

# Evidence, Learning and Intelligent Government: Reflections on Developments in Scotland

*Ian Sanderson*

Leeds Metropolitan University (United Kingdom)

## **Abstract**

The ideas propagated by the Scottish Enlightenment still have resonance in Scotland and relevance to the contemporary challenge of achieving better government. Its legacy survives in the notion that rationality should underpin the conduct of government and it is argued that a coherent basis for such rationality is founded by the concept of ‘intelligent government’, founded upon Deweyan pragmatism. This puts us firmly in the territory of ‘practical rationality’ where intelligence (conceived in the Deweyan sense), experimentation, learning and open dialogue and deliberation underpin the ‘practical-moral reasoning’ of responsible government. Recent changes in devolved government in Scotland have reinforced an outcomes-based approach and, following a review of the approach to policy making, there are signs of a strengthening of a ‘policy learning’ model, with government analytical services placing increased emphasis on evidence reviews, evaluation and knowledge exchange. However, it is argued that there is a need for stronger emphasis on deliberative approaches and on genuine experimentation in order to progress towards ‘intelligent government’.

## **Zusammenfassung**

Die von der schottischen Aufklärung propagierten Ideen wirken in Schottland noch immer nach und sind auch für die derzeitigen Bestrebungen nach einem „besseren Regieren“ relevant. Das Vermächtnis der schottischen Aufklärung zeigt sich in der Vorstellung, dass das Handeln der Regierung rational sein sollte. Der Artikel stellt das Konzept des „intelligenten Regierens“, das auf den Pragmatismus von John Dewey zurückgreift, als Grundlage für ein solches rationales Handeln vor. Gemäß dieser Konzeption einer „praktischen Rationalität“ gründet das „praktisch-moralische Argumentieren“ einer verantwortungsbewussten Regierung auf Intelligenz (im Sinne von Dewey), Experimentieren, Lernen, offenem Dialog und Deliberation. Jüngste Veränderungen in der schottischen Regierung haben einen am Outcome orientierten Ansatz der Politikgestaltung gestärkt. Zudem gibt es nach einer internen Überprüfung der Politikgestaltung Anzeichen, dass lernorientierte Modelle („Policy-Learning“) aufgewertet werden. Die Analyse-dienste der schottischen Regierung legen verstärkt Wert auf systematische

Reviews, Evaluationen und Wissensaustausch. Um in Richtung „intelligentes Regieren“ voranzukommen, müssen gemäß dem Autor aber deliberative Ansätze und echtes Experimentieren noch stärker betont werden.

## 1 Introduction

The role of the ‘Scottish Enlightenment’ in the development of ideas that define the character of our civilization is beyond dispute; in Buchan’s view it “shaped the West with its modern scientific and provisional character” and “created a world that headed towards the egalitarian and, within reason, the democratic” (Buchan 2003: 336). The key thinkers in Scotland—Francis Hutcheson, Adam Smith, David Hume, Sir John Sinclair, Hugh Blair—were important figures in the wider body of *philosophes* across Europe who challenged the ‘dead hand’ of political and religious authority, heralding a period of critical reflection and analysis, of independent thought and sharing of ideas through open discussion and debate (Broadie 2001; Porter 2001). As Porter (2001) argues, the Enlightenment is commonly thought of as a French phenomenon, associated with such thinkers as Voltaire, Diderot, Condorcet and Rousseau, but there was a distinctive British contribution reflecting the social, political and economic context of late seventeenth and early eighteenth century Britain, where there was a very practical concern to make new political settlements work and to promote economic growth and prosperity. This practical orientation was particularly strong in Scotland; many of the key figures had links with government, business and commerce and had a focus on improvement and the practical application of their ideas. According to Buchan (2003: 273), “ambition for improvement and ethical earnestness... combined with what Johnson...called ‘all solid practical experimental knowledge’.” Christie (1995) is emphatic about the distinctive contribution of the Scottish Enlightenment:

The Scots, living through a period of visibly rapid economic, social and cultural transformation, realized and faced the meaning of that transformation earlier and more profoundly than other centers of Enlightenment, and it is in exactly that dialectic tension that the distinctive significance of the Scottish Enlightenment resides (Christie 1995: 481).

Important features of the Scottish context were the strength of market processes, a broader involvement of civil society in economic and cultural development and the close association between intellectual, social and political life (Christie 1995). These features can be seen as underpinning its influence and its legacy; the ideas still influence the Scottish outlook and ambition and they still have strong relevance to the contemporary tasks of government. As Grayling argues in relation to the Enlightenment more generally, the legacy “survives in the reliance placed on the public, repeatable and conditional methods of science at their best, and on the idea that responsibility in public affairs is essentially a matter of rationality, evidence, and reflective judgment” (Grayling 2008: xxv). These are challenging times for governments seeking to preserve their credibility and legitimacy while the fundamental tasks become increasingly difficult. The nature of the challenge facing policy makers in government is summarized by Bullock et al. (2001) as follows:

The world for which policy-makers have to develop policies is becoming increasingly complex, uncertain and unpredictable. The electorate is better informed, has rising expectations and is making increasing demands for services tailored to their individual needs. Key policy issues, such as social exclusion and reducing crime, overlap and have proved resistant to previous attempts to tackle them, yet the world is increasingly inter-connected and inter-dependent (Bullock et al. 2001: 15).

Lodge and Kalitowski argue that: “Societies are more complex and less governable than ever before” (Lodge and Kalitowski 2007: 7) and that these trends are undermining the legitimacy of governments. Indeed, Chapman has argued that there is “a perceived crisis in the ability of government to deliver improved performance in key areas of public service” (Chapman 2004: 23). Much has been written by the OECD about the pressures faced by governments in meeting the challenges posed by contemporary society and their efforts at reform (OECD 2005, 2010). It is clear that such reform efforts have not been unambiguously successful; they may have produced efficiency gains but “have not automatically led to better government” (OECD 2003: 2).

On the British context, writing in *The Observer*, John Gray (2008) has argued that the British state is no longer trusted,

“seems no longer fit for any coherent purpose and its authority is slipping away.” He presented a damning picture of an ‘incompetent state’, with accountability and effectiveness undermined by “an apparatus of internal markets and government targets”, which has produced “an impenetrable chaos that ministers and watchdog bodies are unable to control.” The response of the present UK government to failures of performance, he argues, is to seek to equip a dysfunctional machine with new powers—a “Canute-like pose.” Yet, he argues, “an effective state remains the most important precondition of anything that can be called a liberal society...Renovating the state is emerging as the political task of the age, for unless it is achieved, no other objective can be realized.”

So how do we set about achieving ‘better government’? This paper reflects on recent changes in devolved government in Scotland, particularly with the advent in May 2007 of a Scottish Nationalist administration, and focuses on the role of evidence and analysis in promoting ‘intelligent government’. This notion is based upon the work of John Dewey and the paper elaborates a framework of underpinning ideas drawing on Dewey’s version of pragmatist philosophy and Mark Moore’s concept of public value. It is argued that the central themes emerging from this framework are the key role of processes of experimentation, reflective practice and learning, inclusive public deliberation, and a capacity for adaptation and improvement. The second part of the paper, discusses how these themes have emerged in work on governance, regulation, and policy making, and how this literature has identified the key role of capacities for learning, experimentation and deliberation as the basis to achieve effective societal guidance. The third part of the paper discussed recent developments in the approach to policy making in Scotland and the role played by Government Analytical Services and assesses the extent to which movement towards a model of ‘intelligent policy making’ can be discerned.

## 2 The Challenge for the Scottish Government

In simple terms the mission for the Scottish Government is to provide effective governance for Scotland in order to increase the well-being of the country and its people, so developing ‘better government’ is a key concern. However, it is evident that there are significant problems facing Scotland and its people that need to be addressed—for example, the persistence of inequalities in educational achievement and health, the persistence of high levels of deprivation, particularly in parts of Glasgow and the performance of the Scottish economy. Devolved government in Scotland is maturing and increasingly seeking new policy approaches to address these problems. After nearly a decade of devolved government, the election of a minority Scottish Nationalist Party (SNP) administration posed a challenge for the policy-making machinery to deliver on high ambitions for Scotland, its economy and the social welfare of its people in a period of constrained public expenditure. The SNP Government defined these ambitions in terms of an over-arching Purpose: ‘to focus government and public services on creating a more successful country, with opportunities for all of Scotland to flourish, through increasing sustainable economic growth’. Supporting this Purpose are five strategic objectives, a set of 15 economic and social outcomes and a suite of 45 National Indicators designed to provide the best possible ‘proxy representation’ of the outcomes. This provides a framework expressing the SNP Government’s vision for a better Scotland (Scottish Government 2007) and the *Scotland Performs* website<sup>1</sup> was developed to provide public access to information on progress towards the outcomes and to fulfill a commitment to full public reporting and accountability.

It is possible to see the strategy of the SNP administration as one of redefining the challenge for government from one of micro-managing *delivery*, which was seen as the legacy of previous coalition administrations, to one of improving *performance* in terms of outcomes and public value. However, an outcomes-focused approach presents serious challenges to traditional ‘command-and-control’ approaches to government and public management (Mayne 2007). In particular, it implies the streng-

thening of an evidence-based, learning approach to the tasks of government: to understand the effectiveness of existing policies and programs in contributing to the outcomes; to challenge existing commitments on this basis; to develop new, innovative and more effective policy solutions; and to shift resources from demonstrably less effective to potentially more effective interventions in order to re-align delivery in pursuit of the Government's desired outcomes and strategic objectives. The development of such a model of policy innovation and learning represents a major challenge for government, one that Lodge and Kalitowski (Lodge and Kalitowski 2007) argue few governments have succeeded in meeting.

Indeed, it has been argued that the traditional centralist, hierarchist political culture in Britain militates against experimentation, innovation and learning (Jowell 2003; Chapman 2004). Jowell points to Britain's centralized political structure and legislative process, and the importance of manifesto commitments in government's programs— "circumstances that do not amount to optimal experimental conditions" (Jowell 2003: 23). With reference to central-local relations in the UK, Wilson (Wilson 2003) argues that the New Labour Government largely maintained a centralist, hierarchist approach which failed to realize the potential for learning in the quest to modernize government, whilst acknowledging the less-polarized central-local relations in Scotland and greater variability in governing arrangements. This suggests a potential, boosted by devolution, for greater creativity and innovation but a potential which, according to Keating (Keating 2005, 2010), was not realized under the post-devolution coalition governments. Thus, Keating argues that, notwithstanding the strong 'centralist' thrust of UK public policy, Scotland has indeed developed its own distinct, more consultative, policy style. However, a heavy reliance on consensual policy making negotiated in networks and lack of institutional capacity to make policy means that policy has tended to drift behind England rather than striking out on its own. The election of the SNP administration in 2007 constituted a more radical break with the UK Government and has again raised the promise of a different 'policy style' (Keating 2010).

Arnott and Ozga (2009), argue that the SNP approach to government represents a “shift in governing culture” (Arnott and Ozga 2009: 4), a move away from the governing practices of previous administrations towards an outward-looking, networked approach to governance based on developing coalitions and shared interests. The key role of the Government is to provide leadership and direction, focusing on strategic priorities rather than seeking to micro-manage delivery. It is argued here that this approach embodies certain principles—it needs to be collaborative, critical and reflective, challenging existing commitments, continually seeking to understand what value is being created for the people of Scotland and what changes are necessary in order to add more value from available resources. The question addressed here is: to what extent can this be seen as an attempt to move towards smarter government—we might call it more ‘intelligent government’—acquiring and using knowledge to learn, improve and innovate?

### **3 ‘Intelligent Government’, Public Value and Pragmatism**

The notion of ‘intelligent government’ does not have strong currency; we are more used to talking about ‘strong government’ or ‘effective government’ and political dispute tends to focus on the size of government. However, the debate is moving beyond these traditional concerns, which increasing recognition of “a more sophisticated set of perspectives on how the state might be transformed” towards the notion of a ‘smarter state’ (IPPR and PWC, 2009: 5). More than a generation ago, Etheredge’s discussion of ‘intelligent government’ highlighted the importance of an ethical dimension in addition to traditional concerns with efficiency and effectiveness (Etheredge 1981). The ethical concern, in simple terms, is about ‘doing good’. Governments have an obligation to ensure that where they intervene in people’s lives, it is on the basis of the best available evidence that such intervention is necessary to achieve defined social ends (i.e. the ends could not be achieved without such intervention), and that such intervention will actually achieve its intended effects and benefits with mi-

nimal risk of adverse and unintended consequences. There is an important ethical/moral dimension here that goes beyond traditional 'technical' conceptions of efficiency and effectiveness. This moral dimension has also been emphasized by Mulgan in his enquiry into the nature of 'good government' (Mulgan 2007).

The concept of 'public value' also seeks to combine effectiveness and ethical dimensions to the purposes of government. The ideas expounded by Mark Moore (1995) have been taken up in the Scottish Government as a framework for improving the capacity to govern intelligently. Moore argues that from a public value perspective, the justification for government intervention does not lie simply in the efficient production and distribution of amenities, overcoming market imperfections, but also (and more importantly) in concerns for justice and fairness, which involve collective judgments by citizens acting through politics about what constitute 'socially valuable conditions', thus expressing a 'shared social, moral aspiration' (Moore 1995: 43-8). Moore's aim is to provide a structure of practical reasoning to identify the ethical responsibilities of public managers and "what constitutes virtue in the execution of their offices" (Moore 1995: 1). In Moore's view, it is a key ethical responsibility for public managers to search 'conscientiously' for public value and innovation. There is a strong learning element to the model and Moore emphasizes the role of evaluation in providing the evidence that public value is being appropriately defined and delivered for citizens as a basis for learning how to do better and for accountability.

Moore's ideas on public value are underpinned by two key propositions about the conditions for good government: first, the importance of healthy democratic political processes through which citizens can express a shared moral aspiration for a better society; and, second, the importance of knowledge, intelligence and learning as the basis for confidence that government is doing the best it can in delivering on that aspiration. These themes resonate with Enlightenment values, as discussed previously, but a more contemporary and highly relevant treatment is in the work of John Dewey. Dewey was arguably the most important figure in the development of Pragmatism and I would argue that, ignor-

ing the post-modernist diversions instigated by Richard Rorty (e.g. 1980, 1999), *Deweyan* pragmatism provides a sound foundation for a contemporary vision of intelligent government (Sanderson 2009). Indeed, Alan Ryan (1995) has pointed to the relevance of Dewey's work to our contemporary situation.

Dewey's key concern was to make philosophy relevant to the task of creating a better world and he was passionate about the cause of social improvement and in "his strong belief in the human capacity for working things out" (De Waal 2005: 109). We must engage actively with the world through 'intelligent action' founded upon robust knowledge. However, regarding the foundation of such knowledge, he rejected traditional epistemological stances that present the knower as a 'passive onlooker', seeking to grasp the reality of the world whilst not engaging with it, and equating the validity of knowledge with the extent to which it 'corresponds' to that reality (Dewey 1984). On the contrary, Dewey argued that the foundation for the development of robust knowledge about the world lies in active engagement with concrete problems and situations and the test of its validity must be the extent to which it helps us resolve those problematical situations (Dewey 1957, 1984, 1993). For Dewey, inquiry involves the attempt to resolve problems through active experimentation, rigorously applying the principles and methods of scientific inquiry. If the practical, empirical test of a hypothesis is successful in providing guidance in resolving problematical situations, this provides the warrant for asserting the validity of that hypothesis. Thus, the most rigorous basis for sound knowledge is active experimentation to test out our ideas in solving problems (Dewey 1997; Ratner 1939).

Given this view of science as a practical activity engaged with the world, Dewey saw the search for knowledge as tied to the practical interest in changing the world for the better. For this task he argued that what we seek is 'intelligence'—a capacity to apply knowledge to guide us in taking appropriate action in an ethical-moral context where values and ends must be explicitly considered: "A pragmatic intelligence is a creative intelligence not a routine mechanic" (Dewey 1993: 6-7). From this point of view, discussion of ethics and morality, of the interests and val-

ues that influence our view of the world and what we should do to change it, is just as rational as discussion of social scientific knowledge about the state of the world (Westbrook 1991: 142-44).

Following Dewey puts us firmly in the territory of ‘practical rationality’ where, according to Stephen Toulmin (2001: 123), ‘practical-moral reasoning’ can help us “in untying the knots in which our lives enmesh us.” In this territory, two themes from Dewey’s work can be highlighted as pointing up key attributes in a conception of intelligent government and policy making. First, the commitment to experimentation and fallibilism in the development of knowledge implies that the capacity for learning is crucial to the task of good government. Dewey’s theory of knowledge emphasizes the necessity of testing thought through action and Dewey was consistent in applying this principle to the education of individuals and to the process of government. Learning occurs by confronting problematical situations that arise from pursuing interests; such problematical situations are resolved through the application of intelligence, testing our hypotheses about what it would be good to do; and knowledge is the accumulation of wisdom that such problem-solving generates (Westbrook 1991: 96-7). The application of a scientific, experimental approach is the key to building knowledge through experience of seeking to change the world for the better. And in the process of effecting such change, Dewey (1954: 202-3) argued that:

...policies and proposals for social action...be treated as working hypotheses, not as programs to be rigidly adhered to and executed. They will be experimental in the sense that they will be entertained subject to constant and well-equipped observation of the consequences they entail when acted upon, and subject to ready and flexible revision in the light of observed consequences.

Clearly, this implies a learning model of policy making and connects with the second key theme of Dewey’s work that is central to the notion of intelligent government. Sleeper (2001) points to the key role of communication in Dewey’s ‘transformational ontology’ and Dewey (1954: 208) himself argued that in seeking to resolve social problems and change the world for the better:

“The essential need...is the improvement of the methods and conditions for debate, discussion and persuasion.” Dewey was passionately committed to the ideal of participatory democracy, “the generation of democratic communities and an articulate democratic public” (Dewey 1954: 217), informed through free and open dissemination and discussion of the results of social inquiry. Dewey’s admittedly idealistic vision was one of an informed public, with all people possessing the intelligence to contribute equally to directing the affairs of society as active members of communities, equipped to ‘think scientifically’ through application of experimentation, communication, dialogue and self-criticism (Westbrook 1991). For Dewey, according to Rosenthal (2002: 220), democracy is “inherently experimental, cooperative, transformational”, the foundation for people and communities to grow through learning.

#### **4 Key Themes in ‘Intelligent Government’: Learning, Experimentation and Public Deliberation**

Underpinning this Deweyan notion of intelligent government, then, are three key themes that have been explored in the literature on public policy making: learning, experimentation and public deliberation. There has been increasing recognition over recent years of the central importance of learning as the basis for improving social and organizational systems. As long as 35 years ago Donald Schon drew attention to the ‘loss of the stable state’, arguing that institutions are in continuous processes of transformation and that in order to influence and manage such transformations:

We must...become adept at learning. We must become able not only to transform our institutions, in response to changing situations and requirements; we must invent and develop institutions which are ‘learning systems’, that is to say, systems capable of bringing about their own continuing transformation (Schon 1973: 28).

Much has been written subsequently about the notion of the ‘learning society’ and its validity. For its advocates, the notion provides a helpful way of making sense of the shifts required in

the context of the profound changes associated with globalization and other dynamics of social and economic change (Smith 2000). Indeed, Anthony Giddens (1990) has argued that as we move into conditions of ‘late modernity’, with accelerated scope and pace of change, ‘reflexivity’ increasingly replaces the habits and rules of tradition as the basis for reproduction of social relations, with social practices being constantly evaluated and reformed. Under conditions of ‘wholesale reflexivity’ we have lost the capacity to predict and control; it is increasingly recognized that ‘governing failure’ is primarily due to the difficulty of achieving purposeful influence over the internal dynamics of societal subsystems (Mayntz 1993). Traditional modes of ‘command and control’ governance in these circumstances are no longer sustainable and the focus has shifted to the task of dealing with complexity and building capacity for ‘societal self-organization’ through ‘interactive governance’ underpinned by reflexive learning processes (Amin and Hausner 1997; Jessop 1997; Kooiman 1993).

The practical manifestation of these trends can be seen in changes in approaches to regulation. Gunningham (2005) refers to the decline in capacity of the regulatory state to deal with increasingly complex social issues and discusses the rise of ‘reflexive regulation’, replacing traditional command-and-control regimes and with a strong emphasis on learning processes—what he terms “self-reflective processes...to encourage creative, critical and continual thinking about how to minimize...harm and maximize benefits” (Gunningham 2005: 336). He concludes by pointing up “the virtue of adaptive learning and the merits of treating policies as experiments from which we can learn” (Gunningham 2005: 350). Dewey would indeed have been gratified!

The message from this literature on governance and regulation is clear—we need an enhanced capacity for learning as a means of reconciling the implications of increasing social complexity with the requirement for effective ‘governmental steering’ and public policy intervention (Sanderson 2002, 2006). This learning model of policy making finds a coherent intellectual underpinning in the practical rationality of Deweyan pragmatism and in the understanding of the social world provided by the complexity sciences (Sanderson 2009). It also highlights the importance of

another key theme—that of policy experimentation and here we can draw on the impressive intellectual credentials of Donald Campbell's notion of the 'experimenting society'. Such a society, Campbell argued, is founded upon a commitment to innovation, 'social reality-testing' and learning, a society which "would vigorously try out possible solutions to recurrent problems and would make hard-headed, multidimensional evaluations of outcomes, and when the evaluation of one reform showed it to have been ineffective or harmful, would move on to try other alternatives" (Campbell and Russo 1999: 11). The links between Campbell's and Dewey's visions have been drawn by Beauregard:

The experimenting society is a hotbed of American pragmatism. A commitment to science as a systematic and skeptical search for usable knowledge is combined with an American liberalism that assumes an informed and reasonable public debating its differences and concerns in a democratic fashion, desirous of improving the quality of life for all, and blessed with compassionate and open institutions whose interests are those of the publics they serve (Beauregard 1998: 213).

Indeed, the underpinning vision here is 'avowedly utopian' and idealistic, as Campbell recognized, premised on the existence of certain political, social and cultural conditions that have echoes in Giddens' 'modernist social reflexivity' and Habermas' 'communicative competence' (Beauregard 1998: 214-5). To be sure, there are many obstacles and barriers to the achievement of such a vision in the "political realities of most policymaking" (Peters 1998: 128) but the argument here is that there is a real need to investigate seriously how we can strengthen learning on the basis of experimentation as a core feature of policy making. This is very much in the spirit of the 'meliorative' approach to social improvement implied by Peters:

Adopting the style of the experimenting society may not be a panacea for all the policy problems that afflict modern governments, but it is a means of trying to move societies ahead in the face of palpable ignorance about the causes of most of those policy problems and even more ignorance about the solutions to the problems (Peters 1998: 137).

The evolutionary, problem-centered approach embodied in the notion of the experimenting society presents a challenge to the traditional 'intellectualist' model of evidence-based policy mak-

ing, which assumes a simplistic and direct relationship between scientific evidence and policy formulation (Dunn 1998: 21-2). It certainly does not undermine the vision of social progress informed by knowledge and reason but rather implies a more complex model of this relationship in which the crucial policy-relevant knowledge is produced through an ‘evolutionary, trial-and-error process of learning’—through active engagement in addressing policy problems.

This conception of policy experimentation and learning accords well with Majone’s (1989) analysis of policy making as a ‘communicative’, practical activity, more akin to the Aristotelian conception of ‘craft’, undertaken in complex and ambiguous institutional and moral contexts where intelligence is applied in what Majone calls ‘argumentation’, involving “...a complex blend of factual statements, interpretations, opinions and evaluations” (Majone 1989: 63). Majone’s analysis highlights the importance of our third key theme—public deliberation. Thus, far from being a technical matter, Majone argues, policy choice “...raises institutional, social and moral issues that must be clarified through a process of public deliberation and resolved by political means” (Majone 1989: 143). Similarly, Lindblom and Woodhouse’s (1993) discussion of ‘interactive policy making’ emphasizes the role of analysis in supporting political processes of partisan bargaining and negotiation towards shared solutions, arguing that analysis “...must intertwine inextricably with political interaction, judgment and action” (ibid.: 32), and advocates ‘thoughtful trial and error’ and strengthened learning processes as the basis for more intelligent social problem solving. The potential for learning in practical, deliberative processes is highlighted by Majone (op. cit.: 183), who indeed argues that “...the rationality of public policy making depends more on improving the learning capacity of the various organs of public deliberation than on maximizing achievement of particular goals.”

A key requirement for this notion of rationality is inclusive participation of all stakeholders in policy issues to integrate diverse perspectives and values, as has been emphasized in work on whole systems approaches (Chapman 2004; Burns 2007). Lindblom and Woodhouse (1993) emphasize the degree to which

intelligent problem solving in complex societies requires a capacity for inclusive debate based on widespread participation and democratic practice. Such an inclusive approach requires recognition of the validity and legitimacy of different types of knowledge—the ‘tacit’ and experiential knowledge of practitioners and citizens as well as scientific evidence. Discussing the notion of collaborative, deliberative policy making, Innes and Booher (2003) point to the requirement for conditions or spaces for ‘authentic dialogue’ between all stakeholders to permit open declaration of interests and free and open discussion to reach negotiated and agreed solutions. They emphasize how the building of relationships, cooperation and trust in such conditions is a precondition for collaboration, learning and creativity. Again, we can recall that in Dewey’s ‘democratic communities’ and Campbell’s experimenting society, the capacity for experimentation and learning is premised on the existence of political and cultural conditions that support ‘competent universal discourse’—free and open dialogue and conflict resolution (Beauregard 1998: 213-4; Holzner 1998: 178-82).

It is argued, therefore, that at the heart of intelligent policy making should be the commitment to experimentation, learning, and public deliberation. Clearly, this conception represents a normative model, highly idealistic in many ways, with institutional, political and cultural implications that present real challenges. It takes us beyond the instrumental rationality of much contemporary discussion of ‘rational’, evidence-based policy making (EBP) into the territory of ‘practical rationality’ where the focus is on a value-relevant concern with appropriate and reasonable decisions rather than a supposedly value-free, technical concern with effectiveness. Thus, it is argued that the traditional EBP model provides an inadequate basis for effective policy making under contemporary conditions of unpredictability, uncertainty and complexity. It embodies a model of ‘instrumental rationality’ that reduces policy making to a technical exercise, failing to recognize the complex political, ethical and moral dimensions of policy making that require a range of forms of knowledge to be combined in judgments about appropriate courses of action (Parsons 2001, 2002; Sanderson 2002, 2006).

In contrast to the key themes of intelligent policy making discussed above, it provides a conception of the role of evidence that neglects the importance of practical, tacit knowledge and of deliberative processes in accommodating and debating different views and clarifying issues around values and ethical/moral concerns; it provides no model for promoting more participatory policy analysis or facilitating greater deliberation and democratization; and it embodies an inadequate conception of learning, with a model of evaluation focused on steering and guidance and a top-down orientation to change which potentially conflicts with decentralized processes of experimentation and learning.

## **5 Recent Developments in Policy Making in Scotland and the Role of Analytical Services**

This conception of intelligent policy making clearly presents a real challenge for contemporary governments given, for example, Lodge and Kalitowski's (2007) findings on the lack of real innovation and policy learning in a wide range of states. The question addressed in this section concerns the extent to which movement towards this model can be discerned following the advent of the SNP Government in Scotland in 2007. As discussed above, the election of the SNP Government can be seen as representing a shift in the approach to governing, a move towards an outcomes-focused and a more collaborative, networked model (Arnott and Ozga 2009). Does this provide the potential to move towards more 'intelligent policy making'? Under the previous Labour-Liberal Democrat coalition the approach to policy making was reviewed in the context of the UK Government's 'better policy making' initiative. The UK Government's 1999 'Modernising Government' White Paper (Cabinet Office 1999a) included a commitment to improve the policy-making process by making it more focused on outcomes, more forward-looking, joined-up and strategic, and more evidence-based. A more specific model of a modernized policy process with these attributes was subsequently published under the banner of 'Professional Policy Making for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century' (Cabinet Office 1999b).

The Professional Policy Making model was largely adopted in Scotland, albeit in modified form with a stronger emphasis on innovation, creativity and openness. However, as discussed earlier, policy making in Scotland in the post-devolution era has been subject to criticism by Keating (2005) for a lack of creativity and innovation. Leicester (2006) also identified limitations to policy making capacity in Scotland, arguing that policy processes had not kept up with the rapid pace of change in the world. In an increasingly complex world he argued that governments are becoming overwhelmed and as pressures for immediate policy responses grow, the time and space for creative thinking are sacrificed and there is a tendency to retreat to tried and trusted methods. Recognizing these criticisms and responding to the context of the change of government in 2007 to an SNP administration and the attendant shift towards a more outcome-focused, joined-up and collaborative approach to government, a review of policy making was undertaken by the Scottish Government in 2008.

Underpinning this review was a recognition of the need to adapt the approach to policy making to a new context and to promote greater flexibility in tailoring the approach to specific circumstances. In particular, three themes featured strongly in the review process that echo the criticisms discussed above and resonate with elements of 'intelligent policy making'. First, there was a strong emphasis on the implications of the shift away from the 'top-down' emphasis on the traditional levers of government towards the more collaborative approach, especially a new partnership relationship with local government and the notion of 'co-production' of policy. Second, there was recognition of the potential created in this approach for greater experimentation, innovation and learning, although it was acknowledged that realizing this potential would be a challenge given the 'realities' of the pressures on the Government to 'deliver'. And, third, the importance of evidence and analysis was emphasized, but recognizing the broad range of scientific and experiential knowledge that is valid and relevant for policy making and with a particular focus on evaluation as a driver of learning and improvement (Scottish Government, 2009a).

These themes clearly have important implications for the ‘analytical capacity’ of government; the strength of this capacity and the way it works within government to support policy making are crucial to the development of more ‘intelligent government’ but are not sufficiently recognized. In the Scottish Government, Analytical Services constitute a significant resource with nearly 300 analysts in three professions—economists, social researchers and statisticians. Most of this resource is located in Analytical Services Divisions (ASDs) alongside policy divisions, supporting policy development and implementation across the Government. These ASDs provide an integrated service with analysts in the three professions working together to provide analytical advice on the basis of statistical data, in-house and commissioned research and economic analysis, working closely with their ‘policy customers’.

In terms of the contribution to a learning model of policy making, three aspects of the role of Analytical Services can be highlighted for particular emphasis. First, undertaking reviews of available evidence of ‘what works’ to inform new policy development; second, undertaking policy evaluation to assess effectiveness and impact and learn lessons from implementation to inform policy improvement and, again, future policy development; and, third, working to ensure that the messages from such research, evaluation and analytical work actually do have an impact on policy formulation, change and improvement. As regards the first aspect, it is possible to discern an increased emphasis in analytical work in the Scottish Government on ensuring that the best use is made of available evidence that is relevant to policy development. This can be seen in a number of recent strategic policy frameworks produced during 2008-09 addressing, for example, drugs, health inequalities, offending by young people, early years, antisocial behavior, alcohol and climate change. These policy frameworks are characterized by quite extensive use of evidence, especially reviews of previous research and evaluation on relevant policy interventions. This can be seen in the development of the frameworks for health inequalities (for example, Scottish Government 2008a) and antisocial behavior (Scottish Government 2009b).

The development of the policy framework on alcohol (Scottish Government, 2009c) was informed by a comprehensive program of research—the Scottish Alcohol Research Framework—overseen by the Alcohol Evidence Group, comprising representatives from the Scottish Government, NHS Health Scotland and other public bodies. The approach taken here illustrates the concern to make best use of available evidence:

The Scottish Government is committed to developing interventions which are informed by a strong evidence base. There is a considerable and growing body of UK and international research on the extent and nature of alcohol problems and the effectiveness of harm reduction interventions...The Alcohol Evidence Group (AEG) was established in 2006 to oversee the development of a co-coordinated alcohol evidence base in which existing research (from Scotland, the rest of the UK and internationally) was consolidated and gaps identified (Scottish Government, 2008b: 1).

The research program contained several evidence reviews relating, for example, to pregnant women, alcohol-attributable mortality and drinking cultures (Scottish Government 2008b: 3-17). Other recent evidence reviews undertaken within the Scottish Government include one on integrated resource planning across health and social care sectors (Scottish Government, 2010a) and one on third sector approaches to obtaining employment for people with multiple and complex needs (Scottish Government 2010b).

The second aspect to highlight in the movement towards a 'policy learning' model is an increased emphasis on evaluation. As indicated above, the review of policy making placed considerable emphasis on evaluation as a driver of learning and improvement and signaled efforts to strengthen and develop the capacity to undertake evaluation to provide a better understanding of the effectiveness and impact of policy in relation to outcomes and the capacity to make use of the resulting information to inform future policy development and resource allocation decisions. Key elements included the development of a more strategic approach to evaluation, with stronger focus on the policy/program level and on assessing outcomes and impact; a longer-term perspective in planning evaluation studies which are

more ‘joined up’ across policy areas; greater use of ‘theory-based’ approaches to promote focus of evaluation effort on key evidence needs; and greater use, where appropriate, of quasi-experimental and longitudinal research designs in the context of multi-method approaches (Sanderson 2008).

A recent example that potentially signals a strengthening of approach consistent with the ambitions for policy making, evaluation and learning is provided by the report of the Ministerial Task Force on Health Inequalities (Scottish Government 2008a). Two elements in the recommendations of this report are of particular note. First, the designation of a number of ‘test sites’ for experimentation and innovation in client pathways for services, involving the use of evidence to inform change, evaluation of process and outcomes, and the establishment of ‘learning networks’ to share the experience and promote learning. Second, the report makes strong recommendations on the need to improve evaluation practice:

The Government should work with existing and new expert organizations in Scotland to develop a wider range of approaches to outcome and impact evaluation appropriate for specific interventions and for complex and comprehensive packages of actions designed to reduce health inequalities.....the policies and actions that the Task Force recommends across the board should be implemented in ways that will allow for proper evaluations of their effectiveness.....an adequate proportion of resources should be devoted to evaluation (Scottish Government, 2008a: 54/82)

However, it is widely recognized that the realization of such ambitions for evaluation within government represents a real challenge (Mayne 2007). It requires capacity building, firstly in terms of the skills and expertise of government analysts and amongst external researchers and consultants required to undertake evaluation commissions and, secondly, in terms of the broader development of an ‘evaluative-learning culture’ within government such that the importance and value of evaluation is recognized, the approach to policy making accommodates its meaningful use (i.e. it is ‘planned in’ to policy initiatives; scope for piloting is maximized etc.), and the results from evaluation are actually used to inform future policy and budgetary decisions.

A key element, for example, concerns the use of evaluation findings to inform the Spending Review process.

This leads us to the third aspect of the contribution of Analytical Services to the promotion of a ‘policy learning’ model—ensuring that the available evidence has an impact on policy and decision-making processes. The importance of this element of the work of Analytical Services is highlighted in the plans of one of the Analytical Service Divisions (ASDs) in the Scottish Government:

There is an inestimable wealth of external knowledge to tap into. We will place greater emphasis within the division on ensuring that relevant information is conveyed to those who need it in a timely and meaningful way. This means that understanding relevant knowledge bases and tailored dissemination of information, particularly through pro-active engagement with key stakeholders, is key to our approach (Scottish Government, 2009c, p. 2).

This indicates that increasing attention is being given to knowledge transfer/exchange as a key role for government analysts. Indeed, this was signaled back in 2005 in the creation of a Knowledge Transfer Team within the Office of the Chief Researcher and in a project to identify and share good practice (Clark and Kelly 2005; Clark et. al. 2005). The importance of this role has been highlighted in wider literature on the impact of research on policy and practice which emphasizes the key role of communication process and relationships (Lomas 1997; Nutley et. al., 2007). The work of the Commission on the Social Sciences (2003) underscored the importance of ‘communication and interface management’ and advocated ‘more constructive dialogue’ between the worlds of research and policy making in order to enhance the impact of research on policy. The National Audit Office (2003) has also emphasized the importance of ‘two-way communication’ between policy makers and researchers and the need to develop long-term relationships. According to Carol Weiss (1999), what is needed is a ‘two-way conversation’ and “...an ongoing discourse, sustained over time” (Weiss 1999: 483). An important element emerging from the literature is the potential for the role of ‘knowledge brokers’ as intermediaries in facilitating the development of communication processes and

networks of relationships. The role of research brokers is elaborated by Rigby (2005: 210-11):

It is only by bringing together researchers and policy makers—and linking their work through the activities of research brokers—that the barriers between research and policy making may be overcome. Through such collaborations and contacts, researchers may be able to identify important policy questions and provide more of the clear answers and recommendations that policy makers seek, while policy makers may be able to increase their understanding and tolerance of the complexities uncovered by social science.

A key element of the role of government analysts is to act as knowledge brokers in terms of developing connections and relationships and transferring evidence into the policy-making process. Thus, the role of the government analyst is not simply the *professional analyst*, undertaking research and analysis, managing data collection and research procurement and synthesizing and summarizing evidence. In order to ensure that evidence makes an impact on policy analysts must work as *knowledge brokers*, building relationships with all relevant players and groups involved in the production translation and use of evidence relevant to policy formulation and delivery, in order to facilitate ‘knowledge exchange’. Moreover, they need to act as *advocates for evidence*, seeking to communicate evidence to policy officials and ministers so as to maximize its potential impact on thinking and decision making around policy issues.

This conception of the role of analysts in government brings us back to the model of intelligent policy making and government. It takes us beyond traditional ‘rational-technocratic’ models that emphasize systems and process, focus on knowledge and evidence as disembodied entities that ‘speak for themselves’, and conceive of researchers and analysts as neutral technicians. Rather, in the pragmatist world of ‘practical rationality’, the focus is on the social-organizational dimensions of the problem, on developing connections, relationships and dialogue between people in organizational contexts governed by an informal ‘normative order’ that conditions what is perceived as ‘appropriate’ (March and Olsen 1989). Analysts have to operate in this territory to extract messages from evidence that are relevant to particular poli-

cy contexts, to push those messages into the dialogues, and to advocate those messages relative to the many other voices in the dialogue. In the context of dialogues around policy, evidence never speaks for itself.

## 6 Conclusion

The notion of intelligent government and policy making clearly provides a strongly normative model, admittedly idealistic in many respects with strong echoes of ‘Enlightenment values’. The wider political and cultural assumptions are, perhaps, particularly challenging but present a vision worth striving towards. As an ‘ideal-type’, the model of intelligent policy learning may not be fully achievable, but we can identify aspect that we can work towards. Thus, we should ensure that all relevant ‘intelligence’ is brought into the processes of deliberation—intelligence comprising our best available social scientific evidence, the practice wisdom of those who are experienced in dealing with social problems ‘on the ground’ and the ‘common sense’ of those who experience such problems. We should treat our policies as ‘hypotheses’ designed to provide appropriate solutions to complex social problems but around which there are greater or lesser degrees of uncertainty. Therefore, they need to be tested out in experience, with the nature of the test reflecting the degree of uncertainty. Where there is greater uncertainty, we should introduce pilots or trials, evaluate their success and move forward cautiously. Where there is less uncertainty we can be more decisive in implementation but rigorous monitoring and evaluation should be undertaken to test the validity of the assumptions upon which the policy is based and capture learning to feed into future policy deliberations.

There are indications in the work that is progressing within the Scottish Government on policy making and evaluation of a desire to move towards some aspects of the model of ‘intelligent policy making’ albeit tempered by the ‘realities of government’ and a recognition of the challenges involved in achieving genuinely collaborative approaches, experimentation, innovation and learn-

ing. More broadly, we have seen some moves in UK policy making towards the incorporation of elements of experimentation and learning in the use of pilots, which has increased markedly since 1997, notable examples including 'Welfare to Work' reform, smoking cessation, Education Maintenance Allowance and in drug treatment and school meals in Scotland. However, reservations remain about the degree of true experimentation involved and Jowell (2003) has argued that there is a need for a culture change in policy making to foster experimentation and learning.

There are some positive signs in Scotland, for example in the recent report of the Ministerial Task Force on Health Inequalities which recommended a strengthening of the role of evaluation in policy learning and the piloting of 'learning networks' in a number of sites to encourage experimentation with new approaches (Scottish Government 2008a). This report therefore provides some important signals towards the development of a learning approach to policy making in Scotland and the approach of the SNP Government in developing a new, more collaborative relationship with local government and new policy frameworks for early years intervention, for tackling drug and alcohol abuse and anti-social behavior and offending by young people can be seen as indicating a strengthening of the 'Scottish policy style' identified by Keating (2010) as involving "partnership, stakeholder empowerment, ...consensus, and learning by doing" (Keating 2010: 216).

However, it remains to be seen whether or not a new approach more consistent with the tenets of 'intelligent government' will succeed in becoming established, given the previous disappointments in the post-devolution period and the acknowledged difficulties associated with developing experimentation, a 'learning culture' and deliberative politics. The challenge is made even more acute by the economic problems deriving from the banking crisis which have required severe reductions in public expenditure to be introduced by the UK Coalition Government. A recent report by the Scottish Government analyzed the potential scale of public expenditure reduction in Scotland in the years ahead and concluded that this presents "a significant challenge for the delivery of public services in Scotland" (Scottish Government,

2010c). This could represent a watershed for the approach to government. On the one hand, the scale of the challenge may stimulate more creativity and innovation, a greater preparedness to take risks, experiment and learn from success elsewhere and develop a more open deliberative style of policy making. On the other hand, it may trigger a retrenchment into a cautious, inward-looking and defensive approach more dominated by conflict between stakeholder groups concerned to defend their interests.

If the more optimistic of these outcomes is to be achieved, I would argue that there needs to be a stronger emphasis on two aspects: firstly, on the development of deliberative forums that are inclusive of the range of interests and knowledge salient to the discussion of policy issues and which can articulate and clarify values and issues of ethical-moral concern as well as issues of substantive dispute; and, secondly, on the ‘trial-and-error’ model of policy making—on the role of experimentation and piloting and on how evaluation can be a more effective driver of learning and improvement. A genuine commitment to open deliberation, experimentation and learning would constitute a key pillar of a model of good government, with a robust ethical foundation sustained by real openness and transparency, that could provide a much-needed exemplar in our troubled times. For, if John Gray’s (2008) strictures about incompetent and chaotic government were relevant at the time he wrote, the fiscal crisis and recent revelations about the personal finances of ministers and MPs in UK Government and Parliament indicate that the need to rebuild the foundations of good government—effective, transparent, accountable, ethical, ‘intelligent’ government—is now more pressing than ever.

## Notes

1. The Scotland Performs website can be accessed at <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/About/scotPerforms>

---

**References**

- Amin, A., Hausner, J. (1997). *Beyond Market and Hierarchy: Interactive Governance and Social Complexity*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Arnott, M., Ozga, J. (2009). *The Discourse of Education and Nationalism: Education Policy and the SNP Government*. Paper presented to the Social Policy Association Annual Conference, 29 June to 1 July, Edinburgh. Retrieved August 5, 2010, from <http://www.ces.ed.ac.uk/PDF%20Files/SNPWP2.pdf>
- Beauregard, R.A. (1998). *The Deeper Context of the Experimental Society*. In W. M. Dunn (Ed.) *The Experimenting Society: Essays in Honor of Donald T. Campbell*, (pp.211-27), *Policy Studies Review*, 11. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.
- Broadie, A. (2001). *The Scottish Enlightenment: The Historical Age of the Historical Nation*. Edinburgh: Birlinn.
- Buchan, J. (2003). *Capital of the Mind: How Edinburgh Changed the World*, London: John Murray.
- Bullock, H., Mountford, J., Stanley, R. (2001). *Better Policy Making*. London: Centre for Management and Policy Studies.
- Burns, D. (2007). *Systemic Action Research: A Strategy for Whole System Change*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Cabinet Office (1999a). *Modernising Government*. Cm. 4310. London: The Stationery Office.
- Cabinet Office (1999b). *Professional Policy Making for the Twenty First Century*. Strategic Policy Making Team. London: Cabinet Office.
- Campbell, D.T., Russo, M.J. (1999). *Social Experimentation*. Sage Classics 1. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Chapman, J. (2004). *System Failure: Why Governments Must Learn to Think Differently*. 2nd ed, London: Demos.

- Christie, J.R.R. (1995). Scotland. In J. W. Yolton (Ed.), *The Blackwell Companion to the Enlightenment* (pp. 479-481). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Clark, G., Easterlow, D., Ruiz, J., Sinclair, S., Tyrer, P., Virdee, L., Wilkinson, D. (2005). *Knowledge Transfer Project: Final Report*. Edinburgh: Scottish Executive.
- Clark, G., Kelly, L. (2005). *New Directions for Knowledge Transfer and Knowledge Brokerage in Scotland*. Research Report. Edinburgh: Scottish Government.
- Commission on the Social Sciences (2003). *Great Expectations: The Social Sciences in Britain*. London: Commission on the Social Sciences.
- De Waal, C. (2005). *On Pragmatism*. Belmont, Ca.: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Dewey, J. (1954). *The Public and its Problems*. Athens: Swallow Press.
- Dewey, J. (1957). *Reconstruction in Philosophy*. Enlarged Edition. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Dewey, J. (1984). The Quest for Certainty, in J.A. Boydston (Ed.), *John Dewey: The Later Works 1925-53*, Vol. 4:1929. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Dewey, J. (1993). The Need for a Recovery of Philosophy, in D. Morris, I. Shapiro (eds.) *John Dewey: The Political Writings* (pp.1-9). Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Co.
- Dewey, J. (1997). The Ethics of Democracy, in L. Menand (Ed.) *Pragmatism: A Reader* (pp.182-204). New York: Vintage Books.
- Dunn, W.N. (1998). Campbell's Experimenting Society: Prospect and Retrospect, in W. M. Dunn (Ed.) *The Experimenting Society: Essays in Honor of Donald T. Campbell* (pp.1-34). *Policy Studies Review*, Vol. 11, New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers,

- Etheredge, L.S. (1981). Government Learning, in S. L. Long (Ed.) *The Handbook of Political Behaviour 2* (pp.73-161). New York: Plenum Press.
- Giddens, A. (1990). *The Consequences of Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Gray, J. (2008). We Trusted this Country: Look How it Treats Us, *Observer*, 10th February.
- Grayling, A. (2008). Introduction. In *The Ideas that Made the Modern World: The People, Philosophy and History of the Enlightenment* (pp.ix-xxix). London: Constable and Robinson Ltd.
- Gunningham, N. (2005). Reconfiguring Environmental Regulation, in P. Eliadis, M. M. Hill, M. Howlett (eds) *Designing Government: From Instruments to Governance* (pp.333-352). Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queens University Press.
- Holzner, B. (1998). Cultural Dimensions in the Experimenting Society, in W. M. Dunn (Ed.) *The Experimenting Society: Essays in Honor of Donald T. Campbell* (pp.171-88). *Policy Studies Review*, 11, New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.
- Innes, J.E., Booher, D.E. (2003). Collaborative Policymaking: Governance through Dialogue, in Hajer, M., Wagenaar, H. (eds.) *Deliberative Policy Analysis: Understanding Governance in the Network Society* (pp.33-59). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- IPPR, PWC (2009). *Towards a Smarter State: A Joint Programme from IPPR and PricewaterhouseCoopers*. London: PricewaterhouseCoopers.
- Jessop, B. (1997). The Governance of Complexity and the Complexity of Governance: Preliminary Remarks on Some Problems and Limits of Economic Guidance, in A. Amin, J. Hausner (eds.) *Beyond Market and Hierarchy: Interactive Governance and Social Complexity*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

- Jowell, R. (2003). *Trying it Out: The Role of 'Pilots' in Policy Making*. London: Cabinet Office.
- Keating, M. (2005). *Policy Making, Innovation and Civil Society*, *View*, 3, 4-5.
- Keating, M. (2010). *The Government of Scotland: Public Policy Making after Devolution*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Kooiman, J. (1993). Findings, Speculations and Recommendations, in J. Kooiman (Ed.) *Modern Governance: New Government—Society Interactions* (pp. 249-262). London: Sage Publications.
- Leicester, G. (2006). *Policy Learning: Can Government Discover the Treasure Within?* St. Andrews: International Futures Forum.
- Lindblom, C.E., Woodhouse, E.J. (1993). *The Policy Making Process*, 3rd ed, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Lodge, G. and Kalitowski, S. (2007). *Innovations in Government: International Perspectives on Civil Service Reform*. London: Institute for Public Policy Research.
- Lomas, J. (1997). *Improving Research Dissemination and Uptake in the Health Sector: Beyond the Sound of One Hand Clapping*. Policy Commentary C97-1, Centre for Health Economics and Policy Analysis, Hamilton, McMaster University.
- Majone, G. (1989). *Evidence, Argument and Persuasion in the Policy Process*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- March, J.G. and Olsen, J.P. (1989). *Rediscovering Institutions: The Organizational Basis of Politics*. New York: The Free Press.
- Mayne, J. (2007). *Challenges and Lessons in Implementing Results-Based Management*, *Evaluation*, 13, 87-109.
- Mayntz, R. (1993). *Governing Failures and the Problem of Governability: Some Comments on a Theoretical Paradigm*, in J. Kooiman (Ed.) *Modern Governance: New Government—Society Interactions* (pp. 9-20). London: Sage Publications.

- Moore, M.H. (1995). *Creating Public Value: Strategic Management in Government*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Mulgan, G. (2007). *Good and Bad Power: The Ideals and Betrayals of Government*. London: Penguin Books.
- National Audit Office (2003). *Getting the Evidence: Using Research in Policy Making*. HC586-1, London: NAO.
- Nutley, S. M., Walter, I., Davies, H. T. O. (2007). *Using Evidence: How Research Can Inform Public Services*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- OECD (2003). *Managing Senior Management: Senior Civil Service Reform in OECD Member Countries*. Paris: Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development.
- OECD (2005). *Modernising Government: The Way Forward*. Paris: Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development.
- OECD (2010). *Value for Money in Government: Public Administration after New Public Management*. Paris: Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development.
- Parsons, W. (2001). Modernising Policy-Making for the Twenty First Century: The Professional Model. *Public Policy and Administration*, 16, 93-110.
- Parsons, W. (2002). From Muddling Through to Muddling Up: Evidence Based Policy Making and the Modernisation of British Government, *Public Policy and Administration*, 17, 3, 43-60.
- Peters, B. G. (1998). The Experimenting Society and Policy Design, in W. M. Dunn (Ed.) *The Experimenting Society: Essays in Honor of Donald T. Campbell* (pp.125-39). *Policy Studies Review*, 11, New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers,
- Porter, R. (2001). *The Enlightenment*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ratner, J. (1939). *Intelligence in the Modern World: John Dewey's Philosophy*. New York: Random House.

- Rigby, E. (2005). Linking Research and Policy on Capitol Hill: Insights from Research Brokers, *Evidence and Policy*, 1, 195-213.
- Rorty, R. (1980). *Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Rorty, R. (1999). *Philosophy and Social Hope*. London: Penguin Books.
- Rosenthal, S.B. (2002). Habermas, Dewey and the Democratic Self, in M. Aboulaflia, M. Bookman, C. Kemp (eds.) *Habermas and Pragmatism* (pp.210-22). London: Routledge.
- Ryan, A. (1995). *John Dewey and the High Tide of American Liberalism*. New York: W. W. Norton and Co.
- Sanderson, I. (2000). Evaluation in Complex Policy Systems, *Evaluation*, 6, 433-454.
- Sanderson, I. (2002). Evaluation, Learning and Evidence-Based Policy Making, *Public Administration*, 80, 1-22.
- Sanderson, I. (2006). Complexity, 'Practical Rationality' and Evidence-Based Policy Making, *Policy and Politics*, 34, 115-32.
- Sanderson, I. (2008). Developing a strategic approach to evaluation: The case of Scotland. Presentation to European Institute of Public Administration Seminar, *Evaluation of Public Policies: Procedures, Methods, Practices and Standards*, Barcelona, 29-31 October, 2008.
- Sanderson, I. (2009). Intelligent Policy Making for a Complex World: Pragmatism, Evidence and Learning, *Political Studies*, 57, 699-719.
- Schon, D.A. (1973). *Beyond the Stable State: Public and Private Learning in a Changing Society*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Scottish Government (2007). *Scottish Budget Spending Review 2007*. Edinburgh: Scottish Government.

- Scottish Government (2008a). *Equally Well: Report of the Ministerial Taskforce on Health Inequalities*. Edinburgh: Scottish Government.
- Scottish Government (2008b). *Scottish Alcohol Research Framework*, Edinburgh: Scottish Government. Retrieved August 5, 2010, from <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Research/About/Social-Research/Work-Programmes>.
- Scottish Government (2009a). *Review of Policy Making in the Scottish Government: A Summary*. Edinburgh: Office of the Chief Researcher.
- Scottish Government (2009b). *Promoting Positive Outcomes: Working Together to Prevent Antisocial Behaviour in Scotland*. Volumes 1 and 2. Edinburgh: Scottish Government.
- Scottish Government (2009c). *Changing Scotland's Relationship with Alcohol: A Framework for Action*. Edinburgh: Scottish Government.
- Scottish Government (2009d). *Communities Analytical Services Division: Analytical Programme 2009-10*. Edinburgh: Scottish Government. Retrieved August 5, 2010, from <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Research/About/Social-Research/Work-Programmes>.
- Scottish Government (2010a). *Financial Integration Across Health and Social Care: Evidence Review*. Research Report, Edinburgh: Scottish Government.
- Scottish Government (2010b). *Third Sector Approaches to Bridging the Distance from the Employment Market for People with Multiple and Complex Needs: An Evidence Review*. Research Report, Edinburgh: Scottish Government.
- Scottish Government (2010c). *Outlook for Scottish Government Expenditure: 2010 Emergency budget Update*. Office of the Chief Economic Advisor. Edinburgh: Scottish Government.
- Sleeper, R. (2001). *The Necessity of Pragmatism: John Dewey's Conception of Philosophy*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

- Smith, M.K. (2000). The Theory and Rhetoric of the Learning Society, *The Encyclopedia of Informal Education*. Retrieved August 5, 2010, from <http://www.infed.org/lifelonglearning/b-lrnsoc.htm>.
- Toulmin, S. (2001). *Return to Reason*. Cambridge, Ma.: Harvard University Press.
- Weiss, C.H. (1999). The Interface between Evaluation and Public Policy, *Evaluation*, 5, 468-86.
- Westbrook, R.B. (1991). *John Dewey and American Democracy*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Wilson, D. (2003). Unravelling Control Freakery: Redefining Central-Local Government Relations. *British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 5, 3, 317-346.