ADVANCE SOCIAL SCIENCE ARCHIVE JOURNAL
Available Online: https://assajournal.com
Vol. 05 No. 01. Jan-March 2026.Page# 7051-7059
Print ISSN: 3006-2497 Online ISSN: 3006-2500
Platform & Workflow by: Open Journal Systems
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22726387

Comparative Economic Reform Strategies in China and Pakistan: Institutional Capacity, Policy Sequencing, and Development Outcomes

Beenish Shuja
Lecturer, School of Business Administration and Social Sciences, Iqra National University, Peshawar.
beenish@inu.edu.pk
Dr. Ahmad Farhan Saeed
Assistant Professor, Area Study Centre University of Peshawar.
Drfarhan@uop.edu.pk
Dr. Hina Gul
College of Home Economics, University of Peshawar.
Hinaupes@gmail.com

ABSTRACT
Economic reform is now at the core of sustainable growth and structural transformation policies in developing economies. Countries following a similar market-oriented reform have gotten very different development results, though. This study makes a comparative analysis of the economic reform policies of China and Pakistan during 1978-2025 and looks into the institutional and policy factors that have influenced their development paths. The article suggests that the success of economic reforms will require more than just market liberalization, but also institutional capacity, policy sequence and reform over the long-term, based on Developmental State Theory and Institutional Economics. The study is of qualitative comparative type and use secondary data extracted from various reputable sources, such as the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the Asian Development Bank, United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development and official publications of the governments of China and Pakistan. The results suggest that both countries were engaged in reforms to improve economic efficiency and integration into the global economy, but that they had different reform strategies, both in terms of the relative speed of reform and in the institutional structures and policy emphases that they adopted. Although the specific economic and institutional environments were different, China's gradual reform process enabled sustained industrialization, export growth, and technological advancements, while Pakistan's reform process allowed financial liberalization, increased role of the private sector, and gradual integration of the market. While the analysis is comparative, it underscores the need for institutional development and strategic policy coordination and human resource investments as the key drivers of economic transformation over the long-term. The article culminates with the identification of policy lessons which could help future reform programs in other developing economies including Pakistan.

Keywords: *Economic Reform, China, Pakistan, Comparative Development, Institutional Economics, Developmental State, Industrial Policy, Economic Transformation.*

1. Introduction

Economic reform is increasingly the heart of the strategy for achieving sustainable economic growth, boosting productivity and competitiveness in developing economies. A number of countries have adopted reforms in the last twenty years in the areas of trade liberalisation, financial sector modernisation, privatisation and investment promotion measures, in order to speed up their development and to integrate with the rest of the world. While there are some countries with similar development goals, the results have been significantly different, indicating that the impact of economic reform is not solely dependent on the policies adopted, but also on the institutional and governance frameworks in which they are applied (North, 1990; Rodrik, 2007).

China and Pakistan offer a valuable comparative perspective on these differences. China's Reform and Opening Up programme, which began in 1978, adopted a gradual and pragmatic strategy, involving the gradual implementation of institutional changes alongside strategic coordination by the state. In successive periods, the reforms in agriculture, industry, trade and investment made China one of the biggest economies in the world and a major player in the global value chain (Naughton, 2018; World Bank, 2022). Market-oriented reforms, including privatization, financial liberalisation, trade reforms and investment promotion, were also pursued in Pakistan to enhance economic performance and promote more private-sector involvement. These changes have helped achieve economic modernization and greater integration with regional and international markets, and have adapted to domestic development priorities (Ahmed & Amjad, 2022; Husain, 2018).

Both countries embraced market-oriented reforms, but took along different policy courses influenced by their institutional environments, governance systems and economic priorities. These experiences offer lessons about the effectiveness and impacts of reform strategies in sustainable and inclusive development in various national contexts.

The economic transformation of China and the reform experience in Pakistan have been explored in detail in the past, but most of these studies have looked at the two countries in isolation or considered individual policy measures like privatization, liberalization of trade or foreign investment. There are comparatively fewer studies that test the effectiveness of a combination of institutional capacity, policy sequencing, and governance on long-term reform results. Filling this gap is essential to understanding why similar reform policies can result in different development trajectories.

The study compares the economic reform approach of China and Pakistan from the point of view of "Developmental State Theory" and "Institutional Economics" from 1978 to 2025. The study does not claim to provide a comparison of the two countries to see which one is better, but investigates the impact of differences in institutional development, policy sequencing and policy implementation on their experiences of reform.

2. Literature Review

Economic reform plays a key role in development economics since its aim is to increase productivity, encourage investment, increase competitiveness and encourage sustainable growth. The early theories of development focused more on capital accumulation and industrialization as the key factors in development. Scholarship became more and more attuned to the fact that institutions, governance, and state capacity are important as well as economic reform in deciding upon the extent to which reforms can lead to long-term economic change (North, 1990).

In the late 1980s, the Washington Consensus emerged as one of the most prominent approaches to economic reform. Williamson (1990) offered policy prescriptions based on the concepts of fiscal discipline, privatization, deregulation, trade liberalization, tax reform and macroeconomic stability. These recommendations had a strong impact on structural adjustment programmes that were undertaken in a large number of developing economies. Advocates said that less government involvement would stimulate private capital, better use of resources and better lasting growth.

However, over time there was a growing doubt among scholars whether the standardized reform packages properly represented the institutional diversity of the states. Stiglitz (2002) has suggested that the success of the reforms depends on the effectiveness of the institutions that can facilitate markets rather than just liberalization policies. Likewise, Rodrik (2007) argued that development strategies should be tailored to the institutional environment rather than to any universal policy prescriptions. This focus moved away from selling individual reform policies to the larger governance systems needed to support their implementation.

China's experience brought a new angle to the economic reform. Instead of going for speedy liberalization, the Chinese government pursued a gradual and pragmatic path which involved experimentation, gradual implementation, and ongoing institutional modification. The agricultural reform, Special Economic Zones development, investments in infrastructure, and export-driven industrialization led to decent macroeconomic stability and a conducive environment for agricultural productivity improvements (Lin, 2012; Vogel, 2011). This experience proved that markets and state coordination could be complementary means of development and not competition.

In later years, this concept of the developmental state was elaborated by other scholars such as Johnson (1982), Wade (1990), Evans (1995) and Chang (2002), who argue that a capable government can support the structural transformation process by implementing industrial policy, technological upgrading, and strategic coordination between public institutions and private enterprise. They rejected the idea that governments can, and should, play only a limited economic role and focused on institutional capacity as a key factor in the success of development.

Another reason for differences in the reform results is provided by Institutional Economics. According to North (1990), institutions influence economic incentives in three ways they diminish uncertainty, enhance property rights, and aid productive investment. Acemoglu and Robinson (2012) also argue that inclusive institutions promote innovation and long-term growth, while poorer institutions limit economic performance. These views imply that a comparable reform could yield varying results based on the quality of the administration, of governance, and of policy continuity.

Studies on Pakistan's reform journey have identified important gains in financial liberalization, private sector development and trade integration, and noted ongoing challenges to enhance institutional effectiveness and competitiveness of industries (Ahmed & Amjad, 2022; Husain, 2018). The need to improve governance, develop human capital and technological capability and diversify exports are themes that are increasingly gaining traction in recent studies as priorities for long-term economic growth.

Comparative analysis of the experiences of China and Pakistan is rather limited, although there is already a considerable amount of scholarship. The majority of studies study one country at a time or concentrate on single policy changes. There is, therefore, still some room for comparative research, which would consider how institutional capacity, sequencing of reforms, and state co-ordination impact the longer-term development outcomes across different national contexts.

3. Theoretical Framework

This study draws on Developmental State Theory and Institutional Economics in order to gain a deeper understanding of the link between institutional capacity and policy choices and economic reform outcomes. Both perspectives see markets and the state as complementary tools to support sustainable economic development rather than competing.

Developmental State Theory states that governments can spur structural transformation by providing conditions which are conducive to industrialization, technological upgrading and long-term economic growth (Johnson 1982; Evans 1995). The state supports market performance and private sector growth through strategic planning, infrastructure investments, through industrial policy and investment in human resources. This is the model that underpinned China's reform process, which involved some degrees of liberalization along with a gradual process of institutional adaptation and continued state coordination (Lin, 2012; Naughton, 2018).

Institutional Economics supports this view by highlighting the necessity of good institutions to minimize uncertainty, promote good policy implementation and foster productive investments. North (1990) believed that economic incentives are influenced by institutional characteristics, which can offer permanent rules and governance frameworks for economic activity. Strong institutions thus improve the effectiveness of market-oriented reform and help to improve long-term economic performance.

Combining these viewpoints offer a satisfactory analytical tool for comparing China with Pakistan. Both countries-initiated market-oriented reforms, but at the same time, they did so in different institutional and policy contexts. These complementary theories help to understand economics and economic transformation in the light of institutional development, policy sequencing and governance.

In this respect, the present study makes a case for the need for both liberalization and robust institutions, coordinated strategy and constant adjustments to evolving economic circumstances for sustainable economic reform. This model is used to inform the comparative analysis in the subsequent sections.

4. Research Methodology

Qualitative comparative research design is used in this study to gain insight into the economic reform strategies of China and Pakistan from 1978 to 2025. The comparative method is suitable for examining the impact of institutional environments and institutional policy options on economic development and the transfer of the lesson for institutional reform (Collier, 1993).

The analysis relies entirely on secondary data from well known and reliable sources like the World Bank, Asian Development Bank (ADB), United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), World Trade Organization (WTO) and the official publications of the Government of China and Government of Pakistan. To support the theoretical and comparative analysis, peer-reviewed books and articles from journals were consulted.

The study focuses on five areas of comparison between the two countries: institutional development, industrial policy, trade and investment, macroeconomic performance, and human development. Results from different sources of data were triangulated to provide credibility and consistency to the findings.

This research is of a qualitative nature, which aims to explain, not to establish causal relationships between comparative reform experiences. However, the authoritative international data and the theoretical frameworks are available and sound which have been developed to measure the economic reform policies of China and Pakistan.

5. Comparative Reform Experiences and Development Outcomes

5.1 Reform Strategies and Policy Evolution

China and Pakistan adopted market-oriented reforms to boost economic growth and facilitate their integration into the world economy. Although the two countries had the same goal of economic modernization, the approaches to reform differed in the institutional frameworks, development priorities, and historical backgrounds of the two countries. China's Reform and

Opening Up Programme (1978) began a gradual process of introducing markets. The first agricultural reforms under the Household Responsibility System resulted in enhanced productivity and improved incomes for rural people, and then Special Economic Zones (SEZs) were introduced to promote foreign investment, export-driven manufacturing and technology transfer. Successful policy experiments were slowly being introduced on a national scale, as a pathway to a gradual transition to a socialist market economy (Development Research Center of the State Council & World Bank, 2013).

During the late 1980s, the reform process in Pakistan picked up speed and emphasized on privatization, liberalization of financial sector, trade liberalization, tax reforms and investment promotion. The measures increased the role of the private sector and improved the market-oriented economic policy. In recent years, such as the China-Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC), the development of infrastructure, regional connectivity, and industrial cooperation have increased, which also provides new space for economic diversification and long-term development. Both countries embarked on reform programmes, but with different paces and sequences, with common objectives of increasing productivity, competitiveness and economic openness.

5.2 Economic Growth and Structural Transformation

Both countries experienced a significant degree of structural transformation due to economic reforms. China saw steady economic development, fuelled by industrialisation, investment in infrastructure, export expansion and higher productivity. The manufacturing sector was a key driver of growth, helping China to become one of the world's biggest industrial and trading economies (World Bank, 2024). On-going investment on infrastructure, logistics and technological capability further bolstered the competitiveness of the country in global markets.

The structural changes were favorable in Pakistan as well, in successive stages of liberalization. The liberalisation of financial markets helped to develop banking and capital markets, and the involvement of the private sector helped to develop industrial and service sectors. In addition to the traditional sectors, manufacturing has also been growing and the last few policy initiatives have increasingly focused on technology, renewable energy, digital services and diversifying exports. Despite the different paths to development, the two countries are examples of how lasting change can enable gradual economic modernization and structural change.

5.3 Trade, Investment, and Institutional Development

Liberalisation of trade and foreign direct investment (FDI) were significant elements of reform in both countries. China combined the trade reforms and its efforts of industrial policy, infrastructure projects and export promotion, thus enabling the domestic industries to gain from technology transfer and access to global value chains. The World Trade Organization (WTO) membership further boosted China's performance in international trade, and improved its role in the international economy (WTO, 2024).

Pakistan also brought in reform of its tariff policy, investment incentives and export promotion measures, to invite more and more in international economic activities. The investments in CPEC have enhanced transport facilities, energy availability and industrial cooperation, thus advancing national development goals. The initiatives highlight the government's efforts to promote regional connectivity and boost productive capacity in Pakistan.

These economic reforms were accompanied by institutional development. The upgrading and innovation of industries was facilitated by the process of long-term planning, administrative continuity, and the gradual adaptation of policy in China. Pakistan has also made reforms to bolster governance, regulatory quality, digital public services and financial inclusion. This has helped foster a more conducive atmosphere for entrepreneurship, investment and development of the private sector, and ensured the effective enforcement of economic reforms.

5.4 Human Development and Inclusive Growth

At the end of the day, economic reform aims at enhancing citizens' welfare by increasing their income, public services and economic opportunities. With China's uninterrupted growth, significant achievements have been made in terms of education, health care, infrastructure, employment and poverty alleviation, which have been supplemented by persistent investment in human capital and policies to enhance productivity. The World Bank (2022) classifies China's poverty alleviation efforts as one of the greatest development successes in the past few decades. Pakistan has also achieved noteworthy progress in inclusive development through improving access to education, health, financial services and social protection programmes. The Benazir Income Support Programme, Ehsaas Programme, and expansion of digital connectivity have expanded the access to the necessary services and support for vulnerable communities. These advances suggest that economic reform, if coupled with continued human and institutional capital investment, can help drive social and economic development more generally.

Overall, the comparative evidence indicates that whilst both China and Pakistan have followed paths to reform, both nations have sought to modernise their economies through policies that have encouraged market development, institutional strengthening, industrialisation and human wellbeing. Their experiences offer clues about how reform strategies can be customized to the local contexts in various countries and to how they can be used to advance sustainable and inclusive development.

6. Discussion

The comparative analysis demonstrates the dynamic nature of economic reform, which is influenced by institutional factors, national priorities, and the level of commitment to the policy over a longer time horizon. The experiences of the countries of China and Pakistan do not represent a single model of development but instead provide examples of countries that can take different routes to reform while having similar goals: sustainable growth, industrialization, and better living standards.

The results confirm the main tenets of Developmental State Theory, as they show the benefits of government-market linkages. China's case shows how policy sequencing, institutional learning and industrial planning can help achieve structural transformation in the long run. The results are in line with Johnson's (1982), Evans' (1995) and Wade's (1990) views that efficient public institutions are contributing factors to economic development by providing an environment conducive to productive investment and technological development.

The analysis also strengthens the applicability of Institutional Economics. North (1990) pointed out that institutions eliminate uncertainty and enhance incentives for productive economic activity. The two countries' experiences have shown that institutional development promotes the success of market-oriented reforms in five areas: policy implementation; investment promotion; and administrative coordination. The evidence does not indicate a clear dichotomy between the institutions and markets but on the contrary, that they work best when they are built together.

One of the significant findings is on the issue of policy sequencing. China's incremental reform approach demonstrates the possibility of a simultaneous development of the institutions and markets. In Pakistan, the experience shows us that reform is a never-ending process as it evolves in view of the domestic development priorities and shifting global economic dynamics. This comparison underscores the need for flexibility in reform approaches, rather than the imposition of a single policy prescription.

The study also provides new elements to the controversies over the Washington Consensus, showing that market liberalisation will be best implemented together with other development measures. The institutional strengthening, investment in infrastructure, development of human resources, and industrial policy, together with trade liberalization, privatization and promotion of investment, are positive in terms of economic development. This is in line with Rodrik (2007) who contended that "good reform must be country-specific, meaning that it must be rooted in the institutional conditions of the country.

Finally, the comparative analysis reveals that the process of economic reform is an ongoing learning and adaptation process. The experiences of China provide lessons on policy continuity, industrial upgrading and innovation; while Pakistan's reform process provides lessons on the need to continue institutional modernization, to scale-up productive capacity, and to deepen regional economic integration. The aim is not to copy another country's model, but to look for "lessons to be learnt" which can be transferred or adapted to local conditions.

7. Policy Implications

Some policy conclusions are drawn from this comparative analysis:

First, economic reforms will be more effective in the long run when they are complemented by clear national development plans that are based on macroeconomic stability and industrial growth, innovation, and investment in human resources.

Secondly, institutional strengthening must continue to be a key aspect of reform programmes. Further governance and regulatory development, public administration and digital government improvements can improve the capacity to implement, and boost investor confidence.

Third, in addition to market reforms, industrial policy should promote technological improvement, manufacturing competitiveness and export diversification. Research & Development, Vocational education and Digital infrastructure will gain even greater significance for maintaining productivity growth.

Fourth, foreign direct investment needs to be continued to be associated with technology transfer, trainings and training the locals for industrialization. Enhancing linkages between multinationals and local industry can boost the overall long-term economic gains.

Finally, increased economic cooperation, infrastructure connectivity and knowledge sharing in the region can be fruitful in fostering inclusive and sustainable development of developing economies.

8. Conclusion

The purpose of the study was to analyze and discuss the economic reform policies of China and Pakistan from 1978 to 2025 using the lens of two theories: Developmental State Theory and Institutional Economics. The analysis reveals that both countries have engaged in a process of market-oriented reforms in the interest of economic modernization, albeit with different institutional settings, policy agendas and development experiences. China's slow and carefully planned reforms enabled the process of industrialization and technological progress while Pakistan's reform programme helped to make the markets more open, involve private sector and promote the ongoing institutional and economic development.

The comparative analysis shows that market liberalization is not the only component of economic reform that can be successful. Effective institutions, strategic policy coordination, investments in human capital, and adaptation to changing economic conditions help to support long-term progress. The results do not just support a single model of development but stress the need to develop reform designs that are based on national priorities and institutional realities.

References

Acemoglu, D., & Robinson, J. A. (2012). *Why nations fail: The origins of power, prosperity, and poverty*. Crown Business.
Ahmed, V., & Amjad, R. (2022). *Pakistan's economy: Challenges and prospects*. Oxford University Press.
Amsden, A. H. (1989). *Asia's next giant: South Korea and late industrialization*. Oxford University Press.
Asian Development Bank. (2024). *Asian development outlook 2024*. Asian Development Bank.
Chang, H. J. (2002). *Kicking away the ladder: Development strategy in historical perspective*. Anthem Press.
Collier, D. (1993). The comparative method. In A. W. Finifter (Ed.), *Political science: The state of the discipline II* (pp. 105–119). American Political Science Association.
Development Research Center of the State Council, & World Bank. (2013). *China 2030: Building a modern, harmonious, and creative high-income society*. World Bank.
Evans, P. (1995). *Embedded autonomy: States and industrial transformation*. Princeton University Press.
Hall, P. A., & Soskice, D. (2001). *Varieties of capitalism: The institutional foundations of comparative advantage*. Oxford University Press.
Haggard, S. (1990). *Pathways from the periphery: The politics of growth in the newly industrializing countries*. Cornell University Press.
Hausmann, R., Rodrik, D., & Velasco, A. (2008). Growth diagnostics. In N. Serra & J. E. Stiglitz (Eds.), *The Washington Consensus reconsidered: Towards a new global governance* (pp. 324–355). Oxford University Press.
Husain, I. (2018). *Governing the ungovernable: Institutional reforms for democratic governance*. Oxford University Press.
International Monetary Fund. (2024). *Pakistan: 2024 Article IV consultation*. International Monetary Fund.
International Monetary Fund. (2024). *World economic outlook: Steady but underwhelming: Resilience amid divergence*. International Monetary Fund.
Johnson, C. (1982). *MITI and the Japanese miracle: The growth of industrial policy, 1925–1975*. Stanford University Press.
Khan, M. H. (2010). *Political settlements and the governance of growth-enhancing institutions* (SOAS Working Paper). SOAS University of London.
Khan, S. R. (2017). Pakistan's economy: Challenges and opportunities. *The Pakistan Development Review, 56*(4), 617–636.
Lin, J. Y. (1992). Rural reforms and agricultural growth in China. *American Economic Review, 82*(1), 34–51.
Lin, J. Y. (2012). *New structural economics: A framework for rethinking development and policy*. World Bank.
Lin, J. Y., Cai, F., & Li, Z. (2003). *The China miracle: Development strategy and economic reform* (Rev. ed.). Chinese University Press.
Naughton, B. (2018). *The Chinese economy: Adaptation and growth* (2nd ed.). MIT Press.
North, D. C. (1990). *Institutions, institutional change and economic performance*. Cambridge University Press.
Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2023). *OECD economic surveys: China 2023*. OECD Publishing.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2024). *OECD economic outlook 2024*. OECD Publishing.
Pierson, P. (2000). Increasing returns, path dependence, and the study of politics. *American Political Science Review, 94*(2), 251–267.
Qian, Y. (2003). How reform worked in China. In D. Rodrik (Ed.), *In search of prosperity: Analytic narratives on economic growth* (pp. 297–333). Princeton University Press.
Rodrik, D. (2007). *One economics, many recipes: Globalization, institutions and economic growth*. Princeton University Press.
State Bank of Pakistan. (2024). *Annual report 2023–24*. State Bank of Pakistan.
State Council of the People's Republic of China. (2021). *The 14th Five-Year Plan (2021–2025) for national economic and social development*. Government of the People's Republic of China.
Stiglitz, J. E. (2002). *Globalization and its discontents*. W. W. Norton.
United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. (2024). *World investment report 2024*. United Nations.
United Nations Development Programme. (2024). *Human development report 2023/2024*. United Nations Development Programme.
United Nations Industrial Development Organization. (2024). *Industrial development report 2024*. United Nations Industrial Development Organization.
Vogel, E. F. (2011). *Deng Xiaoping and the transformation of China*. Harvard University Press.
Wade, R. (1990). *Governing the market: Economic theory and the role of government in East Asian industrialization*. Princeton University Press.
Williamson, J. (1990). What Washington means by policy reform. In J. Williamson (Ed.), *Latin American adjustment: How much has happened?* (pp. 7–20). Institute for International Economics.
World Bank. (2022). *Four decades of poverty reduction in China: Drivers, insights for the world, and the way ahead*. World Bank.
World Bank. (2024a). *Global economic prospects*. World Bank.
World Bank. (2024b). *World development indicators*. World Bank.
World Trade Organization. (2024). *World trade report 2024*. World Trade Organization.
Zhu, X. (2012). Understanding China's growth: Past, present, and future. *Journal of Economic Perspectives, 26*(4), 103–124.