

## Economic and Social Progress under Civilian & Military Set-ups in Pakistan

Ahmed Rizwan Raheem<sup>1\*</sup> Parmar Vishnu<sup>2</sup> Ahmad Nawaz<sup>1</sup> Amin Muhammad Ahmed<sup>1</sup>

1.Department of Business Administration, Indus University, Pakistan

2.Institute of Business Administration, Sindh University, Pakistan

\* E-mail of the corresponding author: [rizwanraheemahmed@gmail.com](mailto:rizwanraheemahmed@gmail.com)

### Abstract

This paper is an attempt to analyze the social indicators of two government eras i.e. the military regime of General Pervaiz Musharraf (FY00-FY05) and the democratic governments of Pakistan Peoples Party (PPP) and the Muslim League (FY89-FY99). Since the social indicators are the benchmark & performance factors for having an ease and well being of a common person for any country. The objectives of the study are two fold. First of all, it is to develop a statistical framework of analysis to compare the performance in social sectors of Pakistan during two different types of governments; namely, the democratic era (FY89-FY99) and Military regime (FY00-FY05). Descriptive & Inferential statistics were used over a period of time 1989-2005 to analyze the difference in Group Means of the time period as opposed to comparing them from one year to another, which is the conventional method. The findings indicate that amongst the key social indicators and variables there is no significant statistical difference in the group means for most of the variables studied. Therefore, the main conclusion of this study is that the military regime (FY00-FY05) has not performed significantly better than the previous regimes in the democratic era (FY89-FY99) as indicated by key social indicators. The overall quality of life in terms of the development of the social sectors i.e., education, health, and poverty has not changed at all during the military rule (FY00-FY05) as compared to the previous democratic era (FY89-FY99). In fact it has been observed that most of the Social indicators of the military era (FY00-FY05) remained stagnant or even more worsened as compared to the democratic governments (FY89-FY99).

**Keywords:** Social indicators, Military regime, Democratic regime, Statistical framework, Descriptive & inferential statistics, Social sectors, Social performance

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Pakistan has been a military state for a long period of time since its birth. The country during its 66 years of history has been mainly governed by the armed forces and its agencies, overtly, and covertly. Even during quasi-democratic regimes the Armed forces have acted as backseat drivers and dismissed governments at the slightest pretense without giving any of them a fair chance for carrying out proper political and economic reforms. S.M. Naseem<sup>1</sup>, a well known political commentator, provides further insight with the following statement: "Objective analysis shows that both political and military regimes are at least equally to blame for the tragic plight of democracy in Pakistan. Even in the period between Zia-ul-Haq and Musharraf, the military is known to have constantly interfered in the election process, both openly and covertly, and ensuring that "right-minded" people get elected. During the democratic period 1988-99, seven different democratic governments have been formed, in which four were elected and three were caretaker governments. Caretakers' government supported by technocrats from international financial institutions IMF overtly ruled during this period. This was a highly uncertain period and none of government could complete their tenure. Pakistan Army Generals quietly ruled from behind by supporting and establishing new political groups who can accomplish their cause. The idea, then, is to maintain its influence through a mixture of force, mediation, and interference in civic institutions.

According to the Pakistan Economic Survey 2004-05<sup>2,3</sup> during fiscal year FY05 as Pakistan's real GDP grew by 8.4% as compared to 6.4% in FY04. At face value practically all-major social & economic indicators exhibited improvement compared to previous years. Even per capita income, which was stagnant for decades, crossed the \$700 mark. Agriculture registered the growth of 4%, whereas, the services sector has shown tremendous growth i.e. 7.9%. The economic performance has improved, but social indicators decreased further in FY05 as shown by the macroeconomic & social indicators. Inflation, fiscal deficit and trade deficit has increased<sup>4</sup>. The military government has made strong claims that the economy has stabilized and is poised for higher growth using key macroeconomic & social indicators as their basis for projection. This paper analyzes the government assertions by comparing the group means of the indicators in two different times.

The Bretton Woods Institutions such as the IMF and World Bank have been working with Pakistan for several decades. The IMF supported Pakistan in order to improve balance of payment deficits. In poverty reduction, improving infrastructures and social sectors, the World Bank and Asian development bank have assisted the Pakistan throughout that period<sup>7,8</sup>.

During the military regime (1999-2005), there were strong evidences of stable economy; almost all the macroeconomic indicators have performed exceptionally well<sup>9</sup>. In contrary, social sector did not perform well during that period. There were severe problems in basic infrastructures, public sector deficits and social development projects. Poverty has increased and unemployment opportunities have not been created. One such method of benchmarking is to look at the growth rate of different indicators associated with the following two criteria of economic and social performance<sup>10</sup>. First, distribution of growth benefits, impact of growth on job creation, poverty alleviation, income distribution, and access to social services, if growth is not accompanied by these development even a high average rate of per capita GNP growth can not be considered satisfactory<sup>11, 12</sup>. Second, growth must also be judged by sustainability, which has been defined as the viability of growth trends. In Pakistan gross investment rates have not been high but investment has relied heavily on the inflow of large external resources on concessional terms, huge foreign exchange earnings from workers remittances, and the strong underpinning of foreign exchange support provided by the narcotics trade. Sustainability of investment levels and viability of the balance of payments, therefore, would naturally influence future growth, as would the level of industrialization and the structure of industry<sup>13</sup>.

### 1.1. Empirical Studies

Faisal Cheema conducted a study<sup>14</sup> in May 2004 at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, for (ACDIS) Program in Arms control, Disarmament, and International Security where he studied macroeconomic variables and their consequences in social reforms and structures and help of IMF and World Bank during the period of 1997 to 2003. Cheema looked at 15 Macroeconomic indicators and their performance over six years 1997-2003, which is summarized. He sums up his conclusions as: “ During the period 1997-2003, the overall economic condition was very much stable, almost all the economic variables were encouraging and the country was achieving macroeconomic stability. But the performance of economic indicators could not be translated into the social ease of a common person of the country. Poverty and unemployment are still high, posing serious challenges to the policy makers in Islamabad. The government of Pakistan has launched a poverty alleviation strategy with the help of the IMF and the World Bank; still, 33 percent of the people live below the poverty line. The rising population and lack of employment opportunities create persistent unemployment problems in the country. In addition to unemployment, underemployment is even higher in the country. There is a need to devise a comprehensive employment strategy to tackle this gigantic problem”.

Dr. Ishrat Husain<sup>18</sup>, the governor State Bank of Pakistan at that time has discussed and analyzed the situation of the Pakistani economy and pointed out the improved macroeconomic indicators have shown two pictures or point of views at a time. One, the drastic improvement in the economy and the economic indicators are just illusion and could be shattered at any point of time because these economic numbers are not being translated into overall well being of the common people.

The Small medium enterprises have expanded in that period in Pakistan. The SMEs played a vital role in a long-term growth in any economy and improvement in key social indicators because these SMEs create number of jobs, which provides ample opportunities of an employment to the masses. China, India, Korea and Malaysia are the biggest examples of sustainable economic growth rate & and reduce their poverty by providing employment opportunities to the population. Overall SMEs not only provide the sustainable growth but also helpful in order to reduce poverty and unemployment<sup>15</sup>. In contrary, Pakistan has faced several serious problems and challenges in last decade like increase in poverty, gape has increased many folds and relative poverty has increased substantially in that period. Despite the enormous help from IMF and World Bank the financial and social objectives have not been achieved. Policy makers were unable to give the concrete plan and population has increased rapidly, which hampered the existing polies for poverty alleviation and reduction in unemployment<sup>16, 17</sup>. For the purpose of brevity, the performance of the major macroeconomic & social indicators is given in Table 1.”

**Table - 1**  
**Changes in Key Macroeconomic & Social Indicators**

	<i>October 1999</i>	<i>June 2003</i>	<i>Change in the Indicator</i>
<b>GDP Growth Rate</b>	4.2 %	5.1 %	Positive
<b>Inflation</b>	5.7 %	3.3 %	Positive
<b>Fiscal Deficit/GDP</b>	-6.1 %	-4.0 %	Positive
<b>Current Account/GDP</b>	-3.2 %	+ 7.1 %	Positive
<b>Domestic Debt/GDP</b>	52.0 %	43.4 %	Positive
<b>External Debt</b>	\$37 billion	\$35 billion	Positive
<b>Remittances</b>	\$88 million per month	\$350 million per month	Positive
<b>Exports</b>	\$7.8 billion	\$11.1 billion	Positive
<b>Tax Revenue</b>	PRs 391 billion	PRs 460 billion	Positive
<b>Rupee-Dollar Parity</b>	Depreciating	Appreciating	Positive
<b>Foreign Direct Investment</b>	\$472 million	\$800 million	Positive
<b>Foreign Exchange Reserves</b>	\$1.6 billion	\$9.9 billion	Positive
<b>Poverty Incidence</b>	33 %	Data not available but perhaps rising	Negative
<b>Poverty Related Expenditure</b>	PRs 133 billion	PRs 161 billion	Positive
<b>Unemployment</b>	6 %	8 %	Negative

Source (State Bank of Pakistan)

### 1.2. U.S. Dependency

“Pakistan’s economy performed extremely well during the three periods of Ayub, Zia and Musharraf. But Dr. Husain empirically proves that it’s not merely US foreign Aid. If the U.S. and foreign aid is the main explanatory factor, than it must increased the flow of foreign savings during the military period. We confine ourselves to the period beyond 1971. The evidence shows that Pakistan’s current account deficit was 6.5 percent of GDP on average in the 1972-77 period, financing 40 percent of investment outlay. It was 6 percent of GDP during the 1990-99 periods the most recent non-military period. In other words, more than one third of investment was financed from external borrowing and grants as against 20 percent in the 1980s-Zia period<sup>19</sup>. In the four years under the Musharraf Government (2000-2004), the country in fact generated a current account surplus, thus exporting capital to the U.S. and other developed countries rather than obtaining foreign flows. Besides repaying and prepaying a large amount of external debt and liabilities, the country has accumulated \$12 billion plus in foreign exchange reserves compared to an average of \$1 billion in the 1990s<sup>20</sup>.

This can be further substantiated by the movement of net external transfer i.e. gross disbursement of foreign loans and grants minus debt servicing. Net external transfers were the highest during the 1990-99 period compared to the 1980s and 2000-04 periods<sup>21</sup>. Despite these high net external transfers, growth rate was below the trend in the 1990s, poverty incidence resurged to 33 percent and fiscal deficits were unmanageable. While the observation that Pakistan thrives economically when relations with the U.S. are at their best is empirically true at a superficial level, a more nuanced analysis suggests that it is what economists call spurious correlation. Two un-related events may occur at the same time but their cause-effect relationship may be statistically insignificant<sup>22</sup>.

### 1.3. The second hypothesis of the recent economic progress is that it is the windfall of 9/11

**Dr. Ishrat Husain argues that,** “Pakistan’s participation in the war against terrorism and the resulting largesse by the U.S. As such, these are all transitory and short-term gains and have nothing to do with the quality of economic policies and governance. This line of reasoning completely ignores key developments prior to September 11, 2001<sup>23</sup>.

In another, study Dr. Ishrat Husain substantiated the policies of the military government of Musharraf and discussed the situation of exchange reserves in 1999 and the implication of deadly low reserves. He discussed the post 9/11 implications on Pakistani economy and pointed out foreign reserves has sharply increased due to foreign remittances and foreign ads from United States and allied countries. The tax rate has also increased in a very impressive manner. Experts have increased from \$7.8 billion in FY99 to \$9.2 billion. The GDP was very consistent in that period; the exchange rate has become stable since June 2000<sup>23</sup>.

#### 1.4. Defense Crowding Out Hypothesis

In the last hypothesis Dr. Husain states<sup>23</sup>, “Defense expenditures in real terms (as percentage of GDP and as a percentage of public revenues and as a percentage of total expenditures) have been on a downward path since 1990. The detail is presented in table 2:

**Table - 2**  
**Defense Expenditure as % of GDP**

Year	% of GDP	% of Revenues	% of Expenditure
1990-91	6.9	39.4	24.8
1991-96	5.6	32.5	23.1
2000.01	4.0	23.7	18.3
2003-04	3.8	22.7*	19.5*

\*The increase reflects the expenditure incurred on logistical support provided to the U.S. troops.

Defense expenditure, which used to account for about 7 percent of GDP in the early 1990s, declined to 3.8 percent in 2003-04. As a proportion of government revenues and total expenditure, the slide is even steeper. While it is true that Pakistan should spend relatively more on social sectors, the constraint was the ever-increasing debt servicing burden during the 1990s rather than the defense expenditure<sup>18</sup>.

#### 1.4. 1988-1999: Democratic Era

The post Zia period, despite many changes in the political regimes, has proved to be more consistent in its policy stance towards liberalization and, particularly, privatization of public enterprises. In 1989, the new elected government of Benazir Bhutto established a Board of Investment for laying down the policy guidelines of affecting industry. In 1990, the new Nawaz Sharif’s government announced a series of policy reforms to stimulate investment in manufacturing, removal of the complicated investment licensing, the liberalization of exchange control, the facilitation of easy access to credit, and the granting of further tax incentives to industrialists. By 1996, over eighty units had been privatized<sup>19</sup>.

Dr. Ashfaq has presented the bright side of the picture. The macro economic indicators are showing positive change but its sustainability is in question. Can it continue in the coming years? These positive achievements seem to be the result of changing global environment and the geo-political situation of the country. The fruits of macro economic growth have not reached the common man. Rising poverty, increasing rate of social crimes, high unemployment and rising inflation are the big challenges. In terms of the Human Development index, Pakistan’s ranks 135<sup>th</sup> out of 177. So, the dark side of the bright economy is that the glowing macroindicators have not been transformed into the social performance of the government and a common man did not get any benefit from these positive changes in economy.

## 2. MATERIAL & METHODS

### 2.1. Framework of Analysis

Descriptive and inferential statistical techniques are used in order to analyze the results. For this purpose statistical software SPSS has been used. Descriptive statistics shows the results of central tendency and variances and standard deviations in the data. Three inferential statistical models have been used. T-test is used for the analysis and comparison of group means and two independent samples with equal variances. The F-test is used to validate the assumptions for equal variances. To further validate the results one factor ANOVA was applied.

### 2.2. Hypothesis Testing

Formulation of the Hypotheses is essential to infer or explain and test proposed facts and phenomenon about the sample and population.

#### 2.2.1. T- TEST

The T-Test is used to test a hypothesis stating that the means for the variables associated with two independent samples or groups will be the same. It is appropriate in situations where the sample size is 30 or less and the population standard deviation is unknown.

#### 2.2.2. P- Value in Hypothesis Testing

*P-value* strengthens the decision, if *p*-Value is smaller than the significance level, *H*<sub>0</sub> is rejected. It is larger than the significance level, *H*<sub>0</sub> is not rejected. A very small *p*-Value like .0001 indicates that there is little likelihood that it is false. If *p*-Value is very large then it is likely that *H*<sub>0</sub> is true. The *p* value confirms and validates the decision about the hypothesis as well as determines the strength of evidence about the *H*<sub>0</sub>.

#### 2.2.3. F-Distribution

F-Distribution is utilized as the test statistic for several situations like two samples are from populations having equal variances, or comparing several population means simultaneously. To employ that test it is necessary to

assume that the two population variances are the same. This test of hypothesis is:

$$H_0: \sigma_1^2 = \sigma_2^2$$

$$H_1: \sigma_1^2 \neq \sigma_2^2$$

To conduct the test, a random sample  $n_1$  observation is obtained from one population, and a sample of  $n_2$  observations is obtained from the second population. The test statistic is  $S_1^2/S_2^2$ . If the null hypothesis is true the test statistics follow the F-Distribution with  $n_1-1$  and  $n_2-1$  degrees of freedom.

#### **2.2.4. ANOVA**

One factor Analysis of Variances (ANOVA) is used to further validate the results obtained from this model because the t-test applied earlier is a special case of one-way ANOVA.

### **2.3. The Sample**

The data for the selected 8 variables were collected from secondary sources mainly from the various editions of Pakistan Economic Surveys like (2005, 2004, 2003, 2000, 1995 1990 1988), published by the Federal Bureau of Statistics, Government of Pakistan. Essentially convenience sampling was used to select the variables and collect the data. Then stratified sampling was used to divide the population into two different groups, which are representative of the two types of government for the time period FY89-FY05.

### **2.4. Selected variables for Social indicators**

#### **2.4.1. Unemployment Rate (UR)**

The unemployment rate measures the proportion of people in the labor force who are out of work. Different kinds of unemployment include the following: Frictional Unemployment; This is when people are unemployed for a short time due to various reasons such as changing jobs and/or the previous job not being fulfilling; Seasonal Unemployment: This is unemployment that occurs due to changes in seasons, e.g. agricultural workers lose jobs in winter.

#### **2.4.2. Consumer Price Index (CPI)**

This is a key indicator to measure inflation, which occurs when too much money chases too few goods on the market. It could be caused by demand-pull or supply push factors. Increase in prices is a normal consequence of economic growth but inflation measures the rate of increase, which should be kept to a minimum. Hyperinflation (rising at rates of 100% or more annually) causes people to lose confidence in their economy and put their money in speculative assets such as gold, shares, and real estate.

#### **2.4.3. Investment in Education as % of GDP (IEDU)**

This variable is the proportion of investment or spending in education as a proportion of GDP.

#### **2.4.4. Investment in Health (IHLTH)**

This measures the total investment or spending in health as percentage of GDP.

#### **2.4.5. Per Capita Income % of GDP (PCGDP)**

The per capita income is determined by dividing the aggregate income of any geographic area by the total population in that area. This variable is then divided by GDP to get it as a proportion of GDP.

#### **2.4.6. Poverty (POV)**

The level of Poverty is defined by the government of Pakistan by the benchmark of rupee value of Rs. 25 a day or Rs. 748 a month enough to afford 2,350 calories a day. Anyone earning less than this is considered as absolute poor. This differs dramatically from the internationally accepted measure of US\$1 a day (i.e. Rs. 59) to be considered absolutely poor and US\$2 a day, which is considered very poor.

## **3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The results obtained in the study, as summarized follows. Our main hypothesis, which was to compare the group means of most of the economic and social indicators, is not rejected for most of the variables. Key macroeconomic and social indicators displayed no significant statistical difference in the two eras. That means the samples obtained for most of the indicators belong to the same population. The validation through the p value and Analysis of Variance also shows that there is extremely strong evidence that there is no significant difference in economic performance during the Democratic era and Military rule. The analysis is summarized below.

### **3.1. Hypotheses & Results**

#### **3.1.1. Unemployment Rate (UR)**

*H<sub>0</sub>*: There is no difference in the mean growth rate of Unemployment during the two regimes.

*H<sub>1</sub>*: There is a difference in the mean growth rate of Unemployment during the two regimes.

This null hypothesis for the unemployment rate is rejected with at the 99% confidence level. The t-computed value-3.85 is higher than the t-critical value 3.169, which proves that there is significant difference between the two regimes. There is extremely strong evidence as the p-value 0.003 which is less than the significance level .01.

The ANOVA test further confirms the same, as the F-computed value 14.88 is greater than F-critical value 8.683.

### **3.1.2. Consumer Price Index (CPI)**

*Ho:* There is no difference in the mean growth rate of Consumer Price Index during the two regimes

*H1:* There is a difference in the mean growth rate of Consumer Price Index during the two regimes

The group means of Consumer Price Index is statistically different during the two-selected time periods. The t-computed value 4.269 is much higher than the t-critical value 2.947. We have extremely strong evidence to reject this null hypothesis with 99% confidence level. The p-value .0007 is greater than the significant level of .01. The ANOVA test further validates the same, as the F-computed value 18.225 is higher than the F-critical value 8.683.

### **3.1.3. Investment or Spending in Education as % of GDP (IEDU)**

*Ho:* There is no difference in the mean growth rate of Investment in Education as % of GDP during the two regimes?

*H1:* There is a difference in the mean growth rate of Investment in Education as % of GDP during the two regimes.

Investment in education as % of GDP has t-computed value of 2.541, which is, less than the t-critical value 2.947. This null hypothesis falls within the acceptance region for the null hypothesis at .01 significance level, which also means that it cannot be rejected at 99% confidence level. Since the p-value of 0.023 is greater than .01 there is strong evidence that the group means are not different in both the regimes. The ANOVA test also validates the same result, as the F-computed value is 6.456 less than the F-critical value 8.683.

### **3.1.4. Investment or Spending in Health (IHLTH)**

*Ho:* There is no difference in the mean growth rate of Investment in Health as % of GDP during the two regimes.

*H1:* There is a difference in the mean growth rate of Investment in Health as % of GDP during the two regimes.

The group means of Investment in Health as % of GDP in both eras remain statistically the same. As the t-computed value 1.895 is less than the t-critical value 2.947 it falls within the acceptance region of null hypothesis at .01 significance level. Therefore, this null hypothesis cannot be rejected at the 99% confidence level. There is very strong evidence that the two group means are statistically the same as the p-value 0.078 is much greater than .01. This result is further validated by the ANOVA test, as the F-computed value 3.59 is less than the F-critical value 8.683

### **3.1.5. Per Capita Income % of GDP (PCGDP)**

*Ho:* There is no difference in the mean growth rate of Per Capita Income as % of GDP during the two regimes?

*H1:* There is a difference in the mean growth rate of Per Capita Income as % of GDP during the two regimes

This null hypothesis cannot be rejected at the 99% confidence level. As the t-computed value 2.424 is less than the t-critical value 2.947, and the p-value 0.08 is higher than 0.01. Therefore, we have very strong evidence that the group means of Per Capita Income % of GDP are the same in both eras of democratic and military. This further validates by the ANOVA test where the F-computed value 5.874 is less than the F-critical value of 8.683.

### **3.1.6. Poverty (POV)**

*Ho:* There is no difference in the mean growth rate of Poverty during the two regimes.

*H1:* There is a difference in the mean growth rate of Poverty during the two regimes.

The Poverty level during the two eras is statistically different. The t-computed value -9.02 falls in the rejection region and we have extremely strong evidence as indicated by the p-values for both the t-test and validated by the ANOVA test.

## **4. CONCLUSION**

The overall results concluded that there was significant statistical difference in the unemployment rate and Consumer price index (CPI) in the two eras, which is indicated by t-test and ANOVA test results. So, it is concluded that the military era performed well in unemployment reduction and they have also control the inflation during the period (FY00-FY05). The t-computed value 2.424 is less than the t-critical value 2.947, and the p-value 0.08 is higher than 0.01. Therefore, we have very strong evidence that the group means of Per Capita Income % of GDP are the same in both eras of democratic and military. This further validates by the ANOVA test where the F-computed value 5.874 is less than the F-critical value of 8.683. So, this is also strong evidence that there is no significant statistical difference in two form of government because per capita income has not increased in military regime as they are claiming the shining macro indicators have a positive impact on a social performance of the government. The t-computed value 2.424 is less than the t-critical value 2.947, and the p-value 0.08 is higher than 0.01. Therefore, we have very strong evidence that the group means of Per Capita Income % of GDP are the same in both eras of democratic and military. As the t-computed value 1.895 is less

than the t-critical value 2.947 it falls within the acceptance region of null hypothesis at .01 significance level. Therefore, this null hypothesis cannot be rejected at the 99% confidence level. There is very strong evidence that the two group means are statistically the same as the  $p$ -value 0.078 is much greater than .01. This result is further validated by the ANOVA test, as the F-computed value 3.59 is less than the F-critical value 8.683. So, it concluded that the investment in health and education is not significantly different in both military and democratic eras. This further validates by the ANOVA test where the F-computed value 5.874 is less than the F-critical value of 8.683. Therefore, it is finally concluded that the overall social indicators do not show any significant statistical differences in the two form of governments i.e. the democratic era (FY89-FY99) and the military regime (FY00-FY05). So, it is finally concluded that the hypothesis has not proved that the military government has performed exceptionally well as compared to the democratic governments in Pakistan as far as the social performance is concerned.

## REFERENCES

1. Naseem S.M., If democracy is to work, article, Daily Dawn, Karachi, October 4 (2004)
2. Pakistan Economic Survey 2004-05, page II (2005)
3. Pakistan Economic Survey 2003-04 (2004)
4. Pakistan Economic Survey 1998-99, page I (1999)
5. State Bank's Annual Report 2004-05 (2005)
6. Cheema A., Pakistan's Textiles and Trade Performance: 1972-1990, mimeo, Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge (1995)
7. Ghausi Sabihuddin, WB finds flaw with GDP calculations, article, Daily Dawn, Karachi, September 25 (2005)
8. Pakistan National Human Development Report, UNDP, Oxford University Press (2003)
9. Nabi, I., Entrepreneurs and Markets in Early Industrialization: A case study from Pakistan, International Center for Economic Growth, pp. 4-5, San Francisco (1988)
10. Nadvi K., Employment Creation in Urban Micro-Enterprises in the Manufacturing sector in Pakistan, ILO/ARTEP, Bangkok (1990)
11. Chowdhury A.H., Nuruddin M., Small & Medium Industries in Asian Developing Countries. Asian Development Review, Studies of Asian and Pacific Economic Issues, 8 (2), pg. 28 (1990)
12. SME Development Review, SMEDA, July-Sept. Vol (01), Page 16 (2004)
13. Hassan P., Pakistan's economy at the Crossroads: Past Policies and Present Imperatives, Oxford, pg.6-7 (1998)
14. Cheema F., Macro economic stability of Pakistan 1997-2003, University of Illinois-Champaign, ACDIS Occasional paper (2004)
15. Shunji Karikomi, The Development Strategy for SMEs in Malaysia, IDE APEC Study Center, Working Paper Series 97/98-No, 4 (1998)
16. Zaidi S.A., Issues in Pakistan's Economy, Oxford, page 124 (1999)
17. Zaidi S.A., Issues in Pakistan's Economy, Oxford University Press (2005)
18. Husain, I., Pakistan's economic progress since 2000: False Dawn or a Promising Start, paper presented at John Hopkins, University of Washington DC, October (2004)
19. Medhi Krongkaew, The Development of SMS industries in Thailand, Asian Development Review (Studies of Asian and Pacific Economic Issues), 6 (2), 70-71 (1988)
20. Iqbal, Zafar, article, Daily Dawn, August 24 (2005)
21. Shaukat Aziz, Economy likely to grow by 8%, Daily Dawn, page I (2005)
22. Ali Z., Iqbal A., Jan M., and Ahmad A., Coverage of Pak-U.S. Relations on Issue of Counter Terrorism by U.S. Leading News Magazines, Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research, 15 (10), 1464-1471 (2013)
23. Husain Ishrat, Pakistan, the Economy of an Elitist State, Oxford, Karachi (1996)
24. Eskandar J., Intellectual Capital and its Effects on Firms' market value and Financial Performance in Iran: An Investigating Public Model, Research Journal of Recent Sciences, 2(3), 1-6 (2013)

The IISTE is a pioneer in the Open-Access hosting service and academic event management. The aim of the firm is Accelerating Global Knowledge Sharing.

More information about the firm can be found on the homepage:  
<http://www.iiste.org>

## CALL FOR JOURNAL PAPERS

There are more than 30 peer-reviewed academic journals hosted under the hosting platform.

**Prospective authors of journals can find the submission instruction on the following page:** <http://www.iiste.org/journals/> All the journals articles are available online to the readers all over the world without financial, legal, or technical barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself. Paper version of the journals is also available upon request of readers and authors.

## MORE RESOURCES

Book publication information: <http://www.iiste.org/book/>

## IISTE Knowledge Sharing Partners

EBSCO, Index Copernicus, Ulrich's Periodicals Directory, JournalTOCS, PKP Open Archives Harvester, Bielefeld Academic Search Engine, Elektronische Zeitschriftenbibliothek EZB, Open J-Gate, OCLC WorldCat, Universe Digital Library, NewJour, Google Scholar

