

# ANALYSING ATTITUDES TOWARDS DEMOCRACY IN PAKISTAN USING WORLD VALUES SURVEY

Faiza Azhar Khan & Azhar Shahbaz Khan\*

## **Abstract**

*This study aims at analysing people's attitudes towards democracy in Pakistan. According to the World democracy ranking of 2019, Pakistan is at 108<sup>th</sup> number amongst 167 countries. This figure is discouraging. Identifying attitudes of people towards democracy is a key determinant of the state of democracy in the country. This paper attempts to empirically analyse people's attitudes towards democracy in Pakistan in terms of support, understanding and evaluation. For this purpose, the data of latest and 4<sup>th</sup> wave of World Values Survey has been utilized. Data regarding political attitude, political interest, participation in elections, preference for democratic government and other socio-economic and demographic variables has been analysed using descriptive statistics and cross-tabulation. Results have shown that people of Pakistan have an equal acceptability for the army rule and democratic political system. People of Pakistan are not satisfied with the way democratic system has been developing in their country and yet most of the people in the sample aspire to live in a democratic governing structure. People's attitudes towards democracy differ on the basis of income, education and gender. The study concludes that common citizens must be sensitized regarding the basic aspects of democracy and they must be given civic education.*

**Keywords:** Democracy, Modernization theory, Congruence theory, Democratic attitude

## **Introduction**

**D**ue to the extremely subjective nature of the concept, no commonly accepted and precise definition of democracy has been put forward so far. Nonetheless, it has been recognized widely that the classic definition of democracy entails four components: 1) a political system in which citizens play pivotal role in electing the representatives via free and transparent elections; 2) citizens are provided ample opportunities to participate in political and civic domains of their lives; 3) provision and protection of human rights is considered the basic function of government; 4) rules of law are same for all and all the citizens are governed by rules of law without any exemptions.<sup>1</sup> The

---

\*Dr Faiza Azhar Khan is Assistant Professor, Department of Economics at Fatima Jinnah Women University, (FJWU), Rawalpindi and Dr Azhar Shahbaz Khan is Assistant Professor, Department of Defence and Diplomatic Studies at (FJWU), Rawalpindi.

concomitance and appropriate functioning of these components is analogous to the prevalence of democracy.

Apart from the disagreements regarding the definition and components of democracy, some values and attitudes are unanimously considered pre-requisites for instituting and consolidating democracy.<sup>2</sup> Consolidated democracies need to have more than just free and fair elections. They must be stable high quality democracies and that must be demonstrated through guaranteeing civil liberties, providing the rule of law, ensuring horizontal accountability and eliminating authoritarian enclaves.<sup>3</sup> It is widely believed that transformation of dictatorial or totalitarian political systems into secure and strong democracies is conditional on the existence of general viewpoint among people who recognize the authority of the new system and encourage the political behaviour that is consistent with fundamental democratic norms.<sup>4</sup>

In this regard, contemporary democratic theories have acknowledged certain set of pro-democratic values, which encircle the variety of democratic attitudes held among people in different parts of the world. For instance, Almond and Verba (1963), in their pioneering work, considered the civic cultural attributes conducive to sustainable and stable democracy.<sup>5</sup> On the other hand, Gibson (1996) investigated the relationship between certain democratic beliefs and democracy. These beliefs include myriad sets of variables including political will, supporting transparent elections, exercising liberal values, support for conflicting ideas, free media and awareness of political rights.<sup>6</sup> Putnam (1993) operationalized vitality of associational life, electoral turnover, readership of newspapers, and absence of preferential voting. The author emphasized the role of voluntary associational life in stimulating interpersonal trust and widespread reciprocity which in turn are conducive for durable and effective democracy. This influential literature provides the fundamentals for the positive analysis of democratic values.<sup>7</sup>

According to Hu (2003), political viewpoints and citizens' attitudes are essential ingredients of democracy, specifically, in societies experiencing democratic transition. The existence of favourable attitudes towards democracy among majority of the population is rendered as a pre-requisite for democracy.<sup>8</sup> According to Tessler and Altinoglu (2004), democratic survival depends on changes in political behaviour leading to a more meaningful democracy. An ideal democratic setup is sustainable provided that majority of public opinion, despite of major economic difficulties and profound dissatisfaction with occupants, holds the belief that democratic processes and institutes are the most effective way to govern the masses.<sup>9</sup>

Over the past few years, one of the major advancements in the comparative study of democratization has been the development of research on public attitudes towards democracies. This information on people's attitudes towards democracy is a useful data which can help assess the quality of democracies in

different countries. Perceptions of citizens regarding democracy are considered to play an important role towards the working and the improvement of a democratic system. But, there are mixed views regarding the reliability of surveys to assess the perceptions on democracy. Some scholars have argued that “public opinion surveys provide more legitimate, politically-relevant and practically useful diagnostic tools to compare, monitor, and hopefully improve, the quality of democratic practice.”<sup>10</sup>

Many countries are somewhere between dictatorship and democracy. Pakistan’s democratic situation falls in the category of competitive authoritarian regime; a widely discussed type of hybrid regime. Such regimes hold regular competitive elections, but these elections are often not free. Civil liberties are sometimes violated and the playing field is occasionally unfair because of unequal access to recourses, the media and the law.<sup>11</sup> Pakistan has been striving for a stable and sustainable democratic system throughout its 72 years history. There have been only two civilian governments, which completed terms of five years. There were periods of army rule, which spanned over thirty-four years, and the minimum duration of it was nine years.<sup>12</sup> The process of democratization in Pakistan has been slow and inactive. The nature of democracy has remained weak.<sup>13</sup> Khan (2014) in his comprehensive analysis about the nature of government of Pakistan has reported that out of 24, 488 days (inception till August 31, 2014), Pakistan had democratic rule for only 8, 781 days, which makes only 34% of its national life.<sup>14</sup>

According to the democracy index (ranging from 0 to 10) published by Economist Intelligence Unit, the score of Pakistan regarding the state of democracy in 2019 is 4.25 and is ranked 108 among 167 countries. This score is an improvement over the previous year’s score of 4.17 in 2018 with a ranking of 112 in 167 countries. According to the literature, there has been a strong desire for democracy in Pakistan since its inception.<sup>15</sup> However, structural and cultural conditions have not been in favour of promoting democratic institutions and processes in Pakistan.<sup>16</sup> Despite adopting parliamentary democracy and gaining improvements in electoral procedures, democracy in Pakistan has been facing problems; but there has been some improvement in the rankings as is evident from the aforementioned democracy scores.<sup>17</sup>

Some of the reasons of this quality of democracy in Pakistan have already been extensively discussed in the literature. Significant among them are a great deal of institutional imbalance, weak institutions and non-democratic political parties. Similarly, weak party system, feudalism, corruption and manipulated process of elections have also been discussed as plausible explanations for the weak democratic system.<sup>18</sup>

Given the significance of public attitudes and opinions in democratic transition of a country and the focus of recent studies on public attitudes towards democracy together with the weaknesses of democratic system of

Pakistan, the study is an attempt to study public attitudes towards democracy in Pakistan. The study is the first of its kind to analyse the attitudes of people towards democracy in Pakistan. For this purpose the World Values Survey (WVS) data has been utilized. The paper proceeds with literature review in Section 2. Methodology and data has been presented in Section 3, while section 4 presents the analysis of the study. Finally section 5 concludes.

### **Literature Review**

There is considerable evidence that development and religion shape societal values. In this context modernization theory, and societal and cultural theory of democracy i.e. congruence thesis fit well into the subject area. Modernization theory has focused on economic factors and is derived from the observation that developed countries tend to be more democratic. This observation was first made by Seymour Martin Lipset in 1950s. Modernization theorists have provided various explanations for the core relation between democracy and development e.g. some argued that development strengthened the middle classes who supported democracy and weakened monarchs and rural landlords who opposed it. Others have argued that development created urban working classes who pushed the state towards democratization.<sup>19</sup> Still others have suggested that development led to rising education levels which promoted democratic values. Some modernization theorists attribute democratization to shift in cultural values that accompany development in the shape of rising education levels; greater societal differentiation and increased female labour force participation values.<sup>20</sup>

Inglehart and Welzel<sup>21</sup> identify a set of values that they refer to as emancipative values. These include support for gender equality, tolerance, and individual autonomy over authority and participation. This constitutes congruence thesis which show that there is a correlation between support for these values and democracy. The congruence thesis stipulates that regimes are only likely to be stable when they are viewed as legitimate. And they are only likely to be viewed as legitimate where the patterns of authority correspond to societal beliefs. Then they make the comparison of authoritarian regimes and democracies. Authoritarian regimes will prevail where the public accepts traditional forms of authority and the democratic systems rely upon emancipative values. States tend to be democratic if the people embrace emancipative values.

Another school of thought that relates to the subject area considered the impact of religion on democratization. Many scholars have argued that religion also shapes the prospects for democracy because it transmits cultural values. Some scholars are of the view that certain religions are more likely to propagate emancipative or democratic values. They have claimed that Protestantism has a positive effect on democracy while Islam and Catholicism have a negative impact.<sup>22</sup> But this theory is very controversial and is based on stereotypes or

misunderstanding of these religions.

As far as the empirical literature on attitudes of people towards democracy is concerned, many researchers have investigated the phenomenon for numerous countries in a number of studies, largely based on the data from WVS. One of these is the study by Dalton and Ong (2005), who have analysed the public attitudes for democracy in six East Asian nations and four Western democracies. The study tests the “Asian Values” hypothesis, which illustrates that “Confucian” traditions are a hindrance for the development of democratic culture in Asia. However, results of the study have shown contradictory findings indicating that the modernization in the region during the late 20<sup>th</sup> century has altered peoples’ view towards democracy.<sup>23</sup> Nevitte and Kanji (2003) have analysed the determinants of democratic satisfaction of people in cross-country analysis using the logistic regression approach. Results have shown that people’s confidence on political institutions and on the way government handles the current affairs are significant determinants of democratic satisfaction. The changing attitude of people from favouring military rule to supporting democracy in Lesotho has been the point of discussion by Afro-barometer network (2006) conducted in 2000, 2003 and 2005. Overtime a greater number of people in the population were able to explain the meaning of democracy.<sup>24</sup>

A detailed analysis of people’s attitudes towards democracy and market economy has been furnished by Bratton et al. (2005). Results show that across 12 African countries, Namibians have the highest acceptability of military rule while majority of Tanzanians have rejected the military rule.<sup>25</sup> Finally, perceptions regarding democracy of Pakistani secondary school teachers have been analysed by Sarwar et al. (2010). Not only the attitude of teachers towards democracy was negative but also the school teachers were of the view that democratic values have not been developed among students in schools.<sup>26</sup>

## Methodology and Data

The analysis of the paper is based on the data from World Values Survey (WVS).<sup>27</sup> The WVSs are a valuable data source for analysing issues about autocracy, perceptions about the performance of the government and attitudes and satisfaction regarding democracy. The survey is widely used in various researches since it covers a number of countries (approximately 100 countries) with identical questionnaire to facilitate comparative analysis. The WVS data consists of 6 waves (or time durations) which are 1981-84, 1990-94, 1995-98, 1999-2004, 2005-2009 and 2010-14. The questionnaires and data files are freely accessible on the World Values Survey website.<sup>28</sup>

This study has utilized two waves of WVS data for the analysis. These are the latest wave of 2010-2014 and the 4<sup>th</sup> wave, 1999-2004 because these waves have been surveyed for Pakistan. The reason of focusing on an older wave is that some of the relevant questions regarding democracy are part of the older wave but not of the latest one. The data of the 6<sup>th</sup> wave includes 1200 respondents and

2000 Pakistani citizens are interviewed for the 4<sup>th</sup> wave. The focus of the study is the perception regarding democracy which includes understanding, evaluation and satisfaction regarding democratic setup in the country. Table 1 illustrates the focused questions of the study from each wave along with their respective number in the WVS questionnaire.

Besides, data of other attitudinal variables like interest in politics and participation in elections, importance of religion and demographic characteristics of respondents, such as age, income, education and gender, are also used in the analysis.

**Table 1: Focused Questions of World Values Survey Regarding Democracy for Data Analysis**

Value	Statement
<b>Wave 6</b>	
V129	<i>“Describe whether ‘having the army rule’ is very good, fairly good, fairly bad or very bad way of governing this country”.</i>
V130	<i>“Describe whether ‘having a democratic political system’ is very good, fairly good, fairly bad or very bad way of governing this country”.</i>
<i>For each of the following things how essential you think it is as a characteristic of democracy. Use this scale where 1 = “not at all an essential characteristic of democracy” and 10 = definitely is “an essential characteristic of democracy”</i>	
V132	<i>“Religious authorities ultimately interpret the laws”</i>
V133	<i>“People choose their leaders in free elections”</i>
V135	<i>“The army takes over when government is incompetent”</i>
V136	<i>“Civil rights protect people from state oppression”</i>
V138	<i>“People obey their rulers”</i>
V139	<i>“Women have the same rights as men”</i>
V140	<i>“How important is it for you to live in a country that is governed democratically? On the scale where 1 means it is “not at all important” and 10 means “absolutely important”</i>
V141	<i>“And how democratically is this country being governed today? Again using a scale from 1 to 10, where 1 = it is “not at all democratic” and 10= it is “completely democratic,”</i>
<b>Wave 4</b>	
E110	<i>On the whole are you very satisfied, rather satisfied, not very satisfied or not at all satisfied with the way democracy is</i>

	<i>developing in the country?</i>
E122	<i>Could you please tell if you agree strongly, agree, disagree or disagree strongly, with the view that 'Democracies aren't good at maintaining order'</i>
E123	<i>Could you please tell if you agree strongly, agree, disagree or disagree strongly, with the view that 'Democracy may have problems but it's better than any other form of government'</i>

## Analysis

Before presenting the results, descriptive statistics of non-democracy variables included in the analysis are worth reporting. Table 2 presents the frequency distribution/descriptive statistics of variables. Frequencies along with percentages are reported for each of the categorical variable like gender, education, income, importance of religion in life, interest in politics and participation in elections. While, for the quantitative variable namely, age, minimum, maximum, mean and standard deviation are given at the end of the Table. The number of observations may be a few less for some variables because of either no response or the response do not know.

Out of 1200 respondents, 52% are male and 48% are females. For the variable of education, there are 23% respondents with no formal education and other majority lies in the categories of incomplete secondary education and complete secondary education with respective percentages of 23% and 21%. As far as income categories are concerned, WVS categorizes household income into ten scales from lowest to 10<sup>th</sup> scale where 10<sup>th</sup> scale represents highest level of income. The question reads as "On this card is an income scale on which 1 indicates the lowest income group and 10 the highest income group in your country. We would like to know in what group your household is" Majority of respondents belongs to middle-income groups and majorly has income in categories of 4<sup>th</sup> level to 7<sup>th</sup> level. Descriptive statistics of a quantitative demographic variable, age, is given at the end of the Table 2. The minimum and maximum age for the sample is 18 years and 85 years respectively. The average age is 34 years with the standard deviation of 12 years.

After discussing demographic variables, some attitudinal variables are important to discuss in the context of perceptions regarding the democracy. One of them is participation in national elections, 37% of respondents have always participated in national elections while, 28% of respondents have never participated in national elections. Finally, for 90% of the respondents, religion is very important in life. Religion is not important for quite few respondents.

An important part of descriptive analysis is discussion of frequency distributions of democracy related variables. The first focused question is about people's choice of political system, whose results are reported in Table 3. Given

the question of 'Having the Army Rule', 21% of the respondents consider it very good, while 38% consider the army rule *fairly good*. There are only 13% respondents who consider army rule *fairly bad*. In contrast, 40% and 35% of the respondents think that *having a democratic political system* is very good and good, respectively. Although a total of 25 per cent respondent's evaluation of democratic political system is either very bad or bad. These comparative percentages in Table 3 show the acceptability/adaptability of Pakistani people towards the army rule. Pakistan's army intervention in its governance system has been widely accepted by the people of the Country because of their belief on Pakistan's army's abilities to protect the national interests and to build the nation.<sup>29</sup>

**Table 2: Frequency Distribution/Descriptive Statistics of Variables in the Study**

Variable/Category	Frequency	Per cent
<b>Gender</b>		
Male	622	52
Female	578	48
<b>Total</b>	<b>1200</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Education</b>		
No formal education	271	23
Incomplete primary school	36	3
Complete primary school	145	12
Incomplete secondary school: technical/vocational type	276	23
Complete secondary school: technical/vocational type	250	21
Incomplete secondary: university-preparatory type	24	2
Complete secondary: university-preparatory type	110	9
Some university-level education, without degree	25	2
University-level education, with degree	63	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>1200</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Income Scale</b>		
Lower step	39	3

Second step	51	4		
Third Step	140	12		
Fourth step	167	14		
Fifth step	189	16		
Sixth step	208	17		
Seventh Step	189	16		
Eighth step	130	11		
Ninth Step	42	3		
Tenth Step	45	4		
<b>Total</b>	<b>1200</b>	<b>100</b>		
<b><i>Participation in National Elections</i></b>				
Always	439	37		
Usually	408	34		
Never	328	28		
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,175</b>	<b>100</b>		
<b><i>Importance of Religion</i></b>				
Very important	1074	90		
Rather important	93	8		
Not very important	19	1.5		
Not at all important	7	0.5		
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,193</b>	<b>100</b>		
<b>Descriptive Statistics</b>				
<b>Variables</b>	<b>Minimum</b>	<b>Maximum</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Dev.</b>
Age (years)	18	85	34	12

These contradictory results in form of support for both democratic political system and army rule may be clarified by studying additional questions regarding democracy. One way of measuring the support for democratic values among citizens of Pakistan is to view responses to the question 'How important is it for you to live in a country that is governed democratically'. The original responses on 1-10 scale have been re-coded into two categories of important and

not important. According to results, which are given in Table 4, there is effectual support for democracy in Pakistan with 86% of respondents rendering democratic political system important for living.

**Table 3: People's Choice of Political System for Governing the Country in Pakistan**

Having Army Rule			Having a Democratic Political System		
Category	Frequency	%	Category	Frequency	%
Very Good	248	21	Very Good	1,080	40
Fairly Good	444	38	Fairly Good	967	35
Fairly Bad	322	28	Fairly Bad	395	15
Very Bad	147	13	Very Bad	281	10
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,161</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,157</b>	<b>100</b>

**Notes:** The Table corresponds to the respective values V129 and V130 in the data. The question has four responses, very good, fairly good, fairly bad and very bad.

**Table 4: People's View on Importance of Living in a Democratic Country in Pakistan**

Category	Frequency	Percentage
<b>Important</b>	1,034	86
<b>Not Important</b>	166	14
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,200</b>	<b>100</b>

**Notes:** The Table corresponds to the value V141 in the 6<sup>th</sup> Wave. The respondents have to respond to the value on a scale of 1 to 10 where 10 being completely democratic and vice versa. Considering '5' as a cut point, the score of 1 to 5 has been re-coded as a consideration that it's not democratic, while, 6 to 10 have been re-coded as a consideration that it's democratic.

Similar kind of support for democratic political system is illustrated by respondents against the value "Democracy may have problems but is better", whose results are reported in Table 5. Approximately, 80% of respondents either strongly agree or agree with this statement that is reflective of their support for democratic political system in the country. However, respondents also believe that "Democracies are not good at maintaining order" as 53% of respondents agree with the statement [see Table 5]. On the other hand, 47% of respondents disagree with the statement. Therefore, there are mixed views of citizens regarding democracy being the governing structure. The reason behind these mixed views is that proper democratic culture has not developed in Pakistan, which may be due to the undemocratic social structure of the country lacking

democratic values like freedom, justice, equity and equality. Other countries where researches have reported dissatisfaction of people towards democracy are justified on different grounds such as people believe that elections did not bring much change, there are corrupt politicians who do not reach out to common people and the judiciary is not fair.<sup>30</sup>

In this context, an important question here is 'whether people have a good understanding of the democracy or democratic political system in general'. Otherwise, the percentages in Table 5 may reflect their historical experiences with both kinds of system in their country instead of a genuine choice for a true democratic system or army rule. To answer this pertinent issue, results of question on understanding of democracy are presented in Table 6. The survey mentions six characteristics as possible aspects of democracy and asked the respondents to share their views on a scale of 1 to 10 whether it is an essential or not at all essential characteristic of democracy. Out of six items mentioned in Table 6, Item 1, 3 and 5 are not the defining characteristics of democracy while, Item 2, 4 and 6 are generally considered to be part of democratic set up. With the purpose of better comparisons, the responses against each aspect are recoded into two options of essential and not essential (score 1-5 is recoded as not essential and score of 6-10 is considered as essential). Results of Table 6 reveal a poor understanding of democracy among surveyed people of Pakistan. Because, theoretically, item 1 in Table 6 which states '*Religious authorities ultimately interpret the laws*' is not a characteristic of democracy but 79% of respondents considered it as an essential characteristic of democracy. Similarly, item 3 which states '*The army takes over when government is incompetent*' is also rendered as an essential characteristic of democracy by 73% of respondents, although it is not the characteristic of democracy. Finally, another non-characteristic of democracy, item 5, '*People obey their rulers*' has been declared as an essential characteristic of democracy by 75% of respondents.

**Table 5: People's Support for Democracy in Pakistan**

<b>Democracy may have problems but is better</b>		
<b>Category</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Strongly Agree	831	43
Agree	772	40
Disagree	181	9
Strongly Disagree	166	8
<b>Total</b>	<b>1950</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Democracies aren't good at maintaining order</b>		

Strongly Agree	197	12
Agree	650	41
Disagree	651	41
Strongly Disagree	101	6
<b>Total</b>	<b>1599</b>	<b>100</b>
The 1 <sup>st</sup> and 2 <sup>nd</sup> indicators of Table correspond to the respective Questions E123 and E122 in the 4 <sup>th</sup> wave. These questions comprise of four responses, namely, Strongly agree, Agree, Disagree and Strongly Disagree.		

**Table 6: People's Understanding of Democracy in Pakistan  
(Essential vs. Not Essential Characteristics of Democracy)**

<i>1. Religious authorities ultimately interpret the laws.</i>		
<b>Category</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Essential</b>	940	79
<b>Not essential</b>	244	21
<b>Total</b>	1,184	100
<i>2. People choose their leaders in free elections</i>		
<b>Essential</b>	1,022	89
<b>Not essential</b>	123	11
<b>Total</b>	1,145	100
<i>3. The army takes over when government is incompetent</i>		
<b>Essential</b>	858	73
<b>Not essential</b>	311	27
<b>Total</b>	1,169	100
<i>4. Civil rights protect people from state oppression</i>		
<b>Essential</b>	926	79
<b>Not essential</b>	247	21
<b>Total</b>	1,173	100
<i>5. People obey their rulers</i>		
<b>Essential</b>	879	75
<b>Not essential</b>	289	25

<b>Total</b>	1,168	100
<i>6. Women have the same rights as men</i>		
<b>Essential</b>	981	83
<b>Not essential</b>	197	17
<b>Total</b>	1,178	100

As far as the actual essential characteristic of democracy, item 2, 4 and 6, are concerned, 89% of the respondents consider '*People choose their leaders in free elections*' as an essential characteristic of democracy. Similarly, 79% and 83% of respondents respectively reported '*Civil rights protect people from state oppression*' and '*Women have the same rights as men*' as necessary for democracy. Testing the theories of institutional legitimacy and social learning, Cho (2014) indicated strong relationship between support for democracy and citizens' informed understanding of democracy in cross-national analysis. Moreover, an important conclusion, also relevant to Pakistan's case, is that positive relation between understanding and support of democracy also depends on actual regime type according to which people formulate their attitudes towards either type of rule.<sup>31</sup>

Contemplating on plausible explanations for weak understanding of democracy by the respondents, low level of interest in politics may provide an explanation. Results of the question on importance of politics in life are reported in Table 7. According to results, only 10% of respondents give much importance to politics in life while, 28% of respondents consider it rather important. Moreover, for more than half of respondents i.e. 62%, politics is not important in life.

**Table 7: Importance of Politics in Life for People**

Category	Frequency	Percentage
<b>Very Important</b>	125	10
<b>Rather Important</b>	338	28
<b>Not very important</b>	376	32
<b>Not at all important</b>	353	30
<b>Total</b>	1,192	100

Notes: The Table corresponds to the Question V7 in the data of the 6<sup>th</sup> Wave. The question has four responses, Very important, rather important, not very important and not at all important.

Finally, it will be interesting to discuss people's evaluation of democratic system of Pakistan, whose results are presented in Table 8. As far as the question on "how democratically is your country being governed today" is concerned, 70% respondents consider it democratic and only 30% consider it not democratic. An interesting observation appears related to the results of question "Satisfaction with development of democracy in the country". Only 4% of respondents are very satisfied with it and 14% are rather satisfied. It is worth noting that 82% of respondents are not satisfied with the way democracy has been developing in Pakistan.

**Table 8: People's Evaluation of Democratic System of Pakistan**

<i>How democratically is your country being governed today?</i>		
Category	Frequency	Percentage
Democratic	842	70
Not democratic	358	30
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,200</b>	<b>100</b>
<i>Satisfaction with development of democracy in the country</i>		
Very satisfied	68	4
Rather satisfied	251	14
Not very satisfied	740	41
Not at all satisfied	722	41
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,781</b>	<b>100</b>
Notes: The first indicator corresponds to the Question V141 in the 6 <sup>th</sup> Wave. The respondents have to respond the question on a scale of 1 to 10 where 10 being completely democratic and vice versa. Considering '5' as a cut point, the score of 1 to 5 has been re-coded as a consideration that it's not democratic, while, 6 to 10 have been re-coded as a consideration that it's democratic. The 2 <sup>nd</sup> indicator of Table corresponds to the Question E10 in the 4 <sup>th</sup> wave. The question has four responses, very satisfied, rather satisfied, not very satisfied and not at all satisfied.		

It is worth mentioning here that literature has also reported peoples' dissatisfaction regarding democracy among different countries of the world specifically in the recent years. In a survey of 27 countries, a median of 21% are not satisfied with working of democracy in their countries. In almost all of the developing countries, more than half of the respondents are not satisfied with functioning of democracy. The study identified multiple reasons behind people's dissatisfaction such as corrupt politicians, poor economic conditions of the country, poor law and order, weak/unfair judicial system etc.<sup>32</sup> Another

comprehensive study on satisfaction regarding democracy covering 4 million respondents through 3500 country surveys spanning over 1973-2020 has concluded that dissatisfaction regarding democracy has increased over time particularly after 2005 and specifically for developed countries.<sup>33</sup>

The next part of analysis is cross tabulation of variables with the democracy variable to analyse the determinants of democratic attitude among Pakistani citizens. Given the theoretical framework, the focused variables are age, gender, education, income and importance of religion. One question related to democracy is focused for determining democratic attitude and that is 'importance of living in a democratic country' whose response categories have been re-coded into important and not important. Only cross-tabulations with significant values of chi-square are presented in the analysis. The first cross-tabulation in Table 9 is of gender with importance of living in a democratic country. Results have shown that relatively larger percentage of males is in favour of living in a democratic country as compared to the females. An interesting finding appearing from the cross-tabulation of working class and democracy is that working class seems to support the democratic setup more than the non-working class. However, the number of people in the working class is quite small. Focusing on the cross-tabulation of education and democracy, it is evident that percentage of respondents giving importance to living in a democratically governed country increases with higher levels of education and vice versa for a non-democratic country. Finally, considering the cross tabulation of income with democracy, the percentage of respondents who preferred to live in a non-democratic country decreases with higher income levels. Thus, the support for democracy increases with increase in income of the public.

**Table 9: Bivariate Relationship between Importance of Living in Democratic Country and Socio-Demographic Variables using Cross-Tabulations**

<b>Cross-Tabulation of Gender and Importance of Living in a Democratic Country</b>				
<b>Gender</b>				
<b>Importance of living in country</b>		<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Total</b>
	Democratic	47	39	86
	Not democratic	5	9	14
	<b>Total</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>100</b>
Chi-square=25.27***				
<b>Cross-Tabulation of Working Class and Importance of Living in a Democratic Country</b>				

Importance of living in country		Working class	Non-working class	Total
	Democratic	70	16	86
	Not democratic	12	2	14
	<b>Total</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>100</b>

Chi-square=3.43\*

**Cross-Tabulation of Education and Importance of Living in a Democratic Country**

Importance of living in country		Education			Total
		Incomplete primary	Primary	Secondary and above	
Democratic		20	33	33	<b>86</b>
Not Democratic		6	4	4	<b>14</b>
<b>Total</b>		<b>26</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>100</b>

Chi-square = 28.01\*\*\*

**Cross-Tabulation of Income and Importance of Living in a Democratic Country**

Importance of living in country		Income			Total
		Lower	Middle	High	
Democratic		26	28	32	<b>86</b>
Not Democratic		7	5	2	<b>14</b>
<b>Total</b>		<b>33</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>100</b>

Chi-square = 34.5\*\*\*

Another notable finding of the study is attitudes of women towards democracy in Pakistan. In many countries, women have made important contributions to the struggle for democracy and women's movements have central role in the struggle for female suffrage, which was crucial for democracy. Globally, in some parts of the world, women have lobbied for greater descriptive representation through gender quotas and other reforms but in Pakistan, women's attitude towards democratization is not positive and one of the reasons may be lack of civic education and patriarchal society that hinders the

women's participation in decision-making processes. There is also evidence of gender gap in support for democracy in other parts of the world, specifically in developing countries. Gender differences exist in not only voting behaviour, policy preferences and interest in politics but also in support for democracy. Some differences are intrinsic; however, it is believed that women prefer democracy in more egalitarian societies, because of support to their rights, while inequality in social institutions shapes discrimination against women in society, leading to their negative support for democracy. It is further believed that women are more interested in policy outcome particularly in relation to the social sector regardless of the type of regime, while men are most interested in political process. Moreover, if democratic transition involves onset of civil conflict and cost of conflict may be higher for women leading to their low support.<sup>34</sup>

## Conclusion

The paper attempts to analyse the relationship of democracy with some social, demographic and economic variables. In this regard modernization theory and congruence thesis has been tested in Pakistan's case by analysing the data of 4<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> wave of surveys conducted by World Values Survey. The relationship has been positively tested and our findings reflect that rise of income and development has a positive relationship with democracy in Pakistan and at the same time the absence of emancipative values, which are interpreted by the congruence thesis, have a negative impact on democratization in Pakistan.

Pakistan makes a somewhat fragile case study of democracy. Successive martial laws, political autocracy and personality cults have personified the system and did not allow Pakistan to get ahead with institutional consolidation. Unchecked powers, lack of accountability and authoritarian enclaves have not only contradicted democratic parties in Pakistan but have developed an attitude of wrong doings and malpractices dubbed as democracy in Pakistan. Still there is a hope as a lot of evidence emphasizes that economic factors, especially the level of development will shape prospects for democracy. But we still have a lot to learn about the causal mechanisms that mediate this process. It is likely that cultural, institutional, and international variables shape the relationship between economic factors and democracy.

Over the period of time, several quantitative and qualitative studies have been conducted to analyse the phenomenon of democratization all over the world. Quantitative research has identified various factors that are correlated with democracy mainly the structural factors at national level. It has not been very effective at demonstrating causality. Nor has it shed many insights on the complex processes that lead to democratization or democratic consolidation. At the same time, qualitative research has included single case studies as well as comparative histories. It has often focused on actors and agency, rather than

structural factors at national level. It has been an effective tool for inductive theory building and has shed much light on complex causal processes but it is not an effective tool for testing theories as an attempt has been made in this paper i.e. testing modernization theory and congruence thesis in Pakistan's case.

We have a long way to go in terms of generating thick, cumulative, and general knowledge of democratization processes. Future research should combine quantitative and qualitative methods, use experimental methods, employ formal models, scale down to the sub national or individual level and integrate structural and agent-centered approaches to strengthen the democratic practices in Pakistan.

## Endnotes

<sup>1</sup> Mervyn Abrahams and Julie Smith, *Democracy Perception Report 2010*, (South Africa: The Pietermaritzburg Agency for Christian Social Awareness (PACSA), 2011); Robert A. Dahl, *Democracy and its Critics* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1989).

<sup>2</sup> Richard Rose, William Mishler and Christian Haerpfer, *Democracy and its Alternatives. Understanding Post-Communist Societies* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998); Larry Diamond, *Developing Democracy: Towards Consolidation* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999).

<sup>3</sup> Rose, Mishler and Haerpfer, *Democracy and its Alternatives*.

<sup>4</sup> Ronald Inglehart and Christian Welzel, *Modernization, Cultural Change and Democracy: The Human Development Sequence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

<sup>5</sup> Gabriel Almond and Sidney Verba, *The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963).

<sup>6</sup> James Gibson, "Political and Economic Markets: Changes in the Connections Between Attitudes Toward Political Democracy and a Market Economy Within the Mass Culture of Russia and Ukraine," *The Journal of Politics* 58, no. 4 (1996): 954-984.

<sup>7</sup> Robert Putnam, *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy* (Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993).

<sup>8</sup> Alfred Ko-wei Hu, *Attitudes toward Democracy between Mass Publics and Elites in Taiwan and Hong Kong*, (Taipei: Asian Barometer Project Office, 2003).

<sup>9</sup> Mark Tessler and Ebru Altinoglu, "Political Culture in Turkey: Connections among Attitudes toward Democracy, the Military and Islam" *Democratization* 11, no. 1 (2004): 22-51.

<sup>10</sup> Abrahams and Smith, *Democracy Perception Report 2010*: 1.

<sup>11</sup> Steven Levitsky and Way A. Lucan, *Competitive Authoritarianism: Hybrid Regimes After the Cold War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

<sup>12</sup> Zafarullah Khan, "Pakistan's Experience with Democracy," *Dawn*, September 15, 2014.

<sup>13</sup> Jamil H. Junejo, "Why democratic system is weak in Pakistan: causes and solutions," *Indus Asia Online Journal*, December 12, 2010.

<sup>14</sup> Khan, "Pakistan's Experience with Democracy".

<sup>15</sup> Evens Hugh and Leo Rose, "Pakistan's Enduring Experiment," *Journal of Democracy* 8, no. 1 (1997): 83-96.

<sup>16</sup> David Taylor, "Parties, Elections and Democracy in Pakistan," *Journal of Commonwealth*

- and *Comparative Politics* 30, no. 1(1992): 96–115.
- <sup>17</sup> Anita Weiss and Zulfiqar Gilani, eds., *Power and Civil Society in Pakistan* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2001).
- <sup>18</sup> Junejo, "Why Democratic System is Weak in Pakistan: Causes and Solutions".
- <sup>19</sup> Julian Wucherpfennig and Franziska Deutsch, "Modernization and Democracy: Theories and Evidence Revisited," *Center for Comparative and International Studies* 1 (2009): 1-9.
- <sup>20</sup> Martin Lipset, "Some Social Requisites of Democracy: Economic Development and Political Legitimacy," *American Political Science Review* 53 (1959): 69-105
- <sup>21</sup> Ronald Inglehart and Christian Welzel, *Modernization, Cultural Change and Democracy: The Human Development Sequence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).
- <sup>22</sup> Michael L. Ross M. L., "Does Oil Hinder Democracy?," *World Politics* 53 (2001): 325–61.
- <sup>23</sup> Russell Dalton, R. J. and Nhu-Ngoc Ong, "Authority Orientations and Democratic Attitudes: A Test of the 'Asian Values' Hypothesis," *Japanese Journal of Political Science* 6, no. 2 (2005): 1-21.
- <sup>24</sup> Neil Nevitte and Mebs Kanji, "Authority Orientations and Political Support: A Cross-national Analysis of Satisfaction with Governments and Democracy," *Comparative Sociology* 1, no. 3-4 (2002); Ronald Inglehart, ed., "in *Human Values and Social Change. Findings from the Values Surveys*," (Leiden: Brill, 2003).
- <sup>25</sup> Michael Bratton, Robert Mattes and E. Gyimah-Boadi, *Public Opinion, Democracy and Market Reform in Africa* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).
- <sup>26</sup> Muhammad Sarwar, Muhammad Imran Yousuf, Shafiqat Hussain, "Attitude towards Democracy in Pakistan: Secondary School Teacher's Perceptions," *Journal of College Teaching and Learning* 7, no.3 (2010): 33-38.
- <sup>27</sup> *World Values Survey* (2014). On-line data analysis. Retrieved from [www.worldvaluessurvey.com](http://www.worldvaluessurvey.com)
- <sup>28</sup> Ronald Inglehart, Christian Haerpfer, Alejandro Moreno, Christian Welzel, Kseniya Kizilova, Jaime Diez-Medrano, Marta Lagos, Pippa Norris, Eduard Ponarin, and Bi Puranen. "World values survey: Round six-country-pooled data file version," (*Madrid: JD Systems Institute*, 2014).
- <sup>29</sup> Christine C. Fair, C. "Why the Pakistan army is here to stay: prospects for civilian governance," *International Affairs* 87, no. 3 (2011): 571-588.
- <sup>30</sup> Richard Wike, Katie Simmons, Bruce Stokes, and Janell Fetterolf. "Globally, broad support for representative and direct democracy," *Pew Research Center* 16 (2017).
- <sup>31</sup> Youngho, Cho. "To know democracy is to love it: A cross-national analysis of democratic understanding and political support for democracy," *Political Research Quarterly* 67, no. 3 (2014): 478-488.
- <sup>32</sup> Richard Wike, Katie Simmons, Bruce Stokes, and Janell Fetterolf. "Globally, broad support for representative and direct democracy," *Pew Research Center* 16 (2017).
- <sup>33</sup> Roberto Foa, Stefano, A. Claystone, M. Slade, A. Rand, and R. Williams. "*The global satisfaction with democracy report 2020*," (Cambridge: Centre for the Future of Democracy, 2020).
- <sup>34</sup> Cecilia Garcia-Peñalosa and Maty Konte, "Why are women less democratic than men? Evidence from Sub-Saharan African countries," *World Development* 59 (2014): 104-119.