Asian Development Bank
Public Opinion Surveys on Judicial Independence and Accountability
RETA 6063

Country Report: Cambodia

Submitted by

The Asia Foundation
September 2004

**[The Asia Foundation submits this report in partnership with its implementing
local polling institution, the Cambodia-Center for Advanced Study.]**

Table of Contents

Annexes
Annex 1: Additional tables
Annex 2: Construction of SES dummy
Annex 3: Questionnaire

List of Tables

I. Survey Methodology

1. Introduction

With the sponsorship of the Asia Foundation, a Public Opinion Survey on Cambodia's Judicial System was organized and conducted under the supervision of the Cambodia-Center for Advanced Study. Using a standard survey instrument developed in partnership with international consultants, Roger Henke and Hean Sokhom were responsible for directing the study.

Location
The survey covered all of Cambodia by way of a sampling scheme based on the following geographical areas: the Coastal zone, Central Cambodia, Eastern Cambodia, the highlands, and the Northwestern zone.

Timetable
The fieldwork took place over a three week period from 22 August 2003 until 13 September 2003.

2. Sampling

Sample size and error margins
The indicator of data quality used is the standard error of the estimate. Survey statistics are mostly proportions, which means that the key measure of data precision is the standard error of a proportion taken from a sample. Its formula is:

$$\pm Z * \sqrt{\frac{p(1-p)}{n}}$$

Z = 1,96 (confidence level 95%)
p = sample proportion estimate
n = sample size

For the overall sample size of 816 respondents this means that the maximum error margin at a 95% confidence level, assuming a simple random sampling design, is approximately ± 3.5%. However, somewhat higher error margins are expected because the sampling design is not simple but multi-stage. The associated design effect is not readily measurable through established statistical software. Margins increase when disaggregating the data. For a background variable like sex or educational level which splits the total sample into two equal sub samples the margin of error increases to 5%. The smaller the sub sample, the larger the margin of error. This needs to be taken into account when interpreting the data.

Sampling scheme
The sampling scheme was subcontracted to staff of the National Institute of Statistics. A two-stage stratified Simple Random Sampling Without Replacement design has been used for the study. The Primary Sampling Unit was the village and 70 were selected. The sample of villages yields the sample of households and respondents of 18 years of age

and older to be interviewed. The sample of villages was constructed proportionally (i.e. according to the NIS population projections for 2003 based on the 1998 census). The sampling scheme was constructed in such a way that sets of two villages within one commune were selected. Within each village 12 households were selected. On site household selection was done on the basis of village maps, choosing a random starting point and taking a 5 housing unit interval. Within the household, the sex stratified selection of the adult member to be interviewed was done using the random methodology of Kish Grid maps.

The above mentioned constraints underlying the sampling frame (i.e. a relatively limited number of 68 PSUs, sets of two villages within the same commune, and 12 respondents per village) were pragmatic choices that cut down travel time and thereby enabled the team to interview a sufficiently large sample of respondents with the resources available to make the data representative with an acceptable margin of error. These constraints, however, did compromise the urban/rural composition of the sample. Urban areas were somewhat over-sampled: Cambodia's actual urban population average is 17% urban households, while the sample urban average is 30% urban households[1]. Although this compromise is unfortunate from the perspective of full representativeness of the data, it has the advantage that on the basis of our sample we can say something sensible about the rural/urban differences with acceptable margins of error.

The table below gives the sample distribution of PSUs and respondents.

Table 1: Sample distribution of PSUs and respondents

	Registered Households			Sample Villages			Sample respondents		
	Urban	Rural	Total	Urban	Rural	Total	Urban	Rural	Total
Banteay Meanchey	18201	102730	120931	2	4	6	24	48	72
Battambang	25248	139023	164271	2	6	4	24	72	96
SiemRiep	19954	107026	126980	2	5	7	24	60	84
Kampong Cham	7940	305797	313737	2	15	17	24	180	204
Mondolkiri	1243	3852	5095	1	1	2	12	12	24
Kampot	6007	99803	105810	2	4	6	24	48	72
Sihanoukville	29314	0	29314	2	0	2	24	0	24
Subtotal	35321	99803	135124	4	4	8	48	48	96
Phnom Penh	94028	74388	168416	6	4	10	72	48	120
Kandal	10111	192944	203055	2	8	10	24	96	120
Subtotal	104139	267332	371471	8	12	20	96	144	240
TOTAL	212046	1025563	1237609	21	47	68	252	564	816
	17%	83%	100%				30%	70%	100%

3. Research methodology

---

[1] In data analysis, an even higher proportion of respondents is classified as urban because all Phnom Penh respondents, also those living in the 4 villages that were categorized as rural in the 1998 Census, are included in the urban category. Given the access to urban facilities in these outskirts a rural classification seemed a distortion of reality to the team.

Questionnaire design

The main core of the questionnaire was designed in a collaborative effort with research partners from Thailand, Indonesia, the Philippines, and Sri Lanka to ensure international comparability of the data set. This process was facilitated by two international consultants, Erik Jensen of Stanford Law School/The Asia Foundation (US) and Mahar Mangahas of Social Weather Stations (Philippines) and was based on a conceptual scheme of efficiency and legitimacy indicators for opinion research on systems of justice, developed by José Juan Toharia (Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Spain). The questionnaire design followed an iterative process with consecutive drafts produced by Mahar Mangahas. Each participating country localized this common core, both in terms of target and background variables and included some additional questions focused on country specific conditions and interests. CAS, in consultation with The Asia Foundation Cambodia added questions on:

- Expectations regarding the relative weight of position, wealth, and personal connections in influencing court decisions.
- Perceptions regarding the corruptability of courts in comparison with other government agencies.
- Events that are perceived as examples of true justice and clear injustice, not directly related to the court.
- A set of questions on the prestige of professions, including judges and lawyers.
- A set of questions on the expected fairness of the outcome of different conflict resolution options, such as involving elders in the village, petitioning the Royal Palace, or going to court.
- A question to probe ideas about ways to improve courts' performance.

Pre-testing and Training of data collectors

The draft was pre-tested on 12 respondents, 6 in urban Phnom, 6 in rural Kandal, 6 males, and 6 females. The respondents were mainly selected on the basis of being uneducated because that background characteristic was expected to influence respondents' understanding of the questions to the largest extent. The major objective of the pretest was to adjust wording for maximum comprehension among respondents. Other pre-test objectives were to:

- Determine the time necessary for the interview

- Find out which items are conceptually vague

- Check the accuracy and adequacy of the questionnaire instructions

- Determine whether the focus of the questions are clear

- Identify interviewers' recording difficulties

Before the pre-test a first interviewer training was organized. Objectives of the training were to:

- Familiarize the team members with the format of the questionnaire, including the interrelationships between various questions;
- Ensure good understanding of the exact meaning of all questions and answer codes, including probing options and understanding of the relevance of each question in light of the general objectives of the survey;
- Ensure good understanding of how to record the information and opinions received.
- Remind team members (all were experienced data collectors from CAS regular pool of enumerators) of proper behavior in the field.

The training confirmed the research coordinators' intuition that phrasing of questions was going to be of major importance. Members of the data-collection team, all of whom have university degrees and considerable experience in household and opinion surveys, faced difficulties in conceptually grasping some of the issues. Because of this, the training also served as a pre-test on a highly educated sample of respondents and through intensive group discussions many of the phrasings were adjusted.

The training made ample use of role-plays. Two team members played the roles of interviewer and interviewee, while the others listened and recorded the answers individually. After the role play team members exchanged their work and verified each others' questionnaires. Mistakes were counted and recorded for each individual from one role-play to another. This procedure enabled the trainer to spot and work on the weaknesses of each enumerator and provided an objective indicator of both individual and group improvement. A mistake free last round at the end of the training is regarded as the first step in the process of quality control of the field work. Post pre-test another day of discussion and training was needed to consolidate the final Khmer version of the questionnaire.

It was apparent that many questions, even with the best possible wording, would remain difficult to understand, especially for uneducated, rural respondents. This meant that interviewers would have to use alternative wording, splitting the question into two constituent parts, each of which could be separately checked for respondent understanding, before being combined into the original question. Ultimately, if even this technique did not generate the necessary conceptual understanding[2], the interviewer would need to have non-guiding examples available that could be used to facilitate understanding. However, these examples had to be standardized across interviewers to avoid bias. If one data collector approached these kinds of probes in a different way from the next data collector, answers would not be comparable because respondents would not have been asked the question in the same way. Designing effective probing questions and reaching consensus on their use was part of the training and evaluation of the pre-test results.

4. Data-collection and data-entry

---

[2] Obviously, if the problem is lack of factual knowledge, what is called 'awareness' of the issue at hand, the data collector can score for that. However, before concluding that a 'Don't know' answer actually reflects lacking awareness a check on the conceptual grasp of what is being asked is in order.

Survey team and supervision

The team consisted of 12 member: two teams consisting of five enumerators and one supervisor each. The size of the teams enabled the supervisor to sit in on approximately two interviews per enumerator per three days, making for a high number of observed interviews (approximately 20%). In addition to the regular supervision, the research coordinator conducted one spot check and was in near daily telephone contact with the team members. The supervisors also ensured proper execution of the household sampling procedures and uniform application of probing procedures.

Quality control

Supervision is crucial, but only one aspect of quality control. Other elements included:

❑ The questionnaire contained detailed interviewer instructions, spelling out what to do;
❑ Where relevant, the interviewer training included concrete examples for non-suggestive probing and where possible, these were included in the instructions mentioned above;
❑ Field editing: each enumerator was required to check the completeness of the questionnaire before leaving the household. A second check was performed by the supervisor, and if necessary, the enumerator was sent back to clarify or complete the information required.

Interview time

The estimated interview time per questionnaire was one hour. In practice, because of the need to use probing techniques for many of the questions, especially in rural areas, the average interview time turned out to be close to an hour and a half.

Data entry and cleaning

The data entry template was written by the research coordinator and data entry, including the normal double entry procedure, was done in-house. Extensive logical checks and cross-tabulation checks were executed to ensure a clean data-set. The strict quality control procedures applied (see above) enabled the inclusion of all questionnaires collected in the dataset. This means that the number of interviews conducted equals the sample number of the resulting dataset.

II. Background Variables

1. General overview

The sample population's knowledge and opinions can be expected to differ along the lines of various background characteristics of the respondents. The background characteristics of respondents included in the data-set are:

❑ *Location of the Household/respondent*

The total sample was split into a rural and an urban sub-sample and the urban sub-sample was split again into two, Phnom Penh and other cities[3]. The rationale for doing this was twofold. First, the 1998 census uses this categorization and Cambodian poverty incidence calculations are based on different poverty-lines for each of these three areas. Also, the Phnom Penh population differs in several respects from the general urban averages (e.g. in their access to educational facilities, media information, etc). And secondly, the rural/urban split makes sense because only urban locations have courts, but among the urban locations, Phnom Penh is unique because it is also the seat of the Appeal Court, the Supreme court, and the Military court.

❑ *Sex*

Females and males

❑ *Age*

The questionnaire recorded respondents' ages in five year categories[4], but for analytic purposes the sample was divided into three aggregated categories: 18-29 year olds, 30-44 year olds, and 45 and older.

❑ *Educational attainment*

The questionnaire recorded respondents' educational attainment in two ways. The highest level education was scored on a ten-category scale and by way of cross-checking, the number of years of formal education received was also recorded. For analytic purposes, the sample was divided into two aggregated levels of educational attainment: those with no formal schooling at all or primary school incomplete versus those who had at least completed primary school.

❑ *Socio-Economic Status (SES)*

Obviously the questionnaire was not a socio-economic survey instrument. The detail and the quality[5] of socio-economic information gathered is therefore very limited. However, as respondents' socio-economic background can be expected to influence their knowledge and opinions, the team made an effort to create three categories - below average, average and above average – based on a set of indicator variables that go beyond simply splitting the sample into three equal sized groups. Respondents' socio-economic status was based on a combination of five indicators: self-rated social status, household income, educational attainment, fuel used for cooking, and roofing

---

[3] Provincial capitals.

[4] And one two year category (18-19 yr).

[5] This is just to say that eliciting e.g. information on income that is reasonably valid in an absolute sense requires a lot more time and (cross-checking) questions than was available. Such kind of information was therefore not interpreted in an absolute way but only for comparative purposes, i.e. to divide the sample into income groups.

material of the respondent's dwelling. Social class categories were then determined through a set of decision rules about which variable levels indicate which social class (for each of the three locations separately: Phnom Penh, other urban, and rural) and how to combine the variables into a summary SES attribution. The decision rules are described in detail in annex 2.

❑ *Personal experience with the court*

Personal experience with the court as a complainant, a defendant or otherwise (e.g. witness) can be expected to be a major determinant of knowledge and opinions about the courts. However, this study is a opinion poll of the *general* Cambodian population and not of *court users*. This means that the sample only contains a limited number of respondents with personal experience[6], and one has to be cautious in making too much of the profile of background characteristics of this sub-group and in interpreting differences in opinion between those with and without experience.

However, because sampling was done randomly, the proportion of respondents with court experience *does* indicate a population average. And although the sub-sample size makes for large margins of error, the patterns of background characteristics and opinions still do allow for some very interesting observations. The opinions of this group are described in the results' section. Their background characteristics are analyzed in the following section on interaction of background characteristics.

The background characteristics of the total population of 816 respondents are cross-tabulated-below.

---

[6] I.e. only those that we happened to come across in our random sample of the Cambodian population.

Table 2: Overview of background characteristics

Respondent background characteristics N=816		Location			Sex		Age			SES			Educational attainment		Court experience	
		Urban PHP	Urban Other	Rural	F	M	18-29	30-44	45+	Below average	Average	Above average	Primary incomplete	Primary complete+	+	-
Location	Urban PHP				62 (51.7)	58 (48.3)	31 (25.8)	53 (44.2)	36 (30.0)	36 (30.0)	53 (44.2)	31 (25.8)	42 (35.0)	78 (65.0)	7 (5.8)	110 (91.7)
	Urban Other				90 (50.0)	90 (50.0)	40 (22.2)	80 (44.4)	60 (33.3)	77 (42.8)	77 (42.8)	26 (14.4)	71 (39.4)	109 (60.6)	22 (12.2)	157 (87.2)
	Rural				257 (49.8)	259 (50.2)	109 (21.1)	227 (44.0)	180 (34.9)	282 (54.6)	170 (32.9)	64 (12.4)	354 (68.6)	162 (31.4)	32 (6.2)	465 (89.8)
Sex	F	62 (15.2)	90 (22.0)	257 (62.8)			105 (25.7)	190 (46.4)	114 (27.9)	219 (53.5)	132 (32.3)	58 (19.2)	272 (66.5)	137 (33.5)	26 (6.3)	373 (91.0)
	M	58 (14.3)	90 (22.1)	259 (63.6)			75 (18.4)	170 (41.8)	162 (39.8)	176 (49.2)	168 (41.3)	63 (15.5)	195 (47.9)	212 (52.1)	35 (8.8)	359 (88.0)
Age	18-29	31 (17.2)	40 (22.2)	109 (60.6)	105 (58.3)	75 (41.7)				74 (41.1)	74 (41.1)	31 (17.8)	63 (35.0)	117 (65.0)	9 (5.0)	166 (92.2)
	30-44	53 (14.7)	80 (22.2)	227 (63.1)	190 (52.8)	170 (47.2)				180 (50.0)	130 (36.1)	50 (13.9)	208 (57.8)	152 (42.2)	25 (6.9)	326 (90.6)
	45+	36 (13.0)	60 (21.7)	180 (65.2)	114 (41.3)	162 (58.7)				141 (51.1)	96 (34.8)	39 (14.1)	196 (71.0)	80 (29.0)	26 (9.4)	240 (87.0)
SES	Below average	36 (9.1)	77 (19.5)	282 (71.4)	219 (55.4)	176 (44.6)	74 (18.7)	180 (45.6)	141 (35.7)				326 (82.5)	69 (17.5)	26 (6.6)	353 (89.4)
	Average	53 (17.7)	77 (25.7)	170 (56.7)	132 (44.0)	168 (56.0)	74 (24.7)	130 (43.3)	96 (32.0)				93 (31.0)	207 (69.0)	20 (6.7)	272 (90.7)
	Above average	31 (25.6)	26 (21.5)	64 (52.9)	58 (47.9)	63 (52.1)	32 (26.4)	50 (41.3)	39 (32.2)				48 (39.7)	73 (60.3)	14 (11.6)	107 (88.4)
Educational attainment	Primary incomplete	42 (9.0)	71 (15.2)	354 (75.8)	272 (58.2)	195 (41.8)	63 (13.5)	208 (44.5)	196 (42.0)	326 (69.8)	93 (19.9)	48 (10.3)			29 (6.2)	422 (90.2)
	Primary complete+	78 (22.3)	109 (31.2)	162 (46.4)	137 (39.3)	212 (60.7)	117 (33.5)	152 (43.6)	80 (22.9)	69 (19.8)	207 (59.3)	73 (20.9)			32 (9.1)	310 (88.6)
Court experience	+	7 (11.7)	22 (36.7)	31 (51.7)	25 (41.7)	35 (58.3)	9 (15.0)	25 (41.7)	26 (43.3)	26 (43.3)	20 (33.3)	14 (23.3)	28 (46.7)	32 (53.3)		
	-	110 (15.0)	157 (21.4)	465 (63.5)	373 (51.0)	359 (49.0)	166 (22.7)	326 (44.5)	240 (32.8)	353 (48.2)	272 (37.2)	107 (14.6)	422 (57.7)	310 (42.3)		
Total		120 (14.7)	180 (22.1)	516 (63.2)	409 (50.1)	407 (49.9)	180 (22.1)	360 (44.1)	276 (33.8)	395 (48.4)	300 (36.8)	121 (14.8)	467 (57.2)	349 (42.8)	60 (7.4)	732 (89.7)

( ) gives the percentage; percentages add up by background characteristic by row

2. Interaction of background characteristics

First of all, when examining the interaction of background characteristics, it is important to keep in mind that two of them were controlled for in the sampling procedure: location and sex. It then is interesting to check to what extent the sub-sample proportions for these two differ from the overall sample proportions. Obviously, the female/male proportions in the various locations match those of the total. This merely demonstrates that this was adequately controlled for. But is that also the case for female/male proportions across age groups, levels of educational attainment, etc.?

❑ The age distribution is very similar across the three rural/urban locations.
❑ As was to be expected, the SES distribution across the three rural/urban locations is skewed. Phnom Penh has less below average and more above average respondents than the total sample, whereas for rural areas it is the other way around, and provincial capitals are in between. This means that when interpreting across different location types one has to keep in mind that to a certain extent they are correlated with SES differences.
❑ For educational attainment there is a basic split between urban and rural locations, with the urban population being substantially better educated.
❑ The age distribution is less similar across sexes than across locations, but the variation is still quite limited.
❑ As was to be expected with a controlled sample, across sexes variations among SES levels is even more limited.
❑ However, educational attainment levels vary considerably across sexes. This, again, means that these characteristics are not independent, but correlated.
❑ Also, SES and educational attainment are correlated. This result was expected, even though educational attainment is only one of the five variables used to construct SES levels. Given the correlation between educational attainment and SES, one might question the need for separate SES categories. Doesn't educational attainment alone tell us enough? Table 3 provides a more detailed picture of the relationship between levels of SES and educational attainment than the summary table of background characteristics above. Although the correlation is evident, it is also clear that there is more to SES than educational attainment alone. This mainly reflects the comparatively weak relationship between educational attainment and income/expenditure levels in Cambodia.

Table 3: Relationship between SES and educational attainment

N=816	No schooling and primary incomplete	Secondary incomplete	Secondary complete and above
Below average SES respondents	82%	16%	2%
Average SES respondents	31%	61%	8%
Above average SES respondents	40%	30%	31%

3. Court users

Given the particular interest that the small group of court users has for analytic purposes, the composition of this sub-sample merits special attention.

The overview of background characteristics shows that court users are:

- More urban (48%) than the sample average (37%), but it is also worth noting that there is an unexpectedly high proportion of rural users (52%), especially given the lack of courts in rural areas.
- More male (58%) than female (42%), but, again, the distribution is not as skewed as one might have expected.
- As can be expected with any experience, there is a slight experience-increases-with-age effect.
- There is also a slight the-higher-the-SES-the-more-experience effect, but this effect is by far not as strong as one might expect.
- Idem for educational attainment.

In summary, what stands out is a pattern of *similarity* of the court users to the overall population.

One might question this conclusion on the argument that it is those who file cases in court, the complainants, who matter. And isn't it to be expected that the richer, better educated, etc. file cases, while the poorer, less educated are only brought into the picture as defendants? However, table 4 shows that this counter argument does not hold.

Table 4: Court users by SES and complainant/defendant

N=61		Complainant	Defendant	Total	
Below average SES	**Primary incomplete**	8	9	17	**26**
	Primary complete+	7	2	9	
Sub total		15	11		
Average SES	**Primary incomplete**	2	6	8	**21**
	Primary complete+	6	7	13	
Sub total		8	13		
Above average SES	**Primary incomplete**	3	1	4	**14**
	Primary complete+	6	4	10	
Sub total		9	5		
Total		**32**	**29**		**61**

4. Media consumption

As part of the section on background information, the questionnaire also probed respondents' media consumption because media is such an important source of knowledge and opinions. Table 5 below summarizes the results of the five consumption answer options into two aggregated categories:

- Daily/regularly (daily, a few times a week, weekly)
- Occasionally/never (not even once a week/never)

The basic picture is that newspapers are read by the select few, while radio and television reach the majority to a very similar extent.

The relationship between respondents' characteristics and media consumption are as can be expected. Males have better access to media than females; the educated have better access than the non-educated; and moving up the SES scale goes along with increasing media consumption. All of these background variables interact to some extent but none is more than partly explained by any other and each variable can be viewed as independently contributing to observed differences. The only exception is the higher proportion of newspaper readers amongst the youngest age group, which can be interpreted as an educational effect, as this age group is better educated than the other two.

The postulated higher media access of Phnom Penh residents is also borne out, especially for printed media.

Table 5: Media consumption by background characteristics

	Newspapers		Radio		Television	
N=816	Daily/ Regularly	Occasionally/ Never	Daily/ regularly	Occasionally never	Daily/ regularly	Occasionally/ never
All respondents	15%	85%	70%	30%	69%	31%
Phnom Penh respondents	44%	56%	79%	21%	88%	12%
Other urban respondents	24%	76%	73%	27%	81%	19%
Rural respondents	5%	95%	67%	33%	60%	40%
Females	8%	92%	62%	38%	66%	34%
Males	21%	79%	79%	21%	72%	28%
No schooling/primary incomplete	4%	96%	63%	37%	60%	40%
Primary complete and above	29%	71%	81%	19%	81%	19%
Below average SES	6%	94%	60%	40%	55%	45%
Average SES	20%	80%	79%	21%	79%	21%
Above average SES	30%	70%	83%	17%	88%	12%
Age 18-29	21%	79%	72%	28%	73%	27%
Age 30-44	13%	87%	68%	32%	63%	37%
Age 45+	14%	86%	72%	28%	73%	27%

5. Reporting of results

Apart from the limited set of questions on respondents' backgrounds, all questions are opinion questions, some of them followed up by an open probe into what makes respondents' evaluate an issue, person, or institution as they do. For most questions respondents are asked to express their opinions or judgments in terms of a five point scale (e.g. *strongly agree, somewhat agree, neither agree nor disagree, somewhat disagree, strongly disagree*, or, *very little [trust], little [trust], neither much nor little [trust], much [trust], very much [trust])* with several possibilities for the data-collector to score "don't know" (can't choose, refuses to answer, doesn't know this institution, etc.).

For purposes of reporting we have chosen to focus on a **one-figure indicator of respondents' opinion**: their so-called Net Opinion.

Those respondents who express an opinion, also called the *aware* respondents, may have a favorable, neutral or unfavorable judgment. **The Net Opinion is favorable % minus unfavorable %, and is +100 if unanimously favorable, -100 if unanimously unfavorable, and 0 if opinions are exactly divided.** Usually, the % used as a basis for the calculation of Net Opinions are % of the *aware* segment of the total sample, that is those respondents who expressed an opinion (i.e. those who did not respond "don't know"). However, for this reporting format to be unproblematic two conditions have to be fulfilled:

❑ When the sampling for the opinion poll is intended to ensure the representativeness of answers – as is the case in this study – the size of the *aware* segment should be close to the total sample size. If the number of aware respondents drops way below the total sample size, the representativeness of the net opinion becomes questionable.
❑ When opinions are compared – as we do often in this study (e.g. comparison of trust in government professions, public institutions, etc.) - the aware segments should be of similar magnitude or else it becomes impossible to interpret the significance of differences between net opinions without statistical testing for each individual difference.

In our case neither condition is fulfilled. We therefore choose to report Net Opinions on the basis of both % of the total sample and % of the aware segment. Thus, tables include a column for the size (%) of the aware segment of the total population, a column describing the Net Opinion based on the total sample (all respondents), and a column for the Net Opinion based on the aware segment. In cases of tables that compare opinions, the row order is from most positive or negative to least positive or negative and is determined by the Net Opinion based on the *aware* segment.

6. Respondent knowledge
The questionnaire did not probe respondents' knowledge of the judicial system directly. That is, no questions of the "Have you ever heard of…."/"Do you know…." kind were asked. However, indirectly, expressing an opinion signifies knowledge and lack of knowledge is expressed by giving a "Don't know" answer. Obviously, "Don't know" might mean other things, most important of which is an unwillingness to answer (e.g. it might reflect the socio-political sensitivity of an issue). In other words, the aware score of a particular question is not only an indicator of respondents' knowledge. However, on a question by question basis one can make quite defensible assumptions regarding whether or not the aware score is a good expression of knowledge. For example, when asking for an opinion about the fairness of a dispute settlement intervention by the Prime Minister, the aware score is a questionable reflection of respondents' knowledge, but when asking about trust in prosecutors, the size of the aware segment most probably *does* reflect knowledge.

Overall, that is across all court related questions in the study (58 in total), the aware score is low when compared to figures obtained in polls in other countries in the region (e.g. the Philippines: 79%). As explained above, the figure can be interpreted as a mix of respondents' lack of knowledge and hesitation to express opinions. However, we do contend that it primarily reflects Cambodians' general lack of knowledge of formal institutions not directly present in their daily environment. To substantiate this contention we constructed a scale of the 7 items probing respondents' trust in court institutions/officials only[7]. These 7 items are directly relevant to the issue of knowledge of the court and do not seem sensitive.

Table 6 below shows that the aggregate aware figure for these 7 items is quite low: 61%. It also shows that the aware figure varies along the lines of background characteristics in exactly the way one would expect it to vary if it does actually reflect respondents' knowledge: higher for males, the better educated, above average SES, and Phnom Penh residents. Thus, in our analysis of the results we will regularly refer to the aware figure as a justifiable indicator of knowledge differentials.

Table 6: Aware rates by background characteristics

	Total N	Aware
Rural respondents	516	54%
Female respondents	409	55%
No schooling/primary incomplete respondents	467	55%
Below average SES respondents	395	56%
Male respondents	407	66%
Primary complete and above respondents	349	68%
Above average respondents	121	70%
Phnom Penh respondents	120	73%
All respondents	816	61%

7. General observations on the results

This study is the first ever, public opinion poll on judicial efficiency and legitimacy in Cambodia. Because the poll addresses only a limited number of issues it is a potentially powerful instrument to gauge popular opinions. Survey questions are notoriously subject to eliciting vastly different results on the basis of minor differences in phrasing, the ordering of questions, whether respondents are asked to affirm or deny a statement, etc. This makes the interpretation of results on issues that have been probed by only one or two questions very difficult.

For this very reason, psychological tests make a point of only drawing conclusions on the basis of aggregated indicators. Particular constructs are operationalized in terms of a

---

[7] Q2: How much trust do you have in the following people in your area: judges?
  Q4: : How much trust do you have in the following people in your area: prosecutors?
  Q7: How much trust do you have in the following institutions: Supreme Court?
  Q8: How much trust do you have in the following institutions: Provincial Court?
  Q74: What is your opinion about the prestige of the following occupation: Judge?
  Q75: What is your opinion about the prestige of the following occupation: Lawyer?
  Q92: If you ask the court, how fair do you think that the outcome of the settlement will be?

battery of questions that together constitute a "scale". Scale results have proven to be much more robust, both in terms of reliability and validity, than the results of individual questions. Unfortunately, as sociologists often have to access information on a broad range of topics within a limited amount of interview time, they may have to make do with just one or two questions to gauge a particular opinion.

The delimitation of the topic enabled us to include quite a lot of questions on conceptually related aspects, asking for "similar" things in slightly different ways and within different settings. This is not to claim that this instrument in any way contains scales for court efficiency and/or court legitimacy, but it is to claim that the instrument holds the potential to generate patterns of opinions that are more telling than opinions based on single questions. However, in the end what matters is not potential, but actual outcomes. If the outcome shows haphazard, chaotic patterns that are difficult to interpret so much for the potential[8]. The survey research community has developed quite a sophisticated and elaborate toolbox to detect patterns in apparent chaos. However, despite the merits of these technical advances, the bottom line is that nothing is a more powerful result than a pattern staring you in the face without the need for much statistical wizardry to unveil[9] it.

Our data set proved a lucky draw. It contained some pretty obvious patterns regarding perceptions regarding the legitimacy and efficiency of the Cambodian judicial system. These patterns came in various kinds.

❑ Relative answer percentage points to *similar* questions in different sections of the questionnaire were consistent in the total sample.
❑ Relative answer percentage points to *similar* questions in different sections of the questionnaire were consistent across specific sub samples (e.g. females or above average SES respondents).
❑ Relative answer percentage points to *similar* questions in different sections of the questionnaire differ in the sense that for a particular sub sample some of the questions might generate more extreme answers in the positive or negative direction when compared to other sub samples, but hardly ever to the extent that the basic pattern is upturned.
❑ The same kinds of patterns are evident in question sequences wherein *different* individuals, institutions, influences, or professions are compared.

For some of these, one might even claim that the results do signify the existence of *conceptual scales or hierarchies[10]*. For example, if institutions are scored in the same

---

[8] But this is not to say that patterned results are better or the outcome of a better instrument! Often, opinions just are not internally consistent, highly context dependant, etc. and the chaos reflects reality. Patterned results are just easier to interpret and therefore a lucky draw for the analyst.
[9] Given a reasonably robust sample size, the need for heavy statistical techniques to detect significance almost always implies that only a small proportion of the total variance in the data is explained by that pattern. And, in the end, real world significance as opposed to statistical significance is determined by the variation explained.
[10] A term used by Hagendoorn et.al. in their work on national majority preference orders of ethnic minorities living in their country.

order, irrespective of respondents' background characteristics and irrespective of the magnitude of the rating/evaluation, that order can be argued to reflect a collective representation.[11]

---

[11] A term used by the French social psychologist Serge Moscovici to indicate conceptions that are shared by social or cultural groups.

III. Cambodian Public Opinion on the Legitimacy and Efficiency of the Judiciary

We report the opinions more or less in the order that the questions were asked (see annex 3 - the questionnaire). In this section the overall results are presented in table form and described. For each question or set of questions, the differences between sub samples of different backgrounds (e.g. females and males, less educated and better educated, etc.) are also indicated. However, for detailed tables of results split down according to background variables, we refer to annex 1. After the description of the results per question or set of questions, we conclude with an overview of the patterns that are evident, both in the data set as a whole and in the results for specific sub groups.

1. Trust in government professionals

Cambodians' trust in judges and prosecutors is negative. They are the least trusted among 6 government professions – much less than teachers, chairmen of commune councils, or doctors. Both the relative position of the court professionals and their negative ratings are stable across all background characteristics. In other words, whether rich or poor, educated or without schooling, etc. Cambodians are very negative about judges and prosecutors.

Table 7: Trust in government professionals

N=816	Aware (%)	Net opinion (%) Base all responses	Net opinion (%) Base: total aware
Teachers in public schools	98	+33	+34
Your National Assembly representative	61	+3	+4
Chairman of your commune council	97	+3	+3
Doctors in government hospitals	96	-1	-1
Prosecutors	27	-9	-33
Judges	38	-15	-40

Regarding differences among respondents of varying backgrounds, the following can be noted:

- In general, Phnom Penh residents are most negative, but regarding court officials other urban citizens are even more negative. Rural respondents are least negative. There is a clear awareness difference with rural residents least aware.
- Women are least negative in general and also regarding court officials; their aware scores are clearly lower than that of men.
- The young report more trust in general and also regarding court officials.
- Below average SES respondents are least negative in general and also about court officials. They are also less aware.
- The less educated are least negative in general and also about court officials and are less aware.
- Those with court experience are very negative about court officials.

2. Trust in public institutions

Cambodians trust the Supreme Court, the police, and provincial courts least of eleven public institutions. Their distrust in the provincial courts is especially strong. Both the

relative position of the courts and their negative ratings are stable across all background characteristics.

Table 8: Trust in public institutions

N=816	Aware (%)	Net opinion (%) Base: all responses	Net opinion (%) Base: total aware
Your Pagoda	100	+80	+80
NGO	78	+54	+69
National Assembly	62	+13	+21
The national government	93	+2	+2
Television	81	+2	+2
The newspapers	51	-1	-2
The military	85	-2	-2
Your commune council	99	-5	-5
Supreme Court	46	-5	-11
The police	97	-19	-20
The provincial court	74	-32	-43

Regarding differences between respondents of varying backgrounds, the following can be remarked:

❑ In general, Phnom Penh residents are most negative, including about the Supreme Court, but their provincial court ratings did not stand out. There is a clear awareness difference (rural least aware), but regarding provincial courts Phnom Penh and other urban residents are equally aware.

❑ Males are more negative about the Supreme Court, but both sexes are equally negative about the provincial courts; clear lower aware scores for females.

❑ The young report some trust in the Supreme Court and are least negative about the provincial courts.

❑ Average SES respondents are almost consistently most negative, but regarding the provincial courts above average SES respondents are even more negative.

❑ The less educated are more positive in general and also less negative about the courts. They are also less aware.

❑ Those with court experience are extremely negative, especially about the provincial courts.

3. Rating of courts' present performance and as compared to five years ago

Cambodians rate courts' performance as clearly substandard and as is to be expected, given the answers to the earlier sets of questions, this holds true irrespective of respondents' background characteristics. Interestingly, they perceive a slight improvement over the last five years.

Table 9: Courts' present performance and as compared to five years ago

N=816	Aware (%)	Net opinion (%) Base: all responses	Net opinion (%) Base: total aware
Present performance	88	-35	-40
Compared to five years ago	84	+12	+14

Regarding differences between respondents of varying backgrounds, the following can be remarked:

- Only small across location differences, with the other urban group being least negative and perceiving the most improvement.
- Sexes are equally negative, but males perceive more improvement.
- The young are less negative and see more improvement.
- Below average SES respondents are least negative about present performance. Perceptions of improvement increase from below average to above average SES.
- The less educated are less negative in general, but there is no educational attainment difference for perceived improvement.
- Those with court experience are extremely negative.

4. Feelings regarding the courts' resistance to outside pressures

Cambodians strongly feel that the courts cannot/do not resist pressures. The aware proportions for most of the questions was quite limited, causing big differences between the net opinions based on the total sample and the net opinions based on the aware segment of the public. However, the order of influences is quite robust and consistent across respondents with different backgrounds, particularly the top positions of big business and high government officials and the bottom position of NGOs in terms of exerting influence.

Table 10: courts' resistance to outside pressures

N=816	Aware (%)	Net opinion (%) Base: all responses	Net opinion (%) Base: total aware
Big business	73	-69	-92
High government officials	52	-45	-87
Mafia/criminal groups	45	-37	-83
The Council of Ministers	26	-20	-77
Local authorities	54	-33	-61
The military	42	-24	-58
The National Assembly	21	-10	-47
NGOs	42	-11	-25

Differences across background variables are near absent. The only variable showing some variance is SES, with the below average respondents scoring less extreme than the others. The aware differences evident in earlier questions appear again.

5. Media influence on the court

In as far as Cambodians are media aware, which is not very much (34% only), many feel that court cases don't attract heavy publicity, and of those who notice publicity, somewhat more perceive the influence on court decisions in a negative light than the other way around.

Table 11: Media influence on the court

N=816	Aware (%)	Net opinion (%) Base: all responses	Net opinion (%) Base: total aware
Media publicity is never heavy	34	+13	+38
Media publicity means fairer court decisions	34	-5	-14

There is no background differentiation regarding the results on this question.

6. Expectations about chances of particular kinds of people to win their case

Respondents were given three small scenarios ('vignettes') of disputes between two persons, let's call them A and B, and asked to rate the chances of one of the two winning the case. Because responses to such questions have proven to be very sensitive to who takes action, this question was asked using a split sample approach. This means that half of the sample were given the scenario with A filing the court case against B, and the other half with B filing the case against A[12].

The scenarios were:
1a. A high government official claims ownership of a piece of land that is occupied by a wealthy businessman. He files a court case. How likely is he to win over the wealthy businessman?
1b. A wealthy businessman claims ownership of a piece of land that is occupied by a high government official. He files a court case. How likely is he to win over the high government official?
2a. A high government official has a serious dispute with a person with strong *ksae* or connections to court officials. He files a court case. How likely is he to win over the person with strong *ksae* or connections to court officials?
2b. A person with strong *ksae* or connections to court officials has a serious dispute with a high government official. He files a court case. How likely is he to win from the high government official?
3a. A wealthy businessman has a serious dispute with a person with strong *ksae* or connections to court officials. He files a court case. How likely is he to win from the person with strong *ksae* or connections to court officials?
3b. A person with strong *ksae* or connections to court officials has a serious dispute with a wealthy businessman . He files a court case. How likely is he to win from the wealthy businessman?

The intention of this set of questions was to tap perceptions of the relative strength of position, wealth, and personal relationship. All three are regularly mentioned in both lay and expert analyses of the partiality of the Cambodian justice system, and Cambodian governance in general. Do Cambodians perceive them to be equally important or strong, or do they perceive a hierarchy?

---

[12] The results confirmed the appropriateness of applying this technique to counter bias: actors attracted more winning 'votes' in the (B) as compared in the (A) position consistently across the dataset.

The overall picture of Cambodians' perceptions of the relative strength of position, wealth, and personal relationships is that personal relationships outweigh the impersonal attributes of position and money, and that position slightly outweighs money.

Table 12: chances of particular kinds of people to win their case

N=816	Aware (%)	Net opinion (%) Base: all responses	Net opinion (%) Base: total aware
High government official versus a wealthy businessman	97	+5	+5
Someone with strong connections to court officials versus a high government official	95	+10	+10
Someone with strong connections to court officials versus a wealthy businessman	96	+8	+9

However, there are interesting differences between this overall pattern and the mental map of respondents with specific backgrounds. However, the dominance of personal relations still holds up in this more detailed analysis.

- For Phnom Penh residents position much more clearly dominates wealth than in the overall pattern, and they are less sure that personal relations beat position than the average. The pattern for rural respondents is more subtle than the overall one regarding the dominance of position over money.
- Females are quite outspoken about the importance of personal relations and the dominance of position over money. The pattern for males indicates that they are much less sure about the latter, to the extent that personal relations only marginally dominates money.
- For young respondents, the pattern indicates that the importance of personal relations is stronger than the overall pattern. The oldest age group is doubtful that position and personal relations outweigh money.
- Below average SES respondents attribute more strength to money than the overall pattern. The average and above average SES groups display extreme versions of the overall pattern, with position dominating money.
- The less educated score position and wealth equally and are less sure than the average that personal relations win over money.
- The pattern of respondents with court experience is the only one which really 'violates' the overall pattern: personal relations outweigh position, but *not* money, and money very clearly beats position.

In summary, with one exception, personal relations dominate the hierarchy. And rural respondents, males, older respondents, below average SES, and less educated all attribute more importance to money than is evident in the overall average pattern, but money only *really* outweighs position in the mental maps of those with personal experience with the courts, even to the extent of being seen as stronger than personal relations.

7. Confidence about courts' decisions in specific kinds of cases
In this set of questions, respondents were presented with four different types of cases and asked their opinions regarding various aspects of the decision: fairness, timeliness, and based on the merits of the case (rather than the quality of the lawyers).

Cambodians are negative in their expectations regarding all aspects of the courts' decisions. And the extent of their lack of confidence regarding particular aspects of court decisions is stable across the different types of cases presented. That is to say, irrespective of the nature of the case, they are most negative regarding the fairness of the decision and then the timeliness of the decision. They are least negative about the decision being based on the merits of the case rather than the quality of the lawyers.

Respondents' negative opinions hold up across all four different types of cases, but there is a clear cut difference between the three cases involving a power differential between the two parties involved and the family dispute case in which the parties involved are equal. As soon as power differentials are involved, confidence in proper decisions drops dramatically.

Table 13: Courts' decisions in specific kinds of cases

N=816	Decision will be fair			Decision will be issued within a reasonable amount of time			Decision will be based on evidence rather than quality of the lawyers			Aggregated confidence		
	Aware (%)	Net all (%)	Net (%) aware	Aware (%)	Net all (%)	Net (%) Aware	Aware (%)	Net all (%)	Net (%) aware	Aware (%)	Net all (%)	Net (%) Aware
Murder case, accused is important person, victim is ordinary person	96	-56	-60	91	-46	-51	92	-23	-25	93	-42	-45
High government official charged with corruption	85	-48	-57	83	-39	-47	83	-27	-32	84	-38	-45
Police or military charged with human rights violation of government opponents	86	-42	-49	85	-35	-41	84	-20	-24	85	-32	-38
Dispute between family members about property inheritance	92	-15	-16	91	-10	-10	91	+1	+1	91	-8	-8

Regarding differences between respondents of varying backgrounds, the following can be remarked:

❑ Urban residents are more negative than rural residents. Phnom Penh residents are the only ones who score the decision in the case of a high government official accused of having amassed wealth through corruption more negatively than the decision in the case of an important person who has murdered a normal citizen.
❑ Females are slightly less negative than males.
❑ In terms of age, the oldest respondents are most negative. The young score family disputes neither positively nor negatively.
❑ Below average SES respondents are least negative, above average respondents are most negative.
❑ The better educated are the most negative. The less educated are not negative about family disputes.
❑ Those with court experience are extremely negative, and much more negative about family cases than the average.

8. Susceptibility of court officials to bribery

Cambodians' expectation that bribery is unavoidable when going to court is very high (82%). Although that is a disturbing figure, it does not tell us if the courts are more or less susceptible to bribery than other government agencies. The implications of this figure depend on the degree to which the courts stand out, in either a positive or a negative sense, from other government agencies. While bribery in Cambodia is indeed widespread, the net opinion of those who think it is easier to bribe court officials than officials from other agencies is –50%. And an even higher percentage is more unhappy about bribery in the courts than in other places.

Table 14: Court officials to bribery

N=816	Aware (%)	Net opinion (%) Base: all responses	Net opinion (%) Base: total aware
In case I myself would take a case to court my opponent would probably resort to bribery in order to win the case	97	+80	+82
It is harder to bribe court officials in comparison to officials of other government agencies	87	-44	-50
Bribery at the court makes me more unhappy than bribery at other places	94	+60	+64

Regarding differences between respondents of varying backgrounds, the following can be remarked:
❑ While scores are quite similar across locations, people in Phnom Penh are somewhat more unhappy about bribery in the courts.
❑ Females and males have similar ratings.
❑ The young score the courts as being more susceptible to bribery. In combination with their overall less negative judgments of the courts (when compared to other age groups), this finding evokes a picture of the young being more accepting or perhaps more 'pragmatic' regarding corruption.
❑ Below average SES respondents are less negative about the courts' susceptibility to bribery, but are equally unhappy about it.

- The better educated rate the courts more negatively and are more unhappy about bribery in the courts.
- Cambodians with court experience are substantially more negative about the courts' susceptibility to bribery than the average Cambodian, but are not more unhappy about it.

9. Willingness to testify

Cambodians are moderately positive about their willingness to testify as a witness in court.

Table 15: Willingness to testify

N=816	Aware (%)	Net opinion (%) Base: all responses	Net opinion (%) Base: total aware
Witnesses to crimes are generally willing to testify in court	98	+15	+-15

An analysis of differences across background variables reveals that the urban, females, the older, the above average SES, and the better educated are less willing to testify.

However, those with court experience are considerably more willing to testify (32%).

10. Availability of conflict resolution mechanisms in the community

A high proportion of Cambodians feel that the courts can be avoided because even serious disputes can be settled fairly and peacefully through other means

Table 16: Other conflict resolution mechanisms in the community

N=816	Aware (%)	Net opinion (%) Base: all responses	Net opinion (%) Base: total aware
In our community, even strong grievances between persons are settled fairly and peacefully, without bringing a case to court	97	+47	+48

Background differences are evident for:
- Location: Phnom Penh residents are less positive than others.
- Sex: females are somewhat less positive than males.
- SES: above average are more positive than others.

11. Guilty unless proven otherwise

Somewhat more Cambodians (16%) believe that in court one is *guilty* unless proven otherwise than that one is presumed innocent.

Table 17: Knowledge of the innocent unless proven otherwise principle

N=816	Aware (%)	Net opinion (%) Base: all responses	Net opinion (%) Base: total aware
One who is accused of a crime must prove his innocence, or else he will usually be punished	96	+15	+16

The "guilty unless proven otherwise" belief is stronger among Phnom Penh residents, females, the young, below and above average SES respondents, and the better educated. Personal court experience does not influence peoples' opinion regarding this principle.

12. Accountability of Judges
Cambodians' are moderately convinced that judges are held accountable for mistakes.

Table 18: Accountability of Judges

N=816	Aware (%)	Net opinion (%) Base: all responses	Net opinion (%) Base: total aware
Judges who mistakenly convict people who are really innocent usually get into trouble	88	+27	+31
Judges who mistakenly acquit people who are really guilty usually get into trouble	89	+27	+30

Other urban, average SES, and those with court experience are less positive about judicial accountability.

13. Equal treatment
When asked directly Cambodians report moderately negative expectations about the rich and poor receiving equal treatment in court, but they are less sure about the unequal enforcement of court decisions for rich and poor convicts.

Cambodians are very sure that religion/ethnicity is not a factor that influences the way people are treated in court and they are somewhat less but still strongly convinced that sex is not a factor either.

Table 19: Equal treatment

N=816	Aware (%)	Net opinion (%) Base: all responses	Net opinion (%) Base: total aware
Whether rich or poor, people who have cases in court generally receive equal treatment	97	-25	-26
Whether rich or poor, people convicted of crimes are generally punished according to the court judgment	95	-13	-14
Whether Christians or Muslims, people who have cases in court receive equal treatment	86	+69	+80
Women who are victims of rape are generally treated fairly by the courts	87	+49	+56

Regarding differences in opinions about differential treatment of the rich and poor between respondents of varying backgrounds, the following can be remarked:
- Phnom Penh residents are most negative about equal treatment, but not about the equal enforcement of decisions in criminal cases.
- Males are more negative about equal treatment. Females are positive about enforcement.
- The better educated are more negative about both.
- Below average SES respondents are the least negative, while above average are the most negative about both – in fact, they are twice as negative as the total average.
- The most negative of all are Cambodians with court experience.

The absence of a religion/ethnicity bias holds up across all background variables (with the exception that other urban respondents were more positive). The few Christians (N= 9 or 1%) or Cham/muslims (N=16 or 2%) respondents scored the same on this question as other Cambodians.

The absence of a sex bias was equally uniform across background variables, including women (with only other urban being more positive than the average).

14. System of justice as the ultimate guarantee of democracy and public liberties

The questionnaire included one test item to compare the legitimacy of courts across countries worldwide (e.g. this item is also part the Eurobarometer opinion polls that cover all EC countries). This item tested reactions to the statement that the system of justice is the ultimate guarantee of democracy and public liberties, whatever its shortcomings. Cambodians are moderately positive about this statement.

Table 20: System of justice as the ultimate guarantee of democracy and public liberties

N=816	Aware (%)	Net opinion (%) Base: all responses	Net opinion (%) Base: total aware
Whatever its shortcomings and inadequacies may be, our system of justice provides the ultimate guarantee of democracy and public liberties	85	+17	+20

Opinions do not differ between respondents of different background, apart from below average SES respondents being most positive about this statement.

15. Problems in getting proper services from the court

Cambodians strongly feel that being involved in a court case involves a lot of problems, the greatest of which are difficulties in finding trusted help and legal assistance (85%), and high costs (82%). Also, the perceived likelihood of one's opponent resorting to bribery (82%) – as reported in table 14 above – ranks in the top three barriers to access.

The question on finding trusted assistance is very relevant to the lack of access to justice in Cambodia. People in countries with much better rated judicial systems[13] than Cambodia also tend to lack *specific* knowledge of the law and the legal procedures required to stand up for one's rights in court. However, they are normally quite confident that should they have to, they would be able to obtain the necessary assistance to approach the courts and navigate the system. Cambodians, on the other hand, are near unanimous in their opinion that lack of knowledge and assistance are major barrier to accessing the courts.

Enforcement is perceived as the least problematic, but is still a moderately serious barrier.

---

[13] Better rated in terms of expert assessments and in terms of public opinion.

Table 21: Problems in getting proper services from the court

N=816	Aware (%)	Net opinion (%) Base: all responses	Net opinion (%) Base: total aware
It is hard for me to understand what the judge and other lawyers say	89	+61	+69
To take a case to court costs more money than I can afford	97	+75	+77
To take a case to court takes more time than I can afford	97	+79	+82
The judge would probably not understand the problems of someone like me	92	+58	+63
If the court decision is in my favor, I cannot be sure that it will be enforced	88	+19	+22
It is difficult for me to find someone that I trust to help me	96	+82	+85

Regarding differences in perceptions of the problems between respondents of varying backgrounds, the following can be remarked:
❑ The perceptions of the problem among females is even more pronounced than the already very high average pattern.
❑ The better educated perceive the problems to be more extreme than the less educated, with the exception of the issue of difficulties in understanding the language of court proceedings, which is scored as more of a problem by the less educated.
❑ Below average SES respondents are somewhat less negative than the other SES groups, but their difficulties in understanding the proceedings and finding assistance are exceptions to this pattern.
❑ The perceptions of those with court experience confirms that time and bribery are primary barriers. Compared to the average, they are outspoken in the view that money is an obstacle, but are less concerned about the problem of finding assistance and much less concerned about the proceedings being difficult to understand (48%).

16. Where to look for help with the court
Nearly a third of Cambodians don't know where to seek assistance for resolving disputes, whether through the courts or other means. Those who do know, overwhelmingly mention finding an organization to provide a lawyer (rather than finding one themselves).

Table 22: Help with the court

N=816	Aware (%)	Net opinion (%) Base: all responses	Net opinion (%) Base: total aware
Hire my own private lawyer	71	16%	23%
Find an organization to provide a lawyer to help me	71	54%	77%
Cannot choose/Don't Know		29%	29%

Background differences that play into this general picture are:
❑ Females, the less educated, and below average SES are more likely to not know where to seek assistance in resolving disputes.
❑ Finding an organization to provide assistance was the option of choice for respondents, regardless of background variables. The one exception to this pattern was above average SES respondents, who opted to find a private lawyer significantly more often.

The organizations mentioned as possible sources of legal assistance were overwhelmingly NGOs, with (named) human rights organizations clearly topping the list at 35%, followed by the category unnamed NGOs, and a small minority of answers (5%) referring to other (non human rights) named NGOs.

17. Sources of knowledge about the court

The major sources of knowledge about the courts are relatives and friends (65%), radio and TV (41%), and people with court experience (35%). Overall the most important source of information is other people (rather than media or anything else).

Table 23: Sources of knowledge about the court

N=816	Aware (%)	Percentage of respondents Base: all responses	Percentage of respondents Base: total aware
From relatives and friends	95	62	65
From radio or TV	95	39	41
From people with court experience	95	33	35
From newspapers or magazines	95	14	15
Personal experience in court	95	7	8
From school	95	5	6
Others	95	3	3
Don't Know		5	5

The order of importance of sources of knowledge about the court stands, regardless of respondents' background. Differences mainly emerge in the proportions of the two media categories ('from radio and TV' and 'from newspapers and magazines'), which can be explained by the media consumption patterns of different groups (see table 5).

18. Personal experience in court

Two questions in the questionnaire targeted personal experience in the courts. The question above, probing sources of knowledge about the courts, included 'personal experience in court' as one of the options. Another questions asked directly about personal experience with the courts. Of the 60 respondents who indicated that they had personal experience in court, 57 said that they had been either a complainant or a defendant. Of the 57, 2 had been both complainant and defendant, causing the total of both roles to add up to 61. This implies that one respondent got his personal experience in another capacity, i.e. as a witness[14].

Table 24: Personal experience in court

N=816	Yes		No		Don't know		Total	
	Nr.	%	Nr.	%	Nr.	%	Nr.	%
As complainant	30	3.7%					30	3.7%
As defendant	27	3.3%					27	3.3%
As both complainant and defendant	2	0.2%					2	0.2%
Otherwise (e.g. witness)	1	0.1%					1	0.1%
Neither as complainant nor defendant or otherwise			731	89.6%			731	89.6%
Don't know					25	3.1%	25	3.1%
Total	60	7.4%	731	89.6%	25	3.1%	816	100%

Note: Base for the % calculation is the total number of respondents

---

[14] Respondents reporting was totally consistent: all 59 who indicated having knowledge about the court through personal experience mentioned having been either a complainant or defendant, and no one who reported the latter did not mention personal experience as a source of knowledge about the court.

19. The outcome of cases of respondents' with court experience

Of the Cambodians who indicated that they had personal experience with the court as a complainant (N=30), a defendant (N=27), or both (N=2), nearly half had their case decided in their favor, although complainants were much more likely to win than defendants.

Table 25: Outcome of cases of respondents' with court experience

	Complainants	Defendants	Total
Case decided in my favor	18	8	26 (44%)
Case decided against me	6	15	21 (35%)
Unresolved/cannot choose	8	6	14 (21%)

20. Their judgment of the fairness of the courts that they have had dealings with

As can be expected, respondents' opinions about the fairness of the court are influenced by the outcomes of their own cases. Table 26 shows a clear trend towards a more unfair assessment by those who had lost their cases. While 81% of those who lost their cases thought the judgment was unfair, only 31% of those who had won their cases thought so. And while none of those who had lost their cases considered the judgment fair, 46% of those who won did. Nevertheless, given that *more* cases than not were resolved *favorably* (+8%), the overall assessment is very negative (-34%). Most of those whose cases remained unresolved (67%) *and* a third of those who won their cases *still* thought the judgment was *unfair*.

Table 26: Fairness of decision by outcome of decision

	Decision in own case: Favorable	Decision in own case: Unfavorable	Decision in own case: Unresolved/ can't choose	Total Nr.	Total %	Net
Court was in general fair	12	0	1	13	22%	-34%
Court was in general unfair	8	17	8	33	56%	
Court was neither fair nor unfair/ Can't choose	6	4	3	13	22%	
Total Nr.	26	21	12	59		
Total %	44%	36%	20%		100%	
Net	+8%					

21. Examples of true justice and clear injustice in and outside the court room

Respondents were asked if they could give examples of true justice and clear injustice delivered by the courts. The underlying rationale for this question was to find out what kinds of cases would come to mind. Would justice and injustice be symbolized by so-called media intensive "macro" cases in which a court would have taken a stand (justice) or refused to do so (injustice) against a high profile offender in an affair that is beyond the day to day troubles of ordinary people (e.g. former dictators being tried, etc.)? Or would respondents assess the justice system in terms of the courts' treatment of "micro" cases – inheritance disputes, domestic violence, land disputes, etc. – that are part of everyday life? The same questions were also asked in more general terms; that is,

respondents were asked to cite examples of true justice and clear injustice in Cambodia, not related to the court.

The results are interesting in three ways:

1. Before considering the substance of examples cited, the numbers of respondents able to provide examples is a telling indicator of Cambodians' expectations regarding justice delivered by the courts compared to justice delivered through other mechanisms. The number of respondents able to provide examples of clear injustice delivered by the courts was consistently the highest, regardless of respondents' background characteristics.

Table 27: Examples of true justice and clear injustice

N=816	Nr. Of Examples	%	Net %
Examples of clear justice of the courts	140	17%	-25%
Examples of true injustice of the courts	345	42%	
Examples of clear justice outside the courts	285	35%	17%
Examples of true injustice outside the courts	144	18%	

The above pattern was consistent across respondents of different backgrounds. There were no major age or sex variations in numbers able to provide examples, but the following are worth noting:
❑ Phnom Penh residents show a bigger difference.
❑ The average SES respondents show the biggest difference, followed by the above average SES group, and then the below average SES group.
❑ The better educated show a bigger difference.

2. Secondly, all examples cited (for justice and injustice both inside and outside the courts) were "micro". In other words, Cambodians are concerned about issues of justice that directly impact their daily lives, rather than justice as the protector of abstract values. One might have expected some reference to the Khmer Rouge tribunal. The silence on this issue is certainly telling, although it is impossible to deduce from our data *exactly what* it is telling of because we did not probe the issue.

3. Thirdly, the number of times particular types of cases were mentioned can be interpreted as a reflection of their importance. The list of cases mentioned as examples of court in/justice is dominated by the single category of land disputes, the majority of which are in fact land dispute related *murder* cases.

Table 28: Kinds of cases

N=485	%
Land dispute cases, including murder	36%
Cases of thievery, robbery, violence and murder (not related to a land dispute)	33%
Family dispute cases	8%
Rape cases	6%
Other cases	16%

22. Professional prestige

Respondents were probed for their evaluations of the prestige associated with certain professions, including those associated with the justice system (i.e. judges, lawyers, policemen). Respondents were asked which positions they associated with the descriptive phrases - 'high position', 'respect from the public', 'well known/famous' (*kee smue*) and 'well behaved'. The question explicitly instructed respondents not to evaluate the professions in terms of their potential monetary gain.

The results indicate a clear hierarchy in professional prestige, with university teachers and engineers at the top and policemen at the bottom. Although lawyers and judges are rated positive, they fall on the bottom of the hierarchy, particularly judges which only outrank policemen in terms of prestige.

Table 29: Professional prestige

N=816	Aware (%)	Percentage of respondents Base: all responses	Percentage of respondents Base: total aware
University teacher	83	+65	+79
Engineer	76	+57	+76
NGO staff	84	+57	+69
Doctor	98	+59	+61
High civil servant	93	+37	+40
Big business owner	87	+34	+39
School teacher	100	+33	+33
Lawyer	72	+22	+30
Farmer	99	+26	+26
Judge	80	+14	+18
Policeman	97	-5	-5

Regarding variations in opinions about professional prestige, the following stand out:
- The responses of Phnom Penh residents are lower than average in general and also with regard to judges and lawyers. Awareness about particular professions (i.e. university teacher, engineer, NGO staff, lawyer, judge) varies across locations.
- Females are somewhat more positive in general, and also about lawyers and judges. They are less aware than males about the less common professions.
- The young are the most positive about lawyers and judges.
- The better educated are more negative about both.
- Below average SES respondents are most positive in general and about lawyers and judges, followed by the above average SES group. The aware differences follow the standard pattern.
- Cambodians with court experience are much less positive about lawyers (+8%) and judges (+3%) than the total average.

23. Expectation about the fairness of various conflict resolution options

Respondents were asked about the fairness of various dispute resolution options. It is evident from the responses that the courts (and the police) are *way outside* the normal scale of expectations regarding fair outcomes.

Table 30: Fairness of various conflict resolution options

N=816	Aware (%)	Percentage of respondents Base: all responses	Percentage of respondents Base: total aware
Royal palace	68	+57	+84
NGO	76	+59	+78
National Assembly	60	+37	+61
Respected Elders in your neighborhood/village	94	+54	+57
Prime Minister	69	+30	+44
Village Chief	99	+30	+31
Commune Council	98	+22	+22
Court	89	-20	-22
Police	97	-24	-25

Regarding variations in opinions, the following stand out:
❑ Phnom Penh residents are the least positive in general and have the most negative opinions about the courts. Rural respondents, on the other hand, are least negative about the courts.
❑ Females are *less* positive in general and also about the courts.
❑ The young are more positive in general and about the courts in particular.
❑ The better educated are more negative both in general and about the courts.
❑ There were no substantial differences in the opinions of the various SES subgroups, except that below average SES respondents are least negative about the courts.
❑ Cambodians with court experience are by far the most negative about the courts (-50%), ranking them way below the police (-27%).

The overall rank order is consistent across groups for the two top positions (Royal Palace and NGOs) and the four lowest places (police, courts[15], commune councils and village chiefs).

24. Alternative Dispute Resolution: a hypothetical problem

Respondents were presented the following hypothetical problem: "Suppose one of your neighbors, who recently bought a piece of land, tells you that suddenly another person is claiming to have documents of ownership of the same piece of land. Which of the following things, if any, would you advise your neighbor to do right away? You can mention more than one, but not more than three, most important things to do."

Only half of the respondents came forward with advice. Of those, nearly equal numbers advised formal dispute resolution (36%) and informal dispute resolution (38%) options.

---

[15] With the exception of the position of the courts in the rank order of those with court experience.

Table 31: Alternative Dispute Resolution: a hypothetical problem

N=815	Number of responses	% of responses	% of cases[16]
Go to the police	51	6%	6%
Consult a lawyer	82	9%	10%
File a case in court	164	18%	20%
Formal dispute resolution advice	297	32%	36%
Consult a very respected person in your community	108	12%	13%
Consult a religious person	27	3%	3%
Consult someone in your community with experience in settling disputes	61	7%	8%
Talk to the relatives of the other person claiming the land	30	3%	4%
Informal dispute resolution advice	226	24%	38%
Just wait and see/None of the above/Don't Know	407	44%	50%
Total	930	100%	

25. Suggestions to improve the performance of courts

Respondents were asked if they thought that good salaries alone would lead the courts to perform their tasks honestly and impartially or if other measures would be necessary to improve court performance. 60% of respondents answered that good salaries alone would be sufficient. Of the remaining 40%, 88% suggested that implementing various anti-corruption measures would improve court performance.[17]   This figure indicates that according to public opinion, corruption in the courts is a significant problem. 25% of respondents suggested other improvement measures that did not directly relate to countering corruption[18].

Table 32: Suggestions to improve the performance of courts

N=815	Number of responses	% of responses	% of cases Base: all	% of cases Base: answers
Good salaries alone are enough to help the courts to perform their task honestly and impartially	492	56%	60%	NA
Implement anti-corruption measures to improve court performance	289	33%	35%	88%
Implement measures not directly referring to countering corruption, to improve court performance	80	9%	10%	25%
Other suggestions	25	2%	2%	5%
Total	886	100%		

IV. General evaluative patterns in the responses of respondents of different backgrounds

In the reporting so far, variations along the lines of respondents' background characteristics have been described at the question level.[19]   In this section, we summarize the analyze differences in terms of the evaluative patterns that emerges *across* individual questions.

---

[16] The percentages don't add up to 100 because some respondents gave more than one answer.

[17] E.g. 'law should be enforced,' 'the current staffing of courts (corrupt officials) should be reformed,' and 'corrupt court officials should be imprisoned'

[18] E.g. 'courts should be independent' or 'courts should recruit well-educated staff'.

[19] Narrative description in the main body, tables in annex 1.

To quantify the assessment of 'patterns' in a non-technical way, we constructed a scale of items that require respondents to assess court officials, court institutions, or court performance in positive/negative terms. One may debate the inclusion or non-inclusion of particular items, but in the end, adding or excluding one or two items does not affect the overall picture very much. The patterns that emerge are quite robust and the scale value provides a summary indicator that is easy to understand.

The items included are listed in table 33 below

Table 33: Scale to quantify evaluation of courts by sub samples

Question	Items	Cumulative nr. of items
Trust in government professionals	Prosecutors	1
	Judges	2
Trust in public institutions	Supreme Court	3
	Provincial court	4
Present performance of courts		5
Improvement over the last five years		6
Comparative susceptibility to bribery of court officials		7
Comparative unhappiness about bribery at the court		8
Willingness to testify		9
Accountability of judges	Both items combined	10
Equal treatment	Equal treatment of poor and rich	11
	Equal enforcement of poor and rich	12
	Equal treatment of Christians and Muslims	13
	Equal treatment of female rape victims	14
System of justice as the ultimate guarantee		15
Efficiency of the court	All 7 items combined	16
Confidence in the court decisions of different cases	All 4 cases combined	17
Inside and outside court fairness indicator		18
Professional prestige	Lawyer	19
	Judge	20
Expected fairness of outcome of dispute settlement	Court	21

This scale establishes if the responses of a particular sub group (e.g. females or the less educated) demonstrate evidence of a particular pattern in their evaluations of the courts. For example, if the pattern that we want to quantify is that *the young have more trust in the courts than the other two age categories* a scale item receives a (1) score if the pattern is evident for that particular item; it receives a (0) score if the pattern is not evident, but is also not violated; and it receives a (-1) score if the pattern is violated. *Violation* of a pattern is defined as the presence of its opposite. That is to say, if for a particular item the young are the *least* trusting category, the pattern is violated and the item is scored (1-). If the young are not the most trusting group, but do not stand out or are in between the least and most trusting categories, the item receives a score of (0).

The scale will produce a one figure pattern indicator, with a maximum of +21 and a minimum of –21. Negative figures are not really to be expected because they would just indicate that our pattern assumptions are totally wrong. In interpreting the positive results we define weak, moderately strong, strong and very strong patterns according to the following cut-off points:

Table 34: Pattern definitions in terms of scale value ranges

Pattern	Scale value range
Weak pattern	1-5
Moderately strong pattern	6-10
Strong pattern	11-15
Very strong pattern	16+

Obviously these definitions are arbitrary and one should not make too much of them. The important point is that substantial differences in the indicator values reflect substantial differences in the evidence for an evaluative pattern.

We report pattern violations separately because, irrespective of the scale total, the more violations, the more cautious one should be in postulating the presence of a consistent pattern.

Table 35: Evaluative pattern in the responses of respondents of different backgrounds

Background variable	Pattern	Strength	Score	Violations
Location	Rural respondents are less negative about the courts than urban respondents	Moderately strong	+8	0
	Phnom Penh respondents are more negative about the courts than others	Moderately strong	+6	0
Sex	Women are less negative about the courts than men	Weak	+4	4
Age	The young are more positive about courts than the other age categories	Moderately strong	+8	1
Educational attainment	The better educated are more negative about the courts than the less educated	Very strong	+16	0
SES	Below average SES respondents are less negative about the courts than the other two SES groups	Strong	+15	0
	Above average SES respondents are more negative than other two SES groups	Moderately strong	+8	1
Court experience	Respondents who have personal experience with the courts are more negative than those who don't have personal experience	Strong	+14	2
	Respondents with personal experience with the courts are **much** more negative than those who don't have personal experience	Strong	+12	0

Patterns always have to be checked for the possible influence of general answer tendencies. A general tendency to score higher or lower across the board indicates an obvious bias. Those questions that list a series or set of institutions, professions, or dispute resolution options are especially susceptible to this bias. Again, such a bias makes the pattern appear somewhat stronger than it actually is; however, it does not create a pattern where none exists.

Apart from the evaluative patterns listed above, there are **two more patterns** that have already been mentioned, but that warrant reiteration here:

❑ A pattern evident across nearly all background variations, is the *knowledge differential*: males, the better educated, above average SES respondents, and Phnom Penh respondents are more aware of court officials and procedures than others. This

knowledge differential is not specific to knowledge about the courts. It is also evident in knowledge about other public institutions and professions.

❑ Another obvious pattern is that nearly all rank orders of government professionals, public institutions, pressures on the courts, problems with the courts, sources of knowledge about the courts, professional prestige and the fairness of conflict resolution options are stable to very stable across background characteristics. All apart from 'sources of knowledge' are evaluative and their stability can be interpreted as reflecting *conceptual hierarchies*.

By way of concluding, it is worth noting two findings for the *court users* sub sample that convey important messages regarding the performance of courts in Cambodia.

The first is that that those with actual court experience are negative, but significantly less so than those without court experience about the extent to which the language used in court procedures is difficult to understand. They are also much more willing the testify in court than any other sub group. This means that at least *some* fears about the courts turn out to be exaggerated when one has actual experience with them.

The second significant finding is that court users are more negative about nearly all issues related to corruption and the influence of money in the courts. The general ratings on these issues are already very negative so it is not easy to be even more outspoken, but court users are. The most telling example is that they are the only sub group who really overturn the pattern regarding perceptions of the relative importance of personal connections, position, and money in influencing court outcomes. While all other Cambodians put personal connections on top and are at most doubtful about position outweighing money, for court users there is no doubt: money buys everything. This is a most disturbing result.

Annex 1: Additional Tables

Results split down according to respondents' background characteristics

Table 7A: Trust in government professionals
Table 8A: Trust in public institutions
Table 9A: Ratings of courts' present performance and as compared to five years ago
Table 12A: Expectations about chances of particular kinds of people to win their case
Table 13A: Confidence about courts' decisions in specific kinds of cases: Location
Table 13B: Confidence about courts' decisions in specific kinds of cases: Sex
Table 13C: Confidence about courts' decisions in specific kinds of cases: Age
Table 13D: Confidence about courts' decisions in specific kinds of cases: SES
Table 13E: Confidence about courts' decisions in specific kinds of cases: Educational attainment
Table 13F: Confidence about courts' decisions in specific kinds of cases: Court experience
Table 14A: Susceptibility of court officials to bribery
Table 15A: Willingness to testify
Table 16A: Availability of conflict resolution mechanisms in the community
Table 17A: Guilty unless proven otherwise
Table 19A: Equal treatment
Table 21A: Problems in getting proper services from the court
Table 27A: Examples of clear justice and true injustice, inside and outside courts: Location, sex and age
Table 27B: Examples of clear justice and true injustice, inside and outside courts: SES, Educational attainment and court experience
Table 29A: Professional prestige
Table 30A: Expectation about the fairness of various conflict resolution options

Table 7A: Trust in government professionals

Respondent background characteristics N=816		Location			Sex		Age			SES			Educational attainment		Court experience	
		Urban		Rural	F	M	18-29	30-44	45+	Below average	Average	Above average	Primary incomplete	Primary complete +	+	All
		PHP	Other													
Teachers	Aware (%)	98	99	98	98	98	98	98	98	99	97	99	98	98	98	**98**
	Net Opinion (%) Base: all	+7	+37	+38	+35	+31	+47	+31	+26	+29	+37	+34	+31	+35	+43	**+33**
	Net Opinion (%) Base aware	+7	+37	+38	+36	+31	+48	+31	+27	+30	+39	+34	+32	+36	+44	**+34**
Your national Assembly representative	Aware (%)	59	70	59	57	66	58	59	65	62	60	64	61	62	68	**61**
	Net Opinion (%) Base: all	-9	+3	+5	+3	+2	+10	+1	+2	+6	0	-2	+5	0	+3	**+3**
	Net Opinion (%) Base aware	-15	+5	+9	+6	+3	+17	+2	+$	+9	+1	-3	+8	0	+5	**+4**
Chairman of your commune council	Aware (%)	96	96	99	97	99	97	98	99	99	97	98	99	97	98	**97**
	Net Opinion (%) Base: all	-9	+12	+3	+3	+3	+4	+2	+3	+5	-2	+9	+4	+2	+5	**+3**
	Net Opinion (%) Base aware	-10	+13	+3	+3	+3	+5	+2	+3	+5	-2	+9	+4	+2	+5	**+3**
Doctors in government hospitals	Aware (%)	98	97	94	95	96	94	96	95	94	97	96	94	97	97	**96**
	Net Opinion (%) Base: all	-18	-1	+3	+12	-14	+2	-7	+4	+9	+9	-12	+11	-16	-27	**-1**
	Net Opinion (%) Base aware	-19	-1	+3	+13	-15	+2	-7	+5	+9	+10	-13	+11	-17	-28	**-1**
Prosecutors	Aware (%)	35	38	21	22	32	26	24	31	25	27	35	23	32	60	**27**
	Net Opinion (%) Base: all	-14	-18	-4	-6	-12	-3	-9	-12	-7	-11	-10	-4	-15	-30	**-9**
	Net Opinion (%) Base aware	-40	-49	-20	-26	-37	-11	-40	-40	-29	-40	-29	-17	-49	-50	**-33**
Judges	Aware (%)	46	49	32	34	42	39	35	40	36	37	44	35	42	78	**38**
	Net Opinion (%) Base: all	-20	-24	-11	-2	-19	-12	-15	-17	-10	-19	-22	-8	-24	-45	**-15**
	Net Opinion (%) Base aware	-44	-50	-34	-6	-46	-31	-43	-42	-28	-51	-49	-24	-58	-57	**-40**

Table 8A: Trust in public institutions

Respondent background characteristics N=816		Location			Sex		Age			SES			Educational attainment		Court experience	
		Urban		Rural	F	M	18-29	30-44	45+	Below average	Average	Above average	Primary incomplete	Primary complete +	+	All
		PHP	Other													
Your pagoda	Aware (%)	98	100	100	99	100	99	100	99	99	100	100	99	100	100	**100**
	Net Opinion (%) Base: all	+62	+84	+82	+81	+78	+76	+80	+82	+85	+72	+82	+85	+73	+73	**+80**
	Net Opinion (%) Base aware	+63	+84	+84	+82	+78	+76	+80	+83	+86	+72	+82	+85	+73	+73	**+80**
NGO	Aware (%)	94	83	73	72	84	87	75	76	75	78	89	72	86	87	**78**
	Net Opinion (%) Base: all	+58	+59	+51	+45	+62	+58	+60	+54	+48	+56	+66	+44	+66	+58	**+54**
	Net Opinion (%) Base aware	+62	+71	+69	+63	+74	+68	+67	+71	+64	+69	+74	+61	+77	+67	**+69**
National Assembly	Aware (%)	79	68	56	51	74	64	60	65	53	68	79	54	83	72	**62**
	Net Opinion (%) Base: all	-3	+19	+14	+9	+17	+15	+11	+14	+12	+14	+13	+12	+1	+23	**+13**
	Net Opinion (%) Base aware	-3	+28	+25	+17	+23	+23	+19	+21	+23	+20	+17	+23	+1	+33	**+21**
The national government	Aware (%)	94	94	93	90	98	91	94	95	91	96	95	92	96	95	**93**
	Net Opinion (%) Base: all	-18	+7	+5	+1	+5	+3	0	+4	+8	-3	-3	+6	-3	+5	**+2**
	Net Opinion (%) Base aware	-19	+7	+6	+1	+5	+4	0	+4	+9	-4	-3	+7	-4	+5	**+2**
Television	Aware (%)	98	92	74	74	88	88	78	82	73	87	94	74	91	93	**81**
	Net Opinion (%) Base: all	-14	+14	+2	+4	0	+10	0	0	+5	-5	+7	+4	0	-5	**+2**
	Net Opinion (%) Base aware	-15	+15	+2	+6	0	+11	-1	0	+7	-5	+8	+5	0	-5	**+2**
The newspapers	Aware (%)	82	65	38	42	60	59	49	46	40	56	72	38	67	67	**51**
	Net Opinion (%) Base: all	-8	+1	0	+2	-4	0	0	-3	+3	-6	+1	+2	-5	-8	**-1**
	Net Opinion (%) Base aware	-9	+1	+1	+5	-7	0	-1	-5	+6	-10	+1	+6	-8	-13	**-2**

Table 8A: Trust in public institutions (cont.)

Respondent background characteristics N=816		Location			Sex		Age			SES			Educational attainment		Court experience	
		Urban		Rural	F	M	18-29	30-44	45+	Below average	Average	Above average	Primary incomplete	Primary complete +	+	All
		PHP	Other													
The military	Aware (%)	83	85	85	79	90	86	85	84	84	85	87	84	86	87	**85**
	Net Opinion (%) Base: all	-9	+12	-5	+2	-5	-9	0	+1	+3	-6	+4	+4	-9	-10	**-2**
	Net Opinion (%) Base aware	-11	+7	-5	+2	-6	-10	0	+1	+3	-8	+5	+5	-11	-12	**-2**
Your commune council	Aware (%)	99	99	98	98	99	98	99	99	98	99	98	98	99	100	**99**
	Net Opinion (%) Base: all	-15	+1	-4	-6	-3	-7	-8	+1	0	-14	+3	+1	-12	-5	**-5**
	Net Opinion (%) Base aware	-15	+1	-4	-6	-3	-7	-8	+1	0	-15	+3	+1	-12	-5	**-5**
Supreme Court	Aware (%)	75	51	37	39	52	47	44	47	41	49	54	41	52	58	**46**
	Net Opinion (%) Base: all	-22	-5	-1	-3	-7	+4	-9	-6	+2	-12	-10	-1	-11	-12	**-5**
	Net Opinion (%) Base aware	-29	-10	-4	-8	-14	+9	-21	-13	+4	-25	-19	-3	-20	-20	**-11**
The police	Aware (%)	98	99	96	95	99	97	97	96	96	98	98	95	98	100	**97**
	Net Opinion (%) Base: all	-37	-8	-19	-13	-26	-22	-19	-17	-14	-25	-21	-13	-29	-23	**-19**
	Net Opinion (%) Base aware	-38	-8	-20	-14	-30	-23	-20	-18	-15	-26	-21	-13	-30	-23	**-20**
The provincial court	Aware (%)	87	87	66	67	80	71	71	78	66	79	83	66	84	100	**74**
	Net Opinion (%) Base: all	-40	-39	-27	-29	-35	-22	-37	-32	-22	-39	-46	-22	-44	-65	**-32**
	Net Opinion (%) Base aware	-46	-45	-41	-43	-44	-31	-51	-40	-33	-49	-56	-34	-53	-65	**-43**

45

Table 9A: Ratings of courts' present performance and as compared to five years ago

Respondent background characteristics N=816			Present Court Performance			Compared to five years ago		
			Aware (%)	Net Opinion (%) Base: all	Net Opinion (%) Base aware	Aware (%)	Net Opinion (%) Base: all	Net Opinion (%) Base aware
Location	Urban	PHP	96	-41	-43	93	+9	+10
		Other	91	-34	-38	88	+16	+18
	Rural		85	-34	-41	81	+12	+14
Sex	F		82	-33	-40	77	+6	+8
	M		93	-38	-41	92	+18	+20
Age	18-29		91	-27	-30	85	+23	+27
	30-44		86	-36	-42	83	+7	+9
	45+		88	-40	-45	86	+12	+14
SES	Below average		83	-27	-32	80	+14	+18
	Average		92	-43	-46	89	+11	+12
	Above average		93	-45	-49	89	+8	+9
Educational attainment	Primary incomplete		83	-29	-34	79	+11	+14
	Primary complete+		94	-45	-47	91	+14	+15
Court experience	+		98	-60	-61	97	0	0
	All		**88**	**-35**	**-40**	**84**	**+12**	**+14**

Table 12A: Expectations about chances of particular kinds of people to win their case

Respondent background characteristics N=816			High government official versus a wealthy business man (%)	Someone with strong connections to court officials versus a high government official (%)	Someone with strong connections to court officials versus a wealthy business man (%)
Location	Urban	PHP	+15	+2	+13
		Other	+7	+5	+8
	Rural		+2	+13	+7
Sex	*F*		+9	+9	+14
	M		+3	+10	+3
Age	18-29		+5	+17	+22
	30-44		+9	+3	+10
	45+		+2	+13	+1
SES	Below average		-4	+11	+3
	Average		+17	+11	+13
	Above average		+6	+3	+17
Educational attainment	Primary incomplete		0	+12	+5
	Primary complete+		+12	+7	+13
Court experience	+		-17	+20	-5
	All		**+5**	**+10**	**+8**

The   net   opinions   are   based   on   the   total   sample

Table 13A: Confidence about courts' decisions in specific kinds of cases: Location

N=816		Decision will be fair (%)	Decision will be issued within a reasonable amount of time (%)	Decision will be based on evidence rather than quality of the lawyers (%)	Aggregated confidence (%)
Phnom Penh	**Murder case, accused is important person, victim is ordinary person**	-60	-23	-26	-44
	High government official charged with corruption	-63	-53	-33	-50
	Police or military charged with human rights violation of government opponents	-43	-43	-29	-38
	Dispute between family members about property inheritance	-18	-4	-3	-8
Other Urban	**Murder case, accused is important person, victim is ordinary person**	-53	-54	-27	-45
	High government official charged with corruption	-48	-42	-28	-39
	Police or military charged with human rights violation of government opponents	-46	-33	-29	-36
	Dispute between family members about property inheritance	-19	-5	-1	-9
Rural	**Murder case, accused is important person, victim is ordinary person**	-56	-44	-21	-40
	High government official charged with corruption	-45	-34	-24	-35
	Police or military charged with human rights violation of government opponents	-41	-33	-15	-29
	Dispute between family members about property inheritance	-13	-12	+2	-8

The net opinions are based on the total samples

Table 13B: Confidence about courts' decisions in specific kinds of cases: Sex

N=816		Decision will be fair (%)	Decision will be issued within a reasonable amount of time (%)	Decision will be based on evidence rather than quality of the lawyers (%)	Aggregated confidence (%)
Female	**Murder case, accused is important person, victim is ordinary person**	-52	-46	-28	-42
	High government official charged with corruption	-47	-33	-27	-36
	Police or military charged with human rights violation of government opponents	-40	-32	-21	-31
	Dispute between family members about property inheritance	-14	-7	+1	-7
Male	**Murder case, accused is important person, victim is ordinary person**	-59	-46	-19	-42
	High government official charged with corruption	-50	-45	-26	-40
	Police or military charged with human rights violation of government opponents	-44	-38	-20	-34
	Dispute between family members about property inheritance	-16	-12	0	-9

The net opinions are based on the total samples

Table 13C: Confidence about courts' decisions in specific kinds of cases: Age

N=816		Decision will be fair (%)	Decision will be issued within a reasonable amount of time (%)	Decision will be based on evidence rather than quality of the lawyers (%)	Aggregated confidence (%)
18-29	Murder case, accused is important person, victim is ordinary person	-56	-46	-17	-40
	High government official charged with corruption	-44	-39	-26	-36
	Police or military charged with human rights violation of government opponents	-37	-31	-18	-29
	Dispute between family members about property inheritance	-4	-1	+8	+1
30-44	Murder case, accused is important person, victim is ordinary person	-53	-40	-19	-37
	High government official charged with corruption	-48	-35	-24	-35
	Police or military charged with human rights violation of government opponents	-40	-29	-16	-29
	Dispute between family members about property inheritance	-12	-9	+2	-6
45+	Murder case, accused is important person, victim is ordinary person	-60	-55	-33	-49
	High government official charged with corruption	-52	-44	-31	-42
	Police or military charged with human rights violation of government opponents	-47	-45	-26	-39
	Dispute between family members about property inheritance	-27	-15	-7	-16

The   net   opinions   are   based   on   the   total   samples

Table 13D: Confidence about courts' decisions in specific kinds of cases: SES

N=816		Decision will be fair (%)	Decision will be issued within a reasonable amount of time (%)	Decision will be based on evidence rather than quality of the lawyers (%)	Aggregated confidence (%)
Below Average	Murder case, accused is important person, victim is ordinary person	-49	-37	-15	-33
	High government official charged with corruption	-43	-30	-23	-32
	Police or military charged with human rights violation of government opponents	-35	-26	-17	-26
	Dispute between family members about property inheritance	-10	-5	+5	-4
Average	Murder case, accused is important person, victim is ordinary person	-62	-51	-24	-46
	High government official charged with corruption	-50	-42	-25	-39
	Police or military charged with human rights violation of government opponents	-45	-41	-18	-35
	Dispute between family members about property inheritance	-17	-16	-1	-11
Above Average	Murder case, accused is important person, victim is ordinary person	-70	-64	-46	-60
	High government official charged with corruption	-60	-60	-42	-54
	Police or military charged with human rights violation of government opponents	-55	-47	-36	-46
	Dispute between family members about property inheritance	-26	-8	-8	-14

The   net   opinions   are   based   on   the   total   samples

Table 13E: Confidence about courts' decisions in specific kinds of cases: Educational attainment

N=816		Decision will be fair (%)	Decision will be issued within a reasonable amount of time (%)	Decision will be based on evidence rather than quality of the lawyers (%)	Aggregated confidence (%)
No schooling plus primary incomplete	Murder case, accused is important person, victim is ordinary person	-48	-42	-17	-36
	High government official charged with corruption	-43	-29	-20	-31
	Police or military charged with human rights violation of government opponents	-36	-30	-14	-27
	Dispute between family members about property inheritance	-10	-10	+5	-5
Primary complete and above	Murder case, accused is important person, victim is ordinary person	-67	-52	-31	-60
	High government official charged with corruption	-55	-52	-36	-48
	Police or military charged with human rights violation of government opponents	-49	-42	-28	-40
	Dispute between family members about property inheritance	-21	-9	-5	-12

Table 13F: Confidence about courts' decisions in specific kinds of cases: Court experience

N=816		Decision will be fair (%)	Decision will be issued within a reasonable amount of time (%)	Decision will be based on evidence rather than quality of the lawyers (%)	Aggregated confidence (%)
Court experience	Murder case, accused is important person, victim is ordinary person	-77	-48	-27	-51
	High government official charged with corruption	-55	-43	-35	-44
	Police or military charged with human rights violation of government opponents	-60	-43	-20	-41
	Dispute between family members about property inheritance	-35	-23	-5	-21
All	Murder case, accused is important person, victim is ordinary person	-56	-46	-23	-42
	High government official charged with corruption	-48	-39	-27	-38
	Police or military charged with human rights violation of government opponents	-42	-35	-20	-32
	Dispute between family members about property inheritance	-15	-10	+1	-8

The net opinions are based on the total samples

Table 14A: Susceptibility of court officials to bribery

Respondent background characteristics N=816			In case I myself would take a case to court my opponent would probably resort to bribery in order to win the case			It is harder to bribe court officials in comparison to officials of other government agencies			Bribery at the court makes me more unhappy than bribery at other places		
			Aware (%)	Net Opinion (%) Base: all	Net Opinion (%) Base aware	Aware (%)	Net Opinion (%) Base: all	Net Opinion (%) Base aware	Aware (%)	Net Opinion (%) Base: all	Net Opinion (%) Base aware
Location	Urban	PHP	98	+85	+86	94	-45	-48	96	+70	+74
		Other	98	+82	+84	91	-46	-51	96	+59	+62
	Rural		96	+77	+81	85	-42	-50	93	+57	+62
Sex	F		95	+86	+90	83	-41	-50	91	+56	+61
	M		98	+77	+78	92	-44	-47	97	+64	+66
Age	18-29		97	+83	+86	90	-53	-59	93	+62	+66
	30-44		96	+83	+86	88	-40	-46	94	+59	+63
	45+		97	+73	+75	86	-42	-49	94	+60	+63
SES	Below average		95	+74	+75	81	-38	-46	89	+58	+65
	Average		98	+84	+86	93	-48	-52	98	+61	+62
	Above average		98	+85	+87	96	-53	-55	100	+62	+62
Educational attainment	Primary incomplete		95	+75	+79	82	-38	-46	91	+54	+60
	Primary complete+		99	+85	+86	95	-52	-55	98	+67	+68
Court experience	+		100	+88	+88	98	-70	-71	100	+62	+62
	All		**97**	**+80**	**+82**	**87**	**-44**	**-50**	**94**	**+60**	**+64**

Table 15A: Willingness to testify

Respondent background characteristics N=816			Witnesses to crimes are generally willing to testify in court		
			Aware (%)	Net Opinion (%) Base: all	Net Opinion (%) Base aware
Location	Urban	PHP	98	+8	+9
		Other	98	+8	+8
	Rural		98	+19	+19
Sex	F		97	+9	+9
	M		99	+22	+22
Age	18-29		97	+20	+21
	30-44		98	+18	+18
	45+		99	+8	+8
SES	Below average		97	+19	+19
	Average		99	+17	+17
	Above average		98	0	0
Educational attainment	Primary incomplete		97	+18	+19
	Primary complete+		99	+11	+11
Court experience	+		100	+32	+32
	All		**98**	**+15**	**+15**

Table 16A: Availability of conflict resolution mechanisms in the community

Respondent background characteristics N=816			In our community, even strong grievances between persons are settled fairly and peacefully, without bringing a case to court		
			Aware (%)	Net Opinion (%) Base: all	Net Opinion (%) Base aware
Location	Urban	PHP	98	+39	+40
		Other	97	+53	+55
	Rural		97	+50	+52
Sex	F		95	+46	+48
	M		99	+52	+53
Age	18-29		96	+46	+48
	30-44		98	+48	+49
	45+		96	+53	+55
SES	Below average		95	+47	+49
	Average		98	+48	+49
	Above average		100	+58	+58
Educational attainment	Primary incomplete		96	+48	+50
	Primary complete+		98	+50	+51
Court experience	+		98	+40	+41
	All		**97**	**+47**	**+48**

Table 17A: Guilty unless proven otherwise

Respondent background characteristics N=816			One who is accused of a crime must prove his innocence, or else he will usually be punished		
			Aware (%)	Net Opinion (%) Base: all	Net Opinion (%) Base aware
Location	Urban	PHP	100	+24	+24
		Other	97	+16	+17
	Rural		95	+13	+14
Sex	F		93	+21	+23
	M		99	+9	+9
Age	18-29		97	+31	+31
	30-44		94	+11	+12
	45+		97	+11	+11
SES	Below average		93	+22	+24
	Average		99	+5	+5
	Above average		98	+21	+21
Educational attainment	Primary incomplete		94	+12	+13
	Primary complete+		99	+20	+20
Court experience	+		100	+17	+17
	All		**96**	**+15**	**+16**

Table 19A: Equal treatment

Respondent background characteristics N=816			Whether rich or poor, people who have cases in court generally receive equal treatment			Whether rich or poor, people convicted of crimes are generally punished according to the court judgment		
			Aware (%)	Net Opinion (%) Base: all	Net Opinion (%) Base aware	Aware (%)	Net Opinion (%) Base: all	Net Opinion (%) Base aware
Location	Urban	PHP	98	-34	-35	95	-11	-11
		Other	98	-28	-28	98	-15	-15
	Rural		96	-22	-23	94	-13	-14
Sex	F		95	-22	-24	92	+9	+10
	M		98	-28	-28	98	-18	-18
Age	18-29		97	-24	-25	95	-13	-14
	30-44		97	-3-	-31	95	-19	-20
	45+		97	-19	-20	95	-6	-7
SES	Below average		94	-15	-16	92	-2	-2
	Average		100	-30	-30	97	-21	-22
	Above average		98	-46	-47	99	-33	-33
Educational attainment	Primary incomplete		96	-19	-20	93	-9	-10
	Primary complete+		98	-33	-34	98	-19	-19
Court experience	+		98	-58	-59	100	-37	-37
	All		**97**	**-25**	**-26**	**95**	**-13**	**-14**

Table 21A: Problems in getting proper services from the court

Respondent background characteristics N=816		Location			Sex		Age			SES			Educational attainment		Court experience	
		Urban		Rural	F	M	18-29	30-44	45+	Below average	Average	Above average	Primary incomplete	Primary complete +	+	All
		PHP	Other													
Hard to understand	Aware (%)	91	94	87	88	91	89	88	91	88	89	94	88	91	100	**89**
	Net Opinion (%) Base: all	+57	+62	+62	+63	+60	+56	+58	+69	+62	+60	+60	+66	+55	+48	**+61**
	Net Opinion (%) Base aware	+62	+66	+71	+71	+66	+63	+66	+75	+71	+68	+64	+75	+60	+48	**+69**
Costs too much money	Aware (%)	98	97	96	95	98	96	97	97	95	99	98	96	98	100	**97**
	Net Opinion (%) Base: all	+64	+74	+77	+78	+71	+79	+76	+70	+70	+78	+79	+73	+77	+82	**+75**
	Net Opinion (%) Base aware	+65	+77	+80	+82	+73	+83	+78	+72	+74	+79	+81	+76	+79	+82	**+77**
Costs too much time	Aware (%)	98	96	97	96	98	96	97	96	95	98	98	96	98	100	**97**
	Net Opinion (%) Base: all	+70	+79	+81	+82	+76	+79	+82	+72	+77	+80	+84	+75	+84	+85	**+79**
	Net Opinion (%) Base aware	+72	+83	+84	+86	+77	+82	+84	+79	+81	+82	+86	+79	+85	+85	**+82**
Judge will not understand	Aware (%)	96	97	90	89	96	93	91	93	89	95	98	90	95	100	**92**
	Net Opinion (%) Base: all	+63	+57	+57	+63	+53	+53	+58	+61	+54	+59	+65	+58	+58	+53	**+58**
	Net Opinion (%) Base aware	+65	+59	+63	+70	+55	+57	+63	+66	+61	+62	+67	+64	+60	+53	**+63**
Unsure about enforcement	Aware (%)	92	93	85	82	94	90	87	88	83	91	97	84	93	97	**88**
	Net Opinion (%) Base: all	+22	+24	+17	+20	+18	+27	+19	+14	+11	+26	+28	+16	+24	+28	**+19**
	Net Opinion (%) Base aware	+24	+26	+20	+25	+20	+30	+22	+17	+14	+29	+29	+19	+26	+29	**+22**
Difficult to find trusted help	Aware (%)	96	97	96	94	98	96	97	96	95	97	98	95	98	100	**96**
	Net Opinion (%) Base: all	+79	+79	+83	+82	+81	+82	+83	+81	+81	+85	+76	+81	+83	+78	**+82**
	Net Opinion (%) Base aware	+83	+81	+87	+87	+83	+85	+85	+84	+85	+88	+77	+85	+85	+78	**+85**

Table 27A: Examples of clear justice and true injustice, inside and outside courts: Location, sex and age

N=816		Nr. Of Examples	%	Net %
Phnom Penh	**Clear justice of the courts**	17	14	-33
	True injustice of the courts	57	47	
	Clear justice outside courts	37	31	+19
	True injustice outside courts	14	12	
Other Urban	**Clear justice of the courts**	45	25	-23
	True injustice of the courts	87	48	
	Clear justice outside courts	52	29	+14
	True injustice outside courts	26	14	
Rural	**Clear justice of the courts**	78	15	-24
	True injustice of the courts	201	39	
	Clear justice outside courts	196	38	+18
	True injustice outside courts	104	20	
Female	**Clear justice of the courts**	56	14	-25
	True injustice of the courts	160	39	
	Clear justice outside courts	139	34	+17
	True injustice outside courts	70	17	
Male	**Clear justice of the courts**	84	21	-25
	True injustice of the courts	185	45	
	Clear justice outside courts	146	36	+18
	True injustice outside courts	74	18	
18-29	**Clear justice of the courts**	29	44	-28
	True injustice of the courts	79	16	
	Clear justice outside courts	65	36	+18
	True injustice outside courts	33	18	
30-44	**Clear justice of the courts**	66	18	-26
	True injustice of the courts	159	44	
	Clear justice outside courts	123	34	+15
	True injustice outside courts	68	19	
45+	**Clear justice of the courts**	45	16	-23
	True injustice of the courts	107	39	
	Clear justice outside courts	97	35	+20
	True injustice outside courts	43	16	

Table 27B: Examples of clear justice and true injustice, inside and outside courts: SES, Educational attainment and court experience

N=816		Nr. Of Examples	%	Net %
Below average	Clear justice of the courts	48	12	-19
	True injustice of the courts	121	31	
	Clear justice outside courts	136	34	+11
	True injustice outside courts	91	23	
Average	Clear justice of the courts	56	19	-34
	True injustice of the courts	157	52	
	Clear justice outside courts	117	39	+24
	True injustice outside courts	44	15	
Above average	Clear justice of the courts	36	30	-26
	True injustice of the courts	67	55	
	Clear justice outside courts	32	26	+19
	True injustice outside courts	9	7	
No schooling + primary incomplete	Clear justice of the courts	66	14	-19
	True injustice of the courts	153	33	
	Clear justice outside courts	163	35	+15
	True injustice outside courts	93	20	
Primary complete and above	Clear justice of the courts	74	21	-34
	True injustice of the courts	192	55	
	Clear justice outside courts	122	35	+20
	True injustice outside courts	51	15	
Court experience	Clear justice of the courts	27	45	-23
	True injustice of the courts	41	68	
	Clear justice outside courts	15	25	+12
	True injustice outside courts	8	13	
All	**Clear justice of the courts**	**140**	**17**	**-25**
	True injustice of the courts	**345**	**42**	
	Clear justice outside courts	**285**	**35**	**+17**
	True injustice outside courts	**144**	**18**	

Table 29A: Professional prestige

Respondent background characteristics N=816		Location			Sex		Age			SES			Educational attainment		Court experience	
		Urban		Rural	F	M	18-29	30-44	45+	Below average	Average	Above average	Primary incomplete	Primary complete +	+	All
		PHP	Other													
University teacher	Aware (%)	91	89	79	82	84	91	79	83	79	85	89	79	89	95	**83**
	Net Opinion (%) Base: all	+60	+69	+65	+65	+65	+68	+64	+65	+65	+64	+68	+64	+66	+72	**+65**
	Net Opinion (%) Base aware	+66	+78	+82	+79	+78	+75	+81	+77	+82	+76	+76	+82	+75	+75	**+79**
Doctor	Aware (%)	100	99	97	98	99	98	98	98	96	100	100	97	99	100	**76**
	Net Opinion (%) Base: all	+48	+62	+61	+62	+56	+64	+55	+62	+60	+56	+64	+62	+56	+58	**+57**
	Net Opinion (%) Base aware	+48	+63	+63	+64	+57	+66	+56	+63	+63	+57	+64	+64	+56	+58	**+76**
NGO staff	Aware (%)	95	88	80	79	89	91	83	81	81	85	89	78	91	83	**84**
	Net Opinion (%) Base: all	+63	+63	+54	+54	+61	+57	+57	+58	+59	+56	+58	+54	+62	+67	**+57**
	Net Opinion (%) Base aware	+67	+71	+68	+68	+69	+63	+69	+72	+72	+66	+65	+70	+68	+80	**+69**
Engineer	Aware (%)	89	85	69	71	81	83	73	74	70	78	88	68	85	83	**98**
	Net Opinion (%) Base: all	+58	+63	+56	+56	+59	+56	+56	+61	+57	+57	+60	+57	+58	+63	**+59**
	Net Opinion (%) Base aware	+64	+74	+80	+79	+73	+68	+76	+81	+82	+73	+68	+84	+68	+76	**+61**
High civil servant	Aware (%)	96	94	92	90	96	96	93	90	90	94	98	90	97	97	**93**
	Net Opinion (%) Base: all	+30	+38	+39	+40	+35	+45	+36	+34	+44	+30	+36	+41	+32	+32	**+37**
	Net Opinion (%) Base aware	+31	+40	+42	+44	+36	+47	+38	+38	+48	+31	+36	+46	+33	+33	**+40**
Big business owner	Aware (%)	93	93	100	84	89	89	86	86	84	88	91	83	92	95	**87**
	Net Opinion (%) Base: all	+28	+37	+34	+39	+28	+36	+38	+27	+35	+32	+31	+36	+31	+37	**+34**
	Net Opinion (%) Base aware	+30	+40	+41	+47	+31	+46	+44	+32	+42	+37	+35	+44	+33	+39	**+39**

Table 29A: Professional prestige (cont.)

Respondent background characteristics N=816		Location			Sex		Age			SES			Educational attainment		Court experience	
		Urban		Rural	F	M	18-29	30-44	45+	Below average	Average	Above average	Primary incomplete	Primary complete +	+	All
		PHP	Other													
School teacher	Aware (%)	100	99	100	100	100	100	100	99	99	100	100	99	100	100	100
	Net Opinion (%) Base: all	+12	+32	+39	+33	+33	+29	+33	+36	+34	+29	+41	+38	+27	+25	+33
	Net Opinion (%) Base aware	+12	+32	+39	+34	+33	+29	+33	+37	+34	+29	+41	+38	+27	+25	+33
Farmer	Aware (%)	99	99	99	99	100	99	99	99	100	99	99	99	100	100	72
	Net Opinion (%) Base: all	+25	+28	+25	+24	+27	+24	+23	+29	+26	+27	+21	+29	+21	+20	+22
	Net Opinion (%) Base aware	+25	+28	+25	+25	+27	+24	+23	+30	+26	+27	+21	+29	+21	+20	+30
Lawyer	Aware (%)	84	86	65	66	79	74	70	75	64	77	88	64	84	95	99
	Net Opinion (%) Base: all	+19	+27	+20	+22	+21	+28	+21	+19	+24	+16	+28	+24	+18	+8	+26
	Net Opinion (%) Base aware	+23	+32	+31	+34	+26	+38	+29	+25	+38	+20	+32	+37	+22	+9	+26
Judge	Aware (%)	91	89	74	74	86	80	79	81	72	84	95	72	90	97	80
	Net Opinion (%) Base: all	+12	+17	+13	+15	+12	+18	+12	+14	+19	+8	+12	+18	+9	+3	+14
	Net Opinion (%) Base aware	+13	+19	+18	+21	+14	+22	+16	+17	+27	+10	+12	+24	+10	+3	+18
Policeman	Aware (%)	99	99	96	95	99	98	97	96	96	98	98	96	99	100	97
	Net Opinion (%) Base: all	-11	+1	-5	0	-10	-4	-3	-7	-2	-10	-3	+1	-12	-12	-5
	Net Opinion (%) Base aware	-11	+1	-5	0	-10	-5	-3	-7	-2	-10	-3	+1	-12	-12	-5

Table 30A: Expectation about the fairness of various conflict resolution options

Respondent background characteristics N=816		Location			Sex		Age			SES			Educational attainment		Court experience	
		Urban		Rural	F	M	18-29	30-44	45+	Below average	Average	Above average	Primary incomplete	Primary complete +	+	All
		PHP	Other													
Royal Palace	Aware (%)	63	71	69	64	73	70	68	69	69	68	68	68	69	75	68
	Net Opinion (%) Base: all	+51	+58	+59	+53	+62	+61	+56	+57	+60	+57	+52	+58	+56	+67	+57
	Net Opinion (%) Base aware	+81	+82	+85	+83	+84	+87	+82	+84	+86	+84	+77	+86	+81	+89	+84
NGO	Aware (%)	91	84	69	69	83	81	76	72	73	77	84	68	86	85	76
	Net Opinion (%) Base: all	+73	+70	+52	+51	+67	+59	+61	+58	+55	+62	+68	+52	+70	+82	+59
	Net Opinion (%) Base aware	+81	+83	+75	+75	+81	+73	+80	+80	+75	+81	+81	+76	+81	+96	+78
National Assembly	Aware (%)	63	65	58	51	69	63	58	61	59	63	60	56	65	73	60
	Net Opinion (%) Base: all	+31	+41	+36	+28	+45	+43	+36	+33	+38	+35	+35	+35	+38	+53	+37
	Net Opinion (%) Base aware	+49	+62	+63	+55	+65	+69	+62	+54	+65	+56	+58	+63	+58	+73	+61
Respected elders in your village	Aware (%)	93	92	95	93	94	96	93	94	97	93	87	99	94	98	94
	Net Opinion (%) Base: all	+53	+49	+55	+50	+57	+57	+52	+53	+60	+47	+48	+55	+52	+38	+54
	Net Opinion (%) Base aware	+58	+54	+58	+53	+61	+60	+56	+57	+63	+51	+55	+58	+55	+39	+57
Prime Minister	Aware (%)	64	69	70	62	75	72	70	66	71	68	65	69	71	72	69
	Net Opinion (%) Base: all	+13	+43	+30	+24	+37	+37	+32	+23	+29	+33	+26	+29	+32	+40	+30
	Net Opinion (%) Base aware	+21	+62	+43	+39	+49	+52	+47	+35	+42	+49	+41	+44	+44	+56	+44

Table 30A: Expectation about the fairness of various conflict resolution options (cont.)

Respondent background characteristics N=816		Location			Sex		Age			SES			Educational attainment		Court experience	
		Urban		Rural	F	M	18-29	30-44	45+	Below average	Average	Above average	Primary incomplete	Primary complete +	+	All
		PHP	Other													
Village Chief	Aware (%)	99	97	99	98	99	100	98	99	99	99	98	99	98	100	**99**
	Net Opinion (%) Base: all	+27	+32	+31	+27	+33	+33	+36	+21	+32	+31	+22	+31	+29	+18	**+30**
	Net Opinion (%) Base aware	+27	+33	+31	+28	+34	+33	+37	+21	+33	+32	+23	+32	+30	+18	**+31**
Commune Council	Aware (%)	100	96	98	98	98	97	99	98	98	99	98	98	98	98	**98**
	Net Opinion (%) Base: all	+15	+27	+21	+22	+22	+28	+19	+21	+21	+26	+14	+23	+19	+18	**+22**
	Net Opinion (%) Base aware	+15	+28	+22	+22	+22	+29	+19	+21	+21	+26	+14	+24	+20	+18	**+22**
Court	Aware (%)	96	94	85	85	93	91	86	91	86	89	94	85	95	97	**89**
	Net Opinion (%) Base: all	-32	-23	-16	-21	-19	-12	-20	-24	-11	-26	-32	-9	-34	-50	**-20**
	Net Opinion (%) Base aware	-33	-25	-18	-24	-20	-13	-24	-26	-12	-30	-34	-11	-36	-52	**-22**
Police	Aware (%)	99	98	96	94	99	98	96	96	95	98	98	95	99	100	**97**
	Net Opinion (%) Base: all	-27	-16	-26	-25	-23	-16	-20	-33	-20	-25	-35	-23	-25	-27	**-24**
	Net Opinion (%) Base aware	-27	-16	-27	-26	-23	-16	-21	-35	-20	-26	-35	-24	-25	-27	**-25**

Annex 2
Construction of the Socio-Economic Status dummy variable
Variables used

Variable	levels	rural	other urban	Phnom Penh
Self classification	poor	BA	BA	BA
	below average	BA	BA	BA
	average	A	A	A
	better off	AA	AA	AA
	rich	AA	AA	AA

In general, self classification is unreliable in Cambodia. Nevertheless, in line with international usage, we give **priority** to self classification as a tool for class assignment.

However, because there is a strong tendency to underreport, we use it as an indicator in combination with other indicators

Variable	levels	rural	other urban	Phnom Penh
Income	115000	BA	BA	BA
	225000	A	BA	BA
	300000	AA	A	BA
	500000	AA	AA	A
	800000	AA	AA	AA

This variable is notorious for underreporting; given the limited attention that could be given to cross checking reported income

We defined the lowest 35 percentiles as below average, the middle 45 percentiles as average and the top 20 percentiles as above average

Variable	levels	rural	other urban	Phnom Penh
Education	no schooling	BA	BA	BA
	primary incomplete	BA	BA	BA
	primary complete	BA	BA	BA
	secondary incomplete	A	A	A
	secondary complete	AA	A	A
	post secondary	AA	AA	AA

Variable	levels	rural	other urban	Phnom Penh
Fuel	firewood	BA	BA	BA
	charcoal, gas, electricity	A/AA	A/AA	A/AA

Variable	levels	rural	other urban	Phnom Penh
Roofing	other	BA	BA	BA
	Tile/concrete	A/AA	A/AA	A/AA

BA = Below Average
A = Average
AA = Above Average

SES classification rules

We differentiate three socio-economic classes: below average, average and better off

These classes are not defined by splitting the total sample into three equal segments using one or more indicator variables but by using a set of indicator variables in combination with decision rules if different variables indicate different class.

Apply	**Rule**
in this order	
A	Split dataset into rural, other urban and Phnom Penh respondents
B	For **Phnom Penh and other urban** apply decision rules in the following order
1	if self classification = better off: classify as above average
2	if at least three of the other four variables at above average level: classify as above average
3	if at least 3 of the other four variables at below average level: classify as below average
4	otherwise classify as average
C	For **rural** apply decision rules in this order
1	if self classification = better off: classify as above average if self classification is average and at least 2 other variables are at above average level: classify as better off
2	if income is at above average level and self classification is average: classify as average
3	if at least 3 of the other four variables at below average level: classify as below average
4	otherwise classify as average

Note: "other variables" refers to the variables "other" than self classification

Annex 3 Questionnaire

The questionnaire indicates which questions are CORE questions, i.e. asked in all countries participating in the comparative study, and which questions are Cambodia specific, so called ADDED questions.

Also if particular institutions or officials that respondents are asker to evaluate are the Cambodian equivalents of a more general category, i.e. *Chairman of your commune/sangkat council* for *Your town/city major*, this is also indicated.

The section on background characteristics probes the same variables as in all other participating countries but using Cambodia specific categories (e.g. for education, religion, etc.).

TALK TO PROBABILITY RESPONDENT

INTRODUCTION:
Good morning/afternoon/evening. I am _____ from The Center for Advanced Study in Phnom Penh and we are conducting a public opinion survey in your area today.

A.   COURTS

1-6.

CORE

*How much TRUST do you have in the following **people** in your area --- would you say that you have **VERY LITTLE**, **LITTLE**, **NEITHER LITTLE, MUCH**, or **VERY MUCH TRUST** in them? If you do not know anyone in a particular group, just say so. Please indicate your answers ese cards on the appropriate places on this board.*

Qs. 1-6.									
(SHUFFLE CARDS – Qs 1-6) (RATING BOARD 1)	Very	Little	Neither	Much	Very	Don't know roup	C	D	RA
1. *Physicians in government hospitals*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
2. *Judges*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
3. *Teachers in government schools*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
4. *Prosecutors*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
5. *Chairman of your commune/sangkat council*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
6. *Your National Assembly representative*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

CC = Cannot Choose
DK = Don't Know (this profession)
RA = Refuse to Answer

7-17.

CORE

How much TRUST do you have in the following **institutions** --- would you say that you have **VERY LITTLE, LITTLE, NEITHER MUCH NOR LITTLE, MUCH,** or **VERY MUCH TRUST** in them? If you do not know the institution, just say so. Please indicate your answers by putting these cards on the appropriate places on this board.

Qs. 7-17.									
(SHUFFLE CARDS – Qs 9-19) (RATING BOARD 1)	Very little	Little	Neither much nor little	Much	Very much	Don't know this institution	C C	DK	R A
7. *Supreme Court*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
8. *Trial courts*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

9.	*The National Government*	1	2	3	4	5	6		7	8	9
10.	==*Parliament*==	1	2	3	4	5	6		7	8	9
11.	==*Your commune/sangkat council*==	1	2	3	4	5	6		7	8	9
12.	*The military*	1	2	3	4	5	6		7	8	9
13.	*The Police*	1	2	3	4	5	6		7	8	9
14.	==*Your Pagoda*==	1	2	3	4	5	6		7	8	9
15.	*Television*	1	2	3	4	5	6		7	8	9
16.	*The newspapers*	1	2	3	4	5	6		7	8	9
17.	*Non-government organizations*	1	2	3	4	5	6		7	8	9

CC = Cannot Choose
DK = Don't Know (how much I trust this institution)
RA = Refuse to Answer

Now we have some questions about COURTS in particular. By COURTS we mean the official government bodies that make judgments of guilt or innocence of those accused of crime and judgments of right and wrong between parties who cannot resolve a dispute between themselves.

[==Note to Cambodian Interviewer==: ==This means we are interested only in the COURTS and not in others resolving disputes like the police or commune chiefs==]:

18.   *In your opinion, is the **present performance** of courts in Cambodia…(**SHOWCARD**)?*
CORE
Very good 1
Good 2
Neither Good nor Poor...3
Poor 4
Very Poor 5
Can't choose..7
Don't know 8
Refused to answer..9

19.   *Compared to the performance of the courts **FIVE YEARS AGO**, would you say that its performance **now** is…* CORE *(**SHOWCARD**)…than/as before?*

Much better..1
Somewhat better..2
he Same 3
Somewhat worse...4
Much worse 5
Can't choose..7
Don't know 8
Refused to answer..9

20-27. CORE	In your opinion, do the following entities seriously try to influence court decisions, and if so, do courts **ALMOST ALWAYS RESIST, USUALLY RESIST, SELDOM RESIST, ALMOST NEVER RESIST** such pressures? **(SHUFFLE ORDER)** Please indicate your answers by putting these cards on the appropriate places on this board.

(SHUFFLE CARDS – Qs 24-30) (RATING BOARD 3)	Qs. 20-27.							
	Courts Almost always resist	Courts Usually resist	Courts Seldom resist	Courts Almost never resist	No serious pressure from this entity	CC	D K	RA
20. *The Council of Ministers*	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9
21. *Parliament*	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9
22. **ADD** *High Government Officials*	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9
23. *Local authorities*	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9
24. *Big businesses*	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9
25. *The military*	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9
26. *Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs)*	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9
27. *Big criminal groups or , "mafia" like traffickers, smugglers, or kidnappers*	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9

CC = Cannot Choose
DK = Don't Know (about their resistance to corruption)
RA = Refuse to answer

28-30. ADD	Now we would like to know your expectations about the chances of **specific kinds of people** to win their case **(SHUFFLE CASES)**. For each of the cases mentioned below, please tell us if you expect the claimant to have **MUCH MORE, MORE, NEITRHER MORE NOR LESS, LESS** or **MUCH LESS chance** to win his case. Please indicate your answers by putting these cards on the appropriate places on this board.
	INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTIONS: THE 1 AND 2 VERSIONS ARE TO BE ADMINISTERED SPLIT SAMPLE

(SHUFFLE CASES – Qs 28-30) (RATING BOARD 1)	Qs. 28-30.							
	Much more	more	Neither more nor less	less	Much less	C C	D K	RA
A.1 **A high government official (unrightfully??) claims ownership of a piece of land that is occupied by a wealthy businessman.**								
28.1 *when the high government official files a court case he has….chances to win than the wealthy businessman*	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9
A.2 **A wealthy businessman (unrightfully??) claims ownership of a piece of land that is occupied by a high government official.**								
28.2 *when the wealthy businessman files a court case he has….chances to win than the high government official*	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9
B.1 **A high government official has a serious dispute with a person that has strong ksae (connections) to court officials.**								

29.1	*when the high government official files a court case he has....chances to win than the person with the ksae*	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9
B.2	**A person with strong ksae (connections) to court officials has a serious dispute with a high government official.**								
29.2	*when the person with the ksae files a court case he has....chances to win than the high government official*	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9
C.1	**A wealthy businessman has a serious dispute with a person that has strong ksae (connections) to court officials.**								
30.1	*when the wealthy businessman files a court case he has....chances to win than the person with the ksae*	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9
C.2	**A person with strong ksae (connections) to court officials has a serious dispute with a wealthy businessman.**								
30.2	*when the person with the ksae files a court case he has....chances to win than the wealthy businessman*	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9

CC = Cannot Choose
DK = Don't Know
RA = Refuse to answer

31. *Does media, like TV, radio and newspapers sometimes give heavy publicity to court cases, or never? If sometimes heavy, what is your opinion about the effect of the publicity on the decision of the courts? Are the decisions... (SHOWCARD) or don't you know enough about these cases?*
CORE

Much fairer..1
Somewhat fairer...2
No different 3
Somewhat less fair 4
Much less fair...5
Media publicity is never heavy...6
Can't choose..7
Don't know enough 8
Refused to answer..9

32-43. CORE	*We would like to know about how much confidence you have in court decisions on **specific kinds of cases (SHUFFLE CASES)**. For each of the cases mentioned below, please tell us if you have **VERY LITTLE, LITTLE, NEITHER MUCH NOR LITTLE, MUCH,** or **VERY MUCH** **confidence that:** (1) the court decision will be issued within a reasonable amount of time; (2) the court will consider the merits of the case more than the quality of the lawyers arguing the case, and (3) the decision of the court will be fair. Please indicate your answers by putting these cards on the appropriate places on this board.*

Qs. 32-43.

	Very little	Little	Neither much nor little	Much	Very much	CC	DK		RA

(SHUFFLE CASES – Qs 32-43) (RATING BOARD 1)

A. *A case of murder, where the victim is an ordinary person and the accused is an important person.*

32.	*… the court decision will be issued within a reasonable amount of time?*	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9
33.	*… the court will consider the* ==evidence== *of the case more than the quality of the lawyers arguing the case?*	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9
34.	*… the decision of the court will be fair?*	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9

B. *A charge against the police or the military of violating the human rights of certain persons who are against the government.*

For Cambodia: "higher level authorities in stead of "government"?

35.	*(… the court decision will be issued within a reasonable amount of time?*	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9
36.	*… the court will consider the* ==evidence== *of the case more than the quality of the lawyers arguing the case?*	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9
37.	*… the decision of the court will be fair?*	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9

C. *A dispute between members of a family as to the proper division of a property inheritance among them.*

38.	*… the court decision will be issued within a reasonable amount of time)*	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9
39.	*… the court will consider the* ==evidence== *of the case more than the quality of the lawyers arguing the case?*	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9
40.	*… the decision of the court will be fair?*	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9

D. *A charge against a high government official for amassing wealth through corruption.*

41.	*(… the court decision will be issued within a reasonable amount of time?*	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9
42.	*… the court will consider the* ==evidence== *of the case more than the quality of the lawyers arguing the case?*	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9
43.	*… the decision of the court will be fair?*	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9

CC = Cannot Choose
DK = Don't Know
RA = Refuse to answer

44.   *How would you compare officials of the court to officials of other government agencies with respect to* **susceptibility to bribery** *– do you think it is… **(SHOWCARD)** … to bribe officials of the court?*

CORE
Much harder... 1
Somewhat harder 2

Neither harder nor easier.. 3

Somewhat easier... 4

Much easier 5

Can't choose 7

Don't know 8

Refused to answer 9

45.　　　Many people say that bribery is the normal way of doing things in Cambodia. Most are unhappy about bribery but often they are more unhappy about some kinds of bribery than others. Does **bribery at the court**
(SHOWCARD) than bribery at other places
ADD

Make you Much More Unhappy..1　　→ **GO TO Q46**

Make you Somewhat More Unhappy..2　　→ **GO TO Q46**

Make you Neither More nor Less Unhappy ....3　　→ **GO TO Q47**

Make you Somewhat Less Unhappy..4　　→ **GO TO Q47**

Make you Much Less Unhappy ....5　　→ **GO TO Q47**

Can't choose..7　　→ **GO TO Q47**

Don't know ....8　　→ **GO TO Q47**

Refused to answer...9　　→ **GO TO Q47**

46.　　　**If answered '1' or '2' in Q46:** Why do you say that? **(OPEN ENDED) (ALLOW MULTIPLE RESPONSE)**

ADD
VERBATIM:_____

47-56.	*Do you Strongly agree, Somewhat agree, Neither agree nor disagree, Somewhat disagree, or Strongly disagree with the following (random order except for last item)? Please indicate your answers by putting these cards on the appropriate places on this board.*							
CORE		Qs. 47-56.							
	(SHUFFLE CARDS – Qs 47-56) (RATING BOARD 4	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	C C	D K	RA
47.	*"Witnesses to crimes are generally willing to testify in court."*	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9

48.	*"In our community, even strong grievances between persons are settled fairly and peacefully, without bringing a case to court."*	1	2	3	4	5		7	8	9
49.	*"One who is accused of a crime must prove his innocence, or else he will usually be punished."*	1	2	3	4	5		7	8	9
50.	*"Judges who mistakenly convict people who are really innocent usually get into trouble."*	1	2	3	4	5		7	8	9
51.	*"Judges who mistakenly acquit people who are really guilty usually get into trouble."*	1	2	3	4	5		7	8	9
52.	*"Whether rich or poor, people who have cases in court generally receive equal treatment."*	1	2	3	4	5		7	8	9
53.	*"Whether rich or poor, people convicted of crimes are generally punished according to the court judgment."*	1	2	3	4	5		7	8	9
54.	==*"Whether Christians or Muslims, people who have cases in court receive equal treatment."*==	1	2	3	4	5		7	8	9

ADD

55.	*"Women who are victims of rape are generally treated fairly by the courts."*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8

(DO NOT SHUFFLE CARD–Q56
(RATING BOARD 4)

56.	*"Whatever its shortcomings and inadequacies may be, our system of justice provides the ultimate guarantee of democracy and public liberties."*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8

CC = Cannot Choose
DK = Don't Know
RA = Refuse to answer

57-63.	*There are some problems people have in getting proper service from the courts. In case you yourself were to take a case to court, would you* **STRONGLY AGREE, SOMEWHAT AGREE, NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE, SOMEWHAT DISAGREE,** *or* **STRONGLY DISAGREE** *that the following problems would apply to you? Please indicate your answers by putting these cards on the appropriate places on this board.*

Qs. 57-63.

CORE

(SHUFFLE CARDS – Qs 57-63)
(RATING BOARD 4

		Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	CC	DK	RA
57.	*"It is hard for me to understand what the judge and other lawyers say."*	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9
58.	*"To take a case to court costs more money than I can afford."*	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9
59.	*"To take a case to court takes more time than I can afford."*	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9

No.	Statement								
60.	*"My opponent would probably resort to bribery in order to win the case."*	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9
61.	*"The judge would probably not understand the problems of someone like me."*	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9
62.	*"If the court decision is in my favor, I cannot be sure that it will be enforced."*	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9
63.	==*"It is too difficult for me to find someone that I trust to help me."*==	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9

CC = Cannot Choose
DK = Don't Know
RA = Refuse to answer

64.   Which of the following would you probably do to get help in court or to resolve the problem without going to court? (MULTPLE RESPONSE ALLOWED)
CORE
Hire your own private lawyer ....1 → GO TO Q66
Find an organization to provide a lawyer to help you 2   CONTINUE

Can't choose...7 → GO TO Q66
Don't know...8 → GO TO Q66
Refused to answer...9 → GO TO Q63

65. *   **IF ANSWERED '2 'IN Q61**: What are the names of the organizations that might be able to help you in this way? (OPEN-ENDED) (ALLOW MULTIPLE RESPONSE)*
CORE
VERBATIM: _____

_____

66.   Have you learned about the courts in any of the following ways? – you can mention as many as are applicable. (SHOWCARD) (ALLOW MULTIPLE RESPONSE)
CORE
Personal experience in court 1
From people with court experience 2
From relatives and friends 3
From TV or radio 4
From newspapers or magazines 5
From school 6
Others, pls. specify... 7
Don't know... 8
Refused to answer... 9

67. *Have you ever been a complainant or a defendant in a court case?* (MULTIPLE RESPONSES ALLOWED)
CORE

Complainant 1	→ CONTINUE
Defendant 2	→ CONTINUE
Neither 3	→ GO TO Q70
Don't know...8	→ GO TO Q70
Refused to answer 9	→ GO TO Q70

68. <u>*FOR THOSE WHO HAVE BEEN EITHER A COMPLAINANT OR A DEFENDANT*</u>: *Were these cases Mostly resolved in your favor, Mostly resolved against you, or Mostly unresolved?*
CORE

Mostly in your favor 1

Mostly against you 2

Mostly unresolved 3

Can't choose 7

Don't know..8

Refused to answer 9

69. Regardless of the outcome of your cases, do you think that the courts were generally **FAIR, NEITHER FAIR NOR UNFAIR, or UNFAIR**?
CORE

Fair 1

Neither Fair nor Unfair 2

Unfair 3

Can't choose 7

Don't know...8

Refused to answer 9

70. *What specific act by the courts is for you the best actual example, if any, of TRUE JUSTICE done in this country?* **(OPEN-ENDED) (ALLOW MULTIPLE RESPONSE)**
CORE

VERBATIM: _____

_____

_____

<u>PRE-CODES</u>:

Macro cases (specify) 1   → GO TO Q72

74

Micro-cases (property, crime, divorce, claims, other) 2   **→ GO TO Q72**
Don't know.. 8   **→ GO TO Q71**
Refused to answer 9   **→ GO TO Q71**

71.   *Is there any specific event, not directly related to the court, that you consider a good example of TRUE JUSTICE done in this country? (OPEN ENDED) (MULTIPLE RESPONSES ALLOWED)*

ADD

VERBATIM: _____

_____

_____

<u>PRE-CODES</u>:

Macro cases (specify) 1
Micro-cases (property, crime, divorce, claims, other) 2
Don't know.. 8
Refused to answer 9

72.   What specific act by the courts is for you the best actual example, if any, of CLEAR INJUSTICE being done in this country?

CORE

VERBATIM: _____

_____

_____

<u>PRE-CODES</u>:

Macro cases (specify) 1   **→ GO TO Q74**
Micro-cases (property, crime, divorce, claims, other) 2   **→ GO TO Q74**
Don't know.. 8   **→ GO TO Q73**
Refused to answer 9   **→ GO TO Q73**

73.   *Is there any specific event, not directly related to the court, that you consider a good example of TRUE INJUSTICE done in this country? (OPEN ENDED) (MULTIPLE RESPONSES ALLOWED)*

ADD

VERBATIM: _____

_____

_____

PRE-CODES:

Macro cases (specify) 1

Micro-cases (property, crime, divorce, claims, other) 2

Don't know... 8

Refused to answer... 9

B. ....OPINION ON LAWYERS AND JUDGES

74-84. *Some occupations are much more highly regarded/respected/prestigious/dignified than others. What is your opinion about the prestige of the following occupations? (Very prestigious, etc.)*

[Note to Interviewer: make explicit that the issue is not about earning money]

ADD	(SHUFFLE CARDS – Qs 74-84)	Very prestigious	More prestigious than average	Average Prestige	Less Prestige than average	Very unprestigious	<u>CC</u>	<u>DK</u>	<u>RA</u>
74.	*Judge*	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9
75.	*Lawyer*	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9
76.	*Doctor*	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9
77.	*University teacher*	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9
78.	*Primary School teacher*	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9
79.	*Engineer*	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9
80.	*NGO worker*	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9
81.	*Big business owner*	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9
82.	*High civil servant*	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9
83.	*Farmer*	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9
84.	*Police officer*	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9

CC = Cannot Choose
DK = Don't Know
RA = Refuse to answer

C.   ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION
CORE

85.   *Please tell us your opinion about the following problem: Suppose one of your neighbors, who recently bought a piece of land, tells you that suddenly another person is claiming to have documents of ownership of the same piece of land. Which of the following things, if any, would you advise your neighbor to do right away? You can mention more than one, but not more than three, most important things to do:*
[Note to FI: Place on cards, laid down in random order for R to see]

Go to the police 1   → GO TO Q86

Consult a lawyer...2   → GO TO Q86

File a case in court 3   → GO TO Q86

Consult a very respected person in your community 4   → GO TO Q87
Consult a priest or minister in your village...5   → *GO TO Q87*
Consult someone in your community with experience in settling disputes 6   → GO TO Q87
Talk to the relatives of the other person claiming the land..7   → GO TO Q87

Just wait and see..8   → GO TO Q88

None of the above 9   → GO TO Q88
Don't know..10   → GO TO Q88
Refused to answer 11   → GO TO Q88

86.   **Follow up question to 1,2,3**: why do you say that?
ADD

          VERBATIM:_____

          _____

87.   **Follow up question to 4-7**: why do you say that?
ADD

          VERBATIM:_____

          _____

88-96.

ADD

*When you have a conflict with someone that you cannot solve by yourself, there are various ways to look for outside intervention to settle the problem. If for the particular problem that you have **the following help is the most appropriate**, how **fair** do you think that the outcome of the settlement will be. For each of the cases mentioned below please tell us if you expect the outcome to be **VERY FAIR, SOMEWHAT FAIR, NEITHER FAIR NOR UNFAIR, SOMEWHAT UNFAIR, VERY UNFAIR***
Qs. 88-96.

	(SHUFFLE CARDS – Qs 88-96)	Very fair	Somewhat fair	Neither fair nor unfair	Somewhat unfair	Very unfair	CC	DK	RA
88.	*If you ask respected elders in your neighborhood/village…..*	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9
89.	*If you ask the village chief….*	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9
90.	*If you ask the commune/sangkat council ………….*	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9
91.	*If you ask the police…..*	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9
92.	*If you ask the court….*	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9
93.	*If you ask an NGO….*	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9
94.	*If you ask the prime minister….*	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9
95.	*If you ask the National Assembly…*	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9
96.	*If you ask the Royal palace….*	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9

CC = Cannot Choose
DK = Don't Know
RA = Refuse to answer

D.   SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

97.   Do you think that good salaries alone will help the courts to perform their task honestly and impartially? What other measures do you think are necessary to improve the performance of courts?

ADD

     Good salaries alone are enough…………………………………………………1

     …………………………………………………………………………………2

     …………………………………………………………………………………3

     …………………………………………………………………………………4

     …………………………….

SOCIO-ECONOMIC BACKGROUND VARIABLES

SE1 COUNTRY CODE

Cambodia	1
Indonesia	2
Philippines	3
Sri Lanka	4
Thailand	5

SE2 GENDER

Male	1
Female	2

SE3 ACTUAL AGE & AGE GROUP

18-19	01
20-24	02
25-29	03
30-34	04
35-39	05
40-44	06
45-49	07
50-54	08
55-59	09
60-70	10
71-75	11
76 & OVER	12
Actual	___

SE4 MARITAL STATUS

Married	1
Living-in as married	2
Widowed	3
Separated/Married but separated/ not living with legal spouse	4
Divorced	5
Single/Never married	6

SE5 EDUCATION
What is your highest level of education?

No formal education	01
Incomplete primary	02
Complete primary	03
Incomplete secondary/high school: technical/vocational type	04
Complete secondary/high school: technical/vocational type	05
Incomplete secondary	06

Complete secondary	07
Some university/college-level, with diploma	08
With University/College degree	09
Post-graduate degree	10

SE5a How many years of formal education you have received? 2-digit code

(NOTE: EXCLUDE Kindergarten)

SE6 <u>RELIGION</u>

Catholic	10
Protestant	20
Islam	40
Buddhist	60
Other, specify _____	( )
NONE	99

SE7 <u>RELIGIOSITY</u>

How often do you practice religious or rituals?

Several times a day	1
Once a day	2
Several times a week	3
Once or less a week	4
Only on special religious days	5
Practically never	6

SE8 <u>SIZE OF HOUSEHOLD</u>

SE8a How many people live in this household? (Code EXACT no. of people)
(only those who live and eat together)

ACTUAL COUNT
(INCLUDE servants, transients/borders) _____

SE9 <u>Housing type (Record Observation)</u>

Thatch	1
Tiles	2
Concrete	3
Galvanized Iron/Aluminum	4
Salvaged Materials	5
Tent	6
Mixed but predominantly made of tiles and galvanized irons/Aluminum	7
Mixed but predominantly made of thatch and salvaged Material	8
Other	9

SE10 <u>Types of main fuel used for cooking</u>

Firewood	1
Charcoal	2
Kerosene	3
Gas	4
Electricity	5
Others	6

SE11 <u>MONTHLY HOUSEHOLD INCOME</u>

On average, counting all wages, salaries, pensions, dividends and other incomes before taxes and other deductions, how much is the total monthly income in your family?

....

SE11a <u>MONTHLY PERSONAL INCOME</u>

And about how much is *your own* monthly income?   ....

SE11b <u>TYPES OF INCOME RECEIVED</u>
In the past 6 months in the course of an ordinary month, where does your <u>personal</u> income come from?   Where else?
(ALLOW MULTIPLE RESPONSE)

(SHOWCARD)

Wages and salaries	1
Rentals of property or any asset	2
Business income	3
Gift/help from relatives and other people	4
Pension and retirement benefits	5
Others, pls. specify _____	( )

SE12.   <u>SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS (self classification)</u>

Better off	1
Above average	2
Below average	3
Poor	4

SE13 <u>ETHNICITY</u>
Do you consider yourself as…(SHOWCARD)?

Khmer	01
Chinese	02
Khmer-Chinese	03
Cham	04
Vietnamese	05
Lao	06
Chon Cheat (indigenous highlanders)	07
Others: Specify	_____
Don't know	98

Refused   99

SE14. <u>MAIN OCCUPATION</u>

VERBATIM: _____
(POSITION/DESIGNATION/EMPLOYER)

I.   IN THE LABOR FORCE
<u>Hired Workers </u>(Excluding unpaid family workers)   10
 Professional/technical (including military, police, security personnel)   11
Managers/Supervisors   12
Clerical/Administrative/Sales (office workers)   13
Non-agricultural, skilled (non-office workers)   14
Non-agricultural, unskilled (laborers)   15
Agricultural (include fishing, forestry)   16
<u>Employers and Self-Employed</u>   17
Agricultural operators (include fishing, forestry)   18
Non-agricultural entrepreneurs   19
With 10 or more employees   20
With less than 10 employees   21
No employees   22
<u>Purely Property Owners </u>(Income mainly from rentals)   30
Rentals from agricultural properties   31
Rentals from non-agricultural properties   32
Others (specify) _____   ( )

Unpaid Family Worker_____   40

Presently unemployed but LOOKING FOR WORK_____   50

Homecare   51
Student   52
Retired   53
Disabled   54

II.   NOT IN THE LABOR FORCE
Presently unemployed and NOT LOOKING FOR WORK_____   60
Homecare   61
Student   62
Retired   63
Disabled   64
Others (specify)   65

Never worked before_____   70
Homecare   71
Student   79

ACCESS TO GENERAL MEDIA

SE15. How often do you read <u>Newspapers?</u>

Daily	1
A few times a week	2
Weekly	3
Not even once a week	4
Never	5

SE16. How often do you listen to <u>Radio?</u>

Daily	1
A few times a week	2
Weekly	3
Not even once a week	4
Never	5

SE17. How often do you watch <u>TV</u>?

Daily	1
A few times a week	2
Weekly	3
Not even once a week	4
Never	5

SE18. Is your home currently located in:

A big city	1
Suburbs or outskirts	2
Small city or town	3
Country village	4
Farm or house in country	5

Interview's Report
[To be filled in by interviewers only.]

Interviewer's number |___|___|

1. Interviewer's gender

Male 1
Female 2

2. Interviewer's Age |___|___|

3. In the interview, other than the respondent, were others present?

Yes .... 1 – *GO TO Q3a*
No .... 2 – *GO TO Q4*

3a. Who were they? (Multiple answers allowed)

Respondent's spouse 01
Children 02
Parents or parents-in-law 03
Others, specify _____   ( )

4. Has the respondent ever refused to be interviewed during the whole process?

Yes. Right at the beginning of the interview. .   1
Yes. In the middle of the interview.   2
Yes. Towards the end of the interview.   3
Never   4

5. Has the respondent ever shown impatience during the interview?

Never 1
Occasionally 2
Sometimes 3
Always 4

6. How cooperative was the respondent during the interview?

Highly cooperative 1
Fairly cooperative 2
Not very cooperative 3

7. Date of Interview:

					2	0	0	3
Month		Date		Year				