

Appendices

1. List of the participants of the Project Team
2. Analysis of the existing surveys on Public Confidence
3. Danish translation of the common questionnaire
4. Dutch translation of the common questionnaire
5. Dutch (Belgium) translation of the common questionnaire
6. French translation of the common questionnaire
7. Hungarian translation of the common questionnaire
8. Italian translation of the common questionnaire
9. Lithuanian translation of the common questionnaire
10. Polish translation of the common questionnaire
11. Portuguese translation of the common questionnaire
12. Romanian translation of the common questionnaire
13. Slovenian translation of the common questionnaire
14. List of questions suggested by the ENCI to be added to the ERA-survey
15. PowerPoint presentation of the ERA-survey
16. The final questionnaire of the ERA-survey

Appendix 1: List of participants of the Project Team “Measurement of National and Transnational Public Confidence”

Country and Organization	Participants
Belgium Belgian High Council of Justice	Mr. Geert Vervaeke (coordinator) Mr. Jean-Marie Siscot Mr. Nicolas Snelders Ms. Caroline De Groote (secretary)
Denmark Domstol	Mr. Michael Villemoes Larsen Mr. Soren Axelsen
France Conseil Supérieur de la Magistrature	Mr. Dominique Latournerie
England and Wales Judges' Council of England and Wales	Mr. Derek Searby
Hungary National Council of Justice of Hungary	Ms. Beata Lukacs
Ireland Courts' service	Mr. William Hamill
Italy Consiglio Superiore della Magistratura	Mr. Alessandro d'Andrea Mr. Roberto Rossi
Lithuania Judicial Council of Lithuania	Ms. Diana Labokaite
The Netherlands Raad voor de Rechtspraak	Ms. Merel Berling Mr. Albert Klijn
Poland National Council of Justice of Poland	Mr. Lukasz Bojarski Ms. Barbara Godlewska-Michalak Mr. Janusz Zimny
Romania Consiliul Superior al Magistraturii	Mr. Alexandru Serban Ms. Alina Barbulescu Ms. Cristina Radu
Portugal Conselho Suprior da Magistratura	Mr. Rui Coelho
Slovenia Republika Slovenija Sodni Svet	Mr. Miro Cerar

Appendix 2: Analysis of the existing surveys on Public Confidence

IMPORTANT SOCIAL PROBLEMS

(RO) In your opinion, what are the five most important problems that Romania is currently facing?

1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5

- Too low salaries
- Prices
- Corruption
- Too low pensions
- Lack of jobs
- Agriculture
- Hospitals, health care system
- Lack of housing
- Infrastructure (roads, bridges, water supply network, ...)
- Lack of opportunities for the young
- Schools, education system
- Poor administration of public finances
- Pollution
- Political conflicts
- Crime
- Justice reform
- Local institutions operation
- Central institutions operation
- DK/NA

(RO) How satisfied are you with the operation of...?

Very satisfied, Rather satisfied, Very unsatisfied, Rather unsatisfied, NS/NR

Justice in Romania

Democracy in Romania

Market economy in Romania

JUSTICE PROBLEMS

(RO) In your opinion, what are the three most important problems that Romanian justice is facing?

1 – 2 - 3

- Corruption
- Lack of professionalism, incorrectness
- Vague/Misinterpretation of the legislation
- Involvement of the politics into justice
- Too long duration of solution for lawsuits
- Reduced number of qualified persons
- Slowness of the reform/poor organizations
- High costs for lawsuits
- Crime
- People's lack of trust in justice
- Lack of magistrates' independence
- Other
- DK/NA

INSTITUTION ASSOCIATED WITH "JUSTICE"

(RO) What institution comes to your mind when you think about justice? (several possible answers)

- Trial courts (judicial districts, tribunals, courts of appeal)
- Police
- Prosecutor's offices
- Ministry of Justice
- Superior Council of Magistracy
- Other institution

DK/NA

CONFIDENCE IN LAW

(PL) How do you evaluate your level of confidence in the law in force in your country in general terms?

Please indicate the point in the following scale that best meets your evaluation:

	I have no confidence at all	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	I have full confidence
--	-----------------------------	---------------	------------------------

(PL) How do you evaluate your level of satisfaction with the functioning of law in your country?

Please indicate the point of the below scale that best meets your evaluation:

	I have no confidence at all	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	I have full confidence
--	-----------------------------	---------------	------------------------

CONFIDENCE IN INSTITUTIONS

(BE) I'm going to quote a list of Belgian institutions. Please can you tell me whether or not, broadly speaking, you have confidence in each of them? You may answer as follows: Yes, Yes slightly, No, not much, No.

- Education
- Parliament
- The justice system
- The press
- The police
- Religious institutions

(NL) How much confidence do you have on this moment in the following institutions in The Netherlands?

Big companies

Labour unions

Journals

TV

Judiciary

Parliament

Cabinet

(PL) Now I will present you a list of various institutions. About each one of them, please tell in what degree does it inspire your confidence? At answering, please apply the 1-5 scale, wherein 1 means you have no confidence at all, and 5 means you have full confidence. Obviously you may use other scores in this scale.

Confidence in public institutions	I have no confidence at all	2	3	4	5	No opinion
A. Banks	1	2	3	4	5	9
B. Insurance companies	1	2	3	4	5	9
C. Financial institutions dealing with funds	1	2	3	4	5	9
D. State Insurance Company	1	2	3	4	5	9
E. Stock exchange	1	2	3	4	5	9
F. Science and scientists	1	2	3	4	5	9
G. Police	1	2	3	4	5	9
H. Press	1	2	3	4	5	9
I. Government	1	2	3	4	5	9
J. Supreme Court	1	2	3	4	5	9
K. Lower House of Parliament	1	2	3	4	5	9

	1	2	3	4	5	9
L. Senate						
M. Health service	1	2	3	4	5	9
N. School and education system	1	2	3	4	5	9
O. Public TV	1	2	3	4	5	9
P. Private TV	1	2	3	4	5	9
Q. Radio stations	1	2	3	4	5	9
R. Military	1	2	3	4	5	9
S. Trade Unions	1	2	3	4	5	9
T. Non-governmental organisations (NGOs)	1	2	3	4	5	9
U. European Union	1	2	3	4	5	9
V. Local authorities	1	2	3	4	5	9
W. Church	1	2	3	4	5	9

(IT) Can you express the level of confidence in the government, the Parliament, the Judiciary and the President of the Republic?

A great deal – very little – don't know/no answer

(IT) Can you express the level of confidence in the government, the Parliament, the Judiciary and the President of the Republic?

Extremely confident, Fairly confident, Little confidence, no confidence at all, Don't know/No answer

(RO) How much do you trust the following institutions?

Very much, Much, Little, Very little / not at all, DK/NA

Church
 Army
 European Union
 Local town hall
 Mass-media (press, radio, TV)
 Presidency
 Police
 Non-governmental organizations
 Government
 Superior Council of Magistracy
 Parliament
 Political parties
 Justice

CONFIDENCE IN INSTITUTIONS - RANKING

(PL) Now I will present you a list of 12 institutions. Please rank them according to you, beginning with those in which you are most confident (1) to those in which you are least confident (12).

Confidence in institution	Position
Banks, stock exchange and other	
Police	
Mass media (press, radio, TV)	
Government	
Local authorities	
Courts	
Lower House of Parliament	
Senate	

Church	
Military	
Non-governmental organisations	
Trade unions	

CONFIDENCE IN JUSTICE INSTITUTIONS

(SE) Confidence in the:

Very - fairly high - neither high nor low - fairly low – very low - no opinion/don't know

Criminal justice system on the whole

Police

Prosecution service

Courts

Prison and probation service

CONFIDENCE IN COURTS

(LT) Do you have confidence in the courts of Lithuania?

(PL) How do you estimate your level of confidence in courts/judiciary in your country?

Please indicate the point in the following scale that best meets your evaluation:

	I have no confidence at all	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	I have full confidence
--	-----------------------------	---------------	------------------------

(PL) How do you estimate your level of confidence in European/international courts in general terms?

Please indicate the point in the following scale that best meets your evaluation:

	I have no confidence at all	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	I have full confidence
--	-----------------------------	---------------	------------------------

(PL) Now I will present you a list of various courts. In reference to each one of them, please tell in what degree do you consider does it inspire your confidence? At answering, please apply the 1-5 scale, wherein 1 means you have no confidence at all, and 5 means that you have full confidence. Obviously you may use other scores in this scale.

Confidence in	I have no confidence at all				I have full confidence	No opinion
A. Criminal courts	1	2	3	4	5	9
B. Civil courts	1	2	3	4	5	9
C. Commercial courts	1	2	3	4	5	9
D. Family Divisions	1	2	3	4	5	9
E. Labour courts/ industrial tribunals	1	2	3	4	5	9
F. Vetting courts	1	2	3	4	5	9
G. Administrative Courts	1	2	3	4	5	
H. Courts of First Instance	1	2	3	4	5	9
I. Supreme Court	1	2	3	4	5	9
J. Constitutional Tribunal	1	2	3	4	5	9
K. European Court of Justice	1	2	3	4	5	9

L. European Court of Human Rights	1	2	3	4	5	9
M. International Court of Justice in The Hague	1	2	3	4	5	9

CONFIDENCE IN COURT PROCEDURES

(PL) How do you estimate your level of confidence in court procedures?

Please indicate the point in the following scale that best meets your evaluation:

	I have no confidence at all	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	I have full confidence
--	-----------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	------------------------

EVALUATION OF ORGANISATION OF COURT WORK - SATISFACTION

(PL) I will present you a list of various features characterising the organisation of court's work. In reference to each one of them, please say how do you evaluate the organisation of court's work? At answering, please apply the 1-5 scale, wherein 1 means that you are not satisfied at all, and 5 means that you are fully satisfied. Obviously you may use other scores in this scale.

Functioning of court proceedings	I am not satisfied at all				I am fully satisfied	No opinion
A. Efficient court proceedings	1	2	3	4	5	9
B. Openness of court proceedings	1	2	3	4	5	9
C. Reliable evaluation of evidence	1	2	3	4	5	9
D. Efficient service of court offices	1	2	3	4	5	9
E. Professional services of court offices	1	2	3	4	5	9
F. Fast services of court offices	1	2	3	4	5	9
G. Access to information in court offices	1	2	3	4	5	9
H. Polite staff of court offices	1	2	3	4	5	9

(PL) How do you evaluate your level of satisfaction with the organisation of court's work in general terms?

Please indicate the point of the below scale that best meets your evaluation:

I am not satisfied at all	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	I am fully satisfied
---------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----------------------

COURT EFFECTIVENESS / EFFICIENCY - SATISFACTION

(BE) Generally speaking, to what extent are you satisfied with the operation of the justice system? Are you...?:

1. Satisfied
2. Reasonably satisfied
3. Somewhat dissatisfied
4. Dissatisfied
5. [No opinion]

(BE) I'm now going to put to you some statements about court procedures. Please can you tell me for each statement whether you agree, are inclined to agree, are inclined to disagree or disagree? [No opinion]

- Legal language is sufficiently clear.
- It should be possible for someone to be acquitted if procedure is not followed.
- Most decisions are fair.
- It generally takes too long to deal with a case.

(BE) Fast-track judicial proceedings now exist in Belgium. This means that some offences are dealt with more quickly by the courts. I'm now going to put to you some statements about these fast-track judicial proceedings. Please can you give me your opinion on each of them? You may answer that you agree, are inclined to agree, are inclined to disagree or disagree. [No opinion]

- Fast-track justice is a good thing.
- Fast-track justice results in more miscarriages of justice.

(PL) I will present you a list of various courts. In reference to each one of them, please say to what degree are you satisfied with the effectiveness / efficiency of its activities? At answering, please apply the 1-5 scale, wherein 1 means that you are not satisfied at all, and 5 means that you are fully satisfied. Obviously you may use other scores in this scale.

Evaluation of effectiveness / efficiency of activities	I am not satisfied at all				I am fully satisfied	No opinion
A. criminal courts	1	2	3	4	5	9
B. civil courts	1	2	3	4	5	9
C. commercial courts	1	2	3	4	5	9
D. family divisions	1	2	3	4	5	9
E. labour courts / industrial tribunals	1	2	3	4	5	9
F. Vetting courts	1	2	3	4	5	9
G. Supreme Court	1	2	3	4	5	9
H. Administrative Courts	1	2	3	4	5	9
I. Constitutional Tribunal	1	2	3	4	5	9
J. European Court of Justice	1	2	3	4	5	9
K. European Court of Human Rights	1	2	3	4	5	9
L. International Court of Justice in The Hague	1	2	3	4	5	9

(PL) How do you evaluate your level of satisfaction with courts' functioning in your country in general terms?

Please indicate the point of the below scale that best meets your evaluation

	I am not satisfied at all	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	I am fully satisfied
--	---------------------------	---------------	----------------------

(PL) How do you evaluate your level of satisfaction with the functioning of European/international courts?

Please indicate the point of the below scale that best meets your evaluation:

	I am not satisfied at all	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	I am fully satisfied
--	---------------------------	---------------	----------------------

(PL) Now I will present you a list of various persons related to the functioning of the judiciary and court proceedings. About each one of them, please tell in what degree are you satisfied with the effectiveness / efficiency of their activities? At answering, please apply the 1-5 scale, wherein 1 means you are not satisfied at all, and 5 means that you are fully satisfied. Obviously you may use other scores in this scale.

Evaluation of effectiveness / efficiency	I am not		I am fully	No
--	----------	--	------------	----

of activities	satisfied at all			satisfied	opinion
A. Minister of justice	1	2	3	4	5
B. national public prosecutor	1	2	3	4	5
C. Ombudsman	1	2	3	4	5
D. judges in criminal trials	1	2	3	4	5
E. judges in civil trials	1	2	3	4	5
F. judges in economic trials	1	2	3	4	5
G. judges in family trials	1	2	3	4	5
H. judges in labour trials	1	2	3	4	5
I. judges in court trials	1	2	3	4	5
J. lawyers in court trials	1	2	3	4	5
K. notaries	1	2	3	4	5
L. legal counsellors	1	2	3	4	5
M. debt collectors	1	2	3	4	5

EVALUATION OF COURT PROCEEDINGS

(IT) Do you think proceedings in Italy last too long? Yes, No

Who's responsibility is it?	
Judges who don't work well	
Lawyers who have economic interests in making them last too long	
Government that does not provide means and resources to the justice	
Too many bureaucratic procedures involved in the proceedings	
Other	
Don't know/ no answer	

(IT) According to you, during a judicial proceeding, should ...

- The defendant prove his/her innocence
- The judge prove the guiltiness of the defendant
- Don't know/ no answer

(PL) Now I will present you a list of various domestic and foreign courts. In reference to each one of them, please tell in what degree do you consider a specific type of court reliable in the proceeding? At answering, please apply the 1-5 scale, wherein 1 means low reliability, and 5 means high reliability of a given court. Obviously you may use other scores in this scale.

Evaluation of reliability	Low reliability			High reliability	No opinion
A. criminal courts	1	2	3	4	5
B. civil courts	1	2	3	4	5
C. commercial courts	1	2	3	4	5

D. family divisions	1	2	3	4	5	9
E. labour courts / industrial tribunals	1	2	3	4	5	9
F. vetting courts	1	2	3	4	5	9
G. Administrative Courts	1	2	3	4	5	9
H. Courts of First Instance	1	2	3	4	5	9
I. Supreme Court	1	2	3	4	5	9
J. Constitutional Tribunal	1	2	3	4	5	9
K. European Court of Justice	1	2	3	4	5	9
L. European Court of Human Rights	1	2	3	4	5	9
M. International Court of Justice in The Hague	1	2	3	4	5	9

(RO) In your opinion, what is the main reason for which lawsuits last too long?

Legislation, in general

The way the trial courts' activity is organized

The existence of too many stages of appeal against a decision

The actions taken by the parties involved in the lawsuit

DK/NA

Other reason

CONFIDENCE IN PEOPLE**(EN-W) Now I will read out a list of different people. For each, would you tell me whether you generally trust them to tell the truth or not?****Tell the truth****Not tell the truth****Don't know**

Doctors
 Teachers
 Professors
 Judges
 Clergymen/Priests
 Scientists
 Television Newsreaders
 The Police
 Ordinary man/woman in street
 Pollsters
 Civil Servants
 Trade Union Officials
 Business Leaders
 Journalists
 Government Ministers
 Politicians generally

(PL) Now I will present you a list of various persons related to the functioning of the judiciary and court proceedings. About each one of them, please tell in what degree do you have confidence in that person? At answering, please apply the 1-5 scale, wherein 1 means you have no confidence at all, and 5 means that you have full confidence. Obviously you may use other scores in this scale.

Confidence in	I have no		I have full	No
---------------	-----------	--	-------------	----

	confidence at all				confidence	opinion
A. Minister of justice	1	2	3	4	5	9
B. National public prosecutor	1	2	3	4	5	9
C. Ombudsman	1	2	3	4	5	9
D. Judges in criminal trials	1	2	3	4	5	9
E. Judges in civil trials	1	2	3	4	5	9
F. Judges in economic trials	1	2	3	4	5	9
G. Judges in family trials	1	2	3	4	5	9
H. Judges in labour trials	1	2	3	4	5	9
I. Prosecutors in court trials	1	2	3	4	5	9
J. Lawyers in court trials	1	2	3	4	5	9
K. Notaries	1	2	3	4	5	9
L. Legal counsellors	1	2	3	4	5	9
M. Debt collectors	1	2	3	4	5	9

(PL) How do you evaluate your level of confidence in judges in general terms?

Please indicate the point of the below scale that best meets your evaluation:

	I have no confidence at all	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	I have full confidence
--	--------------------------------	---------------	---------------------------

(PL) How do you evaluate your level of confidence in other judiciary officials in general terms?

Please indicate the point of the below scale that best meets your evaluation:

	I have no confidence at all	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	I have full confidence
--	--------------------------------	---------------	---------------------------

(RO) How much do you trust the following categories of people?

Very much, Much, Very little / not at all, Little, DK/NA

Notaries
Judges
Policemen
Legal officers
Lawyers
Prosecutors
Officers of the court

EVALUATION OF COMPETENCE

(RO) What do you think about the competence of the following professional categories?

Almost none of them is involved, Few of them are involved , Almost all of them are involved, Many of them are involved , DK/NA

Notaries
Lawyers
Judges
Officers of the court
Prosecutors
Legal officers
Policemen

EVALUATION OF PEOPLE'S CONFIDENCE IN COURTS

(PL) According to you, are people confident in courts/judiciary in your country?

- 1) Yes → go to question Q41
- 2) No
- 3) Hard to tell

What in your opinion are the reasons of lack of confidence in the judiciary in your country

(please state three reasons as maximum):

- 1) Ineffectiveness (impracticability) of court sentences / rulings
- 2) Unprofessionalism of judges
- 3) Bad organisation of the works of courts, haste and disorder
- 4) Corruption
- 5) Unjust sentences / rulings
- 6) Bad treatment of the parties of court proceedings
- 7) Bad law
- 8) Other reasons (what?)
- 9) Hard to tell

QUALITY OF JUDGES

(BE) I'm now going to put to you some statements about judges. Please can you tell me for each statement whether you agree, are inclined to agree, are inclined to disagree or disagree? [No opinion]

- Judges are sufficiently well briefed about the cases they hear.
- Judges treat all citizens equally.

(IT) Do you have confidence in the impartiality of judges?

None, not very much, a little, very much, Don't know/no answer

(IT) Do you think that judges are influenced in their work by their political ideas?

Yes, all of them - Only some - None - Don't know/No answer

(LT) Generally speaking, are the decisions in the courts made fairly?

If your answer in previous question was negative or partly negative, what percent of all decisions are made unfairly?

On what sources of information you rely in giving an answer to this question – your personal experience, articles in mass media, experience of your relatives, acquaintances, other.

(NL) To what degree do they have confidence in judges with respect to five different aspects?

very much – much – not much/not a lot – little – very little

1. the commitment of judges
2. the expertise of judges
3. the integrity of judges
4. the impartiality of judges
5. the verdict of judges

(NL) The Dutch Judges do their work well

Agree

Disagree

(NL)

- whether or not as Dutch civilian you have sufficient access to the law;
- is it desirable that the judges takes into account the cultural background of criminals;
- the views of the judges fit in sufficiently with those of the Dutch society at large;
- is it allowed for a judge to have an additional job;

- the importance of speedy trials.

(PL) Now I will read you several statements on judges and courts in your country. In reference to each one of them, please tell in what degree do you agree or disagree with a given statement? At answering, please apply the 1-5 scale, wherein 1 means that you absolutely disagree with a given statement, and 5 means that you absolutely agree with a given statement. Obviously you may use other scores in this scale.

In my opinion, in your country:	Absolutely no	2	3	4	Decidedly yes
A. Nobody has influence on court rulings/sentences	1	2	3	4	5
B. Courts are independent from political influences, especially political parties	1	2	3	4	5
C. Judges always pronounce just sentences	1	2	3	4	5
D. Judges are influenced by media	1	2	3	4	5
E. Judges demonstrate high professionalism and experience in trials	1	2	3	4	5
F. Judges are impartial towards participants of proceeding/trial	1	2	3	4	5
G. It is law not social standards that regulates everyday life	1	2	3	4	5
H. Judges are influenced by lawyers, prosecutors, experts	1	2	3	4	5
I. It is not good that judges are often young	1	2	3	4	5
J. Judges pronounce too low sentences	1	2	3	4	5
K. Judges are often subjected to various pressures by the parties of court trial	1	2	3	4	5
L. As every citizen, a judge may be detained or arrested	1	2	3	4	5

(RO) To what extend do you agree with the following statements about judges and trial courts in Romania...?

Totally agree, Tend to agree, Totally disagree, Trend to disagree, DK/NA

Lawsuits last too long in Romanian courts

Judges' decisions are influenced by politicians

Courts allow many criminals to be free due to procedural flaws

Often judges interpret the same law differently

Judges do not pay the required attention and do not allocate the time necessary to the cases they hear

Judges make honest decisions

The cost of initiating legal action are reasonable

Romanian judges are held liable when settling a case erroneously

Victims are treated correctly throughout the court procedures

Courts treat the poor and the rich equally

(RO) To what extent do you agree to the following statements about Romanian prosecutors and prosecutors' offices?

Totally agree, Tend to agree, Totally disagree, Trend to disagree, DK/NA

In Romania the criminal prosecution of certain criminals lasts too long

Prosecutors' decisions are influenced by politicians

Prosecutors do not pay the required attention and do not allocate the time necessary to the deeds they investigate

Prosecutors' offices treat the poor and the rich equally

Romanian prosecutors are held liable when providing for an erroneous remedy in a file

Prosecutors' offices are preoccupied with observing human rights

Prosecutors treat people with dignity and respect

Prosecutors make decisions based on the facts

Prosecutors make honest decisions

Romanian prosecutor's offices treat all people equally, irrespective of their nationality or race

(RO) How often do you think it happens for...?

Always, Usually, Never, Rarely, Sometimes

Prosecutors to use correct procedures in their investigations
 Judges to correctly apply the procedures in the cases they hear
 People to have a fair judgment in the courts of Romania

JUDGES' COURT BEHAVIOR

(PL) I will present you a list of various features characterising judges' attitude in course of court trial. In reference to each one of them, please say how do you evaluate the manner of conducting court cases by judges in general terms? At answering, please apply the 1-7 scale, wherein 1 means that a given feature does not relate to the manner of conducting trials at all, and 7 means that a given feature fully relates to the manner of conducting trials. Obviously you may use other scores in this scale.

MANNER OF CONDUCTING TRIAL BY JUDGE								
Undeserving respect	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Deserving respect
Unattentive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Attentive
Unpolite	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Polite
Hasty	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Calm
Submissive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Resolute
Unbalanced	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Controlled
Unprofessional	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Professional
Supercilious	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Approachable
Emotional	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Logical
Partial	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Impartial
Hostile	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Friendly
Chaotic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Ordered
Witty	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Serious
Mild	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strict

OPTIONS: COURT ALTERNATIVES

(BE) In a civil case, the parties involved can also seek a solution between themselves, under a judge's supervision. Are you in favour, are you inclined to be in favour, are you inclined not to be in favour or are you not in favour of this method of settling disputes?

1. In favour
2. Inclined to be in favour
3. Inclined not to be in favour
4. Not in favour
5. [No opinion]

(PL) If you had a dispute on financial or property issues, to whom would you first resort for its solving?

- 1) I would ask for help in its solving a family member whom I fully trust
- 2) I would ask for help in its solving a good friend, whom I fully trust
- 3) I would ask for its solving a professional mediator
- 4) I would ask a lawyer for help
- 5) I would direct the case to court
- 6) Hard to say → go to question ...

(PL) What would make you decide to select the answer?

- 1) Saving time and costs
- 2) Intention to solve dispute amicably
- 3) Accurate reliable solving
- 4) Chance to recover money (disputed item)
- 5) To get rid of the problem fast

- 6) Other reason (what?)
- 7) Hard to tell

OPTIONS: PROFESSIONAL – LAY JUDGES - ASSISTANCE

(BE) Would you prefer to be judged by a professional judge or by a group of your fellow citizens, i.e. a jury? You may answer as follows: Yes, Yes, slightly, No, not much, No. [No opinion]

- By a professional judge:
- By a jury, i.e. a group of your fellow citizens:

(BE) In a civil case, the parties may request the judge to appoint an expert to establish the facts and make the necessary findings, for example, to determine the scale or true cause of damage. I'm now going to put to you some statements about such experts. You may answer that you agree, are inclined to agree, are inclined to disagree or disagree. [No opinion]

- It is important to appoint experts, even if it makes the case last longer.
- It is important to appoint experts, even if it increases the costs of the case.

(BE) In a limited number of civil cases, such as cases brought before an employment tribunal, the judge is assisted in taking his/her decision by citizens who are not professional judges but who are specialists in these fields. Do you think that use of this method should be widened to include other civil cases? You may answer as follows: Yes, Yes, slightly, No, not much, No. [No opinion]

(BE) For certain crimes, the decision as to whether someone is innocent or guilty is taken by a jury composed of citizens like you and me who are drawn by lot from the Belgian population at large. Are you in favour, are you inclined to be in favour, are you inclined not to be in favour or are you not in favour of this method of settling disputes? [No opinion]

(BE) In the Assize Court, cases are submitted to a jury composed of ordinary citizens. Do you think that ordinary citizens should also be directly involved in judgments in other criminal cases? Please can you tell me whether you agree, are inclined to agree, are inclined to disagree or disagree? [No opinion]

OPTIONS: DECISIONS

(BE) I'm now going to put to you some statements about the judge's decisions. Please can you tell me for each statement whether you agree, are inclined to agree, are inclined to disagree or disagree? In reaching his/her decisions, the judge must take account of ... Do you ...?

1. Agree

2. Inclined to agree

3. Inclined to disagree

4. Disagree

5. [No opinion]

- the nature of the facts
- the suspect's previous convictions
- the damage or harm suffered by the victim
- the suspect's experiences during his/her youth
- the suspect's mental state
- the suspect's social situation
- public opinion

JUSTICE ISSUES AS DISCUSSION TOPIC

(PL) Are court issues addressed by your family and close friends?

- 1) Yes
- 2) No → go to question

Please say what are the topics of those conversations?

.....

JUSTICE SYSTEM

(BE) I'm now going to put to you some statements about the justice system in general. Please can you tell me for each statement whether you agree, are inclined to agree, are inclined to disagree or disagree? [No opinion]

- When someone has dealings with the justice system as a party to a case, i.e. as a plaintiff or as a defendant, he/she gets a fair trial.
- Ordinary citizens can easily take legal proceedings.
- The justice system gives enough information about its work.

(IT) In Italy the prosecution magistrates (prosecutors) belong to the same professional order of judges (GIP – Pre-trial investigation judge). These judges control investigations done by the prosecutors and check the attendability of the charge (Court, Court of Appeal, Supreme Court). Do you agree with this judicial system?

Yes, No, Don't know

If yes, why?: because:	
I have confidence in the capacity and independence in decision making of Italian judges	
If the careers are separated, there is a risk that the role of the prosecutor be weakened	
Political systems with separate careers (eg, England and U.S.) offer fewer guarantees of independence and reliability	
Other	

If no, why not? Because:	
This undermines the impartiality of the judges	
In this way the prosecution and defense do not deal on equal terms	
Political systems with separate careers (eg. England and U.S.) offer major guarantees of independence and reliability	
Other	

ELECTIONS – PARTY PROGRAMMES AND JUSTICE

(BE) In federal elections do you take account of the points in a political party's programme which concern justice? You may answer as follows: Yes, Yes, slightly, No, not much, No.

(BE) I'm now going to read out a list of issues which normally appear in political parties' electoral programmes. Please can you tell me for each of these issues whether, generally speaking, it determines how you vote? You may answer as follows: Yes, Yes, slightly, No, not much, No.

- Environmental, consumer and health protection
- Economic, fiscal and budgetary policy
- Ethical questions
- Justice
- Security
- Foreign affairs, European integration, defence and development cooperation
- Transport and mobility
- Energy policy
- Political regeneration

INFLUENCE ON PUBLIC OPINION

(UK - GARDANT) Which one of the following do you think has the most influence on public opinion when it comes to Britain's justice system?

- Online social media
- The supreme court
- Tv and newspapers
- Politicians
- Don't know

KNOWLEDGE AND INFORMATION ABOUT THE JUSTICE SYSTEM

(BE) Do you think that hearings in courts should be filmed? Please can you tell me whether you agree, are inclined to agree, are inclined to disagree or disagree? [No opinion]

(LT) What exactly do you want to know about how the court works?

(UK) Which of the following statements would you say describe the UK's new Supreme Court, due to start work in October?

- Yes, No , Don't know

- Very few people have heard of it or understand what it will do
- We need a new Supreme Court
- It will be expensive and less effective than the current system
- It will be in tune with what normal people think is right and wrong

(PL) How do you evaluate the access to information on law in your country?

1. Very small
2. Small
3. Neither small nor extensive
4. Extensive
5. Very extensive
6. Hard to tell

(PL) How do you evaluate the level of your knowledge of the functioning of courts / judiciary?

1. I know very little about it
2. I know little about it
3. My knowledge in this regard is neither small nor extensive
4. I know much about it
5. I know very much about it
6. Hard to tell

(PL) How do you evaluate the level of your knowledge on your rights in court?

1. I know very little about it
2. I know little about it
3. My knowledge in this regard is neither small nor extensive
4. I know much about it
5. I know very much about it
6. Hard to tell

(PL) How do you evaluate the level of your knowledge on your rights in prosecutor's office?

1. I know very little about it
2. I know little about it
3. My knowledge in this regard is neither small nor extensive
4. I know much about it
5. I know very much about it

(PL) According to you, are citizens sufficiently informed on the functioning of courts / judiciary?

1. Absolutely not
2. Rather not
3. Hard to tell
4. Rather yes
5. Absoluyely yes

(PL) In your opinion, is quantity of information materials on the judiciary (folders, brochures, magazines, information on websites) sufficient?

1. Very small
2. Small
3. Neither small nor large
4. Large
5. Very large

(PL) What activities should be launched by the Ministry of Justice to better inform citizens on the works of the judiciary in your country?

.....

(PL) What is your source of knowledge on the functioning of courts in your country?

(please state the four most frequent sources of information):

- 1) My own contacts with the judiciary
- 2) Family members who had personal contact with the judiciary
- 3) Friends who had personal contact with the judiciary
- 4) Financial/legal/accounting advisers
- 5) Articles in daily press
- 6) Articles in popular weeklies/monthlies
- 7) Articles in specialist press
- 8) Radio programmes
- 9) Daily TV news bulletins
- 10) Various programmes watched on TV
- 11) Feature films watched on TV / in Cinema / on CD.DVD
- 12) Internet
- 13) Other sources (what?)

(PL) What court cases have you heard of in the last year in your country?

.....

.....

(PL) I will read you a list of various court cases in your country. Please tell of which of them have you heard?

Many answers possible. Mark selected answers in column ...

From which source did you know about the case of (here state the case(s) previously indicated)?

INTERVIEWER: Ask for each case indicated in the previous question, in which the Respondent participated in court trial. Mark with cross the selected answers in respective column P55.

	Q54	Q55					
		Press	Radio	TV	Internet	other sources	I dont remember
Case 1	1						
Case 2	2						
Case 3	3						
Case 4	4						
Case 5	5						
Case 6	6						
Case 7	7						
Case 8	8						
Case 9	9						
Case 10	10						

(PL) Would you like to be better informed on the activities of the judiciary in your country?

- 1) Yes
- 2) No
- 3) I am not interested
- 4) Hard to tell

(PL) What in your opinion should be done, to improve the level of information in society on the activities of the judiciary?

- 1) Write more in press about specific cases
- 2) Show court trials on television
- 3) Arrange meeting with judges in schools
- 4) Publish more information on this topic on websites
- 5) Launch other efforts (what?).....
- 6) Hard to tell

(RO) How important are the following sources of information for your opinion about the Romanian system of justice?
Very important, Important enough, Not important at all, Not very important, DK/NA

Television news
 What you read in press
 Your direct experience with courts
 Your family members' experience with courts
 One of your friends', acquaintances' experience with courts
 Your lawyer

RELIABILITY OF SOURCES OF INFORMATION

(PL) Now I will present you a list of various sources of information on the functioning of the judiciary and court proceedings. About each one of them, please tell in what degree do you consider it reliable? At answering, please apply the 1-5 scale, wherein 1 means low reliability, and 5 means high reliability of a specific source. Obviously you may use other scores in this scale.

Evaluation of reliability	Low reliability	High reliability	No opinion

A. Family members who had personal contact with the judiciary	1	2	3	4	5	9
B. friends who had personal contact with the judiciary	1	2	3	4	5	9
C. financial/legal advisers	1	2	3	4	5	9
D. articles in daily press	1	2	3	4	5	9
E. articles in popular weeklies/monthlies	1	2	3	4	5	9
F. articles in specialist press	1	2	3	4	5	9
G. information from radio programmes	1	2	3	4	5	9
H. information from daily TV news bulletins	1	2	3	4	5	9
I. information from various TV programmes	1	2	3	4	5	9
J. contents of watched feature films on TV / in Cinema / CD.DVD	1	2	3	4	5	9
K. information from the Internet	1	2	3	4	5	9
L. information from school	1	2	3	4	5	9
M. official publications of the Ministry of Justice	1	2	3	4	5	9

CORRUPTION**(RO) In your opinion, how spread is corruption among the following professional categories?****Almost none of them is involved, Few of them are involved , Almost all of them are involved, Many of them are involved , DK/NA**

Notaries
 Legal officers
 Officers of the court
 Policemen
 Lawyers
 Prosecutors
 Judges

CHANGE – ACTIONS - JUSTICE REFORM**(BE) Do you think that the operation of the justice system has improved, has not changed or has worsened in recent years?**

1. It has improved
2. It has not changed
3. It has worsened
4. [No opinion]

(LT) If you had a power what changes would you like to make in the courts system?**(RO) In your opinion, starting with December 2004...?**

Justice reforms have been implemented at the same pace

Justice reforms have been accelerated

DK/NA

Justice reforms have been slowed down

(RO) In your opinion, in order to reform the justice system, the government has taken...?

Few measures, Very few measures, Many measures, No measures, DK/NA

(RO) In your opinion, these measures have been good or rather bad...?

Rather good

Rather bad

DK/NA

(RO) In your opinion, following the measures taken by the government, during the next 2-3 years, the justice system situation... ?

- Will improve
- Will remain the same
- Will worsen
- DK/NA

(RO) In your opinion, which of the following statements best describes the process of justice reform in Romania?

- Only empty words, nobody does anything to reform justice
- Things have started to move, some efforts are being made
- Serious efforts are made to reform justice, however the results cannot be seen yet
- Serious efforts are being made and the results of the justice reform can already be seen
- Other
- DK/NA

(RO) Which of the following aspects do you consider to have priority in order to improve the Romanian justice situation?

1 - 2

- reducing corruption in the legal system
- simplifying the procedures by reducing the length of a lawsuit
- increasing the judges' and prosecutors' independence from politics
- increasing the transparency of justice
- permanent training of magistrates and legal staff
- court equipment with information and communication technology
- renovating the premises of trial courts
- other

COURT TRIAL EXPERIENCE

(BE) Over the last ten years have you had any contact with the justice system in connection with a civil case? This can have been as plaintiff, defendant or witness.

1. Yes
2. No
3. [Don't know]
4. [No response]

(BE) In connection with how many civil cases have you come into contact with the justice system over the last ten years?

(Interviewer: please do not suggest anything – simply note the number of times)

..... civil cases
 [Don't know]
 [No response]

(BE) Was it as ...?

1. Plaintiff, i.e. you brought the case
2. Defendant, i.e. someone else brought the case
3. Witness
4. Other: *(Interviewer: please specify)*
5. [Don't know]

(BE) Do you think that the outcome of your case was ...?

(Interviewer: read out all the possible responses – only one response allowed)

1. Positive
2. Reasonably positive
3. Rather negative
4. Negative

5. [Don't know]
6. [No response]

(BE) The next question concerns your degree of satisfaction with the way in which your case was dealt with. Are you ...?

(Interviewer: read out all the possible responses – only one response allowed)

1. Satisfied
2. Reasonably satisfied
3. Rather dissatisfied
4. Dissatisfied
5. [Don't know]
6. [No response]

(BE) This question concerns your assessment of the outcome of the case. Do you consider that the decision is:

1. Fair?
2. Unfair?

(BE) Over the last ten years have you had any contact with the justice system in connection with a criminal case? This can have been as victim, person who suffered damage or harm, suspect, witness or member of a jury.

1. Yes
2. No
3. [Don't know]
4. [No response]

(BE) In connection with how many criminal cases have you come into contact with the justice system over the last ten years?

(Interviewer: please do not suggest anything – simply note the number of times)

..... criminal cases
 [Don't know]
 [No response]

(BE) Was it as ...?

(Interviewer: read out all the possible responses – only one response allowed)

1. Victim (person who suffered damage or harm, civil party)
2. Suspect
3. Witness
4. Member of a jury
5. [Don't know]
6. [No response]

(BE) Do you think that the outcome of your case was ...?

(Interviewer: read out all the possible responses – only one response allowed)

1. Positive
2. Reasonably positive
3. Rather negative
4. Negative
5. [Don't know]
6. [No response]

(BE) The next question concerns your degree of satisfaction with the way in which your case was dealt with. Are you ...?

(Interviewer: read out all the possible responses – only one response allowed)

1. Satisfied
2. Reasonably satisfied
3. Rather dissatisfied

4. Dissatisfied
5. [Don't know]
6. [No response]

(BE) This question concerns your assessment of the outcome of the case. Do you consider that the decision is:

1. Fair?
2. Unfair?

(RO) During the past two years, have you personally or has another member of your household had anything to do with any Romanian trial court, that is have you been party in a lawsuit, whether civil or criminal?

No
Yes
DK/NA

(RO) In what capacity have you / has he/she been involved in this lawsuit?

Complainant in a civil case
Respondent (person taken to court in a civil case)
Witness
Defendant in a criminal case
Other situation

(RO) What kind of case was it?

Problems related to inheritances recovery of ownership rights
Divorce, child custody
Debt recovery
Felony
Other
Driving license problems / Car accident
DK/NA

(RO) Have you / has he/she benefited of a lawyer's legal assistance?

Yes, employed private
Yes, ex officio lawyer
No
Other situation
DK/NA

(RO) What is the main reason for which you/he/she did not have a lawyer?

I thought I could defend myself
I could not afford to hire one
I was not offered an ex officio lawyer, as provided by the law
I did not know I needed a lawyer
Other situation
DK/NA

(RO) Is there a final decision pronounced in that lawsuit?

Yes
No
DK/NA

(RO) Based on what you have seen, heard in the trial room, please tell me to what extent you agree to the following statements?

Totally agree, Tend to agree, Totally disagree, Trend to disagree, DK/NA

The lawsuit lasted very long
The decision was made based on the facts
The judge's decision was fair

People were treated with dignity and respect
 The lawsuit cost very much
 The judge was neutral, objective
 The procedures applied in the court were correct
 The court did not allow everybody to present their standpoints
 I did not understand almost anything from what was discussed in the court

LAWYERS

(BE) I'm now going to put to you some statements about lawyers. Please can you tell me for each statement whether you agree, are inclined to agree, are inclined to disagree or disagree?

1. Agree
 2. Inclined to agree
 3. Inclined to disagree
 4. Disagree
 5. [No opinion]
- Lawyers are sufficiently well briefed about their case files.
 - Lawyers treat all their clients equally.

(RO) How satisfied were you/ was he/she with the performance of your lawyer/the lawyer of the person involved in the lawsuit?

Very satisfied
 Rather satisfied
 Very unsatisfied
 Rather unsatisfied
 NS/NR

CRIMINAL JUSTICE

(BE) When the police have investigated an offence, it has to be decided whether or not a prosecution will be brought, meaning that the case will go to court. This decision is taken by the prosecution service. I'm now going to put to you some statements about the prosecution service. Please can you tell me for each statement whether you agree, are inclined to agree, are inclined to disagree or disagree? [No opinion]

- The prosecution service prosecutor, i.e. the person who has to decide whether a case will go to court, is sufficiently well briefed about a case to be able to take the right decision.
- The prosecution service prosecutor, i.e. the person who has to decide whether a case will go to court, treats everyone equally.

(BE) Before some cases come to court, the offender and the victim are given the opportunity of reaching agreement with the assistance of another person. This is what is known as mediation. I'm now going to put to you a statement about mediation. Please can you tell me whether you agree, are inclined to agree, are inclined to disagree or disagree? [No opinion]

- The opportunity to use mediation is a good thing.

PUNISHMENT

(BE) Do you consider that the punishments for the following offences are generally too severe, sufficiently severe, not sufficiently severe?

(Interviewer: read out all the possible responses – only one response allowed)

[No opinion]

- Financial offences

- Sexual offences
- Road traffic cases
- Drugs cases
- Murders
- Organised crime

(BE) I'm now going to put to you two statements about prison sentences. Which of these two statements most accurately reflects your opinion?

1. Prisoners should stay in prison until the end of their sentence.
2. It should be possible for prisoners to be released early and to serve part of their sentence under supervision in society.
3. [No opinion]

(BE) I'm now going to put to you a statement about the alternative sentences, i.e. sentences served outside prison, in society, which have been developed. Are you in favour, are you inclined to be in favour, are you inclined not to be in favour or are you not in favour of these alternative sentences?

1. In favour
2. Inclined to be in favour
3. Inclined not to be in favour
4. Not in favour
5. [No opinion]

(BE) I'm now going to put to you two statements about young offenders aged under 18. Which of these two statements most accurately reflects your opinion?

1. Young people aged under 18 should be locked up in youth prisons.
2. Young people aged under 18 who have committed an offence should be sent to a secure young offenders' institution where supervision, support and education are central.
3. [No opinion]

(NL) Criminals in The Netherlands are being sentenced too lenient

Agree

Disagree

(RO) To what extent do you agree to the following statements?

Totally agree, Tend to agree, Totally disagree, Trend to disagree, DK/NA

More clear laws are necessary, such as to eliminate different interpretations

Often judges rule too severe punishments for misdemeanors

Justice in Romania should be more preoccupied with the rehabilitation of criminals

Alternative punishments, such as community work, should be used more often instead of the prison punishment

Punishments ruled by Romanian judges are too mild compared to the gravity of the felony

Punishments ruled by Romanian judges are too mild compared to the gravity of the felony

Appendix 3: Danish translation of the common questionnaire

Spørgeskema vedr. offentlighedens tillid

Det Europæiske Netværk af Domstolsadministrationer er meget interesseret i, hvordan de nationale og europæiske domstolssystemer opfattes af borgerne i de forskellige EU-lande. Derfor har vi udarbejdet et spørgeskema vedrørende offentlighedens tillid til domstolssystemerne. Vi er interesserede i din personlige opfattelse af dommerene og domstolene i det land, du bor i. De oplysninger, vi får fra borgerne, vil blive brugt til at optimere domstolssystemernes funktion i hele EU.

Vi takker på forhånd for den tid og opmærksomhed, du vil bruge på udfyldelsen af dette spørgeskema, som vil tage ca. 10-15 minutter. Vi forsikrer, at informationerne vil blive behandlet i fuld fortrolighed.

1. Hvilket land bor du i?

- Belgien
- Bulgarien
- Cypern
- Danmark
- England
& Wales
- Estland
- Finland
- Frankrig
- [Grækenland](#)
- Holland
- [Irland](#)
- [Italien](#)
- [Letland](#)
- [Litauen](#)
- [Luxemborg](#)
- [Malta](#)
- Nord Irland
- Polen
- Portugal
- Rumanien
- Skotland
- Slovakiet
- Slovenien
- Spanien
- Sverige
- Tjekkiet
- [Tyskland](#)
- [Ungarn](#)
- [Østrig](#)

Spørgsmål vedrørende offentlighedens tillid til nationale og europæiske domstole
--

2. I hvilken udstrækning – på en skala fra 0 til 10 – har du personligt tillid til følgende institutioner i det land du bor i (0 betyder ”slet ingen tillid” og 10 betyder ”den størst mulige grad af tillid”)?

Medier	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Sundhedsvæsen	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Banker	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Politi	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Domstole	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Anklagemyndighed	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Parlament (Folketinget)	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Regering	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Undervisningssystem	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

3. I hvilken udstrækning – på en skala fra 0 til 10 – er din egen tillid til domstolene i det land du bor i bestemt af følgende (0 betyder ”har ingen betydning” og 10 betyder ”har megt stor betydning”)?

Deres evne til at træffe retfærdige afgørelser	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Deres evne til at løse problemer og konflikter	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Deres evne til at behandle folk ordentligt (med respekt, korrekt)	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Procesomkostninger	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Afgørelsernes rettidighed	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
I hvor høj grad de klart fremstiller og begrunder deres afgørelser	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

4. I hvilken udstrækning – på en skala fra 0 til 10 – mener du, at dommere i det land du bor i (0 betyder ”slet ikke” og 10 betyder ”altid”):

Er ærlige	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Er upartiske	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Er kompetente	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Er uafhængige	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Har forståelse for folk	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

5. Forventer du, at domstolssystemet i det land du bor i vil blive forbedret, forblive uændret eller blive forværret i de næste 5-10 år?

- Forbedret
- Forblive uændret
- Forværret

- Ved ikke
6. Mener du, at de europæiske domstoles (EU-Domstolen, Den Europæiske Menneskeretsdomstol, den internationale domstol i Haag) afgørelser vil have en positiv effekt, en negativ effekt eller ingen effekt på:
- 6.1. Kvaliteten af lovene i det land du bor i
 - Positiv effekt
 - Negativ effekt
 - Ingen effekt
 - Ved ikke
 - 6.2. Kvaliteten af de afsagte domme i det land du bor i
 - Positiv effekt
 - Negativ effekt
 - Ingen effekt
 - Ved ikke

Om dig selv

7. Hvilket køn er du?
- Mand
 - Kvinde
8. Hvilket år er du født?

--	--	--	--

9. Angiv det højeste niveau af skolegang, du har fuldført:
- Ingen uddannelse
 - Folkeskole
 - Gymnasium, HF, HH, HTX eller lignende
 - Kort og mellemlang videregående uddannelse
 - Lang videregående uddannelse (Universitet)
10. Har du personligt været i retten (ikke som professionel) inden for de seneste fem år? (For eksempel som vidne, som tiltalt, som mistænkt eller andet).
- Ja (gå til spørgsmål 10.1 mv.)
 - Nej (gå til spørgsmål 11)

De følgende spørgsmål (10.1 til 10.5) handler om din seneste oplevelse i retten.

- 10.1. Hvilket år var du sidst i retten (ikke som professionel)?

--	--	--	--

10.2 Hvilken type sag drejede det sig om?

- Straffesag
- Anden sagstype

10.3 Hvad var din rolle i sagen?

- Skadelidt
- Tiltalt
- Offer
- Mistænkt
- Vidne
- Andet

10.4 I hvilken udstrækning – på en skala fra 0 til 10 – anså du afgørelsen, i den seneste sag du har deltaget i, for at være retfærdig (0 betyder ”slet ikke retfærdig”, og 10 betyder ”meget retfærdig”.)?

00 01 02 03 04 05 06 07 08 09 10

10.5 I hvilken udstrækning – på en skala fra 0 til 10 – anså du behandlingen, i den seneste sag du har deltaget i, for respektfuld (0 betyder ”slet ikke respektfuld”, og 10 betyder ”meget respektfuld”)?

00 01 02 03 04 05 06 07 08 09 10

11. Har du som professionel været i involveret i en retssag inden for de seneste fem år?
(f.eks. som dommer, anklager, advokat, notar, ekspert, lægdommer, nævning)

- Ja
- Nej

12. Hvis ”ja”, var du involveret som

- Dommer
- Anklager
- Lægdommer
- Advokat
- Medarbejder ved retten
- Ekspert
- Notar
- Nævning
- Andet

Appendix 4: Dutch translation of the common questionnaire

Enquête vertrouwen van de burgers in de rechtspraak

Het Europese Netwerk van Raden voor de Rechtspraak (European Network of Councils for the Judiciary (ENCIJ)) is geïnteresseerd in de manier hoe door de burgers van de verschillende Europese landen gedacht wordt over hun nationale en over de Europese rechtspraak. Daarom heeft het Netwerk een enquête opgesteld over dat vertrouwen in de rechtspraak. De informatie die we met deze enquête verzamelen, zal worden gebruikt om het functioneren van de rechtspraak in de diverse lidstaten van de Europese Unie te verbeteren.

We willen u verzoeken om onderstaande enquête in te vullen. Het invullen van deze enquête zal ongeveer 10 minuten van uw tijd kosten. Natuurlijk zullen wij er zorg voor dragen, dat de informatie die u aan ons verstrekkt zeer zorgvuldig en vertrouwelijk wordt behandeld.

Alvast hartelijk bedankt voor het invullen van deze enquête en voor uw tijd en aandacht.

1. In welk land woont u?

- Oostenrijk
- België
- Bulgarije
- Cyprus
- Tsjechië
- Denemarken
- Engeland
& Wales
- Estland
- Finland
- Frankrijk
- Duitsland
- Griekenland
- Hongarije
- Ierland
- Italyë
- Letland
- Litouwen
- Luxemburg
- Malta
- Nederland
- Noord-Ierland
- Polen
- Portugal
- Roemenië
- Schotland
- Slowakije
- Slovenië
- Spanje

- Zweden

Vragen over het publieke vertrouwen in de nationale, Europese en internationale rechtspraak

2. In welke mate heeft u vertrouwen in de volgende instituties in uw land?

Wilt u uw vertrouwen uitdrukken in een cijfer op een schaal van 0 (geheel geen vertrouwen) tot 10 (heel veel vertrouwen),

Media	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Gezondheidszorg	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Banken	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Politie	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Rechtspraak	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Openbaar Ministerie	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Parlement	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Regering	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Onderwijs	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

3. In welke mate, wordt uw vertrouwen in de rechtbanken in uw land bepaald door het volgende?

Wilt u uw mening uitdrukken op een schaal van 0 (geheel niet bepaald hierdoor) tot 10 (volledig bepaald hierdoor)

Dat zij rechtvaardige beslissingen nemen	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Dat zij problemen en conflicten kunnen oplossen	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Dat zij mensen behoorlijk behandelen	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Door de kosten van de procedure	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Doordat zij tijdelijk beslissen	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Door de mate waarin zij hun beslissingen duidelijk uitleggen en de redenen daarvoor geven	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

4. In welke mate hebben rechters in uw land volgens u de volgende eigenschappen:

Wilt u uw mening uitdrukken op een schaal van 0 (geheel niet) tot 10 (volledig),

Eerlijkheid	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Onpartijdigheid	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Deskundigheid	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Onafhankelijkheid	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Mensenkennis	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

5. Hoe zal de kwaliteit van de rechtspraak in uw land zich volgens u in de komende vijf tot tien jaar ontwikkelen?

- Verbeteren
- Hetzelfde blijven

- Verslechteren
- Ik weet het niet

6.1 Welk effect hebben de beslissingen van de Europese gerechten (Hof van Justitie van de Europese Unie, Europees Hof voor de Rechten van de Mens, Internationaal Hof in Den Haag) op de kwaliteit van de wetten in uw land?

- Positief effect
- Negatief effect
- Geen effect
- Ik weet het niet

6.2 Welk effect hebben de beslissingen van de Europese gerechten (Hof van Justitie van de Europese Unie, Europees Hof voor de Rechten van de Mens) en internationale gerechten (Internationaal Hof in Den Haag) op de kwaliteit van de uitspraken van de rechtbanken in uw land?

- Positief effect
- Negatief effect
- Geen effect
- Ik weet het niet

Persoonlijke gegevens

7. Wat is uw geslacht?

- Man
- Vrouw

8. In welk jaar bent u geboren?

--	--	--	--

9. Wat is het hoogste onderwijsniveau dat u heeft afgerond?

- Geen enkel onderwijsniveau afgerond
- Basisschool
- Middelbare school
- Middelbaar/hoger beroepsonderwijs
- Universiteit

10. Bent u de afgelopen vijf jaar persoonlijk (niet beroepshalve) in aanraking geweest met de rechter?

Bijvoorbeeld als getuige, gedaagde, verdachte.

- Ja (ga naar vraag 10.1 en verder)
- Nee (ga naar vraag 11)

De volgende vragen (10.1 tot en met 10.5) gaan over uw laatste persoonlijke ervaring met de rechter.

- 10.1. In welk jaar bent u voor het laatst in aanraking geweest met de rechtspraak?

--	--	--	--

- 10.2 Wat voor soort zaak was het?

- Strafrechtzaak
- Ander soort zaak

- 10.3 Wat was uw rol in deze zaak?

- Eiser
- Gedaagde
- Verdachte
- Slachtoffer van een strafbaar feit
- Getuige
- Andere rol

- 10.4 Hoe rechtvaardig vond u de uitkomst in uw laatste zaak?

Wilt u uw mening uitdrukken op een schaal van 0 (zwaar onrechtvaardig) tot 10 (volledig rechtvaardig).

00 01 02 03 04 05 06 07 08 09 10

- 10.5 In welke mate, vond u dat u met respect bent behandeld?

Wilt u uw mening uitdrukken op, op een schaal van 0 (geheel geen respect) tot 10 (volledig respectvol)

00 01 02 03 04 05 06 07 08 09 10

11. Bent u de afgelopen vijf jaar professioneel in aanraking geweest met de rechter?

Bijvoorbeeld als rechter, officier van justitie, griffier.

- Ja (ga verder naar vraag 12)
- Nee

12. Indien uw antwoord ja was: was u dan betrokken als?

- Rechter
- Officier van justitie
- Advocaat
- Staf van de rechtbank

- Deskundige
- Notaris
- Anders

Appendix 5: Dutch (Belgium) translation of the common questionnaire

Enquête vertrouwen van de burgers in de rechtbanken

Het Europese Netwerk van Raden voor de Rechtspraak (European Network of Councils for the Judiciary (ENCJ)) is geïnteresseerd in de manier hoe door de burgers van de verschillende Europese landen gedacht wordt over hun nationale en over de Europese rechtbanken. Daarom heeft het Netwerk een enquête opgesteld over dat vertrouwen in de rechtbanken. De informatie die we met deze enquête verzamelen, zal worden gebruikt om het functioneren van de rechtbanken in de diverse lidstaten van de Europese Unie te verbeteren.

We willen u verzoeken om onderstaande enquête in te vullen. Het invullen van deze enquête zal ongeveer 10 minuten van uw tijd kosten. Natuurlijk zullen wij er zorg voor dragen, dat de informatie die u aan ons verstrekkt zeer zorgvuldig en vertrouwelijk wordt behandeld.

Alvast hartelijk bedankt voor het invullen van deze enquête en voor uw tijd en aandacht.

1. In welk land woont u?

- Oostenrijk
- België
- Bulgarije
- Cyprus
- Tsjechië
- Denemarken
- Engeland
& Wales
- Estland
- Finland
- Frankrijk
- Duitsland
- Griekenland
- Hongarije
- Ierland
- Italyë
- Letland
- Litouwen
- Luxemburg
- Malta
- Nederland
- Noord-Ierland
- Polen
- Portugal
- Roemenië
- Schotland
- Slowakije
- Slovenië
- Spanje
- Zweden

Vragen over het publieke vertrouwen in de nationale, Europese en internationale rechtspraak

3. In welke mate heeft u vertrouwen in de volgende instellingen in uw land?

Wilt u uw vertrouwen uitdrukken in een cijfer op een schaal van 0 (geheel geen vertrouwen) tot 10 (heel veel vertrouwen),

Media	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Gezondheidszorg	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Banken	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Politie	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Rechtbanken	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Openbaar Ministerie	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Parlement	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Regering	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Onderwijs	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

4. In welke mate, wordt uw vertrouwen in de rechtbanken in uw land bepaald door het volgende?

Wilt u uw mening uitdrukken op een schaal van 0 (geheel niet bepaald hierdoor) tot 10 (volledig bepaald hierdoor)

Dat zij rechtvaardige beslissingen nemen	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Dat zij problemen en conflicten kunnen oplossen	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Dat zij mensen behoorlijk behandelen	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Door de kosten van de procedure	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Doordat zij tijdelijk beslissen	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Door de mate waarin zij hun beslissingen duidelijk uitleggen en de redenen daarvoor geven	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

5. In welke mate, hebben rechters in uw land volgens u de volgende eigenschappen:

Wilt u uw mening uitdrukken op een schaal van 0 (geheel niet) tot 10 (volledig)

Eerlijkheid	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Onpartijdigheid	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Deskundigheid	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Onafhankelijkheid	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Mensenkennis	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

6. Hoe zal de kwaliteit van de rechtspraak in uw land zich volgens u in de komende vijf tot tien jaar ontwikkelen?

- Verbeteren

- Hetzelfde blijven
- Verslechtern
- Ik weet het niet

6.1. Welk effect hebben de beslissingen van de Europese gerechten (Hof van Justitie van de Europese Unie, Europees Hof voor de Rechten van de Mens, Internationaal Hof in Den Haag) op de kwaliteit van de wetten in uw land?

- Positief effect
- Negatief effect
- Geen effect
- Ik weet het niet

6.2. Welk effect hebben de beslissingen van de Europese gerechten (Hof van Justitie van de Europese Unie, Europees Hof voor de Rechten van de Mens) en internationale gerechten (Internationaal Hof in Den Haag) op de kwaliteit van de uitspraken van de rechtbanken in uw land?

- Positief effect
- Negatief effect
- Geen effect
- Ik weet het niet

Persoonlijke gegevens

9. Wat is uw geslacht?

- Man
- Vrouw

10. In welk jaar bent u geboren?

--	--	--	--

9. Wat is het hoogste onderwijsniveau dat u heeft afgerond?

- Geen enkel onderwijsniveau afgerond
- Basisschool
- Middelbare school
- Middelbaar/hoger beroepsonderwijs
- Universiteit

10. Bent u de afgelopen vijf jaar persoonlijk (niet beroepshalve) in aanraking geweest met de rechtbank?

Bijvoorbeeld als getuige, gedaagde, verdachte.

- Ja (ga naar vraag 10.1 en verder)
- Nee (ga naar vraag 11)

De volgende vragen (10.1 tot en met 10.5) gaan over uw laatste persoonlijke ervaring met de rechter.

10.1. In welk jaar bent u voor het laatst in aanraking geweest met de rechtbank?

--	--	--	--

10.2. Wat voor soort zaak was het?

- Strafrechtszaak
- Ander soort zaak

10.3. Wat was uw rol in deze zaak?

- Eiser
- Gedaagde
- Verdachte
- Slachtoffer van een strafbaar feit
- Getuige
- Andere rol

10.4. Hoe rechtvaardig vond u de uitkomst in uw laatste zaak?

Wilt u uw mening uitdrukken op een schaal van 0 (zwaar onrechtvaardig) tot 10 (volledig rechtvaardig).

00 01 02 03 04 05 06 07 08 09 10

10.5 In welke mate, vond u dat u met respect bent behandeld?

Wilt u uw mening uitdrukken op, op een schaal van 0 (geheel geen respect) tot 10 (volledig respectvol)

00 01 02 03 04 05 06 07 08 09 10

11. Bent u de afgelopen vijf jaar professioneel in aanraking geweest met de rechtbank?

Bijvoorbeeld als rechter, officier van justitie, griffier.

- Ja (ga verder naar vraag 12)
- Nee

12. Indien uw antwoord ja was: was u dan betrokken als?

- Rechter
- Lekenrechter
- Lid van het Openbaar Ministerie
- Advocaat

- Jurylid
- Personeel van de rechtbank
- Deskundige
- Notaris
- Anders

Appendix 6: French translation of the common questionnaire

Questionnaire sur la confiance du public dans les cours et tribunaux

« Le Réseau européen des Conseils de la Justice souhaite connaître l'opinion des citoyens des différents pays de l'Union européenne sur les cours et tribunaux nationaux et européens. Nous avons donc préparé un questionnaire sur la confiance du public dans les cours et tribunaux. Nous souhaitons connaître votre opinion sur les magistrats, les cours et les tribunaux de votre pays de résidence. Les résultats obtenus permettront d'optimiser le fonctionnement des cours et tribunaux à travers l'Union européenne.

Nous vous remercions d'avance du temps et de l'attention consacrés à ce questionnaire, qui ne nécessitera qu'une dizaine de minutes. Les informations communiquées seront traitées en toute confidentialité. »

1. Quel est votre pays de résidence ?

- Autriche
- Belgique
- Bulgarie
- Chypre
- République tchèque
- Danemark
- Angleterre et Pays de Galles
- Estonie
- Finlande
- France
- Allemagne

- Grèce
- Hongrie
- Irlande
- Italie
- Lettonie
- Lituanie
- Luxembourg
- Malte
- Pays-Bas
- Irlande du Nord
- Pologne
- Portugal
- Roumanie
- Écosse
- Slovaquie
- Slovénie
- Espagne
- Suède

Questions relatives à la confiance du public dans les cours, les tribunaux et les magistrats nationaux et européens.

2. Entre 0 et 10, quel est votre degré de confiance dans les institutions de votre pays de résidence (0 pour confiance nulle et 10 pour confiance totale) ?

Médias	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Soins de santé	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Banques	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Police	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Cours et tribunaux	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Ministère public	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Parlement	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Gouvernement	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Système éducatif	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

3. Entre 0 et 10, quel est votre degré de confiance dans les cours et tribunaux de votre pays de résidence (0 pour confiance nulle et 10 pour confiance totale) ?

Capacité à adopter des décisions impartiales	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Capacité à résoudre les problèmes et les conflits	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Traitements des individus (avec respect et correction)	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Coût des procédures	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Rapidité des décisions	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Clarté et motivation des décisions	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

4. Entre 0 et 10, quel est votre degré de confiance dans les magistrats de votre pays de résidence (0 pour confiance nulle et 10 pour confiance totale) ?

Honnêteté	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Impartialité	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Compétence	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Indépendance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Compréhension des gens	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

5. Pensez-vous que le fonctionnement des cours et tribunaux de votre pays s'améliorera, demeurera le même ou empirera durant les cinq à dix années à venir ?
- S'améliorera
 - Demeurera le même

- Empirera
- Sans opinion

6. Pensez-vous que les décisions des cours et tribunaux européens (Cour de justice de l'Union européenne, Cour européenne des droits de l'homme, Cour internationale de justice de La Haye) auront un effet positif, négatif ou neutre sur :

6.1. La qualité des législations de votre pays de résidence

- Effet positif
- Effet négatif
- Effet neutre
- Sans opinion

6.2. La qualité des décisions de justice de votre pays de résidence

- Effet positif
- Effet négatif
- Effet neutre
- Sans opinion

À propos de vous

7. Quel est votre sexe ?

- Masculin
- Féminin
-

8. Quelle est votre date de naissance ?

--	--	--	--	--

9. Quel est votre niveau d'études ?

- Pas d'éducation formelle
- École primaire
- École secondaire
- Enseignement supérieur
- Enseignement universitaire

10. Ces cinq dernières années, avez-vous personnellement fait l'expérience (non professionnelle) des cours et tribunaux ? (En tant que témoin, partie défenderesse ou suspect, par exemple.)

- Oui (rendez-vous à la question 10.1)
- Non (rendez-vous à la question 11)

Les questions suivantes (10.1 à 10.5) concernent votre dernière expérience en date du système judiciaire.

10.1 À quelle année remonte votre dernière expérience en date du système judiciaire (non professionnelle) ?

--	--	--	--

10.2 Dans quel type d'affaire ?

- Pénale
- Autre

10.3 Quel était votre rôle dans l'affaire ?

- Partie demanderesse
- Partie défenderesse

- Victime d'un crime
- Suspect
- Témoin
- Autre

10.4 Entre 0 et 10, quel est selon vous le degré de justice de l'affaire (0 pour totalement injuste et 10 pour totalement juste) ?

00 01 02 03 04 05 06 07 08 09 10

10.5 Entre 0 et 10, dans quelle mesure estimez-vous avoir été traité avec respect durant cette affaire (0 pour sans aucun respect et 10 pour avec un respect total) ?

00 01 02 03 04 05 06 07 08 09 10

11 Durant les cinq dernières années, avez-vous eu professionnellement affaire aux cours et tribunaux (en tant que magistrat, membre du ministère public, avocat, greffier, expert, notaire ou membre d'un jury par exemple) ?

- Oui (rendez-vous à la question 12)
- Non

12 Si oui, à quel titre ?

- Magistrat
- Ministère public
- Juge consulaire

- Avocat
- Membre des services judiciaires
- Expert
- Notaire
- Membre d'un jury
- Autre

Appendix 7: Italian translation of the common questionnaire

QUESTIONARIO SULLA PUBBLICA FIDUCIA (PUBLIC CONFIDENCE)

La RETE EUROPEA dei Consigli di giustizia è molto interessata al modo in cui sono percepiti i tribunali nazionali ed europei da parte dei cittadini dei differenti paesi dell'Unione europea. Per questo motivo abbiamo preparato un questionario sulla fiducia pubblica nei tribunali. Siamo interessati alla Sua personale visione rispetto ai magistrati e ai tribunali del paese nel quale è residente. I risultati ottenuti saranno utilizzati per migliorare il funzionamento dei tribunali nell'ambito di tutta l'Unione europea.

Desideriamo ringraziarla anticipatamente per il Suo tempo e attenzione per compilare questo questionario, che le prenderà circa 10 minuti. Le assicuriamo che le informazioni trasmesse saranno trattate in modo completamente riservato.

1. Qual è il Suo paese di residenza?

- Austria
- Belgio
- Bulgaria
- Cipro
- Repubblica Ceca
- Danimarca
- Inghilterra &
Galles
- Estonia
- Finlandia
- Francia
- Germania
- Grecia
- Ungheria
- Irlanda
- Italia
- Lettonia
- Lituania
- Lussemburgo
- Malta
- Paesi Bassi
- Irlanda del Nord
- Polonia
- Portogallo
- Romania
- Scozia
- Slovacchia
- Slovenia
- Spagna
- Svezia

Domande sulla fiducia pubblica nei confronti dei tribunali e dei magistrati nazionali ed europei

2. Che livello di fiducia ha, in una scala da 0 a 10, nelle seguenti istituzioni nel Suo paese di residenza (0 significa “assolutamente nessuna fiducia” e 10 “il livello più alto possibile di fiducia”)?

Media	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Servizio sanitario	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Banche	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Polizia	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Tribunali	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Procure della Repubblica	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Parlamento	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Governo	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Istruzione	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

3. In una scala da 0 a 10, il Suo livello di fiducia nei tribunali del Suo paese di residenza è determinato da cosa tra i seguenti (dove 0 significa “niente affatto determinato da” e 10 “decisamente determinato da”)?

dalla loro capacità di giungere a decisioni giuste	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
dalla loro capacità di risolvere problemi e risolvere conflitti	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
dalla loro capacità di trattare le persone in modo appropriato (rispettosamente, correttamente)	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
dal costo delle loro procedure	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
dalla tempestività delle decisioni	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
dal livello con cui assumono le decisioni in modo chiaro e spiegano i motivi per cui sono state prese	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

4. In una scala da 0 a 10 a quale livello crede che i magistrati del Suo paese di residenza siano (0 significa “per niente” e 10 “assolutamente”):

Onesti	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Imparziali	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Competenti	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Indipendenti	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Capaci di comprendere le persone	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

5. Si aspetta che dai cinque ai dieci anni prossimi il funzionamento dei tribunali del Suo paese di residenza migliorerà, rimarrà lo stesso o peggiorerà?

- migliorerà
 - rimarrà lo stesso
 - peggiorerà
 - non so
6. Pensa che le decisioni dei tribunali europei (Corte di giustizia dell'Unione Europea, Corte europea dei diritti dell'uomo, Corte internazionale di giustizia de L'Aia) avranno un effetto positivo, un effetto negativo o nessun effetto su:
- 6.1.La qualità delle leggi nel Suo paese di residenza
 - Effetto positivo
 - Effetto negativo
 - Nessun effetto
 - Non so
 - 6.2. La qualità delle sentenze dei tribunali nel Suo paese di residenza
 - Effetto positivo
 - Effetto negativo
 - Nessun effetto
 - Non so

Su di Lei

7. Qual è il Suo genere?

- Uomo
- Donna

8. In quale anno è nato/a?

--	--	--	--

9. Qual è il livello di istruzione da Lei raggiunto?

- Nessun titolo di studio
- Scuola elementare
- Scuola secondaria inferiore
- Scuola secondaria superiore
- Università

10. Ha avuto qualche esperienza personale (diversa da quella professionale) nei tribunali negli ultimi cinque anni? (per esempio come testimone, come imputato, come indagato, ...)

- Sì (vada alla domanda 10.1 e segg.)
- No (vada alla domanda 11)

Le seguenti domande (dalla 10.1. alla 10.5.) riguardano la Sua ultima esperienza in tribunale.

10.1. In quale anno ha avuto la Sua ultima esperienza personale in tribunale (diversa da quella professionale)?

<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
----------------------	----------------------	----------------------	----------------------

10.2 Che tipo di causa era?

- Causa penale
- Altro tipo di causa

10.3 Qual è stato il Suo ruolo in questa causa?

- Ricorrente
- Imputato
- Vittima di un crimine
- Indagato
- Testimone
- Altro

10.4. Quanto, in una scala da 0 a 10, ha considerato giusto l'esito della Sua ultima causa? (0 significa "per niente giusto" e 10 "completamente giusto")

00 01 02 03 04 05 06 07 08 09 10

10.5 Quanto, in una scala da 0 a 10, ha considerato rispettoso il trattamento ricevuto nel corso della Sua ultima causa? (0 significa "per niente rispettoso" e 10 "completamente rispettoso")

00 01 02 03 04 05 06 07 08 09 10

11. E' stato/a coinvolto/a a livello professionale nei tribunali nel corso degli ultimi cinque anni (per esempio in qualità di giudice, pubblico ministero, ausiliario, avvocato, cancelliere, perito, notaio, membro di una giuria)?

- Sì (vada alla domanda 12)
- No

12. Se sì, è stato/a coinvolto/a a livello professionale in qualità di

- Giudice
- Pubblico Ministero
- Giudice onorario
- Avvocato
- Dipendente amministrativo del tribunale
- Perito

- Notaio
- Membro di una giuria
- Altro

Appendix 8: Hungarian translation of the common questionnaire

Az Igazságszolgáltatási Tanácsok Európai Hálózata kíváncsi arra, hogy az egyes, nemzeti és európai bírósági rendszereket hogyan ítélik meg az európai unió különböző államainak állampolgárai. Ezért készítettünk kérdőívet a bíróságokkal kapcsolatos közbizalomról. Annak az országnak a bíráiról és bíróságairól alkotott véleményére vagyunk kíváncsiak, amelynek Ön állandó lakosa.

Az eredményeket arra használjuk, hogy optimalizáljuk az igazságszolgáltatási rendszer működését az egész Európai Unióban.

Előre is köszönjük figyelmét és ránk fordított idejét; a kérdőív kitöltése körülbelül 10 percet vesz igénybe. Biztosítjuk, hogy az összegyűjtött információkat teljesen bizalmasan kezeljük.

1. Melyik országban rendelkezik állandó lakóhellyel?

Kérdések a nemzeti és európai igazságszolgáltatási rendszerbe vetett bizalomról

2. Kérjük 1-10-ig terjedő skálán jelölje meg, hogy Ön mennyire bízik országának alábbi intézményeiben (0 azt jelenti: egyáltalán nem bízom, 10 azt jelenti: a lehető legmagasabb szintű a bizalmam)

Média	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
közegészségügy										
bankok										
rendőrség										
bíróságok										
ügyészségek										
Parlament										
kormány										
oktatási rendszer										

3. Kérjük, 1-10-ig terjedő skálán jelölje meg, hogy milyen szerepet játszanak az alábbi tényezők az Ön állandó lakóhelyének államában lévő bíróságokkal kapcsolatos bizalmának kialakításában:

(0 azt jelenti: egyáltalán nem bízom, 10 azt jelenti: a lehető legmagasabb szintű a bizalmam)

Az igazságos döntésre való képesség	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
A problémák megoldására és a konfliktusok feloldására való képesség										
Képesség arra, hogy az emberekkel megfelelően (tisztelettel és korrekten)bánjanak										
Az eljárások költsége										
Az eljárások időszerűsége										
Az ítéletek közérthetősége és megfelelő indokolása										

4. Mit gondol, - 1-től 10-ig terjedő skálán jelölve - az Ön állandó lakóhelyének országában a bírák:

(0 azt jelenti: egyáltalán nem azok, 10: teljesen azok)

Becsületesek	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Pártatlanok										
Szakmailag hozzáértők										
Függetlenek										
Megértőek az emberekkel										

5. Az Ön megítélése szerint az országban, ahol állandó lakóhellyel rendelkezik, az igazságszolgáltatási rendszer fejlődni fog, ugyanolyan marad,vagy romlani fog a következő 5-10 évben ?

- fejlődik
- ugyanolyan marad
- romlani fog
- nem tudom

6. Az európai szintű bíróságok (az Európai Unió bírósága, az Európai Emberi jogi bíróság, Hágai Nemzetközi Bíróság) döntéseinek pozitív hatása, vagy negatív hatása, vagy nincsen semmilyen hatása a

6.1 törvények minőségére az Ön országában

- pozitív
- negatív

- nincs hatása
- nem tudom

6.2 az ítéletek minőségére az Ön országában

- pozitív
- negatív
- nincs hatása
- nem tudom

Az Önre vonatkozó kérdések:

7. Neme ?

- nő
- férfi

8. Melyik évben született?

9. Mi a legmagasabb, befejezett iskolai végzettsége?

- nincs ilyen
- alapfokú/általános iskolai oktatás
- középiskola
- szakképzés
- egyetem/főiskola

10. Van bármilyen személyes bírósági tapasztalata (nem mint az eljárás hivatásos résztvevője) az elmúlt 5 évben ? (pl. tanú, vádlott, gyanúsított...)

- igen (akkor tovább a 10.1 és következő kérdésekre)
- nem (akkor tovább a 11.kérdésre)

A következő kérdések(10.1-től 10.5.-ig) Az Ön legutóbbi bírósági tapasztalataival kapcsolatosak.

10.1.Melyik évben volt legutóbb személyes tapasztalata a bíróságokkal kapcsolatban?(úgy mint nem hivatásos résztvevő)

.....

10.2. Milyen típusú bírósági ügyben?

- büntető ügyben,
- más jellegű ügyben

10.3. mi volt az ön szerepe ebben az ügyben

- felperes,
- alperes,
- sértett
- vádlott/gyanúsított
- tanú
- egyéb

10.4. Kérjük értékelje 1-től 10-es skálán, hogy az adott ügy kimenetelét hogyan értékeli:

(a 0 azt jelenti, hogy nem volt méltányos és megfelelő, a 10 azt jelenti, hogy teljesen méltányos és megfelelő volt)

10.5. Kérjük értékelje 1-től 10-es skálán, hogy megfelelőnek találta-e a bánásmódot a legutóbbi ügy során:

(a 0 azt jelenti, hogy nem volt megfelelő, míg a 10 azt jelenti, hogy teljesen megfelelő volt.)

11. Került-e kapcsolatba a bírósággal az elmúlt 5 évben például mint bíró, ügyész, ügyvéd, irodai alkalmazott, titkár, szakértő, közjegyző, esküdt vagy ülnök, vagy mint egyéb, hivatása által érintett személy?

- igen (akkor lépjön a 12.kérdésre)
- nem

12. Amennyiben igen, akkor úgy, mint:

- bíró
- ügyész
- ülnök
- ügyvéd
- bírósági alkalmazott
- szakértő
- közjegyző
- más

Appendix 9: Lithuanian translation of the common questionnaire

Klausimynas apie visuomenės pasitikėjimą

Europos teismų tarybų tinklas (toliau – ETTT) domisi, kaip skirtingų Europos Sąjungos valstybių piliečiai suvokia ir vertina savo nacionalines ir Europos Sąjungos teismines institucijas. ETTT itin svarbus gyventojų požiūris apie jų šalių teismų sistemas ir teisėjų darbą. Surinkta informacija bus panaudota optimizuojant visų Europos Sąjungos teismų sistemų funkcionavimą.

Klausimyną užpildyti užtruksite ne daugiau kaip 10 minučių. Užtikriname, kad surinkta informacija liks konfidenciali. Iš anksto dėkojame už Jūsų laiką ir dėmesį pildant šį klausimyną.

1. Kurioje šalyje yra Jūsų gyvenamoji vieta?

- Airijoje
- Austrijoje
- Belgijoje
- Bulgarijoje
- Čekijos Respublikoje
- Danijoje
- Anglijoje ir Velse
- Estijoje
- Graikijoje
- Ispanijoje
- Italijoje
- Kipre
- Latvijoje
- Lenkijoje
- Lietuvoje
- Liuksemburge
- Maltoje
- Nyderlanduose
- Šiaurės Airijoje
- Portugalijoje
- Prancūzijoje
- Rumunijoje
- Škotijoje
- Slovakijoje
- Slovénijoje
- Suomijoje
- Švedijoje
- Vengrijoje

- Vokietijoje

Visuomenės pasitikėjimas nacionalinėmis ir Europos Sąjungos teisminėmis institucijomis.

2. Pažymėkite, skalėje nuo 0 iki 10, kaip pasitikite Jūsų valstybės žemaiu išvardintomis institucijomis (0–visiškai nepasitikiu, 10–tikrai pasitikiu):

Žiniasklaida	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Sveikatos apsauga	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Bankai	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Policija	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Teismai	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Prokuratūra	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Seimas	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Vyriausybė	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Švietimo sistema	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

3. Pažymėkite nuo 0 iki 10, kaip Jūsų pasitikėjimą savo šalies teismais įtakoja (0–nejtakoja, 10–labai įtakoja):

Gebėjimas priimti teisingus sprendimus	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Gebėjimas spręsti problemas ir išspręsti konfliktus	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Gebėjimas tinkamai elgtis su žmogumi (pagarbiai, korektiškai)	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Procesinės išlaidos	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Sprendimų priėmimas per nustatyta laiką	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Sprendimo surašymas ir priimto sprendimo priežasčių aiškumas	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

4. Jūsų nuomone, skalėje nuo 0 iki 10, šalies teisėjai yra (0 – visiškai ne, 10 – tikrai taip):

Sąžiningi	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Nešališki	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Kompetentingi	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Nepriklausomi	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Suprantantys žmones	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

5. Kaip, Jūsų nuomone, pasikeis teismų sistemos funkcionavimas per ateinančius 5 metus: pagerės, išliks toks pats ar pablogės?

- Pagerės
- Išliks toks pats
- Pablogės
- Nežinau

6. Kokį poveikį, Jūsų nuomone, turės Europos Sąjungos teismų (Europos Sąjungos Teisingumo Teismo, Europos Žmogaus Teisių Teismo, Tarptautinio Teisingumo Teismo Hagoje) sprendimai: teigiamą, neigiamą ar neturės jokio poveikio?

6.1. Jūsų valstybės teisės aktų kokybei turės:

- Teigiamą poveikį
- Neigiamą poveikį
- Neturės jokio poveikio
- Nežinau

6.2. Jūsų valstybės teismų sprendimų kokybei:

- Teigiamą poveikį
- Neigiamą poveikį
- Neturės jokio poveikio
- Nežinau

Apie Jus

7. Jūsų lytis?

- Vyras
- Moteris

8. Kuriaiš metais esate gimęs (-usi)?

--	--	--	--

9. Kokį išsilavinimą esate įgijęs (-usi)?

- Jokio oficialaus išsilavinimo
- Pradinį išsilavinimą
- Vidurinį išsilavinimą
- Aukštėsnįjį išsilavinimą
- Universitetinį išsilavinimą

10. Ar per paskutinius 5 metus Jums teko asmeniškai dalyvauti teismo posėdyje? (pavyzdžiui, kaip nukentėjusysis, įtariamasis, kaltinamasis, ieškovas, atsakovas,...)

- Taip (žiūrėti 10.1 ir tolesnius klausimus)
- Ne (žiūrėti 11 klausimą)

Klausimai nuo 10.1. iki 10.5. yra susiję su Jūsų asmenine patirtimi teisme.

10.1. Kuriaiš metais paskutinį kartą esate buvęs teisme?

--	--	--	--

10.2. Kokia tai buvo byla?

- Baudžiamoji byla
- Kita

10.3. Koks buvo Jūsų vaidmuo toje byloje?

- Ieškovas
- Kaltinamasis
- Nukentėjusysis
- Įtariamasis

- Liudytojas
- Kita

10.4. Skalėje nuo 0 iki 10 pažymėkite, ar teismo sprendimas byloje, kurioje dalyvavote paskutinj kartą, buvo teisingas (0–visiškai neteisingas, 10–tikrai teisingas)?

00 01 02 03 04 05 06 07 08 09 10

10.5. Skalėje nuo 0 iki 10 pažymėkite, ar teismas byloje, kurioje dalyvavote paskutinj kartą, elgési su Jumis pagarbiai (0–visiškai nepagarbiai, 10–tikrai pagarbiai)?

00 01 02 03 04 05 06 07 08 09 10

11. Ar per paskutinius 5 metus jums teko kaip profesionalui dalyvauti teismo posėdyje (pavyzdžiui, dalyvavote kaip teisėjas, prokuroras, advokatas, ekspertas, notaras, teismo tarnautojas)?

- Taip
- Ne

12. Jeigu taip, prašome pažyméti, kokias pareigas tuo metu atlikote?

- Teisėjo
- Prokuroro
- Taréjo
- Advokato
- Teismo tarnautojo
- Eksperto
- Notaro
- Prisiekusiojo
- Kita

Appendix 10: Polish translation of the common questionnaire

Kwestionariusz zaufania społecznego

Europejska Sieć Rad Sądownictwa jest bardzo zainteresowana zbadaniem kwestii, jak postrzegane są przez społeczeństwa państw Unii Europejskich ich sądy krajowe oraz europejskie. Dlatego też wypracowany został kwestionariusz dotyczący zaufania społecznego do sądów. Informacje, które otrzymamy od obywateli, posłużą nam do optymalizacji funkcjonowania sądów Unii Europejskiej.

Pragniemy podziękować za Państwa uwagę i czas poświęcony na wypełnienie tego kwestionariusza, co nie powinno zabrać Państwu więcej niż 10-15 min. Zapewniamy, iż otrzymane informacje traktowane będą w sposób poufny.

1. Jaki jest kraj Twojego zamieszkania?

- Austria
- Belgia
- Bułgaria
- Cypr
- Republika Czeska
- Dania
- Anglia i Walia
- Estonia
- Finlandia
- Francja
- Niemcy
- Grecja
- Węgry
- Irlandia
- Włochy
- Łotwa
- Litwa
- Luxemburg
- Malta
- Holandia
- Irlandia Północna
- Polska
- Portugalia
- Rumunia
- Szkocja
- Słowacja
- Słowenia
- Hiszpania
- Szwecja

Pytania dotyczące zaufania społecznego do krajowych i europejskich sądów

2. W jakim stopniu, według skali od 0 do 10, osobiście ufasz poniżej wymienionym instytucjom w kraju Twojego zamieszkania (0 oznacza „zupełny brak zaufania”, 10 oznacza „najwyższy możliwy poziom zaufania”)?

media	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
służba zdrowia	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
banki	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
policja	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
sądy	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
prokuratura	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
parlament	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
rząd	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
system kształcenia	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

3. W jakim stopniu, według skali od 0 do 10, poniższe czynniki decydują o Twoim zaufaniu do sądów w kraju twojego zamieszkania (0 oznacza „w ogóle nie decydują”, 10 oznacza „decydują w stopniu bardzo wysokim”)?

Zdolność do wydawania sprawiedliwych decyzji	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Umiejętność rozwiązywania problemów i zażegnywania sporów	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Umiejętność stosownego traktowania obywateli (z szacunkiem, właściwie)	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Koszty postępowania sądowego	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Wydawanie decyzji na czas (terminowość)	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Stopień jasności decyzji oraz ich uzasadnienia	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

4. W jakim stopniu, według skali od 0 do 10, uważasz, że sędziowie w kraju Twojego zamieszkania są (0 oznacza „w ogóle”, 10 oznacza „w pełni”):

Uczciwi	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Bezstronni	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Kompetentni	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Niezależni	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Rozumiejący obywateli	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

5. Czy przewidujesz, że funkcjonowanie sądów w kraju Twojego zamieszkania w najbliższych 5-10 latach zmieni się na lepsze, pozostanie niezmienione, pogorszy się?

- Poprawi się

- Pozostanie niezmienione
 - Pogorszy się
 - Nie wiem
6. Czy sądzisz, iż decyzje sądów europejskich (Trybunału Sprawiedliwości Wspólnot Europejskich, Europejskiego Trybunału Praw Człowieka, Międzynarodowego Trybunału Sprawiedliwości w Hadze) będą miały pozytywny wpływ, negatywny wpływ, czy też pozostaną bez wpływu:
- 6.1. Na jakość prawa w kraju Twojego zamieszkania
 - Pozytywny wpływ
 - Negatywny wpływ
 - Bez wpływu
 - Nie wiem
 - 6.2. Na jakość decyzji sądowych w kraju Twojego zamieszkania
 - Pozytywny wpływ
 - Negatywny wpływ
 - Bez wpływu
 - Nie wiem

O Tobie

7. Płeć?
- Mężczyzna
 - Kobieta
8. Rok urodzenia?
- | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
9. Poziom Twojego wykształcenia (ukończone)?
- Bez wykształcenia
 - Podstawowe
 - Średnie
 - Pomaturalne
 - Wyższe
10. Czy miałeś osobiście kontakt (inny niż zawodowy) z sądami w ostatnich 5 latach ?
(na przykład jako świadek, pozwany, oskarżony,...)
- Tak (przejdz do pyt. 10.1 i następnych)
 - Nie (przejdz do pyt.11)

Pytania 10.1-10.5 dotyczą Twojego ostatniego kontaktu z sądem.

10.1. Rok Twojego ostatniego kontaktu (innego niż zawodowy) z sądem ?

<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
----------------------	----------------------	----------------------	----------------------

10.2. Jakiego rodzaju była to sprawa?

- Sprawa karna
- Inna sprawa

10.3. Jaka była Twoja rola w tej sprawie?

- Powód
- Pozwany
- Ofiara przestępstwa
- Oskarżony
- Świadek
- Inne

10.4. W jakim stopniu, według skali od 0 do 10, wynik postępowania w tej sprawie oceniasz jako sprawiedliwy (0 oznacza „zupełnie niesprawiedliwy”, 10 „w pełni sprawiedliwy”)?

00 01 02 03 04 05 06 07 08 09 10

10.5. W jakim stopniu, według skali od 0 do 10, uważasz, iż byłeś traktowany w tej sprawie z szacunkiem (0 oznacza „zupełnie bez szacunku”, 10 oznacza „z pełnym szacunkiem”)?

00 01 02 03 04 05 06 07 08 09 10

11. Czy miałeś osobiście kontakt zawodowy z sądami w ostatnich 5 latach? (na przykład jako sędzia, prokurator, prawnik, referendarz, urzędnik sądowy, biegły, notariusz, ławnik)

- Tak (przejdz do pyt. 12)
- Nie

12. Jeśli tak, to jako kto?

- Sędzia
- Prokurator
- Ławnik
- Prawnik
- Urzędnik sądowy
- Biegły

- Notariusz
- Członek ławy przysięgłych
- Inne

Appendix 11: Portuguese translation of the common questionnaire

Questionário Confiança do Públco

A Rede Europeia de Conselhos de Justiça está muito interessada em saber como são vistos pelos cidadãos dos diferentes países da União Europeia, os tribunais nacionais e europeus. Para isso, preparamos um questionário sobre confiança pública nos tribunais. Interessam-nos as suas opiniões sobre os juízes e tribunais do país onde reside. Os resultados que obtivermos serão usados em benefício do funcionamento dos referidos tribunais em toda a União Europeia.

Queremos agradecer antecipadamente o tempo e atenção dispensados no preenchimento deste questionário, que vos tomará 10 minutos. Asseguramos a completa confidencialidade no tratamento da informação prestada.

1. Qual o seu país de residência?

- Alemanha
- Áustria
- Bélgica
- Bulgária
- Chipre
- Dinamarca
- Escócia
- Eslováquia
- Eslovénia
- Espanha
- Estónia
- Finlândia
- França
- Grécia
- Holanda
- Hungria
- Inglaterra e País de Gales
- Irlanda
- Irlanda do Norte
- Itália
- Letónia
- Lituânia
- Luxemburgo
- Malta
- Polónia
- Portugal
- República Checa
- Roménia
- Suécia

Questões sobre confiança pública nos tribunais e nos juízes, nacionais e europeus

2. Numa escala de 0 a 10, em que medida tem confiança nas seguintes instituições do seu país? (0 significa “nenhuma confiança” e 10 significa “toda a confiança possível”)?

Media	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Serviço de saúde	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Bancos	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Polícia	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Tribunais	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Ministério Público	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Parlamento	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Governo	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Sistema Educativo	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

3. Numa escala de 0 a 10, em que medida é a sua confiança nos tribunais do seu país, determinada pelo seguinte? (0 significa “nada determinada por” e 10 significa “fortemente determinada por”)?

A sua capacidade de chegar a decisões justas	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
A sua capacidade de resolver problemas e solucionar conflitos	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
A sua capacidade para tratar adequadamente o público (respeitosamente, correctamente)	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
O custo dos actos processuais	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
A prontidão das decisões	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
O grau de clareza das decisões e sua fundamentação.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

- 4- Numa escala de 0 a 10, em que medida crê que os juízes do seu país são (0 significa “nada” e 10 significa “completamente”):

Honestos	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Imparciais	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Competentes	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Independentes	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Compreensivos com as pessoas	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

5. Espera que o funcionamento dos tribunais do seu país melhore, continue o mesmo ou piore dentro dos próximos cinco a dez anos?
- Que melhore
 - Que continue igual
 - Que piore
 - Não sei
6. Pensa que as decisões dos Tribunais Europeus (Tribunal de Justiça da União Europeia, Tribunal Europeu dos Direitos do Homem, Tribunal Internacional de Justiça de Haia) terão um efeito positivo, negativo ou nenhum efeito:
- 6.1. Na qualidade das leis no seu país
- Efeito positivo
 - Efeito negativo
 - Nenhum efeito
 - Não sei
- 6.2 Na qualidade das decisões judiciais do seu país
- Efeito positivo
 - Efeito negativo
 - Nenhum efeito
 - Não sei

Sobre si próprio (a)

7. Género?
- Masculino
 - Feminino
8. Em que ano nasceu?
- | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
9. Qual o seu grau de habilitações?
- Sem frequência de ensino institucionalizado
 - Ensino básico
 - Ensino Secundário
 - Pós-graduação
 - Ensino Universitário
10. Teve alguma experiência (que não a profissional) nos tribunais durante os últimos cinco anos? (por exemplo como testemunha, réu, suspeito, ...)

- Sim (ir para questão 10.1 e seguintes)
- Não (ir para a questão 11.)

As questões que se seguem (10.1. a 10.5.) são sobre a sua última experiência em tribunal.

10.1. Em que ano teve a sua última experiência em tribunal (que não a profissional)?

--	--	--	--

10.2. Que tipo de processo era?

- Criminal
- Outro

10.3. Qual era o seu papel neste processo?

- Requerente
- Réu/arguido
- Vítima de crime
- Suspeito
- Testemunha
- Outro

10.4. Em que medida, numa escala de 0 a 10, considerou o resultado do seu último caso justo? 0 significa “totalmente injusto” e 10 significa “totalmente justo”.

00 01 02 03 04 05 06 07 08 09 10

10.5. Em que medida, numa escala de 0 a 10, considerou respeitoso o tratamento durante o seu último caso? 0 significa “totalmente desrespeitoso” e 10 significa “totalmente respeitoso”.

00 01 02 03 04 05 06 07 08 09
10

11. Esteve profissionalmente envolvido nos tribunais nos últimos 5 anos (por exemplo como juiz, procurador, advogado, conservador, oficial de justiça, perito, notário, jurado)?

- Sim (ir para a questão 12.)
- Não

12. Se sim, esteve profissionalmente envolvido como:

- Juiz
- Procurador
- Juiz de paz
- Advogado
- Funcionário de justiça
- Perito
- Notário
- Jurado
- Outro

Appendix 12: Romanian translation of the common questionnaire

Chestionar referitor la încrederea publicului

Rețeaua Europeană a Consiliilor Judiciare este foarte interesată cu privire la modul în care instanțele nationale și europene sunt percepute de către cetățenii diferitelor țări ale Uniunii Europene. Prin urmare, noi am elaborat un chestionar despre încrederea publicului în instanțele de judecată. Ne interesează părerea dumneavoastră despre judecătorii și instanțele din țara în care locuiți. Informațiile pe care le vom obține vor fi folosite pentru a optimiza funcționarea instanelor de judecată din întreaga Uniune Europeană.

Dorim să vă mulțumim anticipat pentru timpul și atenția dumneavoastră pentru a completa acest chestionar, care va necesita din partea dvs. aproximativ între 10 și 15 minute. Vă asigurăm că informațiile prezentate vor fi tratate cu deplină confidențialitate.

1. În ce țară aveți reședință ?

- Austria
- Belgium
- Bulgaria
- Cyprus
- Czech Republic
- Denmark
- England & Wales
- Estonia
- Finland
- France
- Germany
- Greece
- Hungary
- Ireland
- Italy
- Latvia

- Lithuania
- Luxembourg
- Malta
- Netherlands
- Northern Ireland
- Poland
- Portugal
- Romania
- Scotland

Întrebări privind încrederea publicului în instanțele de judecată naționale și europene și în judecători

2. În ce grad, pe o scală de la 0 la 10, aveți încredere în următoarele instituții din țara dumneavoastră de reședință (0 însemnând “nu am incredere deloc” și 10 însemnând “cel mai înalt grad posibil de încredere”)?

Media	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Servicii de sănătate	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Bănci	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Poliție	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Instanțe de judecată	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Parchete	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Parlament	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Guvern	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Sistemul de educație	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

3. În ce grad, pe o scală de la 0 la 10, încrederea dumneavoastră în instanțele de judecată din țara dvs. de reședință este determinată de următoarele aspecte (0

însemnand “nu am incredere deloc” și 10 însemnand “cel mai înalt grad posibil de incredere”)?

Capacitatea acestora de a lua decizii echitabile	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Capacitatea acestora de a rezolva probleme și de a rezolva conflicte	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Capacitatea acestora de a trata oamenii cum se cuvine (cu respect, corect)	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Costul procedurilor	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Perioada de timp necesară deciziilor	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Gradul în care pronunță decizii clare și explică motivele acestora	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

4. În ce grad, pe o scală de la 0 la 10, credeți că judecătorii din țara dvs. de reședință sunt (0 însemnand « deloc » și 10 însemnand « deplin »):

Onești	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Imparțiali	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Competenți	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Independenti	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Înțelegători față de oameni	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

5. Vă așteptați ca funcționarea instanțelor din țara dumneavoastră de reședință să se îmbunătățească, să rămână același sau să se înrăutățească în perioada următorilor cinci-zece ani?

- Să se îmbunătățească
- Să rămână același
- Să se înrăutățească
- Nu știu

6. Credeti că deciziile instanțelor europene (Curtea de Justiție a Uniunii Europene, Curtea Europeană a Drepturilor Omului, Curtea Internațională de Justiție de la Haga) vor avea un efect pozitiv, un efect negativ sau nici un efect cu privire la:

6.1 Calitatea legilor din țara dumneavoastră

- Efect pozitiv
- Efect negativ
- Nici un efect
- Nu știu

6.2 Calitatea hotărârilor instanțelor de judecată din țara dvs.

- Efect pozitiv
- Efect negativ
- Nici un efect
- Nu știu

Despre dumneavoastră

7. Care este sexul dumneavoastră?

- Masculin
- Feminin

8. În ce an sunteți născut ?

--	--	--	--

9. Care este cel mai înalt nivel de educație pe care l-ați absolvit ?

- Nici o formă de educație
- Școala primară
- Gimnaziu
- Educație post-gimnaziu
- Învățământ universitar

10. Ați avut vreo experiență personală (alta decât profesională) în cadrul instanțelor judecătoarești în perioada ultimilor 5 ani ? (de exemplu, ca martor, ca parât , ca învinuit, ...)

- Da (continuați cu întrebarea 10.1 și următoarele)
- Nu (continuați cu întrebarea 11)

Următoarele întrebări (de la 10.1 la 10.5) se referă la ultimele dvs. experiențe în cadrul instanțelor de judecată.

10.1. În ce an ați avut ultima dvs. experiență în cadrul unei instanțe de judecată?

<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
----------------------	----------------------	----------------------	----------------------

10.2 Ce tip de cauză a fost?

- Cauză penală
- Altă cauză

10.3 Care a fost rolul dvs. în acel caz?

- Reclamant
- Pârât
- Victimă
- Învinuit
- Martor
- Membru al juriului
- Altul

10.4 În ce grad, pe o scală de la 0 la 10, ați considerat că soluția din ultimul dvs. caz a fost echitabilă? (0 înseamnă “absolut inechitabilă” și 10 înseamnă “absolut echitabilă”?)

00 01 02 03 04 05 06 07 08 09 10

10.5 În ce grad, pe o scală de la 0 la 10, ați considerat comportamentul ca fiind respectuos pe durata ultimei dumneavoastră cauze (0 înseamnă “lipsit de respect” și 10 înseamnă “foarte respectuos”)?

00 01 02 03 04 05 06 07 08 09 10

11. Ați fost implicat profesional în instanțe în decursul ultimilor 5 ani (de exemplu ca judecător, procuror, avocat, arhivar, grefier, expert, notar, membru al unui juriu)?

- Da (continuați cu întrebarea 12)
- Nu

12. Daca da, ați fost implicat profesional ca și

- Judecător
- Procuror
- Judecător asistent
- Avocat
- Personal din cadrul instanței
- Expert
- Notar
- Membru al unui juriu
- Altele

Appendix 13: Slovenian translation of the common questionnaire

Vprašalnik o zaupanju javnosti

Evropsko mrežo sodnih svetov zelo zanima, kako državljeni različnih držav Evropske unije dojemajo nacionalne in evropske sodne sisteme. V ta namen smo pripravili vprašalnik o zaupanju javnosti v sodne sisteme. Zanima nas vaš pogled na sodnike in sodišča v državi, v kateri prebivate. Rezultati, ki jih bomo pridobili, bodo uporabljeni za izboljšanje delovanja sodišč po vsej Evropski uniji.

Vnaprej bi se vam radi zahvalili za vaš čas in pozornost za izpolnitev tega vprašalnika, kar vam bo vzelo nekje 10 minut. Zagotavljamo vam, da bodo pridobljeni podatki obravnavani popolnoma zaupno.

1. V kateri državi prebivate?
 - Anglija in Wales
 - Avstrija
 - Belgija
 - Bolgarija
 - Ciper
 - Češka Republika
 - Danska
 - Estonija
 - Finska
 - Francija
 - Grčija
 - Irska
 - Italija
 - Latvija
 - Litva
 - Luksemburg
 - Madžarska
 - Malta
 - Nemčija
 - Nizozemska
 - Poljska
 - Portugalska
 - Romunija
 - Severna Irska
 - Slovaška
 - Slovenija

- Škotska
- Španija
- Švedska

Vprašanja o zaupanju javnosti v nacionalna in evropska sodišča in sodnike

2. Do katere stopnje, v lestvici od 0 do 10, zaupate navedenim institucijam v državi, v kateri prebivate (0 pomeni »nikakor ne zaupam« in 10 pomeni »najvišja možna stopnja zaupanja«)?

Mediji	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Storitve zdravstvenega varstva	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Banke	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Policija	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Sodišča	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Tožilstvo	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Parlament	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Vlada	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Izobraževalni sistem	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

3. Do katere stopnje, v lestvici od 0 do 10, vaše zaupanje sodiščem države, v kateri prebivate, določa naslednje (0 pomeni »nikakor ne vpliva« in 10 pomeni »zelo močno vpliva«)?

Njihova zmožnost doseči pravično odločitev	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Njihova zmožnost reševati probleme in razreševati konflikte	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Njihova zmožnost ustreznega ravnanja z ljudmi (spoštljivo, korektno)	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Stroški njihovih postopkov	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Pravočasnost njihovih odločitev	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Stopnja jasnosti odločitve in obrazložitev razlogov zanjo	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

4. Do katere stopnje, v lestvici od 0 do 10, verjamete, da so sodniki v državi, v kateri prebivate (0 pomeni »sploh niso« in 10 pomeni »popolnoma«):

Pošteni	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Nepristranski	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Usposobljeni	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Neodvisni	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Razumevajoči do ljudi	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

5. Ali pričakujete, da se bo delovanje sodišč v državi, v kateri prebivate, izboljšalo, ostalo enako ali poslabšalo v prihodnjih petih do desetih letih?

- Izboljšalo
- Ostalo enako
- Poslabšalo
- Ne vem

6. Ali menite, da bodo imele odločitve evropskih sodišč (Sodišča Evropske unije, Evropskega sodišča za človekove pravice, Meddržavnega sodišča v Haagu) pozitiven učinek, negativen učinek ali bodo brez učinka na:

6.1. Kakovost zakonov v državi, v kateri prebivate

- Pozitiven učinek
- Negativen učinek
- Brez učinka
- Ne vem

6.2. Kakovost sodnih odločb v državi, v kateri prebivate

- Pozitiven učinek
- Negativen učinek
- Brez učinka
- Ne vem

O vas

7. Katerega spola ste?

- Moški
- Ženska

8. V katerem letu ste bili rojeni?

--	--	--	--

9. Katera je najvišja stopnja izobraževanja, ki ste jo zaključili?

- Brez formalne izobrazbe
- Osnovna šola
- Srednja šola
- Visoka ali višja šola
- Univerzitetna izobrazba

10. Ali ste imeli v preteklih petih letih kakšno osebno izkušnjo na sodišču (ne v svoji poklicni vlogi)? (Na primer kot priča, toženec, osumljenec, itd.)

- Da (pojdite k vprašanju 10.1. in naslednjim)
- Ne (pojdite k vprašanju 11)

Naslednja vprašanja (10.1. do 10.5.) se nanašajo na vašo zadnjo izkušnjo na sodišču

10.1. V katerem letu ste imeli svojo zadnjo izkušnjo na sodišču (ne v svoji poklicni vlogi)?

--	--	--	--

10.2. Za kakšno vrsto zadeve je šlo?

- Kazenska zadeva
- Druga vrsta zadeve

10.3. Kakšna je bila vaša vloga v tej zadevi?

- Tožnik
- Toženec
- Žrtev
- Osumljenec
- Priča
- Drugo

10.4. Do katere stopnje, v lestvici od 0 do 10, ste menili, da je bil izid vašega zadnjega postopka pravičen (0 pomeni »sploh ne pravičen« in 10 pomeni »popolnoma pravičen«)?

00 01 02 03 04 05 06 07 08 09 10

10.5. Do katere stopnje, v lestvici od 0 do 10, ste menili, da je bilo ravnanje med vašim zadnjim postopkom spoštljivo (0 pomeni »sploh ne spoštljivo« in 10 pomeni »popolnoma spoštljivo«)

00 01 02 03 04 05 06 07 08 09 10

11. Ali ste bili v zadnjih 5 letih na sodišču poklicno udeleženi (na primer kot sodnik, tožilec, odvetnik, vpisničar, referent, izvedenec, notar ali član porote)?

- Da (pojdite k vprašanju 12)
- Ne

12. Če ste bili, ste bili udeleženi kot

- Sodnik
- Tožilec
- Sodnik porotnik
- Odvetnik
- Sodno osebje
- Izvedenec
- Notar
- Član porote
- Drugo

Appendix 14: List of questions suggested by the ENCI to be added to the ERA-survey

1.1. How often have you dealt with issues of EU or transnational law?

[Multiple-choice, only one answer possible]

- Every day
- At least once a month
- At least once every three months
- At least once a year
- Less than once a year
- Never

1.2. (a) In what type of cases?

[Multiple-choice, more than one answer possible]

- Purely domestic cases
- Cross-border cases
- Other, namely:

(b) In which domain of law?

[Multiple-choice, more than one answer possible]

- Criminal law
More specifically: ...
- Civil law
More specifically: ...
- Administrative law
More specifically: ...
- Commercial law
More specifically: ...
- Constitutional law, including human rights
More specifically: ...
- Other, namely: ...

1.3. What is your knowledge of the European law system?

(a) I have a good knowledge of when to apply European law directly

- Yes
- Rather yes
- Neutral
- Rather no
- No

(b) I have a good knowledge of when to refer a preliminary question

- Yes
- Rather yes
- Neutral
- Rather no
- No

(c) I have a good knowledge on how to refer a preliminary question

- Yes
- Rather yes
- Neutral
- Rather no
- No

1.4. (a) Did you get any support in finding out the applicable law?

[Multiple-choice, only one answer possible]

- Yes
- No

(b) If yes, for what kind of support did you seek?

[Multiple-choice, more than one answer possible]

- Online international database (Eur-Lex, Curia, etc. ...)
- Online national database
- Other website, namely: ...
- Law books and journals
- European judicial networks / other networks
- Domestic informal contact person
- Foreign informal contact person
- External legal advisor
- In-court legal advisor
- Other, namely: ...

1.5. I would like to receive specific judicial training concerning:

[Multiple-choice, more than one answer possible]

- The European arrest warrant
- (list to be completed)



Judicial Training in the EU Study for the European Parliament

European Judicial Training Conference
Budapest, 9 March 2011

John Coughlan
Project Leader / Deputy Director, ERA



Judicial Training in the EU Study for the European Parliament



- Study commissioned by European Parliament Secretariat for EP Legal Affairs Committee (Service contract IP/C/JURI/IC/2010-136)
- Consortium composed of ERA and EJTN
- Research to be conducted by:
 - Research team (ERA staff)
 - Expert group of judicial training professionals
 - Research Advisory Committee



Judicial Training in the EU Study for the European Parliament



Research Advisory Committee:

- Josef Azizi, Judge, General Court of the EU
- Miguel Carmona Ruano, President, ENCJ
- Nial Fennelly, Judge, Supreme Court, Ireland
- Victor Hall, Secretary General (outgoing), EJTN
- Pauliine Koskelo, President, Supreme Court, Finland
- Luis Silva Pereira, Secretary General (incoming), EJTN
- Pál Solt, Director, Judicial Academy, Hungary
- Maja Tratnik, Judge, Supreme Court, Slovenia
- Virginijus Valančius, President, Supreme Admin. Court, Lithuania
- Ruud R. Winter, President, Trade & Industry Tribunal, The Hague

met on 25 February 2011 to approve methodology



Judicial Training in the EU Study for the European Parliament



Aims of the study:

- In-depth analysis of judicial training in EU and other Member States' law
- Inventory of training methods, schools and institutions
- Recommendations on best practice and how to address possible shortcomings



Judicial Training in the EU Study for the European Parliament



Scope of the study:

- 27 EU Member States
- “Judicial training” = training of:
 - professional judges, incl. administrative judges
 - public prosecutors
 - court staff who have legal training and who
 - (a) help prepare judgments
 - (b) make preliminary judicial decisions or
 - (c) play a role in judicial cooperation



Judicial Training in the EU Study for the European Parliament



Study must have 4 parts:

1. Profiles of judicial training actors at EU level
2. Profiles of judicial training actors in EU Member States
3. Examples of best practices in judicial training
4. National reports based on survey of individual judges, prosecutors and court staff



Judicial Training in the EU Study for the European Parliament



Research team will survey:

- Individual judges, prosecutors and court staff
- Judicial training actors at EU and Member State level
- Stakeholders in judicial training at EU level (judges' associations, legal professions et al.)



Judicial Training in the EU Study for the European Parliament



Survey of judges, prosecutors and court staff

- Focus on experiences of judicial training: who, what, why, where, when?
- Aim to gather examples of best practice and suggestions for improvement
- Results to be analysed by expert group of judicial training professionals representing diversity of European judicial cultures



Judicial Training in the EU Study for the European Parliament



Survey of judges, prosecutors and court staff

- Questionnaire available in 22 EU languages
- To be completed online (alternatives possible)
- Responses will be anonymous but respondents will be asked to identify themselves with an e-mail address to ensure security
- Target of 4% response rate for each country



Judicial Training in the EU Study for the European Parliament



Survey of judges, prosecutors and court staff

- Launch: Monday 21 March 2011
- Distinct distribution strategies for each Member State
- Deadline for responses: Friday 15 April 2011
- Follow-up measures to be taken for countries in which target response rate not reached



Judicial Training in the EU Study for the European Parliament



Survey of judicial training actors

- Focus on current state of judicial training, especially training on EU law
- Aims to gather data for profiles of judicial training actors at EU and national level
- Also asks about EU action and cooperation
- Complements Eur. Commission consultation



Judicial Training in the EU Study for the European Parliament



Survey of judicial training actors

- Online questionnaire in English
- Launch: Monday 14 March 2011
- Deadline for responses: Friday 8 April 2011



Judicial Training in the EU Study for the European Parliament



Survey of EU judicial training “stakeholders”

- European associations of judges, prosecutors and court staff
- Other legal professions
- ECJ, Eurojust, EJN ...



Judicial Training in the EU Study for the European Parliament



Survey of EU judicial training “stakeholders”

- Training needs analysis
- Evaluation of existing provision
- Examples of best practice

Timescale: March-May



Judicial Training in the EU Study for the European Parliament



Timeframe

March-April 2011	Distribution of surveys
May-June 2011	Analysis of responses and compilation of national reports
July 2011	Delivery of interim results to the European Parliament
July-Sept 2011	Analysis of remaining data and preparation of draft final study
October 2011	Delivery of final study to the European Parliament



Judicial Training in the EU Study for the European Parliament



Study website
www.judicialtraining.eu
(active from 14 March 2011)

Contact

Project leader: John Coughlan - jcoughlan@era.int
Project researcher: Jaroslav Opravil - jopravil@era.int



**JUDICIAL TRAINING IN THE EU
STUDY FOR THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT**

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR JUDGES & PROSECUTORS

1. ABOUT YOU

- 1.1. Country of work:
- 1.2. Your position:
 - Judge
 - Prosecutor
 - Court staff*
 - Trainee judge
 - Trainee prosecutor
- 1.3. With what type of cases do you deal? (more than one answer possible)
 - Civil
 - Commercial
 - Criminal
 - Family
 - Administrative, social or tax
 - Employment or labour
 - Other
- 1.4. At which level of the national judicial system do you work? (more than one answer possible)
 - First instance
 - Second instance
 - Higher instance
 - Supreme instance
 - Not applicable
- 1.5. Your age:
- 1.6. Number of years since you were first appointed (as judge/prosecutor/court staff):

2. ACADEMIC LEGAL STUDIES

2. (a) Did you study EU law, the European Convention on Human Rights or another Member State's law as part of your law degree?

- Yes
- No (please go to Q 3.)

(b) If yes, which and how useful this has been in the course of your judicial career?

	Very	To some extent	Only to a minor extent	Not at all
EU law				
ECHR				
Another Member State's law				

3. INITIAL TRAINING

- 3.1. Did you complete any additional initial training prior to assuming judicial or prosecutorial functions? Yes / No
- 3.2. (a) If yes, was EU law, the European Convention on Human Rights or another Member State's law part of it? Yes / No

* "Court staff" is defined as persons working in courts who are not judges but who have legal training and who (a) help prepare judgments, (b) make judicial decisions at least at a preliminary phase or (c) play a role in cross-border judicial cooperation.

(b) If yes, which and how useful this has been in the course of your judicial career?

	Very	To some extent	Only to a minor extent	Not at all
EU law				
ECHR				
Another Member State's law				

3.3. Did you have to pass any test(s) in order to enter the judicial or prosecutorial profession?

Yes / No (please go to Q 4.)

3.4. (a) If yes, did this include an examination of your knowledge of EU law, the European Convention on Human Rights or another Member State's law? Yes / No (please go to Q 4.)

(b) If yes, which? (more than one answer possible)

- EU law
- ECHR
- Another Member State's law

4. CONTINUOUS TRAINING IN AREAS OTHER THAN EU LAW

4.1. Have you ever participated in judicial training on a subject *other than* EU law or another Member State's law (training in EU law and other Member States' law will be addressed in the next question)? Yes / No (please go to Q 4.3.)

4.2. (a) If yes, who organised it? (more than one answer possible)

- Court
- Prosecution office
- Local or regional judicial training institute
- Your national judicial training institute
- Council of the judiciary
- Ministry
- European training institute
- Judicial training institute of another Member State
- University
- Private company
- Other

(b) What was the subject? (more than one answer possible)

- Administrative law
- Civil law
- Commercial law (including company law, intellectual property, insolvency law etc.)
- Constitutional law (including national human rights law)
- Criminal law
- ECHR
- Environmental law
- Family law
- Labour law
- Procedural skills
- Soft skills
- Other

(c) Did you find it useful in your subsequent career?

- Very
- To some extent
- Only to a minor extent
- Not at all

(d) When was the last time you participated in judicial training in areas other than EU law or other Member States' law?

- In the last year
- In the last three years
- In the last five years
- In the last ten years

- More than ten years ago
- (e) How long was the training?
 - Less than one day
 - One day
 - Two days
 - Three days
 - Up to one week
 - More than one week
- 4.3. If not, why? (more than one answer possible)
 - No such training available
 - No time
 - Not interested
 - Not necessary
 - No funding available
 - Permission denied by superior
 - Other

5. CONTINUOUS TRAINING IN EU LAW OR OTHER MEMBER STATES' LAW

- 5.1. Have you ever participated in judicial training in the field of EU law or another Member State's law? Yes / No (please go to Q 5.3.)
- 5.2. (a) If yes, which? (more than one answer possible)
 - EU law
 - Another Member State's law
- (b) Who organised it? (more than one answer possible)
 - Court
 - Prosecution office
 - Local or regional judicial training institute
 - Your national judicial training institute
 - Council of the judiciary
 - Ministry
 - European training institute
 - Judicial training institute of another Member State
 - University
 - Private company
 - Other
- (c) What was the subject? (more than one answer possible)
 - Administrative law
 - Civil law
 - Commercial law (including company law, intellectual property, insolvency law etc.)
 - Constitutional law (including human rights law)
 - Criminal law
 - ECHR
 - Environmental law
 - EU institutional law
 - Family law
 - Labour law
 - Procedural skills
 - Other
- (d) Did you find it useful in your subsequent career?
 - Very
 - To some extent
 - Only to a minor extent
 - Not at all
- (e) What was your motivation to participate? (more than one answer possible)
 - I had an immediate need for training (e.g. related to case)
 - I need it for my work in the long term

- My superior asked me to take part
 - I had to do it in order to be eligible for promotion
 - I am generally interested in EU and/or other Member States' law
 - Other
- (f) When was the last time you participated in judicial training on EU law or other Member States' law?
- In the last year
 - In the last three years
 - In the last five years
 - In the last ten years
 - More than ten years ago
- (g) How long was the training?
- Less than one day
 - One day
 - Two days
 - Three days
 - Up to one week
 - More than one week
- 5.3. If not, why? (more than one answer possible)
- No such training available
 - No time
 - Not interested
 - Not necessary
 - No funding available
 - Permission denied by superior
 - Other

6. LANGUAGE TRAINING

6.1. What is your principal working language?

6.2. Do you know another EU language? Yes / No (please go to Q 6.4.)

6.3. If yes, which language(s) and to what level?

	Reading	Writing	Speaking
	<input type="radio"/> Basic <input type="radio"/> Independent <input type="radio"/> Proficient	<input type="radio"/> Basic <input type="radio"/> Independent <input type="radio"/> Proficient	<input type="radio"/> Basic <input type="radio"/> Independent <input type="radio"/> Proficient

6.4. Have you ever received language training in the course of your career? Yes / No (please go to Q 6.6.)

6.5. If yes, did you find it useful in your subsequent career?

- Very
- To some extent
- Only to a minor extent
- Not at all

6.6. (a) If not, why? (more than one answer possible)

- No such training available
- No time
- Not interested
- Not necessary
- No funding available
- Permission denied by superior
- Other

(b) Would you consider participating in language training? Yes / No (please go to Q 6.6.(d))

(c) If yes, why? (more than one answer possible)

- In the course of my work I am regularly in contact with parties speaking that language
- I need it for my work in the long term

- My superior wants me to improve my languages
 - I need to speak another language in order to be eligible for promotion
 - I am generally interested in languages
 - Other
- (d) If not, why? (more than one answer possible)
- No such training available
 - No time
 - Not interested
 - Not necessary
 - No funding available
 - Permission denied by superior
 - Other

7. DEALING WITH ISSUES OF EU LAW

7.1. What is your knowledge of the European law system?

	Very	To some extent	Only to a minor extent	Not at all
(a) I have a good knowledge of when to apply EU law directly				
(b) I have a good knowledge of <i>when</i> to refer a preliminary question to the European Court of Justice				
(c) I have a good knowledge of <i>how</i> to refer a preliminary question to the European Court of Justice				

7.2. How relevant do you assess the knowledge of EU law for your judicial or prosecutorial functions?

- Very
- To some extent
- Only to a minor extent
- Not at all

7.3. How often do you deal with issues of EU law?

- At least once a week
- At least once a month
- At least once every three months
- At least once a year
- Less than once a year
- Never (please go to Q 8.)

7.4. (a) In what type of cases? (more than one answer possible)

- Purely domestic cases
- Cross-border cases
- Other

(b) In which area of law? (more than one answer possible)

- Administrative law
- Civil law
- Commercial law (including company law, intellectual property, insolvency law etc.)
- Constitutional law (including human rights law)
- Criminal law
- Environmental law
- Family law
- Labour law
- Other

7.5. Has the number of cases involving EU law increased over the years? Yes / No

- 7.6. (a) Did you get any support in finding out or understanding the applicable law? Yes / No (please go to Q 7.7.)
- (b) If yes, from which source? (more than one answer possible)
- Reference by counsel
 - Legal advisor within the court or prosecution service
 - External legal advisor
 - Domestic informal contact person
 - Foreign informal contact person
 - Online national database
 - Online EU database (Eur-Lex, Curia, etc.)
 - Law books and journals
 - European judicial networks
 - Other
- 7.7. Has any training you have received been helpful in deciding such a case? Yes / No
- 7.8. (a) On which EU law matters would you like more training? (more than one answer possible)
- General principles of EU law
 - Judicial cooperation in civil matters I: Jurisdiction and recognition & enforcement of judgments in civil and commercial matters ("Brussels I"), service of documents, evidence, European payment order, small claims procedure and other civil justice instruments
 - Judicial cooperation in civil matters II: Jurisdiction and the recognition & enforcement in matrimonial and parental responsibility matters ("Brussels II bis") and other family law matters
 - Judicial cooperation in civil matters III: Regulations on the law applicable in contractual ("Rome I") and non-contractual ("Rome II") obligations
 - Judicial cooperation in criminal matters: European arrest warrant and other criminal justice instruments
 - Substantive areas of EU criminal law (organised crime; money laundering; corruption; trafficking in human beings; cybercrime; etc.)
 - Preliminary reference procedure
 - Regular updates on selected areas of substantive EU law
 - Other
- (b) If you selected "regular updates", on which areas of law? (more than one answer possible)
- Administrative law
 - Civil law
 - Commercial law (including company law, intellectual property, insolvency law etc.)
 - Constitutional law (including human rights law)
 - Criminal law
 - Environmental law
 - Family law
 - Labour law

8. CONTACTS WITH FOREIGN JUDGES & PROSECUTORS

- 8.1. Have you ever contacted a foreign judge, prosecutor or other authority in connection with a case? Yes / No
- 8.2. Are you aware of the following existing fora for contacts with foreign judges and prosecutors? (more than one answer possible)
- European Judicial Network in Civil and Commercial Matters
 - European Judicial Network in Criminal Matters
 - Eurojust
- 8.3. (a) Have you ever taken part in an exchange with judges and/or prosecutors from other Member States? Yes / No (go to Q 8.4.)
- (b) If yes, in which framework?
- EJTN

- Bilateral
 - Other
- (c) How useful was it?
- Very
 - To some extent
 - Only to a minor extent
 - Not at all
- 8.4. (a) Would you appreciate measures to make it easier to have contacts with foreign judges and/or prosecutors? Yes / No
- (b) If yes, which? (more than one answer possible)
- More exchanges
 - More joint training
 - Online database/directory
 - Other

9. BEST PRACTICE IN JUDICIAL TRAINING

If possible, please provide your answers to this section in English; if not, your comments will be translated into English.

- 9.1. Based on your professional experience to date, please give an example of what you regard as best practice in judicial training.

Methodology, e.g.: Case studies; Moot/mock courts; Role-play	
Format, e.g.: Conferences; Round-table discussions; Interactive workshops; E-learning; Blended learning (combination of e- and face-to-face learning)	
Funding, e.g.: EU co-funding; EU tender; Contribution by participants	
Composition of participants, e.g.: Judges and prosecutors from different countries; Judges and prosecutors at the same or at different stages of their careers; Judges and/or prosecutors together with lawyers in private practice	

- 9.2. If you have taken part in European judicial training organised by the different training bodies/networks, including academic institutions and professional organisations, how useful was it for your judicial practice?

Name of organisation	Year of training	Very	To some extent	Only to a minor extent	Not at all

- 9.3. Would you have any suggestions for improving and increasing participation in judicial training in EU law?