

The Glittering Prizes: Career Incentives and Bureaucrat Performance*

Marianne Bertrand, Robin Burgess, Arunish Chawla and Guo Xu[†]

October 4, 2017

Abstract

Owing, in part, to the difficulties in measuring employee performance, bureaucracies and other public sector organisations are configured differently to private sector and political organizations. Though entry is competitive, promotion is based on seniority, jobs are often for life and retirement occurs at a fixed age. This implies that older entering officers, who are less likely to attain the glittering prize of reaching the top of the bureaucracy before they retire, may therefore be less motivated and put in less effort. Using a nationwide stakeholder survey and rich administrative data on elite civil servants in India we find evidence of this effect – officers capped from reaching the senior-most positions before they retire are perceived to be less effective and more likely to be suspended. These effects weaken once the constraint on career progression is relaxed through a reform that extends the retirement age, consistent with stronger promotion prospects enhancing career incentives. We then demonstrate that states containing a higher proportion officers who are unlikely to reach the top of the bureaucracy grow less quickly but that this effect is weakened after the retirement age is extended. Career incentives therefore affect both bureaucrat effectiveness and aggregate economic performance.

JEL classification: D73, H11, O10

*We are grateful to Padamvir Singh, the former Director of Lal Bahadur Shastri National Academy of Administration (LBSNAA), for his help with getting this project started and to LBSNAA and the Indian Planning Commission for collaboration. We thank Blackstone Group and its President Ashref Hashim for help with fielding the surveys of bureaucrat effectiveness. The paper has benefited from comments from Montek Singh Ahluwalia, Nava Ashraf, Oriana Bandiera, James Banks, Timothy Besley, Bronwen Burgess, Ernesto Dal Bo, Iqbal Dhaliwal, Claudio Ferraz, Fred Finan, Alessia Isopi, Aprajit Mahajan, Benjamin Olken, Gerard Padro, Rohini Pande, Torsten Persson, Padamvir Singh, Adam Szeidl and presentations at American Economic Association Annual Meetings, Berkeley, Bocconi, CEPR Public Economics Conference, CEPR Workshop on Incentives, Management and Organisation, Harvard/MIT, HU Berlin, IGC Political Economy Conference, LBSNAA, LSE, Manchester, NBER India Conference, NBER Political Economy Conference, Stanford and Stockholm University. The large-scale data collection effort and data processing which underpins this paper was financed by the University of Chicago and the DFID funded Institutions for Pro-Poor Growth (iiG) Research Consortium and LSE/Oxford International Growth Centre. The views expressed here are those of the authors alone and do not necessarily reflect those of DFID.

[†]Marianne Bertrand [University of Chicago Booth School of Business: Marianne.Bertrand@chicagobooth.edu]; Robin Burgess [London School of Economics (LSE) and the International Growth Centre (IGC): r.burgess@lse.ac.uk]; Arunish Chawla [Indian Administrative Service (IAS): arunish.chawla@gmail.com]; Guo Xu [University of Berkeley, Haas School of Business: guo.xu@berkeley.edu]