



USAID | **BOSNIA-HERZEGOVINA**
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

BOSNIA JUSTICE SECTOR DEVELOPMENT PROJECT II

Report of Short-Term Public Opinion Survey
Expert as per USAID JSDP II Year 3 Work Plan
Section 3.2.1

Date: **May 2012**

This publication was produced for review by the United States Agency for International Development. It was prepared by: JSDP II

Report of Short-Term Public Opinion Survey
Expert as per USAID JSDP II Year 3 Work Plan
Section 3.2.1

DISCLAIMER:

The author's views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development or the United States Government.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	5
2. General Public Survey	7
2.1. Methodology	7
a) Selection of the Primary Sampling Units.....	7
b) Selection of the HH Unit.....	8
c) Selection of the respondent	8
2.2. Data Instrument – Questionnaire	8
2.3. Budget Consideration	11
3. Interim Survey 1 – “Judiciary + Partners”	13
3.1. Qualitative dimension.....	13
3.2. Quantitative dimension	15
3.3. Budget Consideration	15
4. Interim Survey 2 – “Court Clients Survey”	16
4.1. Methodology	16
4.2. Selection of Courts and Sample Size.....	16
4.3. Questionnaire	17
4.4. Budget Consideration	17
5. OMNIBUS survey.....	18
6. ANNEX A – General Public Questionnaire	19
6.1. BiH: Mass Public 2012.....	19
6.2. General Section	19
6.3. Trust Module.....	21
6.4. Transparency Module	23
6.5. Understanding of corrupt transactions	24
6.6. Evaluation of Judicial System	26
6.7. Experience with Judiciary & Civil Society	28
6.8. Corruption Perceptions	31
6.9. SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC MODULE	32
7. ANNEX B – Questionnaire for Judges/Prosecutors.....	33
8. ANNEX C – Court Client Survey – general public.....	39

Table of Acronyms

BiH	Bosnia and Herzegovina
CAPI	Computer Aided Personal Interviews
CEA	Census Enumeration Areas
FG	Focus Groups
HH	Household
IDI	In Depth Interview
JSDP II	Justice sector Development Project II
NGO	Non Governmental Organization
PMP	Performance Monitoring Plan
PSU	Primary Sampling Units
TOR	Terms of Reference
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
VC	Voting Center

1. Introduction

The following report is based on the ToR for “Public Opinion Expert” defined by JSDP II. According to the ToR the report should develop a plan for *i) A General Public Opinion Survey* and *ii) Two Interim Surveys* with the following objectives:

1. Contribute to the Project Performance Monitoring
2. Inform on current state of public opinion on judiciary
3. Shape future actions of the project

The design of surveys was carefully considered with the following in mind:

- USAID JSPD II has conducted a general public survey in year I of operation (2010). Such a survey would serve as a baseline for certain measurable indicators.
- Additional indicators have to be designed to reflect certain changes in project activities and PMP.
- The designed indicators/ measurements for project impact are dependent on several targeted groups which have different levels of involvement, knowledge, expertise and interest on the areas of project interventions. The following relevant groups are considered:
 - General Public
 - Court Clients/Users
 - Judges/Prosecutors
 - NGOs
- There should be Quantitative and Qualitative dimensions for the surveys so that more in depth information is collected as to “Why?” and “How?” rather than just “How much?” As such Focus Groups and In-depth interviews have been proposed for certain target groups.
- While the project is mostly interested in opinions and experiences about Judiciary, a more comprehensive view of population towards *institutions (formal and informal), social attitude towards different issues, understanding and awareness of different phenomena*, is needed to make a better analysis and interpretation of results. The Questionnaire has been designed along these lines.
- The General Public Survey should be representative of the population so that assurance of accuracy is given within the margin of error calculated.
- The surveys should be designed to be cost-effective using as much as possible project resources/mechanisms already in place.

The document below presents the options of surveys and for the most important ones it presents also the data collection instruments/questionnaires. While these instruments cover

most of the issues related to the JSDP work they are still subject of change from the JSDP staff review and piloting phase.

Note: *The Questionnaires presented are in draft form. They need some work before they become ready- to-deploy instruments for fieldwork. Firstly, there is a need for a general review by JSDP II staff of the structure and issues covered. Then there is a need for a CODING frame for the questionnaire and finally a piloting phase (5-6 interviews) would give the last insights on what needs to change.*

2. General Public Survey

2.1. Methodology

While it is not clearly stated in the 2010 survey report, it appears that the sampling acquired during the first mass public survey has been a “Quota Sampling”. In other words, enumerators fill pre-determined quota on Gender and Age as they conduct the fieldwork. Such a sampling is called Non-Probability sampling which avoids random selection. Non-probability sampling may or may not represent well the whole population but the issue is that it is hard to know how well this sampling does so (it is difficult to calculate the margin of error). With **random probability sampling** we are at least able to calculate the odds that we have represented the population well. Probability sampling means that each subject has the same probability of being selected in the survey.

To correct for previous wave we propose a **stratified random sampling** to have an accurate representation of the population.

There are 3 steps to ensure this representation:

1. Selection of Primary Sampling Units
2. Selection of the Household (HH) unit
3. Selection of the person within HH as a respondent

a) Selection of the Primary Sampling Units

- Universe of the survey is composed by either “Voting Centers” (VC) or “Census Enumeration Areas” (CEA) as Primary Sampling Units (PSU). It is important to have **either voters’ number** per center (VC) or **population number** per enumeration area (CEA). This parameter will serve to design the algorithm for selection of Primary Sampling units.
- Universe is stratified by
 - a. Firstly i) Federation of Bosnia & Herzegovina, ii) Republika Srpska and iii) Brcko District
 - b. Secondly i) Urban and ii) Rural
- Based on an algorithm that takes into account also the “density” of VC/CEA through voters’/population number, randomly select between 70-100 PSU where the survey will be conducted.
- In each PSU conduct between 10-15 interviews using Random Route Method (described below)

Needed: A full list of voting centers in B&H with number of voters and designated geographical area or a full list of Census Enumeration Areas (CEA) with population numbers.

b) Selection of the HH Unit

In the area covered by the randomly generated voting center/census enumeration area, the households will be selected based on the method Random Route Sampling which is a classic method used there, where proper listing of residents are missing. This method requires strict following of the procedures and rules (Starting point, rule of the left hand, every third door) and as a result of these procedures, we have a sample, which will comply with the highest representativeness requirements.

c) Selection of the respondent

Once a private household has been located, the respondent will be randomly selected using the **nearest birthday method**. The respondent should be of age from 18+ years old, normally living in the private household whose birthday is nearest to the date of contacting. The birthday method is a rigorous method of respondent selection. However, if used on its own, without sufficient call backs, it results in under-sampling of younger people and over-sampling of older people, simply because younger people are less likely to be available. To account for this, the enumerators will ensure that whilst using the birthday method, they will also conduct a sufficiently high number of call backs (going back to the house to find the right respondent). Up to 3 times interviewers should attempt to find the eligible respondent to ensure that the expected impact on survey contact rates and response rates was minimal.

2.2. Data Instrument – Questionnaire

The questionnaire has been designed after close discussion with JSDP II component leaders to define project intervention areas, impacts to be measured, target groups to be surveyed, formulations to be used etc.

- **General Section**

This section “opens the discussion” with the respondent and asks for the most difficult problem the country is facing at the moment, asks about satisfaction with life in general, tries to understand the sources of information for news that people are using and has a specific battery of 3 questions which aim to measure the level of SOCIAL TRUST in the B&H society. The index created by these questions can be used to see the differences in opinions in the forthcoming questions of the questionnaire but it is also an important finding *per se*.

- **Trust Module**

Trust module has been designed to give the project information on the level of trust towards different institutions and society groups. Unlike the baseline survey (2010), we are proposing a scale of 1 to 7 for evaluation of TRUST where 1 means “No Trust at all” and 7 means “A lot of Trust”. We believe such a scale gives the respondents more freedom to “score” trust and the project more possibilities for capturing nuances between different institutions. However, comparison with the 2010 survey is possible through a scale conversion.

There is a list of institutions/societal groups proposed for evaluation by the public but the JSDPP II project staff has to check, adjust and/or confirm the list.

A question about “Safety” perception has been added in this module followed by a hypothetical situation where the respondent is asked about this trust in judiciary if he/she is a victim of an assault.

A battery of questions is also presented in this module regarding the efforts of different parts of Judiciary and other partners in the fight against corruption. The JSPD II staff can evaluate if this is something in line with what they see the survey producing or remove the section from the questionnaire.

This section would produce important data to construct an overall **Public Trust Index** towards institutions.

- **Transparency Module**

This section is similar to Trust but now respondents are asked about their perceptions for Transparency of different institutions. An explanation of “Transparency” notion is given to the respondent.

The list of institutions to be asked has to be checked and confirmed by JSDP II staff.

This section will produce a **Public Transparency Perception Index**.

- **Understanding of corruption transactions**

This is a section proposed in addition having in mind that there should be some understanding of the public tolerance towards corruption/nepotism/favoritism and overall understanding of the phenomena. This is important especially for a Rule of Law project. Different scenarios are given to the respondent to evaluate parties in a “corrupt” transaction. Scenarios include also judges.

The data would provide a comprehensive view of the nuances of corruption among general public and would provide the project information on what kind of awareness campaign and messages to design in this regard.

- **Perception Evaluation of Judiciary**

This section goes more in depth in perception about impartiality of courts and prosecutors, factors that influence their decision based on perception of people, evaluation from the point of view of citizens of professionalism and qualification of judges etc. What is important in this section is the “perspective”, respondents are asked to give opinions about these issues. For each of the evaluation issues they have to compare with 3 years ago and give an opinion if there is i)improvement, ii)stagnation or iii)regress.

The question about the “single most important role of judiciary”¹, used in the first survey wave is not included in the questionnaire for this wave. The formulation of this question may create confusion in interpreting results. As it stands, it obliges the respondent to make a choice on the roles of judiciary that are not comparable in principle, in terms of the “social threats” they (general public) believe judiciary should resolve. In other words, there are different “coordination systems” in comparing “fight against crimes” versus “enforcement of contracts” because in theory “public order” is higher in the ranks compared to “enforcement of contracts” or other things (as an immediate social threat perceived). In the battery of JS5 & JS6 respondents evaluate several dimensions of judiciary in B&H and the ranking of these dimensions would indicate the areas for more intervention/improvements.

On the issue of “public awareness” for judiciary reforms underway,(measured in the first survey wave through questions about specific activities in judiciary such as trainings to judges or prosecutors, examination of judicial appointments etc.) it is our opinion that being too specific on reform activities risks having very low “awareness” level from the public. General public may not be aware of the activities conducted in judiciary, but they are able to evaluate the system overall based on their experiences or perceptions. Consequently, we recommend using these specific activities “awareness” questions in the survey/focus groups for judges and/or prosecutors as well as NGOs dealing with judiciary but not with general public.

- **Experience with Judiciary & Civil Society**

This section gather info to explore the experience with Judiciary in order to create a possibility to distinguish between those who have had a direct experience with the judiciary and those who have just a perception about it (it is our opinion that perceptions even if not based on experience, matter a lot as they shape the overall behavior of society actors).

On the other hand this section gathers also info on the engagement of citizens with civil society organizations, reasons for not being engaged and also on the opinion of citizens on how well the different groups of civil society are doing in having an impact on society.

- **Corruption Perceptions**

In this section respondents are asked to evaluate the Integrity of different institutions/society groups. Judicial system is part of the evaluation and could be compared with other institutions according to the people perceptions.

An overall Integrity Index can be calculated along with a **Judiciary Integrity Index**.

¹ The question looks the following: What is the single most important role of the judicial system? (pick one)- 1) to fight organized crime, corruption, juvenile delinquency, 2) to help in vindication of my property rights, 3) to boost economic development through effective enforcement of contracts, 4)to promote reconciliation through credible war crimes, 5) to hold government accountable, 6) to protect citizens’ rights from unlawful exercise of power by the state

JSDP II staff has to check and confirm the list of institutions presented.

- **Socio-Demographic Module**

This is an important module which should provide the needed socio-demographic module. The needed variables are:

1. Gender
2. Age
3. Education
4. Occupation
5. Social Grade (different countries have different models to evaluate the social grade of the respondent. In absence of such a scale in Bosnia a scale of “Family Income” should be included in order to position the respondent according to the “wealth” in the society)
6. Ethnicity – very important variable for analysis
7. Etc.

Recommended parameters

Sample Size	-	N=1000
Method	-	Face to face
Length of Interview	-	30 minutes

2.3. Budget Consideration

The consideration for the budget should be the following:

1. The cost for the fieldwork should be the same as the previous survey approximately
2. There are two options for analysis

Option A – Create a clear analysis framework which should be followed by the research company when producing the report - Cost for preparing such an analytical framework

Option B- the research company delivers clean dataset (SPSS or STATA) based on an agreed data map and project itself conducts the analysis!

Recommendation – Option B

Estimation: \$ 10 000 – \$18 000 USD (dependent on parameters of survey and options for analysis)²

² This is just estimation with the current level of knowledge and should be indicative only! Project can itself make more accurate estimations.

3. Interim Survey 1 – “Judiciary + Partners”

There are several issues mentioned by the JSDP II PMP that need “qualified judgment” of judges and/or prosecutors. In 2010 the project conducted also a survey of Judiciary “professionals” which included judges, prosecutors, expert associates, ministry employees, lawyers etc. In total 47 respondents. The size is too small and too spread among different subgroups (**judges** vs. **lawyers** vs. **ministry employees** vs. **NGOs**) to statistically quantify answers. For this wave we propose a combination of Qualitative and Quantitative methods.

Qualitative methods would help the project get deeper understanding of the issues expressed by members of the judicial system. These issues relate to priorities of interventions, needs assessments, evaluation of the different mechanisms of the system, evaluation of performance from different actors within the system, evaluation of specific legal and policy issues from a “qualified” perspective etc. The value of Focus Groups is that it may focus deeply into answering questions that start with WHY? and HOW COME?

3.1. Qualitative dimension

We propose:

1. **Focus groups with judges** – about 4-5 Focus Groups (FG) with judges from different layers of the system. Each FG would have between 10-12 judges. The focus groups would be moderated by JSDP II staff through a specific “moderation guide” in order to extract opinions of Judges for issues of interest. The discussions should be max between 1.5-2 hours long and there should be taken good care that there is a system to record the discussion in order to be able to analyze it afterwards. This can be accomplished by either using audio/video recording or through a careful note-taking by at least two trained note-takers in the meeting, in case it is felt that audio/video recording may impact negatively the discussions.

It is important to have “judges only” environment so that the project can get “harmonized opinion” on issues it wants to explore. Usually discussion environments with members of the same group creates a much more relaxed and in depth discussion of issues as the participants feel part of the same “front”.

In total about 40-60 judges would have participated in this exercise.

2. **Focus groups with prosecutors** – Same organizations as for the judges FG. 4-5 FG with prosecutors from different offices and jurisdictions. Specific “moderation guide” used which could be similar to that of judges but also with section to prosecutor’s related work. In total between 40 and 60 prosecutors would have participated.

3. **Focus groups with NGO representatives-** between 2-3 FGs with NGO representatives (a total of 20-30 NGO representatives in total). This exercise could tackle discussions about some direct justice system issues but could also explore and gather information about creating the “NGO sustainability” index. It is in such an environment (10-12 people) that each sub-index of the “NGO sustainability” will be given not just a “score” but discussed as well to explain the score. This is the best way to have “scores” with illustrations.

Use a “moderation guide” for justice system evaluation from the NGO point of view and a **“moderation guide” for constructing the NGO sustainability index** (the latter is ready structured by following the NGO sustainability index structure/evaluation).

4. **In depth interviews with Entity Ministries of Justice and State Ministry of Justice.** Between 15 and 20 in depth interviews with this group would provide useful information regarding strategies, priorities, evaluation of issues and problems of the system, etc. A discussion guide should be developed along the lines the JSDP seeks information. Again, audio recording or careful note-taking is crucial for this exercise.

Each FG and in-depth interview would have its own “transcript” of discussion which then needs to be analyzed. The structure of analysis should follow the structure of “moderation guide” and should be accompanied with conclusions from discussions and also illustration points. Differences of opinions among groups (Judges vs. Prosecutors) should be highlighted.

Organizing such an exercise might be useful because along the discussion for exploring issues JSDP II project can use these groups to also convey/communicate messages from the project point of view (at the end of FG so that the discussion is not impacted) and have a direct link with interested groups.

To summarize:

Target group	Method	Nr	Notes
Judges	Focus Group Discussion	4-5 FGs (40-60 judges)	Can be organized and moderated by JSDP staff. Moderation guide needed, recording or careful note-taking, analysis of “transcripts” for final report. If there is “buy in” from courts and prosecutors office and efficient organization with 2-3 moderators from the project the whole exercise can be finished in 1 month!
Prosecutors	Focus Group Discussion	4-5 FGs (40-60 prosecutors)	
NGOs	Focus Group Discussion	2-3 FGs (20-30 NGOs)	
Entity/ State Ministries	In depth interviews	15-20 IDIs	

3.2. Quantitative dimension

Powerful combination of data can be reached if at the end of each FG (judges +Prosecutors+ NGO representatives) a small questionnaire is distributed for self filling by participants. The questionnaire would provide a way to “quantify” albeit not entirely in a statistical way, some of the most important issues regarding the functioning of the judiciary. It will provide a structure to indicate with numbers the ranking, priorities and evaluation of issues.

A 10-15 minute self-filling anonymous (no name, no any indication that could identify the participant) questionnaire distributed.

The results should be combined with qualitative findings of the FGs/IDIs!

3.3. Budget Consideration

This survey could be conducted significantly through Project resources

The costs involved would be:

1. Finalizing the Moderation Guides and the Questionnaires to be handed over to FGs participants. Such a guide should reflect all the issues each component of the project wants to address in such forums to gauge information from targeted groups.
2. Staff to organize the Focus Groups meetings
3. Staff to moderate the FGs
4. Logistical costs (Renting premises for focus groups, refreshments, etc)
5. Transcribing the discussions
6. Distributing and collecting the filled forms
7. Data entry of the forms
8. Analysis of Qualitative and Quantitative parts.

Expertise might be required just in initial design phases and potentially in analysis of the data/FGs/IDIs

4. Interim Survey 2 – “Court Clients Survey”

A Court User/Client Survey can be design to collect direct experience data regarding the functioning of the court, behavior of judges and court employees, evaluation of different aspects of court procedures etc. Overall this would be a “client satisfaction survey” which would give the project and the courts themselves first hand insights on what the users think about their work.

4.1. Methodology

“Court clients” for the purposes of the survey are:

1. General public /Users of the Court
2. Lawyers/Prosecutors /Users of the Court

Dependent on the availability of funds this can be either:

1. Face to face interviews with users of the court (waiting for them as they go out of the court) through trained enumerator. The selection would be based on a system to ensure randomness.
2. Self-filled questionnaires handed to the users with instructions.
3. CAPI (**Computer Aided Personal Interviews**) with users that go out of the courts. We would encourage this method as it is efficient and allows for quick analysis. Surveys can be designed through an online tool (either Survey Monkey or a self designed online questionnaire) which would be accessed on the spot at the court area through computers/laptops. There is a possibility that the form is filled under a “*cache*” regime and then when the computer/laptop is linked with Internet it is synchronized into a central database.

These two groups are different and the questionnaire has to reflect these differences.

4.2. Selection of Courts and Sample Size

Dependent on the availability of funds and willingness of courts to participate that survey can be conducted in as a many local and district courts as it is possible.

However it is important to have the courts participate voluntarily in the survey (allow access of enumerators in needed, allow the posters for survey information in the premises, allow the forms to be distributed, allow CAPI stations etc)

For each court that participates in the survey there should be a minimum of 100 forms filled by court clients. Fewer forms can be accepted if there is a structured random selection of court clients.

4.3. Questionnaire

Questionnaire would include questions on

- Satisfaction with the court functioning
- Evaluation of the work done during proceedings by the judge and court staff
- Evaluation of court premises
- Evaluation of court documents
- Evolution of attitude of parties in the proceedings
- Evaluation of the judgment (by lawyers and prosecutors only)

Length of the survey should not be more than **10-15 minutes** in total.

A draft Questionnaire is presented as Annex C. However once it is decided to go for a court client survey, the draft questionnaire should be finalized with the input from Court Administration and through piloting.

4.4. Budget Consideration

Even this survey can be conducted significantly through project resources potentially with outside expertise during Analysis phase. Activities that will incur costs to the project:

1. Finalizing the data collection form. Based on discussions within the JSDP project and also exploring the issues with court administration people.
2. Getting approval from courts to conduct the survey in their premises
3. Printing forms & or programming the forms in CAPI format in a dedicated computer in court premises (a dedicated computer in the hall of the court to be accessed by users)
4. Printing posters and leaflets to inform users about the possibility of the survey
5. Some assistance in the ground during the filling of the forms
6. Data entry (if physical forms)
7. Analysis

5. OMNIBUS survey

Omnibus surveys if available in B&H can provide a good mechanism for measuring public opinions on current issues of interest for the project. Omnibus survey allows for “reserving” just few questions and collecting information in a fast and low-cost manner.

Usually the company that conducts Omnibus provides also the section for socio-demographic questions (Gender, Age, Occupation, Social Grade etc). In other words, the JSPD II can “order” just the questions it is interested in and the company should in principle provide the results along with cross-tabulation for socio-demographic variables.

Usually the costs for Omnibus vary between **200-400 Euros/per question** in a national sample Omnibus survey. However, the JSDP II should find out what options are there for Omnibus in B&H.

Omnibus surveys are especially good when **measuring public opinion on policy issues of the moment (currently part of public discussion agenda).**

6. ANNEX A – General Public Questionnaire

6.1. BiH: Mass Public 2012

Identification of the Qnr. (ID. Of the Qnr, Entity, District, ID of PSU, Town/Village/Commune etc)

Starting Time: _____

Mr./Ms.: a) I am an interviewer from _____ a research firm. We are conducting a public opinion survey about different aspects of the situation in the country. You have been randomly selected to be interviewed and we would kindly ask you to collaborate with us. Your answers are confidential. We are interested in your opinion as you are part of the general public.

6.2. General Section

<p>A1. To begin with, in your opinion what is the most difficult problem the country is facing at the moment? [Do not read the options. Categorize the answers after you have noted down what the respondent said]</p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;">(01) Economical Problems</td> <td style="width: 50%;">(02) Inflation, high prices</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(03) Unemployment</td> <td>(04) Poverty</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(05) Delinquency, crime, violence</td> <td>(06) Popular unrest (strikes, road blocks, revolts, etc.)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(07) Processing of War Crimes</td> <td>(08) Changes to political stability</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(09) Environmental Problems</td> <td>(10) Drug Trafficking</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(11) Corruption</td> <td>(12) Traffic of Human Beings</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(13) Bad Governance</td> <td>(14) Migration</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(15) Fight against Terrorism</td> <td>16) Emigration</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(18) Public Services</td> <td>(19) Road infrastructure</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(20) Electricity</td> <td>(21) Water</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(0) Don't know</td> <td>(22) Other</td> </tr> </table>	(01) Economical Problems	(02) Inflation, high prices	(03) Unemployment	(04) Poverty	(05) Delinquency, crime, violence	(06) Popular unrest (strikes, road blocks, revolts, etc.)	(07) Processing of War Crimes	(08) Changes to political stability	(09) Environmental Problems	(10) Drug Trafficking	(11) Corruption	(12) Traffic of Human Beings	(13) Bad Governance	(14) Migration	(15) Fight against Terrorism	16) Emigration	(18) Public Services	(19) Road infrastructure	(20) Electricity	(21) Water	(0) Don't know	(22) Other	A1	
(01) Economical Problems	(02) Inflation, high prices																							
(03) Unemployment	(04) Poverty																							
(05) Delinquency, crime, violence	(06) Popular unrest (strikes, road blocks, revolts, etc.)																							
(07) Processing of War Crimes	(08) Changes to political stability																							
(09) Environmental Problems	(10) Drug Trafficking																							
(11) Corruption	(12) Traffic of Human Beings																							
(13) Bad Governance	(14) Migration																							
(15) Fight against Terrorism	16) Emigration																							
(18) Public Services	(19) Road infrastructure																							
(20) Electricity	(21) Water																							
(0) Don't know	(22) Other																							
<p>Make a note if there is Other _____</p>																								

Now, changing the subject...

<i>How often do you? ...</i>	Everyday	Once or Twice per week	Rarely	Never		
A2. Listen to the news on the radio	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	A2	
A3. Watch the news on television	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	A3	
A4. Read news in the newspapers	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	A4	
A.5 Read/Watch news on Internet	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	A5	

<p>SATIS1. On another subject, in general, to what extent do you feel satisfied with your life? Would you say that you are? [Read alternatives]</p> <p>(1) Very satisfied (2) Somehow satisfied (3) Somehow Unsatisfied (4) Very Unsatisfied (8) Do not know</p>	SATIS1	
---	---------------	--

<p>TRUST1. Now, about the people here, Would you say that people from your neighborhood in general are: [Read alternatives]</p> <p>(1) Very trustworthy (2) Somewhat trustworthy (3) Little trustworthy (4) not at all trustworthy (8) Do not know</p>	TRUST1	
<p>TRUST2 Do you think that most of the time people worry only about themselves or do they try to help others?</p> <p>(1) They worry about themselves (2) try to help the others (8) Do not know</p>	TRUST2	
<p>TRUST3. Do you think that most people, if given the opportunity, will try to take advantage of you or do you think that they would not?</p> <p>(1)Yes , they would take advantage (2) No, they would not take advantage (8) Do not know</p>	TRUST3	

6.3. Trust Module

[Give Card “A” to the interviewee]

Now we will use a new card. This card contains a scale of 7 points; each one indicates a point that goes from 1 that means **NOT AT ALL** to 7 that means **A LOT**. For example, if I asked “up to what point do you like watching TV” if you do not like watching TV at all, then you would choose point 1 but on the contrary, if you really like watching TV a lot then you would choose number 7. If your opinion is somewhere between nothing and a lot then you would choose a number in the middle. Then, up to what point do you like watching TV? Please, read me the number **[Make sure that the interviewee understands correctly]**.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
NOT AT ALL						A LOT	Do not know

Now using card “B” please answer these questions

SYS1. In general, to what extent do you think that BiH Courts guarantee citizens a fair trial?	SYS1	
SYS2. To what extent do you trust Prosecutors in general?	SYS2	
SYS3. To what extent do you trust Judges in general?	SYS3	
SYS4. To what extent do you trust the Parliament?	SYS4	
SYS5. To what extent do you trust the state and entity level government	SYS5	
SYS6. To what extent do you trust your Local/Municipal Government?	SYS6	
SYS7. To what extent do you trust the Prosecutor’s Office?	SYS7	
SYS8. To what extent do you trust the Police?	SYS8	
SYS9. To what extent do you trust religious leaders?	SYS9	
SYS10. To what extent do you trust political parties?	SYS10	
SYS11. To what extent do you trust your Local/Municipal/Basic Court?	SYS11	
SYS12. To what extent do you trust your District/Cantonal Court?	SYS12	
SYS13. To what extent do you trust the B&H State Court?	SYS13	
SYS14. To what extent do you trust media (Newspapers & TV & radios?)	SYS14	
SYS15. To what extent do you trust trade unions?	SYS15	
SYS16. To what extent do you trust NGOs/Civil Society Organizations in BiH	SYS16	

SYS17. To whom would you rather entrust your case (governmental/public institution or non-governmental organization) related to:

Field	Governmental/Public institution	Non-governmental organization
Provision of free legal aid	1	2
Protection from domestic violence	1	2
Reporting corruption	1	2
Reporting mobbing	1	2
Protection from discrimination	1	2
Media reporting	1	2

SYSS1. Talking about the place or neighborhood where you live and also thinking about the possibility of you being victim of an assault or theft, Do you feel very safe, somewhat safe, somewhat unsafe or very unsafe? (1) Very safe (2) Somewhat safe (3) Somewhat unsafe (4) Very unsafe (8) DK	SYSS1	
SYSS2. If you were victim of an assault, how much would you trust the Judicial System to punish the criminal? [Read options] (1) A lot (2) Some (3) A little (4) Nothing (8) Do not know/do not answer	SYSS2	

Using the same scale of 7 points [CARD B], please answer the following questions. To what extent do you think the following organizations or individuals help to fight corruption?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
NOT AT ALL				A LOT			Do not know

COR2. To what extent do you think the Prosecutor's Office helps to fight corruption?	COR2	
COR3. The Local/Municipal courts?	COR3	
COR4. The District/Cantonal courts?	COR4	
COR5. Civil Society organizations/NGOs?	COR5	
COR6. Police?	COR6	
COR7. The media?	COR7	
COR8. Religious Leaders?	COR8	

6.4. Transparency Module

Now we will talk about transparency in various governmental institutions. By transparency we mean permitting citizens and the mass media access to information that would enable them to hold public institutions accountable. Do you think that the following institutions are very transparent, somewhat transparent, or not transparent?

<p>TRAN1. How transparent is your local/municipal government? 1. Very Transparent 2. Somewhat transparent 3. not transparent (8) DK/NA</p>	TRAN1	
<p>TRAN2. How transparent is the Entity Parliament???? 1. Very Transparent 2. Somewhat transparent 3. not transparent (8) DK/NA</p>	TRAN2	
<p>TRAN3. The State Government? 1. Very Transparent 2. Somewhat transparent 3. not transparent (8) DK/NA</p>	TRAN3	
<p>TRAN4. The Local/Municipal Courts? 1. Very Transparent 2. Somewhat transparent 3. not transparent (8) DK/NA</p>	TRAN4	
<p>TRAN5. The District/Cantonal Court 1. Very Transparent 2. Somewhat transparent 3. not transparent (8) DK/NA</p>	TRAN5	
<p>TRAN6. The Prosecutor's Office 1. Very Transparent 2. Somewhat transparent 3. not transparent (8) DK/NA</p>	TRAN6	
<p>TRAN7. The NGOs/Civil Society Organizations 1. Very Transparent 2. Somewhat transparent 3. not transparent (8) DK/NA</p>	TRAN7	

6.5. Understanding of corrupt transactions

In daily life, many things occur. I will mention some of them. Please indicate how you consider the behavior of the following people:		
<p>AOC1. For example: A minister accepts a bribe of ten thousand dollars paid by a business enterprise. Do you consider that the minister is: [Read alternatives]</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Corrupt and must be punished 2. Corrupt but justified 3. Not Corrupt (8) Don't know 	AOC1	
<p>AOC2. And what do you think of the business enterprise that paid the bribe to the minister. In your opinion this behavior is: [Read alternatives]</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Corrupt and must be punished 2. Corrupt but justified 3. Not Corrupt (8) Don't know 	AOC2	
<p>AOC3. A mother of several children needs to obtain a birth certificate for one of her children. Not to waste time waiting, she pays the public official ??? B. marks. Do you think what the mother did was: [Read alternatives]</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Corrupt and must be punished 2. Corrupt but justified 3. Not Corrupt (8) Don't know 	AOC3	
<p>AOC4. And the public official who accepted the bribe was: [Read alternatives]</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Corrupt and must be punished 2. Corrupt but justified 3. Not Corrupt (8) Don't know 	AOC4	
<p>AOC5. An elementary school student, hoping to get a better grade, gives a shirt as a gift to a teacher. In your opinion the student is: [Read alternatives]</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Corrupt and must be punished 2. Corrupt but justified 3. Not Corrupt (8) Don't know 	AOC5	
<p>AOC6. The teacher who accepts the gift, in your opinion is:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Corrupt and must be punished 2. Corrupt but justified 3. Not Corrupt (8) Don't know 	AOC6	
<p>AOC7. A public official uses a vehicle of the government that is only for official use, to take his/her family on vacation to a beach resort. In your opinion this official is :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Corrupt and must be punished 2. Corrupt but justified 3. Not Corrupt (8) Don't know 	AOC7	

<p>AOC9. During the holidays a flower store owner raises the price of flowers. Do you think that the owner of the store is:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Corrupt and must be punished 2. Corrupt but justified 3. Not Corrupt (8) Don't know 	ACO9	
<p>AOC10. An unemployed person is the brother-in-law of an important politician, and he uses his influence to get him a job in the public sector. Do you think the politician is:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Corrupt and must be punished 2. Corrupt but justified 3. Not Corrupt (8) Don't know 	ACO10	
<p>AOC11. A party in a court process gives the judge a gift/money in order to have a decision according to the applicable law (NOT asking the judge to make a decision AGAINST the law). Do you think the judge is</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Corrupt and must be punished 2. Corrupt but justified 3. Not Corrupt (8) Don't know 	AOC11	
<p>AOC12. The person who gave the judge the gift/money is</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Corrupt and must be punished 2. Corrupt but justified 3. Not Corrupt (8) Don't know 	AOC12	

6.6. Evaluation of Judicial System

<p>JS1 Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statement:</p> <p>In my opinion judges are impartial in conducting trial procedures and they make their decisions based on objective application of the law [Read alternatives]</p> <p>1) Strongly Agree 2) Somewhat Agree 3)Somewhat Disagree 4) Strongly Disagree 8) Don't know/No response</p>	<p>JS1</p>	
<p>JS2. On a scale from 1-10 where 1=no influence and 10=influence a lot, how much do you think each of the following factors affect the outcome of trials?</p> <p>JS2.1 The facts and applicable law in each case []</p> <p>JS2.2 Political considerations/Interventions []</p> <p>JS2.3 Personal connections of the judges []</p> <p>JS2.4 Business connection of the judges []</p> <p>JS2.5 Monetary consideration (payment of money to affect the outcome) []</p>		
<p>JS3. In talking now about Prosecutors, please indicate your level of agreement with the following statement</p> <p>Prosecutors are impartial in handling cases and prepare indictments based on the legal process</p> <p>1) Strongly Agree 2) Somewhat Agree 3) Somewhat Disagree 4) Strongly Disagree 8) Don't know/No response</p>	<p>JS3</p>	
<p>JS4. On a scale from 1-10 where 1=no influence and 10=influence a lot, how much do you think each of the following factors affect the outcome of indictment/case?</p> <p>JS4.1 The facts and applicable law in each case []</p> <p>JS4.2 Political considerations/Interventions []</p> <p>JS4.3 Personal connections of the prosecutors []</p> <p>JS4.4 Business connection of the prosecutors []</p> <p>JS4.5 Monetary consideration (payment of money to affect the outcome) []</p>		

Now, I will ask about your opinion for several issues related to judiciary in B&H and how would you compare these issues to 3 years ago.

JS5. On a scale from 1 to 10 where **1=Very Low** and **10=Very High**, based on current situation how would you rate the following:

JS6. In your opinion, compared to 3 years ago, has this situation improved, stayed the same or worsened?

	Current evaluation	Compared to 3 years ago (2010)
	1= Very Low 10= Very High	1=Improved 2=Same 3=Worsened
Independence of Judiciary	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	1 2 3
Transparency of Judiciary	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	1 2 3
Capacity to fight organized crime	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	1 2 3
Capacity to fight corruption	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	1 2 3
Professionalism of judges	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	1 2 3
Qualification of judges	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	1 2 3
Efficiency of trials in terms of timing	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	1 2 3
Processing of war crime trials	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	1 2 3
Protection of Labor rights (from judiciary)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	1 2 3
Protection of Property Rights	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	1 2 3
Access to free legal aid	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	1 2 3
Enforcement of Contracts and Business Law	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	1 2 3
Effectiveness of juvenile justice system? (TBD)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	1 2 3
Discrimination by courts (any discrimination based on ethnicity/gender/vulnerable groups etc)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	1 2 3

EJ6. For the following organizations, do you use services or receive benefits, participate as a member, employee, volunteer, or donate money or goods?

EJ6.1 Advocacy groups promoting human rights, transitional justice, environment, etc.	1. Yes 2. No
EJ6.2 Service-providing groups concerned with health, children, the disabled, housing, training, etc.	1. Yes 2. No
EJ6.3 Cultural or recreational groups active in fine arts, folklore, sports, other leisure, etc.	1. Yes 2. No
EJ6.4 Church or religious organization	1. Yes 2. No
EJ6.5 Foundations	1. Yes 2. No
EJ6.6 Professional or business association	1. Yes 2. No

Interviewer, please fill the following table based on the information above. If the respondent has answered “Yes” at least for one type of organizations above, circle 1=Yes. If the respondent has answered NO for all types of organizations above, circle 2=NO

EJ7. Engaged in some form	1. Yes 2. No
---------------------------	-----------------

If 1=Yes GOTO EJ8
If 2=No GOTO EJ7/1

EJ7/1. Why do you not participate in the work of NGOs in some form? Could you please give me your main reasons for it? (MULTIPLE CHOISE)

EJ7/1.1 Lack of visibility of NGOs (I am not aware of NGOs implementing activities important to me or my community)	1. Yes 2. No
EJ7/1. 2 No interest on the part of NGOs (I offered help but the NGO did not show interest in accepting the assistance)	1. Yes 2. No
EJ7/1.3 Bad image of NGOs (I think NGOs are concerned with their own finance rather than the needs of citizens)	1. Yes 2. No
EJ7/1.4 I don't have the time to work with NGOs or their constituents	1. Yes 2. No
EJ7/1.5 Other (please state): _____	

EJ8. Based on what you know or might have heard/read, how would you evaluate these civil society groups on a scale from 1 to 7 where 1=Very ineffective and 7=Very effective. Please think of “effectiveness” in terms of how well they are fulfilling their mission and impact on society/members.

EJ9. Thinking about the past 3 years and the impact on society and/or their members, do you think these civil society organizations are nowadays stronger, the same or weaker than they were 3 years.

	EJ8							EJ9	
Advocacy groups promoting human rights, transitional justice, environment, etc.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1.stronger	99.DK
Service-providing groups concerned with health, children, the disabled, housing, training, etc.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1.stronger	99.DK
Cultural or recreational groups active in fine arts, folklore, sports, other leisure, etc.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1.stronger	99.DK
Church or religious organization	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1.stronger	99.DK
Foundations	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1.stronger	99.DK
Professional or business association	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1.stronger	99.DK

6.8. Corruption Perceptions

[Use card "D"] Now, I will name various public and private institutions. I am interested to know how Corrupt or honest do you think the representatives of these institutions are. Please, rate each one of them from 1 to 10, 1 being very Honest and 10 very Corrupt.

INSTITUTIONS	Levels of Corruption												
	Very Honest					Very Corrupt					DN		
PC1. The Parliamentarians	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(88)	PC1	
PC2. The Mayors	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(88)	PC2	
PC3. The ministers of national government	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(88)	PC3	
PC4. The ministers of entity government	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(88)	PC4	
PC5. The policemen	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(88)	PC5	
PC6. The university professors	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(88)	PC6	
PC7. The religious leaders	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(88)	PC7	
PC8. The judges	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(88)	PC8	
PC9. The military	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(88)	PC9	
PC10. The leaders of the political parties	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(88)	PC10	
PC11. The leaders of the NGOs	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(88)	PC11	
PC12. The prosecutors	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(88)	PC12	
PC13. Doctors	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(88)	PC13	
PC14. The Media	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(88)	PC14	
PC16. The Customs Officials	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(88)	PC16	
PC17. The Tax Officials	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(88)	PC17	
PC18. Business people	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(88)	PC18	
PC19. Public school teachers	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(88)	PC19	

[Collect Card D]

6.9. SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC MODULE

This module will be based on models already used for B&H surveys. However it should include the following:

ETHNICITY

GENDER

AGE

EDUCATION

OCCUPATION

SOCIAL GRADE

7. ANNEX B – Questionnaire for Judges/Prosecutors

COURTLEVEL TO WHICH COURT DO YOU BELONG? _____ (1 Local Court (2) District Court (3) State High Court (4) Other (specify)	COURTID	

We would kindly ask you to collaborate with us. Your answers are confidential and will be aggregated, not identifying your responses nor those of any other judge.

CAR1. I would like to ask you about your professional career. In which year were you appointed judge/prosecutor for the first time? _ _ _ _ _	CAR1	
CAR2. And for how many years have you held the current post? _____	CAR2	
CAR3. In which year did you graduate as a lawyer? _ _ _ _ _	CAR3	
CAR4. In which university? (TBD) _____ 4. Abroad, (specify) _____ 5. Other, (Specify) _____	CAR4	

<p>A1. To begin with, in your opinion what is the most serious problem the Judiciary in B&H is facing at the moment? [Do not read the options. If more than one, code the most important]</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>	<p>A1</p>	
<p>STEP. To your opinion what would be the number one step/action that should be taken to improve your work as a Judge/Prosecutor?</p> <p>_____ (Text)</p> <p>(CODIFY LATTER)</p>	<p>STEP</p>	

Consider the resources that you need to do your daily work. Below there is a list a series of resources that can be important for carrying out your work. On a scale from one to ten, in which one means “not at all satisfied” and ten means “extremely satisfied,” how satisfied do you feel about the quality of and access to . . . ?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	(Do not know=88)	
Not at all satisfied							Extremely satisfied				
REC01. The physical space in the offices you occupy										REC01	
REC02. The personnel that collaborate with you										REC02	
REC03. Office equipment and supplies (computers, type-writers, stationery)										REC03	
REC05. The information available on jurisprudence and legal topics										REC05	
REC06. Your current remuneration										REC06	
REC07. The remuneration of your employees										REC07	
REC08. The workload										REC08	

<p>REG3. Are you very satisfied, somewhat satisfied or not at all satisfied with the current evaluation system for judges?</p> <p>(1) Very satisfied (2) Somewhat satisfied (3) Not at all satisfied (8) Don't know / No response</p>	<p>REG3</p>	
<p>REG4. Are you aware of how judges' performance is assessed?</p> <p>(1) Yes (2) No (8) Don't know / No response</p>	<p>REG4</p>	

?????		
?????		

<p>PER1. What would help you improve your performance? [Do not read list.] (1) better staff (2) salary increase (3) training (4) improved facilities/equipment (5) improved case management (7) Other (specify) _____ (8) DK</p>	PER1	
<p>PER2. Could you please indicate the most important type of training judges should receive? [Do not read list.] (1) Legal reasoning (2) continuing / legal education as new laws are passed (3) Training on ratified international conventions (4) Better judicial training before graduation in substantive areas of the law, such as bankruptcy and arbitration. (7) Other (specify) _____ (8) DK</p>	PER2	
<p>PER3. Could you please indicate the most important type of training court staff should receive? [Do not read list.] (1) Computer skills (2) time management (3) basic knowledge of how judicial systems work (4) Stenography (7)Other (specify) _____ (8) DK</p>	PER3	
<p>PER8. How would you rate the performance of most judges in B&H/Your Entity/Your District????? ? (1) Very Good (2) Good (3) Fair (4) Bad (5) Very poor (8) Don't know / No response (9) Inappropriate</p>	PER8	
<p>PER. How would you rate the performance of most prosecutors B&H/Your Entity/Your District?????</p>		
<p>PER9. In general, how would you rate the performance of lawyers B&H/Your Entity/Your District????? ? (1) Very Good (2) Good (3) Fair (4) Bad (5) Very Bad (8) Don't know / No response</p>	PER9	
<p>PER10. In general, how would you rate the performance of court staff in B&H/Your Entity/Your District????? (1) Very Good (2) Good (3) Fair (4) Bad (5) Very Bad (8) Don't know / No response</p>	PER10	
<p>PER11. How would you rate your own performance? (1) Very Good (2) Good (3) Fair (4) Bad (5) Very Bad (8) Don't know / No response</p>	PER11	
<p>PER12. Do you consider yourself overworked?</p>	PER12	

(1) Yes (2) No (8) Don't know / No response		
PER13. Has your performance ever been evaluated by the court system evaluation authority? (1) Yes	PER13	

On a scale from 1 to 10 where 1 = **Very poorly** and 10=**Very well** please answer the following

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	(Do not know=88)	
Very poorly											Very well

PCJ1. How well do you think judges are perceived by the public?	PCJ1	
PCJ2. How well do you think lawyers are perceived by the public?	PCJ2	
PCJ3. How well do you think prosecutors are viewed by the public?	PCJ3	

On the same scale where 1= **NOT AT ALL** and 10 = **Very Common** what do you think of the following:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	IDO1 (Do not know=88)
Not at all common					Very common					

PCJ4. How common is it for some B&H court administration staff to be willing to accept or request bribes?	PCJ4	
PCJ6. How common is it for some B&H judges to be willing to accept or request bribes to influence their decisions?	PCJ6	
BRO1. Do litigants approach you with bribe offers? (1) Yes (2) No (8) Don't know / No response	BRO1	
BRO2. Do lawyers approach you outside of court to influence your decisions? (1) Yes (2) No (8) Don't know / No response	BRO2	
BRO3. Do you think corruption in judiciary is more of a problem in our country now than 3 years ago? (1) More	BRO3	
TRA14. Has your family integrity or that of a family member ever been threatened when rendering legal decisions? (1) Yes (2) No (8) Don't know / No response	TRA14	

COURT. Could you please rate on a scale from 1 to 5 where 1 is minimum and 5 is maximum the following aspects of your court?

1. Fairness	Court1	
2. Competency of Judges	Court2	
3. Competency of Administrative Staff	Court3	
4. Transparency	Court4	
5. Efficiency	Court5	

Could you please look at the issues listed in the table below and based on your opinion?

1) Evaluate the importance of each issue on a scale from 1 to 5 where
1=Not at all important and 5=very important

2) Pick the most important issue among those listed

Issue	How important is it? 1=Not at all 5=Very Important				Most important (pick one)
Strengthening the independence of the judiciary	1 5	2	3	4	1
Improving capacity of judiciary to fight organized crime	1 5	2	3	4	2
Improving capacity of judiciary to fight corruption	1 5	2	3	4	3
Harmonizing laws with international standards for EU integrations	1 5	2	3	4	4
Harmonizing laws and sentencing across entities	1 5	2	3	4	5
Introducing mechanisms for alternative dispute resolution in utility cases	1 5	2	3	4	6
Improving the juvenile justice system	1 5	2	3	4	7
Improving access to free legal aid	1 5	2	3	4	8
Ensuring non-discrimination by courts	1 5	2	3	4	9
Processing of war crime trials	1 5	2	3	4	10

Court documents (summons, letters)	1	2	3	4	5
Availability of information on litigation in general	1	2	3	4	5
Judges' activities in general	1	2	3	4	5
Court staff functioning in general	1	2	3	4	5
Availability of information on court proceedings	1	2	3	4	5
Attitude of court staff towards court clients	1	2	3	4	5
Length of trials	1	2	3	4	5

Q8. How much do you agree with these expressions on courthouse and premises?					
Choose only one answer in each line!	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	don't know
Security checks at the court house are kind and correct	1	2	3	4	5
Working hours of court administration are adequate	1	2	3	4	5
It was easy to find my session room	1	2	3	4	5
There are enough signs to find everything	1	2	3	4	5
Waiting areas ensure privacy (for example, the victim does not have to meet the offender)	1	2	3	4	5

Q9. How much do you agree with these expressions on court documents?					
<i>Choose only one answer in each line!</i>	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	don't know
I received documents sent by court (summons, letters, etc.) in due time	1	2	3	4	5
Documents sent by court were easy to understand	1	2	3	4	5
Decision (judgment) was easy to understand	1	2	3	4	5

Q10. How much do you agree with these expressions on functioning of court staff?					
<i>Choose only one answer in each line!</i>	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	don't know
Court staff is easy to contact over the phone	1	2	3	4	5

Court staff is kind	1	2	3	4	5
Court staff is helpful	1	2	3	4	5
I received answers to all my questions from court staff	1	2	3	4	5
Court staff is interested in helping me	1	2	3	4	5
Court session started at the time it was supposed to	1	2	3	4	5

Q11. How much do you agree with these expressions on judge's activities?					
<i>Choose only one answer in each line!</i>	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	don't know
Judge explains agenda of the session	1	2	3	4	5
Judge comes prepared for the session	1	2	3	4	5
Judge reports on the situation of the case	1	2	3	4	5
Judge is impartial towards both parties	1	2	3	4	5
Judge is competent	1	2	3	4	5
Judge understands circumstances of the case	1	2	3	4	5
Judge talks in plain language	1	2	3	4	5
Judge listens to different opinions	1	2	3	4	5
Directions given by judge to parties of case are clear and make sense	1	2	3	4	5
Basis of court judgement is clear and makes sense	1	2	3	4	5
Judge explains the court decision and consequences thereof	1	2	3	4	5
Judge explained how the case is going to be treated after session	1	2	3	4	5
In general I believe the court is just	1	2	3	4	5