

A note on access to Beneficiaries

by Livia Holden and Anna Tsalapatani

The EURO-EXPERT survey was designed in order to engage with four categories of respondent: Judges, Lawyers, Experts, as well as the Beneficiaries of cultural expertise. Expectedly, it was this final group, that of Beneficiaries, which were the hardest to circulate the survey to, and across most of the countries in the survey, they accounted for the smallest number of responses, and were also the group which were least likely to finish the survey, with, in most cases, only a handful or less reaching the end of the survey. A Beneficiary may be defined as a defendant, claimant, or litigant, who had been involved in a case in which cultural expertise had been used. Beneficiaries were asked questions concerning the frequency of use of the services of experts, their engagement with them, possibilities of contribution to the expert report (such as the possibility of requesting amendments), their perceptions and satisfaction around the usefulness of the experts, and their willingness to use experts in the case of future issues. Attempts to access beneficiaries are important in order to endeavour to access the perspective of the diverse users of cultural expertise, and to better understand their experiences.

Country	Number of Beneficiaries ¹	Percentage of Sample ²
Austria	8	6%
Cyprus	100	28%
Denmark	2	1%
Finland	8	4%
France	37	8%
Germany	1	0.2%
Greece	119	29%
Italy	10	5%
Poland	2	1%
Portugal	25	5%
Spain	7	4%
Sweden	14	7%
United Kingdom	3	1%

There are several reasons for these low numbers. The core explanations include the limitations around language and the limitation of gaining access to these populations due to ethical considerations and the issues around these individuals identifying themselves as beneficiaries. In terms of language, many of those who may be a Beneficiary of cultural expertise may not have a strong grasp of the national language(s) of the country where the process is underway – such as those who have undergone Refugee Status Adjudications – and while we made every attempt to make sure that the survey was translated into all the relevant national languages, and occasionally

additionally English, it was beyond the resources of the project to translate the survey into all the diverse languages spoken by Beneficiaries.

Due to ethical considerations concerning privacy and vulnerability Beneficiaries could not be accessed directly but only through their legal representatives. Additionally, in respect of the attorney-client privilege and privacy restrictions, we requested that Lawyers, Judges and Experts only inform the Beneficiaries of the possibility to answer our survey by contacting our data collectors themselves. Unlike the other three categories, Beneficiaries are not part of any association which could be used to approach them, although flyers of the project were widely distributed to all local and international NGOs dealing with Beneficiaries.

¹ This is the number of Beneficiaries who started the survey and identified themselves as beneficiaries, the numbers of those who made it to the end of the survey were far lower, and in many cases no beneficiaries answered all of the questions.

² This is the percentage of the number of Beneficiaries when calculated with the total number of overall respondents to the whole survey.

Access to Beneficiaries was comparatively successful Greece and Cyprus where access was obtained through networks with local communities and organisations. While the survey as a whole was never intended to provide a representative sample, these higher number of responses are largely sourced from within a couple of groups or communities. These limitations concerning access to Beneficiaries will be taken into account in the phase of analysis but do not diminish the importance of their contribution which will be particularly significant in the combination with upcoming qualitative data.