

Policy Outputs in Scotland: Devolution or Duplication?

Paper presented to the Political Studies Association Annual Conference

University of Aberdeen, 5-7 April 2002

Neil McGarvey and Mark Shephard
Department of Government, University of Strathclyde

n.mcgarvey@strath.ac.uk

mark.shephard@strath.ac.uk

This paper represents work in progress any comments on it though - no matter how critical - will be gratefully received.

Introduction

“The Executive has developed an astonishing capacity for regurgitating work done in London and passing it off as its own ... Why have devolution ... if it means the same policies delivered 12 months late with a Scottish accent?”(Fraser Nelson, *The Times*, 26/07/01, p.12)

In a perceptive article in *The Times*, Fraser Nelson asked the question, ‘Is this devolution or is it duplication?’ In it he points to anecdotal evidence of an overlap and regurgitation of Whitehall policy by Scottish Executive civil servants – usually with a time delay. The article suggests Scotland’s ‘wait and copy’ civil servants are ‘pinning a kilt on’ Whitehall policy after a few months time delay and that devolution has barely changed the output of Scottish government.

This paper will present some preliminary case study evidence as to the validity of Nelson’s claim. At a fundamental level devolution is supposed to deliver difference to the Scottish people. Much of the political rhetoric surrounding devolution was that it represented a new dawn for Scottish politics (see Kellas 2001; McGarvey 2001; Mitchell 2001 for reviews of post-devolution literature). This paper seeks to assess the difference devolution has made on the policy outputs of government, using executive policy statements as an indicator of that output.

Ours is not a new research question. Midwinter et al, over a decade ago, were suggesting,

“The key question regarding the network centred on the Scottish Office remains the extent to which it is able to make policy itself as opposed simply to adapting the policy initiatives coming from its Whitehall big brothers”.(1991: 78)

Given the highly negative view of the policy process in Westminster and Whitehall projected by devolution campaigners it is not an unrealistic assumption to expect that they anticipated differential policy outputs once devolution was in place. However, it should be remembered that devolution did not involve new policymaking powers for Scotland – it simply transferred policymaking capacity to new institutions.

In the past two years most of the academic literature in Scotland has been overwhelmingly concentrated on the devolved institutions and their difference with Westminster and Whitehall. This has demonstrated that political institutions are now different in terms of parties (e.g. Hassan and Warhurst 2001) electoral process (e.g. Brown 1999; Clark 2000; Denver and MacAllister 1999),

design (e.g. Brown 2000; Miller 2000; Mitchell 1999; Mitchell and Bradbury 2001), central-local government relations (e.g. McAteer et al forthcoming; McGarvey forthcoming), regulatory arrangements (Midwinter and McGarvey 2001b), parliamentarians (e.g. Bennie et al 2001; Shephard et al 2001), practice (e.g. Cavanagh et al 2000; Cowley 2001; Lynch and Birrell 2001), financial accountability arrangements (e.g. Midwinter and McGarvey 2001a) and public opinion (e.g. McCrone 2000 and 2001).

This paper does not question the validity of any of above findings. We accept the main thrust of this existing research – in terms of democratic and policymaking institutional arrangements, Scotland is now different. Instead it calls for a refocusing of research effort towards a more systematic analysis of the impact of devolution on public policy-making. Policy-making has been one of the few neglected aspects of devolution, as Mitchell observes,

“just how devolution and the array of more ‘mundane’ changes in policy-making have affected the policy-making process in Scotland is far from clear in recent literature”(2001: 221)

In the past three years devolution has matured (see Mitchell et al 2001) – now is the time to re-target research efforts from the institutions of and policy processes of Scottish politics to evaluations of whether difference matters in terms of the key output of politics: policy.

This paper introduces new case study empirical evidence that explores the extent to which there is difference or duplication of policies by comparing the content of press releases of the Scottish Executive with regard to health policy with those of the UK Government’s Department of Health.

Health was chosen for no particular reason other than the fact that it is one of the major non-reserved policy areas. The paper has nothing to say about the overall coherence of health policy. Indeed it does not look into the substance of policy change and development. Policy statements on health are used as the case study empirical data to test the policy duplication hypotheses. Scottish policymaking capacity for health is of course not newly devolved – the old Scottish Office had responsibility for it pre-devolution. Parry (1981 cited in Midwinter et al 1991) identifies health as being an autonomous policy subject in Scotland (rather than ambiguous areas such as industry, agriculture, law and order) where the framework of policy was required to be integrated but the detailed implementation was not. If devolution has made a difference it should be noticeable in a policy area such as health. Health is also a useful case study as there are areas of policy that span devolved and reserved areas. The management and delivery of NHS services is devolved but regulation of

healthcare professionals, medicine and genetics are reserved to Westminster (Lynch 2001: 16).

Our research does not come to any definitive conclusions as to the degree of convergence or continuity in policymaking post-devolution. It does however introduce some preliminary case study evidence on the impact of devolution on policy communication in the field of health. Before outlining our empirical findings the paper reviews what the literature on Scottish politics had to say on the degree of policy divergence between the Scottish Office and Executive and departments in Whitehall. It then acknowledges the limitations of the rather narrow indicator of public policy we have adopted.

Policy-Making in Scotland pre-devolution

The striking thing about the pre-devolution literature on Scottish public policy outputs is its limited nature. We could find no major study into public policy differentials in Scotland and England. There is plenty of work on specific institutions (e.g. local government, Scottish Office) and policy areas (e.g. education, housing, social work, urban policy) and their differences with other parts of the UK but no major comprehensive study.

We are therefore reliant on the broader literature on Scottish politics and the extent to which it addressed this question. To the extent that it did, the literature gives confusing and conflicting interpretations. There is some disagreement in as to the extent of policy divergence in Scotland.

We have adopted a framework to outline two differing schools of thought. It is a framework suggested by Keating (2001a). Interestingly (working separately), Mitchell (2001: 218) identifies half of this framework when he makes reference to the 'Edinburgh view' of Scottish politics. We have taken the writings of Mitchell and Keating (amongst others) to reflect an alternative 'Strathclyde'. The labels reflect the academic origins and/or location of authors associated with each school.

The Edinburgh School

Writers such as Brown, McCrone and Paterson best exemplify the Edinburgh school of thought. Its key starting point is that,

“Scotland has always enjoyed a level of autonomy over aspects of domestic policy which has provided a specific role for the policy elite within Scottish society” (Brown et al 1997: 93)

Paterson (1994) argues the incorporation of Scotland into greater Britain was always incomplete because Scotland's elites through a process of negotiated compromise retained control over religion, law, education and local government. McCrone in a similar vein argues that,

“Scotland's professional classes – lawyers, doctors, teachers, churchmen – while socially conservative, embody the institutional survival of distinctive Scottish ‘civil society’, and can be considered as keepers of native institutions” (1992: 143)

For Paterson (2000: 2) the “Union was partial” with the major institutions in civic life retaining a separate identity.

The Edinburgh school places emphasis on the degree of administrative and policy autonomy within the Union Scotland has enjoyed since the creation of the Scottish Office in 1885. It tends to emphasise the Scottish Office and its associated policy networks as promoting Scottish distinctiveness and identity.

There is no doubt that the Scottish Office, despite being the territorial dimension of UK Government in Scotland, did act as a focal point for actors in Scottish politics such as pressure groups, civil society and the public. To the distinctive administrative apparatus of government could be added the differences in legal, church, education and other social, cultural and civil institutions in Scotland. Paterson (1994) has referred to political institutions and civil society in Scotland as a “world of dense Scottishness”.

Roberts (University of Dundee) seems to concur with the Edinburgh school when he suggests,

“The pre-1997 Scottish model possessed a considerable degree of discretion in the exercise of its responsibilities, an ability to develop and implement policy and policy guidance that matched the specific needs and requirements of all or part of Scotland” (2000: 258).

Brown et al refer to “the consensual decision-making process and negotiated compromises which typified the outcome of policy formation” and suggest that this Scottish approach came under increasing strain during the Conservative years (1997: 93). They note (1997: 108), little evidence of policies imposed directly from London. The Scottish Education Department (SED) was formally autonomous and could develop its own policies and did do with only limited attention paid to UK developments (1997: 108). During the 17 years of Conservative rule (1979-1997) feelings of difference and identity were accentuated (Brown 2000: 543).

In the 1980s and 90s there has been a growth in central state powers “with an increased role given to the Scottish Office in imposing central government policies on Scottish society” (Brown et al 1997: 93). This it is argued helped fuel perception of Scotland as a test-bed. Brown et al (1997: 105) argue that there is little evidence of the Conservative Government being sensitive to gearing policies specifically to meet the Scottish policy environment. As an example they cite the encouragement of schools to opt out of local authority control.

“The ability of the policy elite in Scotland to delay, adapt or reject central government policies has weakened over the many years of Conservative rule since 1979” (1997: 106).

The Edinburgh interpretation of Scottish politics is a broad one, to the extent that matters of public policy are discussed the predominant focus tends to be on education (reflecting the specialism of Paterson in particular). In education there is a long history of separate Scottish policies predating the establishment of the Scottish Office and the professionals within this policy sector have maintained an independence from their English counterparts. Education both at local and national political level has traditionally been a self-contained policy arena. MacPherson and Raab (1988) outline the relatively autonomous line the education policy community in Scotland has pursued. Education is, however, by no means a typical policy area – it is probably the one where Scottish autonomy is most marked. Extrapolating the example of education as typical of the broad spectrum of Scottish Office policymaking may lead to an exaggeration of its autonomy.

The Edinburgh school is more sociological in focus than that of Strathclyde with wider Scottish society (or more accurately Scottish civil society) accorded important status in Scottish politics and policymaking.

The Strathclyde School

The Strathclyde School on the other hand profess a more political science based approach with public administration and policy the key focus. Probably the ‘founding’ member of the Strathclyde school of thought was Rose (1982) who stressed the role of the Scottish Office as part of the British system of government, stressing its functional as opposed to territorial role. In work on elections and voting behaviour, McAllister and Rose (1984) refer to Scotland’s politics as ‘British with a difference’. This line of thinking has also been applied to Scottish public policy.

Midwinter, Keating and Mitchell (1991) are the most elaborate exponents of the Strathclyde school of thought. For them the pressures of received professional wisdom and interest group networks have served to produce similar policies on both sides of the border (1991: 82). It was common pre-devolution to refer to the UK as a unitary state. Midwinter et al (1991: 1) suggest that Scotland stood out from the rest of Britain in respect of institutions, political behaviour and political issues but not public policy.

Scottish policy autonomy and leadership was limited. Policy autonomy occurred when the Scottish Office was allowed to proceed on its own, merely keeping the other department informed of developments (1991: 78). Policy leadership took place when it decided to proceed with a policy for Scotland and the rest of the UK simultaneously followed with the Scottish Office assuming a lead role, preparing the papers convening the meetings. In a policy area such as fisheries this was common due to Scottish Office expertise and its importance to the local economy in various parts of Scotland (1991 78-9). However, these occasions were rare and limited to a very narrow range of policy activities. The possibility for policy diversity within the Scottish Office framework was limited.

Midwinter et al describe the Scottish Secretary as

“ ... a relatively junior British Cabinet Minister with limited powers of innovation ... If Ministerial power is measured by the extent to which a Minister can initiate and implement a policy, then the Scottish Office works within tight constraints. It was never intended to be an innovatory department and performs best in articulating and defending Scotland’s interests” (1991: 57).

On the few occasions when the Scottish Office initiated policies it was within strict parameters or due to exceptional circumstances (1991: 57). For Midwinter et al the phrase ‘administrative devolution’ was something of a misnomer as it conveyed the idea that the Scottish Office represented a form of self-government.

“In reality the Scottish Office is neither an example of devolution, which would involve a capacity to take authoritative decisions and responsibility to a Scottish constituency, nor merely a form of field administration for UK departments. Rather, it is an example of territorial division of administrative responsibilities, existing alongside the more familiar functional ones”(1991: 61)

The Scottish Office was tied into Whitehall policy networks through ministerial and official committees and there was “care not to get too far out of line” (Keating 2001b: 3)

The mainstream UK political parties who served to manage Scotland by channeling demands to the UK level reinforced the “centralist bias” of government in the UK. For the Labour and Conservative Parties territorial objectives were subordinate to the goal of securing a parliamentary majority (1991: 76).

Having established the broad picture of policy similarity between the Scottish Office and UK Departments of State Midwinter et al detected a,

“marked increase in policy experiment, a variety of policy autonomy in which Scotland is allowed to proceed on its own, with English departments waiting to see the effects of the policy before committing themselves”(e.g. extending liquor licensing hours, expanding police powers, local government finance) (1991: 82)

However this is discounted as the Scottish Office “persuading Cabinet or Cabinet committees to let it pursue a slightly different line tangential to, but not in conflict with, overall policy”(1991:82). This is because the Scottish Office had, by and large, no more policy autonomy than other departments of the State (1991: 82-3). They cite Ross, who notes,

“Scottish administration is distinguished from its English equivalent more by how it does things than by what it does”(Ross 1981: 18 cited in Midwinter et al 1991: 83)

This is not to say that the existence of the Scottish Office was not important in a wider political sense – as Mitchell (2002) argues its existence encouraged a conception of Scotland as a political, and not merely a cultural entity.

Rose (1982) uses the term ‘concurrent policies’ to describe those policies whose principles are uniform but which are implemented separately (1991: 83). The Strathclyde school would seem to be suggesting that pre-devolution that vast majority of the Scottish Offices’ public policy outputs were characterised by such policies:

“The scope for policy innovation in Scotland is limited by UK policies, leadership from Whitehall departments and the wide demands on the time of the Secretary of State and most of them have been content to function as managers and adopters of policies” (Midwinter et al 1991: 83)

A product of the Scottish Office's role and position is an enhanced role for the civil service as against politicians. A consequence of the functional spread of the Scottish Office (with a small team of ministers covering a wide variety of fields). This results in a policy process dominated by administrative policymakers and gives Scotland,

“the appearance of a well-ordered, rationally organised but strangely depoliticised society. The executive is more powerful in relation to Parliament than in England while within the executive the civil service holds great influence” (1991: 92)

Rather than policy-making and adaptation, the Scottish Office's most prominent role was in serving Scottish interests within central government (1991: 84). A role they suggest may be compromised by devolution (1991: 201). Scottish particularism is accommodated through the mechanisms of territorial management with a broad consensus on policymaking processes and policy substance (1991: 165). As Mitchell (2002) argues,

“ ... it should not be assumed that the establishment of the Scottish Office set Scottish administration on some ineluctable course ... Concessions to the Scottish view could and were reversed. In addition, limits were placed on the extent to which the Scottish view could prevail over the Whitehall view”.

In the public finance field the mechanisms for channeling budgets to the Scottish Office - the Goschen (followed by the Barnett) formula - have rooted an “institutional incrementalism” (Mitchell 2002) into policymaking.

Midwinter et al (1991: 167) note Parry (1986) - an Edinburgh academic with a Strathclyde background - who argued that Scottish policymaking often involved applying policies worked out in the English context and, while there were some minor differences the question is often whether Scottish ministers wish to accelerate or retain an English derived strategy. Much of Scottish politics, they argue, is about how to bend the details of UK policies (1991: 220-1). They cite Kellas and Madgwick who suggest that the Scottish Office was for most of the time engaging in the humdrum business of implementing policies decided elsewhere (1982: 29). Midwinter et al challenge Kellas' (1989) argument that Scottish government and politics warranted the label 'political system' and suggest it is more accurate to refer to a Scottish political 'arena' (1991: 201).

In summary, the Strathclyde school argument was that the scope for policy innovation, pre-devolution was small, "tightly constrained by the demands of Cabinet and party government and the unitary state"(1991: 202).

"The pressure to uniformity entrenched in the unitary system of government and British political parties make it very difficult for governments to allow other than marginal changes in policy for Scotland ... More scope is available to adapt policy quantitatively, rather than qualitatively"(1991: 211)

Scottish policy demands were becoming increasingly differentiated and this, along with the absence of unitary national identity, was placing strain on the UK's unitary political system (1991: 202-3). Mitchell (2002) argues that by conceptualising the UK as a union-state one can gain a better understanding of the development of the Scottish Office. A union state occurs when,

"administrative standardization prevails over most of the territory, the consequences of personal union entail the survival in some areas of pre-union rights and institutional infrastructures which preserve some degree of regional autonomy and serve as agencies of indigenous elite recruitment." (Rokkan and Urwin 1982: 11 cited in Mitchell 2002)

For Mitchell (2002) adopting an historical institutionalist perspective emphasises that understanding the current devolution settlement "owed much more to the evolution of the Scottish Office than has generally been imagined.". This sums up much of the perspective of the Strathclyde school - rooted in a 'public administration/public policy' view of politics the emphasis tends to be on the importance of the past administrative policy inheritance and legacy in understanding the present.

The Policy Process Post-Devolution

The difference in the Edinburgh and Strathclyde interpretations of Scottish politics and policymaking pre-devolution is being replicated in post-devolution analysis of Scottish politics. The Edinburgh and Strathclyde schools have different interpretations of developments post devolution. This analysis has in the main been focused on the policy process, reflected the limited empirical picture available regarding policy outputs.

The new Edinburgh view?

The 'new' Edinburgh view tends to place great emphasis on the new distinctiveness of Scottish public policy processes. Writers such as Brown and

Paterson best exemplify it. It takes on board the emphasis of Scotland's constitutional planners that policy processes could be re-shaped (see Scottish Constitutional Convention 1990 and 1995; Consultative Steering Group 1999; Scottish Executive 1999a). The Scottish Constitutional Convention's Final Report (1995) suggested its own policy processes had demonstrated hope for "a way of politics that is radically different from the rituals of Westminster: more participative, more creative, less needlessly confrontational". Much effort has gone into the devising of different or new procedural values to govern policymakers in Scotland. There are new rules of the game that cover the policy process in Scotland. Bradbury and Mitchell (2000: 257) refer to the aspiration that the innovations in institutional procedures will lead to a more open and collaborative style of decision-making. Roberts notes,

"Scottish devolution has been accompanied by a new emphasis on bottom-up policy development, partnerships and networks within Scotland. This includes a stated desire to encourage and support innovation in the design of policy solutions" (2000: 260)

New Edinburgh interpretations of Scottish politics offer positive assessments of these changes. For example Brown argues,

"As the new Parliament begins to mature, it will provide opportunities for developing a framework that allows a more informed assessment of whether the Scottish case provides a model of a new type of politics - a model moving away from the adversarial, zero-sum politics associated with Westminster to a more plural and inclusive form of politics" (2000a: 556)

Paterson offers a similarly optimistic evaluation when he suggests "the Scottish Parliament is recovering the best of Scottish unionist policy making" which was characterised by "independent and innovative policy" (2000: 8) until the 1960s. His overall assessment of post-devolution developments is similarly positive:

"Pluralism *is* being renewed, coherent government *is* struggling back to life, although hampered by the ideological vacuum of current left-of-centre politics, and distinctive Scottish details of policy *are* once again finding an acceptable place in the Union" (2000: 11 original emphasis)

Notably Paterson extends his arguments from policy processes to outputs.

Other political analysts have come to conclusions that would sit comfortably in the Edinburgh school. For example Roberts (Dundee University) suggests that a

“combination of a relatively mature culture of territorial policy and strong national awareness, allied with a long tradition of integrated territorial management and a common sense of national purpose, has resulted in the emergence of a model of government and governance that is currently considerably in advance of the UK norm” (Roberts 2000: 250).

Roberts suggests that Scotland is

“both the standard bearer for devolved government and provides a ‘laboratory’ for further experimentation with regard to both the technical-administrative and political aspects of territorial planning, development and management” (2000: 250)

Lynch (Stirling University) in the first post-devolution textbook argues that “The unchallenged ability of civil servants and ministers to dominate policy has gone” (Lynch 2001: 2) with the new Parliament playing a role. Lynch appears to be suggesting policy divergence is increasing when he argues that “Scotland is playing an extremely rapid form of catch-up in many policy areas” (2001: 2) and that, “it is not just the process that is ‘new’ about the new Scotland, it is also the policy outputs” (2001: 2). He cites policies such as the abolition of feudal tenure, Section 2a/28 and land reform that “would not have been instituted under previous institutional arrangements” (Lynch 2001: 2). It is clear that although referring to policy outputs Lynch is referring to differential legislative outputs. He acknowledges devolution as involving both continuity and change in Scottish politics, but suggests that change has been the more obvious feature of devolution (2001:3). However, Lynch does stress that

“The Britishness of Scottish politics ... remains a central fact of political life after devolution. Analysis of the new Parliament therefore has to retain a UK perspective, recognising the limited nature of devolution but also the mutual interdependence of Scottish and UK government in devolved policy areas such as health, law and order and agriculture, as well as reserved policy areas” (2001: 3)

A new Strathclyde view?

The Strathclyde view tends to emphasise the importance of the legacy of the union in understanding contemporary Scottish politics and policy-making. It is also more sceptical in tone as regards the distinctiveness of Scottish politics post-devolution and the notion of ‘new politics’. This can be seen in various writings. The main exponent post-devolution has been Mitchell. He argues,

“Much of the work suggesting that devolution has ushered in a period of ‘new politics’ is fine as polemic but of dubious value as a serious effort to understand contemporary Scotland ... all too often notions of ‘new politics’ are vague and undefined” (2001: 222)

In another work, Mitchell criticises the advocates of new politics as adopting a very crude view of the relationship between institutions, processes and political culture and notes “a growing realisation has emerged in Scottish politics that much remains the same as ever” (2000: 620).

Moreover, new politics discussion of access and transparency has tended to emphasise the Parliament rather than the Executive (Mitchell 2000: 607), despite the fact that the latter remains the key arena of policy-making. The implicit assumption that more representation, participation and deliberation will deliver better public policy outputs is also raised. Mitchell points towards the debate on Clause 28 highlighting some of the difficulties many supporters of a more open policy-making process in Scotland have (2000: 616). Scotland’s civil society may not be quite as mature and attuned to liberal democracy as some home-rule campaigners may have thought.

Mitchell is not alone in his scepticism regarding new politics. Keating identifies a possible source of the naivety of some of its exponents. Civil society during the Conservative years was united by in lobbying for Scottish interests, and this

“ ... allowed Scots to sustain the idea of being in a common cause, bound by shared values and a broad social consensus (and) this experience probably underlay some of the more naïve ideas floating around before 1999 that the Scottish Parliament could operate on the basis of consensus, banishing partisanship, conflict and lobbying” (2001b: 7)

For Keating, policy-making is predominantly incremental – the weight of existing commitments limiting the scope for innovation – and this will limit the scope for policy innovation (2001b: 1). He also points towards the common UK security area, a common market and the welfare state as factors that may limit divergence.

McGarvey in a review of post-devolution writings argues,

“The institutional architecture of Scottish politics, despite all the rhetoric of new politics, is as much informed by old Westminster practice as new ideas” (2001: 431)

The “traditionals and rituals of Westminster and Whitehall practice” are being reflected in practices such as first minister’s question time, the Scottish Ministerial Code as well as party, media and civil service behaviour (2001: 431). He cites research into devolution’s impact on the civil service in Scotland by Parry and Jones who suggest, “The balance between innovation and replication has on the whole been tilted in favour of the latter” (2000: 62). The transition process was one of consolidation and what emerged was the Scottish Office with its name changed (2000: 64).

Overall the tone of Mitchell, Keating and McGarvey’s writings are reflective of a certain scepticism as regards the importance of ‘new politics’. The Strathclyde school does however acknowledge the increased capability of policy divergence post devolution. Midwinter et al predicted, “A self-governing Scotland would have greater latitude in framing its own policies” (1991: 201). This is undoubtedly true. Keating identifies the expansion in ministers, specialist advisors, innovative grouping of functions and the new Parliament as potential forces for innovation (2001b: 3). Whilst acknowledging that that Scotland pre-devolution was distinctive more in how it did things than it what it did, and that post-devolution it will “work within the parameters of the same welfare settlement” he does acknowledge it will “have considerably greater scope in how to adapt to it” (2001b: 12).

Overall while the new Edinburgh view tends to emphasise political and policy change the new Strathclyde view calls into focus continuity. It is possible the differing perspectives stem from each side’s differing vantage points. Whilst the Edinburgh school tend to be ‘insiders’ and very close both geographically and professionally to key policymakers in Scotland, exponents of the Strathclyde view tend to be more detached from the capital and its policy-makers.

Policy processes, products, outputs and statements

As noted above, there is no doubt that these policy-makers are operating in a changed political environment. There is however, some doubt as regards the extent to which that environment has translated into devolved policy differences between Scotland and the UK. Before outlining details of our empirical findings it is worth discussing our own conceptualisation of ‘policy’. What policy outputs are may appear self-evident, but once considered it is not always easy to determine what constitutes the label ‘public policy’. Ripley notes,

"Policy can be treated as a dependent variable (the outcome of decision processes), as an independent variable (the 'intervention' or 'treatment' leading to the results that are studied and/or generating the decision processes themselves)" (1985: 18)

In a similar vein Wildavsky's emphasises that, "policy is a process as well as a product. It is used to refer to the process of decision-making and also the product of that process" (1979: 387).

The focus in this paper is on the *product* rather than the *process*. Policy is treated as the outcome of decision processes within the Scottish Executive and Whitehall. The focus is on authoritative or sanctioned decisions by government actors in Edinburgh and Whitehall. We are focusing on what government does and it is to be distinguished from the process through which decisions are made (the dominant focus of post-devolution research).

In this paper we adopt a relatively simple definition that is broadly in line with that of Burch and Wood (1990: 12): public policy is, "the products of government: what it is that government does". We focus on actual policy announcements and the policy spin given by both Whitehall and Edinburgh. Whilst this definition suits us for the purpose of this research we should acknowledge numerous problems with it.

It imprints a top-down view of the policy-making process and assumes that the government is the originator of and source of policy. It also neglects the important policies can also be what governments choose *not* to do. In focusing on policy announcements our analysis neglects policy that does not change or exist at all. It also fails to capture policies that do not stem from an identifiable policy announcement or statement. Describing it as a process, rather than a single once and for all act (Rose 1969) best conveys the sense of continuous activity and adjustment involved in policy-making. In this era of multi-level governance few policies are decided and executed by a single level of government. We should also note that all too frequently politicians make speeches announcing new policy initiatives which due to a lack of willpower, institutional constraints, finance (or a combination of them all) never actually materialise in the form envisaged. This has been one of the central messages of implementation theory (see Pressman and Wildavsky 1974): those at the frontline delivering public services can, through their actions, recast it in directions not necessarily consistent with 'policymakers' objectives.

It is, of course, far too early to say much as regards the actual implementation of new policies in Scotland. Given that the Scottish Parliament has yet to complete its first term, it will be difficult to trace all intentions through to the output stage. Reflecting its non-executant capacity the Executive is reliant on bodies such as local councils, NDPBs, Agencies and health boards to deliver on its agenda.

In this paper, we are working within the government's own statements of intent and objectives. In using government press statements we are taking the government at face value and assuming their announcements do amount to changes in policy. Some policy announcements can be mere 'window dressing' that does not involve any change in policy. Parsons (1995: 15) cites the *Yes Prime Minister* TV series when the top civil servant discussing a plan to reduce unemployment observes that the PM

"is only trying to look as if he is trying to reduce unemployment. This is because he is worried that it does not look as if he is trying to reduce unemployment".

Thus the policy is merely making public announcements of having concern for the unemployed without any substantive change in concrete policy. Policymaking in politics can often be a symbolic as opposed to substantive activity. In the modern age policy spin means that new policy statements are often re-hashed versions of old statements with 'new' monies being announced for 'new' initiatives.

We should also acknowledge the problem of measurement validity in using press releases. We cannot be sure that every policy intention and output will be communicated through the press release. Moreover, accuracy of comparisons will depend on the time period selected. Generally speaking, the shorter the time frame, the less likely will the opportunity be to detect similarities between the intentions and outputs of different administrations operating under differing constraints (for example, differing procedures and differing electoral and party systems). However, no matter what time period is selected it is likely that findings will overstate divergence and understate duplication since some divergences will prove to be temporal products of their time frame.

Public policy-making is of course much more than simply policy statements. A focus on these statements alone gives only a partial and incomplete view of the dynamics and totality of public policy. We are not however writing a research paper or text on public policy processes in Scotland and the UK. Our focus is on policy statements and we are using government statements as an indicator, rather than definitive statement, of 'policy'.

The stated intentions of governments are an important aspect of public policy. The main focus of the media (and thus the public) is on formally expressed statements of policy. In the context of New Labour policy communication is not simply a tag-on at the end of the policy process - it is seen as central to it. Policy-makers increasingly view public relations, policy spin and communication

as the most crucial stage of the process. Policies are sold to the electorate in the same way a product is sold by companies.

Public perceptions of policy-making is today informed by press releases, glossy policy launches and ministerial set piece speeches. These policy statements are articulations of public policy such as legislation, administrative rules and regulations, court opinions, statements and speeches by public officials indicating the intentions and goals of government and what will be done to realize them. In many instances a focus on rhetoric can reveal a great deal more than the actual activities of government.

Moreover, despite all the rhetoric of 'new politics' and an emphasis on parliamentarians and parliamentary committees as sources of new legislation and policy the fact is nearly three years down the line legislative and policy initiation remains something that the Scottish Parliamentary Committees have exercised only on two occasions. In any case the passage of Bills through Parliament is only an initial stage of public policy-making. Both legislation and policy change remains nearly as much the dominant preserve of the Scottish Executive as it is of Whitehall in England. It is this administrative policymaking (or more accurately policy announcements) within the Executives that is the focus of this paper.

Within both the Scottish Executive and the UK Government such policy statements are carefully controlled - leading to some commentators to lament Labour's 'control freakery' (Riddell 1997). Paragraph 88 of the 1997 UK *Ministerial Code of Conduct* states that,

"The policy content of all major speeches, press releases and new policy initiatives should be cleared in good time by the Number 10 Press Office; the timing and form of announcements should be cleared with the Number 10 Press Office." (Cabinet Office 1997)

Similarly, the 1999 *Scottish Ministerial Code* states that:

"The presentational aspects of all major speeches, announcements and new policy initiatives should be discussed with the Information Directorate and the timing, format and content of all announcements cleared with them." (Scottish Executive 1999b)

Both Codes suggest a high degree of central control over communications. In the case of Westminster, the Number 10 Press Office is central, while in the case of the Scottish Executive it appears to be the Information Directorate.

However, to what extent does Scotland follow not just the policy, but the communication of that policy as well? Hypothesising that Scotland follows London on policy we would expect to find subsequent Scottish mirroring of London's policy intentions and outputs. Hypothesising that Scotland follows London on communication as well we would expect to find subsequent Scottish mirroring of the language used in London's selling of the policy intentions and outputs. Our null hypotheses are that there are no relationships between London and Edinburgh over both policy intentions and outputs and the communication of these.

Detection of policy divergence or duplication in devolved areas is a difficult task. On any given day the policy on 'x' in England and Wales may be different from the policy on 'y' in Scotland, not because there is a divergence of executive intention, but because there is a divergence of outcomes due to such factors as the political climate and institutional arrangements facing the two executives. For instance, governing parties at both Westminster and Holyrood intended to repeal Section 28 (legislation forbidding local authorities from 'promoting' homosexuality). To date, the legislation has been repealed in Scotland (where ironically there was more public opposition), yet remains in England and Wales due to opposition from the House of Lords and a lack of parliamentary time. While both Holyrood and Westminster intended for there to be legislative and policy duplication on the repeal of Section 28, the outcome to date has been one of policy divergence. Consequently, when we compare policy outputs using cross-sectional data we have to be aware that divergences between Westminster and Holyrood are likely to be overstated. Divergences will include unintended policy differences as well as intended policy differences.

To alleviate this problem one could measure the intentions of administrations as well as the outcomes over a period of time. To do this one could compare party manifestos and policy statements. However, comparing party manifestos is less than ideal. Manifestos are increasingly couched in very general terms and give very little away about the specific details (financial or otherwise) of policies. Not all policies in manifestos are implemented (for example, the referendum on the Commons electoral system in Labour's 1997 manifesto) or mentioned (for example, independence for the Bank of England, again Labour's 1997 manifesto). In the context of devolution coalition government has resulted in Labour making policy concessions to its coalition partners the Liberal Democrats (e.g. tuition fees), and on occasions when the Executive parties are divided the Parliament itself (e.g. free personal care for the elderly). Finally, many policies are modified or simply arise to meet the needs and demands of the time (e.g. the amendment to the Prevention of Terrorism Act in the wake of the September 11th attacks on the USA). Consequently, in order that we can measure divergence or duplication of policy intentions and outputs it seems most appropriate to

measure ongoing policy statements and to do this we analyse press releases issued by the Scottish Executive and UK Government.

Press releases offer a wealth of information concerning both the intentions and achievements of the respective governments. They also offer a chance to detect whether there is duplication and divergence of not just policies, but of the communications surrounding these policies as well. Given the context of the increased salience of being 'on message' for Labour (Norris et. al, 1999), and given the anecdotal evidence to date (Nelson, 2001), we wanted to uncover the extent to which there is duplication of not just policy but the communication of that policy across levels of government as well.

Assessing policy divergence and duplication

To detect systematic evidence of divergence and/or duplication, and to expediate the cumbersome process of analysing vast numbers of press releases, we adopted the case study method and compared and contrasted the online press releases of the Scottish Executive on health with those from the UK Department of Health. We analysed 20 months of press releases between 1st January 2000 and 31st August 2001. In this period the Scottish Executive released 415 press releases on health compared with 940 for the UK Department of Health.

To compare and contrast the press releases we first printed lists of both the Scottish Executive press releases on health (currently only available up to August 2001) and those for the UK Department of Health. Our next step was to devise a systematic means of comparing and contrasting these lists and their contents. To do this we employed two stages to our analysis.

Our first stage was to go through each of the Scottish Executive press releases on health to check the extent of the existence of 'same policy issue, same day' announcements at the UK Department of Health (see policies marked with an '*' in Appendix A). We did this so that we would be able to control for the likely higher degree of congruence between 'same policy issue, same day' announcements.

Having controlled for 'same policy issue, same day' announcements our second stage involved listing every remaining policy subject under health press releases by the Scottish Executive. We then sorted these according to two broad categories. The first category includes press releases on health service organisational matters such as NHS pay, regulation of health workers, and appointments to NHS boards and trusts (for full list see Appendix A). The second category includes press releases on health policy areas of concern, for

example, child and family health and welfare, and/or specific health issues such as flu, cancer and heart disease (for full list see Appendix A).

As a preliminary study we decided to test our hypotheses by focusing our analysis on specific public health issues, justifying this on the basis that these are the 'bread and butter' issues that are of most concern to the general public. The other reason why we did this was because 13 out of the 14 'same policy issue, same day' announcements concerned specific public health issues, and so would provide the main basis for comparisons with non 'same policy issue, same day' announcements.

Ideally we would have liked to compare and contrast all of the issues covered in the press releases, but time and space constraints mean that we have limited ourselves to a sample of 13 public health issues that were selected at random from the list (see Appendix A). To avoid double-counting and to facilitate comparisons, this list excluded the 13 public health issues and 1 health service organisational matter that were found to include 'same policy issue, same day' announcements.

The issues that were selected at random were: flu, cot deaths, Propecia, water fluoridation and ageism. These are in addition to the 14 'same policy issue, same day' public health issues and organisational matters that were found in stage one of the analysis. To recall, we are interested in determining the degree of congruence between the policy announcements in Edinburgh and London, and wanted to control for the higher likelihood of congruence between 'same policy issue, same day' announcements.

To detect congruence we compared and contrasted the selected issues within the time frame using both key word searching from the lists and a more laborious manual check to minimise measurement validity concerns. We also manually recorded the issues and the respective press release dates, the basis of the announcement, the similarity of intention or output (the message), the authors of the quotes, and any similarities of language used.¹

While we should expect that 'same policy issue, same day' announcements have a high degree of congruence, to what extent does this congruence exist in non 'same policy issue, same day' announcements? More importantly, to what extent do policy intentions and outputs differ and to what extent does the communication of the message differ?

¹ To reduce the subjectivity of this exercise, particularly in relation to the detection of language similarities, we intend to check findings on quotes using 'collusion' software initially designed to test for similarities in student essays.

Results

Stage 1 comparisons between 'same policy issue, same day' announcements

Between 1st January 2000 and 31st August 2001 only 18 out of the 415 (less than 0.5%) Scottish Executive press releases on health were 'same policy issue, same day' announcements. From these 18 press releases there were 14 topics covered: breastfeeding; landfill; BCG vaccinations; prescription cost increases; nicotine patches; vCJD; polio vaccine recall; fortification of flour with folic acid; National Diet and Nutrition Survey; mobile phone dangers; generic drug pricing; listeria outbreak; insulin pens; and pay increases for NHS staff. Summaries of the findings are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Comparisons of ‘Same Policy Issue, Same day’ Announcements (Scottish Executive (SE) versus Department of Health (DoH) – 01/01/2000-31/08/2001)

Issue/ Date	Basis of Announcement	Similarity of position (Intention or Output)	Authors of Quotes and Similarity of Language Used
<i>Flour Fortification</i> 13/01/01 acid	<i>Statements on study results - fortification of flour with folic acid</i>	<i>Both welcomed and intended to take forward through wider UK consultation (see below)</i>	<i>SE = Susan Deacon + 1 expert DoH = Yvette Cooper Similar message, some similar language: SE = ‘very helpful contribution’ DoH = ‘valuable contribution’</i>
<i>NHS Pay</i> 17/01/01	<i>Policy announcement of above inflation pay for all NHS staff - both ‘in full, with no staging’ (accepting UK independent Pay Review Bodies)</i>	<i>Both accepted</i>	<i>SE = Susan Deacon DoH = Alan Milburn Similar message, some similar language: SE = ‘significantly above inflation’ DoH = ‘well ahead of inflation’</i>
<i>Insulin</i> 09/02/00	<i>Policy announcement that insulin pens and needles will be available on NHS prescription</i>	<i>Both to introduce 01/03/00</i>	<i>SE = Susan Deacon DoH = Lord Hunt Similar message, some similar language: SE = ‘comfort and convenience’ DoH = ‘comfort and convenience’</i>
<i>Prescription Costs (1)</i> 17/02/00	<i>Annual policy announcements</i>	<i>Both to raise prescription costs from £5.90 to £6.00.</i>	<i>SE = Susan Deacon DoH = Lord Philip Hunt SE ‘endorsing’ UK line Similar message (although SE = more justification for rise), some similar language both, ‘increase in line with the movement of the inflation figure from 01 to 11/99’</i>
<i>Listeria</i> 24/02/00	<i>Public warning of listeria outbreak in France</i>	<i>Identical (except that the DoH ‘will continue to keep in touch with French authorities’)</i>	<i>SE = ‘spokesman for SE’ DoH = ‘spokesman for DoH’ Identical message, identical text, identical quotes, identical titles.</i>
<i>Generic Drugs</i> 20/04/00	<i>Policy announcement to cut the price of generic drugs</i>	<i>Both want cuts in cost of generic drugs. DoH concerned over supplier tactics, past costs. SE does not mention this, talks instead of £20m savings can be redirected.</i>	<i>SE = Susan Deacon DoH = Lord Hunt 50% similar message, 50% different Some similar language, but more different</i>
<i>Mobile Phones</i> 11/05/00	<i>Statements on report into the health risks of mobile phones (Independent Expert Group on Mobile Phones & Health)</i>	<i>Both ‘welcome’ report for advice provided</i>	<i>SE = Susan Deacon + Sarah Boyack DoH = Yvette Cooper Similar message, some similar language: SE = ‘comprehensive report’ DoH = ‘comprehensive review’</i>

Issue/ Date	Basis of Announcement	Similarity of position (Intention or Output)	Authors of Quotes and Similarity of Language Used
National Diet 01/06/00	Statements on survey results on the dietary habits & nutrition of GB 4 to 18 year olds (DoH/MAFF initiative in GB)	Both welcome information for subsequent policy development & need to advise public	SE = no quotes + 1 expert DoH = Yvette Cooper Similar message (but Scottish statistics), SE – text emphasises the relative positives of Scottish nutrition, some similar language: SE = ‘provides essential information’ DoH = ‘provides vital information’
Generic Drugs 23/07/01	Launch of a discussion into the supply and reimbursement of generic medicines for the NHS	‘UK wide commitment’ secure supply and VFM	SE = Malcolm Chisholm DoH = Lord Hunt Similar message (some Scottish statistics) evidence of different language used
Flour Fortification 25/07/00 acid	Start of joint consultation on the fortification of flour with folic acid	Both support subject to risk management, cost, & feasibility	SE = Iain Gray + 1 expert DoH = no quotes Similar message, although Gray adopts a ‘best way forward for Scotland’ gloss
Vaccine Recall 20/10/00	Policy announcement based on advice of Medicines Control Agency (MCA)	Both recalled suspect polio vaccine (vCJD risk)	SE = Dep. CMO UK = CMO Similar message (but Scottish statistics) Several sentences virtually identical.
<i>Nicotine Patches... (1)</i> 14/12/00	<i>Start of consultation on making nicotine replacement therapies available on NHS (based on DoH consultation)</i>	<i>Both pro NRT on NHS. DoH restates commitment to end tobacco advertising, while SE states health targets on reducing % smoking</i>	<i>SE = Susan Deacon DoH = Yvette Cooper 50% similar message, 50% different SE = more emphasis on targets. DoH = more emphasis on advertising. 2 near identical sentences</i>
vCJD 04/01/01	Policy announcement of investment to modernise NHS decontamination & sterilisation facilities & single-use instruments	Both pro	SE = Dep. CMO DoH = John Denham + Dep. CMO Similar message, although DoH = more detail, although SE commit to Autumn as well as 2001 for the introduction of single-use instruments + SE title (‘Scots get extra’) suggests it is unique.
Nicotine Patches... (2) 14/03/01	Policy announcements - patches, inhalers, gum to be on prescription (based on DoH consultation)	Both pro NRT on NHS	SE = Susan Deacon DoH = Yvette Cooper Similar message, different emphases SE = more emphasis on benefits to poor Some similarities (esp. statistics), but many differences... Pushed harder by SE.

Issue/ Date	Basis of Announcement	Similarity of position (Intention or Output)	Authors of Quotes and Similarity of Language Used
Prescription Costs (2) 16/03/01	Annual policy announcements	Both to raise prescription costs from £6.00 to £6.10. SE 'commitment' (no mention of 'endorsing' UK line)	SE = Susan Deacon DoH = Lord Philip Hunt <i>Similar message, different emphases</i> SE = more emphasis on those who do not have to pay for prescriptions, but 2 near identical sentences + titles
BCG Vaccination 23/03/01	Relaunch of BCG immunisation against TB in schools – due to end of manufacturing problems	Both pro relaunch Both pro catch up policy	SE = Malcolm Chisholm + CMO DoH = Yvette Cooper Similar message, some similar language: Chisholm + Cooper near identical sentence Cooper + CMO near identical sentence
Landfill 16/08/01	Statements on study results - The Small Area Health Statistics Unit (SAHSU) (on behalf of GB Health Depts.)	SE: welcome findings that minimal health effects. DoH: taking seriously, but say difficult to interpret & need more context	SE = Susan Deacon & Ross Finnie DoH = Dep. CMO Message more different than similar Tone of DoH more sceptical Although some similar language SE = 'important piece of work' DoH = 'important study'
Breastfeeding 31/08/01	Statements on survey results - Infant Feeding Survey 2000 (on behalf of 4 UK Health Depts.)	Both pro breastfeeding. Both welcome ↑ in breastfeeding (esp. among poorer families). DoH links to smoking ↓ successes,	SE = Susan Deacon + 2 experts DoH = Jacqui Smith + 1 expert 50% similar message, 50% different Differently phrased, different emphasises SE does not mention.

Sources (Press release titles for the Scot Executive vs. UK Department of Health): **Flour Fortification (1)**: "Folic acid is powerful weapon in child and maternal health drive" vs. "Report on folic acid and its role in the reduction of neural tube defects..."; **NHS Pay**: "Executive backs NHS staff with across-the-board pay increases" vs. "Nurses and doctors pay rises to be paid in full"; **Insulin**: "Insulin pens and needles to be made available on prescription" vs. "New benefits for people with diabetes announced by Lord Hunt – Pen needles and re-usable insulin pens available to people with diabetes on prescription for the first time"; **Prescription costs (1)**: "Below rise in prescription charges" vs. "Government announces lowest percentage prescription rise for more than 20 years"; **Listeria**: "Health warning over listeria outbreak in France" vs. "Health warning over listeria outbreak in France"; **Generic Drugs (1)**: "Deacon welcomes new, lower costs of NHS generic drugs" vs. "Government cuts price of generic drugs – Lord Hunt announces action to prevent NHS being 'ripped off'"; **Mobile Phones**: "Executive responds to Stewart report on mobile phones" vs. "Government announces new research programme into the health effects of mobile phones"; **National Diet**: "National diet and nutrition survey published" vs. "Yvette Cooper launches joint DH/FSA report into childrens' diets"; **Generic Drugs (2)**: "Chisholm welcomes launch of generic medicine discussion paper and maximum price scheme review" vs. "Debate on future of non-brand drugs launched"; **Flour Fortification (2)**: "Consultation on fortification of flour with folic acid" vs. "Public consultation on folic acid"; **Vaccine Recall**: "Medicines control agency orders recall of vaccine – Scottish Executive takes action" vs. "Medicine control agency orders recall of vaccine – Action taken after manufacturer breached production guidelines"; **Nicotine Patches (1)**: "Deacon announces consultation on NRT" vs. "Minister publishes bill to ban tobacco advertising and welcomes move to make NRT available on prescription"; **vCJD**: "Scots patients to get extra protection against vCJD" vs. "£200m for NHS equipment to protect patients against possible variant CJD risk"; **Nicotine Patches (2)**: "'Patches on prescription' to help more Scots kick the smoking habit" vs. "Nicotine replacement therapy products to be made available on prescription and general sale"; **Prescription costs (2)**: "Lowest percentage prescription rise for more than 20 years" vs. "Prescription charge increase is lowest percentage increase for over 20 years"; **BCG vaccination**: "Chisholm announces relaunch of school BCG vaccination" vs. "BCG schools vaccination programme to re-start in all schools"; **Landfill**: "Executive welcomes publication of study on landfill sites" vs. "Largest ever study into health of populations around landfill sites"; **Breastfeeding**: "Deacon welcomes rise in breastfeeding rates" vs. "Breastfeeding increasing, smoking during pregnancy down, says new survey".

The results of the comparisons between 'same policy issue, same day' announcements provide much more evidence of duplication than divergence in both the policy and in the communication. In all 18 cases the Scottish Executive's policy position closely mirrors that of London's. The main

explanation for the degree of policy congruence is of course that most of the above issues are actually reserved matters (for example, medicine regulation and pricing, and pay).

Given this, one might expect there to be a degree of collusion between Edinburgh and London over the wording of the message that is released. However, results suggest that the extent of that collusion stretch credibility to the limit. The most extreme case of this concerns the listeria press release on 24/02/00. Although the titles, text and quotes are identical, the Scottish Executive attribute their release to a 'spokesman for the Scottish Executive' while the Department of Health attribute their release to a 'spokesman for the Department of Health'. While the other 17 cases are not identical, 16 present similar messages, and 14 present some evidence of language collusion.

Telling examples of language collusion can be found in the 'big picture' responses to the publication of expert reports. In the case of a report on the role of folic acid in preventing neural tube defects, the Scottish Executive take is 'very helpful contribution' compared with the Department of Health's 'valuable contribution'. In the case of a report on mobile phone safety, the Scottish take is 'comprehensive report' versus the UK's 'comprehensive review'. In the case of the publication of the National Diet and Nutrition Survey, the Scottish take is that it 'provides essential information' while the UK take is that it 'provides vital information'. In the case of the publication of a study on the health implications of living near landfill sites, the Scottish take is that the study is an 'important piece of work' while the UK take is that it is an 'important study' (see Table 1).

Even if we exclude both the listeria release and the releases on the four reports, identical phrases/sentences were found in most of the remaining releases. Examples of phrase collusion include the 'comfort and convenience' to user descriptions given by both to the policy announcement that insulin pens and needles would now be available on the NHS, and the 'in full, no staging' NHS pay rise announcement. Examples of sentence collusion (bold indicating identical words used) include:

'...70 per cent of smokers want to give up but find it very difficult...Our decision to make these products available on NHS prescription, as well as in pharmacies, will help less affluent smokers increase their chances of quitting and will help reduce the incidence of tobacco-related deaths and health inequalities.'

(Susan Deacon, 'Deacon announces consultation on NRT', SE3216, 14/12/2000)

vs.

‘Seventy per cent of smokers say they want to give up but they find it very difficult. Making NRT available on prescription as well as in pharmacies will increase the chances of quitting for the less affluent smokers, help to reduce tobacco deaths and health inequalities.’

(Yvette Cooper, ‘Minister publishes bill to ban tobacco advertising and welcomes move to make NRT available on prescription’, 0742, 14/12/2000)

and,

‘Immunisation staff across the country will be starting to relaunch the programme, beginning with those students who missed out on their vaccinations last year and are set to leave school this summer.’

(Malcolm Chisholm, ‘Chisholm announces relaunch of school BCG vaccination’, SE0786, 23/03/2001)

vs.

‘Immunisation staff across the country can now start to relaunch the programme, beginning with those students who missed out on their vaccinations last year and are set to leave school this summer.’

(Yvette Cooper, ‘BCG schools vaccination programme to re-start in all schools’ 0144, 23/03/2001)

To recall, we expected to find some degree of ‘same policy issue, same day’ congruence in policy announcements. However, the extent and brashness of the congruence found was not at all anticipated and in many cases provides evidence that the Scottish Executive is merely duplicating announcements, albeit with a Scottish accent. Alternatively, similarities in language might suggest the tight co-ordination of message taking place between London and Edinburgh. Given that the press releases were same day announcements we have few immediate clues of who is duplicating whom. Nonetheless, on closer inspection it appears that the Scottish Executive is taking its cue from London. For instance, on prescription charges (2000) the Executive is ‘endorsing’ the UK line, while in the case of nicotine patches, the Executive is basing its announcement on the outcome of consultations taken by the UK Health Department. Overall, findings show that the Scottish Executive is not only remarkably ‘on message’, but that it is also ‘branding the message’ as Scottish.

Detecting who is duplicating whom is arguably easier to detect (subject to the limitations of the time frame) on those same policy issues that were not ‘same day’ announcements, and it is to these that our attention now turns.

Controlling for expected ‘same policy issue, same day’ congruence we also randomly selected a comparable number of non ‘same day’ policy issue announcements. To date we are able to report findings on five of these 13 cases (ran out of time). Although we only have five cases, results for these are interesting (see Table 2). In all five cases, the announcements of the Department of Health precede those of the Scottish Executive. In two cases, the Scottish Executive followed up with next day announcements (Hair loss; and water flouridation). In the remaining three cases (cot deaths; flu payments; and ageism in the NHS) the Scottish Executive followed up a week to 2 weeks later.

Table 2: Comparisons of Non ‘Same day’ Policy Issue Announcements (Scottish Executive (SE) versus Department of Health (DoH) – 01/01/2000-31/08/2001)

Issue/ Date	Basis of Announcement	Similarity of position (Intention or Output)	Authors of Quotes and Similarity of Language Used
Cot Deaths UK: 18/02/00 SE: 25/02/00	Publication of advice on risks of cot deaths	Identical – SE launch leaflet one week after DoH	SE = Susan Deacon DoH = Dep CMO <i>Similar message, similar language</i>
Hair Loss Drug UK: 06/06/00 SE: 07/06/00	Policy announcements on availability of prescriptions for hair loss drug Propecia prescription	Identical – SE follows DoH lead to only consider for private prescription (SE: one day later)	SE = no quotes DoH = Lord Hunt Similar message, very similar language <i>Near identical titles</i>
Flu Payments UK: 15/06/00 SE: 26/06/00	Policy announcement to pay GPs to immunise the over 65s against flu	Near identical – SE follows DoH lead to pay GPs. But, payments in Scotland are set o range between £6 and £7.40, England payments set at £6.45 (SE: 11 day delay)	SE = Susan Deacon + 1 expert DoH = John Denham Similar message, different particulars SE: ‘scheme – unique within UK’! DoH: ‘first time’
Water Flouridation UK: 05/10/00 SE: 06/10/00	Statements on report into health effects of water flouridation	Both ‘welcomed’ findings that water flouridation does reduce tooth decay without causing cancer, bone fracture or Down’s Syndrome language (SE: one day delay)	SE = Susan Deacon DoH = Lord Hunt <i>Similar message, similar</i>
Ageism In NHS (1) UK: 03/11/00 SE: 16/11/00	DoH establishing a ‘blueprint for care’. SE announcing a future ‘Scottish Health Plan’ at a Glasgow ‘Coming of Age Seminar’	Both want to tackle ageism in the NHS. (SE: 13 day delay)	SE = Susan Deacon DoH = Alun Milburn Similar message, different approach

Sources (Press release titles for the Scot Executive vs. UK Department of Health): **Cot Deaths**: “New guidelines on cot death prevention” vs. “Department of Health issues new advice on cot death – New ‘Reduce the risk of cot death’ leaflet published”; **Hair Loss Drugs**: “Outcome of consultation on Propecia” vs. “Outcome of consultation on Propecia announced”; **Flu Payments**: “New agreement with GPs underpins flu campaign for Scots pensioners” vs. “Health Minister John Denham welcomes agreement on flu payment to GPs – BMA accepts ‘generous’ offer that paves way for flu immunisation campaign”.

Sources (Press release titles for the Scot Executive vs. UK Department of Health): **Water Fluoridation**: “Deacon welcomes important new report on water fluoridation” vs. “Government welcomes new report on water fluoridation”. **Ageism in NHS**: “No place for ageism in the NHS – Deacon” vs. “Top Doctor appointed to tackle age discrimination of older people”.

In terms of content, results further indicate that non ‘same day’ policy announcements also provide more evidence of duplication than divergence in both policy and in the communication. In all 5 cases the Scottish Executive’s policy position closely mirrors that of London’s (again largely explained by reserved powers). However, the Scottish Executive time delay in its releases leads to some rather interesting presentations of policy. In the case of flu payments to GPs for the immunisation of the over 65s, for example, the Scottish executive press release (SE1876/2000) claims that this ‘scheme’ is ‘unique - within the UK’ even though a near identical scheme had been announced by the Department of Health some 11 days earlier! (DoH 0359/2000). Indeed, the only ‘unique’ aspect of the Scottish scheme was the potential to be paid slightly more or even slightly less than the English scheme. When we compare this statement with the earlier Department of Health statement it rather undermines the validity of the Scottish Executive statement.

More seriously, Scottish Executive comparative delay in communication poses interesting dilemmas for the health and welfare of the Scottish people. In the case of cot deaths, for example, the Department of Health launched their advisory leaflet a week earlier than the Scottish Executive. In terms of communication with the public, this either means that Scots received the message a week late, or, depending upon the media that they consume, that they received the message twice. Either way, some people in Scotland and England will be disadvantaged by this arrangement.

In terms of the congruence over the language used, findings again show evidence of collusion - whether copying the London language, or towing the London line, albeit with a Scottish accent (bold indicating identical words used):

‘The findings show **no association between** the use of **fluoridation and** health problems like **cancer, bone fracture or Down’s Syndrome.**’

(Susan Deacon, “Deacon welcomes important new report on water fluoridation”, SE2659, 06/10/00)

vs.

‘...research...concludes that **no association** has been shown **between** water **fluoridation and cancer, bone fracture or Down’s Syndrome.**’

(Lord Hunt, "Government welcomes new report on water fluoridation", 0563, 05/10/00)

and, in the case of a Scottish accent:

'Regulations, which will allow GPs in Scotland to write private prescriptions for their NHS patients, will come into force later this year.'

(No author attributed, "Outcome of consultation on Propecia", SE01649, 07/06/00)

vs.

'Regulations, which will allow GPs to write private prescriptions for their NHS patients, will come into force later in the year.'

(Main text, "Outcome of consultation on Propecia announced", 0331, 06/06/00)

Discussion

Despite the fact that health is one of the key devolved domains that is touted (the Scottish Executive describe it as "an almost entirely devolved area" (SE2759/2000)) we - quite inadvertently - were surprised to find that we were actually comparing more reserved issues than we expected. The health service is devolved but regulation of healthcare professionals, medicine and genetics are reserved to Westminster (Lynch 2001: 16). We can make no firm judgement as to the extent of policy divergence or duplication. However, the evidence we do have suggests some merit in Nelson's assertion that the Scottish Executive are indeed 'regurgitating work done in London and passing it off as its own'.

The post-devolution literature on Scottish politics has been predominantly focused on change and difference. In doing so it has tended to neglect the significant degree of continuity and conformity that exists. In this study we have examined policy statements from both Whitehall and Edinburgh in the post-devolution period. Rather than devolved difference in these statements there remains a considerable degree of unionist uniformity. It would appear continuity rather than change is a feature of Scottish policymaking. The results are rather surprising, as one would expect that political rhetoric and policy announcements would be more likely to accentuate rather than dilute differences.

The approach adopted in this paper is an institutional/administrative one with the focus on central government department policymaking in Whitehall and Edinburgh. This is very much in the traditions of the Strathclyde approach to understanding Scottish politics with executive institutions the key unit of analysis. This is to be contrasted with the civil society 'Edinburgh' approach outlined by Brown et al 1997. This approach post-devolution has tended to stress the new institutional framework for policymaking and the scope for policy change. The Strathclyde tone, on the other hand, has been more sceptical. Whilst acknowledging some change it has also tended to emphasise significant continuity.

Our results show more evidence of the Strathclyde interpretation of Scottish politics. Whitehall appears to be very much in the lead in terms of policy development – the Scottish Executive (like the Scottish Office before it) appears to be taking its cues from London. The 'old' Strathclyde interpretation of a Scottish policy process circumscribed by the UK agenda appears to retain some relevance post-devolution. We found little evidence of health interests in Scottish civil society carving out a distinct proactive Scottish agenda. Much of Executive health policymaking in Scotland appears to be reactive. However, the reaction of health policymakers is not to the demands of the health policy community in Scotland, it is to the Department of Health's policy agenda.

As noted above there has been no major study adopting a macro-perspective across a broad range of policy areas assessing Scottish policy distinctiveness. This paper adopts a research methodology that, whilst solely applied to health and policy announcements in this paper, could be extended to other policy areas and form the basis of such a study. It could also be extended to other stages of the policy process. It could be that policy distinctiveness is more apparent at other stages in the policy process such as the implementation stage (Midwinter et al 1991: 83). However, until such a study is undertaken we simply do not know.

The dominant post-devolution focus in the Scottish politics literature has been on change and divergence. Factors promoting differentiation have been widely discussed, those reflecting continued assimilation less so. It is perhaps time to consider the factors limiting such change and promoting conformity.

The civil service in Scotland remains part of the UK home civil service. This provides opportunity for the maintenance of a common civil service ethos. In terms of policymaking this could be seen as a factor that will retain some degree of commonality between policy initiatives between each institution. Internal civil service policy learning, policy networks and interpersonal connections will result in clear threads of communication being retained between Edinburgh and

London. The civil service governing Scotland is largely the same one that existed between 1979 and 1997. On most interpretations there was a limiting of Scottish Office policy discretion and the injection of a more centralist culture into territorial policymaking during this period. It could be that the unionist uniformity remains an under-appreciated legacy in present day Scottish policy-making.

Fiscal autonomy whilst not a prerequisite for policy autonomy is undoubtedly an important variable. The Scottish Executive's macro-aggregates for increases in expenditure are dependent on the negotiations between the UK Treasury and the relevant spending ministers in Whitehall. This leads to an inevitable sense of 'lock in' to the UK agenda with spending ministers in Edinburgh naturally anticipating similar settlements to their counterparts in Whitehall. Health has been an expenditure priority of both London and Edinburgh – there are inevitable questions asked why the Scottish Minister is not pursuing a policy initiative the UK Ministry has labeled 'innovative, necessary, visionary' or the like.

Policy outputs from Whitehall and Edinburgh are not wholly independent of each other. The UK remains a relatively integrated polity, society and economy. Cultural distinctions between Scotland and England are negligible. Even post-devolution, decisions made in one part of the UK are likely to have repercussions for the other. The scale and scope of coverage of Whitehall departments means that they are very much the big brother in relations with Edinburgh.

Moreover, there are post-devolution initiatives designed to retain clear linkages between Edinburgh and Whitehall. For example, the Memorandums of Understanding between the Executives that established a series of joint ministerial councils (including one on health). There have also been a series of 'concordats' as well as less formal meetings in which the relevant ministers in England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland discuss issues of common interest.

One could also point to Donald Dewar's 'safety first' approach and his unwillingness to rock the boat in relations with London (Mitchell et al 2001: 51) at the initial stages of devolution. Substantial policy divergence tends to be viewed as a recipe for friction, confrontation and conflict. However, subsequently both McLeish and McConnell have, in differing ways, declared their autonomy from London. The display of that autonomy appears to have been in headline grabbing policy initiatives rather than in the more mundane reality of administrative policymaking.

It should be acknowledged that this research has been undertaken during a transitional period when the new rules, policy processes and policy networks that surround the Scottish Executive and Parliament were in a state of flux. Policymakers in Scotland are learning the new rules of the post-devolution policy game – lacking such new templates it could be that in many instances they are relying on the old Scottish Office ‘rules’.

In summary, we are not saying that devolution has not led to policy divergence. In the case of health, the most publicised divergence is the Scottish Executive’s commitment to introduce free personal care for the elderly. While this does represent an important qualitative difference in policy between England and Scotland, what we have tried to do is to delve more deeply to see how common such divergence is. Although we have not analysed every policy, and although we have restricted ourselves to the analysis of press releases, our findings suggest that it is more common for there to be duplication of policy than there is to be divergence. Of course much of this similarity is due to the fact that many of our health issues are in fact reserved matters (a fact not readily acknowledged by the Scottish Executive).

Having controlled for same day announcements, our findings to date suggest that the Scottish Executive follow London’s lead. All of the non ‘same day’ announcements involved the Scottish Executive releasing similar press releases at later dates to those of the Department of Health. In two of these cases, delay was just one day, although in the case of cot deaths the delay was a week, and in the case of GP flu payments it was 11 days. If devolution was supposed to facilitate the mutual exchange of ideas and best practice, our preliminary findings suggest that this is currently a one way process with the vast majority of ideas and best practices passing from London to Edinburgh and not the other way around.

Moreover, duplication of the language used in press releases raises questions concerning the accountability of the Scottish Executive to the public. In broad terms, the Scottish public have been told that health is a devolved matter. However, responsibility for many health issues such as drug labelling, drug prices and NHS salaries are matters reserved for the UK government. If the Scottish Executive continues to take credit for these (as some of the examples above show), then the public will expect them to be accountable when and if there are problems. However, the Scottish Executive cannot be held accountable for those issues that are reserved to Westminster. Consequently, the only avenues available to the Executive will be to remain silent or to blame London. This seemingly fickle response will have a knock on effect in terms of the public’s trust in the new institutions, something the Executive is paradoxically keen to guard against.

Devolution is undoubtedly a necessary condition for policy autonomy, it is not however sufficient. There is no denying that the political environment of health and other policymaking has changed. The scrutiny and accountability of it has increased in scope, quality and quantity. However, this paper has at least raised questions as regards the relationship between the undoubted changes in policy processes and its translation into devolved differences in policy. The empirical basis of claims of devolved difference, beyond a superficial level, appear weak.

Appendix A

Scottish Executive – Health Press Releases by Topic (01/01/00 – 31/08/01)

Targeted Health service organisation/solutions:

- Doctors/nurses/midwives/healthvisitors/paramedics/ambulance workers/carers
- (Pay*/powers/performance/standards/regulation/hours/training...)
- Funding and modernisation (services and capital investment)
- Public/Private/Voluntary dynamics
- Local services
- NHS boards and trusts (appointments, policies...)

Targeted public health issues/solutions:

- Flu
- Cancer (breast, cervical...)
- Heart disease (operations/transplants)
- HIV
- VCJD*
- HEP C
- Cot deaths
- Euthanasia
- Dementia
- Diabetes (insulin*)
- Dental diseases (water fluoridation...)
- Hair loss (Propecia)
- Hospital contamination
- Needle injuries
- Waiting lists
- Organ retention
- Vaccinations (BCG*, polio*, MMR, flu, meningitis C)
- Medicine availability & usage (antibiotics)
- Medicine costs (generic* and brand)
- Prescription costs*
- Patient confidentiality/consent and consumer rights
- Alcohol abuseSmoking (NRT*/patches/zyban, Tobacco advertising ban)
- Drug abuse (ecstasy)
- Food and nutrition* (free milk, food and cooking skills, flour and folic acid*)
- Food safety and standards (GM foods, shellfish, meat, listeria*)
- Environment (Landfill*, lead in water, mobile phones*, E-Coli, foot and mouth)

Targeted public health areas and associated issues/solutions:

- Teenage health and welfare (pregnancy/sexual diseases/body piercing)
- Child/Family health and welfare (caesareans, neonatal services, adoption, breast feeding*)
- Homeless health and welfare (rough sleepers)
- Mental health and welfare (community care, restricted patients)
- Rural health and welfare (availability of services)
- Disabled health and welfare (adults with incapacity, deafness, blindness)
- Elderly health and welfare (care homes, home care services, ageism)

* 'Same day, same policy issue' announcements. '**' following 'nutrition' refers to the response to the National Diet and Nutrition Survey.

References

- Bennie, L., D. Denver, J. Mitchell, and J. Bradbury (2001) 'Harbingers of New Politics? The Characteristics and Attitudes of Candidates in The Scottish Parliament Elections, 1999' in J. Tonge, L. Bennie, D. Denver and L. Harrison *British Elections and Parties Review Vol.11* (London; Frank Cass).
- Bradley, J. and J. Mitchell (2000) 'Devolution, New Politics for Old?' *Parliamentary Affairs* 54(2): 257-275.
- Brown, A. (1999) 'The First Elections in the Scottish Parliament, May 1999' *Representation* Vol.36 No.3.
- Brown, A. (2000) 'Designing the New Scottish Parliament' *Parliamentary Affairs* 53(3).
- Brown, A. McCrone, D and Paterson, L (1997) *Politics and Society in Scotland* (Basingstoke; MacMillan)
- Burch, M and B. Wood (1990) *Public Policy in Britain* (Basil Blackwell; Oxford)
- Cabinet Office (1997) *Ministerial Code: A Code of Conduct and Guidance on Procedures for Ministers* (London; Cabinet Office)
- Cavanagh, M. N. McGarvey and M. Shephard (2000) 'Closing the Democratic Deficit? The First Year of the Public Petitions Committee of the Scottish Parliament' *Public Policy and Administration* 15(2): 67-80.
- Clarke, I (2000) 'How Scotland Voted in 1999' in A.Wright (ed) *Scotland: The Challenge of Devolution* (Aldershot; Ashgate).
- Consultative Steering Group (1999) *Shaping Scotland's Parliament: Report of the Consultative Steering Group* (Edinburgh; The Stationery Office).
- Cowley, P. (2001) 'Voting in the Scottish Parliament: The First Year' in J. Tonge, L. Bennie, D. Denver and L. Harrison *British Elections and Parties Review Vol.11* (London; Frank Cass).
- Denver, D. and I. MacAllister (1999) 'The Scottish Parliamentary Elections 1999: An Analysis of the Results' *Scottish Affairs* 28: 10-31.
- Hassan, G. and C. Warhurst (2001) 'New Scotland? Policy, Parties and Institutions' *Political Quarterly* 72(2): 213-226.
- Hogwood, B.W. and L.A. Gunn (1984) *Policy Analysis for the Real World* (Oxford; Oxford University Press)
- Keating, M. (2001a) 'Scottish Autonomy, Now and Then' *Scottish Affairs*, September
- Keating, M. (2001b) 'Devolution and Public Policy Convergence in the United Kingdom. Divergence or Convergence?' Seminar on Devolution in Practice 31.10.01 Institute of Public Policy Research.
- Kellas, J (1989) *The Scottish Political System* 4th Ed (Cambridge; Cambridge University Press)
- Kellas, J. (1991) 'The Scottish and Welsh Offices as Territorial Managers' *Regional Politics and Policy* 1: 87-100

- Kellas, J. (2001) 'Scotland: Politics and Devolution' *Parliamentary Affairs* 54(3): 550-552
- Kellas, J and .P. Madgwick (1982) 'Territorial Ministries: the Scottish and Welsh Offices' in P. Madgwick and R. Rose (eds) *The Territorial Dimension in United Kingdom Politics* (London; MacMillan)
- Leicester, G (2000) 'Scotland' in R.Hazell (ed) *The State and the Nations* (Thorverton; Imprint Academic)
- Lynch, P. (2001) *Scottish Government and Politics* (Edinburgh; Edinburgh University Press)
- Lynch, P. and S. Birrell (2001) 'Linking Parliament to the People: The Public Petitions Process of the Scottish Parliament' *Scottish Affairs* 37.
- Marsh, D and R.A.W. Rhodes (1992) *Implementing Thatcherite Policies: Audit of an Era* (Buckingham; Open University Press)
- McAllister, I. And R. Rose (1984) *The Nationwide Competition for Votes* (London; Francis Pinter)
- McAteer, M., Bennett, M. & Fairley, J. (2002 forthcoming) *The Impact of Devolution on Local Government in Scotland*. Joseph Rowntree Foundation Report
- McCrone, D. (1992) *Understanding Scotland - Sociology of a Stateless Nation* (London; Routledge)
- McCrone, D. (2000) 'Scottish Opinion Polls May 1999 - June 2000' *Scottish Affairs* No.36.
- McCrone, D. (2001) 'Opinion Polls in Scotland: June 200 - June 2001' *Scottish Affairs* No.37.
- McGarvey, N. (2001) 'New Scottish Politics, New Texts Required' *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 3(3): 427-444.
- McGarvey, N (2002 forthcoming) 'Central-Local Relations in Scotland Post Devolution' *Local Government Studies*
- McPherson, A. and C. Raab (1988) *Governing Education. A Sociology of Policy since 1945* (Edinburgh; Edinburgh University Press)
- Midwinter, A. and McGarvey, N. (2001a) 'The New Accountability? Devolution and Expenditure Politics in Scotland' *Public Money and Management* 21(3): 47-55.
- Midwinter, A. and McGarvey, N. (2001b) 'In search of the regulatory state: evidence from Scotland' *Public Administration* 79(4): 825-849
- Midwinter, A., Keating, M., and Mitchell, J. (1991) *Politics and Public Policy in Scotland* (Basingstoke; MacMillan)
- Miller, D. (2000) 'Scotland's Parliament: A Mini-Westminster, or a Model of Democracy?' in A.Wright (ed) *Scotland: The Challenge of Devolution* (Aldershot; Ashgate).
- Mitchell, J. (1999) 'The Creation of the Scottish Parliament: Journey Without End' *Parliamentary Affairs* 52(4).
- Mitchell, J. (2000) 'New Parliament, New Politics' *Parliamentary Affairs* 53(3).

- Mitchell, J. (2001) 'The Study of Scottish Politics Post-Devolution: New Evidence, New Analysis and New Methods?' *West European Politics* 24(4): 216-223.
- Mitchell, J. (2002 forthcoming) *Governing Scotland* (Basingstoke; Palgrave)
- Mitchell, J. and the Scottish Monitoring Team (2001) 'Scotland: Maturing Devolution' in A.Trench (ed) *The State of the Nations 2001* (Thorverton; Imprint Academic)
- Nelson, F. (2001) 'Is this devolution or just duplication?' *The Times* 26.7.01
- Norris, P., Curtice, J., Sanders, D., Scammell, M., Semetko, H.A (1999) *On Message: Communication the Campaign* (London; Sage)
- Parry, R. (1981) 'Scotland as a Laboratory for Public Administration' Paper presented to PSA UK Politics Group, Glasgow, September.
- Parry, R. (1986) 'Privatisation and the Tarnishing of the Scottish Public Sector' in D. McCrone (ed) *The Scottish Government Yearbook 1986* (Edinburgh; Unit for the Study of Government)
- Parry, R and Jones, A. (2000) 'The transition from the Scottish Office to the Scottish executive' *Public Policy and Administration* 15(2): 53-66
- Parsons, W. (1995) *Public Policy* (Aldershot; Edward Elgar)
- Paterson, L. (1994) *The Autonomy of Modern Scotland* (Edinburgh; Edinburgh University Press)
- Paterson, L. (2000) 'Scottish Democracy and Scottish utopias' RSA Lecture
- Pressman, J. and A. Wildavsky (1973) *Implementation* (Berkeley; University of California Press)
- Riddell, P (1997) 'Tories should focus on what really matters' *The Times* 01.08.1997
- Ripley, R. (1985) *Policy Analysis in Political Science* (Nelson-Hall; Chicago Ill)
- Roberts, P. (2000) 'Setting the Pace: Scotland and the UK Devolution Project' in A.Wright (ed) *Scotland: The Challenge of Devolution* (Aldershot; Ashgate)
- Rokkan, S. and D. Urwin (1982) 'Introduction: centres and peripheries in western Europe' in S. Rokkan and D. Urwin (eds.) *The Politics of Territorial Identity: Studies in European Regionalism* (London: Sage)
- Rose, R. (1982) *Understanding the United Kingdom: The Territorial Dimension in Government* (London; Longman)
- Ross, J. (1981) 'The Secretary of State for Scotland and the Scottish Office' in *Studies in Public Policy* 87 (Glasgow; University of Strathclyde)
- Scottish Constitutional Convention (1990) *Toward's Scotland's Parliament* (Edinburgh: SCC)
- Scottish Constitutional Convention (1995) *Scotland's Parliament: Scotland's Right* (Edinburgh; Convention of Scottish Local Authorities)
- Scottish Executive (1999a) *Partnership for Scotland* (Edinburgh; The Stationery Office)
- Scottish Executive (1999b) *Scottish Ministerial Code: A Code of Conduct and Guidance on Procedures for Members of the Scottish Executive and Junior Ministers* cited in <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/library2/doc3/smic-00.htm>

Shephard, M., N. McGarvey, & M. Cavanagh (2001) 'New Scottish Parliament, New Scottish Parliamentarians?' *Journal of Legislative Studies* 7(2): 79-104.
Wildavsky , A. (1979) *The Art and Craft of Policy Analysis* (London; MacMillan)