



# THE QUALITY OF GOVERNMENT EXPERT SURVEY 2020: WAVE III

## CODEBOOK

Please reference the following citation when using this dataset:

**Nistotskaya, Marina, Stefan Dahlberg, Carl Dahlström, Aksel Sundström, Sofia Axelsson, Cem Mert Dalli & Natalia Alvarado Pachon. 2021. The Quality of Government Expert Survey 2020 Dataset: Wave III. University of Gothenburg: The Quality of Government Institute, <http://www.qog.pol.gu.se> DOI: 10.18157/qoges2020**

The QoG Institute  
<https://www.gu.se/en/quality-government>  
P.O. Box 711  
405 30 Gothenburg  
Sweden  
[infoqog@pol.gu.se](mailto:infoqog@pol.gu.se)



UNIVERSITY OF  
GOTHENBURG

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1	The Quality of Government Institute . . . . .	2
1.2	The QoG Data . . . . .	2
1.3	The Quality of Government Expert Survey 2020 Dataset . . . . .	3
<b>2</b>	<b>Description of Variables</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1	Identification Variables . . . . .	4
2.2	Expert Survey Variables . . . . .	5

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 The Quality of Government Institute

The QoG Institute was founded in 2004 by Professor Bo Rothstein and Professor Sören Holmberg. It is an independent research institute within the Department of Political Science at the University of Gothenburg. The institute conducts research on the causes, consequences and nature of Good Governance and the Quality of Government (QoG) - that is, trustworthy, reliable, impartial, uncorrupted, and competent government institutions.

The main objective of the research is to address the theoretical and empirical problems of how political institutions of high quality can be created and maintained. A second objective is to study the effects of Quality of Government on a number of policy areas, such as health, environment, social policy, and poverty. While Quality of Government is the common intellectual focal point of the research institute, a variety of theoretical and methodological perspectives are applied.

## 1.2 The QoG Data

The Quality of Government Data is a collection of different types of datasets that are related to the concept of Quality of Government. These data are open-source tools created to facilitate the access of the academic community to high quality information.

There are three main types of datasets: the first one is the compilation datasets (Standard, Basic and OECD) which gather other sources variables into a comprehensive time-series spanning more than 200 countries and more than 70 year data points. There are also researchers' datasets (e.g. Swedish Municipalities Dataset), which are QoG researchers' efforts to contribute to their field with specialized data at different observation levels (country, region, individual etc.). Last but not least there are the original datasets such as the European Quality of Government Index and the Quality of Government Expert Survey.

The most updated versions of QoG datasets can be accessed from Data Downloads section on the QoG Website: <https://www.gu.se/en/quality-government/qog-data/data-downloads>. Previous versions of all our datasets are also available in the Data Archive: <https://www.gu.se/en/quality-government/qog-data/data-downloads/data-archive>

### 1.3 The Quality of Government Expert Survey 2020 Dataset

The general purpose of the QoG Expert Survey is to measure the structure and behaviour of public administration across countries. The survey covers a variety of topics which are seen as relevant to the structure and functioning of the public administration according to the literature, but on which we lack quantitative indicators for a large number of countries. The QoG Expert Survey 2020 is the third wave of the QoG Expert Survey, following the first wave in 2008-2012 and the second wave in 2014.

The QoG Expert Survey 2020 produced ten country-level indicators, pertaining to bureaucratic structure (meritocratic recruitment, security of tenure, closedness) and bureaucratic behavior (political interference into day-to-day bureaucratic decision-making and impartiality). The data is based on the assessments of more than 550 experts, carefully selected for their contextual subject-matter knowledge. The experts took part in the research pro bono. The main innovation of the third wave is the use of anchoring vignettes and Item-Response Theory (IRT)-based aggregation techniques to produce point estimates that account and adjust for systematic differences in expert subjective assessments and variation in expert reliability. The resulting indicators are internally coherent and also correlate well with other well-established measures for the same concepts. The strength of the association between the data from 2020 and the two previous waves of the survey suggests that the data is likely to measure the same underlying phenomena, while offering enough variability over time to be used in time-series analysis.

For a detailed description of the study and its methodology, please see the following publication:

Nistotskaya, Marina, Stefan Dahlberg, Carl Dahlström, Aksel Sundström, Sofia Axelsson, Cem Mert Dalli & Natalia Alvarado Pachon. 2021. <i>The Quality of Government Expert Survey 2020 (Wave III): Report</i> . University of Gothenburg: The QoG Working Paper Series 2021:2.
--

## 2 Description of Variables

### 2.1 Identification Variables

#### 2.1.1 year

Year for which the answers are submitted.

#### 2.1.2 ccode

Numeric country code based on the ISO-3166-1.

#### 2.1.3 ccodecow

Country code from the Correlates of War.

#### 2.1.4 ccodewb

Country code from the World Bank.

#### 2.1.5 cname

The name of the country.

#### 2.1.6 ccodealp

A three-letter country code based on the ISO-3166-1 alpha3 standard.

#### 2.1.7 oecd

Is the country a member of the OECD?

- (0) No
- (1) Yes

#### 2.1.8 eu27

Is the country a member of the EU?

- (0) No
- (1) Yes

#### 2.1.9 region

A tenfold politico-geographic classification of world regions. The categories are as follow:

- (1) Eastern Europe and post-Soviet Union (including Central Asia)
- (2) Latin America (including Cuba, Haiti & the Dominican Republic)
- (3) North Africa & the Middle East (including Israel, Turkey & Cyprus)
- (4) Sub-Saharan Africa
- (5) Western Europe and North America (including Australia & New Zealand)
- (6) East Asia (including Japan & Mongolia)
- (7) South-East Asia
- (8) South Asia
- (9) The Pacific (excluding Australia & New Zealand)
- (10) The Caribbean (including Belize, Guyana & Suriname, but excluding Cuba, Haiti & the Dominican Republic)

## **2.2 Expert Survey Variables**

### **2.2.1 Professionalism Index (proff\_pca)**

Professionalism Index is constructed from Patronage, Merit and Tenure with the help of Principal Component Analysis (PCA). Merit, Patronage and Tenure are load on the same dimension, which predicted scores are used as Professionalism Index.

### **2.2.2 Patronage (proff1)**

Country-level estimate for Patronage, constructed with an IRT model that accounts for differential item functioning (DIF) and variation in expert reliability. Higher values stand for more patronage in recruitment.

### **2.2.3 Patronage, lower limit of 95% credible interval (proff1\_lowCI)**

Lower boundary of 95% credible interval for Patronage.

### **2.2.4 Patronage, upper limit of 95% credible interval (proff1\_upCI)**

Upper boundary of 95% credible interval for Patronage.

### **2.2.5 Merit (proff2)**

Country-level estimate for Merit, constructed with an IRT model that accounts for DIF and variation in expert reliability. Higher values stand for more merit-based appointment.

### **2.2.6 Merit, lower limit of 95% credible interval (proff2\_lowCI)**

Lower boundary of 95% credible interval for Merit.

### **2.2.7 Merit, upper limit of 95% credible interval (proff2\_upCI)**

Upper boundary of 95% credible interval for Merit.

### **2.2.8 Tenure (proff3)**

Country-level estimate for Tenure, constructed with an IRT model that accounts for DIF and variation in expert reliability. Higher values stand for stronger security of tenure.

### **2.2.9 Tenure, lower limit of 95% credible interval (proff3\_lowCI)**

Lower boundary of 95% credible interval for Tenure.

### **2.2.10 Tenure, upper limit of 95% credible interval (proff3\_upCI)**

Upper boundary of 95% credible interval for Tenure.

### **2.2.11 Closedness Index (close\_pca)**

Closedness Index is constructed from Entry at the lowest level only, Entry via examination and Special Laws with the help of Principal Component Analysis (PCA). Entry at the lowest level only, Entry via examination and Special Laws variables are load on the same dimension, which predicted scores are used as Closedness Index.

### **2.2.12 Entry at the lowest level only (close1)**

Country-level estimate for Entry at the lowest level only, scaled between 0 and 1. Highest score refers to cases where entry to bureaucratic positions is possible at the lowest level of hierarchy only, and positions at middle and higher levels of hierarchy are filled by individuals from within the bureaucracy.

### **2.2.13 Entry via examination (close2)**

Country-level estimate for Entry via examination, scaled between 0 and 1. Countries in which formal examination is usually part of the hiring process have higher scores.

### **2.2.14 Special Laws (close3)**

Country-level estimate for Special Laws, scaled between 0 and 1. Higher scores mean that human resource management in public administration is regulated by a set of laws and regulations applicable only to the public sector (including government), which is different from the country's labor code.

### **2.2.15 Political Interference (impar1)**

Country-level estimate for Political Interference, constructed with an IRT model that accounts for DIF and variation in expert reliability. Higher values stand for more political interference.

### **2.2.16 Political Interference, lower limit of 95% credible interval (impar1\_lowCI)**

Lower boundary of 95% credible interval for Political Interference.

### **2.2.17 Political Interference, upper limit of 95% credible interval (impar2\_upCI)**

Upper boundary of 95% credible interval for Political Interference.

### **2.2.18 Impartiality (impar2)**

Country-level estimate for Impartiality, constructed with an IRT model that accounts for DIF and variation in expert reliability. Higher values stand for more impartiality.

### **2.2.19 Impartiality, lower limit of 95% credible interval (impar2\_lowCI)**

Lower boundary of 95% credible interval for Impartiality.

### **2.2.20 Impartiality, upper limit of 95% credible interval (impar2\_upCI)**

Upper boundary of 95% credible interval for Impartiality.