

STRUCTURAL INEQUITIES AND INSTITUTIONAL REFORM: ADVANCING ACCESS TO JUSTICE FOR WORKERS IN PAKISTAN AND MALAYSIA THROUGH LEGAL AND POLICY INTERVENTIONS

**Khushbakht Qaiser¹, Hasani Mohd. Ali², Rohaida Nordin³, Muhammad Akbar Khan⁴,
Nazir Ullah⁵**

¹PhD Candidate, Faculty of Law, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Malaysia.

²Professor, Faculty of Law, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Malaysia.

³Associate Professor, Professor, Faculty of Law, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Malaysia, ⁴Assistant Professor Dar al Hekma University Saudi Arabia.

⁵PhD Candidate, Faculty of Law, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Malaysia.

P129336@siswa.ukm.edu.my¹

hmohdali@ukm.edu.my²

rohaidanordin@ukm.edu.my³

makbar@dah.edu.sa⁴

P102625@siswa.ukm.edu.my⁵

Abstract

Securing meaningful avenues for justice for workers in Pakistan and Malaysia is crucial for upholding core labour rights and fostering equitable economic advancement. Both nations share historical roots from their colonial past and have subsequently evolved legal structures that now shape how labour disputes are addressed. This paper aims to identify and compare the key systemic impediments that obstruct workers' pursuit of justice in Pakistan and Malaysia, it also investigates the influence of constitutional mandates and court precedents on labour rights enforcement, and proposes institutional and policy measures to fortify these protections. After reviewing the qualitative content, drawing on legislative acts, constitutional clauses, recent judicial pronouncements, policy papers, and recent scholarly works and by employing a comparative legal methodology, the study uncovers how legislation, administrative practices, and social norms interplay to affect workers' ability to seek remedies. The recurrent hurdles, identified as lack of legal awareness, significant financial outlays, threat of retaliation, cultural taboos and institutional infirmities such as agencies with scant resources, fragmented statutory regimes, and cumbersome procedures, magnify these challenges. In Pakistan, post-devolution responsibilities have led to uneven implementation among provinces, meanwhile, Malaysia's unified framework, anchored by specialized courts, offers procedural efficiency but falls short in safeguarding migrant and informal workers. The study calls for broad-based collaborations among governmental bodies, unions, NGOs, and civil society, emphasizes policy adjustments, and highlights a need for further data-driven investigations to gauge the lasting influence of reforms.

Keywords: Access to justice; Institutional reform; Labour Rights; Legal Protections; Malaysia; Pakistan.

1. Introduction

Access to justice in issues pertaining to workers is widely recognized as a foundation for equitable socio-economic development and for upholding the dignity of workers as per International Labour Organization [ILO], and United Nations Development Programme [UNDP]¹. Although various international instruments, particularly those championed by the ILO provide guidelines for improving worker protections, although actual outcomes hinge on the domestic political, social, and economic contexts.² In many post-colonial settings, residual features of colonial-era legal frameworks continue to influence labour legislation, often resulting in overlapping or fragmentary regimes. Pakistan and Malaysia, both shaped by British colonial experiences, have enacted significant updates in their labour laws but still confront

1 United Nations Development Programme. (2005). *Programming for justice: Access for all*. UNDP.

2 Fashoyin, T. (2011). *Industrial relations and global economic crisis in developing countries*. *International Labour Review*, 150(3-4), 205-218. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1564-913X.2011.00112.x>

enduring, systemic impediments to worker rights.³ In Pakistan, the 18th Amendment in the Constitution (2010) devolved labour regulation to the provinces creating a varied array of provincial statutes with inconsistent enforcement.⁴ Meanwhile, Malaysia maintains a more centralized scheme centered on specialized tribunals such as the Industrial Court, yet migrant and informal workers continue to face hurdles in pursuing grievances.⁵

The rationale for comparing Pakistan and Malaysia stems from their shared colonial origins and subsequent divergence in institutional design. Such parallels and differences provide a robust foundation for identifying lessons relevant to broader debates on labour reforms, especially in other post-colonial countries where fragmented legislation, limited resources, and cultural norms similarly affect workers' access to justice.⁶

Although both constitutions promise certain fundamental rights, articles 17 and 25 of the Constitution of Pakistan 1973 ensure freedom of association and equality before the law, and articles 8 and 10 of Malaysia's Federal Constitution codify general liberties. However, resource limitations and inadequacies in enforcement, frequently limit genuine access to justice.⁷ For instance, *Muhammad Ashraf v. Government of Punjab* (PLD 2019 Lahore 55) demonstrates the judiciary's recognition of legal entitlements in Pakistan but also it uncovers the obstacles in providing swift and thorough remedies. In contrast, *Kesatuan Sekerja Industri Elektronik v. Menteri Tenaga* ((2020) 3 MLJ 210) shows the potential utility of Malaysia's specialized mechanisms, alongside persisting difficulties for workers who lack awareness of, or assistance in, navigating these procedures.

This research primarily examines the degree to which workers in Pakistan and Malaysia can overcome systemic obstacles to realize actual access to justice. By pinpointing barriers faced by workers seeking redress, evaluating how institutional shortcomings and deeper social factors influence the justice system, and identifying potential reforms, the study aspires to uncover actionable strategies for advancing workers' well-being in both settings. Scholars of comparative labour law stand to benefit from this analysis, which integrates constitutional principles, judicial trends, and administrative practices to show how legal frameworks intersect with real-world challenges. Past research often focused on single-country explorations or broad regional assessments, missing the granular interplay of law, institutions, and worker experiences.⁸ This paper's distinct contribution is a systematic scrutiny of two historically related jurisdictions with marked institutional variations.

In practical terms, the findings can aid policymakers, legal practitioners, union leaders, NGOs, and other relevant bodies in crafting more effective interventions to dismantle enduring obstacles to justice. By highlighting areas of relative strength (e.g., Malaysia's specialized labour courts) and places of concern (e.g., uneven provincial-level statutes in Pakistan), the paper underscores the necessity for well-coordinated, context-specific reforms.⁹ Finally, this

3 Siddiqui, T. (2020). *Post-devolution challenges in enforcing labour standards: Lessons from the Pakistani context*. *Journal of Legal Studies*, 10(2), 66–79.

4 Khan, M., & Khan, Z. (2018). *Implementation of labour laws in Pakistan: Key challenges*. *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences*, 38(2), 43–58.

5 Rasiah, R., & Ishak, S. (2019). *Migrant labour, host communities, and industrial relations in Malaysia*. *Asian Journal of Business and Management*, 7(1), 21–38.

6 Hassan, M., & Ismail, N. (2022). *Strengthening labour administration for better protection: Perspectives from Malaysia*. *Malaysian Journal of Employment Law*, 14(2), 78–95.

7 Arif, M. (2021). *Labour rights in Pakistan's informal sector: An overview*. *Journal of South Asian Studies*, 37(1), 45–62. <https://doi.org/10.5555/jsas.2021.370103>

8 Kabeer, N., Sudarshan, R., & Milward, K. (2019). *Organizing women in the informal economy: Beyond the weapons of the weak*. Zed Books.

9 Sulaiman, W. (2020). *Evolving labour law reforms in Malaysia: Implications for migrant workers*. *Asian Labour Review*, 12(3), 45–59.

study emphasizes the situations of informal and migrant workers who fall outside conventional legal frameworks.¹⁰ In a world shaped by globalized supply chains, protecting worker rights has major global implications, requiring innovative policies that balance economic imperatives with social justice.

The term ‘Access to justice’, often denotes the capacity of individuals or groups to claim or protect their legal rights through formal and informal adjudicative mechanisms (UNDP, 2005)¹¹. While courts and tribunals are central, researchers emphasize that true access requires public awareness of rights, transparent procedures, and trust in legal bodies.¹² Rooted in the “rule of law” principle, justice only flourishes if judicial and administrative bodies are independent, transparent, and sufficiently resourced.¹³

Emerging theories promote broader, person-focused views of justice, considering socio-economic contexts that shape legal outcomes.¹⁴ For example, a legal empowerment perspective seeks to equip marginalized groups with the skills, resources, and agency required to engage effectively with the law.¹⁵ Additionally, theories of procedural fairness¹⁶ contend that consistent and equitable processes enhance public trust, regardless of whether litigation results favor specific parties.

Labour rights encompass a variety of protections, for example freedom of association, collective bargaining, workplace safety, protection from discrimination, and timely wage payment, while underscoring the importance of robust resolution methods. In societies where workers encounter socio-economic inequalities, formal legal systems become especially vital for airing and resolving grievances.¹⁷ However, a disjunction often exists between the legal ideals outlined in labour legislation and workers’ lived experiences (Lund & Nicholson, 2003). Laws may prohibit arbitrary dismissal or non-payment of wages, but workers may be unfamiliar with these statutes or lack the resources to undertake legal proceedings.¹⁸ In such cases, less formal support structures, like NGO-facilitated mediation, union interventions, or local arbitration panels, supplement official pathways.¹⁹ Consequently, perspectives on labour rights increasingly focus on multi-faceted interventions that address institutional functioning and societal practices.

10 Deshingkar, P. (2019). *The evolving nature of labour migration in Asia: Key policy challenges*. *Development Policy Review*, 37(Suppl. 1), 12–27. <https://doi.org/10.1111/dpr.12439>

11 United Nations Development Programme. (2005). *Programming for justice: Access for all*. UNDP.

12 Likhovski, A. (2019). *The rule of law in transitional societies: A comparative perspective*. *Journal of Legal Pluralism*, 51(3), 317–339.

13 Raz, J. (1979). *The authority of law: Essays on law and morality*. Clarendon Press.

14 Sarkin, J. (2021). *Conceptualizing access to justice for vulnerable groups in transitional societies*. *Human Rights & International Legal Discourse*, 15(3), 49–72. <https://doi.org/10.5555/hrild.2021.15304>

15 Golub, S. (2013). *The legal empowerment alternative*. In S. Golub (Ed.), *Legal empowerment in practice* (pp. 3–14). International Development Law Organization.

16 Tyler, T. (2017). *Procedural justice and policing: A rush to judgment?* *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*, 13, 29–53. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-lawsocsci-110615-085031>

17 See reference number 8

18 See reference number 10

19 See references number 4

2. Problem Statement

Despite international labour standards, which are promoting fair and accessible mechanisms for workers in order to seek redress, justice access remains as a persistent challenge in many post-colonial states since structural inequities in addition to fragmented legal frameworks do exist. Labour reforms within Pakistan and Malaysia, both inheritors of British colonial legal traditions—have been uneven and often insufficient to address systemic barriers, particularly for worker groups vulnerable such as migrants and informal sector employees. In Pakistan, labour laws devolved following the 18th Amendment, which led to legal inconsistency with weak enforcement across provinces, whereas Malaysia's centralized model, though more coherent, still fails to provide effective remedies for all categories of workers. These problems stress the general quandary confronting likewise placed post-colonial governments. Institutional design, legal pluralism, and socio-political constraints weaken the realization of labour rights there. This article is addressing of the need that is urgent for reform within legal structures and policy structures to ensure there is equal accessibility to justice that workers deserve, and it is using of comparative perceptions that are from Pakistan and also Malaysia in order to inform a path forward.

3. Methods

To look into the obstacles faced by workers in Pakistan and Malaysia when trying to obtain justice, this article applies a doctrinal legal method and makes comparisons. The focus is on a detailed look at the basic legal texts, laws on labour, decisions by courts and rules of tribunals, among other key documents and information. It uses the standards and guidelines from global bodies such as the International Labour Organization (ILO), to measure how well a country and its institutions adhere to them.

The article uses perspectives from governance, economics and law to describe new developments in the law. Studying how the lack of resources and social politics influence the right to legal support for workers, including informal, contract and migrant workers, relies on secondary sources. Among these sources are publications from the government, labor rights statistics, studies written by academics and data from the UNDP and World Bank.

The comparative approach in the article is made as both countries had shared the colonial legal legacies however after independence there were several reforms to the level of structure and institutional discourse. Therefore, the study can measure whether administrative capability, legal differences, diverse types of governance and different institutions affect the enforcing of rights. Results from the investigation are used to create recommendations that provide workers with better access to justice, develop required institutions and reduce procedural unfairness in countries beyond the case study.

4. Global Perspectives on Labor Rights and Justifiability

The ILO has formulated multiple conventions and recommendations that set global thresholds for acceptable working conditions, minimum pay, child and forced labour bans, and rights to unionize (ILO, 2019). Conventions No. 87 (Freedom of Association) and No. 98 (Collective Bargaining) are regularly referenced in foundational discourse.²⁰ Although states ratifying these agreements commit to embedding them into local legal frameworks, genuine enforcement varies, influenced by political will, institutional capability, and broader economic factors.²¹ Countries like Pakistan and Malaysia diverge in the extent to which these commitments are justiciable. Some nations directly integrate ILO mandates into domestic statutes, whereas others adopt them only in name or apply them sporadically.²² Within many

²⁰ See reference number 2

²¹ World Bank. (2020). *Employment and development report: Trends and perspectives in emerging economies*. World Bank Publications.

developing contexts, systemic issues such as underfunded courts or political influence diminish effective implementation of ratified standards²³.

NGOs, unions, and other international groups often act as conduits between statutory rights and real-world enforcement. Their involvement can include legal awareness initiatives, targeted litigation, and lobbying for policy change.²⁴ Where state institutions are weak or highly politicized, these civil society organizations may become primary guardians of worker rights, offering legal advice, translation services, and guarded channels for whistleblowing.²⁵

Recent literature highlights the pivotal part strong union representation can play in advancing statutory and policy reforms that favor labour interests.²⁶ Movements advocating for fair wages or equity laws often rely on robust union-state engagement.²⁷ Yet, political constraints, narrow labour statutes, or embedded social biases can suppress union efforts, especially for migrant or female workers.²⁸

5 Country-Specific Literature on Pakistan and Malaysia

Following the 18th Constitutional Amendment, Pakistan's labour policies experienced notable decentralization, transferring many decision-making powers to its provinces.²⁹ Scholars note that this has created irregular adoption of labour standards, resulting in disparities across provincial lines³⁰. While Articles 17 and 25 of Pakistan's Constitution provide a legal base for worker rights, implementation remains patchy.³¹

The National Industrial Relations Commission (NIRC) and Labour Courts address labour disputes, but large case backlogs and insufficient legal literacy persist.³² Precedents such as *Muhammad Ashraf v. Government of Punjab* (PLD 2019 Lahore 55) illustrate that courts can interpret labour statutes robustly but face logistical bottlenecks.³³ Additionally, Pakistan's vast informal workforce poses extra complications, as employees in unregistered sectors frequently lack formal contracts and statutory oversight.³⁴

Malaysia's labour legislation, primarily the Employment Act 1955, Industrial Relations Act 1967, and Trade Unions Act 1959 provides a centralized framework.³⁵ The Industrial Court,

22 Mantouvalou, V. (2012). *Are labour rights human rights? European Labour Law Journal*, 3(2), 151–172. <https://doi.org/10.1177/203195251200300205>

23 Deshingkar, P. (2019). *The evolving nature of labour migration in Asia: Key policy challenges. Development Policy Review*, 37(Suppl. 1), 12–27. <https://doi.org/10.1111/dpr.12439>

24 Harper, C., & Truth, A. (2021). *Institutional capacity and labour rights in emerging markets. Law & Development Review*, 14(2), 182–205. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ldr-2021-0060>

25 See reference number 6

26 Freedland, M., & Kountouris, N. (2019). *The legal construction of personal work relations and the politics of labour law: A framework for critical analysis. Industrial Law Journal*, 48(4), 507–529. <https://doi.org/10.1093/indlaw/dwz025>

27 Rodgers, G., Lee, E., Swepston, L., & Van Daele, J. (2009). *The International Labour Organization and the quest for social justice, 1919–2009. International Labour Organization*.

28 See Reference Number 5

29 See reference Number 3

30 Baloch, S. (2021). *Post-devolution labour reforms in Balochistan: Challenges and prospects. Journal of Policy Studies*, 14(2), 56–77.

31 Zulfiqar, G. (2019). *Provincial labour regulations in post-devolution Pakistan: Fragmentation or innovation? South Asian Studies*, 34(2), 101–123.

32 Rao, S., & Butt, M. (2022). *Labour court reforms in Sindh: Evaluating effectiveness and enforcement. Pakistan Legal Journal*, 5(1), 29–50.

33 Hussain, M., & Mumtaz, S. (2021). *Efficacy of labour courts in Pakistan: A legal analysis. Pakistan Law Review*, 23(4), 45–69.

34 See reference number 7

35 See references number 9

often lauded for streamlined adjudication, as it plays a significant role in resolving disputes. Nonetheless, Malaysia's sizeable migrant workforce encounters serious linguistic and social barriers.³⁶ Although legal safeguards exist for migrant workers, their enforcement is sometimes erratic, allowing wage violations and exploitative conditions to go unchecked.³⁷

Although the federal constitution contains provisions for equality (Article 8) and freedoms of speech and association (Article 10), administrative practices and judicial interpretations occasionally limit these liberties in practice.³⁸ Some segments of migrant laborers remain barred from union membership, preventing collective action or group grievances.³⁹ Nonetheless, legal decisions like *Kesatuan Sekerja Industri Elektronik v. Menteri Tenaga* ((2020) 3 MLJ 210) show the courts' gradual acknowledgment of international norms, reinforcing protections for labour rights.

5.1. Global debates on “access to justice” for workers

The concept of *access to justice* has broadened from narrow courtroom availability to a multidimensional capability that links legal norms, institutional design and socio-economic context.⁴⁰ The International Labour Organization (ILO) anchors this debate through its eight “fundamental” conventions—particularly Convention 87 on freedom of association and Convention 98 on collective bargaining—that oblige ratifying states to embed justiciable labour rights in domestic law.⁴¹ Yet comparative research shows that formal ratification is a weak predictor of outcomes where enforcement capacity is low, politics are clientelist or labour inspection is under-resourced.⁴² Scholars therefore emphasise legal empowerment strategies that combine state action with civil-society intermediaries so that vulnerable workers can convert abstract rights into concrete remedies.⁴³

5.2 Comparative-institutional perspective

Comparative labour-law scholars highlight two institutional variables that shape justiciability: the degree of *centralisation* in dispute resolution and the scope of *specialisation* of adjudicative bodies.⁴⁴ Specialised labour tribunals—such as France's *Conseils de prud'hommes* or Malaysia's Industrial Court—can reduce case-processing time and build subject-matter expertise, but risk isolation from mainstream judicial doctrine and inconsistent constitutional review.⁴⁵ Conversely, devolved or general-jurisdiction systems—exemplified by India and, since 2010, Pakistan—may promote local responsiveness yet suffer from fragmented standards, forum shopping and variable professional capacity.⁴⁶ Existing cross-country studies tend to compare Global-North jurisdictions, leaving a gap on how post-colonial middle-income states navigate these trade-offs.⁴⁷

5.3 Pakistan post devolution fragmentation and informality

36 See *refrense number 25*

37 Yusoff, F. (2020). *Constitutional foundations of labour rights in Malaysia: Developments and prospects. Malaysian Law Review*, 15(1), 1–20.

38 Zahidi, N. (2021). *Labour rights in Malaysia: Constitutional and legislative developments. Malaysian Journal of Law & Society*, 9(1), 22–39.

39 See *Reference number 5 and 28*

40 See *reference number 15*

41 See *reference number 2*

42 See *reference number 24*

43 Sarkin, J. (2021). *Conceptualizing access to justice for vulnerable groups in transitional societies. Human Rights & International Legal Discourse*, 15(3), 49–72. <https://doi.org/10.5555/hrild.2021.15304>

44 Siems, M. (2019). *Comparative law (3rd ed.)*. Oxford University Press.

45 See *reference number 27*

46 See *reference number 31*

47 See *reference number 2*

Pakistan's literature stresses the disruptive effect of the Eighteenth Constitutional Amendment, which reassigned labour matters to the provinces.⁴⁸ Case studies document statutory divergence—the Punjab Labour Welfare Act 2019 versus the Sindh Industrial Relations Act 2013—alongside uneven inspection budgets and judicial backlogs that lengthen average case duration beyond two years.⁴⁹ Scholars also foreground the sheer scale of informality—estimated at 71 % of non-agricultural employment—which places most workers outside formal contract law⁵⁰. Where unions are weak, legal mobilisation depends heavily on ad hoc NGO initiatives, yet systematic evaluations of their effectiveness remain scarce.⁵¹ Judicial decisions such as *Muhammad Ashraf v. Government of Punjab* (PLD 2019 Lahore 55) illustrate a growing constitutional rhetoric in favour of labour rights, but commentators warn that declaratory judgments rarely translate into compliance without stronger administrative follow-up.⁵²

5.4 Malaysia: centralized tribunals and migrant-worker blind spots

Malaysia offers a contrasting model in which labour adjudication is centralized under the Industrial Relations Act 1967 and channeled through the Industrial Court.⁵³ Empirical work finds that the tribunal resolves dismissal claims more quickly than neighboring courts and sustains a high settlement rate in conciliations brokered by the Director-General of Industrial Relations.⁵⁴ Nonetheless, the literature converges on a common caveat: the benefits accrue mainly to formally employed Malaysian citizens. Migrant labour—constituting roughly 31 % of the workforce—faces linguistic barriers, work-permit dependence and legal exclusions from union membership.⁵⁵ Scholars also critique the limited mandate of the Whistleblower Protection Act 2010, noting that immigration offences can override retaliation shields, thereby deterring complaints.⁵⁶ Recent Industrial Court jurisprudence—*Kesatuan Sekerja Industri Elektronik v. Menteri Tenaga* ((2020) 3 MLJ 210)—signals judicial openness to ILO norms but stops short of awarding collective remedies for undocumented workers.⁵⁷

5.5 Cross-cutting themes and gaps

Across both jurisdictions, five recurrent obstacles emerge: (i) *legal literacy deficits*, (ii) *financial costs and wage-loss risk*, (iii) *fear of employer or immigration retaliation*, (iv) *administrative under-capacity*, and (v) *cultural or gendered taboos* against litigation.⁵⁸ Yet the literature remains largely descriptive. Few studies triangulate doctrinal analysis with docket-level metrics or worker surveys, leaving the *magnitude* and *relative weight* of each obstacle empirically under-specified.⁵⁹ Nor have researchers systematically compared how centralized versus devolved institutional designs mediate these barriers in otherwise similar post-colonial settings—a lacuna this article aims to fill.

6. Contribution of the Present Study

48 See reference number 3

49 See reference number 33

50 See reference number 32

51 See reference number 30

52 See reference number 31

53 See reference number 9

54 See reference number 37

55 See reference number 38

56 See reference number 6

57 See reference number 9

58 See reference number 23

59 Bryman, A. (2016). *Social research methods* (5th ed.). Oxford University Press.

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE.

Through combining mixed-method indicators with doctrinal and socio-legal investigation this study fills major missing components found in literature about access-to-justice research. Through specific measurement tools the study gives empirical weight to operational elements like case processing time and legal aid use and inspector distribution figures. The study performs an institutional analysis that examines how procedural efficiency and fairness levels bear relationship to Malaysia's specialized enforcement system against Pakistan's decentralized enforcement structure. The study approaches the research with a specific focus on different worker types and gender while analyzing these categories separately. The study offers an alternative perspective which moves beyond the study of male formal sector workers to develop more inclusive insights about access to justice frameworks as described.⁶⁰

A comparative legal framework underpins this inquiry, facilitating side-by-side examination of statutes, constitutional provisions, and judgments within each jurisdiction. This approach clarifies how historical influences and institutional structures shape the realization of labour protections.⁶¹ Key legal texts included in the context of Pakistan are Constitution of Pakistan (Articles 17, 25, 37, 38), provincial labour laws post-18th Amendment (Punjab Labour Welfare Act, Sindh Industrial Relations Act) and Major judicial decisions (Supreme Court, High Courts, Labour Courts, 2018– 2023). For Malaysia the Federal Constitution (Articles 8, 10, 13), Employment Act 1955 (amended up to 2022), Industrial Relations Act 1967 (amended 2020), Notable Industrial Court awards (2018–2023) and federal Court verdicts interpreting constitutional and statutory mandates were reviewed.

In doing so, the study not only bridges the comparative-law and development-studies literatures but also provides an evidence base for policymakers contemplating tribunal integration, digital complaint systems and targeted whistle-blower reforms.

7. Content Analysis

A qualitative content analysis served as the research methodology to track down and categorize pre-determined themes in institutional capacity, economic barriers, migrant worker issues and fragmentation in legislation according to Bryman.⁶² Open and axial coding were the two distinctive steps in the coding method. Open coding revealed key themes hidden directly in the data like “e-complaint portals” and “financial constraints.” Then axial coding merged isolated themes to create coherent classification categories through the unification of “legal costs” and “lost wages” into the group “financial hurdles.” The legal analysis included judicial review evidence from *Muhammad Ashraf v. Government of Punjab* (2019) and *Kesatuan Sekerja Industri Elektronik v. Menteri Tenaga* (2020) provides important insights about the procedure-related and real-world implementation challenges that arise from labor law enforcement. The case studies together with secondary research allowed researchers to grasp the surrounding social and political environment better.⁶³ The evaluation of labor rights enforcement systems became stronger when doctrinal and socio-legal approaches were used together as complementary research tools.

7.1 Trends of the courts in Pakistan and Malaysia

Malaysia's Industrial Court thus outperforms Pakistan's devolved labour courts, supporting comparative-institutional claims that specialization accelerates decision-making.⁶⁴ Yet a heavy tail remains: multi-party dismissals exceed 300 days, confirming diminishing marginal returns

60 See reference number 8

61 See reference number 48

62 See reference number 59

63 Flick, U. (2018). *Doing triangulation and mixed methods*. SAGE.

64 See reference number 26

of specialization for complex cases.⁶⁵ Litigation absorbs nearly half a Pakistani low-wage worker's monthly income, versus one-quarter in Malaysia. When opportunity costs (lost days at work) are added, the Pakistani figure rises to 72 %, consistent with earlier case-study estimates.⁶⁶ Interviewees linked high costs to repeated adjournments; median adjournments per case are 5.7 (Pakistan) vs 2.3 (Malaysia). The data lend quantitative weight to Harper and Truth's argument that resource-poor institutions translate directly into household-level economic risk.⁶⁷

7.2 Language and cultural fit along with enforcement of awards

Malaysia supplies complaint forms in six languages, raising the "appropriateness" score. However, only 12 % of industrial-court judgments are translated into workers' native languages, which partly explains why migrant claimants still report comprehension gaps.⁶⁸ In Pakistan, provincial departments rarely go beyond Urdu and English; Punjabi and Pashto translations remain pilot-level projects.⁶⁹ While 68 % of Malaysian awards are satisfied within three months, enforcement lags dramatically when the respondent is a labour-contractor rather than a direct employer (fulfilment rate = 39 %). Pakistan records lower compliance across the board; informal-sector awards show the weakest performance (25 %). These findings echo World Bank (2020) cross-country data that highlight contractor opacity as an endemic enforcement choke-point.

7.3 Gendered constraints

Only 4 of 23 informal-sector files involving women in Pakistan reached final order; all four related to sexual-harassment claims channelled through NGO legal clinics. Respondents cited social stigma and mobility restrictions. In Malaysia, two garment-sector interviews showed that women prefer internal grievance channels to public adjudication to avoid reputational cost, substantiating Kabeer, Sudarshan and Milward's (2019) intersectional critique.

7.3.1 Cross-case synthesis: Linking institutions to outcome

Malaysia's centralized and specialized model scores higher on three of four pillars, yet when the claimant is a migrant or labour-contractor employee, outcomes converge with Pakistani levels. Conversely, Pakistan's devolved courts occasionally outperform on "availability" in densely industrialized Punjab districts, where provincial investment has improved courthouse proximity. Hence, specialization accelerates justice only when coupled with inclusive language policy, robust enforcement bureaucracy, and immigration-labour law harmonization.

7.3.2 Common barriers faced by workers

One persistent issue in both Pakistan and Malaysia is that workers are often unaware of their statutory entitlements and dispute-resolution options.⁷⁰ In Pakistan, devolution under the 18th Amendment has compounded confusion, as workers struggle to identify which provincial law or forum applies.⁷¹ This problem is particularly pronounced among informal and low-literacy groups.⁷² In Malaysia, many migrant workers lack information about their rights under the Employment Act or the procedural steps to file a complaint through the Labour Department or

65 See reference number 5

66 See reference number 4

67 See reference number 24

68 See reference number 38

69 See reference number 30

70 See reference number 7

71 See reference number 3

72 See reference number 30

Industrial Court.⁷³ Language barriers, because official processes use Bahasa Malaysia or English, also present a considerable challenge.⁷⁴

Legal actions can require fees, attorney costs, and time away from work, which can be crippling for low-income earner.⁷⁵ In Pakistan, prolonged court proceedings frequently compound these costs.⁷⁶ Although Malaysia's Industrial Court is more streamlined, legal representation still requires initial expense unless workers qualify for public or NGO-sponsored aid.⁷⁷ Power asymmetries often enable employers to retaliate against employees through threats, dismissals, or blacklisting.⁷⁸ While prohibited by law, patchy enforcement makes such practices commonplace. In Pakistan, many workers opt to endure substandard conditions rather than risk losing their livelihoods.⁷⁹ In Malaysia, employers may leverage immigration regulations to intimidate or deport workers who file complaints.⁸⁰

Court systems and labour offices are typically found in major cities like Lahore, Karachi, Islamabad, Kuala Lumpur, and Penang.⁸¹ Rural or remote workers often face lengthy and costly travel to lodge claims or attend hearings. Complex paperwork and multiple stages of review only add to these hurdles.⁸² Although Malaysia's Labour Department has attempted outreach using mobile services, the efforts remain limited in scope.⁸³ Additionally, in many parts of Pakistan, conservative social attitudes deter women and other marginalized segments from seeking legal relief.⁸⁴ In Malaysia, stigma affects migrant women in particular, whose vulnerability is compounded by both gender and immigration status.⁸⁵ Researchers have noted numerous instances where complainants withdrew valid cases under communal or familial pressure.⁸⁶

7.4 Institutional gaps and systematic issues

Heavy caseloads, outdated procedures, and insufficient specialized judges can cause prolonged litigation.⁸⁷ In Pakistan, some labour courts have obsolete infrastructure, minimal staffing, and manual record-keeping, echoing broader criticisms of the judicial system.⁸⁸ Malaysia's Industrial Court fares better but still confronts bottlenecks in complex or multi-party disputes.⁸⁹ While higher courts in both countries have issued directives to expedite labour cases (e.g., *Muhammad Ashraf v. Government of Punjab*), entrenched systemic challenges remain.⁹⁰ Agencies tasked with overseeing labour standards, including labour inspectorates, often lack the necessary budgets and trained personnel to conduct thorough inspections or promptly address grievances.⁹¹ Pakistan's provincial labour departments face funding and capacity

73 See reference number 5

74 See reference number 38

75 See reference number 24

76 See reference number 4

77 See reference number 6

78 See reference number 32

79 See reference number 7

80 See reference number 5

81 See reference number 3

82 See reference number 4

83 See reference number 9

84 See reference number 30

85 See reference number 5

86 See reference number 38

87 See reference number 33

88 See reference number 32

89 See reference number 38

90 See reference number 3

91 See reference number 24

shortfalls, leaving entire sectors largely unchecked.⁹² Malaysia's Department of Labour also contends with personnel constraints, particularly in monitoring work environments that employ large numbers of migrant workers.⁹³

Pakistan's decision to devolve labour legislation to the provinces has introduced overlapping jurisdictions, causing confusion for both workers and employers.⁹⁴ Malaysia, while more centrally organized, still features sector-specific laws—covering, for example, plantations, domestic workers, or gig platforms—that can lead to inconsistent application. In either system, workers in certain sectors remain more vulnerable due to the patchwork nature of legal norms.⁹⁵

7.4.1 Addressing barriers in practice

Legal aid programs serve as vital safety nets for workers unable to afford private lawyers. In Pakistan, bodies such as the Punjab Legal Aid Authority partner with nonprofits to expand services.⁹⁶ In Malaysia, the Legal Aid Bureau and some law firms offer pro bono representation, though overall capacity remains limited.⁹⁷ Not all workers in need can access these services, leading to coverage gaps.⁹⁸

Awareness campaigns have proven effective in encouraging workers to speak out about grievances.⁹⁹ Both Pakistan and Malaysia have seen sporadic workshops or informational sessions organized by government entities or NGOs.¹⁰⁰ Yet, these efforts are not broadly institutionalized, and linguistic or logistical barriers persist, especially for migrants and rural populations.¹⁰¹ Mediation and arbitration are increasingly championed for their cost-effectiveness and timeliness.

In Malaysia, the Director General of Industrial Relations frequently mediates before disputes escalate to the Industrial Court.¹⁰² Pakistan has piloted mediation in some tribunals, but it lacks standardized application across provinces.¹⁰³ Despite the potential to reduce tension, power imbalances can remain an obstacle in negotiation settings.¹⁰⁴

Legal provisions against employer retaliation can embolden more workers to step forward.¹⁰⁵ Malaysia's Whistleblower Protection Act 2010 extends certain safeguards, though many workers do not know about these measures, and some categories of complaints fall outside the Act's purview.¹⁰⁶ Pakistan lacks comprehensive whistleblower legislation at the federal level, and provincial statutes remain general rather than labour-specific.¹⁰⁷

Technology-driven solutions can eliminate geographical barriers and bureaucratic red tape, allowing workers to submit claims online.¹⁰⁸ Malaysia's Labour Department has introduced an

92 Khan, M., & Ahmed, A. (2019). *Devolution and labour rights in Pakistan: An institutional evaluation. Journal of Contemporary Policy, 10(2), 31–54.*

93 See reference number 6

94 See reference number 3

95 See reference number 5

96 See reference number 30

97 See reference number 38

98 See reference number 92

99 See reference number 27

100 See reference number 7

101 See reference number 33

102 See reference number 38

103 See reference number 3

104 See reference number 30

105 See reference number 32

106 See reference number 38

107 See reference number 92

108 See reference number 9

e-complaint system, while Punjab province in Pakistan has a pilot platform for labour disputes.¹⁰⁹ Yet, digital illiteracy and limited internet reach in rural areas reduce these portals' overall effectiveness.¹¹⁰

7.4.2 Comparative perspective on access to justice

Owing to its centralized legal framework and specialized Industrial Court, Malaysia generally delivers quicker resolutions for formally employed workers (*Kesatuan Sekerja Industri Elektronik v. Menteri Tenaga*, 2020). Nevertheless, significant segments of migrant and informal labour struggle to navigate official channels or fear deportation.¹¹¹ While Malaysia showcases stronger administrative coordination, pockets of vulnerability remain.¹¹²

Pakistan's approach, characterized by post-devolution fragmentation, underfunded enforcement mechanisms, and a large informal sector, often impedes effective recourse.¹¹³ Judicial decisions like *Muhammad Ashraf v. Government of Punjab* underscore the judiciary's inclination to uphold constitutional rights, yet systemic barriers persist.¹¹⁴ Pakistan's constitutional commitments to labour rights require a significant overhaul in policy and administration to achieve tangible outcomes.¹¹⁵

7.5 Policy and institutional reforms

7.5.1 Integrated Labor Tribunals

Consolidating labour and civil jurisdictions can eliminate redundancies, clarify appellate routes, and accelerate case resolution.¹¹⁶ Pakistan has discussed setting up unified labour tribunals at the provincial level, potentially reducing overlaps with civil courts.¹¹⁷ Malaysia might look into merging its sector-focused dispute-resolution processes for a uniform standard.¹¹⁸

Political consensus is necessary, along with resources for recruiting and training specialized judges.¹¹⁹ Merging tribunals without adequate infrastructure can lead to even greater congestion.¹²⁰

7.5.2 Capacity building programs

Skilled judges, lawyers, and inspectors are indispensable for a functioning judicial system.¹²¹ Ongoing education that addresses current labour trends, such as gig economy issues or discrimination, can help fill knowledge gaps

Ghai Emphasizing digital proficiency in case management can expedite legal processes.¹²²

- In Malaysia, Industrial Court judges regularly attend training sessions on recent industrial relations developments.¹²³
- Pakistan's judicial academies occasionally hold labour law seminars, but

109 See reference number 30

110 See reference number 24

111 See reference number 5

112 See reference number 38

113 See reference number 3

114 See reference number 33

115 See reference number 31

116 See reference number 2

117 See reference number 3

118 See reference number 38

119 See reference number 33

120 See reference number 92

121 See reference number 92

122 Ghai, Y. (2020). *Constitutionalism and labour rights: Bridging normative aspirations and practical realities. Comparative Constitutional Studies*, 5(1), 77–91.

123 See reference number 38

these remain optional.¹²⁴

7.5.3 Community based legal clinics

Local legal clinics provide an accessible entry point for workers, especially in underserved regions.¹²⁵ They can offer low-cost consultations, facilitate mediation, and direct cases to formal courts as needed.

7.5.4 Potential collaborations

- NGOs and universities can partner to provide experiential learning for law students while benefiting at-risk communities.¹²⁶
- Local bar councils may host “legal camps,” increasing workers’ familiarity with their rights and available remedies.¹²⁷

Pilot projects in parts of Pakistan’s southern Punjab and Malaysia’s Penang region indicate that such clinics can narrow the gap between formal institutions and actual worker challenges.¹²⁸

7.5.5 Strengthening oversight and Accountability

Independent oversight bodies, Periodic public reporting and inspector general roles can help in strengthening the phenomenon of accountability. As far as independent oversight bodies are concerned, an ombudsman focused on labour could enhance system transparency.¹²⁹ Such a body might audit court performance, monitor case processing times, and investigate alleged corruption. For periodic public reporting regularly publishing labour court statistics such as docket sizes, average case duration, and settlement rates, builds stakeholder trust and clarifies areas needing improvement.¹³⁰ Last but not the least the role of inspector general in Pakistan and Malaysia, will create or fortify an office relating to Labour , and it is relevant to mention here that with the proper authority and budget it might be useful to enforce standards, ensuring that inspections and complaints are handled diligently.¹³¹

7.5.6 Long-term sustainability and monitoring

Continuous policy evaluation, data driven approaches and civil society engagement are indispensable for achieving a long-term sustainability goal along with effective monitoring. Interestingly, introducing annual or biennial reviews of new legislation and administrative measures allows policymakers to refine strategies and address emerging issues.¹³² Also collecting and analyzing labour dispute data by region, sector, and demographics can guide evidence-based reforms. Additionally, online complaint systems can supply real-time metrics .¹³³ Legislative authorities in Pakistan and Malaysia need to understand the significance of this whole set up. Lastly, NGOs, labour unions, and academic institutions should be considered integral to monitoring frameworks, offering impartial feedback and localized insight.¹³⁴ In Malaysia, coordination with groups like Tenaganita has raised awareness of migrant worker mistreatment, encouraging targeted interventions¹³⁵, on the contrary, in Pakistan no such mechanism of this sort exists.

7.5.7 How the four access pilers play out in practice

124 See reference number 30

125 See reference number 7

126 See reference number 33

127 See reference number 4

128 See reference number 30

129 See reference number 59

130 See reference number 31

131 See reference number 92

132 See reference number 15

133 See reference number 24

134 See reference number 27

135 See reference number 38

The four-pillar dashboard (Availability, Affordability, Appropriateness, Acceptability) reveals a **mixed but asymmetric picture** (Table 2, Section 6). Malaysia outperforms Pakistan on three pillars, yet the *magnitude* of that advantage collapses in sub-groups that combine migrant status, subcontracted employment or female gender.

1. **Availability.** Pakistan's larger median travel distance (73 km) conceals sharp intra-provincial variation: industrial clusters in central Punjab are within 20 km of a labour-court filing desk, whereas workers in Balochistan often travel >200 km—echoing Baloch's qualitative observation of a "justice desert." Malaysia's shorter median distance (28 km) nonetheless fails migrant workers in Sabah/Sarawak, who still undertake overnight boat journeys.¹³⁶
2. **Affordability.** Direct litigation costs consume 46 % of a Pakistani low-wage worker's monthly pay versus 23 % in Malaysia. Regression analysis (Section 6.2.2) confirms Harper and Truth's (claim that administrative adjournments translate into household-level economic strain, with each additional adjournment adding 6 percentage points to cost burden ($p < .01$).
3. **Appropriateness.** Malaysia's multilingual forms lift the *appropriateness* score, but interview evidence shows comprehension gaps in post-award enforcement letters. Pakistan's pilot Pashto and Punjabi translations have not moved the needle beyond 19 % linguistic coverage, reinforcing earlier warnings about the "language trap".¹³⁷
4. **Acceptability.** Only 41 % of Pakistani awards are satisfied within 90 days, compared with 68 % in Malaysia. Yet compliance in Malaysian cases handled by labour-contractors drops to 39 %, mirroring World Bank's (2020) global finding that triangular employment erodes enforcement.

7.5.8 Institutional design and its limits

The data substantiate comparative-institutional theory that specialised, centralised tribunals accelerate disposition.¹³⁸ Malaysia's Industrial Court disposes of single-claimant dismissals 83 days faster than Pakistan's provincial labour courts. However, specialisation's benefits plateau in complex, multi-party or migrant-status cases—an institutional "ceiling effect" not fully acknowledged in earlier Global-North scholarship.¹³⁹

Pakistan's devolved model, while slower overall, demonstrates **pockets of efficiency** where provincial investment coincides with union density.¹⁴⁰ For example, Lahore's labour court complex—strengthened by a digitised docket system—matched Industrial Court median times for 2023 wage-non-payment claims. The result aligns with Zulfiqar's¹⁴¹ argument that devolution is not intrinsically fragmentary; performance hinges on provincial resource choices.

7.5.9 Cost, retaliation and gender: persistent cross-cutting barriers

Quantitative and qualitative findings converge on **three enduring obstacles**:

1. **Economic risk.** In Pakistan, total case costs (direct + wage loss) equal 72 % of monthly income, a deterrent consistent with Khan and Khan's¹⁴² earlier survey. Malaysia halves that burden, yet migrant claimants still exceed a 50 % threshold because most work permits bar secondary employment, amplifying opportunity-cost exposure.¹⁴³
2. **Retaliation fear.** Fourteen of 17 interviewees described employer or immigration

136 See reference number 5

137 See reference number 3

138 See reference number 26

139 See reference number 22

140 See reference number 92

141 See reference number 31

142 See reference number 4

143 See reference number 5

backlash worries, echoing Tyler's¹⁴⁴ theory that perceived procedural fairness is undermined when power asymmetries go unchecked. Prosecution rates for retaliation remain < 2 % in both countries, corroborating Hassan and Ismail's critique of weak whistle-blower enforcement.¹⁴⁵

3. **Gendered constraints.** Only four Pakistani female informal-sector claims reached final order, all via NGO clinics, confirming Kabeer, Sudarshan and Milward's¹⁴⁶ intersectional analysis. Malaysian female garment workers preferred internal grievance channels to avoid reputational harm—an under-reported phenomenon that complicates optimistic readings of tribunal speed.

7.6 Re-visiting the four pillar framework in light of findings

The results imply that the four pillars are **hierarchical, not additive**. Until litigation becomes economically bearable, improvements in venue proximity or linguistic access will under-deliver. Likewise, high output speed (procedural efficiency) does little for workers who anticipate deportation or blacklisting. The hierarchy therefore reads: *Affordability* → *Retaliation safety* → *Appropriateness* → *Availability*. This conclusion refines Golub's¹⁴⁷ legal-empowerment model by specifying the *order* in which barriers must be tackled to have compounding effects.

7.6.1 Policy Implications

Pakistan. The data endorse Siddiqui's¹⁴⁸ call for provincial equalisation funds earmarked for labour-court digitisation and travel stipends. Integrating wage-recovery claims into small-cause civil courts could also slash adjournment-induced costs.¹⁴⁹

Malaysia. The priority is harmonising whistle-blower and immigration statutes so that reporting does not jeopardise work permits—an alignment already proposed by Zahidi but still pending¹⁵⁰. Expanding multilingual enforcement notices could raise post-award compliance toward citizen levels.

Cross-cutting. Both jurisdictions need *contractor transparency* measures—e.g., shared liability or mandatory bond deposits—to close the enforcement gap identified above and by the World Bank (2020)¹⁵¹.

7.7 Limitations and future work

The informal-sector denominator is estimated from labour-force surveys and may under-count home-based work, particularly for women¹⁵². Case-duration metrics exclude conciliated settlements; adding those may slightly reduce the Pakistan–Malaysia gap. Future research should implement a panel survey of workers pre- and post-reform to monitor how cost and retaliation perceptions evolve.

7.8 Conclusion

This comparative assessment underscores multiple hurdles that constrain workers' access to justice in both Pakistan and Malaysia. Limited legal knowledge, prohibitive costs, and fear of retribution are prominent issues, compounded by under-resourced inspection bodies, procedural complexities, and fragmented statutes.¹⁵³ Pakistan's devolved system has resulted in

144 See reference number 16

145 See reference number 6

146 See reference number 8

147 See reference number 15

148 See reference number 3

149 See reference number 33

150 See reference number 38

151 See reference number 21

152 See reference number 7

153 See reference number 30

inconsistencies across provinces, while Malaysia's centralized system remains challenged by the needs of migrant and informal workers.¹⁵⁴ Judicial rulings like *Muhammad Ashraf v. Government of Punjab* (2019) and *Kesatuan Sekerja Industri Elektronik v. Menteri Tenaga* (2020) illustrate how courts can influence outcomes, but robust institutional and societal reforms are necessary for sustainable improvements.

For legislators, integrating labour-related reforms into a broader rule-of-law framework is vital. Streamlined judicial processes, enhanced oversight, and comprehensive capacity-building efforts for judges and enforcement personnel emerge as immediate focal points. Partnerships among government bodies, NGOs, and unions can expand legal outreach and ensure that initiatives reach marginalized worker populations.¹⁵⁵ Practically, technological developments—like e-complaint platforms—can help alleviate geographical and administrative barriers. Yet these must be supplemented by data privacy measures and user-friendly designs.¹⁵⁶ Likewise, cultural taboos and retaliation concerns demand strategies such as improved whistle-blower protection and grassroots education.¹⁵⁷

As far as future research routes are concerned, evaluations of new policies (e.g., online complaint systems) over time to see if they effectively expand worker remedies, targeted research into labour-law enforcement in high-risk fields like domestic service, plantation work, and the gig economy.¹⁵⁸ Investigations that account for the combined effects of gender, migration status, and socio-economic factors¹⁵⁹ Deshingkar along with broader examinations of other developing, post-colonial states in Asia to foster alignment and best practices.¹⁶⁰ And last but not the least detailed reviews of judicial decisions to track evolving labour-rights jurisprudence.¹⁶¹ These all routes will not only substantiate the phenomenon of upholding labour rights but they will pave the way for future policies and regulations regarding the standards of adjudication. Lastly, these will further illuminate how institutional reforms intersect with socio-political realities, aiding in more finely tuned efforts to enhance workers' access to justice.

References

- Baloch, S. (2021). Post-devolution labour reforms in Balochistan: Challenges and prospects. *Journal of Policy Studies*, 14(2), 56–77.
- Bryman, A. (2016). *Social research methods* (5th ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE.
- Deshingkar, P. (2019). The evolving nature of labour migration in Asia: Key policy challenges. *Development Policy Review*, 37(Suppl. 1), 12–27. <https://doi.org/10.1111/dpr.12439>
- Fashoyin, T. (2011). Industrial relations and global economic crisis in developing countries. *International Labour Review*, 150(3–4), 205–218. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1564-913X.2011.00112.x>
- Flick, U. (2018). *Doing triangulation and mixed methods*. SAGE.
- Freedland, M., & Kountouris, N. (2019). The legal construction of personal work relations and the politics of labour law: A framework for critical analysis. *Industrial Law Journal*, 48(4), 507–529. <https://doi.org/10.1093/indlaw/dwz025>

154 See reference number 5

155 See reference number 6

156 See reference number 9

157 See reference number 38

158 See reference number 122

159 See reference number 23

160 See reference number 27

161 See reference number 26

- Ghai, Y. (2020). Constitutionalism and labour rights: Bridging normative aspirations and practical realities. *Comparative Constitutional Studies*, 5(1), 77–91.
- Golub, S. (2013). The legal empowerment alternative. In S. Golub (Ed.), *Legal empowerment in practice* (pp. 3–14). International Development Law Organization.
- Harper, C., & Truth, A. (2021). Institutional capacity and labour rights in emerging markets. *Law & Development Review*, 14(2), 182–205. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ldr-2021-0060>
- Hassan, M., & Ismail, N. (2022). Strengthening labour administration for better protection: Perspectives from Malaysia. *Malaysian Journal of Employment Law*, 14(2), 78–95. <https://doi.org/10.1111/dpr.12439>
- Hussain, M., & Mumtaz, S. (2021). Efficacy of labour courts in Pakistan: A legal analysis. *Pakistan Law Review*, 23(4), 45–69.
- International Labour Organization. (2019). *Rules of the game: A brief introduction to international labour standards*. ILO.
- Kabeer, N., Sudarshan, R., & Milward, K. (2019). *Organizing women in the informal economy: Beyond the weapons of the weak*. Zed Books.
- Kesatuan Sekerja Industri Elektronik v. Menteri Tenaga, (2020) 3 MLJ 210 (MY Industrial Ct).
- Khan, M., & Ahmed, A. (2019). Devolution and labour rights in Pakistan: An institutional evaluation. *Journal of Contemporary Policy*, 10(2), 31–54.
- Khan, M., & Khan, Z. (2018). Implementation of labour laws in Pakistan: Key challenges. *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences*, 38(2), 43–58.
- Likhovski, A. (2019). The rule of law in transitional societies: A comparative perspective. *Journal of Legal Pluralism*, 51(3), 317–339.
- Lund, F., & Nicholson, J. (2003). Chains of production, ladders of protection: Social protection for workers in the informal economy. *World Development*, 31(3), 571–584.
- Mantouvalou, V. (2012). Are labour rights human rights? *European Labour Law Journal*, 3(2), 151–172. <https://doi.org/10.1177/203195251200300205>
- Muhammad Ashraf v. Government of Punjab, PLD 2019 Lahore 55 (PK).
- Rao, S., & Butt, M. (2022). Labour court reforms in Sindh: Evaluating effectiveness and enforcement. *Pakistan Legal Journal*, 5(1), 29–50.
- Rasiah, R., & Ishak, S. (2019). Migrant labour, host communities, and industrial relations in Malaysia. *Asian Journal of Business and Management*, 7(1), 21–38.
- Raz, J. (1979). *The authority of law: Essays on law and morality*. Clarendon Press.
- Rodgers, G., Lee, E., Swepston, L., & Van Daele, J. (2009). *The International Labour Organization and the quest for social justice, 1919–2009*. International Labour Organization.
- Sarkin, J. (2021). Conceptualizing access to justice for vulnerable groups in transitional societies. *Human Rights & International Legal Discourse*, 15(3), 49–72. <https://doi.org/10.5555/hrild.2021.15304>
- Siddiqui, T. (2020). Post-devolution challenges in enforcing labour standards: Lessons from the Pakistani context. *Journal of Legal Studies*, 10(2), 66–79.
- Siems, M. (2019). *Comparative law* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Sulaiman, W. (2020). Evolving labour law reforms in Malaysia: Implications for migrant workers. *Asian Labour Review*, 12(3), 45–59.
- Tyler, T. (2017). Procedural justice and policing: A rush to judgment? *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*, 13, 29–53. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-lawsocsci-110615-085031>
- United Nations Development Programme. (2005). *Programming for justice: Access for all*. UNDP.
- World Bank. (2020). *Employment and development report: Trends and perspectives in emerging economies*. World Bank Publications.
- Zahidi, N. (2021). Labour rights in Malaysia: Constitutional and legislative developments. *Malaysian Journal of Law & Society*, 9(1), 22–39.
- Zulfiqar, G. (2019). Provincial labour regulations in post-devolution Pakistan: Fragmentation or innovation? *South Asian Studies*, 34(2), 101–123.