PUBLIC OPINION POLL
ON CITIZENS' PERCEPTION OF THE JUDICIAL SYSTEM OF SRI LANKA

**First draft report
for
The Asia Foundation
May 2004**

Marga, Colombo, Sri Lanka

Center for Advanced Study, Phnom Penh, Cambodia
Roger Henke
Sally Hendriks

Marga Research Team

Research coordination and supervision:
Field work team:

External Consultants (CAS, Cambodia)

Data analysis:	Roger Henke
	Sally Hendriks
Report writing :	Roger Henke

Table of contents

List of Tables

Main Report
Table 1: **S**ample distribution of PSUs and respondents
Table 2: Overview of background characteristics
Table 3: Court users by educational attainment and complainant/defendant experience
Table 4: Aware rates by background characteristics
Table 5: Trust in government professionals
Table 6: Trust in institutions serving the public
Table 7: Courts' present performance and as compared to five years ago
Table 8: Judiciary's resistance to outside pressures
Table 9: Media influence on the court
Table 10A: Courts' decisions in specific kinds of cases
Table 10B: Courts' decisions in specific kinds of cases
Table 11: Susceptibility of judicial officials to bribery
Table 12: Keeping up with technology and other changing conditions in the world
Table 13: Willingness to testify
Table 14: Other conflict resolution mechanisms in the community
Table 15: Knowledge of the innocent unless proven otherwise principle
Table 16: Accountability of Judges
Table 17: Equal treatment
Table 18: System of justice as the ultimate guarantee of democracy and public liberties
Table 19: Problems in getting proper services from the court
Table 20: Help with the judiciary
Table 21: Sources of knowledge about the court
Table 22: Personal experience in court
Table 23: Outcome of cases of respondents' with court experience
Table 24: Fairness of decision by outcome of decision
Table 25: Alternative Dispute Resolution: a hypothetical problem
Table 26. Examples of True Justice by the courts
Table 27. Examples of True Injustice by the courts
Table 28: Scale to quantify evaluation of courts by sub samples
Table 29: Pattern definitions in terms of scale value ranges
Table 30: Evaluative pattern in the responses of respondents of different backgrounds
Table 31: Summary overview of Sri Lankan Tamil answer patterns

Annex 1: additional tables (backgrounders)
Table 5A: Trust in government professionals
Table 6A: Trust in institutions serving the public
Table 7A: Ratings of judiciary's present performance and as compared to five years ago
Table 8A: Judiciary's resistance to outside pressures
Table 10A: Confidence about courts' decisions in specific kinds of cases: Ethnicity
Table 10B: Confidence about courts' decisions in specific kinds of cases: Sex
Table 10C: Confidence about courts' decisions in specific kinds of cases: Age
Table 10D: Confidence about courts' decisions in specific kinds of cases: Educational attainment
Table 10E: Confidence about courts' decisions in specific kinds of cases: Court experience
Table 11A: Susceptibility of court officials to bribery
Table 12A: Keeping up with technology and other changing conditions in the world
Table 13A: Willingness to testify
Table 14A: Availability of conflict resolution mechanisms in the community
Table 15A: Guilty unless proven otherwise
Table 16A: Accountability of Judges
Table 17A: Equal treatment
Table 18A: System of justice as the ultimate guarantee of democracy and public liberties
Table 19A: Problems in getting proper services from the court
Table 21A: Sources of knowledge about the court

SECTION I

Survey Methodology

1. Introduction

2. Sampling

Sample size and error margins

Sampling scheme

Table1 below gives the sample distribution of PSUs and respondents**.**

3. Research methodology

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 fro Stanford Law School/The Asia Foundation (US) and Mahar Mangahas from the Social Weather Station (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). Questionnaire design followed an iterative process with the consecutive drafts being produced by Mahar Mangahas. Each participating country localized this common core, both in terms of target and background variables and added some additional questions targeting country specific interests.

Pre-testing and Training of data collectors

4. Data-collection and data-entry

Survey team and supervision

Quality control

Interview time

Data entry and cleaning

SECTION 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 included in the data-set are:

- *Sex*
  Females and males
- *Age*
  The questionnaire recorded respondents' age in five-year age categories, but for analytic purposes the sample was divided into three aggregated categories: The young (18-24 year olds), middle aged (25-44 year olds), and seniors (45 and older).
- *Ethnicity*
  The sample was divided into respondents who self identified as Sinhala, Sri Lankan Tamil, Indian Tamil, Muslim, and Burgher. Because of the very small numbers of Indian Tamils (9) and Burghers (2), only the data of the Sinhala, Sri Lankan Tamil and Muslim respondents were included in the analysis of the influence of respondents' ethnic background on her or his opinion.
- *Educational attainment*
  The questionnaire recorded respondents' educational attainment by noting the highest level of education on a ten-category scale For analytic purposes, the sample was divided into three aggregated levels of educational attainment:
    - Lower educational attainment (including 12 respondents with no formal schooling, 52 who attended primary school, i.e. grades 1-5 and 149 who attended lower secondary, i.e. grades 6-9)
    - Medium educational attainment (including 184 who attended higher secondary, i.e. grades 10-11, 276 who attained G.C.E. Ordinary level and 261 who attained G.G.E. Advanced level)
    - Higher educational attainment (including 20 undergraduates, 47 graduates, 41 respondents with professional or technical qualifications and 7 post graduates/respondents with higher professional qualifications
- *Personal experience with the court*
  Personal experience with the court as a complainant or defendant can be expected to be a major determinant of knowledge and opinions about the court. Given that this study is an opinion poll of the *general* Sri Lankan population and not of *court users*, the number of respondents claiming personal experience with the court, 348 or 33% is very high. Their background characteristics are analyzed in more detail in the following section on interaction of background characteristics.

The background characteristics of the total population of 1049 respondents are cross-tabulated below.

Table 2: overview of background characteristics

Respondent background characteristics (N=1049)		Sex		Age			Educational attainment			Ethnicity *			Court experience **	
		F	M	18-24	25-44	45+	Lower	Medium	Higher	Sinhala	Sri Lankan Tamil	Muslim	+	-
Sex	F			55 (53%)	305 (56%)	173 (43%)	115 (54%)	356 (49%)	62 (54%)	456 (53%)	40 (48%)	32 (36%)	123 (35%)	408 (59%)
	M			48 (47%)	238 (44%)	230 (57%)	98 (46%)	365 (51%)	53 (46%)	410 (47%)	44 (52%)	56 (64%)	225 (65%)	286 (41%)
Age	18-24	55 (10%)	48 (9%)				4 (2%)	88 (12%)	11 (10%)	85 (10%)	11 (13%)	7 (8%)	11 (3%)	91 (13%)
	25-44	305 (57%)	238 (46%)				75 (35%)	407 (56%)	61 (53%)	445 (51%)	39 (46%)	37 (42%)	163 (47%)	378 (54%)
	45+	173 (32%)	230 (45%				134 (63%)	226 (31%)	43 (37%)	336 (39%)	34 (40%)	44 (50%)	174 (50%)	225 (32%)
Educational attainment	Lower	115 (22%)	98 (19%)	4 (4%)	75 (14%)	134 (33%)				161 (19%)	21 (25%)	28 (32%)	80 (23%)	133 (19%)
	Medium	356 (67%)	365 (71%)	88 (85%)	407 (75%)	226 (56%)				602 (70%)	55 (65%)	56 (64%)	237 (68%)	478 (69%)
	Higher	62 (12%)	53 (10%)	11 (11%)	61 (11%)	43 (11%)				103 (12%)	8 (10%)	4 (5%)	31 (9%)	83 (12%)
Ethnicity	Sinhala	456 (86%)	410 (79%)	85 (83%)	445 (82%)	336 (83%)	161 (76%)	602 (83%)	103 (90%)				302 (87%)	562 (81%)
	Sri Lankan Tamil	40 (8%)	44 (9%)	11 (11%)	39 (7%)	34 (8%)	21 (10%)	55 (8%)	8 (7%)				22 (6%)	57 (8%)
	Muslim	32 (6%)	56 (11%)	7 (7%)	37 (7%)	44 (11%)	28 (13%)	56 (8%)	4 (3%)				22 (6%)	66 (10%
Court experience	+	123 (23%)	225 (44%)	11 (11%)	163 (30%)	174 (43%)	80 (38%)	237 (33%)	31 (27%)	302 (35%)	22 (26%)	22 (25%)		
	-	408 (77%)	286 (55%)	91 (88%)	378 (70%)	225 (56%)	133 (62%)	478 (66%)	83 (72%)	562 (65%)	57 (68%)	66 (75%)		
Total (1049)		533 (51%)	516 (49%)	103 (10%)	543 (52%)	403 (38%)	213 (20%)	721 (69%)	115 (11%)	866 (83%)	84 (8%)	88 (8%)	348 (33%)	694 (67%)

( ) gives the percentage; percentages add up by background characteristic by column
* = 11 respondents with other ethnicity excluded: 2 Burghers, 9 Indian Tamils
** = 7 Respondents refused to answer the relevant question

Interaction of background characteristics
A check on the interaction of background characteristics is important to prevent mistaken conclusions regarding their influence on opinions. To give a fictitious example: when the subgroup of young respondents would all have been female and the subgroup of senior respondents all males, possible differences in answer patterns of these two age groups might as well be due to sex as to age. Table 2 does not show much evidence of skewed patterns in the nested distribution of background characteristics, and of the six skewed patterns that are notable two are not unexpected:

❑ For the background variable of respondents *Sex* only two interactions are noteworthy: the Muslim subgroup is predominantly Male and the court user subgroup is also predominantly Male

❑ For *Age* we see an expected interaction for educational attainment: the younger respondents are relatively better educated. Another expected interaction is with court experience: older respondents are more likely to have it.

❑ *Educational attainment* shows the above mentioned age effect, in that the subgroup of lower attainment has an age distribution skewed towards older respondents. There is a weak interaction with respondent ethnicity in that the lower attainment subgroup has somewhat more Muslims then their sample sizes would make us expect, and the reverse for the higher attainment subgroup. There is also an unexpected but weak interaction with court experience: the lower educated seem over-represented and the higher educated seem under-represented in the subgroup with court experience (see also below).

Ethnicity and Court experience show no skewed distributions that have not yet been mentioned.

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

The overview of background characteristics shows that court users are:
❑ More male (65%) than female (35%).
❑ As can be expected with any experience, there is a experience-increases-with-age effect.
❑ There is also a slight counterintuitive the-lower-the-educational attainment -the-more-experience effect.

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

One might doubt 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 better educated file cases, while less educated are only brought into the picture as defendants? However, table 4 shows that this counter argument has only some validity. Proportionately, the court experience of the higher educated is indeed more often as complainant. But both the

middle and lower educated groups still report more complainant then defendant experience.

Table 3: Court users by Educational attainment and complainant/defendant experience

N=348	Grade 9-	%	G.C.E. Advanced -	%	BA+	%	Total
Complainant	43	22%	131	67%	22	11%	196
%		54%		55%		71%	56%
Defendant	37	24%	106	70%	9	6%	152
%		46%		45%		29%	44%
Total Court users	80	23%	237	68%	31	9%	348
Total in sample	213	20%	721	69%	115	11%	1049

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 opinion or judgment in terms of a multi-point scale, e.g. *strongly agree, somewhat agree, neither agree nor disagree, somewhat disagree, strongly disagree*, or, *high [trust], modest [trust], little [trust],* with sometimes several possibilities for the data-collector to score "don't know" ('don't know', 'refuses to answer'). Unfortunately, many of the answer grids were unbalanced: the positive side had more options then the negative side, e.g. 'completely agree', 'somewhat agree', 'completely disagree'.

Reporting the full picture would necessarily become very technical because one has to build narrative arguments on the basis of the statistical significance of background differences in answer patterns rather than being able to *show* these patterns in easily readable tables. We have therefore chosen to report in terms of a **one-figure indicator of respondents' opinion**: their so-called Net Opinion. This makes the visual detection of noteworthy patterns in respondents' answers easy and helps audiences without much technical background – and most of our intended policy and practice audiences fall within that category - to quickly grasp the important findings of the survey.

Those respondents who express an opinion, also called the *aware* respondents, may have a favorable ,a neutral or an unfavorable opinion. **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/who did not score "don't know". This measure produces higher net opinions then its alternative, i.e. using the total sample as the basis for the % calculation[2]. For this reporting format to be unproblematic two conditions have to be fulfilled:

---

[2] Because the divider is smaller in all cases except where all respondents expressed an opinion, a very rare occasion.

- When the sampling for the opinion poll under consideration is meant to ensure representativeness of answers – as is the case in our study – the size of the *aware* segment should be close to the total sample size. If the number of aware respondents drops way below total sample size the representativeness of the net opinion becomes questionable.

- When opinions are compared – like we do often in this study, e.g. comparison of trust in government professions, public institutions, etc. etc. – the aware segments should be of similar magnitude, else it becomes impossible to interpret the significance of differences between net opinions without statistical testing for each individual difference.

In our case both conditions are not always well fulfilled. The aware segments of the sample regularly differ across questions that are to be compared and sometimes encompass less than 75% of the total sample. To stick to one reporting format *we therefore chose the total sample as the basis for calculating the Net Opinion*.

Because many answer grids were unbalanced we had to take a decision for each (battery of) question(s) regarding how to calculate the Net Opinion. For some questions we decided to aggregate complete and moderate agreement into the favorable opinion pole, for other questions we decided to treat moderate agreement as the mid-point. These decisions are quite arbitrary and thus contestable. However, the 'damage' is limited. These decisions only affect absolute, not relative levels of Net Opinions. We report how Net Opinions have been derived for *each* table below. Also, in the few cases where our decision resulted in changing Net Opinions from positive into negative or the other way around and thus risks misrepresenting the full data, we report Net Opinions using both ways to calculate them.

All tables report the size of the aware segment as a percentage of the total sample so that the reader is informed on the number of respondents that actually answered the question.

In case of tables that compare opinions, the row order is from most positive or negative to least positive or negative for the answers of the total sample.

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 more things, most importantly 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 only an indicator of respondents' knowledge. On a question by question basis one can make quite defensible assumptions of the aware score being a good or not so good expression of knowledge. E.g. when asking about trust in prosecutors, the size of the aware segment most probably *does* reflect knowledge.

Overall, that is across all questions in the study, the aware score (91%) is very reasonable when compared to figures obtained in polls in other countries in the region, e.g. the Philippines:. As explained above, the figure can be interpreted as a mix of lacking knowledge and hesitation to express opinions. However, we do contend that it primarily reflects Sri Lankans' general lack of knowledge of formal institutions not directly present in daily environment. To substantiate this contention we constructed a scale of the 4 items probing respondents' trust in court institutions/officials[3]. These 4 items are both directly relevant to the issue of knowledge of the court and do not seem sensitive.

Table 4 below shows that the aggregate aware figure for these 4 items is somewhat lower, than the total average aware score (86%) but still quite reasonable. This can be interpreted as implying that Sri Lankans have global knowledge about the judiciary system, sufficient to voice an opinion on many aspects of it but, when they are confronted with questions about 'technicalities', not always enough to feel confident that they know enough.

Table 4 also shows that the aware figure varies along the lines of background characteristics in the way that one would expect it to vary if it reflects respondents' knowledge: higher for those with personal experience with the court, for the better educated, for males, and for older respondents. The low aware rate for Sri Lankan Tamils, a result that seems not confounded by any other background variable[4] is noteworthy.

Table 4: aware rates by background characteristics

	Total N	Aware
Sri Lankan Tamils	84	69%
Lowest level of educational attainment	213	81%
Youngest respondents	103	82%
Female respondents	409	83%
Respondents without personal court experience	694	84%
Middle age and senior respondents	946	87%
Male respondents	516	89%
Sinhalese	866	89%
Highest level of educational attainment	115	90%
Respondents with personal court experience	348	91%
All respondents	1049	**86%**

General observations on the results
This study is the first ever, public opinion poll on judicial efficiency and legitimacy in Sri Lanka. 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

---

[3] 1. How much trust do you have in the following people in your area: judges? (see table 5)
2. How much trust do you have in the following people in your area: prosecutors? (see table 5)
3. How much trust do you have in the following institutions: Supreme Court? (see table 6)
4. How much trust do you have in the following institutions: Courts in your area? (see table 6)

[4] See table 2 and the narrative on the interaction of background variables.

to eliciting vastly different results on the basis of minor differences in phrasing, in the order of questions, in asking respondents 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 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, sociologists often have to access information on a broad range of topics within a limited amount of interview time and 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 of other questions. 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 single opinions. However, in the end it is not potential that matters but actual outcomes. If the outcome shows haphazard, chaotic patterns that are difficult to interpret, so much so for the potential[5]. The survey research community has developed quite a sophisticated and elaborate toolbox to detect patterns in apparent chaos. But, however, important 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[6] it.

This data set proved a lucky draw. It contained some pretty obvious patterns regarding perceived legitimacy and efficiency of the Sri Lankan judicial system. These patterns came in various kinds.

❑ Relative answer percentage points to *similar* questions in different sections of the questionnaire were quite 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 respondents with personal court experience.
❑ 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 as compared to other sub samples. But hardly ever to the extent that the basic pattern is upturned.

---

[5] 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.
[6] 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.

❑ 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*[7]. If, e.g. institutions, irrespective of respondents' background characteristics and irrespective of the magnitude of the rating/evaluation, are scored in the same order, that order can be argued to reflect a collective representation[8].

---

[7] A term used by Hagendoorn et.al. in their work on national majority preference orders of ethnic minorities living in their country.

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

SECTION III

Sri Lankan public opinion on the judicial system
We report the opinions more or less in the order that the were asked (see annex 2 - the questionnaire). In this section the overall results are presented in table form and described. For each question or set of question, also the differences between sub samples of different background, e.g. females and males, less educated and better educated, etc. are indicated. However, for the detailed tables of results split down according to background variables we refer to annex 1. After the description of the results per question of set of question, we conclude with an overview of the patterns that are evident, both in the data set as a whole and in the results of specific sub groups.

Trust in professionals serving the public
Sri Lankans' trust in judges is positive, but their trust in prosecutors is negative. Both the relative position of the court professionals and their negative rating are stable across all background characteristics. Prosecutors seem to be in a league with distrusted politicians, judges share the esteem of other professionals, whether employed by the government or not.

Table 5: Trust in government professionals[9]

N=1049	Aware (%)	Net opinion (%)
Teachers in government schools	99%	+20
Government Doctors	99%	+19
Teachers in private schools	83%	+18
Judges	92%	+16
Chairman/Mayor of your local authority	92%	-15
Prosecutors	84%	-28
Your Member of the Provincial Council	86%	-31
Your member of Parliament	87%	-32

Regarding differences between respondents of varying backgrounds, the following can be remarked:
❑ Tamils are less positive about judges and less negative about prosecutors;
❑ Young respondents are most positive about court professionals, and the middle age group is least positive;
❑ The lower educated are most positive;
❑ Those with court experience are much less positive than those without.

Trust in public institutions
Sri Lankan trust in the Supreme Court is quite positive, trust in the normal courts is mixed, probably reflecting the quite disparate opinion of the different kinds of agencies involved. Judges hold a lot of trust (see table 5),but prosecutors (see table 5) and the police are distrusted strongly. Both the relative position of the courts and their rating close to the zero point are stable across most background characteristics.

---

[9] The trust questions all used a three-point scale (high trust, modest trust, low trust); Net opinion represents the % of high trust responses minus the percentage of low trust responses.

Table 6: Trust in institutions serving the public[11]

N=1049	Aware (%)	Net opinion (%)
The administrator of your place of worship	98%	+62
Supreme Court	78%	+20
Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO)	71%	+8
The courts in your area	90%	+3
The newspapers	96%	-2
Television	97%	-5
Your local authority	93%	-21
The national government	97%	-32
The police	99%	-42
The parliament	94%	-52

Regarding differences between respondents of varying backgrounds, the following can be remarked:
- The young are most positive about both normal courts and the Supreme Court;
- The lower educated are most positive about the Supreme Court;
- Those with personal court experience are much more negative about the courts in their area than those without such experience.

Rating of the judiciary's present performance and as compared to five years ago
Sri Lankans rate courts' performance clearly substandard irrespective of background characteristics. As this can be interpreted as the most basic evaluation of the justice system this result is an important qualifier of the positive evaluation of judges and the neither positive nor negative evaluation of local courts. Interestingly, respondents also perceive a slight improvement over the last five years.

Table 7: judiciary's present performance and as compared to five years ago[10]

N=1049	Aware (%)	Net opinion (%)
Present performance	97%	-18
Compared to five years ago	92%	+5

Regarding differences between respondents of varying backgrounds, the following can be remarked:
- Tamils are the only subgroup who are (somewhat) positive about the present performance and of all ethnicities they perceive most improvement over the last five years;
- Lower educated respondents are least negative about the current performance but do not perceive substantially more improvement than the other educational attainment subgroups;
- Those with court experience are much more negative about current performance of the judiciary and see no improvement over the last five years.

Feelings regarding the judiciary's resistance to outside pressures
Sri Lankans were asked their opinion on the independence of the judiciary through scoring the likelihood of the judiciary resisting pressures from a list of entities.

---

[10] These questions used five point answer scales with a neutral middle point ('average' and 'the same' respectively)

Assuming a societal consensus that the Sri Lankan judiciary is characterized by at least some measure of judicial independence the answer options were limited to 'always' and 'occasionally' resisting outside pressures[11]. In as far as this assumption is unwarranted, the results reported below *under-report* the level of perceived lack of independence of the Sri Lankan judiciary. Because of the above, the meaning of the Net opinion is somewhat different from that of other variables. *In this case, Net opinion expresses the proportion of respondents who believe that the court always resists pressures from a particular entity minus the proportion of respondents who believe that the court only occasionally resists pressures from this entity.*

Sri Lankans clearly believe that the court only succumbs to pressures from a limited number of entities: the President (strongly: -27%) and the Government (moderately: -13%). A slight majority does not believe the courts succumb to pressures from Parliament, and large to very large majorities do not perceive the other entities successfully exerting pressures.

Table 8: the judiciary's resistance to outside pressures

N=1049	Aware (%)	Net opinion (%)
The President	89%	-27
The government	90%	-13
Parliament	87%	+7
Members of Parliament	91%	+33
Big business	87%	+34
Organized crime, i.e. "Mafia"	85%	+37
Police	93%	+44
Local authorities	88%	+52
Civil society advocacy groups	86%	+59

❑ Tamils perceive much less resistance to outside pressures than the other ethnicities and are the only subgroup that sees the judiciary giving in pressure form the parliament in a substantial way;
❑ The young are less convinced of the judiciary's resistance to the pressures of organized crime, police, local authorities and civil society advocacy groups than other age groups;
❑ The lower educated perceive less giving in to the pressures of the President and the government, while the higher educated perceive more giving in, even expect some submission to pressures of parliament, but are more convinced of the judiciary's resistance to organized crime, police, local authorities and civil society advocacy groups;
❑ Those with court experience perceive somewhat more giving in to pressure from the President but less to those of nearly all other entities.

---

[11] I.e. obviously with the standard *Don't Know* and *Refused to Answer* options, but without a *Never Resist* option. Providing respondents with a full range of options is customary in public opinion polling, and in hindsight it would have been better to have done so for this question too.

Media influence on the court

A third of Sri Lankans feel that court cases don't influence court decisions. Those that believe the media do have an influence quite clearly perceive a positive rather than a negative influence.

Table 9: Media influence on the court[12]

N=1049	Aware (%)	Opinion (%)
Media coverage does not influence court decisions	88%	36% *
Media coverage means better justice	88%	+38 Net

* = this was one of the answer options and therefore does not represent a Net opinion but just the percentage of respondents who chose this option

No relevant differences across backgrounders was evident in the data set.

Confidence about courts' decisions in specific kinds of cases

Respondents were presented with five short scenarios ('vignettes') describing court cases involving different kinds of offenders and victims/different kinds of transgressions. They were then asked to express their expectations regarding three aspects of courts' decision making procedure: the decision being based on the merits of the case rather than the quality of the lawyers, the fairness of the decision, and the timeliness of the decision.

The answer grid for this battery was unbalanced with two agreement options ('yes always' and 'yes sometimes') and one disagreement option ('no never'). To derive Net Opinions one can either aggregate the two agreement options or define the 'yes sometimes' option as the neutral mid-point. Whatever the choice several patterns are evident in the responses:

❑ Sri Lankans clearly perceive the three aspects that were assessed in terms of *two underlying dimensions*: decision making based on the merits of the case and the fairness of the decision are highly correlated within court cases and are seen as independent from the decision being issued within a reasonable amount of time. The case that was expected to be dealt with most on the basis of its merits and was expected to result in the most fair decision - A dispute between members of a family as to the proper division of a property inheritance – was also the case which was most overwhelmingly expected to take too long to be resolved.

❑ Overall, and across most back-grounders, *the order of cases*, from most positive to most negative, for the two dimensions (merit/fairness and timeliness) is different but consistent within each dimension. For tables 10A and 10B the merit/fairness dimension is taken as primary.

❑ Overall, and for all back-grounders, Sri Lankans are consistently negative to very negative in their expectations about the decision being taken within a reasonable amount of time.

❑ Overall, and across back-grounders, Sri Lankans are most positive, for all cases, about decisions reflecting the merits of the case rather than the quality of the lawyers.

---

[12] The opinion that 'media coverage means better justice' is a Net Opinion that derived from those that said 'media coverage makes justice better' in four different ways expressing the strength of the influence minus those that said 'media coverage does not influence court decisions'.

However, because the number of respondents that chose the 'yes sometimes' answer option is often quite large, the different ways of deriving a Net Opinion do change the picture in one important respect. When aggregating 'yes always' and 'yes sometimes' into the favorable pole, the overall picture for the merit/fairness dimension is positive: 4 out of five cases are judged *positively* on this dimension (see table 10A). However, when taking 'yes sometimes' as the mid-point, 4 out of five cases are judged *negatively* (see table 10B). In other words, although the relative positions of the judgments of different cases and the relative importance of underlying dimensions does not change (see patterns described above) the overall evaluation of the court cases can be interpreted as either positive or negative, depending upon one's reading of the meaning of the 'yes sometimes' answer. If that answer is judged to be a positive assessment, the overall picture for the merit/fairness dimension is positive, if that answer is judged to express a 'neither positive nor negative' assessment the overall picture is negative.

We report both pictures. Ultimately the decision about which one reflects Sri Lankans 'true' feelings about the court system is a normative one. Those arguing that decisions 'sometimes' being fair and based on the merits of the case rather than the quality of the lawyers is not enough will opt for Net Opinions based on 'yes, sometimes' as the mid-point. Those who argue that the 'yes' part of the answer is what matters most will opt for aggregating 'yes, always/sometimes'.

Because of the two-dimensionality of the expectations expressed it does not make much sense to aggregate respondent expectations across dimensions. In other words, it does not make much sense to rank-order the cases described from most to least positively evaluated. However, it is possible to detect the one case about which Sri Lankans have the *most negative* expectations. Especially inspection of table 10A is illuminating: a charge against a politician amassing wealth through corruption is the only case that is judged negatively on *both* dimensions. The fact that the case involves a politician is in line with the general pattern that politicians are the most distrusted group in society.

Table 10A: courts' decisions in specific kinds of cases[13]

N=1049	Decision will be based on evidence rather than quality of the lawyers		Decision will be fair		Decision will be issued within a reasonable amount of time	
	Aware (%)	Net (%) aware	Aware (%)	Net (%) Aware	Aware (%)	Net (%) aware
A dispute between members of a family as to the proper division of a property inheritance amongst them	96%	+46	93%	+51	97%	-74
A charge against the police or military of violating the human rights of certain persons who are against the government	89%	+35	88%	+29	91%	-4
A murder case, where the accused is an important person and the victim is an ordinary person	94%	+19	92%	+10	95%	-27
A charge against a high government official for amassing wealth through corruption	91%	+6	89%	+1	93%	-4
A charge against a politician amassing wealth through corruption	90%	-3	89%	-13	92%	-12

Table 10B: courts' decisions in specific kinds of cases[14]

N=1049	Decision will be based on evidence rather than quality of the lawyers		Decision will be fair		Decision will be issued within a reasonable amount of time	
	Aware (%)	Net (%) aware	Aware (%)	Net (%) Aware	Aware (%)	Net (%) aware
A dispute between members of a family as to the proper division of a property inheritance amongst them	96%	+4	93%	+4	97%	-83
A charge against the police or military of violating the human rights of certain persons who are against the government	89%	-7	88%	-12	91%	-34
A murder case, where the accused is an important person and the victim is an ordinary person	94%	-22	92%	-30	95%	-53
A charge against a high government official for amassing wealth through corruption	91%	-24	89%	-32	93%	-37
A charge against a politician amassing wealth through corruption	90%	-33	89%	-43	92%	-40

---

[13] The answer options were a three point scale consisting of 'yes, always', 'yes, sometimes' and 'no'. Net Opinion is the % of 'yes always/sometimes' responses minus the percentage of 'no' responses

[14] [14] The answer options were a three point scale consisting of 'yes, always', 'yes, sometimes' and 'no'. Net Opinion is the % of 'yes always' responses minus the percentage of 'no' responses

Regarding differences between respondents of varying backgrounds, the following can be remarked[15]:

❑ The minority ethnicities are clearly less positive across all cases. A particularly noteworthy assessment is the Tamil judgment of the Human Rights violation case; weakly negative while the other two rate this positive to very positive on the merit/fairness dimension;

❑ For age the only noteworthy result is the more negative expectation of the middle age group regarding the corrupt politician's case;

❑ Those with court experience hold lower expectations for the merit/fairness dimension than those without such experience, for all cases.

Susceptibility of judicial officials to bribery

Sri Lankans' expectations regarding how difficult or easy it is to bribe particular judicial officials present an interesting picture. The regard in which *judges* are held is confirmed. They are *the only court officials* who are expected to be *difficult to bribe*. All the other are strongly to very strongly perceived as being easy to bribe. Minor staff, police officers, clerks and prison officials are seen as especially susceptible. The fact that prosecutors attract a 40% positive Net Opinion is a strong indicator of the negative image in the public eye (see also table 5). For this battery of questions the 'somewhat hard' answer option was treated as representing mid-point of the scale. This treatment did not alter the relative position of any of the judicial officials, nor turn positive into negative evaluations or the other way around.

Table 11: Susceptibility of different judicial officials to bribery[16]

N=1049	Aware (%)	Net opinion (%)
Minor staff	91%	+74
Police officers performing judicial functions	88%	+68
Clerks	88%	+67
Prison officials	87%	+60
Prosecutors	81%	+40
Interpreters	74%	+38
Registars	75%	+34
Judges	72%	-32

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

❑ Tamils are less negative about all court officials apart from judges about whom they are very much more negative than the other two ethnicities;

❑ Males are consistently more negative about the corruptability of court officials than females;

❑ The middle age group is consistently more negative about the corruptability of court officials than the other age groups;

❑ The lower educated are consistently less negative about the corruptability of court officials than other subgroups. The higher educated are more negative about prosecutors, and slightly more negative overall;

❑ Those with court experience are consistently more negative than those without.

---

[15] We only report differences along background variables for the primary dimension of merit/fairness.

[16] These questions had three answer options: 'very hard', 'somewhat hard' and 'very easy'; for Net Opinion derivation 'somewhat hard' was treated as the mid-point.

Keeping up with technology and other changing conditions in the world
Compared to officials of other government agencies, judicial officials are judged to be relatively backward in their keeping up with technology and other changing conditions in the world (-18%).

Table 12: Keeping up with technology and other changing conditions in the world[17]

N=1049	Aware (%)	Net opinion (%)
The keeping up with modern times of the judiciary as compared to other government agencies	85%	-18

There are some backgrounder differences:
- ❑ Tamils are the only subgroup rating the judiciary positive on this aspect;
- ❑ The middle age group is more negative;
- ❑ The lower educated are less negative;
- ❑ Those with court experience are more negative.

Opinions regarding the judicial system
Respondents were given a battery of statements about a diverse set of issues related to the judicial system and asked to indicate their agreement or disagreement with these statements. The answer options consisted of an unbalanced four point scale For all of the following tables (13 through 18) the 'somewhat agree' answer option was treated as mid-point of the scale. In cases where the proportion of respondents choosing this answer option is so large as to alter the nature of the evaluation, from agreement to disagreement or the other way around, this will be explicitly marked in the text.

Willingness to testify
Sri Lankans are very negative about their willingness to be a witness in court.

Table 13: Willingness to testify

N=1049	Aware (%)	Net opinion (%)
Witnesses to crimes are generally willing to testify in court	98%	-66

The only subgroup standing out from the rest are the Tamil respondents: they express moderate rather than strong aversion against being a witness.

Availability of conflict resolution mechanisms in the community
Not many Sri Lankans feel that courts can be avoided because even serious disputes can be settled fairly and peacefully through other means. In other words, they do not perceive much alternatives for formal mechanisms for conflict resolution. *However, this is true only when applying the strict definition of 'complete' agreement to the rating. When those 'somewhat' agreeing with this statement are included in the agreement group the Net Opinion becomes quite positive: + 42%.*

---

[17] This question had an four point answer scale: 'very modern', 'somewhat modern', 'no difference' and 'very backward'; 'no-difference' was treated as the mid-point

Table 14: other conflict resolution mechanisms in the community

N=1049	Aware (%)	Net opinion (%)
In our community, even strong grievances between persons are settled fairly and peacefully, without bringing a case to court	98%	-5

Background differences are evident for:
- ❑ Tamils who feel that there community can avoid going to court because they have alternative mediation options;
- ❑ The young who are slightly positive about other options;
- ❑ Those with court experience who more strongly disagree with this statement, or more hesitantly agree with it (depending upon the strictness of the definition of 'agreement') than those without personal experience.

Guilty unless proven otherwise

Sri Lankans overwhelmingly believe that in court one is *guilty* unless proven otherwise rather than that one is innocent unless proven otherwise. This basic principle of the rule of law has not descended into public consciousness.

Table 15: Knowledge of the innocent unless proven otherwise principle

N=1049	Aware (%)	Net opinion (%)
One who is accused of a crime must prove his innocence, or else he will usually be punished	97%	+50

- ❑ The guilty unless proven otherwise belief is stronger the older and the better educated the respondent;
- ❑ Those with court experience are somewhat less convinced of it than those without;
- ❑ Tamils are the only exception to the general pattern: they slightly disagree with the statement.

Accountability of Judges

Sri Lankans are strongly convinced that judges are *not* held accountable for mistakes.

Table 16: accountability of Judges

N=1049	Aware (%)	Net opinion (%)
Judges who mistakenly convict people who are really innocent usually get into trouble	90%	-52
Judges who mistakenly acquit people who are really guilty usually get into trouble	90%	-55

- ❑ Tamils are much less negative about this issue;
- ❑ The middle age group is most negative of all age groups;
- ❑ The lower educated are least negative of all educational attainment subgroups;
- ❑ Those with court experience are more negative than those without personal experience.

Equal treatment

When asked directly Sri Lankans hold no strong expectations about rich and poor receiving unequal treatment in court. *However, this is true only when applying the strict definition of complete agreement to the rating. When those somewhat agreeing with this statement are included in the agreement group the Net Opinion becomes quite positive: + 39%.*

They are reasonably sure about the equal enforcement of court decisions for rich and poor convicts, and more much more so when those 'somewhat' agreeing are included.

They are also reasonably sure that rape victims are not treated fairly by the courts, although this changes into a weakly positive opinion (+9%) when those somewhat agreeing are rated as positive.

Table 17: Equal treatment

N=1049	Aware (%)	Net opinion (%)
The judiciary treats people who come before it equally, irrespective whether they are rich or poor	99%	-2
Convicted criminals are generally punished in accordance with the law, whether they are rich or poor	98%	+25
Women who are victims of rape are generally treated fairly by the courts	94%	-24

Regarding variation in opinions about differential treatment between respondents of varying backgrounds, the following can be remarked:
- Tamil are most negative about treatment by the judiciary and the only subgroup that expressed a negative opinion on impartial enforcement of punishment;
- The older respondents were less negative about courts treating rape victims fairly;
- Those with court experience are less positive about impartial enforcement;
- The absence of a sex difference in the answers regarding rape is noteworthy.

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

The questionnaire included one test item to compare legitimacy of courts across countries world wide (e.g. this item is also part the Euro-barometer opinion polls that cover all EC countries). Sri Lankans are very positive about the statement that the system of justice is the ultimate guarantee of democracy and public liberties, whatever its shortcomings.

Table 18: System of justice as the ultimate guarantee of democracy and public liberties

N=1049	Aware (%)	Net opinion (%)
Whatever its shortcomings and inadequacies may be, our system of justice provides the ultimate guarantee of democracy and public liberties	98%	+63

Opinions do not differ between respondents of different background, apart from:
- Tamils being a clear exception, expressing only modest agreement with the statement;
- Slight 'the older, the stronger' and 'the better educated, the stronger' agreement effects.

Problems in getting proper services from the court

Respondents were given a battery of statements about problems in getting proper services from the court and asked to indicate their agreement or disagreement with these statements. The

answer options consisted of an unbalanced four point scale Table 19A reports the Net Opinions as they appear when the 'somewhat agree' answer option is treated as mid-point of the scale. Although aggregating 'completely agree' and 'somewhat agree' into one positive pole did not alter the relative position of the problem it did turn tables for several of the problems posed. Therefore, we also report the Net Opinion picture that emerges when aggregating both agreement statements (table 19B).

Sri Lankans strongly feel that being involved in a court case goes together with problems. When asked about the extent to which they expect to be confronted with any of the mentioned problems when they themselves were to take a case to court the going to court being seen as a waste of time came out on top. This is in line with the responses to the five court case scenarios reported in table 10 that showed negative expectations across all five scenarios regarding the decisions being taken within a reasonable amount of time. The use of English and the expectation that one's opponent will resort to bribery are also strongly felt to be a barrier. That court proceedings are difficult to understand even when the respondent's own language is used, and that it is difficult to find a competent lawyer to represent one's interests are much less evidently described as being barriers in getting proper services from the court. When only complete agreement is rated as agreement they are even modestly denied as constituting problems.

Table 19A: Problems in getting proper services from the court[18]

N=1049	Aware (%)	Net opinion (%)
To take a case to court is a waste of time	99%	+57
It is hard for me to understand English	98%	+43
My opponent would probably resort to bribery in order to win the case	97%	+27
The judge would probably not understand the problems of someone like me	97%	+3
If the court decision is in my favor, I cannot be sure that it will be enforced	95%	-6
It is hard for me to understand what the judge and lawyers say, even when they use my language	96%	-12
It is difficult for me to find a competent lawyer to help me	99%	-13

Table 19B: Problems in getting proper services from the court[19]

N=1049	Aware (%)	Net opinion (%)
To take a case to court is a waste of time	99%	+79
It is hard for me to understand English	98%	+69
My opponent would probably resort to bribery in order to win the case	97%	+72
The judge would probably not understand the problems of someone like me	97%	+46
If the court decision is in my favor, I cannot be sure that it will be enforced	95%	+41
It is hard for me to understand what the judge and lawyers say, even when they use my language	96%	+30
It is difficult for me to find a competent lawyer to help me	99%	+11

Regarding variation in problem perceptions between respondents of varying backgrounds, the following can be remarked:
- Ethnic differences are plentiful but without much apparent patters. However, overall, the ethnic minority respondents expect less problems than Sinhala respondents;
- Females expect more problems than males;

---

[18] Answer options were 'completely agree', 'somewhat agree', 'completely disagree'; for this table 'somewhat agree' is treated as mid-point of the scale.
[19] Answer options were 'completely agree', 'somewhat agree', 'completely disagree'; for this table 'completely agree' and 'somewhat agree' were aggregated into one 'agreement' pole.

- ❑ The young expect least problems, the older respondents expect most;
- ❑ The higher educated expect least problems;
- ❑ Those with personal court experience do not differ from those without that experience apart from considering going to court more a waste of time and having stronger expectations that their opponent will resort to bribery.

Where to look for help in the judiciary
Nearly all Sri Lankans would hire their own lawyer when in need of help with the judiciary.

Table 20: help with the judiciary

N=1049	(%)
Hire my own lawyer	90%
Depend on the government to assign a lawyer	6%
Find an organization to provide a lawyer	1%
Don't Know/Refused to answer	3%

Only six percent of Sri Lankans would turn to the government for help and even less (1%) would turn to an organization to provide a lawyer. Although the small numbers do not allow for solid statements about their backgrounds these two categories are similar in that both are predominantly not active on the labor market or in its lower ranges and have a proportionally high share for Sri Lankan Tamils. But they differ in that Females seem to look towards the government for help while males prefer organizations.

Sources of knowledge about the court
Respondents were asked if they had acquired knowledge about the court through any of the following sources and indicated a yes/no response for each source. Relatives and friends were mentioned as a source by most (68%), different kinds of media came next with half of the total sample indicating that these had been a source of knowledge for them. Only respondents who have actual experience as a complainant or defendant in a court case (see table 22) mentioned 'personal experience' as a source of knowledge. Otherwise they did not differ from those without court experience.

Table 21: Sources of knowledge about the court

N=1049	Number of Respondents	Percentage of respondents
From relatives and friends	709	68%
From newspapers or magazines	522	50%
From radio or TV	503	48%
From people with court experience	427	41%
Personal experience in court	347	33%

Personal experience in court
Two questions in the questionnaire targeted personal experience in the court. The question above that probed sources of knowledge about the court and included as one of the options 'personal experience' with the court. This was mentioned by 347 respondents, while 348 respondents or 33% of the sample claimed personal experience with the court as either complainant or defendant when asked directly. So the sources of knowledge question corroborates the claims of personal experience.

Table 22: Personal experience in court

N=1049		Total		
		Nr.	%	
Personal court experience	**As complainant**	196	19%	33%
	As defendant	152	14%	
No personal experience		694	66%	66%
Refused to answer		7	1%	

The outcome of cases of respondents' with court experience

Of the Sri Lankans who claimed personal experience with the court as a complainant (N=196) or defendant (N=152), nearly half had their case decided in their favor, although complainants were more likely to win than defendants.

Table 23: outcome of cases of respondents' with court experience

N=348	Complainants	%	Defendants	%	Total	%
Case decided in my favor	101	52%	59	39%	160	46%
Case decided against me	45	23%	54	36%	99	28%
Case unresolved/Refused to answer	50	26%	39	26%	89	26%
Total	196	100%	152	100%	348	100%

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

As can be expected, the outcome of their own case influenced respondents' opinion about the fairness of the court. Table 25 shows a clear trend towards a more unfair assessment of those who had lost their case. While 52% of those who lost their case thought the judgment was unfair, only 13% of those who won the case thought so, and while 82% of those who won their case considered the judgment fair, only 36% of those that lost did. Nevertheless, even given the fact that *more* cases than not were resolved *favorably* (+17%), the overall assessment is quite positive (+31%). Many of those whose case remained unresolved (47%) *and* a third of those who lost their case *still* thought the judgment to be *fair*.

Table 24: fairness of decision by outcome of decision

N=348	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	131 (82%)	36 (36%)	41 (47%)	208	60%	+31%
Court was in general unfair	21 (13%)	52 (52%)	27 (31%)	100	29%	
Don't Know/Refused to answer	8	12	20	40	11%	
Total Nr.	160	100	88	349	100%	
Total %	46%	29%	26%			
Net		+17%				

Alternative Dispute Resolution: a hypothetical problem

Respondents were given a hypothetical situation and asked what they would do: *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?[20]*.

Overall, there is a strong preference for formal conflict resolution mechanisms (61% versus 26%), in line with the answers to the question about the availability in the respondent's

---

[20] Respondents were given 8 different answer options and could indicate with a yes/no answer if they would give this advice to their bneighbor.

community of effective informal mechanisms. However it has to be pointed out that there is a strong interaction between preferences for formal and informal conflict resolution mechanisms. That is to say, people *either* prefer formal *or* informal dispute resolution. Consulting a lawyer and consulting a very respected person in one's community are even scored *mutually exclusive* in their: all who said 'yes' to one, said 'no' to the other way around[21].

Table 25: alternative Dispute Resolution: a hypothetical problem

N=1049	Number of responses	% of responses
Go to the police	632	60%
Consult a lawyer	596	57%
File a case in court	699	67%
Average Formal dispute resolution advice		61%
Consult a very respected person in your community	453	43%
Consult a priest or minister in your village	252	24%
Consult someone in your community with experience in settling disputes	109	10%
Talk to the relatives of the other person claiming the land	0	0%
Average Informal dispute resolution advice		11%
Average Informal dispute resolution advice excluding talking to relative		26%
Just wait and see/None of the above/Don't Know	0	0%

Respondents with and without court experience show exactly the same pattern of answers, and ethnic differences are also very limited. The only noteworthy exception being a somewhat stronger preference for consulting a very respected person in one's community amongst Tamils. This is in line with their equally exceptional answers to the question about the availability in the respondent's community of effective informal mechanisms

---

[21] For filing a case in court and going to the police and consulting a very respected person in one's community the Chi-square test showed statistically highly significant differences (Pearson Chi-Square values of 177.763 and 83.919 respectively)

Examples of True Justice or Injustice by the courts

Respondents were asked if they could mention specific court decisions that represent the best actual example of True Justice and Injustice done. For both questions less than half of the respondents offered examples. Tables 27 and 28 report the examples given. The percentages in the table refer to the segment of respondents gave examples, i.e. to only half of the total sample.

Table 26. Examples of True Justice by the courts

Example mentioned	Nr. of respondents	% of respondents
Suriya Kanda case	101	10%
Sandeepa Lakshan murder case	94	9%
Hokandara murder case	60	6%
Mathive Peris case	57	5%
Judgment in a rape case (particular village)	55	5%
200 year imprisonment sentence against Prabhakaran	52	5%
Judgment in an illegal liquor case (particular village)	36	3%
Krishanti Kumaraswami case	26	3%
Bindunu Wewa case	26	3%
Total	542	48%
Total Sample	1049	100%

For what one can expect to be the most relevant background characteristics with respect to this question, differences were not prominent: Respondents with and without personal court experience give very similar answers. And for ethnic background, only Tamils mentioning the Sandeepa Lakshan case more often and never mention the Prabhakaran sentence stand out.

Table 27: Examples of True Injustice by the courts

Example mentioned	Nr. of respondents	% of respondents
Kamal Addaraarachchi rape case	174	17%
Judgment in a rape case (particular village)	135	13%
Inoka Sewwandi murder case	100	10%
Judgment in an illegal liquor case (particular village)	83	8%
Bindunu Wewa case	18	2%
Total	510	49%
Total Sample	1049	100%

For this question the most relevant background characteristics did not change the pattern at all: No ethnic back ground or court experience differences.

General evaluative patterns in the responses of respondents of different backgrounds
In the reporting so far, variation along the lines of respondent background characteristics was described at question level[22]. In this paragraph we summarize the described information in terms of the evaluative pattern that emerges *across* individual questions.

To quantify the assessment of 'pattern' 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 one or the other item, but in the end, adding one or two or excluding one or two does not affect the overall picture very much. The patterns that emerge are quite robust and the scale value is an easy to understand single indicator summary of them.

The items included are listed in table 28 below

Table 28: scale to quantify evaluation of courts by sub samples

Question	Items	Weight *	Cumulative nr.
Trust in government professionals	Prosecutors	1	1
	Judges	1	2
Trust in public institutions	Supreme Court	1	3
	Courts in your area	1	4
Present performance of courts		1	5
Improvement over the last five years		1	6
Susceptibility to bribery of court officials	All 8 items combined	3	9
Judiciary's resistance to outside pressures	All 9 items combined	3	12
Judiciary keeping up with modern developments		1	13
Willingness to testify		1	14
Accountability of judges	Both items combined	1	15
Equal treatment	Equal treatment of poor and rich	1	16
	Equal enforcement of poor and rich	1	17
	Equal treatment of female rape victims	1	18
System of justice as the ultimate guarantee		1	19
Problems in getting proper services from the court	All 7 items combined	3	22
Confidence in the court decisions of different cases	All 4 cases combined merit/fairness dimension	2	24
Confidence in the court decisions of different cases	All 4 cases combined timeliness dimension	2	26

* = the weight is a maximum score if the pattern is consistent across the whole battery.

We use this scale to establish if a particular sub group, e.g. females or the less educated, show evidence of a particular pattern of court evaluations. To give an example: if the pattern that we want to quantify is that *the young have more trust in the court than the other two age categories* a scale item receives a (+1) score if for that particular item, the pattern is evident, it receives a (0) score if the pattern is not evident but it is also not violated, and it receives a (-1) score if the pattern is really violated. *Violation* of a pattern is defined as the presence of its opposite, That is to say, in our three level example, 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 category but do not stand out or are in between the least and most trusting categories, the item is scored (0).

---

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

The scale will produce a one figure pattern indicator, with a maximum of +26 and a minimum of –26. Negative figures are not to be expected because they would just indicate that our pattern assumptions are totally wrong. Interpreting the positive end of the scale we define weak, moderately strong, strong and very strong patterns by the following cut-off points:

Table 29: pattern definitions in terms of scale value ranges

Pattern	Scale value range
Weak pattern	1-6
Moderately strong pattern	7-12
Strong pattern	13-18
Very strong pattern	19+

Obviously these definitions are arbitrary and one should not make too much of them. The point is that a substantial difference in the indicator value reflects a substantial difference 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 with postulating the presence of a consistent pattern.

Table 30: evaluative pattern in the responses of respondents of different backgrounds

Background variable	Pattern	Strength	Score	Violations
Ethnicity	Tamils are more positive	Weak	+2	10
	Tamils are more negative	Weak	-2	12
Sex	Females are more positive	Moderately strong	+7	3
Age	The young are more positive	Weak	+5	3
	The middle age group is more negative	Moderately strong	+12	0
	The older are more positive	Weak	+3	0
Educational attainment	Lower educated are more positive	Moderately strong	+10	-3
	Higher educated are more negative	Weak	+5	-3
Court experience	Those with personal court experience are more negative	Strong	+16	1

Patterns have always to be checked on the possible influence of general answer tendencies. A general tendency to score higher or lower across the board is an obvious bias. Especially those scale items that are part of a set of the same question for a list of professional, institutions, professions, or dispute resolution options are susceptible to this bias. However, again, the bias makes the pattern appear somewhat stronger than it actually is, it does not create a pattern where there is none.

For the *Sri Lankan Tamil respondents* the scale is not very helpful. It is obvious that they stand out amongst the three ethnicities as *either scoring more positive or scoring more negative*. Therefore it makes sense to have a closer look at the particular (batteries of) items are scored more positive or more negative. Table 31 gives the summary overview:

Table 31: Summary overview of Sri Lankan Tamil answer patterns

Question	Items	Weight	Cumulative score	Tamils are more positive pattern	Tamils are more negative pattern
Trust in government professionals	Prosecutors	1	1	+1	-1
	Judges	1	2	-1	+1
Trust in public institutions	Supreme Court	1	3	-1	+1
	Courts in your area	1	4	0	0
Present performance of courts		1	5	+1	-1
Improvement over the last five years		1	6	+1	-1
Susceptibility to bribery of court officials	All 8 items combined	3	9	+2	-2
Judiciary's resistance to outside pressures	All 9 items combined	3	12	-3	+3
Judiciary keeping up with modern developments		1	13	+1	-1
Willingness to testify		1	14	+1	-1
Accountability of judges	Both items combined	1	15	+1	-1
Equal treatment	Equal treatment of poor and rich	1	16	-1	+1
	Equal enforcement of poor and rich	1	17	-1	+1
	Equal treatment of female rape victims	1	18	+1	-1
System of justice as the ultimate guarantee		1	19	-1	+1
Problems in getting proper services from the court	All 7 items combined	3	22	+1	-1
Confidence in the court decisions of different cases	All 4 cases combined merit/fairness dimension	2	24	-2	+2
Confidence in the court decisions of different cases	All 4 cases combined timeliness dimension	2	26	+2	-2
Pattern score				**+2**	**-2**

Apart from the above evaluative patterns there are several **additional patterns**, some of which were mentioned earlier, that warrant reiteration here:

❑ Sri Lankans overall judgment about the judicial system, weak performance albeit some improvement over the last five years, should be interpreted in the context of a the other 'systemic' judgments. It is the 'mixed' or 'balanced', or whatever other phrasing one may prefer composite picture that is striking:
  o The system of justice is strongly perceived as the ultimate guarantee of democracy and public liberties, whatever its weaknesses (table 18);
  o The lower courts are judged equivocally to say the least but the highest (Supreme) court is scored positively (table 6);
  o The only court officials granted a clean slate are judges (table 11). All others are perceived as being very susceptible to bribe offers. Judges also hold people's trust (table 5). This in strong contrast to the distrust towards prosecutors (table 5) and the police (table 6);
  o Although some government employees are highly trusted (table 5: teachers, doctors), the government machinery as such holds very little trust (table 6). One may conjecture that Sri Lankans put high value on societal institutions like the system of justice, the education system and the health system, and include core professionals in their positive evaluation (judges, teachers and doctors), but are quite negative about the performance of the delivery machinery. In case of the court, all other officials, including prosecutors, are perceived as part of that under-performing service delivery.
❑ A pattern, evident across nearly all background variation, is the *knowledge differential*: males, the better educated, and the elder respondents are more aware of court officials and procedures than others. This knowledge differential is not specific for knowledge about courts. It is also evident in knowledge about other public institutions too. This is also true for the lower aware rates of Tamils, although in their case a 'knowledge' interpretation is more speculative. However, the knowledge differential for respondents with and without personal experience of courts is specific to aspects of the judicial system.
❑ Another obvious pattern is that nearly all rank orders, of government professionals, public institutions, pressures on courts, problems with the court, sources of knowledge about the court, professional prestige and the fairness of conflict resolution option, are stable to very stable across backgrounders. All apart from the 'sources of knowledge' are evaluative and their stability can be interpreted as reflecting *conceptual hierarchies*.

By way of concluding, we want to direct attention to two findings for the *court users* sub sample that convey important messages regarding the perceived performance of courts in Sri Lanka.

The first refers to the one exception to the general pattern that those with personal experience with the court are more negative about everything. Apart from giving in to the President, this subgroup consistently ascribes less susceptibility to outside pressures to the court than those who lack such experience. Therefore judicial independence seems to be confirmed in actual experience.

The second is that court users are more negative about the susceptibility to corruption of court officials. The general ratings for these are already very high so it is not easy to be even more outspoken, but court users are. This implies an important qualification of the above statement regarding judicial independence.

Annex 1: Additional tables – Results split down according to respondents' background characteristics

Table 5A: Trust in government professionals

Respondent Background Characteristics (N=1049)		Ethnicity *			Sex		Age			Educational attainment			Court experience **		ALL (1049)
		Sinhala (866)	Sri Lankan Tamil (84)	Muslim (88)	F (533)	M (516)	18-24 (103)	25-44 (543)	45+ (403)	Lower (213)	Medium (721)	Higher (115)	+ (348)	- (694)	
Teachers in government schools	Aware (%)	100%	94%	99%	99%	99%	100%	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%
	Net Opinion (%)	+18	+31	+27	+28	+11	+34	+23	+13	+26	+18	+19	+9	+26	+20
Government Doctors	Aware (%)	100%	94%	99%	99%	99%	98%	99%	99%	100%	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%
	Net Opinion (%)	+17	+30	+27	+26	+12	+19	+19	+19	+34	+16	+9	+6	+26	+19
Teachers in private schools	Aware (%)	86%	60%	88%	83%	83%	85%	86%	79%	68%	86%	99%	83%	84%	83%
	Net Opinion (%)	+17	+19	+28	+20	+15	+22	+18	+16	+16	+20	+5	+18	+18	+18
Judges	Aware (%)	94%	73%	96%	90%	93%	86%	92%	93%	92%	92%	94%	95%	91%	92%
	Net Opinion (%)	+15	+8	+28	+20	+11	+20	+12	+20	+27	+12	+18	+6	+21	+16
Chairman/ Mayor of your local authority	Aware (%)	94%	75%	96%	91%	94%	84%	95%	91%	91%	93%	91%	95%	91%	92%
	Net Opinion (%)	-15	-21	-3	-13	-17	-8	-14	-18	-15	-13	-28	-19	-12	-15
Prosecutors	Aware (%)	86%	62%	90%	81%	88%	81%	85%	85%	75%	86%	90%	90%	82%	84%
	Net Opinion (%)	-29	-20	-25	-24	-33	-18	-30	-29	-19	-29	-39	-30	-27	-28
Your Member of the Provincial Council	Aware (%)	87%	70%	94%	81%	92%	82%	87%	86%	85%	86%	87%	90%	84%	86%
	Net Opinion (%)	-31	-36	-19	-26	-35	-37	-31	-29	-25	-30	-43	-32	-30	-31
Your member of Parliament	Aware (%)	88%	77%	89%	85%	89%	80%	90%	85%	85%	87%	88%	87%	87%	87%
	Net Opinion (%)	-33	-24	-25	-29	-35	-28	-33	-31	-27	-32	-41	-33	-31	-32

* = 11 respondents not included: 2 Burghers and 9 Indian Tamils

**= 7 respondents refused to answer

Table 6A: Trust in institutions serving the public

Respondent Background Characteristics (N=1049)		Ethnicity *			Sex		Age			Educational attainment			Court experience**		ALL (1049)
		Sinhala (866)	Sri Lankan Tamil (84)	Muslim (88)	F (533)	M (516)	18-24 (103)	25-44 (543)	45+ (403)	Lower (213)	Medium (721)	Higher (115)	+ (348)	- (694)	
The administrator of your place of worship	Aware (%)	99%	98%	99%	99%	98%	99%	98%	99%	98%	99%	99%	99%	98%	98%
	Net Opinion (%)	+61	+56	+77	+67	+58	+66	+62	+62	+69	+63	+43	+61	+62	+62
Supreme Court	Aware (%)	85	64%	74%	75%	81%	75%	79%	78%	69%	79%	87%	81%	77%	78%
	Net Opinion (%)	+21	+13	+24	+22	+19	+30	+18	+21	+25	+20	+13	+18	+22	+20
Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO)	Aware (%)	75%	61%	90%	69%	73%	71%	71%	71%	61%	72%	84%	75%	69%	71%
	Net Opinion (%)	+8	-1	+15	+13	+3	+24	+8	+3	+8	+8	+7	+7	+9	+8
The courts in your area	Aware (%)	91%	77%	89%	87%	93%	86%	91%	90%	87%	91%	90%	96%	87%	90%
	Net Opinion (%)	+3	+5	+5	+7	-1	+17	-1	+4	+4	+3	+3	-9	+10	+3
The newspapers	Aware (%)	96%	94%	97%	95%	97%	99%	96%	95%	90%	97%	100%	96%	96%	96%
	Net Opinion (%)	-6	+26	+10	+2	-7	+1	-1	-5	+1	+2	-12	-7	0	-2
Television	Aware (%)	97%	96%	99%	97%	98%	9%	98%	97%	92%	99%	99%	97%	97%	97%
	Net Opinion (%)	-9	+31	+7	0	-9	+3	-3	-8	+7	+5	-25	-9	-3	-5
Your local authority	Aware (%)	96%	66%	98%	93%	94%	91%	95%	92%	90%	94%	95%	94%	93%	93%
	Net Opinion (%)	-22	-14	-10	-17	-24	-18	-19	-24	-19	-19	-40	-27	-17	-21
The national government	Aware (%)	98%	92%	99%	97%	97%	96%	97%	98%	96%	97%	99%	97%	98%	97%
	Net Opinion (%)	-38	+6	-18	-30	-35	-27	-34	-32	-24	-34	-40	-36	-31	-32
The police	Aware (%)	99%	96%	100%	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%	98%	99%	100%	99%	99%	99%
	Net Opinion (%)	-43	-43	-41	-39	-46	-38	-47	-37	-37	-44	-43	-50	-39	-42
The parliament	Aware (%)	95%	83%	100%	93%	96%	92%	95%	94%	92%	95%	97%	95%	94%	94%
	Net Opinion (%)	-57	-20	-40	-47	-58	-49	-55	-50	-39	-55	-61	-57	-50	-52

*= 11 respondents not included: 2 Burghers and 9 Indian Tamils

**=

Table 7A: Ratings of the judiciary's present performance and as compared to five years ago

Respondent Background Characteristics (N=1049)		Present Court Performance		Compared to five years ago	
		Aware (%)	Net Opinion (%)	Aware (%)	Net Opinion (%)
Ethnicity *	Sinhala (866)	97%	-21	93%	+3
	Sri Lankan Tamil (84)	93%	+11	93%	+19
	Muslim (88)	96%	-17	78%	+8
Sex	F (533)	95%	-16	89%	+6
	M (516)	99%	-20	95%	+3
Age	18-24 (103	96%	-15	84%	+15
	25-44 (543)	96%	-19	91%	+5
	45+ (403)	97%	-18	95%	+2
Educational attainment	Lower (213)	93%	-9	87%	+9
	Medium (721)	98%	-20	93%	+3
	Higher (115)	99%	-23	93%	+6
Court experience **	+ (348)	99%	-28	96%	0
	- (694)	96%	-13	90%	+7
ALL (1049)		97%	-18	92%	+5

* = 11 respondents not included: 2 Burghers and 9 Indian Tamils

**=

Table 8A: the judiciary's resistance to outside pressures

Respondent Background Characteristics (N=1049)		Ethnicity *			Sex		Age			Educational attainment			Court experience **		ALL (1049)
		Sinhala (866)	Sri Lankan Tamil (84)	Muslim (88)	F (533)	M (516)	18-24 (103)	25-44 (543)	45+ (403)	Lower (213)	Medium (721)	Higher (115)	+ (348)	- (694)	
The President	Aware (%)	91%	74%	83%	85%	92%	89%	90%	88%	80%	90%	96%	91%	88%	89%
	Net Opinion (%)	-23	-45	-47	-23	-31	-21	-32	-21	-15	-28	-43	-32	-24	-27
The government	Aware (%)	93%	66%	85%	87%	94%	91%	92%	88%	83%	92%	95%	93%	89%	90%
	Net Opinion (%)	-12	-18	-24	-12	-14	-12	-14	-12	-8	-14	-18	-15	-12	-13
Parliament	Aware (%)	90%	61%	78%	84%	90%	85%	87%	87%	79%	88%	95%	90%	85%	87%
	Net Opinion (%)	+10	-20	+6	+6	+8	+6	+5	+9	+9	+8	-3	+5	+8	+7
Members of Parliament	Aware (%)	94%	60%	91%	88%	94%	90%	92%	89%	84%	92%	96%	95%	90%	91%
	Net Opinion (%)	+35	+9	+27	+34	+31	+28	+33	+33	+44	+30	+28	+41	+29	+33
Big Business	Aware (%)	90%	50%	90%	84%	90%	83%	89%	85%	76%	89%	91%	91%	85%	87%
	Net Opinion (%)	+36	+12	+28	+36	+31	+26	+33	+37	+41	+32	+30	+41	+31	+34
Organized crime, i.e. "Mafia"	Aware (%)	89%	39%	82%	83%	86%	84%	86%	83%	71%	87%	92%	87%	84%	85%
	Net Opinion (%)	+39	+8	+41	+39	+34	+21	+37	+39	+38	+35	+45	+42	+34	+37
Police	Aware (%)	96%	60%	92%	90%	95%	93%	93%	91%	85%	94%	97%	96%	91%	93%
	Net Opinion (%)	+47	+5	+49	+44	+43	+31	+44	+46	+49	+40	+60	+53	+40	+44
Local authorities	Aware (%)	92%	46%	88%	85%	91%	86%	88%	88%	79%	89%	94%	92%	86%	88%
	Net Opinion (%)	+56	+11	+56	+51	+53	+38	+50	+58	+53	+50	+61	+59	+48	+52
Civil society advocacy groups	Aware (%)	90%	49%	83%	84%	87%	86%	87%	84%	74%	88%	94%	87%	85%	86%
	Net Opinion (%)	+63	+13	+51	+60	+57	+48	+59	+61	+54	+57	+75	+60	+58	+59

Table 10A: Confidence about courts' decisions in specific kinds of cases: Ethnicity *

(N=1038)		Decision will be based on evidence rather than quality of the lawyers (%)		Decision will be fair (%)		Decision will be issued within a reasonable amount of time (%)	
Ethnicity	Cases	**Aware (%)**	**Net Opinion (%)**	**Aware (%)**	**Net Opinion (%)**	**Aware (%)**	**Net Opinion (%)**
Sinhala (866)	**Dispute between family members about property inheritance**	98%	+50	95%	+54	99%	-77
	Police or military charged with human rights violation of government opponents	92%	+40	91%	+32	93%	-3
	Murder case, accused is important person, victim is ordinary person	97%	+16	94%	+10	98%	-30
	High government official charged with corruption	94%	+12	91%	+7	95%	-2
	Politician charged with corruption	92%	-3	91%	-12	93%	-9
Sri Lankan Tamil (84)	**Dispute between family members about property inheritance**	77%	+15	71%	+24	79%	-38
	Police or military charged with human rights violation of government opponents	67%	0	63%	-4	73%	-8
	Murder case, accused is important person, victim is ordinary person	68%	+27	70%	+6	76%	-5
	High government official charged with corruption	68%	-11	62%	-10	75%	-15
	Politician charged with corruption	67%	-17	66%	-25	74%	-12
Muslim (88)	**Dispute between family members about property inheritance**	96%	+30	96%	+48	98%	-77
	Police or military charged with human rights violation of government opponents	83%	+19	83%	+28	90%	-8
	Murder case, accused is important person, victim is ordinary person	92%	-1	93%	-7	94%	-40
	High government official charged with corruption	93%	+7	97%	-15	97%	-24
	Politician charged with corruption	93%	+5	97%	-28	97%	-28

* = 11 respondents not included: 2 Burghers and 9 Indian Tamils

Table 10B: Confidence about courts' decisions in specific kinds of cases: Sex

(N=1049)		Decision will be based on evidence rather than quality of the lawyers (%)		Decision will be fair (%)		Decision will be issued within a reasonable amount of time (%)	
Sex	Cases	**Aware (%)**	**Net Opinion (%)**	**Aware (b%)**	**Net Opinion (%)**	**Aware (%)**	**Net Opinion (%)**
Female (533)	**Dispute between family members about property inheritance**	95%	+47	93%	+50	97%	-75
	Police or military charged with human rights violation of government opponents	85%	+34	84%	+25	87%	-6
	Murder case, accused is important person, victim is ordinary person	92%	+12	90%	+7	95%	-32
	High government official charged with corruption	88%	+14	85%	+6	93%	-6
	Politician charged with corruption	87%	-3	87%	-15	90%	-10
Male (516)	**Dispute between family members about property inheritance**	96%	+45	94%	+53	97%	-73
	Police or military charged with human rights violation of government opponents	92%	+36	91%	+33	95%	-3
	Murder case, accused is important person, victim is ordinary person	96%	+19	94%	+10	96%	-27
	High government official charged with corruption	95%	+6	93%	+1	96%	-4
	Politician charged with corruption	94%	-3	92%	-13	94%	-12

Table 10C: Confidence about courts' decisions in specific kinds of cases: Age

(N=1049)		Decision will be based on evidence rather than quality of the lawyers (%)		Decision will be fair (%)		Decision will be issued within a reasonable amount of time (%)	
Age	Cases	**Aware (%)**	**Net Opinion (%)**	**Aware (%)**	**Net Opinion (%)**	**Aware (%)**	**Net Opinion (%)**
18-24 (103)	**Dispute between family members about property inheritance**	95%	+60	95%	+56	97%	-70
	Police or military charged with human rights violation of government opponents	90%	+38	90%	+21	91%	-12
	Murder case, accused is important person, victim is ordinary person	96%	+28	90%	+18	97%	-29
	High government official charged with corruption	91%	-6	88%	-15	93%	-8
	Politician charged with corruption	93%	+6	93%	-6	94%	+1
25-44 (543)	**Dispute between family members about property inheritance**	96%	+46	93%	+52	97%	-74
	Police or military charged with human rights violation of government opponents	88%	+35	87%	+28	92%	-3
	Murder case, accused is important person, victim is ordinary person	94%	+12	92%	+5	96%	-27
	High government official charged with corruption	91%	+6	89%	-1	93%	+2
	Politician charged with corruption	91%	-9	90%	-21	93%	-8
45+ (403)	**Dispute between family members about property inheritance**	95%	+42	92%	+50	97%	-75
	Police or military charged with human rights violation of government opponents	89%	+34	88%	+33	89%	-3
	Murder case, accused is important person, victim is ordinary person	94%	+18	93%	+11	95%	-32
	High government official charged with corruption	91%	+19	90%	+14	93%	-13
	Politician charged with corruption	89%	+2	88%	-7	90%	-17

Table 10D: Confidence about courts' decisions in specific kinds of cases: Educational attainment

(N=1049)		Decision will be based on evidence rather than quality of the lawyers (%)		Decision will be fair (%)		Decision will be issued within a reasonable amount of time (%)	
Educational attainment	Cases	Aware (%)	Net Opinion (%)	Aware (%)	Net Opinion (%)	Aware (%)	Net Opinion (%)
Lower (213)	**Dispute between family members about property inheritance**	92%	+48	91%	+52	94%	-61
	Police or military charged with human rights violation of government opponents	79%	+32	78%	+30	82%	+2
	Murder case, accused is important person, victim is ordinary person	92%	+20	91%	+12	94%	-21
	High government official charged with corruption	87%	+15	84%	+10	88%	-5
	Politician charged with corruption	85%	-2	82%	-15	86%	-8
Medium (721)	**Dispute between family members about property inheritance**	97%	+44	93%	+50	98%	-76
	Police or military charged with human rights violation of government opponents	91%	+35	89%	+28	93%	-4
	Murder case, accused is important person, victim is ordinary person	95%	+16	92%	+7	96%	-29
	High government official charged with corruption	92%	+8	90%	+1	94%	-4
	Politician charged with corruption	92%	-4	91%	-14	93%	-8
Higher (115)	**Dispute between family members about property inheritance**	97%	+54	97%	+57	98%	-84
	Police or military charged with human rights violation of government opponents	91%	+43	93%	+32	92$	-19
	Murder case, accused is important person, victim is ordinary person	94%	+15	93%	+11	97%	-46
	High government official charged with corruption	95%	+13	93%	+11	96%	-10
	Politician charged with corruption	92%	0	92%	-10	95%	-36

Table 10E: Confidence about courts' decisions in specific kinds of cases: Court experience

(N=1049)		Decision will be based on evidence rather than quality of the lawyers (%)		Decision will be fair (%)		Decision will be issued within a reasonable amount of time (%)	
Court Experience	Cases	Aware (%)	Net Opinion (%)	Aware (%)	Net Opinion (%)	Aware (%)	Net Opinion (%)
With court experience (348)	Dispute between family members about property inheritance	98%	+36	94%	+41	97%	-77
	Police or military charged with human rights violation of government opponents	93%	+31	90%	+26	94%	-4
	Murder case, accused is important person, victim is ordinary person	96%	+14	95%	+8	97%	-35
	High government official charged with corruption	94%	+4	92%	+1	95%	-11
	Politician charged with corruption	92%	-8	92%	-19	93%	-17
Without court experience (694	Dispute between family members about property inheritance	95%	+51	93%	+57	97%	-73
	Police or military charged with human rights violation of government opponents	86%	+38	86%	+31	89%	-4
	Murder case, accused is important person, victim is ordinary person	93%	+16	91%	+10	95%	-27
	High government official charged with corruption	90%	+13	88%	+5	92%	-2
	Politician charged with corruption	90%	-1	88%	-11	92%	-9

Table 11A: Susceptibility of court officials to bribery

Respondent Background Characteristics (N=1049)		Ethnicity			Sex		Age			Educational attainment			Court experience		ALL (1049)
		Sinhala (866)	Sri Lankan Tamil (84)	Muslim (88)	F (533)	M (516)	18-24 (403)	25-44 (543)	45+ (403)	Lower (213)	Medium (721)	Higher (115)	+ (348)	- (694)	
Minor staff	Aware (%)	93%	79%	93%	89%	94%	93%	92%	90%	86%	93%	92%	95%	**90%**	**91%**
	Net Opinion (%)	+78	+24	+84	+70	+78	+66	+77	+73	+64	+76	+79	+82	**+71**	**+74**
Police officers performing judicial functions	Aware (%)	89%	77%	90%	85%	92%	92%	87%	88%	83%	90%	88%	92%	**86%**	**88%**
	Net Opinion (%)	+69	+51	+73	+64	+72	+66	+69	+66	+62	+69	+70	+73	**+65**	**+68**
Clerks	Aware (%)	90%	71%	88%	85%	91%	87%	88%	88%	83%	90%	86%	94%	**85%**	**88%**
	Net Opinion (%)	+69	+39	+70	+62	+72	+62	+72	+60	+57	+69	+69	+74	**+63**	**+67**
Prison officials	Aware (%)	89%	73%	83%	84%	90%	87%	88%	85%	79%	89%	90%	91%	**85%**	**87%**
	Net Opinion (%)	+62	+49	+49	+58	+62	+52	+64	+56	+50	+61	+74	+65	**+57**	**+60**
Prosecutors	Aware (%)	84%	58%	80%	76%	87%	78%	84%	79%	75%	82%	86%	87%	**78%**	**81%**
	Net Opinion (%)	+42	+20	+30	+37	+42	+38	+41	+38	+32	+40	+51	+46	**+37**	**+40**
Interpreters	Aware (%)	75%	62%	68%	67%	80%	71%	72%	76%	69%	76%	65%	79%	**70%**	**74%**
	Net Opinion (%)	+40	+25	+34	+29	+48	+41	+39	+37	+28	+42	+36	+44	**+35**	**+38**
Registrars	Aware (%)	77%	66%	68%	70%	81%	`77%	74%	77%	67%	77%	80%	81%	73%	75%
	Net Opinion (%)	+35	+32	+32	+26	+42	+32	+36	+33	+21	+37	+42	+41	+31	+34
Judges	Aware (%)	75%	56%	64%	69%	76%	67%	73%	73%	68%	73%	78%	76%	71%	72%
	Net Opinion (%)	-36	**+4**	-26	-37	-27	-36	-28	-37	-35	-31	-33	-26	-35	-32

Table 12A: Keeping up with technology and other changing conditions in the world

Respondent Background Characteristics (N=1049)		The judiciary compares favorably to other government agencies in how the keep up with technology and other changing conditions in the world	
		Aware (%)	Net Opinion (%)
Ethnicity	Sinhala (866)	86%	-23
	Sri Lankan Tamil (84)	80%	+27
	Muslim (88)	73%	-14
Sex	F (533)	80%	-16
	M (516)	90%	-21
Age	18-24 (103)	88%	-8
	25-44 (543)	87%	-24
	45+ (403)	80%	-13
Educational attainment	Lower (213)	65%	-7
	Medium (721)	89%	-19
	Higher (115)	92%	-35
Court experience	+ (348)	90%	-26
	- (694)	82%	-15
ALL (1049)		85%	-18

Table 13A: Willingness to testify

Respondent Background Characteristics (N=1049)		Witnesses to crimes are generally willing to testify in court	
		Aware (%)	Net Opinion (%)
Ethnicity	Sinhala (866)	99%	-70
	Sri Lankan Tamil (84)	87%	-27
	Muslim (88)	100%	-72
Sex	F (533)	98%	-66
	M (516)	98%	-67
Age	18-24 (103)	99%	-65
	25-44 (543)	97%	-70
	45+ (403)	98%	-62
Educational attainment	Lower (213)	97%	-53
	Medium (721)	98%	-70
	Higher (115)	97%	-68
Court experience	+ (348)	98%	-65
	- (694)	98%	-67
ALL (1049)		98%	-66

Table 14A: Availability of conflict resolution mechanisms in the community

Respondent Background Characteristics (N=1049)		In our community, even strong grievances between persons are settled fairly and peacefully, without bringing a case to court	
		Aware (%)	Net Opinion (%)
Ethnicity	Sinhala (866)	99%	-10
	Sri Lankan Tamil (84)	88%	+26
	Muslim (88)	97%	+1
Sex	F (533)	99%	-8
	M (516)	98%	-2
Age	18-24 (103)	97%	+7
	25-44 (543)	98%	-7
	45+ (403)	98%	-6
Educational attainment	Lower (213)	97%	-7
	Medium (721)	99%	-4
	Higher (115)	97%	-10
Court experience	+ (348)	98%	-13
	- (694)	98%	-1
ALL (1049)		98%	-5

Table 15A: Guilty unless proven otherwise

Respondent Background Characteristics (N=1049)		One who is accused of a crime must prove his innocence, or else he will usually be punished	
		Aware (%)	Net Opinion (%)
Ethnicity	Sinhala (866)	97%	+55
	Sri Lankan Tamil (84)	87%	-5
	Muslim (88)	93%	+50
Sex	F (533)	94%	+50
	M (516)	97%	+50
Age	18-24 (103)	94%	+42
	25-44 (543)	96%	+49
	45+ (403)	95%	+52
Educational attainment	Lower (213)	91%	+45
	Medium (721)	97%	+50
	Higher (115)	95%	+57
Court experience	+ (348)	97%	+43
	- (694)	95%	+54
ALL (1049)		97%	+50

Table 16A: Accountability of judges

Respondent Background Characteristics (N=1049)		Judges who mistakenly convict people who are really innocent usually get into trouble		Judges who mistakenly acquit people who are really guilty usually get into trouble	
		Aware (%)	Net Opinion (%)	Aware (%)	Net Opinion (%)
Ethnicity	Sinhala (866)	90%	-55	89%	-59
	Sri Lankan Tamil (84)	76%	-15	81%	-17
	Muslim (88)	83%	-58	82%	-55
Sex	F (533)	86%	-49	85%	-53
	M (516)	90%	-55	90%	-58
Age	18-24 (103)	87%	-42	88%	-45
	25-44 (543)	89%	-57	88%	-60
	45+ (403)	87%	-47	87%	-51
Educational attainment	Lower (213)	79%	-39	80%	-44
	Medium (721)	90%	-55	89%	-59
	Higher (115)	94%	-55	93%	-54
Court experience	+ (348)	91%	-57	91%	-61
	- (694)	87%	-49	86%	-52
ALL (1049		90%	-52	90%	-55

Table 17A: Equal treatment

Respondent Background Characteristics (N=1049)		The judiciary treats people who come before it equally, irrespective whether they are rich or poor		Convicted criminals are generally punished in accordance with the law, whether they are rich or poor		Women who are victims of rape are generally treated fairly by the courts	
		Aware (%)	Net Opinion (%)	Aware (%)	Net Opinion (%)	Aware (%)	Net Opinion (%)
Ethnicity	**Sinhala (866)**	99%	-2	99%	+27	96%	-25
	Sri Lankan Tamil (84)	89%	-13	87%	-8	79%	-15
	Muslim (88)	99%	+6	97	+35	86%	-21
Sex	**F (533)**	97%	+1	97%	+23	94%	-24
	M (516)	99%	-6	98%	+26	94%	-24
Age	**18-24 (103)**	99%	-3	99	+28	95%	-26
	25-44 (543)	98%	-8	97%	+21	95%	-30
	45+ (403)	98%	+7	98%	+29	92%	-14
Educational attainment	**Lower (213)**	97%	+8	95%	+25	91%	-16
	Medium (721)	98%	-6	98%	+24	95%	-28
	Higher (115)	100%	+2	100%	+30	97%	-10
Court experience	**+ (348)**	99%	-5	99%	+18	96%	-23
	- (694)	97%	-1	98%	+29	94%	-24
ALL (1049)		**99%**	**-2**	**98%**	**+25**	**94%**	**-24**

Table 18A: System of justice as the ultimate guarantee of democracy and public liberties

Respondent Background Characteristics (N=1049)		Whatever its shortcomings and inadequacies may be, our system of justice provides the ultimate guarantee of democracy and public liberties	
		Aware (%)	Net Opinion (%)
Ethnicity	**Sinhala (866)**	99%	+68
	Sri Lankan Tamil (84)	81%	+15
	Muslim (88)	98%	+58
Sex	**F (533)**	96%	+62
	M (516)	98%	+64
Age	**18-24 (103)**	99%	+56
	25-44 (543)	97%	+61
	45+ (403)	97%	+67
Educational attainment	**Lower (213)**	93%	+62
	Medium (721)	98%	+62
	Higher (115)	99%	+72
Court experience	**+ (348)**	98%	+60
	- (694)	97%	+65
ALL (1049)		**98%**	**+63**

Table 19A: Problems in getting proper services from the court

Respondent background characteristics (N=1049)		Ethnicity			Sex		Age			Educational attainment			Court experience		ALL (1049)
		Sinhala (866)	Sri Lankan Tamil (84)	Muslim (88)	F (533)	M (616)	18-24 (103)	25-44 (543)	45+ (403)	Lower (213)	Medium (721)	Higher (115)	+ (348)	- (694)	
Waste of time	Aware (%)	100%	93%	97%	99%	99%	98%	99%	99%	99%	99%	100%	100%	97%	99%
	Net Opinion (%)	+59	+26	+65	+56	+58	+48	+60	+54	+58	+59	+43	+64	+54	+57
Hard to understand English	Aware (%)	97%	89%	93%	95%	98%	95%	96%	96%	94%	96%	100%	99%	93%	98%
	Net Opinion (%)	+47	+36	+14	+46	+40	+39	+40	+48	+72	+62	-3	+45	+43	+43
Opponent will resort to bribery	Aware (%)	97%	6%	90%	94%	97%	95%	96%	95%	93%	96%	97%	97%	95%	97%
	Net Opinion (%)	+31	+23	+28	+26	+28	+17	+30	+25	+28	+26	+25	+32	+24	+27
Judge will not understand	Aware (%)	98%	80%	90%	95%	97%	95%	96%	96%	93%	97%	96%	97%	95%	97%
	Net Opinion (%)	+5	-5	-13	+8	-2	-6	+7	-1	0	+3	+5	+2	+3	+3
Unsure about enforcement	Aware (%)	95%	79%	90%	92%	95%	92%	94%	93%	88%	95%	97%	95%	93%	95%
	Net Opinion (%)	-7	-2	-2	-3	-9	-5	-7	-6	-8	-6	-7	-4	-7	-6
Hard to understand own language	Aware (%)	97%	87%	89%	94%	96%	92%	95%	97%	92%	96%	99%	99%	93%	96%
	Net Opinion (%)	-10	-38	-13	-8	-16	-23	-12	-10	+6	-15	-27	-14	-11	-12
Difficult to find trusted help	Aware (%)	100%	87%	100%	98%	99%	98%	99%	99%	98%	99%	100%	99%	98%	99%
	Net Opinion (%)	-17	-4	+8	-9	-17	-17	-15	-9	-8	-15	-13	-12	-14	-13

Table 21A: Sources of knowledge about the court

N=1049	With Court experience (N=348)	Without Court experience (N=694)
From relatives and friends	234 (67%)	470 (68%)
From newspapers or magazines	182 (52%)	333 (48%)
From radio or TV	175 (50%	324 (47%)
From people with court experience	132 (38%)	295 (43%)
Personal experience in court	347 (100%)	0 (0%)

Annex 3 Questionnaire