

THE IMPACT OF EUROPEAN INTEGRATION AND NEW PUBLIC MANAGEMENT ON RECRUITMENT AND TRAINING OF SENIOR PUBLIC OFFICIALS: A METHODOLOGY

Moshe Maor
Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Abstract-This paper presents a methodology which enable researchers to explore - with the help of Directors of Personnel - how administrative recruitment and training of senior officials in different government departments has responded to EU and NPM pressures. As senior staff responsible for personnel management, Directors of Personnel will be among the first to feel the pressures and respond to them. They will need to hire or train staff familiar with NPM techniques, and they will need to ensure an adequate supply of staff able to operate effectively within environment increasingly conditioned by EU policies. The methodology identifies NPM and EU dimensions of administrative recruitment and training, and formulates a set of multiple-answer questions that serve as indicators of the dimensions identified. An analysis of the individual or average scores for each indicator at time 't' and 't+1' is a measure of the extent methods of recruitment and training have been adapted to the institutional development of the EU and the NPM revolution.

Key Words-Recruitment, Training, Adaptation, New Public Management, European Integration, Senior Officials, Convergence

INTRODUCTION

In many countries the renewed interest in administrative systems results from a number of factors. Prominent among them in the public bureaucracies in Western Europe are the institutional development of the European Union and the New Public Management revolution. For students of public administration the emergence of a common research agenda in so many different countries presents both a challenge and an opportunity. On the one hand, factors underlying NPM and the processes of European integration are not well understood, nor their impact on the nation-state. No single approach or discipline is able to explain, for example, the complex dynamics of European integration (Dehousse and Majone 1994). On the other hand, the emergence of a common research agenda is an unprecedented opportunity for comparative research because it enables scholars to examine aspects of administrative systems, such as, recruitment, train-

ing, budgeting and co-ordination, in a variety of political contexts and to experiment with varied theoretical and empirical approaches.

The empirical literature on recruitment and training of senior public officials is mainly descriptive. Most studies are country-specific (Suleiman 1984; Depré and Hondeghem 1988; Derlien 1990, 1991; Gammon 1989; Stevens 1995) with only a few exceptions (Ridley 1983; Bras, 1988; Siedentopf and Huber 1988; Stevens 1992; IAP 1993; Ziller 1993; Bodiguel 1994; Peters 1984; Page 1992). Other studies approach the topic from a perspective of civil service reforms and their consequences (Ingraham and Ban 1984; Fry 1988; Rose 1988; Aucoin 1988; Newland 1988; Fortin 1984; Rouban 1989; Wilson 1991). A few studies using a quantitative methodological approach - the most widely cited being that by Aberbach et al. (1981) - focus on the socio-economic characteristics of senior officials. The fragmentation of the literature is compounded by the lack of a common frame of reference in the few theoretical attempts which address the topics (Downs 1967; Silberman 1993).

This paper presents a methodology which may enable researchers to explore - with the help of directors of personnel in government departments/ministries - how administrative recruitment and training of senior officials in different government departments and countries has responded to EU and NPM pressures. It highlights three aspects of recruitment and training: the formal, that is, the institutional actors involved in the process and their roles; the personal, that is, personal skills sought or taught; and the administrative culture, which refers to whether the process reflects the culture of the private or public sector. The methodology identifies NPM and EU dimensions of administrative recruitment and training, and formulates a set of multiple-answer questions that serve as indicators of the dimensions identified. An analysis of the individual scores for each question at time 't' and 't+1', and of the average score for each dimension at time 't' and 't+1' is a measure of the way methods of recruitment and training have been adapted to the institutional development of the EU and the NPM revolution. The methodology identifies *general trends* in the impact of these forces, as well as *departmental (or ministerial) variations* in these affects.

The paper first elaborates the nature of EU and NPM pressures from a perspective of directors of personnel, as well as from a theoretical point of view. It then defines NPM and European dimensions in recruitment and training of senior public officials, the indicators for each dimension and the scoring system to be used. Interesting results have been obtained from the application of this methodology in a British study (Maor and Stevens 1996; Maor and Stevens forthcoming).

NPM and EU Pressures: A Director of Personnel Perspective

Directors of Personnel are a sensitive indicator of NPM and EU pressures. Senior staff responsible for recruitment, training and personnel management including appointment and promotion will be among the first to feel the pressures and respond to them. They will need to hire or train staff familiar with NPM techniques, and they will need to ensure an adequate supply of staff able to operate effectively within environment

increasingly conditioned by EU policies. Let us examine briefly the pressure Directors of Personnel may face and their response.

Historically the administrative systems of European Union countries have shown considerable diversity. They have varied not only in the rules and regulations they have to apply to society, but in those rules bureaucrats apply to themselves. Recent studies show this diversity may be in decline as bureaucracies have become exposed to the processes of European integration and the NPM revolution (Dunleavy 1994; Maor 1996, 1997). Two kinds of pressures upon European public administrations are derived from this incremental process: *harmonisation* - which signifies deliberate measures (policies and institutions) taken by the EU (representing the member-states collectively) to achieve compatibility and uniformity; and *convergence* - which refers to the growing similarity of individual administrators' (or individual states') responses to similar changes in their internal and external environments (Burnham and Maor 1995).

The practical implication of these EU pressures on personnel management are twofold. From the perspective of a national administrative system looking at its position in the European Union, its personnel managers need to ensure their administrators represent the national viewpoint effectively. They need to know who best to recruit and appoint and how to train them for negotiating successfully with administrators from other countries. From the opposite direction, the European Commission needs to ensure the national administrations work together coherently (Burnham and Maor 1995).

Though there is no EU policy to harmonise administrative systems, the European Commission seeks to encourage similar administrative responses through the KARLUS programme for the exchange among member states of officials engaged in the administration of the internal market, through programmes of exchange and secondment between the Commission and member states, through research and other programmes which require officials from two or more member states to work together, and through mechanisms for coordination of administrative actions. The KARLUS programme, run for the Commission by the European Institute for Public Administration (EIPA) involved 173 officials between January 1993 and August 1994. All member states took part, but the major sending countries were Spain (33), Italy and UK (24 each) and Germany (20); the main receiving countries were UK (45) and France (42); the main policy areas were public procurement (40), foodstuffs (37), pharmaceuticals (25) and conformity testing/market supervision (24). The usual pattern is a short introduction seminar to prepare participants for the exchange, an attachment of up to 2 months with another national administration, and a closing seminar for participants in the same subject area to discuss and analyse their experience (EIPASCOPE 1994: 18-19).

So far as more general exchanges are concerned, the Commission has for many years arranged 20-30 exchanges between its own staff and the administrations of the member states. However, the numbers coming to Brussels have grown rapidly since 1988 when a Commission Decision put the scheme onto a firmer footing, leading to the current position in which around 600 detached national experts occupy up to 30 per cent of the posts at Grade A4/A5 within the Commission. These staff are welcome partly be-

cause of the specific expertise they bring with them, and partly because they increase the links between the different levels of public administration within the European Union (Hay 1994: 35).

A third means of encouraging similar administrative response is found in research programmes, which frequently favour applications from individuals or research organisations in more than one member state, who are thereby encouraged to work together within a common framework. The fourth means is the application of mechanisms for co-ordination of administrative action in the EU. The Commission has established some mechanisms within which policy co-ordination can take place, for example, the Informal Conference of Ministers organised by the Commissioner responsible for the Public Service (DG IX), and its 'shadow' committee of directors-general of national administrative systems. To encourage member states to learn from one another, and so to improve the implementation of EU policies, the EC has established the Action Plan for the Exchange of National Officials Responsible for the Implementation of Internal Market Legislation (DG III) which aims to promote exchange of staff between member-state administrations.

New Public Management involves a shift in the two basic design co-ordinates of public-sector organisation, moving it 'down-grid' - meaning making the public sector less distinctive as a unit from the private sector, and 'down-group' - meaning reducing the extent to which discretionary power (over staff and money) is limited by uniform and general rules of procedures (Douglas 1982; Dunleavy and Hood 1994). More specifically, this shift consists of a fourfold change in emphasis: (i) from officials' roles as policy advisers to their roles as managers of cost-effective organisations; (ii) from inputs to outputs in the attribution of costs, with output being measured by quantitative performance indicators; (iii) from integrating the public service organisation to desegregating sections that work independently and even in competition with each other, and (iv) from 'statism' to subsidiarity, by transferring delivery of public services from central government units to smaller-scale public-sector, voluntary-sector or private-sector units often working through contractors (Aucoin 1990; Hood and Jackson 1991). According to Dunleavy and Hood (1994) the impact of NPM seems to have elements of both an 'incubated' mode - in which reform ideas do not come into full effect until long after their original introduction, when they establish a new long-term orthodoxy, and the 'acute' innovation mode - in which reform programmes peak early and then break up quickly. These modes are now documented - though not extensively - in empirical research (Hoggett 1991; Pollitt 1993, Zifcak 1994).

That the NPM revolution has had some impact upon west European administrative systems is undoubted, since its elements can be detected, to varying degrees, in most west European countries (Wright 1994; OECD 1995). Client-oriented organisational structures have been set up in Denmark, Portugal and Spain. Some countries are evaluating policy effectiveness (France) or budgeting by programme output (Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, Portugal). In Denmark the central bureaucracies are being split up to decentralised agencies, while in Britain there are moves towards operating on

commercial lines, contracting-out services to private sector organisations and, as is in the Netherlands, privatising. Various countries are experimenting with more flexible, performance-related pay (Denmark, Finland, Netherlands, Turkey, UK). Even Germany is now increasingly sharing in an international agenda of administrative development focused on privatisation and NPM precepts (Goetz 1994; Derlien 1995: 72-3). Virtually all have embarked upon 'administrative modernisation' in one form or another.

The practical implications NPM has on directors of personnel is, for example, the need to hire more economists or accountants people skilled in management and not so many generalist administrators, to borrow management techniques from the private sector, to push back the dividing line between public and private sector activity with the aim of cutting costs, and to change working practices inside the system that are no longer required (Hughes 1994). The NPM revolution may encourage directors of personnel to contract out training, public recruitment agencies or parts of the recruitment process. In the UK most language training is contracted out to the private sector. In addition, the Government has announced in November 1995 that the Recruitment and Assessment Services Agency (RAS) is to be privatised in the course of 1996.

NPM AND EU PRESSURES: A THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE

Since recruitment studies stand at the intersection of research on various topics (e.g. organisations, representativeness and politicisation), the development of theory has faced a serious obstacle denying scholars a common frame of reference with which to conduct cross-national, cross-departmental and cross-time comparisons. Theories that have been developed often suffer from being either too institutional or too individual. The former orientation is because most students of administrative recruitment trace their intellectual roots to Max Weber (e.g. Silberman 1993). In contrast, some theories - notably the 'bureau-shaping model' (Dunleavy 1991) - are based on the assumption that 'A bureau's overall policy is set by some combination of individual decisions made by its officials, and by interactions with a sponsor body' (Dunleavy 1991: 174). This model explains the individual's search for career or promotion paths by using individual means rather than by relying on collective budget increments.

The important difference between these orientations is that whereas officials in the institutional orientation seem unwitting players in an administrative system whose rules and structures they cannot control, the underlying premise of the individual orientation is that public officials are autonomous actors who pursue their own goals and occupy positions of power because of their superior resources, strategies and organisational skills. The present period of change in administrative systems provides an opportunity to test these competing theories against the evidence derived from a data-based account of the way departments have adapted to NPM and EU pressures.

To guide students of public administration in their efforts to produce such a data-based account one needs a conceptual tool. At a 'middle-range' level the concept of

convergence of practices and/or methods may be used to encompass administrative adaptation in response to NPM and European integration pressures. The concept of convergence may seem at first glance straightforward, requiring no sophisticated definition. However, particularly with developments towards European integration, one finds a proliferation of the meanings of the term in academic literature in various economic, social and political contexts. This variety requires differing explanations and has different consequences.

Often convergence is used simply as a synonym for uniformity or similarity. However, such usages belie the fundamental characteristic of convergence as an active phenomenon: it must be seen as a *process of becoming* rather than as a *condition of being* more alike (Bennett 1991). Thus, simply to know that administrative systems are alike in some way tells us nothing about administrative convergence, since convergence refers to the *movement* from different positions towards some common point. The problematic of pinpointing and maintaining a precise definition of the concept is highlighted by the unsatisfactory mixing of its active (i.e. becoming) and its passive (i.e. being) senses within a single text. For example, in discussing moves toward socio-economic cohesion Leonardi (1995) on the one hand defines convergence as "a longitudinal process through which formal as well as informal behaviour and values become increasingly similar" and on the other hand conceives of "complete convergence", representing in fact, a state of cohesion.

In this paper, convergence is defined as the tendency of administrative systems to grow more alike, to develop similarities in structures, processes and performances. The concept thus implies a pattern of organisational change over time: the comparative reference point being a condition of divergence from some former state rather than from another administrative system. Such a perspective allows us to distinguish between two key 'levels' at which administrative convergence may take place: (i) across-system convergence and (ii) within-system convergence. Across-system convergence refers to the adoption of increasingly similar policies, practices and processes by different national administrative systems. Across-system convergence is a cross-national phenomenon.

Within-system convergence, on the other hand, refers to the adoption of increasingly similar policies, practices and processes by the different ministries/departments *within* a national administrative system; or although it is not relevant to this study, at the different levels of a national administration. In countries where recruitment and training policies and procedures are determined and executed centrally convergence at a decentralised level becomes meaningless. However, in most European countries these tasks are to differing degrees allocated to individual ministries and sometimes even further to individual sections within the different ministries. In these cases within-system convergence may constitute an important facet of the overall phenomenon. A direct causal link may exist between the two levels. A decrease in within-system variance may lead directly to an increase in across-system variance and *vice versa*. Such linkages may play an important role in our current study, since a decrease in within-[administrative]-system variance, caused by one government's drive to introduce

New Public Management practices across all of its sectoral ministries, may lead to an increase in across-[administrative]-system variance if other European governments are either making few changes or adopting different policies, perhaps responding to European integration pressures to harmonise.

To make an appropriate use of the concept one is required to define clearly the units to be examined. From a comparative perspective the units of analysis could be government departments/ministries which might have experienced different degrees of exposure to NPM (because of differences in application of NPM measures) and European integration (because of lack of, or existence of, a common policy, e.g. The Common Agriculture Policy). Units of analysis could be administrative systems which might have experienced different degrees of exposure to NPM and European integration. A research strategy should be designed to distinguish between convergence arising from NPM and convergence arising from the development of the EU. To encompass a 'process', one has to choose a starting period 't' and an end period 't+1' where recruitment and training characteristics will be examined. One needs first to establish 'where do administrative units 'come from?', and then, 'to where are they going?'.

The fundamental hypothesis underlying a study which relies on this methodology is that the institutional development of the European Union and the NPM revolution may be causing a convergence of recruitment and training practices for senior officials in European Union countries. It could be expected such changes would be most apparent in: (i) those countries which have long been members of the European project or those which have implemented NPM policies and (ii) those ministries most highly-exposed to European legislation (e.g. Agriculture; and to a lesser extent Fisheries which is quite a new common policy) and NPM pressures. Attention now turns to a methodology built upon this premise. The first task is to identify NPM and European Integration dimensions in administrative recruitment and training.

NPM AND EU DIMENSIONS OF ADMINISTRATIVE RECRUITMENT AND TRAINING

NPM dimensions of recruitment and training may be compared and contrasted according to a large number of dimensions, the most important of which help to distinguish among the actors involved and the process. To gauge NPM pressures on recruitment and training, five dimensions are of importance; (i) centralisation/decentralisation; (ii) management style: public service culture/private sector culture; (iii) private sector involvement in, or absence from, the recruitment and training processes; (iv) performance; and, with relevance to recruitment, (iv) opening up of senior official appointments to recruits from outside central government. These dimensions are defined as follows:

- *Centralisation/decentralisation (NPM1)* refers to variations in the degree to which recruitment and training of senior public officials are delegated to functional units of government (e.g. departments) rather than determined centrally.

- *Management style (NPM2)* refers to variation in the extent to which the managing of the recruitment and training processes inclines to private or public sector models.
- *Private sector involvement in, or absence from the recruitment and training processes (NPM3)* refers to variations in the degree to which the private sector is involved in the recruitment and training of senior public officials.
- *Performance (NPM4)* refers to variations in the degree to which the performance (of recruiting and training organisations) is measured and rewarded by outcome rather than process.
- *Opening up of senior official appointments to recruits from outside central government (NPM5)* refers to variations in the opportunities for recruitment to senior posts available to candidates from the private sector, and from other parts of the public sector.

European integration dimensions of recruitment and training may be compared according to five dimensions; (i) the role of European unit (i.e. any administrative or political section specialising in European affairs within the department under examination or elsewhere within government) in recruitment and training for EU-related posts; (ii) Eurocratic skills (i.e. knowledge and/or expertise of working within the framework of EU institutions), (iii) Euro-languages skills, and (iv) Euro-staff management. These dimensions are defined as follows:

- *The role of European unit in recruitment and training (EUR1)* refers to variations in the degree to which a European unit co-ordinates/takes part in recruitment and training for EU-related posts. An *EU-related post* is any post (i) within a European unit or (ii) where more than 50% of the post-holder's time is spent on EU issues of policy formation and/or policy implementation.
- *Eurocratic skills (EUR2)* refer to variations in the degree to which knowledge and/or experience of working within the framework of EU institutions is valued and taught.
- *Euro-language skills (EUR3)* refer to variations in the degree to which European languages are valued and taught.
- *Euro-staff management (EUR4)* refers to variations in the extent to which staff in departments have direct experience of working in the EU institutions, or in units specialising in EU business.

Indicators of NPM and EU dimensions in Administrative Recruitment and Training

After EU and NPM have been broken down into their various constituent dimensions, and these dimensions having been strictly defined, a series of indicators for each dimension can be devised. In order to discern the practical situation in national minis-

tries, the indicators of NPM and EU dimensions of recruitment and training are defined as sets of multiple-answer questions, as follows (R and T after NPM or EU mean recruitment and training, respectively):

NPM DIMENSIONS IN RECRUITMENT OF SENIOR CIVIL SERVANTS

Questions	Answers
■ NPM1R - Centralisation/Decentralisation	
1. Who draws up the rules governing recruitment?	1. Central organisation does it for all government departments
2. Who monitors compliance with the	2. Task Determined centrally; Departments recruit some staff Subject to central monitoring.
3. Who determines how many staff are to be recruited at each level?	3. Joint responsibilities of central organisation and departments
4. Who is responsible for the conduct of the recruitment competition?	4. Centre has a limited role in setting of the recruitment competition
5. Who selects the successful candidate(s)	5. No central organisation, guidance or control
6. Who officially appoints?	
■ NPM2R - Management Style	
1. Is it the aim to set high standards for other employers to follow, or merely to follow good practice in the private sector?	1. Public service culture 2. Elements of private sector culture, but public sector culture
2. Is recruitment generally to a life-time career, or on a contractual basis?	3. Elements of public sector and private sector culture of more or less equal weight
3. Is cost an important factor in determining recruitment procedures?	4. Elements of public sector culture but private sector culture predominates
4. How much flexibility is there for staff engaged in recruitment to vary pay and conditions of service?	5. Private sector culture (Note: Private sector characteristics underlined)

■ NPM3R - Private sector involvement in, or absence from, recruitment process

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. Do private firms take part in the formulation of recruitment policy? | 1. No private sector involvement |
| 2. Do private firms take part in the provision of recruitment services? | 2. Private sector participates, but public |
| 3. Do private firms take part in the monitoring and evaluation of recruitment policy? | 3. More or less equal partnership between private and public sectors |
| | 4. Public sector participates but private sector predominates |
| | 5. Task is solely performed by private sector |

■ NPM4R - Performance

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. Is recruitment performance measured by process or outcome (or not at all); and what link, if any, is there between performance and remuneration? | 1. Performance not measured |
| | 2. Performance measured in relation to process, but no effect on remuneration |
| | 3. Performance measured in relation to outcome, but no effect on remuneration |
| | 4. Performance measured in relation to outcome, remuneration affected by less than 10% |
| | 5. Performance measured in relation to outcome, remuneration affected by more than 10% |

■ NPM5R - Opening up of senior official appointments to recruits from outside central government

- | | |
|--|----------|
| 1. To what extent are vacancies (above normal entry grades) circulated to other parts of the public sector to seek applications? | 1. Never |
|--|----------|

- | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| 2. To what extent are such vacancies publicly advertised? | 2. Sometimes |
| 3. To what extent are executive search consultants used to find candidates for such vacancies? | 3. In about half of the cases |
| | 4. In more than half of the cases |
| | 5. Always |

NPM DIMENSIONS IN TRAINING OF SENIOR PUBLIC OFFICIALS

■ NPM1T - Centralisation/Decentralisation

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. Who draws up training policy? | 1. Central organisation does it for all government departments |
| 2. Who draws up general training programmes? | 2. Task determined centrally; departments conduct or procure some training subject to central monitoring |
| 3. Who draws up individual training programmes? | 3. Joint responsibilities of central organisation and departments |
| 4. Who decides what training should be compulsory? | 4. Centre has limited role in setting guidance but departments conducts or procures all its own training |
| | 5. No central organisation, guidance or control |

■ NPM2T - Management Style

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Is training paid for centrally or by the trainee's department/unit or both? | 1. Public service culture |
| 2. Does the training provided <i>expose staff to the private sector</i> as teachers or fellow students? | 2. Elements of private sector culture, but public sector culture predominates |
| 3. Is the aim to set high standards of training for other employers to follow, or to follow <i>good practice in the private sector</i> ? | 3. Elements of public sector and private sector culture, of more or less equal weight |
| 4. Does the training provided lead to <i>professional qualifications recognised outside the public sector</i> ? | 4. Elements of public sector culture but private sector culture predominates |

5. Are senior managers featured prominently in training programmes?
 6. Is training mainly intended to help staff achieve their own aims (promotion) or the goal of the organisation?

■ NPM3T - Private sector involvement in, or absence from, training process

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Do private firms take part in the formulation of training policy? | 1. No private sector involvement |
| 2. Do private firms take part in the provision of training services? | 2. Private sector participates, but public sector predominates |
| 3. Do private firms take part in the monitoring and evaluation of training policy? | 3. More or less equal partnership between private and public sector |
| | 4. Public sector participates but private sector predominates |
| | 5. Task is solely performed by private sector |

■ NPM4T - Performance

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. How is the training performance of trainers measured and what link is there between trainer performance and remuneration? | 1. Performance not measured |
| 2. How is the training performance of trainees measured and what link is there, if any, between trainee performance and remuneration? | 2. Performance measured in relation to process, but no effect on remuneration |
| | 3. Performance measured in relation to outcome, but no effect on remuneration |
| | 4. Performance measured in relation to outcome, remuneration affected by less than 10% |
| | 5. Performance measured in relation to outcome, remuneration affected by more than 10% |

EU Dimensions in recruitment of senior officials

■ EUR1R - Role of European unit in recruitment for EU-related posts

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. To what extent is a European unit involved in the formulation of recruitment policy for EU-related posts? | 1. No role for European unit (or no such unit exists) |
| 2. To what extent is a European unit involved in the provision of recruitment services to EU-related posts? | 2. European unit participates, but unit responsible for recruitment predominates |
| 3. To what extent is a European unit involved in the evaluation of recruitment policy for EU-related posts? | 3. More or less equal partnership between European unit and recruitment unit |
| 4. To what extent is a European unit involved in career-planning of officials working in EU-related jobs? | 4. Recruitment unit participates, but European unit predominates |
| | 5. European unit has sole responsibility for the task |

■ EUR2R - Eurocratic skills

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. To what extent is knowledge/experience of the EU institutions taken into account in selecting staff for initial appointment? | 1. EU skills are not considered |
| 2. To what extent is acquisition of such knowledge/experience taken into account in selecting staff for subsequent appointment/promotion? | 2. EU skills noted but other factors carry more weight |
| 3. To what extent is such knowledge/experience taken into account in selecting staff for posts with significant European responsibilities? | 3. EU skills given equal weight alongside other factors |
| | 4. EU skills given more weight than other factors |
| | 5. EU skills are essential |

■ EUR3R - Euro-language skills

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1.To what extent are European language skills taken into account in selecting staff for initial appointment? | 1.European language skills are not considered |
| 2.To what extent is acquisition of European language skills taken into account in selecting staff for subsequent appointment/promotion? | 2.European language skills noted but other factors carry more weight |
| 3.To what extent is there a link between European language skills and remuneration? | 3.European language skills given equal weight alongside other factors |
| 4.To what extent are European language skills taken into account in selecting staff for posts with significant European responsibilities? | 4.European language skills given more weight than other factors |
| | 5.European language skills are essential |

■ EUR4R - Euro-staff Management

- | | |
|---|------------------|
| 1.How many 'senior staff' (unit head and above) are there in your Ministry/Department? How many of the senior staff, and staff in the grades from which senior staff are commonly drawn or promoted, have at least one year's experience of working in or with the EU (e.g. on secondment to the Commission, attached to your national representation in Brussels or in a unit of government specialising in EU affairs? Assign a score based on a ratio of staff with European experience (Q. 2) to all senior management staff (Q. 1) | 1. Less than 20% |
| | 2. 20%-40% |
| | 3. 41%-60% |
| | 4. 61%-80% |
| | 5. Over 80% |

EU DIMENSIONS IN TRAINING OF SENIOR OFFICIALS

■ EUR1T - Role of European unit in training

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1.To what extent is a European unit involved in the formulation of training policy for EU-related posts? | 1.No role for European unit (or no such unit exists) |
| 2.To what extent is a European unit involved in the provision of training services to EU-related posts? | 2.European unit participates, but unit responsible for training predominates |
| 3.To what extent is a European unit involved in the evaluation of training policy for EU-related posts? | 3.More or less equal partnership between European unit and training unit |
| | 4.Training unit participates, but European unit predominates |
| | 5.European unit has sole responsibility for the task |

■ EUR2T - Eurocratic skills

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1.To what extent are senior administrative staff expected to learn Eurocratic skills? | 1.Not considered |
| 2.To what extent are staff about to take up an EU-related post for the first time expected to learn Eurocratic skills? | 2.Information about training courses made available |
| 3.To what extent are staff working in EU-related posts expected to learn Eurocratic skills? | 3.Staff encouraged but not required to take a training course |
| | 4.Training strongly encouraged |
| | 5.Training compulsory, unless competence can be demonstrated without it |

■ EUR3T - Euro-language skills

- | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|
| 1.To what extent are senior administrative staff expected to learn a European language? | 1.No provision for language training |
| 2.To what extent are staff about to take up an EU-related post for the first time ex- | 2.Language training in a low priority |

pected to learn a European language?

3.To what extent are staff working in EU-related posts expected to learn a European language?

3.Staff encouraged but not required to acquire EU language skills through training

4.EU language training strongly emphasised

5.EU language training compulsory unless competence can be demonstrated

MAPPING DEPARTMENTAL/MINISTERIAL DIFFERENTIATION: THE SCORING SYSTEM

The scoring system aims to help explore and comprehend departmental diversity in recruitment and training methods arising from the impact of NPM and the EU. While this goal may seem similar to the goal of identifying general patterns, and complements it in some respects, it is different. One general pattern is that NPM and the recruitment of economists may go together: administrative systems exposed to NPM pressures may tend to recruit economists (Hughes 1994: 11). However, that a general pattern may exist does not mean there are no important exceptions or deviations. Some departments may decide to provide management, financial and economics training for existing staff rather than recruit economists.

Exploring diversity often means that researcher ignores dominant patterns, and focuses on the differences. To counter this tendency, the methodology uses a scoring system which brings out both the similarities and the differences. It enables researchers to avoid exclusive focus on the most common or dominant patterns, and allows exploration of both a general trend and the diversity amongst government departments/ministries. It furthers an understanding and appreciation of *departmental variations* in recruitment and training.

The scoring system - shown in Table 1 - is based on two dimensions (EU and NPM) and the scores (in either raw or average form) given by directors of personnel. Directors of personnel are invited to assign scores to each question on a scale ranging from 1 to 5. The answers for the NPM questions are structured so the higher scores indicate a higher degree of NPM influence. Similarly, the higher scores in the answers for the EU questions indicate a higher degree of EU influence. Using such a scoring system enables the researcher to document departmental diversity arising from the EU and NPM, as well as to indicate a general trend shared by different departments in one or more administrative systems.

Table 1. The Scoring System for NPM dimensions in recruitment and training

Dimension	Question	Score (time 't')	Score (time 't+1')
NPM1R	1		
	2		
	3		
	4		
	5		
	6		
Average			
NPM2R	1		
	2		
	3		
	4		
Average			
NPM3R	1		
	2		
	3		
Average			
NPM4R	1		
	Average		
NPM5R	1		
	2		
	3		
Average			
NPM1T	1		
	2		
	3		
	4		
Average			
NPM2T	1		
	2		
	3		
	4		
	5		
	6		
Average			
NPM3T	1		
	2		
	3		
Average			
NPM4T	1		
	2		

Average	
EUR1R	1
	2
	3
	4
Average	
EUR2R	1
	2
	3
Average	
EUR3R	1
	2
	3
	4
Average	
EUR4R	1
Average	
EUR1T	1
	2
	3
Average	
EUR2T	1
	2
	3
Average	
EUR3T	1
	2
	3
Average	

By examining the answers provided by directors of personnel presented on this scoring sheet it is possible to grasp where a relatively high degree of change (in a raw or average form) is recorded (from score 1 in time 't' to 3,4, or 5 in time 't+1'), a relatively low degree of change (from score 1 in time 't' to score 2 in time 't+1'), or no change at all. It is useful to examine the changes in the appropriate historical context to substantiate them. As the full NPM and EU agenda is only partially implemented in some countries, the variety of questions allow for a precise identification of administrative change at the level of the components of the dimensions observed.

The indicators allow us to gauge a number of things: first, the variations between west European administrations, differing greatly in administrative histories and cultures, in the hitherto neglected area of recruitment and training processes. Second, how far and in what precise ways administrative systems have changed over a given period in their recruitment and training. Third, whether these changes trace any particular pattern, or patterns, caused by the presence or absence of the two explanatory factors, European integration and New Public Management. Fourth, whether these patterns of change represent a divergence or a convergence, both within national administrative systems (i.e. between ministries) and across national administrative systems (i.e. between countries). Finally, the use of European integration and NPM scoring systems allows us to measure the *degree of change* and, thereby, the *degree of convergence*.

CONCLUSIONS

Once one considers the implications of NPM and European integration for administrative recruitment and training one is faced with questions such as, 'What kind of administrative recruitment and training practices are developing in Europe?'; 'What will be the mix of NPM- and EU-related changes?'; and, 'Around which principles and resources are new practices developed?'. It is difficult to answer these questions in periods of administrative transformation. The future direction of each of the forces under consideration is not clear. For NPM, whereas Osborne and Gaebler (1992) claim there is an 'inevitable' and 'global' movement to a single NPM model, Dunleavy and Hood (1994) argue that plausible futures in this area are multiple, and that public management reforms raise issues which go beyond short-term considerations of cost and quality - issues which are ultimately constitutional in nature. For European integration some expect a more traditional type of inter-governmental co-operation whereas others ask whether disintegration is likely in the West after the loss of the external foe in the East (Pohoryles 1994). Furthermore, 'the new Intergovernmental Conference on the future of Europe, starting in 1996, may create new surprises' (Olsen 1995: 2). What is needed is a clear focus on issues of administrative adaptation, and a simple and rigorous methodology - such as the one presented here - which enables us to test hypotheses addressing these issues in an empirical and dispassionate manner.

NOTES

The research on which this paper is based was supported by a British Economic and Social Research Council grant no. R000235266. I should like to acknowledge the help of George Jones, Howard Machin, Handley Stevens and Sidonie Elliott for their useful comments.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aberbach, J.D. Putnam, R.D. and Rockman, B.A.** (1981) *Bureaucrats and Politicians in Western Democracies*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Aucoin, P.** (1988) 'Contraction, Managerialism and Decentralization in Canadian Government', *Governance*, 1(1): 144-161.
- Aucoin, P.** (1990) 'Administrative Reform in Public Management: Paradigms, Principles, Paradoxes and Pendulums', *Governance*, 3:
- Bennett, C.J.** (1991) 'What is Policy Convergence and What Causes It?', *British Journal of Political Science*, 21: 215-233.
- Bodiguel, J.-L.** (1994) *Les fonctions publiques dans l'Europe des douze*, Paris: L.G.D.J.
- Bras, J.-P.** (1988) 'The Higher Civil Service in the Industrialised Countries: Recruitment and Career', in: IAS (ed.) *The Higher Civil Service in Belgium and in Industrialised Countries: Recruitment, Career and Training*, Brussels: IAS, pp. 73-104.
- Burnham, J. and Maor, M.** (1995) 'Converging Administrative Systems: Recruitment, Training and Role Perceptions', *European Journal of Public Administration*, 2(2): 185-204.
- Dehousse, R. and G. Majone** (1994) 'The Institutional Dynamics of European Integration: From the Single Act to the Maastricht Treaty', in: Martin, S.(ed.) *The Construction of Europe. Essays in honor of Emile Noël*, Dordrecht: Kluwer, pp. 91-112
- Depré, R. and Honddeghem, A.** (1988) 'Recruitment, Career and Training of Senior Officials in Belgium', in: IAS (ed.) *The Higher Civil Service in Belgium and in Industrialised Countries: Recruitment, Career and Training*, Brussels: IAS, pp. 11-72.
- Derlien, H.-U.** (1990) 'Continuity and Change in the West German Federal Executive Elite 1949-1984', *European Journal of Political Research*, 18: 349-372.
- Derlien, H.-U.** (1991) 'Historical Legacy and Recent Developments in the German Higher Civil Service', *International Review of Administrative Science*, 57: 385-401.
- Derlien, H.-U.** (1995) 'Public Administration in Germany: Political and Societal Relations', in: Pierre, J. (ed.) *Bureaucracy in the Modern State: An Introduction to Comparative Public Administration*, Aldershot: Edward Elgar, pp. 64-91.
- Douglas, M.** (1982) *In the Active Voice*, London: Routledge.
- Downs, A.** (1967) *Inside Bureaucracy*, Boston: Little, Brown & Co.
- Dunleavy, P.** (1991) *Democracy, Bureaucracy and Public Choice*, Hemel Hempstead: Harvester and Wheatsheaf.

- Dunleavy, P.** (1994) 'The Globalisation of Public Services Production: Can Government be 'Best in World'?', *Public Policy and Administration*, 9(2).
- Dunleavy, P. and Hood, C.** (1994) 'From Old Public Administration to New Public Management', *Public Money and Management*, July-September, pp. 9-16.
- Fortin, Y.** (1984) 'Madam Thatcher et la politisation des échelons supérieurs de l'administration centrale en Grande-Bretagne 1974-1984, mythe ou réalité?', *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 50: 337-354.
- Fry, J.** (1988) 'The Thatcher Government, the Financial Management Initiative and the "New Civil Service"', *Public Administration*, 66: 1-20.
- Gammon, G.J.** (1989) 'The British Civil Service: Recruitment and Training', *Public Policy and Administration*, 4(1): 28-40.
- Goetz, K.** (1994) 'Between Public Bureaucracy and Interactive Administration - Six Propositions on Administrative Development in Germany', *Working Paper*, Prepared for the LSE-Cabinet Office Public Service Seminar.
- Hay, R.** (1994) *The European Commission and the Administration of the Community*, Brussels: European Documentation.
- Hoggett, P.** (1991) 'A New Management in the Public Sector', *Policy and Politics*, 19(4): 243-56.
- Hood, C. and Jackson, M. W.** (1991) 'The New Public Management: A Recipe for Disaster?', in: Parker, D. and Handmer, J. (eds.) *Hazard Management and Emergency Planning*, London: James and James.
- Hughes, O.E.** (1994) *Public Management and Administration: An Introduction*, Houndsmills: St. Martin's Press.
- Institut Internationale d'Administration Publique (IIAP) (1993) *La formation en cours d'emploi des agents de l'état - recherche comparative*, Paris: IIAP.
- Ingraham, P.W. and Ban, C.** (1984) (eds.) *Legislating Bureaucratic Change. The Civil Service Reform Act of 1978*, Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Kessler, M.C.** (1992) 'La fonction publique française et l'Europe', Paper presented at a conference of the European Group of Public Administration, Pisa, September.
- Leonardi, R.** (1995) *Convergence, Cohesion and Integration in the European Union*, Houndsmills: St. Martin's Press.
- Maor, M.** (1996) 'Changes in Recruitment and Training of Senior Public Officials in Britain and Germany, 1970-1995: Rhetorics and Realities', *Working Paper*, The European Institute: The London School of Economics and Political Science.
- Maor, M.** (1997) 'Trends and Fashions in Administrative Policy: A Comparative Analysis of Recruitment and Training of Senior Public Officials in Denmark and Norway, 1970-1995', *Working Paper*, The European Institute: The London School of Economics and Political Science.
- Maor, M. and Stevens, H.** (1996) 'Changing Patterns of Recruitment and Training in the UK: The Impact of European Integration and New Public Management', *Working Paper*, The European Institute: The London School of Economics and Political Science.

- Maor, M. and Stevens, H.** (forthcoming) 'The Impact of New Public Management and European Integration on Recruitment and Training in the UK Civil Service, 1970-1995', *Public Administration*.
- Newland, J.A.** (1988) 'The American Senior Executive Service', *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 54: 625-660.
- OECD** (1995) *Governance in Transition: Public Management Reforms in OECD Countries*, Paris: OECD.
- Olsen, J.P.** (1995) 'European Challenges to the Nation State', Paper prepared for the SOG Conference on 'New Challenges of the State in Comparative Perspective', Seoul, October.
- Osborne, D. and Gaebler, T.** (1992) *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector*, Reading MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Page, E.C.** (1992) *Political Authority and Bureaucratic Power*, 2nd ed. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Page, E.C. and Wouters, L.** (1995) 'The Europeanisation of the national bureaucracies?' in: Pierre, J. (ed.) *Bureaucracy in the Modern State: An Introduction to Comparative Public Administration*, Aldershot: Edward Elgar, pp. 185-204.
- Peters, B.G.** (1984) *The Politics of Bureaucracy*, New York: Longman.
- Pohoryles, R.J. (ed.)** (1994) *European Transformations: Five Decisive Years at the Turn of the Century*, Aldershot: Avebury.
- Pollitt, C.** (1993) *Managerialism and the Public Services: The Anglo-American Experience*, 2nd. ed. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Ridley, F.F.** (1983) 'Career Service: A Comparative Perspective on Civil Service Promotion', *Public Administration*, 61(2): 179-196.
- Rose, R.** (1988) 'Loyalty, Voice or Exit? Margaret Thatcher's Challenge to the Civil Service', *Jahrbuch zur Staats- und Verwaltungswissenschaft* 2, Baden-Baden: Nomos.
- Rouban, L.** (1989) 'The Civil Service and the Policy of Administrative Modernization in France', *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 55: 445-465.
- Siedentopf, H. and Huber, N.** (1988) 'The Higher Civil Service in the Industrialised Countries: Training', in: IAS (ed.) *The Higher Civil Service in Belgium and in Industrialised Countries: Recruitment, Career and Training*, Brussels: IAS, pp. 105-148.
- Silberman, B.S.** (1993) *Cages of Reason*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Stevens, A.** (1992) 'Divergence and Convergence: Recruitment and Training of Senior Civil Servants in Britain and France: A Comparative Perspective', Paper delivered at the conference 'Relation Between Levels of Government: Looking Towards 1992', IPSA, Montpellier, France.
- Stevens, H.** (1995) Recruitment and Training in the United Kingdom, *Working Paper*, London: European Institute, The London School of Economics and Political Science.
- Suleiman, E.** (1984) (ed.) *Bureaucrats and Policymaking*, New York: Holmes & Meier.

- Wilson, G.K.** (1991) 'Prospects for the Public Service in Britain. Major to the Rescue?', *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 57: 327-344.
- Wright, V.** (1994) 'Reshaping the State: The Implications for Public Administration', *West European Politics*, 17(3): 102-137.
- Zifcak, S.** (1994) *New Managerialism: Administrative Reform in Whitehall and Canberra*, Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Ziller, J.** (1993) *Administrations comparées: les systèmes politico-administratifs de l'Europe des Douze*, Paris: Montchrestien.

About the Author:

Moshe Maor is a Senior Lecturer at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. His publications include *Organisational Determinant of Coalition Bargaining: Intraparty Conflicts and Coalition Behaviour in Western Europe* (Routledge, forthcoming), and *Political Parties and Party Systems: Comparative Approaches and the British Experience* (Routledge, forthcoming). Dr. Maor is also co-author of *Barriers to Entry into Political Systems* (Papyrus 1988, in Hebrew) and author and co-author of several articles published in various journals and edited volumes. His fields of specialisation are comparative political systems and comparative administrative systems. Current research relates to *The Convergence of West European Party Systems* as well as to the present project on *The Convergence of EU Administrative Systems: Recruitment, Training and Role Perceptions*.