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Abstract
This study intends to know justice sector employees’ views of their institutions in terms of their satisfaction, access to justice level and their standard performance. Present research consider employees of three main justice sector institutions namely Attorney general Office, Ministry of justice and Supreme Court employees. Quantitative methodology is applied through five point likert scale questionnaire. Questionnaire was administered among 234 subjects of the same institutions who were the training participants, train by independent directorate of local governance of Afghanistan. Data was properly entered in IBM-SPSS and analyzed through descriptive and inferential statistics. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and t-test was applied to test five hypotheses of the study. Study concluded that majority of the justice sector employees is of the view that justice sector institutions’ performance is not up to the mark.
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1. Introduction
To support and maintain Afghanistan justice system many international stakeholders are active. Support from international donors and different stakeholders is in different forms like financial support and capacity buildings. It is said that this support for the enhancing capacity of justice system of Afghanistan is for achieving short term objectives which may not be sufficient for the sustainability of Afghanistan justice system while on other side it is also believed that this support from international donors has been influential and has brought positive changes. This study has been designed to gather thoughts and perception of legal professionals working in justice providing organizations of Afghanistan. Particularly this study focuses on employees’ views of their education, skills and abilities match with their job and to know whether Afghanistan Justice sector is providing legal services according to laws or laws are consider dead letters. This study also focuses on gender dimension and their extent of participation as a justice sector professional.

Research Objectives:
• Job satisfaction: To observe and notice staff views’ concerning their abilities, knowledge and educations in the legal profession and to know the level of legal education facilities available to them.
• Institutions performance: To find out how well do they think the justice sector is delivering legal services to Afghan citizens?

Hypotheses:
H0: There is no significant mean difference of Attorney general Office, Ministry of justice and Supreme Court employees in job satisfaction level
H0: There is no significant mean difference of Attorney general Office, Ministry of justice and Supreme Court employees in access to justice level
H0: There is no significant mean difference in opinions among Attorney general Office, Ministry of justice and Supreme Court employees regarding Standard performance of Justice Institutions of Afghanistan.
H0: There is no difference in access to justice level between male and female employees of Attorney General Office, Ministry of justice and Supreme Court.
H0: There is no difference in opinions of male and female employees of Attorney General Office, Ministry of justice and Supreme Court regarding Standard performance of Justice Institutions of Afghanistan.

2. Literature Review
Highhouse & Becker, (1993) reported that Job satisfaction is the topic which has been researched extensively, specifically in industrial and organisational psychology. According to Locke, (1976) number of articles and books investigating covering job satisfaction increased from 3000 in 1976 and according to Harwood & Rice, (1992) which crossed 5000 in 1992. Today, more than 10,000 articles are available on mention subject.
Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction may be defined as pleasing or positive feelings towards his job (Locke, 1976). Locke and Henne (1986) defined job satisfaction as the enjoyable feelings resulting from the job characteristics in the work setting. Work rewards reflect the intrinsic and extrinsic benefits that workers receive from their jobs (Kalleberg, 1977). Two main work rewards discussed in literature are task, and organizational rewards. Task rewards are an intrinsic reward which is related with performing the job (Katz & Van Maanan, 1977; Mottaz, 1988). Intrinsic rewards include task, self-direction, and responsibility, job variety and opportunities to utilize abilities and skills. On the other hand, organizational rewards are extrinsic rewards that are noticeable like salary, promotions, financial benefits, safety, and relax working environment. (Katz & Van Maanan, 1977; Mottaz, 1988)

According to Loscocco (1989), every employee has some preferences with respect to what he or she wants to pursue. It is commonly believed that mostly employees’ value extrinsic rewards and some emphasize on intrinsic reward. Some employees focus on both types of rewards. However, both kinds of rewards add to job satisfaction (O’Reilly & Caldwell, 1980).

3. Methodology

To test hypothesis of this study, quantitative methodology was applied and five point lickert scale questionnaire was designed to collect data from sample to reach to reliable and valid conclusion of the study.

Instruments and sample of the study

Afghanistan justice sector is a very broad area of study and consists of many different justice institutions. Total size of employees working in three main institutions namely Attorney General Office, Ministry of Justice and Supreme Court is 12,741. Subjects selected for this study were 243 justice sector employees as sample from Attorney General Office (84 subjects), Ministry of Justice (81) and Supreme Court (78) who participated in International Development Law Organization trainings. Questionnaire was designed consisting two sections, one section includes demographic questions and the second comprises 19 items measured through five point Lickert Scale. Data collected from respondents were properly entered in IBM-SPSS and analyzed accordingly which is presented following.

4. Analysis and findings

Below analysis and results are based on primary data collected through questionnaire from 243 respondents of Afghanistan justice sector employees from AGO, MOJ and SC.

Description of study respondents

As mentioned above, questionnaire was distributed among 243 participants among whom 208 were male which is 86% of the respondents and only 38 (14%) were female participants. Subjects of the study were also categorized based on their education level, there were 111 participants who got secondary level, primary level were 37, law faculty were 28, only 5 participants got master degree and there was no one with PhD degree. Remaining participants were from some basic level short courses from institutes and some of them were from religious based schools (Madrasa).

Analysis of study Hypotheses

There were total five hypotheses developed for this study which has been tested through appropriate statistical tests based on data collected from participants. All hypotheses are tested and their results are presented following.

H1: There is no statistical significant mean difference in job satisfaction level among AGO, MOJ and Supreme Court employees.

First Hypothesis, there is no significant mean difference of Attorney general Office, Ministry of justice and Supreme Court employees in job satisfaction level, has been tested through analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and the test shows significant mean differences among subjects from three institutes as can be seen in below table 4.1. F Statistic value is 5.0 and its significant value is .007 which is less than .05, therefore it is concluded that there is significant mean differences among subjects from three institutes.

Table 4.1 Analysis of Variance: Hypothesis 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.368</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>1234.8</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12413</td>
<td>235</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Anova test only shows significant differences but it does not shows where this difference lies. Post Hoc test was applied to know which group is significantly different.
Table 4.1.1 Post Hoc test Hypothesis 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) Institution</th>
<th>(J) Institution</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
<th>Confidence Lower Bound</th>
<th>Confidence Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LSD</td>
<td>AGO</td>
<td>MOJ -.27514</td>
<td>.10914</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>-.5012</td>
<td>- .0711</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>-.317631</td>
<td>.11254</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>-.5291</td>
<td>- .0856</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOJ</td>
<td>AGO</td>
<td>.26523</td>
<td>.10914</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.0711</td>
<td>.5012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>-.0122</td>
<td>.11318</td>
<td>.851</td>
<td>-.2442</td>
<td>.2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>AGO</td>
<td>.3037</td>
<td>.11254</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.0856</td>
<td>.5291</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MOJ</td>
<td>.0122</td>
<td>.11318</td>
<td>.851</td>
<td>-.2018</td>
<td>.2442</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

The post hoc test (LSD) shows following results:
- There is statistically significant difference (P < .05 that is .007) between AGO and MOJ satisfaction level.
- There is statistically significant difference (P < .05 that is .005) between AGO and SC satisfaction level.
- There is no statistically significant difference (p >.05 that is .851) between SC and MOJ satisfaction level.

It is concluded that there is statistically significant differences in satisfaction level of employees between AGO and MOJ and AGO and SC.

H2: There is no statistical significant mean difference among AGO, MOJ and Supreme Court employees in access to justice level

Table 4.2 Analysis of Variance: Hypothesis 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>40.58</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.29</td>
<td>21.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>210.58</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>251.17</td>
<td>234</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of variance test shows significant mean differences among employees of three institutes in access to justice level as shown in above table 4.2. Sig. value is 0.000 which is less than .05 .As mentioned earlier that Analysis of Variance test only shows significant differences but it does not shows where these differences lie, to know specific group significant mean differences post hoc is applied and the result is shown in the following table 4.2.1

4.2.2 Post Hoc test Hypothesis 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) Institution</th>
<th>(J) Institution</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
<th>Confidence Lower Bound</th>
<th>Confidence Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LSD</td>
<td>AGO</td>
<td>-.56617</td>
<td>.2471</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-1.0289</td>
<td>-.2812</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>-1.01372</td>
<td>.1247</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-1.3526</td>
<td>-.6568</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOJ</td>
<td>AGO</td>
<td>.65509</td>
<td>.15800</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.2812</td>
<td>1.0289</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>-.34963</td>
<td>.1501</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>-.7288</td>
<td>.0296</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>AGO</td>
<td>1.00472</td>
<td>.2152</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.6568</td>
<td>1.3526</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MOJ</td>
<td>.4387</td>
<td>.2301</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>-.0296</td>
<td>.7288</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Post hoc test reveals the following results:
- There is statistically significant difference between AGO and MOJ Access to justice level.
- There is statistically significant difference between AGO and SC Access to justice level.
- There is no statistically significant difference between MOJ and SC Access to justice level.

H3: There is no difference in opinions between AGO, MOJ and Supreme Court employees regarding Standard performance of Justice Institutions of Afghanistan.
Table 4.3. Analysis of variance: Hypothesis 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>8.223</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.112</td>
<td>5.580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>168.360</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>.723</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>176.583</td>
<td>235</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a statistically significant difference between the mean numbers of performance standard level for the three tests as can be seen in above Table 4.3. The Sig. value is 0.004 which is less than .05. Post hoc test is further applied to know which specific group has got significant differences; result is presented in the following Table 4.3.1

Table 4.3.1 Post hoc test hypothesis 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) Institution</th>
<th>(J) Institution</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
<th>Confidence Interval</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LSD</td>
<td>AGO</td>
<td>MOJ</td>
<td>-1.756</td>
<td>.1265</td>
<td>.599</td>
<td>-.3315</td>
<td>.1917</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>.3585</td>
<td>.2458</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.7047</td>
<td>-1.652</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOJ</td>
<td>AGO</td>
<td>.0577</td>
<td>.1416</td>
<td>.587</td>
<td>-.1917</td>
<td>.3315</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>.36507</td>
<td>.13768</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>-.6363</td>
<td>-.0938</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>AGO</td>
<td>.43496</td>
<td>.13690</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.1652</td>
<td>.7047</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>MOJ</td>
<td>.36507</td>
<td>.13768</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.0938</td>
<td>.6363</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

The post hoc test reveals the following results:
- There is no statistically significant difference between AGO and MOJ performance standard level.
- There is statistically significant difference between AGO and SC performance standard level.
- There is statistically significant difference between MOJ and SC performance standard level.

Post hoc test shows statistically significant difference between AGO and SC performance standard level and MOJ and SC performance standard level.

H4: There is no difference in access to justice level between male and female employees of AGO, MOJ and Supreme Court.

Hypothesis 4 is tested with independent sample test as there are only two groups that is male and female, result is shown in below table

Table 4.4 Independent Sample Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Index</td>
<td>Equal Variances assumed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal Variances not assumed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances column shows significance level is 0.76 (.76%) which is greater than .05 (0.76 > 0.05) and it means that the variances in two groups is not significantly different, therefore, equal variances row is considered for reading which reveals $t(233) = 0.806, p = 0.347, \alpha = .05$. As significant value is greater than .05 which is .347 (.347 > .05) and it means that there is no significant mean differences in access to justice level between male and female employees of the said organizations.

H5: There is no difference in opinions between male and female employees of AGO, MOJ and Supreme Court regarding Standard performance of Justice Institutions of Afghanistan.
### Table 4.5 independent sample test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Standard of justice institutions</th>
<th>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equal Variances assumed</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.711</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Variances not assumed</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>43.821</td>
<td>.858</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Levene’s test for equality of variance shows equal variance as can be seen in the above table sig. value is greater than .05 (.711 > .05), therefore first row result would be considered for reading and interpretations. Result shows t (233) = .215, significant value is .764 which is greater than .05, it means that there is no statistical significant mean difference between male and female employees views’ of justice institutions performance of Afghanistan.

### 5. Conclusions and recommendations

Study concludes that only 14% of justice institution employees are female, and it shows that female membership in the justice sector of Afghanistan is low.

Out of 243 respondents, primary school respondents were 15%, 46% is Secondary School, bachelor degree respondents were 19% and only 2% participants were having master’s degree holders, it is concluded that the education level of Afghanistan justice sector employees is still very low, study recommends that minimum level of education for justice sector employees must be bachelor degree in Law or Sharia.

**Employees’ Views of their job satisfaction:**
- Among 234 participants, 84% employees are satisfied and 16% are unsatisfied with their current job.
- 62% employees are satisfied and remaining 38% are unsatisfied with current opportunities of education in legal profession.
- 71% employees are satisfied and 29% are unsatisfied with the level of professional qualifications among staff in their department.

**Recommendation:**
- This study recommends that more opportunities in shape of establishing legal studies institutes, training institutes are needed to obtain professional qualification and professional trainings.

**Employees’ Views of Afghans access to justice system:**
- Sixty two (62%) staffs were found agreed and thirty (38%) were not with the statement that all Afghans have impartial and unbiased services from justice institutions.
- Statement that the justice system is accessible to all Afghan citizens, 53% employees were agreed and 47% staff was disagreed.
- Forty four (44%) employees’ were agreed and fifty six (56%) were disagreed with the statement that the Poor have access to justice services.
- Sixty three (63%) employees were agreed and thirty seven (37%) were disagreed with the statement that the women and men have the same access to justice services.

**Recommendation:**
- Many employees were agreed with the view that all Afghans have access to justice system but still there were differences in staff perception by institutions.
- It is strongly recommended that Justice System of Afghanistan should encourage and treat all in such a way where all Afghans men and women must have access to justice, where gender, ethnic discrimination should be discouraged, rich and poor should be treated same.

**Employees’ Views of the performance of justice institutions:**
- Based on sample of 234, sixty eight (68%) of the view that justice institutions are performing below standards in response to the statement that the quality of service the justice institutions provide to
citizens.

- In response to the statement that overall functions of the courts are up to standards, 82% of the staff reported below standards.
- In view of the performance of justice institutions, majority of the justice sector staff reported that justice sector institutions’ performance is below standards.

**Recommendation:**

- Employees’ assessment and satisfaction about their own qualifications and skill levels was very high but their assessment of justice sector performance and Afghans’ access to justice was significantly low.
- The overall functioning of all institutions must be improved effectively and efficiently.
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