

The Global Survey of Public Servants: Evidence from 1,300,000 Public Servants in 1,300 Government Institutions in 23 Countries

Christian Schuster¹ | Kim Sass Mikkelsen² | Daniel Rogger³ |
Francis Fukuyama⁴ | Zahid Hasnain³ | Dinsha Mistree⁵ | Jan Meyer-Sahling⁶ |
Katherine Bersch⁷ | Kerensa Kay³

¹School of Public Policy, University College London, London, UK

²Roskilde University, Roskilde, Denmark

³World Bank, Washington, DC, USA

⁴Freeman Spogli Institute for International Studies, Stanford University, Stanford, California, USA

⁵Hoover Institution and Law School, Stanford University, Stanford, California, USA

⁶University of Nottingham, Nottingham, UK

⁷Davidson College, Davidson, North Carolina, USA

Correspondence

Daniel Rogger, World Bank, Washington, DC, USA.

Email: drogger@worldbank.org

Abstract

Understanding how public administrations around the world function and differ is crucial for strengthening their effectiveness. Most comparative measures of bureaucracy rely on surveys of experts, households, or firms, rather than directly questioning bureaucrats. Direct surveys of public officials create granular data for analysis and government action, so are becoming a cornerstone of public sector management. This article introduces the Global Survey of Public Servants (GSPS), a global initiative to collect and harmonize large-scale, comparable survey data on public servants. The corresponding GSPS data set currently contains responses from 1,300,000 + bureaucrats in 1,300+ government institutions in 23 countries. The surveys measure both employee attitudes (such as job satisfaction and motivation), and their experience with management practices (such as recruitment and performance management). This harmonized data enables governments to benchmark themselves and scholars to study comparative public administration and the state differently, based on micro-data from actors who experience government first-hand.

Evidence for practice

- As a step towards strengthened availability of harmonized but granular data on public administration around the world, the Global Survey of Public Servants (GSPS) brings together surveys based on responses from over 1,300,000 public servants in over 1,300 government institutions in 23 countries. The intention of the GSPS is to encourage further surveying of public officials, in a consistent way where possible, and the sharing of that survey data for the benefit of researchers and public sector managers around the world.
- By implementing the Global Survey of Public Servants core module, governments can generate comparable data on their public service. This facilitates the benchmarking of units, organizations, and the service as a whole to international comparators in key management practices and employee attitudes, such as job satisfaction or work motivation.
- The Global Survey of Public Servants also enables governments to compare the methodological choices they have made in their survey approach to other surveys and better appreciate the trade-offs of those choices. As such, the GSPS hopes to strengthen the quality of public servant survey data, and in turn the understanding of strategic areas for development inside public administration. By improving the quality of benchmarks across different institutions inside government and across different groups of public servants (e.g., comparing public servants of different gender or ranks), government's capacity to strengthen itself is improved.

This is an open access article under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/) License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited and is not used for commercial purposes.

© 2023 The Authors. *Public Administration Review* published by Wiley Periodicals LLC on behalf of American Society for Public Administration.

INTRODUCTION: MEASUREMENT IN COMPARATIVE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AND THE GLOBAL SURVEY OF PUBLIC SERVANTS

How governments are administered is a critical determinant of socio-economic outcomes (see, classically, Evans & Rauch, 1999). Understanding how public administrations function and differ around the world is crucial for identifying the drivers of successful administrations. This poses an immediate measurement challenge: how can differences between public administrations be effectively measured? Within government, this question has often been answered through the direct, qualitative sharing of experience between officials in administrations targeted as “similar.” Such an approach does not directly address comparability concerns and suffers from limiting the scale of comparisons.

The response in widely used quantitative indicators such as the Worldwide Governance Indicators and Corruption Perceptions Index has been by surveying experts, households, and firms, and constructing country-level governance indicators based on their responses (Transparency International, 2021; World Bank, 2022). These indicators have made important contributions to our understanding of comparative public administration by quantifying perceptions of experts and of those interacting with government (such as citizens and firms) around the world.

However, a long list of scholarly criticisms of these indicators exists (see, classically, Arndt & Oman, 2006). To name just three of these criticisms: perceptual biases can thwart comparability across countries. For instance, partisan biases shape the perceptions of citizens and firms of governance (Agerberg, 2022). Country-level governance indicators also suffer from a level of analysis problem. Differences within countries across organizations are often larger than cross-country differences (Meyer-Sahling et al., 2018), and country-level scores are often not informative to understand cross-country differences in functionally equivalent organizations (Gingerich, 2013). Finally, country-level governance indicators are typically not actionable. For instance, a composite score on “government effectiveness” tells governments little about what and where to improve (Arndt & Oman, 2006).

Existing measures of comparative bureaucracy are not based on the experiences and perceptions of bureaucrats themselves. This article introduces the Global Survey of Public Servants (GSPS), a global initiative to harmonize large-scale comparable micro-survey data from public servants around the world (accessible at: <https://www.globalsurveyofpublicservants.org/>). The GSPS was founded by the authors of this article—researchers at or affiliated with the World Bank Bureaucracy Lab, the Stanford University Governance Project, University College London, and Nottingham University. The intention of the GSPS is first off simply to encourage further surveying of public officials

around the world. The second intention is to foster data collection that is consistent across countries where possible. And third, it hopes to support the sharing of that survey data for the benefit of public sector managers and researchers around the world.

To contextualize the GSPS, this article introduces the conceptual framework of the survey, which reflects the dual academic-practitioner aims of the initiative. The GSPS's objective is to improve the scholarly understanding of how public administrations and states around the world work and to help governments manage public servants better. The article then details the methodological approach of the GSPS and current state of play of the GSPS dataset (accessible at: <https://www.globalsurveyofpublicservants.org/indicators/>). Third, we provide illustrations of how scholars can use the GSPS data to study core topics in comparative public administration differently. Last, we show how GSPS indicators correlate at the country-level with one of the most widely used set of governance indicators, the Worldwide Governance Indicators (Kaufmann et al., 2010).

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK OF THE GSPS

By making public much of the survey data we—and governments—have collected, we have faced the challenges of integrating surveys that were not always implemented with integration in mind. By including a core module of questions consistent across settings and enumerating it to a similar set of central administrators in our own surveys, the scope of integration is increased. Towards this end, we have developed a conceptual framework to define the topics and questions we include in this core module.

The conceptual framework of the Global Survey reflects its dual aims: to better understand how public administrations work, and to provide actionable evidence to governments to improve management of public servants. To this end, the core questionnaire of the Global Survey contains measures that reflect core scholarly interests in comparative public administration on the one hand, and government interests on the other.

As further detailed in Mikkelsen et al. (2021), from a scholarly perspective, our core questionnaire follows public administration literature in focusing on assessing “ideal types” of modes of governing—“the actual operating modes and administrative arrangements by which rulers govern” (Roth, 1968, 156). We distinguish and measure in the GSPS indicators related to three “ideal types”: patrimonialism, Weberian bureaucracy, and (new) public management.¹

Weber (1978) coined the term ‘patrimonialism’ for an administrative system in which rulers treat the state as private property and govern it as ‘patrons’ through informal connections with—and loyalty and reciprocity of—public employees (their ‘clients’). Patterns of (neo) patrimonial rule persist in many countries in the global

south in particular (cf. Fukuyama, 2004), underscoring the conceptual importance of patrimonialism for a GSPS. What then are the key concepts for measurement in a survey of public servants that derive from patrimonial rule? In terms of management practices, politicization and ‘personalization’ (nepotism) are central: personnel decisions—such as recruitment or promotions—are decided on political and personal (family and friends) criteria. In terms of employee attitudes and behaviors, corruption (the abuse of public office for private gain) and clientelism (the exchange of state resources for electoral support) stand out—so much so that patrimonialism (or patronage) is often equated with both (Rothstein & Varraich, 2017).

Weber’s (1978) bureaucratic ideal-type was designed as an antidote to neopatrimonialism: bureaucrats were to become autonomous from political (or other particularistic) influences through merit examinations, job stability, seniority-based promotions, and sufficient pay to reduce corruption to supplement incomes. This was complemented by hierarchy and detailed rules, in line with a Rechtsstaat ideal (cf. Olsen, 2006). This set of administrative characteristics was intended to foster key (Weberian) employee attitudes: an *esprit de corps*, impartiality, political neutrality, integrity, rule following, and expertise. Our core questionnaire thus includes their measurement.

While Weberian bureaucracy was an antidote to patrimonialism, it created problems of its own; in particular, a lack of incentives to perform and innovate (Osborne & Gaebler, 1992). New Public Management (NPM) sought to address these (Hood, 1991). While the term has competing conceptualizations (Dunleavy et al., 2006), at its core it is a “doctrine that the public sector can be improved [through] business concepts, techniques and values” (Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2011). For personnel management, this implied a shift to performance: the setting of targets, the measurement of their achievement, and the incentivization of public servants to achieve those targets, for instance through performance pay, temporary job contracts, and autonomy to innovate (Osborne & Gaebler, 1992). These management practices were to foment a series of favorable employee attitudes and behaviors—such as work motivation, innovation, and performance orientation. Again, our core questionnaire therefore includes their measurement.

Our core survey thus includes measures that capture key characteristics of patrimonialism, Weberian bureaucracy, and New Public Management. They enable scholars to understand to what extent governments and different institutions inside government blend different elements of these “ideal-types.”

At the same time, to further ensure our results are actionable, the GSPS module also contains measures that are core to governmental interests when governments themselves undertake surveys of public servants. To identify these measures, we reviewed the topics covered by six governments which regularly conduct government-wide employee surveys: the United States, Canada,

Australia, the United Kingdom, Colombia, and Ireland (see Mikkelsen et al., 2021, for details of this review). Our review finds that governments measure an overlapping set of management practices and employee attitudes. For instance, in terms of employee attitudes, all governments measure employee engagement and organizational commitment, and all but one measure job satisfaction and turnover intention. In terms of management practices, all governments measure employee perceptions of pay, leadership, and performance management. To ensure we measure indicators of practitioner interest, we thus include in the Global Survey core module those measures which at least five out of six reviewed governments include in their surveys.

Comparing measures included in government employee surveys and measures of core scholarly interest in academic models of governance, there is some overlap—for instance around performance management or career commitment of public servants. There is also divergence, however, with government employee surveys giving greater pride of place to concepts that are core to organizational psychology—such as job satisfaction or engagement—but seldom referenced in academic “ideal types” of public sector governance; and academic ‘ideal types’ giving greater place to management practices—such as merit recruitment—which are less consistently covered in government employee surveys.

To ensure our core module is of interest to both scholars and practitioners, our conceptual framework (and the GSPS core module) thus cover both (see Figure 1). This leads to a questionnaire with 46 questions and a running time of 10 (online) and 15 (in-person) minutes respectively.

METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH OF THE GSPS

Surveying public servants around the world poses an immediate comparability challenge: how to ensure that survey responses can be compared across countries? We take several duties of care, while also being explicit about the limitations of our data. Our intention is also that over time, the initiative will improve the core comparability of the measures as well as learn more about the validity of comparing measures over time, space, and setting.

First, in terms of duties of care, our surveys are conducted with comparable survey population frames. All surveys included in the GSPS target public servants in a broad range of central government institutions—or, in short, central government bureaucrats. Our data does not contain responses from frontline officials such as teachers or doctors, in part as other efforts—such as the OECD Talis survey (OECD, 2018)—focus on them.

Second, we invite a census or representative sample of bureaucrats in all or a subset of central government institutions in each country to respond to the survey (rather than, e.g., a convenience sample). In a number of cases where

Topic	Academic Models	Employee Surveys
Management practices (and other inputs)		
Job autonomy / Level of supervision	X	
Job stability	X	
Meritocracy / Politicization / Nepotism	X	
Pay sufficiency and structure	X	X
Performance management	X	X
Promotions and career development	X	X
Communication and information		X
Leadership		X
Resources (e.g. materials, equipment)		X
Teamwork practices		X
Training and skill development		X
Work-life balance policies		X
Bureaucratic attitudes and behaviors		
Expertise / Competence	X	
Performance orientation / Rule following	X	
Political clientelism / Impartiality / Autonomy / neutrality	X	
Public service identification / Motivation	X	
Work motivation	X	
Corruption / Integrity	X	X
Innovation / Rule following	X	X
Turnover / Career intentions	X	X
Job engagement		X
Job satisfaction		X
Organizational commitment		X

FIGURE 1 Core concepts measured in the global survey of public servants. *Source:* Meyer-Sahling et al. (n.d.)

comparable sub-national surveys of public administrators were conducted, we include this data in the initiative's data release. However, the core rationale for inclusion is that the survey has a central government component.

Third, we conducted over 150 cognitive interviews with public servants across countries in which we fielded surveys to develop our measures and safeguard a comparable understanding of measures across countries.

Fourth, we combine in our questionnaire established measures in the literature where available (e.g., for job satisfaction) with measures developed by ourselves where needed (e.g., to measure whether respondents were hired based on merit). We drew on the aforementioned cognitive interviews and a measurement validation framework (Mikkelsen et al., n.d.) to develop these measures, and continue to undertake methodological work for further questionnaire improvement (cf. Rogger & Schuster, 2023).

Our current dataset brings together responses from over 1,300,000 public servants in over 1,300 government institutions in 23 countries in the Americas, Europe, Africa, and Asia (Table 1). The dataset comprises surveys


conducted by the authors in 18 countries, as well as published data from 5 countries that conduct their own surveys (United Kingdom, United States, Australia, Canada, and Colombia). As a result—and as some of our surveys were conducted by GSPS members before our core module was finalized—the country coverage of different indicators varies. Figures 2 to 11 in this manuscript thus have varying country coverage (we always show the full set of countries available for an indicator).

Our online dashboard on <https://www.globalsurveyofpublicservants.org/indicators/> enables scholars to compare countries and to assess within-country variation in each indicator—for instance across institutions or demographic groups (e.g., by gender or age group). The data can also be downloaded (at the country, organizational, and demographic group level) with confidence intervals (see <https://www.globalsurveyofpublicservants.org/datadownloads/>).

Before providing illustrative insights based on the indicators to motivate future scholarly work, several caveats about cross-country comparisons using the data are due.

TABLE 1 Current country coverage of the global survey of public servants.

Country	Mode	Year	# of institutions	# of respondents	Response rate	Conducted by
Australia	Online	2019	102	104,471	77%	National government
Canada	Online	2019	86	182,306	62.30%	National government
Chile	Online	2019	66	26,106	43.70%	GSPS
Colombia	Online	2019	202	25,082	95.20%	National government
Ethiopia	In-person	2016	78	2195	99.50%	GSPS
Ghana	In-person	2018	51	3343	95%	GSPS
Albania	Online	2017	17	3690	47%	GSPS
Brazil	Online	2017	18	3992	11%	GSPS
Estonia	Online	2017	49	3555	25%	GSPS
Kosovo	Online	2017	62	2465	14%	GSPS
Croatia	Online	2017	64	6711	18%	GSPS
Slovakia	Online	2017	100	10,817	33%	GSPS
Guatemala	In-person	2019	18	3670	96%	GSPS
Indonesia	In-person	2012	15	3903	83%	GSPS
Liberia	In-person	2016	32	2790	92%	GSPS
Lithuania	In-person (via video)	2021	11	956	83%	GSPS
Nigeria	In-person	2010	94	5630	100%	GSPS
Philippines	In-person	2014	7	2573	100%	GSPS
Romania	In-person + online	2019	81	6037	92% (In-person), 24% online	GSPS
United Kingdom	Online	2019	106	308,556	67%	National government
Ukraine	Online	2018	15	1802	43%	GSPS
United States	Online	2019	45	615,395	42.60%	National government
Uruguay	Online	2021	20	10,232	29%	GSPS
Total			1339	1,336,227	63%	

**FIGURE 2** Performance pay, by country (% of public servants indicating that work performance is important for pay rises). *Source:* Fukuyama et al. (n.d.).

First, survey modes across countries differed, ranging from in-person to online to phone. Our evidence suggests cross-country comparisons are nonetheless possible. Several of us conducted a field experiment in Romania, in which we randomly assigned respondents to complete our survey online or in-person. We found only small mode effects for national averages (Han et al., 2023).

Second, response rates across countries differed, from 11% to 95%. Our evidence suggests cross-country comparisons are nonetheless possible. In a field experiment in Romania, we found that varying response rates to an online survey across organizations did not have substantive effects on means (relative to an in-person survey with consistently high response rates across organizations) (Han et al., 2023).

Third, while our survey populations were consistently central government bureaucrats, practical constraints in collaborating with different governments on the survey implies that the precise set of institutions included in central government varies across countries, as does the coverage of central government institutions. Differences in country means might thus reflect differences in organizational coverage inside governments, though—as a criterion for inclusion into the dataset—we surveyed a broad range of central government institutions.

Fourth, for some of the measures, there are differences in precise wording or scales of survey measures—in particular for measures for which our cross-country coverage extends to governments implementing their own surveys. The dashboard and dataset make these differences explicit, for instance by showing the exact question text (translated into English) when hovering over indicators. Wording differences—where applicable—should be kept in mind when comparing country means.

Last, despite a large set of cognitive interviews, we cannot rule out that cross-country differences stem from differences in language, social desirability biases or meaning across countries (cf. Jilke et al., 2015). Particularly culturally sensitive concepts—such as public service motivation—may suffer from scalar non-invariance (Mikkelsen et al., 2021). They thus require more care when interpreting cross-country differences than factual questions in our questionnaire (such as whether respondents had a performance evaluation in the last 2 years).

Although these are important limitations to keep in mind, they of course equally affect many other approaches to constructing cross-country governance indicators. In an expert survey, for instance, experts cannot be randomly sampled, respond to questions in different languages, and might exhibit different social desirability biases, among others. We thus believe that our approach nonetheless adds to the available landscape of cross-country governance indicators, and with more granularity than most existing indicators. Moreover, as the initiative develops and the core module is included in a wider range of surveys, some of the abovementioned concerns will be reduced.

USES OF THE GSPS

How can the GSPS enrich the study of comparative public administration? To illustrate their utility, this section sketches out six possible uses of the indicators.

First, the indicators can be used to nuance popular global stereotypes—at times reflected in the literature—about bureaucracies. One such stereotype is that bureaucrats around the world lack performance incentives: their work effort is not rewarded with, for instance, better pay or greater promotion prospects (see, classically, Osborne & Gaebler, 1992). The data from the GSPS suggest important nuances to this stereotype. In line with conventional wisdom, only a minority of public servants—31% on average across countries in our sample—believes that work performance matters for pay rises (Figure 2).

However, contrary to stereotypes about bureaucracies, a majority—70% on average in our sample—believes that their work performance has at least some importance for their promotion prospects (Figure 3). Public servants may not be as deprived of performance incentives as stereotypes presume, at least in the countries that we analyze.

Second, the GSPS can—with the appropriate caveats noted above including those related to variation in exact question wording and scale—help understand sharp differences in employee attitudes and management practices across countries. For instance, as illustrated in Figure 4, the share of respondents indicating that it would be difficult to dismiss them or public servants generally varies between 21% (Slovakia) to 70% (Brazil). These results suggest sharp differences in the perceived job stability of bureaucrats across countries.

Third, the GSPS indicators can enable scholars to understand change over time in recruitment practices in governments, by assessing how recruitment practices interact with years of service of public servants.² To illustrate, Figure 5 plots the share of public servants indicating that they found out about their public sector job through a public advertisement in several countries (Chile, Croatia, Romania, Estonia), by years of service of public servants. It shows that in a range of countries, the share of public




FIGURE 3 Performance-based promotions, by country (% of public servants indicating that work performance is important for promotion prospects). Source: Fukuyama et al. (n.d.).




FIGURE 4 Job stability by country (% of public servants agreeing that it would be difficult to dismiss them/public servants). *Source:* Fukuyama et al. (n.d.).




FIGURE 5 Recruitment through job advertisements in select countries, by years of service of public servants (% of public servants indicating they found out about their first public sector job vacancy through an advertisement). *Source:* Fukuyama et al. (n.d.).

servants finding out about their first public sector job through an advertisement (e.g., newspaper, government website) has increased sharply. For instance, in Chile, only 18% of public servants recruited more than 20 years ago learned about their first public sector job through an advertisement, relative to 44% of public servants recruited in the last decade. With jobs being publicly advertised rather than only disseminated through word of mouth, transparency in public sector recruitment has arguably increased in these countries, at least in terms of vacancy dissemination. Our data can thus also help assess changes in civil service management and reforms where applicable.

Fourth, the GSPS indicators can shed light on variation across countries in the nature and internal organization of the state, for instance in how centralized or decentralized civil services are. To illustrate, Figures 6 and 7 compare variation across organizations inside the governments of Albania and Croatia in pay competitiveness (measured by whether respondents agree that it would be easy for them to find a private sector job that pays better). In Albania, variation in pay competitiveness with the private sector across organizations is relatively limited, with the share of respondents indicating that it would be easy for

them to find a better-paid private sector job ranging from 42% to 64% (Figure 6).

By contrast, in Croatia, this share varies much more sharply across organizations, between 6% and 92% (Figure 7). It reflects much greater decentralization of pay setting in Croatia than in Albania, with different government organizations in Croatia in some cases counting on separate pay regulations.

The granular nature of our data thereby allows further nuance in understanding the (de)centralized nature of the state. For instance, within Albania, pay setting is relatively homogenous across institutions, while, in practice, recruitment practices vary sharply. To illustrate, the share of public servants indicating that they were assessed by a written exam in their initial recruitment to the public sector varies across organizations in Albania between 21% and 73% (Figure 8), reflecting the requirement for civil servants to pass a centrally administered exam but not for employees of institutions regulated by the labor code. In other words, within countries, some civil service management practices are more centralized while others vary sharply across institutions. The GSPS indicators provide granular data across countries to help scholars study and understand these nuances.




FIGURE 6 (Lack of) pay competitiveness in Albania, by organization (% of public servants indicating it would be easy for them to find a private sector job that pays better). *Source:* Fukuyama et al. (n.d.).




FIGURE 7 (Lack of) pay competitiveness in Croatia, by organization (% of public servants indicating it would be easy for them to find a private sector job that pays better). *Source:* Fukuyama et al. (n.d.).




FIGURE 8 Merit recruitment in Albania, by organization (% of public servants indicating being assessed through a written exam in their public sector recruitment). *Source:* Fukuyama et al. (n.d.).

The perspective of the GSPS is that cross-country analysis and a deeper dive into the variation exhibited across institutions within a single country are complementary lenses by which researchers and public sector managers can understand a specific public administration. Figure 9 showcases how national averages (darker blue bars) for satisfaction of public servants with their salaries compares across countries. The figure then overlays these national averages with the distribution of salary satisfaction across

organizations, using the example of the UK civil service (lighter blue bars). The figure showcases how organizations inside the government compare with a global distribution of salary satisfaction. The ability to benchmark against other country averages highlights important challenges in some UK government organizations with pay satisfaction. As such, benchmarking across countries can be an input to an improved understanding of the variation observed within a single government.




FIGURE 9 Salary satisfaction in the United Kingdom, by country and organization (% of public servants indicating that they are satisfied with their salary).




FIGURE 10 Pay satisfaction, by country and gender (% of public servants agreeing they are satisfied with their pay and/or total benefits). *Source:* Fukuyama et al. (n.d.).

Beyond helping scholars understand heterogeneity inside government across institutions, the GSPS indicators also enable scholars to study how the experience of different demographic groups of public servants varies across countries—for instance in terms of generational differences, rank differences, differences by contract type of employees, or gender differences. To illustrate, Figure 10 splits pay satisfaction of public servants by gender within each country. The graph shows that gender differences in pay satisfaction are relatively small in many countries. Yet the figure also shows that in some governments—such as Ethiopia—significantly more female employees are satisfied with their pay, whereas in others—such as Slovakia—significantly more men are satisfied with their pay.

The data thus enable scholars to understand systematically how sociodemographic factors like gender differences vary systematically across countries—from employee attitudes such as motivation or job satisfaction, to perceptions of male and female employees of management practices such as leadership. Observing these differences, scholars may seek explanations for why, in some countries, men or women respond more favorably than in others. To our knowledge, this research endeavor—exploring variation across countries in the experience of different demographic groups of public

servants—was previously not feasible for scholars at scale.

Finally—and perhaps most straightforwardly—our indicators may also help scholars implementing surveys of public servants in specific countries understand how their case countries are similar or different from others in the world in employee attitudes or management practices. We hope the indicators can thus lead to more empirically grounded case selection and generalizability discussions in country-specific research.

RELATING THE GSPS TO OTHER GOVERNANCE INDICATORS

How do existing composite governance indicators relate to the GSPS indicators? To illustrate, consider, first, the relation between GSPS indicators and the widely used Worldwide Governance Indicators (World Bank, 2022). We do not intend the comparison to be a “validation” exercise, but rather an exploration of the linkages between the GSPS data and the existing literature. Figure 11 provides scatterplots showing the relationship at the country-level between three GSPS indicators—work motivation, pay satisfaction, and perceived job stability of public servants—and the two indicators from the




FIGURE 11 Global survey of public servants country indicators versus worldwide governance indicators.

Worldwide Governance Indicators that arguably most closely relate to public administration: Government Effectiveness and Control of Corruption.

The graphs show that different GSPS indicators correlate differently with Government Effectiveness and Control of Corruption. Greater work motivation of public servants is positively correlated with both greater government effectiveness ($r = 0.47$) and better control of corruption ($r = 0.35$) (greater work motivation is measured by whether public servants agree that they are willing to go the extra mile or perform tasks that are not really required from them, among others). By contrast, pay satisfaction of public servants is negatively—albeit weakly so—correlated with both governance indicators, whereas perceived job stability is (weakly) positively related with corruption control, but negatively related to government effectiveness.

Although these are merely suggestive correlations (which might additionally be affected by differences in wording across countries), they do underscore that the Global Survey can uncover differences in nuanced characteristics of public administration across countries and enable scholars to explore their relevance for governance outcomes in a way that composite governance indicators cannot and do not predict (as different employee attitudes and management practices in the GSPS indicators are differentially correlated with composite governance scores³).

CONCLUSIONS AND OUTLOOK

How do civil service management practices differ within and across governments? How do core attitudes of public servants—such as their motivation or satisfaction—differ

within and across governments? This article introduces the GSPS, which enables scholars to draw on micro-data from public servants around the world to understand these key questions in comparative public administration.

The GSPS can help scholars explore stereotypes about public administrations, assess changes in civil service recruitment, and understand the internal dynamics of governments. For instance, in terms of heterogeneity across institutions, across indicators of public service management, and across demographic groups. They also enable scholars to compare public administrations around the world (with due limitations about measurement invariance and differences in languages and question wording among others kept in mind).

Existing composite governance scores are less resource intensive to collect and will continue to have advantages in terms of cross-country and intertemporal coverage. At the same time, where the GSPS is implemented, it arguably brings greater nuance and actionability than composite governance scores by enabling more disaggregated assessments of specific management practices in specific organizations or for specific groups of public servants inside government. We are thus confident that the GSPS contributes to the growing set of micro datasets available to study governments around the world (cf. Baig et al., 2021; Charron et al., 2021; Fazekas & Czibik, 2021), and offers a sea change in micro data availability to study comparative civil service management and organizational behavior in particular.

Although this article presented the current state of play of the GSPS, the GSPS co-founders (the co-authors of this piece) will continue to conduct surveys of public servants with governments around the world and work with governments which already implement surveys to align their measures with the GSPS core questionnaire module.

We also have pending requests with several governments to incorporate their employee survey data into the GSPS. As such, we hope that the GSPS dataset—and its utility to scholars—will further grow over time in coverage and comparability. We hope other scholars may join the effort, and we are keen to collaborate with colleagues seeking to conduct government-wide surveys of public servants in countries not currently covered by the GSPS. We also highlight the need for undertaking further methodological validation work on the GSPS indicators and on the measurement of public administration more generally (cf. Rogger and Schuster, 2023).

Understanding the functioning of public administration is complicated by the lack of objective benchmarks in much government activity. Micro-data on the experience of public servants of their work contributes to a more granular approach to understanding the state despite this, and coherence in that data across organizations and countries facilitates more precise comparative work. Our hope is that the GSPS is a step toward each of these aims, and toward a stronger study of the public service.

ENDNOTES

- ¹ These are, of course, not the only ideal-types advanced by scholars. Since the 1990s, a number of others—such as network governance or ‘digital era governance’—have been posited (Dunleavy et al., 2006). None of them have been as ‘dominant’ a model as the three we measure, however (Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2011).
- ² This is suggestive only, as it is based on responses from public servants who were recruited in the past but remain in public service at the time of the survey. Given the low rate of turnover in many public services, however, this may be more credible an exercise than in a comparable private sector setting.
- ³ Composite governance scores draw, of course, from underlying indicators. Yet, these are themselves typically aggregated. ‘Government Effectiveness’, for instance, aggregates indicators such as ‘Quality of public administration’ or ‘Institutional effectiveness’ (World Bank, 2022).

REFERENCES

- Agerberg, Mattias. 2022. “Corrupted Estimates? Response Bias in Citizen Surveys on Corruption.” *Political Behavior* 44(2): 653–78. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11109-020-09630-5>.
- Arndt, Christiane, and Charles Oman. 2006. *Uses and Abuses of Governance Indicators*. Paris: OECD Development Centre https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/development/uses-and-abuses-of-governance-indicators_9789264026865-en.
- Baig, Faisal Ali, Xu Han, Zahid Hasnain, and Daniel Rogger. 2021. “Introducing the Worldwide Bureaucracy Indicators: A New Global Dataset on Public Sector Employment and Compensation.” *Public Administration Review* 81(3): 564–71. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13355>.
- Charron, Nicholas, Victor Lapuente, and Monika Bauhr. 2021. *Sub-National Quality of Government in EU Member States: Presenting the 2021 European Quality of Government Index and its Relationship with Covid-19 Indicators*. QoG The Quality of Government Institute Working Paper Series 4. Gothenburg, Sweden: University of Gothenburg <http://hdl.handle.net/2077/68410>.
- Dunleavy, Patrick, Helen Margetts, Simon Bastow, and Jane Tinkler. 2006. “New Public Management Is Dead—Long Live Digital-Era Governance.” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 16(3): 467–94. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mui057>.
- Evans, Peter, and James E. Rauch. 1999. “Bureaucracy and Growth: A Cross-National Analysis of the Effects of ‘Weberian’ State Structures on Economic Growth.” *American Sociological Review* 64(5): 748–65. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2657374>.
- Fazekas, Mihály, and Ágnes Czibik. 2021. “Measuring Regional Quality of Government: The Public Spending Quality Index Based on Government Contracting Data.” *Regional Studies* 55(8): 1459–72. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00343404.2021.1902975>.
- Fukuyama, Francis. 2004. *State-Building: Governance and World Order in the 21st Century*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Francis Fukuyama, Daniel Rogger, Zahid Hasnain, Katherine Bersch, Dinsha Mistree, Christian Schuster, Mikkelsen, Kim Sass, Kerenssa Kay, and Jan-Hinrik Meyer-Sahling. n.d. Forthcoming. *Global Survey of Public Servants Indicators*. Available at: <https://www.globalsurveyofpublicservants.org/indicators/>.
- Gingerich, Daniel W. 2013. “Governance Indicators and the Level of Analysis Problem: Empirical Findings from South America.” *British Journal of Political Science* 43(3): 505–40. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0007123412000403>.
- Han, Xu, Camille Parker, Daniel Rogger, and Christian Schuster. 2023. “Determining Survey Modes and Response Rates: Do Public Servants Respond Differently to Online and In-Person Surveys?” In *The Government Analytics Handbook: Leveraging Data to Strengthen Public Administration*, edited by Daniel Rogger and Christian Schuster, Chap. 20. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Hood, Christopher. 1991. “A Public Management for All Seasons?” *Public Administration* 69(1): 3–19. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9299.1991.tb00779.x>.
- Jilke, Sebastian, Bart Meuleman, and Steven Van de Walle. 2015. “We Need to Compare, but How? Measurement Equivalence in Comparative Public Administration.” *Public Administration Review* 75(1): 36–48. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12318>.
- Kaufmann, Daniel, Aart Kraay, and Massimo Mastruzzi. 2010. *The Worldwide Governance Indicators: Methodology and Analytical Issues*. World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 5430. Washington, DC: World Bank. Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=1682130>.
- Meyer-Sahling, Jan-Hinrik, Christian Schuster, and Kim Sass Mikkelsen. 2018. *Civil Service Management in Developing Countries: What Works? Evidence from a Survey with 23,000 Civil Servants in Africa, Asia, Eastern Europe, and Latin America*. Report prepared for the UK-Department for International Development (DFID).
- Meyer-Sahling, Jan-Hinrik, Dinsha Mistree, Kim Mikkelsen, Katherine Bersch, Francis Fukuyama, Kerenssa Kay, Christian Schuster, Zahid Hasnain and Daniel Rogger. n.d. Forthcoming. *The Global Survey of Public Servants: Approach and Conceptual Framework*. <https://www.globalsurveyofpublicservants.org/about>.
- Mikkelsen, Kim Sass, Dinsha Mistree, Kerenssa Kay, Jan-Hinrik Meyer-Sahling, Francis Fukuyama, Christian Schuster, Zahid Hasnain, Katherine Bersch, and Daniel Rogger. n.d. Forthcoming. *The Global Survey of Public Servants: Measurement Approach*. <https://www.globalsurveyofpublicservants.org/about>.
- Mikkelsen, Kim Sass, Christian Schuster, and Jan-Hinrik Meyer-Sahling. 2021. “A Cross-Cultural Basis for Public Service? Public Service Motivation Measurement Invariance in an Original Survey of 23,000 Public Servants in Ten Countries and Four World Regions.” *International Public Management Journal* 24(6): 739–61. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10967494.2020.1809580>.
- OECD. 2018. TALIS—The OECD Teaching and Learning International Survey. July 22, 2022. <https://www.oecd.org/education/talis/>.
- Olsen, Johan P. 2006. “Maybe it is Time to Rediscover Bureaucracy.” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 16(1): 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mui027>.
- Osborne, David, and Ted Gaebler. 1992. *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit Is Transforming the Public Sector*. New York: Addison-Wesley.
- Pollitt, Christopher, and Geert Bouckaert. 2011. *Public Management Reform: A Comparative Analysis — New Public Management, Governance, and the Neo-Weberian State*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Rogger, Daniel, and Christian Schuster, eds. 2023. *The Government Analytics Handbook: Leveraging Data to Strengthen Public Administration*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Roth, Guenther. 1968. "Personal Rulership, Patrimonialism, and Empire-Building in the New States." *World Politics* 20(2): 194–206. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2009795>.
- Rothstein, Bo, and Aiysha Varraich. 2017. *Making Sense of Corruption*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Transparency International. 2021. *The ABCs of the CPI: How the Corruption Perceptions Index is Calculated*. Berlin: Transparency International. Last modified December 20, 2021. <https://www.transparency.org/en/news/how-cpi-scores-are-calculated>.
- Weber, Max. 1978. *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- World Bank. 2022. *Worldwide Governance Indicators*. Washington, DC: World Bank. Accessed July 22, 2022. <https://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/>.

AUTHOR BIOGRAPHIES

Christian Schuster is a Professor in Public Management at the School of Public Policy at University College London. Email: c.schuster@ucl.ac.uk

Kim Sass Mikkelsen is an Associate Professor of Politics and Public Administration at Roskilde University. Email: ksass@ruc.dk

Daniel Rogger is a Senior Research Economist in the Development Impact Evaluation Research Group of the World Bank. Email: drogger@worldbank.org

Francis Fukuyama is the Olivier Nomellini Senior Fellow at Stanford University's Freeman Spogli Institute for International Studies (FSI), and a faculty member of FSI's Center on Democracy, Development, and the Rule of Law (CDDRL). Email: f.fukuyama@stanford.edu

Zahid Hasnain is a Lead Governance Specialist in the Governance Global Practice of the World Bank. Email: zhasnain@worldbank.org

Dinsha Mistree is a Research Fellow and Lecturer in the Rule of Law Program at Stanford University Law School. Email: dmistree@stanford.edu

Jan Meyer-Sahling is a Professor of Political Science at the University of Nottingham. Email: j.meyer-sahling@nottingham.ac.uk

Katherine Bersch is an Assistant Professor of Political Science at Davidson College. Email: kabersch@davidson.edu

Francis Fukuyama is the Olivier Nomellini Senior Fellow at Stanford University's Freeman Spogli Institute for International Studies (FSI), and a faculty member of FSI's Center on Democracy, Development, and the Rule of Law (CDDRL). Email: f.fukuyama@stanford.edu

Zahid Hasnain is a Lead Governance Specialist in the Governance Global Practice of the World Bank. Email: zhasnain@worldbank.org

Dinsha Mistree is a Research Fellow and Lecturer in the Rule of Law Program at Stanford University Law School. Email: dmistree@stanford.edu

Jan Meyer-Sahling is a Professor of Political Science at the University of Nottingham. Email: j.meyer-sahling@nottingham.ac.uk

Katherine Bersch is an Assistant Professor of Political Science at Davidson College. Email: kabersch@davidson.edu

Kerenssa Kay was Survey Manager at the Bureaucracy Lab, a joint initiative of the Global Governance Practice and the Development Impact Evaluation Research Group at the World Bank. Email: kkay@worldbank.org

How to cite this article: Schuster, Christian, Kim Sass Mikkelsen, Daniel Rogger, Francis Fukuyama, Zahid Hasnain, Dinsha Mistree, Jan Meyer-Sahling, Katherine Bersch, and Kerenssa Kay. 2023. "The Global Survey of Public Servants: Evidence from 1,300,000 Public Servants in 1,300 Government Institutions in 23 Countries." *Public Administration Review* 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13611>