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Summary of Findings

This is the final report on a baseline public opinion survey designed to measure Georgian citizens’ knowledge and perception of the judicial system. The survey of 1,200 randomly chosen respondents was conducted from October 5 through December 1, 2004 across Georgia. The survey was conducted by the American Bar Association’s Central European and Eurasian Law Initiative Tbilisi Office (ABA/CEELI) and the Analysis and Consulting Team (ACT).

A summary of the findings of the study follows.

Attitude toward the Public Sector

➢ The majority of the Georgian population thinks that presently the country’s public policy is headed in the right direction.

➢ The majority of people think that all social institutions have improved compared to the previous year. The most improvement is seen in the media and the President’s office, while only minor improvements are perceived in the Ministry of Justice and the courts.

➢ The population expects that the effectiveness of the media and the President’s office will continue to improve, compared with expectations of only minor improvement in the effectiveness of the Ministry of Justice.

➢ The people of West Georgia are the least critical of the public sector, while those residing in Tbilisi are the most critical.

Qualification Examinations for Judges, Advocates, and Prosecutors

➢ Approximately two-thirds of Georgia’s population has never heard of qualification examinations for judges, prosecutors, or advocates. Nonetheless, the population is more informed about judges’ examinations than about those for prosecutors.

➢ The residents of Tbilisi are the most informed about the qualification examinations; the residents of East Georgia are the least informed.

➢ Georgians consider the qualification examinations for judges, advocates, and prosecutors to be “more or less objective.”

➢ The majority of Georgia’s population thinks that qualification examinations for judges, advocates, and prosecutors are necessary. The percentage in favor of examinations is much higher in West and East Georgia than in Tbilisi.

➢ The majority of the population, irrespective of their place of residence, gender, or age, thinks that it is vital to hold qualification examinations periodically for judges, advocates, and prosecutors.

Professionalism of Judges, Advocates, and Prosecutors

➢ The Georgian people give an average rating to the professionalism and qualification of judges, advocates, and prosecutors. Among the regions, the highest ratings were given in West Georgia, while the lowest were rendered in Tbilisi.
Almost one-fourth of the population was unable to evaluate the professionalism and qualification of judges, advocates, and prosecutors of their own district; the remaining three-quarters evaluated them as “more or less professional.” In the evaluation of judges, advocates, and prosecutors of their own district, residents of West Georgia gave the most favorable rating, while residents of Tbilisi were the least favorable.

People feel that in the last five years there has been “insignificant improvement” in the professionalism and qualification of judges, advocates, and prosecutors.

Criteria for the Evaluation of Judges

- In appointing judges, the population thinks it vital to take into consideration factors such as (1) conscientiousness and impartiality, (2) professionalism/competence, (3) education, and (4) experience.

- For the citizens of Georgia, the most important criteria for promoting a judge are (1) qualification examination scores and (2) reputation.

Gender and Ethnicity of Judges, Advocates, and Prosecutors

- For the majority of the population, gender appeared to be an insignificant factor in their evaluation of judges, advocates, and prosecutors.

- With regard to ethnicity, half of the population thinks that only ethnic Georgians should be appointed as judges and prosecutors; the other half thinks that every Georgian citizen should have an equal opportunity to be appointed to these positions.

- The population’s tolerance is highest towards Armenians, Azerbaijani, and Russians. Their tolerance is the lowest towards Turks, Ossetians, and Abkhazians. Residents of Tbilisi are the most tolerant toward non-ethnic Georgian judges and prosecutors; East Georgians are the least tolerant.

Average Monthly Salary of Judges

- The majority of the population does not know the average monthly salary of judges. Only 6.9% are knowledgeable about this issue. 56.2% of respondents think that the current salary is not enough to prevent an individual from taking bribes.

- Those respondents (53%) who think that the current salary is insufficient indicate an optimal salary of over 600 Lari, which is a close approximation of current judicial salaries in Georgia.

Appointment of Individuals for Judgeship

- Almost half of the population does not know how judges are appointed. Among the regions, the residents of West Georgia are the least informed on this issue.

- 65.7% of the population, regardless of region, gender, or age, thinks that judges should be elected.
Of those who support the election of judges, 53% believe that judges should be elected by the entire population, 31% believe that judges should be elected by their peers, and 14% support election of judges by the Parliament.

A large percentage of Tbilisians thinks that judges should be elected by their peers. The majority of the population of West and East Georgia support their general popular election.

Non-Judicial and Non-Prosecutorial Activities of Judges and Prosecutors

Only one-tenth of the population knows that judges and prosecutors have a right to participate in educational activities but that performing any other job is prohibited by law. The residents of Tbilisi and West Georgia are more informed about this, while the East Georgians are the least informed.

Private Sector Activities of Judges and Prosecutors

Half of the population knows that judges and prosecutors do not have the right to be involved in the private sector. Tbilisians are more informed about this, while East Georgians are the least informed.

Two-thirds of the Georgian population thinks that judges and prosecutors should be prohibited from involvement in the private sector. West Georgians have the most negative view of such involvement.

Political Activities of Judges and Prosecutors

About one-third of the Georgian population knows that judges and prosecutors are prohibited from becoming members of a political party. The people of Tbilisi were the most informed about this.

The majority of the population supports this prohibition. Approximately, one-third of the population thinks otherwise.

Membership of judges and prosecutors in a political party is less acceptable to the population of Tbilisi, while more acceptable to East Georgians.

Corruption in the Judicial System

About half of the population thinks that at present there are only a few corrupt people in the judicial system. The rest believe that the judicial system is either completely corrupt or that half of the judges are corrupt.

More Tbilisians believe the judicial system to be completely or significantly corrupt than East Georgians.

The general population is more likely to believe that judges and prosecutors are corrupt and that advocates are less corrupt.

The majority of the population thinks that since 1998 corruption in the judicial system has decreased.
Influence on Judges, Advocates, and Prosecutors

- The majority of people are unaware of instances of exertion of influence on judges, advocates, or prosecutors. Of those who are aware, most are from Tbilisi, and fewest are from West Georgia.

- The main sources of information about influence on the judicial system are (1) television, (2) friends, and (3) the mass media.

- The population thinks that influence on judges, advocates, and prosecutors comes mostly from the prosecutor’s office, the courts, or the plaintiffs.

- People believe that in the last five years, the exertion of influence on judges, advocates, and prosecutors has decreased.

- 43.2% of respondents are informed about judicial immunity.

- 57.8% of respondents have a positive view of judicial immunity.

- Georgians think that judges and prosecutors are “more or less” protected from influence and that advocates are more protected than judges.

- Only 3.1% of the Georgian population knows that the distribution of cases among judges is done by random selection or lottery. The majority believes it is done by the chairmen of the court.

Access of Journalists and Public to Court Proceedings

- About half of the population is not aware that reporters and public have the right to attend court proceedings.

- The majority of respondents believe that reporters and civilians should have such a right, but one-third believes that they should be granted this right only in specific circumstances.

- 37% of the population is informed about the right to access court documents. Only 56% thinks that citizens should have this right.

- 90% are aware of the possibility of voicing their dissatisfaction with judicial proceedings.

- The majority of the Georgian population has a general knowledge about the right to appeal a judge’s decision. The majority believes this right is important.

Experience with the Judicial System

- During the past five years, 91% of the population has had no contact with the judicial system in Georgia.

- One-third of cases brought to the court within the past five years are still pending. Most of these cases were filed in 2003 or 2004. On average, cases last one or two years. Most cases are criminal, the fewest involve commercial law. In most cases, the parties were represented by a private attorney.
Attitudes toward Judges, Advocates, and Prosecutors

- Persons who have had experience with the judicial system considered their advocates to be “competent;” however, they considered judges and prosecutors to be “more or less competent.”

- These same people considered the judges to be “more or less objective”, advocates more “zealous”, and prosecutors “more or less” fair.

- Those who express dissatisfaction with the actions of the judges, advocates, or prosecutors usually point out corruption and improper influences as the basis for their complaints.

Attitudes about Using the Courts in the Future

- Almost half of Georgian citizens (47%) indicated that they would do their utmost to avoid the judicial system in the future.
The Purposes and Goals of the Survey

The main purpose of the survey is to provide data on the Georgian citizens’ attitude toward, knowledge of, and the experience with the country’s judicial system. The survey had to address the following issues:

➢ Determine the public’s level of awareness about the following:
  ▪ Qualification examinations/preparation for the representatives of the judicial system
  ▪ Rules for appointing judges
  ▪ Regulations for case distribution among judges
  ▪ Rights and immunities of judges
  ▪ Availability of public information
  ▪ Average monthly salary of judges
  ▪ Rules for filing appeals from adverse judgments
  ▪ Influence on judges and the sources of information about influence

➢ Determine the public’s attitude toward the following:
  ▪ Direction of state development and activities of the public sector
  ▪ Corruption in the judicial system
  ▪ Qualifications and professionalism of members of the judicial system
  ▪ Gender and ethnic representation in the judicial system
  ▪ Average monthly salary of judges
  ▪ Rights of and restrictions on the players in the judicial system
  ▪ Attitudes about future use of the courts

➢ Determine the public’s experience with the following:
  ▪ Access to court proceedings
  ▪ Access to court documents
  ▪ Appeals
  ▪ Experience with the judicial system during last five years
Results, Analysis, and Interpretation

This section presents the results, analysis, and interpretation of the survey data. The conclusions cited below are based on the statistical data of the survey, which has been determined to be reliable.

The results of the survey are statistically weighted, which made it possible to generalize on a nationwide scale. In addition, the results were analyzed on the basis of region (Tbilisi, East and West Georgia), gender, and age.

Statistical tests used

To determine whether the frequency distribution of the dependent variable was statistically significant, we used the Pearson’s chi-square test, while Student’s T-criterion (T-Test) was applied to define significance for the difference of statistical means. To measure the significance, if any between the means, we used the T-Test.

The reliability of data is evaluated at the 0.05 asymptotic significance level, i.e. difference in data is statistically significant, if the significance of difference between indicators is less than 0.05 (p<0.05).

Statistically significant difference shows that within the framework of the given survey, difference between variables can be universally applied with 95% reliability (considering sampling error and variation ratio). Statistically insignificant difference shows that tendencies identified in the survey (frequency breakdown, means, etc.) are inherent to a specific sampling, and outside the sample, such a breakdown might not exist at all.
3.1 KNOWLEDGE AND ATTITUDE

3.1.1 Attitude towards Public Policy and Social Institutions

A1. How effective is the development of the country’s public policy? According to the majority of the population (72.7%), the development of Georgia’s public policy is moving in the “right” or “sufficiently right” direction. The opposite opinion was expressed by a relatively small portion of the population, (26.4%). See Chart #1

Regional Picture The results in the regions varied. Western Georgians are more positively disposed towards the current public policies of the country (80.7%) than their fellow citizens residing in Tbilisi (60.4%). See Chart #1

Gender Distribution The results for male and female respondents also differed. Women (30.6%) were more critical than men (21.5%) of the current Georgian public policy.

Chart #1
Attitudes toward Public Policy
The performance of social institutions was evaluated on a 5-point scale, where “1” stood for “very ineffective” and “5” stood for “very effective.” Respondents evaluated all social institutions as average or above average. The media and the President’s Office were rated as most effective, the courts, the Parliament and the Ministry of Justice as least effective.

In Tbilisi, a below average evaluation was given to the Parliament and the courts (2.8 and 2.9, respectively). In Eastern Georgia such a rating was given to the police (3.1), while West Georgians thought that overall the court system was “less effective.”

In general, it can be stated that in their evaluation of public institutions, the residents of West Georgia were most loyal, while Tbilisians were the most critical. The only exceptions were for the police and the advocates (defense advocates), where the ratings for Tbilisi were the same as for East Georgia. See Table #1

Women and men have different attitudes toward the Parliament, the prosecutors, the Ministry of Justice, and the media. The men’s evaluations compared to those of women were more positive (Parliament, Prosecutor’s office, and Ministry of Justice 3.3 and 3.1, respectively; the media 3.9 and 3.8, respectively).

### Table #1
**Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Social Institutions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tbilisi Average</th>
<th>Eastern Georgia Average</th>
<th>Western Georgia Average</th>
<th>Total Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President’s office</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliament</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosecutors</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocates</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courts</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Justice</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights Protection</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizations</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p>0.05  p<0.05
A3. How effective is the performance of social institutions, compared to last year?

The performance of social institutions compared to last year was evaluated on a 5-point scale, where 1 stood for “dramatically worse” and 5 stood for “improved dramatically.”

People perceive that, compared to last year, the performance of every social institution improved at least marginally (on the 5-point scale, the results fluctuate between 3.7–4.1 points). More improvement is seen in the President’s Office (4.1) and the media (4.0), less improvement in the Ministry of Justice and courts (3.7 each). See Table #2

Regional Picture

Consistent with this general picture, the populations of all three regions agree that there has been insignificant improvement in the effectiveness of social institutions during the past year. At the same time, a comparative analysis showed major differences among the regions. For example, in Tbilisi, most improvements are seen in the police department and fewest in the Parliament (3.85 and 3.50, respectively). In West Georgia, most improvements are observed in the media (4.2) and least improvements in human rights protection organizations (3.8). East Georgians believe that the President’s office has improved significantly (4.1), while little improvement is felt to have occurred in the Ministry of Justice (3.6).

In general, we may say that the population of West Georgia believes that social institutions have improved to a greater extent, while the residents of Tbilisi believe otherwise (the only exceptions being the police and the Ministry of Justice, where the results in Tbilisi are higher than in East Georgia). See Table #2

Gender Distribution

Women and men have different attitudes only in evaluating the President’s Office and the prosecutors. In both cases, the evaluations by men are more positive than those by women (the President’s Office 4.1 and 4.0, respectively, and the prosecutors 3.9 and 3.8, respectively).

Age

Evaluations differed only with respect to attitudes toward the police. Compared to previous years, adults between 18 and 25 see more improvement in the activities of the police than adults over 66 (4.0 and 3.7, respectively).
Table #2

Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Public Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tbilisi Average</th>
<th>Eastern Georgia Average</th>
<th>Western Georgia Average</th>
<th>Total Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President’s Office</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliament</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosecutors</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocates</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Justice</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights Protection</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass media</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p&gt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A4. How will the performance of public institutions change in the next year? The public’s expectations of institutional performance during the upcoming year was evaluated on a 5-point scale, where 1 stood for “deteriorate dramatically” and “5” stood for “improve dramatically.”

The population of Georgia expects measurable improvements in the President’s Office and the media. Less improvement is expected in the Ministry of Justice (respectively, 4.2, 4.2 and 4.0). See Table #3

Regional Picture

An identical picture is seen for East and West Georgia. As for Tbilisi, the population is expecting positive changes in the performance of the police department and the media (each 4.0). There are lower expectations for the Parliament (3.8).

Generally, it can be claimed that the entire country, as well as the citizens of different regions, expect at least a small improvement in the performance of all the listed institutions in the next year – with expectations highest in Western Georgia and the lowest in Tbilisi. See Table #3

Age

Despite the generally positive expectations for the prosecutors, the Bar (or the advocates), the courts, the police, the Ministry of Justice, and human rights organizations, people of different ages have different expectations. People in the 18-25 age group have a much more positive attitude, than people of 66 years
or more. Expectations for other institutions do not differ according to age group.

Table #3
Expectations about the Changes in Public Institutions in the Next Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tbilisi Average</th>
<th>Eastern Georgia Average</th>
<th>Western Georgia Average</th>
<th>Total Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President’s Office</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliament</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosecutors</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocates</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Justice</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights Protection</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizations</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1.2 Qualifying Examinations for Judges, Advocates, and Prosecutors

A5, A7, A9. Have you ever heard of the qualifying examinations for judges, prosecutors, and advocates? The majority of the population is informed about the qualifying examinations administered for judges, prosecutors, and advocates. (Respectively, 70.8%, 60.3% and 63.0%). However, Georgians are more informed about the judicial qualifying examinations than the prosecutorial exams. See Chart #2

Regional Picture

Most informed about the qualifying examinations for judges, prosecutors, and advocates are the people of Tbilisi; the least informed are Eastern Georgians (Tbilisi – 83.3%, 69.5%, 74.3% respectively; Eastern Georgia – 57.7%, 49.8%, and 55.5%, respectively).

In all three regions, there is a high degree of awareness of the qualifying examinations for judges. The populations of Tbilisi and East Georgia are least aware about the qualifying examinations for prosecutors (respectively, 69.5% and 49.8%), while those residing in West Georgia are least knowledgeable about the bar examination (62.4%). See Chart #2
Age

There are significant differences among the age groups. Most aware of the qualifying examinations for judges, prosecutors, and advocates are people in the 26-55 age group. See Table #4

Table #4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>18-25</th>
<th>26-35</th>
<th>36-45</th>
<th>46-55</th>
<th>56-65</th>
<th>66&lt;</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judges Yes</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges No</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosecutors Yes</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosecutors No</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocates Yes</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocates No</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p<0.05

A6, A8, A10. How objective are the qualifying examinations for judges, prosecutors, and advocates? Respondents who were informed about the qualifying examinations for judges, prosecutors, and advocates were asked to evaluate how objective these examinations were on a 5-point scale, where “1” stood for “very unfair” and “5” for “very fair.”

The data show that Georgians believe all examinations are “more or less fair.” However, the indicator of fairness for the bar examination is slightly higher than that for judicial and prosecutorial exams (respectively, 3.3, 3.3, and 3.4). See Chart #3
It must be noted that there were no differences based on region, age, or gender in respondents’ assessment of the objectivity of examinations for judges, prosecutors, and advocates (the difference had no statistical significance).

**Chart #3**
**Objectivity of Qualifying Examinations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judges</th>
<th>Prosecutors</th>
<th>Lawyers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A11 (a, b, c).** Are qualifying exams judges, prosecutors, and advocates necessary?

The majority of the Georgian population believes that examinations for judges, prosecutors, and advocates are necessary (95.1%, 94.4%, and 94.4%, respectively).

**Regional Picture**

There was a slight difference among the regions. The need was perceived to be higher in East and West Georgia, than in Tbilisi. See Chart #4

**Chart #4**
**The Need for Qualifying Examinations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judges</th>
<th>Prosecutors</th>
<th>Lawyers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tbilisi</td>
<td>East Georgia</td>
<td>West Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Age**

The belief in the need for qualifying examinations differed slightly by age. More individuals between ages of 18-35 believe that prosecutors and judges must be tested, than their elders. There was no difference by age group as to the judicial examinations. See Table #5
Table #5
The Need for Qualifying Examinations (Age Distribution)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>18-25</th>
<th>26-35</th>
<th>36-45</th>
<th>46-55</th>
<th>56-65</th>
<th>66 &lt;</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judges</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>98.4%</td>
<td>97.8%</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
<td>92.8%</td>
<td>93.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t</td>
<td>.8%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>.9%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Know/Unable to Answer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosecutors</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>98.1%</td>
<td>97.5%</td>
<td>93.5%</td>
<td>94.7%</td>
<td>92.6%</td>
<td>92.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t</td>
<td>.8%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Know/Unable to Answer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A12. Is it necessary to conduct continuous education courses for judges, prosecutors, and advocates?

The majority of the Georgian population believes that it is necessary for judges, prosecutors, and advocates to periodically attend and pass qualification courses or trainings (95.1%, 94.4% and 94.4%, respectively). See Chart #5

The data did not give any significant differences by region, age, or gender of the respondents.

Chart #5
The Need for Continuous Education Courses and Trainings
### 3.1.3. Professionalism of Judges, Advocates, and Prosecutors

**A13.** How would you assess the professionalism of judges, advocates, and prosecutors?

The professionalism of judges, advocates, and prosecutors was measured on a 5-point scale, where “1” stood for “very low qualification” and “5” for “very high qualification.”

The population assesses the professionalism of judges, advocates, and prosecutors in the country as average. However, the highest mark was given to advocates and the lowest to judges (3.24 and 3.17 respectively).

**Regional Picture**

The highest evaluation score for advocates, judges, and prosecutors was given in Western Georgia and the lowest in Tbilisi. See Chart #6

**Chart #6**

**Evaluation of the Professionalism of Judges, Advocates, and Prosecutors**

![Chart #6](chart.png)

**A14.** How would you assess the professionalism of judges, advocates, and prosecutors in your district?

Almost one-fourth of the population could not assess the professionalism of judges, advocates and prosecutors in their district (respectively, 23.4%, 24.3%, and 24.1%). The remaining one-third rated the professionalism of judges, advocates, and prosecutors as average (3.2, 3.1, and 3.1 respectively).

**Regional Picture**

Important differences were noted among the regions. More than one-fifth of Tbilisians find it difficult to evaluate the qualifications of judges, advocates, and prosecutors of their own district, while in East and West Georgia only 14.5% felt the same.

In the evaluation of professionalism of judges, advocates, and prosecutors in their district, the most favorable ratings were given in West Georgia, while...
the most critical were the residents of Tbilisi. See Chart #7

Chart #7
Evaluation of the Professionalism of Judges, Advocates, and Prosecutors /Average Indicator

![Chart #7](image-url)

A15. How did the qualification of judges, advocates, and prosecutors change between now and five years ago?

The public’s perception of the professionalism of judges, advocates, and prosecutors now compared to five years ago was evaluated on a 5-point scale, where “1” stood for “dramatically worse” and “5” for “improved dramatically”. On average, the professionalism of judges, advocates, and prosecutors was thought to have improved slightly (3.8 each).

Regional Picture

Among the regions, the qualification improvement indicator was highest in West Georgia and lowest in Tbilisi. See Chart #8

Chart #8
Evaluation of the Qualification of Judges, Advocates, and Prosecutors Compared to 5 Years Ago (Average Indicators)

![Chart #8](image-url)
3.1.4 Criteria for the Evaluation of Judges

A16. If you had the power to appoint a judge, which factors would influence your decision? The four most frequently noted factors influencing the appointment of judges were: honesty/integrity (30.3%), professionalism/competence (23.2%), education (19.9%) and experience (13.8%). The percentage indicator for the remaining factors was too low to be considered statistically significant (maximum 6.3%). See Chart #9

Chart #9
Criteria Influencing the Appointment of Judges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honesty/Impartiality</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism/Competence</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation/Recommendations of colleagues</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The results of the qualification exams</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A17. Priority of factors in the promotion of judges

Respondents were given a hypothetical situation, in which they were asked to make a decision on the promotion of a judge. They were provided the criteria to make the decision and asked to prioritize them.

The most important criteria were: “Results of the qualification exams” (4.8) and “Reputation/Recommendations of colleagues” (4.4). See Chart #10

Chart #10
Criteria for the Promotion of Judges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Results of the qualification exams</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation/Recommendations of colleagues</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism/Competence</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty/Impartiality</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.1.5 Gender and Ethnicity of Judges, Advocates, and Prosecutors

**A18.** If you were appointing a judge, advocates, or prosecutor would gender influence your decision?

For the majority of Georgians, gender would not influence them in appointing judges, advocates, and prosecutors (respectively, 69.1%, 71.7%, and 65.0%). However, men are preferred for judgeships and prosecutor positions more than is the case for advocates (respectively, 17.8%, 30.0%, and 20.8%). See Chart #11.

**Regional Picture**

Among the regions, the general attitude toward advocates and prosecutors does not differ, but the attitude toward the gender of judges and advocates is different. Gender is of least importance in Tbilisi, where 74.5% of respondents thought that the gender of a judge had no importance. Gender is of much higher importance in East Georgia (14.2% in favor of women) and West Georgia (26.1% in favor of men).

**Gender Distribution**

The data does not demonstrate statistically significant differences in the responses of men and women. Thus, we can say that at present women and men have the same attitude on gender of judges, advocates, and prosecutors.

**Age**

For different age groups, attitudes about the gender of judges, advocates, and prosecutors were very different. In the age group 18-55 (in contrast to older respondents), people think that while appointing judges, advocates, and prosecutors, gender should not be a factor.

**Chart #11**

**Gender Preferences in the Appointment of Judges, Advocates, and Prosecutors**
A19. Attitude toward the nationality of judges and prosecutors

People’s attitude toward the ethnicity of judges and prosecutors is equally divided. Half of the population thinks that judges and prosecutors should be ethnic Georgians. Half think that every citizen of Georgia, regardless of his or her ethnic affiliation, should have an equal chance to be appointed to these positions (50.2% and 49.8%, respectively).

Regional Picture

We get a different picture when we disaggregate the data by regions. Thus, the number of people who do think ethnicity should be a factor in appointing judges and prosecutors is much larger in Tbilisi (57.2%), than elsewhere; the indicator for West Georgia (44.3%) is lowest among the regions. See Chart #12

Chart #12

Attitude toward the Ethnicity of Judges and Prosecutors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tbilisi</th>
<th>East Georgia</th>
<th>West Georgia</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Every citizen can be appointed as a judge or a prosecutor irrespective of the nationality</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only Georgians by nationality should be appointed as a judge or a prosecutor</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A20. Attitude toward the representatives of specific nationalities

Apart from general attitudes toward different ethnic groups, respondents were also asked to express their opinion toward judges and prosecutors of a specific nationality. According to the survey results, only judges and prosecutors who are Georgians by nationality are acceptable to the Georgian population. The average indicator of the attitude toward other nationalities differs from 2-3 points. This indicator fits on the 5-point scale between unacceptable and neutral attitudes.

However, it is worth noting that the population’s tolerance is the highest toward Armenian, Azeri, and Russian judges and prosecutors (each 2.9). It is the lowest toward Kurds, Ossetians, and Abkhazians (each 2.7).

Regional Picture

The most tolerant respondents toward judges and prosecutors of different nationalities are Tbilisians, with East Georgians being the least tolerant of the group.
Table #6
Attitude toward Judges and Prosecutors of Different Nationalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Average Tbilisi</th>
<th>Average East Georgia</th>
<th>Average West Georgia</th>
<th>Total Average</th>
<th>Probability Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Georgian</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenian</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azeri</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abkhazian</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurdish</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ossetian</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1.6 Average Monthly Salary of Judges

A21. How much do you think the average monthly judicial salary is?

76.8% of the population does not know the average monthly judicial salary. Only 9.8% of the population knows that the average monthly salary of judges is 650-1130 Lari.

Regional Picture

The number of respondents who are correctly informed on this issue is lowest in East Georgia (5.9%), while there is little difference between Tbilisi and West Georgia (respectively, 13% and 11.2%). In East Georgia (compared to Tbilisi and West Georgia), the number of those who think that the average monthly income of judges is lower than 650 Lari is much larger (14.4%, 6.5%, and 13.3%, respectively). See Table #7

Table #7
Knowledge of the Average Monthly Judicial Salary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Tbilisi</th>
<th>East Georgia</th>
<th>West Georgia</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 650 Lari</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>650-1130 Lari</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 1130 Lari</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/Hard to answer</td>
<td>79.2%</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
<td>73.4%</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A22. Is the amount mentioned above enough to prevent judges from taking bribes?

Of those who answered the question concerning judges’ salaries, 56.2% think that their present salary is not enough to prevent judges from taking bribes.

1 Both the salary and benefits were considered in calculating the minimum and maximum average monthly salary of judges.
Regional Picture 70.8% of Tbilisians, 54.2% East Georgians, and 50.5% of West Georgians hold the opinion that the current judicial salaries are not enough to prevent judges from taking bribes.

A23. How much should the average monthly salary of the judge be? Those respondents who considered judges’ salaries to be inadequate were asked to state an amount that, in their opinion, would be enough to prevent a judge from taking a bribe. It is interesting to note that in this case, 31.4% of the population believes that the judges’ current salary (650-1130 Lari) is sufficient for them not to take a bribe. 42.2% think less than 650 Lari is sufficient and 21.3% think more than 1130 is sufficient.

Regional Picture As for regional differences, Tbilisi has the largest number of respondents who consider more than 1130 Lari to be enough (Tbilisi – 35.1%, West Georgia – 18.4%, East Georgia – 13.9%). In East Georgia, most people believe that an income of up to 650 Lari is enough for a judge (East Georgia – 52.2%, West Georgia, 42.3%, Tbilisi – 28.8%). See Table #8

Table #8
How Much Should the Average Monthly Judicial Salary Be?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary Range</th>
<th>Tbilisi</th>
<th>EE East Georgia</th>
<th>West Georgia</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 650 lari</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>650-1130 lari</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 1130 lari</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/Hard to answer</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis of people’s knowledge of and attitudes toward judges’ monthly salaries indicates that (1) the majority of the population does not know the monthly salary of judges and (2) because of this, people believe that the salary is much less than it actually is. Presumably, then, people’s opinions about the level of judges’ salaries needed to allow them to withstand bribes are based on misinformation.

3.1.7 The Appointment of Individuals for Judgeship

A24. How are the judges appointed to the position? More than half of the population is knowledgeable about the appointment of judges (58.5%). The remainder either has difficulty answering, or is incorrectly informed about the issue (19.9% and 21.6% respectively).
Regional Picture

Clear differences were noted among the regions. In Tbilisi and East Georgia (compared to West Georgia), a significantly larger percentage knows that judges are appointed. (64.1%, 63.9%, and 50.3%, respectively). See Chart #13

Gender Distribution

The level of knowledge also differed by gender: men were significantly better informed (62.5%) than women (55.2%).

Age

28.8% of the respondents in the 18-25 age group believe that judges are elected. The most informed about this issue are those in the 26-35 age group (63.1%).

Thus, approximately half of the population does not know how the judgeships are obtained. Among the regions, this indicator is the lowest in West Georgia

Chart #13

How Are the Judges Appointed to the Position?

A25. How should the judgeship be obtained?

The majority of the population (65.7%) thinks that judges should be elected; but 32.4% disagree. This pattern is repeated regardless of the region, gender, or age group.

A26. Who should elect judges?

Out of those people, who favor the election of judges, 53.0% believe that they should be elected by the public; 31.0% believe that judges should chosen by their peers, and 14.3% think that the Parliament should appoint them.

Regional Picture

A different picture emerges from the regions. In East and West Georgia, the majority of the population believes that judges should be elected by the public (61.6% and 56.1% respectively). Tbilisians favor judges choosing other judges (48.1%). See Chart #14
More people under 55 favor judges electing other judges. Very few think that judges should be elected by the public.

Chart #14
Who Should Elect Judges?

3.1.8 Non-Judicial and Non-Prosecutorial Activities of Judges and Prosecutors

**A27-28. According to the law, do judges have a right to other employment?** If so, are there any limits on the type of employment?

Almost half of the population thinks that judges do not have a right to have other employment (48.3%), but 17.7% believe that it is legal. Out of those who believe that a judge can have other employment, 62.3% believe that a judge only has a right to have another job in the **field of education**. An analysis of this indicator on a total selective scale shows that in Georgia only 11% know that judges have a right to hold additional employment in the field of education but that any other job is prohibited by law.

**A29-30. According to the law, does the prosecutor have a right to additional employment?** If so, are there any restrictions on the type of employment?

Almost half of the population thinks that prosecutors do not have a right to have any additional employment (49.2%), while 17.2% believe that they can. Of those, who answered that they could have other employment, 58.0% believes that the prosecutor should only have a right to have educational employment. A review of the data indicates that only 10% of the respondents is aware of a prosecutor’s right to have an additional employment.

**Regional Picture**

The number of those informed about the law is highest in Tbilisi and Western Georgia, while the least informed are those residing in Eastern Georgia.

The data reveals that only a small portion of the Georgian population has accurate information about
the right of judges and the prosecutors to additional employment

3.1.9 Private Sector Activities of Judges and Prosecutors

A31. According to the law, does a judge or a prosecutor have a right to be involved in private business?

Less than half of the population (44.4% and 43.7%, respectively) is correctly informed about the right of judges and the prosecutors to be involved in private business.

Regional Picture

The citizens of Tbilisi are most accurately informed about the private sector activities of judges and prosecutors (47.6% and 46.8%, respectively); the least accurately informed are residents of East Georgia. (58.3% and 58.6%, respectively). See Chart #15

Gender Distribution

When gender is factored in, men are more informed than women about the prohibition on judges and prosecutors from being involved in businesses (respectively, men – 48.4% and 47.8%, women – 40.3% and 40.2%).

Age

When age is factored in, those under 55 years are more informed than those older than 55.

Chart #15

Do Judges and Prosecutors Have the Right to Be Involved in Private Business?

A32. Should a judge and a prosecutor be allowed to own a business enterprise?

About two-thirds of Georgians believe that judges and prosecutors should not be allowed to be involved in any private business (64.8% and 64.6%, respectively).

Regional Picture

Among the regions, East Georgia has the highest percentage of those who believe that
judges and prosecutors should have a right to be involved in a private business (40.1% and 39.6%, respectively). West Georgia has the lowest percentage of those who hold the same belief (26.9% each). See Chart #16

Gender Distribution

A comparative analysis of the data for gender showed, that more women than men find it acceptable for judges and prosecutors to be involved in private businesses (respectively, men – 28.5% and 28.4%, women – 35.2% each).

Age

Different age groups demonstrated different attitudes: a larger share of those in the age group of 18-35, compared to those in older age groups, were of the opinion that it is acceptable for judges and prosecutors to engage in private business.

Chart #16
Should Judges and Prosecutors Have the Right to Engage in Private Business?

3.1.10 Political Activities of Judges and Prosecutors

A34. Does a judge or a prosecutor have a right to become a member of a political party?

Approximately one-third of the population knows that judges and prosecutors do not have the right to membership in a political party (38.0% and 37.7%, respectively). Almost half of the population finds it difficult to answer the question or is misinformed on this issue (62.0% and 63.3%, respectively).

Regional Picture

Among the regions, Tbilisians are the most informed about this issue (See Chart #17).
A35. Should a judge or a prosecutor have a right to become a member of a political party?

According to the majority of the population, judges and prosecutors should not have a right to become members of political parties (62.8% and 62.6%, respectively). Among these respondents, there is no difference in the response for either judges or prosecutors (32.1%).

Regional Picture

Among the regions, a negative attitude toward the membership in political parties was the highest in Tbilisi and the lowest in East Georgia (respectively, 71.2% and 70.9%; each 57.2%). See Chart #18

Gender Distribution

More men than women think it unacceptable for the judges and prosecutors to become members of political parties.
3.1.11 Corruption in the Judicial System

**A37. The degree of corruption in the judicial system.**

The population is equally divided on the question of whether there is corruption in the judicial system. In response to the statement, “Today the judicial system is half corrupt,” 42.9% agreed. When asked, “Are only a few people in the judicial system corrupt?” 42.6% responded affirmatively.

A comparison of positive and negative responses shows that half the population thinks that the judicial system is fully or partially corrupted (respectively, 49.7% and 46.3%).

**Regional Picture**

Of the people who think that the judicial system is fully or partially corrupt, the highest percentage resides is in Tbilisi (56.9%), the lowest is in East Georgia (47.2%). See Table #9

**Table #9**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Degree of Corruption in the Judicial System</th>
<th>Tbilisi</th>
<th>East Georgia</th>
<th>West Georgia</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Today, the judicial system is fully corrupt</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Today, the judicial system is partially corrupt</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are only a few corrupt people in the judicial system today</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are no corrupt people in the judicial system today</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know/Difficult to say</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A38. The degree of corruption of judges, advocates, and prosecutors**

Respondents evaluated judges, prosecutors, and advocates separately. In general, the population is more skeptical about prosecutors and judges than advocates. 49.9% of those who were interviewed believe that there are no (or at least very few) corrupt advocates. The indicator is lower with respect to judges (44%) and prosecutors (44.6%).

**Regional Picture**

Overall, West Georgians possess the most positive view of judges, advocates, and prosecutors. East Georgians hold the most negative attitudes towards the advocates (43.7%), while Tbilisians are most negative.
A39. How did the degree of corruption change in the judicial system from 1998 to present?

The majority of the population (74.6%) thinks that since 1998, the level of corruption has decreased. Only 6.2% hold the opposite view.

Regional Picture

Over 80% of West Georgians think that the level of corruption decreased since 1998, while only 69.6% of East Georgians hold the same view.

Gender Distribution

More men than women believe that there has been a lessening of corruption since 1998 (respectively, 79.8% and 70.3%).

Chart #19

How has the degree of corruption changed in the judicial system from 1998 to present?

A40. How did the degree of corruption change in judges, advocates, and prosecutors from 1998 to present?

The majority of the population thinks that the level of the corruption among judges, advocates, and prosecutors has slightly or significantly decreased (respectively, 74.3%, 70.7%, and 72.8%). Only 6% of the respondents do not agree with such a view.

Regional Picture

According to the citizens’ perceptions, the most significant reduction of corruption among judges, prosecutors, and advocates took place in West Georgia (74.3%, 70.7%, and 72.8% respectively) and least significant change occurred in East Georgia (68%, 70.7%, and 72.8% respectively).
Gender Distribution

According to the data, women are more critical than men about changes in the level of corruption in the judicial system. (Women: judges - 70.7%, advocates - 67.3%, prosecutors - 68.9%. Men: judges - 78.4%, advocates - 74.7%, prosecutors - 77.3%).

Chart #20

How did the degree of corruption change in judges, advocates, and prosecutors from 1998 to present?

3.1.12 Influence on Judges, Advocates, and Prosecutors

A41, A43, A45. Have you ever heard of instances of influence on judges, advocates, and prosecutors? The majority of the population has never heard of any specific instance of influence on judges, advocates, and prosecutors (respectively, 74.9%, 82.1%, and 82.3%). Of those who knew of such influence, most concerned judges.

Regional Picture

Of those who had heard of instances of influence on judges, advocates, and prosecutors, the majority were in Tbilisi, the fewest were in West Georgia (respectively, Tbilisi – 34.4%, 27.1%, and 27.0%, Western Georgia – 17.3%, 12.2%, and 13.1%)

Of those who have heard of instances of influence, in all three regions, judges were involved. See Chart #21
A42, A44, A46. Please state all sources from which you learned about exertion of influence on judges, advocates, and prosecutors.

Regional Picture

A47. How often do judges experience influence from private parties and institutions?

Those having information about the exertion of influence on actors in the judicial system were asked to name the source of that information. The most frequently cited source of information was television (judges – 55.3%, advocates – 57.1%, and prosecutors – 57.5%). The second most frequently named sources with respect to judges and prosecutors were friends, acquaintances, and relatives (18.7% and 19.3%), and with respect to advocates, the press (18.7%).

In the regions, television is the primary source of information. With respect to judges and prosecutors, in West Georgia, the press is named as the second most important source of information (23.7% and 21.3%) With respect to advocates, friends, relatives, and acquaintances were named as second most important source of information (19.9%). The opposite picture is presented in East Georgia and Tbilisi: with judges and prosecutors, friends, relatives, and acquaintances were named as the second most significant source of information; while the printed press was named as the second most important source of information with respect to advocates.

According to public opinion, influence on judges is most frequently exerted by the prosecutor’s office (2.8), the courts (2.7), or parties themselves (2.7) and seldom by the media or the ombudsman (2.2 each).
Regional Picture

With respect to the exertion of influence on judges by the prosecutor’s office, courts, police, and the media, the highest levels are perceived in East Georgia, the lowest in Tbilisi. See Table #10

Table #10
Exertion of Influence on Judges (Average Indicators)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tbilisi Average</th>
<th>East Georgia Average</th>
<th>West Georgia Average</th>
<th>Total Average</th>
<th>P Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President’s Office</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>&gt; 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliament</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>&gt; 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosecution</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>&lt; 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>&gt; 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courts</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>&lt; 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaintiff/Defendant</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>&gt; 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>&lt; 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Justice</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>&gt; 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ombudsman</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>&gt; 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Media</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>&lt; 0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A48. How often are advocates influenced by the aforementioned parties and institutions?

Respondents believe that advocates are more likely to be influenced by the courts, prosecution, and the parties to the case (respectively, 2.7, 2.6, and 2.6) and rarely by the media, the Parliament or and the Ombudsman (2.1 each).

Regional Picture

With respect to the exertion of influence on advocates, highest levels of exertion of influence are perceived by the residents of East Georgia and the lowest by those who reside in Tbilisi. See Table #11

Table #11
Exertion of Influence on Advocates (Average Indicators)
A49. How often are prosecutors subject to influence from the aforementioned persons and institutions? The survey shows that people think that prosecutors are more often subject to undue influence from the prosecutor’s office (2.6) and the courts (2.8), and more seldom from the media, the Parliament, and ombudsman.

Regional Picture

With respect to the exertion of influence on prosecutors, the highest levels are perceived by the residents of East Georgia and the lowest by those who reside in Tbilisi. See Table #12

Table #12
Exertion of Influence on Prosecutors (Average Indicators)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tbilisi Average</th>
<th>East Georgia Average</th>
<th>West Georgia Average</th>
<th>Total Average</th>
<th>P Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President’s Office</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>&gt; 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliament</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>&gt; 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosecution</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>&lt; 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>&lt; 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>&lt; 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaintiff/Defendant</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>&gt; 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>&lt; 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Justice</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>&gt; 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ombudsman</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>&lt; 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Media</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>&lt; 0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A50. Compared to five years ago, has the degree of influence on judges, advocates, and prosecutors decreased, increased or remained the same? The public believes that influence on judges, prosecutors, and advocates has been reduced, compared with five years ago. Judges are felt to have experienced the greatest reduction (2.26) and prosecutors the least (2.29).
Regional Picture

According to the data, East Georgians think that the decrease in influence has been greater than the residents of West Georgia. More Tbilisians believe that there has been a decrease in influence on advocates (2.26), while the residents of East and West Georgia believe that there has been a greater reduction in the degree of influence on judges (2.36 and 2.16). See Chart #22

Chart #22
Changes in Exertion of Influence on Judges, Advocates, and Prosecutors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Judges</th>
<th>Lawyers</th>
<th>Prosecutors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tbilisi</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Georgia</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Georgia</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A51. According to the law, do judges have professional immunity? 43.2% of the population knows that judges are granted professional immunity. Approximately the same percentage is unable to answer this question (42%); the remaining 14.8% (155 respondents) are not accurately informed on this issue.

Regional Picture

The residents of East Georgia are more informed about this issue, than those residing in Tbilisi. Specifically, 57% of East Georgians know about the professional immunity of judges, while only 34.3% of Tbilisians possess the same knowledge. See Chart #23

Gender Distribution

Men (46.2%) are more aware than women (40.7%) about this issue.

Chart #23
Are Judges Granted Professional Immunity?
A52. Attitude toward the professional immunity of judges

More than half of the Georgian population, regardless of their place of residence, is of the opinion that immunity protects judges from influence and allows them to render impartial decisions (57.8%), while 40.4% think that professional immunity lets them avoid punishment for biased decisions. (Note: The results shown for regional differences are not statistically significant).

A53. How protected are judges and advocates from undue influence?

People believe that judges and prosecutors are “more or less” protected. However, advocates are perceived to be more protected than judges.

Regional Picture

There are no significant regional differences on this issue. Residents of East Georgia perceive that judges and advocates are more protected (2.9 and 2.8), while the perception indicators are lowest in Tbilisi (2.4 each).

A54. How are the cases distributed among judges?

Only a small portion of Georgia’s population knows that the cases are randomly distributed among the judges (3.1). 36% of the respondents believe that the Chairman of the Court distributes cases among the judges.

Regional Picture

Tbilisians are most knowledgeable about this issue (8.2%). The residents of West Georgia are least aware of this issue (1.1%).

3.1.13 The Right to Attend Court Proceedings

A55-56. Do journalists and citizens have a right to attend court proceedings?

More than half of the population is correctly informed about the law which requires court proceedings to be open to journalists and citizens (58.0% and 54.9% respectively).
About one third of the population believes that journalists and the public have access to court proceedings on special occasions only (27.6% and 31.0% respectively).

Regional Picture

The most knowledgeable about the access of journalists and public to court hearings are residents of East Georgia (71.4% and 65.9% respectively). With regard to journalists, the lowest score was in West Georgia (50.2%), while with regard to the public, the lowest score was in Tbilisi (47.1%). See Chart #24

Gender Distribution

Men are more aware of this issue than women (57.8% and 52.4%).

Age Distribution

More individuals in the age group 45-55 are aware of the right of journalists to attend court proceedings. Individuals in the 26-35 age group are more aware of the public’s right to attend court proceedings. Individuals in the 56-65 age group demonstrated the lowest awareness of this issue.

Chart #24

Do Journalists and Citizens Have a Right to Attend Court Proceedings?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tbilisi</th>
<th>East Georgia</th>
<th>West Georgia</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depends on circumstances</td>
<td>Depends on circumstances</td>
<td>Depends on circumstances</td>
<td>Depends on circumstances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A57-58. Should journalists and citizens have a right to attend court proceedings?

Most citizens think that journalists and citizens should have the right to attend court proceedings (74.0% and 72.5%, respectively). 22.8% of the respondents believe that journalists should be present only under special circumstances. 24.6% think that the public should be allowed to attend court hearings on such (special) occasions.
Regional Picture

The number of individuals who think that journalists and citizens should have a right to attend court proceedings is highest in East Georgia and lowest in Tbilisi. Furthermore, the greatest number of people who think that journalists and citizens should have a right to attend court proceedings only on special occasions are in Tbilisi (32% and 33.9%). See Chart #25

Age Distribution

More people in the 46-55 age group think that journalists should have unrestricted access to court proceedings (61.9%). Most people in the 18-25 age group believe that access to court proceedings should be regulated depending upon the circumstances (31.3%).

Chart #25
Should Journalists and Citizens Have a Right to Attend Court Proceedings?

A59-60. During the last five years, have you tried to attend a court proceeding? If so, were you allowed to do so?

During the last five years, only 9.5% of the population has attempted to attend a trial. Most of them (88.7%) were allowed to do so.

Regional Picture

The regional data were not reliable. For this reason, no regional comparisons were made.

Gender Distribution

More men than women attempted to attend court proceedings and were allowed to do so (94.7% and 82.3%, respectively).

Age Distribution

13.5% of the people in the 18-25 age group attempted to attend a court hearing, while on 4.0% tried to do in the 56-65 age group.
3.1.14 The Right to View Court Documents

A61. Do citizens have a legal right to view documents filed for and during court proceedings?  
More than one-third (36.9%) of the population is aware of the law that gives them a right to view documents filed for and during court proceedings. Almost an equal number of the respondents (32.8%) think that citizens can view court documents only in special cases.

Regional Picture  
Most informed about this issue are the residents of East Georgia, with West Georgians being the least informed (48.0% and 24.9%, respectively). See Chart #26

Gender Distribution  
Men are more informed than women about their right to view court documents (40.8% and 33.6%, respectively).

Age Distribution  
More individuals in the age group 18-25 are aware of their right to view court documents (40.3%); the least aware are people 66 or older (28.9%).

Chart #26  
Do Citizens Have a Right to View Court Documents?

A62. Should citizens have a right to view court documents?  
More than half of the population thinks that citizens should have a right to view court documents (55.6%). Almost one-third of the respondents think that such a right should be granted depending on the specific circumstances.
More residents of East Georgia and Tbilisi answer the above question affirmatively, than those who reside in West Georgia (58.9%, 58.2% and 51.2%, respectively). See Chart # 27

**Chart # 27**
*Should Citizens Have a Right to View Court Documents?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Yes, they should have a right</th>
<th>No, they shouldn’t have a right</th>
<th>Depends on circumstances</th>
<th>Don’t know/difficult to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tbilisi</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Georgia</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Georgia</td>
<td>86.1%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>89.9%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A63-64. In the last five years, did you attempt to get court documents? If so, were you allowed to do so?

Only a small number of people have attempted to get court documents (5.2%). Of these, 60.6% were allowed to actually see them.

A65. Is it possible for parties to the lawsuit to express their dissatisfaction with a court proceeding?

The majority of the population believes that parties to a lawsuit can express their dissatisfaction with a court proceeding (89.9%). A small percentage (1.6%) is misinformed about this issue.

Regional Picture

Regional data reflect the same results. (Tbilisi - 92.5%, East Georgia – 92.5%, and West Georgia - 86.1%).

**3.1.15 The Right to File an Appeal against the Activities of a Judge**

A66-A67. Is it possible to appeal a judge’s decision? Do you think there should be such a right?

The majority of Georgians know that parties to a lawsuit have the right to appeal a judge’s decision (87.3%). Most approve of such a right (96.7%).

Regional Picture

The residents of Tbilisi and East Georgia are more knowledgeable about the right to appeal, than those residing in West Georgia (91.5%, 90.9%, and 81.4% respectively).
for population’s attitudes toward this issue, the difference among the regions was not statistically significant.

A68. Is it possible to change a judicial decision as a result of an appeal?

The majority of the respondents believe that a court judgment can be altered (89.6%).

A69. Who has a right to alter a court decision? (89.6%)

Among those who answered this question affirmatively, half are aware that it is only possible to do so through an appeal (58.7%). The remainder of the population is misinformed. The most frequently cited incorrect answers were that the President and the prosecutor’s office can alter a judicial decision (13.1% and 9.7% respectively).

Regional Picture

Tbilisians were most aware of the right to appeal, while the residents of West Georgia were the least aware (72.3% and 50.1% respectively).

3.2 Experience

3.2.1 Experience with the Judicial System

B1. Have you/your family/friends gone to court in the past five years?

According to the data, the majority of people, their families or friends (91.2%) have not gone to court in the past five years.

Regional Picture

Tbilisians have the most experience with the judicial system (13.5%), while the residents of West Georgia have the least experience (5.7%). See Table # 12

Age Distribution

Those in the 56 and older age group have had the least contact with the judicial system in the past five years. Those in the 26-55 age group have had more experience with the court system than those under 26 or over 55.

Table # 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience with the Judicial System in the Past Five Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tbilisi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family member, friend/acquaintance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B2. When (what year) was the court case filed?

According to the data, 29.3% of court cases filed in the past five years are still pending. Most cases began either in 2003 or in 2004 (36.4% and 37.8%, respectively).

B3. When (what year) was the case resolved?

The data shows that most court cases were concluded within one or two years of their filing. See Chart #28

Chart #28
The Duration of Court Proceedings

B4. What type of case was filed?

In the past five years, most people filed criminal law cases and fewest commercial law cases (51.4% and 5.1%, respectively). See Chart #29

Chart #29
Type of Court Cases Filed

B5. Please indicate whether you, your family member, friend or acquaintance were a plaintiff or a defendant?

More people indicated that they had been a plaintiff rather than a defendant (25.8% and 21.9% respectively). In criminal law cases, the percentage of those who were defendants
was higher than those who were victims of crimes (33.6% and 17.8% respectively).

**B6. In whose favor was the ruling?**

More respondents indicated that the court had ruled in their favor rather than for the other party (43.8% and 25.3% respectively).

**B7. Was the lower court’s decision appealed?**

The data shows that one fifth (30.3%) of lower court decisions were appealed.

**B8. Did you hire your lawyer or was a lawyer appointed for you?**

64.5% of the respondents who had gone to court hired private attorneys. 21.1% stated that an attorney was appointed for them (see Chart #30). In most of these cases (79.4%), the lawyer was appointed by the government. 13.5% of the respondents whose acquaintances were represented by an appointed lawyer did not know the source of the appointment. No one mentioned appointment of a lawyer from a non-governmental organization.

**B9. Who appointed the lawyer?**

Regional Picture

Retaining private advocates is much more frequent in Tbilisi (86.1%) than in East (57.7%) and West Georgia (41.6%). See Chart #30

The government is the main source of appointments for advocates in all three regions. The difference among the regions is accounted for by the economic situation. More Tbilisians are able to retain private advocates than the residents of East and West Georgia.
3.2.2 Evaluation of Judges, Advocates, and Prosecutors

**B10.** On a 5-point scale, how would you evaluate the competence/professionalism of judges, advocates, and prosecutors involved in the case?

Of the people who have had experience with the judicial system in the past five years, the majority think that their advocates were competent. They evaluated judges and prosecutors involved in the same case as “more or less” competent. Overall, people’s confidence in the professionalism and competence of advocates is much higher than that of judges or prosecutors.

**B11.** How would you assess the objectivity of the judge on a 5-point scale?

Most of the respondents who have had experience with the courts evaluate judges as “objective/very objective.” See Chart # 31. But on a 5-point scale, taking into consideration all the data, judges were evaluated as average.
**B12.** Why do you think that the judge was more or less objective? Those who considered the judge to be less than or not at all objective, believed that this was mainly due to either personal corruption or exertion of influence (36.5% and 40.8% respectively).

**B13.** Who do you think exerted pressure on a judge? People believe that the judges are being pressured primarily by plaintiffs and defendants (63.7%), less so by the prosecution (13.2%), and rarely from the Ministry of Justice and the President’s office (4.2% and 4.6% respectively). See Chart #32

**Chart # 32
Who Exerted an Influence on the Judge?**

**B14.** On a 5-point scale, how would you assess the zeal of your lawyer? The overwhelming majority of those who have had some experience in court, believe that the advocates showed some or a
lot of zeal (65.8%). Overall, the zeal of the advocates was evaluated as higher than average (4 on the 5-point scale).

Chart # 33
Evaluation of the Advocate’s Zeal

B15. Why do you think the advocate was more or less zealous?

Those respondents who felt that the advocate exhibited a lack of zeal during the performance of their duties think that the main reason for this is either corruption or influence on them (31.6% and 39.1%, respectively).

B16. Who do you think was influencing the lawyer?

In the opinion of most Georgians (65.6%), advocates are mostly subject to influence from a defendant and or a plaintiff. Respondents think that advocates are less likely to be subjected to influence from the prosecution and the courts (25.3% each).

Chart # 34
Who Exerted Pressure on the Advocate?

B17. How would you assess the fairness

One third of those who have had some
experience in court think that the prosecutors were fair or somewhat fair (39.8%). After reviewing all the data, the fairness of the prosecutors was evaluated to be average (3.2 meaning “more or less fair”). See Chart #35

Chart #35
Evaluation of Prosecutor’s Fairness

B18. Why do you think that the prosecutor was more or less fair?

Those who consider the prosecutors “somewhat fair” or “not at all fair,” think the main reason for this is corruption or influence (33.4% and 47.6%, respectively).

Regional Picture

Opinions about prosecutors vary according to the region. In Tbilisi, more respondents believe that the prosecutors are not fair because of influence. Fewer people believe this in West Georgia. It is interesting to note that residents of West Georgia believe that prosecutors are incompetent and have a dishonest attitude towards the cases reviewed – “did not investigate thoroughly” (54%).

B19. Who do you think was influencing the prosecutor?

Most Georgians think that the prosecutors, as well as judges and advocates, are influenced mostly by plaintiffs and defendants (51.6%), followed by the courts, and the prosecutor’s office (22.4% and 21.4% respectively). See Chart #36
B20. During the last five years have you ever tried to express your dissatisfaction about a court case?

During the last five years, the majority of people with at least some experience with the courts (96.4%) have not made any attempts to express their dissatisfaction about a case.

Regional Picture

The situation in the regions is different. The majority of people who expressed dissatisfaction about a case are from East Georgia (7.3%), while only 1.5% of West Georgians expressed dissatisfaction.

B21. Were you able to express your dissatisfaction?

According to the survey, only 50.2% of population was able to express dissatisfaction about a court case. At the same time, only 22.2% of those who complained obtained results.

B22. Did it result in any positive response?

3.2.3 Attitudes of People Regarding Future Contact with the Courts

B23. In the future, do you intend to resort to the courts?

The data reveals that about one-third of the population (32%), would prefer to avoid the courts, and 15% would prefer to “never” resort to the courts.

Regional Picture

Attitudes toward the courts differ considerably by region. More Tbilisians and West Georgians (52.7% and 50.9% respectively), than East Georgians (41.4%), would either try to avoid the courts or not use them at all. See Chart #37

Gender Distribution

The tendency to avoid the courts is considerably higher among women than men. For example, “regarding resolution of any
dispute,” only 8.5% of women would go to court, while 11.4% of men would do the same. Furthermore, the percentage of those women who would try never to go to court is much higher than that of men (51.6% and 43.9%, respectively).

**Age Gap**

The desire to avoid the courts is lowest among people in the 36-65 age group. Among people over 66 years, such a desire is higher. A negative attitude toward the courts reaches its peak among young people in the 18-35 age group.

**Chart # 37**

**In What Cases Would You Resort to Court?**
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