



# PUBLIC VERDICT ON DEMOCRACY 2008 - 2013

*Based on a nationally-representative Survey*



# PUBLIC VERDICT ON DEMOCRACY 2008 - 2013

*Based on a nationally-representative Survey*

PILDAT is an independent, non-partisan and not-for-profit indigenous research and training institution with the mission to strengthen democracy and democratic institutions in Pakistan.

PILDAT is a registered non-profit entity under the Societies Registration Act XXI of 1860, Pakistan.

Copyright ©Pakistan Institute of Legislative Development And Transparency PILDAT

All Rights Reserved

Printed in Pakistan

Published: February 2013

ISBN: 978-969-558-303-6

Any part of this publication can be used or cited with a clear reference to PILDAT.

#### Supported by



Pakistan Institute of Legislative Development and Transparency - PILDAT

**Islamabad Office:** No. 7, 9th Avenue, F-8/1, Islamabad, Pakistan

Tel: (+92-51) 111-123-345 | Fax: (+92-51) 226-3078

**Lahore Office:** 45-A, Sector XX, 2nd Floor, Phase III Commercial Area, DHA, Lahore, Pakistan

Tel: (+92-42) 111 123 345 | Fax: (+92-42) 3569 3896

E-mail: [info@pildat.org](mailto:info@pildat.org); Web: [www.pildat.org](http://www.pildat.org)

# CONTENTS

## *Preface*

<b>Introduction</b>	07
Sample Size	07
Composition	07
Jury's Brief	07
<b>Popular Jury's Verdict</b>	09
<b>Interpretation of Jury's Verdict: A mixture of Applause, Appreciation and Reprimand</b>	11
Rural-Urban Split	11
General Split	11
Provincial Splits	11
Comparing the Verdict of Popular Jury and Expert Jury	11
What divides the two Verdicts most sharply	12
<b>Tabular Results</b>	13
<b>Expert Jury's Verdict</b>	19
<b>Tables</b>	
Table 1: Popular Jury's Verdict on 10 Dimensions of Democratic Process	09
Table 2: Independent Media	13
Table 3: Effective Supreme Court	13
Table 4: Provincial Autonomy	14
Table 5: Effective Cabinet	14
Table 6: Democratic Checks on Military	15
Table 7: Effective Parliament	15
Table 8: Law-Observing Executive	16
Table 9: Respect for Human Rights	16
Table 10: Prospects for Fair Elections	17
Table 11: Encroached Sovereignty	17
Table 12: Overall Verdict on the Quality of Governance through Democracy	18
Table 13: Expert Jury's Verdict on 10 Dimensions of Democratic Process	19
<b>Appendices</b>	
Appendix A: Composition of Popular Jury	23
Appendix B: Methodology	24



## Preface

As the present Government and Parliament complete five-year term in 2013, PILDAT joined hands with Gallup Pakistan to hold a popular jury of the average Pakistani citizens, the voters, to give their verdict on the performance of Pakistan's first democratic experience which lasted for 5 years.

**Public Verdict on Democracy 2008-2013** presents analysis of the results of a nationally representative survey on performance of democracy in Pakistan during the past 5 years. To provide comparative analysis of the popular survey result, the report also compares these with the opinions of the expert jury, consisting of PILDAT Democracy Assessment Group (DAG) on the performance of democracy in Pakistan during the period.

As the report presents the analysis, the verdict of the survey is a mixture of “applause,” “appreciation” and “reprimand.”

## Acknowledgments

PILDAT gratefully acknowledges the support of Democracy Assessment Group for their invaluable input.

This report has been published by PILDAT under the project ***Supporting Monitoring of Democracy, Electoral Reforms and Development of Youth in Pakistan*** which is supported by the ***Danish International Development Agency (DANIDA), Government of Denmark***.

## Disclaimer

The views expressed in this report do not necessarily represent the views of DANIDA, the Government of Denmark and the Royal Danish Embassy, Islamabad.

The initial preliminary data presented at the PILDAT Democracy Assessment Group meeting on January 30 was incomplete and thus needs to be corrected by the findings presented in this Final Version of the Report. Any inconvenience caused by the presentation of incomplete preliminary findings is greatly regretted.

Gallup Pakistan is not related to Gallup Inc. headquartered in Washington D.C. USA. We require that our surveys be credited fully as Gallup Pakistan (not Gallup or Gallup Poll). We disclaim any responsibility for surveys pertaining to Pakistani public opinion except those carried out by Gallup Pakistan, the Pakistani affiliate of Gallup International Association. For details on Gallup International Association see website: [www.gallup-international.com](http://www.gallup-international.com)

Islamabad  
February 2013



## Introduction

### Background

The current Government in Pakistan was formed through a nation-wide election held in February 2008, and assumed authority in the following month. Thus in January 2013 it almost completed its entire tenure of five years. If fresh elections are held over the next few months, it would be the first democratically-elected Government in Pakistan's history, under a democratically-elected President, to complete its full term.<sup>1</sup> Prior to 2008, the country held 8 General Elections and formed as many governments but none were able to complete their constitutionally-sanctioned terms.

As the Government completes its **FIRST SUCCESSFUL TERM**, we believed it was timely to hold a popular jury of the average Pakistani citizens, the voters, to give their verdict on the performance of Pakistan's first democratic experience which lasted for 5 years.

### Sample Size

This report is based on a nationally representative survey of over 9,500 men (approximately 5000) and women (approximately 4500) who served as the jury for this judgment. The jury comprised a cross-section of Pakistanis, most of them from the villages of Pakistan (approximately 6700, others from towns, cities and large cities (approximately 2800). Many of them were illiterate or lowly educated (50%), while others had middle or high school education and some were college and university educated. They came from Punjab, Sindh, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KP) and Balochistan.

The sample provides a nationally representative cross-section of various age, education, linguistic and socio-economic segments of the citizens of Pakistan. They were interviewed face to face in their homes across the country during the months of January and February 2013.

### Composition

Our jury comprised a carefully chosen set of adult men and women from across the country. They were chosen through the scientific method of probability sampling in order to ensure their representative character. Since the majority of Pakistanis (nearly two thirds) live in villages, so were our selected jury members; the remaining one third came from towns, cities and large cities. Again since a

majority of Pakistanis have never completed high school education, the jury included 50% who were either illiterate or had primary education only. The remaining had varied levels of middle and high school education, while 14% had tasted elementary college or university education. It was by all means a jury that could claim to be highly representative of the citizens of Pakistan. At the same time it was not a jury of highly educated eminent persons or experts. In fact one of the purposes of setting up a citizens' jury was that it would complement an Eminent Persons' Jury (known as Democracy Assessment Group) which PILDAT had been holding every year since the year 2009. That Democracy Assessment Group consists of roughly 30 eminent public figures and experts. We conducted a poll among them as well on identical questions and the verdict of the Expert Jury is available separately as an appendix.

### Jury's Brief

The Jury's brief **did not** concern the performance of the Government of Pakistan People's Party and its Allies. That would be a separate exercise. Instead the focus of the **jury's brief was on the performance of democracy**. It delineated 10 indicators which dealt with the process of democracy, either directly or indirectly.

The ten indicators began with the mother of democratic governance in Pakistan, that is the Parliament. We sought jury's verdict on its effectiveness to perform its constitutional role. The members of the jury were asked whether in their opinion the effectiveness of the Parliament had 'improved', 'deteriorated' or 'remained unchanged' during the past five years. Those voting in favour of 'improved' were considered a 'yes' vote while those voting to favour 'deteriorated' were considered a 'No' vote. We considered those who said 'unchanged' or remained silent as 'abstentions'. The difference between 'Yes' vote and 'No' vote was thus considered the **net verdict of the jury**.

Beyond asking the key question concerning the Legislative branch of a democratic government, we asked another question which bears indirectly on performance of the legislature; it was on the subject of legislation on provincial autonomy. We then proceeded to raise 8 more questions with the jury. Each question dealt with a specific aspect of the process of democracy. Four of them concerned the **Executive** branch, namely Cabinet, Civilian Executive, the Military and the ability to hold free and fair elections. One

1. Although the 12th National Assembly of Pakistan, elected in 2002, also completed its five-year term from 2002-2007, it was formed and continued under a Military President who was also the Chief of Army Staff.

question dealt with the **Judicial** branch, namely the Supreme Court. The remaining 3 Questions dealt with democratic **Environment** or the playing field of democracy (*state Sovereignty, respect for Human Rights and an independent Media*).

The jury was thus asked to give its verdict on 10 Questions, together constituting their judgment on the performance of the process of democracy in Pakistan during 2008-2013. Finally the jury was also asked to give its overall verdict on the progress in the process of democracy in Pakistan during the past 5 years.

Summary of the jury's verdict is carried in Table 1.

## Popular Jury's Verdict

<b>Overall Verdict on Quality of Democratic Governance</b> (Taking all things into account) <i>(Improved (31%), Deteriorated (53%); Unchanged (15%))</i>	<b>-22%</b>
---	-------------

**Table 1: Popular Jury's Verdict on 10 Dimensions of Democratic Process**

<b>Independent Media</b> <i>(Improved (62%), Deteriorated (19%); Unchanged (17%))</i>	<b>+43%</b>
<b>Effective Supreme Court</b> <i>(Improved (58%), Deteriorated (26%); Unchanged (14%))</i>	<b>+32%</b>
<b>Provincial Autonomy</b> <i>(Improved (44%), Deteriorated (30%); Unchanged (23%))</i>	<b>+14%</b>
<b>Effective Cabinet</b> <i>(Improved (45%), Deteriorated (33%); Unchanged (20%))</i>	<b>+12%</b>
<b>Democratically Checked Military</b> <i>(Improved (43%), Deteriorated (33%); Unchanged (19%))</i>	<b>+10%</b>
<b>Effective Parliament</b> <i>(Improved (44%), Deteriorated (37%); Unchanged (18%))</i>	<b>+7%</b>
<b>Law abiding Executive</b> <i>(Improved (37%), Deteriorated (38%); Unchanged (22%))</i>	<b>-1%</b>
<b>Respect for Human Rights</b> <i>(Improved (36%), Deteriorated (38%); Unchanged (24%))</i>	<b>-2%</b>
<b>Prospects for Fair Elections</b> <i>(Improved (31%), Deteriorated (36%); Unchanged (26%))</i>	<b>-5%</b>
<b>Externally Encroached Sovereignty</b> <i>(Improved (27%), Deteriorated (47%); Unchanged (22%))</i>	<b>-20%</b>

\* When figures do not add up to 100%, the balance is DON'T KNOW/NO RESPONSE

## Sample

This verdict provided by a Jury consisting of a citizen panel of 9660 men and women comprising a national cross-section.



## Interpretation of Jury's Verdict: A mixture of *Applause*, *Appreciation* and *Reprimand*

The verdict of the jury appears to be a combination of Applause, Appreciation and Reprimand.

In our interpretation, the Top 3 scorers are recipient of **Applause**. They are:

1. **Media**
2. **Supreme Court &**
3. **Provincial Authority**

We interpret the Middle 3 as the recipients of **Appreciation**. They are:

1. **Effectiveness of the Cabinet**
2. **Democratic Checks on Military &**
3. **Effectiveness of Parliament**

Finally we interpret the Bottom 4 as recipients of **Reprimand**. They are:

1. **Failure to bring about law observing civil Executive;**
2. **Respect for Human Rights**
3. **Credible prospects of Fair Elections &**
4. **Protection of National Sovereignty**

## Rural-Urban Split

The jury's verdict shows a clear split between the rural and the urban members of the jury. Compared to their rural counterparts, the urban members were much more critical of the process of democracy during the past 5 years. While -41% of the urban members gave an overall negative rating to the process of democracy during the past 5 years, the verdict of rural members of the jury was considerably less critical as -12% of them gave an overall negative rating. This difference shows up even more sharply in individual verdicts given on the 10 dimensions of democratic process

## Generational Split

Our findings also show a generational split among members of the jury. The older generation was notably more critical about any progress in the process of democracy during the past five years. While the net verdict among jury members under the age of 30 was 19%; the figure was somewhat higher among the older members (over 50 years of age), among whom it was -24%.

## Provincial Splits

The detailed analysis of popular verdict shows notable differences among jury members of various provinces of the country. The split generally reflects the prevailing political affiliations of the province. Thus **Punjab** which is heavily tilted against incumbent government alliance at the centre is more critical than Sindh. The overall net performance rating to democratic process given by jury members coming from Punjab province is **-35** per cent; while in **Sindh** it is in comparison more favourable at **-6** per cent. This trend also holds for their detailed verdicts on the 10 dimensions of the democratic process.

## Comparing the Verdict of Popular Jury and Expert Jury

An interesting comparison to note would be the verdicts of the two Jurys, namely the popular jury and the jury of eminent

persons or experts.

The **Popular jury** is less critical on the whole about the quality of democratic governance during the past 5 years. Its overall verdict has a score of **-22%**; while the overall score given by the **Expert Jury** is **-30%**.

### **What Divides the two Verdicts Most Sharply?**

The sharpest difference between Expert verdict and Popular verdict is on the issue of **FAIR ELECTION PROSPECTS**. The popular verdict is quite sceptical about the prospect of a fair election in 2013; it gives it a net score of **-5** per cent.

On the other hand the Expert verdict is quite hopeful that 2013 will produce a fair election; it gives that possibility a net score of **+70** per cent.

What explains such a sharp difference between the two verdicts?

In our view the Expert has taken into account the marked progress achieved by Election Commission(ECP) through instituting a range of safeguards against electoral fraud. The Popular verdict, it seems, did not count in that progress while giving its verdict.

## Tabular Results

**Question: In your opinion, was Pakistani media (television, radio, newspapers) more free of Government influence 5 years ago or is it more free now or is it the same?**

**Table 2: Independent Media**

Fig are Row Percentage

	Media freer now A	Media freer 5 years ago B	Unchanged/NR	Net Score (A-B)
All Pakistan	62	19	19	42
<b>Location-wise</b>				
Rural	64	18	18	46
Urban	58	21	21	37
<b>Age-wise</b>				
Young (Under 30)	67	15	18	52
Middle (30 - 50)	60	20	19	40
Old (51+)	60	22	18	38

**Question: In your opinion, Supreme Court was stronger during the last govt. meaning 5 years ago or is it stronger now or has there been no difference?**

**Table 3: Effective Supreme Court**

Fig are Row Percentage

	Is stronger now A	Was stronger 5 years ago B	Unchanged/NR	Net Score (A-B)
All Pakistan	58	26	16	32
<b>Location-wise</b>				
Rural	62	22	15	40
Urban	51	32	17	19
<b>Age-wise</b>				
Young (Under 30)	61	23	16	38
Middle (30 - 50)	57	26	16	31
Old (51+)	59	29	13	30

**Question: In your opinion, do provincial governments have more authority and power now under the current government or did they have more authority and power 5 years ago?**

**Table 4: Provincial Autonomy**

*Fig are Row Percentage*

	They have more power now A	Provincial governments had more power and authority 5 years ago B	Unchanged/NR	Net Score (A-B)
All Pakistan	44	30	26	14
<b>Location-wise</b>				
Rural	49	25	26	24
Urban	33	40	27	-7
<b>Age-wise</b>				
Young (Under 30)	45	29	25	16
Middle (30 - 50)	43	30	27	13
Old (51+)	40	32	28	8

**Question: In your opinion, Prime Minister and his ministers had more effective authority in running affairs of the state five years ago ( meaning last Govt.) or has it more authority now?**

**Table 5: Effective Cabinet**

*Fig are Row Percentage*

	Has more authority now A	Had more authority 5 years before B	Unchanged/NR	Net Score (A-B)
All Pakistan	45	33	22	12
<b>Location-wise</b>				
Rural	50	28	22	22
Urban	34	44	22	-10
<b>Age-wise</b>				
Young (Under 30)	47	31	22	16
Middle (30 - 50)	44	34	22	10
Old (51+)	39	40	20	-1

**Question: What is your opinion on the submission of the Military to the supremacy of the Parliament. Has the level of submission increased or decreased in 5 years?**

**Table 6: Democratic Checks on Military**

*Fig are Row Percentage*

	Increased A	Decreased B	Unchanged/NR	Net Score (A-B)
All Pakistan	43	33	24	10
<b>Location-wise</b>				
Rural	47	30	24	17
Urban	36	40	24	-4
<b>Age-wise</b>				
Young (Under 30)	44	30	26	14
Middle (30 - 50)	43	34	23	9
Old (51+)	41	40	20	1

**Question: In your opinion, National Assembly of the country was stronger five years ago (during Pervez Musharraf Govt.) or is it stronger now?**

**Table 7: Effective Parliament**

*Fig are Row Percentage*

	Is stronger today A	Was stronger 5 years ago B	Unchanged/NR	Net Score (A-B)
All Pakistan	44	37	20	7
<b>Location-wise</b>				
Rural	48	31	21	17
Urban	34	48	18	-14
<b>Age-wise</b>				
Young (Under 30)	47	33	20	14
Middle (30 - 50)	43	38	19	5
Old (51+)	38	38	24	0

**Question: In your opinion, civil executive meaning civil officers and bureaucracy is more observant of the country's constitution and law now, or was it more so 5 years ago?**

**Table 8: Law-Observing Executive**

*Fig are Row Percentage*

	More observing now A	Was more observing 5 years ago B	Unchanged/NR	Net Score (A-B)
All Pakistan	37	38	25	-1
<b>Location-wise</b>				
Rural	40	34	26	6
Urban	30	45	25	-15
<b>Age-wise</b>				
Young (Under 30)	37	37	26	0
Middle (30 - 50)	37	38	25	-1
Old (51+)	31	41	28	-10

**Question: In your opinion respect for human rights has increased or declined during the last 5 years, or has there been no difference?**

**Table 9: Respect for Human Rights**

*Fig are Row Percentage*

	People are more mindful now A	People were more mindful 5 years ago B	Unchanged/NR	Net Score (A-B)
All Pakistan	36	38	26	-2
<b>Location-wise</b>				
Rural	41	32	27	9
Urban	25	50	24	-25
<b>Age-wise</b>				
Young (Under 30)	33	41	26	-8
Middle (30 - 50)	38	36	26	2
Old (51+)	26	42	32	-16

**Question:** *In your view will the next elections be more fair or less fair than the previous election or will there be no difference?*

**Table 10: Prospects for Fair Elections**

*Fig are Row Percentage*

	More fair A	Less fair B	Unchanged/NR	Net Score (A-B)
All Pakistan	31	36	32	-5
<b>Location-wise</b>				
Rural	34	33	33	1
Urban	27	43	30	-16
<b>Age-wise</b>				
Young (Under 30)	31	37	32	-6
Middle (30 - 50)	32	36	32	-4
Old (51+)	31	36	34	-5

**Question:** *In your opinion have any unfair influences of foreign powers like the United States and World Bank on Pakistan's sovereign governance increased, decreased or remained unchanged during last 5 years?*

**Table 11: Encroached Sovereignty**

*Fig are Row Percentage*

	Encroachment decreased A	Encroachment increased B	Unchanged/NR	Net Score (A-B)
All Pakistan	27%	47%	25%	-20%
<b>Location-wise</b>				
Rural	29%	48%	23%	-19%
Urban	24%	47%	29%	-23%
<b>Age-wise</b>				
Young (Under 30)	25%	50%	25%	-25%
Middle (30 - 50)	29%	46%	25%	-16%
Old (51+)	24%	50%	26%	-26%

**Question:** *What is your view on the overall quality of governance through democracy in the country? Has there been improvement, deterioration or no difference?*

**Table 12: Overall Verdict on the Quality of Governance through Democracy**

*Fig are Row Percentage*

	Improved A	Deteriorated B	Unchanged/NR	Net Score (A-B)
All Pakistan	31	53	15	-22
<b>Location-wise</b>				
Rural	36	48	16	-12
Urban	22	63	14	-41
<b>Age-wise</b>				
Young (Under 30)	33	52	15	-19
Middle (30 - 50)	31	54	15	-23
Old (51 +)	29	53	19	-24

## Expert Jury's Verdict

<b>Overall Verdict</b> ( <i>Taking all things into account</i> ) (Improved (30%), Deteriorated (60%); Unchanged (10%))	-30%	-22%
---	------	------

**Table 13: Expert Jury's Verdict on 10 Dimensions of Democratic Process**

	Expert Jury Verdict	Popular Jury Verdict
<b>Independent Media</b> (Improved (50%), Deteriorated (nil); Unchanged (50%))	+50%	+42%
<b>Effective Supreme Court</b> (Improved (70%), Deteriorated (30%); Unchanged (nil))	+40%	+32%
<b>Provincial Autonomy</b> (Improved (50%), Deteriorated (nil); Unchanged (50%))	+50%	+14%
<b>Effective Cabinet</b> (Improved (20%), Deteriorated (50%); Unchanged (30%))	-30%	+12%
<b>Democratically Checked Military</b> (Improved (40%), Deteriorated (10%); Unchanged (50%))	+30%	+10%
<b>Effective Parliament</b> (Improved (30%), Deteriorated (40%); Unchanged (30%))	-10%	+7%
<b>Law abiding Executive</b> (Improved (30%), Deteriorated (40%); Unchanged (30%))	-10%	-1%
<b>Respect for Human Rights</b> (Improved (10%), Deteriorated (30%); Unchanged (40%))	-20%	-2%
<b>Prospects for Fair Elections</b> (Improved (80%), Deteriorated (10%); Unchanged (10%))	+70%	-5%
<b>Externally Encroached Sovereignty</b> (Improved (nil), Deteriorated (50%); Unchanged (50%))	-50%	-20%

\* When figures do not add up to 100%, the balance is DON'T KNOW/NO RESPONSE

### Sample:

This verdict was provided by an Expert Jury consisting of 10 members.



# APPENDICES



## Appendix A

### Composition of Popular Jury

The sample for the survey on which this study is based is the following:

	Un-Weighted count	Weighted Percent (%)
All Pakistan	9,660	100%
<b>Province-wise</b>		
Punjab	3,020	58%
Sindh	1,800	24%
KPK	3,880	14%
Balochistan	960	5%
<b>Location-wise</b>		
Rural	6,800	67%
Urban	2,860	33%
<b>Gender-wise</b>		
Male	5,120	53%
Female	4,540	47%

\* When figures do not add up to 100%, it is so because of rounding off of decimal figures

## Appendix B

### Methodology

Selection of popular Jury through a national opinion poll

1-	<b>Sample Size:</b>	9,660
2-	<b>Scope of Sample:</b>	The sample is representative of Male and Female adult (Age 18+) population of Pakistan. The sample represents both rural and urban areas of all four provinces of the country
3-	<b>Sampling Method:</b>	The sample was selected through area probability sampling, using the method of Population Proportionate to size (PPS). The achieved sample was weighted to correspond with the census distribution of population for rural and urban areas of all four provinces of Pakistan
4-	<b>Field Work:</b>	The field work was done through face to face, in-home interviews.
5-	<b>Field Dates:</b>	The field-work was carried out during the month of January and February 2013.
6-	<b>Field verification and Quality Checks:</b>	The survey was carried out by Gallup Pakistan whose field work processes are ISO certified and strictly observe guidelines required by Gallup International Association and European Society of Opinion and Marketing Research (ESOMAR) Code of Conduct. These require as elaborate set of Field Verification and Quality Control steps whose details are available separately.
7-	<b>Estimation of Error Margins:</b>	The sampling error for this survey is estimated to be +2-3 percent at 95% confidence level.



**Islamabad Office:** No. 7, 9th Avenue, F-8/1, Islamabad, Pakistan  
Tel: (+92-51) 111 123 345 | Fax: (+92-51) 226 3078  
**Lahore Office:** 45-A, Sector XX, 2nd Floor, Phase III Commercial Area, DHA, Lahore  
Tel: (+92-42) 111 123 345 | Fax: (+92-42) 3569 3896  
E-mail: [info@pildat.org](mailto:info@pildat.org) | Web: <http://www.pildat.org>