

Continuous Improvement

Court User Satisfaction Survey 2011

Report for Scottish Court Service

November 2011

Document Control

Project Title: Court User Satisfaction Survey 2011

MVA Project Number: C3A41500

Document Type: Final Report

Directory & File Name: G:\Contracts\Contracts Live\C3A41500_Court User Satisfaction Survey 2011-2015\02 - 2011 Survey\08 - Reporting\03_Final Report\Final Report Delivered.Doc

Document Approval

Primary Author(s): Elaine Wilson Smith and Shirley McCoard

Reviewer(s): Kate Skellington Orr

Formatted by: Elaine Wilson Smith

Distribution

Issue	Date	Distribution	Comments
1	12/09/2011	Kate Skellington Orr	Draft for Review
2	14/09/2011	Ian Clark	Draft for Review
3	31/10/11	Kate Skellington Orr	Final Report for Review
4	1/11/11	Ian Clark	Final Report Submitted

This report, and information or advice which it contains, is provided by MVA Consultancy Ltd solely for internal use and reliance by its Client in performance of MVA Consultancy Ltd's duties and liabilities under its contract with the Client. Any advice, opinions, or recommendations within this report should be read and relied upon only in the context of the report as a whole. The advice and opinions in this report are based upon the information made available to MVA Consultancy Ltd at the date of this report and on current UK standards, codes, technology and construction practices as at the date of this report.

Following final delivery of this report to the Client, MVA Consultancy Ltd will have no further obligations or duty to advise the Client on any matters, including development affecting the information or advice provided in this report. This report has been prepared by MVA Consultancy Ltd in their professional capacity as Consultants. The contents of the report do not, in any way, purport to include any manner of legal advice or opinion. This report is prepared in accordance with the terms and conditions of MVA Consultancy Ltd's contract with the Client. Regard should be had to those terms and conditions when considering and/or placing any reliance on this report. Should the Client wish to release this report to a Third Party for that party's reliance, MVA Consultancy Ltd may, at its discretion, agree to such release provided that:

- (a) MVA Consultancy Ltd's written agreement is obtained prior to such release, and
- (b) by release of the report to the Third Party, that Third Party does not acquire any rights, contractual or otherwise, whatsoever against MVA Consultancy Ltd and MVA Consultancy Ltd, accordingly, assume no duties, liabilities or obligations to that Third Party, and
- (c) MVA Consultancy Ltd accepts no responsibility for any loss or damage incurred by the Client or for any conflict of MVA Consultancy Ltd's interests arising out of the Client's release of this report to the Third Party.

Contents

1	Introduction	1.1
1.1	Introduction	1.1
1.2	Methodology	1.1
1.3	Reporting Conventions and Caveats	1.5
2	Response Rate and Sample Profile	2.1
2.1	Response Rates	2.1
2.2	Sheriffdom	2.1
2.3	User Groups	2.2
2.4	Respondent Demographics	2.5
2.5	Particular Facilities	2.6
3	Attending Court	3.1
3.1	Previous Visits to the Court	3.1
3.2	Travel to Court	3.3
3.3	Finding Way Around the Court Building	3.5
4	Satisfaction with Court Staff	4.1
4.1	Contact with Court Staff	4.1
4.2	Helpfulness of Court Staff	4.2
4.3	Politeness of Court Staff	4.4
5	Information Provided	5.1
5.1	Information Upon Arrival	5.1
5.2	Update Information	5.3
5.3	Information Provided to Jurors by SCS	5.6
5.4	Further Information Respondents Would Have Liked	5.7
5.5	SCS Website	5.8
6	Waiting in Court	6.1
6.1	Waiting to Take Part in Court Proceedings	6.1
6.2	Waiting to be Served at a Public Counter	6.5
6.3	Updates from Court Staff	6.6
7	Catering and Other Court Facilities	7.1
7.1	Use of Catering Facilities	7.1
7.2	Satisfaction with Catering Facilities	7.2
7.3	Other Court Facilities Used	7.4
7.4	Perceptions of Safety and Security	7.5

8	Overall Satisfaction	8.1
8.1	Overall Satisfaction with the Scottish Court Service	8.1
8.2	Overall Satisfaction by Sheriffdom	8.2
8.3	Overall Satisfaction by Core User Group	8.2
8.4	Service Development	8.3
9	Key Driver Analysis	9.1
9.1	Key Drivers of Overall Satisfaction	9.1
10	Changes Over Time	10.1
10.1	Introduction	10.1
10.2	Weighting	10.1
10.3	Aggregate Analysis	10.3
10.4	Within Sheriffdom Analysis	10.4
11	Summary	11.1

Tables

Table 1.1	Workload of Courts Surveyed	1.2
Table 1.2	Court User Typologies	1.3
Table 2.1	Reasons for Non-Participation	2.1
Table 2.2	Interviews Achieved by Sheriffdom	2.2
Table 2.3	Reasons Non-Professionals were Attending Court	2.2
Table 2.4	Capacity of Professionals Attending Court	2.3
Table 2.5	Reasons Professional Court Users were Attending Court	2.4
Table 2.6	Number of Respondents in Clustered User Groups	2.4
Table 2.7	Age of Respondents	2.5
Table 2.8	Ethnicity of Respondents	2.6
Table 3.1	Previous Visits to the Court by Sheriffdom	3.1
Table 3.2	Previous Visits to the Court by User Group	3.2
Table 3.3	Mode of Travel to Court	3.3
Table 3.4	Length of Time the Journey to Court Took	3.4
Table 3.5	Distance Travelled to Get to Court	3.4
Table 3.6	Source of Directions Upon Arrival	3.5
Table 4.1	Contact with Court Staff by Sheriffdom	4.1
Table 4.2	Contact with Court Staff by User Group	4.2
Table 4.3	Helpfulness of Court Staff by Sheriffdom	4.3
Table 4.4	Helpfulness of Court Staff by User Group	4.3
Table 4.5	Politeness of Court Staff by Sheriffdom	4.4
Table 4.6	Politeness of Court Staff by User Group	4.5
Table 5.1	Information Provided Upon Arrival by Sheriffdom	5.1
Table 5.2	Information Provided Upon Arrival by User Group	5.2
Table 5.3	Accuracy of Information Upon Arrival by Sheriffdom	5.3
Table 5.4	Update Information Provided by Sheriffdom	5.4

Contents

Table 5.5	Update Information Provided by User Group	5.5
Table 5.6	Helpfulness of Information by Sheriffdom	5.6
Table 5.7	Use of the Scottish Court Website by User Group	5.8
Table 5.8	Reasons for Using the Website	5.9
Table 5.9	Ease of Finding the Information Needed on the SCS Website	5.10
Table 6.1	Waiting to Take Part in Court Proceedings by Sheriffdom	6.1
Table 6.2	Waiting to Take Part in Court Proceedings by User Group	6.2
Table 6.3	Length of Time They Had to Wait	6.2
Table 6.4	Satisfaction with Waiting Time by Sheriffdom	6.3
Table 6.5	Satisfaction with Waiting Time by User Group	6.4
Table 6.6	Waiting to be Served at a Counter by Sheriffdom	6.5
Table 6.7	Waiting to be Served at a Counter by User Group	6.5
Table 6.8	Length of Time They Had to Wait	6.6
Table 6.9	Respondents Who Received Court Staff Updates by Sheriffdom	6.7
Table 6.10	Respondents Who Received Court Staff Updates by User Group	6.7
Table 6.11	Satisfaction with Being Kept Informed by Sheriffdom	6.8
Table 6.12	Satisfaction with Being Kept Informed By User Group	6.9
Table 6.13	Respondents Told Why They Had To Wait By Sheriffdom	6.10
Table 6.14	Respondents Told Why They Had To Wait By User Group	6.11
Table 6.15	Satisfaction with Explanation of Wait by Sheriffdom	6.12
Table 6.16	Satisfaction with Explanation of Wait by User Group	6.13
Table 7.1	Use of Catering Facilities by Sheriffdom	7.1
Table 7.2	Type of Catering Facilities Used	7.1
Table 7.3	Use of Other Court Facilities	7.4
Table 7.4	Satisfaction with Safety and Security of Facilities	7.5
Table 7.5	Satisfaction with Safety and Security of Facilities	7.6
Table 8.1	Overall Satisfaction with SCS	8.1
Table 8.2	Overall Satisfaction by Sheriffdom	8.2
Table 8.3	Overall Satisfaction by Core User Group	8.3
Table 10.1	Clustered Typologies for 'User Group within Sheriffdom' Weighting	10.2
Table 10.2	Total Sample: Mean Scores 2009 and 2011	10.3
Table 10.3	Glasgow and Strathkelvin: Mean Scores 2009 and 2011	10.5
Table 10.4	Grampian, Highland and Islands: Mean Scores 2009 and 2011	10.6
Table 10.5	Lothian and Borders: Mean Scores 2009 and 2011	10.7
Table 10.6	North Strathclyde: Mean Scores 2009 and 2011	10.8
Table 10.7	South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway: Mean Scores 2009 and 2011	10.9
Table 10.8	Tayside, Central and Fife: Mean Scores 2009 and 2011	10.10
Table 10.9	High Court and Court of Session: Mean Scores 2009 and 2011	10.11

Figures

Figure 8.1	Overall Satisfaction (2005-2011)	8.1
------------	----------------------------------	-----

Appendices

Appendix A	Crosstabulations for Core Satisfaction Scores
Appendix B	Survey Questionnaire

Summary

Introduction

The Scottish Court Service (SCS) has conducted satisfaction surveys with public and professional court users since 2005. This report presents the findings from the 2011 survey.

The survey is designed to derive a measure of court users' overall satisfaction with the services provided, and to collect data on satisfaction with individual service elements, including waiting times; comfort, cleanliness, and safety and security of the court building and facilities; information provided; and interaction with court staff.

As with previous sweeps of the survey, an exit survey of all users of all courts across the SCS estate was designed to canvass views on court facilities and the various services provided. Broad quotas were applied to ensure coverage of all user groups, however, interviewers based at the court invited people to take part as they left the court building on the basis that the next available person was approached. Data were collected by combining interviewer administered questionnaires and self-completion questionnaires.

The survey period covered nine weeks between May and July 2011 and a total of 64 courts were surveyed. This involved carrying out interviews at all 49 Sheriff Courts across the six sheriffdoms, the Court of Session, the three permanent locations of the High Court of Justiciary, and 11 Justice of the Peace Courts.

Sample Profile

In total, 2905 individuals took part in the survey, of which 76% were classified as non-professional users and 24% were attending court in their professional capacity on the day that they were surveyed.

Interviews were carried out in each of Scotland's six sheriffdoms and, for analysis purposes, the High Court and Court of Session were grouped together as if they were a seventh sheriffdom. The achieved sample was distributed as follows:

- Glasgow and Strathkelvin = 12%;
- Grampian, Highland and Islands = 17%;
- Lothian and Borders = 12%;
- North Strathclyde = 15%;
- South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway = 16%;
- Tayside, Central and Fife = 19%; and
- Court of Session and High Court = 9%.

Over half of the respondents were male (61%) and just over two thirds (67%) were between the ages of 16 and 44. The majority (87%) of respondents described themselves as White Scottish. Two per cent of respondents stated that they had a longstanding illness, disability or infirmity which meant that they required particular facilities when using public buildings.

Survey Results

Generally, high levels of satisfaction were reported with nearly all aspects of the service delivered by the SCS.

Attending Court

Nearly three quarters (72%) of respondents indicated that they had previously visited the court in which they were surveyed. Respondents were less likely to have previously visited the High Court and Court of Session (38%) compared to other sheriffdoms. Unsurprisingly, almost all Advocates, Solicitors and Solicitor Advocates (96%) and other professionals (95%) had previously visited the court in which they were surveyed, while over three quarters (78%) of accused in a criminal case and supporters of accused had also previously visited the court.

Travel to Court

Almost a third (31%) of respondents stated that they had travelled to court on the day of the survey as a car driver, with a further 15% stating that they were a car passenger. A quarter (25%) stated that they travelled to court by bus.

Over three quarters of respondents (78%) had travelled for up to 30 minutes to attend court. Visitors to courts in North Strathclyde and Tayside, Central and Fife seemed to have the quickest journeys when compared to other sheriffdoms.

Satisfaction with Court Staff

The majority of respondents (83%) had spoken to court staff during their visit. This ranged from 70% in Tayside, Central and Fife to 91% in South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway. Meanwhile, the majority of victims in a criminal case and supporters of victims (92%) and people visiting the public counter/fines office (94%) stated that they had had contact with court staff, with accused in a criminal case and supporters of accused (73%) the least likely to say that they had had contact with court staff.

The majority of these respondents stated that they had found court staff to be either 'very' or 'fairly' helpful (95%) and either 'very' or 'fairly' polite (96%). There was little difference in the results when disaggregated by sheriffdom and user group.

Information Provided

Fewer than half (48%) of all respondents said that, when they arrived at court, court staff explained what was going to happen and what they should do, while 16% said this was not the case. A further 36% said that it was not applicable for them to have been given an explanation. Most of those who received an explanation, however, indicated that they had found it either 'very' or 'fairly' accurate (97%).

Similarly, less than half (46%) of all respondents stated that court staff had kept them informed about what was happening during the time they were in the court building, while 20% said that they had not. A further 34% said that it was not applicable for them to have been kept informed. However, the majority of respondents (96%) who were given update information said that this information was either 'very' or 'fairly' helpful.

Summary

All jurors (both selected and non-selected) were asked if they had received any information about jury service from the SCS before they arrived at court. As many as 87% reported that they had received such information. Of these jurors, 91% stated that this information was either 'very' or 'fairly' helpful.

Only 10% of the whole sample stated that they would have liked further information from court staff. Information that respondents said they would have liked included information about when trials would start, how long they would last, and how long people should expect to be kept waiting at the court.

Satisfaction with the SCS Website

Just over a quarter (26%) of respondents said they had used the SCS website in the last twelve months. Advocates, Solicitors and Solicitor Advocates were the most frequent users of the website (92%), followed by other professionals (60%). People visiting the public counter/fines office (6%) and victims, and supporters of victims, in a criminal case (3%) were the least likely to have accessed the website in the last 12 months.

The main reason given for visiting the website was 'to obtain information on daily court business' (85%), followed by 'to obtain court addresses/phone numbers/direction to courts' (49%). The majority of respondents indicated that they found the information they were looking for on the website either 'very' or 'fairly' easy to find.

Waiting in Court

Just over half of all respondents (55%) said that they had had to wait to take part in court proceedings. Respondents who stated that they were attending court to visit the public counter were not asked this question. Around two thirds of respondents in Grampian, Highland and Islands (68%), Glasgow and Strathkelvin (65%) and North Strathclyde (60%) said that they had had to wait. Conversely, over half of the respondents in Lothian and Borders (58%) and the High Court and Court of Session (62%) said that they did not have to wait.

Responses were relatively evenly split across the four specified waiting time periods (up to 30 minutes; 31 minutes to 1 hour; over 1 hour and up to 2 hours; and over 2 hours) with regard to how long respondents had had to wait. It appears that waiting times in the High Court and Court of Session were slightly less than in any other sheriffdom.

Over half of the respondents said that they were either 'very' or 'fairly' satisfied (52%) with their wait to take part in court proceedings. A further 19% said they were either 'very' or 'fairly' dissatisfied, and 29% said they were 'neither satisfied nor dissatisfied'.

Only 12% of respondents said that they had had to wait to be served at the public counter, including the main reception. Almost all of these respondents said that they had had to wait up to 15 minutes (99%), with a majority stating that they were 'very' or 'fairly' satisfied (91%) with this time.

Those respondents who waited, either to take part in court proceedings or at a counter, were asked to specify whether court staff provided updates about how much longer they were likely to have to wait and why they had to wait. Similar proportions stated that they were given updates (40%) or were not given updates (42%) about waiting times. Meanwhile, 44% stated they were told why they were waiting, compared to 38% who said they were not told.

Summary

Almost two thirds of respondents (63%) who either had or had not been given updates about waiting times, stated that they were 'very' or 'fairly' satisfied with court staffs' attempts to keep them informed about waiting times. Similarly, 65% said that they were 'very' or 'fairly' satisfied with court staffs' attempts to keep them informed about why they had had to wait.

Catering and Other Facilities

Only 24% (n=580) of respondents indicated that they had used any of the catering/vending facilities in the court building on the day of the survey. The type of facility used most was a cafeteria, used by 60% of respondents.

Nearly two thirds (64%) of respondents indicated that they were either 'very' or 'fairly' satisfied with the range of food and drink available. However, this ranged from 46% in Glasgow and Strathkelvin to 79% in Tayside, Central and Fife.

With reference to the quality of the food and drink purchased, 70% stated that they were either 'very' or 'fairly' satisfied. This ranged from 47% in Glasgow and Strathkelvin to 79% in Lothian and Borders.

The service in cafeterias was rated very positively among those who had used these facilities, with 82% stating that they were either 'very' or 'fairly' satisfied.

Other Court Facilities Used

The court room was the type of court facility most commonly used by respondents on the day that they were surveyed, followed by waiting areas, the public entrance, and the toilets.

Levels of satisfaction were high in relation to both the comfort and security of all facilities; generally over two thirds of respondents stated that they were either 'very' or 'fairly' satisfied with each facility used. The only exceptions were in relation to the comfort (31%) and cleanliness (55%) of the cells, the comfort of the public entrance/area outside the court building (54%) and the waiting area/area outside the court room (59%).

Perceptions of Safety and Security

New questions were included in the 2011 survey to assess the safety and security of court facilities. There was a high level of satisfaction with regard to perceived safety and security, ranging from 80% for the cells to 96% for the jury room.

Overall Satisfaction

With reference to overall satisfaction, 83% of respondents stated that they were either 'very' or 'fairly' satisfied.

Results remain very positive when disaggregated by sheriffdom, with satisfaction ranging from 74% of respondents who were either 'very' or 'fairly' satisfied in Tayside, Central and Fife to 90% in the High Court and Court of Session.

Levels of satisfaction were similar for professional and non-professional users, with 85% of professional respondents, and 82% of non-professionals, stating that they were either 'very' or 'fairly' satisfied overall.

Service Development

Almost half (44%) of all respondents said they knew how to make a complaint or provide feedback, good or bad, about the services they had used whilst in the court building. A total of 504 respondents provided details of at least one aspect of the service provided by the SCS that they would change, while 1803 said that they would 'change nothing' or that they could not think of anything they would change.

The main suggestions by respondents who felt that there was a need for change included:

- more information and updates to be provided to them on court proceedings by court staff or on information boards;
- a generally more efficient service, resulting in reduced waiting times, including not being made to wait all day to find out they were not needed; and
- the provision of increased and improved catering/vending facilities; this included the provision of water coolers.

Key Drivers of Overall Satisfaction

To complement the descriptive statistical analyses detailed above, a Key Driver Analysis (KDA) was carried out.

This indicated that the main drivers of overall satisfaction were:

- satisfaction with court staffs' attempts to keep respondents informed about how much longer they were likely to have to wait; and
- satisfaction with helpfulness of the information provided by the court staff.

Comparisons Over Time

When comparing results from 2009 and 2011, the survey generally highlights an increase in satisfaction. Although the increase in the mean satisfaction score between 2009 and 2011 is not statistically significant, overall satisfaction has been recorded at its highest level since the survey began. Also, quality of food and drink available, comfort and cleanliness of the court room, cleanliness of the waiting areas, and the comfort of the toilets all showed a statistically significant increase in their mean scores from 2009 to 2011.

In addition, it is worth highlighting that there have been statistically significant improvements in overall satisfaction from 2009 to 2011 in Lothian and Borders and the High Court and Court of Session. This is particularly noteworthy since these two sheriffdoms have, in the past, shown some of the lowest levels of satisfaction.

As in previous years, the survey has, therefore, revealed generally positive feedback from users and a number of helpful comments which can assist the SCS to make further strides forward in meeting users' needs.

1 Introduction

1.1 Introduction

- 1.1.1 The Scottish Court Service (SCS) is a non-ministerial public body, established by the Judiciary and Courts (Scotland) Act 2008, to provide administrative support to the Scottish courts and judiciary and to the Office of the Public Guardian (OPG). It is responsible for delivering operational support to the High Court of Justiciary and the Court of Session and to sheriff courts and justice of the peace courts in over 70 locations across Scotland.
- 1.1.2 The aim of the 2008 Act, which came into being on 1 April 2010, was to ensure a more unified and independent Judiciary, to allow the SCS to identify and meet the needs of court users, and to engage effectively with other bodies within the justice system. This is set out in the SCS 2011-14 Corporate Plan¹.
- 1.1.3 SCS aims to positively build a stronger SCS and justice system by:
- improving the efficiency of internal processes;
 - maximising the opportunities offered by technology;
 - making better use of buildings;
 - developing the skills of staff; and
 - collaborating with other Justice bodies to achieve further system-wide improvements.
- 1.1.4 Given this commitment to providing a high quality service, SCS commissioned MVA Consultancy in May 2011 to conduct the latest in the series of Court User Satisfaction Surveys.

Court User Satisfaction Survey

- 1.1.5 The SCS has conducted court user satisfaction surveys of public and professional court users from 2005-09.
- 1.1.6 The survey is designed to derive a measure of court users' overall satisfaction with the services provided, and to collect data on satisfaction with individual service elements, including waiting times; comfort and cleanliness of the court building and facilities; information provided; and interaction with court staff.
- 1.1.7 This year, questions on satisfaction with the safety and security of the court buildings were also included.

1.2 Methodology

- 1.2.1 As with previous sweeps of the survey, an exit survey of all users of all courts across the SCS estate was designed to canvass views on court facilities and the various services provided. Broad quotas were applied to ensure coverage of all user groups, however,

¹ The SCS 2011-14 Corporate Plan can be found at http://www.scotcourts.gov.uk/courtsadmin/corporateplan/SCS_CorporatePlan2011-14.pdf

interviews were largely administered on a 'next-to-pass' basis (interviewers based at the court invited people to take part as they left the court building on the basis that the next available person was approached). Data were collected by combining interviewer administered questionnaires and self-completion questionnaires.

Survey Coverage

- 1.2.2 At least one interviewer day was allocated to each court building within the SCS estate in order to ensure the survey was representative. This involved carrying out interviews at all 49 Sheriff Courts across the six sheriffdoms, the Court of Session², the three permanent locations of the High Court of Justiciary, and 11 Justice of the Peace Courts.
- 1.2.3 Sheriffdom Legal Managers, responsible for the Justice of the Peace Courts, provided an indication of sites where footfall was likely to be insufficient to justify an interviewer presence. It was decided to concentrate days allocated to Justice of the Peace business to those courts located within specifically designated JP business buildings, rather than those convened in Sheriff Court buildings. Where Sheriff Courts and Justice of the Peace Courts were housed in the same building, the views of Justice of the Peace Court users were captured on same survey days allocated to the Sheriff Court³. This meant that, in total, 64 sites were surveyed.

Fieldwork Programming

- 1.2.4 The survey period covered nine weeks between May and July 2011. All Sheriff Clerks and Sheriffdom Legal Managers were contacted for each site to identify the most suitable fieldwork days within the allotted fieldwork period. As far as possible, this enabled fieldwork to be scheduled for days when the greatest footfall was anticipated, ensuring that opportunities for engaging with a broad mix of users were maximised throughout the survey.
- 1.2.5 A total of 113 interviewer days were scheduled, and a further eight days fieldwork were required to achieve sheriffdom quotas. Interviews were carried out in a mixture of high, medium and low workload courts. Table 1.1 summarises the number of courts surveyed which fell into each workload category.

Table 1.1 Workload of Courts Surveyed

High Workload (>1000 sitting days per annum)	Medium Workload (300-1000 sitting days per annum)	Low Workload (<300 sitting days per annum)
11	17	36

- 1.2.6 At all high workload courts, a total of four interviewer days were scheduled. Two interviewer days were scheduled at the medium workload courts, and one day was scheduled at all low workload courts. All Justice of the Peace Courts were classified as low workload courts, with the exception of Glasgow Justice of the Peace Court which was classified as a high workload court.

² The Court of Session sits in Parliament House in Edinburgh.

³ Where possible, interviewer days were scheduled for days that had both Sheriff Court and Justice of the Peace Court business scheduled.

User Profiles

- 1.2.7 Table 1.2 details the different user groups that fell within the scope of the survey. The typologies were derived from previous surveys and from other SCS intelligence⁴.

Table 1.2 Court User Typologies

Non-Professional Court Users (15)	
Accused in a criminal case	Victim in criminal case
Supporter of accused	Supporter of victim
Civil litigant	Visiting public counter/fines office
Supporter of civil litigant	Witness in criminal case
Witness in civil case	Supporter of criminal case witness
Supporter of civil case witness	Spectator/tourist
Juror (selected)	Other
Juror (not selected)	
Professional Court Users (21)	
Advocate (senior or junior)	Reliance staff
Advocate Depute	Safeguarder
Appropriate adult	Sheriff Officer/Messenger-at-Arms
Children's reporter	Shorthand writer
Crown junior	Social worker (or trainee social worker)
Expert witness	Solicitor (or trainee solicitor)
Interpreter	Solicitor Advocate
Police witness	Victim Support worker
Press reporter	Witness Service worker
Prison Service staff	Other
Procurator Fiscal/depute	

- 1.2.8 Members of the Judiciary, SCS staff (including all contracted staff) and people aged under 16 were ineligible to take part in the survey and were excluded via a screening process.

Data Collection Instruments

- 1.2.9 Data collection instruments were consistent with those used in previous sweeps of the survey. They included an interviewer administered questionnaire and a self-completion questionnaire. Both questionnaires included the same questions and response options to allow the final data to be merged for analysis purposes, and both were designed to be completed by non-professional and professional court users. Appropriate routing (asking respondents to skip questions that were not relevant to them) was highlighted where necessary, and appropriate screening was undertaken with both versions of the questionnaires to ensure that no ineligible court users participated.

⁴ It should be noted that the typologies have been expanded since the 2006 sweep. Additional options include 'supporter of civil litigant'; 'supporter of civil case witness'; and 'supporter of criminal case witness'.

1 Introduction

- 1.2.10 Interviewer distributed self-completion questionnaires were given to respondents in the equivalent of an exit survey. Self-completion questionnaires were used only to boost the sample where appropriate. For example, when a case adjourns or ends, many individuals connected to the case may exit the building simultaneously. In these situations, it is neither practical nor desirable to interview more than one person at a time as this may introduce a bias in responses. In these situations, one respondent would complete the questionnaire with the interviewer, while other individuals would be offered self-completion questionnaires. In addition, self-completion questionnaires were also offered to professional users who wished to take part, but who were unable to do so on site (for example, because they were too busy). These respondents were offered the opportunity to take the survey form away for completion.
- 1.2.11 Those courts that had jury trials scheduled during the fieldwork period were also sent packs of self-completion questionnaires to distribute. These were distributed to a sample of jurors by court staff at each site.
- 1.2.12 The questionnaires covered:
- use of the SCS website;
 - getting to court;
 - navigation around the court building;
 - the helpfulness and politeness of court staff;
 - information provided by court staff;
 - waiting in court;
 - use of the catering facilities;
 - use of other court facilities;
 - satisfaction with all the above, and overall satisfaction;
 - service development; and
 - user profile information.
- 1.2.13 For all questions which asked respondents to indicate their level of agreement with a particular statement (for example satisfaction, helpfulness, accuracy, etc.), respondents were asked to rate their feelings on a scale of one to five (with one being the least favourable and five being the most favourable response).

1.3 Reporting Conventions and Caveats

- 1.3.1 For ease of analysis, the Court of Session and the permanently sitting High Court locations (i.e. Edinburgh, Glasgow, and Aberdeen) were clustered together and treated as if they were a seventh sheriffdom. They are referred to throughout this report as the 'High Court and Court of Session'.
- 1.3.2 Any respondents interviewed at the High Court when it was sitting on circuit have been grouped within the geographic sheriffdom of the Sheriff Court at which they took part. As most facilities used by these respondents would have been relevant to the Sheriff Court building, it was considered more appropriate to classify their responses as such, rather than within the High Court and Court of Session group. However, where services/facilities differed, for example the information provided to jurors, analysis has been conducted based on the nature of the business they were attending for, i.e. disaggregated by jurisdiction level rather than sheriffdom.
- 1.3.3 When interpreting the data it should be noted that, as the true distribution of user types across the court estate is unknown, the sample can not be considered as representative. It instead represents the range of users who engage with SCS services on one particular day.
- 1.3.4 The combination of self-completion and interviewer administered questionnaire responses for analysis purposes may affect data purity. A decision to combine the two data sources was made in the interests of ensuring overall robust samples following segmentation of the data at the user group level. Any instances where questions received a low number of responses, which prevents statistically rigorous analysis and reporting, are identified in the text. This approach was consistent with earlier sweeps of the survey.
- 1.3.5 Where no respondents have provided a response, the symbol '-' has been used in tables, and where sample sizes are below 1%, the reporting convention <1% has been used, thereby allowing the reader to differentiate between true zero values and small sample sizes.

2 Response Rate and Sample Profile

2.1 Response Rates

- 2.1.1 A total of 4344 court users were invited to participate in the survey this year. Of these, 1187 (27%) declined, and a further 252 (6%) were ineligible for the reasons outlined in Table 2.1 below.

Table 2.1 Reasons for Non-Participation

		Number	%
Declined	Too busy/not enough time	831	58
	Already taken part at this court	100	7
	Already taken part elsewhere	109	7
	Do not wish to use Language Line ⁵	10	1
	Other	137	9
Ineligible	Member of the Judiciary/SCS staff	90	6
	Housekeeping/cleaning	12	1
	Catering service staff	16	1
	Security staff	28	2
	Maintenance staff	25	2
	Delivering goods	67	5
	Aged under 16	14	1
Total		1439	100

- 2.1.2 In total, 2905 useable interviews were achieved, a response rate of 67%. The breakdown of these responses by survey method was as follows:

- 2399 respondents completed an interviewer administered questionnaire;
- 319 respondents completed a self-completion questionnaire; and
- 187 respondents completed a self-completion juror questionnaire.

2.2 Sherifdom

- 2.2.1 Table 2.2 provides a breakdown of the number of interviews achieved by sherifdom. The number of interviews achieved was fairly evenly distributed between the sherifdoms, with slightly fewer interviews undertaken in the High Court and Court of Session.

⁵ Language Line is a facility for individuals whose first language is not English; it allows access to an interpreter via the telephone. Ten non-English speaking individuals were invited to take part in the survey using the language line to facilitate their participation, but this was refused in each case.

Table 2.2 Interviews Achieved by Sheriffdom

	Number	%
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	347	12
Grampian, Highland and Islands	485	17
Lothian and Borders	357	12
North Strathclyde	436	15
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	471	16
Tayside, Central and Fife	546	19
High Court and Court of Session	263	9
Total	2905	100

2.2.2 The total number of interviews achieved at each court is detailed in Table 2.1 (Appendix A).

2.3 User Groups

2.3.1 Around three quarters (76%, n=2196) of the respondents classified themselves as non-professionals. The reasons that non-professionals were attending court on the day of the survey are detailed in Table 2.3.

Table 2.3 Reasons Non-Professionals were Attending Court

	Number	%
Accused in criminal case	540	25
Supporter of accused	400	18
Civil litigant	55	2
Supporter of civil litigant	19	1
Witness in civil case	22	1
Supporter of civil case witness	2	<1
Juror (selected)	212	10
Juror (not selected)	82	4
Victim in criminal case	20	1
Supporter of victim	54	2
Visiting public counter/fines office	415	19
Witness in criminal case	171	8
Supporter of criminal case witness	47	2
Spectator/tourist	109	5
Other	48	2
Total	2196	100

2.3.2 Table 2.2 (Appendix A) provides a breakdown of the 'other' reasons that non-professionals were attending court.

2 Response Rate and Sample Profile

- 2.3.3 A total of 709 respondents (24%) indicated that they were attending court as part of their professional/working role. Table 2.4 details the capacity in which these professional respondents were attending court on the day of the survey.

Table 2.4 Capacity of Professionals Attending Court

	Number	%
Advocate (senior or junior)	10	1
Advocate depute	1	<1
Appropriate adult	1	<1
Children's reporter	5	1
Expert witness	13	2
Interpreter	29	4
Police witness	132	19
Press reporter	28	4
Prison service staff	3	<1
Procurator fiscal/depute	15	2
Reliance staff	34	5
Safeguarder	1	<1
Sheriff officer/messenger-at-arms	2	<1
Shorthand writer	4	1
Social worker (or trainee social worker)	45	6
Solicitor (or trainee solicitor)	284	40
Solicitor advocate	17	2
Victim support worker	6	1
Witness service worker	37	5
Other	42	6
Total	709	100

- 2.3.4 Table 2.3 (Appendix A) provide a breakdown of the 'other' reasons that professionals were attending court.

- 2.3.5 Professional court users were also asked to indicate the reasons they were attending court. A total of 613 respondents indicated at least one reason for their attendance, with some respondents indicating multiple reasons (a total of 645 responses). Three quarters (75%, n=457) of respondents stated that they were attending a criminal court. Table 2.5 provides a full breakdown of the reasons given by professional court users for attending court on the day that they were surveyed.

Table 2.5 Reasons Professional Court Users were Attending Court

	Number of Responses	% of Respondents
Attend criminal court	457	75
Attend civil court	77	13
Visit criminal office	11	2
Visit civil office	7	1
Visit cashiers office	1	<1
Visit commissary	2	<1
Visit fiscal's office	6	1
Visit in-court advisor/mediation services	5	1
Visit public counter/fines office	3	1
Visit social work office	5	1
Visit information and advice office	5	1
Permanent place of work	45	7
Other	21	3
Total	645	106

Note: Totals do not equal 100% due to multiple responses

- 2.3.6 Table 2.4 (Appendix A) provides a full breakdown of the 'other' reasons professionals were attending court.
- 2.3.7 In line with previous sweeps of the survey, the separate user typologies were condensed into eight clustered user groups for analysis purposes (six non-professional and two professional user groups). Table 2.6 details the number and percentage of respondents in each clustered group.

Table 2.6 Number of Respondents in Clustered User Groups

	Number	%
1 Accused in a criminal case and supporters of accused	940	32
2 Civil litigants, supporters of civil litigants, witnesses in a civil case and supporters of civil case witnesses	98	3
3 Jurors (selected and not-selected)	294	10
4 Victims in a criminal case and supporters of victims	74	3
5 People visiting the public counter/fines office	415	14
6 Witnesses in a criminal case, supporters of criminal case witnesses, spectators/tourists and others	375	13
7 Advocates, solicitors and solicitor advocates	311	11
8 All other professionals	398	14
Total	2905	100

2 Response Rate and Sample Profile

- 2.3.8 It should be noted that the core non-professional SCS user groups are clustered groups two, three and five above. These groups represent those whose experiences in court are most likely to reflect interaction with SCS staff and services. The experiences of non-core users are more likely to reflect factors that are more directly influenced by SCS's justice system partners.
- 2.3.9 A full breakdown of user group by sheriffdom can be found in Tables 2.5 and 2.6 in Appendix A.

2.4 Respondent Demographics

- 2.4.1 In total, of the respondents who disclosed their sex, 61% (n=1760) were male and 38% (n=1114) were female. A further 31 respondents (1%) did not provide details of their sex (refused/did not answer the question).
- 2.4.2 Table 2.7 provides a full breakdown of respondents' age groups. Just over two thirds (67%, n=1933) of respondents were between the ages of 16 and 44.

Table 2.7 Age of Respondents

	Number	%
16-24	544	19
25-34	752	26
35-44	637	22
45-54	561	19
55-64	311	11
65 or over	80	3
Not disclosed	20	<1
Total	2905	100

- 2.4.3 The majority (87%, n=2519) of respondents described themselves as White Scottish. Table 2.8 provides a full breakdown of respondents' ethnicity. Only 31 respondents did not disclose their ethnicity.

Table 2.8 Ethnicity of Respondents

	Number	%
White		
- Scottish	2519	87
- Other British	206	7
- Irish	26	1
- Gypsy/Traveller	-	-
- Polish	21	1
- Other	45	2
Mixed or Multiple Ethnic Groups		
- Any mixed or multiple ethnic groups	4	<1
Asian, Asian Scottish or Asian British		
- Pakistani, Pakistani Scottish or Pakistani British	25	1
- Indian, Indian Scottish or Indian British	8	<1
- Bangladeshi, Bangladeshi Scottish or Bangladeshi British	-	-
- Chinese, Chinese Scottish or Chinese British	1	<1
- Other	3	<1
African		
- African, African Scottish or African British	10	<1
Caribbean or Black		
- Caribbean, Caribbean Scottish or Caribbean British	1	<1
- Black, Black Scottish or Black British	-	-
Other Ethnic Group		
- Arab	2	<1
- Other	3	<1
Not Disclosed	31	1
Total	2905	100

2.5 Particular Facilities

- 2.5.1 Two percent (n=60) of respondents stated that they had a longstanding illness, disability or infirmity which meant that they required particular facilities when using public buildings.
- 2.5.2 Facilities required included a lift, parking close to the entrance, and more seats/comfortable seats. Particular problems mentioned included back problems, depression, and walking difficulties.
- 2.5.3 Of the respondents who specified that they required particular facilities, almost all commented on the extent to which their requirements were met. Just over half (56%, n=31) of the respondents who answered the question (n=55) stated that their requirements

2 Response Rate and Sample Profile

were fully met, 18% (n=10) said they were partially met, and 26% (n=14) stated they were not met at all. Six respondents did not answer the question.

- 2.5.4 Those respondents who stated that their special requirements were not met were asked to explain their reasons why. The most cited reasons included lack of lift facilities, not being able to tune into the induction loop system, and uncomfortable seating in waiting rooms.

Communication and/or Reading Needs

- 2.5.5 Most respondents' first language was English (95%, n=2769) with only 4% (n=101) stating that their first language was not English. A further 35 people (1%) did not answer the question.
- 2.5.6 Almost all respondents stated that they did not have particular communication or reading requirements (98%, n=2840), with 22 respondents (1%) stating that they did, and three respondents stating that they did not know. A further 40 respondents (1%) did not answer the question. When asked what their needs were, the main responses were dyslexia and difficulties with reading/writing.
- 2.5.7 Respondents who stated they had particular communication or reading requirements were asked if they used any facilities provided by the court. Of the 15 people who provided an answer, four stated they used induction loops and three said 'interpreter for the accused'. The remaining eight respondents said they did not use any services.
- 2.5.8 Those who did use the services were asked to rate their satisfaction with these. Only some of those who used the induction loops rated this service. Of the respondents who provided a response, two were 'very' or 'fairly' satisfied with the induction loop service, while two were 'very' or 'fairly' dissatisfied.

3 Attending Court

3.1 Previous Visits to the Court

- 3.1.1 Nearly three quarters (72%, n=2093) of respondents indicated that they had previously visited the court in which they were surveyed, while 27% (n=792) stated that it was their first visit. A further 20 people (1%) did not respond to this question.
- 3.1.2 Table 3.1 shows that respondents were less likely to have previously visited the High Court and Court of Session (38%, n=96) compared to courts in other sheriffdoms.

Table 3.1 Previous Visits to the Court by Sheriffdom

	Never Visited Before (%)	Previously Visited (%)	N
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	22	78	345
Grampian, Highland and Islands	23	77	485
Lothian and Borders	23	77	357
North Strathclyde	23	77	437
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	36	64	470
Tayside, Central and Fife	17	83	536
High Court and Court of Session	62	38	255
All Scotland	27	72	2885

Note: A further 1% (n=20) did not respond to this question.

3 Attending Court

3.1.3 Table 3.2 provides a breakdown of responses by user group. Almost all Advocates, Solicitors and Solicitor Advocates (96%, n=298), and other professionals (95%, n=373) had previously visited the court in which they were surveyed. Over three quarters (78%, n=724) of accused in a criminal case and supporters of accused had previously visited the court.

Table 3.2 Previous Visits to the Court by User Group

	Never Visited Before (%)	Previously Visited (%)	N
Accused in a criminal case and Supporters of accused	22	78	931
Civil litigant, Supporters of civil litigants, Witnesses in a civil case, and Supporters of civil case witnesses	36	64	98
Jurors (selected and not selected)	64	36	294
Victims in a criminal case and Supporters of victims	46	54	74
People visiting the public counter/fines office	30	70	412
Witnesses in a criminal case, Supporters of criminal case witnesses, Spectators/tourists, and Others	47	53	373
Advocates, Solicitors, and Solicitor Advocates	4	96	310
All other professionals	5	95	393
All Scotland	27	73	2885

3.2 Travel to Court

- 3.2.1 Almost a third (31%, n=894) of respondents stated that they had travelled to court on the day of the survey as a car driver, with a further 15% (n=423) stating that they were a car passenger. A quarter (25%, n=717) stated that they travelled to court by bus. A full breakdown of the modes of transport that respondents used to travel to court can be found in Table 3.3 below.

Table 3.3 Mode of Travel to Court

	Number	%
Walked	579	20
Bicycle	21	1
Motorbike	12	<1
Car (driver)	894	31
Car (passenger)	423	15
Bus	717	25
Train	73	2
Taxi	112	4
Other	69	2
Total	2900	100

- 3.2.2 For those who stated they travelled to court by an 'other' mode of travel, the most common responses included:
- escorted from police stations (n=22);
 - from custody (n=14);
 - took the subway (n=13);
 - travelled by plane (n=8); and
 - drove or was a passenger in a van or lorry (n=6).
- 3.2.3 Looking at responses by sheriffdom, the most popular mode used by respondents in Grampian, Highland and Islands (35%, n=170), North Strathclyde (34%, n=147), South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway (42%, n=199), and Tayside, Central and Fife (34%, n=182) was car driver. The most popular mode in Glasgow and Strathkelvin (33%, n=113), Lothian and Borders (46%, n=165), and the High Court and Court of Session (40%, n=103) was travel by bus.
- 3.2.4 Looking at responses by user group, the most popular mode for travel to court for Advocates, Solicitors, and Solicitor Advocates (56%, n=174) and all other professionals (42%, n=165) was as a car driver. By bus was the most popular mode for accused in a criminal case and supporters of accused (32%, n=299) and victims in a criminal case and supporters of victims (38%, n=28).
- 3.2.5 A full breakdown of responses by user group and sheriffdom can be found in Tables 3.1 and 3.2 in Appendix A.

3 Attending Court

- 3.2.6 Respondents were then asked roughly how long their journey to court had taken. Of the 2888 respondents who were able to indicate a time, the majority had travelled for up to 30 minutes (78%, n=2235). Table 3.4 provides a detailed breakdown of all journey times provided.

Table 3.4 Length of Time the Journey to Court Took

	Number	%
Up to 15 minutes	1058	37
16 to 30 minutes	1177	41
31 minutes to 1 hour	474	16
Over 1 hour and up to 2 hours	110	4
Over 2 hours	69	2
Total	2888	100

- 3.2.7 By sheriffdom, visitors to courts in North Strathclyde and Tayside, Central and Fife seemed to have the quickest journeys, followed by those attending court in Glasgow and Strathkelvin, Lothian and Borders, South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway and the High Court and Court of Session. Journeys in Grampian, Highland and Islands varied more with around a third of respondents saying that their journey took up to 15 minutes (39%, n=188), and a further third of respondents saying 16 to 30 minutes (35%, n=171).
- 3.2.8 With regard to user group, generally the most frequent response was 16 to 30 minutes. A full breakdown of responses by user group and sheriffdom can be found in Tables 3.3 and 3.4 in Appendix A.
- 3.2.9 Respondents were also asked how far they had to travel to get to court. Of the 2873 respondents who answered the question, almost a third (29%, n=823) had travelled over 2 miles and up to 5 miles. This can be seen in Table 3.5.

Table 3.5 Distance Travelled to Get to Court

	Number	%
Up to 1 mile	492	17
Over 1 and up to 2 miles	511	18
Over 2 and up to 5 miles	823	29
Over 5 miles and up to 10 miles	465	16
Over 10 and up to 20 miles	316	11
Over 20 miles	266	9
Total	2873	100

- 3.2.10 Almost half of the respondents in Glasgow and Strathkelvin (44%, n=151), around a third in Lothian and Borders (36%, n=127) and High Court and Court of Session (34%, n=86), and around a quarter in South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway (27%, n=127) stated that they had to travel over 2 miles and up to 5 miles to get to court on the day of the survey. A quarter of respondents in Grampian, Highland and Islands (24%, n=118) stated that they

3 Attending Court

travelled up to one mile. The distance respondents travelled in Tayside, Central and Fife and North Strathclyde was more likely to vary from up to one mile to up to 5 miles.

- 3.2.11 Generally, all professionals were more likely to have travelled up to one mile to get to court that day compared to non-professionals who were more likely to have travelled over 2 miles and up to 5 miles. It is unclear, however, where respondents were travelling from – their home, place of work, or elsewhere.
- 3.2.12 A full breakdown of responses by user group and sheriffdom can be found in Tables 3.5 and 3.6 in Appendix A.

3.3 Finding Way Around the Court Building

- 3.3.1 A total of 2877 respondents specified how they found out where they needed to go when they arrived at court that day (giving 3702 responses in total). Table 3.6 shows that 46% of respondents (n=1335) had previously visited/were familiar with the building, while 44% (n=1250) had asked at the front reception.

Table 3.6 Source of Directions Upon Arrival

	Number of Responses	% of Respondents
Asked at front reception	1250	44
Asked security guard	134	5
Looked at notice board	201	7
Followed signs	380	13
Previously visited/familiar with building	1335	46
From correspondence sent to me	202	7
Asked someone else	112	4
Other	85	3
Can't remember	3	<1
Total	3702	129

Note: Totals do not equal 100% due to multiple responses

- 3.3.2 For those who stated that they had asked someone else, the most popular responses included:
- solicitor (n=44);
 - court staff/officer (n=34); and
 - police officer (n=8).
- 3.3.3 For those who stated 'other', the most frequently cited responses included:
- with someone who knew where to go (n=18);
 - came from custody (n=12);
 - already knew where to go (n=9);
 - work at the court (n=9);

3 Attending Court

- had checked the website (n=6); and
- wandered around until they found it (n=5).

- 3.3.4 Respondents were asked how easy or difficult it was to find out where in the building they had to go. From 2841 responses, the majority of respondents (97%, n=2742) found it either 'very' or 'fairly' easy. Only 23 respondents (<1%) stated that they found it 'very' or 'fairly' difficult, while 76 respondents (3%) stated that it was 'neither easy nor difficult' to find out where in the building they had to go.
- 3.3.5 There was little difference when the data was considered by either sheriffdom or user group, with the majority of respondents, in all cases, indicating that they found it either 'very' or 'fairly' easy to find out where in the building they had to go. Tables 3.7 to 3.8 in Appendix A provide a full breakdown of responses by user group and sheriffdom.

4 Satisfaction with Court Staff

4.1 Contact with Court Staff

- 4.1.1 Respondents were asked if they spoke to any court staff during their visit. Of the 2889 respondents who provided an answer, 83% (n=2387) stated that they had spoken to court staff, while 17% (n=502) stated that they had not.
- 4.1.2 Contact with court staff was broken down by sheriffdom and user group. In South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway most respondents (91%, n=429) stated that they spoke to court staff during their visit. Respondents in Tayside, Central and Fife were least likely to say that they had had contact with court staff (70%, n=382). This can be seen in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1 Contact with Court Staff by Sheriffdom

	Contact (%)	No Contact (%)	N
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	86	14	343
Grampian, Highland and Islands	84	16	484
Lothian and Borders	87	13	356
North Strathclyde	78	22	438
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	91	9	471
Tayside, Central and Fife	70	30	543
High Court and Court of Session	87	13	254
All Scotland	83	17	2889

4 Satisfaction with Court Staff

- 4.1.3 Looking at responses by user group, over 90% of victims in a criminal case and supporters of victims (92%, n=68) and people visiting the public counter/fines office (94%, n=388) stated that they had had contact with court staff. Accused in a criminal case and supporters of accused were the least likely to say that they had had contact with court staff (73%, n=682). This can be seen in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2 Contact with Court Staff by User Group

	Contact (%)	No Contact (%)	N
Accused in a criminal case and Supporters of accused	73	27	935
Civil litigant, Supporters of civil litigants, Witnesses in a civil case, and Supporters of civil case witnesses	85	15	98
Jurors (selected and not selected)	87	13	292
Victims in a criminal case and Supporters of victims	92	8	74
People visiting the public counter/fines office	94	6	415
Witnesses in a criminal case, Supporters of criminal case witnesses, Spectators/tourists, and Others	84	16	375
Advocates, Solicitors, and Solicitor Advocates	82	18	306
All other professionals	88	12	394
All Scotland	83	17	2889

4.2 Helpfulness of Court Staff

- 4.2.1 Those respondents who stated that they spoke with court staff were asked how helpful they found them to be. Of the 2384 respondents who answered the question, the majority (95%, n=2261) stated that they had found court staff to be either 'very' or 'fairly' helpful. Only 41 respondents (2%) stated court staff were either 'very' or 'fairly' unhelpful and 82 respondents (3%) considered court staff to have been 'neither helpful nor unhelpful'.
- 4.2.2 Helpfulness of court staff was also disaggregated by sheriffdom and user group. Again, the majority of respondents in each group stated that court staff were either 'very' or 'fairly' helpful. Table 4.3 shows this breakdown by sheriffdom while Table 4.4 shows the breakdown by user group.

Table 4.3 Helpfulness of Court Staff by Sheriffdom

	Very or Fairly Unhelpful (%)	Neither Helpful nor Unhelpful (%)	Very or Fairly Helpful (%)	N
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	2	7	91	296
Grampian, Highland and Islands	1	3	96	405
Lothian and Borders	<1	2	98	309
North Strathclyde	1	3	96	343
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	2	4	94	428
Tayside, Central and Fife	4	4	92	382
High Court and Court of Session	1	1	98	221
All Scotland	2	3	95	2384

Table 4.4 Helpfulness of Court Staff by User Group

	Very or Fairly Unhelpful (%)	Neither Helpful nor Unhelpful (%)	Very or Fairly Helpful (%)	N
Accused in a criminal case and Supporters of accused	3	6	91	682
Civil litigant, Supporters of civil litigants, Witnesses in a civil case, and Supporters of civil case witnesses	4	4	92	83
Jurors (selected and not selected)	3	3	94	252
Victims in a criminal case and Supporters of victims	2	-	98	68
People visiting the public counter / fines office	<1	2	98	388
Witnesses in a criminal case, Supporters of criminal case witnesses, Spectators/tourists, and Others	<1	3	97	316
Advocates, Solicitors, and Solicitor Advocates	2	1	97	250
All other professionals	1	4	95	345
All Scotland	2	3	95	2384

4.3 Politeness of Court Staff

- 4.3.1 Again, those respondents who stated they had spoken to court staff were asked how polite they were. Of the 2381 respondents who answered the question, 96% (n=2296) found court staff either 'very' or 'fairly' polite. Only 25 respondents (1%) found court staff 'very' or 'fairly' impolite, and 60 respondents (3%) said staff had been 'neither polite nor impolite'.
- 4.3.2 When looking at the responses by sheriffdom (Table 4.5) and user group (Table 4.6), the majority of respondents in each case stated that court staff were either 'very' or 'fairly' polite.

Table 4.5 Politeness of Court Staff by Sheriffdom

	Very or Fairly Impolite (%)	Neither Polite nor Impolite (%)	Very or Fairly Polite (%)	N
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	1	6	93	294
Grampian, Highland and Islands	<1	2	98	404
Lothian and Borders	-	<1	100	309
North Strathclyde	<1	2	98	343
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	3	1	96	428
Tayside, Central and Fife	2	3	95	382
High Court and Court of Session	<1	4	96	221
All Scotland	1	3	96	2381

Table 4.6 Politeness of Court Staff by User Group

	Very or Fairly Impolite (%)	Neither Polite nor Impolite (%)	Very or Fairly Polite (%)	N
Accused in a criminal case and Supporters of accused	2	4	94	681
Civil litigant, Supporters of civil litigants, Witnesses in a civil case, and Supporters of civil case witnesses	2	2	96	83
Jurors (selected and not selected)	1	4	95	252
Victims in a criminal case and Supporters of victims	-	3	97	68
People visiting the public counter/ fines office	<1	2	98	388
Witnesses in a criminal case, Supporters of criminal case witnesses, Spectators/tourists, and Others	1	2	97	316
Advocates, Solicitors, and Solicitor Advocates	1	<1	99	250
All other professionals	<1	2	98	343
All Scotland	1	3	96	2381

- 4.3.3 Those respondents who rated the helpfulness and/or politeness of court staff as less than satisfactory were asked to explain why. Of the 25 respondents who gave reasons, just over one third (n=9) said it was to do with the attitude of court staff which they considered rude, grumpy and/or lacking in friendliness.
- 4.3.4 Others generally said it was do with the lack of respect shown to them by court staff (n=3) or that court staff did not provide them with enough information (n=3).

5 Information Provided

5.1 Information Upon Arrival

5.1.1 Respondents were asked if, when they arrived at court that day, court staff explained what was going to happen and what they should do. Of the 2374 respondents who answered the question, almost half (48%, n=1141) said yes while 16% (n=375) said no. A further 36% (n=858) said that it was not applicable for them to have been given an explanation of what was happening or what they should do, the most common reasons being that the respondent:

- was paying a fine, visiting the public counter or visiting the court to obtain information;
- already knew what was happening or what they should do;
- was a police officer or solicitor;
- had been given an explanation about what was happening or what they should do by a solicitor; and
- was a visitor or spectator.

5.1.2 Looking at responses by sheriffdom, Table 5.1 shows that around half of the respondents in each sheriffdom stated that court staff had explained what was going to happen and what they should do upon arrival. However, just over a quarter of respondents in Glasgow and Strathkelvin (29%, n=85) and almost a fifth in Lothian and Borders (19%, n=60) said that this was not the case.

Table 5.1 Information Provided Upon Arrival by Sheriffdom

	Information Provided (%)	Information Not Provided (%)	N/A	N
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	45	29	26	297
Grampian, Highland and Islands	49	13	38	398
Lothian and Borders	40	19	41	309
North Strathclyde	47	12	41	342
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	55	13	32	426
Tayside, Central and Fife	47	15	38	382
High Court and Court of Session	51	10	39	220
All Scotland	48	16	36	2374

5.1.3 Table 5.2 shows that jurors were the most likely to state that court staff explained what was going to happen and what they should do (87%, n=221), followed by victims in a criminal case and supporters of victims (79%, n=53). Almost a third of accused (32%, n=219) stated that court staff did not explain what was going to happen or what they should do when they arrived at court that day. Advocates, Solicitors, and Solicitor Advocates (64%,

5 Information Provided

n=160) were the most likely to say it was not applicable for court staff to provide them with information, followed by all other professionals (47%, n=162).

Table 5.2 Information Provided Upon Arrival by User Group

	Information Provided (%)	Information Not Provided (%)	N/A (%)	N
Accused in a criminal case and supporters of the accused	59	32	9	677
Civil litigants, supporters of civil litigants, witnesses in a civil case and supporters of civil case witnesses	61	21	18	83
Jurors (selected and not selected)	87	6	7	254
Victims in a criminal case and supporters of victims	79	16	5	67
People visiting the public counter/ fines office	7	3	90	386
Witnesses in a criminal case, supporters of criminal case witnesses, spectators/tourists, and others	56	15	29	313
Advocates, solicitors and solicitor advocates	25	11	64	251
All other professionals	45	8	47	343
All User Groups	48	16	36	2374

Accuracy of Information

- 5.1.4 Respondents who stated that court staff did explain what was going to happen and what they should do, were asked to specify how accurate the explanation was. The majority of respondents (97%, n=1090) stated that the explanation provided was either 'very' or 'fairly' accurate. Only three respondents (<1%) stated that the explanation was 'very' or 'fairly' inaccurate, while 31 respondents (3%) said it was 'neither accurate nor inaccurate'.
- 5.1.5 Table 5.3 shows that there was no variation by sheriffdom, with almost all respondents in each sheriffdom stating that the explanation provided was either 'very' or 'fairly' accurate. A full breakdown of responses by user group and sheriffdom can be found in Tables 5.1 to 5.2 in Appendix A.

Table 5.3 Accuracy of Information Upon Arrival by Sheriffdom

	Very or Fairly Inaccurate (%)	Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate (%)	Very or Fairly Accurate (%)	N
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	-	3	97	133
Grampian, Highland and Islands	-	2	98	192
Lothian and Borders	-	2	98	122
North Strathclyde	1	3	96	159
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	-	1	99	230
Tayside, Central and Fife	1	4	95	178
High Court and Court of Session	1	4	95	110
All Scotland	<1	3	97	1124

5.2 Update Information

- 5.2.1 Respondents were asked if court staff had kept them informed about what was happening during the time they were in the court building. Of the 2360 respondents who answered the question, almost half (46%, n=1090) said that they had been kept informed, while 20% (n=477) of respondents said that they had not. A further 34% (n=793) of respondents said that it was not applicable for them to have been kept informed. Common reasons for this included that respondents:
- already knew what was happening;
 - were kept informed by their solicitor/lawyer;
 - were visiting or spectating;
 - were making a query at the desk; and
 - were visiting the fines office, handing in paperwork or picking/dropping off paperwork.
- 5.2.2 Over half of the respondents in Glasgow and Strathkelvin (51%, n=151), Grampian, Highland and Islands (55%, n=218), and South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway (53%,

n=225) stated that court staff kept them informed. However, over a quarter of respondents in Glasgow and Strathkelvin (29%, n=85) and Lothian and Borders (28%, n=86) said that they had not been kept informed. Table 5.4 details responses by sheriffdom.

Table 5.4 Update Information Provided by Sheriffdom

	Updates Provided (%)	Updates Not Provided (%)	N/A (%)	N
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	51	29	20	296
Grampian, Highland and Islands	55	15	30	395
Lothian and Borders	32	28	40	305
North Strathclyde	45	17	38	340
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	53	18	29	423
Tayside, Central and Fife	39	20	41	381
High Court and Court of Session	44	17	39	220
All Scotland	46	20	34	2360

5 Information Provided

5.2.3 The majority of jurors (88%, n=221) stated that court staff kept them informed about what was happening. Additionally, over half of victims in a criminal case and supporters of victims (69%, n=46), other professionals (60%, n=205), and civil litigants, supporters of civil litigants, witnesses in a civil case, and supporters of civil case witnesses (57%, n=47) stated that court staff had kept them informed. The majority of people visiting the public counter/fines office (94%, n=360) and around half of the Advocates, Solicitors and Solicitor Advocates (49%, n=121) stated that it was not applicable for them to have been kept informed. A full breakdown by user group is provided in Table 5.5.

Table 5.5 Update Information Provided by User Group

	Updates Provided (%)	Updates Not Provided (%)	N/A	N
Accused in a criminal case and supporters of the accused	45	44	11	676
Civil litigants, supporters of civil litigants, witnesses in a civil case and supporters of civil case witnesses	57	25	18	83
Jurors (selected and not selected)	88	5	7	252
Victims in a criminal case and supporters of victims	69	28	3	67
People visiting the public counter/fines office	2	4	94	383
Witnesses in a criminal case, supporters of criminal case witnesses, spectators/tourists, and others	50	22	28	314
Advocates, solicitors and solicitor advocates	43	8	49	245
All other professionals	60	7	33	340
All User Groups	46	20	34	2360

Helpfulness of Update Information

- 5.2.4 Respondents who were given update information were asked how helpful the information they received was. The majority of respondents (96%, n=1035) said that the information was either 'very' or 'fairly' helpful, with only 5 respondents (<1%) stating the information was 'very' or 'fairly' unhelpful, and 39 respondents (4%) stating it was 'neither helpful nor unhelpful'.
- 5.2.5 Table 5.6 shows a breakdown by sheriffdom. Responses were largely similar across all sheriffdoms, with the majority of respondents stating that they found the information provided by court staff either 'very' or 'fairly' helpful. This ranged from 93% (n=90) in the High Court and Court of Session to 98% (n=93) in Lothian and Borders.
- 5.2.6 A full breakdown of responses by user group and sheriffdom can be found in Tables 5.3 to 5.4 in Appendix A.

Table 5.6 Helpfulness of Information by Sheriffdom

	Very or Fairly Unhelpful (%)	Neither Helpful nor Unhelpful (%)	Very or Fairly Helpful (%)	N
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	-	5	95	151
Grampian, Highland and Islands	1	2	97	217
Lothian and Borders	-	2	98	95
North Strathclyde	-	5	95	149
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	1	3	96	223
Tayside, Central and Fife	1	2	97	147
High Court and Court of Session	-	7	93	97
All Scotland	<1	4	96	1079

5.3 Information Provided to Jurors by SCS

- 5.3.1 All jurors (both selected and non-selected) were asked if they had received any information about jury service from SCS before they arrived at court. They were also asked to rate how helpful they had found this information.
- 5.3.2 Of the 294 jurors who completed the survey, 87% (n=255) reported that they had received information about jury service from SCS, while only 2% (n=6) stated that they had not. A further 33 respondents (11%) did not answer the question.
- 5.3.3 The majority of the 254 who rated the helpfulness of the information provided stated that it was either 'very' or 'fairly' helpful (91%, n=231), with only four respondents (2%) stating they found it either 'very' or 'fairly' unhelpful, and 19 (7%) stating they found the information 'neither helpful nor unhelpful'.

5 Information Provided

- 5.3.4 The information that jurors receive may differ depending on whether they attend court for High Court or Sheriff Court business. However, responses to the survey showed that both groups were similarly happy with the information they received, with 94% (n=61) of jurors attending for High Court business, and 90% (n=169) of those attending for Sheriff Court business, stating that the information provided was either 'very' or 'fairly' helpful.

5.4 Further Information Respondents Would Have Liked

- 5.4.1 Only 10% of the whole sample (n=298) stated that they would have liked further information from court staff. The overwhelming majority of responses related to receiving information about when trials would start, how long they would last and how long people should expect to be kept waiting at the court. A number of people suggested that there should also be regular updates.
- 5.4.2 Others felt that the following would be useful:
- more information regarding the whole court procedure, particularly for those who were attending for the first time;
 - more information provided to jurors on their first day and about how jurors are selected;
 - information on where an accused could find their solicitor/lawyer; and
 - information on why their friends and relatives were being kept in custody and what they had been charged with.

5.5 SCS Website

- 5.5.1 All respondents (n=2905) were asked if they had used the Scottish Court Service website in the last twelve months. In total, 26% of respondents (n=757) reported that they had.
- 5.5.2 Table 5.7 provides a breakdown of the use of the Scottish Court Service website by user group. Advocates, Solicitors and Solicitor Advocates were the most frequent users of the website (92%, n=286), followed by other professionals (60%, n=238). People visiting the public counter/fines office (6%, n=26) and victims, and supporters of victims, in a criminal case (3%, n=2) were the least likely to have accessed the website in the last 12 months.
- 5.5.3 A full breakdown of responses by user group and sheriffdom can be found in Tables 5.5 to 5.6 in Appendix A.

Table 5.7 Use of the Scottish Court Website by User Group

	Used (%)	Not Used (%)	N
Accused in a criminal case and supporters of the accused	10	90	937
Civil litigants, supporters of civil litigants, witnesses in a civil case and supporters of civil case witnesses	22	78	98
Jurors (selected and not selected)	12	88	294
Victims in a criminal case and supporters of victims	3	97	74
People visiting the public counter/fines office	6	94	415
Witnesses in a criminal case, supporters of criminal case witnesses, spectators/tourists, and others	15	85	374
Advocates, solicitors and solicitor advocates	92	8	311
All other professionals	60	40	397
All User Groups	26	74	2900

- 5.5.4 The 757 respondents who stated they used the website were asked to identify the reasons why they had visited the site (see Table 5.8). The main reason given for visiting the website was 'to obtain information on daily court business' (85%, n=645), followed by 'to obtain court addresses/phone number/direction to courts' (49%, n=369).

Table 5.8 Reasons for Using the Website

	Number of Responses	% of Respondents
To obtain information on daily court business	645	85
To obtain information about SCS and/or role	183	24
To obtain information about the Scottish justice system	232	31
To obtain information leaflets and/or forms used in court	206	27
To obtain court addresses/phone numbers/ directions to courts	369	49
To pay a fine or other financial penalty online	23	3
Other	64	8
Total	1722	227

Note: Totals do not equal 100% due to multiple responses

- 5.5.5 There were 64 people who said they were looking for 'other' information, most commonly this included:
- court judgements;
 - court opinions and/or publications;
 - job vacancies; and
 - case reports or case histories.
- 5.5.6 Due to the small number of respondents involved, it is not possible to disaggregate this information by either sheriffdom or user group.
- 5.5.7 Respondents were also asked how easy it was to find the information that they needed on the SCS website. The results for each reason that the website was used for are shown in Table 5.9.
- 5.5.8 The majority of respondents indicated that, for each reason, they had found the information either 'very' or 'fairly' easy to find. This ranged from 74% (n=14) for how to pay a fine or other financial penalty, to 90% (n=323) for court addresses/phone numbers, etc.

Table 5.9 Ease of Finding the Information Needed on the SCS Website

	Very or Fairly Difficult (%)	Neither Easy nor Difficult (%)	Very or Fairly Easy (%)	N
How easy to find info on daily court business	3	12	85	622
How easy to obtain info about SCS and its role	3	11	86	176
How easy to obtain info about Scottish justice system	6	16	78	221
How easy to obtain info leaflets and forms used in court	3	15	82	200
How easy to obtain court addresses/phone numbers etc	2	8	90	358
How easy to pay a fine or other financial penalty	10	16	74	19
Other	17	19	64	58

Note: No Total row is provided as each row represents a different question.

6 Waiting in Court

6.1 Waiting to Take Part in Court Proceedings

- 6.1.1 Respondents were asked if they had had to wait to take part in court proceedings. Just over half of the 2833 respondents who answered the question stated that they had had to wait (55%, n=1568). Respondents who stated that they were attending court to visit the public counter were not asked this question.
- 6.1.2 Looking at responses by sheriffdom, around two thirds of respondents in Glasgow and Strathkelvin (65%, n=221), Grampian, Highland and Islands (68%, n=308), and North Strathclyde (60%, n=259) said that they had had to wait. Over half of the respondents in Lothian and Borders (58%, n=206) and the High Court and Court of Session (62%, n=157) said that they did not have to wait to take part in court proceedings. This can be seen in Table 6.1.

Table 6.1 Waiting to Take Part in Court Proceedings by Sheriffdom

	Had to Wait (%)	Did Not Have to Wait (%)	N
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	65	35	340
Grampian, Highland and Islands	69	31	448
Lothian and Borders	42	58	355
North Strathclyde	60	40	430
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	50	50	464
Tayside, Central and Fife	56	44	544
High Court and Court of Session	38	62	252
All Scotland	55	45	2833

6 Waiting in Court

- 6.1.3 Over three quarters of jurors (selected and not selected) (77%, n=223) and victims in a criminal case and supporters of victims (78%, n=57) said that they had had to wait to take part in court proceedings (see Table 6.2).

Table 6.2 Waiting to Take Part in Court Proceedings by User Group

	Had to Wait (%)	Did Not Have to Wait (%)	N
Accused in a criminal case and supporters of the accused	65	35	933
Civil litigants, supporters of civil litigants, witnesses in a civil case and supporters of civil case witnesses	64	36	96
Jurors (selected and not selected)	77	23	291
Victims in a criminal case and supporters of victims	78	22	73
Witnesses in a criminal case, supporters of criminal case witnesses, spectators/tourists, and others	53	47	367
Advocates, solicitors and solicitor advocates	69	31	309
All other professionals	55	45	379
All User Groups	55	45	2448

- 6.1.4 Respondents who had had to wait were asked to detail approximately how long they had waited. Table 6.3 shows that responses were relatively evenly split across the four time periods.

Table 6.3 Length of Time They Had to Wait

	Number	%
Up to 30 minutes	455	29
31 minutes to 1 hour	368	24
Over 1 hour and up to 2 hours	354	23
Over 2 hours	365	24
Total	1542	100

- 6.1.5 Looking at responses by sheriffdom, it appears that waiting time in the High Court and Court of Session was slightly less than in any other sheriffdom, where again, the most commonly cited waiting time was over 31 minutes. As explained above, people here were also less likely to have to wait at all.
- 6.1.6 Looking at responses by user group, 45% (n=25) of victims in a criminal case and supporters of victims stated that they had to wait over 1 hour and up to 2 hours, while 41% (n=80) of witnesses in a criminal case, supporters of criminal case witnesses,

6 Waiting in Court

spectators/tourists, and others had to wait over 2 hours. Among the other user groups, waiting times generally ranged from 31 minutes to over 2 hours.

- 6.1.7 A full breakdown of responses by user group and sheriffdom can be found in Tables 6.3 to 6.4 in Appendix A.
- 6.1.8 A total of 1541 respondents also rated how satisfied they were with their wait to take part in court proceedings. Over half of the respondents said that they were either 'very' or 'fairly' satisfied (52%, n=813) with the length of time they had had to wait. A further 19% (n=291) said they were either 'very' or 'fairly' dissatisfied, and 29% (n=449) said they were 'neither satisfied nor dissatisfied'.
- 6.1.9 Over half of respondents in Grampian, Highland and Islands (61%, n=187), North Strathclyde (68%, n=170), South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway (55%, n=126) and High Court and Court of Session (56%, n=53) stated that they were either 'very' or 'fairly' satisfied with the time they had had to wait. Around a third of respondents in Glasgow and Strathkelvin (31%, n=67) and Tayside, Central and Fife (34%, n=102) stated that they were either 'very' or 'fairly' dissatisfied with the time they had had to wait. This can be seen in Table 6.4.

Table 6.4 Satisfaction with Waiting Time by Sheriffdom

	Very or Fairly Dissatisfied (%)	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied (%)	Very or Fairly Satisfied (%)	N
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	31	26	43	217
Grampian, Highland and Islands	12	27	61	304
Lothian and Borders	17	37	46	143
North Strathclyde	9	23	68	251
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	12	33	55	231
Tayside, Central and Fife	34	31	35	301
High Court and Court of Session	12	32	56	94
All Scotland	19	29	52	1541

- 6.1.10 Table 6.4 shows that over half of accused in a criminal case and supporters of accused (54%, n=325), civil litigants, supporters of civil litigants, witnesses in a civil case, and supporters of civil case witnesses (58%, n=35), Advocates, Solicitors, and Solicitor Advocates (53%, n=109), and all other professionals (52%, n=105) stated that they were either 'very' or 'fairly' satisfied with the time they had to wait.

Table 6.5 Satisfaction with Waiting Time by User Group

	Very or Fairly Dissatisfied (%)	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied (%)	Very or Fairly Satisfied (%)	N
Accused in a criminal case and supporters of the accused	20	26	54	603
Civil litigants, supporters of civil litigants, witnesses in a civil case and supporters of civil case witnesses	20	22	58	60
Jurors (selected and not selected)	18	33	49	220
Victims in a criminal case and supporters of victims	16	39	45	56
Witnesses in a criminal case, supporters of criminal case witnesses, spectators/tourists, and others	23	29	48	194
Advocates, solicitors and solicitor advocates	12	35	53	206
All other professionals	19	29	52	202
All User Groups	19	29	52	1541

6 Waiting in Court

6.2 Waiting to be Served at a Public Counter

- 6.2.1 Respondents were asked if they had had to wait to be served at the public counter, including the main reception. Only 12% (n=342) said that they had to wait.
- 6.2.2 At sheriffdom level, Table 6.6 shows that the area where most people had to wait was Glasgow and Strathkelvin (31%, n=104).

Table 6.6 Waiting to be Served at a Counter by Sheriffdom

	Had to Wait (%)	Did Not Have to Wait (%)	N
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	31	69	339
Grampian, Highland and Islands	17	83	478
Lothian and Borders	13	87	353
North Strathclyde	12	88	425
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	11	89	465
Tayside, Central and Fife	1	99	540
High Court and Court of Session	1	99	252
All Scotland	12	88	2852

- 6.2.3 Looking at responses by user group, those who were most likely to have to wait were victims in a criminal case and supporters of victims (40%, n=29). This can be seen in Table 6.7.

Table 6.7 Waiting to be Served at a Counter by User Group

	Had to Wait (%)	Did Not Have to Wait (%)	N
Accused in a criminal case and supporters of the accused	9	91	932
Civil litigants, supporters of civil litigants, witnesses in a civil case and supporters of civil case witnesses	10	90	98
Jurors (selected and not selected)	8	92	288
Victims in a criminal case and supporters of victims	40	60	73
People visiting the public counter/fines office	19	81	414
Witnesses in a criminal case, supporters of criminal case witnesses, spectators/tourists, and others	10	90	372
Advocates, solicitors and solicitor advocates	8	92	296
All other professionals	13	87	379
All User Groups	12	88	2852

6 Waiting in Court

- 6.2.4 Of the 342 respondents who stated that they had waited to be served at a public counter, 340 also indicated the length of time they had had to wait. Almost all respondents said that they had had to wait up to 15 minutes (99%, n=336). This can be seen in Table 6.8.

Table 6.8 Length of Time They Had to Wait

	Number	%
Up to 15 minutes	336	99
16 to 30 minutes	1	<1
31 minutes to 1 hour	3	1
Over 1 hour and up to 2 hours	-	-
Over 2 hours	-	-
Total	340	100

- 6.2.5 Respondents who had had to wait were asked how satisfied they were with the length of time they waited. Of the 337 respondents who answered the question, the majority said that they were 'very' or 'fairly' satisfied (91%, n=306), with only eight respondents (2%) saying they were 'very' or 'fairly' dissatisfied and 23 respondents (7%) saying they were 'neither satisfied nor dissatisfied' with the length of time they had had to wait.
- 6.2.6 Responses were broken down by sheriffdom and user group, but were generally too small for any noticeable differences to be made. A full breakdown of responses by user group and sheriffdom can be found in Tables 6.11 to 6.12 in Appendix A.

6.3 Updates from Court Staff

Updates Regarding Waiting Times

- 6.3.1 Those respondents who waited either to take part in court proceedings or at a counter were asked to specify whether court staff gave updates about how much longer they were likely to have to wait. Of the 1622 respondents who answered the question, responses were fairly evenly split among those who said they were given updates (40%, n=649) and those who said they were not given updates (42%, n=683). A further 18% (n=290) said that it was not applicable that they were given updates.
- 6.3.2 By sheriffdom, over 40% of respondents in Grampian, Highland and Islands (44%, n=144), South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway (48%, n=117), Tayside, Central and Fife (40%, n=121), and High Court and Court of Session (62%, n=55) said that court staff gave them updates about how much longer they had to wait. Almost three quarters of respondents in Lothian and Borders (74%, n=122) said that staff did not give updates; this was by far the highest number of respondents who stated this. This can be seen in Table 6.9.

Table 6.9 Respondents Who Received Court Staff Updates by Sheriffdom

	Yes (%)	No (%)	Not Applicable (%)	N
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	37	45	18	236
Grampian, Highland and Islands	44	37	19	331
Lothian and Borders	18	74	8	166
North Strathclyde	36	33	31	260
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	48	41	11	241
Tayside, Central and Fife	40	40	20	299
High Court and Court of Session	62	32	6	89
All Scotland	40	42	18	1622

6.3.3 Table 6.10 shows that over three quarters of jurors (selected and not selected) (78%, n=165) and around 60% of victims in a criminal case and supporters of victims (61%, n=36) and all other professionals (62%, n=123) said that court staff had given them updates about how much longer they would have to wait. Around half of accused in a criminal case and supporters of accused (59%, n=356) and people visiting the public counter/fines office (45%, n=33) said that staff did not give them updates.

Table 6.10 Respondents Who Received Court Staff Updates by User Group

	Yes (%)	No (%)	Not Applicable (%)	N
Accused in a criminal case and supporters of the accused	21	59	20	608
Civil litigants, supporters of civil litigants, witnesses in a civil case and supporters of civil case witnesses	45	41	14	63
Jurors (selected and not selected)	78	20	2	213
Victims in a criminal case and supporters of victims	61	37	2	59
People visiting the public counter/fines office	3	45	52	73
Witnesses in a criminal case, supporters of criminal case witnesses, spectators/tourists, and others	43	48	9	205
Advocates, solicitors and solicitor advocates	39	27	34	201
All other professionals	62	25	13	200
All User Groups	40	42	18	1622

6 Waiting in Court

- 6.3.4 Respondents who had been given information and those who indicated that they had not were asked to rate their level of satisfaction with court staffs' attempts to keep them informed about how much longer they were likely to have to wait. Generally, of the 1282 respondents who answered the question, 63% (n=807) stated that they were 'very' or 'fairly' satisfied, and only 15% (n=188) were either 'very' or 'fairly' dissatisfied. The remaining 22% (n=287) stated that they were 'neither satisfied nor dissatisfied'.
- 6.3.5 Table 6.11 shows that around 70% of respondents in Grampian, Highland and Islands (74%, n=193), North Strathclyde (72%, n=122), South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway (69%, n=145), and High Court and Court of Session (71%, n=58) were either 'very' or 'fairly' satisfied with court staffs' attempts to keep them informed about waiting times. However, almost a quarter of respondents in Tayside, Central and Fife (24%, n=53) were either 'very' or 'fairly' dissatisfied.

Table 6.11 Satisfaction with Being Kept Informed by Sheriffdom

	Very or Fairly Dissatisfied (%)	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied (%)	Very or Fairly Satisfied (%)	N
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	17	28	55	188
Grampian, Highland and Islands	11	15	74	259
Lothian and Borders	14	40	46	151
North Strathclyde	7	21	72	169
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	16	15	69	211
Tayside, Central and Fife	24	24	52	222
High Court and Court of Session	8	21	71	82
All Scotland	15	22	63	1282

6.3.6 Around three quarters of jurors (selected and not selected) (76%, n=153), victims in a criminal case and supporters of victims (71%, n=41), people visiting the public counter/fines office (77%, n=27), Advocates, Solicitors, and Solicitor Advocates (72%, n=87), and all other professionals (74%, n=128) said that they were either 'very' or 'fairly' satisfied that court staff kept them informed. Around a quarter of civil litigants, supporters of civil litigants, witnesses in a civil case, and supporters of civil case witnesses (24%, n=13) and witnesses in a criminal case, supporters of criminal case witnesses, spectators/tourists, and others (20%, n=36) and accused in a criminal case and their supporters (20%, n=91) were either 'very' or 'fairly' dissatisfied with court staffs' attempts to keep them informed. This can be seen in Table 6.12.

Table 6.12 Satisfaction with Being Kept Informed By User Group

	Very or Fairly Dissatisfied (%)	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied (%)	Very or Fairly Satisfied (%)	N
Accused in a criminal case and supporters of the accused	20	30	50	457
Civil litigants, supporters of civil litigants, witnesses in a civil case and supporters of civil case witnesses	24	17	59	54
Jurors (selected and not selected)	11	13	76	202
Victims in a criminal case and supporters of victims	5	24	71	58
People visiting the public counter/fines office	6	17	77	35
Witnesses in a criminal case, supporters of criminal case witnesses, spectators/tourists, and others	20	21	59	183
Advocates, solicitors and solicitor advocates	2	26	72	121
All other professionals	11	15	74	172
All User Groups	15	22	63	1282

6.3.7 Some respondents (n=287) said it was not applicable for court staff to give them updates about how much longer they were likely to have to wait. The most common reasons were:

- the respondent was a supporter/spectator;
- the respondent was visiting the fines office;
- the respondent was given this information by their lawyer/solicitor; and
- the respondent was familiar with court proceedings, only had to wait a short time, or already knew when their case was likely to be called.

Updates Regarding Reasons for Waiting

- 6.3.8 Respondents who had waited were also asked if they were told why they had had to wait. Of the 1611 respondents who answered the question, 44% (n=717) said that they were, while 38% (n=606) said that they were not. A further 18% (n=288) said that it was not applicable that they were told why they had had to wait.
- 6.3.9 By sheriffdom, Table 6.13 shows that 70% (n=60) of respondents in the High Court and Court of Session said they were told why they had had to wait. Over half of the respondents in Grampian, Highland and Islands (52%, n=172) and South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway (52%, n=125) also stated they were told why they had had to wait. Three-quarters of respondents in Lothian and Borders (75%, n=125), however, stated that they were not told about why they had had to wait.

Table 6.13 Respondents Told Why They Had To Wait By Sheriffdom

	Yes (%)	No (%)	Not Applicable (%)	N
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	45	38	17	229
Grampian, Highland and Islands	53	29	18	328
Lothian and Borders	19	75	6	166
North Strathclyde	37	30	33	260
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	52	37	11	242
Tayside, Central and Fife	43	36	21	300
High Court and Court of Session	70	27	3	86
All Scotland	44	38	18	1611

6.3.10 Again, around a quarter of jurors (selected and not selected) (76%, n=162) and around two thirds of victims in a criminal case and supporters of victims (69%, n=41) and all other professionals (65%, n=130) stated that they were told why they had had to wait. Around half of accused in a criminal case and supporters of accused (52%, n=313), people visiting the public counter/fines office (53%, n=38), and witnesses in a criminal case, supporters of criminal case witnesses, spectators/tourists, and others (48%, n=100) said that they were not told why they had had to wait. This can be seen in Table 6.14.

Table 6.14 Respondents Told Why They Had To Wait By User Group

	Yes (%)	No (%)	Not Applicable (%)	N
Accused in a criminal case and supporters of the accused	27	52	21	605
Civil litigants, supporters of civil litigants, witnesses in a civil case and supporters of civil case witnesses	57	38	5	60
Jurors (selected and not selected)	76	22	2	214
Victims in a criminal case and supporters of victims	69	29	2	59
People visiting the public counter/fines office	10	53	37	72
Witnesses in a criminal case, supporters of criminal case witnesses, spectators/tourists, and others	43	48	9	206
Advocates, solicitors and solicitor advocates	48	15	37	195
All other professionals	65	19	16	200
All User Groups	44	38	18	1611

6.3.11 Some respondents (n=287) said it was not applicable for them to be told why they had had to wait at court, most commonly stating that:

- they were aware of why they had had to wait or that they should expect to have to wait;
- they were a supporter/spectator;
- their lawyer/solicitor explained to them; and
- they were visiting the fines office, visiting someone or making a query.

6.3.12 Respondents were asked how satisfied they were with court staffs' attempts to keep them informed about why they had had to wait on the day they were surveyed. Table 6.15 shows a breakdown of the 1,280 respondents who answered the question, by sheriffdom. Grampian, Highland and Islands (77%, n=204), North Strathclyde (75%, n=124) and the

High Court and Court of Session (73%, n=60) had the greatest proportion of 'very' or 'fairly' satisfied respondents, while Tayside, Central and Fife had the greatest proportion of respondents who were 'very' or 'fairly' dissatisfied (25%, n=55).

Table 6.15 Satisfaction with Explanation of Wait by Sheriffdom

	Very or Fairly Dissatisfied (%)	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied (%)	Very or Fairly Satisfied (%)	N
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	18	20	62	182
Grampian, Highland and Islands	9	14	77	265
Lothian and Borders	13	42	45	152
North Strathclyde	8	17	75	166
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	13	16	71	211
Tayside, Central and Fife	25	24	51	222
High Court and Court of Session	9	18	73	82
All Scotland	14	21	65	1280

- 6.3.13 Table 6.16 shows the breakdown of respondents' satisfaction with court staffs' attempts to keep them informed about why they had had to wait by user group. It shows that the greatest percentage of respondents who were 'very' or 'fairly' satisfied were people visiting the public counter/fines office (82%, n=36) and the greatest proportion who were 'very' or 'fairly' dissatisfied were civil litigants, supporters of civil litigants, witnesses in a civil case and supporters of civil case witnesses (25%, n=14).

Table 6.16 Satisfaction with Explanation of Wait by User Group

	Very or Fairly Dissatisfied (%)	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied (%)	Very or Fairly Satisfied (%)	N
Accused in a criminal case and supporters of the accused	20	29	51	455
Civil litigants, supporters of civil litigants, witnesses in a civil case and supporters of civil case witnesses	25	9	66	56
Jurors (selected and not selected)	10	13	77	206
Victims in a criminal case and supporters of victims	9	16	75	57
People visiting the public counter/fines office	7	11	82	44
Witnesses in a criminal case, supporters of criminal case witnesses, spectators/tourists, and others	17	25	58	182
Advocates, solicitors and solicitor advocates	1	22	77	118
All other professionals	7	15	78	162
All User Groups	14	21	65	1280

7 Catering and Other Court Facilities

7.1 Use of Catering Facilities

- 7.1.1 All respondents were asked if they had used any of the catering/vending facilities in the court building on the day of the survey. Only 24% (n=580) of respondents indicated that they had used any of the facilities.
- 7.1.2 Table 7.1 provides a breakdown of the use of catering/vending facilities by sheriffdom. This shows that the highest usage of catering facilities was in Glasgow and Strathkelvin, where 36% (n=107) of respondents indicated that they had used them. Meanwhile, the lowest usage was in Lothian and Borders, where only 14% (n=42) of respondents reported using any catering facilities.

Table 7.1 Use of Catering Facilities by Sheriffdom

	Used (%)	Not Used (%)	N
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	36	64	294
Grampian, Highland and Islands	22	78	383
Lothian and Borders	14	86	309
North Strathclyde	21	79	365
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	17	83	386
Tayside, Central and Fife	29	71	475
High Court and Court of Session	27	73	237
All Scotland	24	76	2449

- 7.1.3 Of the 580 respondents who had used the catering facilities on offer, 525 respondents identified at least one facility which they had used. The most popular was a cafeteria, which was used by 60% (n=317) of respondents. A further 24% (n=126) had used a tea/coffee dispenser, and 14% had (n=73) had used a trolley service. Table 7.2 provides details of all the facilities used.

Table 7.2 Type of Catering Facilities Used

	Number of Responses	% of Respondents
Cafeteria (public or staff)	317	60
Tea/coffee dispensers	126	24
Trolley	73	14
Soft drink dispensers	10	2
Snack dispensers	7	1
Other	45	9
Total Responses	578	110

Note: Totals do not equal 100% due to multiple responses.

- 7.1.4 The majority of 'other' catering facilities used were specified as a "jurors' lunch".

7.2 Satisfaction with Catering Facilities

- 7.2.1 Respondents who had used catering facilities were asked to rate their satisfaction with the following elements:

- the range of food and drink available;
- the quality of the food and drink that they purchased; and
- where appropriate, the service provided in the cafeteria.

- 7.2.2 Cross-tabulations of respondents' satisfaction with these elements can be found in Tables 7.1 to 7.6 in Appendix A.

Range of Food and Drink Available

- 7.2.3 In total, 562 respondents who had used any catering facilities provided a rating for how satisfied they were with the range of food and drink available. Nearly two thirds (64%, n=360) indicated that they were either 'very' or 'fairly' satisfied in this respect, with only 9% (n=48) stating that they were dissatisfied to any extent. The remaining 27% (n=154) stated that they were 'neither satisfied nor dissatisfied'.

- 7.2.4 At the sheriffdom level, Glasgow and Strathkelvin showed the lowest levels of satisfaction with the range of food and drink available, with 46% (n=48) of respondents indicating they were either 'very' or 'fairly' satisfied.

- 7.2.5 The highest levels of satisfaction with the range of food and drink were recorded in Tayside, Central and Fife, followed by North Strathclyde, where 79% (n=109) and 74% (n=54) were either 'very' or 'fairly' satisfied respectively.

Quality of Food and Drink Purchased

- 7.2.6 In total, 532 respondents provided a rating for their satisfaction with the quality of the food and drink they had purchased. Of these, 70% (n=371) stated that they were either 'very' or 'fairly' satisfied in this respect, while only 7% (n=36) indicated that they were dissatisfied to any degree. The remaining 23% (n=125) stated that they were 'neither satisfied nor dissatisfied'.

- 7.2.7 At the sheriffdom level, Glasgow and Strathkelvin again recorded the lowest levels of satisfaction with the quality of food and drink purchased, with 47% (n=49) of respondents indicating they were either 'very' or 'fairly' satisfied.

- 7.2.8 Satisfaction with the quality of food and drink purchased was highest in Lothian and Borders, followed by North Strathclyde, where 79% (n=30) and 77% (n=57) of respondents were either 'very' or 'fairly' satisfied respectively. However, it should be noted only a few respondents had used any catering facilities in Lothian and Borders (n=42).

Service Provided in the Cafeteria

- 7.2.9 Of the 317 respondents who had used a cafeteria, 299 indicated their level of satisfaction with the service they had received. Results were very positive, with 82% (n=246) stating that they were either 'very' or 'fairly' satisfied, and only 4% (n=12) indicating that they were dissatisfied to any extent. The remaining 14% (n=41) stated that they were 'neither satisfied nor dissatisfied'.
- 7.2.10 It should be noted that the number of respondents in each sheriffdom was relatively small, ranging from 14 in Lothian and Borders to 90 in Glasgow and Strathkelvin. Therefore, disaggregated results for this question should not be regarded as reliable. However, over a third of respondents in each sheriffdom were either 'very' or 'fairly' satisfied with the service provided in a cafeteria, ranging from 67% (n=26) in the High Court and Court of Session to 95% (n=60) in North Strathclyde.

Reasons for Dissatisfaction with the Catering Facilities

Respondents who indicated that they were dissatisfied with the catering facilities were asked to explain their reasons for this. The most common responses were as follows:

- some respondents were dissatisfied with the choice of food available, stating that there was no hot food available at the time they required (typically late afternoon) and others that there should be more healthy options, including vegetarian options;
- there was some dissatisfaction with the quality/taste of the food as well as the tea and coffee;
- some respondents felt that catering was too expensive;
- others felt that the food and/or drink was cold when they received it; and
- some made comments that catering staff were not very knowledgeable (i.e. about allergies and intolerances) or that they were unhelpful or abrupt.

7.3 Other Court Facilities Used

- 7.3.1 In total, 2884 respondents indicated that they had used one or more of the other court facilities on the day that they were surveyed. Table 7.3 details the number of respondents that had used each of the other court facilities. The most commonly used was the court room, with 70% (n=2032) of respondents indicating that they had used this, with waiting areas, the public entrance, and the toilets being the next most commonly used facilities.

Table 7.3 Use of Other Court Facilities

	Number of Responses	% of Respondents
Court Room	2032	70
Jury Room	246	9
Waiting Area/Area Outside Court Room	1118	39
Witness Room	438	15
Public Entrance/Area Outside the Court Building	1093	38
Agents' Room/Solicitors' Room	261	9
Cells in Court Building	122	4
Fines Counter/Public Counter/Clerk's Counter	634	22
Toilets in Court Building	1090	38
Restaurant/Café in Court Building	287	10
Other	76	3
Total	7397	257

Note: Totals do not equal 100% due to multiple responses.

- 7.3.2 Levels of satisfaction were high in relation to both the comfort and security of all facilities; generally over two thirds of respondents stated that they were either 'very' or 'fairly' satisfied with each facility used. The only exceptions were in relation to the comfort and cleanliness of the cells, (where only 31% (n=37) and 55% (n=64) of respondents were either 'very' or 'fairly' satisfied respectively), and with the comfort of the public entrance/area outside the court building and the waiting area/area outside the court room, (where 54% (n=589) and 59% (n=661) were either 'very' or 'fairly' satisfied respectively).
- 7.3.3 A full breakdown of satisfaction with the comfort and cleanliness of these other court facilities by user group and sheriffdom can be found in Tables 7.8 to 7.47 in Appendix A.
- 7.3.4 Those respondents who reported that they were dissatisfied with any of the court facilities were asked to explain the reasons for their dissatisfaction. The main reasons included:
- that the seating in the court buildings was uncomfortable, predominantly highlighting that it was hard, wooden and with a lack of leg room;
 - that there was a lack of seating, both in and around the building, when waiting to go into court;
 - that the jurors' room was too small to accommodate all the jurors;
 - that the toilet facilities were dirty and/or smelly;

- that the court building in general was unclean and in need of upgrading;
- respondents would like more areas where they could have private discussions;
- that the temperature in different parts of the court buildings was considered by some respondents to be too hot and by others to be too cold; and
- that jurors should not have to walk through public areas where there may be accused and/or their families.

7.4 Perceptions of Safety and Security

7.4.1 New questions were included this year to assess the perceived safety and security of the court buildings. As such, respondents were asked to rate their levels of satisfaction with the safety and security of the various facilities that they had used on the day that they were surveyed. Table 7.4 provides a breakdown of responses for each of the facilities. It shows a high level of satisfaction across all facilities, ranging from 80% (n=90) for the cells to 96% (n=226) for the jury room. Although safety and security of the cells was rated the lowest across all facilities, a further 14% (n=16) stated that they were 'neither satisfied nor dissatisfied', and the proportions who were dissatisfied to any extent were largely similar to the other facilities.

Table 7.4 Satisfaction with Safety and Security of Facilities

	Satisfaction %			N
	Very or Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Very or Fairly Satisfied	
Court Room	2	4	94	2008
Jury Room	1	3	96	235
Waiting Area/Area Outside Court Room	5	8	87	1105
Witness Room	4	8	88	434
Public Entrance/Area Outside the Court Building	5	9	86	1084
Agents' Room/Solicitors' Room	6	9	85	255
Cells in Court Building	6	14	80	113
Fines Counter/Public Counter/Clerk's Counter	1	4	95	633
Toilets in Court Building	5	9	86	1077
Restaurant/Café in Court Building	3	7	90	278
Other	1	4	95	74

Note: No Total row is provided as each row represents a different question.

7 Catering and Other Court Facilities

7.4.2 Table 7.5 outlines levels of satisfaction with the safety and security of each of the various court facilities at sheriffdom level. Although sample sizes are small within some of the sheriffdoms for some of the facilities, generally the majority of respondents indicated that they were either 'very' or 'fairly' satisfied with each individual facility across all of the sheriffdoms.

7.4.3 Lowest levels of satisfaction were recorded in Glasgow and Strathkelvin for the witness room, the cells and the toilets, each recording 71%. Meanwhile, of those sheriffdoms and facilities where sufficient sample sizes were achieved, the highest levels of satisfaction were with the safety and security of the court room in Lothian and Borders and North Strathclyde (both 96%), and with the public entrance/area outside of the court building and the toilets in Lothian and Borders, (again 96% respectively).

Table 7.5 Satisfaction with Safety and Security of Facilities

	Percentage (%) Very or Fairly Satisfied						
	Glasgow & Strathkelvin	Grampian, Highland & Islands	Lothian & Borders	North Strathclyde	South Strathclyde, Dumfries & Galloway	Tayside, Central & Fife	High Court and Court of Session
Court Room	88	95	96	96	93	94	94
Jury Room*	100	100	86	96	94	98	96
Waiting Area/Area Outside Court Room	77	91	90	91	89	89	83
Witness Room*	71	95	97	91	88	94	89
Public Entrance/Area Outside the Court Building	67	86	96	88	81	69	90
Agents' Room/Solicitors' Room*	65	89	90	88	96	81	92
Cells in Court Building*	71	84	100	69	80	84	100
Fines Counter/Public Counter/Clerk's Counter*	86	96	99	97	97	85	96
Toilets in Court Building	71	92	96	89	87	83	85
Restaurant/Café in Court Building*	88	88	85	93	92	82	95

* Small sample sizes available across most/all sheriffdoms.

7.4.4 Tables 7.47 to 7.67 in Appendix A provide detailed breakdowns of satisfaction with safety and security of each of the other facilities by sheriffdom and user group.

8 Overall Satisfaction

8.1 Overall Satisfaction with the Scottish Court Service

8.1.1 All respondents were asked to rate their overall satisfaction with the services provided by the SCS on the day of the survey. Of the 2877 respondents who provided a rating, 83% (n=2386) stated that they were either 'very' or 'fairly' satisfied, with only 5% (n=132) stating that they were dissatisfied to any extent. Table 8.1 provides a breakdown of responses.

Table 8.1 Overall Satisfaction with SCS

	Number	%
Very Dissatisfied	51	2
Fairly Dissatisfied	81	3
Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	359	12
Fairly Satisfied	907	32
Very Satisfied	1479	51
Total	2877	100

8.1.2 Figure 8.1 indicates a year on year increase in overall satisfaction since 2007. It should be noted, however, that the sample profiles have varied across each survey year which may account for some of the variation in satisfaction scores.




Figure 8.1 Overall Satisfaction (2005-2011)

8.2 Overall Satisfaction by Sheriffdom

- 8.2.1 Results remain very positive when disaggregated by sheriffdom (see Table 8.2). Satisfaction ranged from 74% (n=401) of respondents who were either 'very' or 'fairly' satisfied in Tayside, Central and Fife to 90% (n=228) in the High Court and Court of Session. This is in contrast to the results in previous years, where satisfaction was often lowest in the High Court and Court of Session.

Table 8.2 Overall Satisfaction by Sheriffdom

	Very or Fairly Dissatisfied (%)	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied (%)	Very or Fairly Satisfied (%)	N
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	7	18	75	344
Grampian, Highland and Islands	4	9	87	478
Lothian and Borders	4	13	83	355
North Strathclyde	3	10	87	434
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	5	8	87	466
Tayside, Central and Fife	7	19	74	546
High Court and Court of Session	1	9	90	254
All Scotland	5	12	83	2877

- 8.2.2 The differences in satisfaction between the sheriffdoms may have been influenced by the varying proportions of professional and non-professional respondents interviewed in each sheriffdom.

8.3 Overall Satisfaction by Core User Group

- 8.3.1 Levels of satisfaction were similar for professional and non-professional users, with 85% (n=587) of professional respondents, and 82% (n=1799) of non-professionals, stating that they were either 'very' or 'fairly' satisfied overall. Table 8.3 provides a full breakdown of responses by these core user groups, while Table 8.1 in Appendix A provides a breakdown by all eight clustered user groups.

Table 8.3 Overall Satisfaction by Core User Group

	Professionals		Non-Professionals	
	N	%	N	%
Very Dissatisfied	5	1	46	2
Fairly Dissatisfied	14	2	67	3
Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	85	12	274	13
Fairly Satisfied	209	30	698	32
Very Satisfied	378	55	1101	50
Total	691	100	2186	100

8.4 Service Development

- 8.4.1 For those respondents who indicated that they were dissatisfied to any extent with the overall service provided by the SCS on the day of the survey (n=132), a new question was included this year to identify if this dissatisfaction had, in any way, been driven by any of the following personal protected characteristics:
- disabilities;
 - ethnic origin;
 - sex;
 - gender reassignment;
 - religious beliefs;
 - sexual orientation;
 - age;
 - marital/civil partnership status; and
 - pregnancy or need to breastfeed a baby.
- 8.4.2 Responses were, however, restricted to merely repeating general dissatisfactions with the SCS (discussed below) or facilities (discussed above). This either indicates that dissatisfaction was not impacted by any individuals' experiences related to their personal protected characteristics, or that this particular question was not well understood by the respondents (although this did not seem to be an issue during the pilot for the survey and field staff did not report any misunderstanding on behalf of respondents).
- 8.4.3 All respondents were asked if they knew how to make a complaint or provide feedback, good or bad, about the services they had used whilst in the court building. Of the 2877 respondents who provided an answer, 44% (n=1264) indicated that they did know, whilst 54% (n=1542) stated they did not know. The remaining 2% (n=71) stated that they were unsure/did not answer the question. (A full breakdown is provided by user group and sheriffdom in Tables 8.3 to 8.4 in Appendix A).

- 8.4.4 Respondents were also asked if there were any aspects of the service provided by the SCS that they would change. A total of 504 respondents provided details of at least one aspect of the service that they would change, while 1803 said that they would 'change nothing' or that they could not think of anything they would change.
- 8.4.5 The main suggestions by respondents who felt that there was a need for change included:
- more information and updates to be provided to them on court proceedings by court staff or through information boards (n=163). Within this group at least eight respondents suggested electronic information displays within courts/waiting areas;
 - a generally more efficient service, resulting in reduced waiting times (n=131), including not being made to wait all day to find out they were not needed; and
 - the provision of increased and improved catering/vending facilities (n=58); this included the provision of water coolers.
- 8.4.6 Other suggestions that were mentioned by fewer respondents included:
- additional or more comfortable seating at locations within and outside court buildings (n=38), specifically additional seating in waiting areas (n=10) and jurors' rooms (n=5) and more comfortable seating within court rooms (n=5);
 - improved (n=6) and/or cleaner (n=18) cells;
 - improved acoustics in the court room (n=14);
 - improved waiting areas (n=13), which included more space and entertainment such as a television;
 - improved parking facilities (n=9);
 - improved (n=9) and/or cleaner (n=7) toilet facilities;
 - improved jury rooms; normally a request that they are larger as they often cannot comfortably accommodate the amount of people using them (n=7);
 - court buildings being outdated and in need of refurbishment (n=5); and
 - increased and improved private interviewing facilities (n=4).
- 8.4.7 Other themes to emerge, which were not as easily quantifiable were:
- to separate the accused, witnesses and jurors so that they are not in the same waiting areas or entering/exiting the court building through the same door; and
 - to have more friendly and informative court staff.

9 Key Driver Analysis

9.1 Key Drivers of Overall Satisfaction

- 9.1.1 To complement the descriptive statistical analyses detailed above, a Key Driver Analysis (KDA) was carried out.
- 9.1.2 This year, the main predictor of overall satisfaction was satisfaction with court staffs' attempts to keep respondents informed about how much longer they were likely to have to wait. This accounted for 33% of variance in overall satisfaction.
- 9.1.3 The second factor influencing overall satisfaction was helpfulness of the information provided by the court staff, accounting for a further 8% of variance.
- 9.1.4 A further three factors also had a minor influence, each accounting for <1% of variance, which were:
- helpfulness of the court staff;
 - court staffs' attempts to keep respondents informed about why they had to wait; and
 - accuracy of the explanations provided by court staff.
- 9.1.5 Together, these five factors account for 42% of variance in overall satisfaction.
- 9.1.6 The statistical relationships between any other of the remaining variables and the overall satisfaction score were too weak for them to be included in the statistical relationship.
- 9.1.7 This year, due to the separation of questions regarding waiting to take part in court proceedings and waiting to be served at a public counter, it was also possible to include respondents' satisfaction with the waiting times for both of these elements in the KDA. When these two variables are added to the KDA, the main predictor of overall satisfaction becomes satisfaction with waiting times to be served at a public counter, accounting for 26% of variance. This is then followed by the helpfulness of the information provided by court staff (accounting for a further 7% of variance), and satisfaction with court staffs' attempts to keep respondents informed about how much longer they were likely to have to wait (accounting for a further 5% of variance). In this situation, these three variables combine to explain 36% of variance in overall satisfaction.

10 Changes Over Time

10.1 Introduction

10.1.1 This chapter compares the main user satisfaction variables between the results of the 2009 survey and the results this year.

10.1.2 Data from all courts in the SCS estate at the time of the surveys have been included in the analysis. The unification process to introduce Justice of the Peace Courts throughout the SCS estate had been complete by the time of the 2011 survey; therefore, all sheriffdoms now contain Justice of the Peace Court users. Due to the staged nature of the unification process, however, only four sheriffdoms had unified at the time of the 2009 survey and therefore only four of those surveyed sheriffdoms contained Justice of the Peace Court users within their sample. The other two sheriffdoms had not unified and, therefore, the 2009 data in this analysis does not include any Justice of the Peace Court users. This difference in sample structure should be borne in mind when reading the comparisons provided for these two sheriffdoms which were:

- North Strathclyde; and
- South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway.

10.1.3 All key satisfaction and service delivery questions were analysed, including:

- overall satisfaction;
- ease of finding out where in the building respondents had to go;
- helpfulness and politeness of court staff;
- accuracy and helpfulness of information provided;
- satisfaction with attempts by court staff to keep respondents informed about how much longer, and why, they had to wait;
- satisfaction with various elements of catering facilities; and
- satisfaction with the comfort and cleanliness of court rooms, waiting areas, and the toilet facilities.

10.1.4 The user profiles were weighted to the average within each sheriffdom to ensure the sample populations were comparable in each survey year. Only differences which were significant at the 95% confidence interval level are reported here in detail.

10.1.5 All of the 5-point satisfaction scales were converted to an average satisfaction score (using a score of 1 for least satisfied, up to 5 for most satisfied). The resulting average satisfaction level can therefore be used to detect changes anywhere across the satisfaction range.

10.2 Weighting

10.2.1 There is no way to know the true population (i.e. the actual number) of court users using the SCS services in any given year, since this data is not recorded by the SCS and is also, inevitably, dependent on the type of business that is transacted, the composition of which varies on a daily basis in response to external demand. Therefore, it is impossible to weight

the sample of court users each year to any known population so as to ensure that the sample is completely representative.

- 10.2.2 It is possible, however, to generate a pseudo-population based on the average sample characteristics from across the various sweeps of the survey (i.e. 2009 and 2011). The resulting profile can then be used to weight data from each year to negate sample variations between sweeps. This makes comparison more reliable than it would be if raw data from the two years were used, since the variation in sample profiles may bias the ratings achieved for the main performance variables. Ensuring that the sample in each year is weighted so that all user groups are equally represented across the years makes comparative analysis more robust.
- 10.2.3 Although the 2009 report detailed satisfaction scores, these are not necessarily the same as those calculated here due to the different years' data included in the weighting factor. Further, it would not be accurate to append the results of any other previous surveys to these results, both due to the different years involved in creating the weighting applied, and due to the differences in the sample structures created by the introduction of Justice of the Peace Courts.
- 10.2.4 Comparisons within sheriffdom between years, which will illustrate any changes in individual sheriffdoms over time, requires a 'user group within sheriffdom weight' to be generated. When disaggregated by sheriffdom, the number of respondents in some user groups were too small in individual years to permit weighting. Therefore, to generate this weighting factor, further clustering of the user groups was required. The resulting combinations of user groups are shown in Table 10.1.

Table 10.1 Clustered Typologies for 'User Group within Sheriffdom' Weighting

Clustered User Groups	
1	Accused in a criminal case and supporters of accused
2 & 3	Civil litigants, supporters of civil litigants, witnesses in a civil case and supporters of civil case witnesses, and Jurors (selected and not-selected)
4 & 6	Victims in a criminal case and supporters of victims, and Witnesses in a criminal case, supporters of criminal case witnesses, spectators/tourists, and others
5	People visiting the public counter/fines office
7	Advocates, solicitors and solicitor advocates
8	All other professionals

- 10.2.5 User groups 2, 3 and 5 are considered as core users, however, these were not grouped into one category as it was considered that those attending for civil business or jury service would, for example, have different experiences to people visiting the public counter. The experiences of those in user groups 1, 4 and 6 are also impacted upon by people external to the SCS, such as solicitors, victim and witness support, etc. Again, however, these could not be grouped into one category as victims' and witnesses' experiences in court would be very different to that of the accused.

10.3 Aggregate Analysis

- 10.3.1 User profiles were weighted to the average profile across the two sample years to account for the variation in each year's sample populations.
- 10.3.2 Table 10.2 shows the (weighted) mean satisfaction scores for each of the key variables in each survey year. Only those variables that are highlighted show any statistically significant changes between the years. All others show no statistically significant changes.

Table 10.2 Total Sample: Mean Scores 2009 and 2011

Satisfaction Variable	Mean Score	
	2009	2011
Overall Satisfaction	4.24	4.27
Ease of finding out where in the building to go	4.74	4.78
Helpfulness of court staff	4.72	4.74
Politeness of court staff	4.77	4.82
Accuracy of information provided by court staff	4.67	4.67
Helpfulness of information provided by court staff	4.68	4.71
Helpfulness of information for jurors provided by SCS	4.59	4.54
Satisfaction with attempts by court staff to keep respondents informed about how much longer they had to wait	3.78	3.73
Satisfaction with attempts by court staff to keep respondents informed about why they had to wait	3.79	3.80
Range of food and drink available	3.69	3.86
Quality of food and drink purchased	3.78	3.96
Service in the cafeteria	4.23	4.32
Comfort of court room	3.86	4.04
Cleanliness of court room	4.46	4.61
Comfort of waiting areas	3.50	3.59
Cleanliness of waiting areas	4.34	4.46
Comfort of the toilets	3.70	3.83
Cleanliness of the toilets	4.17	4.12

- 10.3.3 In summary, the mean satisfaction score increased from 3.78 in 2009 to 3.96 in 2011 for the quality of food and drink purchased. With regard to comfort of the court room, the mean increased from 3.86 in 2009 to 4.04 in 2011. For the cleanliness of the court room, the mean increased from 4.46 in 2009 to 4.61 in 2011. Satisfaction with the cleanliness of waiting areas increased from 4.34 in 2009 to 4.46 in 2011. Additionally, satisfaction with comfort of the toilets increased, with the mean rising from 3.70 in 2009 to 3.83 in 2011.
- 10.3.4 There were only few observable 'decreases' in satisfaction, and none of these were statistically significant.

10.4 Within Sherifffdom Analysis

- 10.4.1 As with the aggregate analysis, the user profiles were weighted to the average within each sherifffdom to ensure the sample populations were comparable across the survey years. The results for each sherifffdom are dealt with here in turn.
- 10.4.2 This section highlights and discusses only those variables that show a statistically significant difference between the mean scores from 2009 and 2011 at the 95% confidence level.
- 10.4.3 Sample sizes were too small for the following variables across all sherifffdoms, in either/both years, and so they were not included in the following analysis:
- helpfulness of information provided to jurors by SCS; and
 - satisfaction with the service in the cafeteria.
- 10.4.4 Further, only those variables with a sample size of $n=100$ or greater in each year have been included in the following analysis. Those variables with small sample sizes (i.e. $n < 100$) in one or more years have not been included as the response rates were not considered high enough to be reliable. The variables with small sample sizes vary between sherifffdoms.

Glasgow and Strathkelvin

- 10.4.5 Table 10.3 shows the (weighted) mean satisfaction scores for each of the key variables in each survey year for respondents within the Glasgow and Strathkelvin sheriffdom. Only those variables that are highlighted show any statistically significant changes between the years. All others show no statistically significant changes.

Table 10.3 Glasgow and Strathkelvin: Mean Scores 2009 and 2011

Satisfaction Variable	Mean Score	
	2009	2011
Overall Satisfaction	4.19	4.10
Ease of finding out where in the building to go	4.65	4.62
Helpfulness of court staff	4.69	4.63
Politeness of court staff	4.72	4.70
Accuracy of information provided by court staff	4.52	4.60
Helpfulness of information provided by court staff	4.67	4.67
Satisfaction with attempts by court staff to keep respondents informed about how much longer they had to wait	3.84	3.58
Satisfaction with attempts by court staff to keep respondents informed about why they had to wait	3.85	3.70
Comfort of court room	4.14	3.96
Cleanliness of court room	4.66	4.54
Comfort of waiting areas	3.85	3.12
Cleanliness of waiting areas	4.54	4.09
Comfort of the toilets	3.29	3.17
Cleanliness of the toilets	3.81	3.49

- 10.4.6 Only comfort and cleanliness of waiting areas and showed any statistical difference from 2009 to 2011 in Glasgow and Strathkelvin. The mean score for comfort of waiting areas decreased from 3.85 in 2009 to 3.12 in 2011. For cleanliness of waiting areas, the mean score decreased from 4.54 in 2009 to 4.09 in 2011.

Grampian, Highland and Islands

10.4.7 Table 10.4 shows the (weighted) mean satisfaction scores for each of the key variables in each survey year for respondents within the Grampian, Highland and Islands sheriffdom.

Table 10.4 Grampian, Highland and Islands: Mean Scores 2009 and 2011

Satisfaction Variable	Mean Score	
	2009	2011
Overall Satisfaction	4.52	4.41
Ease of finding out where in the building to go	4.75	4.77
Helpfulness of court staff	4.80	4.82
Politeness of court staff	4.84	4.86
Accuracy of information provided by court staff	4.71	4.67
Helpfulness of information provided by court staff	4.73	4.80
Satisfaction with attempts by court staff to keep respondents informed about how much longer they had to wait	4.26	4.04
Comfort of court room	4.09	4.17
Cleanliness of court room	4.81	4.80
Comfort of waiting areas	3.61	3.78
Cleanliness of waiting areas	4.79	4.74
Comfort of the toilets	3.82	4.04
Cleanliness of the toilets	4.63	4.48

10.4.8 No variables showed statistically significant differences in the mean scores in Grampian, Highland and Islands between 2009 and 2011.

Lothian and Borders

- 10.4.9 Table 10.5 shows the (weighted) mean satisfaction scores for each of the key variables in each survey year for respondents within the Lothian and Borders sheriffdom. Only those variables that are highlighted show any statistically significant changes between the years. All others show no statistically significant changes.

Table 10.5 Lothian and Borders: Mean Scores 2009 and 2011

Satisfaction Variable	Mean Score	
	2009	2011
Overall Satisfaction	3.78	4.07
Ease of finding out where in the building to go	4.65	4.79
Helpfulness of court staff	4.63	4.84
Politeness of court staff	4.71	4.94
Accuracy of information provided by court staff	4.76	4.87
Satisfaction with attempts by court staff to keep respondents informed about how much longer they had to wait	3.13	3.25
Satisfaction with attempts by court staff to keep respondents informed about why they had to wait	3.12	3.35
Comfort of court room	3.06	3.55
Cleanliness of court room	3.60	4.39
Comfort of waiting areas	2.86	3.21
Cleanliness of waiting areas	3.49	4.39
Comfort of the toilets	3.40	4.14
Cleanliness of the toilets	3.64	4.46

- 10.4.10 In Lothian and Borders, there was an increase in the mean scores for a number of variables when looking at satisfaction levels in 2009 and 2011. The mean score for overall satisfaction increased from 3.78 in 2009 to 4.07 in 2011.
- 10.4.11 Both helpfulness and politeness of court staff also increased with the mean score for helpfulness of court staff increasing from 4.63 in 2009 to 4.84 in 2011, and the mean score for politeness of court staff increasing from 4.71 in 2009 to 4.94 in 2011.
- 10.4.12 Satisfaction with comfort and cleanliness of the court room, waiting areas, and the toilets also increased in 2011 from 2009 figures. The mean score for the comfort of the court room increased from 3.06 in 2009 to 3.55 in 2011, while the mean score for cleanliness of the court room increased from 3.60 in 2009 to 4.39 in 2011, a significant increase. The mean score for comfort of waiting areas increased from 2.86 in 2009 to 3.21 in 2011, while the mean score for cleanliness of waiting areas increased from 3.49 in 2009 to 4.39 in 2011, another significant rise in satisfaction. Satisfaction with the comfort of the toilets also increased shown by an increase in the mean score from 3.40 in 2009 to 4.14 in 2011, mirrored by satisfaction in the cleanliness of the toilets shown by an increase in the mean score from 3.64 in 2009 to 4.46 in 2011.

North Strathclyde

10.4.13 Table 10.6 shows the (weighted) mean satisfaction scores for each of the key variables in each survey year for respondents within the North Strathclyde sheriffdom.

Table 10.6 North Strathclyde: Mean Scores 2009 and 2011

Satisfaction Variable	Mean Score	
	2009	2011
Overall Satisfaction	4.44	4.49
Ease of finding out where in the building to go	4.84	4.85
Helpfulness of court staff	4.75	4.81
Politeness of court staff	4.79	4.87
Accuracy of information provided by court staff	4.70	4.72
Helpfulness of information provided by court staff	4.73	4.81
Satisfaction with attempts by court staff to keep respondents informed about how much longer they had to wait	4.02	4.02
Satisfaction with attempts by court staff to keep respondents informed about why they had to wait	4.12	4.05
Comfort of court room	4.21	4.37
Cleanliness of court room	4.69	4.79
Comfort of waiting areas	4.05	4.05
Comfort of the toilets	4.04	4.04

10.4.14 No variables show statistically significant differences in the mean scores in North Strathclyde between 2009 to 2011.

South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway

10.4.15 Table 10.7 shows the (weighted) mean satisfaction scores for the key variables in each survey year for respondents within the South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway sheriffdom.

Table 10.7 South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway: Mean Scores 2009 and 2011

Satisfaction Variable	Mean Score	
	2009	2011
Overall Satisfaction	4.44	4.45
Ease of finding out where in the building to go	4.79	4.77
Helpfulness of court staff	4.79	4.76
Politeness of court staff	4.82	4.82
Accuracy of information provided by court staff	4.76	4.78
Helpfulness of information provided by court staff	4.76	4.79
Satisfaction with attempts by court staff to keep respondents informed about how much longer they had to wait	3.95	3.91
Satisfaction with attempts by court staff to keep respondents informed about why they had to wait	3.96	4.01
Comfort of court room	4.25	4.34
Cleanliness of court room	4.75	4.78
Comfort of waiting areas	3.80	4.10
Cleanliness of waiting areas	4.68	4.70
Comfort of the toilets	3.84	3.80
Cleanliness of the toilets	4.04	4.08

10.4.16 From the 2009 and 2011 data, no variables show statistically significant differences in the mean scores in South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway.

Tayside, Central and Fife

- 10.4.17 Table 10.8 shows the (weighted) mean satisfaction scores for the key variables in each survey year for respondents within the Tayside, Central and Fife sheriffdom. Only those variables that are highlighted show any statistically significant changes between the years. All others show no statistically significant changes.

Table 10.8 Tayside, Central and Fife: Mean Scores 2009 and 2011

Satisfaction Variable	Mean Score	
	2009	2011
Overall Satisfaction	4.06	3.95
Ease of finding out where in the building to go	4.81	4.90
Helpfulness of court staff	4.63	4.57
Politeness of court staff	4.71	4.71
Accuracy of information provided by court staff	4.59	4.39
Helpfulness of information provided by court staff	4.51	4.41
Satisfaction with attempts by court staff to keep respondents informed about how much longer they had to wait	3.53	3.36
Satisfaction with attempts by court staff to keep respondents informed about why they had to wait	3.52	3.34
Range of food and drink available	3.87	4.18
Quality of food and drink purchased	4.06	4.27
Comfort of court room	3.58	3.64
Cleanliness of court room	4.29	4.31
Comfort of waiting areas	3.29	3.15
Cleanliness of waiting areas	4.19	4.08
Comfort of the toilets	3.61	3.72
Cleanliness of the toilets	4.07	4.02

- 10.4.18 Satisfaction increased for ease of finding out where in the building to go from a mean score of 4.81 in 2009 to 4.90 in 2011. Satisfaction decreased, however, for accuracy of information provided by court staff, shown by a fall in the mean score from 4.59 in 2009 to 4.39 in 2011.

High Court and Court of Session

- 10.4.19 Table 10.9 shows the (weighted) mean satisfaction scores for the key variables in each survey year for respondents within the High Court and Court of Session. Only those variables that are highlighted show any statistically significant changes between the years. All others show no statistically significant changes.

Table 10.9 High Court and Court of Session: Mean Scores 2009 and 2011

Satisfaction Variable	Mean Score	
	2009	2011
Overall Satisfaction	4.26	4.51
Ease of finding out where in the building to go	4.57	4.69
Helpfulness of court staff	4.74	4.81
Politeness of court staff	4.83	4.83
Accuracy of information provided by court staff	4.77	4.63
Helpfulness of information provided by court staff	4.70	4.61
Comfort of court room	3.77	4.09
Cleanliness of court room	4.34	4.58
Comfort of waiting areas	3.75	3.94
Cleanliness of waiting areas	4.37	4.46
Comfort of the toilets	3.91	4.11
Cleanliness of the toilets	4.44	4.28

- 10.4.20 Overall satisfaction for the High Court and Court of Session increased from 2009 to 2011, shown by an increase in the mean score from 4.26 in 2009 to 4.51 in 2011.
- 10.4.21 The mean score for comfort of court room increased from 3.77 in 2009 to 4.09 in 2011, while the mean score for cleanliness of the court room increased from 4.34 in 2009 to 4.58 in 2011.

11 Summary

- 11.1.1 The results of the 2011 survey, the first full survey since court unification took place, has generally provided positive results. The majority (83%) of respondents stated that they were either 'very' or 'fairly' satisfied with the overall service provided by the Scottish Court Service, a slight increase from the previous survey undertaken in 2009. The mean score in 2011 also increased, from 4.24 in 2009 to 4.27 in 2011 (on a scale of one to five where one is 'very dissatisfied' and five is 'very satisfied').
- 11.1.2 Results remain very positive when disaggregated by sheriffdom, ranging from 74% of respondents who were either 'very' or 'fairly' satisfied in Tayside, Central and Fife to 90% in the High Court and Court of Session. This is an improvement in overall satisfaction for the High Court and Court of Session when compared with previous years where, often, this sheriffdom scored amongst the lowest in this respect.
- 11.1.3 Encouraging results are also provided when broken down by core user group, with similar levels of satisfaction for professional and non-professional users, with 85% of professional respondents, and 82% of non-professionals, stating that they were either 'very' or 'fairly' satisfied overall.
- 11.1.4 Likewise, most respondents (generally over 95%) were either 'very' or 'fairly' satisfied with each of the key service elements, with the exception of attempts by court staff to keep respondents informed about how much longer and why they had to wait, where only around two thirds of the respondents stated they were either 'very' or 'fairly' satisfied.
- 11.1.5 When comparing results from 2009 and 2011, the survey generally highlights an increase in satisfaction. At the aggregate level, as detailed above, the mean score for overall satisfaction increased between these two years. Additionally, the range of food and drink in the cafeteria, service in the cafeteria, and comfort of waiting areas, in particular, have shown noteworthy increases in satisfaction with the mean scores rising significantly from 2009 to 2011.
- 11.1.6 Further, at the sheriffdom level, although three sheriffdoms showed no statistically significant changes in levels of satisfaction, the remaining four sheriffdoms show increases in satisfaction with regard to at least one key service element. Lothian and Borders in particular saw an increase in mean scores for a number of service elements over the two years.
- 11.1.7 Overall satisfaction improved from 2009 to 2011 in Lothian and Borders and High Court and Court of Session and this is perhaps one of the most interesting findings from the survey since these two sheriffdoms have, in the past, shown some of the lowest levels of satisfaction. The other sheriffdoms showed no statistically significant change in overall satisfaction, but did maintain high levels of overall satisfaction.
- 11.1.8 As in previous years, a number of helpful comments have been provided which can assist SCS in making even further strides forward in meeting users' needs. These mainly relate to reduced waiting times in court, being kept better informed of reasons for waiting and likely time people have to wait, and improving some of the facilities in specific court buildings to improve the overall comfort of the court experience.

Appendix A – Crosstabulations for Core Satisfaction Scores

Table 2.1 Interviews achieved at each court

	Frequency	Percent		Frequency	Percent
Aberdeen HC	36	1.2	Hamilton Civil Annex	20	0.7
Aberdeen JP	20	0.7	Hamilton JP	7	0.2
Aberdeen SC	136	4.7	Hamilton SC	189	6.5
Airdrie SC	50	1.7	Inverness HC	5	0.2
Alloa SC	26	0.9	Inverness JP	12	0.4
Annan JP	10	0.3	Inverness SC	54	1.9
Arbroath SC	38	1.3	Irvine JP	20	0.7
Ayr SC	47	1.6	Jedburgh SC	11	0.4
Banff SC	8	0.3	Kilmarnock HC	3	0.1
Campbelltown SC	21	0.7	Kilmarnock SC	59	2.0
Coatbridge JP	19	0.7	Kirkcaldy JP	18	0.6
Cumbernauld JP	21	0.7	Kirkcaldy SC	55	1.9
Cupar SC	24	0.8	Kirkcudbright SC	10	0.3
Dingwall SC	16	0.6	Kirkwall SC	23	0.8
Dornoch SC	21	0.7	Lanark SC	40	1.4
Dumbarton SC	78	2.7	Lerwick SC	15	0.5
Dumfries SC	34	1.2	Livingston SC	63	2.2
Dundee JP	17	0.6	Lochmaddy SC	12	0.4
Dundee SC	135	4.6	Motherwell JP	18	0.6
Dunfermline SC	62	2.1	Oban SC	28	1.0
Dunoon SC	23	0.8	Paisley SC	134	4.6
Duns SC	10	0.3	Peebles SC	20	0.7
Edinburgh CoS	44	1.5	Perth SC	45	1.5
Edinburgh HC	91	3.1	Peterhead SC	15	0.5
Edinburgh SC	199	6.9	Portree SC	22	0.8
Elgin SC	34	1.2	Rothesay SC	16	0.6
Falkirk SC	55	1.9	Selkirk SC	15	0.5
Forfar SC	19	0.7	Stirling SC	52	1.8
Fort William SC	16	0.6	Stonehaven SC	17	0.6
Glasgow HC	84	2.9	Stornaway SC	26	0.9
Glasgow JP	145	5.0	Stranraer SC	6	0.2
Glasgow SC	202	7.0	Tain SC	17	0.6
Greenock SC	57	2.0	Wick SC	21	0.7
Haddington SC	39	1.3	Total	2905	100.0

Table 2.2 'Other' Non-Professionals

	Number
Accompany friend for Jury Service (not selected)	1
Came for hearing but case has been put off until the 29th	1
Came to deliver letter to Sheriff Clerks Office but I'm in the wrong court.	1
Came to wrong court, should have been in high court	1
Children's hearing	8
Drawing case	1
Handing in papers to the Proc. Fiscal	1
Letter from hospital, could not attend court	1
Looking for Court of Session	1
Looking for family/friend	6
Looking for procurator fiscal offices	1
Meeting in commissary office	1
Thought this was the Sheriff Court	1
To get notables signature	1
To see if husband can be excused jury duty because of his age.	1
To see solicitor	15
To use the toilet	2
Visiting civil office regarding will	1
Visiting potential juror	1
Want to find out where I can get a licence to trade on the High street during the festival - thought it was here	1
Total	47

Table 2.3 'Other' Professionals

	Number
Advocacy worker	1
Autographor	1
Child welfare	1
Citizens advice bureau legal advisor	1
Courier	1
Court Police Officer	10
Delivering documents for case	1
Despatching clerk	1
Handing in documents	2
Lay Representative (Citizens Advice)	1
Local government officer	1
Not Specified	6
Police Officer	6
Reporter	1
Solicitors Secretary	2
Work experience	5
Work in solicitors office	1
Total	42

Table 2.4 'Other' Reasons Professionals were Attending Court

	Number
Agents room	1
Child protection	1
Deliver documents	1
Delivering 'reports' to solicitor	1
Fatal Accident Enquiry	2
Local government officer	1
Meeting fellow solicitor to uplift files.	1
Not Specified	2
To see solicitor	1
To support witnesses attending	1
Visit court office	1
Visit witness service	2
Witness Service Volunteer	2
Work experience	4
Total	21

Table 2.5 User Group by Sheriffdom (% within User Group)

	Sheriffdom							Total
	Glasgow and Strathkelvin	Grampian, Highland and Islands	Lothian and Borders	North Strathclyde	South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	Tayside, Central and Fife	High Court and Court of Session	
1 Accused in a criminal case and Supporters of accused	116 12.3%	143 15.2%	117 12.4%	141 15.0%	149 15.9%	251 26.7%	23 2.4%	940 100.0%
2 Civil litigant, Supporters of civil litigants, Witnesses in a civil case, and Supporters of civil case witnesses	14 14.3%	20 20.4%	11 11.2%	17 17.3%	16 16.3%	16 16.3%	4 4.1%	98 100.0%
3 Jurors (selected and not selected)	34 11.6%	31 10.5%	28 9.5%	28 9.5%	46 15.6%	59 20.1%	68 23.1%	294 100.0%
4 Victims in a criminal case and Supporters of victims	13 17.6%	19 25.7%	3 4.1%	14 18.9%	15 20.3%	2 2.7%	8 10.8%	74 100.0%
5 People visiting the public counter / fines office	25 6.0%	76 18.3%	96 23.1%	71 17.1%	67 16.1%	59 14.2%	21 5.1%	415 100.0%
6 Witnesses in a criminal case, Supporters of criminal case witnesses, Spectators/tourists and Others	38 10.1%	39 10.4%	72 19.2%	42 11.2%	38 10.1%	48 12.8%	98 26.1%	375 100.0%
7 Advocates, Solicitors, and Solicitor Advocates	46 14.8%	71 22.8%	18 5.8%	51 16.4%	53 17.0%	56 18.0%	16 5.1%	311 100.0%
8 All other professionals	61 15.3%	91 22.9%	12 3.0%	75 18.8%	87 21.9%	55 13.8%	17 4.3%	398 100.0%
Total	347 11.9%	490 16.9%	357 12.3%	439 15.1%	471 16.2%	546 18.8%	255 8.8%	2905 100.0%

Table 2.6 User Group within each Sheriffdom (% within Sheriffdom)

	User group								Total
	1 - Accused in a criminal case and Supporters of accused	2 - Civil litigant, Supporters of civil litigants, Witnesses in a civil case, and Supporters of civil case witnesses	3 - Jurors (selected and not selected)	4 - Victims in a criminal case and Supporters of victims	5 - People visiting the public counter / fines office	6 - Spectators/tourists, Witnesses in a criminal case, Supporters of criminal case witnesses, and Others	7 - Advocates, Solicitors, and Solicitor Advocates	8 - All other Professionals	
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	116 33.4%	14 4.0%	34 9.8%	13 3.7%	25 7.2%	38 11.0%	46 13.3%	61 17.6%	347 100.0%
Grampian, Highland and Islands	143 29.2%	20 4.1%	31 6.3%	19 3.9%	76 15.5%	39 8.0%	71 14.5%	91 18.6%	490 100.0%
Lothian and Borders	117 32.8%	11 3.1%	28 7.8%	3 0.8%	96 26.9%	72 20.2%	18 5.0%	12 3.4%	357 100.0%
North Strathclyde	141 32.1%	17 3.9%	28 6.4%	14 3.2%	71 16.2%	42 9.6%	51 11.6%	75 17.1%	439 100.0%
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	149 31.6%	16 3.4%	46 9.8%	15 3.2%	67 14.2%	38 8.1%	53 11.3%	87 18.5%	471 100.0%
Tayside, Central and Fife	251 46.0%	16 2.9%	59 10.8%	2 0.4%	59 10.8%	48 8.8%	56 10.3%	55 10.1%	546 100.0%
High Court and Court of Session	23 9.0%	4 1.6%	68 26.7%	8 3.1%	21 8.2%	98 38.4%	16 6.3%	17 6.7%	255 100.0%
Total	940 32.4%	98 3.4%	294 10.1%	74 2.5%	415 14.3%	375 12.9%	311 10.7%	398 13.7%	2905 100.0%

Table 3.1 Mode of Travel to Court by User Group

	Mode of Travel									Total
	Walked	Bicycle	Motorbike	Car (driver)	Car (passenger)	Bus	Train	Taxi	Other	
1 Accused in a criminal case and Supporters of accused	171 18.2%	7 0.7%	4 0.4%	170 18.1%	181 19.3%	299 31.8%	18 1.9%	60 6.4%	30 3.2%	940 100.0%
2 Civil litigant, Supporters of civil litigants, Witnesses in a civil case, and Supporters of civil case witnesses	8 8.2%	1 1.0%	0 0.0%	39 39.8%	18 18.4%	22 22.4%	5 5.1%	5 5.1%	0 0.0%	98 100.0%
3 Jurors (selected and not selected)	15 5.1%	1 0.3%	1 0.3%	122 41.5%	28 9.5%	107 36.4%	9 3.1%	8 2.7%	3 1.0%	294 100.0%
4 Victims in a criminal case and Supporters of victims	9 12.2%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	12 16.2%	17 23.0%	28 37.8%	1 1.4%	7 9.5%	0 0.0%	74 100.0%
5 People visiting the public counter / fines office	111 26.9%	5 1.2%	5 1.2%	125 30.3%	27 6.5%	129 31.2%	4 1.0%	3 0.7%	4 1.0%	413 100.0%
6 Witnesses in a criminal case, Supporters of criminal case witnesses, Spectators/tourists and Others	82 21.9%	3 0.8%	0 0.0%	87 23.2%	70 18.7%	100 26.7%	15 4.0%	17 4.5%	1 0.3%	375 100.0%
7 Advocates, Solicitors, and Solicitor Advocates	96 31.1%	0 0.0%	1 0.3%	174 56.3%	12 3.9%	5 1.6%	11 3.6%	6 1.9%	4 1.3%	309 100.0%
8 All other professionals	87 21.9%	4 1.0%	1 0.3%	165 41.6%	70 17.6%	27 6.8%	10 2.5%	6 1.5%	27 6.8%	397 100.0%
Total	579 20.0%	21 0.7%	12 0.4%	894 30.8%	423 14.6%	717 24.7%	73 2.5%	112 3.9%	69 2.4%	2900 100.0%

Table 3.2 Mode of Travel to Court by Sheriffdom

	Mode of Travel									Total
	Walked	Bicycle	Motorbike	Car (driver)	Car (passenger)	Bus	Train	Taxi	Other	
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	36 10.4%	2 0.6%	1 0.3%	94 27.2%	50 14.5%	113 32.7%	14 4.0%	21 6.1%	15 4.3%	346 100.0%
Grampian, Highland and Islands	139 28.4%	5 1.0%	3 0.6%	170 34.8%	54 11.0%	88 18.0%	2 0.4%	10 2.0%	18 3.7%	489 100.0%
Lothian and Borders	54 15.1%	2 0.6%	1 0.3%	65 18.2%	59 16.5%	165 46.2%	4 1.1%	6 1.7%	1 0.3%	357 100.0%
North Strathclyde	101 23.0%	2 0.5%	1 0.2%	147 33.5%	81 18.5%	71 16.2%	16 3.6%	11 2.5%	9 2.1%	439 100.0%
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	70 14.9%	7 1.5%	1 0.2%	199 42.3%	77 16.4%	57 12.1%	12 2.6%	39 8.3%	8 1.7%	470 100.0%
Tayside, Central and Fife	123 22.6%	2 0.4%	4 0.7%	182 33.5%	76 14.0%	120 22.1%	8 1.5%	14 2.6%	15 2.8%	544 100.0%
High Court and Court of Session	56 22.0%	1 0.4%	1 0.4%	37 14.5%	26 10.2%	103 40.4%	17 6.7%	11 4.3%	3 1.2%	255 100.0%
Total	579 20.0%	21 0.7%	12 0.4%	894 30.8%	423 14.6%	717 24.7%	73 2.5%	112 3.9%	69 2.4%	2900 100.0%

Table 3.3 Journey Time to Court by User Group

	Journey Time					Total
	Up to 15 minutes	16 to 30 minutes	31 minutes to 1 hour	Over 1 hour and up to 2 hours	Over 2 hours	
1 Accused in a criminal case and Supporters of accused	346 37.4%	381 41.1%	132 14.3%	39 4.2%	28 3.0%	926 100.0%
2 Civil litigant, Supporters of civil litigants, Witnesses in a civil case, and Supporters of civil case witnesses	28 28.6%	42 42.9%	25 25.5%	3 3.1%	0 0.0%	98 100.0%
3 Jurors (selected and not selected)	84 28.6%	130 44.2%	66 22.4%	14 4.8%	0 0.0%	294 100.0%
4 Victims in a criminal case and Supporters of victims	12 16.2%	45 60.8%	17 23.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	74 100.0%
5 People visiting the public counter / fines office	165 39.9%	210 50.7%	32 7.7%	7 1.7%	0 0.0%	414 100.0%
6 Witnesses in a criminal case, Supporters of criminal case witnesses, Spectators/tourists and Others	105 28.0%	167 44.5%	75 20.0%	16 4.3%	12 3.2%	375 100.0%
7 Advocates, Solicitors, and Solicitor Advocates	126 40.5%	91 29.3%	65 20.9%	18 5.8%	11 3.5%	311 100.0%
8 All other professionals	192 48.5%	111 28.0%	62 15.7%	13 3.3%	18 4.5%	396 100.0%
Total	1058 36.6%	1177 40.8%	474 16.4%	110 3.8%	69 2.4%	2888 100.0%

Table 3.4 Journey Time to Court by Sheriffdom

	Journey Time					Total
	Up to 15 minutes	16 to 30 minutes	31 minutes to 1 hour	Over 1 hour and up to 2 hours	Over 2 hours	
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	90 26.0%	155 44.8%	94 27.2%	5 1.4%	2 0.6%	346 100.0%
Grampian, Highland and Islands	188 38.4%	171 35.0%	75 15.3%	30 6.1%	25 5.1%	489 100.0%
Lothian and Borders	66 18.5%	226 63.3%	51 14.3%	10 2.8%	4 1.1%	357 100.0%
North Strathclyde	228 51.9%	125 28.5%	50 11.4%	17 3.9%	19 4.3%	439 100.0%
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	157 33.5%	228 48.7%	65 13.9%	12 2.6%	6 1.3%	468 100.0%
Tayside, Central and Fife	291 54.5%	158 29.6%	58 10.9%	17 3.2%	10 1.9%	534 100.0%
High Court and Court of Session	38 14.9%	114 44.7%	81 31.8%	19 7.5%	3 1.2%	255 100.0%
Total	1058 36.6%	1177 40.8%	474 16.4%	110 3.8%	69 2.4%	2888 100.0%

Table 3.5 Distance Travelled to Court by User Group

	Distance Travelled						Total
	Up to 1 mile	Over 1 and up to 2 miles	Over 2 and up to 5 miles	Over 5 miles and up to 10 miles	Over 10 and up to 20 miles	Over 20 miles	
1 Accused in a criminal case and Supporters of accused	117 12.7%	186 20.2%	286 31.0%	163 17.7%	89 9.7%	81 8.8%	922 100.0%
2 Civil litigant, Supporters of civil litigants, Witnesses in a civil case, and Supporters of civil case witnesses	2 2.0%	20 20.4%	33 33.7%	22 22.4%	15 15.3%	6 6.1%	98 100.0%
3 Jurors (selected and not selected)	14 4.8%	42 14.4%	116 39.7%	69 23.6%	34 11.6%	17 5.8%	292 100.0%
4 Victims in a criminal case and Supporters of victims	5 6.8%	13 17.6%	36 48.6%	9 12.2%	10 13.5%	1 1.4%	74 100.0%
5 People visiting the public counter / fines office	101 24.3%	100 24.1%	130 31.3%	52 12.5%	20 4.8%	12 2.9%	415 100.0%
6 Witnesses in a criminal case, Supporters of criminal case witnesses, Spectators/tourists and Others	61 16.4%	64 17.3%	118 31.8%	50 13.5%	44 11.9%	34 9.2%	371 100.0%
7 Advocates, Solicitors, and Solicitor Advocates	97 31.6%	24 7.8%	29 9.4%	43 14.0%	55 17.9%	59 19.2%	307 100.0%
8 All other professionals	95 24.1%	62 15.7%	75 19.0%	57 14.5%	49 12.4%	56 14.2%	394 100.0%
Total	492 17.1%	511 17.8%	823 28.6%	465 16.2%	316 11.0%	266 9.3%	2873 100.0%

Table 3.6 Distance Travelled to Court by Sheriffdom

	Distance Travelled						Total
	Up to 1 mile	Over 1 and up to 2 miles	Over 2 and up to 5 miles	Over 5 miles and up to 10 miles	Over 10 and up to 20 miles	Over 20 miles	
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	25 7.2%	45 13.0%	151 43.8%	81 23.5%	27 7.8%	16 4.6%	345 100.0%
Grampian, Highland and Islands	118 24.3%	70 14.4%	98 20.2%	66 13.6%	58 12.0%	75 15.5%	485 100.0%
Lothian and Borders	62 17.4%	50 14.0%	127 35.7%	73 20.5%	29 8.1%	15 4.2%	356 100.0%
North Strathclyde	99 22.7%	87 19.9%	97 22.2%	63 14.4%	42 9.6%	49 11.2%	437 100.0%
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	51 10.9%	81 17.4%	127 27.3%	89 19.1%	74 15.9%	44 9.4%	466 100.0%
Tayside, Central and Fife	97 18.2%	133 24.9%	137 25.7%	46 8.6%	69 12.9%	52 9.7%	534 100.0%
High Court and Court of Session	40 16.0%	45 18.0%	86 34.4%	47 18.8%	17 6.8%	15 6.0%	250 100.0%
Total	492 17.1%	511 17.8%	823 28.6%	465 16.2%	316 11.0%	266 9.3%	2873 100.0%

Table 3.7 Ease of Finding Way Around the Court Building by User Group

	Ease of Finding Way Around Building					Total
	Very Difficult	Fairly Difficult	Neither Easy nor Difficult	Fairly Easy	Very Easy	
1 Accused in a criminal case and Supporters of accused	7 0.8%	4 0.4%	11 1.2%	97 10.7%	785 86.8%	904 100.0%
2 Civil litigant, Supporters of civil litigants, Witnesses in a civil case, and Supporters of civil case witnesses	0 0.0%	3 3.1%	5 5.1%	18 18.4%	72 73.5%	98 100.0%
3 Jurors (selected and not selected)	0 0.0%	1 0.3%	25 8.6%	57 19.6%	208 71.5%	291 100.0%
4 Victims in a criminal case and Supporters of victims	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 2.7%	32 43.2%	40 54.1%	74 100.0%
5 People visiting the public counter / fines office	1 0.2%	1 0.2%	6 1.5%	43 10.5%	358 87.5%	409 100.0%
6 Witnesses in a criminal case, Supporters of criminal case witnesses, Spectators/tourists and Others	0 0.0%	2 0.5%	6 1.6%	65 17.4%	300 80.4%	373 100.0%
7 Advocates, Solicitors, and Solicitor Advocates	2 0.7%	0 0.0%	8 2.7%	31 10.3%	260 86.4%	301 100.0%
8 All other professionals	0 0.0%	2 0.5%	13 3.3%	42 10.7%	334 85.4%	391 100.0%
Total	10 0.4%	13 0.5%	76 2.7%	385 13.6%	2357 83.0%	2841 100.0%

Table 3.8 Ease of Finding Way Around the Court Building by Sheriffdom

	Ease of Finding Way Around Building					Total
	Very Difficult	Fairly Difficult	Neither Easy nor Difficult	Fairly Easy	Very Easy	
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	5 1.5%	1 0.3%	12 3.5%	80 23.3%	245 71.4%	343 100.0%
Grampian, Highland and Islands	3 0.6%	1 0.2%	10 2.1%	78 16.1%	392 81.0%	484 100.0%
Lothian and Borders	0 0.0%	6 1.7%	4 1.1%	55 15.5%	290 81.7%	355 100.0%
North Strathclyde	0 0.0%	2 0.5%	7 1.6%	42 9.7%	382 88.2%	433 100.0%
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	2 0.4%	1 0.2%	14 3.0%	66 14.1%	385 82.3%	468 100.0%
Tayside, Central and Fife	0 0.0%	1 0.2%	11 2.2%	25 4.9%	470 92.7%	507 100.0%
High Court and Court of Session	0 0.0%	1 0.4%	18 7.2%	39 15.5%	193 76.9%	251 100.0%
Total	10 0.4%	13 0.5%	76 2.7%	385 13.6%	2357 83.0%	2841 100.0%

Table 4.1 Helpfulness of Court Staff by User Group

	Helpfulness of Court Staff					Total
	Very Unhelpful	Fairly Unhelpful	Neither Helpful nor Unhelpful	Fairly Helpful	Very Helpful	
1 Accused in a criminal case and Supporters of accused	12 1.8%	8 1.2%	40 5.9%	135 19.8%	487 71.4%	682 100.0%
2 Civil litigant, Supporters of civil litigants, Witnesses in a civil case, and Supporters of civil case witnesses	2 2.4%	1 1.2%	3 3.6%	11 13.3%	66 79.5%	83 100.0%
3 Jurors (selected and not selected)	5 2.0%	2 0.8%	9 3.6%	40 15.9%	196 77.8%	252 100.0%
4 Victims in a criminal case and Supporters of victims	0 0.0%	1 1.5%	0 0.0%	15 22.1%	52 76.5%	68 100.0%
5 People visiting the public counter / fines office	2 0.5%	0 0.0%	7 1.8%	24 6.2%	355 91.5%	388 100.0%
6 Witnesses in a criminal case, Supporters of criminal case witnesses, Spectators/tourists and Others	1 0.3%	0 0.0%	8 2.5%	27 8.5%	280 88.6%	316 100.0%
7 Advocates, Solicitors, and Solicitor Advocates	1 0.4%	3 1.2%	3 1.2%	22 8.8%	221 88.4%	250 100.0%
8 All other professionals	2 0.6%	1 0.3%	12 3.5%	22 6.4%	308 89.3%	345 100.0%
Total	25 1.0%	16 0.7%	82 3.4%	296 12.4%	1965 82.4%	2384 100.0%

Table 4.2 Helpfulness of Court Staff by Sheriffdom

	Helpfulness of Court Staff					Total
	Very Unhelpful	Fairly Unhelpful	Neither Helpful nor Unhelpful	Fairly Helpful	Very Helpful	
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	5 1.7%	2 0.7%	20 6.8%	46 15.5%	223 75.3%	296 100.0%
Grampian, Highland and Islands	3 0.7%	1 0.2%	12 3.0%	34 8.4%	355 87.7%	405 100.0%
Lothian and Borders	0 0.0%	1 0.3%	6 1.9%	31 10.0%	271 87.7%	309 100.0%
North Strathclyde	2 0.6%	2 0.6%	9 2.6%	32 9.3%	298 86.9%	343 100.0%
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	5 1.2%	4 0.9%	17 4.0%	39 9.1%	363 84.8%	428 100.0%
Tayside, Central and Fife	8 2.1%	6 1.6%	16 4.2%	86 22.5%	266 69.6%	382 100.0%
High Court and Court of Session	2 0.9%	0 0.0%	2 0.9%	28 12.7%	189 85.5%	221 100.0%
Total	25 1.0%	16 0.7%	82 3.4%	296 12.4%	1965 82.4%	2384 100.0%

Table 4.3 Politeness of Court Staff by User Group

	Politeness of Court Staff					Total
	Very Impolite	Fairly Impolite	Neither Polite nor Impolite	Fairly Polite	Very Polite	
1 Accused in a criminal case and Supporters of accused	5 0.7%	9 1.3%	27 4.0%	104 15.3%	536 78.7%	681 100.0%
2 Civil litigant, Supporters of civil litigants, Witnesses in a civil case, and Supporters of civil case witnesses	1 1.2%	1 1.2%	2 2.4%	10 12.0%	69 83.1%	83 100.0%
3 Jurors (selected and not selected)	1 0.4%	2 0.8%	9 3.6%	25 9.9%	215 85.3%	252 100.0%
4 Victims in a criminal case and Supporters of victims	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 2.9%	12 17.6%	54 79.4%	68 100.0%
5 People visiting the public counter / fines office	0 0.0%	1 0.3%	7 1.8%	17 4.4%	363 93.6%	388 100.0%
6 Witnesses in a criminal case, Supporters of criminal case witnesses, Spectators/tourists and Others	2 0.6%	0 0.0%	6 1.9%	11 3.5%	297 94.0%	316 100.0%
7 Advocates, Solicitors, and Solicitor Advocates	1 0.4%	1 0.4%	1 0.4%	19 7.6%	228 91.2%	250 100.0%
8 All other professionals	0 0.0%	1 0.3%	6 1.7%	29 8.5%	307 89.5%	343 100.0%
Total	10 0.4%	15 0.6%	60 2.5%	227 9.5%	2069 86.9%	2381 100.0%

Table 4.4 Politeness of Court Staff by Sheriffdom

	Politeness of Court Staff					Total
	Very Impolite	Fairly Impolite	Neither Polite nor Impolite	Fairly Polite	Very Polite	
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	3 1.0%	1 0.3%	17 5.8%	42 14.3%	231 78.6%	294 100.0%
Grampian, Highland and Islands	0 0.0%	1 0.2%	9 2.2%	34 8.4%	360 89.1%	404 100.0%
Lothian and Borders	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 0.3%	15 4.9%	293 94.8%	309 100.0%
North Strathclyde	0 0.0%	2 0.6%	6 1.7%	26 7.6%	309 90.1%	343 100.0%
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	4 0.9%	7 1.6%	6 1.4%	28 6.5%	383 89.5%	428 100.0%
Tayside, Central and Fife	2 0.5%	4 1.0%	13 3.4%	65 17.0%	298 78.0%	382 100.0%
High Court and Court of Session	1 0.5%	0 0.0%	8 3.6%	17 7.7%	195 88.2%	221 100.0%
Total	10 0.4%	15 0.6%	60 2.5%	227 9.5%	2069 86.9%	2381 100.0%

Table 5.1 Accuracy of the Information Provided by Court Staff by User Group

	Accuracy of Information Provided					Total
	Very Inaccurate	Fairly Inaccurate	Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate	Fairly Accurate	Very Accurate	
1 Accused in a criminal case and Supporters of accused	1 0.3%	1 0.3%	19 4.9%	106 27.1%	264 67.5%	391 100.0%
2 Civil litigant, Supporters of civil litigants, Witnesses in a civil case, and Supporters of civil case witnesses	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 3.9%	14 27.5%	35 68.6%	51 100.0%
3 Jurors (selected and not selected)	0 0.0%	1 0.5%	4 1.8%	55 25.3%	157 72.4%	217 100.0%
4 Victims in a criminal case and Supporters of victims	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 3.8%	24 46.2%	26 50.0%	52 100.0%
5 People visiting the public counter / fines office	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	6 24.0%	19 76.0%	25 100.0%
6 Witnesses in a criminal case, Supporters of criminal case witnesses, Spectators/tourists and Others	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 1.1%	40 23.0%	132 75.9%	174 100.0%
7 Advocates, Solicitors, and Solicitor Advocates	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	22 34.4%	42 65.6%	64 100.0%
8 All other professionals	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 1.3%	41 27.3%	107 71.3%	150 100.0%
Total	1 0.1%	2 0.2%	31 2.8%	308 27.4%	782 69.6%	1124 100.0%

Table 5.2 Accuracy of the Information Provided by Court Staff by Sheriffdom

	Accuracy of Information Provided					Total
	Very Inaccurate	Fairly Inaccurate	Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate	Fairly Accurate	Very Accurate	
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	4 3.0%	45 33.8%	84 63.2%	133 100.0%
Grampian, Highland and Islands	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	4 2.1%	55 28.6%	133 69.3%	192 100.0%
Lothian and Borders	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 1.6%	13 10.7%	107 87.7%	122 100.0%
North Strathclyde	1 0.6%	0 0.0%	5 3.1%	33 20.8%	120 75.5%	159 100.0%
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 1.3%	43 18.7%	184 80.0%	230 100.0%
Tayside, Central and Fife	0 0.0%	1 0.6%	8 4.5%	91 51.1%	78 43.8%	178 100.0%
High Court and Court of Session	0 0.0%	1 0.9%	5 4.5%	28 25.5%	76 69.1%	110 100.0%
Total	1 0.1%	2 0.2%	31 2.8%	308 27.4%	782 69.6%	1124 100.0%

Table 5.3 Helpfulness of the Information Provided by Court Staff by User Group

	Helpfulness of Information Provided					Total
	Very Unhelpful	Fairly Unhelpful	Neither Helpful nor Unhelpful	Fairly Helpful	Very Helpful	
1 Accused in a criminal case and Supporters of accused	1 0.3%	0 0.0%	12 4.0%	78 26.0%	209 69.7%	300 100.0%
2 Civil litigant, Supporters of civil litigants, Witnesses in a civil case, and Supporters of civil case witnesses	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 6.4%	5 10.6%	39 83.0%	47 100.0%
3 Jurors (selected and not selected)	1 0.5%	1 0.5%	7 3.2%	51 23.4%	158 72.5%	218 100.0%
4 Victims in a criminal case and Supporters of victims	0 0.0%	2 4.4%	2 4.4%	10 22.2%	31 68.9%	45 100.0%
5 People visiting the public counter / fines office	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 25.0%	6 75.0%	8 100.0%
6 Witnesses in a criminal case, Supporters of criminal case witnesses, Spectators/tourists and Others	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 1.9%	29 18.8%	122 79.2%	154 100.0%
7 Advocates, Solicitors, and Solicitor Advocates	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 1.9%	19 18.1%	84 80.0%	105 100.0%
8 All other professionals	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	10 5.0%	29 14.4%	163 80.7%	202 100.0%
Total	2 0.2%	3 0.3%	39 3.6%	223 20.7%	812 75.3%	1079 100.0%

Table 5.4 Helpfulness of the Information Provided by Court Staff by Sheriffdom

	Helpfulness of Information Provided					Total
	Very Unhelpful	Fairly Unhelpful	Neither Helpful nor Unhelpful	Fairly Helpful	Very Helpful	
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	8 5.3%	34 22.5%	109 72.2%	151 100.0%
Grampian, Highland and Islands	0 0.0%	1 0.5%	5 2.3%	31 14.3%	180 82.9%	217 100.0%
Lothian and Borders	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 2.1%	18 18.9%	75 78.9%	95 100.0%
North Strathclyde	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	7 4.7%	15 10.1%	127 85.2%	149 100.0%
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	1 0.4%	1 0.4%	7 3.1%	26 11.7%	188 84.3%	223 100.0%
Tayside, Central and Fife	1 0.7%	1 0.7%	3 2.0%	74 50.3%	68 46.3%	147 100.0%
High Court and Court of Session	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	7 7.2%	25 25.8%	65 67.0%	97 100.0%
Total	2 0.2%	3 0.3%	39 3.6%	223 20.7%	812 75.3%	1079 100.0%

Table 5.5 Use of Website by User Group

	Have you used the website in the last 12 months?		Total
	Yes	No	
1 Accused in a criminal case and Supporters of accused	93 9.9%	844 90.1%	937 100.0%
2 Civil litigant, Supporters of civil litigants, Witnesses in a civil case, and Supporters of civil case witnesses	22 22.4%	76 77.6%	98 100.0%
3 Jurors (selected and not selected)	35 11.9%	259 88.1%	294 100.0%
4 Victims in a criminal case and Supporters of victims	2 2.7%	72 97.3%	74 100.0%
5 People visiting the public counter / fines office	26 6.3%	389 93.7%	415 100.0%
6 Witnesses in a criminal case, Supporters of criminal case witnesses, Spectators/tourists and Others	55 14.7%	319 85.3%	374 100.0%
7 Advocates, Solicitors, and Solicitor Advocates	286 92.0%	25 8.0%	311 100.0%
8 All other professionals	238 59.9%	159 40.1%	397 100.0%
Total	757 26.1%	2143 73.9%	2900 100.0%

Table 5.6 Use of Website by Sheriffdom

	Have you used the website in the last 12 months?		Total
	Yes	No	
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	106 30.7%	239 69.3%	345 100.0%
Grampian, Highland and Islands	158 32.3%	331 67.7%	489 100.0%
Lothian and Borders	50 14.0%	307 86.0%	357 100.0%
North Strathclyde	138 31.5%	300 68.5%	438 100.0%
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	127 27.0%	343 73.0%	470 100.0%
Tayside, Central and Fife	128 23.4%	418 76.6%	546 100.0%
High Court and Court of Session	50 19.6%	205 80.4%	255 100.0%
Total	757 26.1%	2143 73.9%	2900 100.0%

Table 6.1 Had to Wait to take part in Court Proceedings by User Group

	Did you have to wait to take part in court proceedings?		Total
	Yes	No	
1 Accused in a criminal case and Supporters of accused	610 65.4%	323 34.6%	933 100.0%
2 Civil litigant, Supporters of civil litigants, Witnesses in a civil case, and Supporters of civil case witnesses	61 63.5%	35 36.5%	96 100.0%
3 Jurors (selected and not selected)	223 76.6%	68 23.4%	291 100.0%
4 Victims in a criminal case and Supporters of victims	57 78.1%	16 21.9%	73 100.0%
5 People visiting the public counter / fines office	0 0.0%	385 100.0%	385 100.0%
6 Witnesses in a criminal case, Supporters of criminal case witnesses, Spectators/tourists and Others	196 53.4%	171 46.6%	367 100.0%
7 Advocates, Solicitors, and Solicitor Advocates	214 69.3%	95 30.7%	309 100.0%
8 All other professionals	207 54.6%	172 45.4%	379 100.0%
Total	1568 55.3%	1265 44.7%	2833 100.0%

Table 6.2 Had to Wait to take part in Court Proceedings by Sheriffdom

	Did you have to wait to take part in court proceedings?		Total
	Yes	No	
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	221 65.0%	119 35.0%	340 100.0%
Grampian, Highland and Islands	306 68.3%	142 31.7%	448 100.0%
Lothian and Borders	149 42.0%	206 58.0%	355 100.0%
North Strathclyde	258 60.0%	172 40.0%	430 100.0%
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	233 50.2%	231 49.8%	464 100.0%
Tayside, Central and Fife	306 56.3%	238 43.8%	544 100.0%
High Court and Court of Session	95 37.7%	157 62.3%	252 100.0%
Total	1568 55.3%	1265 44.7%	2833 100.0%

Table 6.3 Time Waited to take part in Court Proceedings by User Group

	Time waited to take part in court proceedings				Total
	Up to 30 minutes	31 minutes to 1 hour	Over 1 hour and up to 2 hours	Over 2 hours	
1 Accused in a criminal case and Supporters of accused	150 24.7%	139 22.9%	153 25.2%	165 27.2%	607 100.0%
2 Civil litigant, Supporters of civil litigants, Witnesses in a civil case, and Supporters of civil case witnesses	19 31.1%	18 29.5%	14 23.0%	10 16.4%	61 100.0%
3 Jurors (selected and not selected)	93 42.5%	67 30.6%	28 12.8%	31 14.2%	219 100.0%
4 Victims in a criminal case and Supporters of victims	7 12.5%	16 28.6%	25 44.6%	8 14.3%	56 100.0%
6 Witnesses in a criminal case, Supporters of criminal case witnesses, Spectators/tourists and Others	26 13.4%	30 15.5%	58 29.9%	80 41.2%	194 100.0%
7 Advocates, Solicitors, and Solicitor Advocates	104 50.0%	48 23.1%	35 16.8%	21 10.1%	208 100.0%
8 All other professionals	56 28.4%	50 25.4%	41 20.8%	50 25.4%	197 100.0%
Total	455 29.5%	368 23.9%	354 23.0%	365 23.7%	1542 100.0%

Table 6.4 Time Waited to take part in Court Proceedings by Sheriffdom

	Time waited to take part in court proceedings				Total
	Up to 30 minutes	31 minutes to 1 hour	Over 1 hour and up to 2 hours	Over 2 hours	
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	50 23.1%	57 26.4%	58 26.9%	51 23.6%	216 100.0%
Grampian, Highland and Islands	88 29.2%	75 24.9%	63 20.9%	75 24.9%	301 100.0%
Lothian and Borders	52 35.6%	30 20.5%	34 23.3%	30 20.5%	146 100.0%
North Strathclyde	69 27.7%	58 23.3%	62 24.9%	60 24.1%	249 100.0%
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	81 34.9%	62 26.7%	55 23.7%	34 14.7%	232 100.0%
Tayside, Central and Fife	71 23.4%	72 23.8%	70 23.1%	90 29.7%	303 100.0%
High Court and Court of Session	44 46.3%	14 14.7%	12 12.6%	25 26.3%	95 100.0%
Total	455 29.5%	368 23.9%	354 23.0%	365 23.7%	1542 100.0%

Table 6.5 Satisfaction with wait to take part in Court Proceedings by User Group

	How satisfied/disatisfied were you with your wait today?					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
1 Accused in a criminal case and Supporters of accused	65 10.8%	58 9.6%	155 25.7%	153 25.4%	172 28.5%	603 100.0%
2 Civil litigant, Supporters of civil litigants, Witnesses in a civil case, and Supporters of civil case witnesses	7 11.7%	5 8.3%	13 21.7%	23 38.3%	12 20.0%	60 100.0%
3 Jurors (selected and not selected)	16 7.3%	23 10.5%	73 33.2%	71 32.3%	37 16.8%	220 100.0%
4 Victims in a criminal case and Supporters of victims	2 3.6%	7 12.5%	22 39.3%	21 37.5%	4 7.1%	56 100.0%
6 Witnesses in a criminal case, Supporters of criminal case witnesses, Spectators/tourists and Others	29 14.9%	15 7.7%	56 28.9%	53 27.3%	41 21.1%	194 100.0%
7 Advocates, Solicitors, and Solicitor Advocates	7 3.4%	18 8.7%	72 35.0%	59 28.6%	50 24.3%	206 100.0%
8 All other professionals	17 8.4%	22 10.9%	58 28.7%	62 30.7%	43 21.3%	202 100.0%
Total	143 9.3%	148 9.6%	449 29.1%	442 28.7%	359 23.3%	1541 100.0%

Table 6.6 Satisfaction with wait to take part in Court Proceedings by Sheriffdom

	How satisfied/disatisfied were you with your wait today?					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	40 18.4%	27 12.4%	56 25.8%	46 21.2%	48 22.1%	217 100.0%
Grampian, Highland and Islands	17 5.6%	19 6.3%	81 26.6%	88 28.9%	99 32.6%	304 100.0%
Lothian and Borders	15 10.5%	9 6.3%	53 37.1%	51 35.7%	15 10.5%	143 100.0%
North Strathclyde	5 2.0%	17 6.8%	59 23.5%	84 33.5%	86 34.3%	251 100.0%
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	17 7.4%	12 5.2%	76 32.9%	61 26.4%	65 28.1%	231 100.0%
Tayside, Central and Fife	45 15.0%	57 18.9%	94 31.2%	77 25.6%	28 9.3%	301 100.0%
High Court and Court of Session	4 4.3%	7 7.4%	30 31.9%	35 37.2%	18 19.1%	94 100.0%
Total	143 9.3%	148 9.6%	449 29.1%	442 28.7%	359 23.3%	1541 100.0%

Table 6.7 Had to Wait to be Served at Counter by User Group

	Wait to be Served at Counter		Total
	Yes	No	
1 Accused in a criminal case and Supporters of accused	88 9.4%	844 90.6%	932 100.0%
2 Civil litigant, Supporters of civil litigants, Witnesses in a civil case, and Supporters of civil case witnesses	10 10.2%	88 89.8%	98 100.0%
3 Jurors (selected and not selected)	22 7.6%	266 92.4%	288 100.0%
4 Victims in a criminal case and Supporters of victims	29 39.7%	44 60.3%	73 100.0%
5 People visiting the public counter / fines office	79 19.1%	335 80.9%	414 100.0%
6 Witnesses in a criminal case, Supporters of criminal case witnesses, Spectators/tourists and Others	39 10.5%	333 89.5%	372 100.0%
7 Advocates, Solicitors, and Solicitor Advocates	24 8.1%	272 91.9%	296 100.0%
8 All other professionals	51 13.5%	328 86.5%	379 100.0%
Total	342 12.0%	2510 88.0%	2852 100.0%

Table 6.8 Had to Wait to be Served at Counter by Sherifdom

	Wait to be Served at Counter		Total
	Yes	No	
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	104 30.7%	235 69.3%	339 100.0%
Grampian, Highland and Islands	82 17.2%	396 82.8%	478 100.0%
Lothian and Borders	46 13.0%	307 87.0%	353 100.0%
North Strathclyde	49 11.5%	376 88.5%	425 100.0%
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	52 11.2%	413 88.8%	465 100.0%
Tayside, Central and Fife	6 1.1%	534 98.9%	540 100.0%
High Court and Court of Session	3 1.2%	249 98.8%	252 100.0%
Total	342 12.0%	2510 88.0%	2852 100.0%

Table 6.9 Time Waited at Public Counter by User Group

	Length of Wait at Counter			Total
	Up to 15 minutes	16 to 30 minutes	31 minutes to 1 hour	
1 Accused in a criminal case and Supporters of accused	87 98.9%	1 1.1%	0 0.0%	88 100.0%
2 Civil litigant, Supporters of civil litigants, Witnesses in a civil case, and Supporters of civil case witnesses	10 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	10 100.0%
3 Jurors (selected and not selected)	22 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	22 100.0%
4 Victims in a criminal case and Supporters of victims	28 96.6%	0 0.0%	1 3.4%	29 100.0%
5 People visiting the public counter / fines office	76 98.7%	0 0.0%	1 1.3%	77 100.0%
6 Witnesses in a criminal case, Supporters of criminal case witnesses, Spectators/tourists and Others	38 97.4%	0 0.0%	1 2.6%	39 100.0%
7 Advocates, Solicitors, and Solicitor Advocates	24 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	24 100.0%
8 All other professionals	51 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	51 100.0%
Total	336 98.8%	1 0.3%	3 0.9%	340 100.0%

Table 6.10 Time Waited at Public Counter by Sheriffdom

	Length of Wait at Counter			Total
	Up to 15 minutes	16 to 30 minutes	31 minutes to 1 hour	
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	102 98.1%	1 1.0%	1 1.0%	104 100.0%
Grampian, Highland and Islands	80 98.8%	0 0.0%	1 1.2%	81 100.0%
Lothian and Borders	45 97.8%	0 0.0%	1 2.2%	46 100.0%
North Strathclyde	49 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	49 100.0%
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	51 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	51 100.0%
Tayside, Central and Fife	6 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	6 100.0%
High Court and Court of Session	3 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 100.0%
Total	336 98.8%	1 0.3%	3 0.9%	340 100.0%

Table 6.11 Satisfaction with Queue at the Public Counter by User Group

	Satisfaction with Wait at Counter					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
1 Accused in a criminal case and Supporters of accused	1 1.1%	2 2.3%	5 5.7%	50 57.5%	29 33.3%	87 100.0%
2 Civil litigant, Supporters of civil litigants, Witnesses in a civil case, and Supporters of civil case witnesses	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	4 40.0%	6 60.0%	10 100.0%
3 Jurors (selected and not selected)	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	4 18.2%	7 31.8%	11 50.0%	22 100.0%
4 Victims in a criminal case and Supporters of victims	0 0.0%	1 3.7%	0 0.0%	12 44.4%	14 51.9%	27 100.0%
5 People visiting the public counter / fines office	2 2.6%	0 0.0%	4 5.1%	20 25.6%	52 66.7%	78 100.0%
6 Witnesses in a criminal case, Supporters of criminal case witnesses, Spectators/tourists and Others	1 2.6%	0 0.0%	1 2.6%	18 46.2%	19 48.7%	39 100.0%
7 Advocates, Solicitors, and Solicitor Advocates	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 8.3%	4 16.7%	18 75.0%	24 100.0%
8 All other professionals	0 0.0%	1 2.0%	7 14.0%	11 22.0%	31 62.0%	50 100.0%
Total	4 1.2%	4 1.2%	23 6.8%	126 37.4%	180 53.4%	337 100.0%

Table 6.12 Satisfaction with Queue at the Public Counter by Sheriffdom

	Satisfaction with Wait at Counter					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	1 1.0%	2 1.9%	7 6.8%	43 41.7%	50 48.5%	103 100.0%
Grampian, Highland and Islands	1 1.2%	0 0.0%	7 8.6%	18 22.2%	55 67.9%	81 100.0%
Lothian and Borders	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	5 11.1%	34 75.6%	6 13.3%	45 100.0%
North Strathclyde	0 0.0%	1 2.1%	2 4.2%	12 25.0%	33 68.8%	48 100.0%
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	2 3.9%	1 2.0%	0 0.0%	16 31.4%	32 62.7%	51 100.0%
Tayside, Central and Fife	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 16.7%	1 16.7%	4 66.7%	6 100.0%
High Court and Court of Session	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 33.3%	2 66.7%	0 0.0%	3 100.0%
Total	4 1.2%	4 1.2%	23 6.8%	126 37.4%	180 53.4%	337 100.0%

Table 6.13 Satisfaction with court staff's attempts to inform respondents about how much longer they would have to wait by User Group

	Satisfaction with being Informed about Waiting Times					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
1 Accused in a criminal case and Supporters of accused	43 9.4%	47 10.3%	137 30.0%	138 30.2%	92 20.1%	457 100.0%
2 Civil litigant, Supporters of civil litigants, Witnesses in a civil case, and Supporters of civil case witnesses	7 13.0%	6 11.1%	9 16.7%	14 25.9%	18 33.3%	54 100.0%
3 Jurors (selected and not selected)	8 4.0%	14 6.9%	27 13.4%	74 36.6%	79 39.1%	202 100.0%
4 Victims in a criminal case and Supporters of victims	3 5.2%	0 0.0%	14 24.1%	26 44.8%	15 25.9%	58 100.0%
5 People visiting the public counter / fines office	1 2.9%	1 2.9%	6 17.1%	16 45.7%	11 31.4%	35 100.0%
6 Witnesses in a criminal case, Supporters of criminal case witnesses, Spectators/tourists and Others	23 12.6%	13 7.1%	38 20.8%	52 28.4%	57 31.1%	183 100.0%
7 Advocates, Solicitors, and Solicitor Advocates	2 1.7%	1 0.8%	31 25.6%	32 26.4%	55 45.5%	121 100.0%
8 All other professionals	5 2.9%	14 8.1%	25 14.5%	46 26.7%	82 47.7%	172 100.0%
Total	92 7.2%	96 7.5%	287 22.4%	398 31.0%	409 31.9%	1282 100.0%

Table 6.14 Satisfaction with court staff's attempts to inform respondents about how much longer they would have to wait by Sheriffdom

	Satisfaction with being Informed about Waiting Times					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	23 12.2%	10 5.3%	52 27.7%	43 22.9%	60 31.9%	188 100.0%
Grampian, Highland and Islands	13 5.0%	15 5.8%	38 14.7%	75 29.0%	118 45.6%	259 100.0%
Lothian and Borders	11 7.3%	10 6.6%	60 39.7%	56 37.1%	14 9.3%	151 100.0%
North Strathclyde	5 3.0%	7 4.1%	35 20.7%	57 33.7%	65 38.5%	169 100.0%
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	18 8.5%	16 7.6%	32 15.2%	48 22.7%	97 46.0%	211 100.0%
Tayside, Central and Fife	19 8.6%	34 15.3%	53 23.9%	81 36.5%	35 15.8%	222 100.0%
High Court and Court of Session	3 3.7%	4 4.9%	17 20.7%	38 46.3%	20 24.4%	82 100.0%
Total	92 7.2%	96 7.5%	287 22.4%	398 31.0%	409 31.9%	1282 100.0%

Table 6.15 Satisfaction with court staff's attempts to inform respondents about why they had to wait by User Group

	How satisfied/dissatisfied being kept informed why waiting?					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
1 Accused in a criminal case and Supporters of accused	43 9.5%	48 10.5%	130 28.6%	137 30.1%	97 21.3%	455 100.0%
2 Civil litigant, Supporters of civil litigants, Witnesses in a civil case, and Supporters of civil case witnesses	8 14.3%	6 10.7%	5 8.9%	16 28.6%	21 37.5%	56 100.0%
3 Jurors (selected and not selected)	8 3.9%	13 6.3%	26 12.6%	66 32.0%	93 45.1%	206 100.0%
4 Victims in a criminal case and Supporters of victims	3 5.3%	2 3.5%	9 15.8%	24 42.1%	19 33.3%	57 100.0%
5 People visiting the public counter / fines office	2 4.5%	1 2.3%	5 11.4%	20 45.5%	16 36.4%	44 100.0%
6 Witnesses in a criminal case, Supporters of criminal case witnesses, Spectators/tourists and Others	22 12.1%	10 5.5%	45 24.7%	45 24.7%	60 33.0%	182 100.0%
7 Advocates, Solicitors, and Solicitor Advocates	1 0.8%	0 0.0%	26 22.0%	30 25.4%	61 51.7%	118 100.0%
8 All other professionals	2 1.2%	9 5.6%	24 14.8%	37 22.8%	90 55.6%	162 100.0%
Total	89 7.0%	89 7.0%	270 21.1%	375 29.3%	457 35.7%	1280 100.0%

Table 6.16 Satisfaction with court staff's attempts to inform respondents about why they had to wait by Sheriffdom

	How satisfied/dissatisfied being kept informed why waiting?					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	20 11.0%	13 7.1%	36 19.8%	47 25.8%	66 36.3%	182 100.0%
Grampian, Highland and Islands	12 4.5%	11 4.2%	38 14.3%	67 25.3%	137 51.7%	265 100.0%
Lothian and Borders	11 7.2%	9 5.9%	64 42.1%	50 32.9%	18 11.8%	152 100.0%
North Strathclyde	7 4.2%	6 3.6%	29 17.5%	56 33.7%	68 41.0%	166 100.0%
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	17 8.1%	10 4.7%	35 16.6%	45 21.3%	104 49.3%	211 100.0%
Tayside, Central and Fife	20 9.0%	35 15.8%	53 23.9%	77 34.7%	37 16.7%	222 100.0%
High Court and Court of Session	2 2.4%	5 6.1%	15 18.3%	33 40.2%	27 32.9%	82 100.0%
Total	89 7.0%	89 7.0%	270 21.1%	375 29.3%	457 35.7%	1280 100.0%

Table 7.1 Satisfaction with the Range of Catering Facilities by User Group

	Range of food & drink available					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
1 Accused in a criminal case and Supporters of accused	6 4.4%	5 3.7%	18 13.2%	48 35.3%	59 43.4%	136 100.0%
2 Civil litigant, Supporters of civil litigants, Witnesses in a civil case, and Supporters of civil case witnesses	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	4 26.7%	2 13.3%	9 60.0%	15 100.0%
3 Jurors (selected and not selected)	4 2.7%	5 3.4%	47 32.2%	39 26.7%	51 34.9%	146 100.0%
4 Victims in a criminal case and Supporters of victims	1 4.3%	0 0.0%	11 47.8%	11 47.8%	0 0.0%	23 100.0%
5 People visiting the public counter / fines office	0 0.0%	1 33.3%	1 33.3%	0 0.0%	1 33.3%	3 100.0%
6 Witnesses in a criminal case, Supporters of criminal case witnesses, Spectators/tourists and Others	2 2.5%	6 7.5%	20 25.0%	29 36.3%	23 28.8%	80 100.0%
7 Advocates, Solicitors, and Solicitor Advocates	5 6.0%	7 8.3%	25 29.8%	25 29.8%	22 26.2%	84 100.0%
8 All other professionals	1 1.3%	5 6.7%	28 37.3%	18 24.0%	23 30.7%	75 100.0%
Total	19 3.4%	29 5.2%	154 27.4%	172 30.6%	188 33.5%	562 100.0%

Table 7.2 Satisfaction with the Range of Catering Facilities by Sheriffdom

	Range of food & drink available					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	5 4.8%	7 6.7%	45 42.9%	25 23.8%	23 21.9%	105 100.0%
Grampian, Highland and Islands	4 5.1%	4 5.1%	25 31.6%	22 27.8%	24 30.4%	79 100.0%
Lothian and Borders	1 2.4%	3 7.3%	10 24.4%	9 22.0%	18 43.9%	41 100.0%
North Strathclyde	1 1.4%	3 4.1%	15 20.5%	27 37.0%	27 37.0%	73 100.0%
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	4 6.3%	5 7.9%	19 30.2%	19 30.2%	16 25.4%	63 100.0%
Tayside, Central and Fife	2 1.4%	3 2.2%	24 17.4%	48 34.8%	61 44.2%	138 100.0%
High Court and Court of Session	2 3.2%	4 6.3%	16 25.4%	22 34.9%	19 30.2%	63 100.0%
Total	19 3.4%	29 5.2%	154 27.4%	172 30.6%	188 33.5%	562 100.0%

Table 7.3 Satisfaction with the Quality of Food and Drink by User Group

	Quality of food & drink					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
1 Accused in a criminal case and Supporters of accused	4 2.9%	6 4.3%	15 10.9%	45 32.6%	68 49.3%	138 100.0%
2 Civil litigant, Supporters of civil litigants, Witnesses in a civil case, and Supporters of civil case witnesses	0 0.0%	1 6.7%	3 20.0%	2 13.3%	9 60.0%	15 100.0%
3 Jurors (selected and not selected)	4 3.4%	7 5.9%	32 27.1%	35 29.7%	40 33.9%	118 100.0%
4 Victims in a criminal case and Supporters of victims	0 0.0%	1 4.3%	10 43.5%	12 52.2%	0 0.0%	23 100.0%
5 People visiting the public counter / fines office	1 33.3%	0 0.0%	1 33.3%	0 0.0%	1 33.3%	3 100.0%
6 Witnesses in a criminal case, Supporters of criminal case witnesses, Spectators/tourists and Others	2 2.6%	0 0.0%	17 21.8%	38 48.7%	21 26.9%	78 100.0%
7 Advocates, Solicitors, and Solicitor Advocates	2 2.4%	3 3.7%	24 29.3%	28 34.1%	25 30.5%	82 100.0%
8 All other professionals	1 1.3%	4 5.3%	23 30.7%	25 33.3%	22 29.3%	75 100.0%
Total	14 2.6%	22 4.1%	125 23.5%	185 34.8%	186 35.0%	532 100.0%

Table 7.4 Satisfaction with the Quality of Food and Drink by Sheriffdom

	Quality of food & drink					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	4 3.8%	5 4.8%	47 44.8%	24 22.9%	25 23.8%	105 100.0%
Grampian, Highland and Islands	3 4.4%	2 2.9%	13 19.1%	29 42.6%	21 30.9%	68 100.0%
Lothian and Borders	1 2.6%	2 5.3%	5 13.2%	11 28.9%	19 50.0%	38 100.0%
North Strathclyde	0 0.0%	3 4.1%	14 18.9%	27 36.5%	30 40.5%	74 100.0%
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	1 1.7%	3 5.1%	15 25.4%	26 44.1%	14 23.7%	59 100.0%
Tayside, Central and Fife	2 1.5%	2 1.5%	16 12.0%	51 38.3%	62 46.6%	133 100.0%
High Court and Court of Session	3 5.5%	5 9.1%	15 27.3%	17 30.9%	15 27.3%	55 100.0%
Total	14 2.6%	22 4.1%	125 23.5%	185 34.8%	186 35.0%	532 100.0%

Table 7.5 Satisfaction with the Service in the Cafeteria by User Group

	The service in the cafeteria					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
1 Accused in a criminal case and Supporters of accused	1 1.5%	2 2.9%	3 4.4%	12 17.6%	50 73.5%	68 100.0%
2 Civil litigant, Supporters of civil litigants, Witnesses in a civil case, and Supporters of civil case witnesses	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	4 100.0%	4 100.0%
3 Jurors (selected and not selected)	1 1.6%	1 1.6%	14 23.0%	14 23.0%	31 50.8%	61 100.0%
4 Victims in a criminal case and Supporters of victims	0 0.0%	1 6.7%	4 26.7%	8 53.3%	2 13.3%	15 100.0%
5 People visiting the public counter / fines office	1 33.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 33.3%	1 33.3%	3 100.0%
6 Witnesses in a criminal case, Supporters of criminal case witnesses, Spectators/tourists and Others	1 2.0%	1 2.0%	6 12.2%	13 26.5%	28 57.1%	49 100.0%
7 Advocates, Solicitors, and Solicitor Advocates	1 2.0%	0 0.0%	7 14.3%	19 38.8%	22 44.9%	49 100.0%
8 All other professionals	0 0.0%	2 4.0%	7 14.0%	12 24.0%	29 58.0%	50 100.0%
Total	5 1.7%	7 2.3%	41 13.7%	79 26.4%	167 55.9%	299 100.0%

Table 7.6 Satisfaction with the Service in the Cafeteria by Sheriffdom

	The service in the cafeteria					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	2 2.2%	4 4.4%	15 16.7%	27 30.0%	42 46.7%	90 100.0%
Grampian, Highland and Islands	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 7.1%	1 7.1%	12 85.7%	14 100.0%
Lothian and Borders	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 9.5%	1 4.8%	18 85.7%	21 100.0%
North Strathclyde	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 4.8%	22 34.9%	38 60.3%	63 100.0%
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	0 0.0%	1 2.2%	9 19.6%	9 19.6%	27 58.7%	46 100.0%
Tayside, Central and Fife	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 11.5%	6 23.1%	17 65.4%	26 100.0%
High Court and Court of Session	3 7.7%	2 5.1%	8 20.5%	13 33.3%	13 33.3%	39 100.0%
Total	5 1.7%	7 2.3%	41 13.7%	79 26.4%	167 55.9%	299 100.0%

Table 7.7 Facilities Used by Sheriffdom

	Facilities Used											Sheriffdom Total
	Court Room	Jury Room	Waiting Area / Area Outside Court Room	Witness Room	Public entrance / Area Outside the Court Building	Agents' Room / Solicitors' Room	Cells in Court Building	Fines Counter / Public Counter / Clerk's Counter	Toilets in Court Building	Restaurant / Cafe in Court	Other	
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	243 70.6%	27 7.8%	161 46.8%	64 18.6%	107 31.1%	39 11.3%	20 5.8%	36 10.5%	184 53.5%	84 24.4%	8 2.3%	344
Grampian, Highland and Islands	369 76.1%	31 6.4%	235 48.5%	76 15.7%	183 37.7%	64 13.2%	39 8.0%	110 22.7%	185 38.1%	17 3.5%	5 1.0%	485
Lothian and Borders	214 60.3%	22 6.2%	176 49.6%	33 9.3%	301 84.8%	20 5.6%	2 0.6%	143 40.3%	112 31.5%	20 5.6%	10 2.8%	355
North Strathclyde	303 70.1%	29 6.7%	139 32.2%	76 17.6%	105 24.3%	45 10.4%	18 4.2%	78 18.1%	159 36.8%	58 13.4%	8 1.9%	432
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	373 79.7%	36 7.7%	137 29.3%	113 24.1%	125 26.7%	45 9.6%	16 3.4%	79 16.9%	183 39.1%	41 8.8%	7 1.5%	468
Tayside, Central and Fife	350 64.2%	46 8.4%	170 31.2%	49 9.0%	66 12.1%	36 6.6%	26 4.8%	73 13.4%	160 29.4%	28 5.1%	12 2.2%	545
High Court and Court of Session	180 70.6%	55 21.6%	100 39.2%	27 10.6%	206 80.8%	12 4.7%	1 0.4%	115 45.1%	107 42.0%	39 15.3%	26 10.2%	255
Total	2032	246	1118	438	1093	261	122	634	1090	287	76	2884

Note: Percentages and Total are based on respondents, multiple responses given.

Table 7.8 Comfort of Court Room by User Group

	Comfort of Court Room					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
1 Accused in a criminal case and Supporters of accused	35 4.2%	41 4.9%	152 18.1%	268 31.9%	345 41.0%	841 100.0%
2 Civil litigant, Supporters of civil litigants, Witnesses in a civil case, and Supporters of civil case witnesses	1 1.5%	3 4.4%	13 19.1%	19 27.9%	32 47.1%	68 100.0%
3 Jurors (selected and not selected)	7 2.9%	10 4.1%	52 21.3%	93 38.1%	82 33.6%	244 100.0%
4 Victims in a criminal case and Supporters of victims	1 1.5%	0 0.0%	3 4.5%	45 67.2%	18 26.9%	67 100.0%
5 People visiting the public counter / fines office	1 12.5%	1 12.5%	1 12.5%	4 50.0%	1 12.5%	8 100.0%
6 Witnesses in a criminal case, Supporters of criminal case witnesses, Spectators/tourists and Others	3 1.2%	8 3.3%	41 16.9%	91 37.4%	100 41.2%	243 100.0%
7 Advocates, Solicitors, and Solicitor Advocates	7 2.4%	15 5.1%	65 22.2%	100 34.1%	106 36.2%	293 100.0%
8 All other professionals	2 0.7%	9 3.4%	33 12.4%	111 41.6%	112 41.9%	267 100.0%
Total	57 2.8%	87 4.3%	360 17.7%	731 36.0%	796 39.2%	2031 100.0%

Table 7.9 Comfort of Court Room by Sheriffdom

	Comfort of Court Room					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	7 2.9%	14 5.8%	44 18.1%	95 39.1%	83 34.2%	243 100.0%
Grampian, Highland and Islands	7 1.9%	14 3.8%	44 11.9%	147 39.8%	157 42.5%	369 100.0%
Lothian and Borders	9 4.2%	14 6.5%	83 38.8%	70 32.7%	38 17.8%	214 100.0%
North Strathclyde	6 2.0%	5 1.7%	33 10.9%	81 26.7%	178 58.7%	303 100.0%
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	14 3.8%	8 2.1%	41 11.0%	82 22.0%	228 61.1%	373 100.0%
Tayside, Central and Fife	13 3.7%	31 8.9%	76 21.8%	179 51.3%	50 14.3%	349 100.0%
High Court and Court of Session	1 0.6%	1 0.6%	39 21.7%	77 42.8%	62 34.4%	180 100.0%
Total	57 2.8%	87 4.3%	360 17.7%	731 36.0%	796 39.2%	2031 100.0%

Table 7.10 Cleanliness of Court Room by User Group

	Cleanliness of Court Room					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
1 Accused in a criminal case and Supporters of accused	2 0.2%	8 1.0%	58 6.9%	193 23.0%	579 68.9%	840 100.0%
2 Civil litigant, Supporters of civil litigants, Witnesses in a civil case, and Supporters of civil case witnesses	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 2.9%	6 8.8%	60 88.2%	68 100.0%
3 Jurors (selected and not selected)	0 0.0%	4 1.7%	10 4.2%	52 21.8%	173 72.4%	239 100.0%
4 Victims in a criminal case and Supporters of victims	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 4.5%	6 9.1%	57 86.4%	66 100.0%
5 People visiting the public counter / fines office	1 12.5%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 25.0%	5 62.5%	8 100.0%
6 Witnesses in a criminal case, Supporters of criminal case witnesses, Spectators/tourists and Others	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	14 5.8%	51 21.2%	176 73.0%	241 100.0%
7 Advocates, Solicitors, and Solicitor Advocates	1 0.4%	5 1.8%	28 9.9%	83 29.2%	167 58.8%	284 100.0%
8 All other professionals	1 0.4%	1 0.4%	14 5.3%	40 15.1%	209 78.9%	265 100.0%
Total	5 0.2%	18 0.9%	129 6.4%	433 21.5%	1426 70.9%	2011 100.0%

Table 7.11 Cleanliness of Court Room by Sheriffdom

	Cleanliness of Court Room					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	1 0.4%	4 1.7%	30 12.7%	34 14.3%	168 70.9%	237 100.0%
Grampian, Highland and Islands	2 0.6%	1 0.3%	11 3.0%	40 11.0%	309 85.1%	363 100.0%
Lothian and Borders	0 0.0%	4 1.9%	30 14.1%	55 25.8%	124 58.2%	213 100.0%
North Strathclyde	0 0.0%	1 0.3%	11 3.7%	34 11.4%	251 84.5%	297 100.0%
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	0 0.0%	2 0.5%	17 4.6%	37 9.9%	316 84.9%	372 100.0%
Tayside, Central and Fife	2 0.6%	6 1.7%	15 4.3%	186 53.3%	140 40.1%	349 100.0%
High Court and Court of Session	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	15 8.3%	47 26.1%	118 65.6%	180 100.0%
Total	5 0.2%	18 0.9%	129 6.4%	433 21.5%	1426 70.9%	2011 100.0%

Table 7.12 Comfort of Jury Room by User Group

	Comfort of Jury Room					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
1 Accused in a criminal case and Supporters of accused	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 50.0%	0 0.0%	1 50.0%	2 100.0%
3 Jurors (selected and not selected)	10 4.4%	12 5.2%	47 20.5%	78 34.1%	82 35.8%	229 100.0%
4 Victims in a criminal case and Supporters of victims	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%
5 People visiting the public counter / fines office	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%
6 Witnesses in a criminal case, Supporters of criminal case witnesses, Spectators/tourists and Others	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%
7 Advocates, Solicitors, and Solicitor Advocates	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 14.3%	1 14.3%	5 71.4%	7 100.0%
8 All other professionals	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 50.0%	0 0.0%	1 50.0%	2 100.0%
Total	10 4.1%	12 4.9%	51 21.0%	81 33.3%	89 36.6%	243 100.0%

Table 7.13 Comfort of Jury Room by Sheriffdom

	Comfort of Jury Room					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	0 0.0%	2 7.7%	3 11.5%	15 57.7%	6 23.1%	26 100.0%
Grampian, Highland and Islands	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	5 16.7%	7 23.3%	18 60.0%	30 100.0%
Lothian and Borders	2 9.1%	0 0.0%	7 31.8%	4 18.2%	9 40.9%	22 100.0%
North Strathclyde	1 3.6%	1 3.6%	7 25.0%	9 32.1%	10 35.7%	28 100.0%
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	0 0.0%	1 2.8%	10 27.8%	10 27.8%	15 41.7%	36 100.0%
Tayside, Central and Fife	6 13.0%	3 6.5%	11 23.9%	16 34.8%	10 21.7%	46 100.0%
High Court and Court of Session	1 1.8%	5 9.1%	8 14.5%	20 36.4%	21 38.2%	55 100.0%
Total	10 4.1%	12 4.9%	51 21.0%	81 33.3%	89 36.6%	243 100.0%

Table 7.14 Cleanliness of Jury Room by User Group

	Cleanliness of Jury Room					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
1 Accused in a criminal case and Supporters of accused	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 50.0%	0 0.0%	1 50.0%	2 100.0%
3 Jurors (selected and not selected)	0 0.0%	2 0.9%	12 5.3%	61 27.1%	150 66.7%	225 100.0%
4 Victims in a criminal case and Supporters of victims	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%
5 People visiting the public counter / fines office	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	1 100.0%
7 Advocates, Solicitors, and Solicitor Advocates	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 33.3%	4 66.7%	6 100.0%
8 All other professionals	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 33.3%	1 33.3%	1 33.3%	3 100.0%
Total	0 0.0%	2 0.8%	14 5.9%	65 27.3%	157 66.0%	238 100.0%

Table 7.15 Cleanliness of Jury Room by Sheriffdom

	Cleanliness of Jury Room					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 4.2%	3 12.5%	20 83.3%	24 100.0%
Grampian, Highland and Islands	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 3.4%	6 20.7%	22 75.9%	29 100.0%
Lothian and Borders	0 0.0%	1 4.5%	2 9.1%	5 22.7%	14 63.6%	22 100.0%
North Strathclyde	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 3.7%	9 33.3%	17 63.0%	27 100.0%
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	4 11.1%	7 19.4%	25 69.4%	36 100.0%
Tayside, Central and Fife	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 6.7%	19 42.2%	23 51.1%	45 100.0%
High Court and Court of Session	0 0.0%	1 1.8%	2 3.6%	16 29.1%	36 65.5%	55 100.0%
Total	0 0.0%	2 0.8%	14 5.9%	65 27.3%	157 66.0%	238 100.0%

Table 7.16 Comfort of Waiting Area/Area Outside Court Room by User Group

	Comfort of Waiting Area/Area Outside Court Room					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
1 Accused in a criminal case and Supporters of accused	32 7.3%	46 10.5%	104 23.7%	148 33.7%	109 24.8%	439 100.0%
2 Civil litigant, Supporters of civil litigants, Witnesses in a civil case, and Supporters of civil case witnesses	6 13.3%	3 6.7%	5 11.1%	19 42.2%	12 26.7%	45 100.0%
3 Jurors (selected and not selected)	11 8.6%	18 14.1%	33 25.8%	36 28.1%	30 23.4%	128 100.0%
4 Victims in a criminal case and Supporters of victims	0 0.0%	1 2.0%	18 36.0%	27 54.0%	4 8.0%	50 100.0%
5 People visiting the public counter / fines office	0 0.0%	1 6.7%	3 20.0%	7 46.7%	4 26.7%	15 100.0%
6 Witnesses in a criminal case, Supporters of criminal case witnesses, Spectators/tourists and Others	8 5.6%	14 9.7%	26 18.1%	57 39.6%	39 27.1%	144 100.0%
7 Advocates, Solicitors, and Solicitor Advocates	15 11.2%	15 11.2%	33 24.6%	41 30.6%	30 22.4%	134 100.0%
8 All other professionals	7 4.3%	13 8.0%	44 27.2%	57 35.2%	41 25.3%	162 100.0%
Total	79 7.1%	111 9.9%	266 23.8%	392 35.1%	269 24.1%	1117 100.0%

Table 7.17 Comfort of Waiting Area/Area Outside Court Room by Sheriffdom

	Comfort of Waiting Area/Area Outside Court Room					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	24 15.0%	23 14.4%	38 23.8%	61 38.1%	14 8.8%	160 100.0%
Grampian, Highland and Islands	8 3.4%	18 7.7%	64 27.2%	74 31.5%	71 30.2%	235 100.0%
Lothian and Borders	19 10.8%	26 14.8%	56 31.8%	50 28.4%	25 14.2%	176 100.0%
North Strathclyde	3 2.2%	8 5.8%	22 15.8%	49 35.3%	57 41.0%	139 100.0%
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	5 3.6%	5 3.6%	16 11.7%	53 38.7%	58 42.3%	137 100.0%
Tayside, Central and Fife	17 10.0%	28 16.5%	49 28.8%	65 38.2%	11 6.5%	170 100.0%
High Court and Court of Session	3 3.0%	3 3.0%	21 21.0%	40 40.0%	33 33.0%	100 100.0%
Total	79 7.1%	111 9.9%	266 23.8%	392 35.1%	269 24.1%	1117 100.0%

Table 7.18 Cleanliness of Waiting Area/Area Outside Court Room by User Group

	Cleanliness of Waiting Area/Area Outside Court Room					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
1 Accused in a criminal case and Supporters of accused	1 0.2%	6 1.4%	40 9.2%	142 32.6%	247 56.7%	436 100.0%
2 Civil litigant, Supporters of civil litigants, Witnesses in a civil case, and Supporters of civil case witnesses	1 2.2%	0 0.0%	2 4.4%	10 22.2%	32 71.1%	45 100.0%
3 Jurors (selected and not selected)	1 0.8%	1 0.8%	11 8.8%	44 35.2%	68 54.4%	125 100.0%
4 Victims in a criminal case and Supporters of victims	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	4 8.0%	8 16.0%	38 76.0%	50 100.0%
5 People visiting the public counter / fines office	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 13.3%	2 13.3%	11 73.3%	15 100.0%
6 Witnesses in a criminal case, Supporters of criminal case witnesses, Spectators/tourists and Others	1 0.7%	3 2.1%	12 8.5%	33 23.2%	93 65.5%	142 100.0%
7 Advocates, Solicitors, and Solicitor Advocates	4 3.0%	7 5.3%	15 11.4%	28 21.2%	78 59.1%	132 100.0%
8 All other professionals	2 1.3%	1 0.6%	14 8.9%	34 21.7%	106 67.5%	157 100.0%
Total	10 0.9%	18 1.6%	100 9.1%	301 27.3%	673 61.1%	1102 100.0%

Table 7.19 Cleanliness of Waiting Area/Area Outside Court Room by Sheriffdom

	Cleanliness of Waiting Area/Area Outside Court Room					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	6 3.8%	12 7.5%	24 15.0%	38 23.8%	80 50.0%	160 100.0%
Grampian, Highland and Islands	1 0.4%	2 0.9%	9 3.9%	32 13.9%	187 81.0%	231 100.0%
Lothian and Borders	0 0.0%	1 0.6%	34 19.5%	32 18.4%	107 61.5%	174 100.0%
North Strathclyde	2 1.5%	0 0.0%	3 2.2%	25 18.4%	106 77.9%	136 100.0%
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	0 0.0%	2 1.5%	9 6.8%	13 9.8%	108 81.8%	132 100.0%
Tayside, Central and Fife	1 0.6%	1 0.6%	13 7.6%	123 72.4%	32 18.8%	170 100.0%
High Court and Court of Session	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	8 8.1%	38 38.4%	53 53.5%	99 100.0%
Total	10 0.9%	18 1.6%	100 9.1%	301 27.3%	673 61.1%	1102 100.0%

Table 7.20 Comfort of Witness Room by User Group

	Comfort of Witness Room					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
1 Accused in a criminal case and Supporters of accused	1 5.6%	2 11.1%	3 16.7%	5 27.8%	7 38.9%	18 100.0%
2 Civil litigant, Supporters of civil litigants, Witnesses in a civil case, and Supporters of civil case witnesses	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	4 12.5%	7 21.9%	21 65.6%	32 100.0%
3 Jurors (selected and not selected)	0 0.0%	1 11.1%	2 22.2%	3 33.3%	3 33.3%	9 100.0%
4 Victims in a criminal case and Supporters of victims	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	16 64.0%	9 36.0%	25 100.0%
6 Witnesses in a criminal case, Supporters of criminal case witnesses, Spectators/tourists and Others	6 3.9%	10 6.5%	19 12.3%	54 34.8%	66 42.6%	155 100.0%
7 Advocates, Solicitors, and Solicitor Advocates	3 7.1%	1 2.4%	7 16.7%	15 35.7%	16 38.1%	42 100.0%
8 All other professionals	10 6.5%	17 11.0%	23 14.9%	56 36.4%	48 31.2%	154 100.0%
Total	20 4.6%	31 7.1%	58 13.3%	156 35.9%	170 39.1%	435 100.0%

Table 7.21 Comfort of Witness Room by Sheriffdom

	Comfort of Witness Room					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	10 15.9%	12 19.0%	8 12.7%	20 31.7%	13 20.6%	63 100.0%
Grampian, Highland and Islands	1 1.3%	2 2.6%	5 6.6%	38 50.0%	30 39.5%	76 100.0%
Lothian and Borders	2 6.1%	3 9.1%	9 27.3%	9 27.3%	10 30.3%	33 100.0%
North Strathclyde	0 0.0%	3 3.9%	6 7.9%	24 31.6%	43 56.6%	76 100.0%
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	4 3.5%	2 1.8%	17 15.0%	32 28.3%	58 51.3%	113 100.0%
Tayside, Central and Fife	3 6.3%	7 14.6%	10 20.8%	21 43.8%	7 14.6%	48 100.0%
High Court and Court of Session	0 0.0%	2 7.7%	3 11.5%	12 46.2%	9 34.6%	26 100.0%
Total	20 4.6%	31 7.1%	58 13.3%	156 35.9%	170 39.1%	435 100.0%

Table 7.22 Cleanliness of Witness Room by User Group

	Cleanliness of Witness Room					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
1 Accused in a criminal case and Supporters of accused	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 16.7%	5 27.8%	10 55.6%	18 100.0%
2 Civil litigant, Supporters of civil litigants, Witnesses in a civil case, and Supporters of civil case witnesses	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 3.1%	6 18.8%	25 78.1%	32 100.0%
3 Jurors (selected and not selected)	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 11.1%	3 33.3%	5 55.6%	9 100.0%
4 Victims in a criminal case and Supporters of victims	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 8.3%	22 91.7%	24 100.0%
6 Witnesses in a criminal case, Supporters of criminal case witnesses, Spectators/tourists and Others	0 0.0%	1 0.6%	9 5.8%	32 20.8%	112 72.7%	154 100.0%
7 Advocates, Solicitors, and Solicitor Advocates	1 2.4%	0 0.0%	4 9.8%	6 14.6%	30 73.2%	41 100.0%
8 All other professionals	2 1.3%	2 1.3%	20 13.0%	45 29.2%	85 55.2%	154 100.0%
Total	3 0.7%	3 0.7%	38 8.8%	99 22.9%	289 66.9%	432 100.0%

Table 7.23 Cleanliness of Witness Room by Sherifffdom

	Cleanliness of Witness Room					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	1 1.6%	2 3.2%	13 20.6%	11 17.5%	36 57.1%	63 100.0%
Grampian, Highland and Islands	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 2.7%	10 13.5%	62 83.8%	74 100.0%
Lothian and Borders	1 3.0%	0 0.0%	4 12.1%	7 21.2%	21 63.6%	33 100.0%
North Strathclyde	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	4 5.3%	11 14.7%	60 80.0%	75 100.0%
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	1 0.9%	0 0.0%	11 9.8%	21 18.8%	79 70.5%	112 100.0%
Tayside, Central and Fife	0 0.0%	1 2.0%	2 4.1%	32 65.3%	14 28.6%	49 100.0%
High Court and Court of Session	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 7.7%	7 26.9%	17 65.4%	26 100.0%
Total	3 0.7%	3 0.7%	38 8.8%	99 22.9%	289 66.9%	432 100.0%

Table 7.24 Comfort of Public Entrance/Area Outside Court Building by User Group

	Comfort of Public Entrance/Area Outside Court Building					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
1 Accused in a criminal case and Supporters of accused	12 4.3%	25 9.0%	100 35.8%	66 23.7%	76 27.2%	279 100.0%
2 Civil litigant, Supporters of civil litigants, Witnesses in a civil case, and Supporters of civil case witnesses	2 7.1%	0 0.0%	8 28.6%	11 39.3%	7 25.0%	28 100.0%
3 Jurors (selected and not selected)	2 1.4%	8 5.5%	41 28.1%	53 36.3%	42 28.8%	146 100.0%
4 Victims in a criminal case and Supporters of victims	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	26 66.7%	9 23.1%	4 10.3%	39 100.0%
5 People visiting the public counter / fines office	1 0.6%	16 9.3%	50 29.1%	64 37.2%	41 23.8%	172 100.0%
6 Witnesses in a criminal case, Supporters of criminal case witnesses, Spectators/tourists and Others	1 0.6%	23 13.0%	61 34.5%	54 30.5%	38 21.5%	177 100.0%
7 Advocates, Solicitors, and Solicitor Advocates	4 3.4%	17 14.7%	43 37.1%	29 25.0%	23 19.8%	116 100.0%
8 All other professionals	4 3.1%	6 4.7%	46 35.9%	44 34.4%	28 21.9%	128 100.0%
Total	26 2.4%	95 8.8%	375 34.6%	330 30.4%	259 23.9%	1085 100.0%

Table 7.25 Comfort of Public Entrance/Area Outside Court Building by Sheriffdom

	Comfort of Public Entrance/Area Outside Court Building					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	7 6.5%	6 5.6%	47 43.9%	36 33.6%	11 10.3%	107 100.0%
Grampian, Highland and Islands	4 2.2%	8 4.4%	58 32.0%	54 29.8%	57 31.5%	181 100.0%
Lothian and Borders	5 1.7%	50 16.7%	125 41.7%	65 21.7%	55 18.3%	300 100.0%
North Strathclyde	1 1.0%	2 1.9%	42 40.8%	33 32.0%	25 24.3%	103 100.0%
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	6 4.8%	6 4.8%	29 23.4%	33 26.6%	50 40.3%	124 100.0%
Tayside, Central and Fife	3 4.6%	8 12.3%	17 26.2%	29 44.6%	8 12.3%	65 100.0%
High Court and Court of Session	0 0.0%	15 7.3%	57 27.8%	80 39.0%	53 25.9%	205 100.0%
Total	26 2.4%	95 8.8%	375 34.6%	330 30.4%	259 23.9%	1085 100.0%

Table 7.26 Cleanliness of Public Entrance/Area Outside Court Building by User Group

	Cleanliness of Public Entrance/Area Outside Court Building					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
1 Accused in a criminal case and Supporters of accused	4 1.4%	3 1.1%	51 18.4%	75 27.1%	144 52.0%	277 100.0%
2 Civil litigant, Supporters of civil litigants, Witnesses in a civil case, and Supporters of civil case witnesses	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 10.7%	8 28.6%	17 60.7%	28 100.0%
3 Jurors (selected and not selected)	1 0.7%	3 2.0%	28 18.9%	41 27.7%	75 50.7%	148 100.0%
4 Victims in a criminal case and Supporters of victims	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	7 18.4%	16 42.1%	15 39.5%	38 100.0%
5 People visiting the public counter / fines office	0 0.0%	2 1.2%	25 14.5%	46 26.7%	99 57.6%	172 100.0%
6 Witnesses in a criminal case, Supporters of criminal case witnesses, Spectators/tourists and Others	0 0.0%	7 4.0%	22 12.6%	59 33.7%	87 49.7%	175 100.0%
7 Advocates, Solicitors, and Solicitor Advocates	1 0.9%	10 8.7%	28 24.3%	44 38.3%	32 27.8%	115 100.0%
8 All other professionals	6 4.7%	2 1.6%	20 15.7%	57 44.9%	42 33.1%	127 100.0%
Total	12 1.1%	27 2.5%	184 17.0%	346 32.0%	511 47.3%	1080 100.0%

Table 7.27 Cleanliness of Public Entrance/Area Outside Court Building by Sheriffdom

	Cleanliness of Public Entrance/Area Outside Court Building					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	5 4.8%	8 7.7%	23 22.1%	39 37.5%	29 27.9%	104 100.0%
Grampian, Highland and Islands	5 2.8%	3 1.7%	21 11.7%	35 19.6%	115 64.2%	179 100.0%
Lothian and Borders	0 0.0%	8 2.7%	76 25.3%	72 24.0%	144 48.0%	300 100.0%
North Strathclyde	1 1.0%	2 1.9%	14 13.5%	50 48.1%	37 35.6%	104 100.0%
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	1 0.8%	3 2.4%	15 12.2%	30 24.4%	74 60.2%	123 100.0%
Tayside, Central and Fife	0 0.0%	3 4.5%	17 25.8%	37 56.1%	9 13.6%	66 100.0%
High Court and Court of Session	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	18 8.8%	83 40.7%	103 50.5%	204 100.0%
Total	12 1.1%	27 2.5%	184 17.0%	346 32.0%	511 47.3%	1080 100.0%

Table 7.28 Comfort of Agents' Room/Solicitors' Room by User Group

	Comfort of Agents' Room/Solicitors' Room					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
1 Accused in a criminal case and Supporters of accused	1 33.3%	0 0.0%	1 33.3%	1 33.3%	0 0.0%	3 100.0%
2 Civil litigant, Supporters of civil litigants, Witnesses in a civil case, and Supporters of civil case witnesses	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%
5 People visiting the public counter / fines office	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%
6 Witnesses in a criminal case, Supporters of criminal case witnesses, Spectators/tourists and Others	0 0.0%	1 25.0%	1 25.0%	1 25.0%	1 25.0%	4 100.0%
7 Advocates, Solicitors, and Solicitor Advocates	7 3.1%	21 9.4%	50 22.4%	79 35.4%	66 29.6%	223 100.0%
8 All other professionals	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 10.7%	13 46.4%	12 42.9%	28 100.0%
Total	8 3.1%	22 8.5%	55 21.2%	96 36.9%	79 30.4%	260 100.0%

Table 7.29 Comfort of Agents' Room/Solicitors' Room by Sheriffdom

	Comfort of Agents' Room/Solicitors' Room					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	7 17.9%	6 15.4%	10 25.6%	12 30.8%	4 10.3%	39 100.0%
Grampian, Highland and Islands	0 0.0%	9 14.1%	8 12.5%	20 31.3%	27 42.2%	64 100.0%
Lothian and Borders	0 0.0%	1 5.0%	15 75.0%	2 10.0%	2 10.0%	20 100.0%
North Strathclyde	1 2.3%	0 0.0%	7 15.9%	26 59.1%	10 22.7%	44 100.0%
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	0 0.0%	1 2.2%	8 17.8%	18 40.0%	18 40.0%	45 100.0%
Tayside, Central and Fife	0 0.0%	5 13.9%	4 11.1%	13 36.1%	14 38.9%	36 100.0%
High Court and Court of Session	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 25.0%	5 41.7%	4 33.3%	12 100.0%
Total	8 3.1%	22 8.5%	55 21.2%	96 36.9%	79 30.4%	260 100.0%

Table 7.30 Cleanliness of Agents' Room/Solicitors' Room by User Group

	Cleanliness of Agents' Room/Solicitors' Room					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
1 Accused in a criminal case and Supporters of accused	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 33.3%	0 0.0%	2 66.7%	3 100.0%
2 Civil litigant, Supporters of civil litigants, Witnesses in a civil case, and Supporters of civil case witnesses	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%
5 People visiting the public counter / fines office	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	1 100.0%
6 Witnesses in a criminal case, Supporters of criminal case witnesses, Spectators/tourists and Others	0 0.0%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	1 25.0%	2 50.0%	4 100.0%
7 Advocates, Solicitors, and Solicitor Advocates	1 0.5%	11 5.0%	42 19.1%	62 28.2%	104 47.3%	220 100.0%
8 All other professionals	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	7 25.0%	7 25.0%	14 50.0%	28 100.0%
Total	1 0.4%	12 4.7%	51 19.8%	70 27.2%	123 47.9%	257 100.0%

Table 7.31 Cleanliness of Agents' Room/Solicitors' Room by Sheriffdom

	Cleanliness of Agents' Room/Solicitors' Room					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	1 2.7%	4 10.8%	18 48.6%	7 18.9%	7 18.9%	37 100.0%
Grampian, Highland and Islands	0 0.0%	3 4.8%	6 9.7%	10 16.1%	43 69.4%	62 100.0%
Lothian and Borders	0 0.0%	1 5.0%	6 30.0%	10 50.0%	3 15.0%	20 100.0%
North Strathclyde	0 0.0%	1 2.2%	7 15.6%	14 31.1%	23 51.1%	45 100.0%
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	0 0.0%	2 4.4%	4 8.9%	10 22.2%	29 64.4%	45 100.0%
Tayside, Central and Fife	0 0.0%	1 2.8%	8 22.2%	14 38.9%	13 36.1%	36 100.0%
High Court and Court of Session	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 16.7%	5 41.7%	5 41.7%	12 100.0%
Total	1 0.4%	12 4.7%	51 19.8%	70 27.2%	123 47.9%	257 100.0%

Table 7.32 Comfort of Cells by User Group

	Comfort of Cells					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
1 Accused in a criminal case and Supporters of accused	10 45.5%	7 31.8%	3 13.6%	1 4.5%	1 4.5%	22 100.0%
2 Civil litigant, Supporters of civil litigants, Witnesses in a civil case, and Supporters of civil case witnesses	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%
3 Jurors (selected and not selected)	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%
5 People visiting the public counter / fines office	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 100.0%	2 100.0%
7 Advocates, Solicitors, and Solicitor Advocates	9 14.8%	7 11.5%	29 47.5%	9 14.8%	7 11.5%	61 100.0%
8 All other professionals	2 5.9%	2 5.9%	15 44.1%	9 26.5%	6 17.6%	34 100.0%
Total	21 17.4%	16 13.2%	47 38.8%	21 17.4%	16 13.2%	121 100.0%

Table 7.33 Comfort of Cells by Sheriffdom

	Comfort of Cells					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	7 35.0%	1 5.0%	9 45.0%	3 15.0%	0 0.0%	20 100.0%
Grampian, Highland and Islands	3 7.9%	4 10.5%	22 57.9%	5 13.2%	4 10.5%	38 100.0%
Lothian and Borders	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 100.0%	0 0.0%	2 100.0%
North Strathclyde	1 5.6%	1 5.6%	7 38.9%	4 22.2%	5 27.8%	18 100.0%
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	2 12.5%	3 18.8%	3 18.8%	3 18.8%	5 31.3%	16 100.0%
Tayside, Central and Fife	8 30.8%	7 26.9%	6 23.1%	3 11.5%	2 7.7%	26 100.0%
High Court and Court of Session	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%
Total	21 17.4%	16 13.2%	47 38.8%	21 17.4%	16 13.2%	121 100.0%

Table 7.34 Cleanliness of Cells by User Group

	Cleanliness of Cells					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
1 Accused in a criminal case and Supporters of accused	8 36.4%	1 4.5%	4 18.2%	4 18.2%	5 22.7%	22 100.0%
2 Civil litigant, Supporters of civil litigants, Witnesses in a civil case, and Supporters of civil case witnesses	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%
3 Jurors (selected and not selected)	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	1 100.0%
5 People visiting the public counter / fines office	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 100.0%	2 100.0%
7 Advocates, Solicitors, and Solicitor Advocates	4 7.1%	4 7.1%	19 33.9%	17 30.4%	12 21.4%	56 100.0%
8 All other professionals	2 5.9%	3 8.8%	7 20.6%	12 35.3%	10 29.4%	34 100.0%
Total	14 12.1%	8 6.9%	30 25.9%	34 29.3%	30 25.9%	116 100.0%

Table 7.35 Cleanliness of Cells by Sheriffdom

	Cleanliness of Cells					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	3 16.7%	3 16.7%	6 33.3%	6 33.3%	0 0.0%	18 100.0%
Grampian, Highland and Islands	2 5.3%	2 5.3%	8 21.1%	12 31.6%	14 36.8%	38 100.0%
Lothian and Borders	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 100.0%	0 0.0%	2 100.0%
North Strathclyde	1 5.9%	1 5.9%	5 29.4%	6 35.3%	4 23.5%	17 100.0%
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	2 13.3%	0 0.0%	1 6.7%	2 13.3%	10 66.7%	15 100.0%
Tayside, Central and Fife	6 24.0%	2 8.0%	10 40.0%	6 24.0%	1 4.0%	25 100.0%
High Court and Court of Session	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	1 100.0%
Total	14 12.1%	8 6.9%	30 25.9%	34 29.3%	30 25.9%	116 100.0%

Table 7.36 Comfort of Fines Office/Public Counter/Clerk's Office by User Group

	Comfort of Fines Office/Public Counter/Clerk's Office					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
1 Accused in a criminal case and Supporters of accused	2 3.3%	3 5.0%	28 46.7%	15 25.0%	12 20.0%	60 100.0%
2 Civil litigant, Supporters of civil litigants, Witnesses in a civil case, and Supporters of civil case witnesses	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 15.4%	5 38.5%	6 46.2%	13 100.0%
3 Jurors (selected and not selected)	0 0.0%	3 8.6%	9 25.7%	15 42.9%	8 22.9%	35 100.0%
4 Victims in a criminal case and Supporters of victims	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 25.0%	3 75.0%	0 0.0%	4 100.0%
5 People visiting the public counter / fines office	0 0.0%	7 1.8%	60 15.3%	117 29.8%	208 53.1%	392 100.0%
6 Witnesses in a criminal case, Supporters of criminal case witnesses, Spectators/tourists and Others	0 0.0%	10 12.3%	40 49.4%	19 23.5%	12 14.8%	81 100.0%
7 Advocates, Solicitors, and Solicitor Advocates	0 0.0%	1 6.7%	5 33.3%	3 20.0%	6 40.0%	15 100.0%
8 All other professionals	1 2.9%	1 2.9%	12 35.3%	9 26.5%	11 32.4%	34 100.0%
Total	3 0.5%	25 3.9%	157 24.8%	186 29.3%	263 41.5%	634 100.0%

Table 7.37 Comfort of Fines Office/Public Counter/Clerk's Office by Sheriffdom

	Comfort of Fines Office/Public Counter/Clerk's Office					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	1 2.8%	2 5.6%	3 8.3%	18 50.0%	12 33.3%	36 100.0%
Grampian, Highland and Islands	2 1.8%	3 2.7%	8 7.3%	34 30.9%	63 57.3%	110 100.0%
Lothian and Borders	0 0.0%	9 6.3%	78 54.5%	37 25.9%	19 13.3%	143 100.0%
North Strathclyde	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	4 5.1%	16 20.5%	58 74.4%	78 100.0%
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	0 0.0%	1 1.3%	7 8.9%	13 16.5%	58 73.4%	79 100.0%
Tayside, Central and Fife	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	15 20.5%	26 35.6%	32 43.8%	73 100.0%
High Court and Court of Session	0 0.0%	10 8.7%	42 36.5%	42 36.5%	21 18.3%	115 100.0%
Total	3 0.5%	25 3.9%	157 24.8%	186 29.3%	263 41.5%	634 100.0%

Table 7.38 Cleanliness of Fines Office/Public Counter/Clerk's Office by User Group

	Cleanliness of Fines Office/Public Counter/Clerk's Office					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
1 Accused in a criminal case and Supporters of accused	2 3.3%	0 0.0%	13 21.7%	20 33.3%	25 41.7%	60 100.0%
2 Civil litigant, Supporters of civil litigants, Witnesses in a civil case, and Supporters of civil case witnesses	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	6 46.2%	7 53.8%	13 100.0%
3 Jurors (selected and not selected)	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	5 14.3%	9 25.7%	21 60.0%	35 100.0%
4 Victims in a criminal case and Supporters of victims	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 25.0%	2 50.0%	1 25.0%	4 100.0%
5 People visiting the public counter / fines office	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	26 6.6%	50 12.8%	316 80.6%	392 100.0%
6 Witnesses in a criminal case, Supporters of criminal case witnesses, Spectators/tourists and Others	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	16 19.8%	35 43.2%	30 37.0%	81 100.0%
7 Advocates, Solicitors, and Solicitor Advocates	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 13.3%	6 40.0%	7 46.7%	15 100.0%
8 All other professionals	1 3.1%	0 0.0%	3 9.4%	7 21.9%	21 65.6%	32 100.0%
Total	3 0.5%	0 0.0%	66 10.4%	135 21.4%	428 67.7%	632 100.0%

Table 7.39 Cleanliness of Fines Office/Public Counter/Clerk's Office by Sheriffdom

	Cleanliness of Fines Office/Public Counter/Clerk's Office					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	1 2.8%	0 0.0%	6 16.7%	10 27.8%	19 52.8%	36 100.0%
Grampian, Highland and Islands	2 1.8%	0 0.0%	3 2.8%	9 8.3%	95 87.2%	109 100.0%
Lothian and Borders	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	38 26.6%	43 30.1%	62 43.4%	143 100.0%
North Strathclyde	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 2.6%	6 7.7%	70 89.7%	78 100.0%
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 1.3%	6 7.6%	72 91.1%	79 100.0%
Tayside, Central and Fife	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	4 5.6%	16 22.2%	52 72.2%	72 100.0%
High Court and Court of Session	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	12 10.4%	45 39.1%	58 50.4%	115 100.0%
Total	3 0.5%	0 0.0%	66 10.4%	135 21.4%	428 67.7%	632 100.0%

Table 7.40 Comfort of Toilets by User Group

	Comfort of Toilets					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
1 Accused in a criminal case and Supporters of accused	21 5.9%	16 4.5%	84 23.6%	114 32.0%	121 34.0%	356 100.0%
2 Civil litigant, Supporters of civil litigants, Witnesses in a civil case, and Supporters of civil case witnesses	1 2.7%	0 0.0%	4 10.8%	19 51.4%	13 35.1%	37 100.0%
3 Jurors (selected and not selected)	4 2.2%	7 3.8%	43 23.2%	64 34.6%	67 36.2%	185 100.0%
4 Victims in a criminal case and Supporters of victims	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	19 38.0%	27 54.0%	4 8.0%	50 100.0%
5 People visiting the public counter / fines office	1 4.5%	0 0.0%	4 18.2%	16 72.7%	1 4.5%	22 100.0%
6 Witnesses in a criminal case, Supporters of criminal case witnesses, Spectators/tourists and Others	4 3.0%	5 3.7%	31 23.0%	44 32.6%	51 37.8%	135 100.0%
7 Advocates, Solicitors, and Solicitor Advocates	11 7.9%	15 10.8%	41 29.5%	42 30.2%	30 21.6%	139 100.0%
8 All other professionals	9 5.5%	9 5.5%	40 24.5%	62 38.0%	43 26.4%	163 100.0%
Total	51 4.7%	52 4.8%	266 24.5%	388 35.7%	330 30.4%	1087 100.0%

Table 7.41 Comfort of Toilets by Sheriffdom

	Comfort of Toilets					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	22 12.0%	19 10.4%	66 36.1%	59 32.2%	17 9.3%	183 100.0%
Grampian, Highland and Islands	9 4.9%	5 2.7%	19 10.3%	88 47.8%	63 34.2%	184 100.0%
Lothian and Borders	1 0.9%	5 4.5%	31 27.7%	14 12.5%	61 54.5%	112 100.0%
North Strathclyde	5 3.1%	5 3.1%	34 21.4%	49 30.8%	66 41.5%	159 100.0%
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	8 4.4%	8 4.4%	47 25.7%	71 38.8%	49 26.8%	183 100.0%
Tayside, Central and Fife	6 3.8%	8 5.0%	41 25.6%	74 46.3%	31 19.4%	160 100.0%
High Court and Court of Session	0 0.0%	2 1.9%	28 26.4%	33 31.1%	43 40.6%	106 100.0%
Total	51 4.7%	52 4.8%	266 24.5%	388 35.7%	330 30.4%	1087 100.0%

Table 7.42 Cleanliness of Toilets by User Group

	Cleanliness of Toilets					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
1 Accused in a criminal case and Supporters of accused	17 4.8%	18 5.1%	51 14.3%	106 29.8%	164 46.1%	356 100.0%
2 Civil litigant, Supporters of civil litigants, Witnesses in a civil case, and Supporters of civil case witnesses	2 5.4%	0 0.0%	5 13.5%	9 24.3%	21 56.8%	37 100.0%
3 Jurors (selected and not selected)	2 1.1%	6 3.3%	21 11.5%	59 32.2%	95 51.9%	183 100.0%
4 Victims in a criminal case and Supporters of victims	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	4 8.0%	23 46.0%	23 46.0%	50 100.0%
5 People visiting the public counter / fines office	2 9.1%	0 0.0%	1 4.5%	12 54.5%	7 31.8%	22 100.0%
6 Witnesses in a criminal case, Supporters of criminal case witnesses, Spectators/tourists and Others	4 3.0%	3 2.2%	15 11.2%	42 31.3%	70 52.2%	134 100.0%
7 Advocates, Solicitors, and Solicitor Advocates	5 3.7%	18 13.2%	29 21.3%	37 27.2%	47 34.6%	136 100.0%
8 All other professionals	9 5.5%	8 4.9%	23 14.1%	47 28.8%	76 46.6%	163 100.0%
Total	41 3.8%	53 4.9%	149 13.8%	335 31.0%	503 46.5%	1081 100.0%

Table 7.43 Cleanliness of Toilets by Sheriffdom

	Cleanliness of Toilets					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	16 8.9%	24 13.3%	35 19.4%	68 37.8%	37 20.6%	180 100.0%
Grampian, Highland and Islands	5 2.7%	6 3.3%	11 6.0%	35 19.2%	125 68.7%	182 100.0%
Lothian and Borders	2 1.8%	0 0.0%	15 13.4%	21 18.8%	74 66.1%	112 100.0%
North Strathclyde	4 2.5%	10 6.3%	20 12.6%	40 25.2%	85 53.5%	159 100.0%
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	7 3.8%	6 3.3%	32 17.6%	58 31.9%	79 43.4%	182 100.0%
Tayside, Central and Fife	7 4.4%	6 3.8%	17 10.6%	76 47.5%	54 33.8%	160 100.0%
High Court and Court of Session	0 0.0%	1 0.9%	19 17.9%	37 34.9%	49 46.2%	106 100.0%
Total	41 3.8%	53 4.9%	149 13.8%	335 31.0%	503 46.5%	1081 100.0%

Table 7.44 Comfort of Restaurant/Café in Court Building by User Group

	Comfort of Restaurant/Café in Court Building					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
1 Accused in a criminal case and Supporters of accused	0 0.0%	1 1.5%	6 8.8%	22 32.4%	39 57.4%	68 100.0%
2 Civil litigant, Supporters of civil litigants, Witnesses in a civil case, and Supporters of civil case witnesses	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 25.0%	1 25.0%	2 50.0%	4 100.0%
3 Jurors (selected and not selected)	0 0.0%	1 1.7%	13 22.4%	19 32.8%	25 43.1%	58 100.0%
4 Victims in a criminal case and Supporters of victims	0 0.0%	1 5.6%	3 16.7%	9 50.0%	5 27.8%	18 100.0%
5 People visiting the public counter / fines office	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 50.0%	1 50.0%	2 100.0%
6 Witnesses in a criminal case, Supporters of criminal case witnesses, Spectators/tourists and Others	0 0.0%	5 9.8%	5 9.8%	23 45.1%	18 35.3%	51 100.0%
7 Advocates, Solicitors, and Solicitor Advocates	3 6.8%	2 4.5%	8 18.2%	25 56.8%	6 13.6%	44 100.0%
8 All other professionals	1 2.4%	4 9.8%	12 29.3%	13 31.7%	11 26.8%	41 100.0%
Total	4 1.4%	14 4.9%	48 16.8%	113 39.5%	107 37.4%	286 100.0%

Table 7.45 Comfort of Restaurant/Café in Court Building by Sheriffdom

	Comfort of Restaurant/Café in Court Building					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	3 3.6%	2 2.4%	11 13.1%	38 45.2%	30 35.7%	84 100.0%
Grampian, Highland and Islands	0 0.0%	1 6.3%	1 6.3%	7 43.8%	7 43.8%	16 100.0%
Lothian and Borders	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 15.0%	7 35.0%	10 50.0%	20 100.0%
North Strathclyde	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	5 8.6%	24 41.4%	29 50.0%	58 100.0%
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	0 0.0%	8 19.5%	14 34.1%	9 22.0%	10 24.4%	41 100.0%
Tayside, Central and Fife	1 3.6%	1 3.6%	4 14.3%	14 50.0%	8 28.6%	28 100.0%
High Court and Court of Session	0 0.0%	2 5.1%	10 25.6%	14 35.9%	13 33.3%	39 100.0%
Total	4 1.4%	14 4.9%	48 16.8%	113 39.5%	107 37.4%	286 100.0%

Table 7.46 Cleanliness of Restaurant/Café in Court Building by User Group

	Cleanliness of Restaurant/Café in Court Building					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
1 Accused in a criminal case and Supporters of accused	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	4 5.9%	14 20.6%	50 73.5%	68 100.0%
2 Civil litigant, Supporters of civil litigants, Witnesses in a civil case, and Supporters of civil case witnesses	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 25.0%	3 75.0%	4 100.0%
3 Jurors (selected and not selected)	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	6 10.9%	17 30.9%	32 58.2%	55 100.0%
4 Victims in a criminal case and Supporters of victims	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 5.6%	1 5.6%	16 88.9%	18 100.0%
5 People visiting the public counter / fines office	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 50.0%	1 50.0%	2 100.0%
6 Witnesses in a criminal case, Supporters of criminal case witnesses, Spectators/tourists and Others	0 0.0%	1 2.0%	5 10.0%	9 18.0%	35 70.0%	50 100.0%
7 Advocates, Solicitors, and Solicitor Advocates	1 2.6%	1 2.6%	4 10.3%	12 30.8%	21 53.8%	39 100.0%
8 All other professionals	1 2.5%	1 2.5%	3 7.5%	10 25.0%	25 62.5%	40 100.0%
Total	2 0.7%	3 1.1%	23 8.3%	65 23.6%	183 66.3%	276 100.0%

Table 7.47 Cleanliness of Restaurant/Café in Court Building by Sheriffdom

	Cleanliness of Restaurant/Café in Court Building					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	1 1.3%	1 1.3%	9 11.3%	14 17.5%	55 68.8%	80 100.0%
Grampian, Highland and Islands	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 13.3%	4 26.7%	9 60.0%	15 100.0%
Lothian and Borders	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 5.0%	3 15.0%	16 80.0%	20 100.0%
North Strathclyde	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 1.8%	8 14.3%	47 83.9%	56 100.0%
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	0 0.0%	1 2.6%	3 7.9%	9 23.7%	25 65.8%	38 100.0%
Tayside, Central and Fife	1 3.6%	1 3.6%	0 0.0%	12 42.9%	14 50.0%	28 100.0%
High Court and Court of Session	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	7 17.9%	15 38.5%	17 43.6%	39 100.0%
Total	2 0.7%	3 1.1%	23 8.3%	65 23.6%	183 66.3%	276 100.0%

Table 7.48 Safety and Security of Court Room by User Group

	Safety and Security of Court Room					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
1 Accused in a criminal case and Supporters of accused	4 0.5%	6 0.7%	25 3.0%	149 17.7%	656 78.1%	840 100.0%
2 Civil litigant, Supporters of civil litigants, Witnesses in a civil case, and Supporters of civil case witnesses	1 1.5%	0 0.0%	2 2.9%	5 7.4%	60 88.2%	68 100.0%
3 Jurors (selected and not selected)	2 0.8%	2 0.8%	10 4.2%	46 19.3%	178 74.8%	238 100.0%
4 Victims in a criminal case and Supporters of victims	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 3.1%	5 7.7%	58 89.2%	65 100.0%
5 People visiting the public counter / fines office	1 12.5%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	7 87.5%	8 100.0%
6 Witnesses in a criminal case, Supporters of criminal case witnesses, Spectators/tourists and Others	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	5 2.1%	25 10.4%	211 87.6%	241 100.0%
7 Advocates, Solicitors, and Solicitor Advocates	2 0.7%	8 2.8%	29 10.2%	61 21.6%	183 64.7%	283 100.0%
8 All other professionals	3 1.1%	6 2.3%	13 4.9%	41 15.5%	202 76.2%	265 100.0%
Total	13 0.6%	22 1.1%	86 4.3%	332 16.5%	1555 77.4%	2008 100.0%

Table 7.49 Safety and Security of Court Room by Sheriffdom

	Safety and Security of Court Room					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	4 1.7%	4 1.7%	20 8.4%	28 11.8%	181 76.4%	237 100.0%
Grampian, Highland and Islands	3 0.8%	2 0.6%	12 3.3%	38 10.5%	308 84.8%	363 100.0%
Lothian and Borders	3 1.4%	0 0.0%	5 2.3%	13 6.1%	192 90.1%	213 100.0%
North Strathclyde	0 0.0%	3 1.0%	9 3.0%	30 10.1%	254 85.8%	296 100.0%
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	2 0.5%	6 1.6%	18 4.8%	25 6.7%	321 86.3%	372 100.0%
Tayside, Central and Fife	1 0.3%	6 1.7%	13 3.7%	170 49.0%	157 45.2%	347 100.0%
High Court and Court of Session	0 0.0%	1 0.6%	9 5.0%	28 15.6%	142 78.9%	180 100.0%
Total	13 0.6%	22 1.1%	86 4.3%	332 16.5%	1555 77.4%	2008 100.0%

Table 7.50 Safety and Security of Jury Room by User Group

	Safety and Security of Jury Room					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
1 Accused in a criminal case and Supporters of accused	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 50.0%	0 0.0%	1 50.0%	2 100.0%
3 Jurors (selected and not selected)	1 0.4%	1 0.4%	5 2.2%	36 16.1%	180 80.7%	223 100.0%
4 Victims in a criminal case and Supporters of victims	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%
5 People visiting the public counter / fines office	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	1 100.0%
7 Advocates, Solicitors, and Solicitor Advocates	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 16.7%	5 83.3%	6 100.0%
8 All other professionals	0 0.0%	1 50.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 50.0%	2 100.0%
Total	1 0.4%	2 0.9%	6 2.6%	38 16.2%	188 80.0%	235 100.0%

Table 7.51 Safety and Security of Jury Room by Sheriffdom

	Safety and Security of Jury Room					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 13.0%	20 87.0%	23 100.0%
Grampian, Highland and Islands	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	4 13.8%	25 86.2%	29 100.0%
Lothian and Borders	1 4.5%	1 4.5%	1 4.5%	2 9.1%	17 77.3%	22 100.0%
North Strathclyde	0 0.0%	1 3.7%	0 0.0%	4 14.8%	22 81.5%	27 100.0%
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 5.6%	4 11.1%	30 83.3%	36 100.0%
Tayside, Central and Fife	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 2.3%	11 25.0%	32 72.7%	44 100.0%
High Court and Court of Session	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 3.7%	10 18.5%	42 77.8%	54 100.0%
Total	1 0.4%	2 0.9%	6 2.6%	38 16.2%	188 80.0%	235 100.0%

Table 7.52 Safety and Security of Waiting Area/Area Outside Court Room by User Group

	Safety and Security of Waiting Area/Area Outside Court Room					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
1 Accused in a criminal case and Supporters of accused	4 0.9%	8 1.8%	18 4.1%	115 26.3%	293 66.9%	438 100.0%
2 Civil litigant, Supporters of civil litigants, Witnesses in a civil case, and Supporters of civil case witnesses	2 4.4%	3 6.7%	0 0.0%	8 17.8%	32 71.1%	45 100.0%
3 Jurors (selected and not selected)	2 1.6%	6 4.7%	13 10.2%	41 32.3%	65 51.2%	127 100.0%
4 Victims in a criminal case and Supporters of victims	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 6.1%	7 14.3%	39 79.6%	49 100.0%
5 People visiting the public counter / fines office	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 6.7%	14 93.3%	15 100.0%
6 Witnesses in a criminal case, Supporters of criminal case witnesses, Spectators/tourists and Others	2 1.4%	4 2.8%	10 6.9%	20 13.9%	108 75.0%	144 100.0%
7 Advocates, Solicitors, and Solicitor Advocates	7 5.4%	9 7.0%	18 14.0%	12 9.3%	83 64.3%	129 100.0%
8 All other professionals	2 1.3%	4 2.5%	23 14.6%	19 12.0%	110 69.6%	158 100.0%
Total	19 1.7%	34 3.1%	85 7.7%	223 20.2%	744 67.3%	1105 100.0%

Table 7.53 Safety and Security of Waiting Area/Area Outside Court Room by Sheriffdom

	Safety and Security of Waiting Area/Area Outside Court Room					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	5 3.1%	9 5.6%	23 14.4%	21 13.1%	102 63.8%	160 100.0%
Grampian, Highland and Islands	0 0.0%	5 2.2%	16 6.9%	28 12.1%	183 78.9%	232 100.0%
Lothian and Borders	4 2.3%	7 4.0%	7 4.0%	15 8.5%	143 81.3%	176 100.0%
North Strathclyde	2 1.5%	3 2.2%	7 5.2%	12 9.0%	110 82.1%	134 100.0%
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	4 3.0%	4 3.0%	6 4.5%	13 9.8%	106 79.7%	133 100.0%
Tayside, Central and Fife	3 1.8%	4 2.4%	12 7.1%	111 65.3%	40 23.5%	170 100.0%
High Court and Court of Session	1 1.0%	2 2.0%	14 14.0%	23 23.0%	60 60.0%	100 100.0%
Total	19 1.7%	34 3.1%	85 7.7%	223 20.2%	744 67.3%	1105 100.0%

Table 7.54 Safety and Security of Witness Room by User Group

	Safety and Security of Witness Room					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
1 Accused in a criminal case and Supporters of accused	0 0.0%	1 5.6%	2 11.1%	4 22.2%	11 61.1%	18 100.0%
2 Civil litigant, Supporters of civil litigants, Witnesses in a civil case, and Supporters of civil case witnesses	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 3.1%	6 18.8%	25 78.1%	32 100.0%
3 Jurors (selected and not selected)	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 20.0%	8 80.0%	10 100.0%
4 Victims in a criminal case and Supporters of victims	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	24 100.0%	24 100.0%
6 Witnesses in a criminal case, Supporters of criminal case witnesses, Spectators/tourists and Others	0 0.0%	2 1.3%	3 1.9%	20 13.0%	129 83.8%	154 100.0%
7 Advocates, Solicitors, and Solicitor Advocates	3 7.3%	0 0.0%	3 7.3%	6 14.6%	29 70.7%	41 100.0%
8 All other professionals	2 1.3%	8 5.2%	24 15.5%	28 18.1%	93 60.0%	155 100.0%
Total	5 1.2%	11 2.5%	33 7.6%	66 15.2%	319 73.5%	434 100.0%

Table 7.55 Safety and Security of Witness Room by Sheriffdom

	Safety and Security of Witness Room					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	2 3.2%	4 6.3%	12 19.0%	3 4.8%	42 66.7%	63 100.0%
Grampian, Highland and Islands	0 0.0%	2 2.7%	2 2.7%	7 9.3%	64 85.3%	75 100.0%
Lothian and Borders	1 3.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 9.1%	29 87.9%	33 100.0%
North Strathclyde	0 0.0%	2 2.7%	5 6.7%	8 10.7%	60 80.0%	75 100.0%
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	2 1.8%	2 1.8%	9 8.0%	12 10.7%	87 77.7%	112 100.0%
Tayside, Central and Fife	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 6.1%	26 53.1%	20 40.8%	49 100.0%
High Court and Court of Session	0 0.0%	1 3.7%	2 7.4%	7 25.9%	17 63.0%	27 100.0%
Total	5 1.2%	11 2.5%	33 7.6%	66 15.2%	319 73.5%	434 100.0%

Table 7.56 Safety and Security of Public Entrance/Area Outside Court Building by User Group

	Safety and Security of Public Entrance/Area Outside Court Building					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
1 Accused in a criminal case and Supporters of accused	7 2.5%	3 1.1%	9 3.2%	33 11.9%	226 81.3%	278 100.0%
2 Civil litigant, Supporters of civil litigants, Witnesses in a civil case, and Supporters of civil case witnesses	1 3.6%	2 7.1%	0 0.0%	3 10.7%	22 78.6%	28 100.0%
3 Jurors (selected and not selected)	4 2.7%	12 8.2%	30 20.4%	30 20.4%	71 48.3%	147 100.0%
4 Victims in a criminal case and Supporters of victims	0 0.0%	1 2.7%	4 10.8%	6 16.2%	26 70.3%	37 100.0%
5 People visiting the public counter / fines office	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	13 7.6%	159 92.4%	172 100.0%
6 Witnesses in a criminal case, Supporters of criminal case witnesses, Spectators/tourists and Others	0 0.0%	2 1.1%	5 2.8%	21 11.9%	149 84.2%	177 100.0%
7 Advocates, Solicitors, and Solicitor Advocates	5 4.3%	8 7.0%	23 20.0%	20 17.4%	59 51.3%	115 100.0%
8 All other professionals	5 3.8%	7 5.4%	22 16.9%	31 23.8%	65 50.0%	130 100.0%
Total	22 2.0%	35 3.2%	93 8.6%	157 14.5%	777 71.7%	1084 100.0%

Table 7.57 Safety and Security of Public Entrance/Area Outside Court Building by Sheriffdom

	Safety and Security of Public Entrance/Area Outside Court Building					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	8 7.7%	7 6.7%	19 18.3%	19 18.3%	51 49.0%	104 100.0%
Grampian, Highland and Islands	6 3.3%	2 1.1%	18 10.0%	17 9.4%	137 76.1%	180 100.0%
Lothian and Borders	0 0.0%	8 2.7%	5 1.7%	21 7.0%	267 88.7%	301 100.0%
North Strathclyde	2 1.9%	4 3.8%	7 6.7%	25 24.0%	66 63.5%	104 100.0%
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	3 2.4%	7 5.6%	14 11.3%	13 10.5%	87 70.2%	124 100.0%
Tayside, Central and Fife	2 3.1%	6 9.2%	12 18.5%	34 52.3%	11 16.9%	65 100.0%
High Court and Court of Session	1 0.5%	1 0.5%	18 8.7%	28 13.6%	158 76.7%	206 100.0%
Total	22 2.0%	35 3.2%	93 8.6%	157 14.5%	777 71.7%	1084 100.0%

Table 7.58 Safety and Security of Agents Room/Solicitors Room by User Group

	Safety and Security of Agents Room/Solicitors Room					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
1 Accused in a criminal case and Supporters of accused	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 100.0%	3 100.0%
2 Civil litigant, Supporters of civil litigants, Witnesses in a civil case, and Supporters of civil case witnesses	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%
5 People visiting the public counter / fines office	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	1 100.0%
6 Witnesses in a criminal case, Supporters of criminal case witnesses, Spectators/tourists and Others	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	4 100.0%	4 100.0%
7 Advocates, Solicitors, and Solicitor Advocates	8 3.7%	6 2.7%	19 8.7%	40 18.3%	146 66.7%	219 100.0%
8 All other professionals	1 3.7%	0 0.0%	2 7.4%	7 25.9%	17 63.0%	27 100.0%
Total	9 3.5%	6 2.4%	22 8.6%	47 18.4%	171 67.1%	255 100.0%

Table 7.59 Safety and Security of Agents Room/Solicitors Room by Sheriffdom

	Safety and Security of Agents Room/Solicitors Room					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	6 16.2%	3 8.1%	4 10.8%	7 18.9%	17 45.9%	37 100.0%
Grampian, Highland and Islands	0 0.0%	1 1.6%	6 9.7%	7 11.3%	48 77.4%	62 100.0%
Lothian and Borders	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 10.0%	1 5.0%	17 85.0%	20 100.0%
North Strathclyde	1 2.3%	0 0.0%	4 9.3%	12 27.9%	26 60.5%	43 100.0%
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	0 0.0%	1 2.2%	1 2.2%	6 13.3%	37 82.2%	45 100.0%
Tayside, Central and Fife	2 5.6%	1 2.8%	4 11.1%	12 33.3%	17 47.2%	36 100.0%
High Court and Court of Session	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 8.3%	2 16.7%	9 75.0%	12 100.0%
Total	9 3.5%	6 2.4%	22 8.6%	47 18.4%	171 67.1%	255 100.0%

Table 7.60 Safety and Security of Cells by User Group

	Safety and Security of Cells					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
1 Accused in a criminal case and Supporters of accused	2 9.1%	0 0.0%	2 9.1%	11 50.0%	7 31.8%	22 100.0%
2 Civil litigant, Supporters of civil litigants, Witnesses in a civil case, and Supporters of civil case witnesses	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%
3 Jurors (selected and not selected)	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	1 100.0%
5 People visiting the public counter / fines office	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 100.0%	2 100.0%
7 Advocates, Solicitors, and Solicitor Advocates	1 1.9%	2 3.8%	9 17.0%	17 32.1%	24 45.3%	53 100.0%
8 All other professionals	1 2.9%	1 2.9%	5 14.7%	7 20.6%	20 58.8%	34 100.0%
Total	4 3.5%	3 2.7%	16 14.2%	36 31.9%	54 47.8%	113 100.0%

Table 7.61 Safety and Security of Cells by Sheriffdom

	Safety and Security of Cells					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	1 5.9%	2 11.8%	2 11.8%	7 41.2%	5 29.4%	17 100.0%
Grampian, Highland and Islands	1 2.7%	1 2.7%	4 10.8%	7 18.9%	24 64.9%	37 100.0%
Lothian and Borders	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 100.0%	2 100.0%
North Strathclyde	1 6.3%	0 0.0%	4 25.0%	6 37.5%	5 31.3%	16 100.0%
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	1 6.7%	0 0.0%	2 13.3%	1 6.7%	11 73.3%	15 100.0%
Tayside, Central and Fife	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	4 16.0%	15 60.0%	6 24.0%	25 100.0%
High Court and Court of Session	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	1 100.0%
Total	4 3.5%	3 2.7%	16 14.2%	36 31.9%	54 47.8%	113 100.0%

Table 7.62 Safety and Security of Fines Office/Public Counter/Clerks Office by User Group

	Safety and Security of Fines Office/Public Counter/Clerks Office					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
1 Accused in a criminal case and Supporters of accused	0 0.0%	1 1.7%	2 3.3%	2 3.3%	55 91.7%	60 100.0%
2 Civil litigant, Supporters of civil litigants, Witnesses in a civil case, and Supporters of civil case witnesses	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 15.4%	1 7.7%	10 76.9%	13 100.0%
3 Jurors (selected and not selected)	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	5 14.3%	5 14.3%	25 71.4%	35 100.0%
4 Victims in a criminal case and Supporters of victims	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 75.0%	1 25.0%	4 100.0%
5 People visiting the public counter / fines office	0 0.0%	2 0.5%	8 2.0%	21 5.4%	361 92.1%	392 100.0%
6 Witnesses in a criminal case, Supporters of criminal case witnesses, Spectators/tourists and Others	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 1.2%	5 6.2%	75 92.6%	81 100.0%
7 Advocates, Solicitors, and Solicitor Advocates	1 7.1%	0 0.0%	4 28.6%	2 14.3%	7 50.0%	14 100.0%
8 All other professionals	2 5.9%	0 0.0%	2 5.9%	7 20.6%	23 67.6%	34 100.0%
Total	3 0.5%	3 0.5%	24 3.8%	46 7.3%	557 88.0%	633 100.0%

Table 7.63 Safety and Security of Fines Office/Public Counter/Clerks Office by Sheriffdom

	Safety and Security of Fines Office/Public Counter/Clerks Office					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	0 0.0%	2 5.6%	3 8.3%	7 19.4%	24 66.7%	36 100.0%
Grampian, Highland and Islands	2 1.8%	0 0.0%	2 1.8%	5 4.5%	101 91.8%	110 100.0%
Lothian and Borders	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 0.7%	1 0.7%	141 98.6%	143 100.0%
North Strathclyde	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 2.6%	5 6.5%	70 90.9%	77 100.0%
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 2.5%	3 3.8%	74 93.7%	79 100.0%
Tayside, Central and Fife	1 1.4%	1 1.4%	9 12.3%	10 13.7%	52 71.2%	73 100.0%
High Court and Court of Session	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	5 4.3%	15 13.0%	95 82.6%	115 100.0%
Total	3 0.5%	3 0.5%	24 3.8%	46 7.3%	557 88.0%	633 100.0%

Table 7.64 Safety and Security of Toilets by User Group

	Safety and Security of Toilets					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
1 Accused in a criminal case and Supporters of accused	13 3.7%	7 2.0%	23 6.5%	70 19.7%	243 68.3%	356 100.0%
2 Civil litigant, Supporters of civil litigants, Witnesses in a civil case, and Supporters of civil case witnesses	1 2.7%	0 0.0%	3 8.1%	3 8.1%	30 81.1%	37 100.0%
3 Jurors (selected and not selected)	0 0.0%	3 1.6%	18 9.9%	48 26.4%	113 62.1%	182 100.0%
4 Victims in a criminal case and Supporters of victims	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 6.1%	7 14.3%	39 79.6%	49 100.0%
5 People visiting the public counter / fines office	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 13.6%	3 13.6%	16 72.7%	22 100.0%
6 Witnesses in a criminal case, Supporters of criminal case witnesses, Spectators/tourists and Others	3 2.2%	1 0.7%	12 8.9%	21 15.6%	98 72.6%	135 100.0%
7 Advocates, Solicitors, and Solicitor Advocates	4 3.0%	12 9.0%	22 16.4%	30 22.4%	66 49.3%	134 100.0%
8 All other professionals	5 3.1%	5 3.1%	18 11.1%	32 19.8%	102 63.0%	162 100.0%
Total	26 2.4%	28 2.6%	102 9.5%	214 19.9%	707 65.6%	1077 100.0%

Table 7.65 Safety and Security of Toilets by Sherifdom

	Safety and Security of Toilets					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	14 7.7%	12 6.6%	27 14.9%	31 17.1%	97 53.6%	181 100.0%
Grampian, Highland and Islands	5 2.8%	5 2.8%	5 2.8%	17 9.4%	148 82.2%	180 100.0%
Lothian and Borders	1 0.9%	1 0.9%	2 1.8%	10 8.9%	98 87.5%	112 100.0%
North Strathclyde	1 0.6%	4 2.5%	12 7.6%	28 17.7%	113 71.5%	158 100.0%
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	4 2.2%	2 1.1%	18 9.8%	31 16.9%	128 69.9%	183 100.0%
Tayside, Central and Fife	1 0.6%	3 1.9%	23 14.6%	69 43.9%	61 38.9%	157 100.0%
High Court and Court of Session	0 0.0%	1 0.9%	15 14.2%	28 26.4%	62 58.5%	106 100.0%
Total	26 2.4%	28 2.6%	102 9.5%	214 19.9%	707 65.6%	1077 100.0%

Table 7.66 Safety and Security of Restaurant/Café in Court Building by User Group

	Safety and Security of Restaurant/Café in Court Building					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
1 Accused in a criminal case and Supporters of accused	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 1.5%	18 26.5%	49 72.1%	68 100.0%
2 Civil litigant, Supporters of civil litigants, Witnesses in a civil case, and Supporters of civil case witnesses	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 25.0%	0 0.0%	3 75.0%	4 100.0%
3 Jurors (selected and not selected)	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	5 8.9%	16 28.6%	35 62.5%	56 100.0%
4 Victims in a criminal case and Supporters of victims	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 5.6%	3 16.7%	14 77.8%	18 100.0%
5 People visiting the public counter / fines office	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 50.0%	1 50.0%	2 100.0%
6 Witnesses in a criminal case, Supporters of criminal case witnesses, Spectators/tourists and Others	1 2.0%	2 4.0%	1 2.0%	9 18.0%	37 74.0%	50 100.0%
7 Advocates, Solicitors, and Solicitor Advocates	3 7.7%	1 2.6%	4 10.3%	8 20.5%	23 59.0%	39 100.0%
8 All other professionals	1 2.4%	0 0.0%	8 19.5%	6 14.6%	26 63.4%	41 100.0%
Total	5 1.8%	3 1.1%	21 7.6%	61 21.9%	188 67.6%	278 100.0%

Table 7.67 Safety and Security of Restaurant/Café in Court Building by Sheriffdom

	Safety and Security of Restaurant/Café in Court Building					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	2 2.5%	2 2.5%	6 7.5%	17 21.3%	53 66.3%	80 100.0%
Grampian, Highland and Islands	1 6.3%	0 0.0%	1 6.3%	4 25.0%	10 62.5%	16 100.0%
Lothian and Borders	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 15.0%	2 10.0%	15 75.0%	20 100.0%
North Strathclyde	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	4 7.1%	6 10.7%	46 82.1%	56 100.0%
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 7.7%	7 17.9%	29 74.4%	39 100.0%
Tayside, Central and Fife	2 7.1%	1 3.6%	2 7.1%	9 32.1%	14 50.0%	28 100.0%
High Court and Court of Session	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 5.1%	16 41.0%	21 53.8%	39 100.0%
Total	5 1.8%	3 1.1%	21 7.6%	61 21.9%	188 67.6%	278 100.0%

Table 8.1 Satisfaction with Overall Service Provided by the Scottish Court Service by User Group

	Overall Satisfaction					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
1 Accused in a criminal case and Supporters of accused	24 2.6%	42 4.5%	155 16.6%	357 38.1%	358 38.2%	936 100.0%
2 Civil litigant, Supporters of civil litigants, Witnesses in a civil case, and Supporters of civil case witnesses	7 7.1%	2 2.0%	12 12.2%	30 30.6%	47 48.0%	98 100.0%
3 Jurors (selected and not selected)	5 1.7%	5 1.7%	35 11.9%	101 34.5%	147 50.2%	293 100.0%
4 Victims in a criminal case and Supporters of victims	1 1.4%	2 2.7%	10 13.7%	26 35.6%	34 46.6%	73 100.0%
5 People visiting the public counter / fines office	3 0.7%	6 1.5%	14 3.4%	69 16.7%	320 77.7%	412 100.0%
6 Witnesses in a criminal case, Supporters of criminal case witnesses, Spectators/tourists and Others	6 1.6%	10 2.7%	48 12.8%	115 30.7%	195 52.1%	374 100.0%
7 Advocates, Solicitors, and Solicitor Advocates	3 1.0%	5 1.6%	37 12.1%	99 32.4%	162 52.9%	306 100.0%
8 All other professionals	2 0.5%	9 2.3%	48 12.5%	110 28.6%	216 56.1%	385 100.0%
Total	51 1.8%	81 2.8%	359 12.5%	907 31.5%	1479 51.4%	2877 100.0%

Table 8.2 Satisfaction with Overall Service Provided by the Scottish Court Service by Sheriffdom

	Overall Satisfaction					Total
	Very Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	6 1.7%	17 4.9%	61 17.7%	118 34.3%	142 41.3%	344 100.0%
Grampian, Highland and Islands	6 1.3%	14 2.9%	42 8.8%	131 27.4%	285 59.6%	478 100.0%
Lothian and Borders	9 2.5%	6 1.7%	46 13.0%	165 46.5%	129 36.3%	355 100.0%
North Strathclyde	2 0.5%	9 2.1%	43 9.9%	95 21.9%	285 65.7%	434 100.0%
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	14 3.0%	8 1.7%	37 7.9%	97 20.8%	310 66.5%	466 100.0%
Tayside, Central and Fife	14 2.6%	25 4.6%	106 19.4%	233 42.7%	168 30.8%	546 100.0%
High Court and Court of Session	0 0.0%	2 0.8%	24 9.4%	68 26.8%	160 63.0%	254 100.0%
Total	51 1.8%	81 2.8%	359 12.5%	907 31.5%	1479 51.4%	2877 100.0%

Table 8.3 Knowledge about providing feedback by User Group

	Do you know how to complain or provide feedback?			Total
	Yes	No	Don't know	
1 Accused in a criminal case and Supporters of accused	325 34.8%	601 64.3%	9 1.0%	935 100.0%
2 Civil litigant, Supporters of civil litigants, Witnesses in a civil case, and Supporters of civil case witnesses	33 34.0%	61 62.9%	3 3.1%	97 100.0%
3 Jurors (selected and not selected)	110 38.2%	158 54.9%	20 6.9%	288 100.0%
4 Victims in a criminal case and Supporters of victims	14 18.9%	60 81.1%	0 0.0%	74 100.0%
5 People visiting the public counter / fines office	161 38.9%	248 59.9%	5 1.2%	414 100.0%
6 Witnesses in a criminal case, Supporters of criminal case witnesses, Spectators/tourists and Others	115 30.7%	254 67.9%	5 1.3%	374 100.0%
7 Advocates, Solicitors, and Solicitor Advocates	245 80.3%	48 15.7%	12 3.9%	305 100.0%
8 All other professionals	261 66.9%	112 28.7%	17 4.4%	390 100.0%
Total	1264 43.9%	1542 53.6%	71 2.5%	2877 100.0%

Table 8.4 Knowledge about providing feedback by Sheriffdom

	Do you know how to complain or provide feedback?			Total
	Yes	No	Don't know	
Glasgow and Strathkelvin	137 40.1%	195 57.0%	10 2.9%	342 100.0%
Grampian, Highland and Islands	205 42.7%	255 53.1%	20 4.2%	480 100.0%
Lothian and Borders	193 54.2%	160 44.9%	3 0.8%	356 100.0%
North Strathclyde	214 49.1%	213 48.9%	9 2.1%	436 100.0%
South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	226 48.2%	229 48.8%	14 3.0%	469 100.0%
Tayside, Central and Fife	208 38.3%	328 60.4%	7 1.3%	543 100.0%
High Court and Court of Session	81 32.3%	162 64.5%	8 3.2%	251 100.0%
Total	1264 43.9%	1542 53.6%	71 2.5%	2877 100.0%

Appendix B – Survey Questionnaire

<p>Declaration This interview was conducted by the interviewer named opposite at the specified court. Signature: _____</p>	<p>Interviewer Name: Interview Date/Time: Court: Interview Number:</p>
--	---

Scottish Court Service Court User Satisfaction Survey 2011

Q1. Are you attending court today as part of your professional/working role?

Yes ₁ **ASK Q3 AND Q4** No ₂ **ASK Q2**

Status

Q2. In what capacity are you attending court today? **SHOW CARD A1. Tick one only.**

- | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Accused in Criminal Case | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Victim in Criminal Case |
| Supporter of Accused | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Supporter of Victim |
| Civil Litigant | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Visiting Public Counter/Fines Office |
| Supporter of Civil Litigant | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Witness in Criminal Case |
| Witness in Civil Case | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Supporter of Criminal Case Witness |
| Supporter of Civil Case Witness | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Spectator/Tourist |
| Juror (serving) | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other (tick and write in) |
| Juror (not selected) | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

GO TO Q5

Q3. In what capacity are you attending court today? **SHOW CARD A2. Tick one only.**

- | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| Advocate (Senior or Junior) | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Reliance Staff |
| Advocate Depute | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Safeguarder |
| Appropriate Adult | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Sheriff Officer/Messenger at Arms |
| Children's Reporter | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Shorthand Writer |
| Crown Junior | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Social Worker (or Trainee Social Worker) |
| Expert Witness | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Solicitor (or Trainee Solicitor) |
| Interpreter | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Solicitor Advocate |
| Police Witness | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Victim Support Worker |
| Press Reporter | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Witness Service Worker |
| Prison Service Staff | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other (tick and write in) |
| Procurator Fiscal/Depute | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Q4. For what reason are you attending court today? **SHOW CARD A3. Tick all that apply.**

- | | | | | |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| Attend Criminal Court | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Visit In-Court Advisor/Mediation Services |
| Attend Civil Court | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Visit Public Counter/Fines Office |
| Visit Criminal Office | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Visit Social Work Office |
| Visit Civil Office | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Visit Victim Information and Advice Office |
| Visit Cashier's Office | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | This is my permanent place of work |
| Visit Commissary Office | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other (tick and write in) |
| Visit Fiscal's Office | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Q5. Are you here today for High Court, Sheriff Court or Justice of the Peace Court Business?

- | | | | | |
|----------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| High Court | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Paying a Fine or other Penalty |
| Sheriff Court | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Not Applicable |
| Justice of the Peace Court | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Don't Know |

Use of Scottish Court Service Website

Q6. Have you used the Scottish Court Service website for any of the following reasons in the last twelve months? **SHOW CARD A4. Tick all that apply.**

Yes ₁ **CONTINUE**

No ₂ **GO TO Q9**

Q7. **IF USED WEBSITE ASK:** On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is 'very difficult' and 5 is 'very easy', how difficult or easy was it to find the information that you needed on the SCS website? **SHOW CARD A5 (CIRCLE NUMBER)**

Reason for Using Website	Q6	Q7 Ease of finding the information you needed on the SCS website					
		Very difficult				Very easy	Can't Remember
To obtain information on daily court business	<input type="checkbox"/> ₁	1	2	3	4	5	6
To obtain information about SCS and/or its role	<input type="checkbox"/> ₂	1	2	3	4	5	6
To obtain information about the Scottish justice system	<input type="checkbox"/> ₃	1	2	3	4	5	6
To obtain information leaflets and/or forms used in courts	<input type="checkbox"/> ₄	1	2	3	4	5	6
To obtain court addresses/phone numbers/directions to courts	<input type="checkbox"/> ₅	1	2	3	4	5	6
To pay a fine or other financial penalty online	<input type="checkbox"/> ₆	1	2	3	4	5	6
Other (tick and write in)	<input type="checkbox"/> ₇	1	2	3	4	5	6

Q8. Having visited the website, is there any other information or service you would like to see provided online?

.....

.....

Getting to Court

Q9. Is this the first time that you have ever visited **this** court **in any capacity**?

Yes ₁

No ₂

Can't Remember ₃

Q10. How did you travel to court today? Please select your **main** mode only. **SHOW CARD A6. Tick one option only.**

Walked ₁

Bus ₆

Bicycle ₂

Train ₇

Motorbike ₃

Taxi ₈

Car (driver) ₄

Other (**tick and write in**) ₉ _____

Car (passenger) ₅

Q11. Roughly how long did the journey take? **SHOW CARD A7. Tick one option only.**

Up to 15 minutes ₁

Over 1 hour and up to 2 hours ₄

16 to 30 minutes ₂

Over 2 hours ₅

31 minutes to 1 hour ₃

Can't remember ₆

Q12. How far did you travel to get to court today? **SHOW CARD A8. Tick one option only.**

- | | | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Up to 1 mile | <input type="checkbox"/> ₁ | Over 10 and up to 20 miles | <input type="checkbox"/> ₅ |
| Over 1 and up to 2 miles | <input type="checkbox"/> ₂ | Over 20 miles | <input type="checkbox"/> ₆ |
| Over 2 and up to 5 miles | <input type="checkbox"/> ₃ | Don't know / Not sure | <input type="checkbox"/> ₇ |
| Over 5 and up to 10 miles | <input type="checkbox"/> ₄ | | |

Finding your way Around the Court Building

Q13. When you arrived at court today, how did you find out where you needed to go? **SHOW CARD A9. Tick all that apply.**

- | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|-------|
| Asked at Front Reception | <input type="checkbox"/> ₁ | |
| Asked Security Guard | <input type="checkbox"/> ₂ | |
| Looked at Notice Board | <input type="checkbox"/> ₃ | |
| Followed Signs | <input type="checkbox"/> ₄ | |
| Previously Visited/Familiar with Building | <input type="checkbox"/> ₅ | |
| From Correspondence sent to me | <input type="checkbox"/> ₆ | |
| Asked Someone Else (tick and specify) | <input type="checkbox"/> ₇ | _____ |
| Other (tick and write in) | <input type="checkbox"/> ₈ | _____ |
| Can't Remember | <input type="checkbox"/> ₉ | |

Q14. On a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is 'very difficult' and 5 is 'very easy', how difficult or easy was it to find out where in the building you had to go today? **SHOW CARD A10. (CIRCLE NUMBER).**

- | | | | | | |
|-------------------|---|---|---|--------------|---|
| Very
Difficult | | | | Very
Easy | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | OR TICK Can't Remember <input type="checkbox"/> ₆ |

Satisfaction with Court Staff

Q15. Did you for any reason speak with any of the following court staff during your visit today? **SHOW CARD A11.**

- | | | |
|----------------|---------------------------------------|------------------|
| Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> ₁ | CONTINUE |
| No | <input type="checkbox"/> ₂ | GO TO Q23 |
| Can't Remember | <input type="checkbox"/> ₃ | GO TO Q19 |

Q16. On a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is 'very unhelpful' and 5 is 'very helpful', overall, how unhelpful or helpful were the court staff you spoke with today? **SHOW CARD A12. (CIRCLE NUMBER)**

- | | | | | | |
|-------------------|---|---|---|-----------------|---|
| Very
Unhelpful | | | | Very
Helpful | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | OR TICK Can't Remember <input type="checkbox"/> ₆ |

Q17. Overall, on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is 'very impolite' and 5 is 'very polite', how impolite or polite were the court staff you spoke with today? **SHOW CARD A13. (CIRCLE NUMBER)**

- | | | | | | |
|------------------|---|---|---|----------------|---|
| Very
Impolite | | | | Very
Polite | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | OR TICK Can't Remember <input type="checkbox"/> ₆ |

Q18. **IF RATING AT Q16 AND/OR Q17 IS 2 OR LESS ASK:** Please explain the reasons you have not scored the helpfulness and/or politeness of court staff higher.

.....

.....

Information Provided by Court Staff

Q19. When you arrived today, did court staff explain what was going to happen and what you should do?

- Yes ₁ CONTINUE
- No ₂ GO TO Q21
- Can't Remember ₃ GO TO Q21
- Not Applicable ₄ Ask: Why do you say that? _____ GO TO Q21

Q20. On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is 'very inaccurate' and 5 is 'very accurate' how inaccurate or accurate was the explanation provided to you by the court staff? **SHOW CARD A14. (CIRCLE NUMBER)**

- Very Inaccurate 1 2 3 4 5 Very Accurate
- OR TICK Can't Remember ₆

Q21. During the time you were in the court building, did court staff keep you informed about what was happening?

- Yes ₁ CONTINUE
- No ₂ GO TO Q23
- Can't Remember ₃ GO TO Q23
- Not Applicable ₄ Ask: Why do you say that? _____ GO TO Q23

Q22. On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is 'very unhelpful' and 5 is 'very helpful', how unhelpful or helpful was the information provided to you by the court staff? **SHOW CARD A15. (CIRCLE NUMBER)**

- Very Unhelpful 1 2 3 4 5 Very Helpful
- OR TICK Can't Remember ₆

IF RESPONDENT IS NOT A JUROR (SERVING OR NOT SELECTED), GO TO Q25

Q23. Before you arrived, did you receive information about jury service from the Scottish Court Service?

- Yes ₁ CONTINUE
- No ₂ GO TO Q25
- Can't Remember ₃ GO TO Q25
- Not Applicable ₄ Ask: Why do you say that? _____ GO TO Q25

Q24. On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is 'very unhelpful' and 5 is 'very helpful', how unhelpful or helpful was the information for jurors provided by the Scottish Court Service? **SHOW CARD A15. (CIRCLE NUMBER)**

- Very Unhelpful 1 2 3 4 5 Very Helpful
- OR TICK Can't Remember ₆

Q25. Was there anything that you would like to have been told by court staff or any information you would have liked that was not provided?

Yes ₁ **CONTINUE**

No ₂ **GO TO Q27**

Can't Remember ₃ **GO TO Q27**

Q26. What sort of information would have been helpful for you to have received from court staff?

.....
.....

Waiting in Court

Q27. Did you have to wait to **take part in court proceedings** today?

Yes ₁ **CONTINUE**

No ₂ **GO TO Q30**

Can't Remember ₃ **GO TO Q30**

Q28. Approximately how long did you have to wait to take part in court proceedings today?
SHOW CARD A16.

Up to 15 minutes ₁

Over 1 hour and up to 2 hours ₄

16 to 30 minutes ₂

Over 2 hours ₅

31 minutes to 1 hour ₃

Can't remember ₆

Q29. On a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is 'very dissatisfied' and 5 is 'very satisfied, how dissatisfied or satisfied were you with the time you had to wait today? **SHOW CARD B1.**

Very
Dissatisfied

Very
Satisfied

1 2 3 4 5 **OR TICK Can't Remember ₆**

Q30. Did you have to wait to be **served at a counter**, including the main reception, today?

Yes ₁ **CONTINUE**

No ₂ **GO TO Q33**

Can't Remember ₃ **GO TO Q33**

Q31. Approximately how long, in total, did you have to wait to be served at a counter today?
SHOW CARD A16.

Up to 15 minutes ₁

Over 1 hour and up to 2 hours ₄

16 to 30 minutes ₂

Over 2 hours ₅

31 minutes to 1 hour ₃

Can't remember ₆

Q32. On a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is 'very dissatisfied' and 5 is 'very satisfied, how dissatisfied or satisfied were you with the time you had to wait to be served at a counter?
SHOW CARD B1.

Very
Dissatisfied

Very
Satisfied

1 2 3 4 5 **OR TICK Can't Remember ₆**

IF RESPONDENT WAITED EITHER FOR COURT PROCEEDINGS (Q27) OR AT A COUNTER (Q30) CONTINUE. IF RESPONDENT DID NOT WAIT, GO TO Q37.

Q33. Did **court staff** give you any updates about **how much longer** you were likely to have to wait today?

- Yes ₁ **CONTINUE**
 No ₂ **CONTINUE**
 Can't Remember ₃ **GO TO Q35**
 Not Applicable ₄ **Ask: Why do you say that? _____ GO TO Q35**

Q34. On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is 'very dissatisfied' and 5 is 'very satisfied', how dissatisfied or satisfied were you with court staff's attempts to keep you informed about **how much longer** you were likely to have to wait today? **SHOW CARD B1 (CIRCLE NUMBER)**

- Very Dissatisfied 1 2 3 4 5 Very Satisfied
 OR TICK Can't Remember ₆

Q35. Were you told **why** you had to wait today?

- Yes ₁ **CONTINUE**
 No ₂ **CONTINUE**
 Can't Remember ₃ **GO TO Q37**
 Not Applicable ₄ **Ask: Why do you say that? _____ GO TO Q37**

Q36. On a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is 'very dissatisfied' and 5 is 'very satisfied', how dissatisfied or satisfied were you with **court staff's** attempts to keep you informed about **why** you had to wait today? **SHOW CARD B1. (CIRCLE NUMBER)**

- Very Dissatisfied 1 2 3 4 5 Very Satisfied
 OR TICK Can't Remember ₆

Catering facilities

Q37. Did you use any of the catering/vending facilities in the court building today?

- Yes ₁ **CONTINUE** Can't Remember ₃ **GO TO Q41**
 No ₂ **GO TO Q41** Not Applicable ₄ **GO TO Q41**

Q38. Which of the catering/vending facilities did you use today? **SHOW CARD A17. Tick all that apply.**

- Cafeteria (public or staff) ₁ Snack Dispensers ₅
 Tea or Coffee Dispensers ₂ Can't Remember ₆
 Trolley ₃ Other (tick and write in): ₇
 Soft Drink Dispensers ₄
-

Q39. On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is 'very dissatisfied' and 5 is 'very satisfied', how dissatisfied or satisfied were you with the following: **SHOW CARD B1. (CIRCLE NUMBER)**

	Very Dissatisfied				Very Satisfied	Can't Remember	N/A
Range of food and drink available	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Quality of food and drink purchased	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
IF USED EITHER PUBLIC OR STAFF CAFETERIA ASK: The service in the cafeteria	1	2	3	4	5	6	

Q40. If you were dissatisfied with any of the catering facilities today, please say why.

.....

.....

Other court facilities

Q41. Did you use any of the following facilities while you were in the court building today? **SHOW CARD A18. TICK ALL FACILITIES USED.**

Q42. On a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is 'very dissatisfied' and 5 is 'very satisfied', how dissatisfied or satisfied were you with the **comfort** of those facilities? **SHOW CARD B1. CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH FACILITY USED.**

Q43. On a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is 'very dissatisfied' and 5 is 'very satisfied', how dissatisfied or satisfied were you with the **cleanliness** of those facilities? **SHOW CARD B1. CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH FACILITY USED.**

Q44. On a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is 'very dissatisfied' and 5 is 'very satisfied', how dissatisfied or satisfied were you with the **safety and security** of those facilities? **SHOW CARD B1. CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH FACILITY USED.**

	Q41	Q42 Comfort					Q43 Cleanliness					Q44 Safety & Security				
	Used	Very dissatisfied				Very satisfied	Very dissatisfied				Very satisfied	Very dissatisfied				Very satisfied
Court Room	<input type="checkbox"/> ₁	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Jury Room	<input type="checkbox"/> ₁	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Waiting Area/Area Outside Court Room	<input type="checkbox"/> ₁	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Witness Room	<input type="checkbox"/> ₁	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Public Entrance/ Area Outside the Court Building	<input type="checkbox"/> ₁	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Agents' Room/Solicitors' Room	<input type="checkbox"/> ₁	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Cells in Court Building	<input type="checkbox"/> ₁	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Fines Counter/Public Counter/Clerk's Counter	<input type="checkbox"/> ₁	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Toilets in Court Building	<input type="checkbox"/> ₁	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Restaurant/Café in Court Building	<input type="checkbox"/> ₁	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Other (please specify)	<input type="checkbox"/> ₁	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5

PLEASE MAKE SURE THAT THE INTERVIEWEE HAS PROVIDED A SATISFACTION RATING FOR EACH OF COMFORT (Q42), CLEANLINESS (Q43) AND SAFETY & SECURITY (Q44) FOR ALL ROWS WHERE Q41 WAS TICKED

Q45. If you were dissatisfied with any of the other court facilities today, please say why.

.....

.....

Overall satisfaction

Q46. Thinking about all the questions you have answered so far, on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is 'very dissatisfied' and 5 is 'very satisfied', how dissatisfied or satisfied were you with the overall service provided by the Scottish Court Service today? **SHOW CARD B1. (CIRCLE NUMBER)**

Very Dissatisfied 1 2 3 4 5 Very Satisfied OR TICK Can't Remember _6

Q47. **IF RATING AT Q46 IS 2 OR LESS ASK:** The Scottish Court Service is keen to understand how well it is meeting its commitments to treat all court users with courtesy and consideration. In particular if your dissatisfaction is related to any of the personal characteristics listed on Show card A19, please could you provide some details? **SHOW CARD A19. IF REFUSED, PLEASE WRITE 'REFUSED' BELOW.**

.....
.....
.....

Service development

Q48. Are there **any** aspects of the service provided by the Scottish Court Service that you would change? If so, what are they?

.....
.....
.....

Feedback

Q49. Do you know how to make a complaint or provide feedback, good or bad, about the services you used today?

Yes _1 No _2 Don't Know _3

Demographic information

To help us meet the requirements of different court users it would be helpful if you could provide some information about yourself.

Q50. Would you mind answering a question about what sex you are?

Refused _0 Male _1 Female _2

Q51. Would you mind telling me to which age group you belong? **SHOW CARD A20.**

Refused _0
16-24 _1 35-44 _3 55-64 _5
25-34 _2 45-54 _4 65 or over _6

Q52. Would you mind telling me what is your ethnic group? SHOW CARD A21. Choose ONE section from A to F, then tick ONE box which best describes your ethnic group or background.

Refused _0

A White

Scottish _1

Other British _2

Irish _3

Gypsy/Traveller _4

Polish _5

Any other white ethnic group (tick and write in): _6

B Mixed or multiple ethnic groups

Any mixed or multiple ethnic groups (tick and write in) _7

C Asian, Asian Scottish or Asian British

Pakistani, Pakistani Scottish or Pakistani British _8

Indian, Indian Scottish or Indian British _9

Bangladeshi, Bangladeshi Scottish or Bangladeshi British _10

Chinese, Chinese Scottish or Chinese British _11

Other (tick and write in) _12

D African

African, African Scottish or African British _13

Other (tick and write in) _14

E Caribbean or Black

Caribbean, Caribbean Scottish or Caribbean British _15

Black, Black Scottish or Black British _16

Other (tick and write in) _17

F Other ethnic group

Arab, Arab Scottish or Arab British _18

Other (tick and write in) _19

Particular facilities and requirements

Q53. Do you have a longstanding illness, disability or infirmity which means that you require particular facilities when using public buildings?

Yes _1 CONTINUE

No _2 GO TO Q57

Don't Know _3 GO TO Q57

Q54. Can you tell us what particular facilities you require?

.....

Q55. To what extent were your particular requirements met by the facilities offered at this court today? SHOWCARD A22.

Fully met _1

Partially met _2

Not met at all _3

Q56. If your requirements were not fully met, please can you tell us why?

.....

Q57. Is your first language English?

Yes _1

No _2

Don't Know _3

Q58. Do you have any particular communication and/or reading requirements?

Yes ₁ CONTINUE No ₂ THANK & CLOSE Don't Know ₃ THANK & CLOSE

Q59. Can you tell us what these requirements are?

.....

Q60. Did you use any of the following services/facilities? **SHOW CARD A23.**

- None ₀
- Induction Loops ₁
- Braille ₂
- Interpreter for the Accused ₃
- Language Line ₄
- Other (tick and write in) ₅ _____

Q61. **IF RESPONDENT USED ANY OF THE ABOVE SERVICES ASK:** On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is 'very dissatisfied' and 5 is 'very satisfied', how dissatisfied or satisfied were you with this service/facility? **SHOW CARD B1. (TICK ALL THAT APPLY)**

	Very Dissatisfied				Very Satisfied	Can't Remember	N/A
Induction Loops	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Braille	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Interpreter for the Accused	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Language Line	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Other (write in):	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Q62. If dissatisfied, please say why.

.....

THANK RESPONDENT AND CLOSE

MVA Consultancy provides advice on transport, to central, regional and local government, agencies, developers, operators and financiers.
A diverse group of results-oriented people, we are part of a strong team of professionals worldwide. Through client business planning, customer research and strategy development we create solutions that work for real people in the real world.

For more information visit www.mvaconsultancy.com

Abu Dhabi

AS Business Centre, Suite 201, Al Ain Road, Umm al
Nar, P.O. Box 129865, Abu Dhabi, UAE
T: +971 2 510 2402 F: +971 2 510 2403

Birmingham

Second Floor, 37a Waterloo Street
Birmingham B2 5TJ United Kingdom
T: +44 (0)121 233 7680 F: +44 (0)121 233 7681

Dublin

First Floor, 12/13 Exchange Place
Custom House Docks, IFSC, Dublin 1, Ireland
T: +353 (0)1 542 6000 F: +353 (0)1 542 6001

Edinburgh

Second Floor, Prospect House, 5 Thistle Street,
Edinburgh EH2 1DF United Kingdom
T: +44 (0)131 220 6966 F: +44 (0)131 220 6087

Glasgow

Seventh Floor, 78 St Vincent Street
Glasgow G2 5UB United Kingdom
T: +44 (0)141 225 4400 F: +44 (0)141 225 4401

London

Second Floor, 17 Hanover Square
London W1S 1HU United Kingdom
T: +44 (0)20 7529 6500 F: +44 (0)20 7529 6556

Lyon

11, rue de la République, 69001 Lyon, France
T: +33 (0)4 72 10 29 29 F: +33 (0)4 72 10 29 28

Manchester

25th Floor, City Tower, Piccadilly Plaza
Manchester M1 4BT United Kingdom
T: +44 (0)161 236 0282 F: +44 (0)161 236 0095

Marseille

76, rue de la République, 13002 Marseille, France
T: +33 (0)4 91 37 35 15 F: +33 (0)4 91 91 90 14

Paris

12-14, rue Jules César, 75012 Paris, France
T: +33 (0)1 53 17 36 00 F: +33 (0)1 53 17 36 01

Woking

Dukes Court, Duke Street, Woking
Surrey GU21 5BH United Kingdom
T: +44 (0)1483 728051 F: +44 (0)1483 755207

Email: info@mvaconsultancy.com

Offices also in

Bangkok, Beijing, Hong Kong, Shenzhen and Singapore

mvaconsultancy