


DENMARK'S GEORGIA PROGRAMME 2010-2013
PROMOTION OF JUDICIAL REFORM,
HUMAN AND MINORITY RIGHTS

დანის საქართველოს ჰიმოგამა 2010-2013
სასამართლო ხეფოხმის, ადამიანისა და
უმცოიხსობათა უფლებების ხელშეწყობა



Court Services' Quality Survey

Court User Satisfaction 2012



Survey Tasks


- ▶ Evaluation of general satisfaction level in final users
- ▶ Determination of users' degree of trust towards court system
- ▶ Identification of Key Performance Indicators (KPI), which will be verified over time
- ▶ Clear definition of need for changes and offering relevant steps to the court system
- ▶ Determination of satisfaction in specific target groups



Methodology and Survey Range

The survey was conducted in May 2012. 6 cities fell under the survey range

▶ Tbilisi	768
▶ Rustavi	242
▶ Gori	246
▶ Kutaisi	253
▶ Zugdidi	249
▶ Batumi	253



Methodology – Selection

- ▶ Number of respondents (court user): 2011
- ▶ Selection aberration 3%
- ▶ In view of recommendations of the European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice (CEPEJ), the following groups have participated in the survey:

Survey participant groups	Number
Claimant	448
Respondent	214
Defendant	106
Witness	158
Family member / relative / friend of any party	831
Person seeking public information or document	183
Expert / interpreter	9
Other (to attend hearing, intern, attendee, journalist, to write letter of gratitude, to correct military certificate, etc.)	62


Selection

Groups

Methodology – Selection


In view of specifics of survey it was crucial to interview all categories of court users

Category of Case	Number	%
Civil	909	45.2
Criminal	637	31.7
Administrative	359	17.9




Survey Tool

- ▶ The questionnaire developed in view of recommendations of the European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice (CEPEJ) was used as a survey tool
- ▶ The questionnaire consisted of introductory questions (8 questions), substantive questions (56 questions) and demographic questions (4 questions)
- ▶ Substantive questions were of valuation character, through which the respondent evaluated this or that aspect of court functioning on a 5–point scale. 1 stood for the worst evaluation, while 5 – for the best evaluation.




Key Findings – overall evaluation of services **4.5 points** on a 5–point scale

User satisfaction by various criteria




Key Findings

Comparison of courts by mean points




▶ Judges 4,4



Judges have lowest evaluation under the 'trust' sub-criterion

Under the 'trust' sub-criterion judges have the lowest evaluation in the Tbilisi and Batumi Courts, while the highest - in the Gori and Rustavi Courts, with 4,8 and 4,5 points respectively


Non-Judge Court Personnel 4,6



Non-judge court personnel received high appraisal

Lowest point – 4.4 was attributed to the non-judge personnel of the Tbilisi Court. The Tbilisi and Batumi Courts received comparatively low points under the personnel's professionalism sub-criterion – 4,3 and 4,2 points respectively.


Promptitude / Celerity 4,4



The users had biggest concerns about timeframes of handling the cases. This sub-criterion was evaluated at 4.3 points.

The Tbilisi Court received the lowest evaluation. The users' complaints concerned mainly the punctuality of court hearings and timeframes of handling the cases – 4,1 and 4,1 points respectively under the sub-criteria.


▶ Court Functioning 4,4



Similar to the evaluation of judges, the court functioning received lowest evaluation under the 'trust' sub-criterion – 4,1

Lowest points were awarded to the Tbilisi Court. 'Trust' sub-criterion was evaluated at 3,9 points, while the 'court transparency' – at 4,0 points.


General evaluations – has the respondent's impression changed after visiting the court?



33,3% of respondents have changed their minds about courts towards positive after visiting the courts. 49,4% have not changed their opinion about courts – out of which 39,8% had positive impressions before visiting the courts, while 9,6% – negative.

General evaluations


Over half of respondents (58.8%) is either very satisfied or satisfied with the quality of court services.



On a 5-point scale, general satisfaction with the court services was evaluated at 3,9 points.



General evaluations

Majority of respondents trusts the court



On a 4-point evaluation scale, the courts received average point closest to maximum – 3,3 for the 'trust' criterion. Under this parameter respondents were unable to evaluate the trust towards courts by an average index 3 – „neither trust and do not trust“ – accordingly, the highest evaluation equals 4.


General Evaluations – Level of Corruption



General Evaluations — Level of Corruption

Answers	Tbilisi (%)	Rustavi (%)	Gori (%)	Zugdidi (%)	Kutaisi (%)	Batumi (%)
Of course they take bribes	1,3	2,0		0,8	1,2	2,0
Some of them probably do, but the majority does not dare	4,4	2,9	2,0	2,0	2,8	9,5
Probably only individual judges do	9,1	2,9	0,4	6,0	4,3	10,3
Bribes are no longer taken in the Georgian courts	74,8	66,0	87,4	80,7	77,5	75,4
Don't know – have no answer	10,3	26,2	10,2	10,4	14,2	2,8

Comparison of Groups by General Evaluations – Trust



Respondents, in whose favor the courts have ruled, have bigger trust in courts than those, against whom the courts have ruled.

Respondents, who have to deal with courts in respect of criminal cases, have the lowest degree of trust in courts.


Comparison of Groups by General Evaluations – Trust

- ▶ The young trust the courts more than persons over 45 years of age
- ▶ Difference was identified by sex as well: women have less trust in courts than men
- ▶ 14,7% of unemployed respondents and 19,3% of pensioners think the courts are not trustworthy or more untrustworthy, when this index among the employed respondents equals 11,8%.



Comparison of Groups by General Evaluations – Corruption

- ▶ Mostly the respondent party and defendants believe that judges take bribes in Georgia. Overall, 15,9% of respondents, and 13,1% of defendants do not rule out the individual cases of bribe-taking by judges. In other groups this index does not exceed 10%.
- ▶ Differences by types of cases are not vivid, but small difference was identified: fewer respondents, who have to deal with criminal cases, believe that judges no longer take bribes in Georgia (73,5% – criminal, 76,9% – civil, 81,1% – administrative).
- ▶ Remarkably, the respondents, who have attended hearings in last 1 year, are less reserved in answering and more of them assume individual cases of bribe-taking by judges – 13,7% and 7,2% respectively.
- ▶ A court decision has a significant impact on the respondents' answer to question – do the judges take bribes? While 81,7% of respondents, in whose favor the courts have ruled, believe that bribes are no longer taken in Georgia, only 65,5% of those respondents, against whom the courts have ruled, share the same opinion.



Key Conclusions

- ▶ Quality of services received high evaluation in the target courts – 4,5 points
 - ▶ Quality of the court services is of key importance to the users – 4,9 points
 - ▶ Category of case and the user's status influences the evaluation of courts
 - ▶ Employment status of users has impact on the evaluation of courts
 - ▶ Users of young age evaluate courts more positively than the users of middle and old age
- 