Advanced International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research
E-ISSN: 2584-0487
editor@aijmr.com
Volume 4, Issue 4, July-August 2026
CrossRef DOI: 10.62127/aijmr.2026.v04i04.1485

Leadership for India's Development: A Theoretical and Conceptual Understanding By -Parveen Kumar Sharma PhD Research Scholar PU

Parveen Kumar Sharma

Educationist
History
Panjab University

Abstract:
This article advances a historically grounded, conceptually and theoretically integrated framework to identify the leadership prerequisites for India's development. Drawing from classical political sociology, institutional economics, comparative developmental history, and Indian state formation, the present paper argues that development is fundamentally contingent upon leadership quality at the apex of governance. By examining leadership patterns from the Mauryan state to post-independence India, and integrating insights from Weberian authority, transformational leadership theory, and institutional development scholarship, the article identifies core prerequisites such as ethical legitimacy, institutional consolidation, strategic continuity, state capacity, reform discipline, inclusive nationalism, knowledge and values-centred modernisation, and geopolitical statecraft for India's development. The analysis concludes that India's rise depends not solely on economic metrics but on historically informed, institution-centred, and morally grounded top leadership.

Keywords: political leadership, India, state capacity, institutional reform, power development, governance, historical statecraft, transformational leadership.

Introduction

The transition from a developing nation to a developed nation is neither automatic nor inevitable. Historically, societies that achieved sustained prosperity and global stature did so under leadership of successfully institutionalised authority, stabilised governance, and cultivated long-term national purpose.[1] This article argues that India's transition to developed great nation status requires genuine transformation in the culture of top leadership — toward ethical authority, institutional rationalisation, strategic stable continuity, commitment for greater national purpose and inclusive governance for growth of all.

Historical Foundations of Indian Statecraft

India's political history reveals cyclical patterns of consolidation and fragmentation stepwise. It offers instructive lessons regarding leadership and institutional sustainability. The Mauryan Empire under Ashoka demonstrated early forms of centralised administrative authority and moral statecraft rooted in ethical governance.[2] The Mauryan Empire institutionalised centralised administration combined with moral governance. The Gupta period exhibited institutional sophistication and economic prosperity sustained through administrative coherence.

Weberian Authority and Modern State Formation

Max Weber's typology of authority—traditional, charismatic, and rational-legal—offers analytical clarity in assessing leadership prerequisites.[3] Developed nations predominantly operate under rational-legal authority characterised by institutional continuity and depersonalised governance.

India's post-independence constitutional framework embodies rational-legal foundations. However, the persistence of personalised political authority and patronage networks presents structural challenges. Max Weber identified rational-legal authority as critical for development. India's postcolonial leaders attempted to build a meritocratic bureaucracy (e.g. the IAS), but chronic vacancies and political interference weakened it.

Recent anthropological studies emphasise that bureaucratic practices in India are often "contingent and contextual" (Chakrabarti et al. 2021), deviating from formal norms. Political leadership must thus "institutionalise authority" – empowering civil servants and specialists who ensure policy continuity beyond electoral cycles and political interference. Milan Vaishnav et al. (2017) highlight that India's elite bureaucracy shrank even as the population grew: by 2010 IAS+IPS strength was <11,000 (a 28% vacancy rate) despite 1.2 billion citizens. This under-staffing impairs basic governance (e.g. massive court backlogs, ranking poorly on contract enforcement). Thus the auxiliary institutional leadership: professional administrators and advisers with autonomy to maintain state functions (cf. "auxiliary leadership" theory) is to be strengthened.

For India's transition to developed status, rational-legal dominance must deepen across executive, legislative, and judicial institutions. Institutional maturity reduces arbitrariness and enhances predictability, and thereby lowering transaction costs within the economy. Leadership that prioritises institutional strengthening over personal authority contributes to legitimacy that transcends electoral cycles. The transition to developed status requires strengthening impersonal institutions over personality-driven governance.

Ethical Legitimacy and Moral Authority

Throughout history, enduring states derived strength from moral legitimacy. Ashoka's ethical turn after the Kalinga war illustrates how normative authority can reinforce administrative order.

E-ISSN: 2584-0487
editor@aijmr.com
Volume 4, Issue 4, July-August 2026
CrossRef DOI: 10.62127/aijmr.2026.v04i04.1485

Contemporary scholarship emphasises that corruption erodes institutional trust and economic performance.[4] Ethical leadership establishes predictability and lowers transaction costs. Ethical credibility forms the normative foundation of developed societies. Francis Fukuyama emphasises that political decay occurs when institutions are captured by patronage networks. Trust deteriorates, and administrative effectiveness declines. Corruption undermines public investment efficiency and erodes confidence among domestic and international stakeholders. Ethical leadership, conversely, enhances social trust and institutional stability.

Development legitimacy is not only legal but also ethical. Public trust in leadership requires that government actions reflect shared moral values. India's founders embedded ethics into statecraft: Nehru's emphasis on scientific temper and social justice, and constitutional guarantees to "weaker sections," speak to moral legitimacy. Contemporary leaders too often invoke development goals rhetorically; sustaining public support requires tangible ethical governance. Transformational leadership theory (Burns 1978; Bass 1985) underscores the role of leaders who articulate a moral vision and inspire trust.

Clearer articulation of ethical values (e.g. anti-corruption, secularism, social equity) as core to India's development strategy (cf. Responsible Leadership literature) is recommended. India's leadership should embed transparency, accountability, and impartial governance as structural commitments rather than episodic reforms. For India, ethical credibility at the highest level of governance is foundational for the genuine development.

Institutional Consolidation and Rule of Law

Institutional consolidation—judicial independence, regulatory clarity, bureaucratic professionalism—is central to sustained development.[5] Historical evidence from Meiji Japan and post-war Germany shows that leadership prioritised institutional rebuilding over short-term populism. Acemoglu and Robinson (Why Nations Fail) argue that inclusive institutions generate sustained prosperity, whereas extractive institutions inhibit innovation and entrench inequality. Inclusive governance expands opportunity and fosters economic dynamism. India's diversity necessitates leadership that integrates plural identities into a cohesive national framework. Institutional inclusivity is not merely normative; it enhances productivity by broadening the participation.

Development demands robust institutions. North's work underscores that clear, enforced rules allow economies to flourish. In India, strengthening federal-state relations through empowered Panchayati Raj institutions, ensuring judicial independence, and empowering regulators such as RBI, SEBI is vital. India's parliament has been able to enact landmark reforms like GST, bankruptcy law, but their implementation needs consolidated institutions. For example, reducing bureaucracy via e-governance has begun, but rule-of-law gaps remain (India ranks ~178th globally in contract enforcement). Leadership should champion legal and bureaucratic reforms to embed a culture of compliance and accountability.

Strong institutions enforce development policies consistently. North and others show that without clear rules, economic gains remain fragile. In India's case, institutional consolidation means strengthening federal and state governments (e.g. enhancing local governance under the 73rd and 74th Amendments), reinforcing an independent judiciary, and ensuring regulatory bodies (RBI, SEC) are empowered.

Rule of law should be deepened: despite high Court backlog (31 million pending cases) and slow enforcement, progress in Lok Adalats, legal aid and commercial courts could accelerate. Leadership should publicly champion rule-of-law reforms (e.g. easing contract enforcement and bureaucratic red tape), following models like Singapore's meritocratic bureaucracy. Recent Doing Business data (India ranked ~155th in contract enforcement) highlights urgency. Achieving development thus requires that leaders work *through* rules, not around them, building institutions that deter arbitrariness and corruption.

The leadership must therefore ensure equal access to opportunity, speedy justice, legal protection, civic participation, depoliticised institutions capable of enforcing contracts, protecting property rights, and ensuring regulatory consistency.

Strategic Continuity and Long-Term Vision

Developmental states such as South Korea maintained strategic coherence across decades.[6] Leadership insulated economic policy from electoral volatility. India's demographic window and technological opportunity require long-horizon planning in infrastructure, human capital, and green transition. James MacGregor Burns distinguishes between transactional and transformational leadership. Transformational leadership reshapes national purpose and institutional direction.

Economic transformation is long-term. India's Five-Year Plans historically provided strategic direction, but political shifts led to disruptions. One argues for institutionalising a national development agenda – for example, a cross-party Commission on Long-Term Strategy (similar to South Korea's planning councils) – to ensure continuity across administrations. According to Panagariya (2008) the empirical evidence shows that India needs 7–8% annual growth over decades to address poverty. Such goals require multi-decade commitments in sectors such as, boosting manufacturing and renewable energy. Our proposal is to codify mid-century targets (e.g. becoming a middle-income nation by 2040) and protect them through legislative or constitutional means, so that leaders can build on, rather than reverse the previous policies.

Economic catch-up is a long game. One must learn from history that short-term populist policies can undermine growth. India's Five-Year Plans (1951–2017) attempted strategic planning were often renegotiated politically. Institutionalising a long-term developmental vision – akin to South Korea's industrial policies or China's Five-Year Plans – could stabilise investor expectations. For instance, National Policy on Education (1986/92) and National Manufacturing Policy (2011) set multi-decade goals, but inconsistent implementation blunted the impact. It is suggested to create a bipartisan national development charter or empower the NITI Aayog with greater autonomy to set twenty or thirty year strategies.

Developmental success in postwar economies was driven by leadership that institutionalised long-term planning insulated from short-term political volatility. India's demographic and technological opportunities require multi-decade strategic commitment. Transformational statecraft reframes development as a generational civilisational mission.

State Capacity and Administrative Competence

State capacity—the ability to design and implement policy—is indispensable.[7] Historical failures often stemmed from weak implementation rather than flawed vision. Investment in bureaucratic training, digital governance, and data systems enhances execution capability.

Professionalized civil services, digital governance integration, and data-driven decision systems enhance execution capability. Leadership must prioritise competence and institutional memory within administrative structures. Administrative modernisation represents a structural prerequisite for developed nation status. Leadership must prioritise administrative modernisation as much as political messaging. Economic transformation is long-term. India's Five-Year Plans historically provided strategic direction, but political shifts led to disruptions.

The ability of the state to execute policies (state capacity) is pivotal. Vaishnav et al. (2017) highlight India's paradox: that India can run an election for 850 million voters, yet it struggles with simple public services. To remedy this, leadership must boost administrative competence. Recommendations include merit-based recruitment/promotion (e.g. reform of the IAS/IPS posting process), clear performance metrics, and decentralisation of authority to local officials while holding them accountable. Recent Indian success stories (e.g. digitisation of public records, Aadhar identity system) show what targeted capacity-building can achieve.

Furthermore, comparative analysis of other developing democracies (e.g. Evans's "embedded autonomy" in South Korea) suggests investing in autonomous professional cadres (policy analysts, regulatory experts). Enhancing cooperation between political leaders and technocrats (auxiliary leadership) will ensure evidence-based policy design. This also involves resisting frequent policy reversals: stable leadership coalitions around core reforms (financial inclusion, rural electrification, etc.) encourage sustained outcomes.

Reform Discipline and Economic Transformation

Policy reversals generate uncertainty and deter investment. Leadership in sustaining reforms in taxation, labor markets, land governance, financial systems, and industrial strategy while maintaining fiscal prudence is essential. Consistency in reform signals credibility domestically and internationally. Rodrik argues that growth strategies must adapt while maintaining macroeconomic discipline.[8]

E-ISSN: 2584-0487
editor@aijmr.com
Volume 4, Issue 4, July-August 2026
CrossRef DOI: 10.62127/aijmr.2026.v04i04.1485

India’s partial reforms since 1991 have yielded impressive growth, but critics note unfinished business. As Bhagwati & Panagariya (2012) document, liberalisation post-1991 (coupled with earlier 1980s opening) accelerated GDP growth from ~5–6% in the 1980s to ~7–8% in the 2000s. Trade-to-GDP ratios tripled and foreign investment surged, lifting millions out of poverty. However, legacy sectors (land, labor laws, public utilities) remain rigid. Systematic reforms have driven India’s economic turnaround. Foreign trade expanded (trade/GDP roughly tripled), and sectors like telecom and autos boomed. These reforms also reduced poverty and increased opportunities for marginalised groups.

Leadership must maintain discipline: for instance, allowing independent institutions (statutory regulators, planning bodies) to function without political meddling. The Aadhaar and GST stories show that persistence yields results. Continued commitment to open markets, coupled with social safety nets, should be the agenda.

Leadership plays an important role in maintaining discipline in reform by protecting institutions like RBI’s autonomy and reform bodies (e.g. UPA-era task forces). Recent attempts (e.g. GST tax reform, bankruptcy code) show progress, but these must be coupled with institutional incentives. For example, allow technocratic agencies to set regulatory standards in infrastructure and finance independent of short-term political demands.

India’s leadership is expected to sustain reforms in taxation, labor regulation, land governance, and financial deepening without policy reversals driven by populist pressures. Reform discipline signals credibility to investors and global partners.

Inclusive Nationalism and Democratic Cohesion

Amartya Sen emphasises that development expands freedoms.[9] Social cohesion enhances economic participation. Amartya Sen conceptualises development as expansion of freedoms. Inclusive governance enhances human capital participation and reduces conflict risk.

Development requires social cohesion. India’s pluralism is an asset, but identity politics can threaten inclusiveness. The narrative of the nation must affirm all communities’ stake in progress. India’s founding fathers provided “inclusive grounding” for nationalism. All leaders ought to articulate a broad-based nationalism. Policies that visibly reduce inequality (affirmative action, health/education for marginalised groups) reinforce legitimacy. At the same time, robust democratisation – free press, elections – must continue as mechanisms for channeling grievances. Rising majoritarianism may pose risks, so leadership must consciously counter divisive trends to preserve social capital.

India’s pluralism can be a source of strength, but it depends on inclusive leadership. The nationalist movement’s success was partly its “broad and united front” strategy. Today, leaders must reaffirm that all communities share in the national project. This means protecting minority rights, enforcing secular laws fairly, and pursuing redistributive policies that lift all. Democratically, India’s elections provide

E-ISSN: 2584-0487
editor@aijmr.com
Volume 4, Issue 4, July-August 2026
CrossRef DOI: 10.62127/aijmr.2026.v04i04.1485

accountability, but majoritarian impulses (e.g. demonetisation's hardships, citizenship debates) have tested social cohesion. For leadership to be a success, constitutional principles and model tolerance are pre-requisite. Programs like the Right to Education and National Rural Employment Guarantee Schemes lend credibility to inclusivity. In sum, development leadership must fuse economic goals with social justice to maintain legitimacy.

Leadership must cultivate inclusive nationalism that integrates diversity rather than polarises it. Social fragmentation undermines economic growth and democratic legitimacy. Leadership must cultivate integrative narratives reinforcing unity without suppressing diversity. Trust strengthens institutional resilience and economic dynamism. Pluralism strengthens democratic legitimacy and economic productivity.

Knowledge and Values-Driven Modernisation

Mariana Mazzucato highlights the entrepreneurial role of the state in driving innovation ecosystems. Developed nations transition toward knowledge-intensive production and frontier technologies.

India's leadership must prioritise research investment, higher education reform, and university-industry collaboration. Innovation capacity defines contemporary great power status. Knowledge capital ensures competitiveness in global value chains. Great nations transition toward innovation-driven growth. Mariana Mazzucato highlights the entrepreneurial role of the state.[10]

In the 21st century, knowledge economy elements are key. India's strengths (large STEM-educated workforce, IT services, space program) suggest a path toward **innovation-led growth**. According to the Global Innovation Index (2025), India leads all lower-middle-income countries and ranks 1st globally in ICT services exports. It is also 4th in late-stage venture capital deals and 11th in unicorn valuations, reflecting a vibrant startup ecosystem.

Leaders should leverage this by increasing R&D investment (India's R&D/GDP was ~0.65% in 2020) and forging university–industry links. For example, expanding research partnerships (like the Indian Institutes of Technology cooperating with global firms) will build technology-intensive sectors. Education policy reforms (e.g. NEP 2020) should emphasise critical thinking and vocational training. This knowledge-driven vision must be integrated with broader development goals (Sen 1999) so that technology benefits all citizens, not just elites.

Modern development hinges on knowledge and innovation. India's demographic dividend (hundreds of millions of young citizens) and expanding higher education system lay the groundwork. However, R&D investment (~0.65% of GDP) is low. The **Global Innovation Index 2025** ranks India 38th globally and first among lower-middle-income countries, highlighting strengths in ICT services (India is #1 globally) and startups (4th in late-stage VC deals). Leaders should capitalise on this by boosting R&D funding (aiming for 2–3% GDP), fostering public–private research partnerships, and reforming universities to encourage industry linkages. Policies like the National Education Policy 2020 that emphasise STEM,

Advanced International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research
E-ISSN: 2584-0487
editor@aijmr.com
Volume 4, Issue 4, July-August 2026
CrossRef DOI: 10.62127/aijmr.2026.v04i04.1485

critical thinking, and vocational training should be vigorously implemented. By aligning value based education, innovation, and industry, India can transform into a knowledge-driven economy.

Leadership must invest in research ecosystems, higher education, and frontier technologies including artificial intelligence and renewable energy. Knowledge capital defines twenty-first century power.

Geopolitical Statecraft and Great Power Responsibility

Paul Kennedy demonstrates that great powers decline when military or geopolitical overreach exceeds economic capacity. Internal institutional strength underpins sustainable influence. India's leadership must balance regional engagement, economic diplomacy, and strategic partnerships without compromising domestic development priorities.

Greatness requires calibrated international responsibility. Historically, great nations combine domestic strength with strategic diplomacy. Paul Kennedy's analysis of great powers demonstrates that overextension undermines sustainability.[11] India's leadership role on the world stage has grown. As a potential great power, India has new responsibilities in view of climate change, global health, trade etc. Tellis (2016) notes that India's leaders (e.g. Prime Minister Modi) now aspire to be a "leading power", but achieving this requires solid domestic foundations (economy, institutions, military). India has taken positive steps (e.g. championing the International Solar Alliance), but must also fulfil commitments like net-zero emissions by 2070. Strategic continuity abroad means maintaining nonalignment in principle but deepening partnerships (e.g. QUAD, G20 leadership) that reflect India's pluralistic values. Wise foreign policy requires projecting influence without provocation: consensus-building in South Asia, supporting multilateralism, and contributing to global public goods (peacekeeping, vaccine distribution). Leadership training (through expert internal and foreign service academies) should emphasise this strategic culture of responsibility.

As India's global footprint grows, its leadership responsibilities expand. Internationally, India's leadership is seen in climate initiatives (International Solar Alliance) and diplomatic efforts. Going forward, India should leverage its democracy to advocate for global public goods – for example, by contributing to global health funds or climate finance. Crucially, leadership in world affairs has to be consistent with domestic values: promoting pluralism and rule-of-law at home reinforces India's soft power abroad. India's leadership must balance economic development with prudent geopolitical engagement. Strategic autonomy requires internal strength.

Conclusion: Leadership as the Decisive Variable

India's transition to developed great nation status is fundamentally a leadership challenge. History reveals that prosperity emerges where authority is institutionalised, ethical, stable, strategic, and inclusive. Weberian rational-legal authority dominates political culture. Transformational leadership must be aligned to the national ambition with disciplined reform, inclusive governance, and strategic prudence at its core as important features.

Advanced International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research
E-ISSN: 2584-0487
editor@aijmr.com
Volume 4, Issue 4, July-August 2026
CrossRef DOI: 10.62127/aijmr.2026.v04i04.1485

Development and greatness are not inevitable outcomes of size or history; they are political achievements sustained through institution-centred and ethically grounded statecraft. Development is not merely economic accumulation; it is the political maturation of a civilisation-state. India's leap to developed status requires a new practice of leadership: transformational yet institutionalised.

History shows that when Indian leaders embraced long-term planning, meritocracy, and broad inclusion, society and country advanced (e.g. post-independence industrial base green revolution, IT revolution). In contemporary times, reaffirming those principles is imperative. It is shown that ethical legitimacy, strong institutions, visionary planning, and cohesion are mutually reinforcing. The challenge for current leaders is to craft policies and institutions that endure beyond electoral cycles. By doing so, they will ensure that development becomes an enduring feature of Indian statecraft, fulfilling the nation's great-patriotic aspirations.

India's leap to developed status hinges on leveraging history and forging new institutional norms. The transformational leadership in India must be exercised *through institutions* – that is, by creating ethical, inclusive, capable, stable state structures sustained beyond any single politician's tenure.

Footnotes

1. North, D.C. (1990). Institutions, institutional change and economic performance. Cambridge University Press.
2. Thapar, R. (2002). Early India: From the origins to AD 1300. University of California Press.
3. Weber, M. (1947). The theory of social and economic organization. Oxford University Press.
4. Fukuyama, F. (2014). Political order and political decay. Farrar, Stratus and Giroux
5. Acemoglu, D., & Robinson, J.A. (2012), Why fails. Crown Business
6. Evans, P. (1995). Embedded autonomy, Princeton University Press,
7. Fukuyama, F. (2014). Political order and political decay. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
8. Rodrik, D. (2007). One economics, many recipes. Princeton University Press.
9. Sen, A. (1999). Development as freedom. Oxford University Press.
10. Mazzucato, M. (2013). The entrepreneurial state. Anthem Press.
11. Kennedy, P.(1987). The rise and fall of the great powers. Random House.

REFERENCES:

1. Acemoglu, D., & Robinson, J. A. (2012). *Why nations fail: The origins of power, prosperity, and poverty*. Crown Business.
2. Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. Harper & Row.
3. Evans, P. (1995). *Embedded autonomy: States and industrial transformation*. Princeton University Press.
4. Fukuyama, F. (2014). *Political order and political decay: From the Industrial Revolution to the globalisation of democracy*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
5. Kennedy, P. (1987). *The rise and fall of the great powers*. Random House.
6. Mazzucato, M. (2013). *The entrepreneurial state: Debunking public vs. private sector myths*.

E-ISSN: 2584-0487
editor@aijmr.com
Volume 4, Issue 4, July-August 2026
CrossRef DOI: 10.62127/aijmr.2026.v04i04.1485

Anthem Press.
7. North, D. C. (1990). *Institutions, institutional change and economic performance*. Cambridge University Press.
8. Rodrik, D. (2007). *One economics, many recipes: Globalisation, institutions, and economic growth*. Princeton University Press.
9. Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. Oxford University Press.
10. Thapar, R. (2002). *Early India: From the origins to AD 1300*. University of California Press.
Weber, M. (1947). *The theory of social and economic organisation*. Oxford University Press.