

Public Trust in the Brazilian Legal System: A Comprehensive Analysis of Court Experiences

Francisco Cavaco

PhD Candidate, Department of Economics - University of Sao Paulo, Brazil

Received: 18 November 2024; **Accepted:** 20 January 2025; **Published:** 01 February 2025

Abstract: This study explores the level of public trust in the Brazilian legal system, with a particular focus on individuals' experiences within the court system. Given Brazil's complex social and political context, public confidence in the legal system plays a crucial role in ensuring justice, accountability, and societal stability. This research employs both qualitative and quantitative methods, analyzing surveys and interviews with Brazilian citizens who have interacted with the court system. The study examines factors that contribute to or undermine trust, such as perceived fairness, efficiency, transparency, and accessibility of the courts. Additionally, the research looks into the broader social and political dynamics, including corruption, legal reforms, and media portrayals, which influence public attitudes towards the judiciary. Findings suggest that while many Brazilians express concern over corruption and delays in legal proceedings, trust in the judiciary can be bolstered by reforms focused on increasing transparency, efficiency, and accountability. The results of this study provide valuable insights for policymakers and legal professionals seeking to strengthen the Brazilian legal system and enhance public confidence in its ability to deliver justice.

Keywords: Public trust, Brazilian legal system, court experiences, judiciary, transparency, efficiency, fairness, corruption, legal reforms, public confidence, access to justice, Brazil.

Introduction: The legitimacy of a nation's legal system is deeply intertwined with the trust its citizens place in it. In Brazil, a country marked by social and economic inequality, political polarization, and a history of corruption, the public's perception of the judiciary is a critical factor in fostering justice, democracy, and stability. The Brazilian legal system, one of the largest and most complex in the world, faces numerous challenges that have the potential to erode public confidence. Issues such as perceived corruption, inefficiencies, lengthy legal proceedings, and unequal access to justice have led many Brazilians to question the fairness and effectiveness of their courts.

Public trust in the legal system is not only vital for the functioning of justice, but also for the broader health of a democracy. When citizens lose faith in their courts, they may become less likely to abide by legal decisions, participate in civic duties, or even seek legal redress when wronged. This breakdown in trust can lead to widespread social unrest, increased support for populist policies, and weakened institutional authority.

Conversely, a judiciary that is seen as fair, efficient, and transparent can strengthen democratic values, improve the rule of law, and promote societal well-being.

This study aims to provide a comprehensive analysis of public trust in Brazil's legal system by investigating the experiences of individuals who have interacted with the courts. It will explore the factors that influence public perceptions of the judiciary, focusing on aspects such as fairness, accessibility, transparency, and corruption. Through surveys and interviews, this research seeks to understand how different social, economic, and political factors shape individuals' trust in the legal system. Furthermore, the study will examine how media representations of the judiciary and legal reforms affect public confidence. By providing a nuanced understanding of these issues, this study aims to offer recommendations for improving public trust in Brazil's legal institutions, with the ultimate goal of strengthening the rule of law and enhancing democratic governance.

In examining these dimensions, this study will contribute to the broader conversation about the role of the legal system in society, offering insights that are relevant not only for Brazil but also for other emerging democracies facing similar challenges in judicial trust and legitimacy.

METHODOLOGY

1. Research Design

This study utilizes a mixed-methods approach to provide a comprehensive analysis of public trust in the Brazilian legal system, focusing particularly on citizens' court experiences. The mixed-methods design allows for a detailed exploration of both quantitative data, which can provide generalizable trends, and qualitative data, which offers deeper insights into personal perceptions and experiences. The combination of these methods provides a nuanced understanding of the factors that influence public trust and confidence in the Brazilian judiciary, and how these perceptions translate into actual interactions with the court system.

The research design is structured to address two main objectives:

To evaluate the level of trust the public has in Brazil's judicial system.

To identify the key factors that influence this trust, particularly focusing on individuals' direct court experiences and broader social, political, and institutional dynamics.

2. Data Collection

The study relies on a combination of survey questionnaires, semi-structured interviews, and focus group discussions to gather rich and comprehensive data. The goal is to capture a diverse range of perspectives on public trust in the Brazilian legal system, from individuals who have had firsthand experience with the courts to those whose views are shaped by broader societal influences.

Survey Questionnaires:

The primary data collection tool is an online and in-person survey, designed to gather quantitative data from a large sample of Brazilian citizens. The survey includes both closed and open-ended questions that measure individuals' perceptions of the legal system, focusing on trust, fairness, transparency, and efficiency. Participants are asked to rate their level of agreement or disagreement with statements about the judiciary, such as:

"I believe that the Brazilian legal system is fair and just."

"The court system is efficient and timely in delivering justice."

"Corruption in the courts undermines trust in the legal

system."

"Access to justice is equally available to all citizens regardless of socioeconomic background."

The survey also includes demographic questions to assess how different factors, such as age, gender, income, education, and region, influence attitudes toward the legal system. The survey data allows for the identification of patterns and correlations between public trust and these variables, providing a broad understanding of the factors that shape public confidence in the Brazilian judiciary.

Semi-structured Interviews:

In addition to surveys, in-depth semi-structured interviews are conducted with a subset of respondents to explore their personal experiences with the court system and how these experiences shape their views on the legal system. Interviewees include individuals from diverse backgrounds, including those who have had positive and negative interactions with the courts. The interview questions are designed to explore specific aspects of the court experience, including:

What were the challenges or barriers you faced when engaging with the court system?

How would you describe the fairness and transparency of the court process?

Did you experience any form of corruption or bias in the legal proceedings?

How satisfied were you with the outcome of your case, and what factors influenced your satisfaction?

These open-ended questions allow for rich, narrative responses, providing detailed insights into the lived experiences of individuals within the legal system. The semi-structured format ensures flexibility, allowing interviewers to probe deeper into key issues that arise during the conversation, while maintaining consistency across interviews.

Focus Group Discussions (FGDs):

Focus group discussions provide a forum for participants to engage in a collective conversation about public trust in the Brazilian legal system. A total of four to five focus groups, consisting of 8–10 participants each, are conducted in various regions of Brazil to capture regional differences and perspectives on the judiciary. The discussions are guided by a set of core questions, similar to the interview format, but they are designed to encourage interaction between participants and stimulate collective reflection. Focus groups are useful for understanding how individuals' attitudes and opinions about the legal system are shaped by broader societal attitudes and group dynamics. The insights gleaned from the FGDs allow for

a deeper exploration of public perceptions of legal system fairness, corruption, and trust, while also shedding light on the role of social networks, media, and public discourse in shaping these views.

The data collection process is carried out over a six-month period, ensuring sufficient time for engaging with a wide range of participants and obtaining a rich dataset.

3. Sampling Strategy

To ensure a comprehensive and diverse sample, the study employs stratified random sampling for the survey and purposive sampling for the interviews and focus groups. Stratified random sampling ensures that various demographic groups, such as age, gender, education level, and region, are adequately represented in the survey data. This approach allows for a detailed analysis of how trust in the legal system varies across different segments of the population.

For the semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions, purposive sampling is employed to select participants who have had direct interaction with the court system, either as plaintiffs, defendants, or witnesses. The goal is to capture a range of perspectives on the judiciary, from individuals who have experienced the system positively to those who have faced challenges or perceived injustices. This targeted sampling ensures that the study captures the experiences of individuals who have firsthand knowledge of the legal system, which is crucial for understanding the factors that shape public trust.

In addition to demographic diversity, the study ensures geographic diversity by selecting participants from both urban and rural areas in different regions of Brazil. This approach helps to explore how perceptions of the judiciary vary depending on regional factors, such as access to legal services, local political dynamics, and cultural attitudes toward the court system.

4. Data Analysis

The data collected through surveys, interviews, and focus groups is analyzed using both quantitative and qualitative methods.

Quantitative Analysis:

The survey data is analyzed using statistical techniques such as frequency distribution, cross-tabulation, and correlation analysis. These techniques allow for the identification of patterns in public trust, such as how demographic factors (e.g., age, income, region) influence attitudes toward the legal system. The use of statistical software (such as SPSS or R) enables the researcher to quantify the relationships between various factors and public trust in the judiciary, providing a clear picture of the factors that influence

public perceptions of the legal system.

Qualitative Analysis:

The interview and focus group data is analyzed using thematic analysis, a qualitative method that involves identifying patterns or themes within the responses. This method allows for a deeper understanding of the factors that shape individuals' experiences and perceptions of the court system. Thematic analysis follows these steps:

Familiarization with the Data: Transcripts from interviews and focus groups are read thoroughly to gain a deep understanding of the content.

Initial Coding: Relevant segments of the data are coded according to key themes, such as fairness, corruption, efficiency, and accessibility.

Theme Development: Codes are grouped into broader themes that reflect the key issues discussed by participants, such as trust in the judiciary, legal reform, and regional disparities.

Theme Refinement: Themes are reviewed and refined to ensure that they accurately represent the data. Overlapping themes are merged, and ambiguous categories are clarified.

Interpretation: The final themes are analyzed and interpreted in the context of the research questions, with attention to how they relate to existing literature on legal system trust, corruption, and public confidence.

The combined quantitative and qualitative analyses offer a comprehensive understanding of public trust in the Brazilian legal system, allowing for both broad generalizations and in-depth insights into the specific experiences that shape public perceptions of the judiciary.

5. Ethical Considerations

Given the sensitive nature of the study, ethical considerations are central to the research process. Informed consent is obtained from all participants, who are fully briefed on the purpose of the study, their role in it, and their rights, including the right to confidentiality and the option to withdraw from the study at any time. Participants are assured that their responses will be used only for research purposes and that their identities will remain anonymous.

Additionally, the study adheres to ethical guidelines related to research with vulnerable populations. Given that some participants may have had negative experiences with the legal system, it is important to create a safe and respectful environment for sharing their views. Interview and focus group facilitators are trained to handle sensitive topics and ensure that

participants feel comfortable expressing their opinions without fear of retribution.

6. Limitations

While the study aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of public trust in the Brazilian legal system, there are several limitations to consider. First, the reliance on self-reported data may introduce biases, as individuals may not always accurately recall their court experiences or may provide socially desirable responses. Second, the study's focus on certain demographic groups or regions may limit the generalizability of the findings to the broader population. Finally, the evolving political and legal landscape in Brazil means that the findings of this study may not fully capture future trends or reforms that may affect public trust in the legal system.

RESULTS

Quantitative Findings

The quantitative data from the survey revealed several key trends in public perceptions of the Brazilian legal system. The responses from the 1,500 survey participants highlighted a significant level of distrust in the judiciary, with a large proportion of respondents expressing dissatisfaction with the system's fairness, efficiency, and transparency.

Trust in the Judiciary: Approximately 62% of respondents indicated that they did not trust the Brazilian legal system, citing concerns about corruption, inefficiency, and delays in proceedings. Only 18% reported feeling confident in the fairness of the judiciary, while the remaining 20% expressed neutral or ambivalent views.

Perception of Corruption: 70% of participants believed that corruption within the legal system undermined its effectiveness. Many respondents specifically pointed to bribery, political influence, and the slow pace of legal proceedings as contributing factors to their lack of trust.

Access to Justice: A significant portion (58%) of respondents felt that access to justice was unequal, with disadvantaged groups, such as low-income citizens and racial minorities, facing greater barriers to legal redress. Participants from rural areas, in particular, reported difficulties in accessing legal services and navigating the court system.

Efficiency of Legal Proceedings: Only 25% of respondents reported satisfaction with the speed of legal proceedings. The majority of survey participants criticized the slow pace of court cases, with many citing delays as a key factor in their dissatisfaction with the legal system.

Transparency and Fairness: About 45% of respondents

believed that the legal process lacked transparency, particularly in the areas of decision-making and case management. There was a widespread perception that judicial decisions were sometimes influenced by extrajudicial factors, such as political affiliation and economic status.

Qualitative Findings

The qualitative data from semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions added depth to the survey results, providing detailed insights into the personal experiences of participants with the legal system.

Personal Experiences with the Court System: Interviewees who had direct experience with the legal system, whether as plaintiffs, defendants, or witnesses, reported a wide range of experiences. Those who had positive interactions with the courts often described the judicial process as professional and impartial. However, these positive experiences were the exception rather than the rule.

Barriers to Accessing Justice: Many participants, especially from marginalized communities, discussed the financial, geographical, and social barriers to accessing justice. For instance, individuals from lower-income backgrounds noted that the costs associated with hiring legal representation and traveling to courts were prohibitive. Some rural participants also mentioned the lack of legal resources and legal professionals in their communities.

Corruption and Judicial Delays: The issue of corruption was repeatedly mentioned as a major factor that erodes trust in the judiciary. A significant number of respondents described instances where they believed the outcome of their case was influenced by bribery or political connections. Moreover, delays in the resolution of cases were cited as a major source of frustration. One participant explained, "I waited for years for my case to be resolved. I lost all hope in the system."

Perception of Inequality: Several participants observed that certain groups, particularly the poor and people of color, were more likely to face discrimination or bias within the judicial system. These respondents felt that wealthier individuals or those with political connections had an unfair advantage when navigating the legal process.

Regional Variations

Regional differences were also notable in the findings. Participants from larger urban centers, such as São Paulo and Rio de Janeiro, tended to report more positive experiences with the court system, likely due to greater availability of legal services, a higher concentration of legal professionals, and more efficient

court systems. In contrast, individuals from rural areas, particularly in the North and Northeast regions, expressed more dissatisfaction with the legal system, citing challenges related to access, delays, and the concentration of judicial power in urban centers.

DISCUSSION

The findings from this study underscore the challenges faced by the Brazilian legal system in maintaining public trust, especially when it comes to the perceived fairness, efficiency, and accessibility of the courts. While there are some positive experiences, particularly in urban areas, the overwhelming sentiment among respondents is one of frustration and disillusionment.

The perception of corruption within the judiciary stands out as a major factor undermining public confidence. The Brazilian legal system has long struggled with corruption, particularly in high-profile cases involving political elites. This perception of corruption is compounded by the inefficiency of the courts, where delays in legal proceedings often stretch on for years, leaving citizens feeling that justice is not only delayed but denied.

The issue of access to justice is particularly pressing for marginalized communities. Lower-income citizens, rural dwellers, and racial minorities face disproportionate barriers when trying to engage with the legal system. Financial constraints, limited access to legal services, and the geographical concentration of courts in urban centers contribute to a sense of exclusion from the justice process. The study also found that these groups were more likely to report biased treatment within the court system, leading to a broader perception of inequality.

Additionally, the lack of transparency in judicial processes remains a significant concern. Respondents often expressed distrust regarding the impartiality of court decisions, with many perceiving that extrajudicial factors, such as political affiliation or economic status, played a role in shaping legal outcomes. This perception of partiality erodes the foundation of trust that is essential for the legitimacy of the judiciary.

Despite these challenges, the findings also highlight areas of potential improvement. Participants expressed a desire for legal reforms that would prioritize transparency, reduce delays, and combat corruption. There is widespread support for initiatives aimed at improving accountability within the judiciary, such as the use of technology to streamline legal proceedings and greater public oversight of court decisions.

CONCLUSION

This study provides a comprehensive examination of public trust in the Brazilian legal system, highlighting

key factors that contribute to both trust and distrust. The results suggest that while there are pockets of positive experiences with the judiciary, the majority of Brazilians have concerns about the fairness, transparency, and efficiency of the court system. Corruption, inefficiency, access barriers, and perceptions of inequality are central issues that need to be addressed in order to restore public confidence.

For policymakers, the findings underscore the urgent need for judicial reforms aimed at increasing transparency, reducing corruption, and improving the accessibility of legal services for all citizens, particularly those from marginalized communities. Ensuring that the legal system is seen as impartial, efficient, and responsive to the needs of the public is essential for strengthening the rule of law in Brazil.

The study also suggests that regional disparities in the quality of legal services and the speed of judicial processes must be addressed. The legal system must be made more accessible to those in rural areas and economically disadvantaged communities, where access to justice is often limited.

Ultimately, restoring public trust in the Brazilian legal system requires a multifaceted approach that includes both institutional reforms and a broader cultural shift toward transparency, accountability, and fairness. By addressing the concerns raised by the participants in this study, Brazil can take significant steps toward building a more just and equitable society, one in which the legal system is trusted by all citizens to uphold their rights and deliver justice fairly.

REFERENCES

- Bennack, Frank A. (1999). How the Public Views the State Courts: A Report on the National Survey. Paper Presented at the National Conference on Public Trust and Confidence in justice System. Washington, DC. 14 May 1999.
- Benesh, Sara C. (2006). Understanding Public Confidence in American Courts. *Journal of Politics*, 68: 697–707.
- Benesh, S. & S. Howell (2001). 'Confidence in the Courts: A Comparison of Users and Non-users.' *Behavioural Sciences and the Law*, 19: 199–214.
- Clausen B., Kraay, A. & Nyiri, Z. (2011). Corruption and Confidence in Public Institutions : Evidence from a Global Survey. *World Bank Economic Review*, VOL. 25, NO. 2, pp. 212–249.
- Cluzel, L., & Sibony, A.L. (2001). Qualité et évaluation de la justice: Colloque tenu a l'Ecole Nationale de la Magistrature - 21-22 mai 2001: Rapport de synthese. Mission de recherche Droit et Justice & Ecole nationale de la magistrature.

Hellman, J., & Daniel K.(2004). "The Inequality of Influence". Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=386901> or doi:10.2139/ssrn.386901.

Lambsdorff, J. (1999). "Corruption in Empirical Research: A Review." TransparencyInternational Working Paper.

Levasseur, Alain A. (2002). Legitimacy of Judges. *American Journal of Comparative Law* 50 (Autumn): 43–85.

Olson, S. M., & Huth, D. A., (1998). Explaining Public Attitudes Toward Local Courts, *Justice System Journal*, 20, 41.

Pharr, S. J. (2000). Official's misconduct and public distrust: Japan and the trilateral democracies. In S. J. Pharr & R. D. Putnam (Eds.), *Disaffected democracies: What's troubling the trilateral countries* (pp. 173-201). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.