

Democratic Attitude and Concept of Justice: A Case of Lahroe-Pakistan

¹Muhammad Shoaib, ²Muhammad Naveed Arif Khan and ²Bilal Shaukat

¹Department of Sociology, University of Gujrat, Pakistan

²Rural Sociology, University of Agriculture, Faisalabad, Pakistan

Abstract: The present study aims at understanding the democratic attitude and element of justice. For the present study 520 respondents were sampled from Lahore district through proportionate random sampling technique. A survey method was used as a technique of data collection and an interview schedule was administered by the researchers to collect information from the respondents. The results showed that there is a positive and significant relationship between democratic attitude and element of justice.

Key words: Democratic Attitude • Justice • Family Member • Government • Lahore • Pakistan

INTRODUCTION

In developing countries, there is no compulsory subject like citizenship that is one of the hindrances in the development of democratic attitude in the society. Values are desirable trans-situational goals, varying in importance, that serve as guiding principles in people's lives [1]. The bundle of freedoms called constitutional liberalism, is not synonymous with democracy and is theoretically different and historically distinct from democracy. For much of modern history what characterized governments in Europe and North America and differentiated them from those around the world, was not democracy but constitutional liberalism. Magna Carta, Rule of Law, Habeas Corpus, is all expressions of constitutional liberalism not democracy. During the 19th century most European countries went through the phase of liberalization long before they became democratic [2].

The most important resource for a country to achieve modern social, economic and technological levels that it aims to reach is the human quality. For this reason, human resources must be well-trained. The educational system is the main factor to train the human quality. The most important institutions that affecting the development and socialization of an individual are the family, the peers, religion and the school. Learning experiences at school will help the child or the adolescent to acquire academic information and skills and develop an active, emotionally and socially stable personality capable of adapting to

society [3]. The Koran uses this same expression of command in addressing Mohamed. "Go straight, as you have been ordered.... I am ordered to be just among you (Sura 42, The Consultation, 15).

Each individual is accepted as a unique personality and given respect. Since it is the members of a society who make decisions in democracies, the actual element is the student in the democratic education. The teacher is no longer a person giving a lesson in a classical meaning and teaching students something, but has turned out to a person helping students to access information and learn it, guiding them, planning activities and them participate to planned activities actively and in summary, teaching them how to learn [4].

Democratic attitude promotes justice in society. Individual's having democratic attitude also promote justice in the society. They think that all the matters are settled through mutual discussion, consensus and with cooperation. Democratic attitudes enhance the concept of justice in the society.

Objectives of the Study:

- To explore the socio-economic characteristics of the respondents.
- To find out the level of democratic attitude of the respondents.
- To explore the concept of justice among the respondents.

- To find out relationship (if any) between democratic attitude and the concept of justice among respondents.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

For the present study 520 respondents were selected through proportionate random sampling technique. Sample was selected from Lahore district on the basis of the characteristics like, age 20 to 60 years, living in the vicinity of Lahore. An interview schedule was administered by the researcher which contained different parts like a) education of the respondents; b) occupation of the respondents; c) family income of the respondents; d) democratic attitude; e) element of justice. Further, the data was analyzed by using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 16.0. Percentage and Kendall's tau-b statistical test was used to draw the conclusion.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Education plays a vital role to promote and create awareness and adaptation of modern lifestyle among different group of people having different ages, race, color, residential area and all other characteristics. Societies expand opportunities for education but some people receive much more than others. It affects both occupation and income. Education brings rationality reforms attitude and improve social status through better choices. It makes a sense, how to do efforts properly, how to make choices to adopt modern lifestyle. The data in the table shows, 36.5% respondents had master and above level of education. 24.0% had gradational level, 18.8% had intermediate, 14.6% had matric level educational attainments and only 1.5% was illiterate. The mean of educational level was 13.18 and median was 14 years. Mode of the educational attainments was 16.0 years. Standard deviation of the educational attainments was 3.08 and variance was 9.49 years of schooling. It is concluded that more than half of the respondents education was graduation and above.

Learning is the superlative asset for the people because highly educated citizens have more opportunities to get better employment which increase their earning. Educated persons enjoy better social status. Education is an important feature of the work of civilization and it will elevate the countryside problems and enhance better understanding of communities. One of the important tasks of education is to facilitate people to understand themselves and follow new patterns of life by early acceptance of social change occurring in society.

Table 1: Socio-economic Characteristics of the Respondents

Educational Level	Frequency	Percentage
Illiterate	08	01.5
Under Matric	23	04.4
Matric	76	14.6
Intermediate	98	18.8
Graduate	125	24.0
Master & Above	190	36.5
Total	520	100.0
Occupation of the Respondents		
Agriculture	33	06.3
Housewife	67	12.9
Government Job	64	12.3
Private Job	89	17.1
Business	70	13.5
Self Employment	56	10.8
Students	110	21.2
Un-employed	26	05.0
Skilled Labor	03	00.6
Unskilled Labor	02	00.4
Total	520	100.0
Family Income of the Respondents (Rs.)		
Up To 20000	22	4.2
20001 – 30000	71	13.7
30001 – 40000	100	19.2
40001 – 50000	115	22.1
Above 50000	212	40.8
Total	520	100.0

Std. Deviation=59753.521

The table indicates the distribution of the respondents by their occupation. It shows that 29.4 percent were having same profession in government and private sector followed by 21.2 percent students, 13 percent housewives. From the remaining respondents, 13.5, 10.8 and 12.9 percent were businessman, self-employed and farmers respectively. The data shows that respondents were from good mixture of different occupation and data collected from them will most probably reflect good effect of modernization on various religious aspects. No doubt various occupations are source of livelihood but in addition to income. Work is also an important source of social prestige. Individuals evaluate each other according to the kind of work they do [5].

Income plays a very significant role for the development of family and country. It is very important and required for the regulation of household activities and also regulates national revenue. Individual in any society have different income groups based on different dimensions of social inequality. It determines the social class of an individual and empowers them in different fields of life. Education, occupation, profession and income are very important components of demographic

Table 2: Democratic Attitude of the Respondents Strongly Agree=SA Agree=A No Opinion=NO Disagree=D Strongly Disagree=SD

S.#	Statement	SA 5	A 4	NO 3	D 2	SD 1	Mean
I.	Family issues should be solved through mutual consensus.	46.3 (241)	41.2 (214)	07.5 (39)	03.8 (20)	01.2 (06)	4.28
ii.	In your family both male and female are involved in decision making.	47.3 (246)	36.0 (187)	07.3 (38)	06.5 (34)	02.9 (15)	4.18
iii.	There is no gender discrimination in family.	38.5 (200)	29.2 (152)	14.2 (74)	10.6 (55)	07.5 (39)	3.81
iv.	Every citizen should have an equal chance to influence government.	37.9 (197)	41.9 (218)	11.2 (58)	04.4 (23)	04.6 (24)	4.04
v.	Your family members have the right to express their opinion.	50.0 (260)	38.5 (200)	06.9 (36)	03.1 (16)	01.5 (08)	4.32
vi.	Democratic method is used in your family for mate selection.	25.4 (132)	38.1 (198)	22.7 (118)	07.9 (41)	06.0 (31)	3.69
vii.	Your family gives equal importance to son and daughter for education.	64.2 (334)	23.3 (121)	05.6 (29)	05.0 (26)	01.9 (10)	4.43
viii.	People should have the right to demonstrate.	40.2 (209)	43.7 (227)	11.5 (60)	02.3 (12)	02.3 (12)	4.17

characteristics of individuals. Table no.2.5 demonstrates the total family income of the respondents. According to this Table, 40.8% respondents had income group of 50001 and above. 22.1% had 40001 – 50000, 19.2% had 30001-40000, 13.7% had 20001 – 30000 and only 4.2% had up to 20000 income group. The standard deviation was 59753.521.

Table describes that family issues should be solved through mutual consensus. There should be understanding among all family members to solve all problems of family member with the help of discussion. According to the field data 46.3% were strongly agreed and 41.2% were agreed that family issues should be solved through mutual consensus. While 7.5% had no opinion, 3.8% were disagreed and only 1.2% were strongly disagreed that family issues should be solved through mutual consensus. The mean score was 4.28.

Table shows that in your family both male and female are involved in decision making. More democratic-minded people tend to be younger, better-educated city dwellers, with higher incomes and white-collar jobs [6]. It is very important that all the individuals both male and female should participate in all the matters of family.

Participation is very important for decision making within family. According to the data which is collected from field 47.3% were strongly agreed and 36.0% respondents were agreed that in their families male and female are involved in decision making. 7.3% had no opinion, 6.5% were disagreed while 2.9% were strongly disagreed that their family members both male and female are involved in decision making of family matters within household. The mean score of the statement was 4.18.

Table depicts that there is no gender discrimination in family. There are equal rights for both men and women in the modern societies. According to the data 38.5% were strongly agreed and 29.2% respondents were agreed that there is no gender discrimination in family. Their families are providing and fulfilling all the necessary demand of their gender. Both male and female are getting education, health and nutrition requirements. While on the other

hand 14.2% respondents had no opinion, 10.6% were disagreed and only 7.5% of the respondents were strongly disagreed that there is no gender discrimination in family. The calculated mean score was 3.81.

Table describes that every citizen should have an equal chance to influence government. Democratic regime is consolidated if a strong majority of public opinion, even in the midst of major economic problems and deep dissatisfaction with incumbents, holds the belief that democratic procedure and institutions are the most appropriate way to govern the collective life. Trust in government is a mainstay of democracy [7]. Democracy is the type of government by the people, for the people. In democratic environment every individual has an equal right to influence the government. They can demand for their rights, resist any issue, criticize and support any political party.

According to the data 41.9% of the respondents were agreed and 37.9% were strongly agreed that people should influence government. While 11.2% of the respondents had no opinion, 4.4% were disagreed and only 4.6% of the respondents were strongly disagreed that every citizen should have an equal chance to influence government. The mean score of the statement was 4.04.

Table elaborates that respondent's family members have the right to express their opinion. Data shows that half respondents (50.0%) were strongly agreed and 38.5% respondents were agreed that their family members have the right to express their opinions. They have equal right to share all the matters with all family members. While on the other hand 6.9% had no opinion, 3.1% were disagreed and only 3.1% were strongly disagreed that their family members have the right to express their opinion or views. Mean score was 4.32.

Table describes that democratic method is used in your family for mate selection. Data represents that 38.1% of the respondents were agreed and 25.4% respondents were strongly agreed that democratic method is used in their families for marriages and mate selection.

Table 3: Respondent's Response towards Concept of Justice Strongly Agree=SA Agree=A No Opinion=NO Disagree=D Strongly Disagree=SD

S.#	Statement	SA 5	A 4	NO 3	D 2	SD 1	Mean
I.	Injustice within society promotes crimes.	62.3 (324)	23.3 (121)	06.3 (33)	04.0 (21)	04.0 (21)	4.36
ii.	We should condemn crime.	45.8 (238)	31.5 (164)	12.9 (67)	03.5 (18)	06.3 (33)	4.07
iii.	There should be level play field for everyone in life.	35.8 (186)	44.4 (231)	15.6 (81)	03.8 (20)	00.4 (02)	4.11
iv.	We should help police to control crime.	49.0 (250)	36.2 (188)	10.2 (53)	03.3 (17)	02.3 (12)	4.24
v.	State should provide justice to every citizen.	57.1 (297)	28.1 (146)	07.3 (38)	04.0 (21)	03.5 (18)	4.31
vi.	The demand for justice prevails in all walks of life.	37.5 (195)	40.2 (209)	13.1 (68)	07.5 (39)	01.7 (09)	4.04
vii.	In your family, women inherit half of what a male inherits.	30.0 (156)	33.8 (176)	21.5 (112)	08.5 (44)	06.2 (32)	3.73
viii.	The current government is working to provide justice.	18.1 (94)	17.5 (91)	16.0 (83)	11.7 (61)	36.7 (191)	2.68

They consult each other especially from male and female either they are satisfied or not. After consulting and developing consensus, family members become agree to do marriage according to democratic method. While on the other side 22.7% of the respondents had no opinion, 7.9% were disagreed and only 6.0% were strongly disagreed that democratic method is used in their families for mate selection. The mean score was 3.69. This is all due to changing cultural patterns, media, education, awareness, modernity, modernization and social mobilization.

Table shows that family of the respondents gives equal importance to son and daughter for education. According to the field data 64.2% were strongly agreed and 23.3% respondents were agreed that their family gives equal importance to son and daughter for education. They have no discrimination among them. 5.6% respondents had no opinion, 5.0% were disagreed and only 1.9% were strongly disagreed that their family gives equal importance to son and daughter for education. The calculated mean was 4.43.

Table depicts that people should have the right to demonstrate. Sartre argued that as the appearance of the other turns one into a being-for-itself rather than a being-in-itself, i.e. the other objectifies me and makes me experience alienation, "the other's look is the beginning of my unhappiness" [8].

According to the data which was collected from the field 43.7% were agreed and 40.2% were strongly agreed that people should have the right to demonstrate. While on the other hand 11.5% of the respondents had no opinion, 2.3% were disagreed and also strongly disagreed that people should have the right to demonstrate. Mean score was calculated which was 4.17.

Table indicates that inductive within society promotes crimes. Distribution of resources and properties creates harmony among society members. Injustice, discrimination, exploitation, unfairness, inequality, misuse, mistreatment, intolerance, disproportion and dissimilarity create different problems among family members and in

society. According to the field data 62.3% were strongly agreed and 23.3% were agreed that injustice within society promotes crimes. While on the other hand, 6.3% of the respondents had no opinion, 4.0% respondents were disagreed and also strongly disagreed that injustice within society promotes crimes in the society. The mean score was 4.36. It is concluded on the basis of above discussion that more than half of the respondents were strongly agreed that injustice within society promotes crimes.

Table describes that respondents should condemn crime. It is the right of every individual to demand for justice and condemn crimes. According to the field data, 45.8% were strongly agreed and 31.5% were agreed that we should condemn crimes. While on the other side, 12.9% of the respondents had no opinion, 3.5% were disagreed and 6.3% were strongly disagreed that we should condemn crimes. The calculated mean score was 4.07. It is concluded that more than half of the respondents were agreed and strongly agreed that we should condemn crimes. Table depicts that there should be level play field for everyone in life. Every individual has a right to demonstrate and demand for their rights. According to the data, 35.8% were strongly agreed and 44.4% were agreed that there should be level play field for everyone in life in every society. While on the other hand, 15.6% of the respondents had no opinion, 3.8% were disagreed and only 0.4% were strongly disagreed that there should be level play field for everyone in life.

Table indicates that we should help police to control crime. It is the duty of every individual to support police for the minimization of crimes in the society. Individual should support law and enforcement agencies to control crimes. According to the data collected from the field, 49.0% were strongly agreed and 36.2% were agreed that they should help police to control crime. While on the other side, 10.2% of the respondents had no opinion, 3.3% of the respondents were disagreed and only 2.3% respondents were strongly disagreed that they should help police to control crimes from the society.

Table 4: Democratic Attitude and Concept of Justice

Concept of Justice	Democratic Attitude		
	Low% (f)	High% (f)	Total% (f)
Low	02.1 (11)	07.5 (39)	09.6 (50)
High	03.7 (19)	86.7 (451)	90.4 (470)
Total	05.8 (30)	94.2 (490)	100.0 (520)

Table 5: Kendall's tau-b Symmetric Measures

		Value	Asymp. Std. Error ^a	Approx. T ^b	Approx. Sig.	Exact Sig.
Ordinal by Ordinal	Kendall's tau-b	0.227	0.070	2.846	0.004	0.000
N of Valid Cases		520				

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

The calculated mean score was 4.24. It is concluded that about half (49.0%) of the respondents were strongly agreed that they should help police to control crime form their community and society.

Table depicts that state should provide justice to every citizen. The content of God's appeal to Abraham is justice—the fundamental value of the revelation: “to do justice and judgment” (Gen. 18:19). It is the duty of every state to provide all the basic facilities to every individual in the society. According to the data, 57.1% were strongly agreed and 28.1% were agreed that state should provide justice to every citizen. While on the other side, 7.3% of the respondents had no opinion, 4.0% of the respondents were disagreed and only 3.5% of the respondents were strongly disagreed that state should provide justice to every citizen. The calculated mean score was 4.31. It is concluded that more than half of the respondents were strongly agreed that state should provide justice to every citizen.

Table indicates that the demand for justice prevails in all walks of life. It could be argued that hell and heaven offers justice proportional to the wrongs committed on earth [9]. It is the demand of the day that every individual should do his or her duty honestly and does not exploit any citizen. According to the data, 37.5% were strongly agreed and 40.2% respondents were agreed that the demand for justice prevails in all walks. While on the other side, 13.1% of the respondents had no opinion, 7.5% were disagreed and 1.7% were strongly disagreed that the demand for justice prevails in all walks of life. The calculated mean score was 4.04.

Results show that in respondent's family, women inherit half of what a male inherits. In Islam, every individual has some rights in the society. Both male and female has their own respective rights. According to the field data 30.0% were strongly agreed and 33.8% were agreed that in their family, women inherit half of what a male inherits. While on the other hand 21.5% of the

respondents had no opinion, 8.5% were disagree and 6.2% were strongly disagree that in their family, women inherit half of what a male inherits. The calculated mean score was 3.73. It shows that more than half of the respondents were giving one half of the property share to their women in their families.

Table indicates that the current government is working to provide justice. Human relationships cannot be totalized and harmony and peace should be achieved by facing and being with each other [10]. It is the duty of government to provide justice to every citizen in the society. According to the data collected from the field, 36.7% were strongly disagreed and 11.7% were disagreed that the current government was not working to provide justice. While on the other side, 16.0% of the respondents had no opinion, 17.5% of the respondents were agreed and 18.1% respondents were strongly agreed that the current government is working to provide justice.

Table no. 4 indicates democratic attitude and concept of justice. Democracy is not only a process but rather an attitude and something out of self-perception. It respects other's opinions and aims for social justice, equal opportunity and peoples rights of liberty. Political ideas, values and beliefs of the citizens are important components in democracy especially in societies undergoing democratic transition [11]. Every society consists of two groups the elite and the citizens and democracy is conceptualized as rule by the citizens [12]. According to data, 94.2% of the respondents response was high and only 5.8% of the respondents were falling in the category of low democratic attitude. While on the other hand, 90.4% of the respondents had high and only 9.6% of the respondents had low level or concept of justice in society. There is a positive relationship between democratic attitude and concept of justice among respondents. The calculated value of Kendall's tau-b was 0.227 at 0.004 p-value.

CONCLUSION

Democratic attitude is a key for success in the current age of the world. Individuals, who have democratic attitude, cooperating each other and help each other then the concept of justice prevail in the society. Families adopt the concept of mutual discussion, choice and freedom for mate selection, minimize gender discrimination and give equal opportunities to each member of their family in different areas of the world. These concepts eradicate the concept of crime, evil, injustice, voices and sin form the society. Every individual can influence government through justice and democratic attitude. "Good act complete goodness, the evil completes evil, in the very act itself."

REFERENCES

1. Shechtman, Z., 2002. Validation of the Democratic Teacher Belief Scale (DTBS). *Assessment in Education*, 9: 363-377.
2. Khan, R., 2012. Democracy in Pakistan. *Frei Reden Kann Todlich Sein*.
3. Gozutok, F.D., 1995. *Ogretmenlerin Demokratik Tutumları*. TDV Yayınları.
4. Caglar, D., 1997. Demokrasi Ve Egitim. *Çagdas Egitim Dergisi*, S, pp: 14.
5. Macionis, J., 2006. *Sociology*. Pearson Education, Inc. India: Dorling Kindersley Publishing Inc.
6. Nathan, A., 2004. *Traditional Social Values, Democratic Values and Political Participation*. Taipei: National Taiwan University and Academia Sinica.
7. Christensentom, L.P., 2003. *Trust in Government – the Significance of Attitudes Toward Democracy, the Public Sector and Public Sector Reforms*. Washington D.C: Stein Rokkan Centre For Social Studies, Be R G E N University Research Foundation.
8. Sartre, J.P. 1994. *Being and Nothingness*. Trans. Hazel E. Barnes. New York: Gramercy Books.
9. Seymour, C., 1998. Hell, Justice and Freedom, *International Journal of Philosophy of Religion*, 43(2): 69-86.
10. Emmanuel, L., 1985. *Ethics and Infinity*. Trans. R.A. Cohen. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press.
11. Hu, A.K., 2003. *Attitudes toward Democracy between Mass Publics and Elites in Taiwan and Hong Kong*. Taipei: Asian Barometer Project Office.
12. Acemoglu, D. and J.A. Robinson, 2006. *Economic Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.