

	GOMAL UNIVERSITY JOURNAL OF RESEARCH				
Gomal University, Dera Ismail Khan, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan					
ISSN:1019- 8180 (Print) ISSN: 2708- 1737 (Online)					
Website	www.gujr.com.pk	HEC Recognized	Social Sciences	CrossRef	DOI:10.51380

LAWYERS IN THE ADVERSARIAL SYSTEM: NAVIGATING RESPONSIBILITY, MORALITY AND ETHICAL BOUNDARIES

Hafiza Rafia Tun Nisa¹, Tahira Noor¹ & Shahnila Tariq¹

¹Department of Applied Psychology, School of Professional Psychology, UMT, Lahore., Pakistan

KEYWORDS	ABSTRACT
Adversarial Advocacy, Responsibility, Morality, Ethical Consideration, Lawyers, Variance	The present research aimed to explain relationship and prediction between adversarial advocacy, responsibility, morality and ethical considerations in lawyers. It was hypothesized that there will be significant relationship amid adversarial advocacy, responsibility, morality and ethical considerations in lawyers. It was also hypothesized that adversarial advocacy, responsibility, and morality will likely to predict ethical considerations in lawyers. In this regard, a correlational research design and purposive sampling technique was used to assess the relationship between study variables. The data was collected from 79 lawyers who are currently in practice. Findings of the study describes that there is no association and correlation found between age, adversarial advocacy, responsibility, morality & ethical considerations. But there is a negative correlation found in the adversarial advocacy and responsibility and there is a highly significance level in positive correlation found amid responsibility, sub scales of morality and ethical considerations. By regression analysis, study says that responsibility was a good predictor of ethical consideration and analyses were significant with 50% of variance. The study concluded that lawyers in Pakistan have adversarial advocacy may have very less responsibility, but the moral decision making and ethical consideration doesn't have any effect on lawyers with either high or low adversarial advocacy.
Article History	
Date of Submission: 19-08-2025 Date of Acceptance: 24-09-2025 Date of Publication: 30-09-2025	
	 2025 Gomal University Journal of Research
Corresponding Author	Shahnila Tariq: Shahnila.tariq@umt.edu.pk
DOI	https://doi.org/10.51380/gujr-41-03-06

INTRODUCTION

The intersection of public trust, principle and authority is where the legal profession finds itself (Popelier, Glavina, Baldan & Zimmeren, 2022). This is never more evident than in the day-to-day practice of adversarial advocacy, when it is lawyer's responsibility to vigorously, skillfully, and strategically advance the client's legal interests. However, advocacy doesn't happen in a vacuum. Attorneys are members of profession that is subject to ethical values, officials of the

court and participants in larger justice system. In order to determine how these forces converge where they diverge, and which frameworks best responsible practice, study looks at dynamic interactions amid adversarial advocacy, responsibility, morality & ethical thought in attorneys (Penman, 2025). This research aims to explore delicate intersection amid adversarial advocacy and ethical responsibility of lawyers. It will study how legal practitioners navigate their roles within adversarial system, ethical dilemmas they encounter, and the impact of their conduct on legal outcomes and public trust. Drawing on jurisprudential theories, and professional codes of conduct, this research will analyze whether the adversarial model inherently conflicts with the moral obligations of legal professionals, or whether a harmonious balance can and should be achieved.

The adjective adversarial has two meanings, first is involving or characterized by opposition or conflict. A competitive taste is introduced by this meaning, second, the dictionary provides the definition of adversarial that is particular to law, describing a trial or legal processes in which parties in dispute have responsibility for finding and presenting evidence (Bhatti & Rizwan, 2023; Rundle, 2015). Adversarial advocacy is the legal system in which two advocates present the viewpoints of their parties to unbiased individual or group of individuals, typically a judge or jury, who seek to ascertain the case's veracity. In short, the system works like a fair contest between two parties, with judge acting as a referee who ensures fairness and makes the final decision. (Bhatti & Rizwan, 2023; Power, Larocque & Bossé, 2012; Rundle, 2015). Lawyers have special duties to their clients, such as the loyalty and zealous advocacy. Because of these duties, lawyers are sometimes allowed (even required) to do things for their clients that might seem morally wrong in the everyday life. For example, defending someone they believe is guilty or exploiting a legal loophole might feel unethical personally, but in lawyer's role, it is considered acceptable even needed to properly represent the client (Brescia, 2023; Dare, 2016; Nanasi & Loftis, 2024).

The obligation to exercise the authority or control over something or someone is referred to as responsibility. The word lawyer suggests a certain function, a potential social identity. Thus, it is essential to think of lawyers as participants in more complex activity, a social structure with some institutional legality & separate professional responsibilities (Valančienė & Machovenko, 2024). In addition to receiving generous praise for his high sense of duty, patriotic devotion, and dedication to the welfare of the people in his public service, lawyer has been commended for his loyalty, incorruptibility, fidelity, and trustworthiness in his private practice. He has also maintained self-respect of his profession by upholding high, self-imposed, ethical standards of professional conduct (Bauman, 2021; Dessem, 2009; Levin, 2008). Legal morality means rules, values and ethical standards that determine how lawyers should behave in work and when interacting with people. It is not only question of personal view about what is right, wrong, but adherence to professional codes of ethics designed to ensure honesty, fairness and justice in the practice of law.

These moral standards help to define the way that lawyers treat their clients with loyalty and confidentiality, how they treat their colleagues with respect, and how they fulfill their broader

responsibility to society by promoting justice and rule of law. Because of unique obligations and challenges involved, morality remains a narrative with which legal profession can ensure that its professionals are able to practice with integrity, responsibility, and fairness, not merely for individual profit but for benefit of society (Chow & Calvard, 2020; DiMatteo, Poncibò & Cannarsa, 2022; Pysmenna, 2023). Law can be considered to be morally constituted by values of society and rules and institutions of law itself. Still, in some fields such as corporate law, lawyers are often under pressure to prioritize interests of business and financial bottom lines over more general moral and ethical considerations. Lawyers are expected to be truthful and honest, demonstrate integrity in their affairs, and be competent by maintaining knowledge and skills. They provide framework for a fair legal system, ensuring that balance between fairness, trust and professionalism of the legal system is maintained (Bozhko, 2025; Thakur, 2025; Xu, Li & Li, 2024).

Theoretical Framework

Lawyers have a special responsibility to their clients, as a financial advisor has a responsibility to their investors. This is said to be as fiduciary duty. According to fiduciary theory on private lawyer's states that lawyers as fiduciary, can present a new justification that ethics and moral values are different from each other. Some scholars argues that this fiduciary duty can easily describes that why lawyer have to properly follow hectic rules related to ethical consideration and advocacy. This theory is new plan and alternative of older debates on advocacy & morality (Luban, 2020).

LITERATURE REVIEW

This literature review will offer comprehensive information about various studies, researches on Adversarial advocacy, Responsibility, Morality and Ethical consideration in lawyers. The study conducted by Fish (2017) explained that the American prosecutors are seen as having two kinds of role. First, adversary advocates in which they try to win the certainty and punish the other person for their clients. Second, minister of justice by which they make sure the fairness of legal system. This study argues that the adversary role should be rejected because it is out of the ethics code, prosecutor can do unethical things and don't work morally and can make wrong decisions for their clients. The study suggests other role for prosecutors, when the law is nonjudgmental then the prosecutor should act neutral and proceed the case without caring about winning, losing. When law gives the discretion, they should use moral judgment to decide that what policy should they use which is right both politically and morally for make their decisions as responsible (Flores, 2024; Valvoda, Thompson, Cotterell & Teufel, 2024). In another study author says that adversarial procedure is a battle for lawyers to win from their opposing party.

When a lawyer comes to take adversarial role for case, he starts making beliefs, interpretations about evidence and making judgments about other parties to support their clients either this is ethically right or wrong. This kind of biases affects their emotions, motivation and many other psychological processes. The findings identified negative effect on three parts of legal process e.g. interpreting evidence, moral decision making and judgment (Simon, 2025; Xu et al., 2024).

Strong evidence suggests that lawyers, often ending up by procedural machinery of the court system, focus is mainly on the defendant's guilt or innocence. In 2021 concept of Pre-Charge Engagement (PCE) was introduced. To avoid the unusual and unnecessary trials in the court, resolves the cases quickly and speedy and also to reduce delays are some goals of the PCE. The findings suggested that if PCE is not properly used and ignored by the defense lawyers then they might not act in the best way to serve their client's interests (Johnston, 2024). Johnston (2024) investigated that the defense lawyer act in a way by which he can gets the interest of his client, but because of the court system machinery this idea of adversarial advocacy thus starts slowing down.

Rather than being more adversarial, the system of a very cooperative and manageable style is needed. A very huge change introduced named as the criminal procedure rule 2003 (CrimPR) which aimed to avoid delays, wrong, unuseful trials and quick decision for cases (Johnston, 2024). Saputro and Salman (2024), study legal and moral principles as guidelines for carrying out official duties. The findings suggested that in order to attain conformity regarding duties of state officers, morality plays important role. A close connection was found between bad morals of state officials and behavior that violates the law whereas good morals will make behavior high and far from breaking law. The study investigated that there are many questions raised on ethical, moral responsibilities of lawyers in different companies, law schools and law firms, but never gets a proper answer on it. These three groups blame each other rather than work together. This suggest that they should work together and collaborate with each other for best results. The role of lawyers, responsibilities and moral decision making is useful in shaping the procedure that how they work together and fulfil their accountability (Heineman et al., 2014; Xu et al., 2024).

The study investigated that many people thinks that lawyers are not responsible in their work and also for their goals and clients, but many public lawyers and people argues that lawyers are partly responsible in their actions. The lawyers can show that they are not giving harm to anyone with their work and respond to the challenges they are facing. But sometime they can't respond to the challenges as they only give attention to the small part of large goal (Hammond, 2021; McMorrow, 2022). Chow and Calvard (2021) conducted 58 interviews of the commercial lawyers and then he comes to know that the job environment leads them to be less moral in their work. Lawyers are pressured to make decisions about what is good, useful and profitable for him and his clients rather than the focus on what is right and ethical. The study argues that profession especially for lawyers need to be improved. It will not only improve performance of lawyers and their moral compromises but also make a better legal system. The purpose of another study was to examine the meaning of loyalty in law, legal ethics and fiduciary law and to consider how it relates to the larger concepts of the rule of law as well as the democratic self-government.

The study is nonetheless a valuable contribution by clarifying the role loyalty plays in the legal ethics and providing a framework to show how fidelity to law and fidelity to clients can be in conflict (Wendel, 2020). Ethics for lawyers is a concept that refers to the moral and professional

obligations that lawyers have in realm of practicing law. Moral principles should be integrated in the law when the needs of society are great particularly whereby morality alone cannot be sufficient to regulate conduct. Morality is entrenched in the law in a more unfathomable and less apparent manner than simple rules of professional ethics would lead you to believe. Moral principles which govern every individual also govern lawyers, and are entrenched in the law itself. In brief, the paper demonstrates that law and morality are closely related and legal ethics cannot be regarded as a human morality that is above general human morality (Nurata, 2022). Another study aimed to explore relationship between ethics, morality and law and distinction between them. According to this research, morality manifests itself in the way people behave and relate with each other, whereas law concentrates on the outside behavior of citizens among themselves.

Every legal system is also connected with morality, so the two are closely related. The terms ethics and morality have been used interchangeably, but ethics is more about principles and values whereas morality is about practicing these values within society. It is also emphasized that legal ethics is vital since it helps lawyers to know what they should do as professionals and as members of society, showing a connection between law, morality, and ethics (Xhemajli, 2021). Furthermore, the paper presents concept of professionalism-in-fact, i.e., the way lawyers think about ethics in their everyday activities. In brief, politics and practice influence ethics codes, and the ethics of lawyers are determined by the type of activity (Menkel-Meadow, 2018, 2024). The professional codes cannot be solely used to ensure that lawyers consistently behave in a highly ethical manner, was main purpose of one of the studies. The key to moral behavior in legal practice is the cultivation of the professional moral character of the lawyer, that is to say, the cultivation of stable qualities of character or values that inform his or her behavior. In addition, it noted that, although codes of conduct are not the whole solution, they still have an important role because they can facilitate or impede the development of this moral character (Zacharias, 2007).

Rationale

Several researches describes that adversarial advocacy has to be rejected because those lawyers who have huge intensions to adversarial advocacy are much un ethical and non-responsible and they only try to fulfil the interest of their clients. The legal system in Pakistan is working with delayed justice. It can be because of the issues created by the lawyers' lack of morality and ethics. In Pakistan, very few researches were conducted on lawyers thus purpose of research was to investigate relationship amid adversarial advocacy, responsibility, morality and ethics in lawyers.

Objectives of Study

1. To study the relationship between adversarial advocacy, responsibility, morality and ethical consideration in lawyers.
2. To study the Adversarial advocacy, responsibility and morality as predictors of ethical considerations in the lawyers.

Hypothesis of Study

1. There is likely to be relationship amid adversarial advocacy, responsibility, morality and ethical consideration in lawyers.
2. The adversarial advocacy, responsibility and morality will likely to predict the ethical considerations in the lawyers.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This section identifies the methodologies and strategies we use to conduct this study with the proper ethical considerations of a good style of research. In order to investigate the study on topic of Adversarial Advocacy, responsibility, morality and ethical consideration in lawyers, we use a correlational research design by which we identify the relationship between variables and the prediction in variables through regression. In this study sampling technique we use is convenient sampling technique. In research we took total number of (N= 79) participants. The participants were legal practitioners in Lahore with range of age amid 24-50 years (M = 31.68; SD = 5.49) with at least 2, more years of practice. The participants with physical disability were not included.

Assessment scales

The demographic information about the participants Including age, gender, education, marital status, belonging area, practice duration. The questions for Adversarial Advocacy was selected from "Adversarial System of Justice" from the website named "Quiz and Worksheet". It is an online quiz for the lawyers to assess their competency as a lawyer. It has only three questions which can predicts the advocacy in lawyers. The aim of this quiz is to gauge the knowledge of the lawyers about adversarial system. To learn that how the adversarial system of justice can protect the environment from corruption and crime. Therefore, Cronbach alpha value of the scale was .52.

Responsibility scale (Arslan, & Wong, 2022)

This is an 8-Items questionnaire that is used to examine level of responsibility in people. We use scale to evaluate level of responsibility present in lawyers. It consisted of a 5-point Likert scale. The scale has 5 categories: "strongly disagree," "disagree," "neutral," "agree," "strongly agree." This scale is use to assess personal and social responsibility. Cronbach alpha value of scale was .73.

Morality Scale (Graham, 2008)

To assess morality, we choose the moral foundations questionnaire, this is a reliable scale of theoretically stable measurement of moral foundations. It is a 32-Item questionnaire which is responsible to assess morality in 5 different phases which are Harm-Care, Fairness-Reciprocity, Group-Loyalty, Authority-Respect, Purity-Sanctity. All items of scale are scored using 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 1= not at all relevant to 5= extremely relevant. These types of moral foundations, providing chance to realize moral diversity in a person. Cronbach value of the scale was .87.

Ethical Considerations scale (Plante & McCreadie, 2019)

To assess ethical considerations in lawyers we select questionnaire of Santa Clara Ethics Scale. This is an 8-Items questionnaire which is used to examine ethics in person. All items of scale consist on a 4-point Likert scale, ranging from 1= strongly disagree; 2= disagree; 3= agree; 4= strongly agree. Plante only conduct this scale upon university students but says that for future reference, this scale has to conduct on non- university students and other people. Cronbach value was .72.

Procedure of Study

After getting synopsis approval from institution (University of Management and Technology (UMT)), we started our data collection process. Participants were recruited from the networks, personal contacts, and academic, courts and legal institutions. They were initially contacted over physically personal visits and taking time on phone calls, briefly describing study’s aim and scope. We assure Participants that their data would remain confidential and only use for research purpose. The questionnaire also include demographic sheet of participants and the scales which are related to our variables. We conducted research according to APA declaration on the research ethics and also, we consider all the ethical points to ensure the originality of the research process.

RESULTS OF STUDY

Table 1

Psychometric Properties of the Study Variables

Scales	M	SD	Range	α
Adversarial Advocacy	7.29	2.15	3-12	.52
Responsibility	33.26	4.98	8-40	.78
Morality	116.5	17.48	0-160	.87
Ethical considerations	33.41	4.27	10-40	.72

The table presents descriptive statistics and reliability for four scales: adversarial advocacy, responsibility, morality and ethical consideration. The scales for responsibility, morality, and ethical consideration showing good to high reliability, Adversarial Advocacy has relatively low reliability.

Table 2

Correlation between Research Variables (N= 79)

Variables	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Age	31.68	5.49	-							
2. AA	7.29	2.15	.02	-						
3. R	33.26	4.98	.12	-.34**	-					
4. H-C	22.25	4.20	.03	.03	.58***	-				
5. F-R	22.73	4.22	.13	.19	.45***	.77***	-			

6. G-L	21.51	4.28	.099	.04	.399***	.63***	.72***	-		
7. A-R	22.10	3.62	.10	.07	.43***	.64***	.68***	.56***		
8. P-S	21.58	4.46	.08	.21	.31**	.46***	.52***	.46***	.70***	-
9. EC	33.41	4.27	.07	.07	.496***	.54***	.61***	.55***	.596***	.52***

Note: **p<.01, ***p<.001

Note: AA= Adversarial Advocacy; R= Responsibility; H-C = Harm and care; F-R= Fair Reciprocity; G-L= Group and Loyalty; A-R= Authority and Respect; P-S= Purity and Sanctity; EC= Ethical Consideration.

The relationship between age, adversarial advocacy, responsibility, sub scales of morality and ethical consideration was investigated using Pearson product moment correlation coefficient. No correlation found between all variables and age. A negative correlation was found between adversarial advocacy and responsibility. Thus, no correlation was found between adversarial advocacy and other variables except responsibility. A positive correlation was found between Responsibility and Harm and care, fair reciprocity, group and loyalty, authority and respect, purity and sanctity and ethical consideration respectively. Also there is a positive correlation found between harm and care, fair reciprocity, group and loyalty, authority and respect, purity and sanctity and ethical consideration. There is a positive correlation found between group and loyalty, authority and respect, purity and sanctity and ethical consideration as shown in the table.

Table 3

Linear regression analysis of AA, R, sub scales of M and EC.

Variable	EC		
	B	β	SE
Constant	9.6***		3.4
Adversarial Advocacy	.18	.09	.20
Responsibility	.25**	.29	.10
Harm- Care	-.06	-.06	.15
Fairness-Reciprocity	.19	.19	.16
Group-Loyalty	.17	.17	.12
Authority-Respect	.22	.19	.17
Purity-Sanctity	.12	.12	.12
R2	.50		

Note: ***p< .001, **p<.01

Note: AA= Adversarial Advocacy; R= Responsibility; H-C = Harm and care; F-R= Fair Reciprocity; G-L= Group and Loyalty; A-R= Authority and Respect; P-S= Purity and Sanctity; EC= Ethical Consideration.

Simple linear regression was carried out to investigate contribution of independent variables i.e., AA, R, sub scales of M that predicts EC. Preliminary analyses were performed to ensure no violation of assumptions of normality, linearity & homoscedasticity. The model is significant, result showed that 50% variance is explained by predictor $F(7, 71) = 10.4, p<.01$. These findings showed R was positive predictor of EC, represents that having high level of responsibility can

lead towards the high ethical consideration in lawyers. Furthermore, AA and M are not good predictors of EC.

Table 4
Independent-Samples t-Test

Variables	Male (n= 48)		Female (n= 31)		t
	M	SD	M	SD	
AA	7.4	2.1	7.2	2.3	.42
R	32.2	5.7	34.9	3.1	-2.5*
H-C	21.2	4.4	23.9	3.3	-2.9**
F-R	21.7	4.4	24.3	3.5	-2.8**
G-L	20.5	4.9	23.03	2.6	-2.6*
A-R	21.2	3.7	23.5	3.04	-2.9**
P-S	20.6	4.4	23.03	4.3	-2.4*
EC	32.9	4.1	34.2	4.5	-1.3

Note: AA= Adversarial Advocacy; R= Responsibility; H-C = Harm and care; F-R= Fair Reciprocity; G-L= Group and Loyalty; A-R= Authority and Respect; P-S= Purity and Sanctity; EC= Ethical Consideration.

An independent-samples t-test was used to compare the adversarial advocacy, responsibility, subscales of morality and ethical consideration scores in male and female lawyers. There is a significant difference present in responsibility, harm and care, fairness, reciprocity, group and loyalty, authority, respect and purity and sanctity of male and female lawyers. But there was no significant different present in adversarial advocacy and ethical considerations of male and female lawyers.

Table 5
Independent-Samples t-Test

Variables	Single (n= 38)		Married (n= 41)		t
	M	SD	M	SD	
AA	7.4	2.01	7.1	2.3	.61
R	31.8	6.3	34.6	2.8	-2.6**
H-C	21.2	4.3	23.2	3.9	-2.1*
F-R	21.3	4.5	24.04	3.4	-3.01**
G-L	20.2	5.2	22.8	2.8	-2.8**
A-R	21.3	3.9	22.8	3.1	-1.8*
P-S	20.7	4.9	22.4	3.8	-1.7*
EC	32.5	4.5	34.3	3.9	-1.9*

Note: AA= Adversarial Advocacy; R= Responsibility; H-C = Harm and care; F-R= Fair Reciprocity; G-L= Group and Loyalty; A-R= Authority and Respect; P-S= Purity and Sanctity; EC= Ethical Consideration.

An independent-samples t-test was used to compare the adversarial advocacy, responsibility, subscales of morality and ethical consideration scores in single and married lawyers. There is a significant difference present in responsibility, harm and care, fairness and reciprocity, group and loyalty, authority and respect, purity and sanctity and ethical consideration of single and

the married lawyers. Nonetheless there was no significant different present in the adversarial advocacy.

Table 6
Independent-Samples t-Test

Variables	Urban (n= 40)		Rural (n= 39)		t
	M	SD	M	SD	
AA	7.4	2.2	7.2	2.2	.34
R	32.6	5.8	33.9	3.9	-1.2
H-C	21.8	4.3	22.8	4.1	-1.1
F-R	22.3	4.5	23.2	3.9	-.98
G-L	20.5	4.8	22.6	3.4	-2.3*
A-R	22.4	4.1	21.8	3.1	.68
P-S	21.2	4.9	21.9	4.03	-.77
EC	32.4	4.4	34.5	3.9	-2.3*

Note: AA= Adversarial Advocacy; R= Responsibility; H-C = Harm and care; F-R= Fair Reciprocity; G-L= Group and Loyalty; A-R= Authority and Respect; P-S= Purity and Sanctity; EC= Ethical Consideration.

An independent-samples t-test was used to compare the adversarial advocacy, responsibility, subscales of morality and ethical scores in urban and rural belonging areas lawyers. There is a significant difference present in group and loyalty. But no significant difference present in any other variables.

DISCUSSION

The findings showed that the prosecutors’ adversarial nature has made them tend to behave unethically. They can be too concerned with winning and not so much with fairness or justice. As evident from results, adversarial advocacy was not very reliable and did not significantly influence ethics. Actually, adversarial advocacy and responsibility had a negative relationship, that is, the more a lawyer was oriented towards being adversarial, the less responsible they appeared. This is similar to argument that adversarial practices may lead to moral and ethical decisions making (Fish, 2017). Simon (2025) reported that adversarial lawyering may generate biases and misrepresent the manner in which lawyer’s reason, appraise, and utilize evidence. The findings of research support that argument since adversarial advocacy failed to predict helpful ethical results. Equally, study described how new systems were developed to minimize the evils of adversarial practices such as Pre-Charge Engagement (PCE) (Johnston, 2024). The reason why reforms are needed is that the Adversarial Advocacy did not fit well with ethics in this study.

It further notes that the law profession is diverse and thus the ethical issues affecting lawyers in various regions are not the same. Responsibility, on other side, was strongly and positively correlated with ethical consideration (EC). This finding confirms that lawyers have to answer to their deeds and people they represent (McMorrow & Scheuer, 2010). The findings are also consistent which revealed that responsibility assists lawyers to make superior moral decisions despite pressures in work environment (Chow & Calvard, 2021). The close connection between

responsibility and ethics in this paper confirms that when lawyers cannot ignore responsibility, they tend to engage in ethical practices. In this linking, the morality (M) was very reliable, but it was not a significant predictor of ethical consideration. The fact is interesting, as one of the researchers, Sheppard, (2007) thought that in law, the core of ethical behavior is morality. The outside pressures can explain the difference here. Thus, several lawyers operate in challenging environment where profit and client pressure supersede their own moral principles, values, preventing them from adhering to their own moral standards at all times (Chow & Calvard, 2021).

This is probably why morality alone was not predictor of ethics in study. Although morality is a significant factor, it might not necessarily present itself in the practice, unless the lawyers themselves are responsible and feel accountable. Such a high degree of responsibility to predict ethics is justified by fact that responsibility forces lawyers to think outside the box of winning cases. Lawyers feel a sense of responsibility and therefore consider the relevance of fairness and justice and overall consequences of actions. Such a wider way of thinking automatically results in an increased ethical action. Responsible lawyers will be less willing to undermine fairness, and more willing to behave in a way that honors their clients and legal system. The poor position of adversarial advocacy is attributable to psychological hitches that accompany this form of lawyering. According to Simon adversarial practices also have the potential to cause bias amongst lawyers (Simon, 2025). They can get too attached to the interests of their client and neglect objectivity or justice. This tendency restricts accountability & damage moral assessment.

This is why the process of adversarial advocacy had a negative correlation with responsibility in the results. It is also worth explaining how morality was not found predictor of the ethical consideration. Most lawyers might have strong moral values that they believe in personally, yet the nature of their work does not always permit them to follow through on their beliefs. Indicatively, lawyers can neglect their standards of the morality when there is pressure to win, make money or please some influential clients. study explained that professional codes and personal morals cannot suffice unless lawyers also develop strong moral character as well as a sense of responsibility (Nurata, 2022). This paper reveals that morality in itself cannot help to produce ethical conduct, but when it is combined with responsibility, it will have a stronger impact on the behavior of lawyers. The other issue that is worthy of note is that responsibility appears to serve as intermediary between morality and ethics. Whereas morality alone failed to predict ethics, responsibility did. This indicates that the moral values can still be important but they become more relevant when the lawyers become responsible in their decisions as well as actions.

With responsibility, moral values can become actual ethical choices in practice. The initial test was that positive correlation would exist between responsibility and morality among lawyers. The results supported this. Morality was closely related to responsibility and both were linked to consideration of ethics. Author emphasized role of responsibility when developing moral & ethical work (Heineman et al., 2014; McMorrow, 2022). The considerations of responsibility

would be a good predictor of adversarial advocacy in lawyers. The results also supported this. The regression indicated that responsibility was a significant predictor of ethical consideration, and it predicted much of data variation. This examination resembles to foundational research that stated that responsibility is patient right to informed consent (Chow & Calvard, 2021; Loacker, 2023). The first hypothesis was that there be strong correlation among advocacy and responsibility, morality, and ethics. This was not in the results. Rather, the responsibility was negatively correlated with adversarial advocacy and was not predictor of ethical consideration. This finding is consistent with claims of authors that in many cases, adversarial practices do not enhance fairness, responsibility & ethical integrity but instead deteriorate them (Fish, 2017; Simon, 2025).

CONCLUSION

Finally, the findings of this paper categorically indicate that responsibility is the most notable element in motivating ethical conduct in lawyers. Responsibility assists lawyers to reconcile client interests with fairness and justice and enables moral values to be transformed into actual ethical behaviors. In contrast, the adversarial advocacy undermines accountability and is not linked with ethical practice. Morality is significant concept, but on its own, it is not sufficient and there has to be responsibility to make it work. The research proves the first hypotheses about responsibility, but disapproves hypothesis that was put forward concerning adversarial advocacy. To conclude this, the present study claims that the legal education and professional training must be familiarized at the development of responsibility and accountability, as work on reducing the exaggerated focus law as a strictly adversarial field. In this regard, in so doing, the profession of law would be more principled, more fair, as well as more consistent with the ideals of justice.

Suggestions

There was very a smaller number of researches on Pakistani lawyers so more researches can be conducted on this topic to see that how relationship amid these variables changes by time, for gives more information about Asian lawyers and Asian legal system. If a qualitative research conduct on variables to recognize themes on it by asking questions about topics, then it can be more interesting.

REFERENCES

- Arslan, G., & Wong, P. T. (2022). Measuring personal and social responsibility: an existential positive psychology approach. *Journal of Happiness and Health*, 2(1), 1-11.
- Bauman, R. W. (2021). *The Critical legal studies: A guide to the literature*. Routledge.
- Bhatti, M. U., & Rizwan, M. S. (2023). Alternative dispute resolution in criminal justice system: a case study of the Punjab ADR act 2019. *Pakistan Journal of Social Research*, 5(01), 181-195.
- Bozhko, A. (2025). The ethical component of the lawyer's legal status. *Uzhhorod National University Herald. Series: Law*
- Brescia, R. H. (2023). What's Lawyer For? Artificial Intelligence & Third-Wave Lawyering. *Fla. St. UL Rev.*, 51, 543.

- Chow, D. Y. L., & Calvard, T. (2021). Constrained morality in the professional work of corporate lawyers. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 170(2), 213-228.
- Dare, T. (2016). *The Counsel of Rogues: A Defence of the Standard Conception of the Lawyer's Role*. Routledge.
- Dessem, R. L. (2009). Symposium: Mulling Over the Missouri Plan: A Review of State Judicial Selection and Retention Systems. *Missouri Law Review*, 74(3).
- DiMatteo, L. A., Poncibò, C., & Cannarsa, M. (Eds.). (2022). *The Cambridge handbook of artificial intelligence: global perspectives on law and ethics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Fish, E. S. (2017). Against adversary prosecution. *Iowa L. Rev.*, 103, 1419.
- Flores, I. B. (2024). Lessons from Waluchow: Necessity, Desirability, and Intelligibility of (Weak) Judicial Discretion. In *Law, Morality & Judicial Reasoning: Essays on WJ Waluchow's Jurisprudence and Constitutional Theory* (pp. 139-163). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Graham, J., Nosek, B. A., Haidt, J., Iyer, R., Spassena, K., & Ditto, P. H. (2008). Moral foundations questionnaire. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*.
- Hammond, A. (2021). The Federal Rules of Pro Se Procedure. *Fordham Law Review.*, 90, 2689.
- Heineman, B. W., Lee, W. F., & Wilkins, D. B. (2014). Lawyers as professionals and as citizens: Key roles and responsibilities in the 21st century. *Center on the Legal Profession at Harvard Law School*, 71.
- Johnston, E. (2024). The adversarial lawyer and the client's best interest: Failures with pre-charge engagement. *The Journal of Criminal Law*, 88(1), 3-16.
- Levin, L. C. (2008). Pro Bono Publico in a Parallel Universe: The Meaning of Pro Bono in Solo and Small Law Firms. *Hofstra Law Review.*, 37, 699.
- Loacker, B. (2023). Does the ethos of law erode? Lawyers' professional practices, self-understanding and ethics at work. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 187(1), 33-52.
- Luban, D. (2020). Fiduciary legal ethics, zeal, and moral activism. *Geo. J. Legal Ethics*, 33, 275.
- McMorrow, J. A. (2022). Teaching Legal Ethics in a Client-Centered Profession. *Educating in Ethics Across the Professions: A Compendium of Research, Theory, Practice, and an Agenda for the Future*, 1.
- Menkel-Meadow, C. (2024). Dispute Resolution as Civil Justice: The Evolution of Process Pluralism. *UC Irvine School of Law Research Paper*, (2024-20).
- Menkel-Meadow, C. (2018). Ethics in alternative dispute resolution: new issues, no answers from the adversary conception of lawyers' responsibilities. In *Mediation* (pp. 429-476). Routledge.
- Nurata, Z. C. (2022). The concept of professional ethics and debates on professional ethics in the legal profession: The case of Ankara. *Siyasal: Journal of Political Sciences*, 31(1), 173-193.
- Penman, R. A. (2025). *Justice in the Making: Relating, Participating, Communicating*. CMMi Press.
- Plante, T. G., & McCreadie, A. (2019). The Santa Clara Ethics Scale. *Pastoral Psychology*, 68(3), 321-329.
- Popelier, P., Glavina, M., Baldan, F., & Zimmeren, E. (2022). A research agenda for trust and distrust in a multilevel judicial system. *Maastricht Journal of European and Comparative Law*, 29(3), 351-374.

- Power, M. C., Larocque, F., & Bossé, D. (2012). Constitutional Litigation, the Adversarial System and Some of its Adverse Effects. *Review & Const. Studies.*, 17, 1.
- Pysmenna, O. (2023). Moral and ethical component of the professional culture of a lawyer. *Juridical Scientific and Electronic Journal*, 70
- Rundle, O. (2015). Lawyers' participation in mediation & professional ethical disposition. *Legal Ethics*, 18(1), 46-68.
- Saputro, A., & Salman, R. (2024). Legal and Moral Principles as Guidelines for Carrying Out Official Duties. *Yuridika*, 39(2), 127-152.
- Sheppard, S. (2007). *The History of Legal Education in the United States: Commentaries and Primary Sources* (Vol. 1). The Lawbook Exchange, Ltd.
- Simon, D. (2025). The adversarial bias. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*, 21.
- Study.com. (2025). Adversarial System of Justice | Overview, Benefits & Downsides. Retrieved <https://study.com/academy/practice/quiz-worksheet-adversarial-system-of-justice-benefits.html>.
- Thakur, R. (2025). Legal ethics: navigating morality and professional responsibility in law. *Journal of Society, Culture, and Law*, 1(1), 19-24.
- Valančienė, D., & Machovenko, J. (2024). The Moral Compass of Law: Ensuring Ethical Standards Through Legal Education. *Filosofija. Sociologija*, 35(2 Special).
- Valvoda, J., Thompson, A., Cotterell, R., & Teufel, S. (2024). The ethics of automating legal actors. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 12, 700-720.
- Wendel, W. B. (2020). Should Lawyers Be Loyal to Clients, the Law, or Both? *The American Journal of Jurisprudence*, 65(1), 19-39.
- Xhemajli, H. (2021). The role of ethics and morality in law: Similarities and differences. *Ohio NUL Rev.*, 48, 81.
- Xu, J., Li, Z., & Li, S. (2024). Legal Ethics and Professional Responsibility in Legal Profession. SHS Web of Conferences.
- Zacharias, C. (2007). The preemployment ethical role of lawyer: Are lawyers really fiduciaries? *William & Mary Law Review*, 49, 569.