

Globalization and Internationalization: Impact upon the State and the Civil Service

Jos Raadschelders (The Ohio State University) and Tony Verheijen (World Bank)

Draft: please do not quote

Abstract

This chapter reviews and discusses various aspects of engagement between national civil servants and their international environment, with the aim to establish how these have evolved in a context of growing globalization. This is a research topic that offers ample opportunity for further investigation and review, given the scant literature available on the subject. The authors review the topic through the prism of engagement in multi-level governance systems, patterns of influence in relations between global development actors and national officials and relations between US officials and their international counterparts. At the end of the chapter, an agenda for further research on this important but under-researched topic is presented.

Keywords: Globalization; Internationalization; Civil Service; Policy Advice

Globalization and the internationalization of government and governance are big buzzwords in the world of practitioners in government and scholars of government. This chapter addresses the impacts of globalization on the state and its civil service. We define globalization as a phenomenon where state and international arena influence each other. Next, we will consider the influence of internationalization and globalization upon civil servants in the European Union, in states which engage frequently with multilateral and bilateral development institutions, and, to a much lesser extent for lack of empirical material, in the United States. Finally, we discuss the impact of global economic development upon the career civil service and the state. In the conclusion we suggest some elements of a substantial research agenda for the years to come.

1. Globalization and the two-way street of interaction

Globalization and its impact on the nation state has been the subject of ardent debate over the last decades. Opinions and perspectives on the impact of globalization on the state vary strongly. Some argue that globalization diminishes the ability of states to independently define and manage policy. Others argue that globalization does not change the fact that the state is the only actor that can make international agreements on behalf of its population. In this second line of thought, globalization may actually strengthen and enrich national civil service systems, providing new opportunities rather than weakening the policy making capabilities of national civil servants.

In the first line of argument, the erosion of the state is a consequence of the three main factors. First, there is the influence of globalization's consequences have on the scope and role of the state. Privatization and contracting out may have somewhat hollowed out the domestic role and position of the state (cf. Milward & Provan 2000, but see Jessop 1993). However, regarding the role and position of the state in the international arena, one can argue that the state has been enveloped in a network of international forum and advocacy organizations. Indeed there are multiple international economic, cultural, political, military, and social organizations of which states are the most important members. The second factor concerns the rise of shared sovereignty (most explicit in the case of the European Union (EU)) and the transfer of some competencies to the supranational level. Third, there is the growing importance of issues (from the global economic crisis to climate change) that transcend the ability and power of territorial states, and can only be addressed effectively at a supra- and/or intergovernmental level. In this reasoning, globalization diminishes the autonomy and centrality of the state and its national civil servants.

We argue that the state is still at the center of the international political system since it is the only actor that has authority to make binding decisions on behalf of the entire citizenry. In this reasoning, national civil servants have an expanded role that requires new capacity and ability, in having to frame national contributions to resolving policy challenges that transcend the nation state.

There are different ways in which globalization impacts state systems. First, norms and laws set limits to national autonomy and create obligations for the state. Traditionally, national governments are responsible for maintaining the security and economic welfare of their citizens,

as well as the protection of human rights and the environment within their borders. With global ecological changes, an ever more integrated global economy, physical and cyber terrorism, and other global trends (e.g., human trafficking), policy design is increasingly a shared activity where multiple national systems interact with each other and with international actors to frame solutions to critical policy challenges. The decisions that flow from these interactions subsequently create binding constraints on states, though states also influence these constraints through their own participation.

Second, functional integration, where states jointly generate shared solutions to policy issues, with or without creating binding legal and policy instruments. Functional integration, discussed in more detail in this volume (Legrand), ranges from non-binding exchange and engagement to shared sovereignty in selected areas.

Third, globalization allows influence by international organizations that pool knowledge (e.g., the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)) or funds (Regional development banks), or both (International Monetary Fund (IMF), World Bank) and use these instruments to influence national policy design. This form of influence is not limited to international organizations and can be exercised in state to state relationships, especially in the context of bilateral development assistance.

In addition to these more fluid forms of interaction, there is a rich and long-standing literature on the impact of integration on state autonomy. Research has particularly focused on the growing importance of regional multi-level governance systems, such as the EU particularly, but also ASEAN and Mercosur (e.g. Meny et al. 1996; Marks and Schmitter 1996; Knill 2001), and the way they have impact on and are influenced by the composite national political and administrative cultures that constitute them. Most of these studies focus on how multi-level governance shapes policy content and drives policy. This body of literature has made important contributions to our understanding of how shared sovereignty influences national policy solutions and vice versa. A smaller number of studies also looked into the impact of this interaction on civil servants, and their participation in these processes.

2. Where does this leave civil servants?

The impact of globalization on civil servants and the civil service career has received much less attention with exception of the influence of Europeanization upon EU- and national civil servants in the member states (Sager and Overeem 2015). In an early article, Hopkins (1976) reviewed the engagement of the US bureaucracy in international affairs and how this influences US civil servants. He noted a ‘considerable engagement’ of the US domestic bureaucracy in a variety of policy areas, ranging from agriculture to health and from treasury to transportation (1976, 422-423 and 430). However, beyond this well documented review of how national civil servants interact with bilateral and global institutions, this issue has received limited attention. Yet, engagements that go beyond domestic policy continue to affect national institutions and their staff, though the degree to which this applies depends on many factors (the size of the country concerned, the extent to which the country plays a proactive or reactive role in the international system etc.).

In order to better assess how globalization affects national civil servants today, we will review the issue from two angles. First, how does growing interaction between national and international administrations impact national civil servants? Second, how have recent global economic trends, and in particular the financial crisis, influenced public sector systems? On the first element, there are three dimensions we will consider. First is the impact of direct interaction, nationally and internationally, with an emphasis on relations between national and supranational institutions in the EU. The socialization effect of the participation of national officials in EU decision making, and in particular the impact on countries that accede to the EU, has been subject of various analyses (e.g. Wessels 2001; Mastenbroek and Princen 2010; Bauer and Trondal 2015) and takes us furthest on the interaction spectrum. Particular attention will be paid to the use of secondments and external assignments by national civil servants in international organizations, and the socialization of new member states and their civil service into the EU.

Second, there is the impact of growing and deepening global engagement with International Financial Institutions (IFI), regional development banks and other multilateral partners. The engagement impact depends on global actors themselves (whether they choose to engage with a given country and how) and on the extent to which countries and their civil

servants are receptive to such engagement. Research on this aspect of globalization and its impact on national civil servants are limited. However, documents like World Bank client surveys, which exist for most client countries, provide an insight into how this interaction is perceived by national officials. In addition, recent work done by the AidData consortium (Parks et al. 2015; Custer et al. 2015) has helped shed a rare comparative and evidence-based light on how interaction is perceived by national civil servants and to what extent the hypothesis of growing influence of global actors over national policy making systems is credible. Third, this chapter shares the evolution of structured interaction for civil servants in a large global player like the United States. Are more international interaction and global agendas visible in the daily work of national officials? In the case of the USA, Hopkins' research from 1976 provides a useful starting point to assess how qualitatively different (or not) international engagement by US officials is 40 years later.

Regarding the second main question posed above on how global economic trends impact career officials and the development of civil service systems, there are recent studies on European and OECD countries (Coordinating for Cohesion in the Public Sector of the Future, or COCOPS report) that catalogue the impact of global economic woes on civil service employment conditions and career perspectives. On this dimension, the erosion of the notion that civil service systems provide 'safe havens' in times of economic turmoil is particularly noteworthy, and may in the long term well have a fundamental impact on the ability of public administration systems to attract and retain talent.

3. Influencing and being influenced by globalization

3.1 The EU and structured interaction: the asymmetrical use of secondments

The European Union is a logical start point when reviewing the impact of globalization on national officials. Participation in the EU policy process affects national civil servants in numerous ways (Mastenbroek and Princen 2010, 156). In addition, and although engagement with the EU affects a large number of civil servants to a limited degree, it only affects a small core group to a significant degree (with regard to four Central and Eastern European (CEE) countries, see also Meyer-Sahling and Van Stolk 2015).

For the purpose of this chapter, we will focus on a specific dimension of interaction, which is the use of secondment of national officials to EU institutions and how this impacts civil servants. The EU uses secondment of national officials as a structural tool to both draw on knowledge available in national administrations and create greater connections between EU institutions and national administrations. While there are other organizations that use secondment (e.g., the OECD), the case of the EU is best documented and provides insights in how secondment affects both the recipient institution, the sending institution and the individual civil servant.

The use and impact of secondment has been the subject of several studies (Trondal et al. 2007 and 2008; Murdoch et al. 2014). Trondal et al. focused specifically on secondment and its impact, based on empirical analysis of the experiences of secondees. Murdoch et al. examined the creation of the European External Action Service, which is the EU's new 'Foreign Service,' and the role of national officials in this process. These studies complement the more extensive literature of EU impact on the operation of member-state administrations and on policy substance via a focus on civil servants and institutions.

The studies suggest that the EU draws heavily on seconded member state officials for expertise and for 'reality checks' on policy proposals. National civil servants on secondment tend to be fully engaged in the day-to-day operations of the directorates they work in, and, in the case of the European External Action Service (EEAS), have been critical to building the capacity of EU institutions to operate as a foreign service (Murdoch et al. 2014, 77). This is similar to the experience of establishing the High Authority in 1952, the effective precursor of the European Commission (Trondal et al. 2008, 254).

However, based on the study by Trondal et al., there is a significant and qualitative difference in the way the receiving organization (the European Commission) makes use of the capacities it acquires, and the way national administrations use the additional knowledge their officials gain during their secondment. While the expertise of national officials is highly valued and used by receiving organizations (in this case the European Commission), national administrations barely make use of the experience the officials gained while working at the European Commission. Many respondents indicate that no account is taken of their supranational experience when planning their next assignments back home (Trondal et al. 2008, 265-266). National administrations did not appear to value the insights their staff had gained from their

secondment. Thus, while secondment may offer interesting opportunities, it is irrelevant and often even a negative when it comes to the national civil service career. Further anecdotal evidence from several seconded national officials the European Institute of Public Administration¹ and from national officials seconded to the World Bank², indicates that secondees found it difficult to settle back into their national administrations³ and even might leave for consulting or private sector positions after returning 'home'. While this is based on a limited number of directly observed cases, it further confirms the conclusions drawn by Trondal et al. and Murdoch et al. that secondment is often a one-way street that does not hold long-term career benefits for national officials. Whether for reasons of institutional inertia or for a lack of understanding the potential insights and connections returnees could offer, hardly any of the respondents reported a structural use of the knowledge and experience they gained during their secondment (Trondal et al. 2008, 266-267).

Finally, there is no evidence to suggest that there is a significant change in volume of secondments. Those organizations that routinely use them (European Commission, OECD, United Nations (UN) organizations and the IFIs) continue to do so (Davies 2002, 234-236 on secondment at UN). While the expansion of EU competencies has opened new opportunities (such as the creation of the EEAS) there is no evidence in the literature that other organizations have either expanded or reduced the use of secondment.

3.2 The EU and the limited impact of socialization: the case of central and east European member states

A second EU related case of the impact of globalization on national civil servants is the case of the EU accession of Central and East European states (CEES). As with the previous issue, there has been a limited academic debate (e.g. Verheijen 2007; Meyer-Sahling 2001; Meyer-Sahling and van der Stolk 2015). The accession process of these states has been important in itself, given that this was the first time the EU was taking in countries that had not shared, for over 50 years, European civil service values and traditions (OECD 1998; Cardona 2000). Earlier rounds of

¹ Concerning Irish, Spanish, Portuguese and Finnish seconded officials

² Dutch and Danish seconded officials

³ One striking example is of an official who gained significant expertise on EU policy coordination and management and was put in charge of personnel increase requests of prisons upon return to his home administration, and subsequently left for the private sector

enlargement had been absorbed in countries that had civil service systems similar to the EU. In response,, and considering the importance of national civil service systems in the EU policy process, the EU developed its own civil service standards and criteria that new member states were expected to subscribe to and respect (see OECD 1998; Verheijen 2000, 2002 and 2007; Dimitrova 2002). Civil service benchmarks include law-based management of the civil service, merit-based recruitment and career management, and limitations on politicization.

Studies conducted in the accession aftermath have generated interesting insights. First, there have been several assessments of whether EU accession has influenced the civil service transformation process in the new member states. Second, studies have looked into how post-accession socialization impacted new member state civil service systems. Third, how did participation in the EU policy process impact the day-to-day work of national officials?

With regard to the first issue it appears that the use of civil service and institutional capacity criteria had limited impact on institutional system development in new member states. Studies conducted within 3-4 years after accession (Verheijen 2007 and Meyer-Sahling 2009) showed that reforms introduced to ‘qualify’ for EU accession had either been rolled back or abandoned in most new member states (with the exception of the Baltic States). This reversal is ascribed to two factors. First, the limited credibility of the public administration accession criteria themselves and, second, the fact that both the political elite and civil servants in new member states have views of the role of the civil service that are different from ‘European Principles’. The differences are particularly stark when it comes to tolerance for politicization and the notion of a life-long career, which, especially in Central European states, is not seen as an attractive option by young talented staff (Meyer-Sahling 2009, 66-67). In many ways, this experience and the lack of perceived ‘fit’ of ‘best practice’ principles is akin to the challenges developing countries face when having to adopt civil service reforms based on value systems of ‘core OECD’ countries. In many parts of the world public service as a value is subordinate to other loyalties such as to family, tribe or ethnic group. Civil service impartiality is overruled by political or other loyalties. It remains unclear whether European principles are losing relevance and becoming a global ‘minority view’ (Verheijen 2007b).

The second element concerns two socialization approaches (Meyer-Sahling2011, 251-254). One is the peer-to-peer engagements under EU-financed twinning arrangements, which were expected to help cement critical institutions for civil service development through direct

advice and coaching by member state officials. On this element the assessment is negative as in three of the four cases where such engagement took place civil service offices were abolished in the first years after EU accession. Lithuania was the exception, because of its greater receptivity to European principles and baselines (Verheijen 2007a). The second tool is post-accession socialization efforts through training programs and participation in transnational networks such as the European Public Administration Network (EUPAN). As in the case of secondments to the European Commission, member states did not use the additional capacity (Meyer-Sahling 2011, 253). Finally, fairly similar patterns of Europeanization in four CEE-states have been noted: many civil servants worked partially on EU-related matters and only a small group of civil servants worked full-time on EU-issues (Meyer-Sahling and Van der Stolck 2015). This has also been found to be the case in Denmark (Hanf and Soetendorp 1998), and even in a non-member state as Norway (Tanil 2012).

The final dimension of our review of supranational impact on the day-to-day work of national civil servants in new EU member states is a study by Meyer-Sahling and van Stolck (2015) on the extent to which work with European Institutions is part of day-to-day work of civil servants in Estonia, Latvia, Poland and Slovakia. This was in essence a modified repeat of work done by Mastenbroek and Princen (2010 on the Netherlands) and by Laffan (2006 on Ireland, Greece and Finland). On this dimension the authors found that engagement with EU affairs affected national civil servants to a higher degree than was the case for the previous studies. This holds both for ministries that are strongly Europeanized (such as agriculture etc.) and those that are generally less Europeanized (Meyer-Sahling and van Stolck 2015, 240). While not covered explicitly in the article, it is our impression that the relatively recent experience of the intensive EU accession process may, to a large extent, explain this difference. Another finding is that the number of civil servants in these four states who would like to become permanent European civil servants is very high (between 49 and 63 percent). This can be explained by the attractiveness of remuneration, a generally greater willingness of Central and East Europeans to move and the sense of mission that joining the EU (as 'rejoining Europe') invoked in most new member states..

While efforts by the EU to influence the trajectory of civil service system development in central and east European states have had limited impact, the exposure and participation of civil servants from these same countries in EU policy making and institutions is relatively high. As

noted above, this may be due to higher enthusiasm for European integration and a greater interest in working at supranational level (and the relative novelty of this opportunity), but is a trend that is worth investigating further since EU membership and engagement at supranational level becomes more of a routine feature of day-to-day work of civil servants .

3.3. Interaction between international and national administrations and reform agendas in lower and middle income countries

Another impact of globalization on national civil servants comes in the form of growing interaction with IFIs and other international actors. IFI influence on national policies and their engagement with national civil servants grew rapidly in the 1990s as part of the push for market-based reforms under the Washington Consensus. This not only increased the frequency and breadth of interaction between IFI staff and national officials, but also had a strong impact on them as structural adjustment programs. Such programs included civil service retrenchment, monetization of benefits and public financial management and expenditure management reforms. From what was previously a one-way street of influence, patterns of engagement evolved into a two-way dialogue on reforms, in many instances involving several international and bilateral actors in harmonized approaches (driven by the Paris Principles on Aid Provision and Harmonization) and senior officials from recipient states.

This dialogue further evolved into the ‘market for advice’ (Custer et al. 2015) where competition in the provision of policy advice and support has changed the dynamic in relations between providers of development assistance and national officials from donor countries. Apart from the systematic engagement between supranational and national actors in the EU, the increasingly institutionalized relations between IFI/multilateral organization staff and national civil servants is for the latter the main embodiment of globalization, given that this involves officials from virtually all lower and middle income countries globally.

Again, empirical data on the nature of this engagement, and how it impacts civil servants, is limited. World Bank client surveys provide some insight in the way national officials perceive their engagement with this institution, but these mostly review the impact of the work done by the organization, not so much the quality of interaction with national civil servants. Other studies

review the emerging role of the EU in providing budget support, and how relations with client countries are framed in this context (e.g., Wolff 2015).

The only global and systematic assessment of the various dimensions of interaction between international development partners and national officials is summarized in two reports by the AidData initiative, 'The Marketplace of Ideas' (Parks et al. 2015) and 'Listening to Leaders' (Custer et al. 2015). Covering some 3,400 officials in 126 lower and middle income countries that receive assistance and advice from multilateral and bilateral partners as well as another 3000+ respondents from development partners, the expert community, NGOs and the private sector, these studies systemically gathered information on how national officials perceive their growing engagement with global actors, in other words:

how the buyers in this market, public sector leaders from low-income and middle-income countries, chose their suppliers. Which development partners do leaders prefer and why do they choose these advisory products and services to guide their reform priorities and evidence (Custer et al. 2015, 9)

Officials participating in the study provided feedback on the frequency of communications, usefulness of advice, agenda setting influence and helpfulness in reform implementation. They also assessed the extent to which the ability of partners to provide financial (budget) support impacts their access to policy makers and agenda setting influence. Finally the impact of international benchmarking tools on national policy makers was reviewed.

One important finding of the 'Listening to Leaders' study is the value that civil servants place on the permanency of relations, in particular with those partners with whom they have developed a positive relation. Network building between global and national officials is a critical feature. Familiarity with organizations and their staff is an important factor (and especially previous work-experience at a multilateral organization). Overall, permanent field presence combined with a country-level track record in resolving difficult policy issues are the critical features of perceived partner performance (Custer et al. 2015, 26). Finally, the ability of partners to put money on the table enhances agenda-setting influence, but not necessarily other aspects such as the perceived usefulness of policy advice (Custer et al. 2015, 55).

Another relevant element is frequency of interaction. The Custer et al. study examines two dimensions: the extent to which development partners communicate with counterparts (frequency of communication), and receptivity or the extent to which national governments are open to communications. On frequency of communication,⁴ for donor and recipient countries levels are lower than one might have expected, averaging less than once a month globally. However, specialized (such as the Global Fund and GAVI, active in the health sector, and UNICEF on child development) and generalist multilateral organizations (UNDP and World Bank in particular) have significantly higher levels of interaction. It is these global organizations that advocate for global public goods (such as climate change, eradication of major diseases, sustainable development, poverty reduction etc.) that are of most interest in the context of this chapter. On these issues, UNDP, the World Bank and specialized health organizations fall in the range of 2-3 contacts a month with counterparts (Custer et al. 2015, 18). The numbers are generally much lower for smaller multilaterals or bilateral development partners (exceptions include Ireland and Denmark).

On the opposite side of the same spectrum, there is a significant difference between recipient countries on both the level of engagement and level of selectivity of this engagement. Some countries prefer to infrequently interact with many development partners (and can afford to do so), while others ('donor darlings') opt for deeper engagement with many. This is contrasted with selective countries (small countries that interact with few partners) and disengaged countries that avoid deeper partnerships (Custer et al. 2015, 23-24).

Another important issue, addressed in the 'Marketplace for Ideas' study, is the impact of international benchmarking and its impact on national officials. Program International Student Assessment (PISA) rankings (on education achievements), IMF Article IV assessments (on macro-economic performance), World Bank Education and Health Sector Reviews, Global Fund performance-based funding assessments and PEFA (public financial management) rankings were quoted as the most influential benchmarking systems (Parks et al. 2015, 18-28), impacting the design of national policies and the choice of policy options in specific sectors. One caveat on this issue is the flipside of 'gaming' ranking-based benchmarks, as illustrated by the evolution of the World Bank's 'Doing Business' list. While a useful tool to measure progress on business climate

⁴ Unfortunately only frequency is measured, not the type of communication (policy dialogue, project design implementation related or otherwise)

reforms, its value has been somewhat eroded by countries targeting specific elements of reform agendas to gain places on the ranking instead of engaging broad-based reforms relevant to the business environment.

The AidData studies illustrates the rapid growth of interactions between a variety of international actors with national civil servants as well as the growing impact of international benchmarking tools on public officials. It confirms that global and multilateral actors remain the dominant players in this area, countering perceptions of greater bilateralism and engagement by non-traditional development partners. The latter remain largely outside the engagement on policy dialogue, which is of most interest to us here.

The assessment of this engagement by national civil servants as to how this influences their daily work (in particular on policy design) shows that for a large number of countries, ranging from donor darlings like Tanzania and Rwanda to middle income countries like Kazakhstan, Romania and Serbia (Custer et al. 2015, 45), engagement levels are high, and usefulness of advice and helpfulness in policy implementation and is positively assessed. This is contrasted by responses from other countries, which either by choice does not engage or are not receptive to the advice and support provided. Follow-up research should include drilling down into how this interaction operates in practice in a sample of the most engaged countries, which would help us gain further insights on how globalization and global interaction impacts on national civil servants.

3.4 Perceptions on globalization and its impact on officials in the USA

The final element of the discussion is based on insights about how policy professionals in the USA perceive the influence and impact of globalization. Hopkins (1976) provides rare empirical insight into the breadth and depth of international engagement by national US officials, albeit at a time when ‘globalization’ as a concept was not yet in currency. There are three issues we came across in the literature. First, with regard to Finland, it has been reported that cabinet ministers, top civil servants, and members of Parliament are very much focused on domestic policies and rarely familiarize themselves with EU matters in any detail (Forsberg and Raunio 2014). This would be consistent with a finding in the United Kingdom that much policy content is prepared by mid-level, and more often than not, junior-level civil servants (Page and Jenkins 2005). There

is some suggestion that the same is the case in the United States. Given that specialists became increasingly important in policy making after the Second World War, Hopkins suggested that some mid-level officials have direct influence upon “monitoring, promoting, or regulating resources, services, and information that move internationally” (1976, 406). He also noted that domestically oriented departments and agencies increasingly dealt with problems of international or global concern (ibid., 411) and illustrated this with examples of collaboration (through treaty, working group, and research) of domestically-oriented departments with international organizations and committees (ibid. 420-21). He also estimated that more than 12,000 civil servants were predominantly assigned internationally-oriented tasks. Of these, almost 9,500 worked in the State Department (ibid. 422-23). Interestingly, and reminiscent of the distinction in EU literature between full-time and part-time internationally working civil servants, Hopkins noted that in 1974, 1,200 civil servants worked on international issues at the Department of Health, Education and Welfare of which 403 full-time (ibid. 422). There is no current empirical information with regard to the extent to which American career civil servants are involved in international policies and/or in adapting domestic legislation to international law and standards. We do know that the influence of international law upon domestic policies has increased substantially (Slaughter & Burke-White 2009, 466, 485), that domestically oriented civil servants are increasingly involved in complying with international law (Raustiala & Slaughter 2006, 551), and that career civil servants are actively involved in multiple informational, law enforcement, and harmonization networks (Slaughter 2004, 51-61).

We would need to survey American career civil servants in order to understand which some departments belong to an inner and outer circle, and the percentage of career civil servants who work full-time on international issues. Given the US’s global role and influence, it might be that a larger number of civil servants is quite actively involved in aligning domestic policies with global trends and international agreements/treaties.

One might expect that research attention for globalization of the civil service in the United States is substantial given the country’s role on the world stage. However, contrary to their European colleagues, American scholars of public administration have mainly ignored this topic for reasons that are unclear to us. Hence, this is a major gap in research that can be filled by (doctoral) studies based on surveys and interviews of career civil servants.

Second, recent research has shown that the internationalization of management elites in the private sector in the United States and elsewhere has been substantial and that the number of non-national managers in nationally-based companies, and certainly in multinationals, has increased significantly (Ravasi 2015). We assume that this is much less the case for public sector personnel, because much of government work concerns domestic issues, and foreign nationals will seldom work in national or subnational government unless under secondment. With regard to the US, it would be interesting to see the extent to which departments temporarily outplace some middle to upper level civil servants to international organizations as a means to familiarize them with global and international issues and challenges. In fact, this would be equally interesting to investigate with regard to developing countries.

As far as the US is concerned it may well be that some departments are more globalized/internationalized than others and we could use the Gueijen/'t Hart categories to get a sense of this (2010, 175). Replacing their Eurocratic labels we could distinguish between *global bulwarks* when more than 50% of the civil servants work on global/international issues, the *global runners-up* with 30-40% globalized/internationalized civil service, and the *national champions* or laggards with less than 30% of civil servants engaged in global/international issues.

4. Influencing and being influenced: trends and patterns

The cases discussed above provide some insight into aspects of the engagement of national officials with international and supranational actors. The literature on secondment, diffusion of ideas (e.g., civil service ideals) and the level of permeation of national administrations by supranational engagement remains rather EU specific, and there is significant research to be done on patterns of engagement with comparable regional organizations, which would shed light on the level of representativeness of the EU case (on diffusion, permeating and the promotion (or not) of values/models).

The empirical research on the impact of engagement of national officials with global and regional institutions in the context of reform dialogue provides us deeper evidence of the impact of these interactions. While the frequency of contacts varies significantly depending both on the attitude and engagement level of countries, the responses from over 126 countries that engage

regularly with global or regional development partners show that for a large number of these states, global actors have a significant impact on national officials. The growing importance of international benchmarking instruments, which have become important guiding elements of reform process, adds to this. While, again, data are limited to one set, the literature on international development points to a rapid growth of contacts and mutual influence between national and international officials since the advent of structural adjustment policies in the 1990s. Today's relations are more varied and balanced, with a two-way street of influence having replaced the purported 'imposition' of ideas and reforms of that period.

Finally, the growing number of issues that require international engagement, whether at the regional or global level, has generated a multitude of forms of interaction between national officials and international organizations and systems. While the impact of these evolving patterns of interaction on national civil servants has not been studied extensively, we have presented some of the different features of this engagement and how national officials perceive and respond to these. Based on this review, there is ample room for more evidence based research on this issue.

5. Global economic developments and their impact on civil service and the state

The capacity and quality of the civil service is determined by the ability to attract and retain strong human resources. Traditionally, the civil service has 'traded' lower salaries (especially in managerial and advisory ranks) for job security and benefits. This traditional model remained unchallenged, especially in developed and emerging economies, for many decades. The economic and financial crisis, however, is posing a serious challenge to its survival.

The erosion of the model of the impartial and permanent career civil service arguably started under the influence of New Public Management (NPM), and in developing countries under the structural adjustment policies of the 1990s. However, based on current evidence, this process of erosion accelerated as a consequence of the 2008 financial crisis. In CEE-countries and in the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) the fiscal crisis had serious consequences for civil servants including salary reduction, lay-offs, and an outflow of talent from the public sector into the private sector and even going abroad (Verheijen and Rabrenovic 2015, 26; Kickert et al. 2013). The most serious hit were CEE-states in that their levels of economic

development were reversed (Verheijen and Rabrenovic 2015, 27). Cost-cutting measures coincided with increasing politicization that resulted in growing numbers of civil servants leaving government employment. The effort to establish a leaner government had been ongoing in Western Europe at least since the early 1990s, but received new momentum under the influence of the fiscal crisis. Pay freezes were an immediate consequence (Van der Meer et al. 2015, 42; Pollitt and Bouckaert 2011, 26-28). Fiscal crisis also resulted in further decreasing levels of trust government in Southern European countries. Anglo-American countries, except the UK, were influenced by the fiscal crisis, but less than other OECD countries (Halligan 2015, 71). In general, the fiscal crisis has prompted even more support for austerity through pay cuts, outsourcing of public services (Bezes and Lodge 2015, 136) and reduction of pension rights (Lægreid and Wise 2015, 215).

While it is fairly easy to assess the immediate impact of the global fiscal crisis on the civil service, it will take some time before we can really evaluate its impact upon the role and position of the state and its government in society. Some of that recent literature is reviewed by Franke and it seems that state intervention in both a liberal market economy (the UK) and a coordinated market economy (Germany) has increased under the pressure for state intervention to salvage/help out the economy (Franke 2014, 88). Even before the fiscal crisis, there were scholars arguing that the state as actor had not lost any of its importance. Dolowitz noted that the state is still an important, perhaps even predominant, actor in the international arena; any state can use globalization to strengthen its own domestic and international agenda (2006). In reference to a statement made at the beginning of this chapter, the state is still the only actor that can make binding decisions on behalf of the citizenry at large and the only actor with the authority to exercise regulatory oversight over the market (see Raadschelders & Vigoda-Gadot 2015, 185). International organizations may have regulatory powers, but they have been granted by the member states. *Inter alia*, in their study of global trends in government and governance, the latter two authors point out that there is convergence, i.e., globalization, in how governments are territorially structured and bureaucratically organized, but that in terms of functioning there continues to be clear national differences because of variation in societal and political-administrative culture (Raadschelders and Vigoda-Gadot 2015, 473-474).

Finally, one element of particular importance regards skills requirements. While traditionally administrations seek to employ skills that are relevant to national policy making,

including knowledge of national law, economics or social sciences and an ability to function in specific national settings, engaging in a globalized world requires the ability to negotiate in complex multi-cultural settings as well as to build alliances through influencing and the soft skills that comes with this.

6. Conclusions

Globalization brings both challenges and opportunities to the state and its civil servants. With regard to the state, it is clear that cross-border economic interactions have substantially increased. Also clear is that NPM reforms, whether voluntarily copied or more or less imposed by multilateral actors (such as under the Washington Consensus in the 1990s; for a critical analysis see Reinert 2007; or under the restructuring programs of IMF, European Central Bank and European Commission since 2008; for critical analysis see Stiglitz 2016), have had mixed reception that can partially be explained by variation in societal and political-administrative culture (Kisner 2016). We know that at least in one country NPM-inspired reforms resulted in a government that works a little less well and costs a bit more (Hood and Dixon 2015), but we need much more empirical research into various aspects of NPM-inspired reforms. In this chapter we only focused on literature concerning the EU and – to much lesser extent – the USA. In general, we need more empirical work into the effect of cost-cutting, personnel reduction and pension cuts in the public sector in various parts of the globe. More specifically, and inspired by the extensive empirical literature on the impact of Europeanization on the civil service in EU member states, we need much more empirical work into the effects of globalization and internationalization upon the work and careers of national civil servants.

There is a contradiction between the need for states to invest in capacity to be an effective player in a globalized world and the current tendency to, under fiscal pressure, cut cost and to defer investments in administrative capacity to the future. The risk of such an approach is illustrated throughout this chapter. In the case of EU states, a lack of investment in capacity to operate in a multi-level and multinational system can lead to marginalization as well as missing out on the benefits of EU-membership (painfully illustrated by the recent cases of Romania, Croatia and also Greece). In the case of lower and middle income countries it impacts countries' ability to select and make effective use of the advice and support provided by multilateral and

bilateral partners: it requires adequately skilled officials to be able to ‘translate’ advice to context and to avoid costly mistakes by taking on board ill-suited models of advice (see the point on NPM reforms above). In the case of high income global players there is less risk of marginalization, but a lack of attention for the knowledge and skills requirements for a globalized economy can lead to countries punching well below their weight. In contrast, those countries that invest, even selectively, in building some of the capacities that generate better performance in international and multi-national systems, tend to be rewarded in terms of resources and relative influence (e.g. the case of the Baltic States in the EU), in ability to put international support and advice to generate economic development (e.g. Rwanda and, further in past, South Korea and Malaysia) and to influence and impact major international agendas such as climate change, global health challenges etc.. Unfortunately, the connection between investment in new skills for public administrations and the kind of benefits outlined above is not always obvious, and, in a period of fiscal conservatism, hard to argue. Yet it is an issue that leaders will ignore at their peril.

Finally, as we set out at the start, the question how globalization impacts career civil servants is under-researched, regardless of its growing relevance, and suggestions for further research have been made above. A specific sub-set of questions for further research lies in the use and application of internationally established performance benchmarking systems. In relation to the third aspect of this chapter, evidence-based research on how globalization affects patterns of engagement in advanced economies, we identified a serious gap that needs filling. Only by having further data and information on all three of these elements, can firmer conclusions on changing patterns of engagement be made.

References

- Andrews, M. (2013). *The Limits of Institutional Reform in Development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bauer, M and J. Trondal (2015). *The Palgrave handbook of the European Administrative System*. London: Palgrave
- Bezes, Ph., M. Lodge (2015). Civil Service Reforms, Public Service Bargains and Dynamics of Institutional Change. In F.M. van der Meer, J.C.N. Raadschelders, Th.A.J. Toonen (eds.),

Comparative Civil Service Systems in the 21st Century. Houndsmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 136-161.

- Cardona, F. (2000). *European Public Administration Principles*. Paris: OECD/SIGMA

- Custer, S., Z. Rice, T. Masaki, R. Latourell and B. Parks (2015). *Listening to Leaders: Which Development Partners do They Prefer and Why?* Williamsburg, VA: AidData. Accessed at <http://aiddata.org/listening>.

- Davies, M.D.V. (2002). *The Administration of International Organizations: top down and bottom up*. Athanaeum Press: Gateshead.

- Dimitrova, A. (2002). Enlargement, institution-building and the EU's administrative capacity requirement. *West European Politics*, 25(4), 171-190

- Dolowitz, D. (2006). Bring Back the States: Correcting for the Omissions of Globalization. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 29(4-6), 263-280.

- Forsberg, T., T. Raunio (2014). *Policy Change* (in Finnish). Helsinki: Publishing Company Counterweight.

- Franke, M.M. (2014). State Intervention in Times of the Global Economic Crisis. In E. Bohne, J.D. Graham, J.C.N. Raadschelders (eds.), *Public Administration and the Modern State: Assessing Trends and Impact*. Houndsmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 75-89.

- Gueijen, K., P. 't Hart (2010). Flying Blind in Brussels: How National Officials do European Business without Political Steering. In H. Colebatch, R. Hoppe, and M. Noordegraaf (eds.), *Working for Policy*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 174-194.

- Halligan, J. (2015). Anglophone Systems: Diffusion and Policy Transfer with an Administrative Tradition. In F.M. van der Meer, J.C.N. Raadschelders, Th.A.J. Toonen (eds.), *Comparative Civil Service Systems in the 21st Century*. Houndsmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 57-76.

- Hanf, K., B. Soetendorp (1998). *Adapting to European Integration: Small States and the European Union*. New York: Routledge.

- Hood, Chr., R. Dixon (2015). *A Government that Works Better and Costs Less? Evaluating Three Decades of Reform and Change in UK Central Government*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Hopkins, R.F. (1976). The international role of "domestic" bureaucracy. *International Organization*, 30(3), 405-432.

- Jessop, B. (1993). Towards a Schumpeterian Workfare State? Preliminary Remarks on Post-Fordist Political Economy. *Studies in Political Economy*, 40(1), 7-39.
- Kickert, W., T. Randma-Liiv, R. Savi (2013). *Fiscal Consolidation in Europe: A Comparative Analysis*. COCOPS Trend Report.
- Kisner, M. (2016). *Regressive Effects of NPM-Style Reforms: A Global Comparative Study in Public Administration*. Unpublished Ph.D.-thesis, University of Haifa, Israel.
- Knill, Chr. (2001). *The Europeanisation of National Administrations. Patterns of Institutional Change and Persistence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Læg Reid, P., L.R. Wise (2015). Transitions in Civil Service Systems: Robustness and Flexibility in Human Resource Management. In F.M. van der Meer, J.C.N. Raadschelders, Th.A.J. Toonen (eds.), *Comparative Civil Service Systems in the 21st Century*. Houndsmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 203-222.
- Laffan, B. (2006). Managing Europe from Home in Dublin, Athens and Helsinki. *West European Politics* 29(4), 687-708.
- Marks G., F. Scharpf, Ph. Schmitter and W. Streeck (1996). *Governance in the European Union*. London: Sage
- Mastenbroek, E. and S. Princen (2010). Time for EU Matters: The Europeanization of the Dutch Central Government. *Public Administration*, 88(1), 154-169.
- Mény, Y., P. Muller and J-L Quermonne (1996). *Adjusting to Europe*. London: Routledge.
- Meyer-Sahling, J-H. (2009). *The Sustainability of Civil Service Reform in Central and Eastern Europe Five Years after Accession*. SIGMA Paper No 44. Paris: OECD.
- Meyer-Sahling, J-H. (2011). The Durability of EU Civil Service Policy in Central and Eastern Europe after Accession. *Governance. An International Journal of Policy, Administration, and Institutions*, 24(2), 231-260.
- Meyer-Sahling, J-H., Chr. van der Stolk (2015). A Case of Partial Convergence: The Europeanization of Central Government in Central and Eastern Europe. *Public Administration (UK)*, 93(1), 230-247.
- Milward, B.H., K.G. Provan (2000). Governing the Hollow State. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 10(2), 359-379.

- Murdoch, Z., J. Trondal and S. Gaenzle (2014). Building Foreign Affairs capacity in the EU: The Recruitment of Member State Officials to the EEAS. *Public Administration (UK)*, 92(1), 71-86.
- OECD (1998). *Preparing Public Administrations for the European Administrative Space*. SIGMA Papers, No. 23, OECD Publishing. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/5kml6143zd8p-en>
- Page, E.C., B. Jenkins (2005). *Policy Bureaucracy. Government with a Cast of Thousands*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Parks, B., S. Custer, Z. Rice, T. Masaki and R. Latourell (2015). *The Marketplace of Ideas for Policy Change*. Williamsburg, VA: AidData. Accessed at <http://aiddata.org/marketplace>.
- Pollitt, Chr., G. Bouckaert (2011). *Public Management Reform. A Comparative Analysis: New Public Management, Governance, and the Neo-Weberian State*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Raadschelders, J.C.N., E. Vigoda-Gadot (with Mirit Kisner) (2015). *Global Dimensions of Public Administration and Governance. A Comparative Voyage*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Raustiala, K., A.-M. Slaughter (2006). International Law, International Relations and Compliance. In W. Carlsnaes, Th. Risse, B.A. Simmons (eds.), *Handbook of International Relations*. London: Sage Publications, 538-558.
- Ravasi, C. (2015). *Internationalization of managerial careers: three research articles*. University of Paris-Ouest/University of Fribourg: Unpublished doctoral dissertation.
- Reinert, E.S. (2007). *How Rich Countries Got rich ... and Why Poor Countries Stay Poor*. London: Constable & Robinson Ltd.
- Robinson, M. (2015). *From Old Public Administration to the New Public Service: Implications for Public Sector Reform in Developing Countries*. Singapore: UNDP Global Centre for Public Service Excellence.
- Sager, F., P. Overeem (eds.) (2015). *The European Civil Servants: A Shared Administrative Identity?* Colchester: ECPR Press.
- Slaughter, A.-M. (2004). *A New World Order*. Princeton/Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Slaughter, A.-M., W. Burke-White (2009). The Future of International Law is Domestic (or, The European Way of Law). In Ch. Ku, P.F. Diehl (eds.), *International Law. Classic and Contemporary Readings*. Boulder/London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 465-490.

- Stiglitz, Joseph E. (2016). *The Euro. How a Common Currency Threatens the Future of Europe*. New York/London: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Tanil, G. (2012). *Europeanization, Integration and Identity: A Social Constructivist Perspective on Norway*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Trondal, J., C. van den Berg, S. Suvarierol (2008). The compound Machinery of Government: The Case of Seconded Officials in the European Commission. *Governance: An International Journal of Policy, Administration, and Institutions*, 21(2), 253-274.
- Trondal, J., B.G. Peters (2012). The Rise of European Administrative Space. Working Paper no.1, Centre for European Studies, University of Oslo.
- Verheijen, T.J.G. (2000). *Administrative Capacity Development in Central and Eastern Europe, a Race Against Time?* Background Study W. 107. The Hague: WRR.
- Verheijen, T.J.G. (2002). *Who Rules, Politico-Administrative Relations in Central and Eastern Europe*. Bratislava: NISPACE.
- Verheijen, T.J.G. (2007a). *Administrative Development in the New EU Member States, the Limits to Innovation*. World Bank Research Reports 115. Washington: World Bank.
- Verheijen, T.J.G. (2007b). Independent Civil Service Systems, a Contested Value?, *Journal for Comparative Government and European Policy*, 5 (3-4), 540-556
- Verheijen, T.J.G., A. Rabrenovic (2015). Civil Service Development in Central and Eastern Europe and the CIS: A Perfect Storm? In F.M. van der Meer, J.C.N. Raadschelders, Th.A.J. Toonen (eds.), *Comparative Civil Service Systems in the 21st Century*. Houndsmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 15-37.
- Wessels, W, B. Lippert, G. Umbach (2001). Europeanization of CEE executives: EU membership negotiations as a shaping power. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 6(8), 980-1012.
- Wolff, S. (2015). EU Budget Support as a Transnational Policy Instrument: Above and Beyond the State? *Public Administration*, 93(1), 1-17.