

UDC 327

IRSTI 11.25.15

<https://doi.org/10.48371/ISMO.2026.63.1.002>

THE SINGAPORE MODEL IN KAZAKHSTAN'S EARLY STATE FORMATION

* Chinikev T.O.¹, Makasheva K.N.²

*^{1,2}Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan

Abstract. This article examines the role of Singapore as a point of reference in the formulation of Kazakhstan's development strategy in the 1990s and early 2000s. Drawing on primary sources, including presidential addresses, diplomatic records, and policy documents, as well as secondary academic literature, the study analyzes the channels through which Singapore's experience influenced policy-making and institutional reforms in Kazakhstan.

The article demonstrates that, despite limited direct interaction between the two countries, Singapore acquired significance as an example of successful modernization. However, it did not function as a comprehensive model for replication; rather, it served as a source of selected governance practices and as a legitimizing narrative for reform. Key elements of this influence included meritocratic public administration, anti-corruption measures, investment promotion, and the prioritization of economic development.

At the same time, substantial differences in scale, economic structure, and institutional context constrained the direct transfer of policies. As a result, Kazakhstan adopted a selective and adaptive approach, incorporating specific elements of external experience while adjusting them to domestic conditions. The findings suggest that external models can operate both as practical policy tools and as guiding references in shaping long-term development strategies.

Keywords: Kazakhstan, Singapore, policy transfer, public administration, institutional reforms, modernization, development strategy, governance practices

Introduction

The fall of the Soviet Union in 1991 confronted Kazakhstan, a newly independent Central Asian country, with a strategic question: what kind of a development model should the country pursue? The government was well acquainted with its formerly socialist Eastern European states, but it observed limited progress there and it anticipated that Western economies would face additional pressures associated with German reunification. Most of the European population of Kazakhstan was already moving to Russia, Germany, Poland, and other countries [1]. Theoretically, setting these countries as perfect examples to emulate could potentially lead to more people leaving the country. It could be a

reason, therefore, that the Kazakh government turned its attention to East and Southeast Asia.

Neighboring China was already supplying Kazakhstan with many of its population's needs, including affordable technology and sufficiently warm winter clothes [2]. Anything that could replace the products of dysfunctional factories of the Soviet Union was important. Contemporary accounts and secondary sources indicate that, in the early 1990s, imported consumer goods from China were often perceived as low in quality, contributing to a degree of public skepticism toward Chinese products in Kazakhstan. Singapore, on the other hand, could not directly serve as an exporter of goods or even services in that pre-internet era. However, Singapore attracted particular attention as a notable example of rapid modernization, characterized by competent administration, openness to foreign investment, and a strong rule of law.

In September 1991, three months prior to the proclamation of independence of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Singapore's Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew paid an official visit to the country at the invitation of President Nursultan Nazarbayev. The purpose of the visit was to familiarize the Kazakh leadership with Singapore's model of socio-economic development and public administration. This visit took place within the broader context of post-Soviet state transformation, a period marked by institutional uncertainty and an active search for viable development strategies.

According to later accounts and reported interactions, Lee Kuan Yew expressed positive impressions of his visit and signaled willingness to share governance experience with Kazakhstan's leadership. During these interactions, he was invited to serve as an advisor to the nascent government of Kazakhstan on issues related to the formulation and implementation of national development strategies. Lee Kuan Yew expressed his willingness to share his accumulated experience in governance and reform, indicating a potential mutual interest in institutional learning and policy transfer.

However, despite these preliminary understandings, following Kazakhstan's attainment of independence, this initiative was not translated into practical cooperation. This suggests the presence of political, institutional, or organizational constraints that hindered the development of sustained bilateral expert engagement.

Nevertheless, his visit was an early, but symbolic channel in elite learning. Leaders of the not-yet-independent states of the Soviet Union could for the first time receive firsthand exposure to governance approaches of a rapidly developing country with a respectable reputation in the world. It must have been then that Singapore began to enjoy a myth-like reputation in the country, sparking many conversations in the corridors of power. Given Kazakhstan's natural resources and human capital, the country was considered to have the potential for

successful development, and it is natural that many people were optimistic about the country's future, including, presumably, the President of Kazakhstan.

Although Lee Kuan Yew did not assume a formal advisory role to the Government of Kazakhstan following his 1991 visit, bilateral relations between Kazakhstan and Singapore were institutionalized relatively early: diplomatic relations were formally established on 30 March 1993. In the initial years of Kazakhstan's independence, the establishment of formal diplomatic ties carried primarily political and symbolic significance, as the newly independent state sought international recognition and aimed to expand its network of external partners. In this context, the formalization of diplomatic relations often preceded the development of substantive economic cooperation.

Political dialogue between the two countries evolved gradually. The first official visit of President Nursultan Nazarbayev to Singapore took place in 1996, while his subsequent visit in 2003 contributed to strengthening bilateral engagement and to the establishment of more sustained channels of intergovernmental cooperation [3]. Nevertheless, throughout the 1990s and the early 2000s, the practical substance of Kazakhstan–Singapore relations remained limited, particularly in the trade and economic domain.

At the same time, the divergence in the developmental trajectories of the two states became increasingly pronounced. By this period, Singapore had consolidated its position as a highly developed, export-oriented economy characterized by effective governance institutions, whereas Kazakhstan was undergoing a complex process of post-socialist transformation, involving structural economic adjustments and the formation of new state institutions. These structural differences objectively constrained the depth and intensity of bilateral interaction during the early phase of relations.

Nevertheless, Kazakhstan articulated a long-term development strategy aimed at improving public welfare and fostering societal demand for sustainable economic growth. A central policy document of this period was the Presidential Address “Kazakhstan-2030” (1997), which outlined national priorities and development trajectories, partly drawing on the experience of rapidly growing economies in East and Southeast Asia, commonly referred to in the academic literature as the “Asian Tigers.” Within the framework of symbolic nation-building, this imagery was adapted to the local context and transformed into the metaphor of the “snow leopard” (irbis), associated with Kazakhstan's natural and geographical features. This symbol subsequently gained prominence as an element of national branding and regional identity, including in the city of Almaty.

An important conceptual principle of socio-economic policy was encapsulated in N.Nazarbayev's formulation “economy first, then politics,” which emphasized the prioritization of economic modernization and improvements in living standards [4]. This approach, to some extent, paralleled reform

trajectories observed in several East Asian states, including Singapore, where particular emphasis was placed on the sequencing of institutional reforms and the maintenance of socio-economic stability.

In this context, a primary objective was the establishment of the foundations of a market economy and the adaptation of the population to the new socio-economic conditions associated with the transition period. Concurrently, efforts were undertaken to develop a national model of political organization that would take into account the country's historical, cultural, and institutional specificities.

Relations between Singapore and Kazakhstan exhibit distinctive features that do not fully conform to conventional models of bilateral cooperation, particularly when viewed from the perspective of Kazakhstan's development trajectory. Against this background, this article examines the extent and nature of the influence of Singapore's development model on early political decision-making and institutional transformations in Kazakhstan, while also identifying the constraints and contextual factors that limited its broader application.

This study is situated within the broader literature on policy transfer and institutional adaptation. Following Dolowitz and Marsh, policy transfer is understood as a process through which knowledge about policies, administrative arrangements, or institutions in one setting is used in another. At the same time, the concept of lesson-drawing highlights the selective nature of such processes, while institutionalist perspectives emphasize the role of domestic structures in shaping adaptation outcomes. These frameworks inform the analysis by conceptualizing Kazakhstan's engagement with the Singaporean experience as a case of selective and context-dependent policy transfer rather than direct institutional replication.

The article contributes to several strands of scholarship, including post-Soviet transformation studies, comparative political economy, and public administration, by providing an empirically grounded case of selective policy transfer between structurally dissimilar states.

Materials and Methods

This study employs a multidisciplinary qualitative methodology. Historical-analytical review of presidential addresses, laws, and official communiqués concerning bilateral contacts and domestic reforms (1991-2005) constitutes main body of this research. The materials include *Kazakhstan 2030* [4] and *Kazakhstan 2050* [5], which are important presidential addresses that have been considered national strategies affecting practically every aspect of the country's bureaucratic decision-making. They are coupled with documentary analysis of Singapore-Kazakhstan diplomatic records (1991-2003) and public statements by Singapore's Ministry of Foreign Affairs that verify high-level visits and the early advisory role of Singapore leaders.

Further, the study ventures on a thematic literature review of policy-transfer scholarship and focused case studies on civil service professionalization and the emergence of Samruk-Kazyna as a Temasek-style holding fund. Temasek is one of Singapore's state-owned institutional investment arms that allows the country to invest in important projects worldwide. Even though Samruk Kazyna was founded in 2008, its genesis and conceptual roots date back to much earlier attempts of state-asset consolidation. It is crucial to keep in mind that earlier failed efforts of Kazakhstan's privatization resulted before the adoption and implementation of Kazakhstan's long-term strategies.

In addition, contextual economic indicators from World Bank and International Monetary Fund are used to situate reforms against output performance in the early transition and by the turn of the century. While some coincidence is apparent, it is not within the scope of this paper to argue that the causality can be attributed to Singapore-Kazakhstan relationship.

It is important to emphasize that this study does not seek to establish direct causal relationships between Singapore's experience and Kazakhstan's policy outcomes. Rather, it identifies patterns of influence, reference, and selective borrowing, acknowledging the complexity of post-Soviet transformation and the multiplicity of internal and external factors shaping reform trajectories.

Results

Elite learning and early diplomatic relations (1991-2003)

It can be argued that pre-independence engagement (1991) between Singapore and Kazakhstan was essential in forming Nazarbayev's vision for his country [6]. Based on the texts that he produced later, it is apparent that Nazarbayev was strongly influenced by Lee Kuan Yew. The Singapore leader's visit to Kazakhstan at Nazarbayev's invitation, therefore, established not only an advisory relationship centred on development strategy, but also a leadership strategy that focused on taking the country to the next level.

This meeting, however, was not immediately followed by leadership experience exchanges on government levels. Rather, this meeting may have served as a starting point that helped Kazakhstan to establish a role model for itself and shape it according to its own desires and imagination. True diplomatic relations were only established in 1993, when formal ties on 30 March 1993 institutionalized channels for government-to-government cooperation [6]. It is hard to establish without conducting interviews with former government officials if unofficial bureaucratic apparatus exchanges had taken place between 1993 and 1996, but the President of Kazakhstan took his official trip to Singapore only in 1996 and then once again in 2003.

Nazarbayev's two visits to Singapore have been documented by Singapore's Ministry of Foreign Affairs press statements and archival photographs. In these

visits, he combined investment promotion with policy learning. He spoke to Singapore's industry leaders at Raffles Hotel in 1996, using the platform to pitch Kazakhstan's business environment amid early privatization [7]. These interactions framed Singapore not as a template but as an exemplar of disciplined state capacity and investor-friendly governance, the very attributes that Kazakhstan sought to internalize during volatile transition years and that Nazarbayev, presumably, hoped his government officials would like to emulate.

Strategic narratives: the "Asian Snow Leopard" and reforms

In the 1997 *Kazakhstan 2030* address, N.Nazarbayev explicitly compared Kazakhstan's trajectory to that of the "Asian Tigers," translating the metaphor into the "Asian Snow Leopard" to fit national geography and identity. Irbis, the symbol used to advertise Strategy 2030 throughout the country, was a tiger (or a panther) with wings, not entirely a land animal in line with Singapore's symbolic Merlion, which is a mythical animal with the head of a lion and the body of a fish. The same strategic document, and later the 2012 "Kazakhstan 2050" Strategy reiterated the maxim "economy first, then politics". They provided rhetorical cover for prioritizing macroeconomic stabilization and administrative capacity before expansive political reform [4]. This maxim, too, echoed Lee Kuan Yew's "Asian democracy" approach, which favored economy and order over democracy and politics [8].

To be exact, Lee Kuan Yew received strong criticism from other governments and from academic circles for his unusual approach to democracy in Asia. He was suspected to be pursuing ulterior motives trying to justify paternalistic and illiberal culture that he was building in his country. Some could argue, therefore, that it is not surprising that such an approach would suit the needs of a former Soviet leader. However, it is difficult to make such value judgments, especially in retrospective. Nevertheless, it is clear that Nursultan Nazarbayev got significant inspiration from Lee Luan Yew and he did want his country to be as successful and well-known as Singapore on a world stage.

It is also possible to argue that Nazarbayev borrowed selectively from East and Southeast Asian experiences not only in his words, but also in his deeds. Throughout the 1990s Kazakhstan was attracting multinational corporations from all over the world to invest in its hydrocarbon and mining resources, but it was virtually holding no elections. Almost intentionally, the banking sector was lending money to corporations, but very few individuals were in debt, making them both economically and politically less aggressive. Therefore, when the Asian crisis hit Kazakhstan in 1998, households were affected less severely than enterprises. It is interesting that Singapore too engineered its economic system in such a way that people do not get overly stressed from mortgages and loans by heavily subsidizing social home ownership programs [9].

Once the narrative set and took hold, Singaporean practices gradually influenced Kazakhstan's government bureaucracy. In particular, Singapore's strict anti-corruption measures and professional civil service served as models for selective policy transfers in public administration. These reforms have taken place gradually, however, and may not have achieved the desired impact when it was necessary. For example, salaries of state employees in Kazakhstan remain low and competitive salaries have been offered only through designing special elite government service tracks, such as Korpus A. [10]. In Singapore, on the other hand, the government employees continued to enjoy high salaries and are nowadays considered among the most skilled in the world.

Selective policy transfer in public administration (1998-2001)

Even though there is no clear indication that Kazakhstan started its famous Bolashak Scholarship program following Singapore's example, it became one of the first programs that Nazarbayev supported in the country in order to train Kazakhstani students at the world's best universities. It was quite expensive by the standards of the 1990s economic indicators to afford education for the students abroad. Nevertheless, the scholarship proved to be quite popular in Kazakhstan and continues to train students throughout the world.

Influenced by international best practices in public administration, including those associated with Singapore's professional civil service, Kazakhstan established the Agency for Civil Service Affairs (ACSA) in 1998 as part of broader efforts to modernize its state apparatus. This institutional development was complemented by the creation of the Academy of Public Administration under the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan, which subsequently developed partnerships with a range of international institutions, including counterparts in Singapore. Such cooperation has been sustained over time and continues to contribute to capacity-building initiatives within the civil service.

Similarly, the establishment of Nazarbayev University in 2010 marked a further step toward the development of internationally oriented higher education in Kazakhstan. In collaboration with the Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy, the university founded the Graduate School of Public Policy, which introduced internationally informed curricula and training programs. The institution aims to prepare highly qualified specialists not only for public administration but also for the private sector, with an emphasis on ethical standards, policy analysis, and effective interaction with government institutions.

Available data indicate that a significant proportion of graduates from these programs pursue careers in the public sector, while others contribute to the private and non-governmental sectors, reflecting the broader objective of strengthening governance capacity and professional expertise across different spheres.

In 1999, the Government adopted the Law on Civil Service, instituting competitive recruitment and clearer distinctions between political and

administrative posts. These steps paralleled, in spirit, Singapore's emphasis on a merit-based corps with continuous training, albeit adapted to Kazakhstan's scale and legal context. In practice, however, language served to be somewhat of a barrier because full understanding of the Singaporean civil service training required the knowledge of English. Therefore, some civil service employees continued to be trained in Russian and it became popular to study on distance-learning programs at Russian Academy of Civil Service under the President of the Russian Federation. In fact, it became prestigious to study there and, based on empirical evidence, we can argue that nowadays a number of people in the government hold diplomas from the aforementioned institution.

Based on unforeseen corruption issues that arose in 1990s, Kazakhstan adopted a dedicated Law "On Combating Corruption" on 2 July 1998, one of the first such comprehensive statutes among post-Soviet states. While Singapore's Corrupt Practices Investigation Bureau model was not transplanted, the law embodied a strong normative signal and aligned with the government's state-capacity narrative [11]. The government did not, however, simply take preventive measures. Rather, from the late 1990s, and more systematically in the 2010s, in addition to their studies in educational institutions set up with Singapore programs in mind, Kazakh officials engaged in executive programs. Managed with Singapore's Civil Service College and the Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy (LKYSPP), these programs reinforced administrative norms associated with Singapore's governance model [12]. After the Government's adoption of such norms, state-owned companies followed Singapore's model as well. Many employees at state-owned companies have an opportunity to spend some time in Singapore and pass trainings if they request to do so.

Institutional borrowing in state asset management

By the mid-2000s, Kazakhstan consolidated major state enterprises into a holding vehicle that became Samruk Kazyna (2008), frequently compared with Singapore's Temasek for its activist portfolio management of national champions. Officials and analysts have acknowledged Temasek's influence on Kazakhstan's approach, even as differences in mandate and governance remained substantial [13]. Research and market commentary note, however, that unlike Temasek's commercially disciplined posture, Samruk Kazyna retained heavier policy functions and faced challenges with transparency and politicization, reflecting Kazakhstan's broader political economy [14].

Samruk Kazyna consolidated all important state assets under one umbrella and helped the government centralize its authority and power over the main drivers of Kazakhstan's economy. One disadvantage of such a structure is that government and management interests could be misaligned, since the government relies on public service professionals to represent their interests in a market economy. In addition, companies affiliated with Samruk Kazyna became donors to a lot of social commitments of the government. In a way, copying the structure of Temasek, but not being able to imitate

its efficiency could be one consequence of implementing Singaporean model in Kazakhstan.

Discussion

In the scholarly literature, it is widely noted that for Kazakhstan in the 1990s, “Singapore” functioned less as a coherent and fully transferable development model than as a set of selected policy practices, governance principles, and reform narratives [15-16]. Among the most salient elements were the emphasis on a meritocratic civil service, a strong commitment to anti-corruption measures, the active promotion of foreign investment, and the professionalization of state asset management [17,18]. These components were perceived as relatively adaptable instruments of governance that could be selectively incorporated without replicating Singapore’s broader institutional configuration. In this context, the principle “economy first, then politics,” articulated in Kazakhstan’s official policy discourse, contributed to legitimizing the prioritization of economic and administrative reforms. At the same time, this approach partially resonated with the sequencing of reforms observed in Singapore, thereby providing an external point of reference for domestic policy choices [4, 19].

At the same time, structural differences between Kazakhstan and Singapore were substantial. Kazakhstan is a large, landlocked country with a relatively low population density, a significant reliance on natural resources, and a legacy of Soviet industrial organization. In contrast, Singapore is a small, highly urbanized, and globally integrated economy with a strong emphasis on trade and services [20]. These differences imposed clear constraints on the direct transfer of policy instruments, particularly in areas such as the governance of state-owned enterprises and the implementation of meritocratic bureaucratic systems. Comparative research on policy transfer underscores that successful adaptation depends on institutional compatibility and contextualization, rather than on the mechanical replication of external models [21, 22].

Despite these limitations, engagement with the Singaporean experience contributed to the development of institutional capacity and to the consolidation of a reform-oriented policy discourse in Kazakhstan. Concepts such as “efficiency,” “meritocracy,” and “investment attractiveness” became embedded in official rhetoric and strategic documents and continued to shape policy discussions in subsequent periods.

Importantly, Singapore’s influence extended beyond the domain of economic interaction, which remained relatively limited, and assumed a symbolic dimension. In this regard, the concept of symbolic forms developed by Ernst Cassirer (1944) is instructive, as it suggests that certain states or models may acquire an expressive symbolic significance within collective imagination. From this perspective, Singapore functioned, to some extent, as an idealized reference

point for modernization in Kazakhstan, particularly in the formulation of long-term strategic visions such as the “Kazakhstan–2030” strategy. This symbolic role did not imply a neglect of contextual differences, but rather reflected an attempt to draw selectively on perceived best practices.

Given that Singapore played a relatively modest role in Kazakhstan’s early economic relations, its prominence as a referential model is particularly noteworthy. Interest in Singapore’s experience has persisted over time, including in the field of education. For instance, elements of so-called “Singapore Mathematics” have been introduced in some private educational institutions in Kazakhstan through cooperation with international educational providers. This suggests that the transfer of ideas and practices has extended beyond the sphere of public policy into broader social and institutional domains.

Conclusion

This article has examined the role of Singapore as a referential model in the early stages of Kazakhstan’s state formation, focusing on the 1990s and early 2000s. Drawing on primary policy documents, diplomatic records, and secondary literature, the study has demonstrated that Singapore did not serve as a blueprint for direct institutional replication. Instead, it functioned as a source of selectively interpreted policy ideas, administrative practices, and strategic narratives that informed Kazakhstan’s reform trajectory.

The analysis shows that the influence of Singapore was mediated through processes commonly described in the policy transfer literature as lesson-drawing and institutional adaptation. Rather than importing institutional arrangements wholesale, Kazakhstan engaged in a process of context-sensitive borrowing, incorporating selected elements - such as meritocratic civil service principles, anti-corruption measures, and approaches to state-led economic management - while adapting them to its own political, economic, and administrative environment. This finding is consistent with theoretical perspectives emphasizing that policy transfer is inherently constrained by institutional compatibility and domestic conditions.

At the same time, the study highlights the importance of symbolic and discursive dimensions of policy transfer. Singapore’s role extended beyond the practical adoption of governance mechanisms and contributed to the formation of a reform-oriented policy discourse in Kazakhstan. Concepts such as efficiency, meritocracy, and investment attractiveness became embedded in official rhetoric and strategic planning documents, reinforcing the legitimacy of prioritizing economic development and administrative capacity. In this regard, Singapore functioned not only as a practical reference but also as a symbolic benchmark of successful modernization.

Importantly, the article does not claim a direct causal relationship between Singapore's experience and Kazakhstan's reform outcomes. Instead, it identifies patterns of influence, association, and selective emulation within a broader context of post-Soviet transformation. Kazakhstan's development trajectory was shaped by a complex interaction of internal dynamics and multiple external influences, of which Singapore constituted only one - albeit significant - reference point.

The case of Kazakhstan contributes to the broader literature on comparative political economy and policy transfer by illustrating how states undergoing systemic transformation engage with external models in a pragmatic and non-linear manner. It demonstrates that policy transfer should be understood not as replication, but as a process of translation, reinterpretation, and adaptation, in which imported ideas are reshaped to fit local institutional realities.

More broadly, the findings suggest that the most enduring impact of external models lies not in the direct transplantation of institutions, but in their ability to shape policy paradigms, inform strategic thinking, and legitimize reform agendas. In this sense, Singapore's influence on Kazakhstan represents a case of indirect and ideational transfer, where the power of example operates through perception, narrative, and selective appropriation rather than formal institutional convergence.

Future research may further explore the long-term evolution of these transferred ideas, particularly in the context of subsequent reforms in public administration, state capitalism, and education policy. Comparative studies with other post-Soviet or resource-rich states could also help to clarify the conditions under which external models exert meaningful influence on domestic institutional development.

REFERENCES

- [1] Iglicka K. Are they fellow countrymen or not? The migration of ethnic Poles from Kazakhstan to Poland // *International Migration Review*. - 1998. - Vol. 32, № 4. - P. 995–1014.
- [2] Munro R. H. The Asian interior: China's waxing spheres of influence // *Orbis*. - 1994. - Vol. 38, № 4. - P. 585-606.
- [3] Press Statement: Photo exhibition and reception to celebrate the 20th Anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between Singapore and Kazakhstan, 16 May 2013 / Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Singapore. — URL: <https://www.mfa.gov.sg/Newsroom/Press-Statements-Transcripts-and-Photos/2013/05/MFA-Press-Statement-Photo-exhibition-and-reception-to-celebrate-the-20th-Anniversary-of-the-establishment>
- [4] Казахстан-2030: Процветание, безопасность и улучшение благосостояния всех казахстанцев: Послание Президента Республики Казахстан народу Казахстана. - 1997. - URL: <https://adilet.zan.kz/rus/docs/K970002030>

[5] Стратегия «Казakhstan–2050»: новый политический курс состоявшегося государства. - URL: <https://adilet.zan.kz/rus/docs/K1200002050>

[6] Press Statement: Visit of President Nursultan Nazarbayev of the Republic of Kazakhstan, 6–10 November 2003 / Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Singapore. - URL: <https://www.mfa.gov.sg/Newsroom/Press-Statements-Transcripts-and-Photos/2003/11/MFA-Press-Statement--Visit-of-President-Nursultan-Nazarbayev-of-the-Republic-of-Kazakhstan-6--10-Nov>

[7] Singapore, Kazakhstan leaders exchange letters to mark 25 years of diplomatic relations // The Straits Times. - URL: <https://www.straitstimes.com/singapore/singapore-kazakhstan-leaders-exchange-letters-to-mark-25-years-of-diplomatic-relations>

[8] Barr M. D. Lee Kuan Yew and the “Asian values” debate // Asian Studies Review. - 2000. - Vol. 24, № 3. - P. 309–334.

[9] Lee S. Y., Y- 2012. - Vol. 32, № 1. - P. 52–64.

[10] Asylbayeva A. S. Novaya model gosudarstvennoi sluzhby // Vestnik Instituta zakonodatelstva i pravovoi informatsii Respubliki Kazakhstan. -2013. - № 3 (31). - P. 209–214.

[11] Legislation of 11 countries members of Commonwealth of Independent States. - URL: <https://cis-legislation.com/index.fwx>

[12] The unusual partnership of Singapore, Kazakhstan // The Straits Times. - URL: <https://mahbubani.net/the-unusual-partnership-of-singapore-kazakhstan-opinion-news-top-stories-the-straits-times/>

[13] The Unusual Partnership of Singapore and Kazakhstan // The Astana Times. - 2015. - URL: <https://astanatimes.com/2015/08/the-unusual-partnership-of-singapore-and-kazakhstan/>

[14] Amanbekov T. The Implementation of the Singaporean Model in Kazakhstan: Applying or Appealing? - URL: <https://nur.nu.edu.kz/server/api/core/bitstreams/3936c4fb-bb35-4fb3-8bda-9bd465d7b005/content>

[15] Carroll T. Delusions of Development: The World Bank and the Post-Washington Consensus in Southeast Asia. - Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

[16] Stone D. Understanding the transfer of policy failure: bricolage, experimentalism and translation // Policy & Politics. - 2017. - Vol. 45, № 1. - P. 55–70.

[17] Quah J. S. T. Curbing Corruption in Asian Countries: An Impossible Dream? - Bingley: Emerald, 2010.

[18] Huff W. G. The developmental state, government, and Singapore's economic development since 1960 // World Development. - 1995. - Vol. 23, № 8. - P. 1421–1438.

[19] Rodan G. Transparency and Authoritarian Rule in Southeast Asia: Singapore and Malaysia. - London: Routledge, 2004.

[20] Kazakhstan: Country Economic Memorandum. - Washington, DC: World Bank, 2000.

[21] Dolowitz D. P., Marsh D. Learning from abroad: The role of policy transfer in contemporary policy-making // Governance. - 2000. - Vol. 13, № 1. - P. 5–24.

[22] Evans M. Policy transfer in critical perspective // Policy Studies. - 2009. - Vol. 30, № 3. - P. 243–268.

ҚАЗАҚСТАННЫҢ БАСТАПҚЫ МЕМЛЕКЕТТІК ҚАЛЫПТАСУЫНДАҒЫ СИНГАПУР ТӘЖІРИБЕСІ

***Чиникеев Т.О.¹, Макашева К.Н.²**

***^{1,2} Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан**

Аңдатпа. Бұл мақалада Сингапурдың 1990-жылдар мен 2000-жылдардың басында Қазақстанның даму стратегиясын қалыптастырудағы бағдар ретінде атқарған рөлі қарастырылады. Президенттік жолдаулар, дипломатиялық құжаттар және бағдарламалық материалдар сияқты бастапқы дереккөздерге, сондай-ақ академиялық әдебиеттерге сүйене отырып, зерттеу Сингапур тәжірибесінің Қазақстандағы мемлекеттік саясатты қалыптастыруға және институционалдық реформаларға ықпал ету арналарына талдау жасайды.

Мақалада екі ел арасындағы тікелей өзара іс-қимылдың шектеулі болғанына қарамастан, Сингапурдың табысты жаңғырту үлгісі ретінде маңызды орын алғаны көрсетіледі. Алайда ол толықтай көшірілетін модель ретінде емес, жекелеген басқару тәжірибелерінің көзі және реформаларды негіздеуші дискурстық құрал ретінде қызмет атқарды. Бұл ықпалдың негізгі элементтеріне меритократиялық мемлекеттік басқару, сыбайлас жемқорлыққа қарсы саясат, инвестицияларды тарту және экономикалық дамудың басымдығын айқындау жатады.

Сонымен қатар, елдердің ауқымы, экономикалық құрылымы және институционалдық ортасы арасындағы елеулі айырмашылықтар саясаттарды тікелей көшіру мүмкіндіктерін шектеді. Осыған байланысты Қазақстан сыртқы тәжірибенің жекелеген элементтерін ұлттық жағдайларға бейімдей отырып, селективті және икемді тәсілді қолданды. Зерттеу нәтижелері сыртқы үлгілердің ұзақ мерзімді даму стратегияларын қалыптастыруда әрі практикалық құрал, әрі бағдар ретінде қызмет ете алатынын көрсетеді.

Тірек сөздер: Қазақстан, Сингапур, саясат трансфері, мемлекеттік басқару, институционалдық реформалар, жаңғырту, даму стратегиясы, мемлекеттік басқару тәжірибелері

СИНГАПУРСКИЙ ОПЫТ В ФОРМИРОВАНИИ РАННЕЙ ГОСУДАРСТВЕННОСТИ КАЗАХСТАНА

* Чиникеев Т.О.¹, Макашева К.Н.²

^{*1,2} Казахский национальный университет имени Аль-Фараби,
Алматы, Казахстан

Аннотация. Данная статья рассматривает роль Сингапура как ориентира в процессе формирования стратегии развития Казахстана в 1990-е годы и начале 2000-х годов. На основе анализа первичных источников, включая президентские послания, дипломатические материалы и программные документы, а также академической литературы, исследуются каналы, через которые сингапурский опыт повлиял на формирование государственной политики и институциональных преобразований в Казахстане.

В статье показано, что, несмотря на ограниченный уровень прямого взаимодействия между двумя странами, Сингапур приобрёл значимое значение как пример успешной модернизации. При этом он выступал не столько в качестве целостной модели для воспроизведения, сколько как источник отдельных управленческих практик и легитимизирующий нарратив реформ. К числу таких элементов относятся меритократическое государственное управление, антикоррупционная политика, привлечение инвестиций и приоритет экономического развития.

В то же время существенные различия в масштабах, экономической структуре и институциональной среде ограничивали возможности прямого заимствования. В результате Казахстан реализовал селективный и адаптивный подход, интегрируя отдельные элементы внешнего опыта с учётом национального контекста. Полученные результаты демонстрируют, что внешние модели могут одновременно выступать как практические инструменты и ориентиры, влияющие на формирование долгосрочных стратегий развития.

Ключевые слова: Казахстан, Сингапур, модель развития, государственное управление, институциональные реформы, модернизация, стратегия развития, практики государственного управления

Received / Мақала түсті / Статья поступила: 14.02.2026.

Accepted / Жариялауға қабылданды / Принята к публикации: 27.03.2026.

Information about the authors:

Chinikayev T.O. – PhD student, Educational program “International Relations”, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan, <https://orcid.org/0009-0000-7849-0191>, e-mail: talgatch@gmail.com

Makasheva K.N. – Professor of the Department of International Relations and World Economy, Faculty of International Relations, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1856-1888>, e-mail: klara.makasheva55@gmail.com

Авторлар туралы мәлімет:

Чиникеев Т.О. – PhD докторант, «Халықаралық қатынастар» білім беру бағдарламасы, Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан, <https://orcid.org/0009-0000-7849-0191>, e-mail: talgatch@gmail.com

Макашева К.Н. – Халықаралық қатынастар және әлемдік экономика кафедрасының профессоры, Халықаралық қатынастар факультеті, Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1856-1888>, e-mail: klara.makasheva55@gmail.com

Информация об авторах:

Чиникеев Т.О. – PhD докторант, образовательная программа «Международные отношения», Казахский национальный университет имени Аль-Фараби, Алматы, Казахстан, <https://orcid.org/0009-0000-7849-0191>, e-mail: talgatch@gmail.com

Макашева К.Н. – профессор кафедры международных отношений и мировой экономики, факультет международных отношений, Казахский национальный университет имени Аль-Фараби, Алматы, Казахстан, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1856-1888>, e-mail: klara.makasheva55@gmail.com