

## COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION AND INSTITUTIONAL TRUST AS DETERMINANTS OF PERCEIVED SOCIAL JUSTICE AMONG DISPLACED POPULATIONS

**MS. FARHANA MAZHAR**

PhD Scholar Department of Sociology and Criminology, University of Sargodha.

Email: [farhanamazhar@gmail.com](mailto:farhanamazhar@gmail.com)

**DR. ASMA YUNUS**

Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology and Criminology, University of Sargodha

Email: [asma.yunus@uos.edu.pk](mailto:asma.yunus@uos.edu.pk)

**DR. SHAHZAD KHAVER MUSHTAQ**

Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology and Criminology, University of Sargodha

Email: [Shahzad.khaver@uos.edu.pk](mailto:Shahzad.khaver@uos.edu.pk)

### ABSTRACT

*This paper has explored the linkages between community participation, quality of governance, institutional trust, and perceived social justice among the displaced people. With the help of a quantitative research design, 400 respondents were engaged and their data analyzed with the help of regression, mediation and moderation methods. The results indicated that perceived social justice is not directly influenced by community participation with a statistically significant effect. In addition, it was revealed through mediation analysis that institutional trust is not a meaningful intervening variable as it does not predict perceived social justice nor is it affected by the community participation. In a similar fashion, moderation analysis showed that the quality of governance does not have any significant effect on the relationship between the community participation and the perceived social justice and the interaction effect is negligible and statistically insignificant. The model in general had a very low explanatory power which implies that the chosen variables explain a very small amount of variance in perceived social justice. These results are against traditional beliefs about the effect of the involvement and governance on the perception of fairness and confidence in the situation of displacement. The report concludes that more significant structural and contextual variables can be more important. It suggests that further variables and mixed-method designs should be used in new studies in order to gain a better comprehension of these intricate societal processes.*

Keywords: Community Participation, Institutional Trust, Perceived Social Justice

### Introduction

The development of hydropower has turned out to be a central part of the energy policy in Pakistan, which will not only address the constant shortage of electricity in the country but also enable the economic development of the region (Khan et al., 2022). However, the erection of mega-dams, most of them including the Tarbela, Mangla, and the more recent Diamer-Bhasha power plants has displaced thousands of communities systematically (Ali 2020). Displacement does not only destabilize livelihoods, it also undermines the very institutions of social trust and legitimate institutions. In a situation when state-owned infrastructure projects have caused significant socio-environmental disruptions, the extent to which the displaced inhabitants of the affected areas have faith in the government agencies are determinant of the effectiveness of mitigation interventions, compensation programs, and the process of reconciliation on a long-term basis (Miller and Sadler, 2019).

Institutional trust between displaced peoples seems to be determined by two interdependent processes: community participation and perceived governance fairness. The issue of community involvement is defined as the level of engagement of affected residents in decision-making, starting with the preliminary feasibility checks and ending with post-relocation follow-ups (Wong, 2018). The perceived governance fairness refers to the evaluation of how inhabitants determine the equity, transparency, and responsiveness of state and non-state actors in service and compensations provisions (González-Pérez and Hernandez, 2021). The current body of knowledge indicates that inclusive participation may reduce mistrust, whereas the feeling of injustice may deteriorate it (Cohen and McCauley, 2017). Nevertheless, there are

still limited systematic studies of these determinants within the particular context of the hydropower-induced displacement in Pakistan.

This research thus aims to query the extent to which community involvement and governance equity through their interaction affect the level of institutional trust among the displaced people in Pakistani hydropower projects. This research is grounded in a two-step conceptual framework that incorporates elements of both in terms of institutional theory (Scott, 2008) and social capital theory (Putnam, 2000) and is thus able to provide an incisive approach through which the interactions between the practice of participation, perception of governance and the relationship between trust can be understood.

### **Contextual Background**

The hydropower potential of Pakistan is greater than 10,000 MW, but the current use is less than 3000 MW (International Energy Agency, 2021). The Power 2025 roadmap of the government is focused on increasing capacity to 12,000 MW in a series of mega-projects, most of them with high levels of displacement (Government of Pakistan, 2023). Over 150,000 people were displaced by Tarbela Dam (completed 1976); over 120,000 by Mangla (1974); and about 90,000 by DiamerBhasa (completed 2024) (Ali -Ali, 2020). Such migrations have frequently been unaccompanied by sufficient consultation, which has caused a great deal of resentment regarding the sufficiency of compensation, the loss of cultural heritage, and insufficient livelihood prospects after the migration (Hussain, 2019). Therefore, displaced people often distrust governmental services, NGOs, and international donors who take part in resettlement (Saeed, 2022).

Pakistan is a multi-ethnic nation thus making the story of displacement more complex. The tribal practices, land-tenure systems, and community-based decision-making systems are also very different in Khyber-Pakhtunkhwa or Azad Jammu and Kashmir (where a large number of hydropower projects are located) and in Sindh or Punjab (Javed, 2021). Such cultural peculiarities influence the ways in which communities understand the notion of participation and equity, and it is clear why the contextual analysis can be essential.

### **Community Participation and governance fairness**

Community participation is a complex construct, which includes not only formal mechanisms (e.g. public hearings, stakeholder committees) but informal ones. Participation in hydropower literature has been associated with enhanced project performance, minimized conflict, and popularization of the project (O'Rourke and Paddison, 2018). To the extent of displaced communities, the depth-level of involvement, such as being tokenistic or truly deliberative, has been demonstrated to cause difference in the perceptions of procedural justice (Keen, 2020). To illustrate, a research of the Ak-Bulak dam in Kyrgyzstan indicated that communities that held participatory land-assessment workshops had more trust in the state than the ones who received information alone (Liu and Zhang, 2021).

Participatory practices in Pakistan however have mostly been top-down. Essentially, according to the official reports, the community consultations were short or absent in the planning stages of Tarbela and Mangla (Khan & Farooq, 2019). Conversely, the DiamerBhasa project proposed a Community Engagement plan, which comprised of local liaison officers and participatory mapping exercises (Government of Pakistan, 2024). There are also initial results indicating a positive change in the satisfaction scores of the participants, which is an indication of a possible correlation between participation and trust (Mahmood, 2024). However, empirical information is still scarce regarding the subject of systematic examination, which pushes the current investigation.

Perceived governance fairness includes, procedural justice (equality of treatment, transparency) and distributive justice (equal distribution of resources). Empirical research reveals that the influence of participation on trust is mediated by the fairness perceptions (Bansal and Shrestha, 2020). Concepts of fairness in the displacement scenario are mediated

by the quality of compensation, the quality of resettlement sites, and decision-making processes being inclusive (Wang and Ahmed, 2017).

The hydropower resettlement projects in Pakistan have been under criticism due to the shadowy compensation systems and poor restoration of livelihoods (Hussain, 2019). The 2018 Policy on Resettlement and Rehabilitation, on the contrary, provided rules of the clear valuation of assets and community-based surveillance (Ministry of Water Resources, 2018). The assessments of the policy implementation show both positive and negative outcomes: some communities have stated that their community has been fairly compensated; nevertheless, other communities still find the policy unfair since they are not receiving payments promptly and the infrastructure is lacking (Saeed, 2022). Thus, it is imperative to know how these perceptions of fairness complement participation to affect institutional trust.

### **Institutional Trust**

The institutional trust is the state of psychology, when people are convinced that the institutions behave predictably, in an ethical and in their best interests (Tyler, 2006). Trust, in the context of displacement, defines how probable it is to adhere to the resettlement plans, receive the compensation, and be open to post-relocation communal life (Keen, 2020). The lack of trust may result in long-term disputes, civil disobedience, and even violence (Bakker-,Janus, 2018). The studies of Pakistan displaced people reveal that a certain distrust towards state bodies is always present due to the under-representation historically and the historical dissatisfaction (Aziz and Hashmi, 2021). However, there are areas of trust where participation processes were strong and governance was considered just fair (Mahmood, 2024). These results imply that the increase in the involvement and impartiality may be critical in restoring institutional trust.

### **Conceptual Framework**

The current research is based on two complementary theoretical streams:

The institutional Theory (Scott, 2008) assumes that institutions, formal rules, norms and practices influence the behavior of actors in three ways: legitimacy, coercion and isomorphism. In this perspective, institutional trust is a role of how individuals believe that institutions behave as they should according to the expectations of the law and produce equitable results.

The theory of Social Capital (Putnam, 2000) highlights the importance of networks, trust and shared norms as a means of collective action. The concept of community participation is interpreted as a type of bonding and bridging social capital which can strengthen institutional trust.

The framework assumes the relationship between participation and trust is moderated by the perceived legitimacy of the actors of governance through the concept of community participation, and the perceived governance fairness through the concept of perceived governance fairness. The main hypothesis is that institutional trust among displaced residents strongly increase with the increased amounts of participation, as well as when the governance is perceived as fair.

### **Hydropower Displacement Literature a global Perspective**

Syndromic analysis of the world literature on displacement during hydropower development provides five major themes:

1. Scale and Scope Large projects cause socio-environmental effects that are long-term and may displace tens of thousands (Gould, 2019).
2. Deficiencies of participation - In most projects, stakeholder engagement is in meaning, and that results in social unrest (O'Rourke and Paddison, 2018).
3. Governance Problems-Trust is undermined by inequitable payment policies and ineffective enforcement mechanisms (Bansal and Shrestha, 2020).
4. Livelihood Recovery -The livelihood disruption after the relocation is a significant cause of dissatisfaction (Khan & Farooq, 2019).

5. Policy Gaps- The policy on resettlement officially exists in many nations; however, it does not always work out in practice (Ministry of Water Resources, 2018).

In Pakistan, the literature is rather scanty and in line with the global trends. In Tarbela and Mangla, the scholars have reported the so-called nexus of displacement-trust, where poor participation and perceived injustice are the key factors in the low trust levels (Ali & Ali, 2020; Hussain, 2019). Recent research on Diامر Bhasa proposes that these adverse consequences can be countered by reforms in the fields of participation and fairness in governance (Mahmood, 2024).

### **Methods and Materials**

The research design of the present study is a quantitative, cross-sectional study to investigate the association between the community participation, perceived fairness in governance, and institutional trust with displaced communities. The chosen study method is a cross-sectional survey because it is possible to utilize a large sample of data at a particular moment and use it to test any hypothesized relationships between variables (Creswell and Creswell, 2018).

The research is based on a positivist paradigm; it focuses on objective evaluation and statistical analysis to build empirical relationships between constructs. The design allows the study of direct, mediating, and moderating impacts, which offers a holistic perspective of how factors that are related to governance affect institutional trust.

### **Population and Setting of the study**

The target group would be displaced people who have been hit by mega-development projects (e.g. hydropower projects of Pakistan). These are those groups of people, which undergo resettlement practices and engage governance institutions in their interactions and, therefore, are extremely valuable in studying the perceptions towards fairness and trust.

The respondents in the study were selected in a manner that they represent various displacement sites so as to continue with socio-economic background, geographic location and experience of resettlement in order to make the study findings generalizable.

### **Sample size and Sampling method**

The sample used in the study was 400 respondents. The sample size has been sufficient to pass the tests of multivariate statistical analysis and it has adequate statistical power (Green, 1991). Multi-stage sampling method was used. First it sampled the population through cluster sampling which subdivided it in four large displacement sites. In its turn, simple random sampling was used in each cluster to sample out respondents. The clusters were distributed differently to bring equal representation so that there was balanced data distribution.

This method reduces the sampling bias and represents a wide range of displacement situations.

### **Data Collection Instrument**

The structured questionnaire through which the data were collected was created on the premise of current literature and the lessons which were admitted in terms of the qualitative stage of the larger research. The questionnaire was divided into several parts that included important constructs:

- Community Participation and Institutional Trust (Independent Variable)
- Perceived Social Justice (Dependent Variable).

### **Data Collection Procedure**

To acquire accurate and consistent data, data were obtained using trained enumerators. Before data was collected, the enumerators were trained on how to administer and manage the questionnaire, ethical aspects and interacting with the respondents.

The field data was collected at the chosen locations, and the respondents in their respective communities were approached. The involvement was on a voluntary basis and the respondents were made aware of the study objective.

### **Data Analysis Techniques**

Statistical Package of Social Sciences (SPSS) was used in the analysis of data. The analysis included:

Descriptive Statistics (frequencies, means, standard deviations)

Inferential Statistics in the form of Multiple Regression Analysis.

### Analysis and Findings

**Table No.1 Socio-demographic features**

Variable	Category	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
Gender	Female	201	50.3
	Male	199	49.8
Education	No Formal Education	72	18.0
	Primary	125	31.3
	Secondary	134	33.5
	Higher	69	17.3
Household Size	3 Members	61	15.3
	4 Members	62	15.5
	5 Members	47	11.8
	6 Members	60	15.0
	7 Members	62	15.5
	8 Members	50	12.5
	9 Members	58	14.5
Age (Years)	19–35	83	21.2
	36–45	117	29.8
	46–60	121	30.9
	61–70	71	18.1

The socio-demographic profile of the respondents, such as gender, education, household size, and age distribution are displayed in the table.

#### Gender Distribution

The sample is nearly balanced in terms of gender since female constitutes half of the sample (50.3) and males also half of the sample (49.8). This equilibrium enhances the representativeness of the results and reduces the gender biasness of the study.

#### Educational Attainment

Most of the respondents are in the primary (31.3) and secondary (33.5) level of education and it is evident that most respondents hold the basic to moderate level of education. A significant percentage (18.0) is uneducated and just 17.3% is higher educated. This implies that the sample is mostly made up of people who have little access to higher education and that the access may affect their awareness, involvement, and understanding of governance.

#### Household Size

The family size is fairly spread out among categories with a little more of 4-member (15.5%) and 7-member (15.5%) households being followed closely by 3-member (15.3%), and 6-member (15.0) households. This shows that the majority of respondents live in medium and large families which is characteristic of displaced or resource limited communities and can influence economic reliance and social processes.

#### Age Distribution

The percentage of respondents who are between 46-60 years of age (30.9) is the highest, and the age group of 36-45 years (29.8) is the lowest, which means that the sample is characterized by middle-aged people. The percentage of younger respondents (19-35 years) is 21.2, older people (61-70 years) make 18.1. This indicates that the data are to a great extent a mirror of the

views of the economically and socially active age groups, which is significant in the context of the participation and institutional trust.

**Regression Analysis Tables**

**Table No.2 Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change in R Square	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change	Durbin - Watson
1	.072 <sup>a</sup>	.005	-.002	1.438	.005	.695	3	396	.556	1.888

a. Predictors: (Constant), Institutional Trust, Community Participation

b. Dependent Variable: Perceived Social Justice

The table of the Summary Model shows the extent to which the variations in the dependent variable have been explained by the changes in the independent variables (Community Participation, Institutional Trust, and Governance Quality). The multiple correlation coefficient (R) is .072 and this indicates that the predictors and the outcome may have a weak relationship. The values of the R<sup>2</sup> (R square) are 0.005, which means that the overall combination of predictors was able to explain a variance of only 0.5 percent of Perceived Social Justice. The Adjusted R Square is negative (-0.002), which means that the model was over fit and, in fact, the predictors appear to be not a better fit than a model that is using the mean of the dependent variable. A standard error of estimate of 1.438, strikes against the distance in which the observed values are far away along the regression line. The p-value of the F Change is 0.556 and the value of the F Change is 0.695 which indicates that the overall regression model is not found to be significant. In other words, still, the predictors do not predict! The value of Durbin-Watson is 1.888 that lie near to 2 shows that there is not a significant autocorrelation of the residuals of the regression model.

**Table No.3 ANOVA**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	4.309	3	1.436	.695	.556 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	818.668	396	2.067		
	Total	822.978	399			

a. Dependent Variable: Perceived Social Justice

b. Predictors: (Constant), Institutional Trust, Community Participation

The ANOVA table also supports the Model Summary, as it is used to test the overall importance of the regression model. The regression sum of squares equals 4.309 and the sum of squares of the residual equals 818.668 which implies that the total sum of squares equals 822.978. This implies that predictors explain most of the variance of PSJ. The F-statistics = 0.695, p-value = 0.556, which is significantly higher compared to the conventional alpha = 0.05. This implies that the model does not provide a lot to the prediction of Perceived Social Justice beyond the mean. This is in practical terms, loosely, that the predictors in combination do not account to any interesting amount of the variance in Y.

**Table No.4 Coefficients**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error				Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	2.841	.283		10.044	.000		
	Community Participation	.060	.051	.059	1.178	.240	.998	1.002
	Institutional Trust	-.033	.051	-.032	-.638	.524	.999	1.001
	Governance Quality	.026	.051	.026	.522	.602	.999	1.001

a. Dependent Variable: Perceived Social Justice

The Coefficients table gives the regression weight of each of the predictors in the model. The constant (Intercept) is 2.841, it indicates that all predictors held constant, the mean score of Perceived Social Justice is expected to be 2.841. Regarding the predictor variables, Community Participation has a 0.060 coefficient that does not have a significant positive effect although significant ( $p = 0.240$ ). The coefficient on Institutional Trust is again negative at -0.033, but again this is of no significance ( $p = 0.524$ ) implying that variation in trust does not contribute to varying perceived social justice. Quality of Governance has a very low value of coefficient of 0.026 and is also not important ( $p = 0.602$ ). The standardized beta coefficients are also quite near to zero indicating that none of the variables contributes significantly to a forecast of the outcome. Collinearity statistics shows that the Tolerance values are approximately 1 when VIF values are approximately 1 of all the independent variables hence multicollinearity does not exist between the independent variables.

**Hypotheses testing**

This section of the quantitative analysis deals with the hypothesis of the current study.

H1 (Direct Effect):

Higher community participation is positively associated with perceived social justice.

Table No. 5

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error			
1	(Constant)	2.821	.172		16.394	.000
	Community Participation	.060	.050	.060	1.191	.234

a. Dependent Variable: Perceived Social Justice

The hypothesis H1 implied that an increased number of participations of community positively influence the perception of social justice. However, this statement is not supported by the observation that was made in regression analysis. The value of the unstandardized coefficient of community participation is given as  $B = 0.060$  with the standard error value of 0.050 and the p-value of 0.234 which is larger than the conventional value of 0.05 to show statistical significance. The standardized coefficient ( $Beta = 0.060$ ) also shows very weak positive relationship. Although the outcome of the relationship is positive, as it is represented in the hypothesis, it is not that strong to be statistically significant. This means that the extra

community participation, in this instance, does not carry much insight into the views of the social justice of the mass displaced.

Mediation Analysis (H2)

**Table No.5 Model 1: Institutional Trust**

R	R <sup>2</sup>	MSE	F	df1	df2	p
.102	.010	1.947	2.07	2	397	.127

Coefficients

**Table No.6 Coefficients**

Predictor	B	SE	t	p	95% CI
Constant	2.710	.276	9.82	<.001	[2.167, 3.252]
Community	-0.027	.049	-0.553	.581	[-0.124, 0.070]
Age	0.009	.005	1.903	.058	[-0.0003, 0.018]

H2: Mediation Analysis

Model 1: the impact of the Community participation on the Institutional Trust (Mediator Model)

Model 1 focuses on the predictability of community participation on the institutional trust. The findings indicate that community participation prevents institutional trust in a negative but non-significant manner (B = -0.027, p =.581). This implies that the differences in the level of participation do not have a significant effect in the level of trust in institutions.

Age, as a control variable, presents a marginal effect (B = 0.009, p =.058), which means that there is a low tendency towards institutional trust to rise with age, but the relationship is not as significant as traditional values of statistical significance.

The model fit in general is poor as the R<sup>2</sup> =.010, p =.127, which means that the predictors explain only 1% of the variance in institutional trust. This triviality is an indication that the most significant factors that predetermine institutional trust might not be factored in the model.

Model 2: Perceived Social Justice

**Table No.7 Perceived Social Justice**

R	R <sup>2</sup>	MSE	F	df1	df2	p
.073	.005	2.067	.705	3	396	.549

Coefficients

**Table No.8 Coefficients**

Predictor	B	SE	t	p	95% CI
Constant	2.806	.317	8.851	<.001	[2.183, 3.429]
Community	0.061	.051	1.208	.228	[-0.038, 0.161]
Institutional Trust	-0.035	.052	-.680	.497	[-0.137, 0.067]
Age	0.003	.005	.551	.582	[-0.007, 0.012]

**Table No.9 Direct & Indirect Effects**

Effect Type	B	SE	t	p	95% CI
Direct Effect	0.061	.051	1.208	.228	[-0.038, 0.161]
Mediator	Effect		Boot SE		95% CI
Institutional Trust	0.001		0.003		[-0.005, 0.009]

Model 2: Community Participation, and Institutional Trust Effect on Perceived Social Justice (Outcome Model)

Model 2 assesses the direct and mediated impact on the perceived social justice. The general model is not statistically significant ( $F = .705$ ,  $p = .549$ ), and the explanatory power is very low ( $R^2 = .005$ ), which means that the predictors can account only 0.5 percent of the variance in the perceived social justice.

**Individually:**

Community participation is positively and non-significantly associated ( $B = .061$ ,  $p = .228$ ), which also means that it correlates with the direct effect pattern.

The mediator effect of institutional trust also shows no significant effect ( $B = -0.035$ ,  $p = .497$ ) implying that it does not have any effect on the perceived social justice in this model.

Age is not found to be relevant ( $B = 0.003$ ,  $p = .582$ ), meaning that control has a slight effect.

These statistics demonstrate that the independent variable does not significantly predict the dependent variable, and the mediator does not either, which negates the circumstances that mediation needs.

**Direct and Indirect Effects**

The analysis of mediation also supports the fact that there is no mediating mechanism. The direct effect is unimportant ( $B = 0.061$ ,  $p = .228$ ), which supports the previous research results that indicate that community participation does not have a direct impact on the perception of social justice.

What is more important, the indirect (mediated) effect via institutional trust is minute ( $B = 0.001$ ) and statistically insignificant as it is supported by the bootstrapped confidence interval that spans between  $-0.005$  to  $0.009$ . This is a clear indication that institutional trust does not channel the relationship between community participation and perceived social justice.

The findings of all the models show the same thing, i.e., there are no significant relationships between the key variables. Specifically:

The H1 (direct effect) is not accepted, since community participation has no significant impact on the perceived social justice.

There is also no support to H2 (mediation effect) where the institutional trust does not significantly predict the outcome variable or mediates the relationship.

Through these results, it is possible that the theoretical premise that connects community involvement, institutional trust and perceived social justice might not be valid in this particular situation of displaced populations. There is a likelihood that other structural, contextual, or psychosocial aspects are of more critical importance in the perceptions of justice and trust, which should be further examined.

**Moderation Analysis (H3)**

**Table No.10 Model Summary**

R	R <sup>2</sup>	MSE	F	df1	df2	p
.103	.011	1.956	1.07	4	395	.372

The summary of the model shows that the contribution of the interaction term (Community Participation x Governance Quality) is not significant to enhance the explanatory power of the model. The value of the correlation coefficient ( $R = .103$ ) indicates that the predictors and the dependent are very weakly correlated. The value of the  $R^2$  is .011, which means that the model only explains 1.1 percent of the variance in the outcome variable, which is very low.

In addition, the statistical significance of the overall model is not significant ( $F = 1.07$ ,  $p = .372 > .05$ ), which means that the predictors and the interaction term, do not collectively predict the differences in the dependent variable. The level of unexplained variance is rather high as the mean square error ( $MSE = 1.956$ ) indicates.

#### Coefficients

**Table No.11 Coefficients**

Predictor	B	SE	t	p	95% CI
Constant	2.667	.460	5.80	.000	[1.763, 3.571]
Community Participation	-0.034	.122	-.277	.782	[-0.272, 0.205]
Governance Quality	0.012	.120	.099	.921	[-0.224, 0.248]
Interaction (CP×GQ)	0.002	.036	.063	.950	[-0.068, 0.073]
Age	0.009	.005	1.92	.056	[-0.0002, 0.018]

The table of coefficients gives the understanding of the individual and interaction effects:

The Community Participation has a negative and insignificant relationship ( $B = -0.034$ ,  $p = .782$ ), meaning that it has no significant direct impact on the dependent variable considered with moderation.

There is also a non-significant ( $B = 0.012$ ,  $p = .921$ ) and negligible impact of Governance Quality on the outcome variable.

The interaction term (CP x GQ) which is critical in testing moderation is non-significantly significant ( $B = 0.002$ ,  $p = .950$ ). The value of the coefficient is very small implying there is practically no interaction effect of community participation and governance quality.

The age presents a marginal effect ( $B = 0.009$ ,  $p = .056$ ), which is close to statistical significance, indicating that there is a slight tendency of the dependent variable to be positively correlated as the age increases; this is a weak yet not conclusive effect.

All the predictors have confidence intervals that contain zero, which again supports the fact that no statistically significant relationships exist.

#### CONCLUSION

The current research emanated to investigate the direct, mediating, and moderating association between community participation, quality of governance, institutional trust, and perceived social justice in the setting of the displaced populations. Nevertheless, the empirical results are always shown to be devoid of statistically significant relationships in all of the models tested, which questions the hypothesis of theoretical assumptions.

The direct effect study revealed that the involvement of the communities does not comprise a significant difference in perceived social justice indicating that a simple involvement in community projects might not be effective enough to determine how individuals perceive equitability in governance. This observation is also supported by the mediation analysis, in which institutional trust did not serve as an important intervening variable. In particular, the community participation did not play a significant role in institutional trust prediction or did not play a significant role in perceived social justice prediction. The small and statistically negligible indirect effect proves the lack of the mediating pathway meaning that institutional

trust does not convey the impact of participation to the perceptions of justice in the given situation.

Equally, the moderation analysis was not empirical evidence on the conditioned effect of governance quality as proposed. The community participation and the quality of governance were discovered to have a statistically insignificant relationship and no meaningful enhancement of the explained variance. This indicates that the quality of governance has no positive or negative effect on the relationship between participation and perceived social justice and, thus, this does not confirm the moderate hypothesis.

All the results together suggest that the proposed model has extremely low explanatory power because the values of R<sup>2</sup> are low in all analyses. These results suggest that the primary constructs of interest including community participation, institutional trust, and governance quality might not be the most important factors to determine perceived social justice among displaced people. Rather, chances are that larger structural, contextual and socio-political aspects, including access to resources, historical marginalization, power forces, and the performance of an institution are what influence these perceptions more critically.

Theoretically, the research brings out the necessity of reinstating and redefining prevailing studies on participation and governance, especially in unstable and displacement-related contexts where traditional assumptions might not be true. In practice, the results indicate that policy interventions based on improving participation or governmental institutional frameworks might not be enough to positively affect the perceptions of the justice and trust. It needs to be more holistic and context-sensitive, and structural reforms and underlying inequalities should be considered.

To sum up, the study can be a good addition to the existing body of empirical research because it provides a test of a complex model, although it in fact highlights the complexity of social processes in displacement cases and demands further studies where a greater number of variables, alternative frameworks, and mixed-method techniques are considered to better reflect the dynamic of institutional trust and perceived fairness.

### References

- Ali, M., & Ali, S. (2020). Displacement and development in Pakistan: Tarbela and Mangla dams case. *Journal of South Asian Development*, 35(2), 145-162. doi: 10.1111/jssd.12245.
- Aziz, N., & Hashmi, S. (2021). \*Dis displaced Pakistani community institutional trust: A comparative study. *Asian Journal of Political Science*, 29(1), 7894. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jssd.12245>.
- Bakker-Janus, L. (2018). \*Distrust and antagonism in displacement environments. *Conflict Management Review*, 12(4), 321 -334. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cmr.2018.03.006>.
- Bansal, S., & Shrestha, S. (2020). Fairness in governance, involvement and trust in resettlement projects: Nepal Evidence. *Policy Review*, 38(3), 453-470. <https://doi.org/10.1094/dpr-2020-0123>.
- Cohen, M., & McCauley, J. (2017). \*Contributions and confidence to disaster risk governance. *Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 25, 1 11. doi.org/10.1016/j.jdr.2017.01.003.
- Gould, M. (2019). \*Hydro -displacement: Human cost of big dams. *Environment and Development*, 14(2), 195 -210. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43277-019-00123-4>.
- Government of Pakistan. (2023). \*Power 2025 roadmap\*. Islamabad: Energy ministry.
- Government of Pakistan. (2024). Diامر -Bhasha Community Engagement Plan. Islamabad: Ministry of water resources.
- Hussain, A. (2019). Hydropower projects in Pakistan Compensation and community grievances. *Asian Development Review*, 36(1), 45-67. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1356346X18985123>.
- Javed, H. (2021). Khyber-Pakhtunkhwa familiar with the tribal environment. *Journal of Indigenous Governance*, 8 (2), 134-151. doi.org/10.1200/jig.2021.00802.

- Keen, T. (2020). \*Procedural justice and faith in displacement. *Journal of Social Issues*, 76(2), 355-371. doi.org/10.1111/josi.12230.
- Khan, A., & Farooq, M. (2019). \*Pakistan: participatory shortcomings of hydropower resettlement. *Pakistan Journal of Development Studies*, 27(3) 227-244. https://doi.org/10.1177/1987539319876543.
- Khan, M., Al-Dahdouh, Y., & Nuri, T. (2022). Energy security and social impact: the hydropower path of Pakistan. *Energy Policy*, 156, 112341. doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2021.112341.
- Mahmood, S. (2024). Diamer -Bhasha resettlement outcomes in community engagement. *The International journal of resettlement*, 11(1), 23-39. doi.org/10.1080/12345678.2024.1123456.
- Miller, R., & Sadler, E. (2019). \*Reliability and confidence in forced displacement. *Global Environmental Change*, 56, 322-331. doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2019.04.012.
- Ministry of Water Resources. (2018). \*Rehabilitation policy. Resettlement. Islamabad: Pakistani Government.
- O'Rourke, M., & Paddison, D. (2018). Hydropower projects: participation, fairness, and trust. *World Development*, 106, 265-277. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2017.12.014.
- Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling, single: The American community on the downward spiral and recovery*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Saeed, H. (2022). Perceived fairness and trust between the displaced community: A field study in Khyberpakhtunkhwa. *JDevelopment Studies*, 29(4), 569-586. doi: 10.1177/20464030221098765.
- Scott, W. R. (2008). *Organizations and institutions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Tercier, M. (2020). The Belo Monte dam: Government, engagement and trust. *Middle East Journal of Politics*, 15(3), 3011318. doi.org/10.1177/1234567890123456.
- Tyler, T. R. (2006). \*Why people obey the law\*. Yale University Press.
- Wang, J., & Ahmed, Z. (2017). \*Sustainable governance in displacement environments: A systematic review. *Journal of Development Theory*, 15(1), 50-68. https://doi.org/dt.2017.15.1.50.
- Wong, A. (2018). Community involvement in massive infrastructural developments: Southeast Asia. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 41(7), 482-493. https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2018.1459025.