

# Forensic Handwriting and Signature Examination

## Group Skill Profile Certificate

*for participant*

*All profiled qualified government examiners*

Years:

2000, 2001, 2002

Total number of opinions expressed: 32770

Score	Definition
# Correct	Number of opinions expressed in support of a proposition when the proposition was true.
# Correct Unqualified	As above for unqualified opinions only.
# Correct Qualified	As above for qualified opinions only.
# Misleading	Number of opinions expressed in support of a proposition when the proposition was not true.
# Misleading Unqualified	As above for unqualified opinions only.
# Misleading Qualified	As above for qualified opinions only.
# Inconclusive	Number of opinions expressed that were inconclusive.
% Correct	Percentage of opinions expressed in support of a proposition when the proposition was true.
% Misleading	Percentage of opinions expressed in support of a proposition when the proposition was not true.
% Inconclusive	Percentage of opinions expressed that were inconclusive.
% Correct Called	Opinions expressed in support of a proposition, when the proposition was true, as a percentage of all opinions supporting a proposition (inconclusive opinions not considered).
% Misleading Called	Opinions expressed in support of a proposition, when the proposition was not true, as a percentage of all opinions supporting a proposition (inconclusive opinions not considered).
% Misleading Unqualified Called	As above for unqualified opinions only.
% Misleading Qualified Called	As above for qualified opinions only.

**Table 1.** Authorship opinion unit scores for all opinions expressed in the trials for handwritten text samples according to questioned writing type and opinion level strength.

Questioned Writing Type	Opinion Scores					Total
	# Correct Unqualified	# Correct Qualified	# Inconclusive	# Misleading Qualified	# Misleading Unqualified	
Normal by specimen writer	3117	75	17	0	0	3209
Disguised by specimen writer	267	422	579	12	10	1290
Simulated by specimen writer	375	136	288	11	0	810
Normal not by specimen writer	1633	2077	1314	5	0	5029
Disguised not by specimen writer	821	1188	2048	3	2	4062
Simulated not by specimen writer	185	648	1227	29	11	2100
						16500

**Table 2.** Authorship opinion unit scores for all opinions expressed in the trials for handwritten text samples according to questioned writing type.

Questioned Writing Type	Opinion Scores							
	# Correct	# Misleading	# Inconclusive	% Correct	% Misleading	% Inconclusive	% Correct Called	% Misleading Called
Normal by specimen writer	3192	0	17	99.5	0.0	0.5	100.0	0.0
Disguised by specimen writer	689	22	579	53.4	1.7	44.9	96.9	3.1
Simulated by specimen writer	511	11	288	63.1	1.4	35.6	97.9	2.1
Normal not by specimen writer	3710	5	1314	73.8	0.1	26.1	99.9	0.1
Disguised not by specimen writer	2009	5	2048	49.5	0.1	50.4	99.8	0.2
Simulated not by specimen writer	833	40	1227	39.7	1.9	58.4	95.4	4.6

**Table 3.** Authorship opinion unit scores for all opinions expressed in the trials for signature samples according to questioned signature type and opinion level strength.

Questioned Signature Type	Opinion Scores					Total
	# Correct Unqualified	# Correct Qualified	# Inconclusive	# Misleading Qualified	# Misleading Unqualified	
Normal by specimen writer	3312	720	160	0	1	4193
Disguised by specimen writer	276	562	1567	4	4	2413
Simulated not by specimen writer	1424	866	7347	25	2	9664
						16270

**Table 4.** Authorship opinion unit scores for all opinions expressed in the trials for signature samples according to questioned signature type.

Questioned Signature Type	Opinion Scores							
	# Correct	# Misleading	# Inconclusive	% Correct	% Misleading	% Inconclusive	% Correct Called	% Misleading Called
Normal by specimen writer	4032	1	160	96.2	0.0	3.8	100.0	0.0
Disguised by specimen writer	838	8	1567	34.7	0.3	64.9	99.1	0.9
Simulated not by specimen writer	2290	27	7347	23.7	0.3	76.0	98.8	1.2

**Table 5.** Percentage scores for misleading opinions by opinion strength, and inconclusive opinions, for handwritten text according to questioned writing type.

Questioned Writing Type	% Opinion Scores				
	Inconclusive	Misleading	Misleading Called	Misleading Qualified Called	Misleading Unqualified Called
Normal by specimen writer	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Disguised by specimen writer	44.9	1.7	3.1	1.7	1.4
Simulated by specimen writer	35.6	1.4	2.1	2.1	0.0
Normal not by specimen writer	26.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0
Disguised not by specimen writer	50.4	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1
Simulated not by specimen writer	58.4	1.9	4.6	3.3	1.3

Questions regarding the La Trobe University Forensic Expertise Profiling Program should be directed to Dr Bryan Found.

Email: [b.found@latrobe.edu.au](mailto:b.found@latrobe.edu.au)

**Table 6.** Percentage scores for misleading opinions by opinion strength and inconclusive opinions, according to questioned signature type.

Questioned Signature Type	% Opinion Scores				
	Inconclusive	Misleading	Misleading Called	Misleading Qualified Called	Misleading Unqualified Called
Normal by specimen writer	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Disguised by specimen writer	64.9	0.3	0.9	0.5	0.5
Simulated not by specimen writer	76.0	0.3	1.2	1.1	0.1



Bryan Found BSc DipEd GradDipNeurosci PhD RFP (ANZFSS)  
Head  
Forensic Expertise Profiling Laboratory



Douglas Rogers BSc (Hons) PhD  
Director  
Handwriting Analysis and Research Laboratory



Bundoora, Victoria 3086 Australia