

CENTER

FOR

COURT

INNOVATION

A Project of the Fund for the City of New York

RESEARCH

The Effects of the Harlem Housing Court on Tenant Perceptions of Justice

Rashida Abuwala and Donald J. Farole, Jr.

520 Eighth Avenue, 18th Floor
New York, New York 10018
212.397.3050 fax 212.397.0985
www.courtinnovation.org

March 2008

Acknowledgements

This report was made possible with the support and cooperation of many individuals. We are especially grateful to the Honorable Fern Fisher, Administrative Judge of the Civil Court of the City of New York, for her support and feedback at all stages of the research process and for helping to facilitate administration of the survey upon which this report is based.

We are grateful to the Honorable Ruben A. Martino, Presiding Justice of the Harlem Housing Court, who provided assistance to the research team throughout the course of this project. Hon. Ernest Cavallo and Hon. Pam B. Jackman Brown, supervising judges of the Manhattan Housing Court (at the beginning and end of the project, respectively) were most gracious in helping to facilitate administration of the survey. Finally, we would like to thank all of the judges in the New York City Housing Court for their cooperation and assistance in allowing us to interview litigants in their court parts: Hon. Gilbert Badillo, Hon. David B. Cohen, Hon. Sheldon J. Halprin, Hon. Karen Lin, Hon. Gary F. Marton, Hon. Jean T. Schneider, Hon. Michelle Schreiber, and Hon. Peter M. Wendt.

From the Center for Court Innovation, Greg Berman, Alfred Siegel, Raye Barbieri, Chris Watler, Michael Rempel and Michael Bournes-Ney provided feedback on drafts of the survey instrument and earlier versions of this report. Several staff and interns helped to conduct interviews and in data entry: Lindsey Wylie, Rachel Finkelstein, Kaishi Lee, Kira Mandella, Ashley Kloepfer, Iris Diaz, Damon Dobbs-Brown, Gisell Perez-Ortiz.

Any opinions and interpretations are those of the authors; they do not necessarily represent the official positions of the New York City Housing Court or the Center for Court Innovation.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	iv
I. Introduction	1
II. Methodology	3
III. Description of Survey Sample	4
IV. Housing Resource Center	8
V. Court Experience	10
VI. Perception of the Judge and Court	12
VII. Overall Evaluation of the Court Experience	15
VIII. Conclusions	18
References	20
Appendix A	21
Appendix B	29

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This study examines the impact of the Harlem Community Justice Center’s housing court, a community-based housing court that attempts to achieve speedier and more durable outcomes in landlord-tenant disputes. The primary objective was to determine the perceptions of pro se tenants (i.e., those who represent themselves without an attorney) whose cases are heard in Harlem about their court experience. Also examined are the perceptions of pro se tenants whose cases are heard in New York City’s centralized housing court located in southern Manhattan (“downtown housing court”). The study is based on 343 in-person interviews conducted between January and May 2007 both in Harlem and the downtown housing court and on direct observation of 406 court appearances across the two sites.

KEY FINDINGS

While the tenant survey covered a variety of topics, two key findings emerge.

- 1. Tenants both in the Harlem and downtown housing courts provided favorable overall evaluations of their housing court experience, with Harlem tenants viewing their court experience in somewhat more positive terms.**
 - **Tenants, particularly in Harlem, felt they were treated fairly and were pleased with their court experience.**
 - Six in ten (63%) in Harlem and four in ten (40%) downtown were “very pleased” with the outcome of their court appearance.
 - Nearly nine in ten (86%) in Harlem and two in three (66%) downtown “strongly agree” or “agree” that the “result of your case was fair.”
 - Nine in ten (92%) tenants in Harlem and three in four (75%) downtown “strongly agree” or “agree” that the “case was handled fairly by the court.”
 - **Tenant perceptions of the judge and other court personnel were overwhelmingly favorable in both the Harlem and downtown courts. On most measures, those in Harlem tended to view the judge somewhat more favorably.**
 - Large majorities “strongly agree” or “agree” that the judge “treated you fairly” (98% in Harlem, 81% downtown).
 - Virtually all (99%) Harlem tenants said they “strongly agree” or “agree” that the judge “treated you with respect” (compared to 87% downtown).
 - Large majorities both in Harlem (92%) and downtown (72%) “strongly agree” or “agree” that the judge “carefully considered what you said when making a decision.”
 - Nearly all (97%) in Harlem and nine in ten (90%) downtown “strongly agree” or “agree” that the “court officers were respectful.”

2. **Tenants in Harlem had more positive perceptions of their housing court experience because they were more likely to perceive the court process and outcome as fair.**
 - **Perceived fairness of court procedures and outcomes are the most important factors predicting tenants' overall satisfaction with their court experience.**
 - Tenants with more positive perceptions of fairness—both in procedures and outcomes—are considerably more likely to have a positive overall view of their court experience.
 - Other factors, including the factual outcome of the court appearance and tenants' demographic characteristics, are not significant predictors of satisfaction with the court experience.

CONCLUSIONS

- **The Harlem Community Justice Center appears to achieve its goal of improving tenants' satisfaction with their court experience as well as the perception that they were treated fairly, both in terms of the court process and outcomes.** To be sure, both the downtown and Harlem housing courts fare very well in terms of tenant perceptions of the court experience, although Harlem does receive higher marks on most measures.
- **Enhancing perceptions about fairness, both in court procedures and outcomes, is critical to efforts to improve pro se tenants' housing court experience.** Enhanced perceptions of procedural fairness are *not* necessarily inherent in a community-based housing court model—indeed, the downtown housing court also is rated positively in terms of procedural fairness.

I. Introduction

This study examines the impact of the Harlem Housing Court, a community-based housing court. The Harlem Housing Court attempts to assist all parties—both landlords and tenants—by achieving speedier and more durable outcomes. However, it may be particularly beneficial to pro se litigants (i.e., those who represent themselves without an attorney). In New York City, most landlords are represented, while the vast majority of tenants are not. In fact, one report notes that only 12% of tenants are able to afford counsel while 98% of landlords are represented (Community Training and Resource Center 1993).¹

The primary objective of this study is to determine whether pro se tenants whose cases are heard in Harlem have a more positive or different perception about their court experience—in terms of the fairness, accessibility, timeliness, respectfulness, and comprehensibility of the court process—than those whose cases are not heard in a community-based housing court.² Perceptions of the housing court experience are measured through a survey administered to pro se tenants both in the Harlem Housing Court and in New York City’s centralized housing court located in southern Manhattan (hereinafter referred to as “downtown housing court”). Survey results are supplemented with structured court observations, also conducted at both locations.

BACKGROUND

The vast majority of housing court cases in New York City and elsewhere are filed by landlords to evict tenants for nonpayment of rent. These tenants are often hampered by their inability to navigate the complexities of the legal system. Unable to afford legal representation, often unaware of their rights and responsibilities, and afraid of losing their apartments, many tenants must file their own pleadings and responses to pleadings in court – an intimidating and complex process. These problems are compounded by the high-volume of housing court cases such as New York City’s, which hears more than 300,000 cases annually (Galowitz 1999). According to one recent description: “housing court, with its unruly atmosphere of lawyers and tenants negotiating in the hallways or yelling into cell phones, can be overwhelming ... the hearings before some of the most overworked judges in the system are usually brief, so litigants often have but a few minutes to recount their emotional slide into debt” (Chen 2003).

Recently, community-based models have emerged which offer alternative approaches to resolving housing cases in New York City, as well as the possibility of enhanced access to justice for pro se litigants. Community courts hearing housing cases were opened in Harlem and Red Hook, Brooklyn. The focus of this research is the Harlem Housing Court, which opened in May 2001 at the Harlem Community Justice Center, a community court located in the East Harlem neighborhood of New York City. The Harlem Housing Court handles all cases from two Harlem zip codes (10035 and 10037). All other housing cases in Manhattan are heard at the centralized housing court in the county’s downtown housing court.

¹ Another citywide survey, conducted in 2007, finds that 76% of New York City Housing Court tenants were unrepresented (Krenichyn and Scheffer-McDaniel 2007).

² Pro se landlords are not examined in this research because of their relatively small numbers.

The Harlem Housing Court seeks to achieve speedier and more durable outcomes to housing litigation while simultaneously addressing many of the underlying problems that give rise to housing cases. To achieve these goals, the court is designed to help the judge gain a comprehensive understanding of local issues and concerns: it is staffed by a single judge and handles cases only from a limited geographic area. It also seeks to provide the judge with access to comprehensive and up-to-date information. The court works closely with an on-site housing resource center that is staffed by case managers, a pro-se attorney, and staff from partner city agencies. The resource center seeks to link clients to needed resources, including mediation, benefits assistance, budget counseling, and loan assistance programs. Additional resource coordinators are stationed in the courtroom to answer tenant questions, provide service referrals and in other ways assist pro se litigants.

Aspects of the Harlem Housing Court—its neighborhood location, single judge and courtroom, on-site services—might be expected to improve the court experience for tenants in terms of both perceptions and outcomes. The importance of enhanced tenant *perceptions* should not be underestimated. Studies show that litigants place great weight on having their problems settled in a way they view as fair. When interacting with courts, perceptions of fair treatment are often more important than receiving favorable case outcomes (see, e.g., Tyler and Lind 1992; Tyler 1990). Indeed, it would be disturbing if people who go through a process designed to be fair left it feeling that they had been treated unfairly.

To date there has been no systematic evaluation of the impact of community-based housing court. By drawing on the perspectives of unrepresented tenants appearing in both the Harlem and downtown housing courts, this research provides the first indications of the comparative advantages (and/or disadvantages) of a community-based housing court.

II. Methodology

At the heart of the research is a survey testing whether pro se tenants in the Harlem Housing Court have more positive or different perceptions about their court experience than pro se tenants in Manhattan's downtown housing court. Between January and May 2007, a total of 343 tenants were interviewed: 196 in the Harlem Housing Court and 147 from a variety of court parts in the downtown housing court.

The survey measures tenant perceptions about, and satisfaction with, their court experience. Tenants were asked to assess their experience in a variety of procedural fairness domains, including:

- Opportunity to participate in the process;
- Clarity of the process;
- Polite and fair treatment from the judge and court staff; and
- Fairness of the outcome;
- Satisfaction with the outcome.

Tenants were also asked to rate their preparation for court, difficulties faced in preparing for the appearance, awareness and use of available services and suggestions for improvement. Characteristics of the court case, as well as demographic information, were also collected. [See Appendix A, Survey Instrument.]

Data was collected via in-person interviews. The interviews took approximately five minutes to administer. Tenants were given the option of conducting the interview in English or Spanish. Tenants in the downtown housing court were sampled, in roughly equal numbers, from eight different court parts.

The survey relied on a convenience sample, with litigants approached by research staff or court personnel to participate in the survey. Tenants were assured that participation was strictly voluntary, would in no way affect their court cases, and that their responses would be kept confidential and reported in the aggregate only. Surveys were administered to tenants at various stages of the court process—from initial appearances to hearings for post-judgment motions.

To complement the survey, research staff conducted structured court observations in the Harlem and downtown housing courts. Using court observation instruments, researchers formally assessed tenant court appearances in terms of preparation, behavior during the appearance, treatment by other parties (judge, court clerks, attorneys, etc.), and case outcomes. [See Appendix B, Court Observation Instrument.] In total, 407 court appearances were observed: 109 in the Harlem housing court, 297 in various downtown court parts. A sample of approximately 50 of the appearances was coded by multiple research staff; the findings indicate substantial inter-coder reliability.

III. Description of Survey Sample

Overall, survey respondents appear to be generally representative of housing court tenants. Most of those interviewed were racial/ethnic minorities—half African-American and another quarter Hispanic. Seven in ten (67%) were female. The majority had at least one indicator of low socioeconomic status: 59% reported being unemployed, received Section 8 rental assistance, or lived in public housing (Table 1).

Those interviewed in the Harlem and at the downtown housing courts were similar in many, but not all, respects. There were no significant differences across sites in gender, education level, and employment status. However, other differences emerged. Most notably, those interviewed in Harlem were more likely to identify themselves as African-American (63% compared to 36% downtown) and less likely as white (4% compared to 16% downtown)—likely due to the relatively high proportion of African-Americans among East Harlem residents. Harlem respondents were also more likely to receive Section 8 rental assistance (21% compared to 12% in downtown).

Table 1: Characteristics of Survey Respondents

	Harlem	Downtown	Total
Race			
Black***	63%	36%	51%
Latino/a [†]	21%	31%	25%
White	4%	16%	9%
Other	12%	18%	15%
Gender			
Female**	70%	63%	67%
Education			
High school diploma/GED	86%	86%	86%
Currently In School	13%	17%	15%
Employment			
Employed***	68%	59%	64%
Part-time	11%	17%	14%
Full-time	57%	42%	50%
Receive Section 8***	21%	13%	17%
Live in NYCHA Housing	29%	25%	28%

[†]p<.10 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Table 2: Case Characteristics

	Harlem	Downtown	Total
Case Type			
Nonpayment***	92%	76%	85%
Holdover***	7%	19%	13%
Other***	2%	4%	3%
Tenant in public housing (NYCHA)	29%	25%	28%
First Appearance in Current Case [†]	26%	19%	23%
Tenant Pro-Se*	97%	87%	93%
Landlord Pro-Se	5%	6%	5%
Tenant Facing Eviction*	45%	62%	53%

*p<.05 ***p<.001

Location of Litigants in Downtown Housing Court

Note that the majority (66%) of litigants interviewed in the downtown housing court lived in neighborhoods of roughly comparable socioeconomic status to the East Harlem zip codes served by the Harlem Housing Court: 27% in Central Harlem/Morningside Heights, 24% in Washington Heights/Inwood, and 15% in the Lower East Side.

Case Characteristics

Table 2 provides information regarding the cases in which survey litigants were involved. Not surprisingly, more than eight in 10 (85%) of those surveyed were involved in a nonpayment of rent case, which typically constitute the vast majority of housing court cases. Note, however, that those in Harlem (92%) were more likely than those downtown (76%) to have a nonpayment case. By contrast, a larger percentage of downtown litigants were in court on a holdover case (19% vs. 7% downtown).³ Importantly, despite the fact that public housing (NYCHA) cases comprise a larger percentage of Harlem's than downtown's caseload, the Harlem tenants interviewed for this study were not significantly more likely to be public housing residents than were those downtown (29% vs. 25%, respectively).

Not surprisingly, the overwhelming majority of tenants, both downtown (87%) and particularly in Harlem (97%) appeared pro-se. By contrast, very few tenants reported that their landlord was pro-se (5% in Harlem; 6% downtown). These data demonstrate the typical scenario in housing court, in which tenants without legal representation face represented landlords. The majority of

³ A holdover case is brought to evict a tenant or person in the apartment who is not a tenant for reasons other than the nonpayment of rent—for example, violating a lease provision, illegally putting others in the apartment, being a nuisance to other tenants.

Table 3: Appearance Outcome

	Harlem	Downtown	Total
Appearance Outcome			
Stipulation*	49%	36%	43%
Stipulation with final judgment*	26%	17%	22%
Order to show cause granted	7%	12%	9%
Order to show cause denied	1%	2%	2%
Adjourned***	8%	24%	15%
Discontinued	8%	4%	6%
Set for trial	2%	1%	2%
Unsure	0%	2%	1%
Agreed to Pay Money to Landlord**	69%	46%	59%

*p<.05 ***p<.001

tenants (53%) also report that they are facing eviction as a result of their current court case, although those in downtown housing court are significantly more likely to report this than those in Harlem (62% vs. 45%, respectively).

Appearance Outcome

The appearance outcomes appear in Table 3. Harlem tenants are much more likely to report having agreed to a stipulation or stipulation with final judgment (75% compared to 53% downtown). While stipulations do not necessarily result in a final case resolution, often they do. Note too that Harlem litigants are less likely to have reported an adjournment (8% vs. 24% downtown). Harlem tenants are much more likely to report having agreed to pay money to their landlord (69% vs. 46% downtown). This appears to reflect the fact that a higher percentage of the Harlem cases appear to have reached a resolution—70% (across both sites) of those who reported that their appearance resulted in signing a stipulation, either with or without final judgment, also reported that they agreed to pay money to their landlord. It is important to note that Table 3 reports outcomes only for those tenants who participated in the survey, all of whom appeared in court the day in which they were interviewed. They are not necessarily representative of overall patterns of case processing in the Harlem or downtown housing courts.

Factors Affecting Court Case

In order to learn about underlying problems facing housing court tenants, survey respondents were asked whether a variety of factors were relevant to their current case (Table 4). In both Harlem and downtown, similar factors were cited. Income and financial problems were most-often cited in both courts, although Harlem tenants were more likely to cite it (63% vs. 46%, respectively). This frequently-cited factor points to deeply-rooted, endemic problems facing housing court litigants, problems that are difficult to address through the court process. These problems appear particularly acute among East Harlem litigants.

Table 4: Factors Affecting Court Case

	Harlem	Downtown	Total
Income or Financial Problems**	63%	46%	56%
Housing Repairs Needed	40%	44%	41%
Unemployment [†]	30%	26%	28%
Problems with Public Assistance	20%	22%	21%
Medical Emergency	22%	20%	21%
Housing Code Violations***	16%	35%	24%

[†]p<.10 **p<.05 ***p<.001

Note: Percentages do not add up to 100% because respondents were allowed to cite more than one factor.

Other often-cited factors include the need for housing repairs and, among downtown residents, housing code violations (the latter suggests that the failure to make repairs on the part of the landlord may have prompted tenants to withhold rent, although the survey findings are not conclusive in that regard). Housing code violations were much more likely to be reported among downtown tenants than those in Harlem (35% vs. 16%, respectively).

IV. Housing Resource Center

Both the Harlem and downtown courts feature housing resource centers, which attempt to link clients to needed resources, including mediation, entitlement assistance, budget counseling, and loan assistance programs. The majority of tenants interviewed at both sites (57% in Harlem, 59% downtown) report being knowledgeable about the housing resource center—i.e., knowing that there is a resource center in the building (Table 5).

Of those who know about the resource center, most (59% across sites) were referred to the center, as opposed to discovering on their own. Tenants in Harlem (61% vs. 56% downtown) were slightly, although not significantly, more likely to have been referred. Among those referred to the housing resource center, the judge and court clerk were among the most common referral sources, particularly in Harlem. Nearly two in three (63%) of those in Harlem who were referred to the resource center received the referral from either the judge (31%) or court clerk (32%). Note that a substantial minority of tenants, particularly at the downtown housing court (44%) but also in Harlem (21%), reported another referral source or not remembering the source. Many of the downtown tenants who say they received the referral from “other” sources cited flyers or signs that appear in the courtroom hallways directing tenants to the resource center.⁴

Most of those (56% overall) who know about the resource centers report having visited it for assistance related to their current court case (although they may not necessarily have visited the resource center on the day in which they were interviewed). Those at the downtown housing court, however, were more likely than were those in Harlem to report having visited the resource center (64% vs. 51%). Note too that downtown tenants are far more likely than those in Harlem (57% vs. 29%, respectively) to say they intend to visit the resource center in the future.

Why Harlem tenants were less likely to have visited the housing resource center or to intend to visit the center is unclear. While the survey did not ask about satisfaction with the resource center, the results do show that, among those who report having visited the resource center for their current case (total n=68), those in Harlem are more likely than those downtown to say they do *not* intend to visit again (55% vs. 33%, respectively). This finding may or may not be cause of concern for the Harlem court. It might suggest that previous experiences with the resource center among tenants in Harlem were less likely to live up to their expectations than among those downtown. Alternatively, it may be that tenants in Harlem are more likely to have had their case resolved the day in which they were interviewed, which might make them less likely to visit in the future. Indeed, two-thirds (67%) of those who said they do not intend to visit the resource center in the future also reported having signed a stipulation the day of the appearance. This might suggest a perhaps unintended consequence of speedier case resolution—fewer opportunities to link tenants with needed services. Yet another possible explanation for Harlem tenants being less likely to report intending to visit the resource center again is that these tenants were linked to services the day of the court appearance in which they were interviewed, thus precluding the need to return. Once again, however, the survey findings provide no conclusive answer. Note too that the explanations discussed above are not necessarily mutually exclusive; each might in part account for the observed findings.

⁴ Since some tenants did not report the specific “other” source, the exact percent is unavailable.

Table 5: Knowledge and Use of Housing Resource Center

	Harlem	Downtown	Total
Knowledge of Resource Center	57%	59%	58%
<i>Of those in court for the first time</i>	40%	41%	40%
<i>Of those in court after the first time</i>	63%	63%	63%
How found out about Resource Center ^a			
Referred	61%	56%	59%
On own	39%	44%	42%
Referral Source ^b			
Judge	31%	22%	27%
Court clerk	32%	26%	30%
Court attorney	9%	7%	8%
Housing resource center coordinator	7%	2%	5%
Other/Not sure***	21%	44%	30%
Visited Resource Center for current case* ^a	51%	64%	56%
Intend to Visit Resource Center*** ^a	29%	57%	41%

^aAsked only of those who have knowledge of the Resource Center (n=198).

^bAsked only of those referred to the Resource Center (n=114).

* p<.05 ***p<.001

Finally, it is important to note a significant difference between the Harlem and downtown housing courts' approach to linking clients to resources that is not captured in the survey. The Harlem housing resource center has two staff members (court analysts) stationed in the courtroom to answer tenant questions, provide service referrals and information about section 8 rental assistance, and engage in other activities. These staff members are able to provide immediate assessment of those tenants who did not visit the housing resource center prior to their court appearance and have access to case management notes for those tenants who did visit the resource center. The court analysts also are able to provide the judge with additional information that may be pertinent to the judge's decisions. And since tenants may receive assistance and services in the courtroom without visiting the resource center, the scope and potential impact of the Harlem housing resource center surely goes well beyond what is suggested in the survey results.

V. Court Experience

Survey respondents were asked about a wide variety of aspects of their court experience, ranging from how long they waited for their case to be called, to their preparedness for and understanding of the court process, to their views about the judge and other court actors, to their overall satisfaction with the court process.

Wait Time

Tenants were asked how long they waited to pass through security upon entering the court, as well as how long they waited in the courtroom before their case was called. The average reported wait time in security was roughly comparable (2-4 minutes) —downtown respondents report waiting slightly longer, likely due to the greater overall court volume (Table 6). Tenants in Harlem report waiting in the courtroom, on average, about 30 minutes longer than do those downtown. Note that, unlike downtown, on some days the Harlem Housing Court hears cases primarily in the morning, meaning that on these days there tends to be a relatively greater volume of cases on the morning docket vis-à-vis downtown, which also has an afternoon part. This may account for the longer reported courtroom wait time in Harlem, although this explanation is speculative.

Table 6: Median Wait Time

	Harlem	Downtown	Total
In Security	2 minutes	4 minutes	2 minutes
In Courtroom*	120 minutes	90 minutes	90 minutes

*p<.05

Tenant Preparedness

Data regarding tenant preparedness for and understanding of the court process is presented in Table 7. The vast majority (83%) of tenants “strongly agree” or “agree” that they felt prepared for their court appearance, with tenants in Harlem more likely to feel prepared (90% in Harlem vs. 73% downtown). These percentages, which may appear high, are likely due in part to some survey respondents’ inclination to provide socially-desirable responses or their erroneous belief that they were in fact prepared. Note that, both in Harlem and downtown, tenants who lived in public (NYCHA) housing were no more likely to report having felt prepared than those who did not live in public housing.

Table 7: Tenant Preparedness for and Understanding of the Court Experience⁺

	Harlem	Downtown	Total
Felt Prepared for Court Appearance***	90%	73%	83%
Understood What Happened in Court***	99%	90%	95%
Received materials about the housing court process	43%	47%	45%

⁺ Percentages refer to the percent “strongly agree” and “agree.” Other choices given were “neither agree nor disagree,” “disagree” and “strongly disagree.”

*** p<.001

Understanding of the Court Process

Tenants were also asked about their understanding of the court process and the overwhelming majority (99% in Harlem, 90% downtown) “strongly agree” or “agree” that they did understand what was happening in court (Table 7). Again, these percentages may reflect a tendency to provide socially-desirable responses. Indeed, research staff conducting structured court observation reported that the tenant appeared to understand what happened in court (i.e., they did not appear confused or unable to follow the proceedings) in only 47% of the observed appearances.

Note that those who reported having received information or materials about the housing court process are slightly more likely to “strongly agree” that they understood what happened in court (22% vs. 14% for those who did not receive materials). (Pamphlets and flyers, readily available in both courts, provide tenants with information about how to fill out court paperwork, explanations of the types of housing court cases and relevant legal terms, and other matters). This finding should be understood in light of earlier findings that show that fewer than half (45%) of tenants both in Harlem (43%) and downtown (47%) said they did receive materials about the court process, suggesting the possibility that efforts to ensure that pro-se litigants receive information may help to enhance their understanding of that process, if only slightly.⁵

⁵ Because survey respondents tend to provide socially-desirable responses, our survey findings likely understate actual tenant understanding of the court process, hence the potential benefits of proactive efforts to educate tenants about that process.

VI. Perception of the Judge and Court

Perception of the Judge

Tenant perceptions of the judge were overwhelmingly favorable in both the Harlem and downtown housing courts, although on most measures those in Harlem tended to view the judge somewhat more favorably than those downtown (Table 8).

On a variety of measures relevant to perceived procedural justice, judges both downtown and in Harlem receive high marks although, to varying degrees, perceptions of the judge in Harlem are more positive than those of downtown judges. Specifically, Harlem tenants were more likely to “strongly agree” or “agree” that the judge:

- treated them with respect (99% vs. 87% downtown);
- carefully considered their input in making a decision (92% vs. 72% downtown);
- listened to them (99% vs. 83% downtown);
- treated them fairly (98% vs. 85% downtown); and
- understood the facts of the case (99% vs. 81% downtown).

Table 8: Perceptions of Judge^a

	Harlem	Downtown	Total
Judge was audible***	99% (32%)	90% (13%)	95% (23%)
Judge’s decision was clear to you***	99% (28%)	89% (17%)	95% (24%)
Judge treated you with respect***	99% (38%)	87% (19%)	95% (31%)
Judge understood the facts of your case***	99% (22%)	81% (12%)	93% (19%)
Judge listened to you***	99% (30%)	83% (16%)	93% (25%)
Judge treated you fairly***	98% (30%)	85% (17%)	93% (26%)
Judge explained your case to you***	94% (21%)	80% (9%)	89% (17%)
Judge carefully considered what you said when making decision***	92% (23%)	72% (13%)	85% (19%)
Judge’s instructions were confusing	19% (4%)	16% (2%)	18% (3%)

^a Percentages refer to the percent “strongly agree” and “agree.” The percentages in parentheses refer to only the percent “strongly agree.” Other choices given were “neither agree nor disagree,” “disagree” and “strongly disagree.”
***p<.001

When looking only at the “strongly agree” responses, the cross-site differences are starker. For example, Harlem tenants are much more likely than those downtown to “strongly agree” that the judge treated them with respect (38% vs. 19% downtown), listened to them (30% vs. 16% downtown) and treated them fairly (30% vs. 17% downtown). In sum, tenant perceptions of the judge, while positive in both sites, are significantly more favorable in the Harlem Housing Court than in the downtown housing court. This is particularly the case with respect to procedural justice measures which, as will be discussed below, are closely associated with overall satisfaction with the court experience.

Observed Interactions between the Judge and Tenant Litigant

Structured court observation noted characteristic interactions between litigants and the judge (Table 9). On some measures, no differences emerge between Harlem and downtown. Of note is that at both sites, the judge asked if the tenant understood what was occurring in the court proceeding in fewer than half the observed appearances. Recall that court observation also indicated that only 47% appeared to understand the proceeding.

On other measures, differences across sites do emerge. The observations indicate that tenants in Harlem were much more likely to have been directly greeted by the judge at the beginning of the court appearance (90% vs. 56% downtown), a finding that should be understood in light of the earlier finding that Harlem tenants were also more likely to consider the judge respectful. The judge in Harlem was also observed more often to explain the case to the tenant (i.e., summarizing the case history and current case status, describing resolution options available to the tenant, describing court procedures, etc.). By contrast, judges downtown were more likely to have made eye contact with the tenant (80% downtown vs. 67% in Harlem)—again, a finding that should be understood in light of the earlier finding that nearly nine in 10 (87%) downtown tenants agreed that the judge was respectful.

Note that both in Harlem (7%) and downtown (11%), the judges were seldom observed to have mentioned the housing resource center and available services. These findings do raise concern about how consistently tenants learn about the housing resource center (both in Harlem and downtown) from the judge and perhaps suggest a need for housing court judges to be more proactive.

Table 9: Observation of Judges’ Behavior

	Harlem	Downtown	Total
Greeted Tenant***	90%	56%	65%
Explained Case	80%	72%	74%
Asked if Tenant Understands	40%	37%	37%
Made Eye Contact*	67%	80%	77%
Mentioned Housing Resources/Services	7%	11%	10%

*p<.05 ***p<.001

The court observations regarding housing resources and services may not at first appear consistent with the findings from the survey that about three in 10 of those referred to the housing resource center were referred by the judge (see Table 5). The apparent discrepancy is due to the fact that the research staff administering the survey asked about referral source not to all interviewed tenants, but only to those who indicated that they both had knowledge about the resource center and had been referred to the center. While 27% of this *subset* of tenants report having been referred by the judge, this constitutes only 9% of the *entire* sample of surveyed litigants.⁶ In other words, the self-reported findings in the survey are virtually identical to the court observation findings.

Other Attitudes

Court officers and court attorneys were rated favorably both in the Harlem and downtown courts. More than nine in ten at both courts “strongly agree” or “agree” that the court officers were respectful, although those in Harlem were somewhat more likely to feel this way (97% compared to 90% at downtown court). Most at both sites believed court attorneys’ explanation of the stipulation was sufficient,⁷ although again, those in Harlem were more likely to believe so (84% compared to 73% at downtown court).

While court personnel were rated positively at both courts, ratings of the court atmosphere were much more positive in Harlem. Six in ten (58%) “strongly agree” or “agree” that the court atmosphere in Harlem is “pleasant;” only 28% of those in the downtown court felt the same way.

Table 10: Other Attitudes

	Harlem	Downtown	Total
Court Attorney’s Explanation of Stipulation Sufficient (among those who signed a stipulation) ^{a*}	84%	73%	79%
Court Officers Respectful ^{a*}	97%	90%	94%
Court Atmosphere Pleasant ^{b***}	58%	28%	45%
Answering process in the clerk’s office was confusing*	21%	31%	25%
Felt fully informed before signing any agreements ^{a***}	93%	78%	88%

* p<.05 ***p<.001

^a Percentages refer to the percent “strongly agree” and “agree.” Other choices given were “neither agree nor disagree,” “disagree” and “strongly disagree.”

^b Other choices given were “neutral” and “unpleasant.”

⁶ Among all litigants interviewed, 58% reported knowledge of the resource center and, among these, 57% reported having been referred to the center. Finally, among those referred, 27% were referred by the judge. Thus, 9% of the entire survey sample report having been referred by the judge (58% X 57% X 27% = 9%).

⁷ This question was asked only of those tenants who reported having signed a stipulation.

VII. Overall Evaluation of the Court Experience

The majority of tenants both in Harlem and downtown provided favorable overall evaluations of their housing court experience, with the Harlem Housing Court receiving slightly higher marks than downtown on all measures.

Harlem tenants were more likely to “strongly agree” or “agree” that their legal rights were taken into account (85% vs. 73% downtown), that the case was handled fairly (92% vs. 75% downtown), and that the case result was fair (86% vs. 66% downtown). Harlem tenants were also more likely to say that they were “very” or “somewhat” pleased with the outcome of their court appearance (87% vs. 71%). When looking only at those who report being “very pleased,” the cross-court differences are even starker—63% in Harlem compared to 40% downtown. Note that Harlem tenants have especially favorable perceptions with respect to both the fairness of the court procedures and the fairness of the outcome of their court appearance. Note too that in both sites, tenant perceptions were not significantly correlated with the outcome of their court appearance. For example, tenants who reported having signed a stipulation were no more likely than those who did not to be satisfied with their court experience (on all measures reported in Table 11), suggesting that evaluations of the court experience are not associated with the resolution of the dispute.⁸

Table 11: Satisfaction with Court Experience

	Harlem	Downtown	Total
Your legal rights were taken into account ^{a***}	85% (16%)	73% (8%)	80% (13%)
Case handled fairly by the court ^{a***}	92% (19%)	75% (11%)	85% (16%)
The result of your case was fair ^{a***}	86% (15%)	66% (10%)	77% (13%)
Overall Satisfaction			
- <i>Very pleased</i> ^{***}	63%	40%	53%
- <i>Somewhat pleased</i> [*]	24%	31%	27%
- <i>Not very pleased</i> [*]	13%	29%	20%

^a Percentages refer to the percent “strongly agree” and “agree.” Percentages in parentheses refer only to the percent “strongly agree.” Other choices given were “neither agree nor disagree,” “disagree” and “strongly disagree.”

* p<.05 ***p<.001

⁸ As previously noted, this interpretation assumes that tenants who agree to a stipulation are more likely to have concluded the court process (or nearly so). Clearly, this is not the case in all situations.

Table 12: Multivariate Model Measuring Impact on Overall Satisfaction

Variables	Model 1 Coefficients	Model 2 Coefficients
Harlem Court	.709***	.278
<u>Demographics</u>		
Gender (Female)	.310	.573*
African-American	.583 [†]	.470
Hispanic	.246	-.001
Signed Stipulation	.511 [†]	.192
Fair Result		1.293***
Fair Procedures		.553***

[†]p<.10, *p<.05, ***p<.001.

Predictors of Satisfaction

To examine which factors are related to tenants’ satisfaction with the outcome of their housing court appearance, a multivariate regression analysis was conducted to predict variance in respondents’ satisfaction. The purpose of a regression analysis is to examine the impact of factors—demographic characteristics, attitudes, etc.—that might influence an individual’s satisfaction with their court experience while at the same time accounting (“controlling”) for other factors that might provide alternative explanations for satisfaction. The analysis identifies the factors that most influence satisfaction.⁹

The results of the analysis are presented in Table 12. Two statistical models are presented to fully illustrate which factors most influence satisfaction. Model 1 indicates that, even after controlling for a variety of demographic factors as well as whether a stipulation was agreed to (our proxy measure for whether the appearance may have resulted in a resolution of the dispute), tenants in the Harlem Housing Court were significantly more satisfied with their court experience than those in the downtown housing court.¹⁰ In other words, the earlier findings showing higher levels of satisfaction in Harlem vis-à-vis downtown were not due to cross-court differences in respondent demographics or whether the tenant agreed to a stipulation.

⁹ Specifically, an ordered logistic regression analysis was conducted to identify factors predicting overall satisfaction. Order logit is the regression model most appropriate for dependent variables measured on a three-point scale (here, the dependent variable has three response categories: “very pleased,” “somewhat pleased” and “not very pleased.”)

¹⁰ Other factors (for example, whether the tenant lived in public housing, whether the tenant felt prepared for the court appearance, visited the resource center, received materials about the housing court process, etc.) are not included in the statistical models presented in Table 12 either because they are not significant predictors of overall satisfaction, are highly intercorrelated with independent variables included in the analysis, or are measures for which there is a considerable missing data.

Model 2 reveals why tenants in the Harlem Housing Court had a more positive overall view of their court experience. This model shows that the perceived fairness of the court procedures and in the outcome of the court appearance are the most influential factors affecting pro-se tenants' evaluation of their housing court experience. Individuals with more positive perceptions of fairness—in procedures and outcomes—are considerably more likely to have a positive overall view of their court appearance, even after controlling for a variety of factors. By contrast, those with more negative perceptions of fairness are likely to be less pleased with their court experience. Importantly, after tenants perceptions of fairness are taken into account, tenants' court location (i.e., Harlem vs. downtown) is no longer a significant predictor of satisfaction. Thus, *pro-se tenants perceive the court experience in Harlem more positively because they are more likely to perceive the court process and appearance outcome as fair.*

Note that our analysis does not take into account tenant perceptions of the judge. These variables are not included in the statistical models because they are highly correlated with both tenant perceptions of fair results and fair procedures.¹¹ We chose to include the fairness measures and not perceptions of the judge in the analysis for two reasons. First, there is extensive literature documenting the impact of litigant perceptions of fair treatment on overall evaluations of the court experience. Second, we believe it important that the analysis focus on factors that can, in practice, help courts to enhance tenants' housing court experience. There is growing consensus on best practices that courts can implement to enhance perceptions of procedural fairness.¹² By contrast, there is far less courts can do to change judges' personalities.

That said, the fact that perceptions of the judge are highly correlated with the fairness measures does point to the central role of the judge in shaping tenant perceptions of procedural and outcome fairness. And since perceptions of fairness are the most powerful predictors of overall satisfaction with the court experience, the findings suggest that the efforts to enhance perceptions of procedural fairness in housing court should begin with a focus on judicial demeanor and judicial decorum—judges set the tone for their courtroom and their words and actions drive litigants' perceptions of their court experience.

¹¹ A scaled variable was created measuring tenant perceptions of the judge based on all items included in Table 8. This variable has a bivariate correlation of .635 with perceived fair results and of .542 with perceived fair procedures.

¹² For discussion of policies and programs that may enhance perceived fairness among court users, see Rottman (2005).

VIII. Conclusions

This study was designed to determine how pro se tenants perceived their court experiences in the community-based Harlem Housing Court and the centralized housing courts located in southern Manhattan. The survey findings indicate that, in most areas, Harlem tenants viewed their court experience in somewhat more positive terms. Harlem tenants give the court higher marks with regard to taking their legal rights into account, fairness both in court procedures and the outcomes of the court appearance, and overall satisfaction with the court experience. Harlem tenants have somewhat more positive perceptions of the judge and other court officers.

To be sure, both the downtown and Harlem housing courts fare exceedingly well in terms of tenant perceptions of the court experience. Contrary to some accounts (e.g., Galowitz 1999), our findings indicate generally positive perceptions even among tenants appearing in the high-volume downtown housing court. Across nearly all measures, the community-based Harlem Housing Court appears to achieve its goal of improving tenants' comprehension of their court experience as well as their perception that they were treated fairly, both in terms of the court process and the outcome of that process.

Importantly, our analysis demonstrates that the more positive perceptions of the Harlem Housing Court experience are due largely to the fact that Harlem tenants are more likely than those downtown to feel that the court process and outcomes are fair. While this finding is not surprising in so far as it is consistent with a broad literature emphasizing the importance of perceived procedural justice, its implications for housing court are potentially far-reaching. Enhanced perceptions of procedural fairness are *not* necessarily inherent to a community-based court model—indeed, it is to the credit of judges in the downtown housing courts that they too receive high marks on procedural justice measures. The findings suggest that steps certainly can be taken to further improve perceptions of procedural fairness in all court settings. Educating judges and court staff about procedural fairness, and identifying and implementing best practices for promoting procedural fairness, are two examples of such steps.

The results do raise areas for potential follow-up by the Harlem Housing Court. For example, the Harlem court model aims to link litigants with needed resources and services. However, survey respondents in Harlem were no more likely than those downtown to report having knowledge about the resource center, having been referred to the resource center, or having visited it. (This is subject to the caveat, discussed above, that Harlem Housing Court tenants often receive services from resource center staff stationed in the courtroom, without having ever visited the resource center itself.) Further, court observation indicates that the judge in Harlem mentions housing resources and services in less than 10% of all court appearances. The results suggest the need to explore ways to most effectively link tenants with needed and readily accessible resources.

Certainly, there are limits to what this research can tell researchers about a community-based housing court model. The study examines only the Harlem Housing Court; it is unclear whether the findings would be generalizable in other communities and court contexts. The research was also unable to determine conclusively which specific aspects of the Harlem Housing Court model may account for the somewhat more positive overall perceptions vis-à-vis downtown

housing court. Finally, since we lack data about case outcomes and future tenant appearances in housing court, we cannot evaluate whether or to what extent the Harlem Housing Court has achieved its goal of reaching speedier and more durable case resolutions. Future research might address these issues.

Nevertheless, the survey results offer encouraging news as to the benefits of a community-based housing court. There has been growing nationwide attention to public concerns about access to the courts and perceptions of fair treatment, particularly when litigants lack the benefit of legal counsel. The Harlem Housing Court model does appear to enhance pro se litigants' perceptions of fair treatment and their overall satisfaction with the court process. It is hoped that the results of our research will help court planners, both in New York City and nationwide, when deciding whether to advocate for a greater number of community-based housing courts or to apply features of the Harlem Housing Court model in all kinds of housing courts on a broader scale.

References

- Chen, D. (2003). "Boon Time in the City's Housing Courts." *New York Times*. May 27.
- Community Training and Resource Center and Citywide Task Force on Housing Court, Inc. (1993). "Housing Court, Evictions, and Homelessness: The Costs and Benefits of Establishing a Right to Counsel." New York: Community Training and Resource Center and Citywide Task Force on Housing Court, Inc., available at: <http://www.cwtfhc.org/about.html>.
- Galowitz, P. (1999). "The Housing Court's Role in Maintaining Affordable Housing." In M. Schill, ed., *Housing and Community Development in New York City*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Kernighan, K. and N. Scheffer-McDaniel, *Results from three surveys in New York City housing courts*, Graduate Center of the City University of New York, 2007, 22.
- Rottman, D, *Trust and Confidence in the California Courts*, Administrative Office of the Courts, 10 (2005).
- Scherer, A. (1988). "Gideon's Shelter: The Need to Recognize a Right to Counsel for Indigent Defendants in Eviction Proceedings." *Harvard Civil Rights-Civil Liberties Law Review* 23:557-88.
- Tyler, T. and E. Lind. (1992). "A Relational Model of Authority in Groups." *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* 25: 115-191.
- Tyler, T. (1990). *Why People Obey the Law*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Appendix A: Survey Instrument

Harlem Community Justice Center- Housing Court Survey, January 2007

Hello my name is _____. I'm with the Center For Court Innovation. We're conducting a survey to learn about **tenant's experience** today in court. Participation in this survey is voluntary. Your responses will be kept confidential. We will not ask you for your name, and your responses will not affect your court case. The information is for research purposes only. The survey will be about 10 minutes long.

Today's Date _____

Time _____
Survey
was taken AM / PM

ENGLISH
(1)

SPANISH
(2)

Please circle the answer below.

1		1 2	Did you represent yourself in court today? Yes No
2		1 2 3	Did you consult a lawyer or pro se attorney about this case? Lawyer Prose Attorney Neither
3		1 2	What brought you to court today? A new court case Continued activity on a court case
4		1	When did you first come to court for this case? today _____

		<p>2 within the past month</p> <p>3 1 to 3 months ago</p> <p>4 3 to 6 months ago</p> <p>5 6 to 12 months ago</p> <p>6 over a year ago</p> <p>7 I don't remember</p>	<p>FREE RESPONSE: Note to Interviewer: Read the question, let the respondent respond, and select the appropriate choice yourself. (do not read each choice aloud to them.)</p>
5		<p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p>	<p>Did you come to court because you got a notice from your landlord?</p> <p>If 'No' skip to question 7</p>
6		<p>1 Nonpayment (<i>means that the landlord is claiming that you owe money</i>)</p> <p>2 Holdover (<i>means that the landlord is not claiming that you owe money, but the landlord is bringing you to court for other reasons</i>)</p> <p>3 Other _____</p>	<p>What type of case did you have in court today?</p>
7		<p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p>	<p>Did you file a complaint against your landlord that was the subject of today's proceeding?</p>
8		<p>1 HP Action (<i>means that repairs need to be made in your apartment</i>)</p> <p>2 Illegal Eviction (<i>means that you are asking to be allowed to move back into your apartment after being illegally evicted</i>)</p> <p>3 7A (<i>means that you and the tenants in your building are asking the court to take control of your building</i>)</p>	<p>What type of case did you have in court today?</p>
9			<p>Was your landlord represented by a lawyer?</p>

		1 2	Yes No
10			Did you sign any documents (i.e. stipulations) regarding your appearance today? 1 Yes 2 No
11			What was the result of your case today? 1 A settlement or a stipulation was reached, but there was no final judgment against me 2 A settlement or a stipulation was reached with a final judgment against me 3 My Order to Show Cause was denied 4 My Order to Show Cause was granted (the judge gave you more time). 5 The case was adjourned until a later date 6 The case was dismissed or discontinued 7 The case was set for trial 8 The case was set for a hearing 9 None of those things happened. Note to Interviewer: Probe for what did happen. 10 Don't know. Note to interviewer: Probe for what did happen.
12			Did the judge tell you that you have to pay money to the landlord? 1 Yes 2 No
13			Will you face difficulty in paying by the date the judge told you? 1 Yes 2 No
14			Are you facing eviction? 1 Yes 2 No 3 I don't know

15			How pleased were you with today's outcome? 1 Very 2 Somewhat 3 Not very
16			Do you have to come back to court again to see the judge? 1 Yes 2 No 3 Don't know.
17			About how many minutes did it take you to get through security today? _____ minutes
18			How long did you have to wait in the courtroom before the judge heard your case? (Please elicit a response in hours and/or minutes, whichever is appropriate). _____ hours _____ minutes
19			Did you find waiting in the courtroom to be: 1 Unpleasant 2 Neither pleasant nor unpleasant 3 Pleasant

<p>Now, I'm going to read you a series of statements related to your court experience. For each statement please tell me whether you strongly agree, agree, disagree or strongly disagree.</p>	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree

20	Your landlord/ landlord's lawyer listened to you.					
21	The judge listened to you.					
22	The judge treated you with respect.					
23	*The judge's instructions were confusing.					
24	You felt prepared for today's court appearance.					
25	The court attorney sufficiently explained the stipulation to you.					
26	You felt fully informed before signing any agreements today.					
27	The judge explained your case to you.					
28	The judge treated you fairly.					
29	The judge's decision was clear to you.					
30	*The process for answering at the Clerk's office was confusing.					
31	The court officers treated you with respect.					
32	The judge carefully considered what you said when making a decision.					
33	The judge understood the facts of your case.					
34	You were able to hear what the judge said during your appearance.					

Now, I'd like you to think about your case overall. To what extent to you strongly agree, agree, disagree or strongly disagree with the following statements:

35	Your case was handled fairly by the court.					
36	Your legal rights in court were taken into account.					

37	*You were not treated the way you deserved in court.					
38	The result of your case was fair.					
39	You understood what happened in court.					

40			Is there a Resource Center here?
		1	Yes
		2	No
		3	Don't know
			If "No" skip to no. 45
41			How did you find out about the Resource Center?
		1	You were referred
		2	You came on your own
42			Who told you about the Resource Center?
		1	Court Clerk
		2	Court Attorney
		3	Housing Resource Coordinator
		4	The Judge
		5	Other _____
		6	Don't know
43			Did you go to the Resource Center to discuss your current court case?
		1	Yes
		2	No
44			Do you plan to go to the Resource Center to discuss your current court case?
		1	Yes

		2	No
45			<p>Were any of the following conditions related to your current housing problem? <i>(Interviewer: read each choice and wait for a yes or no answer for each one, if responded with a yes, circle choice).</i></p> <p>1 Income/Financial problems 2 Unemployment 3 Medical Emergency 4 Problems with Public Assistance 5 Housing needs repairs 6 Housing Code Violations 7 Other _____</p>
		Circle all that apply	
46			<p>Were materials on the housing court process ever given to you?</p> <p>1 Yes 2 No</p>

Now I'm going to ask you a few demographic questions.

47			<p>What race or ethnicity would you identify yourself as?</p> <p>1 White 2 Black 3 Latino/Latina 4 Asian or Pacific Islander 5 Other (please specify) _____</p>
48			<p>Do you have a high school diploma or a GED?</p> <p>1 Yes 2 No</p>
49			<p>Are you currently in school?</p> <p>1 Yes, full time 2 Yes, part-time 3 No</p>

50		<p>1 Yes, full time</p> <p>2 Yes, part-time</p> <p>3 No</p>	<p>Are you employed?</p>
51			<p>What zip code do you live in?</p> <hr/>
52		<p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p>	<p>Do you currently receive Section 8 subsidies? (Note to surveyor: If necessary, clarify as rental assistance usually based on income)</p>
53		<p>1 Yes</p> <p>2 No</p>	<p>Do you currently live in NYCHA (public) housing?</p>
54			<p>Is there anything else you would like to add concerning how you were treated today in court?</p> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>

INTERVIEWER: Select respondent's gender based on observation: (1) M (2) F (3) Other

Appendix B: Court Observation Instrument

Observer Name: _____

Judge: _____

Date: ____ / ____ / ____

Session Time Start: ____ : ____

Session Time Finish: ____ : ____

Total time: ____ : ____

Total cases: _____

Case	Start Time	T. Show	LL Show	J. Eye	J.Greet	J.Inquire	T.Pprwork	J. EqOpp	T. Ans Qu's	J.Ten Comp	J.Ten Agree	J. Exp Case	HRC ref	T.Repmand	T. Comp	T. Speak	Evict Case?	Interp use	Adj	Disc	Settled	End Time
1						<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A							0-1-2-3		<input type="checkbox"/> N/A				
2						<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A							0-1-2-3		<input type="checkbox"/> N/A				
3						<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A							0-1-2-3		<input type="checkbox"/> N/A				
4						<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A							0-1-2-3		<input type="checkbox"/> N/A				
5						<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A							0-1-2-3		<input type="checkbox"/> N/A				
6						<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A							0-1-2-3		<input type="checkbox"/> N/A				
7						<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A							0-1-2-3		<input type="checkbox"/> N/A				
8						<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A							0-1-2-3		<input type="checkbox"/> N/A				
9						<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A							0-1-2-3		<input type="checkbox"/> N/A				
10						<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A							0-1-2-3		<input type="checkbox"/> N/A				
11						<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A							0-1-2-3		<input type="checkbox"/> N/A				
12						<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A							0-1-2-3		<input type="checkbox"/> N/A				
13						<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A							0-1-2-3		<input type="checkbox"/> N/A				
14						<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A							0-1-2-3		<input type="checkbox"/> N/A				
15						<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A							0-1-2-3		<input type="checkbox"/> N/A				
16						<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A							0-1-2-3		<input type="checkbox"/> N/A				
17						<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A							0-1-2-3		<input type="checkbox"/> N/A				
18						<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A							0-1-2-3		<input type="checkbox"/> N/A				
19						<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A							0-1-2-3		<input type="checkbox"/> N/A				
20						<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A							0-1-2-3		<input type="checkbox"/> N/A				

