Bulletin of Nexus
Multidisciplinary International Research Journal, Double-Blind Peer Reviewed, Open Access Journal
ISSN: 3065-7865 / Volume-3, Issue-3, March 2026

Original Article

India And the World: Evolving Governance Models in Global Public Administration

Thokchom Reaganchandra Singh[1], Gurpreet Choudhary[2] Deepak Sharma[3]
[1,2,3] Department of Training Rajiv Gandhi National Institute of Youth Development, Regional Centre, Chandiagrh

Manuscript ID:
BN-2026-030346

ISSN: 3065-7865

Volume 3

Issue 3

March 2026

Pp. 230-234

Submitted: 18 Feb 2026

Revised: 27 Feb 2026

Accepted: 15 Mar 2026

Published: 31 Mar 2026

DOI:
10.5281/zenodo.20151012
DOI link:
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20151012

Abstract

This article examines India's public administration and governance practices in comparison with two established democracies (the United States and Germany), two non-democratic states (China and Saudi Arabia), and one hybrid model (Singapore). Using a qualitative comparative approach based on secondary literature, policy documents, and global governance indices, the study highlights structural, cultural, and technological differences in governance. It finds that democratic systems (India, USA, Germany) emphasize accountability and rule of law but often face bureaucratic inertia and complexity, whereas authoritarian regimes (China, Saudi) achieve rapid top-down decision-making at the cost of citizen participation. Singapore's hybrid model combines efficiency and anti-corruption with limited political freedoms. The analysis draws on case examples such as India's Digital India initiative and China's centralized planning to illustrate these contrasts. The discussion suggests that India can learn from global best practices to improve efficiency, transparency, and citizen engagement while upholding democratic values.

Keywords: *Public Administration; Governance Models; comparative analysis; India; global practices*

Introduction

Globalization and technological change are reshaping public governance worldwide. Nations increasingly look beyond their borders for models and innovations in public administration. India, the world's largest democracy, is no exception. With rapid economic growth (GDP rising from $476 billion in 2000 to $3.73 trillion in 2023) and a tech-driven service sector, India's bureaucracy faces pressure to become more agile, citizen-centric, and innovation-friendly (ISPP, 2025). At the same time, India must balance its democratic accountability with efficient service delivery. This paper compares India's governance model with five other countries: two democratic systems (the United States and Germany), two authoritarian systems (China and Saudi Arabia), and one hybrid model (Singapore). The aim is to understand how different political and administrative contexts shape governance practices, and to identify lessons that India might draw from global experiences.

Background

Governance models and administrative structures: Public administration systems vary along several dimensions: political structure (federal vs unitary, presidential vs parliamentary, democratic vs authoritarian), bureaucratic culture, and use of technology. India's system is a federal parliamentary democracy inherited from the British Westminster model.

It features a powerful bureaucracy (the Indian Administrative Service) with roots in colonial institutions. The United States is a federal presidential republic with a strong separation of powers and independent regulatory agencies. Germany is a federal parliamentary democracy (Basic Law) with Länder (states) exercising substantial autonomy in areas like education and policing. In contrast, China is a unitary one-party state where the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) directs both policy and administration, and Saudi Arabia is an absolute monarchy with power concentrated in the royal family and religious authorities. Singapore, a city-state, is

Creative Commons ***(CC BY-NC-SA 4.0)***

This is an open access journal, and articles are distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International Public License, which allows others to remix, tweak, and build upon the work noncommercially, as long as appropriate credit is given and the new creations ae licensed under the identical terms.

Address for correspondence:
Thokchom Reaganchandra Singh,Department of Training Rajiv Gandhi National Institute of Youth Development, Regional Centre, Chandiagrh
Email: trcsingh321@gmail.com

How to cite this article:
Singh, T. R., Choudhary, G., & Sharma, D. (2026). India And the World: Evolving Governance Models in Global Public Administration. Bulletin of Nexus Journal, 3(3), 230–234.
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20151012

Quick Response Code:

Website: https://bnir.us

formally a parliamentary republic but has been governed by the dominant People's Action Party for decades, creating a "hybrid" system often described as benevolent authoritarianism. Each model has evolved in its own context: for instance, Germany's postwar governance stresses rule of law and consensus-building, while China emphasizes centralized planning and social stability, and Singapore prizes meritocracy and anti-corruption. These different frameworks lead to contrasting accountability mechanisms and service delivery approaches. Democratic systems rely on elections and an independent media for oversight, whereas authoritarian regimes use internal party controls and executive decree.

Governance performance and indicators: International indices illustrate these differences. For instance, Transparency International's 2024 Corruption Perceptions Index ranks Singapore as the **3rd least corrupt country** (score 84/100) (CPIB, 2025), reflecting its strong anti-corruption laws and clean bureaucracy. In contrast, India's score is much lower (around 38/100) and its rank is far behind (see *Corruption Perceptions Index*, TI 2024). Freedom House ratings similarly classify India, Singapore, and the USA as "partly free" or "free" democracies, while China and Saudi Arabia are labeled "not free." On World Bank governance indicators, Singapore typically scores in the high 90th percentiles (effectiveness, rule of law, etc.), whereas India, the USA, and Germany score lower on some dimensions. These data underscore that Singapore's hybrid system achieves very high effectiveness and low corruption (CPIB, 2025), whereas India's and the USA's larger democracies manage broader civil liberties with somewhat lower technical efficiency.

Literature Review

Comparative public administration scholarship has long examined how institutional legacies and reform paradigms shape governance. Traditional Weberian models emphasize hierarchical, rule-based bureaucracy, which describes much of India's and Germany's civil services. Beginning in the 1980s, New Public Management (NPM) reforms in many democracies advocated performance measurement, outsourcing, and customer-oriented services, influencing both the United States and India (e.g. privatisation and e-governance initiatives). More recent frameworks (often called "new public governance" or "digital governance") focus on networks, citizen participation, and ICT integration. For example, Khan and Haider (2025) note that India's **e-governance** initiatives – from the National e-Governance Plan (2006) to Digital India (2015) – aim to leverage ICT to improve transparency, accountability, and efficiency in service delivery. In particular, e-governance tools (like the Aadhaar biometric ID and one-stop portals) are intended to reduce red tape and corruption by digitizing transactions. Similarly, Singapore has implemented a highly centralized digital platform (Singapore Single Sign-On) so that "citizens can access government services and information through a single portal". Estonia is often cited as a pioneer, but Singapore's "Smart Nation" approach is also considered a global best practice in digital government. In contrast, China's recent literature emphasizes its "state-led" model: the CCP promotes a **meritocratic** bureaucracy evaluated on economic and social targets, with less emphasis on civil society input. Research on authoritarian public administration highlights that while these systems may achieve rapid policy execution, they often lack bottom-up accountability and citizen voice. Academic debates on governance also underscore trade-offs: strong controls (as in Singapore or China) can bring efficiency and low corruption, but at the cost of political freedoms and transparency (Leber, 2025). This literature suggests that understanding India's path requires examining how its democratic norms, bureaucratic legacy, and reform efforts interact with lessons from other regimes.

Methodology

This study uses a comparative case analysis of India and the five selected countries. It relies on secondary data sources: governance indices, scholarly and policy literature on each country's administration, and documented case examples. The approach is largely qualitative and descriptive: we identify key dimensions (political-administrative structure, bureaucratic culture, performance and accountability mechanisms, and innovation/technology use) and compare them across cases. Where possible, specific policy initiatives or programs (such as India's Digital India, China's 5-Year Plans, Saudi's Vision 2030, Singapore's Civil Service College training, etc.) are referenced to illustrate differences. The goal is not statistical analysis but an analytical synthesis highlighting contrasting governance models. While this method cannot capture every nuance, it allows cross-national insights grounded in recent data and expert studies.

Results

Structural contrasts: India, the USA, and Germany share broad democratic frameworks, but with differing mechanics. The United States employs a **presidential** federal system with three separate branches and a professional civil service under the Office of Personnel Management. Germany has a **parliamentary** federal system with strong rule-of-law institutions; its civil service is largely merit-

© 2026 Bulletin of Nexus| Published by: Royal International Global LLC (USA)

based and rules-driven. India's system is also **parliamentary**, but with a strong central government; its civil service remains hierarchical and often influenced by political leaders. In these democracies, regular elections and checks-and-balances help hold administrators accountable. By contrast, China's government is a single-party dictatorship: its bureaucracy is formally state-owned and CCP-controlled, emphasizing adherence to party directives and economic targets. Saudi Arabia's system is a monarchy where ministers are often royal appointees and religious figures, so accountability flows upward to the king rather than to citizens. Singapore, meanwhile, is **technically parliamentary** but has been ruled by one party continuously; its political system allows for some opposition but operates with discipline akin to a dominant-party state. Each structure shapes governance: for instance, legislation in the US often involves negotiation across branches (which can slow implementation), whereas China can issue national policies that are executed top-down with little public input.

Bureaucratic culture and reforms: India's bureaucracy has roots in a **colonial civil service**, prioritizing procedure and law-and-order. It is one of the world's largest, but also rigid (promotions often based on tenure, extensive red tape) (ISPP, 2025). Recent analyses urge India to modernize this legacy. For instance, the Indian School of Public Policy observes that "bureaucratic processes still rely on manual procedures" despite recent e-governance initiatives (ISPP, 2025). India's government has launched multiple reforms – digitization (Digital India), service delivery platforms, and performance tracking – to address inefficiency and corruption. The USA's bureaucracy is comparatively decentralized: federal agencies coexist with 50 state governments, and political appointees serve short terms while career civil servants (protected by merit systems) remain. This ensures institutional memory but can lead to occasional inertia; recent U.S. reform efforts (e.g. executive orders on "government efficiency") reflect tensions between expertise and political priorities. Germany emphasizes vocational training and a **coherent administrative culture** across Länder and federal levels; its civil servants enjoy strong job security and an anti-corruption climate similar to Singapore's. Singapore consciously adopted a **Western-style civil service** but added local innovations: high salaries to deter graft, rigorous recruitment exams, and continuous training. As a result, its bureaucracy is widely respected for efficiency and integrity. In contrast, China's bureaucracy evolved under Communist rule, with cadres vetted through party schools and promotions based on a mix of merit and political loyalty. That system has been effective at mobilizing large-scale infrastructure projects and rapid economic growth, but it often places party objectives above individual liberties. Saudi Arabia's bureaucracy has been undergoing modernization under Vision 2030: the government has reorganized ministries, introduced accountability measures, and encouraged private-sector growth. Saudi's Vision 2030 has achieved "undeniable progress" in diversifying the economy, but that much decision-making remains **centralized and personalized** in Crown's office (Leber, 2025).

Governance performance and technology: Across these countries, performance outcomes vary. Singapore leads in global benchmarks: it consistently ranks at or near the top for government effectiveness, regulatory quality, and corruption control (e.g. World Bank's indicators and the World Economic Forum's competitiveness reports). For instance, in 2024 Singapore's Corruption Perceptions score was 84 (3rd best in the world) (CPIB, 2025). India has made progress – its ease-of-doing-business rank improved from 130 (2016) to 63 (2023) – but it still faces bottlenecks in permitting, land records, and judicial delays (ISPP, 2025). The United States and Germany also score highly on infrastructure and rule of law, though each faces challenges (e.g. the U.S. score dipped due to political polarization, Germany's federalism can slow nationwide reforms). China excels at large-scale project execution (high-speed rail, urbanization) but its legal and media environment ranks low in transparency assessments. Saudi Arabia has improved governance indicators in recent years (new taxes, digital government services), but scholars note a "lack of bottom-up accountability" and persistent human rights concerns (Leber, 2025).

Technology and innovation highlight further contrasts. India's **Digital India** program has deployed Aadhaar biometric ID cards, e-payment of subsidies, and online portals to reduce middlemen and corruption. These efforts have streamlined services (e.g. electronic birth certificates) and expanded financial inclusion. Singapore's **Smart Nation** initiative goes further, integrating data analytics, e-government services and even trialing AI for municipal planning; it ensures almost all government services are accessible online via unified platforms. China has rolled out its own digital tools (e.g. mobile payment ubiquity, digital health codes) and even a nascent "social credit" system to reward compliance, reflecting its comfort with tech-driven social management. The USA leverages innovation in budgeting and open data, but still relies heavily on legacy systems in many

© 2026 Bulletin of Nexus| Published by: Royal International Global LLC (USA)

agencies. Saudi Arabia has embraced e-government (issuing many licenses online, e-visa programs) as part of Vision 2030. Notably, despite India's advances, experts point out that many Indian bureaucratic tasks remain manual and that adoption of analytics or AI is "still slow" (ISPP, 2025). Overall, the results show that democracies like India can mobilize diverse stakeholder input and use ICT to enhance transparency, but may struggle with coordination (Khan, 2025). Authoritarian or hybrid governments can implement tech rapidly (given strong central directives) but often balance data use against privacy or rights concerns.

Discussion

The comparative analysis reveals key trade-offs in governance models. Democratic systems (India, USA, Germany) benefit from legitimacy, public participation, and rule-of-law safeguards, but often suffer from bureaucratic complexity and slower decision cycles. For instance, coalition politics in India and Germany can complicate reform, and the U.S. separation of powers can lead to policy gridlock. On the other hand, authoritarian systems (China, Saudi) can push through reforms quickly – China lifted hundreds of millions out of poverty via targeted plans, Saudi has rapidly reformed its economy – but they rely on tight political control and have limited transparency. Singapore's hybrid model demonstrates that even a non-competitive political environment can produce very high governance efficiency and low corruption, though critics note this comes with constraints on free speech and opposition.

India's experience contains elements of both worlds. As a democracy, India enshrines freedom of expression and a free press, but it also depends on a legacy bureaucracy that some analysts describe as "rooted in a colonial mindset". India must "take cues from best practices" to become more efficient. For example, Singapore's first-place ranking in bureaucratic efficiency (per IMD World Competitiveness) contrasts with India's much lower placement, suggesting that India could benefit from merit-based performance systems and reduced red tape. At the same time, India must preserve democratic accountability; learning from Germany or the USA could involve strengthening judicial review, empowering local governance (Panchayati Raj), and ensuring transparent procurement. Case in point, India's Digital India programs have already begun to reduce corruption in welfare delivery by linking subsidies directly to citizen bank accounts, illustrating how technology can complement democratic processes.

The authoritarian examples underline the importance of strong institutions alongside leadership. China's anti-corruption campaigns and data-driven management have improved administrative performance, but they depend on an omnipotent party-state. Saudi Arabia's Vision 2030 shows how a government can focus on efficiency and diversification (for instance, by digitizing many government services and cutting subsidies), yet this has been criticized as benefiting a narrow elite. These cases suggest India should be cautious about merely centralizing power for efficiency – it needs checks and citizen input. Conversely, India could aim to emulate Singapore's rigorous anti-corruption frameworks: the Singaporean Corrupt Practices Investigation Bureau (CPIB) is empowered to pursue cases at all levels, contributing to Singapore's rise to "least corrupt" status.

Hybrid features in Singapore (efficient bureaucracy within a one-party context) may not be wholly transferable to India's plural democracy. Yet, pragmatic governance lessons – such as using technology to bypass bureaucratic bottlenecks, or setting clear performance metrics for public servants – can be adapted. The literature suggests blending approaches: adopting meritocratic elements (higher salaries, performance reviews) while ensuring public accountability (e.g. India's Right to Information Act, election commissions). As one analysis concludes, India's reforms should pursue agility and transparency without sacrificing democratic values.

Conclusion

India's evolving governance model sits at the intersection of democratic ideals and global efficiency trends. By comparing India with the USA, Germany, China, Saudi Arabia, and Singapore, this article highlights that India's strengths (broad-based democracy, linguistic and cultural diversity) also bring challenges (bureaucratic delays, corruption). While authoritarian or hybrid models can deliver swift outcomes, India's path lies in strengthening its institutions – for example, continuing digital innovations to curb graft and decentralizing administration where feasible – and in learning global best practices. The analysis implies that India should **benchmark** against successful policies abroad (as recommended by ISPP), but implement them in a uniquely Indian way. Future research could empirically examine specific reform initiatives (e.g. state-level administrative overhauls) and citizen satisfaction surveys. In any case, India's growing role on the world stage means its governance model will increasingly be part of global conversations, and this comparative insight can inform both policymaking and academic discourse.

© 2026 Bulletin of Nexus| Published by: Royal International Global LLC (USA)

Acknowledgement

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to all those who supported and guided me in the completion of this project titled "India and the World: Evolving Governance Models in Global Public Administration."

First and foremost, I extend my heartfelt thanks to my teachers and mentors for their valuable guidance, encouragement, and continuous support throughout the preparation of this work. Their insights and suggestions greatly helped me in understanding the complex dimensions of global governance and public administration.

I am also thankful to my institution and library staff for providing access to important resources, references, and research materials that contributed significantly to this study.

Special appreciation goes to my family and friends for their motivation, patience, and moral support during the completion of this project.

Lastly, I would like to acknowledge all the scholars, authors, and organizations whose published works and research papers provided valuable information and inspiration for this project.

Financial support and sponsorship

Nil.

Conflicts of interest

The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper

References

1. Indian School of Public Policy. (2025). *Reforms for the Indian Bureaucracy in the 21st Century*. Mumbai: ISPP. Retrieved March 2025.
2. Khan, I., & Haider, M. (2025). *E-governance in India and Its Role in Modern Governance: A Conceptual Overview*. *International Journal for Research Trends and Innovation*, 10(3).
3. Leber, A. (2025). *Vision 2030 in the Home Stretch: Clear Achievements yet Limited Accountability*. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
4. Corrupt Practices Investigation Bureau (CPIB), Singapore. (2025). *2024 TI CPI: Singapore Rises 2 Spots to 3rd Least Corrupt Country in the World, Top in Asia Pacific*.
5. World Bank. (2024). *Worldwide Governance Indicators 2022*. Retrieved from https://www.worldbank.org/en/publication/worldwide-governance-indicators
6. Transparency International. (2024). *Corruption Perceptions Index 2024*.
7. Freedom House. (2024). *Freedom in the World 2024 – Country Reports: India, United States, Germany, China, Saudi Arabia, Singapore*.

© 2026 Bulletin of Nexus| Published by: Royal International Global LLC (USA)