



The University of
Nottingham

UNITED KINGDOM · CHINA · MALAYSIA

Meyer-Sahling, Jan-Hinrik and Van Stolk, Christian
(2015) A case of partial convergence: the
Europeanization of central government in Central and
Eastern Europe. *Public Administration*, 93 (1). pp. 230-
247. ISSN 0033-3298

Access from the University of Nottingham repository:

<http://eprints.nottingham.ac.uk/35759/1/Public%20Administration1%20-%20Submitted%20Version%202013.pdf>

Copyright and reuse:

The Nottingham ePrints service makes this work by researchers of the University of Nottingham available open access under the following conditions.

This article is made available under the Creative Commons Attribution Non-commercial licence and may be reused according to the conditions of the licence. For more details see: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/2.5/>

A note on versions:

The version presented here may differ from the published version or from the version of record. If you wish to cite this item you are advised to consult the publisher's version. Please see the repository url above for details on accessing the published version and note that access may require a subscription.

For more information, please contact eprints@nottingham.ac.uk

Ever More Time for EU Matters: The Over-Europeanisation of Central Government in Central and Eastern Europe

Jan-Hinrik Meyer-Sahling
University of Nottingham
j.meyer-sahling@nottingham.ac.uk

Dr Christian van Stolk
RAND Europe
christian_van_stolk@rand.org

July 2013

This paper is under review – please do not circulate without permission from the authors

Abstract

This paper examines the Europeanisation of central government in four Central and Eastern European countries (CEECs): Estonia Latvia, Poland and Slovakia. It replicates a study by Mastenbroek and Princen (2010) on the Netherlands to compare Europeanisation in old and new member states. Using a survey of ministerial civil servants, it finds that central government is subject to a much larger scope of Europeanisation, indicating the over-Europeanisation of central government compared to old member states. In particular, more civil servants deal with EU affairs and they spend more time on EU issues. At the same time, there are signs of convergence, in that patterns of Europeanisation are similar among CEECs and between them and old member states. In particular, some ministries are more affected by the EU, only a small proportion of civil servants works full-time on EU issues and routinely engages in activities that 'project' national policies at EU level.

Introduction

This paper examines the Europeanisation of central government in the new member states of Central and Eastern Europe (CEECs). Much of the debate on the Europeanisation of central government has concentrated on the impact of EU conditionality on administrative capacity building before accession (Dimitrova 2005, Goetz 2005, Camyar 2010). More recently, the focus of study has shifted towards the development of public administration after accession of CEECs to the EU. This research has found that the end of conditionality did not necessarily lead to reform backsliding. Instead, the CEECs have taken diverse pathways after becoming full members of the EU (Dimitrova 2010, Meyer-Sahling 2011).

The examination of the effectiveness of EU conditionality before and beyond the date of accession represents an angle of research that is specific for CEECs. Research that bridges the study of Europeanisation in East and West and hence the old and the new member states is much less common. An important exception concerns the study of EU coordination structures. Their emergence and effectiveness has been examined for the pre-accession period (Lippert et al 2001, Lippert/Umbach 2005, Zubek 2008). More recently, the adaptation of pre-accession institutional structures to post-accession realities has been subject to investigation, applying conceptual frameworks that were initially developed for the old member states (Dimitrova/Toshkov 2007, Zubek 2011, Batory 2012, Zubek/Staronova 2012).

This paper contributes to the emerging body of literature that seeks to bridge the study of the Europeanisation of government in old and new member states. Specifically, it replicates research on the Europeanisation of central government that t'Hart et al (2007) and Mastenbroek and Princen (2010) conducted for the Netherlands in four CEECs that joined the EU in 2004. The paper explicitly follows the approach proposed by Mastenbroek and Princen (2010). Accordingly, it examines the extent to which the EU affects the (i) structure and (ii) culture of governmental organisations and (iii) the activities of civil servants employed at central government level. The empirical analysis is based on individual-level data from a survey of civil servants who are employed in central government ministries.

In order to compare the CEECs to existing research on the Netherlands, the paper distinguishes the *scope* of Europeanisation and the *pattern* of Europeanisation. The former refers to the extent to which the EU has been incorporated into the structure, culture and activities of central government organisations and staff. The latter addresses the internal order of the three dimensions of Europeanisation such as the distinction of an 'inner' and 'outer core' of ministries dealing with EU affairs (Laffan 2006, 2007) and the relative importance of specific types of EU-related activities in the day-to-day work of civil servants such as the distinction of 'projection' and 'reception-related' activities (Bulmer/Burch 2009).

Empirically, the paper concentrates on exploring the data on the Europeanisation of central government in four CEECs: Estonia, Latvia, Poland and Slovakia. It presents three core findings. First, central government in CEECs is over-Europeanised in that the scope of Europeanisation is far more encompassing compared to the old member states. Second, patterns of Europeanisation in CEECs are remarkably similar along all three

dimensions of Europeanisation. Third, the differences between CEECs are relatively small for the structural and the staff dimensions, in that the CEECs under study are more similar to each other than to the Dutch case. Differences between the four CEECs are relevant with regard to the cultural dimension of Europeanisation.

The paper discusses the findings in the context of the literature on the Europeanisation of central government, in particular, arguments that predict (i) the convergence of CEECs with the old member states, (ii) the exceptionalism of CEECs in comparison to the old member states, and (iii) the emergence of clusters of CEECs and hence the differentiation among CEECs. It argues that the Europeanisation of central government qualifies as a case of partial convergence. The similarities between old and new member states and among the CEECs provide support for the notion of convergence. However, convergence is partial in that a much larger proportion of civil servants is involved in EU activities, indicating the over-Europeanisation of central government compared to old member states.

The paper is divided in four parts. The first part discusses Mastenbroek and Princen's (2010) framework and findings of the study of the Europeanisation of central government. The second part outlines the data and operationalization of the framework. The third part presents the empirical findings for the CEECs collectively and individually. The conclusion summarises the findings and explores mechanisms of executive Europeanisation in light of the literature on the Europeanisation of central government.

Studying the Europeanisation of central government

Following the literature on the Europeanisation of central government (Goetz 2000, Jordan 2003, Laegrid et al 2004, Laffan 2006, 2007, Laffan/O'Mahoney 2007, Bulmer/Burch 1998, 2005, 2009), Mastenbroek and Princen (2010) (*henceforth* M&P) distinguish three dimensions of Europeanisation: the incorporation of the EU into the structure and culture of government organisation and the type of EU-related activity that civil servants perform.

First, the 'structural dimension' concerns the incorporation of EU affairs into government organisations. M&P (2010) specifically examine the extent to which civil servants employed by government organisations, primarily ministries, deal with EU policies and the amount of time that they spend every week on EU affairs. In the analysis of the Dutch case, they show that approximately 30 per cent of all central level civil servants are involved in the management of EU policies. However, there are important differences across ministries. They identify the ministries of agriculture, foreign affairs, economic affairs and transport as an inner core of ministries. By contrast, the involvement of civil servants in ministries of interior, justice, education and the prime minister's office is much lower. These ministries represent their outer core of ministries, in which EU affairs merely play a secondary role.

M&P further show that the overwhelming majority of civil servants spend only a small part of their weekly working time in EU affairs. As a result, only a small group of civil servants spends most of its working week on EU policies. M&P therefore conclude that

the Europeanisation of Dutch central government is 'two-sided': on the one hand, a significant proportion of civil servants deals with EU but only a very small group carries the bulk of the government's EU-related work.

Second, M&P refer to the cultural dimension of Europeanisation as the 'civil servants' working practices and their outlook'. In order to observe the role of the EU for the culture of government organisations and civil servants, they examine the importance of the EU in personnel management, in particular, for training curricula, recruitment practices and career progression. Moreover, they seek to capture the extent to which civil servants 'think European'. Following Jordan (2003), they explore issues such as the importance of EU issues in ministerial policy-making relative to national issues and the extent to which civil servants direct their attention for the coordination of policies to Brussels rather than to other ministries at the national level.

M&P find limited support for the Europeanisation of Dutch central government on the cultural dimension. EU issues are moderately incorporated into the management of personnel and there is no evidence that civil servants think overly European at the expense of their national orientation in policy-making and coordination. Only the inner core of highly Europeanised ministries differs in that civil servants show a slightly greater EU focus than their peers in the less Europeanised ministries.

Third, M&P refer to the 'tasks and roles' of civil servants as the third dimension of Europeanisation. It concerns questions of what type of activity civil servants perform with regard to the EU. Following Bulmer and Burch (2009), reception-related activities concern the transposition and implementation of EU policies at the national level. By contrast, projection-related activities include the preparation of national positions for EU-level negotiations, regular participation in EU-level meetings organised by the Council and the Commission as well as the coordination of policies with officials from other EU member states.

For the Dutch case M&P show that reception-related activities are more important for civil servants than projection-related activities. Moreover, reception and projection form two different dimensions of civil servants' roles. Civil servants who deal with projection-related activities do not necessarily work on projection-related tasks. This finding reinforces the two-sided nature of the Europeanisation of central government. It suggests a subtle form of fragmentation between a narrow circle of 'EU cadres' (Laffan 2007) that concentrates on projection-related activities and a wider circle that deals with reception-oriented work.

There is no study of old member states directly comparable to the research by M&P. Laegrid et al (2004) are a partial exception. They compare the Europeanisation of central government in Finland, Sweden, Norway and Iceland. Using evidence from a survey of heads of ministerial departments, they provide insights with regard to the structural dimension of Europeanisation. For instance, it is shown that the involvement of civil servants in EU-related activities is fairly high for areas dealing with EU single market policies. Laegrid et al (2004) do not examine the cultural and the staff dimension of executive Europeanisation.

The findings by M&P and by Laegrid et al (2004) are partially matched by qualitative studies of Europeanisation. Laffan (2006) in research on Ireland, Finland and Greece and Laffan/O'Mahoney (2007) in a study of the Irish case distinguish between the 'holy trinity' of foreign affairs, finance and prime minister's offices, an 'inner core' such as agriculture, interior and economic affairs and an 'outer core' of ministries for which EU affairs is merely secondary. M&P's results differ in that the finance and interior ministries and the equivalent of the prime minister's office play a less important role in the Dutch case. However, M&P confirm the existence of a basic distinction between an inner and an outer core of ministries dealing with EU affairs.

The Europeanisation of central government in CEECs has mainly been addressed in the context of studies of the coordination of EU policies. Research that moves beyond specialized structures for EU coordination is much less common. An important exception is the study by Zubek and Staronova (2012) on the impact of EU exposure on ministerial oversight structures in Estonia, Poland and Slovakia. They find that ministerial oversight is more centralized in ministries that are more exposed to the EU. By implication, their research reveals a distinction between an inner and an outer core of EU-oriented ministries in CEECs, for instance, the distinction between highly exposed ministries such as of agriculture and less exposed ministries such as interior in all countries under study.

What to expect for the CEECs?

Applying the framework by M&P the question arises what to expect for the CEECs with regard to the Europeanisation of central government. In order to present a meaningful comparison between the CEECs and existing research on the Netherlands as a 'typical' old member state, the paper first distinguishes between the *scope* of Europeanisation and the *patterns* of Europeanisation. The former refers to the extent to which central government is Europeanised. The latter concerns the ordering of Europeanisation features as identified by M&P. Put simply, the scope of Europeanisation allows one to distinguish basic proportions, for instance, the difference between 30, 50 or 70 per cent of civil servants dealing with EU policies. By contrast, the pattern of Europeanisation indicates whether the inner and outer core of ministries are by and large identical across countries regardless of the extent to which civil servants deal with EU policies. The distinction between the scope and the patterns of Europeanisation applies to all three dimensions under study.

Second, this paper distinguishes three scenarios in order to capture similarities and differences between the CEECs and the old member states. The first scenario expects a convergence of CEECs with the old member states. Convergence of national administrative systems is frequently hypothesised in the Europeanisation literature (Kassim/Peters 2000, Goetz 2000, Batory 2012). The participation in EU policy-making and implementation exerts functional pressures for adaptation in the member states. Because all members have to deal with the implementation of EU policies and the participation in the EU policy-making in the same way, the adaptive pressures are assumed to be uniform, leading to a convergence of administrative systems. As a consequence, one should expect that CEECs are similar to the Dutch case with regard to

the scope and the patterns of Europeanisation. Moreover, differences among the CEECs should be small.

Second, even if convergence is frequently hypothesised, it is rarely found (for an exception, see Kaeding 2007). Instead, the differential impact of the EU on national administrations is a widely accepted finding in the literature on the Europeanisation of public administration in the old member states. Laegrid et al (2004) who compare the Europeanisation of central government in the Nordic states confirm this finding. Factors such as the status of political relations to the EU, the timing of accession and the size of a country are found to affect the extent to which central government is Europeanised. In particular, Laegrid et al (2004) argue that countries with a small administration are likely to be more Europeanised. These countries have generally less opportunities for specialisation and hence a larger proportion of officials is involved in EU affairs. As a result, Laegrid et al (2004) can explain why the Icelandic government is much more exposed to the EU than the Norwegian case even though both countries were non-EU-members at the time of research.

The insights from Laegrid et al (2004) are relevant for the CEECs. While ten CEECs joined the EU within relatively short succession in 2004 and 2007, they differ considerably with regard to other factors including the size of the country and hence public administration. Especially the Baltic States and Slovenia are small countries, while Poland and Romania stand out as the largest CEECs. Taking into account the general expectation of a 'differential Europe' (Heritier et al 2001), one should therefore expect that the CEECs differ among each other in scope and pattern, while similarities among CEECs and in comparison to old member states should be limited to countries with similar conditions.

The third scenario returns to a regional perspective, expecting the CEECs to be different from the old member states but similar among each other. The notion of CEECs as regionally exceptional with regard to administrative developments is not new. Taking issue with delays in public administration reform, persisting politicisation, a lack of executive coordination capacity and a sense of general institutional weakness, Goetz/Wollmann (2001) suggested more than a decade ago that a specifically post-communist type of administration might emerge on the ruins of the communist legacy.

With regard to the Europeanisation of central government, a similar argument can be raised. It is widely acknowledged that the preparation for EU accession involved a major logistic effort on the side of the CEECs (Grabbe 2006, Zubek 2008, 2011, Toshkov 2008). It required a wide range of institutional changes and an impressive mobilisation of resources, in particular, human resources. While the accession to the EU in 2004 and 2007 implied a normalisation of the relations between the EU and the CEECs, theories of organisations and more specifically administrative traditions would lead one to expect organisational inertia (at least in the early period) after accession. According to the scenario of regional exceptionalism, the scope of Europeanisation should therefore be expected to be much higher in the CEECs than in the Netherlands. Moreover, a large scope of Europeanisation should be a general phenomenon for CEECs.

Case selection and data

Empirically, the paper compares the Europeanisation of central government in Estonia, Latvia, Poland and Slovakia. The four CEECs joined the EU in 2004 in the context of the east enlargement of the EU. They therefore share the common functional pressures for adaptation that stem from EU membership. They also underwent largely similar accession processes. Estonia and Poland opened negotiations in 1998. Latvia and Slovakia followed in 2000. With regard to the first and third scenario outlined in the last section, a similar scope and similar patterns of Europeanisation should therefore be expected across the four countries.

At the same time, the four countries differ with regard to their size, which according to Laegrid et al (2004) presents a relevant condition for differences in the Europeanisation of central government. Estonia and Latvia are among the smallest EU member states with a population of 1.3 and 2.0 million respectively. Slovakia is not much larger with 5.4 million inhabitants. Poland is the largest new member state with a size of 38.2 million. Following the second scenario of differentiation among CEECs, a much larger scope of Europeanisation should therefore be expected in the small countries, especially Estonia and Latvia. By contrast, the large size of Poland relative to the Netherlands implies that the scope of Europeanisation might even be lower in Poland compared to the Netherlands.

The empirical analysis relies on a large N survey of ministerial civil servants that was conducted in the spring and summer of 2008 in the context of an OECD study on the post-accession sustainability of civil service reform in CEECs. The survey replicated many but not all of the questions initially asked for the Netherlands by t'Hart et al (2007) and later used by M&P. The survey of the CEECs targeted civil servants in most but not all central government ministries. They include the ministries of agriculture, economy, regional development, transport, labour and social affairs, environment, education, culture, finance, health, interior, justice and the prime minister's office or equivalent. The ministries were chosen in order to maximize the comparability of results across countries.

The survey was managed as an online survey. Web-based surveys have the advantage that one reaches a much larger number of potential respondents and they are more cost and time-efficient than traditional, paper-based surveys. However, web-based surveys especially when targeting a large population such as ministerial civil servants provide less control over the identity of respondents. In order to maximize the consistency and reliability of the data, the same strategy for the distribution of the survey link was followed in each country. The survey link was sent with an explanation to the central civil service management department. The head of the department was asked to send the invitation to participate in the survey together with the explanation to the ministries listed above. The head of personnel in the ministries then distributed the survey link within the core structure of the ministry. Civil servants in agencies, deconcentrated and territorial units of the ministries were excluded from the survey.

For the four countries, the survey generated 1507 responses. It is not possible to exactly define the survey response rate because it is not known with certainty who precisely received the email invitation to participate in the survey in the ministries. However, it

was possible to secure data on the size of government ministries. The comparison to the staff size suggests that the response rate varies between 8 per cent and 12 per cent for Poland and 14 and 26 per cent for Slovakia. This is likely to be a conservative estimate of the response rate.

The analysis of the three dimensions of Europeanisation follows the approach by M&P as closely as possible. With regard to the structural dimension, it examines

- the proportion of civil servants that is involved in EU-related activities
- the proportion of weekly working time that they deal with EU-related activities
- the differences in EU involvement across government ministries in order to identify the inner and outer core of Europeanised ministries.

With regard to the cultural dimension, the analysis deviates from M&P for the lack of directly comparable data. It therefore focuses on the beliefs and expectations of civil servants with regard to European integration. Specifically, the paper examines

- the extent to which civil servants seek to pursue careers in EU institutions, and
- the extent to which civil servants support both EU membership and further European integration.

With regard to the staff dimension, the paper directly follows M&P. It hence examines

- the extent to which civil servants deal with reception and projection-related activities in the context of their daily jobs.

The next part presents the results of the analysis. This paper represents a rare opportunity to replicate empirical research that was done for a Western European state in CEECs. It follows M&P's analysis and presentation of results as closely as possible to make the comparison between the Netherlands and the four CEECs as easy and clear as possible. In order to present the results of a four-country comparison more efficiently, it was decided to trim tables where possible. However, an exact replication of the tables is available in an online appendix.

Results

Structural dimension

This section examines the extent to which EU-related activities are part of the day-to-day work of central government civil servants. Table 1 shows that the proportion is very high, ranging from 53.4 per cent in Latvia to 66.1 per cent in Poland. The proportion is much higher than in the Netherlands where 30 per cent of all civil servants deal with EU issues. The values indicate that the scope of Europeanisation is much greater in CEECs than in the old member states.

Table 1. Civil servants dealing with EU-related activities

	Estonia	Latvia	Poland	Slovakia
Proportion working on EU in %	65.5%	53.4%	66.1%	59.2%
Frequency working on EU	232	126	250	319
Total number of respondents	354	236	378	539

The difference between the four countries suggests that small countries are not necessarily subject to a larger scope of Europeanisation than large countries. In fact, Poland as the largest country in the sample has the largest proportion of civil servants involved in EU affairs. By contrast, Latvia, one of the small countries in the sample, has the lowest proportion. The difference between the countries should not be over-interpreted. Instead, the four CEECs are more similar to each other than to the Netherlands. The very large scope of Europeanisation therefore appears to be a general feature for the CEECs, primarily providing support for the third scenario of regional exceptionalism.

Table 2 lends further support to this argument. It shows the time that civil servants spend on EU affairs during the working week. The largest proportion of civil servants spends less than 25 per cent of their time on EU issues (second column). It ranges from 60.1 per cent in Poland to 78.8 per cent in Latvia. This proportion is lower for the Netherlands where more than 90 per cent of the civil servants work for less than a quarter of the working week on EU policies. It implies that a larger proportion of civil servants in the CEECs spend more time of the working week on EU issues than in the Netherlands.

Table 2. Time spent on EU-related work (assuming 40 hours working week)

	Total group		Civil servants involved in EU-related activities	
	Frequency	Valid percentage	Frequency	Valid percentage
Estonia				
<25	239	72.2%	92	50.3%
25-50	33	10.0%	32	17.5%
50-75	31	9.4%	31	16.9%
>75	28	8.5%	28	15.3%
Latvia				
<25	197	78.8%	50	48.5%
25-50	19	7.6%	19	18.4%
50-75	8	3.2%	8	7.8%
>75	26	10.4%	26	25.2%
Poland				
<25	232	60.1%	71	31.8%
25-50	48	12.4%	48	21.5%
50-75	40	10.4%	40	17.9%
>75	66	17.1%	64	28.7%

Slovakia				
<25	391	71.7%	95	38.9%
25-50	39	7.2%	38	15.6%
50-75	44	8.1%	41	16.8%
>75	71	13.0%	70	28.7%

At the same time, there is only a small proportion of civil servants who work full time or almost full time on EU issues. The proportion ranges from 8.5 per cent in Estonia to 17.1 per cent in Poland. However, these are high proportions compared to the Netherlands where the category of civil servants who work full time on EU issues stands at merely 3 per cent. The last column of Table 2 shows the proportional time commitments for civil servants who are involved in EU issues. It confirms the pattern whereby the largest proportion of civil servants spends less than 25 per cent of their working time on EU issues.

While Table 2 confirms the finding that the scope of Europeanisation is higher for the CEECs, it also shows that the pattern of temporal involvement is similar for CEECs and the Netherlands. In both cases, civil servants who deal with EU issues are divided in two groups. For one group, EU affairs are only one, potentially minor aspect of their working time. For the other, much smaller group of civil servants, the EU is at the centre of their work. This pattern applies uniformly across the four CEECs. The similarity in pattern provides support for the first scenario of cross-regional convergence between old and new member states.

Table 3 distinguishes the involvement of civil servants across government ministries. In order to enhance the comparability of results across the four CEECs, the paper distinguishes eight policy sectors that coincide with individual ministries in most but not all cases.¹ In particular, it merges the economic policy ministries such as economic affairs, regional development, transport and labour into one category. This takes into account that central governments differ in the way they organize economic policies, for instance, in Latvia transport policy is covered by the ministry of economic affairs. Yet the eightfold differentiation of central government ministries still allows for a comparison with the Dutch case.

Table 3. EU involvement by ministry

	Involved in EU-related work		Median EU-time share (among civil servants involved in EU work)	Dispersion of EU work (civil servants involved in EU work)
	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage of working time	Dispersion index*
Estonia				
Agriculture	78%	54	50.0%	0.77
Economy, regional, transport, labour	71%	46	22.5%	0.60

¹ The focus on eight policy sectors facilitates the presentation of four countries (rather than a single case) and it takes into account that the sample sizes for the four countries are smaller compared to the Netherlands.

Education and culture	n.d.			
Environment	56%	47	17.5%	0.53
Finance	67%	26	50.0%	0.61
Health	75%	3	18.8%	
Interior and justice	66%	19	20.0%	0.57
Prime minister's office	50%	10	7.5%	0.42
Total	66%	205	25.0%	0.61
Latvia				
Agriculture	58%	15	75.0%	0.74
Economy, regional, transport, labour	58%	29	37.5%	0.62
Education and culture	40%	2	10.0%	
Environment	64%	9	75.0%	
Finance	n.d.			
Health	62%	26	37.5%	0.55
Interior and justice	50%	14	20.0%	0.56
Prime minister's office	42%	8	16.3%	
Total	56%	103	32.5%	0.61
Poland				
Agriculture	75%	24	50.0%	0.81
Economy, regional, transport, labour	73%	94	75.0%	0.78
Education and culture	44%	4	37.5%	
Environment	70%	19	62.5%	0.68
Finance	61%	72	50.0%	0.65
Health	50%	6	81.3%	
Interior and justice	50%	10	50.0%	0.75
Prime minister's office	67%	12	45.0%	0.86
Total	66%	241	50.0%	0.72
Slovakia				
Agriculture	63%	29	37.5%	0.68
Economy, regional, transport, labour	62%	127	50.0%	0.71
Education and culture	28%	8	12.5%	
Environment	64%	23	50.0%	0.76
Finance	53%	57	62.5%	0.75
Health	54%	13	75.0%	0.80
Interior and justice	75%	3	57.5%	
Prime minister's office	64%	34	50.0%	0.66
Total	58%	294	50.0%	0.71

*) Dispersion index not calculated for ministries with few than ten respondents who work on EU issues (see M&P for the same approach). For the background and calculation of the dispersion index, see the online appendix.

The comparison across government suggests three broad groups of ministries. First, the ministries of agriculture, economy (and related ministries) and environment are the most Europeanised ministries. In the words of Laffan (2006, 2007), they form the 'inner core' of ministries dealing with EU policies. The proportion of civil servants dealing with EU issues is above the mean involvement for all four countries. This finding is not surprising in that the EU has acquired relatively more competencies in these policy areas. Second, the ministries of education and culture are consistently least

Europeanised and hence part of the 'outer core' of ministries dealing with EU issues. The values show that the degree of involvement is lowest for all countries for which data is available.

The third group consists of the ministries of finance, interior and justice, health and the prime minister's office (or equivalent). Ministries of finance cluster relatively closely to the country means. The involvement is just above the mean in Estonia and just below the mean in Poland and Slovakia. The differences in the proportions are likely to be related to differences in the allocation of functions across countries. In Estonia, for instance, the ministry of finance also deals with regional development, which are strongly influenced by EU policies. By contrast, in Poland regional policy is delegated to a separate ministry of regional development and in Slovakia it is part of the ministry of construction and regional development.

The other ministries of the middle category also differ across the countries. State Chancelleries in Estonia and Latvia are much less involved in EU issues than the Prime Minister's Office in Poland and the Government Office in Slovakia. For health ministries, the opposite pattern applies. Ministries of interior and justice are below the country mean for Estonia and Latvia and close to the country mean of involvement in EU affairs in Poland. Slovakia's interior ministry differs in that the proportion of civil servants who deal with EU issues is much greater than in the other countries. However, the number of respondents from the interior ministry in Slovakia is small, so that one can be less certain about this particular value.

Table 3 reinforces the impression that the scope of Europeanisation is greater in CEECs than in old member states. The proportion of civil servants who deal with EU issues in the highly Europeanised ministries is considerably higher than in the highly Europeanised ministries of the Netherlands. It reaches up to 78 per cent in Estonia's ministry of agriculture. Generally, Table 3 suggests that the most Europeanised ministries in the Netherlands are comparable to ministries that cluster around the mean in the CEECs.

Second, Table 3 shows a pattern of Europeanisation that is very similar to the Netherlands where ministries of agriculture, economic policy and environment are at the top of the list, while ministries of education and culture belong to the 'outer core' of ministries in which civil servants are much less involved in EU issues. The paper does not provide data for ministries of foreign affairs. However, it is likely that in the CEECs they also belong to the group of highly Europeanised ministries, in particular, when bearing in mind that they are charged with the coordination of EU policies in Latvia and Poland (Dimitrova/Toshkov 2007).

The findings resonate closely with the research by Zubek and Staronova (2012) on six ministries in Estonia, Poland and Slovenia. They argue that the ministries of agriculture, labour and transport are consistently among the most Europeanised ministries. They also show that ministries of finance and interior are relatively less Europeanised. The only relevant deviation concerns the status of ministries of environment. In contrast to this paper, Zubek and Staronova (2012) identify them as relatively less exposed to EU policies.

The third and fourth columns of Table 3 complement the findings. Column three shows the amount of time that civil servants in the ministries spend on EU issues. It shows, like in the Netherlands, that civil servants in highly Europeanised ministries spend more time on EU affairs. The last column presents the extent to which working time on EU issues is concentrated or dispersed among civil servants. The dispersion index correlates with the proportion of civil servants working on EU issues and the amount of time they spend on it. In ministries of agriculture, for instance, a much larger share of the civil servants spends a lot of time working on EU issues. By contrast, in the less exposed ministries the dispersion index is lower.

Overall, CEECs demonstrate a much larger scope but a similar pattern of Europeanisation when compared to the Netherlands as a typical old member state. Moreover, CEECs are remarkably similar among each other with respect to both the scope and pattern of Europeanisation. So far, the analysis therefore provides partial support for both the first scenario of cross-regional convergence and third scenario of regional exceptionalism.

Cultural dimension

The essence of the cultural dimension of Europeanisation concerns the orientations of civil servants towards the EU. This paper addresses the extent to which they seek to pursue a career at EU institutions and the extent to which they support EU integration. The paper follows M&P by examining the relation between the degree of Europeanisation and the orientation towards the EU. One would expect that greater exposure to the EU is associated with support for the EU and greater interest in a career at the EU level. This argument also reflects Egeberg's (1999) findings, in that greater EU exposure of civil servants is associated with a shift of allegiances from national to supranational institutions.

In this paper, the degree of Europeanisation was coded by taking for each country the mean for the proportion of civil servants involved in EU affairs as the point of reference (see above, Table 1). The middle category of ministries was then defined as the range +/- 5 per cent of the country mean. Ministries with a degree of EU involvement that is more than 5 per cent above the country mean was labeled as a 'high' degree of Europeanisation. Ministries with a degree of involvement that is more than 5 per cent below the country mean was defined as a 'low' degree of Europeanisation.

Table 4. Civil servants seeking to pursue a career at EU institutions

	Estonia	Latvia	Poland	Slovakia
Low	39%	50%	52%	88%
Moderate	47%	52%	35%	60%
High	61%	54%	51%	69%

Table 4 shows the proportion of civil servants who seek to pursue a career in EU integration in relation to the degree to which their ministry is Europeanised.² It shows a remarkably high proportion of civil servants who seek a career in EU institutions. It ranges from approximately 40 per cent in Poland to around 70 per cent in Slovakia. In Estonia and Latvia the proportion is also above 50 per cent. The values indicate the attractiveness of EU jobs for civil servants from CEECs. The differences between the countries might be related to the size of public administration and therefore lend some support for the second scenario of differentiation among CEECs. For instance, the smaller proportion of Polish civil servants interested in an EU career might be related to a larger range of job opportunities in the much larger Polish administration.

With regard to the relation between the degree of Europeanisation and the interest in an EU career, Table 4 does not present a clear picture. In Estonia and to a lesser extent Latvia, it is evident that more exposure is associated with a greater interest in a career at EU institutions. For Poland and Slovakia, this pattern does not apply. Slovakia comes relatively close to the two Baltic States, as the number of observations is very low for the category of lowly Europeanised ministries. The relevant distinction might be drawn between moderately and highly Europeanised ministries. Overall, it therefore appears that the degree of Europeanisation and the interest of civil servants in an EU career are related to each other albeit weakly. This pattern is similar to the Netherlands.

Table 5 shows the support of civil servants for EU accession and future integration. The most interesting result is seen at the aggregate level. In Poland and Slovakia well over 90 per cent of the civil servants support EU membership. Furthermore, more than 90 per cent of the Polish civil servants favour more integration and around 70 per cent of the Slovak civil servants do so. The overall support for EU integration is lower for Latvia and Estonia. However, in Estonia support is above 80 percent and in Latvia it is above 60 per cent. The second question reported in Table 5 concerns the support for further EU integration. While aggregate values are slightly lower, the results correlate closely with the support for EU membership in the first place.

Table 5. Civil servants' support for EU integration

	Degree of Europeanisation	Estonia	Latvia	Poland	Slovakia
Membership was good for my country	Low	74%	58%	98%	100%
	Moderate	84%	70%	87%	91%
	High	89%	66%	96%	90%
I'm in favour of more EU integration	Low	70%	50%	96%	88%
	Moderate	66%	58%	94%	68%
	High	60%	60%	92%	63%

The relatively large differences between the countries appear to be explained by the extent to which citizens support EU integration. In 2008, i.e. the year when the survey was taken, Latvia was the country with the lowest public support for EU integration among the new member states, in that less than 30 per cent of the population

² For presentational reasons, we report the proportion of civil servants that 'agree' and 'strongly agree' with the statement. For the complete replication of M&P's table, see the online appendix.

considered EU membership ‘a good thing’. By contrast, in Poland approval ratings stood at 66 per cent and in Estonia and Slovakia they were just above 60 per cent (European Commission 2012). The differences in support for EU integration provide some support for the second scenario of differentiation among CEECs.

At the same time, there appears to be no strong relation between the degree to which ministries are Europeanised and the support of civil servants for EU integration. For Estonia, a high degree of Europeanisation appears to be associated with a positive evaluation of EU membership. In Latvia, the pattern is similar though the difference lies between low Europeanisation on the one hand and medium and high Europeanisation on the other. Yet for Poland and Slovakia there appears to be no association between the degree of Europeanisation and civil servants’ support for EU integration. The differences between the two Baltic States on the one hand and Poland and Slovakia on the other are likely to be driven by the generally high support for EU integration among the latter. That is, the degree of Europeanisation does not make a significant difference in a context of overall high support for EU integration.

It is difficult to directly compare the results for the CEECs with the Netherlands. However, the general conclusion drawn for the structural dimension also applies to the cultural dimension: The large interest in EU careers and the positive evaluation of EU membership suggest a large scope of Europeanisation also for the cultural dimension. At the same time, M&P find a weak relationship between the degree of Europeanisation and the extent to which civil servants ‘think European’. For the CEECs, the relation is fairly weak too, in particular, for Poland and Slovakia. However, in contrast to the structural dimension of Europeanisation, the cultural dimension has demonstrated more differences between CEECs, therefore also providing some support for the scenario of differentiation among CEECs.

Staff dimension

The last section examines the type of EU-related activity that civil servants perform. Based on t’Hart et al’s (2007) original survey, seven questions were asked that largely correspond to the questions that M&P used for their analysis. They distinguish between so-called ‘projection-related’ and ‘reception-related’ activities (Bulmer/Burch 2009). Table 6 shows the proportion of respondents that considers these activities as important or very important.³ Two major findings can be identified.

First, in relative terms civil servants consider reception-related activities more important than projection-related activities. When asked about the need to generally take EU policies into account at the national level, up to 80 per cent of the civil servants respond positively. However, even projection-related activities are seen as important by 40 to 55 per cent of the civil servants. The proportions suggest again that the scope of Europeanisation is large for CEECs, while the pattern is similar to the old member states. By comparison, in the Netherlands reception-related activities are regarded as important by up to 67 per cent (application and enforcement of EU rules) and

³ For the exact replication of M&P’s table, see the online appendix.

projection-related activities by up to 33 per cent (consultation with colleagues from other member states and preparation of Dutch input into EU level meetings).

Table 6. Importance of types of EU-related activities for civil servants working on EU issues

Statement	Estonia	Latvia	Poland	Slovakia
Preparation of national input into meetings that take place at the EU-level.	57.8%	48.7%	46.8%	58.3%
Participation in meetings organised by the European institutions such as the European Commission, the Council of Ministers.	48.9%	40.0%	54.9%	48.8%
Consultation with colleagues from one or more EU member states.	46.8%	40.0%	44.9%	54.2%
Exchange of experts, bilateral or multinational cooperation programs.	38.5%	41.3%	64.1%	49.0%
Transposition of European policies into national legal measures.	70.6%	71.7%	67.1%	67.0%
Practical application or enforcement of rules and policies that originated in the EU.	79.3%	74.6%	81.1%	81.0%
Taking into account EU policies during national policy making.	80.2%	75.2%	80.2%	72.8%

Second, on the staff dimension the differences between the countries are fairly small. The absolute values are relatively similar across the countries. Moreover, for all four countries reception-related activities are considered to be more important than projection related activities. This finding fits the pattern that was found by M&P for the Netherlands. It suggests that reception-related activities reach a much larger group of civil servants than projection-related activities.

M&P completed their assessment using principal component analysis to uncover underlying dimensions in the data. A high factor loading suggests that responses correlate closely. It implies that officials who find one activity important will also find another, correlated activity important. M&P identify two separate dimensions. As expected by the conceptual distinction, one dimension includes activities related to reception and the other dimension captures reception-related activities. M&P therefore conclude that reception and projection-related activities are essentially performed by distinct groups of civil servants. More specifically, they identify what they call a 'participation ladder' whereby one group of civil servants primarily works on reception related tasks, while a second group deals with reception and, in particular, projection-related tasks.

Table 7. Factor loadings of specific EU-related activities

Estonia		
	National input into EU policy-making	Implementation of EU rules
Preparation of national input	0.801	0.240
Participation in EU-level meetings	0.840	0.228

Consultation with other member states	0.865	0.139
Bi- and multilateral exchange	0.705	-0.010
Transposition of EU policies	0.221	0.844
Application and enforcement of EU rules	-0.035	0.882
Taking into account EU policies	0.268	0.779
Latvia		
Preparation of national input	0.835	0.148
Participation in EU-level meetings	0.839	0.056
Consultation with other member states	0.769	0.152
Bi- and multilateral exchange	0.626	0.353
Transposition of EU policies	0.229	0.821
Application and enforcement of EU rules	-0.004	0.860
Taking into account EU policies	0.292	0.765
Poland		
Preparation of national input	0.785	0.105
Participation in EU-level meetings	0.775	0.308
Consultation with other member states	0.868	0.051
Bi- and multilateral exchange	0.719	0.062
Transposition of EU policies	0.275	0.804
Application and enforcement of EU rules	-0.069	0.803
Taking into account EU policies	0.206	0.836
Slovakia		
Preparation of national input	0.704	0.429
Participation in EU-level meetings	0.804	0.335
Consultation with other member states	0.869	0.112
Bi- and multilateral exchange	0.839	0.011
Transposition of EU policies	0.205	0.824
Application and enforcement of EU rules	0.102	0.826
Taking into account EU policies	0.179	0.837

For the four CEECs the analysis reveals a very similar picture. Table 7 shows that projection-related tasks form one dimension, while reception-related tasks form another. The two-dimensional pattern applies consistently to all four countries. Moreover, the factor loadings for both dimensions reported in Table 7 are high, ranging from 0.63 to 0.87 (0.4 is usually taken as a cut-off point to decide whether or not to include a variable for a particular dimension). For the staff dimension, we can therefore also conclude that the scope of Europeanisation tends to be greater for CEECs than the old member states, while the pattern of Europeanisation is very similar.

Conclusion

This paper has examined the Europeanisation of central government in Estonia, Latvia, Poland and Slovakia. It has replicated the study by M&P on the Netherlands in order to compare new member states from Central and Eastern Europe to old member states

from Western Europe. Three dimensions were assessed on the basis of individual-level survey data: a structural, cultural and staff dimension of Europeanisation. They have been discussed with regard to the 'scope' and 'pattern' of Europeanisation in order to make the comparison between East and West and among the CEECs as meaningful as possible.

The empirical analysis has revealed three main findings. First, the scope of Europeanisation is higher in CEECs than in the Netherlands. This finding applies to all three dimensions. Compared to the Netherlands, more civil servants are involved in EU-related activities and they tend to spend more time on EU affairs; civil servants show a greater orientation towards EU in that support for EU integration is high and many civil servants are interested in pursuing a career at an EU institution; civil servants attach more importance to both reception and projection-related activities. Compared to the Netherlands, the CEECs appear to be over-Europeanised.

At the same time, the analysis has shown that the patterns of the Europeanisation of central government are very similar in CEECs compared to the Netherlands. Again, this result is relevant for all three dimensions. With regard to the structural dimension, the Europeanisation of central government in CEECs is two-sided like in the Netherlands. A large proportion of civil servants is involved in managing EU affairs (53 – 66 per cent among the four CEECs) but only a small proportion (8 – 17 per cent) deals with EU issues on a full-time basis. Moreover, a small group of ministries such as agriculture, economic affairs and environment form the inner core of ministries dealing with EU policies, while EU issues play a smaller role in other ministries.

On the cultural dimension, it has been shown that civil servants in highly Europeanised ministries are more oriented towards the EU than civil servants in less Europeanised ministries. However, the association between the degree of Europeanisation and the EU orientation of civil servants is fairly weak, which compares well to M&P's finding for the Netherlands. Finally, on the staff dimension, the analysis showed patterns that are almost identical for CEECs and the Netherlands. A larger group of civil servants considers reception-related EU activities important, while a relatively smaller group regards both or only projection-related tasks relevant for their day-to-day work.

Third, the paper has identified only moderate differences between CEECs. The four countries were similar with regard to both scope and patterns of Europeanisation insofar as the structural and the staff dimensions are concerned. By contrast, differences were evident on the cultural dimension. In particular, Latvian civil servants show less support for EU integration and Polish civil servants are less interested in pursuing a career at EU institutions.

These cross-country differences among CEECs will have to be made subject to further investigation. However, differences in support for EU integration among civil servants – an issue that has so far not attracted any attention in the literature on Europeanisation – closely reflect the attitudes of the public towards EU membership. It appears that bureaucracies in the CEECs demonstrate a certain degree of social representativeness insofar as attitudes towards the EU are concerned. By contrast, the differences in career orientations of civil servants from the CEECs might be related to the size of a country's public administration. Especially for smaller countries, EU careers might be an

attractive opportunities in addition to the limited scope for mobility within one's own public administration and the private sector. This argument closely resembles the explanation by Laegrid et al (2004) for differences among the Nordic states.

The paper developed three scenarios in order to structure the comparison between CEECs, the Netherlands and other EU member and non-member states insofar as comparable data is available. The findings provide basic support for each of the three scenarios. First, the large scope of Europeanisation of central government in CEECs lends support to the scenario of regional exceptionalism, in that CEECs are different from the old member states. The impressive scope of Europeanisation in the four CEECs compared to the Netherlands might plausibly be traced to the pre-accession period. The preparation for EU accession required a major mobilization of resources in the CEECs. Moreover, pre-accession Europeanisation involved major institutional and policy change in CEECs that complemented and reinforced the transformation that was triggered by the change of regime in 1989/1990. It is likely that the large scope of Europeanisation reflects the specific European integration trajectory of CEECs in comparison to old member states.

Second, the similar patterns of Europeanisation that are identified for CEECs and the Netherlands as well as the similarity in scope among the CEECs provide support for the scenario of convergence between old and new member states. The findings suggest that functional pressures stemming from EU integration are at work and they lead to similar outcomes. Zubek and Staronova (2012) support these results for CEECs in that they find similarities in ministerial oversight structures and in the exposure of ministries to EU policies.

This study has provided least support for the scenario that emphasizes differences among CEECs. The intra-regional differences have been largely limited to the cultural dimension of Europeanisation. It implies that this scenario is relevant, and it might gain importance as the formative period of pre-accession Europeanisation will become temporally more distant. For the time being, the comparison of the Netherlands and four CEECs might be best characterized as a form partial convergence in the Europeanisation of central government. The similarities between the Netherlands and CEECs and among the four CEECs provide considerable support for the notion of convergence. Yet convergence is merely partial in that the much larger extent of civil servants involvement in EU activities indicates an over-Europeanisation of central government in comparison to the old member states.

References

- Batory, A. 2012. 'The National Coordination of EU Policy in Hungary: Patterns of Continuity and Change', *Public Administration*, 90, 4, 922-936.
- Bulmer, S. and M. Burch. 1998. 'Organizing for Europe: Whitehall, the British State, and the European Union', *Public Administration*, 76, 4, 601-628.
- Bulmer, S. and M. Burch. 2005. 'The Europeanization of UK Government: From Quiet Revolution to Explicit Step-Change?', *Public Administration*, 83, 4, 861-890.
- Bulmer, S., and M. Burch. 2009. *The Europeanisation of Whitehall: UK Central*

Government and the European Union. Manchester, MUP.

- Camyar, I. 2010. 'Europeanization, Domestic Legacies and Administrative Reforms in Central and Eastern Europe: A Comparative Analysis of Hungary and the Czech Republic', *Journal of European Integration*, 32, 2, 137-155.
- Dimitrov, V., K. Goetz and H. Wollmann. 2006. *Governing After Communism*, Boulder: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Dimitrova, A. and D. Toshkov. 2007. 'The Dynamics of Domestic Coordination of EU Policy in the New Member States: Impossible to Lock In?', *West European Politics* 30, 5, 961-86.
- Dimitrova, A.L. 2005. 'Europeanization and Civil Service Reform in Central and Eastern Europe', in F. Schimmelfennig and U. Sedelmeier (eds), *The Europeanization of Central and Eastern Europe*, Ithaca, Cornell University Press, pp. 71-90.
- Dimitrova, A.L. 2010. 'The New Member States of the EU in the Aftermath of Enlargement: Do New European Rules Remain Empty Shells?', *Journal of European Public Policy*, 17, 1, 137-148.
- Egeberg, M. 1999. 'Transcending Intergovernmentalism? Identity and Role Perceptions of National Officials in EU Decision-Making', *Journal of European Public Policy*, 6, 3, 456-474.
- Goetz, K.H. 2000. 'European Integration and National Executives: A Cause in Search of an Effect?', *West European Politics*, 23, 4, 211-231.
- Goetz, K.H. and H. Wollmann. 2001. 'Governmentalizing Central Executives in Post-Communist Europe: A Four-Country Comparison', *Journal of European Public Policy*, 8, 6, 864-887.
- Grabbe, H. 2006. *The EU's Transformative Power: Europeanization through Conditionality in Central and Eastern Europe*. New York, Palgrave.
- Heritier, A. et al (eds.). 2001. *Differential Europe: The European Union Impact on National Policy-Making*. Boulder, Rowman & Littlefield.
- Jordan, A. 2003. 'The Europeanization of National Government and Policy: A Departmental Perspective', *British Journal of Political Science*, 33, 261-282.
- Kaeding, M. 2007. 'Administrative Convergence Actually – An Assessment of the European Commission's Best Practices for Transposition of EU Legislation in France, Germany, Italy, Sweden and Greece', *Journal of European Integration*, 29, 4, 425-445.
- Kassim, H., B.G. Peters, and V. Wright (eds.). 2000. *The National Coordination of EU Policy: The Domestic Level*. Oxford, OUP.
- Læg Reid, P., R.S. Steinthorsson, B. Thorhallsson. 2004. 'Europeanization of Central Government Administration in the Nordic States', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 42, 2, 347-69.
- Laffan, B. 2006. 'Managing Europe from Home in Dublin, Athens and Helsinki: A Comparative Analysis', *West European Politics*, 29, 4, 687-708.
- Laffan, B. 2007. 'Core Executives', in P. Graziano and M. Vink (eds), *Europeanization: New Research Agendas*, Basingstoke, Palgrave, pp. 128-140.

- Laffan, B., J. O'Mahoney. 2007. 'Managing Europe from an Irish Perspective: Critical Junctures and the Increasing Formalization of the Core Executive in Ireland', *Public Administration*, 85, 1, 167-188.
- Lippert, B., G. Umbach and W. Wessels. 2001. 'Europeanisation of CEE Executives: EU Membership Negotiations as a Shaping Power', *Journal of European Public Policy*, 8, 6, 980-1012.
- Lippert, B. and G. Umbach. 2005. *The Pressure of Europeanization: From Post-Communist State Administrations to Normal Players in the EU System*. Baden-Baden: Nomos.
- Mastenbroek, E. and S. Princen. 2010. 'Time for EU Matters: the Europeanization of Dutch Central Government', *Public Administration*, 88, 1, 154-169.
- Meyer-Sahling, J-H. 2011. 'The Durability of EU Civil Service Policy in Central and eastern Europe after Accession', *Governance*, 24, 2, 231-260.
- t'Hart, P., K. Geuijen, S. Princen, K. Yesilkagit and E. Mastenbroek. 2007. *The Europeanisation of the Civil Service Craft*. Report presented to the Dutch Ministry of the Interior.
- Toshkov, D. 2008. 'Embracing European Law: Compliance with EU Directives in Central and Eastern Europe', *European Union Politics*, 9, 3, 379-402.
- Zubek, R. 2008. *Core Executive and Europeanization in Central Europe*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Zubek, R. 2011. 'Core Executives and the Co-ordination of EU Law Transposition: Evidence from New Member States', *Public Administration*, 89, 2, 433-450.
- Zubek, R. and K. Staronova. 2012. 'Organizing for EU Implementation: The Europeanization of Government Ministries in Estonia, Poland, and Slovenia', *Public Administration*, 90, 4, 937-956.

Online appendix: Tables based on format used by Mastenbroek and Princen (2010)

1. Structural Dimension	23
<i>Table 1. Civil servants dealing with EU-related activities: This additional table was necessary in order to show differences in EU involvement across four countries</i>	23
<i>Table 2. Time spent on EU-related work (assuming 40 hours working week): Table format used by M&P was also used in the paper</i>	23
<i>Table 3. EU involvement by ministry: Table format used by M&P was also used in the paper</i>	24
2. Cultural dimension	26
<i>Table 4. Civil servants seeking to pursue a career at EU institutions: In the paper only the sixth column (Agree in per cent) was shown</i>	26
<i>Table 5. Civil servants' support for EU integration: In the paper only the sixth column (Agree in per cent) was shown</i>	27
3. Staff dimension	28
<i>Table 6. Importance of types of EU-related activities for civil servants working on EU issues: In the paper only the second column (Important in per cent) was shown</i>	28
<i>Table 7. Factor loadings of specific EU-related activities: Table format used by M&P was also used in the paper</i>	29

1. Structural Dimension

Table 1. Civil servants dealing with EU-related activities: This additional table was necessary in order to show differences in EU involvement across four countries

	Estonia	Latvia	Poland	Slovakia
Proportion working on EU in %	65.5%	53.4%	66.1%	59.2%
Frequency working on EU	232	126	250	319
Total number of respondents	354	236	378	539

Table 2. Time spent on EU-related work (assuming 40 hours working week): Table format used by M&P was also used in the paper

Total group		Civil servants involved in EU-related activities	
Frequency	Valid percentage	Frequency	Valid percentage
Estonia			
<25	239	72.2%	92
25-50	33	10.0%	32
50-75	31	9.4%	31
>75	28	8.5%	28
Latvia			
<25	197	78.8%	50
25-50	19	7.6%	19
50-75	8	3.2%	8
>75	26	10.4%	26
Poland			
<25	232	60.1%	71
25-50	48	12.4%	48
50-75	40	10.4%	40
>75	66	17.1%	64
Slovakia			
<25	391	71.7%	95
25-50	39	7.2%	38
50-75	44	8.1%	41
>75	71	13.0%	70

Table 3. EU involvement by ministry: Table format used by M&P was also used in the paper

	Involved in EU-related work		Median EU-time share (among civil servants involved in EU work)	Dispersion of EU work (civil servants involved in EU work)
	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage of working time	Dispersion index*)
Estonia				
Agriculture	78%	54	50.0%	0.77
Economy, regional, transport, labour	71%	46	22.5%	0.60
Education and culture	n.d.			
Environment	56%	47	17.5%	0.53
Finance	67%	26	50.0%	0.61
Health	75%	3	18.8%	0.90
Interior and justice	66%	19	20.0%	0.57
Prime minister's office	50%	10	7.5%	0.42
Total	66%	205	25.0%	0.61
Latvia				
Agriculture	58%	15	75.0%	0.74
Economy, regional, transport, labour	58%	29	37.5%	0.62
Education and culture	40%	2	10.0%	0.94
Environment	64%	9	75.0%	0.80
Finance	n.d.			
Health	62%	26	37.5%	0.55
Interior and justice	50%	14	20.0%	0.56
Prime minister's office	42%	8	16.3%	0.55
Total	56%	103	32.5%	0.61
Poland				
Agriculture	75%	24	50.0%	0.81
Economy, regional, transport, labour	73%	94	75.0%	0.78
Education and culture	44%	4	37.5%	0.75
Environment	70%	19	62.5%	0.68
Finance	61%	72	50.0%	0.65
Health	50%	6	81.3%	0.77
Interior and justice	50%	10	50.0%	0.75
Prime minister's office	67%	12	45.0%	0.86
Total	66%	241	50.0%	0.72
Slovakia				
Agriculture	63%	29	37.5%	0.68
Economy, regional, transport, labour	62%	127	50.0%	0.71
Education and culture	28%	8	12.5%	0.49
Environment	64%	23	50.0%	0.76
Finance	53%	57	62.5%	0.75
Health	54%	13	75.0%	0.80
Interior and justice	75%	3	57.5%	0.92
Prime minister's office	64%	34	50.0%	0.66
Total	58%	294	50.0%	0.71

*) For the calculation of the Dispersion Index we rely on the formula proposed Mastenbroek and Princen.

$$\text{Dispersion Index} = 1/(n \cdot \sum v_i^2)$$

The Dispersion index is modelled on the measure for the effective number of parties (see M. Laakso and R. Taagepera 1979. "Effective" Number of Parties: A Measure with Application to West Europe', *Comparative Political Studies*, 12, 1, 3-27), which does not merely measure the number of parties but takes into account their size. Mastenbroek and Princen (2010: 169) adapt the index to measure the 'effective number of civil servants who are involved in EU-related work' in an organisation. In the formula,

- v_i stands for the 'time spent by each civil servant as a share of the total time spent on EU-related activities in that organisation', and
- n stands for the 'total number of respondents in that organisation'.

2. Cultural dimension

Table 4. Civil servants seeking to pursue a career at EU institutions: In the paper only the sixth column (Agree in per cent) was shown

Estonia	Disagree		Neutral		Agree		N
	Freq.	Perc.	Freq.	Perc.	Freq.	Perc.	
Degree of Europeanisation*)							
Low	11	19%	24	42%	22	39%	57
Moderate	13	15%	34	38%	42	47%	89
High	11	19%	11	19%	35	61%	57
Latvia							
Low	2	8%	10	42%	12	50%	24
Moderate	6	14%	15	34%	23	52%	44
High	7	20%	9	26%	19	54%	35
Poland							
Low	15	16%	29	32%	48	52%	92
Moderate	8	26%	12	39%	11	35%	31
High	15	13%	41	36%	59	51%	115
Slovakia							
Low	1	13%	0	0%	7	88%	8
Moderate	27	12%	61	28%	130	60%	218
High	5	8%	13	22%	41	69%	59

*) In order to distinguish the 'degree of Europeanisation', we cannot directly follow M&P because they take the mean of EU involvement for the Netherlands as their point of reference. Yet we try to follow their approach as closely as possible. As explained in the paper, the degree of Europeanisation was coded by taking for each country the mean for the proportion of civil servants involved in EU affairs as the point of reference (see above, Table 1). The middle category of ministries was then defined as the range +/- 5 per cent of the country mean. Ministries with a degree of EU involvement that is more than 5 per cent above the country mean was labeled as a 'high' degree of Europeanisation. Ministries with a degree of involvement that is more than 5 per cent below the country mean was defined as a 'low' degree of Europeanisation.

Table 5. Civil servants' support for EU integration: In the paper only the sixth column (Agree in per cent) was shown

		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		N
		Freq.	Perc.	Freq.	Perc.	Freq.	Perc.	
Estonia								
Membershi p was good for my country	Low	1	2%	14	25%	42	74%	57
	Moderate	4	4%	10	11%	76	84%	90
	High	1	2%	5	9%	51	89%	57
I'm in favour of more EU integration	Low	3	5%	14	25%	40	70%	57
	Moderate	9	10%	21	24%	59	66%	89
	High	8	14%	15	26%	34	60%	57
Latvia								
Membershi p was good for my country	Low	4	17%	6	25%	14	58%	24
	Moderate	5	11%	8	18%	31	70%	44
	High	3	9%	9	26%	23	66%	35
I'm in favour of more EU integration	Low	7	29%	5	21%	12	50%	24
	Moderate	6	14%	12	28%	25	58%	43
	High	3	9%	11	31%	21	60%	35
Poland								
Membershi p was good for my country	Low	0	0%	2	2%	90	98%	92
	Moderate	1	3%	3	10%	27	87%	31
	High	3	3%	2	2%	113	96%	118
I'm in favour of more EU integration	Low	0	0%	4	4%	88	96%	92
	Moderate	1	3%	1	3%	29	94%	31
	High	4	3%	6	5%	108	92%	118
Slovakia								
Membershi p was good for my country	Low	0	0%	0	0%	8	100%	8
	Moderate	5	2%	16	7%	205	91%	226
	High	2	3%	4	7%	54	90%	60
I'm in favour of more EU integration	Low	0	0%	1	13%	7	88%	8
	Moderate	18	8%	53	24%	153	68%	224
	High	4	7%	18	30%	38	63%	60

3. Staff dimension

Table 6. Importance of types of EU-related activities for civil servants working on EU issues: In the paper only the second column (Important in per cent) was shown

Estonia					
Statement	Important		Not important		Total
	Freq.	Perc.	Freq.	Perc.	N
Preparation of national input	129	57.8%	94	42.2%	223
Participation in EU-level meetings	110	48.9%	115	51.1%	225
Consultation with other member states	104	46.8%	118	53.2%	222
Bi- and multilateral exchange	85	38.5%	136	61.5%	221
Transposition of EU policies	156	70.6%	65	29.4%	221
Application and enforcement of EU rules	180	79.3%	47	20.7%	227
Taking into account EU policies	182	80.2%	45	19.8%	227
Latvia					
Statement	Important		Not important		Total
	Freq.	Perc.	Freq.	Perc.	N
Preparation of national input	58	48.7%	61	51.3%	119
Participation in EU-level meetings	48	40.0%	72	60.0%	120
Consultation with other member states	48	40.0%	72	60.0%	120
Bi- and multilateral exchange	50	41.3%	71	58.7%	121
Transposition of EU policies	86	71.7%	34	28.3%	120
Application and enforcement of EU rules	91	74.6%	31	25.4%	122
Taking into account EU policies	91	75.2%	30	24.8%	121
Poland					
Statement	Important		Not important		Total
	Freq.	Perc.	Freq.	Perc.	N
Preparation of national input	109	46.8%	124	53.2%	233
Participation in EU-level meetings	130	54.9%	107	45.1%	237
Consultation with other member states	106	44.9%	130	55.1%	236
Bi- and multilateral exchange	150	64.1%	84	35.9%	234
Transposition of EU policies	159	67.1%	78	32.9%	237
Application and enforcement of EU rules	197	81.1%	46	18.9%	243
Taking into account EU policies	194	80.2%	48	19.8%	242
Slovakia					
Statement	Important		Not important		Total
	Freq.	Perc.	Freq.	Perc.	N
Preparation of national input	175	58.3%	125	41.7%	300
Participation in EU-level meetings	146	48.8%	153	51.2%	299
Consultation with other member states	161	54.2%	136	45.8%	297
Bi- and multilateral exchange	147	49.0%	153	51.0%	300
Transposition of EU policies	203	67.0%	100	33.0%	303
Application and enforcement of EU rules	251	81.0%	59	19.0%	310
Taking into account EU policies	222	72.8%	83	27.2%	305

Table 7. Factor loadings of specific EU-related activities: Table format used by M&P was also used in the paper

Estonia		
Variable	National input into EU policy-making	Implementation of EU rules
Preparation of national input	0.801	0.240
Participation in EU-level meetings	0.840	0.228
Consultation with other member states	0.865	0.139
Bi- and multilateral exchange	0.705	-0.010
Transposition of EU policies	0.221	0.844
Application and enforcement of EU rules	-0.035	0.882
Taking into account EU policies	0.268	0.779
Latvia		
Variable	Factor1	Factor2
Preparation of national input	0.835	0.148
Participation in EU-level meetings	0.839	0.056
Consultation with other member states	0.769	0.152
Bi- and multilateral exchange	0.626	0.353
Transposition of EU policies	0.229	0.821
Application and enforcement of EU rules	-0.004	0.860
Taking into account EU policies	0.292	0.765
Poland		
Variable	Factor1	Factor2
Preparation of national input	0.785	0.105
Participation in EU-level meetings	0.775	0.308
Consultation with other member states	0.868	0.051
Bi- and multilateral exchange	0.719	0.062
Transposition of EU policies	0.275	0.804
Application and enforcement of EU rules	-0.069	0.803
Taking into account EU policies	0.206	0.836
Slovakia		
Variable	Factor1	Factor2
Preparation of national input	0.704	0.429
Participation in EU-level meetings	0.804	0.335
Consultation with other member states	0.869	0.112
Bi- and multilateral exchange	0.839	0.011
Transposition of EU policies	0.205	0.824
Application and enforcement of EU rules	0.102	0.826
Taking into account EU policies	0.179	0.837