

Educating and training civil servants in the Netherlands 1814-2014

**Paper presented at the IIAS working group on administrative history
Corfu, April 2014**

Draft

Leiden University
Institute of Public Administration, Faculty Campus the Hague
Frits van der Meer
Toon Kerkhoff
Danielle van Osch

1. Introduction

The importance of ‘the human factor’ in government has been stressed time and time again. Most famously, perhaps, by Max Weber in whose work on bureaucracy the *Bürokratischer Verwaltungsstab* was a core element. Similarly, Richard Rose (1984) wrote how “public employees in a very real sense put the flesh on the bare bones of government”. Up to the present day it has often been argued that reform of government, naturally, also depends on the quality of civil servants and their adaptation to new needs. Developing and running education and training programs and systems are at the very center of that adaptation. This has also (or especially?) been the case in the last two centuries in many Western-European nations.

Education and training for civil servants very much depends on the nature of the civil service system in a certain country. The latter, in turn, depends on administrative culture and tradition but also on more tangible elements such as political-administrative institutional design. Describing and analyzing the historical development of education and training for civil servants in The Netherlands therefore necessitates looking at both these elements. Relevant political-administrative cultural elements as well as changes in institutional design form a context that is essential to provide possible explanations for changes in systems of education and training of civil servants.

In the following sections we focus our attention on education and training of civil servants for the period between 1814 and 2014. It is safe to say that the events in this time-span of two hundred years were vital in creating the present-day Dutch political-administrative system and its bureaucracy. We will follow main lines of state and nation building and bureaucratization and professionalization over the period to trace – for now only rudimentary – developments in educating and training civil servants. In this we follow the most relevant questions that have already been formulated in the introductory paper by Denis Moschopoulos. These questions will make up the subsequent sections of this paper.

We proceed, in section two, with paying attention to the relation between the institutional design of the Dutch state between 1814 and 2014 and the organization of the education and training programs and systems for Dutch civil servants. As we will see, this organization follows two general trends. First, this concerns a trend towards increased professionalization and bureaucratization in Dutch government and administration following an expansion of the state, its tasks and its apparatus. Second, this concerns a trend of decentralization of the Dutch state, especially from the second half of the nineteenth century onwards.

Next, in sections three and four, we discuss the distinction between pre-entry and post-entry education and training and both will be closely connected to the discussion presented in section two. Pre-entry programs in The Netherlands in the beginning of the 19th century mostly fell under the category of University degrees in law and relatively basic entry exams to test skills and basic knowledge for (senior) civil servants. Post-entry programs, on the other hand, can by and large be differentiated in the following way: there were career related and relatively long-running programs as was customary for entering larger corps-like structures such as the military, the police and the civil engineers. There were also more short-running training programs applicable to larger corps-like structures as well but also to job systems, usually for smaller groups of civil servants. Importantly, post-entry training also took the form of on-the-job learning as part of the civil service. We will take a brief look at the various types of pre- en post-entry education and training programs for civil servants according to their (rank) level and level of government. We will also discuss differing emphasis on pre- and post-entry programs by various organizations in the Netherlands and shifts in the importance between and the content of both types of programs between 1814 and 2014. As it turns out, we can distinguish three main periods of change within our chosen time-frame: from 1814 to 1870, from 1870 to 1945 and from 1945 onwards. Between the periods, rough changes in content and type can be distinguished.

Throughout the discussion in sections three and four we will pay special attention to the higher or top civil servants. With regard to their pre-entry education we discuss whether we can see changes in the percentage of academically trained higher civil servants over time and what this academic training consisted of. Nowadays few if any top civil servants are without a university education. It seems to be a near absolute requirement. In earlier times, however, it seems it was (in theory and practice) possible to rise through the ranks without a university education. This begs the question when and why this occurred? In addition, we look at the *kind* of university program that was required. We discuss how in the case of the Netherlands we can discern a decline of law school as the major supplier of higher civil servants over time. As we will see, the 'legal monopoly' seems to have eroded over time and we will briefly assess when and why this happened. We also ask ourselves what discipline replaced law? Again we have to briefly consider various types and levels of governments, functional fields of administration and ranks. Since a university degree is now a near absolute requirement for entering senior civil service posts, we will also examine post-entry education of mid-ranking civil servants who want(ed) to reach a higher position. As we will see, these

post-entry education programs increasingly involved taking a university Master's degree during one's career either at a university or at a civil service training institute.

Finally, in these sections three and four we will also focus on those institutions delivering (mostly post-entry) education and training programs between 1814 and 2014, such as governments, (public) education institutions, civil service training schools, universities or private market parties, with an emphasis on post-1945 institutions and initiatives. We will therefore also examine where initiatives for education and training programs actually originated. Apart from aforementioned institutions we will also take a closer look at civil servant organizations (both trade unions and professional associations) that enhance civil service professionalism and assess the interplay between them.

2. The institutional design of the Dutch state and its impact on education and training

From its inception in 1814 the state structure of The Netherlands can be characterized as a decentralized unitary state (although in the beginning it was headed by a King in what was in fact a patriarchal and autocratic monarchy). The decentralized unitary state balanced the perceived positive elements of the old Dutch Republic (from roughly 1566 onwards) with its highly autonomous provinces and free cities and its weak central government on the one hand, and the more powerful administrative capabilities of a vigorous central state developed during the so-called French era (between 1810 and 1813) on the other. The decentralized unitary state could remedy both the institutional weakness of the Dutch Republic as well as some of the oppressive aspects of a strong central state that manifested itself in particular manifest during the French annexation between 1810 and 1813 (Raadschelders & Van der Meer, 1995: 220).

The principle of decentralization that was manifest in the Dutch state structure implied that from the onset hiring staff and formulating the entry and promotion requirements were considered a prime responsibility of each (local, provincial and central) government layer separately. This partly explains why there has, until this day, never been any truly centralized recruitment and promotion system, also for the central government (its departments or ministries). A notable exception to this rule was recruitment and training for core like structures such as the colonial service in the former Dutch Indies; the Royal Dutch Colonial Army and higher (officers) ranks in the military. Another exception consisted of nominations and appointments by the King, who due to his position and character had in practice – at least until the constitutional reform of 1848 and the installment of a constitutional monarchy and

democracy – a substantial influence in personnel matters at various government levels. Few formal requirements for senior civil servants existed early on (with the exception of corps like structures), reflecting why the King could have much personal influence. This would change after the 1850s, when the King was forced to take a step back and the present-day fragmented, decentralized and largely non-governmental education and training systems came into play with the post-1848 state structure of municipalities, provinces and central government that were each supposed to do as much as possible on their own.

Since the turn of the 20th century, senior civil servants such as Secretary-Generals are increasingly recruited from the civil service itself. More and more, relevant educational background and expertise rather than connections became relevant. From the ten Secretary-Generals at the eve of World War II, six had reached the highest administrative position by means of an earlier career in the civil service.¹ More recent concerns regarding the compartmentalization of, especially, central government departments and the need to enhance the professional nature, effectiveness and efficiency of the civil service have led to initiatives regarding more cooperation in terms of Human Resource Management in central government. In more recent times this has led to the creation of shared service centers for (executing) personnel matters, the creating (as mentioned) of a general career system (the *Algemene Bestuursdienst*, ABD) for the senior public service and a centralized program for policy and management trainees. These developments have also had consequences for pre- and post-entry education and training as we will discuss below.

3. Pre-entry education

In central government in the early nineteenth century, administrative functions were most dominant. Exceptions were, for instance, engineers in the higher ranks and manual laborers at lower levels employed by Public Works (*Rijkswaterstaat*). Other exceptions came later in the 20th century, for instance in the case of medical and veterinarian staff working in the health care inspection and the food and livestock inspection (which were until the late 20th century municipal and provincial services) and the personnel at the defense department. Given the job oriented nature of the Dutch public employment system (with a focus on specific positions, rather than careers as a whole) recruitment and selection of (new) staff in the Netherlands has

¹ Frederiks op Binnenlandse Zaken, Six op Koloniën, Scholtens op Sociale Zaken, Snouck Hurgronje op Buitenlandse Zaken, Spitzen op Waterstaat, Handel en Nijverheid, en Tenkink op Justitie. Politiekcompendium.nl:<http://www.politiekcompendium.nl/9351000/1f/j9vvh40co5zodus/vh4vam53kdxy>, visited April 15 2014.

always emphasized a certain level of pre-entry education. However, the nature and level of pre-entry education varied over time according to rank and type of government.

At first, during the biggest part of the nineteenth century, only a basic level of pre-entry education was considered sufficient. To properly ensure that someone was fit for a particular job there was mostly (post-entry) training on the job. Often, a civil servant had a father and/or other relatives employed in government. Recruitment to a public sector job therefore often relied on ‘proper’ family connections rather than pre-entry education. Still, from the State Committee *Repelaer van Driel* (instated by orders of the King to advise on the reform of central government and its personnel) it becomes clear that certain requirements for pre-entry education were already around as early as the 1810s.

The *Repelaer van Driel* report came out in 1822 and clearly stated the need for clerks and *commiezen* (entry and higher level civil servants at various central departments who could often move to higher ranks from there²) to have “knowledge of administrative practices and skills in writing and reasoning” (*Repelaer van Driel*: 16). Furthermore, a doctoral law degree was an important requirement because it provided civil servants with knowledge of “political economy, arts and history” (Ibid. 17-18). Apart from a law degree, a minimum of two and a maximum of five years of experience in practicing law was also needed (Ibid. 45). Interestingly, the report made a point of stressing the need to find a balance between theoretical and practical legal and administrative knowledge. Furthermore, a law degree was not essential to enter the civil service. In order to avoid an elite bureaucracy (with enough money to pay for academic studies) the report and subsequent Royal Decree stated how six years of practical experience in administration and demonstrated motivation to work in public administration could also secure an entry level position in central government from which one could in principle move up (Ibid. 45-46).

Entry exams with quite specific requirements for the various grades and classes of clerks and *commiezen* equally formed a part of the report’s advice to the King. 2nd grade 2nd class clerks were to have knowledge of the German language and the four main rules of calculus (subtract, multiply, divide and add). 2nd grade 1st class clerks had also to be able to prepare tables with numbers. 1st grade clerks of 2nd class also had to know French, the Dutch system of measurements and weights and had to be able to write well and make calculations. 1st grade clerks of 1st class had to also have knowledge of Dutch and foreign currencies and

² From top to bottom, the following civil servants in Ministries existed for most parts of the 19th and 20th century: Secretaris-Generaal – Administrateurs – Referendarissen – Hoofdcommiezen – Commiezen (1e en 2e graad en klasse) – Adjunct-commiezen – 1e klerken (1e graad en klasse en 2e graad en klasse) – 2e klerken (1e graad en klasse en 2e graad en klasse) – Schrijvers op jaarloon (Koninklijk Besluit no. 110, 9 mei 1906, art. 1).

Dutch geography. For the higher ranked *commiezen* of the various grades and classes more specific professional expertise was required. 2nd grade *commiezen* 2nd class had to also have knowledge of general geography and Dutch history. They also had to be able to edit and interpret incoming documentation. 2nd grade *commiezen* 1st class had to add knowledge of trade and commerce and had to be able to take notes from the minister. 1st grade *commiezen* 2nd class had to have knowledge of political economy across the world and were expected to be able to report straight to the King. Finally, 1st grade *commiezen* 1st class had to also have knowledge of law (as in a University degree) and had to be knowledgeable regarding “any subject that was of interest to the popular interest” (Ibid. 37-38). Importantly, the King agreed to all aforementioned adjustments and made them into law.³ Interestingly, one notable suggestion by the committee to set up a *National School for the Nation’s Administration* for clerks (Ibid. 18) seems to have been ignored entirely since there has never been such a thing.

In the first half of the 19th century on-the-job training after having entered the public service through personal contacts (or perhaps better: *learning-as-you-go-along*) still had not disappeared in the Netherlands (see below) but the expansion of the scope of government intervention, the proliferation of tasks and the increasing complexity of government did increase the need for new types of expertise and subsequent pre-entry requirements in addition to the traditional administrative and clerical skills. It seems that professionalization of the civil service went top-down, first for the highest ranks and then for the lower ranks. Instructions for office, on the other hand, went bottom-up: first for the lower ranks and only later for the higher ones.⁴ This we can see clearly in the case of the office of Secretary-General, which was created upon advice by the *Repelaer van Driel* committee but for whom no specific requirements or instructions can be found in this report or its follow-up report by the State Committee *Van Leeuwen*.

As such, more formal requirements to fulfilling public office came into being after roughly the 1850s. On central Dutch level we find comparative exams for technical functions (such as the telegraph since 1852, for the corps engineers at the ministry of Public Works in 1853 and for the postal services in 1861). These were soon followed (as we have seen) by exams for other more administrative functions such as clerks and *commiezen*. Improvement in regular education, however, would result in abolishing comparative clerk exams in 1934.⁵

³ Royal Decree 4 September 1823.

⁴ Politiekcompedium.nl: <http://www.politiekcompedium.nl/9351000/1fj9vvh40co5zodus/vh4vam53kdx>, visited April 15 2014.

⁵ Ibid.

Growth in the range of civil service expertise and the need for pre-entry education was equally visible in local (municipal) government from the 1870s onwards.⁶ There too, *in-service* training was steadily replaced by more formal education for municipal administration and finances. These programs were designed by civil servant unions and the Association of Municipal Interests (*Vereniging voor Gemeentebelangen*). Due to industrialization, urbanization and the rise of subsequent so-called ‘social issues’ in the larger municipalities (such as urban poverty, high mortality rates, poor housing and increased crime) a much more active and diverse local government naturally developed. More specialist knowledge embodied in pre-entry education was therefore required in areas such as housing and spatial planning⁷, social health care and social medicine⁸ and/or security.⁹ Proof of such a trend can be found in the fact that the percentage of all vacancies for functions at municipalities in which a preference for candidates with an academic degree was found, rose from 4,6% in 1890 to 63% in 1950.¹⁰ This process of proliferation of pre-entry education continued into the 20th century and to the present day, and not just for specialist functions but also for external and internal administrative positions as well. The latter refers to knowledge and education needed for fulfilling management functions in the field of, for instance, financial and personnel management and ICT. The process for hiring specialist expertise and related education programs again increased after World War II and more in particular in the 1960s and 1970s.

Regarding, especially, administrative functions, there was academically trained personnel in the higher levels but they certainly had no monopoly in these ranks. For 1915, Randeraad (1994) provides a number of 26 academics out of 87 *referendaries* (a senior rank comparable to a current position of director). By that time, there were still ample opportunities to get to higher positions with a secondary schooling and an in-service training (or training on-the-job in modern terms) and building a career on one’s experience and family relations. We have to keep in mind that this mode of making career was also the norm in the private sector. There, an academic education was sometimes (as it can still be) considered a disadvantage for a proper career in commerce and trade. The percentage of academics among all ranks increased over time. In 1915, for instance, 8.1% of central government personnel had

⁶ Compare Van Poelje’s *Gemeentekunde*

⁷ See in *Koninkrijk van Sloppen*

⁸ See history of social medicine, Kerkhoff, A.H.M.

⁹ See Fijnaut on the organization of the police from roughly the 1810s onwards

¹⁰ Politiekcompendium.nl: <http://www.politiekcompendium.nl/9351000/1fj9vvh40co5zodus/vh4vam53kdxv>, visited April 15 2014.

an academic background, whereas nowadays this is roughly 24% (see Table 1). For the higher civil servants this growth has been even more spectacular. Van Braam measured 38% academics for 1951 (1957). Nowadays we rarely encounter a senior civil servant without an academic qualification.¹¹

Table 1: Pre-entry educational background of all civil servants working in all government levels and in central government in 1988 en 2006 excluding the military.

Level of Education	Central Government	
	1988	2006
Primary/middle level education	43.4	21.8
Middle level education	30.8	31
High professional schools	13.9	23.3
University education	11.1	23.9

Source: Van der Meer & Roborgh 1993 Ministry of the Interior, Het Personeels- en Mobiliteitsonderzoek over 2006, Table Z2, The Hague 2007.

A related issue concerns the *kind* of pre-entry education taken by (higher) civil servants. As we have seen, an academic background in central government in the 19th and first half of the 20th century often implied a legal training. There were however some important exceptions. A first exception involves the corps engineers from the early 19th century and medical staff in the military. Later on with the expansion of government tasks – particularly at the local level – we can see (as mentioned above) a widening of desired disciplines (see also later Tables). Nevertheless the clerical and administrative types of functions were still largely considered legal in nature. In Table 2 we can see the erosion of the law monopoly from 1930 to the 1988s. In part this erosion can be explained by the expansion of government tasks and the necessary specialist education needed for those functions (see before). In addition, particularly after the Second World War, there was a strong diversification of disciplines taught at the universities whose alumni were competing with the legal students. We can think of economists, social scientists, political scientists and public administration experts.

¹¹ Compare M. Bovens & A. Wille 2011.

Table 2: University educated civil servants in government 1930-1988 (in %)

	1930	1947	1988
Law	75	56	27
Economy & Social Sciences	1	9	35
Natural Sciences & Engineering	16	23	21
Other (incl. Humanities)	8	12	17

Source: Van der Meer & Roborgh 1993: 326.

This erosion is also (or even?) visible with regard to the top civil servant positions in central government (see Table 3).

Table 3: Master's degrees of top civil servants (Secretaries-General) in 1946 and 2009 (in %)

	1946	2009
Law	69	23
Mathematics, Natural Sciences & Medicine	0	7.7
Technical Sciences	7.7	7.7
Economics	7.7	31
Social Sciences		23
None	7.7	6.7

Source: Van der Meer & Dijkstra 2011, 174 and *Parlement & Politiek*.

Developments as described above with regard to the erosion of law as main requirement to enter the civil service can be seen in local government as well. We have to keep in mind that in the municipalities the percentage of academics does and did vary according to the size of the municipalities. The larger municipalities were and still are to a degree comparable to central government departments. However, an important difference regarding higher local government positions is that a person can and could often start at a smaller municipality and during their career could then move to a larger municipality. A – relatively speaking – lower initial education could as such still give people a chance to reach a higher position due to their work experience and post-entry education and training. That, however, will be (part of) the topic of the next paragraph.

4. Post entry education and training

As mentioned earlier, the dominant orientation within the Dutch civil service systems since 1814 has been on personal connections, increasingly coupled with pre-entry education (first in law, later in other disciplines as well) and exams and specific requirements for entry-level higher positions. Nevertheless, post-entry education and training also had a definite place within the system. Within the post-entry education and training we have to make a distinction between longer term programs aimed at a particular career or career step and short term training for a particular job or aspect of that job.

Regarding the longer term programs, the earliest examples of post entry education are to be found in the few corps like structures we have in the Netherlands: the military, the corps engineers, the police, the judiciary, public prosecuting office, the foreign service and to an extent the inland revenue. Technically speaking the term post-entry education is somewhat awkward in this context. Still, as a kind of on-the-job education and training, it fits the category. In addition, we need to keep in mind that in some cases, the people who entered the education facilities for these services were employed by the government and in other cases they could have been selected.

The oldest Dutch post-entry programs ones are programs for the military (army and navy) and the corps engineers. The date refers to respectively from 1826 (army), 1814 (navy) and 1814 Corps engineers. The facilities for training engineers was originally embedded in the military programs but was “civilized” when the engineer programs were transferred to Delft in 1842 and formed the start for the present technical university of Delft. Training for the police services developed much later. Becoming a police officer involved during the 19th and early 20th century training on-the-job and not following a formalized programs or doing entry exams (Fijnaut 2008). Often, people with a military background were also hired for police work. At first, initiatives were developed by the union of Police officers who developed police exams and a police school (*model politie vakschool*). As we will elaborate upon below that model was also used in other sectors. The first public police academies were created during World War II by the German occupying authorities according to the German model. After the war a system of police post-education was created.

For the judiciary and the public prosecuting office after World War II, initiatives were equally taken to professionalize both offices. The Inland Revenue had created an academy for tax inspectors (*Belastingacademie*) in 1939 (Pfeil 2009: 484) Later after World War II the *belastingacademie* was abolished in 1964 and replaced by special programs within university economics and law programs. The program fiscal law in Leiden was considered the heir to

this academy. Using universities instead of such academies became the trend. This followed the general increasing importance attached to an academic training for higher positions in government (a similar development can also be seen in the private sector). This turned education for the public sector a more externally organized format. Even the internal military post entry education (KMA and KIM) tried to get an academic status. KMA en KIM became part of the Dutch Defense Academy (*Nederlandse Defensie Academie*) in 2005.

Recently new post-entry education initiatives are taken within the framework of central government (see Table 4). In addition there is a management trainee program that was started in 1998 within central government. The program is aimed at people with a recently finished Master's degree. It lasts two years and consists of internships at various departments during which initial training and education is also offered.

Table 4: Post-entry Government Academies¹²

Academy	In existence since
IMAC, overheidsacademie voor Informatiemanagement	2003
Rijksacademie voor Financiën, Economie en Bedrijfsvoering	2003
Academie voor Overheidscommunicatie	2002
Academie voor Wetgeving	2001
Academie voor Overheidsjuristen	2009
Academie SZW	

Apart from government academies there are also examples of semi-public and private sector academies (or rather: educational organizations). There is, seemingly, no end to the list of semi-public and private sector organizations that focus on the education and skills development of Dutch civil servants. This is especially the case when we would take consultancy agencies into account as well. For present aims and purposes it suffices to give an overview of the most notable educational organizations only. It is interesting that most of these organizations came into existence in the late 1980's and the early 1990's. This seems to coincide with the idea that the education of civil servants was not deemed a task for the Dutch (central) government during that time (Zwaap, 14-12-2012).

¹² See also: http://www.rijksacademie.nl/rijksacademie_academies_bij_de_rijksoverheid.htm

A first group with a particular focus on civil servant training and educating consists of semi-public organizations. These seem to have been at first established in collaboration with universities or public funds. One of these is the Netherlands School for Public Administration (*Nederlandse School voor het Openbaar Bestuur* (NSOB), which was established to end the lack of postdoctoral education on the public sector in general and public sector management in specific. Another institute is the *Netherlands Institute of International Relations (Instituut Clingendael)* who offer various courses on diplomacy and IR and have in the past been responsible for the training of the Dutch *corps diplomatique*. *Campus The Hague* also has had its own *Centre for Professional Learning* (formally known as *In Company*). The Centre offers specific courses in public administration and public policy for professionals already working in (central and local) government and has equally offered training for the Dutch *corps diplomatique*. Finally, *Comenius Leergang* is an educational program with semi-public roots created in 1996 and devoted to leadership.

A second group of organizations are private sector educational organizations (although some have public sector roots). The oldest post-entry educational organization specialized in public sector management is the *Bestuursacademie* which was established in 1954. It offered short and longer educational programmes for civil servants. Others soon followed, such as the *Rijksopleidingsinstituut* (ROI) which started as a public sector organization in 1960 but became privately owned in 1992. Another is the *Centre for Labour Markets and Labour Relations Conditions Government Personnel* (CAOP), a governmental organization started in 1989 and private since 1995. *Platform 31* was established after a merger between several institutes¹³ and focuses on research and teaching on spatial planning, economics and social affairs.

¹³ KEI, NICIS, Nirov and SEV

Table 5: Post entry Semi-public or private sector educational organizations

Educational organization	In existence since
Bestuursacademie	1954
Rijksopleidingsinstituut (ROI) ¹⁴	1960's (privatised since 1992)
Instituut Clingendael	1983
Nederlandse School voor het Openbaar Bestuur	1989
CAOP	1989 (privatized since 1995)
Comenius Leergang	1996
Campus The Hague (Center for Professional Learning / In Company)	2009 ¹⁵
Platform 31	2012
Overheidsacademie (NCOI)	+ 1996

The overview in Table 5 includes organizations that offer both longer and shorter post-entry programs. The longer programs seem to have been and still are directed at giving civil servants more comprehension concerning a specific public sector field, such as diplomacy. Shorter programs, naturally, do not have such a broad scope. These appear to be divided into two distinct groups. First, there are training programs that specifically target a certain specialized skill. 'Skill' development in areas of communication, legal matters or leadership are followed by civil servants. Second, there are short programs mainly focused on broader competences, such as career development. Whether this career will be in public service or not seems to be of less concern. Even though programs of post-entry education seem to have come into existence since the 1950's (with the *Bestuursacademie*) it is not yet clear whether or not similar shorter programs were in place, in the skills form or the broader scope. The latter is probably more recent as we can distinguish a clear change in governmental policy in preparing civil servants with career skills that would be beneficial in other sectors as well (ABD, 2010; WRR, 2006: p: 82-85; Den Boer & Noordegraaf, 2006).

¹⁴ Van WIKIPEDIA: Stichting **Het Expertise Centrum** is in 1988 opgericht vanuit het toenmalige ministerie van Binnenlandse Zaken (nu: het ministerie van Binnenlandse Zaken en Koninkrijksrelaties) met als belangrijkste doel om het kennisniveau betreffende grote ICT-projecten binnen de overheid te verhogen en kennisdeling hierover te stimuleren. Het Expertise Centrum is vanaf 2012 samen met de stichting ROI (Rijksopleidingsinstituut) en organisatieadviesbureau Zenc BV verder gegaan als advies-, onderzoeks- en opleidingsorganisatie in het publieke domein onder de naam PBLQ

¹⁵ Under the name of *In Company* . Became *Centre for Professional Learning*.

As mentioned, the Dutch government was not itself very much concerned with the development, training and education of civil servants during the late 1980's and the early 1990's. A clear end to this attitude was the establishment of the *Algemene Bestuursdienst* (ABD). This particular governmental service came into being in 1995 and was designed along the lines of Senior Public Services (Den Boer & Noordegraaf, 2006). Collaboration among senior civil servants and a fight against red tape were being the focal points of the organization from the beginning (ABD, 2010). In terms of education, the ABD has developed seven key competences a top civil servant should have: insight, learning ability, context awareness, development of employees, persuasiveness, integrity and initiative (ABD, 2003). These competences align with the aforementioned policy change.

Finally, within post-entry programs for civil servants we can, most recently, also see the emergence of professional organizations that develop their own training. This bottom-up approach can be seen in the creation of educational programs such as *Train Your Colleague* (*Train je collega*) (Intermediair, 21-10-2013). The latter programs make it clear that Dutch central government is these days reclaiming its position within the education and training of its (top) civil servants, thus somewhat ending the fragmentation. Whether or not this is also the result of the current economic crisis in which private and semi-public sector academies are struggling remains to be seen (Bekkers, 26-3-2011; Geijtenbeek, 26-3-2011). Private academies that do struggle, now seek refuge in offering shorter post-entry programs. Longer post-entry programs are more and more the domain of governmental academies and semi-public academies. The development of bottom-up courses or trainings is interesting although it remains to be seen whether or not it will be a sustainable growth or just a sporadic emergence.

5. Preliminary conclusions

In the previous we have attempted to show how Dutch education and training systems for civil servants very much depended on the changing political-administrative culture and institutional design of the Netherlands. Describing and analyzing the historical development of these education and training systems in the Netherlands necessitated looking at relevant changes in this design as a context and possible explanatory factors for changes in aforementioned systems. In the previous we started our (preliminary) analysis in the early 19th century – where the foundations of the present day Dutch State and its civil service were created – and followed some lines until the present day. We have shown how the organization

of education and training followed two general trends. First, a move towards increased professionalization and bureaucratization in Dutch government and administration (following an expansion of the state, its tasks and its apparatus). Second, a trend of decentralization of the Dutch state (especially from the second half of the nineteenth century onwards).

With regard to pre-entry programs, some conclusions can already be drawn from our preliminary investigations. It seems that the 19th century was by and large characterized by informal ways of on-the-job (or *in-service*) recruitment and training, often following personal and/or familial connections (and sometimes through direct intervention of the Dutch King). This concerned mostly post-entry training but increasingly with pre-entry qualifications and (law or other) degrees. For most of the period between roughly 1814 and 1870 it remained possible to rise through the ranks without a university education although this did decrease. Training and education closely followed decentralization and division of tasks which meant different levels could by and large organize things in their own way. This prevented any kind of centralized education and training programs. The question as to why informal post-entry practices were slowly but steadily replaced by formal pre-entry education and training/skills requirements deserves further research. Still, we can already say this was closely connected to the growing complexity of Dutch government and the growing proliferation of government tasks during the 19th and early 20th centuries. For this reason, the need for more specific requirements such as an academic degree, practical (legal) experience and/or clerical skills became increasingly important. This was perhaps most clearly visible in corps-like structures in the Netherlands which have always had a distinctly different way of recruitment and training than purely administrative functions. More hands-on positions in the civil service (for instance at the telegraph office etc.) equally required specific training programs already from the 1850s onwards.

From the above it follows that the period 1870 – 1945 could best be seen as a phase of transition. Following pressing ‘social issues’ and subsequent proliferation of government tasks, we find increased professionalization and bureaucratization, mostly on a local municipal level where typically 19th century problems of administration led to professionalization and the need for more heterogenic educational backgrounds and expertise. This also led to increasing importance of other academic disciplines than law as suppliers of civil servants. There, we see changes happening especially after roughly 1945 when the steady rise of the social sciences (and especially political science, economics, sociology and public administration) created competition for traditional legal studies for civil servants. We could say that specific training for government personnel (as distinct from lawyers within

government!) only really started after roughly 1945. As such, the period 1945 – 2014 shows a clear move towards different disciplinary backgrounds that were deemed necessary for civil servants. Also, an academic pre-entry education became essential for most offices on all government levels.

With regard to post-entry education and training, certain conclusions can also already be drawn. First, post-entry, on-the-job systems were crucial in the informal system based on familial and/or personal connections that often lacked formal rules and procedures. People entered via personal contacts and then learned the ‘tricks of the trade’ as they went along. More formalized post-entry programs could (again) be found in the core-like structures of the military and the police (as is to be expected), but also in such cases as the judiciary and the public prosecuting office (especially after World War II) where we can see many initiatives for further professionalization. More recent years (in the 21st century) have, furthermore, shown somewhat of an explosion of post-entry programs at a local municipal level (such as traineeships in large municipalities such as Amsterdam) and central level (Such as a national trainee program and various academies (see Figure 1).

This brings us to some final conclusions as to whom and what actually delivered these post-programs. Were these (mostly) offered by governments, (public) education institutions, civil service training schools, universities, private market parties or civil servant organizations (both trade unions and professional associations)? (i.e. also: were these largely private or public in nature)? Although this requires more research as well, we see a host of other institutions than government that deal with post-entry education and training. We can see (albeit as yet only tentatively) that there is a strong connection and interplay between government, universities and fully privatized institutions in training civil servants.

References

- ABD (2003). *Competentiemanagement*. Ministerie van Binnenlandse Zaken en Koninkrijksrelaties: Den Haag.
- ABD (2010). *15 Jaar Algemene Bestuursdienst*. Ministerie van Binnenlandse Zaken en Koninkrijksrelaties: Den Haag.
- Bekke, A.J.G.M., J.L. Perry and Th.A.J. Toonen (Eds) (1996), *Civil Service Systems in Comparative Perspective*, Bloomington/Indiana: Indiana University Press.
- Boer, M., den & Noordegraaf, M. (2006). “Verlangen naar het ‘vak’ van topambtenaar”. *Bestuurskunde*, 3, p.11-22.
- Bovens, M., Wille, A. (2011), *Diploma-democratie. Over de spanning tussen meritocratie en democratie* (Bert Bakker, Soest)
- Braam, A. van (1957), *Ambtenaren en bureaucratie in Nederland*, Zeist: De Haan.
- Dijkstra, Gerrit S.A. & Frits M. van der Meer, The civil service system of the Netherlands, in: Frits M. van der Meer (ed.) (2011), *Civil service systems in Western Europe*, Cheltenham/Aldershot: Edward Elgar
- Fijnaut, C. (2008), *A history of the Dutch police*, Nijmegen: SUN.
- Kickert, W.J.M. (Ed.) (1991), *Veranderingen in Management en Organisatie bij de Rijksoverheid*, Alphen aan den Rijn: Samson HD Tjeenk Willink.
- Meer, F.M. van der, J.C.N. Raadschelders, L.J. Roborgh and Th.A.J. Toonen (1991), “Representative Bureaucracy in the Netherlands in an Historical Perspective”, in V. Wright (ed.), *The Representativity of Public Administration*, Brussels: IIAS.
- Meer, F.M. van der and L.J. Roborgh (1993), *Ambtenaren in Nederland*, Alphen aan den Rijn: Samson HD Tjeenk Willink.
- Meer, F.M. van der and J.C.N. Raadschelders (1995), ‘Between Restoration and Consolidation: The Napoleonic Model of Administration in the Netherlands 1795–1990’, in B. Wunder (ed.), *The Napoleonic Model of Government*, Brussels: Bruylant.
- Meer, F.M. van der and J.C.N. Raadschelders (eds) (1998a), *Administering the Summit*, Brussels: Bruylant.
- Meer, F.M. van der and J.C.N. Raadschelders (1998b), “Administering the Summit in the Netherlands”, in F.M. van der Meer and J.C.N. Raadschelders (eds), *Administering the Summit*, Brussels: Bruylant.
- Meer, F.M. van der and J.C.N. Raadschelders (1999), “The Senior Civil Service in the

- Netherlands”, in Vincent Wright and Edward C. Page, *Bureaucratic Elites in Western European States*, Oxford: OUP.
- Ministerie van Binnenlandse Zaken (Ministry of the Interior) (1976–), *Kerngegevens Bezoldiging Overheidspersoneel* (also titled: Kerngegevens Personeel Overheid en Onderwijs, Den Haag.
- Pfeil, T. (2009), *Op gelijke voet. De geschiedenis van de belastingdienst*, Kluwer.
- Raadschelders, J.C.N. and M.R. Rutgers (1996), “A History of Civil Service Systems”, in A.J.G.M. Bekke, J.L. Perry and Th.A.J. Toonen (eds), *Civil Service Systems in Comparative Perspective*, Bloomington/Indiana: Indiana University Press.
- Raadschelders, Jos C.N., Theo A.J. Toonen and Frits M. van der Meer (2007), *Civil Service in the 21st Century*, Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Raadschelders, Jos C.N. and Frits M. van der Meer (2014) The Social Profile of Administrative Elites in the Netherlands, 1980-2010 in: *International Review of Administrative Sciences* (2014) The Social Profile of Administrative Elites in the Netherlands, 1980-2010 in: *International Review of Administrative Sciences*
- Randeraad, N. (1994), “Civil Servants in Nederland (1815–1915)”, *Bijdragen en Mededelingen over de Geschiedenis van Nederland*, 2 (109): 209–36.
- Rosenthal, U. and M.P.C.M. van Schendelen (1977), ‘Ambtelijke top in Nederland’, *Bestuurswetenschappen*, 6: 383–401.
- Rosenthal, U. (1979), ‘De Secretaris-generaal: Politisering of Verambtelijking?’, *Acta Politica*, 343–77.
- Rosenthal, U. (1983), ‘De mandarijnen van de Rijksdienst: Modieuze Stellingen en Harde Feiten over de Nederlandse Topambtenarij’, *Bestuurswetenschappen*, 5: 302–15.
- Staatscommissie voor de inwendige organisatie van de departementen van Algemeen Bestuur (Staatscommissie-Van Leeuwen), *Verslag van de Staatscommissie over de inwendige organisatie van de departementen van algemeen bestuur (Commissie Van Leeuwen) ingesteld bij KB van 10 augustus 1910 nr. 26*, Den Haag, 1912.
- WRR (2006). *Lerende overheid; een pleidooi voor probleemgerichte politiek*. Amsterdam University Press.
- IJsselmuiden, P.G. van (1988), *Binnenlandse Zaken en het Ontstaan van de Moderne Overheidsbureaucratie in Nederland 1813–1950*, Kampen: Kok.

Internet references:

Bekkers, H. (26-3-2011). *Opleiden voor minder*. Date of reference April 19th 2014 at: <http://www.binnenlandsbestuur.nl/sociaal/achtergrond/achtergrond/opleiden-meer-voor-minder.978757.lynkx>

Geijtenbeek, W. (26-3-2011). *Academies in ademnood*. Date of reference April 19th 2014 at: <http://www.binnenlandsbestuur.nl/bestuur-en-organisatie/achtergrond/achtergrond/academies-in-ademnood.978858.lynkx>

Intermediair (21-10-2013). *Ambtenaren, train je collega!* Date of reference April 20th 2014 at: <http://www.intermediair.nl/vakgebieden/overheid/ambtenaar-train-je-collega>

NSOB (n.d.). *Over NSOB*. Date of reference April 17th 2014 at: <http://www.nsob.nl/overnsob/>

Zwaap, R. (14-12-2012). *Permanente educatie mondt uit in wildgroei*. In: Public Mission. Date of reference April 18th 2014 at: <http://www.pm.nl/artikel/2609/permanente-educatie-mondt-uit-wildgroei>