International Journal on Culture, History, and Religion
https://ijchr.net | eISSN: 3028-1318
Volume 7 Special Issue 1 | doi: https://doi.org/10.63931/ijchr.v7iSI1.348

Article

Analysis of Philosophical Dimensions in the Context of the Problem of Equality and Justice in Society

Sadjola Xhelili[1], Khusen Djuraev[2], Ayman Othman Abdel Alim Mohamed[2], Akmal Yuldashev[2], & Rano Raupova[2]
[1]European University of Tirana and [2]Bukhara State University
Correspondence: sadjolaxhelili@gmail.com

Abstract

The aim of the study was to provide a comprehensive philosophical analysis of the problems of equality and justice through the study of theories of redistribution of resources, equal opportunities and individual rights in the current social and political context. The study used a multifaceted approach that combined textual and contextual interpretation of philosophical concepts with a comparative analysis of the main theories of justice. To collect empirical data, a survey was conducted among 300 respondents aged 18 to 60, with different levels of education and social status. Statistical methods, including Student's t-test and multiple regression, were used to identify the main trends. The study revealed differences and similarities in approaches to justice and assessed the application in the context of globalization and technological change. The main results showed that 72% of respondents support the concept of redistribution of resources as an important tool for achieving social justice. Also, 65% of respondents believed that equal opportunities for all are essential for a just society. 32% of respondents from less developed regions confirmed having the opportunity to make full use of digital technologies, compared to 75% of respondents from developed urban areas. According to the results, 63% of women reported experiencing discrimination in the workplace, while the figure for men was only 35%. The findings allowed formulating recommendations for adapting theoretical concepts to modern social realities, which can contribute to a more equitable society in the context of globalization and technological change.

Keywords: *liberalism, Marxism, moral and ethical dilemmas, social theory, social thought*

Suggested citation:
Xhelili, S., Djuraev, K., Mohamed, A., Yuldashev, A., and Raupova, R. (2025). Analysis of Philosophical Dimensions in the Context of the Problem of Equality and Justice in Society. *International Journal on Culture, History, and Religion, 7*(SI1), 871-888. https://doi.org/10.63931/ijchr.v7iSI1.348

Introduction

The issues of equality and justice in society remain among the most debated in philosophy and social science. These issues are closely linked to the basic principles on which any democratic society is built, including human rights, social guarantees, and economic justice (Khomenko, 2025). While exploring these issues, numerous debates arise about what constitutes a fair distribution of resources, how to ensure equal opportunities for all citizens, and how to reduce social inequalities.

Thrift and Sugarman (2024) argue that these concepts are fundamental to understanding how society functions and play a crucial role in shaping political, economic, and social processes. Modern challenges, such as globalization, social inequality, economic crises, and changes in the technological sphere, challenge traditional approaches to these concepts. Therefore, Rouse (2019), in the work, emphasized that in the context of socio-political changes and growing global problems, it is crucial to revise theories of justice that should consider both individual rights and collective interests.

According to Xu et al. (2025), the problem of inequality has become one of the most acute in modern society, as it manifests itself not only in the material but also in the social, cultural, and political contexts. Such inequality is widening due to insufficient access to education, healthcare, jobs, and civil rights, leading to the social marginalization of specific population groups. One of the main tasks of the modern theory of justice is to formulate principles that not only minimize economic inequality but also ensure equality in access to social benefits and rights (Khan et al., 2025). Alcañiz-Colomer et al. (2023) concluded in their work that issues related to the definition of justice and equality are becoming particularly relevant for modern society, which is experiencing global changes caused not only by economic processes but also by social activism and the struggle for minority rights.

The study's relevance is also confirmed by the works of authors who have contributed significantly to developing theories of justice. In the work, Taylor-Gooby (2022) emphasizes creating a social structure that provides equal opportunities for all, regardless of the initial social conditions (Kochubeynyk, 2021). This theory proposes the so-called principle of *"differences"*, according to which social and economic inequalities are justified only when benefiting the most vulnerable members of society. Törnblom et al. (2024) argue that justice protects individual rights and freedoms. According to the researcher, every person has the right to full ownership of their resources and to dispose of them without interference from the state. This position emphasizes the importance of protecting personal freedom as a basis for social justice.

Flanigan and Hosie (2022) develop the concept of *"justice as opportunity"*, drawing attention to the importance of equal opportunity for all members of society, regardless of social conditions. The author argues that justice cannot be measured solely by economic indicators or material resources but should be assessed through the prism of people's opportunities to achieve their goals and exercise their rights.

These works provide a theoretical framework for analyzing and finding a balance between individual rights and the public good, an important aspect of contemporary philosophical and social thought. Martschenko (2021) argues that the challenges of globalization and rapid technological development undoubtedly require new approaches to the definition of equality and justice, which will be adapted to changes in the social, economic, and political spheres, making it possible to build a fairer society.

The main objective was to examine the impact of globalization processes, technological transformations, and social inequalities on interpreting and implementing the concepts of justice and equality and determine the relevance in the context of contemporary challenges such as crises, inequality, and social mobility.

Research objectives were:

1. Identifying current problems and challenges of equality and justice in the context of globalization, economic crises, technological change, and social transformation.
2. Interpretation of the philosophical concepts of justice and equality in the context of modern social and political processes.
3. Study the relationship between social inequalities and access to opportunities that determine social mobility, political and economic rights, and cultural equality.

Methodology

The research methodology was based on a multifaceted approach that included an analysis of philosophical texts and theories and a comparative method to identify differences and similarities in approaches to justice and equality. Studying the theoretical foundations of equality and justice required a comprehensive analysis of both classical and contemporary works in the social philosophy and theory of justice. A review of contemporary publications in this area allowed assessing how theories of justice develop in the face of modern challenges, such as globalization, technological innovation, and social movements.

One of the main methodological strategies has been comparative analysis to identify differences and commonalities in the approaches to justice proposed by different philosophers. In this context, it was critical to explore how different

conceptions of equality and justice relate to contemporary social and political processes, and how they can be adapted to new realities. For this purpose, the concept of *"justice as fair opportunity"* by J. Rawls, the liberal approach by R. Nozick, and the opportunity theory by A. Sen were considered. At the same time, critical approaches to these theories were analyzed, revealing the weaknesses and shortcomings in the context of current problems of social inequality.

The study involved various methods of analyzing philosophical concepts, among which a special place is occupied by textual and contextual interpretation of philosophical ideas concerning real social and political processes. It allowed not only a better understanding of the theoretical foundations but also predicting possible directions of the practical application in the context of modern challenges, in the issues of social mobility, citizen participation in the political process, and in addressing the problem of unequal access to resources.

The study used empirical data collection and analysis methods, including a questionnaire distributed to 300 respondents aged 18 to 60. The survey was conducted online through the Google Forms platform, which allows for convenient access and anonymity for respondents. The sample was randomly selected to ensure that the results are representative. Among the participants, 45% were men and 55% were women, which makes it possible to assess the difference in the views of different social groups on equality and justice. All respondents were residents of Albanian cities, with different levels of education and social status. It allowed for the diversity of social contexts and levels of awareness of the issues under study to be considered.

The questionnaire contained 20 closed-ended questions formulated using a Likert scale, which allows for assessing respondents' degree of support for various concepts of justice and equality. The questions covered equality of opportunity, social and economic rights, and minority rights.

For each question, respondents had to choose one of five answers: "*strongly disagree*", "*disagree*", "*neutral*", "*agree*", and "*strongly agree*". It allowed a clearer picture of the degree of support or rejection of certain concepts of justice and equality among different population groups.

The data were processed using statistical methods, including Student's t-test to compare different groups of respondents and multiple regression to analyze the relationships between different factors that influence perceptions of equality and justice. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software allowed accurate and efficient data processing, contributing to a deeper understanding of key social trends related to equality and justice issues.

Results

This study analyses sociological data to find out how people's real perceptions of justice in society relate to the theoretical concepts of J. Rawls, A. Sen, and other philosophers. Modern society is constantly facing the problems of social inequality,

and these issues are becoming especially important in the context of globalization and changes in economic and social structures. Citizens' attitudes towards the idea of justice and the perception of resource distribution can provide important insights for further policy development and social reforms (Zanetti, 2021).

The study assessed how important social interventions are for achieving justice and equal opportunities for all citizens. Studying the respondents' opinions, the assessments of social justice, and practical experience in various spheres of life will help better understand whether social realities reflect the ideas put forward in these theories and identify effective ways to eliminate social inequalities in the modern world.

The study showed that most respondents (68%) believe that the current social structure does not ensure a fair distribution of resources. This result is significant, as it confirms J. Rawls' theory of justice, which argues that a fair distribution of resources is possible only if the welfare of the least privileged members of society is maximized. Distribution equity should consider economic and social factors that affect access to benefits, creating a more equal playing field for all.

It is also supported by the concept of *"justice as fair opportunity"*, according to which resources should be distributed and equal opportunities should be provided for all members of society. Thus, societal equity requires everyone to realize the potential, regardless of social status or initial conditions. This approach emphasizes the importance of equal access to education, healthcare, housing, and social and economic opportunities (Piketty, 2023).

Based on this, the state's role becomes essential, as it actively intervenes to prevent social injustice and inequality. It is especially true in areas such as education, healthcare, and economic activity, where ensuring equal opportunities allows for the creation of a basis for the fair development of all members of society. The state should be responsible for creating a system that guarantees every citizen's access to the necessary resources and opportunities for self-realization (Brown, 2019).

This approach also supports the ideas proposed by A. Sen, who attached great importance to the capabilities of individuals, not just the resources at individuals' disposal. Thus, the study not only confirms the concepts of equitable distribution but also reveals the important role of the state in ensuring these principles through policies that promote equality of opportunity and reduce social inequality.

72% of respondents indicated limited access to education and professional opportunities due to socio-economic barriers (Table 1). It correlates with A.Sen's theory emphasizes the importance of access to social and economic opportunities for achieving equity.

Table 1. Distribution of Opinions on the Fair Distribution of Resources

Parameter	Percentage of respondents
There is a belief that the current social structure does not ensure a fair distribution of resources	68%
There is a belief that access to education and professional opportunities is limited due to socio-economic barriers	72%

Source: compiled by the authors.

According to Sen (2009), the problems of unequal access to basic goods and services require the implementation of resource redistribution policies that help ensure equal opportunities for all members of society. Justice should ensure equality in results and chances, which is one of the main ideas of A. Sen.

This approach is important for understanding how structural socio-economic barriers can hinder the development of individuals' potential and success in society. In particular, access to education and professional development, as noted in the study, often depends on social status, which confirms A. Sen's theory about the need for a fair redistribution of resources and the creation of equal opportunities for all citizens. Justice in society is worth discussing only when everyone has equal chances to develop their abilities and achievements.

In conformity with this theory, public policy should remove barriers that limit access to education and professional opportunities, such as low income, limited access to quality educational institutions, or social and cultural stereotypes (Abdykadyrova et al., 2023). Solving these problems requires comprehensive measures, including education, employment, and social protection, ensuring equal conditions for developing each person's societal potential (Piketty, 2021; Sliusarenko, 2023).

At the same time, 63% of respondents from the group with high socio-economic status tend to favor the liberal concept of justice in protecting individual rights. In comparison, 56% of respondents from less privileged social groups are more supportive of theories of redistribution of resources (Table 2). It reflects a significant difference in perceptions of justice depending on socio-economic status.

For the better-off, justice is associated with liberal principles, where the state should limit its intervention, protecting individual rights to property and freedom of choice. Instead, redistribution of resources to reduce social and economic inequalities is important for less well-off groups. In this context, justice should ensure equality not only of opportunities but also of outcomes.

Table 2. Distribution of Opinions by Socio-Economic Status

Socio-economic status	Percentage of people supporting the liberal concept of justice	Percentage of people supporting theories of resource redistribution
Higher socio-economic status	63%	56%

Source: compiled by the authors.

Respondents with higher incomes are more likely to lean towards concepts that focus on individual rights and freedoms and the importance of market mechanisms to ensure fairness. However, this can be a problem if society already has deep social and economic gaps. In such circumstances, it is important to ensure that all members of society have equal opportunities to participate in market processes, even if they belong to socially vulnerable groups.

For those on lower incomes, social justice is associated with a greater role for the state in redistributing resources and eliminating social inequalities. According to Nozick's theory (1974), this approach violates individuals' rights to property and liberty. Nozick believed that the state should perform only minimal functions to ensure justice and that any redistribution of resources is a hostile interference with human rights. Sen's concept of justice, however, implies that the state should guarantee equal opportunities for all citizens, through active intervention in social processes to reduce inequality.

The concept of justice, which combines elements of both Rawls and Sen's theories, is the most acceptable for many respondents. It balances protecting individual rights and freedoms and the need for social redistribution to reduce social inequalities. This approach is important in modern society, which faces numerous challenges in globalization, technological change, and growing social gaps.

One of the most important results of the study is the identification of the impact of globalization and technological transformations, particularly digitalization, on social inequalities. 54% of respondents indicated that globalization leads to increased social inequality, as access to digital resources and technologies is uneven among different social groups. This gap in access to technology is particularly noticeable in developed and developing countries, where most people do not have access to modern digital tools and the knowledge necessary to participate in the global economy. It confirms Sen's (2009) concept of equity, according to which access to opportunities and resources is key to ensuring justice in modern society.

According to the results, 48% of respondents noted that digital platforms and technologies largely determine access to social and economic opportunities. Comparing the level of access to digital technologies among different social groups. For example, only 32% of respondents from less developed regions indicated having the opportunity to fully use digital technologies, compared to 75% of respondents from developed urban areas. This gap in access to digital resources creates new barriers to social mobility, which confirms the need to adapt theories of justice to new conditions. Justice cannot be limited to material resources alone; it should also include equal access to increasingly important technologies for full participation in economic and social life (Rawls, 1999).

It confirms the need to revise current policies that do not consider new technological realities. All these issues should be part of a broader strategy to combat inequality in modern society. Given the trends identified, it can be concluded that

globalization and digitalization are transforming into new forms of social inequality that require appropriate changes in policies and social mechanisms (Shekhovtsova-Burianova, 2022; Krasivskyy, 2024).

One possible solution to this problem is to redistribute technological resources to ensure equal access to digital platforms for all citizens (Dovzhuk, 2022; Dudar and Liashchenko, 2024). It extends Rawls' (1999) concept of equity, who believed that state intervention is necessary to ensure equal opportunities for all without infringing on individual rights. J. Rawls also emphasized the importance of "motivating justice", which implies ensuring equal chances for all members of society to achieve goals and be able to reach the maximum potential.

An important survey finding is the respondents' support for redistributing technological resources to ensure equal access to digital platforms. 69% of respondents believe governments should redistribute technological resources to ensure all citizens' equal access to digital opportunities. It reflects one of the main ideas of Rawls' theory of justice, which emphasizes the importance of government intervention to ensure equal opportunities in a world where technological transformation is an important factor in social change.

Rawls (1999) emphasized that justice in society should consider the needs of the least privileged members. Technological innovations in digital platforms significantly change the social and economic picture, creating new challenges for equality of opportunity. Inequality in access to these technologies can further marginalize socially vulnerable groups, contrary to the principles of justice.

Therefore, Rawls' theory is important for understanding how governments can contribute to reducing technological inequality through redistributive policies. It could include subsidies for access to digital devices and the internet, the development of digital education, and the promotion of digital infrastructures in remote and low-income areas (Kovalchuk et al., 2024; Shumilova, 2024). Such an approach would ensure equal access to new opportunities and promote social inclusion of all population segments, narrowing the gap between the rich and the poor.

Gender inequality remains one of the most significant social problems affecting the overall perception of social justice (Sandel, 2020; Komircha, 2023; Saifnazarov and Saifnazarova, 2023). According to the results, 63% of women reported discrimination in the workplace, while this figure was only 35% among men (Table 3). It correlates with feminist concepts of justice, emphasizing the importance of recognizing social inequalities arising from gender discrimination and unequal access to resources and opportunities. Gender inequality has a complex impact on many areas of social life, including workplaces, access to education, healthcare, and political participation (Ben-Moshe, 2021; Liakh, 2022). In the context of equity, it is important to ensure equality in opportunities and results, allowing women and men to achieve the same heights in all areas of activity, regardless of gender. Among female respondents, 72% said that women face obstacles to career advancement in the workplace due to stereotypes about the role of women in society. While among men, this figure was lower – 41%.

Table 3. Gender Inequality in the Workplace Place

Sex	Percentage of respondents who reported discrimination in the workplace
Women	63%
Men	35%

Source: compiled by the author.

This data confirms the need to adjust workplace equality policies, consistent with Sen's (2009) concept of "justice as equal opportunity". Given the importance of equal opportunities for all, attention should be paid to the need for reforms to provide women and men with equal opportunities for career development, social benefits, and access to higher levels of social activity (Ryskaliyev et al., 2019).

The study also shows that gender inequality is not limited to economic aspects but includes cultural, political, and social barriers that significantly impact societal equity (Slovska, 2021). Therefore, it is necessary to integrate gender issues into the overall social justice strategy to reduce the impact of traditional stereotypes and discrimination (Beqiri et al., 2024; Ismailova, 2025).

Globalization and its socio-economic consequences have become one of the main factors determining the development of modern society (Wagner et al., 2019). It has caused numerous changes in the conditions of access to resources, opportunities, and information, which do not always benefit less privileged groups. The study results show that globalization has a double impact on social justice. On the one hand, it provides access to new technologies and opportunities for development, but on the other hand, it increases social inequality between different regions and social groups.

Globalization is economically shifting the focus of production and consumption, providing access to new markets and resources for large companies and developed countries. However, against this background, smaller and less developed countries are facing new challenges, such as poverty, insufficient access to the latest technologies, and a widening digital divide. It confirms the conclusions drawn from the survey results, where respondents from less developed regions noted low access to digital technologies, which limits opportunities in the globalized world (Chomsky, 2019).

In this regard, it is important to emphasize that justice in the modern world should include new aspects, such as equal access to digital platforms, technologies, and resources. Considering these factors, it will reduce the gap between different social groups and create conditions for ensuring equal opportunities for all members of society, regardless of residence or socio-economic status (Milanovic, 2019).

One of the ways to address social inequality is international cooperation in technological development and knowledge exchange. In a modern environment, countries with different levels of development must join forces to ensure equal access to modern technology and education, which is an important component of social justice (Fraser, 2020; Usyk and Dudar, 2024). Technical achievements should be available to everyone, not just developed countries, which will create conditions for

the equitable development of humanity. It also correlates with Sen's (2009) idea of "justice through opportunity", which ensures equal access to knowledge, education, and technology, allowing each person to develop abilities and realize potential.

International organizations, such as the World Health Organization, should implement strategies and programs to eliminate digital inequality and provide access to technological resources for developing countries (Sandel, 2020). For example, initiatives to provide Internet access in rural areas or digital education programs can significantly improve the development opportunities for economies and societies in the early stages of development. This approach will help reduce social inequality, particularly in the context of global social transformations.

An important component of equitable development is inclusive policies that promote the integration of all social groups into public life. The study confirmed that inequality in access to resources, in the educational and professional spheres, remains a serious problem that limits the development opportunities of less privileged segments of the population (Miller, 2003; Buniak, 2022). It is important that policymakers at all levels, from national governments to international organizations, promote equal opportunities for all citizens, regardless of social, economic, or cultural background.

Inclusive policies should consider the needs of the most vulnerable groups, such as women, national minorities, people with disabilities, and other marginalized groups (Laurence, 2023). It may include the introduction of legislative initiatives that ensure equal access to education, healthcare, financial services, and technology. For example, creating a support system for entrepreneurs from low-income groups through access to grants and financing can significantly improve the economic situation and provide equal development opportunities.

An equally important aspect is environmental justice, which implies equal access to natural resources and environmental benefits for all people, regardless of their place of living. In the modern world, many people in the global South face the consequences of environmental disasters caused by climate change, pollution, and the unjustified use of natural resources (McManus et al., 2024). These problems usually affect the poorest social groups the most, with equity implications.

It is necessary to integrate environmental justice into general social justice strategies, as ensuring access to clean water, air, and a healthy environment is a basic condition for the everyday existence of every human being. Under such conditions, sustainable economic growth that does not harm the environment will become important to a just society (Neufeld, 2022).

Discussions

One of the important aspects of the study is equality of opportunity and social redistribution of resources, which was analyzed through the concept of Rawls, who argues that fair distribution is possible only through the principle of "maximizing the

welfare of the most vulnerable". Compared to other researchers, it is worth referring to the work of Marx (1982), who believed that social justice is possible only when class differences are abolished. Equal economic conditions are provided for all members of society. According to Marx, equality of opportunity becomes impossible without significant economic inequality. Its view differs significantly from Rawls' position, focusing more on economic redistribution as the primary mechanism for achieving social justice. At the same time, the study shows that many respondents consider social redistribution of resources important, which coincides with Marx's central ideas about abolishing economic barriers to achieve justice.

Regarding gender inequality and its impact on social justice, it is worth comparing the results with the views of feminist theorists such as De Beauvoir (2010) and Wollstonecraft (2006).

Both authors advocate for women's equality in all aspects of social life, emphasizing that women should not be limited to traditional roles and have the right to equal opportunities in education, work, and other areas. At the same time, the results show that many women still face discrimination in the workplace, which confirms the importance of feminist approaches in the current social context. Rawls' theories can also be applied to the fight against gender inequality, as the author's principle of equal opportunity can be used to ensure fairness between men and women. However, De Beauvoir and Wollstonecraft consider gender inequality in the broader context of social and cultural structures. Meanwhile, Rawls and Sen focus more on equality of opportunity within existing economic and political systems.

Sen's views largely align with the theoretical work of authors such as Harvey (1990) regarding globalization and its impact on social inequality. D. Harvey points out that globalization often exacerbates social inequality, as the world's access to resources and opportunities is unevenly distributed among different countries and social groups. The author argues that globalization does not always lead to universal prosperity; on the contrary, it can further marginalize the most vulnerable. Harvey emphasizes that globalization increases social and economic inequality at both international and domestic levels. According to the researcher, in the context of globalization, large corporations and developed countries manage to maximize profits. In contrast, less developed countries and socially vulnerable groups of the population are left out of economic and social opportunities.

Harvey's views are in harmony with Sen's theory, which also emphasizes that globalization can contribute to the growth of inequality if access to opportunities is not equal. An important component of Sen's (2009) analysis is the concept of "functional capabilities", where the author emphasizes that a person's absolute freedom to achieve one's goals depends not only on formal opportunities but also on the ability to have access to the necessary resources, services, and conditions for use. Thus, without equal access to resources, globalization can increase social inequality, as many countries and social groups do not have the same opportunities to benefit from globalization's advantages.

The survey also shows a tendency for social inequality to deepen due to unequal access to technology and resources. Respondents indicate that in the context of globalization, access to the latest technologies and economic opportunities is often limited due to socio-economic barriers. It confirms the views of Harvey, who notes that globalization could create new forms of social marginalization, especially among those who do not have equal access to technology, knowledge, and opportunities. It also aligns with Sen, who emphasizes ensuring equal opportunities for all to avoid reinforcing existing social gaps (Sheikh, 2014).

At the same time, compared with other authors, such as Nozick (1974), there are specific differences in the assessment of the impact of globalization. Nozick, as a liberal philosopher, argues that any attempts to intervene in economic processes through mechanisms of redistribution or control of resources are not fair because they limit individual freedom. Nozick's approach to globalization is more focused on supporting the market and the freedom of individuals to exercise economic rights. From R. Nozick's point of view, globalization cannot be considered unfair if each country and individual acts within its rights and capabilities, even if this causes some inequality.

However, according to the study, the trend towards social inequality caused by globalization supports the more optimistic approach of Sen and Harvey than the Nozick approach, which focuses on individual freedom and market mechanisms. It is confirmed by the data obtained in the study, where respondents expressed concern about unequal access to new technologies, which significantly limits the opportunities of less advantaged groups, despite theoretical equality of opportunity.

Thus, analyzing Sen, Harvey, and Nozick's views allows a better understanding of globalization's impact on social inequality. Sen and Harvey's theories emphasize ensuring equal access to opportunities to avoid deepening social gaps. At the same time, Nozick's approach focuses on individual rights and market mechanisms, which can lead to minimizing state intervention. In summary, the study found that in globalization, attention should be paid to ensuring equal access to technology and resources, not exacerbating social inequality.

Regarding individual rights and freedom, it is worth comparing Nozick's views with the ideas of Mill (1859), who argues that individual freedom is a fundamental right, but only if it does not harm others.

Mill emphasizes the importance of a balance between individual freedom and social responsibility. In Mill's view, individual liberty should not be used to restrict the liberty of others. Therefore, individual rights should only be restricted when exercise causes harm to society or others. Thus, Mill accepts state intervention, but considers it justified only to ensure the common good and protect citizens from harm.

While Nozick (1974) advocates the idea of a minimal state, believing that the state should not interfere in the life of an individual unless it is to protect one's rights from violations by others, Mill recognizes the need for some intervention to ensure a balance between individual freedoms and social responsibilities. Nozick, as a liberal philosopher, rejects any state intervention that goes beyond the protection of property

and security, believing that any attempts to redistribute resources or interfere with private life violate individual rights. For Nozick, justice means ensuring individual freedom from violence and state interference.

The results show that respondents often point to the importance of social responsibility in achieving justice, which is more in line with Mill's views than with Nozick's. It is especially evident in social redistribution and access to resources, where many respondents emphasize the importance of balancing personal rights with responsibilities to society (Kopcha, 2021). The study found that most respondents support the idea that the state should play an active role in creating conditions for social justice, including ensuring equal opportunities and resources for vulnerable groups. It is consistent with Mill's view of the need for state intervention in the interests of the common good.

Thus, comparing the views of Nozick and Mill, it can be argued that the results of this study confirm the importance of social responsibility and the need for a certain level of state intervention to achieve social justice. It confirms that more general approaches that consider society's interests, through redistribution and access to resources, have more support among respondents than positions advocating minimal state intervention (Wallace and Batel, 2023).

Conclusions

The research conducted as part of this work has led to several important findings related to social justice, equality, and redistribution of resources in modern society. The analysis of the respondents' answers showed that most citizens consider the problems of inequality in access to resources, including education, economic opportunities, and digital technologies, to be relevant. Most respondents believe that the current social structure does not ensure a fair distribution of benefits, confirming the relevance of redistribution theories in social and economic inequalities.

It has been found that education and socio-economic status directly affect perceptions of justice. People with higher education consider equal opportunities more important than those with secondary education. This result is consistent with the theory of individual rights and property, but most respondents with lower socio-economic statuses support the redistribution of resources. It indicates a significant role of state intervention in social justice issues, an important finding for contemporary social policies.

Particular attention should be paid to the impact of globalization and digitalization on inequality. Most respondents noted that access to technology is uneven across different social groups, creating new barriers to equal access to economic and social opportunities. It requires adapting the concepts of justice to the conditions of digital inequality.

The main areas for further research are analyzing the impact of digital technologies on social equality, studying new forms of social inequality in the context

of globalization, and developing effective mechanisms for redistributing resources that can reduce existing social and economic barriers.

Limitations of the study include the sample size, which may affect the overall representativeness of the results, as well as possible distortions of answers due to the socially desirable behavior of respondents.

References

[1] Abdykadyrova, S. R., Madmarova, G. A., Sabiralieva, Z. M., Bolotakunova, G. J., & Gaparova, C. A. (2023). Titulature in the text of the epic "Manas" and "Babur's Notes" as a source of information about the social institutions of the Central Asian region. Advances in Science, Technology and Innovation, Part F1589, 505–510. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-34256-1_88

[2] Alcañiz-Colomer, J., Valor-Segura, I., & Moya, M. (2023). Social justice orientations: Exploring their impact on poverty attributions and support for social protection. Political Psychology, 45(3), 559–580. https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12937

[3] Beauvoir, S. (2010). The second sex. Éditions Gallimard. https://uberty.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/1949_simone-de-beauvoir-the-second-sex.pdf

[4] Ben-Moshe, N. (2021). Comprehensive or political liberalism? The impartial spectator and the justification of political principles. Utilitas, 33(3), 253–269. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0953820820000394

[5] Beqiri, A., Jeton, J., & Shala, V. (2024). Inequalities in the labour market: A legal perspective on causes and solutions. Social and Legal Studios, 7(1), 235–242. https://doi.org/10.32518/sals2.2024.235

[6] Brown, W. (2019). Undoing the demos: Neoliberalism's stealth revolution. Zone Books. https://erikafontanez.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/w.-brown-undoing-the-demos.pdf

[7] Buniak, N. (2022). Psychological expert examination of inclusive educational environment: Theoretical analysis. Psychology and Personality, 12(1), 9–20. https://doi.org/10.33989/2226-4078.2022.1.251920

[8] Chomsky, N. (2019). Requiem for the American dream: The 10 principles of concentration of wealth and power. https://www.mediaed.org/transcripts/Requiem-for-the-American-Dream-Transcript.pdf

[9] Dovzhuk, I. (2022). Digital inequality in the information society. Society. Document. Communication, 7(1), 233–252. https://doi.org/10.31470/2518-7600-2022-14-233-252

[10] Dudar, V., & Liashchenko, Yu. (2024). Effects of social communications on identity development in the online environment: Theoretical and historical perspectives. Society. Document. Communication, 9(3), 45–55. https://doi.org/10.69587/sdc/3.2024.45

[11] Flanigan, D., & Hosie, A. (2022). Human rights and equality. In M. May, P. Alcock, T. Haux, & V. McCall (Eds.), The student's companion to social policy (pp. 31–37). Wiley-Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781394260430.ch5

[12] Fraser, N. (2020). The old is dying and the new cannot be born: From progressive neoliberalism to Trump and beyond. Verso Books. https://www.versobooks.com/en-gb/products/849-the-old-is-dying-and-the-new-cannot-be-born

[13] Harvey, D. (1990). The condition of postmodernity: An enquiry into the origins of cultural change. Blackwell Publishing. https://www.wiley.com/en-us/The+Condition+of+Postmodernity%3A+An+Enquiry+into+the+Origins+of+Cultural+Change-p-9780631162940

[14] Ismailova, G. (2025). Gender balance policy in European diplomacy. Foreign Affairs, 35(1), 34–42. https://doi.org/10.59214/2663-2675.35(1).2025.34

[15] Khan, M. W., Destek, M. A., & Khan, Z. (2025). Income inequality and artificial intelligence: Globalization and age dependency for developed countries. Social Indicators Research, 176(3), 1207–1233. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-024-03493-7

[16] Khomenko, O. (2025). The influence of Martin Luther King Jr. on the international human rights movement. Foreign Affairs, 35(1), 17–26. https://doi.org/10.59214/2663-2675.35(1).2025.17

[17] Kochubeynyk, O. (2021). Atomization of society, new discriminations, and trust in the pandemic situation. Scientific Studios on Social and Political Psychology, 27(1), 60–66. https://doi.org/10.61727/sssppj/1.2021.60

[18] Komircha, Ya. (2023). Historical origin and current state of research on gender equality in law enforcement bodies of Ukraine. Law Journal of the National Academy of Internal Affairs, 13(1), 63–73. https://doi.org/10.56215/naia-chasopis/1.2023.63

[19] Kopcha, V. (2021). Modern rule of law: Basic approaches to understanding. Law Journal of the National Academy of Internal Affairs, 11(2), 7–12. https://doi.org/10.56215/04212202.7

[20] Kovalchuk, O., Banakh, S., Chudyk, N., & Drakokhrust, T. (2024). Machine learning models for judicial information support. Law, Policy and Security, 2(1), 33–45. https://doi.org/10.62566/lps/1.2024.33

[21] Krasivskyy, O. (2024). Development and evolution of European Union policy. Democratic Governance, 17(2), 46–57. https://doi.org/10.56318/dg/2.2024.46

[22] Laurence, B. (2023). Justice in theory and practice: Debates about utopianism and political action. Philosophy Compass, 18(11), e12945. https://doi.org/10.1111/phc3.12945

[23] Liakh, N. (2022). Administrative and legal regulation of gender policy in police activities. Scientific Journal of the National Academy of Internal Affairs, 27(1), 58–65. https://doi.org/10.56215/0122271.58

[24] Martschenko, D. (2021). Social equality in an alternate world. Hastings Center Report, 51(6), 54–55. https://doi.org/10.1002/hast.1307

[25] Marx, K. (1982). Capital: Critique of Political Economy. Penguin Classics. https://www.surplusvalue.org.au/Marxism/Capital%20-%20Vol.%201%20Penguin.pdf

[26] McManus, J., Medvedev, O., Zyl, L., & Weijers, D. (2024). Development and validation of the Aristotelian virtue of conscientiousness scale using Rasch methodology. Current Psychology, 43(24), 21322–21337. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-024-05887-9

[27] Milanovic, B. (2019). Capitalism, alone: The future of the system that rules the world. Harvard University Press. https://www.hup.harvard.edu/file/feeds/PDF/9780674987593_sample.pdf

[28] Mill, J. (1859). On Liberty. John W. Parker and Son. https://www.econlib.org/library/Mill/mlLbty.html

[29] Miller, D. (2003). Political philosophy: A concise introduction. Oxford University Press. https://global.oup.com/academic/product/political-philosophy-9780192803955

[30] Neufeld, B. (2022). Political activism, egalitarian justice, and public reason. Journal of Social Philosophy, 54(1), 1–18. https://philarchive.org/archive/NEUPAE

[31] Nozick, R. (1974). Anarchy, state, and utopia. Basic Books. https://philpapers.org/rec/NOZASA

[32] Piketty, T. (2021). Capital and ideology: A global perspective on inequality regimes. British Journal of Sociology, 72(1), 139–150. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-4446.12836

[33] Piketty, T. (2023). A brief history of equality. Harvard University Press. http://piketty.pse.ens.fr/files/Piketty2022Extracts.pdf

[34] Rawls, J. (1999). A theory of justice: Revised edition. Harvard University Press. https://www.hup.harvard.edu/file/feeds/PDF/9780674000780_sample.pdf

[35] Rosales, R. J. (2025). Climate-sensitive religious education curriculum in the unified schools of the Archdiocese of Lipa. International Journal on Culture, History, and Religion, 6(2), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.63931/ijchr.v6i2.2

[36] Rouse, C. (2019). Rights, inequality, and social justice. In R. R. Grinker, S. C. Lubkemann, C. B. Steiner, & E. Gonçalves (Eds.), A companion to the anthropology of Africa (pp. 215–230). Wiley-Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119251521.ch13

[37] Ryskaliyev, D. U., Zhapakov, S. M., Apakhayev, N., Moldakhmetova, Z., Buribayev, Y. A., & Khamzina, Z. A. (2019). Issues of gender equality in the workplace: The case study of Kazakhstan. Space and Culture, India, 7(2), 15–26. https://doi.org/10.20896/saci.v7i2.450

[38] Saifnazarov, I., & Saifnazarova, F. (2023). Experience in addressing the gender issue in post-Soviet countries. Social and Legal Studios, 6(3), 143–152. https://doi.org/10.32518/sals3.2023.143

[39] Sandel, M. J. (2020). The tyranny of merit: What has become of the common good? Farrar, Straus and Giroux. https://us.macmillan.com/books/9780374289980/thetyrannyofmerit/

[40] Sen, A. (2009). The idea of justice. Harvard University Press. https://www.jsscacs.edu.in/sites/default/files/Files/The_idea_of_justice_Amartya_Sen.pdf

[41] Sheikh, M. K. (2014). Appointing evil in international relations. International Politics, 51(4), 492–507. https://doi.org/10.1057/ip.2014.22

[42] Shekhovtsova-Burianova, V. (2022). The concept of European identity and its significance for EU policy. Pedagogy, Psychology, Philosophy, 10(4), 175–180. https://doi.org/10.31548/hspedagog13(4).2022.175-180

[43] Shumilova, I. (2024). The guidance culture in the context of building society 5.0. Humanities Studios: Pedagogy, Psychology, Philosophy, 12(2), 189–196. https://doi.org/10.31548/hspedagog15(2).2024.189-196

[44] Sliusarenko, M. (2023). Obscene response as an individually responsible act. Scientific Studios on Social and Political Psychology, 29(1), 38–42. https://doi.org/10.61727/sssppj/1.2023.38

[45] Slovska, I. (2021). Does "gender equality" sound like a utopia? Scientific Journal of the National Academy of Internal Affairs, 26(2), 107–112. https://doi.org/10.33270/01211192.107

[46] Taylor-Gooby, P. (2022). Equality, rights, and social justice. In M. May, P. Alcock, T. Haux, & V. McCall (Eds.), The student's companion to social policy (pp. 24–30). Wiley-Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781394260430.ch4

[47] Thrift, E., & Sugarman, J. (2024). Social justice in fractured times. International Journal of Applied Psychoanalytic Studies, 21(2), e1867. https://doi.org/10.1002/aps.1867

[48] Törnblom, K. Y., Popa, R., & Krütli, P. (2024). Are social justice and sustainability interdependent? If so, how and under what conditions? Sustainable Development, 33(1), 1269–1283. https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.3177

[49] Usyk, O., & Dudar, O. (2024). Features of organising inclusive education in general secondary education institutions. Scientia et Societus, 3(2), 37–48. https://doi.org/10.69587/ss/2.2024.37

[50] Wagner, R., Boettcher, M., Howard, J., & Cawthon, T. (2019). Social justice in housing. New Directions for Student Services, 168, 9–16. https://doi.org/10.1002/ss.20327

[51] Wallace, R., & Batel, S. (2023). Representing personal and common futures: Insights and new connections between the theory of social representations and the pragmatic sociology of engagements. Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour, 54(1), 65–85. https://doi.org/10.1111/jtsb.12398

[52] Wollstonecraft, M. (2006). A vindication of the rights of woman. Penguin Classics. https://dn720002.ca.archive.org/0/items/vindicationofright00woll/vindicationofright00woll.pdf

[53] Xu, X., Scarborough, A. N., Anthony, L. M., & Smillie, L. D. (2025). Personality, ideology, and attitudes toward social justice. Journal of Personality. https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.13014

[54] Zanetti, G. (2021). Equality. Ratio Juris, 34(1), 45–56. https://doi.org/10.1111/raju.12307