P-ISSN: 2709-6254	Journal of Development and Social Sciences	Jan-March 2025, Vol. 6, No. 1
O-ISSN:2709-6262	https://doi.org/10.47205/jdss.2025(6-I)78	[908-920]

Journal of Development and Social Sciences
www.jdss.org.pk

RESEARCH PAPER

Nexus between Reforming the Economy and Privatization of Public Enterprises: A Case Study of Pakistan

[1]Shaiza Nazeer, [2]Dr. Abdul Basit Khan and [3]Zaryab Ishaq

1. Visiting Lecturer, Department of Political Science, Government College University, Faisalabad, Punjab, Pakistan
2. Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, Government College University, Faisalabad, Punjab, Pakistan
3. Visiting Lecturer, Department of Political Science, Government College University, Faisalabad, Punjab, Pakistan

Corresponding Author: abdulbasit@gcuf.edu.pk

ABSTRACT

A well-designed plan pertaining to the privatization of public institutions of any state makes possible achieving the macro-stability, lowering monetary deficits, decreasing inflationary financing, and improving the balances of payments driven by productivity gains, and helps attracting investment and avoiding quasi-fiscal losses, nevertheless, within concentrated sectors, where there are no guarantees of competition, the privatization may generate negative outcomes, further escalate public hostility, and create instability within reforms trajectories. While implementing a wider reformative agenda encompassing competitive markets, robust regulatory institutions, cost-sensitive network industries regulations, as well as sound governance mechanism of the state-owned enterprises (SOEs) with public ownership, the sustainable benefits of privatization could be materialized. In the case of Pakistan, privatization of public enterprises was necessitated chiefly by the budgetary deficits and need for the deployment of private sector in the managerial organization of the public institutions which has been successfully manifested in the case of banking and telecom sectors whereas the energy sector and the PIA are currently major problematic sectors for the Government of Pakistan which would be at the top priority during the forthcoming phase of privatization. This research study evaluates the interlinking of economic reforms and privatization in Pakistan and reviews the opportunities, challenges, and consequences that influenced the development of the economy with respect to the privatization process. The study concludes that Pakistan needs to have a compliant regulation regime for its privatization policy to resolve the deep-rooted structural problems faced by the economy of Pakistan. The state should ensure that reforms package would focus on the ultimate strengthening of the institutions, providing transparency while consolidating institutional solidarity, efficiency with social security of the workers avoiding at the same creation of capitalist monopolies since the end result of all these steps would have to be the protection of consumers. While adopting a gradual, sector-wise approach, along with good governance and inclusive policies, it could be possible to make privatization a functional strategy for Pakistan.

KEYWORDS Privatization Process of Pakistan, Capitalist Monopolies, PTCL, DISCOs, PIA

Introduction

Privatization and economic reforms remain one of the most disputed and imperative themes in the developmental trajectory of Pakistan till to date. Right from the establishment of Pakistan in 1947, the country has experienced successive cycles of market-oriented liberalization and state-led industrialization; all of which have been in response not only to the compulsions of the political structure of Pakistan but international influences exerted from global financial institutions. Fiscal imbalances in the country, the corresponding rise in the national debt levels, and the inefficiencies that have been experienced in State-Owned Enterprises (SOEs) have all contributed to low economic growth in Pakistan. This has driven successive governments to opt for the concept of privatization that has the potential to reduce the financial burdens of the state. While the basic reference of privatization, at a conceptual level, is the transfer of ownership, management, or control of public enterprises into private hands, economic reforms pertain more generally to structural changes in government policies, such as deregulation, fiscal restructuring, and market liberalization, aimed at transforming the economy from a predominantly state-dominated one into a more competitive, investment-friendly system aligned with international neoliberal tendencies.

The economy of Pakistan has never been without structural frailty. A tenuous industrial base was inherited by the state at independence, and to see growth through successive decades, heavy reliance was placed on loans, remittances, and foreign aid. While there have indeed been periods of expansion, especially during the 1960s and the early 2000s, this has frequently been short-lived, constrained as it has been by narrow institutional capacity, political unpredictability, and energy supply bottlenecks. The late 1980s saw a serious financial crisis in Pakistan because SOEs were employing a huge amount of public resources. Many organizations, banks, airlines, and power distribution companies were affected by the interference and inefficiencies in the government. SOEs were not only employing the scarce financial resources, but the unprofitable organizations also led to a distorted market structure and inefficiencies in the economy and hindered the private sector investment in the economy. This has made the adoption of the policy instrument of privatization a relevant strategy in the Pakistani economy.

The privatization in the case of Pakistan has proceeded through three major phases which are reflected in its changing priorities and challenges in realizing its objective of shifting “from state-controlled to market-driven economy.” These phases might be explained as follows:

Phase one started under Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif in the early 1990s, marked ‘the big turn’ for industries which were nationalized by Prime Minister Zulfikar Ali Bhutto in the 1970s. The government initiated to divest their stakes to private interests and managed operations on a day-to-day basis. There was no better rationale than to turn a financial loss into a profit by encouraging private sector engagement. However, controversies involving favoritism, lack of openness, and intense politicized resistance from trade unions and political groups characterized phase one. Nevertheless, during the 1990s, a shift took place towards adopting a more liberal economic policy by the government of Pakistan.

The second wave emerged in the 2000s with a stronger push into the energy and telecom sectors. This was the result of the advent of the private sector as well as the part-privatization of Pakistan Telecommunication Company Limited (PTCL) to bring about a radical change in the domains of connectivity, service provision, and technology. This was coupled with the part-privatization of the power distribution companies (DISCOs) to improve efficiency and reduce losses to some extent. The banking sector was well along the path of privatization to improve efficiency and build upon the achieved stability. Still, the overall scenario was marked by some sectors performing well while others—railway transport and air transport—went off the rails thanks to pathologies and politics.

The third phase appeared in the 2010s and was a direct result of the structural adjustment loans provided by the World Bank and the IMF. This was accompanied by a condition regarding economic reforms, deregulation, and privatization. The World Bank and the IMF directly impacted the privatization policy in Pakistan. This was in relation to improving the performance of the public sectors, the elimination of subsidies, and balancing the budget. Although the idea was to ensure a stabilized economy since the advent of the changes, the approach was continually criticized in relation to sovereignty, social aspects, and the pace of the changes. This clearly pointed to the influence of the foreign factors in the acceleration of the politicized market in Pakistan.

The Pakistani experience with privatization varies from sector to sector. In the sector of banking, privatization led to growth in service provision, lowering non-performing loans, and improved stability. This had a great impact on enhancing trust in the sector. In the sector of telecom, there was growth in technological innovation, lowering costs, and enhanced access. However, in the sector of energy, growth in productivity was impeded because of inadequacies in frameworks and unaffordability. Privatization of the entities in the sector of energy was expected to make a positive impact in terms of lowered losses and improved productivity. These sectoral trends reveal the imbalance in the rate of the privatization process because some sectors are facing the challenge of being hampered by the barriers of privatization while being positively impacted by the success that was achieved. The reforms package that is undertaken encompasses public-private partnership and deregulation and also tax reforms that would ensure that there is a changed or transformed economy. However, its implementation took a long time because of the identified challenge of institutional and political will that continued to hamper its implementation despite efforts that would support its revenue generation base. Public-private partnership initiatives have appeared on the reforms scene as the means to derive private sector finance for the development of infrastructure, including deregulation initiatives to attract finance for the promotion of entrepreneurship. Another key theme of the reforms program of Pakistan is reforming of public enterprises through privatization or better management to ensure that the economic progress must remain under observation on the matter of fairness despite its need to remain sustainable.

When placed in a relative perspective, the privatization experience of Pakistan can be compared with other countries such as Malaysia, Turkey, and India, which all present different combinations and degrees of success relative to privatization strategies and goals.

Justification of Privatization and Economic Reforms

The National Debt Problem

Fiscal gaps in the budget have contributed to the loss of macro-economic stability and investments in Pakistan. Fiscal challenges, which are stressed in the World Bank Public Expenditure Review in 2023, reveal the risk posed by fiscal imbalances, which can be cited as a major constraint to economic advancement and fiscal debt service delivery. A study carried out by Yar, Arif, & Rahim (2013) examines the role of the privatization process, which can help enhancing government taxes garnered from such an activity, thereby taking advantage of the value derived from such a sale, along with decreasing the level of subsidized amounts given to organizations owned by the government. As cited by the Ministry of Finance, the interest service charge on loans consumes a huge amount in the budget, restraining expenditures to be directed towards development spending due to limited fiscal growth seen in FY2024.

Political Interference, Corruption, and Inefficiency

The SOEs in Pakistan have long suffered from political interference, corruption, and inefficiency. Lack of transparency in management, political discrimination, and institutional inefficiency have resulted in reduced productivity and performance quality. The IMF's "Governance and Corruption Diagnostic Report" identifies widespread patronage and corruption in SOEs in the following manner: "Patronage and corruption in SOEs are widespread and represent a significant challenge to reform and efficiency. Patronage appointment of non-performing senior managers persists, creating institutional inefficiency and reduced performance." This impacts reform performance, and research in the field assigns credit performance to weak institutions, prevalent corruption, and government changes. Political interference in SOEs results in misallocation of resources, overstaffing, and poor management; hence, SOEs are financially vulnerable and uncompetitive. "Privatization is one such strategy that shields enterprises from political interference by vesting them in the hands of the private sector," where "the forces of competition work as a stimulus for improved performance and efficiency" (Ullah et al., 2024).

The Need for Market Efficiency and Private Investment

The essence of the privatization movement is improving the market system's efficacy. Attracting private investment into the system is another matter. Pakistan has a long history of neglecting investment, particularly high-tech and large infrastructure investments. This has influenced the decision to opt for privatization as a possible solution. The forces behind this movement include:

- Increasing the efficacy of the market system
- Improving the manner of provision of services
- Increasing foreign direct investments (FDI)

The aims of this movement are clear: "to increase the performance of the capital market, reduce the financial burden of the government, increase the efficiency of operations" (Privatization Commission of Pakistan (n.d.)). It is further argued by analysts that this concept will allow Pakistan to align itself with the worldwide trend of neoliberal policies. This will make it possible to efficiently allocate resources with the aim of accelerating technological advancements (Sodhar, 2024). A major example in this regard is of the telecommunication industry. The privatization of PTCL as well as the entry of the private sector allowed it to revive technological connectivity (Sodhar, 2024).

Important Challenges in Privatization

Inconsistent Public Policy and Political Instability

There has been political instability, which has been making it hard to perform privatization. Often, political power shifts from one government to another and, at times, military regimes. This has been making it tough for privatization because it is hard to invest when political stability is lacking. According to research, political instability affects investor confidence and fiscal policies. This has been making it hard for politicians to perform privatization successfully (Dogar & Khalid, 2024). Moreover, privatization policies that were implemented during the rule of former Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif experienced setbacks during later administrations. This has been making it hard for economists to sense bipartisan support for privatization policies (Sodhar, 2024). Investors require political stability so that the task of investing becomes easy. According to research, inconsistency has been hampering foreign direct investment (Fida, 2024). The World Bank describes political instability as an issue that jeopardizes budgetary and structural reforms and acts as a reason why reforms come to a standstill (World Bank, 2023).

Organized Labor and Politics

Trade unions and political groups have opposed the phenomenon of privatization as it threatens the sovereignty of the nation as well as the rights of workers. Trade unions associated with sectors such as aviation, railways, and energy have held protests and go-slow actions against the proposed privatization of such sectors due to the expected large-scale laying off of workers as well as reduced protection of labor. The phenomenon of privatization has been taken as a populist theme by political parties opposed to the government. It is considered as compromising to foreign lenders such as the World Bank and the IMF (Samad & Faraz, 2024). Studies conducted on the impact of trade unions in Pakistan reveal that these unions still exert considerable influence over economic policies of the country, especially if those policies affect the rights of workers (**Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, 2021**).

Obstacles Faced by the Privatization Process

Poor Regulation Frameworks

Pakistan's privatization process is also challenged by its lackluster regulation framework. For a country to privatize effectively, it must develop expert regulations to control the environments in which privatized entities operate. Despite the presence of commissions such as the Competition Commission of Pakistan (CCP) and the National Electric Power Regulatory Authority (NEPRA), they sometimes lack effectiveness and resources (World Bank, 2023). Research shows that when the regulation framework is not adequately developed, it is expected that inefficiencies would be maintained in the privatized entity, as is the case of the privatized power distribution companies of Pakistan, which are suffering from high transmission losses and inefficient services (Khan & Khan, 2023). According to the World Bank (2023), Pakistan is yet to fully develop its regulatory framework, which is causing concern about its ability to effectively control the privatized entities.

Threats of Price Increases & Monopoly of Power

Another significant worry is that there may be an increase in prices and possibly monopolies formed during the privatization of such sectors. This is because, during privatization, there are chances of market concentration, and few firms control the market with regard to prices and delivery of services in sectors such as energy and telecom (Malik, 2021). For example, although the involvement of the private sector and the privatization of PTCL have increased the reach of connectivity, there have been arguments about prices and affordability of telecom services on the part of low-income segments of the population (Samad & Faraz, 2024). Again, under the energy sector, there have been instances of increased tariffs passed on to customers because of privatization of the distribution sector, but there have been no changes brought about by privatization to make these sectors less inefficient (Malik, 2021).

Investor Confidence Concerns

Pakistan's privatization programme has ways caused creating a state of doubt among investors. Locals as well as overseas capitalists have remained apprehensive owing to political flux, policy reversals, and unstable regulatory frameworks. Corruption and governance issues in state-owned corporations add to the skepticism about the privatization policy. The overall macroeconomic situation in Pakistan, with rising inflation, increased debt, and depreciating the value of the rupee, has further deteriorated investor sentiment (Dogar & Khalid, 2024). There are indications that without increased transparency, predictability, and better institutionalization of political power, privatization will fail to attract the level of investments needed to turn around the Pakistani economy (Batool, et. al., 2023; Fida, 2024).

Social Challenges Caused by the Privatization

Layoffs and Worker Anxieties

Among the perennial issues relevant to the privatization process of Pakistan are the fear of large-scale layoffs as a result of the privatization of organizations, especially those that are highly labor-intensive such as the power distribution sector, the railways, and the airlines. Employees see the coming of the privatization juggernaut as the harbinger of widespread layoffs, diminished security, and slashed benefits. One such instance is that of the Pakistan International Airline (PIA), in which widespread layoffs and benefits cuts due to the threat of the privatization which resulted in demonstrations and shutdowns by the employees (Ahmed, 2018). Researchers working on the social implications of privatization on the basics of the South Asian labor market have established that there is a dearth of sufficient social safeguards to provide succor to the laid-off workers, thereby leaving them vulnerable to the menace of unemployment and the resultant poverty (Asian Development Bank, 2016).

Public Mistrust and Fear of Asset Sell-Offs

Aside from concerns about the workforce, there is an underlying skepticism concerning privatization. Many citizens are concerned that the country is selling off its resources to foreigners at discounted prices. According to some opinion polls, there is skepticism towards privatization with respect to corruption and preference towards biased bidding (Transparency International Pakistan, 2022). Critics of the measure say that privatizing core sectors such as PTCL undermines the future of the country and that such policies are an expression of external pressure by organizations such as the World Bank and the IMF (Zaidi, 2019). This is because privatization policies are resisted by opposition political parties that take advantage of popular resentment of what is referred to as an "asset sell-off."

Problems related to Affordability and Inequality

Privatization takes center stage in raising apprehensions that affordability and inequality will worsen. When basic services such as energy, telecom, and education are privatized, it is the poor segments of the population that suffer most when prices skyrocket. A study on Pakistan's energy sector privatization highlights that it was mostly the poorer consumers who were most adversely affected when prices were increased after privatization, while there were inequalities in access to electricity too (Malik, 2021). Similarly, while there has been some enhancement in educational standards due to increased privatization of educational institutions such as private schools and universities, it is the marginalized section that finds it difficult to afford an increased fee structure for a costlier service (Hoodbhoy, 2016). However, privatization might exacerbate divides between the rich and poor if there are no checks through regulations.

Governance Issues Related to the Privatization

Issues of Transparency regarding Bidding Procedures

There has been criticism that many of Pakistan's privatization transactions lack public scrutiny, allowing little to no disclosure of the bidding score. Take, for instance, the privatization of Pakistan Telecommunication Company Limited in 2005, which was accused of having an unclear bidding process that heavily favored certain individual investors (Burki, 2019). According to Transparency International of Pakistan (2022), a lack of public perception of honesty during privatization has been widespread, suggesting that many think that these transactions occur behind closed doors. This naturally has raised questions over whether privatization is working for the public good because it lacks public credibility. Indeed, it has been suggested that problems of public credibility will continue to be experienced unless greater bidding transparency would be achieved (Zaidi, 2019).

Favoritism and Claims of Corruption

Charges of corruption and bias within privatization transactions always follow closely behind transparency issues. In business networks and among politics, there are allegations that corruption permeates privatization in a manner through which businesspeople support each other through privatization. The IMF's Report on Governance and Corruption Diagnostics mentions that bias within leadership recruitment and asset sheltering within privatization reduce effectiveness due to a high level of corruption within governance of public enterprises and within privatization. Cases within Pakistan indicate that political linkage influences outcomes, where assets are sold to well-linked individuals at less-than-market rates (Samad & Faraz, 2024; Muzaffar, et al., 2023). These indicate that privatization is within the coffers of a few individuals, contrary to improving economic efficiency, while undermining public confidence. Apart from damaging the privatization outcomes, there are indications that corruption and bias might affect foreign investment which asserts a strong need for fairness within the relevant processes (Dogar & Khalid, 2024).

Inadequate Institutional Capability

Another big hurdle to governance is the fragile capacity of regulatory and watchdog bodies. Healthy privatization outcomes depend upon sound institutions capable of enforcing contracts, monitoring compliance, and ensuring accountability; yet several institutions in Pakistan lag behind in much-needed technical and other resources and managerial independence (Muzaffar, et al., 2024). In 2023, the World Bank reported that Pakistan's regulatory agencies were still in their infancy, hence making it hard for them to oversee privatized firms and avoid misuse of market power. This weakness is pretty well reflected in the energy sector, where the failure of the authorities to enforce performance standards against privatized distribution companies is a fact. Some scholars stress that this institutional weakness lies at the heart of bad governance: constant political interference compromised bureaucratic expertise and continuity. Unless institutions are strengthened, there is always the risk that privatization will not cause bringing true reforms but only a mere transfer of inefficiencies from the public to the private sector.

Sectoral Analysis

Energy Sector

The DISCOs require privatization/involvement of the private sector, given the persistent distribution losses, weak recovery rates, and accumulation of circular debt in Pakistan's energy landscape. NEPRA, through its State of the Industry Report, once again echoed the need for performance-based management at the distribution level coupled with better governance by underlining sustained technical and commercial losses together with inefficiencies in tariff determination that pose a risk to financial viability. To this effect, the government has been striving toward private participation in DISCOs management through phased processes and expression of interest with underlying operational turnaround, loss reduction, and service-quality improvement under explicit performance contracts. This has encouraged support for such a policy position by international partners. For instance, ADB has encouraged the market structural reforms aimed at upgrading the transmission and distribution frameworks in the country, hastening the modernization of the grid, and increasing the share of renewable energy resources. The obvious policy argument is to reduce AT&C Losses, improve the recoveries of bills, and ensure the stability of cash flows in the power chain.

Banking Sector: Stability, Privatization, and Risk Management

Such an elevated level of resilience and efficiency can emerge within the banking sector due to the privatization of major banks, including HBL, UBL, and MCB, and the enforcement of stronger prudential norms by the State Bank of Pakistan (SBP). In the context of the SBP Financial Stability Review and Risk Perspective 2024, it has been noted, "In the backdrop of the emerging macroeconomic uncertainties, the resilience of the banking sector stands strong and sound due to the enhanced asset base, supplementary provisions accruals arising out of the induction of the IFRS9 standards, and reduced solvency risk." Such an emerging scenario can highlight the efficiency of market-regulation mechanisms and the overall proficiency of risk management systems put through the post-privatization scenario. Other factors, according to analysts, include the enhanced degree of capital adequacy, overall diversification of profits, and enhanced efficiency through digital changeovers. The need to emphasize, through the entire development and consequent implementation of superior performance, the necessity to address funding risks, buffers of liquidity, and credit standards can, therefore, remain imperative. In totality, the post-privatization approach to instill market discipline and risk-aware management is well-integrated into the definition of empirical research conducted on the performance of banks in the context of the economy of Pakistan. It further suggests that the stability of banks (measured through the Z-score) is fundamental to enhanced performance, while the constraints of funding and liquidity risks represent barriers to increased profit generation within the economy. Additionally, the need to conduct macro-prudential regulation in the context of the economy is embedded within the above definition to ensure the transition from politically unconditional lending to commercial-intermediation lending through the privatization process is

Achievements: Privatization of Telecommunication Sector

The privatization experience in Pakistan has a strong success case in the telecommunications sector, where the inability to fully privatize PTCL catalyzed rapid progress, competition, and investment. The entry of private operators increased mobile and internet penetration as well as innovative telephone services with the 2006 privatization of PTCL displaying noticeable post-privatization improvements in finances and focus. While cost and geographic access remain with the regulators, statistics from PTA depict remarkable improvements in tele density, internet usage, and technological improvements catalyzed by competition and private investment. The case histories verify the theory that appropriately complemented privatization produces consumer benefits and productivity improvements by facilitating faster technological progress and improvements. The case offers evidence that competition legislation and privatization can produce apparent gains (Samad & Faraz, 2024; Pakistan Telecommunication Authority, 2024; Saeed & Khan, 2017).

Transportation Services & Facilities

Despite the constraints posed by capacity constraints, old infrastructure, and resource bottlenecks, reforms within Pakistan Railways remain under way through corporatization, freight optimization, and the judicious use of contracting; the annual official publications underline operational turns and future corridor improvements (such as the ML-1 projects) as a precondition for sound performance (Ministry of Railways, 2023). The various examples illustrate the need for feasible regulation, investment mobilization, and a step-by-step process of change during the course of the privatization of network service providers to ensure service delivery continuity while remaining more efficient (Ministry of Railways, 2023;).

Outcomes and Impacts of Privatization

Effect on the Debts and Revenues of the Government

Upfront revenues, lower subsidies, and potential extension of taxes from successful privatized firms can ease public finances. Empirical studies show that the initial aims of this scheme included specifically cutting subsidies of SOEs and mobilizing funds through asset sales to decrease budget deficits (Yar, Arif, & Rahim, 2013). On the contrary, the transaction value, assumed liabilities by new owners, and transfer of funds by loss-making firms like DISCOs remain important parameters. This indicates that consistent policies regarding privatization, as well as fiscal reforms, tend to trace along a progressive stabilizing course of debt patterns, as indicated by recent development reports. However, these are subject to SOE's arrears as well as its governance, which happen to remain vulnerable without these. Additionally, it has been indicated by recent policies that stabilization of primary balances is essential regarding public finances, and that the proposed privatization measures would not satisfy these (PIDE, 2024). In conclusion, privatization helps lower current subsidies and budget constraints, while sustained debt reduction policies need to accompany privatization policies of energy pricing, taxation, and state-owned enterprises (IMF, 2024).

Variation in Terms of Efficiency & Quality of Service

There has been an improvement in efficiency and service delivery, which has been made possible by combining privatization with legitimate competition and regulatory policies. This can be noted by looking at the telecommunications sector, which not only adopted privatization but was also deregulated. As mentioned earlier, this has helped improving network rollout, tele density, and internet speeds (Pakistan Telecommunication Authority, 2024; Zubair & Khalid, 2020). Moreover, after privatization, improvements were noticed in the banking sector, which was a result of stronger prudential regulations. This can be noted by looking at increased efficiency of intermediation and improved risk management techniques (State Bank of Pakistan, 2024; Ahmed & Malik, 2017). However, it has been noticed that, merely through corporatized administration of electricity distribution, better recoveries and aggregate commercial losses could not be experienced persistently (NEPRA, 2024; ADB, 2023). Following the cross-sector pattern, the effect of efficiency within the privatized sector is enhanced through market power restraints and enforceability of performance criteria by regulators, while otherwise it faces pressures that reduce or fully negate the gains.

Trends Surrounding Employment

With mixed effects on employment, on the one hand, expansion in various sectors can give rise to new employment opportunities in downstream activities, but on the other hand, privatized units often resort to workforce reductions to not only minimize costs but also improve productivity, which was evident in Pakistan's transactions in the 1990s to 2000s, marked by employment consolidation in the workforce in the booming privatized sectors such as banking and telecom (Asian Development Bank, 2016; Ahmed, 2018). Statistics for worker surveys indicate employment proportions in services increased along with privatization and liberalization policies, although employment security and quality differed, marked by more contractual employment in privatized services like utilities, and related aspects (Pakistan Bureau of Statistics, 2023; ILO, 2022).

Prices and Accessibility for Consumers

The management of pricing and accessibility after the privatization of any sector remains a determinant for the realization of social outcomes. The presence of competition raised the level of consumer welfare in the telecommunication sector through the reduction of cost per unit and the increase in accessibility, mainly for the mobile sector (Pakistan Telecommunication Authority, 2024; Zubair & Khalid, 2020). The lack of protection by the lifeline provisions led to the rise in energy costs based on price to reduce the quasi-fiscals, increasing the amount paid by the customer in household costs (Malik, 2021; NEPRA, 2024). The same dilemmas are realized in transport sector reforms, where the greater contribution by the private sector or selective outsourcing may result in greater dependability, but the lack of clarity on the public service obligation leads to problems of affordability (Ministry of Railways, 2023; Ahmed & Khan, 2019).

Labor Market Changes

A loss of employment in the State-Owned Enterprises (SOEs), occupation diversification into services, and increased demand for technical and interpersonal skills are some of the common labor market shifts associated with the privatization process. This is reflected in the Pakistani context, where staff in the sales, IT, and operations departments were employed by the expanding presence of the private sector, while unionized occupations witnessed layoffs and job transformation (Asian Development Bank, 2016; Ahmed, 2018). From the macro point of view, the overall employment outcomes are conditional on the pace of the reform process and the economy's absorption capacities; active labor market policies such as apprenticeships, re-skilling, and employment services can enhance the outcomes for earnings and re-employment (ILO, 2022; PIDE, 2024). In the absence of such provisions, the risk of job dislocation is manifested through protracted employment and earnings deceleration among affected wage earners.

Prospects for Long-Term Growth

Sustainability of Reforms

Involving diversity of options as a component of a wider reform agenda encompassing competitive markets, robust regulatory institutions, cost-sensitive network industries regulation, as well as sound SOE governance with public ownership, the growth benefits of privatization become clear for the long term results. Indeed, according to country reports, a modest rate of economic growth is foreseen under a continued scenario of reforms, although prospects will gradually brighten with enhanced private investments as well as reduced public deficits. By contrast, a reversal will make sustainability more challenging as it will revive losses through a lack of investment trust due to weak enforcement of contracts as well as stalled energy reforms (IMF, 2024).

Impact on Stability of the Economy

Successful privatization helps achieving macro-stability, which contributes to lowering deficits, decrease inflationary financing, and an improved balances of payment, driven by productivity gains, and helps attract investment and avoid quasi-fiscal losses (IMF, 2024; PIDE, 2024). As far as the Pakistani experience is described, macro-stability would be fully achieved when the reform encompasses the taxation administration sector or the whole energy sector, from the point of production to distribution, and avoids the generation of circular debt further (ADB, 2023; NEPRA, 2024). However, within concentrated sectors, where there are no guarantees of competition, it may generate negative outcomes, further escalate public hostility, and create instability within reform trajectories. The view of the overwhelming body of literature remains that when there is healthy structural reform alongside the application of privatization, it helps generate stability rather than creating instability (ILO, 2022).

Conclusion

The privatization process has remained a complex and drawn-out experience for Pakistan, and replete with promises as well as controversy. On the one hand, the need to carry out the task has remained quite clear, since there has been a lack of efficiency that has derailed economic expansion, the depletion of public funds through financially unrequited state-owned enterprises, and an expansion of budget deficits. However, there have been challenges that continue to affect the effectiveness and pace of the reforms.

Nevertheless, the chances that also emanate from the onset of privatization are enormous. This situation has resulted in a vast influx of money that induces competitiveness, efficiency, and quality in the banking sector as well as the telecommunication sector. In spite of the above, the sectors that entail the airlines industry as well as the energy sector substantiate the inequality in chances where the intervention of politics functions as an impediment to advancement. Social opportunities emanating from the onset of privatization are characterized by threats as well as chances. Even though there are favorable probabilities in access and innovations, job security is also endangered. Anyway, the truth about the onset of privatization in the economy of Pakistan is that it is a fact but not effective in a similar manner. Privatization can be said to implement effective methods of productions in the various sectors but appears to be lacking in balance regarding the aspect of equity or rather the interpretation of governance. The imperative is very clear, and it appears that the Pakistani economy does not have the type that can be rectified by the implementation of privatization as a discrete event or a standalone process but one that has to be put in the larger context that it has to be placed in the greater scheme of the overall reforms that would basically entail openness, the strength of its institutions, and, more specifically, that the effort for more efficient production does not have to be accompanied by, for example, social costs. Furthermore, the less rapid, more targeted, and more specific to the particular sector the emphasis on responsibility, openness, and equitability seems to be the secret to the success. Pakistan needs to have a compliant regulation regime for its privatization policy to ensure that the end result will be the protection of consumers and that it will avoid the creation of monopolies.

References

Ahmed, N. (2018). Privatization in Pakistan: Labor market consequences and union responses. *Pakistan Journal of Industrial Relations, 10*(2), 45–62.

Ahmed, S., & Khan, R. (2019). Public service obligations and transport sector reforms in Pakistan. *Journal of Transport Policy Studies, 12*(1), 33–49.

Ahmed, S., & Malik, A. (2017). Banking sector privatization and efficiency: Evidence from Pakistan. *South Asian Journal of Finance, 9*(2), 65–82.

Asian Development Bank. (2016). *Social protection and labor market impacts of privatization in South Asia*. Manila: ADB.

Asian Development Bank. (2023). Pakistan: Addressing circular debt and power sector reforms. Manila: ADB.

Batool, A., Asmat, K., & Muzaffar, M. (2023). Governance and Transparency: A Case of Pakistan. *Annals of Human and Social Sciences*, *4*(3), 846–856.

Burki, S. J. (2019). *Pakistan's political economy: Challenges of reform*. Lahore: Vanguard Books.

Dogar, A. H., & Khalid, M. M. (2024). *Economic consequences of political instability in Pakistan: A study of fiscal policy and investor confidence*. *Pakistan Social Sciences Review, 8*(3), 628–637

Fida, M. (2024, October 28). Pakistan's political instability and policy challenges: Barriers to development and progress. *Daily Parliament Times*.

Friedrich Ebert Stiftung. (2021). *Mapping labour unions in Pakistan*. https://library.fes.de/pdf-files/bueros/pakistan/19148.pdf

Hoodbhoy, P. (2016). Education reform and privatization in Pakistan: Equity implications. *Economic and Political Weekly, 51*(32), 23–27.

International Labour Organization. (2022). *Labour market transitions and skills policies in Pakistan*. Geneva: ILO.

International Monetary Fund. (2024). *Pakistan: Article IV consultation and selected issues.* Washington, DC: IMF.

Khan, A., & Khan, S. (2023). Privatization and regulatory challenges in Pakistan's energy sector. *Journal of Economic Policy Studies, 15*(2), 45–62.

Malik, R. (2021). Energy sector reforms and consumer welfare in Pakistan. *Lahore Journal of Economics, 26*(1), 55–78.

Ministry of Finance, Pakistan. (2024). *Fiscal development report FY2024*. Ministry of Finance, Pakistan

Ministry of Railways, Pakistan. (2023). *Pakistan Railways year book 2022–23.* Islamabad: Government of Pakistan.

Muzaffar, M., Fern, Y. S., & Yaseen, Z (2024). Good Governance and Citizen's Trust in Pakistan: A Moderation Effect of Unethical Behavior**,** *Asian Journal of Human Services, 26*, 91-108 https://www.jstage.jst.go.jp/article/ajhs/26/0/26_91/_article/-char/en

Muzaffar, M., Fern, Y. S., & Yaseen, Z. (2023). Governance Dilemma: A Way Forward For Third World States, *Journal of Research Administration 5*(2), 9792-9803

National Electric Power Regulatory Authority (NEPRA). (2024). *State of industry report 2024*. Islamabad: NEPRA.

Pakistan Bureau of Statistics. (2023). *Labour force survey 2022–23*. Islamabad: PBS.

Pakistan Institute of Development Economics (PIDE). (2024). *Beyond privatization: Institutions, incentives, and fiscal sustainability*. Islamabad: PIDE Policy Brief.

Pakistan Telecommunication Authority. (2024). *Annual report 2023–24.* Islamabad: PTA.

Saeed, A., & Khan, M. A. (2017). Impact analysis of privatization of PTCL in Pakistan. *Punjab University Historical Society, 30*(2), 25–42.

Samad, G., & Faraz, N. (2024). *Political economy of privatization*. In *The Face of Privatization in Pakistan* (pp. 167–176). Springer.

Sodhar, M. (2024, September 10). *Privatization in Pakistan*. Paradigm Shift.

State Bank of Pakistan. (2024). Financial stability review 2024. Karachi: SBP.

Transparency International Pakistan. (2022). *Public perceptions of corruption in privatization processes*. Karachi: TIP.

Ullah, W., Khan, I. U., Bashir, H., & Zadd, U. (2024). Pakistan's governance paradox: A critical analysis of issues and reform strategies (2013–2022). *International Journal of Social Science Archives, 7*(2), 1185–1191

Vohra, M. S., Mubeen, M., Arif, K., & Perwez, K. (2023). Stability, funding risk, and bank performance: Evidence from Pakistan*. Pakistan Business Review, 25*(1), 67–88.

World Bank Group. (2023, April 13). *Pakistan federal public expenditure review 2023*. World Bank Group.

Yar, A., Arif, M. A., & Rahim, R. A. (2013). Privatization and fiscal deficit: A case study of Pakistan. *Research Journal of Finance and Accounting, 4*(15), 1–10.

Zaidi, S. A. (2019). *Issues in Pakistan's privatization: Sovereignty, politics, and economics*. Economic Review of Pakistan, 54(3), 12–28.

Zubair, T., & Khalid, R. (2020). Telecom liberalization and consumer welfare in Pakistan. *Journal of Economic Perspectives in Asia, 5*(3), 91–110.