

Perceptions of Selected Social Sectors towards Democratic and Military Regimes in Pakistan

By

BASEER Abdul

Supervised by

Professor Robert AC Salazar

Thesis submitted to Graduate School of Asia Pacific Studies

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement for

The Degree of Masters in Arts

June, 2017

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

*In the name of **Allah**, the Benevolent, the Merciful*

DEDICATION

To my mother and father

Table of Contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	i
DEDICATION	ii
LIST OF TABLES	vi
ABSTRACT	viii
CHAPTER 1	1
INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Background of the Study.....	1
1.2 Pakistan: An Overview	4
1.3 Statement of the Problem	6
1.4 Theoretical Framework.....	7
1.5 Objectives of the Study.....	10
1.6 Research Questions	11
1.7 Hypotheses	11
1.8 Conceptual Definitions.....	12
1.8.1 Democracy	12
1.8.2 Military Dictatorship	12
1.8.3 People	12
1.9 Scope and Limitations	13
1.10 Organization of Thesis.....	13
CHAPTER 2	15
PAKISTAN’S POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC SITUATION	15
2.1 Pakistan’s Political History	15
2.1.1 Brief history of military and civil regimes in Pakistan.	17
2.2 Economic history.....	18
2.2.1 A Glance to the Socio-Economic Performance of Military and Democratic Governments in Pakistan.	19
2.2.2 Unemployment and Inflation.....	20
2.2.3 Trade	21
2.2.4 Workers’ Remittances.....	21
2.2.5 Foreign Exchange Reserves.....	22
2.2.6 Education	22

2.2.7	Health.....	22
2.2.8	Poverty	22
CHAPTER 3		24
LITERATURE REVIEW.....		24
3.1	Introduction	24
3.2	Basic Ideology and Principles of Democracy (Intrinsic factors)	25
3.3	Is popular support value instrumentally or intrinsically?	26
3.4	What is military regime/dictatorship)?.....	28
3.5	performance of military regime in Pakistan (instrumental factors)	28
3.6	Military Intervention in Democratic Government, its Causes and Consequences: a Case of Pakistan	32
3.6.1	Causes	32
3.6.2	Consequences	34
CHAPTER FOUR		36
METHODOLOGY		36
4.1	Research Design	36
4.2	Study area and selection of respondents	36
Table 4.1: Sample Design		37
4.3	Data gathering	37
4.4	Data Analyses.....	40
CHAPTER FIVE		41
FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION		41
5.1	Respondents' Profile and Background Characteristics	41
5.1.2	Educational Level and Voting Eligibility of the Respondents.....	41
5.2	Interest of the respondents in politics.....	43
5.3	Access to health services	44
5.4	Perceptions of the respondents regarding constant changes	45
5.5	Influences on people's perceptions	59
Prediction of support for democracy and military regimes.		61
5.5.1	Educational Factors.....	62
5.5.2	Health factors.....	62
5.5.3	Economic factors.....	62
5.5.4	Social background factors.	63
5.5.5	Summary	63

CHAPTER 6	1
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	1
6.1 SUMMARY	1
6.2 CONCLUSIONS	3
6.3 RECOMMENDATIONS.....	6
REFERENCES.....	8

LIST OF TABLES

Table-5.1	Respondents' Age and Gender	41
Table-5.2	Educational level and Voting eligibility of the Respondents	42
Table-5.3	Income level and Housing of the Respondents	43
Table-5.4	Interest of the respondents in politics	44
Table-5.5	Access to health services	44
Table-5.6	Perception of Respondents regarding Constant Changes in Government	45
Table-5.7	Perception of Respondents regarding Military Intervention in democratic government	57
Table 5.8	Reasons for popularity of democratic government	49
Table 5.9	Comparison of Educational Performance of Democratic and Military Government	51
Table 5.10	Comparison of Educational Performance of Democratic and Military Government	53
Table 5.11	Comparison of Economic Performance of Democratic and Military Government	56
Table 5.12	Predictor of support for democracy and military	61

Certification Page

I, BASEER Abdul (Student ID 51115003) hereby declare that the contents of this Master's Thesis are original and true, and have not been submitted at any other university or educational institution for the award of degree or diploma.

All the information derived from other published or unpublished sources has been cited and acknowledged appropriately.

BASEER Abdul

2017/07/25

ABSTRACT

The study is about the perceptions of selected social sectors towards the support of democratic and military regimes in Pakistan. It examines whether support for either democratic or military regimes is based on instrumental factors (i.e., a regime is instrumental to improving the material standards of living) or on intrinsic factors (i.e., basic ideological principles). The study also investigates how the social sectors perceive the frequent changes in government and the advantages and disadvantages of these changes. The study was carried out through a survey among 384 respondents from three districts of Pakistan's Khyber Pakhtunkhwa province, namely Swat, Dir Lower and Malakand.

The study found that there was enough popular support for the democratic government in Pakistan; even though the respondents were not satisfied with performance of democratic government. The people of Pakistan were also not in favor of constant changes in government. A majority of people consider military intervention in democratic government as a bi-product of shaky sociopolitical conditions in Pakistan, and it is harmful for the democratic governments to function properly. Further, it weakens the rule of law, disturbs the basic ideology of democracy, threatens constitutional legitimacy, and leads to a failure of long term policies. Nevertheless, the findings show that the military has an influence on politicians, and sometimes military intervention is inevitable if only to control the unstable political situation. On the other hand, there are numerous reasons for the popularity of democratic governments in Pakistan. The public believe that democracy works in favor of the state. Interestingly, however, the findings indicate that the public viewed the military regime slightly more favorably in terms of its performance and consequences for the educational sector. In the sphere of public health, however, the favorable perceptions toward the military and democratic governments are about even.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

In 1947, Pakistan was established on basis of democratic ideology and was officially named as Islamic Republic of Pakistan. Pakistan constitutionally is a democratic parliamentary republic with its political system based on an elected form of governance. However, democracy never flourished in the state and is primarily dominated by military regimes therefore, due to continuous interruptions by the military; the state faced many socio-economic problems.

Regularly changing government is one of the core issues and/or problems related to Pakistan. As a result, the country never flourished socially as well as economically. For instance, the situation did not allow the country to adopt a single path for development. With changing governments there was a constant change in policies, with some policies being discarded and new ones introduced, and again the process being repeated leading to policy chaos in the country (Zafar, 2013). Further, the constant direct as well as indirect interventions by military in the civil governments even did not allow the civil government to work in their way. In this regard, it is evident that the military intervened in order to direct the civil government's decision and policies in their favor. However, it is also important to mention that military regimes at many point of times gain popularity among the public of Pakistan (Khan, 2012).

The constantly changing governments in Pakistan led to socio-economic problems primarily including weak and fragile political system, political instability, terrorism, civil and military conflicts as well as economic crises such as inflation, corruption, lack of industrial

development etc. Concomitantly, the state is currently rated as underdeveloped on the basis of having low ranking on indicators for socio-economic development and prosperity (Zafar, 2013). Under such conditions, people have suffered considerably. The state is unable to provide the people with standard education, health services and certain other basic rights. Further, according to Zahid (2011) the major institution such as judiciary, stock exchange, law enforcement agencies etc. remain dysfunctional, leading to further chaos making the state unable to provide public with fulfillment of their basic rights. In short, it is the people who suffer most.

Yet, in the face of this constant change in government, it is still not clear what various sectors of the population think of the political situation, or how indeed changes in government influence, if at all, the people's perceptions. Thianthai (2012) has suggested that public perceptions are associated with the government's performance and the outcomes experienced by the people. There have been occasional reports describing the people's views toward various issues. For instance, the Daily Times (2004) reported a study which investigated what people thought about democracy in Pakistan. Is democracy considered good or bad for the country? Is democracy better than military dictatorship despite having and facing many problems in Pakistan? What about decision making in a democratic system? Do rulers and parties in Pakistan's democratic system work for the harmony and benefit of the country or do they pursue their self-interests? How has the state functioned in a democracy so far? The survey also investigated the satisfaction level of the respondents, for instance, were they happy with the democratic governments in Pakistan? How much confidence did they have in the democratic system so far? Were they happy about the economic growth and law and order situation observed in the country during democratic regime? The study concluded that majority of people were in favor of democratic system in Pakistan and considered it as a better government than military dictatorship. People perceived

that democracy despite having and facing many problems is better forth country. The data also revealed that parties and political leader were self-interested. The respondents were also satisfied with the economic growth during democracy but had more confidence in the military in terms of making decisions. They had less confidence in political parties but were reasonably satisfied with the country's law and order situation during democratic regimes (Daily Times, 2004).

Similarly, according to an opinion poll conducted by the Pakistan Legislative Strengthening Consortium (PLSC), in Pakistan, 45 per cent of the people believe and perceive that political parties are important and necessary for democracy. However, 62 percent think and perceive that the parties primarily serve their own interests. Only 13 per cent of respondents were of the opinion that political parties do serve the public interest. These figures show what political parties have to do to gain wider popular support. Another study conducted by IFES in 2004 on behalf of the Pakistan Legislative Strengthening Consortium with support from the USAID found that the military was the only institution with which majority of people were satisfied while the other institutions were not able to gain popularity among the public during democratic regimes (IFES, 2004).

Although the preceding reports give a glimpse of people's views toward democracy, political parties, and military institutions, it remains unclear as to how people would compare military and democratic governments relative to each other. In this connection, it is important to ask how people consider the constant changes in the government. What do they think about the intervention of military in civil government; and, how and why different regimes gain popularity among the public? These are some basic questions which this study hopes to address.

1.2 Pakistan: An Overview

Established on the basis of democracy, Pakistan never developed and thrived as a democratic nation. At the very beginning, Pakistan did not have strong political parties which made the system weak and fragile at the earlier stages. The parties and system were unable to deal properly with key problems and issues related to the state. Due to growing political instability, the civilian bureaucracy and military took power in 1958. As a result, since its independence, Pakistan's democratic system has fluctuated between civilian and military governments at various times throughout its political history. The major reasons behind such a fluctuating government as mentioned earlier were immature political parties, lack of leadership along with factors including instability, civil-military conflicts, political corruption, and the periodic coup d'états by the military establishment against weak civilian governments. These factors paved way and made easy for military to intervene and take control of the government at several points in time such as in 1958, 1977 and 1999. Such interventions did not allow democracy to flourish and made the situation worse (Hassan, 2011).

The military, also termed as armed forces, includes individuals who are trained to use weapons and strategies in order to protect a state and provide security to and within the state (Jamshed & Ghulam, 2013). In addition, military have several functions, for example, promotion of a political agenda, protecting corporate economic interests, internal population control, construction, emergency services, arranging and supporting social ceremonies as well as guarding important areas. In many ways the military forms a subculture within a given nation-state. However, unnecessary military interventions are part of history.

As far as the military rule in Pakistan is concerned, Pakistan has experienced three coups in its 69 years of history whereby both civil and military regimes ruled the country for about 30-35 years each. However, none of the regimes were successful in satisfying the public of the country. Firstly, the civilian government was weakened in itself primarily due to the early death of Muhammad Ali Jinnah in 1948; and secondly, the army was needed to deal with the unstable situation in the newly established country which provided more impetus to the power of military enabling it to intervene in the country's democratic and civilian government. Thus with the passage of time the military grew stronger in structure and gained more respect in eyes of the public (Selochan et al., 2004). Despite the recent power transfer among political parties in 2013, none of the previous political governments completed their tenure due to military coups. The first coup occurred in 1958, the second in 1977, and the third in 1999. Aside from these coups, there were several other indirect interventions and many unsuccessful coups attempts.

Since Pakistan came into being, it has never been politically stable. It has faced enormous socio-political problems e.g. economic crises, geographical threats, sectarianism, terrorism and so many others. Concomitantly, unstable governance is one of the prime problems from which Pakistan has suffered and is suffering. Since the creation of Pakistan in 1947, it has been under many regimes, i.e. democratic as well as military regimes which indicate the political instability of the state. According to Zafar (2013), the state of government in Pakistan is transitory in nature whereby democratic rules have been accompanied by prolonged military regimes. In numbers, Pakistan has been ruled by three military dictators while PPP and PMLN are the democratic parties which have ruled Pakistan. Such situation is an intense threat to the integrity of the nation. Inconsistency in the rule has made Pakistan vulnerable to many crises. One of the important among such crises is

the failure of democracy whereby democracy hasn't ruled the country on consistent basis. Institutions of Pakistan, i.e. legislation, judiciary, bureaucratic setup, military as well as economic institution has never flourished. In short, the country's institutions have remained dysfunctional due to the transitory nature of governance. Authoritarianism or dictatorship has contributed immensely to democratic disruptions and dysfunctional democracy in Pakistan (Zahid, 2011). Pakistan has spent about half of its life under dictatorship, i.e. military rules of General Ayub Khan, General Zia and General Musharraf (Siddiq, 2007). Consequently, democracy hasn't flourished, leaving Pakistan behind in crises.

Military interventions not only directly hurt Pakistan's integrity but also indirectly, In this regard, it is evident that the acts of military leaders to favor their rule lead to poor rule of law. For instance, military leader brought amendments in Pakistan's law according to their wishes. Consequently, it led to flaw in laws and constitution. Such flaws made the constitution to protect leaders and dictators rather than protecting their citizens. Further, it decreased the faith of the citizens on law, constitution as well as elections. It is also observable that laws made by military dictators have prevented authorities to conduct credible elections.

1.3 Statement of the Problem

People respond differently to both types of regimes, i.e. Democratic and military regimes. Although some may perceive democracy as a type of government which can serve them in better way as compared to military regime, other sectors at certain times and places may favor a military regime. Thus, both regimes try to develop perceptions and public opinion through different methods in order to gain popularity among the public (Javid, 2014). At the end of the day, people's perceptions toward government matters. People's perceptions decide which regime is beneficial and why.

The current study is about the perceptions of people towards democratic and military regimes in Pakistan. The study will try to find out how people perceive both type of regimes, which type of regime is popular among the people, and why. How do people consider the regularly changing government? Is it considered beneficial for the state or is it viewed as threatening the country's socio-political and economic development? The study also aims to find out the people's views of and their attitudes towards the military interventions in the civil government. What type of regime is popular among the public and what are the reasons behind such popularity?

1.4 Theoretical Framework

The perception, conception and philosophy of democracy vary across cultures, nations and generations. However, there is no doubt in mentioning that political socialization is perhaps the most notable factor in building perception, attitudes and conception about democracy; and, national history, social structure, and political traditions are key to political socialization. Discussing democracy in the context of history, it is evident in that certain components are key to democracy including freedom of expression, fair electoral competition, and separation of powers as key norms. The major part of literature regarding democracy is based on the mentioned components, and to Thianthai (2012) there is very little discussion over perceptions of people towards democracy. Thianthai further asserts that perception's towards democracy across the globe due to variable political socialization due to national history, social structure and political traditions. In this connection, the current study aims to find out the perceptions of the public towards democratic regimes in Pakistan by keeping in view the national history, social structure, and political traditions.

In addition, According to Klousis, McDevitt, & Wu, there are many contributing component to political socialization through which public opinion towards a government

develops. For example, the core among such components is the attention to news. Attention to news is further linked with increase in knowledge and communication which are significant components regarding public opinion with regard to a political situation. Knowledge and communication is further associated with political discussion which works as a building block in formation of perception towards a political scenario. Through the mentioned route, public perception is formed regarding policy makers, bureaucrats, and the voting process. This process is also termed as Agenda-setting theory (Klousis, McDevitt, & Wu 2005).

They further argue that there are many sources of political socialization which develop the attitudes and perceptions of the public towards democratic regimes. The most notable among such sources are familial, educational, religious, media (exposure to news and information) and political environment. The study of Holbert and LaMarre concluded that media play a vital role in building public perception towards a political situation or scenario. For instance, it is posited that debate viewing serves as a mediator of this relationship leading to formation of attitude and perception towards political scenario. Further, the study illustrated that young people aging, under 35 years are more prone to the influence of media and TV with reference to their perception and attitude formation regarding political parties and governments. The study “details a series of positive unintended consequences of late-night TV comedy viewing on what are defined normatively as positive democratic communicative activities (i.e., debate viewing, political discussion), and these media effects are stronger the younger the voter” (Holbert & LaMarre, 2010).

In a similar way, the current research is an effort to identify different sources influencing popular attitudes and perceptions towards democratic regimes in Pakistan, including educational, familial and religious profiles along with importance of social and mass media and political environment. James Sloam concluded from his research that

education is the key aspect which contributes to political socialization of an individual. In his research, he worked on some basic questions such as “what is politics?” and “How do (young) people come to understand politics?” It then discusses how education, politics, and society are interlinked? The research study concluded that an individual’s definition of politics, his/her level of understanding the political process, and an individual’s opinion about association of politics with other social structures depends of his/her education (Sloam, 2010).

It is important to mention various indicators through which a regime gains popularity among the public. In this connection, Bratton and Mattes (2000) explain the process or indicators into two main dimensions through which a particular regime gains popularity. First, *intrinsic factors*, i.e. a regime works on a particular ideology and principles. In this regard, principles such as equality, freedom of expression, liberty and representation of opinions are the key components around which processes of democracy take place. Globally, researches show that such principles are the first choice of the public than anything. Second, *instrumental factors*, for instance, increase in job opportunities, increase in income, and provision of social services such as health and education, and development of physical infrastructure are important indicators for popularity of a regime.

With reference to Pakistan, both of the regimes i.e. democracy and military dictatorship have popular support as well as rejection. For example, some portions of the public are keener to see Pakistan under a democratic system for numerous reasons. For instance, a portion of the public is in favor of democracy due to its key principles and qualities including freedom of expression, liberty, value for opinion etc. However, on the other hand, literature indicates that during military regimes a considerable amount of socio-economic development has been observed, for instance, increase in foreign investment and

industrialization was accelerated during Pervez Musharraf's regime. It is also evident that various universities including University of Malakand and Hazara University became functional after 30 years during the same regime. Many democratic governments were unable to open the mentioned universities due to political problems. Besides, increase in job opportunities, for example, National internship program (NIP) was initiated during military regime which provided significant amount of opportunities to young students to work, to earn and to learn. In a nut shell, military government had an edge while considering instrumental factors.

Matanock and Garcia-Sanchez (2014) enumerate that social support exists for military regimes. The reasons for the support of military regime vary according to the situation. However, the literature shows that the ability to have control in difficult situation is one of the reasons behind support of social democracy. When there is need for survival, support is said to exist for military leaders (Hassan, M. 2011). Further, studies in Pakistan suggest that the non-responsiveness of democratic governments helps the situation where people support military regimes. Certain other factors i.e. trust and involvements in parliamentary groups are sources for support of military among public (Hassan, N. 1999).

1.5 Objectives of the Study

- To determine and analyze the perceptions of selected population sectors about the constantly changing government in Pakistan.
- To investigate the perceptions of selected population sectors about military interventions in civil governments.
- To investigate the perceptions of selected population sectors regarding the popularity of democratic and military regimes.

1.6 Research Questions

- What are the attitudes of people towards regularly changing government and how do people perceive the impact of changing government?
- How do people look at military interventions? Do they see them as having positive or negative consequences for the country?
- How and to what extent do intrinsic and instrumental factors contribute to developing perception towards democratic and military regime?

1.7 Hypotheses

1. H₀: people perceive the constantly changing government as beneficial for the country.

H₁: people do not perceive the constantly changing government as beneficial for the country.

2. H₀: people perceive military intervention in civil government as a positive aspect.

H₁: people do not perceive military intervention in civil government as a positive aspect.

3. H₀: Military governments are more popular in the country as compared to democratic government.

H₁: Military governments are less popular in the country as compare to democratic government.

The study further hypothesizes that:

4. H₀: Military governments have popular support due to instrumental factors.

H₁: Democratic governments have popular support due to intrinsic factors.

1.8 Conceptual Definitions

1.8.1 Democracy

Democracy is defined as a system of government in which the supreme power is vested in the people. Democratic process provides equal opportunity to all adult citizens to participate in election and/or voting process (Coglianese cited in Dahl; 1990). Democracy is type of government in which the party (or a coalition of parties) with the greatest representation (which comes through voting and/or elections) in the parliament (legislature) forms the government, its leader becoming prime minister or chancellor. The party or parties which do not have greatest representation works as opposition to those in governments and challenges the efforts and government of the ruling party. Operationally, democracy in Pakistan refers to the functioning of the parliament and the participation of multiple parties such as Pakistan People Party, Pakistan Tehreek Insaf (PTI), Pakistan Muslim League N (PMLN), Muttahida Qaumi Movement (MQM), etc.

1.8.2 Military Dictatorship

It is a type of rule where the highest ranked officer, for example, the army chief rules a country. The head of state is the senior military commander or general. Lower-ranking generals form the governing board. Further, in such type of rule, political parties in the state exists, however, their position remains considerably weak (Nicholus, 2013). In a similar context, the current study includes military dictatorship as an important concept which means the rule of the highest ranked army officer in the state.

1.8.3 People

The term people in general refers to “*any group of human beings (men, women or children) collectively*” (Cited in Word Web, 2015). According to Oxford Online Dictionary the term people refers to “*the ordinary men and women of the country rather than those who govern or have special position in society*”. With reference to the current study people refers to the selected population sectors which includes university teachers i.e. lecturers and

professors, army retired personnel, politicians and students studying in the study locality. These selected population sectors are termed as people, preferred and sampled for the current study due to the fact that they may respond and understand the basic philosophy of the study and the reason of the collection of information. Further, the mentioned sector of population have basic education, they understand political structure, the economic structure, governmental policies, they watch news and read newspapers, and therefore have interest in politics and develop perception regarding governments

1.9 Scope and Limitations

The scope of this study is limited to the case of Pakistan only and it doesn't explain the pros and cons of either democracy or dictatorship in general. Secondly, the study is conducted in a very short time period with limited resources therefore it has some limitations. It is suggested that a caution must be made while referring the empirical findings of this study. Due to time and resource constraints the research couldn't conduct an in-depth survey and the study is based only on a small proportion of the entire population. Also, the study only highlights the peoples' perception does not cover other benefits and consequences of both democracy and dictatorship such as macroeconomic indicators GDP, rate of growth, etc. This issue is intentionally left for the future researchers as it can be addressed through a large scale survey with an in-depth study.

1.10 Organization of Thesis

This thesis comprises six chapters. The first chapter introduces the objectives, hypotheses and significance of the study. The second chapter gives an overview of Pakistan's political and economic situation, while the third chapter reviews the literature related to the subject and expounds on the theoretical framework adopted for this study. Chapter four (Methodology) provides a detailed description of the methods and procedures that have been applied and utilized during the course of the research activity. Chapter five is divided into

two parts: the first part presents the data in general, while the second part focuses on the testing of the study's hypotheses. Chapter six presents the study's conclusions and implications, and proposes several recommendations.

CHAPTER 2

PAKISTAN'S POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC SITUATION

2.1 Pakistan's Political History

Pakistan is a country with cultural, ethnic, geographic and resource variations. It was intended to function as a parliamentary democracy with federal structure on the pattern of Westminster. However, democracy has not root in the sixty years of Pakistan's history (Kamran, 2008). As a post-colonial state, Pakistan is said to have had a chequered history with a few interludes of democratic rule during the sixty years of its existence. "Parliamentary democracy failed four times primarily due to mismanagement, disproportionate development of institutional matrix and the mounting political ambitions of the Army Generals". Ian Talbot(2009) terms Pakistan's political history as "a fruitless search for stability with frequent changes of Government and regime. Talbot also mentions the experiments that the state of Pakistan made during the first two decades of its existence, with "two constituent assemblies, one constitutional commission and three constitutions." Nevertheless Pakistan's quest for political stability and the lasting democratic system remained a distant dream. Right from the outset, Pakistan was ruled by forces generally known as the 'establishment', comprising civil bureaucracy and Army, which in the views of Hamza Alvi, Constituted the over-developed state structure. The establishment asserted its role to ensure strong power center to the detriment of the provincial and regional actors, who were consigned to the margins of Pakistani polity (Zaidi, 2004).

As discussed earlier, Pakistan has never experienced the continuity of government, Hussain (2016) argues that continuity of democratic government is one of the basic indicators for development; history suggests that continuity of democracy is one of the main differences between developed and developing world. Although changes are often necessary, democracy

has the capability to adopt changes and provide space for changes. Democratic governments in developed societies still have stuck with democracy due to its unique advantages.

Currently, there has been some consistency in the government of Pakistan (Hussain 2016). For instance, the democratic government formed in 2008 was replaced by another democratic government in 2013. Considering continuity, the democratic governments are able up to some extent to understand the situation, analyze it, devise a policy and implement it. Democratic governments are now able to contribute significantly to education, health, and infrastructure and to bring foreign investment to the country.

The military of Pakistan has always had an important role in the politics and political structure of Pakistan since its independence. The military on many occasions has assisted the civil and democratic government instead of taking over the government. (Javed cited in Shah A. 2014) asserts that “Pakistan has always been saved from complete and utter destruction by the timely and judicious intervention of the military, the only institution in the country possessing the expertise and wherewithal to address these complex problems”. In many cases the military played a key role in sorting out problems created by incompetent politicians. Thus the military has been titled as a savior organization for the country. Therefore, there is certain occasion's history of Pakistan which led to rise of military image. Among such occasions, first, the assistance and rescue of migrants from India and their rehabilitation is perhaps the starting point of rise of military image among the public of the nation (for details see also the study of Khan, 1978). Second, military officials are always in front whenever there is talk on occupied Jammu Kashmir, and have dealt on many occasions with difficulties faced by civil governments when the position of the states has weakened on the issue (Javaid and Irfan 1977).

2.1.1 Brief history of military and civil regimes in Pakistan.

Pakistan has suffered three coups in 63 years of its history. In fact, neither military nor civilian regime could win the people's mind and heart in their favor. Pakistan could not produce the high quality and charismatic leaders after founding father of Pakistan Muhammad Ali Jinnah. In the early 1950s, social chaos in Pakistan and the assassination of first Prime Minister Liaqat Ali Khan in 1951 did make the political organizations weak and corrupt which promoted nepotism (Kamran. 2008). The civilian governments were dependent on the army for the restoration of authority in law and order crises and in coping with natural calamities. These operations gave the military a positive image and exposed the weakness of the political leaders. These situations provided the military with useful experience in handling civilian affairs, and gave the military some confidence to perform the job when the civil governments failed. The military thus never had any problem in justifying its assumption of power while blaming the displaced governments for political chaos, misadministration and corruption (Selochan, V & May, R. 2013).

The military grew in stature and continued to enjoy respect in society. It was therefore not surprising that when the military dictator Ayub Khan decided to displace civilian governments in 1958-1969. In 1971 Pakistan was separated in East Pakistan (Bangladesh) and West Pakistan which was a shocking incident for Pakistani nation (Kamran. 2008). Bhutto wins the election in 1971 and people of Pakistan were hoping that these elected democratic leaders would change their fate and will restore the image of the country image which was lost after the disaster of 1971. Bhutto tried to minimize the military strength and involvement of in politics, but he could not succeed as army had deep roots in politics which was not possible to eliminate. In 1977 Bhutto's government was replaced by then chief of the army staff, General Zia, and Bhutto was hanged on the order of Supreme Court of Pakistan in 1979. Zia promised to conduct general election as

soon as possible, but he engaged politicians in the local politics and diverted nation's attention from the general elections. Zia regime finished with his death in a plane crash in 1988. General Musharraf was the next general who dismissed an elected government on 12 October 1999-2008. Even though Pakistanis, nation were believed in democracy but they opposed Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif, policies and welcomed military dictatorship in 1999. Pervez Musharraf conducted so-called general elections by October 2002 but he refused to quit his office as Chief of Army Staff till the confirmation of his next presidency. Musharraf continued to rule even after replacing military rule with constitutional rule. The prime ministers and the parliament (2002-2007) could not enjoyed their powers and did not bring any change because the prime ministers and cabinet members owed their jobs to Musharraf". In 2008 another general elections was held which led to the defeat of the pro-Musharraf party, Pakistan Muslim League-Q and brought a democratic government in Pakistan.

Stages	Duration	Regime	System of government and ruler
Stage 1	1947-1958	Democratic	Parliamentary system
Stage 2	1958-1971	Military regime	Military dictator Ayub Khan (1958-1969)/ Yahya Khan (1969-1971)
Stage 3	1971-1977	Democratic	Presidential/Parliamentary (Zulfiqar Bhutto ruled the country)
Stage 4	1977-1988	Military regime	Military dictator (Zia ul Haq ruled the country)
Stage 5	1988-1999	Democratic	Parliamentary (Nawaz Sharif/ Benazir ruled the country)
Stage 6	1999-2008	Military regime	Military dictator Pervez Musharraf
Stage 7	2008-	democratic	Parliamentary system (Zardari and Nawaz Sharif ruled)

Source: Alternative future for Pakistan beyond the pendulum of general and landlord politics. Inayat. S (2012)

2.2 Economic history

Pakistan's economic history since its birth has shown mixed results. The different types of governments which have ruled the nation have influenced its macroeconomic

performance. The development during president Ayub Khan(1958-1969)has been documented to be the best era in the history of Pakistan. During this period the GDP growth rate averaged 6.8% (Moreau, 2006).

The economic survey of Pakistan (2015-16) reveals that the current democratic governments are able devise a stable and appropriate educational policy. For example, the current government is investing cost of Rs. 189 billion over the 3-year period to increase the literacy and primary education to 91 per cent from 55 per cent. Besides, the educational goral of the current democratic government also include promoting gender equality and women empowerment by enhancing the women's educational profile through primary, middle and higher education(Pakistan economic survey 2015-16).

According to the Economic Survey of Pakistan (2005), the economy gained greater momentum during fiscal year FY2004-05 as Pakistan's real GDP grew by 8.4% against 6.4% in FY2003-04. All major macroeconomic indicators showed improvement from previous years. Although Pakistan's economic performance improved further in FY2005-06 as shown by the major macroeconomic indicators, shortages of essential food items, high oil prices, and inflation increased sharply. The fiscal deficit also increased, and the current balance of payments accounts turned into deficit after three years of surplus. Lastly, trade deficit exceeded US \$6 billion, which is highest in decades.

2.2.1 A Glance to the Socio-Economic Performance of Military and Democratic Governments in Pakistan.

Pakistan has remained under many military and democratic regimes since its independence. There are many dimensions of the socio-economic performance of military and democratic regimes, for example, reduction in unemployment and inflation, increase in trade, focus on migration and remittances, improvement in education and health, reduction in poverty etc. The following portion includes a comparison of the performance of military and

democratic regimes such as reduction in unemployment and inflation, increase in trade, focus on migration and remittances, improvement in education and health, reduction in poverty etc.

dimension	Military government	Democratic government	Conclusion
Unemployment ratio	a. average 7.52% b. 3.13% in FY90 during Benazir Bhutto's government and a high of 6.22%	a. Average 5.19% b. During the military era it touched the highest ever at 8.70%	Democratic government has performed slightly better while providing employment
Trade	The average export rate was recorded 12.95 % during 1989-2005.	The average export rate was recorded 12.91 % during 1989-2005.	Almost similar performance by both type of governments
Workers' Remittances	During the span of 1989-2005, remittances received during military regime was 3.21 % of total GDP	During the span of 1989-2005, remittances received during Democratic government was 3.13 % of total GDP	Military government performed slightly better
Educational sector	The average growth rate of investment in education during 1989-2005 was 2.0 % of the total GDP	The average growth rate of investment in education during 1989-2005 was 2.18 % of the total GDP	Democratic government performed slightly better
Health sector	The average growth rate of investment in health sector during 1989-2005 was 0.67%. of the total GDP	The average growth rate of investment in health sector during 1989-2005 was 0.74 % of the total GDP	Health sector has been ignored by both of the governments
Poverty	During the span of 16 years i.e. 1989-2005, the average growth of poverty in Pakistan was 31.7%	During the span of 16 years i.e. 1989-2005, the average growth of poverty in Pakistan was 29 %	Military government performed slightly better

2.2.2 Unemployment and Inflation

The Unemployment Rate and Consumer Price Index in the two eras, differ significantly. The average unemployment rate during (1989-2005) was close to 6%. It averaged 5.19% during the democratic era and increased to 7.52% during the military era. Despite high growth rate (8.4% in 2004-05, and 6.40% in 2003-04), the unemployment rate has increased which shows that the benefit of high growth rate of GDP is not benefiting the public.

During Benazir Bhutto's time the unemployment rate was at a low of 3.13% in FY90 this reached a high of 6.22% in the following year FY91 during Mian Nawaz Sharif's tenure.

During the military era, unemployment was at the highest ever at 8.70% in FY05. The average inflation rate when measured by the consumer price index was 8.14% during the last 17 years and 8.60% when measured using the GDP deflator. It averaged close to 10% during the democratic era and 4.75% in the military regime. During the democratic era inflation ranged from 5.70% to 13%. During the military regime, CPI also varied greatly (3.10% in FY03 and 9.30% in FY05). The average growth rate of GDP deflator was 8.60% during the 17 year period, but was much higher in the democratic era 10.0% than during the military regime at 5.89%.

2.2.3 Trade

During the span of 1989-2005, the average export rate was recorded to be 12.92% of the total GDP in %. With regard to comparing military and democratic governments, it remained 12.95 % during the rule of Military while 12.91 % during the rule of democratic government. Thus, there is a minor or slight statistical difference, however, is not significant. There is a high dissimilarity in export growth for the duration of the entire period particularly in democratic period where it reached a high of 19.80% in 1990-91, and a low down of - 10.70% in 1998-99 yielding a difference of almost 30%. During the military regime it was 2.30% low in FY02 but it was 19.10% very high in the subsequent year.

2.2.4 Workers' Remittances

Pakistan is one of the top countries with receiving remittance from Middle East as well as American and European states. People from Pakistan moves the mentioned countries for the sack of employment and increase in income, therefore, the facilitation and provision of appropriate mechanism for migrant has always remained the focus of government to get success and gain popularity.

During the span of 16 years, for example, 1989-2005, the average remittance send by migrants to Pakistan were 3.15 % of the total GDP. With reference to military government it

was 3.21 % while during democratic regimes it remained 3.13 % which indicates that military government remained more successful in providing migrants with better opportunities.

2.2.5 Foreign Exchange Reserves

Robust foreign exchange reserves position reduced vulnerability of the exchange rate and provided some stability to country's currency value. However, in the domestic front, economic growth rate remained stagnant until 2003 despite structural adjustment mainly due to neglect of overall investment especially in the social sector, infrastructure and human development.

2.2.6 Education

During 16 years i.e. 1989-2005, the average growth rate of Investment in education was 2.18 % of the total GDP. With regard to comparing democratic and military regime, it remained 2.28 % in democratic governments while 2.0 % during military governments. Thus, the investment of democratic government in education is slightly ahead of military governments. However, it is evident and important to highlight that educational sector was ignored by both type of regimes. Further, the bare minimum 2.10 in 1991-92, and the 2.50 is the greatest in 1996- 97. The minimum and maximum of military rulers were 1.60 and 2.50 in 2000-01, and 2004-05 respectively.

2.2.7 Health

In the health sector the average growth rate of Investment during the 17 years of study (1989-2005) was .7118%. It was 0.74 during the era and 0.67% during, the military era. It shows that there is no significant statistical difference between the two eras.

2.2.8 Poverty

During the span of 16 years i.e. 1989-2005, the average growth of poverty in Pakistan remained 30.13 per cent. However, a statistical difference is evident in both regimes. For example, the average growth was 31.7% in military regime while 29% during the democratic era. Thus, during the mentioned span military regime has performed better while considering

economic growth as compared to democratic governments. It is also important to mention that the definition and interpretation of poverty varies across countries. In this regard, according to government of Pakistan defines poverty in its own terms whereby the benchmark of rupee value of Rs. 25 a day or Rs. 748 a month enough to afford 2,350 calories a day. Therefore, a person who earns below 25 rupees per day or 748 rupees per month has been defined as absolute poor. Many economists guess that in order to make an impact on poverty, GDP growth rate should be sustained at least 6%. In order for Pakistan to have that kind of rate, during the next 6 years, GDP would have to average at least 7.2% (Economic Survey of Pakistan, 2005).

CHAPTER 3

LITERATURE REVIEW

3.1 Introduction

According to the existing literature on comparative analysis of peoples' perception about the democratic and military regimes, a majority of the researchers believe that there are two dominant factors, i.e. intrinsic factors (regime works on certain basic ideological principles) and instrumental factors “(means to improve a material living standard)” (Michael & Bratton, 2001). Intrinsic factors such as equality, freedom of expression, liberty and representation of opinions are the key components around which processes of democracy take place. On the other hand the military regime does not focus on fundamental rights; but mainly focuses on the instrumental factors. Both of these factors provide strong support for a form of government, such as people in Africa strongly support democratic regime even the economic performance of the elected government is very weak in Africa, while minority of the people support for alternative regime due to economic benefits (Diamond, 1999). In Pakistan regularly changing government is one of the core issues and/or problems. In the sixty years of its history the government of Pakistan regularly shifting between democratic and military regime, the public of Pakistan welcome both form of government (Kamran, 2008). Public Support is important for the consolidation of government (Michael & Bratton, 2001). Political performance is the essence of political support but economic development is the assessment for the support of government. (Rose et al, 1998).

This study aims to find whether it is economic performance that molds the perception of the people in Pakistan toward political support or is it the basic political rights that shape the perceptions of the people.

3.2 Basic Ideology and Principles of Democracy (Intrinsic factors)

Fundamental freedom and fundamental rights provided to the people of the state is one of the basics in democracy. It is a type of government which enables people to exercise their liberties, express themselves, and the freedom to exercise religious and cultural activities. The main reason of the ability of democratic governments in providing people with such freedom is the process of formation of democratic government, e.g. the elections. Election or the electoral process enables the people to participate and to be involved in the process of forming the government. As a result, they expect the government to allow them with liberties. Rule of law is another notable aspect while considering the democratic government. Democracy is a type of government which believes in maintaining certain standards for citizens of the state and in equal manner. Each and every citizen is bound to obey certain rules and regulations which are for the purpose of protecting their own rights. Democratic governments are keen to distribute powers rather than accumulating it into few hands or offices. The basic reason and purpose behind the distribution of powers is to achieve a true sense of the representation of the people. The parliament then is the source of distribution of power which is one of the preeminent components of democratic governments. The parliament is composed of the ruling and the opposition parties which representing the whole of the population of the state. It is important to discuss that public opinion is key to democracy and the parliament is a source to represent the public while making decision and implementing policies (Kamran, 2008). Thus, the discussion supports the view that democracy provides the public with equal representation through its principle including right to vote, freedom of expression, liberty, distribution powers etc.

Considering democracy in Pakistan, it is evident that it has never flourished in the country. There are few shortcomings of democratic regimes in Pakistan which led to constant changes in the political structure of the country.

3.3 Is popular support value instrumentally or intrinsically?

Democratic and undemocratic governments are two different forms of government, but one thing is common in both systems of governments. They need popular support (voluntarily or involuntarily) to maintain their authority (Rose, R., Mishler, W., & Munro, N. 2011). The popular support for governmental system varies from country to country based on the performance of the governments. The questions arise here, Is it instrumental factors (economic performance of the government), or is it intrinsic factors (certain basic ideological principle), that make the perception of the people to support a form of government? Many theorists note that the public consider material welfare improvement (instrumental factors) observed in government tenure as a major reason for supporting it (Easton, 1975). The economic and material performance of the governments is associated with many socio-economic factors and challenges in managing the needs, demands and expectations of the public. Kitschelt (1932) asserts the public's perception about the government depends on the economic performance of the governments. It is very important for government to achieve the end for which it is instituted. The argument is very simple; if people feel that the government can serve them in terms of economic improvement they will support it (Thompson, D. F. 2015). An evidence for the mentioned argument has been found from the findings of many studies such as the studies of Kotzian, P. (2011), He added to the argument that electoral systems, marketization and political factors also influence public response and perception of supporting the governments. The study of Mattes and Bratton (2001) is also in line with the above mentioned studies and adds to the argument that support for the government is always performance driven whereby the economic performance and the

performance in securing the political rights of citizens determines the popular support for political regime.

On the other hand, many researchers and scientist are of the views that, there are some specific reasons for the popularity of democracy among the public which are independent of the socio-economic and material benefits (instrumental factors). For example, principles of democracy (intrinsic factors) are the main reasons which compel people to like it. Democracy is based on certain basic principles whereby rule of law is one of such basic principles. Rule of law is a democratic aspect which ensures the participation of each and every individual in political activities. In a sense the rule of law is the basic requirement of freedom and participation which is the right to a free blossoming of individual personality. Rule of law is the actual power of the state which is also linked with laws of the country and the principles to rule which is important in a sense that it can provide individuals with freedom and liberty without police and forced implementations. One of the prime qualities and characteristics of democracy is equality i.e. equality before the law despite belonging to any social class, race, ethnicity or gender. There is respect for everyone which is ensured through the constitution and rule of law. In democratic systems, the state is responsible for providing the public with equal rights such as shelter, education, health care etc. Public opinion also serve as a basic principle of democracy and the literature shows that the public opts for democracy because their opinion has a place in it (Becker and Raveloson, 2008).

Tolerance is one of the preeminent principles of democracy which embed certain other values as well. Given the fact that democracy constitutes a conviction, its direction concerns fundamental values that help human beings to apply democratic transformations and to try to live this democracy. Those fundamental values, among others: justice, equality, solidarity, tolerance, pluralism, the taking into account of the minorities, non-violence,

dialogue and negotiations, free community life. Democracy then upholds the interests of the minorities in the framework of the adoption of majority decisions. Tolerance, capacity and good frame of mind for dialogue, discussions, non-violence, and such unique qualities make the democratic government popular among the public and polices as well (Becker and Raveloson, 2008).

The discussion thus enumerates that the economic performance (instrumental factors) of governments is somehow the reason for the popular support which is one of the core factors in formation of public opinion and perception. But, the basic ideological principles (intrinsic factors) are also a key to public opinion and perception about the governments.

3.4 What is military regime/dictatorship)?

It is a type of rule where the highest ranked officer, for example, the army chief rules a country. The head of state is the senior military commander or general. Lower-ranking generals form the governing board. Further, in such type of rule, political parties in the state exists, however, the position remain considerably weak (Przeworski, 1991).

3.5 performance of military regime in Pakistan (instrumental factors)

Pakistan army or military is one the dominant contributing organization while considering socio-economic development in the country. It is evident that Pakistan's military is on front line when it comes to contribute to industrial, infrastructural, educational and health care development. For instance, Hetland argues that Pakistan's military is one the main contributors to developmental process in the country. In this regard, development aspects such as building and enhancing infrastructure level including roads, airports, electricity system, provision of services including health and educational services are also the key focus of Pakistan's army (Hetland, 2013).

Since the independence of Pakistan and establishment of Pakistan's army as a national institution, the army has contributed significantly to economic development in the country. There are many evidences which enumerates that Pakistan's military have intentions to bring industrial and economic prosperity in the country. For instance, on the official site of Pakistan's army it has been stated that army is devoted towards infrastructural development in the country. In this context, a detail of various military organization have been mentioned which are working to build roads, electric system etc. among such organization the most notable are; first, National Logistics Cell which comprises a national system of providing relief at the time disaster. This organization has certain special equipment's, machinery and vehicles which are helpful at the time providing relief at the time of disaster as well as helps in the construction. Second, Frontier Work Organization is a military organization which works in the field infrastructural development including building roads, bridges, and canals. One of the well-known highways in world named as Kora Krum Highway is also constructed by the mentioned organization. The highway links Pakistan with China and is significant to import export between Pakistan and China. The organization also works in the field of energy sector and has built so far many dams including Mangla dam. Third, Fuji foundation is important to many developmental aspects in the country, for example, this organization has important contributions to the national cause in the fields of industry, social development, employment opportunities and enhancing the national exchequer by paying considerable taxes. Fourth, Army Welfare Trust is a military organization in Pakistan which works in field of providing public with relief activities as well as contributes significantly to health sector. Army also runs several organizations which contribute to industrial development in the country. The Pakistan Armed Forces have established several organizations for managing industrial and commercial enterprises. These organizations provide employment for ex-servicemen, besides creating job opportunities for others. The notable industrial

organizations run by Pakistan Army Welfare Sugar Mill situated in Badin; Army Welfare Cement Plant situated in Nizampur; Askari Cement Factory situated in Wah; Army Welfare Woolen Mills; Army Welfare Pharmaceutical Project; and, Mobil Askari Lubricants Limited. Army is involved in numerous financial enterprises as well, for instance, the known of such financial enterprises are Askari Commercial Bank Limited, Askari Leasing Limited, Army Welfare Trust Housing Schemes. Askari Bank Bank Limited was also awarded with best domestic bank in Pakistan. The award was given in 1994 by Euro money Magazine and by Asia Money Magazine in 1996. Army Welfare Trust Housing Schemes is one of the leading welfare housing schemes in Pakistan which already has started many housing schemes in Lahore, Peshawar and Islamabad. Pakistan army is contributing significantly to social sector, and is known as one of the leading national institutions while discussing provision of health, education, and so many other facilities to public. For example, with reference to medical care since 1950 about 28 million patients are provided with treatment by medical organizations of Pakistan's army. Currently there are 12 active hospitals supported and operated by Pakistan's army. These hospitals comprises of 1479 beds for severe ill persons. There are 24 health centers run by Pakistan army and 41 mobile dispensaries and 24 static dispensaries along with 2 artificial limb centers. In addition to it, army is active in providing young generation with skill and technical education. For this purpose army built many technical training centers which are 75 in number and spread throughout the country. At higher educational level, universities such as National Defense University and National University of Science and Technology (NUST) are the well reputed national university educating the young generation which are administrated by Pakistan's army (Pakistan Army Web Portal, 2016).

Recently army has enormously contributed to one the ignored provinces of Pakistan that is Baluchistan. Baluchistan ranks very low on human rights profile, educational profile,

infrastructural profile, health and related services etc. In this regard, Pakistan army has established many educational institutions in Baluchistan primarily including Army Institute of Mineralogy (AIM) situated in Quetta; Army Public School, situated in Loralai; Baluchistan Institute of Marine Sciences (BIMS); Fuji Foundation Vocational Training Centre; FC Public School which have many branches situated in Bolan, Chaman, DeraBugti, FazalChak, Loralai; Chamalang Beneficiary Education Program (CBEP); Gwadar Institute of Technology (GIT); Military College Sui (MCS); and, Quetta Institute of Medical Sciences (QIMS) etc. With regard to provision of health services in Baluchistan, Pakistan Army has established many hospitals named as Combined Military Hospital (CMH) which is situated in Quetta; Fuji Foundation Medical Centre; 50-bed Hospital in Sui etc. Recently, Pakistan army has remained involved in many infrastructural projects in Baluchistan as well. These projects includes 653-km Makran Coastal Highway (N-10) from Karachi to Gwadar; 180 meter long Lakpass Tunnel 27 km from Quetta on N-25 National Highway with approach road of 5.3 km; New Gwadar International Airport Package-A Site Protection Works -18 KMs; 448-km Nag-Panjgur-Hoshab Road Project and so many other projects. In addition, Pakistan army also works in providing public with facilities compulsory for daily life. Among facilities, army is actives in providing public with water, sanitation and irrigation projects for agriculture. For instance, Augmentation of Water Sanitation Scheme (WSS), Kohlu Town; Water Sanitation Scheme (WSS) introduced in Lasezai; Rehabilitation of Water Sanitation Scheme, Malikzai, Kohlu; and, Water Sanitation Scheme, Sahib Khan are the prominent projects introduced and carried out by Pakistan military. In Baluchistan, Pakistan's army is also interested in providing sports facilities whereby Garrison Sports Complex, Quetta is one of the prime examples of development of sports sector (The Pakistani Nationalist, 2013; Xeric, 2013).

3.6 Military Intervention in Democratic Government, its Causes and Consequences: a Case of Pakistan

3.6.1 Causes

The constant direct as well as indirect interventions by military in the civil governments even did not allow the civil government to work in their own way. In this regard, it evident that military intervened in order to direct the civil government's decision and policy in their favor. However, it is also important to mention that military regimes at many points in time gain popularity among the public of Pakistan (Khan, 2012).

There are many reasons for supporting the military in Pakistan. The slogan of national security is one of them. Whenever a situation comes where security issues rise, the military come to the front and achieves popularity among the public. Administrative vacuums are present while democratic leaders are often unable to fill such vacuums providing an opportunity to military to gain popularity. Hard work and faster doing of things due to proper mechanism and strict rules are some characteristics related to the military whereby working of military inspires the public in various situations i.e. providing relief during flooding, earth quack which is one of the sources of gaining popularity among the public (Daily Dawn, 2015; Kamran, 2008).

Matanock and Garcia-Sanchez (2014) enumerates that social support exists for military regimes. The reason for support of military regime varies according to a situation. In some situation when there is need for survival, support exists for military leaders. Further, studies in Pakistan suggest that non-response of democratic government helps the situation where people support military regimes. Certain other factors i.e. trust and involvements in parliamentary groups are sources of public support of military.

According to another opinion poll, conducted by the Pakistan Legislative Strengthening Consortium (PLSC), in Pakistan 45 per cent of the people believe and perceive

that political parties are important and necessary for democracy; however, 62 per cent think and perceive that the parties primarily serve their own interests. Only 13 per cent of respondents were of the opinion that political parties do serve the public interest. These figures show that the political parties have to put their house in order to gain wider acceptance and reclaim their lost ground (Munir, 2015).

Keeping in view the socio-political structure of Pakistan, it assumed that Pakistan's military and civil government are inter-connected, and considers Pakistan's military is termed as an institution which contributes to the state in its own capacity and manner. The political history of Pakistan has been associated with dictatorships such as from self-declared Field Marshall, General Ayub Khan to the so called Chief Executive, General Pervez Musharraf. The total time period of military rule in Pakistan is more than 30 years. Therefore, considering such a long period of military rule, the military has left a significant and deep impact on mentality of the public and masses. For instance, the military or army has developed an image of hope for the people, whenever something goes wrong during a civil or democratic government. Therefore, a general perception about democratic government has been developed among the public that democratic or civil governments are unable to work properly, and the intervention and support of army is necessary for democratic government in governmental affairs. This is why most of the people consider the army Chief as the most dominant personality in Pakistan rather than the President or Prime Minister who is the head of the state. Besides, another reason that people perceive that military support and intervention are necessary for democratic government in Pakistan lies in the fact that the public have lost faith in the democratic parties, politicians and bureaucrats as a result of their unfulfilled promises. During election campaigns, communication with public and voting public and masses are promised to be ready for socio-economic development, however, it has

never happened while on the other hand military regimes have some level of success in facilitating the public, bringing education as well as industrial development in the country. the Democratic governments, despite their promises made to prior to election, become self-interested after the election and a new way of corruption starts. Self-serving officials in the civil and democratic governments are no longer ready to listen to the needs of the public, and so far it is evident that the officials are not worried about accountability, and social justice due to the fact they are first involved in weakening the agencies responsible for accountability (Sana, 2010). The military's involvement in Pakistan's politics is also attributed to its self-perception that Pakistan's military have the highest capability to save the state from any sort of external threats and people have a certain amount of belief over this perception. Therefore, it also makes the military upfront whenever it is about the national interest. These arguments of the military are also supported and backed by Pakistan's military institutional culture, for instance, the military's institutional norms, beliefs, and values are extremely useful that the efficiency and capabilities of Pakistan's military are applauded globally. Another important reason of justifying military intervention in Pakistan's politics is the continuous tension between Pakistan and India. In this connection, the military is always welcome to assist the democratic or civil government in devising the foreign policy. In many cases, military officials are encouraged to take decisions instead of the democratic government because people believe in army's capabilities. Thus, the army or military has been labeled as a guardian of the state, and is allowed to have formal as well as informal interventions in democratic governments either for support, assistance, efficacy, and solution of ethnic and governance problems or self-interests (Shah, 2014).

3.6.2 Consequences

Literature also reveals that formal and informal intervention of military in democratic government is linked with weakening of rule of law and denial of equality. Democratic

governments in many cases have not been given a fair chance to represent themselves either to frequent intervention, less time or even taking over of the government by military. In this regard, it is important to mention that the military has actively damaged democratic institutions and politics, co-opting and controlling different civilian actors through a combination of coercive and non-coercive measures (Sana, 2010; Shah, 2014).

The discussion in the whole chapter indicates that, first, democracy is one of the state running designs based on numerous ideological principle including equality, equal representation, liberty and freedom of expression, tolerance etc. Pakistan being a democratic state has never experienced continuation of democracy due to constant military interventions. Secondly, there are various causes and consequences of constant military intervention in democratic government including beneficial as well as harmful consequences. Third, both of regimes i.e. democratic and military regimes have performed differently in providing public with rights including educational, health related and economic rights.

CHAPTER FOUR

METHODOLOGY

4.1 Research Design

The study follows a descriptive-coreational and quantitative research design. It employs a sample survey approach using a structured interview schedule.

4.2 Study area and selection of respondents

The survey respondents were selected following a multi-stage, stratified and non-probability sampling method. First, the sample size was set at 384, with a sampling error of 5%, the sample size was distributed proportionately among the three districts (see Table 3.1). The sampled three Districts are the heavily populated Districts of Malakand Division, KPK, Pakistan. Most of the educational institution i.e. University of Malakand, Abdul Wali Khan University, University of Swat are situated in these districts. Further, District Malakand is hub of Malakand division where majority of politicians, army officers and government offices are situated. Therefore, these districts were purposively selected by the researcher in order to have ease in access to the relevant respondents. Keeping in view the title, purpose and objectives of the study the researcher choose politicians as they are involved in politics, have keen observation on political structure, and are exposed to changes in the political structure; military officials have their own perception about democratic and military regimes, and they can better answer to the question that why military official take over the control of the state or intervene in the political structure; professors understand the logics, changing scenarios in the country, and studies about the changes in governments while students thinks about their future, and understands the changing political conditions. The sample size is determined the sampling method provided by Uma Sekaran (2005).

These selected population sectors, preferred and sampled for the current study due to the fact that they may respond and understand the basic philosophy of the study and the reasons of the collection of information. Further, the mentioned sector of population have basic education, they understand political structure, the economic structure, governmental policies, they watch news and read newspapers, and therefore have interest in politics and develop perception regarding governments.

Table 4.1: Sample Design

Total population	Targeted population	Sample size	Method of sampling
District Malakand, (500,000)	Thana (100,000)	384 (96 from each strata of politicians, professors, retired army, students)	Stratified and purposive (mix method sampling)
District lower Dir. (1,500,000)	Chakdara (200,000)		
District Swat (2,000,000)	Mingora (200,000)		

Source: Made by a

4.3 Data gathering

A structured questionnaire was utilized as a tool for data collection. Further, the questionnaire contained questions regarding socio-demographic characteristics of respondents while the comparison of democratic and military regimes a three level scale have been devised i.e. judging respondent's perceptions by average, poor and excellent categories. Rest of the questions was asked by replying to an option through yes or no. The questionnaire contained four portions. The first portion (section-A) had 11 questions in total and was about the socio-demographic information regarding respondents such as age, gender, income level, access to health facilities etc. The second portion (Section-B) contained 9 statements about first research question "what are the attitudes of people towards regularly changing government and how do people perceive the impact of changing government?" and was specifically about judging and knowing respondents' perceptions about constantly changing government in Pakistan. Further, regarding the second research question that is "How do people look at military interventions? Do they see them as having positive or negative

consequences for the country?” is (SECTION-C), that is designed to know about people perception regarding military interventions and its consequences. These are design to know the intrinsic value of the support.

Section-D of the questionnaire is designed to know about the instrumental aspects of military and democratic government and is in accordance to the third research question. It contained question number 15 which was about rating the performance of military and democratic government in educational sector and had 6 statements. Question no.16 about rating the performance of military and democratic government in health sector and had 5 statements. Question no.17 about rating the performance of military and democratic government in economic sector and had 5 statements.

Section-A contained socio-demographic questions, where simple options e.g. a, b, c were given against each category of opinion. Section-B and Section-C contained dichotomous questions where respondents answered yes or no against each category of opinion. Section-D contained rating scale questions where three level scale was adopted by the researcher to rate the performance of military and democratic regimes. The scale was poor, average and excellent.

The questions were in English as the respondents were university students, army personnel, politicians and university teachers/lecturers or professors. Therefore, the respondents were able to understand basic and simple English.

The field work was done during the April, 2016 and July 2016. The researcher requested his brothers and former colleagues to provide assistance in collection of information. 7 colleagues agreed to provide assistance to the researcher. Following are the details of the friends and colleagues

S. No	Name	Education/Designation/profession/	District
1	Mr. A.J	B.S (4-YEAR in Sociology, Bachelor of education/Master in Education. works as a primary school teacher.	Malakand
2	Mr. N.K	B.S (4-YEAR in Sociology), M. Phil in Sociology. Lecturer in Sociology, University of Malakand, KP, Pakistan.	Dir Lower
3	Mr. M.I	B.S (4-YEAR in Mathematics), M. Phil in progress.	Swat
4	Mr. T.U	B.S (4-YEAR in Sociology), M. Phil in Sociology.	Malakand
5	Mr. S.A	Master in Islamyat. Ex-Military officer	Malakand
6	Mr. M.U	B.A (English). Working as a captain in Pakistan Army	Dir Lower
7	Mr. S.N	Political activist	Dir Lower

The questionnaires were distributed by friends and peers. The friends and colleagues were guided by Mr. N.K. He distributed and collected the questionnaires from lecturers and professors in University of Malakand, Mr. M.I distributed and collected the questionnaires from lecturers and professors in University of Swat, Mr. A.J distributed and collected questionnaires from politicians and some army personnel in Thana District Malakand. The distribution of questionnaire and getting quick response from teachers and students was not difficult because they were easily accessible in colleges and universities, and were able to understand the contents and purpose of the data. Collecting the data from military officials was a challenge because of security issues, while the contents of questionnaire were also difficult for them. However my brothers S.A and A.J explained the purpose of the study and the contents of questionnaire, After the military officers were convinced, it was easy to collect data in Malakand as well as in lower Dir and Swat district because the military official in Lower Dir and Swat responded quickly after inquiring from Malakand head quarter and

getting its permission. The issue of collecting data from politician was limited accessibility, because face to face meeting with politician was difficult and time consuming, as it was difficult to find them in groups. It took almost two to three months to collect data from politicians. However they did not have any security issue to fill out the questionnaire.

Response from the students and teachers were received within two weeks. Majority of the questionnaires were collected back within three to four weeks. However, some teachers and army personnel took a month while returning the questionnaire. While 11 respondents were not responding at all, therefore after two to three month 373 questionnaires were collected and were analyzed.

4.4 Data Analyses

Data were coded and analyzed using SPSS statistical software. Summary statistics were obtained and tests of association (Multiple regressions test) were applied.

CHAPTER FIVE

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

5.1 Respondents' Profile and Background Characteristics

Of the 373 respondents, 70 are male and 30% are female. Thirty-one percent belonged to the age-group 31-42 years old, 24 percent were in the age category 43-54 years old, while the rest were 18-30 years (24%) or 55 years and above (17%; see Table 5.1). Majority (29 percent) of the respondents in the age-groups of 43-54 and 55 and above were males.

Table 5.1 Respondents' Age and Gender

Gender	Age				Total	
	18-30	31-42	43-54	55-above	n	%
Female	43	57	11	0	111	(30%)
Male	48	58	93	63	262	(70%)
Total	91	115	104	63	373	
Percent	24%	31%	24%	17%	100%	

Ninety (90) percent of the female respondents were in the age range of 18-to-42 years, while 60 percent of the males were 43 years old and above.

5.1.2 Educational Level and Voting Eligibility of the Respondents

Educational level is an important source of variation in response, attitude and perception towards different social processes. Well-educated people have a better understanding of different political processes which may lead to variations in response, attitude and perception (Kiran et al. 2015). Further, voting eligibility is a condition whereby an individual is allowed to cast his/her vote. Voting eligibility can determine one's level of

interest and understanding of political processes. Table 5.2 shows the respondents' educational level and voting eligibility.

Table 5.2 Educational level and Voting eligibility of the Respondents

Educational level	Voting eligibility		Total
	Yes	No	n %
No formal education	6	0	6 (2%)
Basic education	35	0	35 (9%)
Secondary education	73	0	73 (20%)
Intermediate	110	0	110 (29%)
College graduate	119	12	131 (35%)
Master	10	8	18 (5%)
Doctorate			
Total	353 (95%)	20 (5%)	373

As shown in Table 5.2 respondents have a relatively high level of education. Sixty-nine percent have either a college (29 percent), a master's (35 percent), or a doctorate (5 percent) degree. As for voting eligibility, 95 percent are eligible to vote. Interestingly, all the respondents who reported not being eligible voters were those who had at least a college degree.

Income level and housing are important socio-economic indicators which may be associated with changes in perceptions, attitudes and responses towards many important phenomena (Matthews, C.E. 2008)

Table 5.3: Income level and Housing of the Respondents

Income Level in PRs (PRs= Pakistani rupee)	Housing			Total N %
	personal House	Government House	On rent	
No Income	60	0	0	60 (16%)
01-10,000	7	7	0	14 (4%)
10,001-20,000	5	14	5	24 (6%)
20,001-30,000	39	0	3	42 (11%)
30,001-40,000	141	17	0	158 (42%)
40,001-above	0	36	39	75 (20%)
Total	252 (68%)	74 (20%)	47(13%)	373

One Pakistan rupee = .0096 US\$ as of May 12, 2017.

Table 5.3 shows that the sample included respondents with different income levels, although 60 percent were having no income however they were residing in personal houses did not provide any income information. Forty-two (42) percent had incomes of 40,000 rupee and above, while 16 percent reported no income at all. As for housing, 68 percent reported owning their own home, 21 percent said they were living in a government house, while 13 percent were renting. Majority (89 percent) of those with incomes of at least 40,001 rupee owned their homes.

5.2 Interest of the respondents in politics

Level of interest of an individual in politics is an important indicator for having knowledge and understanding about political structure, political changes, and certain other aspects related to politics (Dewey, J. Rogers, M. L. 2012) With reference to the current study, the political interest of the respondents is an eminent indicator for response and perception reading the democratic and military government. For details of the level of the interest of respondents see the table 5.4:

Level of interest	Frequency	Percent
Not at all	83	22%
To some extent	116	31%
To greater extent	174	47%
Total	373	100.0

A less number such as 83 (22%) of the respondents were not interest in politics at all. While 116 (31%) respondents were interest in politics up to some extent while majority that is 174 (47%) respondents interested in politics up to greater extent.

5.3 Access to health services

Health refers to one's state of physical, mental and social well-being (WHO, 2010). An individual's response, attitude and perception can vary due to access to health facilities and level of satisfaction from a particular regime. The table 5.5 contains information regarding access to health facilities:

Table 5.5 Access to health services

	Frequency	Percent
Very limited	44	12%
Limited	128	34%
Reasonable	149	40%
Proper access	52	14%
Total	373	100.0

The above tabular information enumerates that 44 (12%) of the respondents had a very limited access to health facilities. 128 (34%) respondents had a limited access to services. One hundred and forty nine 149 (40%) respondents had a reasonable access to

health facilities while 52 (14%) respondents were having access to advance and proper health facilities.

5.4 Perceptions of the respondents regarding constant changes

Table 5.6: Perception of Respondents regarding Constant Changes in Government

S. No	Q.Cd	Statements	Yes	No
1	C1	You think that constant change in government is a necessary process	121(32%)	252(68%)
2	C2	You think that constant changing do not allow government to make policy and strategy according to scenario	233(62%)	140(37%)
3	C3	You think that constant change in government can provide chance to more parties to represent themselves	255 (68%)	118 (32%)
4	C4	You think that constantly changing government make the state machinery unable to make strategy to facilitate the public	257 (69%)	116 (31%)
5	C5	You think that constant changing do not provide government sufficient time to understand the situation	236 (63%)	137 (37%)
6	C6	You think that fear of constant change in government compels the ruling party/parties make their performance better	236 (63%)	137(37%)
7	C7	You think that constant changing do not allow government to implement policies after devising it	239 (64%)	134 (36%)
8	C8	You think that constant change in government provide less duration to corrupt rulers	257(69%)	116(31%)
9	C9	You think that constantly changing government brings socio-political instability	255 (68%)	118 (32%)

Table 5.6 illustrates the perception of respondents toward the constantly changing government in Pakistan and its consequences. In this context, respondents were asked that, is the constant change in government is a necessary process? Majority of the respondents 252 (68%) replied “no” while 121 (32%) respondents replied with “yes”. Two hundred and thirty three 233 (62%) respondents said that constant changing do not allow government to make policy and strategy according to scenario while 140 (37%) said no. increased representation of parties in constantly changing government is an important aspect whereby 255 (68%) respondents were of the opinion that yes constantly changing governments allows more parties to represent themselves while 118 (32%) respondents replied with no. Two hundred

and fifty seven 257 (69%) respondents said that yes constantly changing government make the state machinery unable to make strategy to facilitate the public while 116 (31%) respondents opposed the statement by replying with no. Further, 236 (63%) agreed by replying with yes that constant changing do not provide government sufficient time to understand the situation while 137 (37%) disagreed with argument by opting to reply with no. furthermore 239 (64%) respondents said that yes that constant changing do not allow government to implement policies after devising it while 134 (36%) respondents said no the argument that constant changing do not allow government to implement policies after devising it.

Table 5.7: Perception of Respondents regarding Military Intervention in Democratic Government

S. No	Q.Cd	Statements	Yes	No
1	M1	You think that military intervention in democratic government weakens the rule of law	258 (69%)	115 (31%)
2	M2	You think that military intervention in democratic government disturbs the basic ideology of democracy	247 (66%)	126 (34%)
3	M3	You think that democratic government require military intervention in order to cope with problematic situation	211 (57%)	162 (43%)
4	M4	You think that military intervention do not allow democratic government to create and work in favorable environment	207 (55%)	166 (44%)
5	M5	You think that military intervention is mostly for the purpose of interests	208 (59%)	165 (44%)
6	M6	You think that military have more influential officers who can better deal with a given situation	229 (61%)	144 (39%)
7	M7	You think that military intervention do not allow democratic government to devise prolonged strategies for development	244 (65%)	129 (35%)
8	M8	You think that military intervention threatens the legitimacy of constitution	261 (70%)	112 (30%)
9	M9	You think that military government is more effective due to its strict rules	264 (71%)	109 (29%)
10	M10	You think that military intervention is important to make politicians accountable	206 (55%)	167 (45%)
11	M11	You think that military intervention in civil matters is associated with unstable political scenario in Pakistan	226 (61%)	147 (39%)
12	M12	You think that military intervention is linked with increased control over the state matters	214 (57%)	159 (43%)
13	M13	You think that military intervention do not allow democratic government to devise an effective policy	249 (67%)	124 (33%)

Table 5.7 is about the intervention of military in democratic government along with its consequences. Military intervention in democratic government is associated with weakening of rule of law as supported by 258 (69%) respondents while 115 (31%) respondents opposed the argument by marking the no option. Whereas 247 (66%) respondents were of the opinion that military intervention in democratic government disturbs the basic ideology of democracy while a lesser number of respondents negated the statement by replying with no. Democratic government require military intervention in order to cope with problematic situation which is supported by 211 (57%) of the respondents while 162 (43%) respondents said no to the statement. In addition 207 (55%) respondents were of the

opinion that yes military intervention do not allow democratic government to create and work in favorable environment while 166 (44%) of the respondents disagreed by replying with no. Moreover 208 (56%) respondents viewed that military intervention is mostly for the purpose of interests while 165 (44%) said no to the argument. Military have more influential officers who can better deal with a given situation such as disasters, decisions regarding foreign relations and certain other important matters which is supported by 229 (61%) respondents by replying with yes while 144 (39%) replied with no. Military interventions do not allow democratic government to devise prolonged strategies for development whereby the statement is supported by 244 (65%) while 129 (35%) respondents did not support the statement. And 261 (70%) respondents said that yes military intervention threatens the legitimacy of constitution while 112 (30%) respondents said no to the statement. The military government is more effective due to its strict rules whereby 264 (71%) of the respondents said that yes military government is more effective due to its strict rules whereas 109 (29%) respondents said no. 206 (55%) respondents said yes to the statement that military intervention is important to make politicians accountable. However, 167 (45%) Said “no”. 226 (61%) responds agreed that military intervention in civil matters is associated with unstable political scenario in Pakistan whereas 147 (39%) respondents replied negating. Military intervention is linked with increased control over the state matters which is supported by 214 (58%) of the respondents whereas 159 (43%) respondents, replied with no. 249 (67%) respondents said yes to the statement that military intervention do not allow democratic government to devise an effective policy while 124 (33%) respondents opted for the no option.

Table 5.8: Reasons for popularity of democratic government

S. No	Q.Cd	Statements	Yes	No
1	D1	You think that Pakistan came into being under the ideology of democracy	298 (80%)	75 (20%)
2	D2	You think that military has been seldom unsuccessful in enhancing the educational sector in Pakistan	202 (54%)	171 (46%)
3	D3	You think that democratic governments are more tolerant.	255(68%)	118 (32%)
4	D4	You think that democratic governments are more open for public opinion	266(71%)	107 (29%)
5	D5	You think that military governments are less vulnerable to be failed in providing the state with positive economic directions	133(36%)	240 (64%)
6	D6	You think that democratic politicians are in more interaction with public	270 (72%)	103 (28%)
7	D7	You think that democratic governments provide more space to cultural diversity in Pakistan	270 (72%)	103 (28%)
8	D8	You think that military have more control over the state matters	164 (44%)	209 (56%)
9	D9	You think that democratic governments are flexible providing space to resolve issue under collective consensus	248 (66%)	125 (33%)
10	D10	You think that military governments are more successful to bring foreign investor to the country	165 (44%)	208 (56%)
11	D11	You think that military leaders are less vulnerable to be unsuccessful in dealing with internal conflicts due to their better abilities taking firm decisions	227 (61%)	146 (39%)
12	D12	You think that democratic governments are keen to provide public with freedom of expression, liberty and practices	247 (66%)	126 (34%)

Table 5.8 contains field information on why people favor the democracy or military regime and the key aspects of democratic and military regimes which makes them popular among the public. In this regard, Moreover 298 (80%) said yes to the statement that they favor democracy because Pakistan came into being under the ideology of democracy while a lesser number of respondents that is 75 or (20%) disagreed with the statement. On the hand 202 or (54%) favored the military regime by replying yes to the statement that military has been seldom unsuccessful in enhancing the educational sector in Pakistan, while 171 or (46%) said no to the argument. Whereas 255 or (68%) of the respondents were of the opinion that that democratic governments are more tolerant, However, 118 or (32%) disagreed by replying with no. The statement that democratic governments are more open for public

opinion is supported by 266 (71%) of the respondents, whereas 107 (29%) respondents opted for the no option. On the other hand 133 (36%) respondents said yes to the argument that military governments are less vulnerable to be failed in providing the state with positive economic directions whereas a higher number of respondents such as 240 or (64%) replied with no. Democratic politicians are in more interaction with the public is supported by 270 or (72%) while 103 or (28%) respondents disagreed. The same number of respondents replied yes and no to the statement that democratic governments provide more space to cultural diversity in Pakistan. One hundred and sixty four 164 or (44%) respondents were of the opinion that military have more control over the state matters, while, a higher number of respondents 209 or (56%) disagreed. While 248 or (66%) respondents said yes to the statement that “democratic governments are flexible providing space to resolve issue under collective consensus”, while 125 or (33%) respondents replied with no. “Military leaders are less vulnerable to be unsuccessful in dealing with internal conflicts due to their better abilities taking firm decisions” was supported by 227 or (61%) respondents by whereas 146 (39%) respondents opposed the statement. Two hundred and forty seven 247 or (66%) respondents said yes to the statement that “democratic governments are keen to provide public with freedom of expression, liberty and practices”, while 126 or (34%) respondents said no.

Table 5.9: performance of government in health sector

		Type of government	Democratic Government			Military Government		
S. No.	Q.Cd	Statements	Poor	Average	Excellent	Poor	Average	Excellent
1	H1	Increasing the number of dispensaries and hospital in the area.	117(31%)	187(50%)	69 (18%)	121(32%)	193(58%)	59 (16%)
2	H2	Providing basic health facilities i.e. doctors, nurses, diagnostic and medication facilities in hospitals.	99 (26%)	223(60%)	51 (14%)	118(32%)	164(44%)	91 (24%)
3	H3	Efforts to improve rural health facilities.	154(41%)	161(43%)	58 (15%)	101(27%)	193(52%)	79 (21%)
4	H4	Efforts for improving women's health.	75 (20%)	220(59%)	78 (20%)	137(37%)	190(51%)	46 (12%)
5	H5	Taking initiatives to increase public health awareness.	126(34%)	179(48%)	68 (18%)	135(36%)	134(36%)	104(28%)

Health includes in one of the basic indicators for socio-economic development in any country. Provision of health services is one of the basic rights which a state must provide to its citizens (WHO. 2015). Table 5.9 involves rating the performance of democratic and military regimes in Pakistan in providing health services to the public. Performance is rated through three levels, i.e. poor, average and excellent. Improving the health infrastructure is one of the basics in provision of health services. In this context the respondents were asked to rate the performance in increasing the number of dispensaries and hospital in the area. One hundred and seventeen 117 or (31%) and 121 or (32%) respondents respectively argued that the performance of democratic and military regime is poor in increasing the number of dispensaries and hospital in the area. While 187 or (50%) and 193 or (58%) respondents respectively argued that the performance of democratic and military regime is average in increasing the number of dispensaries and hospital in the area. However, slightly higher number 69 or (18%) respondents rated the performance of democratic government as

excellent as compared to 59 or (16%) respondents who rated the performance of military governments as excellent in increasing the number of dispensaries and hospital in the area. In addition, providing basic health facilities i.e. doctors, nurses, diagnostic and medication facilities in hospitals are also important aspect in health services provision. In this regard, 99 or (26%) respondents rated the performance of democratic government as poor while 118 or (32%) respondents rated the performance of military as poor. Moreover 223 or (60%) respondents rated the performance of democratic government as average while 164 or (44%) respondents rated the performance of military as poor. Whereas 51 or (14%) respondents stated the performance of democratic government is excellent in the mentioned context while a higher number that is 91 or (24%) respondents rated the performance of military as excellent.

About 60-70 percent of Pakistan's population resides in rural areas therefore improving and focusing on rural health is an important aspect of health services provision in the country. In this regard, with reference to efforts to improve rural health facilities, 154 or (41%) and 101 or (27%) respondents respectively argued that the performance of democratic and military government is poor. While 161 or (43%) and 193 or (52%) respondents were of the opinion that the performance of democratic and military governments is average in the mentioned context. Fifty eight 58 or (15%) respondents marked the excellent option for democratic government in improving and focusing on rural health while a higher number 79 or (21%) respondents marked excellent for military government.

Women constitute about 51 percent of Pakistan's population and improvement and provision of health services to women is an integral part of health sector in Pakistan. In this regard, 75 or (20%) and 137 or (37%) respondents respectively rated the performance of democratic and military government as poor. While 220 or (59%) and 190 or (51%)

respondents rated the performance as average. Further, 78 or (21%) respondents stated that performance of democratic government is excellent in improving the health of women while a slightly lower number of respondents 46 or (12%) rated the performance of military as excellent. Whereas 126 or (34%) and 135 or (36%) respondents rated the performance of democratic and military government as poor in taking initiatives to increase public health awareness. One hundred and seventy nine 179 (48%) and 134 (36%) respondents argued that the performance of democratic and military government is average in taking initiatives to increase public health awareness. While 68 (18%) respondents rated the performance of democratic government as excellent, however, a higher number of respondents such as 104 (28%) rated the performance of military as excellent.

Table 5.10: Comparison of Educational Performance of Democratic and Military Government

		Type of government	Democratic Government			Military Government		
S. No	Q.Cd	Statements	Poor	Average	Excellent	poor	Average	Excellent
1	E1	Focus to enhance primary education	108(29%)	183 (49%)	82 (22%)	101(27%)	197(53%)	75 (20%)
2	E2	Effort to enhance intermediate education	98(26%)	211(57%)	64 (17%)	105(28%)	177 (47%)	91 (24%)
3	E3	Efforts to enhance higher level education	107(29%)	195(52%)	71 (19%)	93 (25%)	176 (47%)	104 (28%)
4	E4	Focus and efforts to increase awareness and ratio of female education	131(35%)	166(44%)	76 (20%)	127 (34%)	159 (43%)	87 (23%)
5	E5	Focus and efforts to improve teaching quality in educational institutions at all levels	102(27%)	175(47%)	96 (26%)	118(32%)	151 (40%)	104 (28%)
6	E6	Providing educational facilities i.e. improving physical infrastructure relating to education	104(28%)	194 (52%)	75 (20%)	103(28%)	161 (43%)	109 (29%)

Education is an important instrumental factor which is focused by regimes in order to gain popularity while the public considers efforts of any regime in educational sector when voting a particular candidate or a political party. The above table is regarding the public view

about the performance of democratic and military governments in Pakistan. Various indicators have been mentioned with reference to educational performance along with judging it on three levels i.e. poor, average and excellent.

Performance of governments in providing quality primary education is considered by the public. In this context, regarding democratic government 108 or (29%) respondents said that democratic government performed poorly in primary education sector, and 183 or (49%) respondents stated that democratic government performance was average while 82 or (22%) respondents said that democratic government performed excellent in primary education. In comparison, 101 or (27%) respondents replied that military government performance is poor while 197 or (53 %) said that democratic government performed averagely in primary education. Seventy five 75 or (20%) respondents were of the opinion that the performance of military government is excellent in provision of primary level education.

College or inter level education (11-12th grade education) is an important part of education in Pakistan. Therefore, the above table has compared the performance of democratic government and military government in provision of college or inters level education in the country. In this regard, 98 or (27%) and 105 or (28%) respondents stated that the performance of democratic and military government in provision of college level education is poor. 211 or (57%) respondents opted that the performance of democratic is average in the mentioned context as compare to 177 or (47%) respondents opting for average performance of military government. However, a greater number of respondents 91 or (24%) considered the efforts of military government as excellent as compared to 64 or (17%) respondents considering the efforts of democratic government as excellent. Ninety eight 98 or (26%) respondents were of the opinion that the performance of democratic government in provision of higher education is poor while 105 or (28%) respondents stated that the performance of military government is poor. Whereas 195 or (52%) and 176 or (47%)

respondents consecutively replied that the performance of democratic and military government is average in providing the public with higher education. a greater number 104 or (28%) respondents asserted that the performance of military government is excellent in provision of higher education as compared to lower number 71 or (19%) who considered the performance of democratic government as excellent.

Pakistan's female population is often neglected; Women are discriminated in health, educational as well as employment sector significantly(Rajesh, R. 2010). With reference to the performance of governments in female education, almost similar number 131 or (35%) and 127 or (34%) consecutively stated that the performance of democratic and military government is poor in focusing on female education. Again almost similar numbers of respondents, 166 or (44%) and 159 or (43%) respectively, demonstrated that the performance of democratic and military government is average in focusing female education. Lastly, 76 or (20%) respondents said that the performance of democratic governments is excellent in provision of education to female, while 87 or (23%) respondents said that the performance of military governments is excellent in providing education to female.

Teaching quality in educational institutions is an important indicator for standard of education (Fabrice, H. 2010).In this regard, the efforts of democratic and military governments to improve teaching quality in educational institutions have been focused in the current study. One hundred and two 102 (27%) respondents stated that the performance of democratic government is poor in improving the quality of teaching while 118 (32%) respondents replied that the performance of military government is poor in improving the quality of teaching in educational institutions. A greater number 175 or (47%) respondents were of the opinion that the performance of democratic governments is average in improving the teaching quality while 151 or (40%) respondents said that the performance of military

government is average in the mentioned context. whereas 104 or (28%) and 103 or (28%) respondents replied consecutively that the performance of democratic and military regimes is poor in improving physical infrastructure for education, and 194 or (52%) of the respondents stated that the performance of democratic regime is average in improving physical infrastructure for educational purpose whereas 161 or (43%) mentioned the same argument for military governments. A greater number of respondents such as 109 or (29%) said that military regimes performed excellently in improving physical infrastructure for education as compared to a lesser number of respondents 75 or (20%) who stated that democratic governments performed excellently.

Table 5.11: Comparison of Economic Performance of Democratic and Military Government

S.No	Q.Cd	Type of government	Democratic regime			Military regime		
		Statements	Poor	Average	Excellent	Poor	Average	Excellent
1	F1	Facilitation of migrants working abroad	162 (43%)	159 (43%)	52 (14%)	142(38%)	133 (36%)	98(26%)
2	F2	Facilitating and providing environment for foreign investment in Pakistan	113(30%)	175(47%)	85(23%)	133(36%)	106 (28%)	134 (36%)
3	F3	Providing employment opportunities within the state	149 (40%)	163(44%)	61(16%)	111(30%)	150(40%)	112(30%)
4	F4	Focusing on industrialization growth in the country	178 (48%)	150(40%)	45 (12%)	141(38%)	144(39%)	88(24%)
5	F5	Efforts to improve per capita income	179 (48%)	150 (40%)	44 (12%)	136(36%)	130(35%)	107(29%)
6	F6	Efforts to curb inflation	135(36%)	134(36%)	104(28%)	114(31%)	143(38%)	116(31%)
7	F7	Improvement in physical infrastructure	175(47%)	139(37%)	59(16%)	119(32%)	150 (40%)	104(28%)

Pakistan is one of the developing economies whereby migration to developed countries in order to seek employment is very common (Raza, A. 2008). Saudi Arabia, Dubai, Malaysia, Qatar, United Kingdom, China and United States of America are the

common working destinations for migrants (The Dawn NEWS. 2016). These migrants are contributing to the economy of the country through remittances and the facilitation of these migrants is one of the core concerns of government. Table 5.11 explains the performance of governments in facilitating migrants. In this connection, 162 (43%) respondents stated that the performance of democratic governments is poor in facilitating migrants while a lesser number (142 or 38%) respondents stated that the performance of military government is poor in the mentioned context. 159 (43%) and 133 (36%) respondents respectively argued that the performance of democratic and military government is average while facilitating migrants. A considerably high number 98(26%) respondents said that the performance of military government is excellent in facilitating migrants as compared to 52 (14%) respondents who said that democratic governments performed excellently while facilitating migrants.

Foreign investment is an important developmental indicator for the economy of any countr (OECD. 2002)In this regard, facilitating and providing environment for foreign investment in Pakistan is an eminent factor in analyzing the performance of governments. 113 (30%) respondents were of the opinion that the performance of democratic government is poor while 133 (36%) respondents were of the opinion the performance of military government is poor in facilitating and providing the country with foreign investment. 175 (47%) and 106 (28%) respondent respectively replied that the performance of democratic and military government is average in facilitating and providing opportunities of foreign investment in the country. 85(23%) respondents were of the view that the performance of democratic government is excellent in facilitating foreign invest in the country, however, a higher number that is 134 (36%) respondents said that the performance of military government is excellent in facilitating foreign investment in the country.

Providing employment opportunities within the state is significant to the economic development in the country. It decreases the burden of traveling, enhances developmental indicators and brings prosperity in the country (Collier, P. 2013). The current study also has focused on the performance of regimes in provision of employment opportunities within the country. In this regard, 149 (40%) respondents said that the performance of democratic government is poor while lesser number e.g. 111 (30%) respondents stated the performance of military government is poor. 163 (44%) respondent argued that the performance of democratic government is poor while 150 (40%) respondents argue that the performance of military government is average. 61 (16%) respondents were of the opinion that the performance of democratic government is excellent while a much higher number such as 112 (30%) respondents were of the opinion the performance of military government is excellent in providing employment opportunities within the state.

Industrialization without any doubt is the hallmark of development for any state in current times. The level of industrialization determines the economic position and level of prosperity in a given nation (Yong, L. 2014). In this regard, the table 5.11 has analyzed the performance of government in improving the industrial sector. 178 (48%) respondents were of the view that democratic government performed poorly in industrializing the country, while 141 (38%) respondents stated that military government performed poorly. 150 (40%) respondents were of the view that the democratic government performed averagely in developing the industrial sector of the country, while 144 (39%) respondents mentioned the same argument about the performance of military governments. 45 (12%) of the respondents viewed the performance of democratic government as excellent in developing industrial sector of the country, while a higher number (88 or 24%) respondents argued that military performed excellently.

An effort to improve per capita income is another significant factor in economic development in the country. Higher per person income is associated with increase in ability to avail facilities including health, education and transport facilities (Zimmerman, & Woolf, 2014). In this regard, the collected information regarding the performance of government in improving per capita income indicates that public favors that military governments are more successful in improving per capita income. For example, 179 (48%) respondents said that democratic government performed poorly in improving per capita income while a lesser number of respondents (136 or 36.5) said that military government performed poorly. 150 (40%) and 130 (34.9) respondents respectively argued that democratic and military government performed averagely in the mentioned context. However, a considerable higher number of respondents (107 or 29%) as compared to 44 (12%) respondents for democratic governments replied that military government performed excellently in improving per capita income.

5.5 Influences on people's perceptions

As some studies have suggested, the people's perceptions of the military and the democratic governments may be influenced by their perceptions of how the governments have done in terms of the educational, health, and economic sectors. To test this general hypothesis, the study first measured people's support for the military and democratic regimes based on their replies to selected questions. The study then regressed this variable on the respondent's answers to several statements concerning the respective government's performance in the areas of education, health, and economy. The influence of socio-economic variables such as age, education, income, and access to health was also examined. Two regression models were thus developed, Model 1 for Support for Democratic Regimes, and Model 2 for Support for Military Regimes. These models indicate the relationship of independent variables for predicting the support of democratic and military regime. Rose

(1998) suggested using the regression model because it is a strong statistical tool to predict the variability of the regression equation.

As shown in Table 5.12, a significant regression equation was found ($F(22,350) = 70.918, p < .000$) and the explained variance of the dependent variable is 80.5% for model 1 based on the value of adjusted R square. While regression equation ($F(22,350) = 27.490, p < .000$) explained the variance as 61% model 2 according to the estimated value of adjusted R square. In model 1 the variables for educational performance are entered at step 1, variables of health sector are at step 2, variables of economic factor are kept at 3rd step while social background are at 4th. Democratic support is the dependent variable for Model 1 while support of military regime is the dependent variable for Model 2.

Prediction of support for democracy and military regimes.

	MODEL-1: Support for Democratic Regime				MODEL-2: Support for military regime			
	B	Std. Error	Beta	Sig.	B	Std. Error	Beta	Sig.
Performance in education sector								
E1:Focus to enhance primary education	-.150	1.056	-.023	.887	.176	.590	.070	.766
E2:Effort to enhance intermediate education	-4.173	.967	-.590	.000	.073	.641	.031	.909
E3:Effort to enhance Higher education	-.262	1.118	-.039	.815	.154	.392	.065	.696
E4:Focus to enhance female education	1.038	.818	.164	.205	-.453	.452	-.199	.317
E5:Focus to improve teaching quality	4.211	.632	.665	.000	.314	1.326	.142	.813
E6:physical infrastructure in education sector	-.816	1.063	-.122	.443	.079	.593	.035	.894
Performance in health sector								
H1:Increasing the number of hospital	-.010	.981	-.002	.992	.164	.356	.065	.646
H2:Provision of basic health facilities	-3.672	.821	-.494	.000	-.848	.817	-.370	.300
H3:Effort to improve rural health facilities	-.834	.929	-.128	.370	-.560	.631	-.227	.375
H4:Effort for improving women's health	-.833	.503	-.116	.098	-.406	.326	-.156	.213
H5:Effort to increase health awareness	1.571	.939	.240	.095	-.971	.807	-.453	.230
Performance in economic sector								
F1:Facilitation of migrants working abroad	.434	.788	.066	.582	.523	.478	.243	.275
F2:Effort to increase foreign investment	.217	.914	.034	.813	2.514	.267	1.247	.000
F3:Effort to increase job opportunities	.317	.850	.049	.709	-.168	.534	-.076	.753
F4:Industrialization growth in the country	-.654	1.568	-.097	.677	1.277	.536	.577	.018
F5:Effort to improve per capita income	2.603	1.461	.386	.076	.025	.697	.012	.971
F6:inflation	1.296	1.162	.201	.266	.634	.477	.292	.185
F7:Improve physical infrastructure road etc.	2.143	1.152	.338	.064	-.721	1.164	-.327	.536
Socio-economic Variables								
S1:Age	-.930	.293	-.208	.002	-.946	.153	-.571	.000
S2:Educational level	.313	.167	.076	.062	.254	.083	.167	.002
S3:Income	1.311	.244	.480	.000	-.179	.125	-.177	.153
S4:Access to health	.807	.284	.153	.005	.898	.155	.460	.000
N	373							
R squared	80.5%				61%			

5.5.1 Educational Factors.

The analysis of the data on educational variables shows some interesting results. In Model 1 the variables “focus on primary education” (E1), “efforts to enhance intermediate education” (E2), and “efforts to enhance higher education” (E3) are all negatively correlated with support for democratic regimes, although only E2’s relationship is significant. Moreover, the variable “focus to enhance teaching quality” (E5) is a positive predictor of support for democratic regimes. In Model 2 (support for military regime), although all variables are positively correlated, the relationships are all not significant. In sum, support for democratic regimes (Model 1) is partially influenced by its perceived efforts at improving teaching quality.

5.5.2 Health factors.

None of the health variable is statistically significant in model 2, but a variable provision of basic health facilities is statistically significant at (.000) level in model 1, which negatively influences the support for democracy. Interestingly, all the variables negatively predicted the support for both regimes except facilities of migrant working abroad is positive predictor (Beta=.65) in model 2 and effort to increase public health awareness (B=.240) in model 1, while both are not statistically significant.

5.5.3 Economic factors.

Evaluation of effort to increase foreign investment is a positive predictor (beta=.034) of support for democratic regime as well as positive predictor (Beta=1.247 n.s) for support of military regime, but the variable is significant at (.000) level for support of military regime. This could mean that people are fully satisfied with the performance of military regime and partially satisfied with the performance of democratic regime. We cannot take other economic factors as evidence that regime legitimization in Pakistan rests upon economic performance because only the variable for the effort to increase foreign investment

(Beta=1.247) is significant in the support of military regime, while all other variables of economic factors are insignificant for both regimes legitimization.

5.5.4 Social background factors.

Interestingly, all the variables for social background are significant except the variable for the income level which is negatively affected the model 2 (support for military regime). While, as it was expected the variable of income level positively influence (Beta=.480) the support for democracy at (0.00) significant level, which means that democratic support is highly related with increased income levels. Age is not relevant to the legitimization of both regimes in Pakistan. However, education level and access to health is significant for democratic regime as well as military regime.

5.5.5 Summary

The regression results seem to indicate a mixed picture. Although both models show that the variables taken together account for much of the variation in support for democratic as well as military regimes (R squared value of 81% for model 1 and 62% for model 2), few of the variables significantly account for support for either regime. Support for democratic regimes is significantly higher among respondents with higher incomes. It is also best predicted by its perceived “efforts to enhance teaching quality”, and to a lesser extent by its “efforts to improve per capita income” and perceived “improvements in physical infrastructure”. On the other hand, support for military regimes is best predicted by its perceived performance in the economic arena, i.e., “effort to increase foreign investment” and “industrialization growth in the country”. In both cases, support is higher among people with better education and better access to health. Some variables suggest perplexing results. For instance, the variables perceived “efforts to enhance intermediate education” and “provision of basic health facilities” negatively predict support for democratic regimes.

The regression models partially tested whether support for either democratic or military regime is based on instrumental reasons. To what extent would a government's perceived performance in education, health, and economic matters predict political support? Unfortunately the regression data cannot offer conclusive results. On the one hand, it may be said that support for democratic governments is not clearly and significantly based on its positive performance in the health and economic areas, thus going against the instrumentalist view. However, the significant and positive correlation with "efforts to enhance teaching quality" casts limits to the preceding observation, unless of course this variable is reinterpreted as non-instrumentalist in nature. Moreover, the significant negative correlations between support and one education and one health variable raise doubts about the validity of this initial observation.

On the other hand the regressions seem to provide a stronger basis for the view that support for military regimes is more instrumental. This is borne out by the fact that the only two of 18 perceived performance variable-- "perceived effort to increase foreign investment, and "industrialization growth in the country"--significantly accounted for support for the military regime. This may suggest that support for military regimes is instrumental only insofar as it is perceived to do well at the macro-, national level issue.

One implication from these ambiguous results is that instrumentality needs to be further disaggregated into macro- and micro-level concerns. Conceivably, some sectors such as those in this study may be supportive of military regime if it does clearly well with national issues. Alternatively, other section may support the regime to the extent that it is instrumental in meeting their own immediate local need.

CHAPTER 6

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 SUMMARY

What are the attitudes of people towards regularly changing government and how do people perceive the impact of changing government?

Findings show that people perceive that constant change in government is not necessary as 68% respondents supported the argument due to the fact that 62% respondents were of the opinion that constant change in government does not allow government to make policy and strategy according to scenario. In addition, 69% compare to 32% respondents stated that constant change in government do not allow government to develop strategies and provide government with insufficient time to understand situation respectively. 64% and 68% respondents replied respectively that constant changing do not allow government to implement policies after devising it and brings socio-political instability.

How do people look at military interventions? Do they see them as having positive or negative consequences for the country? It is evident from findings that people negatively perceives military intervention in democratic government. For example, 69% respondents were of the opinion that military intervention in democratic government weakens the rule of law; 66% respondents revealed that military intervention in democratic government disturbs the basic ideology of democracy; and 65% respondents replied that military intervention do not allow democratic government to devise prolonged strategies for development. Moreover, 70% respondents stated that military intervention threatens the legitimacy of constitution while 61% respondent opined that military intervention in civil matters is associated with unstable political scenario in Pakistan. Lastly, 67% respondents viewed that military

intervention do not allow democratic government to devise an effective policy. However, it is important to mention that people also supports military government in some matters, for instance, 57% respondent stated that military intervention is linked with increased control over the state matters while 55% respondents were of the opinion that military intervention is important to make politicians accountable.

How and to what extent do intrinsic and instrumental factors contribute to developing perception towards democratic and military regime? And same studies have indicated intrinsic and instrumental factors (e.g. performance of democratic and military government in health, education and economic sector) are linked with perception of people. In this regard, the findings show that people had mixed responses regarding the performance of governments in health sector for instance 24% of respondents considered the Military Government's performance as excellent in providing basic health resources and facilities as compared to 14% for democratic government. On the other hand, 20% of respondents marked the democratic government's performance as excellent in term of improving women's health, as compared to 12% for the performance of military government.

With reference to the performance of democratic and military government in educational sector, the findings indicate that people perceive the performance of military government as better than that of democratic government. Specifically, 24% of respondents marked the performance of military government as excellent in effort to enhance intermediate education, compared to 17% for democratic government; 28% respondents stated that the military government's efforts to enhance higher level education are excellent, compared to 19% for democratic government. Further, 29% respondents marked the performance of military government as excellent in providing educational facilities, i.e. improving physical infrastructure relating to education as compare to that of 20% for democratic government.

There is also evidence that respondents perceive the performance of military government as better than the performance of democratic government. For instance, 26% respondent marked excellent performance for facilitation of migrants working abroad by military government as compared to that of 14% for democratic government. Thirty-six (36) percent of respondents stated that the performance of military government is excellent in facilitating and providing environment for foreign investment in Pakistan, as compared to 23% for democratic government. Furthermore, respondents rated the military government's performance as excellent in providing employment opportunities within the state and focusing on industrialization growth in the country (24 and 29 percent, respectively), as compared to 12% and 12%, respectively, for the democratic government.

6.2 CONCLUSIONS

People's perceptions towards military and democratic regimes vary in Malakand Division, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. Some sectors of the population positively perceive military regimes, while some favor democratic governments. There are many reasons behind these varying perceptions, for instance, people perceive that democratic government is type of government where people have freedom and rights to claim and Pakistan was made upon democratic ideology. Military intervention damages the democratic ideology, constitutional legitimacy, affects the development of effective policy and its implementation etc. Some population sectors perceive that the military regime is effective in Pakistan as it is important for keeping politicians accountable; military have more influential officials and the fact that military have more capacity to deal with difficult situations.

Factors that affect perceptions (intrinsic and instrumental)

Intrinsic and instrumental factors affect the perception of people regarding democratic and military regimes in Malakand Division, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. Ideological aspects, freedom and rights are the basic intrinsic factors which affect the perception of people in the study area. For example, some sectors favor democratic government on the basis of freedom of opinion, ideology and rights, and do not favor military intervention as it damages the ideological and constitutional legitimacy in the country. Besides, instrumental factors are imperative to development of people's perceptions towards regimes. In this regard, factors such as the educational performance; performance in health sector and performance of regimes in economic sectors affect the perception of people regarding governments.

The results showed that the public perceive constant change in government negatively because it does not allow governments to work in a favorable environment. Constant changes in government do not allow a particular government to understand the situation of the state, its socio-economic and political problems and to devise a policy appropriate to the situation. Frequent regime change also results in socio-political instability in the country. With reference to the causes and consequences of military intervention in democratic government, the public perceive military intervention in democratic government as the result of unstable socio-political scenario in Pakistan and is harmful for the state and democratic government. Military intervention in democratic government weakens the rule of law, disturbs the basic ideology of a democratic state as well as threatens the constitutional legitimacy. The findings also indicate that democratic governments are unable to devise an effective and prolonged policy due to constant intervention by military. However, the findings also show that the military have officials whose intervention is required to deal with problematic situations due to influential officials.

The study found numerous reasons for the popularity of democratic government in Pakistan. These reasons include the belief that Pakistan has been created on the ideology of democracy and so democratic government should exist only in the country. In addition, democratic principles such as the rule of law, freedom of expression and liberty, providing space for cultural diversity in the country, higher level of tolerance, frequent interaction of public office holders with the public, and flexibility were perceived favorably by the respondents. However, people also perceive that the military has the ability to deal with internal conflicts and are more capable to deal with disaster situations and thus favored military governments.

The study found that support for either military or democratic governments depends on which sector or aspect of life is concerned. For example, the results indicate that the public slightly supports more the performance of the military in the educational sector. A slightly higher number of respondents said that the performance of the military is better in the educational sector. In the economic sphere, the performance of military is slightly better as compared to democratic government as perceived by the people. A slightly higher number of respondents ranked the performance of military as excellent in comparison to the democratic government. As far as performance in the health sector is concerned, the results are mixed. In a nutshell, the performance of military governments is slightly perceived better by the public with reference to instrumental factors, i.e. in the provision of health, educational and economic services.

6.3 RECOMMENDATIONS.

The people of Pakistan equally favor both democracy and military regimes especially in tough political situations. It is evident from the history of Pakistan that due to corruption among the political elite, the military was able to take over the government. In such situations common people believe that the military is the ultimate savior of all their problems in the country. However, the other side of the coin is that the institutions become weaker with every passing day and unable to function properly.

Given this ambiguous situation, the following policies are proposed:

- i. Constitutional amendments are necessarily required to bar the military intervention in the political system.
- ii. Political institutions should have the maturity and strength to handle outside pressure and to cope with the threats of military intervention.
- iii. The main institutions like Federal Board of Revenue (FBR), National Accountability Bureau (NAB), and Federal Investigation Agency (FIA) etc. should have autonomy powers and the appointments and transfers should be free from political influence.

Further studies are also recommended. Research can investigate the following issues:

- i. The perception of people among all provinces of the country can vary the result, because of the different culture language and traditions; this study is only conducting in the province of Khyber pakhtunkhwa. But the detail study of all provinces is necessary for the understanding of real situation.
- ii. Evaluation of people from different walk of life is also necessary for instance the perception of illiterate and masses is also important as majority of the people are poor in Pakistan. But that will take much time and resources to interview the

illiterate and masses throughout the country, as they will not be able to fill in questionnaire.

REFERENCES

1. Adejumobi, S. (2000). Africa and the Challenges of Democracy and Good Governance in the 21st Century.
2. Baviskar, S., & Malone, M.F. (2004). What democracy means to citizens-and why it matters.
3. Becker, P., & Raveloson, J. A.A. (2008). What is democracy?. Retrieved from <http://library.fes.de/pdf-files/bueros/madagaskar/05860.pdf>
4. Bratton, M., & Mattes, R. (2001). Support for Democracy in Africa: intrinsic or instrumental? *British Journal of Political Science*, 31(03), 447-474.
5. Bratton, M., & Lewis, P. (2007). The Durability of Political Goods? Evidence from Nigeria's New Democracy
6. Chu. Y.H., Bratton, M., Lagos, M., Shastri, S., & Tessler, M. (2008). Public opinion and democratic legitimacy. *Journal of democracy*, 19(2), 74-87.
7. Coglianesi, C. (1990) Democracy and Its Critics cited in Robert A. Dahl. The Michigan Law Review Association, Vol. 88, No. 6, pp 1662-1667.
8. Collier, P. (2013). Exodus: How migration is changing our world. Oxford University press
9. Demirel, T. (2005). Lessons of military regimes and democracy: the Turkish case in a comparative perspective. *Armed Forces & Society*, 31(2), 245-271.

10. Dewey, J., & Rogers, M.L. (2012). The public and its problem: An essay in political inquiry. Penn state press.
11. Easton, D. (1975). A re-assessment of the concept of political support, British journal of political science, 5(4), 435-457.
12. Fabrice, H. (2010). Learning our lesson review of quality teaching in higher education: Review of quality teaching in higher education (vol. 2010, No. 2) OECD Publishing..
13. Hassan, N. (1999). Democracy and dictatorship in Pakistan. Retrieved from <http://www.sacw.net/aai/gardezi99.html>.
14. Hassan, M. (2011). Causes of Military Intervention in Pakistan: A Revisionist Discourse. *Pakistan Vision*, 12(2).
15. Hetland, A. (2013). Nation-building and identity. *The Nation*. Retrieved from <http://nation.com.pk/columns/25-Oct-2016/continuity-of-the-democratic-process>.
16. Holbert, R.L. & LaMarre, L. H. (2010). The Influence of Late-Night TV Comedy Viewing on Political Talk: A Moderated-Mediation Model,. *The International Journal of Press/Politic*. page 485.
17. Hussain, J. (2016). Continuity of the democratic process. *The Nation*. Retrieved from <http://nation.com.pk/columns/25-Oct-2016/continuity-of-the-democratic-process>.

18. Ibrahim, A. (2009). Guarding the state or protecting the economy? The economic factors of Pakistan's military coups. *Crises states occasional paper, London school of economics*.
19. Baloch, J. A., & Gaho, G. M. (2013). Military Interventions in Pakistan and Its Implications. *The Government-Annual Research Journal of Political Science*. 2(02).
20. Javid, H. (2014). The Army & Democracy: Military Politics in Pakistan cited in shah A. The Daily DAWN. Retrieved from <https://www.dawn.com/news/1146181>.
21. Jenkins, W. C. (2010). An elusive balance: explaining Pakistan's fluctuating civil-military relationship. *Journal of Georgetown University*.
22. Kamran, T (2008). Democracy and Governance in Pakistan. South Asia Partnership-Pakistan. Page 14
23. Khan, Z. (n.d.). Pakistan's Experience with democracy and its Outcomes. *Dehli: Center for the Study of Developing Societies*.
24. Kiran. et al. (2015). Comparative study of educated and uneducated population regarding knowledge, attitude and understanding of prescription: a cross sectional study. *Journal of EJPMR*, 2(6), 207-2010.
25. Kitschelt, Herbert. (1932). "The Formation of Party Systems in East Central Europe." *Politics and Society* 20: 7-50.

26. Klousis, Spiro, McDevitt, Michael & Xu Wu (2005): The Genesis of Civil Awareness: Agenda Setting in Political Socialization, *Journal of Communication* 55(4): 756-774.

27. Kotzian, P. (2011). Public support for liberal democracy. *International Political Science Review*, 32(1), 23-41.

28. Kukreja, V. (1991). Civil-Military Relations in South Asia: Pakistan, Bangladesh and India. *Sage publications*.

29. Matanock, A. M. and Garcia-Sanchez, M. (2014). Controlling Civilians? Examining support for military in Colombia. *Journal of University of California*.

30. Matthews, C. E. (2008). Socio-economic Status, Student Perceptions and College Readiness (Doctoral dissertation, Washington State University).

31. Munir, R. S. (2015). Politics 101: why military cope happens in Pakistan. *The Daily Dawn*. Retrieved from <https://www.dawn.com/news/1196709>.

32. Nasr, V. (2004). Military rule, Islamism and democracy in Pakistan. *The Middle East Journal*, 58(2), 195-209.

33. Nasreen, A. (2014). The Upper Hand on Pakistani Politics: An Analysis of Seasonal Politics, *Virginia review of Asian studies*.

34. OECD. (2002). Foreign direct investment for development; maximizing benefits and minimizing costs. Retrieved from.
<https://www.oecd.org/investment/investmentfordevelopment/1959815.pdf>
35. Pakistan Army Web Portal (2016). Retrieved from *<https://www.pakistanarmy.gov.pk/>*
36. Pakistan Economic Survey (2005-2006). Retrieved from *<http://121.52.153.178:8080/xmlui/handle/123456789/6553?show=full>*
37. Pakistan Economic Survey (2014-15). Retrieved from *www.finance.gov.pk/survey_1415.html*.
38. Przeworski, A. (1991). Democracy and the market: Political and economic reforms in Eastern Europe and Latin America. Cambridge University Press.
39. Rajesh, R (2010). Gender discrimination in education and economic development. *The Journal of income and wealth*.
40. Raza, A. (2008). The effect of remittances on employment in Pakistan. Available at, SSRN: *<https://ssrn.com/abstract=1253162>*. Or *<http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1253162>*.
41. Rizvi, H. A. (1998). Civil-military relations in contemporary Pakistan. *Survival*, 40(2), 96-113.
42. Rizvi, H. A. (2000). The Military & Politics in Pakistan, 1947-1997. *Sang-E-Meel Publication*.

43. Ross, M. (2006). Is democracy good for the poor? *American Journal of Political Science*, 50(4), 860-874.
44. Ross, M. (1998). Support for democratic and its alternative regime in post-communist countries. Retrieved from <http://www.opgavebank.dk/opgaver/83.pdf>.
45. Rose, R., Mishler, W., & Munro, N. (2011). Popular support for an undemocratic regime: the changing view of Russians. Cambridge University Press.
46. Sana, J. (2010). Role of Army in Pakistan government. Retrieved from <https://revivinghope.wordpress.com/2010/04/13/role-of-army-in-pakistan-government/>.
47. Sekaran, U. (2003). Research method for business: A skill building approach, 4th edition, John Wiley & Sons.
48. Selochan, V. & Mar, R. (2013). The MILITARY and DEMOCRACY in the ASIA PACIFIC (p. 197) ANU Press.
49. Sloam, James (2010): Introduction: Youth, Citizenship, and Political Science Education: Questions for the Discipline, *Journal of Political Science Education* 6(4): 325-335.
50. Smith, B. C. (2003). Understanding Third World politics: theories of political change and development. *Indiana University Press*.

51. The Dawn News.(2016). 2m people went abroad for employment in three years, NA told. Retrieved from <https://www.dawn.com/news/1233909>.
52. Thompson, D. F. (2015). John Stuart Mill and representative government. Princeton University Press.
53. WHO. (2015). Health and human rights. Retrieved from <http://www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs323/en/>.
54. Word Web (Def. 1) (n.d). Word Web 8 online. Retrieved July 24, 2016, from <http://www.wordwebonline.com/en/PRINCETONUNIVERSITY>.
55. Young, L. (2014). Inclusive and sustainable industrial development. Retrieved from https://www.unido.org/fileadmin/user_media_upgrade/Who_we_are/Mission/ISID-Brochure-LowRes1_EN.pdf.
56. Yun-han, Bratton, Marta, Shastri, and Tessler. (2008). Public Opinion and Democratic Legitimacy. *Journal of Democracy*. Volume 19.
57. Zahid, M. (n.d.) Dictatorship in Pakistan: A Study of the Zia Era (1977-88). *Pakistan journal of history and culture*, 32(1).
58. Zimmerman, E, & Woolf, S, H. (2014). Understanding the relationship between education and health. Institute of medicine of the national academies.

QUESTIONNAIRE

My name is Abdul Baseer. I am student at Asia Pacific university Japan and I am conducting my research on the topic “Democracy and Military Dictatorship: Perception of the public towards Democracy and Military governments in Pakistan”. This effort to collect information is solely for the purpose of providing an insight to the issue and it is requested to share authentic information. The anonymity of the respondents will be ensured by the researcher.

Section-A

This portion of the questioner is about the socio-demographic characteristics of respondents. Please let me know some basic things to know about you which are important in developing political attitudes and perception. Encircle the appropriate option.

1. Gender
 - a. Male
 - b. Female
2. Age
 - a. 18-30
 - b. 31-42
 - c. 43-54
 - d. 54 and above
3. Educational level
 - a. Illiterate
 - b. School level education
 - c. College level
 - d. Masters
 - e. Higher education
4. Voting eligibility; on the basis of having name in official voter list (Encircle the appropriate option)
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
5. You are living in district
 - c. Swat
 - d. Dir
 - e. Malakanad
6. Occupation
 - a. Military officials
 - b. Politician
 - c. Student
 - d. Teacher

7. Income level (in PKR)
 - a. No income
 - b. 01-10,000
 - c. 10,001-20,000
 - d. 20,001-30,000
 - e. 30,001-40,000
 - f. 40,001 and above
8. The house in which you live is a.....
 - a. personal house
 - b. Government accommodation
 - c. On rent
 - d. Others (please specify).....
9. Interest in politics or state matters
 - a. Not at all
 - b. To some extent
 - c. To greater extent
10. Sources of information of regarding politics (you may check multiple answers)
 - e. Newspapers
 - f. Television
 - g. Discussion with friends, family etc.
11. Access to health care services
 - a. Very limited access (not having access to local health care services)
 - b. Limited (having access to local health care services)
 - c. Reasonable (having access to qualified doctor and ability to avail proper medication)
 - d. Proper access (having access to advance level health care system)

Section-B

This portion of the questionnaire is about the views of respondent regarding the constantly changing government in Pakistan. In this regard, positive as well as negative effects of constantly changing government are mentioned in separate tables. Further, you have to answer against each category of opinion mentioned in the tables.

12. How do you consider the constantly changing government in Pakistan? (Tick yes or no against each statement).

Table no. 01

S. No	Statements	Yes	No
1	You think that constant change in government is a necessary process		
2	You think that constant changing do not allow government to make policy and strategy according to scenario		
3	You think that constant change in government can provide chance to more parties to represent themselves		
4	You think that constantly changing government make the state machinery unable to make strategy to facilitate the public		
5	You think that constant changing do not provide government sufficient time to understand the situation		
6	You think that fear of constant change in government compels the ruling party/parties make their performance better		
7	You think that constant changing do not allow government to implement policies after devising it		
8	You think that constant change in government provide less duration to corrupt rulers		
9	You think that constantly changing government brings socio-political instability		

Section-C

This part of the questionnaire is about the perception regarding military interventions and the reasons that why a democratic or military government is popular among the public. Besides, numerous intrinsic factors i.e. ideological factors and principles of various governments are given in table which make a government popular.

13. How do you perceive military intervention in democratic government?(Tick yes or no against each statement)

Table no. 02

S. No	Statements	Yes	No
1	You think that military intervention in democratic government weakens the rule of law		
2	You think that military intervention in democratic government disturbs the basic ideology of democracy		
3	You think that democratic government require military intervention in order to cope with problematic situation		
4	You think that military intervention do not allow democratic government to create and work in favorable environment		
5	You think that military intervention is mostly for the purpose of interests		
6	You think that military have more influential officers who can better deal with a given situation		
7	You think that military intervention do not allow democratic government to devise prolonged strategies for development		
8	You think that military intervention threatens the legitimacy of constitution		
9	You think that military government is more effective due to its strict rules		
10	You think that military intervention is important to make politicians accountable		
11	You think that military intervention in civil matters is associated with unstable political scenario in Pakistan		
12	You think that military intervention is linked with increased control over the state matters		
13	You think that military intervention do not allow democratic government to devise an effective policy		

14. In your opinion which form of government is more popular in Pakistan and why? (Tick yes or no against each statement)

Table no. 03: Reasons for popularity of democratic government

S. No	Statements	Yes	No
1	You think that Pakistan came into being under the ideology of democracy		
2	You think that military has been seldom unsuccessful in enhancing the educational sector in Pakistan		
3	You think that democratic governments are more tolerant		
4	You think that democratic governments are more open for public opinion		
5	You think that military governments are less vulnerable to be failed in providing the state with positive economic directions/ military governments unable to provide the state with positive economic direction		
6	You think that democratic politicians are in more interaction with public		
7	You think that democratic governments provide more space to cultural diversity in Pakistan		
8	You think that military have more control over the state matters		
9	You think that democratic governments are flexible providing space to resolve issue under collective consensus		
10	You think that military governments are more successful to bring foreign investor to the country		
11	You think that military leaders are less vulnerable to be unsuccessful in dealing with internal conflicts due to their better abilities taking firm decisions		
12	You think that democratic governments are keen to provide public with freedom of expression, liberty and practices		

Section-D

This portion contains instrumental factors, for instance, the performance to democratic government and military government through which popularity is achieved. In this context, indicators regarding educational, health and economic performance are given in the tables.

15. Please rate the statements keeping view the performance of democratic and military governments in Pakistan

Table no. 04: Performance of Governments in educational sector

Type of government		Democratic Government			Military Government		
S. No	Statements	poor	Average	Excellent	poor	Average	Excellent
1	Focus to enhance primary education						
2	Effort to enhance intermediate education						
3	Efforts to enhance higher level education						
4	Focus and efforts to increase awareness and ratio of female education						
5	Focus and efforts to improve teaching quality in educational institutions at all levels						
6	Providing educational facilities i.e. improving physical infrastructure relating to education						

16. Please rate the statements keeping view the performance of democratic and military governments in Pakistan

Table no. 05: performance of governments in health sector

Type of government		Democratic Government			Military Government		
S. No	Statements	poor	Average	Excellent	poor	Average	Excellent
1	Increasing the number of dispensaries and hospital in the area						
2	Providing basic health facilities i.e. doctors, nurses, diagnostic and medication facilities in hospitals						
3	Efforts to improve rural health facilities.						
4	Efforts for improving women's health						
5	Taking initiatives to increase public health awareness						

17. Please rate the statements keeping view the performance of democratic and military governments in Pakistan

Table no. 06: Economic performance of the governments

Type of government	Democratic regime			Military regime		
Statements	Poor	Average	Excellent	poor	Average	Excellent
Facilitation of migrants working abroad						
Facilitating and providing environment for foreign investment in Pakistan						
Providing employment opportunities within the state						
Focusing on the industrialization growth in the country						
Efforts to improve per capita income						
Efforts to curb inflation						
Improvement in physical infrastructure.						