the population of judges of the general department.

Forensic Examination of Documents and Manuscripts in Judicial Proceedings Is Important

Table No. 12 presents the frequency and percentage results regarding the perception of the importance of forensic expertise of documents and manuscripts in judicial proceedings.

The empirical results showed that about 60.6% of judges or 40 of them completely agree that forensic expertise of documents and manuscripts in judicial proceedings is important, 19.7% or 13 of the judges agree that expertise of documents is important, 13.6% or 9 judges, somewhat agree, 1.5% or 1 judge, disagree that expertise of documents is important, while 4.5% or 3 judges do not agree at all that expertise of documents is important. Despite the fact that expertise of documents is important in cases where a document is contestable, some of the judges consider that this is not important.

Table No. 13 presents descriptive statistics regarding the importance of forensic expertise of documents and manuscripts in judicial proceedings. Based on the results, we note that the arithmetic mean is 4.30, the median has a value of 5.00, which is a higher value than the arithmetic mean, and the standard deviation is 1.067.

This table also presents the values with the lowest and highest limits of the confidence interval for the 95% level, which are 4.04 and 4.57. The average of judges who consider forensic expertise of documents and manuscripts important in judicial proceedings, in the population of judges of the general department, has a 95% chance of being somewhere in the interval 4.04 and 4.57.

The minimum values are 1, while the maximum values are 5, while the skewness value is -1.661 and the kurtosis is 2.342.

When the skewness coefficient is divided by the standard error of curvature 0.295, we obtain the Fisher skewness value which is -5.63, while when we divide the Kurtosis coefficient by the standard error of curvature 0.582, we find the value of 4.02.

Test was also performed , which tests whether the distribution is normal or not.

In this situation, Ho: The data distribution follows the normal distribution.

HA: The data distribution does not follow the normal distribution.

According to the 5% significance level, the value p=0.000<0.05 is an indication that the data are non-normally distributed.

The skewness, kurtosis, and Kolmogorov-Smirnov test data suggest that the data regarding the importance of forensic expertise of documents and manuscripts in judicial proceedings do not have a normal distribution in the population of judges of the general department.

In Figure 3, we notice that the curve is asymmetric and is skewed to the left. Based on these data and the curve, we conclude that the data distribution is abnormal and negative.

Table 6. Frequency results regarding the forensic importance of documents and manuscripts in judicial proceedings

Forensic examination of documents and manuscripts in judicial proceedings is important				
	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
I don't agree at all.	3	4.5	4.5	4.5
I disagree.	1	1.5	1.5	6.1
I agree to some extent.	9	13.6	13.6	19.7
subscribe	13	19.7	19.7	39.4
I completely agree.	40	60.6	60.6	100.0
Total	66	100.0	100.0	

Table 7. Descriptive results regarding the forensic importance of documents and manuscripts in judicial proceedings

Descriptive statistics			
Forensic examination of documents and manuscripts in judicial proceedings is important		Statistics	Std. Error
Mean		4.30	.131
95% Confidence Interval for Mean	Lower Bound	4.04	
	Upper Bound	4.57	
5% Trimmed Mean		4.44	
media		5.00	
Variance		1.138	
Std. Deviation		1,067	
Minimum		1	
Maximum		5	
Range		4	
Interquartile Range		1	
Scans		-1.661	.295
Kurtosis		2,342	.582

Table 14. Normality test, regarding the forensic importance of documents and manuscripts in judicial proceedings

Tests of Normality			
	Kolmogorov-Smirnov [a]		
	Statistics	df	Sig.
Forensic examination of documents and manuscripts in judicial proceedings is important	.349	66	.000
a. Lilliefors Significance Correction			

Expertise of Documents and Manuscripts Can Play a Dominant Role in the Procedure

The empirical results presented in Table No. 15 showed that about 51.5% or 34 judges, fully agree that the expertise of documents and manuscripts can play a dominant role in the procedure, 33% or 22 judges agree that the expertise can play a dominant role, 10.6% or 7 of them somewhat agree that the expertise of documents and manuscripts can play a dominant role in the procedure, 3% or 2 judges, disagree and 1.5% or 1 judge completely disagree that the expertise of documents and manuscripts can play a dominant role in the procedure. It is well known that without scientific findings, it is not possible for the defendant to be convicted of forgery of documents, therefore the expertise of documents and manuscripts can play a dominant role in the procedure .

In table no. 16, descriptive statistics are presented, related to the statement: Expertise of documents and manuscripts can play a dominant role in the procedure . Based on the results, we note that the arithmetic mean is 4.30, the median has the value, 5.00, which is a higher value than the arithmetic mean value and the standard deviation is 0.894.

This table also presents the values with the lowest and highest limits of the confidence interval for the 95% level, which are 4.08 and 4.52. The average of judges who consider forensic expertise of documents and manuscripts to be predominant in judicial proceedings, in the population of judges of the general department, has a 95% probability of being somewhere in the interval 4.08 and 4.52.

The minimum values are 1, while the maximum values are 5, while the skewness value is -1.445 and the kurtosis is 2.239.

When the skewness coefficient is divided by the standard error of curvature 0.295, we obtain the value of curvature which is -4.9, while when we divide the kurtosis coefficient by the standard error of curvature 0.582, we find the value of 3.85.

Test was also performed , which tests whether the distribution is normal or not.

In this situation, Ho: The data distribution follows the normal distribution.

HA: The data distribution does not follow the normal distribution.

According to the 5% significance level, the value $p=0.000<0.05$ is an indication that the data are non-normally distributed.

The skewness, kurtosis and Kolmogorov-Smirnov test data suggest that the data related to the assertion that the expertise of documents and manuscripts can play a dominant role in the procedure does not have a normal distribution in the population of judges of the general department.

In Figure 4, we notice that the curve is asymmetric and is skewed to the left, which represents a non-normal and negative distribution.

Table 8. Frequency and percentage of results: Expertise of documents and manuscripts may play a dominant role in the procedure.

Expertise of documents and manuscripts can play a dominant role in the procedure	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
I don't agree at all.	1	1.5	1.5	1.5
I disagree.	2	3.0	3.0	4.5
I agree to some extent.	7	10.6	10.6	15.2
subscribe	22	33.3	33.3	48.5
I completely agree.	34	51.5	51.5	100.0
Total	66	100.0	100.0	

Table 16. Descriptive results: Document and manuscript expertise may play a dominant role in the procedure

Descriptives			
Expertise of documents and manuscripts can play a dominant role in the procedure		Statistics	Std. Error
Mean		4.30	.110
95% Confidence Interval for Mean	Lower Bound	4.08	
	Upper Bound	4.52	
5% Trimmed Mean		4.40	
media		5.00	
Variance		.799	
Std. Deviation		.894	
Minimum		1	
Maximum		5	
Range		4	
Interquartile Range		1	
Scans		-1.445	.295
Kurtosis		2.239	.582

Table 17. Normality test: Expertise of documents and manuscripts may play a dominant role in the procedure

Tests of Normality	Kolmogorov-Smirnov [a]		
	Statistics	df	Sig.
Expertise of documents and manuscripts can play a dominant role in the procedure	.297	66	.000
a. Lilliefors Significance Correction			

If The Expert Report Shows That the Document or Signature is Forged, We Do not Need Any Further Evidence Regarding the Documents

Based on the results presented in Table No. 18, we note that 7.6% or 5 judges completely agree that, if the expert report shows that the document or signature is forged, we do not need other evidence regarding the documents, 30.3% or 20 judges agree with this statement, 36.4% or 24 judges somewhat

agree, 18.2% or 12 judges disagree and 7.6% or 5 judges completely disagree that, if the expert report shows that the document or signature is forged, we do not need other evidence regarding the documents.

In table no. 19, descriptive statistics are presented, related to the statement that: If the expert report shows that the document or signature is forged, we do not need other evidence regarding the documents . Based on the results, we note that the arithmetic mean is 3.12, the median is less than the arithmetic mean, 3.00. and the standard deviation is 1.045.

This table also presents the values with the lower and upper limits of the confidence interval for the 95% level, which are 2.86 and 3.38. The average of judges who consider that If the expert report shows that the document or signature is forged, we do not need other evidence regarding the documents , in the population of judges of the general department, has a 95% chance of being somewhere in the interval 2.86 and 3.38. The minimum values are 1, while the maximum ones are 5, while the value of the skewness is -0.249 and the kurtosis is -0.396.

When the skewness coefficient of -0.249 is divided by the standard error of curvature of 0.295, we obtain the value of curvature which is -0.84, while when the Kurtosis coefficient of -0.396 is divided by the standard error of curvature of 0.582, then the value of -0.68 is found.

In Table No. 20, the results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov normality test are presented, which tests whether the distribution is normal or not.

The null hypothesis for this situation is: The data distribution follows a normal distribution.

HA: The data distribution does not follow the normal distribution.

The results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov normality test , for the 5% significance level, p-value=0.000<0.05, showed that the data are non-normally distributed.

The skewness, kurtosis, and Kolmogorov-Smirnov test data suggest that the data related to the statement: If the expert report shows that the document or signature is forged, we do not need any other evidence regarding the documents , have a non-normal distribution in the population of judges of the general department.

In Figure 5, we note that the curve has a slight asymmetry and presents a non-normal distribution.

Table 18. Frequency and percentage of results, related to the expert report and the need for further evidence

If the expert report shows that the document or signature is forged, we do not need any further evidence regarding the documents.				
	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
I don't agree at all.	5	7.6	7.6	7.6
I disagree.	12	18.2	18.2	25.8
I agree to some extent.	24	36.4	36.4	62.1
subscribe	20	30.3	30.3	92.4
I completely agree.	5	7.6	7.6	100.0
Total	66	100.0	100.0	

Table 19. Descriptive results, regarding the expert report and the need for further evidence

Descriptive			
If the expert report shows that the document or signature is forged, we do not need any further evidence regarding the documents.		Statistics	Std. Error
Mean		3.12	.129
95% Confidence Interval for Mean	Lower Bound	2.86	
	Upper Bound	3.38	
5% Trimmed Mean		3.13	
media		3.00	
Variance		1,093	
Std. Deviation		1,045	
Minimum		1	
Maximum		5	
Range		4	
Interquartile Range		2	
Scans		-.249	.295
Kurtosis		-.396	.582

Table 9. Normality test, related to the expert report and the need for further evidence

Tests of Normality			
	Kolmogorov-Smirnov [a]		
	Statistics	df	Sig.
If the expert report shows that the document or signature is forged, we do not need any further evidence regarding the documents.	.196	66	.000
a. Lilliefors Significance Correction			

Forensic Document Examinations Are Indisputable Evidence and Are Very Important in Creating Free and Professional Conviction for Decisions in Judicial Processes in Kosovo

The empirical results presented in Table No. 21 showed that about 45.5% or 30 judges completely agree that forensic document expertise is indisputable and very important evidence in establishing free and professional conviction for decisions in judicial processes in Kosovo, 37.9% or 25 judges agree, 9.1% or 6 of them somewhat agree and 7.6% or 5 of the participating judges do not agree at all that forensic document expertise is indisputable and very important evidence in establishing free and professional conviction for decisions in judicial processes in Kosovo. Based on these results, we note that the majority of judges have a high assessment of the importance of forensic document expertise for establishing free and professional conviction.

In table no. 22, descriptive statistics are presented, related to the statement that: Forensic document examinations are indisputable and very important evidence in creating free and professional conviction for decisions in processes . Based on the results, we note that the arithmetic mean is 4.14, the median is smaller than the arithmetic mean, 4.00. , while the standard deviation is 1.108.

This table also presents the values with the lowest and highest limits of the confidence interval for the 95% level, which are 3.86 and 4.41. The average of judges who consider that forensic document expertises are indisputable evidence and very important in creating free and professional conviction for decisions in judicial processes in Kosovo, in the population of judges of the general department, has a 95% chance of being somewhere in the interval 3.86 and 4.41.

The minimum values are 1, while the maximum values are 5, while the skewness value is -1.678 and the kurtosis is 2.575.

When the skewness coefficient is divided by the standard error of curvature 0.295, we obtain the value of curvature which is -5.688, while when the kurtosis coefficient of 2.575 is divided by the standard error of curvature 0.582, then the value of 4.4 is found.

In Table No. 23, the results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov normality test are presented, which tests whether the distribution is normal or not.

The null hypothesis for this situation is: The data distribution follows a normal distribution.

HA: The data distribution does not follow the normal distribution.

The results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov normality test , for the 5% significance level, p-value=0.000<0.05, showed that the data are non-normally distributed.

The skewness, kurtosis, and Kolmogorov-Smirnov test data suggest that the data related to the assertion that forensic document examinations are indisputable and very important evidence in establishing free and professional conviction for decisions in trials has a non-normal distribution in the population of judges of the general department.

In Figure 6, we note that the curve is asymmetric and is skewed to the left, which represents a non-normal and negative distribution.

Table 21. Frequency and percentage of results: Forensic expertise of documents and the creation of free and professional conviction for decisions in judicial processes in Kosovo.

Forensic document examinations are indisputable evidence that is very important in creating free and professional conviction for decisions in judicial processes in Kosovo.				
	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
I don't agree at all.	5	7.6	7.6	7.6
I agree to some extent.	6	9.1	9.1	16.7
subscribe	25	37.9	37.9	54.5
I completely agree.	30	45.5	45.5	100.0
Total	66	100.0	100.0	

Table 22. Descriptive statistics , related to forensic document expertise and the creation of free and professional conviction for decisions in judicial processes in Kosovo.

Descriptives			
Forensic document examinations are indisputable evidence and are very important in creating free and professional conviction for decisions in judicial processes in Kosovo.		Statistics	Std. Error
Mean		4.14	.136
95% Confidence Interval for Mean	Lower Bound	3.86	
	Upper Bound	4.41	
5% Trimmed Mean		4.26	
media		4.00	

Variance	1,227	
Std. Deviation	1.108	
Minimum	1	
Maximum	5	
Range	4	
Interquartile Range	1	
Scans	-1.678	.295
Kurtosis	2.575	.582

Table 10. Normality test, related to forensic document expertise and the creation of free and professional conviction for decisions in judicial processes in Kosovo

Tests of Normality			
	Kolmogorov-Smirnov [a]		
	Statistics	df	Sig.
Forensic document examinations are indisputable evidence that is very important in creating free and professional conviction for decisions in judicial processes in Kosovo.	.284	66	.000
a. Lilliefors Significance Correction			

References

Aaker A, Kumar VD, George S. 2000. Marketing Research. New York: John Wiley & Sons Inc.

Azemi, Bashkim&Remzi Bujari. 2013. Foundations of Research in Education, ISP, Prishtina.

Bartlett, JE, Kotrlik, IJW and Higgins, CC (2001). "Organizational Research: Determining the Appropriate Sample Size in Survey Research". *Information Technology, Learning and Performance Journal* 19 (1) 43-50.

Bell, E. and A. Bryman. 2007. The Ethics of Management Research: An Exploratory Content Analysis, British Journal of Management, Vol. 18, 63-77.

Cohen, L., Lawrence, M. & Marrison K. 2007. Research Methods in Education, sixth edition, London and New York: Routledge/Falmer.

Creswell, J., & Plano Clark, V. (2007). Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Fejzi Beqiri, Elda Maloku and Ahmet Maloku, 'Human Organs Trafficking: Perspective from Criminal Matters, Business and Human Rights' (2023) 4(21) Access to Justice in Eastern Europe. https://doi.org/10.33327/AJEE-18- 6.4-a000489.

Fraenkel, JK, & Wallen, NE (Eds.). (2003). How to design and evaluate research in education. The McGraw-Hill Company, Inc. New York.

George, D., & Mallery, P. (2003). SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference. 11.0 update (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Gorard 2003 in Cohen, L., Lawrence, M. & Marrison K. 2007. Research Methods in Education, sixth edition, London and New York: Routledge/Falmer.

Gratton, C. and I. Jones. 2010. Research methods for sports studies (second edition), by Routledge, USA and Canada.

Jasarevic, N. Osman & Maloku, Sh. Ahmet. 2021. Kriminologija (etiologija i fenomenologija kriminaliteta). Univerzitet u Travniku, pravni fakultet. Travnik,

Jasarević, N. Osman and Maloku, Sh. Ahmet (2021b). Krivično procesno pravo I i II, (opšti i posebni dio), Univerzitet u travniku, Pravni fakultet. Travnik.,.

Karović, S., Maloku, A., & Shala, S. (2020). Juvenile Criminal Law in Bosnia and Herzegovina With Reference to the Criminal Legal Position and Responsibility of Juveniles. Kriminalističke Teme, (1-2), 107-122. https://krimteme.fkn.unsa.ba/index.php/kt/article/view/205.

Maloku, A., Maloku, E. (2021). Fjalor i terminologjisë juridiko -penale për gazetarë. Kolegji Iliria, Prishtinë.

Maloku, A., Kastrati, S., Gabela, O., & Maloku, E. (2022). Prognostic scientific research in planning and successful management of organizations in the security sector. Corporate & Business Strategy Review, 3(2), 138–150. https://doi.org/10.22495/cbsrv3i2art12.

Maloku, A., Maloku, E. (2020). Protection of Human Trafficking Victims and Functionalization of Institutional Mechanisms in Kosovo. Acta Universitatis Danubius. Juridica, 16 (1), 21–44.

Schobar, Patrick, Christa Boer& Lothar A. Sch w arte . 2018. Correlation Coefficients: Appropriate Use and Interpretation, Anesthesia&Analgesia, 126 (5):1, pp: 1762-1768.

TELL Delaware Survey. 2013. Validity and Reliability Report. Santa Cruz.

Tomšik, Robert. 2019. Power Comparisons of Shapiro-Wilk, Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Jarque-Bera Tests, Scholars Journal of Research in Mathematics and Computer Science, 237-243.

Wellington, J. 2000. Educational Research: contemporary issues and practical approaches, London: Continuum.

Yamane, T. (1967). Statistics: An Introductory Analysis (2nd ed.). New York: Harper and Row.

Copyrights