

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Open Access

# Confidence over Judicial Proceedings from the Perception of Plaintiff and Defendant: An Empirical Study on Tangail Court, Bangladesh

Md. Nahid Hasan<sup>\*1</sup>  Moonmoon Binta Aziz<sup>2</sup>  Amin Mohammed Ismail<sup>3</sup>  Md. Nur-A-Alam Nuhas 

\*Corresponding Author

Received: 31.08.2025

Accepted: 30.12.2025

Publication Date: 15.01.2026

© The Author(s) 2026  
(CC BY 4.0)

ISSN: 3108-6144

1 3 4 Postgraduate Student,  
Department of Criminology  
and Police Science, Faculty  
of Life Science, Mawlana  
Bhashani Science and  
Technology University,  
Tangail, Bangladesh

2 Associate Professor,  
Department of Criminology  
and Police Science, Faculty  
of Life Science, Mawlana  
Bhashani Science and  
Technology University,  
Tangail, Bangladesh

\*Corresponding Author:  
[nahidhasan331998@gmail.com](mailto:nahidhasan331998@gmail.com)

## Abstract

Procedures of the court, whether criminal or civil, are the processes that are used for the court system to process the collection, distribution, or protection of rights of a person or thing. The research seeks to measure plaintiffs and defendants' trust in court, the extent of the performance of court sanction of court employees and access to justice and to explore overall confidence. The study collected quantitative data using the purposive sampling technique with the help of quantitative survey (N=57) in Tangail district court. The main findings show that 85.2% of respondents are men, and the majority (36.7 and 35.5%) are between the ages of 21-30 or 31-40 years, and 65% live in rural areas. Although the majority of cases are that of property-related crimes (63.3%) or riot (33.3%). The level of confidence in court is mostly moderate, and judges' performance ranks low. Respondents identify high costs (40.4%) and the length of the process as significant obstacles. Confidence rate is lower across all procedural stages and level of information about the process is restricted (57.9%). To get better, the government needs to tackle caseloads, delays, costs, corruption and other issues to promote a more accessible and credible system.

**Keywords:** Plaintiff, Defendant, Trust, Confidence, Knowledge.

**Cite this article:** Hasan, M. N., Aziz, M. B., Ismail, A. M., & Nuhas, M. N.-A.-A. (2026). Confidence over Judicial Proceedings from the Perception of Plaintiff and Defendant: An Empirical Study on Tangail Court, Bangladesh. *Journal of South Asian Issues (JSAI)*, 1(1), 96–114. <https://doi.org/10.65826/JSAI.1.1.2026.62>



©The Author(s) 2026. **Open Access** This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License, which permits any non-commercial use, sharing, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license, and indicate if you modified the licensed material. You do not have permission under this license to share adapted material derived from this article or parts of it. The images or other third-party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The criminal justice system is the system or process in the community by which crimes are investigated, and the persons who are suspected are taken into custody, prosecuted in court, and punished, in case of guilty, preparation is made for their correction and rehabilitation. In another word, the criminal justice system is a network of public and private organizations designed to handle criminal suspects and offenders. Delivering justice to the person who has been accused of a crime is also known as criminal justice. Major components of the criminal justice system are the police, the court, and the correction. The judiciary system is one of the most important parts of the criminal justice system. The judicial system of Bangladesh is based on the constitution of the people's republic of Bangladesh, and the law are acted by the legislature and interpreted by the higher court. The judiciary system always tries to ensure citizens rights and proper justice. A citizen has the right to fair justice or effective remedy by an appropriate tribunal. The constitution of Bangladesh declares that every person shall have the right to a speedy and public trial through an independent and impartial court established by law. There is no alternative to an effective judiciary to protect and enforce the rights of citizens or victims. Only an effective judiciary can give justice to the victims. The effective judiciary is related to the victim's confidence.

Legislative, judicial, and executive are the three key branches of the state. One of these is the judiciary, which is vital to protecting people's rights when those rights are violated by an individual, a state department, or the State itself (Akram, 2017). The present judiciary proceedings of Bangladesh are not functioning properly. It is not accessible to needy people. The informal and formal routes through which one can reach justice are not easy (Alim & Ali, 2007). For example, 61% of disadvantaged urban women experience spousal violence, until now most of these women choose not to use formal or informal judicial systems out of shame and a perception that their efforts will be in vain (Bhuiya et al., 2003). Trust or confidence is the most significant component of an effective judiciary system. If there have no trust in any organization, then anyone doesn't go to this organization to take service. For an effective judiciary system, the government should earn trust or confidence. If the public has confidence in a public institution, then it will be easy for the institution to give service. On the other hand, if there has no confidence in judiciary proceedings or the judiciary system it will be difficult to give service. Organized society is one where citizens have confidence or trust in the social organizations and when there is no corruption in social organization. Corruption and confidence are strongly related to any organization (Sinha & Bangladesh, 2019). The case management procedure in the current justice delivery system is so long, expensive, and time-consuming. A person views it as a tool of harassment and a difficult adventure in filing or defending a lawsuit before any court of the nation. In Bangladesh, there are approximately 100 Supreme Court judges, 1400 District Court Judges are facing 0.38 million active cases. 2.7 million cases are to be considered and resolved. Current there almost 3 million cases are pending in the supreme court and lower courts (Sinha & Bangladesh, 2019).

The level of confidence in the higher judiciary is still not very high. The level of confidence in the higher judiciary has declined from 86% in 2010 to 78.7% in 2015. These create negative perceptions about the lower courts and affect the mentality of the citizens (Akanda, 2016).

In this study, I try to measure the level of confidence in the plaintiff and defendant. The plaintiff is the person or being that file the lawsuit. The defendant is the person or entity being sued. Court or judiciary proceedings work to keep the rights of the victim or plaintiff and punish the criminal. This study tries to measure the trust level of the plaintiff and defendant. This study also tries to know how much the plaintiff and defendant get access to justice and how many rights the court can fulfil. Authority also can know where they should increase their supervision for making an effective judiciary system from this study.

### **1.1. Statement of the Problem**

The executive, judicial, and legislative branches of the state are each significant. One of the most vital components of the criminal justice system is the judiciary or court system, which also plays a vital role in protecting citizens' rights when such rights are violated either by a single person, a group of people, or any State department. In Bangladesh, the Supreme Court and the lower courts can greatly expand the broad judiciary. It has been observed that Bangladesh's judiciary is not effective. It is also observed that this judiciary system could not adequately protect and ensure the rights of the citizens (Hossain Millan, 2017).

Opinions and confidence levels can be influenced by knowledge of the legal system. A confident attitude toward the system likely reflects a favourable outlook. Individual (who take service) trust is necessary for government institutions to function effectively. For there to be effective government, citizens trust in those institutions is essential. As representatives of a government institution, government officials are the main source of support for government institutions. If citizens have confidence in government institutions (Judiciary system) then became easier for the government to establish better Government and good governance. So, like other developed countries, Bangladesh's government also needs to establish trust between the individual (plaintiff and defendant) and the judicial court system.

When citizens do not get the desired services in government institutions (judiciary system) or do not get services on time or face some illegal practices, then there is create a mismatch between their expectation of receiving quality services and the services provided by a government institution. Because of this mismatch, a perception is created in the minds of citizens that government officials lack transparency, accountability, and efficiency and they feel that government officials are strict, corrupt, and do not care about the welfare of citizens (Kim, 2010). Plaintiff and defendant's trust in the judiciary system may depend on the degree of responsiveness and satisfaction of the people. Without trust, a judiciary may become a source of dissatisfaction to the people of a country and may gradually lose its effectiveness and future sustainability. If the courts or judiciary are not active enough to provide effective services to the citizens and if there are mismanagement and corruption, it can cause distrust in the minds of the citizens about the judiciary.

This research or study will try to assess the level of trust or confidence in the judicial system. But a certain level of confidence is needed to create a collaborative environment between citizens (plaintiff and defendant) and the judiciary. A lot of work has already been done on various public institutions. Many articles and journals research has been done on it, but no specific academic work has been done and there is still a lack of study to find out the real reasons behind the confidence or distrust of the plaintiff and defendant. This study maps the trust perception of the plaintiff and defendant over the judiciary system.

Judicial proceedings are responsible for providing legal services. The Government of Bangladesh is committed to ensuring services to the citizens increase the trust of the citizens (Plaintiff and defendant) in the court system for an effective judiciary system and proper judicial rights. But there is no available study conducted about the factors that are responsible for trust or mistrust of plaintiff and defendant in the court in Bangladesh. There is a research gap. This study addresses this gap and is no doubt that the plaintiff defendant's confidence in the judiciary system is very important. The court system needs to be effective that provide every judiciary right to the people. So, this is very important to study confidence over judicial proceedings on the theory of the plaintiff and the defendant.

### **1.2. Significance of the Study**

Every person in society has the right to legal protection. Nobody can violate others rights. Sometimes we see that there occurred some unexpected or illegal activities which violate other rights. When anyone

violates others rights then he or she complains against them. The main function of the court is to protect one's rights. Sometimes there some people complain against anyone only for harassment. In this situation, the court decides what happened or what should be done about this. That means the court will play a vital role in our society for protect rights. There is little research on it. Though this study focuses on the plaintiff and defendant's confidence in the judicial system only in Tangail Court, this will give a broad idea about the current situation of individuals confidence in the court system. This study will give an idea to the state authority to reform the activities and performance of the court system of Bangladesh. Some research has already been conducted about public institutions and trust in Bangladesh and globally. There has also been some study about public perception of the court system. But there has been no study on the plaintiff and defendant's confidence in judicial proceedings. This is a research gap. This study addresses that gap and there is no doubt that plaintiff ad defendant confidence in the judicial system is very important. So, it is important to analyse the things that may influence the level of trust of the plaintiff and defendant in the court system.

As a student of criminology and police science, it is also very important to research the judicial court system. This discipline not only teaches us about the causation of crime and prevention of crime but also teaches about the activities of the police, court, and correction system as a criminal justice system. As a part of the criminal justice system, it is also very important to study about judicial court system or judicial proceedings. This study gives an idea and maps the truest perception of the plaintiff and defendant on the court system and tries to assess the level of their trust or confidence in the judicial system.

## **2. LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL OVERVIEW**

The literature review provides us with a handy guide to a particular topic. A literature review discusses published information in a particular subject area, and sometimes information in a particular subject area within a certain period. The judiciary system and the confidence of the plaintiff and defendant are reviewed to make the current research relevant, particular and reliable and to lay the foundation for the current study. However, very little relevant literature is found in the case of the Bangladesh judiciary system and very little work has been done. So, it's too difficult to research this subject. This literature review gives a broad idea about the understanding of the plaintiff and defendant in the judicial system of Bangladesh, what factors affect the public victim trust in the judicial system, and the effect of different processes of court on plaintiff and defendant confidence. On the other hand, a Literature review helps to describe how the study is related to prior research. It also helps to find out the research problem.

### **2.1. General Understanding of Confidence and Judiciary System**

One of the most vital components of the criminal justice system is the judiciary or court system. Public trust in the legal system varies depending on several variables. A reliable predictor of institutional legitimacy is the confidence indicator. A legitimate institution is positively correlated with confidence, although it is not essential to its ability to carry out its activities. Judicial policy judgments are not correlated with trust in the Court (Gibson et al., 2003).

A crucial component of institutions, society, and the economy is trust or confidence. The productivity of government institutions depends on public confidence. (Van De Walle, 2009). Confidence or trust refers to the level of weakness of a person who has expressed himself in front of some other person or institution. These people and organizations can damage him. However, he thinks that if he relies on someone or something, that person or thing won't betray him (Levi & Stoker, 2000). The belief of citizens in public institutions is crucial to ensuring good governance. Government institutions rely mostly on government officials because government officials are representatives of a government institution. If citizens have confidence in government officials or government institutions, then became

easier for the government to establish better Government and good governance. So, for a developing country, Bangladesh needs to build a bridge of trust between the citizens and the public institution (Akanda, 2016). In democracies, the legal system has a significant impact. In many nations, the judiciary is the last option when it comes to argumentative issues, which are frequently of significant political and societal importance (Benesh, 2006).

## **2.2. Affecting Factors of Trust in the Judiciary System**

A fundamental principle of the Rule of Law is that the public should have faith and confidence in the legal system. Transparency and legitimacy are essential for the Rule of Law to operate effectively. That means the authority should prove itself and the citizens also has the rightful control of power. Institutions (courts) also should prove to the general public that they are dependable and they have rightful authority. The courts and judiciary are given institutional responsibility to interpret and apply the law in a society that maintains the Rule of Law. Some people thought that transparency and skilful application of the law is the way to winning trust. But it is also earned by an obvious commitment and the activities of each part of the procedure (Wallace & Goodman-Delahunty, 2021).

There are three levels of oath or belief. The first category is interpersonal beliefs, in which people have faith in their relatives, close friends, etc. The second is social belief, in which individuals continue to trust strangers. The third is institutional faith, which refers to people's faith in many things. Institution. Institutional trust includes, for instance, faith in governmental institutions (Akanda, 2016).

Confidence in the judiciary system also depends on judicial independence and the accountability of the judiciary. To maintain judicial independence authorities should take proper steps and they should also establish an adequate judicial accountability system without declining the judicial independence. All public institutions should be held accountable for the use of their legal authority and the fulfilment of their public responsibilities to earn the public's trust in their efficiency and honesty. Being a government institution, the judiciary must also be held accountable. (Akkas, 2002).

Bangladesh's judiciary system and judges are not in the debate of the general people for their lack of accountability, transparency, and impartiality which work as effective factors of public confidence. The first condition for judicial decision-making is to ensure a high standard of decision-making and public acceptance and to build public respect for judicial decisions, increasing public confidence, and accountability (Mahmud, 2013).

Stable or declining confidence in a particular organization can be a factor in responsiveness, openness, accessibility, neutrality, and how politically it can be lifted. On the other hand, if the citizens show distrust towards the government officials, it will be very difficult for any government institution (Judiciary system) to survive (Jamil & Askvik, 2013).

Among the socio-economic variables, the study finds that gender and education have a significant impact on confidence levels in the court system. Compared to women, men are less likely to believe in governmental institutions. Men are more at risk of interfering with government institutions because they are involved in transactions than women. So, they can be more aware and aware of institutional customs and standards and be critical. An uneducated or less educated person has no proper knowledge about the citizen's rights, and they don't know the roles of citizens. An educated person has proper knowledge about citizens' rights and is aware of the rule's ad regulation. If there is any deviation from the rules, there is a greater chance of dissatisfaction with the performance of government institutions (Judiciary system).

They may have less confidence in public institutions than less educated people. Transparency and accountability of government officials have become very significant factors. If government officials can be transparent and accountable, then they can earn more trust of the people. Trust depends on public

institution and how the citizen or public evaluate the performance of government officials (Akanda, 2016).

### **2.3. Performance of Court Personnel**

An essential component of the judiciary is the courts. To reduce the caseload and an effective judiciary system increasing court performance is very essential. Any organization's performance is vital to its development and to more successfully achieving its goals. Access to any organization's performance measure is very important. The concept of court performance has many dimensions (Reiling & Contini, 2022).

Another study about the relationship between judicial staff and court performance are conducted in Brazil. The main objective of this study is to know about the performance of the court and its relation to judicial staff. Data from all 27 state courts in Brazil are used in this study. Data from the Justice in Numbers reports covering the years 2003 to 2012 were gathered. They find that (a) the ratio of judges has no bearing on court productivity; (b) the number of assistants has a positive impact on court productivity; and (c) the number of assistants moderates the positive correlation between court workload and court productivity (de Oliveira Gomes et al., 2016).

A comparison study is known as "court performance around the world". The main purpose of this study is to compare court performance in a different country. Researchers try to collect data from 11 countries. In this study, they found different levels of court performance in different countries (Dakolias, 1999).

The evaluation of court performance and court personnel can be conducted at three levels. These are: At a national level, at a court level, and the individual department level of a court. (Albers, n.d). The main objective of this study is to measure court performance at a different level. To measure court performance, use primary and secondary data collection methods. This study found that efficiency and court personnel performance are correlated. And it is not possible to measure court performance without reliable information.

### **2.4. Access to Justice**

To assure that every individual has meaningful access to justice, mechanisms and systems need to be obtainable for the fair resolution of disputes, compensation for human rights violations, and accountability for misconduct. People must be informed about their rights, given the freedom to exercise their rights, and allowed to do so. States agree to ensure access to justice for all under SDG 16 (Peace, Justice, and Strong Institutions), acknowledging that it is a crucial sign of an inclusive and peaceful society (UNDP, n.d).

A study about access to justice in Bangladesh tries to measure the level of access to justice and identified the gateway through which an individual can access justice for protecting his/her rights. In this study, they use primary and secondary data collection methods. This study found that due to the current state of affairs increased procedural obstacles and the length of time required for litigation, access to justice has become incredibly painful (Akram, 2017)

One of the fundamental tenets of the rule of law is access to justice. People are unable to exercise their rights, speak out against injustice, or hold decision-makers responsible in the absence of access to justice. The High-Level Meeting on the Rule of Law's Declaration highlights everyone's equal right to access justice, including those who belong to vulnerable groups. It also reaffirms Member States commitment to taking all necessary measures to offer services that are fair, transparent, effective, non-discriminatory, and accountable to advance access to justice for all. Obstacles to access to justice are lengthy procedures in the justice system, corruption, and the cost of legal advice (United Nation, 2019).

A study in the USA of this relevant topic is making justice accessible. In this study, they try to find out the relationship between rising income inequality and access to the legal system. Growing income inequality increases the justice gap. It is very difficult for lower-income people to access justice. Lower-income people and struggling people need help in solving legal problems. The Government should try to reduce the cost of easy access to the justice system for all classes of people (Frank, 2019).

## **2.5. Level of Confidence over Judicial Court System in Different Countries**

A study in Brazil titled confidence in the judicial system and court experience. The purpose of this study is to focus on the causal relationship between confidence in the judicial court system and utilization of the judiciary of Brazil. They use the quota sampling method and collect data by phone. They also collected data by analysing the main newspapers of the country about government corruption from 2010 to 2013. They collected data from several 7 states. They revealed that confidence in the judicial system has a positive impact on the utilization of the judiciary. (Sampaio et al., 2014) they also find that those people who have a higher level of confidence in the judiciary system have a great tendency to seek the judiciary. They also found a positive relationship between the confidence in the judicial court system and utilization of the judiciary for some demographic characteristics like as income, education race, and age.

Another study in the USA on this relevant topic is public confidence in the USA supreme court: A new look at the impact of the court decision. In this study, researchers try to find out the nature of public confidence in the court and the impact of court decisions on public confidence. They use the secondary data collection method. They focus on the impact of several high-profile decisions by the court matters over the last 35 years. They also try to collect aggregated level time series data of public opinions as well in place of individual-level data. The findings of this study are, public confidence may have been significantly impacted by court decisions. There are two implications: (I) Even when survey participants are unaware of the judgment, court rulings can affect public trust in the court, and (II) decisions do not have to lead to a decline in confidence, decisions can also contribute to an increase in confidence (Stoutenborough & Haider-Markel, 2008).

A study about confidence in the criminal justice system of the citizens occurred in England. The purpose of this study is to examine the citizen's experience of the criminal justice system on their judgment of the criminal justice system in England and Wales. In this study, they use primary and secondary data collection methods. They use data from the 2005-06 British crime survey. They also try to see the level of fairness, efficiency, and effectiveness of the criminal justice system through the survey. In this article, they see that Lack of knowledge is to blame for low levels of confidence in the judicial system. (Van De Walle, 2009) confidence can be improved by changing enormous and incorrect perceptions.

(Roberts, 2007) In his articles, he tries to identify the confidence level of Canadians in the judiciary system. In his article, he shows that a large number of people are more pleased than dissatisfied with the criminal justice system. Some people are dissatisfied because the criminal justice system doesn't practice in the accurate way which people want.

In another study about the relationship between political awareness and public confidence in the judiciary democracy level. This study's goal is to determine whether and to what extent the degree of democracy in a nation affects how political awareness affects public trust in the judiciary. This study uses data from the World Values Survey (2005-2009) for 49 countries and a variety of other data sources to analyse the interaction between personal and national level characteristics. In this study, they found that democracies public trust in the court is positively impacted by political awareness factors including education and political activity. Higher levels of political awareness and weak democratic countries increased sarcasm about the judiciary system. (Aydın Çakır & Şekercioğlu, 2016).

### 3. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Explaining the theoretical framework is one of the important tasks of research, which can help to verify our research findings and analysis. Judiciary proceedings are one of the significant parts of the criminal justice system. Client trust or confidence must be needed for any effective governmental institution. The due process model and the cultural theory are suitable to describe the Plaintiff and defendant's confidence in the judicial court system.

#### 3.1. Cultural Theory

This theory was first explained in the book 'natural symbols', written by anthropologist Mary Douglas in 1970. This theory was developed by Mary Douglas, Michael Thompson, and Aaron Wildavsky. The cultural theory begins with an analysis of how we understand and assess risk and how we make decisions based on that understanding and assessment. Case, Cultural theory has developed over the last 20 years to become an important framework for understanding how people in society tend to understand and interpret risks and the tendency to build trust or distrust in building institutions (Tansey & O'Riordan, 1999). Cultural theories are divided into macro and micro variants as subsets. Macro-cultural theories emphasize the shift of trust between individuals within a society. Micro-cultural theories focus on political beliefs as well as differences in society (Mishler & Rose, 2001).

According to this study, the plaintiff and defendants are trying to understand the court system and make appropriate observations and evaluations. Based on this, the foundation of individual trust and distrust is established. In this case, the cultural theory includes patterns of both trust and distrust and is going to be valuable. Cultural theories of trust differ from institutional theories because they basically abandon all political factors of the relationship of trust between individuals and government institutions. It is in many ways closely related to the generalization of trust and it emphasizes external determinants of trust in government institutions.

#### 3.2. Due Process Model

Due process is the legal requirement that all the legal rights of an individual should be respected by the state. Due process balances the power of the state and protects the individual from the power of the state. The main goal of this model is to establish a system in which a person is acquitted until proven guilty in court. In the 1960s, lawyer Herbert L. Packer created the model to describe the highest expectations of the criminal justice system. A due process model is the justice system that is built on the premise that a citizen has certain perfect rights and cannot be deprived of life, liberty, or property without proper legal process and protection. The due process involves both systematic and concise aspects. The due process usually requires fairness in government activities. A person has the right to notice and opportunity at the hearing while he or she is free or the property is at risk. Laws should be applied equally without discrimination for prohibited reasons such as gender, nationality, disability, or age. It helps to ensure fair proceedings in criminal cases that no accused will be given cruel and unusual punishment. This model suggests that the criminal process determines the legal barriers to the state, which must be discussed to ensure a conviction.

According to this study, confidence in the court fluctuates over the various activities of the court system. Court proceedings often determine the plaintiff and defendant's trust. Public confidence in the court also depends on how the court serves the public and whether its activities are all legal. Generally, this theory is associated with trust such as individual characteristics, and socio and institutional demographic features. Therefore, this research is relevant to this theory because of the variables that are connected to the institutions. These theories use different approaches to explaining the justice system which provides a mixed perception of the justice system and this theory will provide a more useful and satisfactory framework for studying the generalized trust or confidence in the court system.

#### **4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

The study is mainly quantitative which is statistics based and collects quantitative data from different respondents. The study is mostly descriptive and describes the confidence of plaintiff and defendant in the court system.

The research has conducted at the Tangail Criminal Court which is situated in Tangail town. On the other hand, the Tangail district is one of the most populated and largest districts in the country. In Tangail, the court comparatively has to face more criminal activities and criminal cases. That's why the study has been conducted in this specific area.

Data have been collected mainly from primary sources directed to the respondents in the field level of the court system by collecting their experiences. Primary data are collected from those who faced court procedures (plaintiff and defendant) in the Tangail criminal court. A structured survey questionnaire that includes mostly close-ended and some open-ended questions has been used for data collection.

In this study, the respondents are the public who faced court procedures in Tangail Criminal Court (Plaintiff and defendants). Here the total population of this study was unknown as there is no separate record of the number plaintiffs and defendants face the judicial process. This study used non-probability purposive sampling techniques where the sample was selected based on a common characteristic, which is long duration of case processing. A total 57 respondents had participated in this study.

The questionnaire consists of socio-demographic characteristics of the respondent, Information about the people about the judicial proceedings, affecting factors confidence, level of confidence in the court system, and recommendations. In the questionnaire, there are 23 questions to ask the respondents. There are several parameters of the data was collected through Likert scale, which ranged from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (5). Data has collected from face-to-face interviews with a questionnaire that included essential and in-depth questions related to the study. It was very hard to build a rapport with the respondent and get information. The data were collected within 7 days. The collection process started on August 20, 2022, and continued till August 26, 2022.

The data processing started with the beginning of the data collection. After data Collection, preceding and post coding are constructed to analysing the raw data. After the coding process, the data is imputed in the format of the SPSS data editor. SPSS is a special package for social science in analysing data. Descriptive and inferential statistics used for analysing data the result of analysis has been presented in many forms related to statistical analysis as various tabular forms like frequency table, cross table and so on, percentage with various graph cross-tabulation and others. These all has been used for showing the information collected from the study and the causal relation among variables. The study has used univariate analysis by various analyses for better analysis. The Likert scale have shown validity as the value of Cronbach's Alpha for each Likert scale exceeds the threshold value of 0.7 (range from 0.741 to 0.819).

#### **5. RESEARCH RESULTS**

In this section, the findings have been analysed from the collected data and the findings provide socio-demographic information, trust, performance, access to justice, and overall confidence in the judiciary system. In this chapter, all of the information is represented in the frequency table, bar chart, pie chart, and cross-tabulation. The hypothesis also included in this chapter.

**Table 1:** Socio-demographic Characteristics of Respondents

<b>Socio-demographic Characteristics</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Gender of the respondent	Male	48 84.2%
	Female	9 15.8%
	Others	0 0.0%
Age of the respondent	less than 20 years	1 1.8%
	21-30 years	17 29.8%
	31-40 years	17 29.8%
	41-50 years	6 10.5%
	Above 50 years	16 28.1%
Religion of the respondent	Muslim	56 98.2%
	Hindu	1 1.8%
	Buddhist	0 0.0%
	christian	0 0.0%
Marital status of the respondent	Married	46 80.7%
	Unmarried	9 15.8%
	Divorced	2 3.5%
	Separated	0 0.0%
Family type of the respondent	Nuclear	28 49.1%
	Joined	28 49.1%
	Extended	1 1.8%
Educational qualification of the respondent	S.S.C	8 14.0%
	H.S.C	16 28.1%
	Graduated	5 8.8%
	Uneducated	19 33.3%
	Others	9 15.8%
Living area of the respondent	Rural	37 64.9%
	Urban	12 21.1%
	Sub-urban	8 14.0%
	Others	0 0.0%
Occupation of the respondent	Employee	4 7.0%
	Businessman	7 12.3%
	Housewife	4 7.0%
	Farmer	12 21.1%
	Workers	10 17.5%
	Student	5 8.8%
	Unemployed	4 7.0%
	Others	11 19.3%
Monthly income of the respondent	Less than 5000 taka	18 31.6%
	5001-10000 taka	12 21.1%
	10001-15000 taka	8 14.0%
	15001-20000 taka	4 7.0%
	Above 20000 taka	15 26.3%
Family income of the respondent	Less than 10000 taka	9 15.8%
	10001-20000 taka	21 36.8%
	20001-30000 taka	7 12.3%

	30001-40000 taka	6	10.5%
	Above 40000 taka	14	24.6%
The monthly expenditure of the respondent	Less than 10000 taka	12	21.1%
	10001-20000 taka	24	42.1%
	20001-30000 taka	8	14.0%
	30001-40000 taka	5	8.8%
	Above 40000 taka	8	14.0%

Source 1:Data Collected by Authors

The dataset provides a rich overview of the socio-demographic characteristics of respondents. Gender distribution shows that 84.2% are male, while females account for only 15.8%, with no representation from other genders. In terms of age, the majority of respondents are between 21–40 years, with both the 21–30 and 31–40 age brackets constituting 29.8% each. This means nearly 60% of the sample falls into the working-age group. Respondents above 50 years represent 28.1%, while the youngest group (less than 20 years) is underrepresented at 1.8%. Religious affiliation is highly homogeneous, with 98.2% of respondents identifying as Muslim. The only minority group, Hindus, represents just 1.8%, while no respondents identify as Buddhist or Christian. Regarding marital status, 80.7% of respondents are married, while 15.8% are unmarried. Only a small fraction is divorced (3.5%), and none are separated. This suggests that marital responsibilities heavily influence the socioeconomic behavior of most respondents. Family structure shows a balance, with nuclear and joint families each representing 49.1% of the sample. Extended families are rare, at only 1.8%, highlighting a shift toward smaller family units. Educational attainment is a key concern. A significant proportion of respondents (33.3%) are uneducated, which may limit access to better economic opportunities.

Those with higher secondary education (H.S.C.) make up 28.1%, while only 8.8% are graduates. This indicates educational challenges, with most respondents achieving only basic or no formal education. Living area data highlights that 64.9% reside in rural areas, while 21.1% are from urban settings and 14% from suburban areas. In terms of occupation, farmers form the largest group (21.1%), followed by workers (17.5%). Other notable groups include businessmen (12.3%) and those categorized as "others" (19.3%), which may include informal or undefined jobs. Students, housewives, and the unemployed each make up around 7–9%, reflecting a mix of traditional and modern roles. Monthly income reveals economic disparities. About 31.6% earn less than 5000 Taka, marking them as low-income earners. At the higher end, 26.3% earn more than 20000 Taka, while middle-income brackets (5001–20000 Taka) together account for around 42.1%. Family income mirrors individual income patterns, with 36.8% earning 10001–20000 Taka and 24.6% exceeding 40000 Taka. At the lower end, 15.8% earn less than 10000 Taka, suggesting some level of financial stability for the majority of families, but with notable disparities. Monthly expenditure aligns with income levels. Most respondents (42.1%) spend 10001–20000 Taka, while 21.1% spend less than 10000 Taka. A smaller group (14%) reports expenditures exceeding 40000 Taka, suggesting limited disposable income for most households.

### 5.1. Assessment of the Activities of the Court Based on Trust

Table number 2 illustrates that, In the case of accountability 19.3% of the respondents assess the accountability of court as very low, 10.5% of the respondent’s assessment is low, 28.1% assessment is Average, 33.3% of the respondents think it is high, 7.0% of the respondent think it is very high and 1.8% of the respondents don’t know about this. In the case of transparency, 8.8% of the respondents said that court transparency is very low, 29.8% respondent assessment is low, 22.8% of the respondent assessment is average, 26.3% of respondents think it is high, 5.3% told it’s very high and 7.0% respondents don’t know. In the case of legitimacy, 3.5% of respondents think the legitimacy of the court is very low, 5.3% of the respondent assessment is low, 29.8% of respondents think its average, 28.8% of the respondent assessment is high and 33.33% of the respondents don’t know about it. In the case of impartiality, 10.5%

of the respondents think that impartiality in court is very low, 8.8% of the respondent assessment is low, 28.1% of respondents think its average, 22.8% of the respondent assessment is high, 5.3% of the respondent assessment is very high and 24.6% of the respondents don't know.

In the cases of fairness in the court, 3.5% of the respondent assessment is very low the fairness in the court: 14.05% of the respondents think it is low, 31.6% of respondents think it's average, 15.8% of the respondent assessment is high, 10.5% of the respondent assessment is very high and 24.6% of the respondents don't know about it. On the performance of effectiveness, 5.3% of respondents said it is very low, 26.3% said it is low, 19.3% said it's average, 24.6% respondents said it's high, 7.0% f respondents said it's very high and 17.55 respondent don't know. Finally, in the case of respectfulness, 5.3% of the respondents said that respectfulness in court is very low, 17.5% of respondents said it's low, followed by 19.3% are average, 33.3% are high, 19.3% are very high and 5.3% of the respondents don't know.

**Table 2:** Assessment of the court based on trust

Assessment Performance	Very low	Low	Average	High	Very high	Don't know
Accountability	19.3%	10.5%	28.1%	33.3%	7.0%	1.8%
Transparency	8.8%	29.8%	22.8%	26.3%	5.3%	7.0%
Legitimacy	3.5%	5.3%	29.8%	28.1%	0.0%	33.3%
Impartial	10.5%	8.8%	28.1%	22.8%	5.3%	24.6%
Fairness	3.5%	14.0%	31.6%	15.8%	10.5%	24.6%
Effectiveness	5.3%	26.3%	19.3%	24.6%	7.0%	17.5%
Respectfulness	5.3%	17.5%	19.3%	33.3%	19.3%	5.3%

## 5.2. Experience of the Respondents Regarding Access to Justice

Table number 3 demonstrates that 5.263% of the respondents said that cost of the court system is low, 21.05% of the respondents said that it is average, 31.58% of the respondents think it is high, 40.35% of the respondents said it is very high and 1.745% of the respondents don't know about it. In the case of corruption shows that 15.8% of the respondents said the corruption rate of the court is very low, 14.0% of the respondent said it is low, 19.3% of the respondent said it's average, 33.3% of the respondents said it is high, 12.3% of the respondent said that it is very high and 5.3% of the respondent don't know about it. In the cases of lengthy procedure, 1.8% of the respondents said that lengthy procedure of the court is very low, 3.5% said it is low, 1.8% said it is average, 17.5% of the respondents think it is high and 66.7% of the respondents think it is very high. 8.8% of the respondents don't know about it.

In the cases of risk factors of court activities, 22.8% of the respondent think that the risk factor is very low, 22.8% of the respondent said it is low, 19.35 of the respondents said it's average, 17.55 of the respondents said it is high, 12.3% of the respondent said that it is very high and 5.3% of the respondent don't know about it. In the cases of social impact, 14.0% of the respondent said that social impact for

court involvement is very low, 14.0% of the respondent said that is low, 17.5% of the respondent said it is average, 15.8% of the respondent said it is high, 14.0% of the respondent said that it's very high and 24.6% of the respondent don't know about it.

**Table 3:** Experience of the respondents regarding access to justice

<b>Assessment</b> <b>Features</b>	<b>Very low</b>	<b>Low</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>High</b>	<b>Very high</b>	<b>Don't know</b>
Cost	0.0%	5.3%	21.1%	31.6%	40.4%	1.8%
Corruption	15.8%	14.0%	19.3%	33.3%	12.3%	5.3%
Lengthy procedure	1.8%	3.5%	1.8%	17.5%	66.7%	8.8%
Risk	22.8%	22.8%	19.3%	17.5%	12.3%	5.3%
Social impact	14.0%	14.0%	17.5%	15.8%	14.0%	24.6%

### 5.3. Perception of the respondent on the different professions of court

Table number 4 shows that in the case of the profession of judge 52.6% of the respondent has a positive view of them, 1.8% of respondents have a very positive view of them, 5.3% of respondents had a negative view of them, 5.3% of respondents have a very negative view on them, 10.5% of respondents have not positive, not negative view on them and 24.6% of the respondent don't know about it. In the case of the profession of the magistrate, 26.3% of respondents had a positive view of them, 1.8% of the respondents had a very positive view, 3.5% of the respondents have a very negative view, 3.5% of the respondents has no negative, not positive view and 64.9% of respondents don't know about the profession of the magistrate. In the case of public prosecutors, 12.3% of respondents had a positive view of them, 1.8% of respondents has a very positive view, 5.3% of respondents had a negative view, 3.5% of respondents had a very negative view, 88% of respondents have neutral view and 68.4% of the respondents don't know about the profession of the public prosecutor.

In the case of the lawyer, 35.1% of the respondent has a positive view of this profession, 3.5% of respondents have a very positive view, 12.3% of the respondent has a negative view, 10.5% of respondent has a very negative view, 21.1% of the respondent has no negative, not positive view, and 17.5% of the respondents don't know about this profession. In the case of the clerk, 12.3% of the respondents feel that the profession of the clerk is positive, 19.3% feel that is negative, 14.0% of respondents feel it is very negative, 26.35% of respondents think as neutral and 28.15% of the respondents don't know about this profession.

**Table 4:** Perception of the respondent on different professions in court

<b>Perception</b> <b>Profession</b>	<b>Positive</b>	<b>Very positive</b>	<b>Negative</b>	<b>Very negative</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Don't know</b>
Judge	52.6%	1.8%	5.3%	5.3%	10.5%	24.6%
Magistrate	26.3%	1.8%	0.0%	3.5%	3.5%	64.9%
Public prosecutor	12.3%	1.8%	5.3%	3.5%	8.8%	68.4%
Lawyer	35.1%	3.5%	12.3%	10.5%	21.1%	17.5%
Clerk	12.3%	0.0%	19.3%	14.0%	26.3%	28.1%

## 6. BIVARIATE ANALYSIS

### 6.1. Educational Qualification and Knowledge About Judiciary Proceedings of the Respondents

Table 5 indicates the relationship between the educational qualification and level of knowledge about judicial proceedings of the respondents. From this table, we see that graduated respondents have a high level of knowledge (40.0%) about judicial proceedings. S.S.C level respondents have a low level (75.0%) of knowledge about judicial proceedings. Uneducated respondents also have a low level (57.9%) of knowledge about judiciary proceedings. In the case of H.S.C. level respondents, they also have a low level of knowledge (56.2%) about the judiciary system.

**Table 5:** Educational qualification and knowledge about judicial proceedings of the respondents

	<b>Level of Knowledge</b> <b>Educational Qualification</b>	<b>Knowledge About Judicial Proceedings of Respondents</b>				<b>Total</b>
		<b>High</b>	<b>Moderate</b>	<b>Low</b>	<b>Don't Know</b>	
Educational qualification of the respondent	S.S.C		12.5%	75.0%	12.5%	100%
	H.S.C	12.5%	18.8%	56.2%	12.5%	100%
	Graduated	40.0%	40.0%	20.0%		100%
	Uneducated	5.3%	31.6%	57.9%	5.3%	100%

	Others	11.1%	11.1%	66.7%	11.1%	100%
<b>Total</b>		10.5%	22.8%	57.9%	8.8%	100%

## 6.2. Hypothesis Test 1

**I) Null Hypothesis (H<sub>0</sub>):** There is no association between court corruption and fulfilling the rights of the plaintiff and defendant by the court system.

**II) Alternative Hypothesis (H<sub>a</sub>):** There is an association between court corruption and fulfilling the rights of the plaintiff and defendant by the court system

**Table 6:** Chi-Square test

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	33.452 <sup>a</sup>	15	.004
Likelihood Ratio	39.162	15	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	18.698	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	57		

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.766	.004
	Cramer's V	.442	.004
N of Valid Cases		57	
a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.			
b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.			

A Chi-Square test for independence with  $\alpha=0.05$  was used to access whether the level of court corruption is related to fulfilling the rights of the plaintiff and defendant by the court system. The Chi-Square test was statistically significant,  $\chi^2(1, N=57) = 33.452, p = .004$ , with the camera's V confidence of .442, indicates that a Medium to large relationship between court corruption and the fulfilled rights of the plaintiff and defendant by the court system. Here the p-value  $< 0.05$ , so there is sufficient ground to reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis.

So, it is said that there is a significant relationship between court corruption and fulfilling the rights of the plaintiff and defendant by the court system.

## 7. DISCUSSION

The study indicates 85.2% of the respondents are male and only 15.8% are female. It shows that the highest number of the respondents (29.8%) belongs to the age group between 21-30 years and 31-40 years combinedly. If we try to see the educational qualification of the respondents then we see that most of the respondents (33.3%) are uneducated. This posits that, in most of the cases male are the participants in criminal justice system and women's participation in this process is rare.

The socio-demographic part shows that most of the respondents (65%) are living in rural areas and the maximum number of respondents (21.1%) are farmers. In the case of the marital status of the respondents, it shows that most of the respondents (80.7%) are married. Most of the respondents (31.6%) earn less than 5000 Taka but the family income of the respondents, most of them (36.8%) belongs to the income range of 10001-20000 Taka. In this study, 49.1% of the respondents are the plaintiff and 50.9% of the respondent are the defendant. They both are involved with judiciary proceedings for civil or criminal cases. 52.6% of the respondents are involved in civil cases and 47.4% of the respondents are involved in criminal cases. In the cases of civil cases, most of the respondents (63.3%) are involved in the judiciary system for property-related crimes and in criminal cases, we can see that most of the respondents (33.3%) are involved in the riot. These descriptive statistics have shown that mostly the rural poor people are involved in either criminal or civil cases.

This study shows that the accountability of the court personnel is high (33.3%), and most of the respondents think that the transparency of the court (29.8%) is low. In the case of legitimacy, most of the respondents showed average (29.8%) and high (28.1%) legitimacy. In the case of impartial, fairness, effectiveness, and respectfulness its shows that most of the respondents think these are average. There are some different activities of court impact on plaintiff and defendant confidence like responsiveness, efficiency, carefulness, and helpfulness. According to this study, most of the respondents think that the responsiveness of the court is average (31.6%) or high (33.3%). Efficiency is average (29.8%), carefulness is also average (42.1%) and helpfulness is low to average. In the case of access to justice, most of the respondents think that the cost of the court system is very high (40.4%), corruption is high (33.3%), and the lengthy procedure of the court system is very high (66.7%). This study also tries to know the knowledge of respondents about the court system. Most of the respondents knowledge is low (57.9%) about the court system. These analysis have revealed that the respondents have mixed experiences and insights of due process in court system in Bangladesh. Almost threefourths of the respondents have expressed their deepest concern about corruption in this system. Lengthy procedure of this due process is another severe challenge among others.

According to this study, most of the respondents have quite a lot of confidence in the pre-trial stage (43.9%), post-trial stage (49.1), and hearing (29.8). most of the respondents (50%) think the court can't fulfill their rights.

The perception of the respondents about court personnel id differs for different professions. Their perception of the judge is positive (52.6%), most of the respondent's perception of the lawyer is also positive (35.1%) and the perception of clerks is neutral(26.3%). The chi-square analysis has found significant association between court corruption and fulfilling the rights of the plaintiff and defendant by the court system, which refers that corruption shape the responses of cour toward the plaintiff and defendant.The findings of this study reflect both the Cultural Theory and the Due Process Model, revealing how trust, perception, and institutional experience shape confidence in judicial settings. According to Cultural Theory, individuals form trust or distrust toward institutions based on their social beliefs and collective experiences.

The results have shown that confidence levels of respondents were shaped by shared perceptions of corruption, lengthy procedures, and inefficiency. Most participants expressed moderate to low confidence, and many associated the court system with high costs and procedural delays, which indicates

that distrust is culturally reinforced through negative collective experiences. Limited legal knowledge and the prevalence of rural, less-educated respondents further emphasize how socio-cultural contexts influence institutional trust. The Due Process Model emphasizes fairness, accountability, and equality before the law. These are the principles essential to maintaining public confidence. However, findings in this study reveal that respondents perceive the judiciary as falling short of these ideals. While some respondents rated judicial accountability and fairness as average or high, many doubted the impartiality and effectiveness of the court. The statistically significant relationship between corruption and the fulfillment of rights of participants represents how perceived violations of due process reduce confidence. Moderate satisfaction across procedural stages also shows concerns about procedural fairness and transparency.

## **8. RECOMMENDATION**

The following recommendations are necessary to develop an effective judiciary system which is given by the respondents in my studies.

- i. The process of the judiciary system executes very fast.
- ii. To investigate properly and ensure justice neutrally according to law.
- iii. To reduce corruption everywhere in the justice system.
- iv. To ignore and stop false litigation.
- v. To increase the number of sufficient lawyers in the courtroom.
- vi. Check properly all documents which are submitted to the judge.
- vii. Respecting the victim in the judiciary system.
- viii. To ensure the monitoring of court personnel activities.
- ix. Provide effective and expert personnel recruited.
- x. To take proper steps for increasing public awareness.

## **9. CONCLUSION**

This study explores the confidence over judiciary proceedings in the eye of the plaintiff and defendant. It shows that the Trust level of respondents is not very much high. Most of the respondents do not trust the court system. Most of the respondents think that there have some performance factors of the court like responsiveness, efficiency, carefulness, and helpfulness which are average. There have some affecting factors like cost, corruption, and Lengthy procedure which affect confidence. This study shows that cost, corruption, and lengthy procedure levels are high. The court can't fully fulfill the plaintiff and defendant's rights. People's knowledge about judiciary proceedings is also low. So, the authority should take proper steps to reduce cost, corruption, and lengthy procedure and try to grow public awareness about judiciary proceedings.

The main findings from this data is lack of knowledge, confidence and increasing corruption in the court system in Bangladesh. The policymaker should take such measures so that the general people get proper knowledge about how to handle a dispute. For increasing the confidence in judiciary, oversight should be increased where necessary and the availability of information about trial should be made. Lastly, zero-tolerance policy should be taken to tackle corruption in every stage of court proceeding. Ministry of Law has the ultimate power to do such amendments and integrate these suggestions into the policies. The people also should be aware about their rights and responsibilities.

The main limitation of this study is the sample size as the population were unknown and only 57 respondents participated. Also, only one hypothesis has been found significant in this study. In future, this study can be extended with large sample which may generate more significant findings within several factors of knowledge and confidence among the participants in the criminal justice system in global south.

### Acknowledgements

Not Applicable

### Declaration of Competing Interest

No conflicts of interest.

### Declaration of Generative AI and AI-assisted technologies in the writing process

Not Applicable

### Funding

Not Applicable

## REFERENCES

- Akanda, M. M. M. (2016). Citizens' trust in public institutions: Exploring trust in public officials of Bangladesh (Master's thesis, North South University). North South University. [https://www.northsouth.edu/newassets/files/ppg-research/PPG\\_5th\\_Batch/1.\\_MahadiCitizensTrustin\\_Public\\_Institutions\\_Exploring\\_Trust\\_in\\_Public\\_Officials\\_in\\_Bangladesh.pdf](https://www.northsouth.edu/newassets/files/ppg-research/PPG_5th_Batch/1._MahadiCitizensTrustin_Public_Institutions_Exploring_Trust_in_Public_Officials_in_Bangladesh.pdf)
- Akkas, S. A. (2002). Judicial independence and accountability: A comparative study of contemporary Bangladesh experience (Doctoral thesis, University of Wollongong). Research Online, University of Wollongong. <https://ro.uow.edu.au/theses/1856>
- Akram, M. S. (2017). A critical analysis of access to justice in Bangladesh. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention*, 6(8), 50–58. [https://www.ijhssi.org/papers/v6\(8\)/Version-3/G0608035058.pdf](https://www.ijhssi.org/papers/v6(8)/Version-3/G0608035058.pdf)
- Albers, P. (n.d.). Performance indicators and evaluation for judges and courts (Council of Europe). Council of Europe. <https://rm.coe.int/performance-indicators-and-evaluation-for-judges-and-courts-dr-pim-alb/16807907b0>
- Alim, M. A., & Ali, T. O. (2007). NGO-shalish and justice-seeking behaviour in rural Bangladesh (BRAC Research Report). BRAC Research and Evaluation Division. <https://bigd.bracu.ac.bd/wp-content/uploads/2007/11/NGO-Shalish-and-Justice-Seeking-Behaviour-in-Rural-Bangladesh.pdf>
- Aydın Çakır, A., & Şekercioğlu, E. (2016). Public confidence in the judiciary: the interaction between political awareness and level of democracy. *Democratization*, 23(4), 634–656. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13510347.2014.1000874>
- Benesh, S. C. (2006). Understanding public confidence in American courts. *The Journal of Politics*, 68(3), 697–707. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2508.2006.00455.x>
- Bhuiya, A., Sharmin, T., & Hanifi, S. M. (2003). Nature of domestic violence against women in a rural area of Bangladesh: Implication for preventive interventions. *Journal of Health, Population and Nutrition*, 21(1), 48–54. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/12751674/>

- Dakolias, M. (1999). Court performance around the world: A comparative perspective (World Bank Technical Paper No. 430). World Bank. <https://doi.org/10.1596/0-8213-4436-6>
- de Oliveira Gomes, A., de Aquino Guimaraes, T., & Akutsu, L. (2016). The relationship between judicial staff and court performance: Evidence from Brazilian state courts. *International Journal for Court Administration*, 8(1), 12–19. <https://doi.org/10.18352/ijca.214>
- Gibson, J. L., Caldeira, G. A., & Spence, L. K. (2003). Measuring Attitudes toward the United States Supreme Court. *American Journal of Political Science*, 47(2), 354–367. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3186144>
- Hossain, M. M. (2017). Effective judiciary and citizens' rights: A study - Bangladesh perspective. *Australasian Journal of Law, Ethics and Governance*, 3(1), 1–10.
- Jamil, I., & Askvik, S. (2013). Citizens' trust in public officials: Bangladesh and Nepal compared. In I. Jamil, S. Askvik, & T. Dhakal (Eds.), *In search of better governance in South Asia and beyond* (Public administration, governance and globalization, Vol. 3). Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-7372-5\\_9](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-7372-5_9)
- Frank, R. H. (2019). How Rising Income Inequality Threatens Access to the Legal System. *Daedalus*, 148(1), 10–18. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/48562959>
- Kim, S. (2010). Public Trust in Government in Japan and South Korea: Does the Rise of Critical Citizens Matter? *Public Administration Review*, 70(5), 801–810. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40802376>
- Levi, M., & Stoker, L. (2000). Political trust and trustworthiness. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 3, 475–507. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.polisci.3.1.475>
- Mishler, W., & Rose, R. (2001). What are the origins of political trust? Testing institutional and cultural theories in post-communist societies. *Comparative Political Studies*, 34(1), 30–62. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0010414001034001002>
- Reiling, D., & Contini, F. (2022). E-justice platforms: Challenges for judicial governance. *International Journal for Court Administration*, 13(1), 6. <https://doi.org/10.36745/ijca.445>
- Roberts, J. V. (2007). Public confidence in criminal justice in Canada: A comparative and contextual analysis. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 49(2), 153–184. <https://doi.org/10.3138/RN84-2371-2482-MR06>
- Sampaio, J. O., De-Losso, R., & Cunha, L. G. (2014). Confidence in the judicial system: Evidence from Brazil. SSRN. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2470151>
- OECD. (2019). Linking the indigenous Sami people with regional development in Sweden (OECD Rural Policy Reviews). OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264310544-en>
- Stoutenborough, J. W., & Haider-Markel, D. P. (2008). Public confidence in the U.S. Supreme Court: A new look at the impact of Court decisions. *Social Science Journal*, 45(1), 28–47. Retrieved September 3, 2022, from <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sosci.2007.12.012>
- Tansey, J., & O'Riordan, T. (1999). Cultural theory and risk: A review. *Health, Risk and Society*, 1(1), 71–90. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13698579908407008>
- UNDP. (n.d.). Access to justice. <https://www.undp.org/rolhr/justice/access-to-justice>
- Van De Walle, S. (2009). Confidence in the criminal justice system: Does experience count? *British Journal of Criminology*, 49(3), 384–398. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azp001>
- Wallace, A., & Goodman-Delahunty, J. (2021). Measuring Trust and Confidence in Courts. *International Journal for Court Administration*, 12(3), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.36745/IJCA.418>