

**Europeanization and Nation-Building Process:
The Case of Scottish Cultural Heritage Policies**

Presented by Caroline Cantin

**Thesis submitted to the
Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies
In partial fulfillment of the requirements
For the MA in Political Science**

**Master's of Arts
Faculty of Political Science
The University of Ottawa**

Table of Contents

Abstract	vi
Acknowledgement	vii
Introduction	1
Chapter 1: Research Problem and Literature Review	7
1.1. The Statement of the Research Problem	7
1.2. Review of the literature	10
1.2.1. Culture and Cultural Heritage	11
1.2.2. Regionalization.....	15
1.2.3. Identity: National Identity, Cultural Identity and the European Dimension.....	18
1.2.3.1. The National Identity.....	20
1.2.3.2. The Cultural Identity.....	21
1.2.3.3. The European Dimension	22
1.2.4. Cultural Public Policies	26
1.3. The Purpose of our Project.....	31
Chapter 2: Conceptual and Methodological Frameworks	32
2.1. The concept of Europeanization.....	32
2.2. The notion of referential.....	36
2.3. Sectoral Policies	38
2.4. Europeanization or Convergence?.....	39
2.5. Methodology and Sources.....	40

2.5.1. Types of research.....	40
2.5.2. Our research design	41
2.5.3. Data collection.....	44
2.5.4 Limitations	46
2.6. The Last Word.....	46
Chapter 3: The Referential or How to Use this Concept in Our Analysis.....	48
3.1. The economic and social justifications of public policies.....	49
3.2. The democratization of culture or cultural democracy?.....	51
3.3. The cultural development of regions.....	52
3.4. The EU policy process	53
3.5. The emphasis placed on the development of partnerships.....	55
3.6. The ambivalence on the notion of the EU identity.....	56
3.7. The global referential	57
Chapter 4: The economic and social justifications of cultural heritage policies	58
4.1. The Scotland's position regarding the instrumental dimension of culture.....	58
4.2. Do we find the instrumental dimension in the museums' policies?.....	61
4.2.1. The Social Dimension	61
4.2.2. The Economic Dimension	63
4.2.3. The Instrumental Dimension in Scottish Cultural Heritage Policies.....	65
Chapter 5: The Cultural Supremacy.....	67
5.1. Cultural Rights	67
5.2. Increasing accessibility to all forms of culture by using different strategies	70
5.2.1. Facilitating access to cultural institutions: visits to museums.....	71
5.2.2. Facilitating access to young people	73

5.2.3. In the name of social inclusion.....	75
5.2.4. The power of digital initiatives.....	76
5.3. Scotland’s Cultural Democracy	78
Chapter 6: The Cultural Regional Development	80
6.1. Cultural Regional Planning	80
6.2. The importance of partnerships in cultural regional development.....	83
6.3. The Cultural Regional Development in Scotland: A Final Word	86
Chapter 7: Partnerships in the Scottish Cultural Heritage Field.....	88
7.1. National Partnerships	88
7.2. International Partnerships.....	94
7.3. Conclusion.....	98
Chapter 8: The Ambivalence on the Notion of Identity	100
8.1. The Scottish Identity: Cultural Unity	100
8.2. The Scottish Identity: Beyond Cultural Unity.....	104
8.3. The Scottish Case: Unity vs Diversity	107
Chapter 9: The EU Policy and Decision-Making Process	110
9.1. A Step-by-Step Process.....	110
9.2. Evaluation and Measurement	111
9.2.1. The Importance of Objectives, Indicators and Standards.....	111
9.2.2. Different Strategies to Evaluate and Measure the Performance of the Museums	112
9.2.3. A Timeline for the Introduction of the Evaluation and Measurement Policy in Scotland.....	113
9.3. The Three-Step Decision Making-Process.....	115

9.3.1. Consultation.....	115
9.3.2. Cooperation	117
9.4. The Policy Cycle Stages and the Decision-Making Process in Scotland.....	119
Conclusion	121
Bibliography	126

Abstract

Our thesis discusses the issue of Europeanization in light of Scottish cultural heritage policies since devolution. This sectoral public policy is not the subject of much attention, but this thesis wants to fill the gap. This thesis also raises the questions of identity in the field of cultural heritage. We tend to determine the forces that are involved in the construction of the Scottish identity post-devolution. This work is done by keeping in mind the fact that Scotland is torn between the European and the British influences. In order to operationalize our object of study, we identify six variables that are part of the EU public policies. These variables are the economic and social justifications of cultural public policies, the importance of cultural democracy, the cultural development of regions, the EU policy process and the decision-making process, the emphasis placed on the development of partnerships and the ambivalence of the notion of the EU identity. Our analysis reveals that all of these variables are present in Scottish cultural heritage policies. The omnipresence of all these variables is significant. Nevertheless, because of the limited extent of our work, we consider that it is more appropriate to assert that policy convergence is taking place in Scotland instead of concluding that Scottish cultural heritage policies are openly Europeanized. Our thesis also shows that the presence of these variables in Scottish cultural heritage policies since devolution is an efficient way for Scotland to assert its difference from the UK. Indeed, for almost all of these variables, Scotland's position tends to differ from the UK.

Keywords: Europeanization, Scotland, Cultural Heritage Policies, Identity

Notre thèse discute de la question de l'Européanisation à la lumière des politiques patrimoniales écossaises depuis la dévolution. Cette politique publique sectorielle ne fait pas beaucoup l'objet de publications, mais cette thèse veut combler cette lacune. Cette thèse soulève aussi des questions identitaires dans le domaine patrimonial. Nous tentons de déterminer ici les forces impliquées dans la construction de l'identité écossaise dans un contexte post-dévolutionnaire. Notre démarche est menée en gardant à l'esprit le fait que l'Écosse est tiraillée entre deux courants d'influence, soit l'influence européenne et l'influence britannique. Afin d'opérationnaliser notre objet de recherche, six variables sont identifiées comme faisant partie de plusieurs politiques publiques européennes. Ces variables sont le recours à des explications économiques et sociales pour justifier les politiques publiques, l'importance accordée à la démocratisation culturelle, le développement culturel des régions, un processus politique et une prise de décision typiquement européenne, l'emphase mise sur l'établissement de partenariats et l'ambivalence en lien avec la notion d'identité. Notre analyse révèle que toutes ces variables parcourent les politiques patrimoniales européennes. La récurrence de ces variables est hautement significative. Néanmoins, du fait du caractère limité de notre démarche, nous considérons qu'il n'est pas possible de conclure catégoriquement que les politiques patrimoniales écossaises sont européanisées. Il est davantage avisé de conclure pour l'instant à une convergence des politiques publiques. En terminant, notre thèse démontre aussi que la présence des six variables dans les politiques patrimoniales écossaises depuis la dévolution est un outil efficace pour cette région d'affirmer sa différence par rapport au Royaume-Uni.

Mots-clés : Européanisation, Écosse, politiques patrimoniales, identité

Acknowledgement

Completing a master's degree is never an easy task. For that reason, I would like to thank people who made possible this academic enterprise. Of course, my supervisor, Professor Jonathan Paquette, helped me to keep my motivation during this long journey into cultural policies. Thanks to his feedbacks, I always ended up seeing the light in times of darkness. Finally, I would like to highlight the support of Olivier and Diane who were always there to listen to me when I wanted to discuss my subject.

Introduction

The relationships between Scotland and England have always been tumultuous. Several conflicts took place between Scotland and England before 1707, date until which Scotland was a nation state distinct from England. In 1707, the Acts of Union were signed by the English and Scottish Parliaments. The union saw the birth of ‘the United Kingdom of Great Britain’ (Munro, 1999, p. 104). The Acts introduced a “full political and economic union”, but “the union was not designed to effect a complete assimilation” because the Scots kept their legal system and courts, their churches and their national identity (Munro, 1999, p. 103-104). Causes of dissatisfaction were numerous after the Acts of Union and, as a result, since the end of the 19th century, several concessions had been made by England to “appease demands or accommodate Scottish identity within the union” (Munro, 1999, p. 97). The Scotland Act in 1998 marked a new step in the devolution process: with this Act, Scotland now had the right to have its own Parliament and Executive (Munro, 1999, p. 114). Michael Keating et al. state that this “political devolution builds upon a history of administrative devolution” (Keating et al., 2012, p. 290).

Here, two important things regarding Scotland must be mentioned. First, the process of devolution in Scotland has been a gradual phenomenon. In other words, 1999 did not mark the introduction of a novelty in the British political landscape, but rather the acceleration of a political mechanism that had already been implemented several years ago. Second, despite the Acts of Union in 1707, Scotland has been able to preserve its own identity, a Scottish identity distinct from the British identity. These nuances are really important in order to appreciate the complexities of the Scottish case.

In terms of the political context at large, several considerations must be taken into consideration. Scotland deals with two major influences, which are the British influence and the European dynamic. Despite the fact that Scotland has its own identity, it remains that it is part of the UK and, then, it faces “similar social and economic conditions and a range of standard policy tools” (Keating et al., 2012, p. 291). By extension, the British influences, no matter the sector, circulate in Scotland; this implies that it becomes difficult to ignore them completely.

On the other side of the spectrum, we find the EU, which has tended to be more and more attractive for Scotland over the past years. The UK became part of the European Economic Community (EEC) in 1975 following a referendum. It is interesting to note that, at that time, Scotland was less enthusiastic than the UK regarding the entry into the ECC. Indeed, both the Scottish Labour Party and the Scottish National Party (SNP) were widely against this entry. Progressively, Scotland has changed its mind on that matter:

A review of the documents passed by SNP annual conferences shows that the change to the current policy of “independence in Europe” took place in the late eighties. While the annual conference of 1982 still declared that “membership of the European Economic Community is incompatible with Scotland’s national interests”, in 1988, the conference foresaw that “after negotiating an entry into the European Community acceptable to the Scottish people, an independent Scotland will have a full say in all Community policy [...]” (Nagel, 2004, p. 66 – *The quotations in this quote are from SNP headquarters’ documents according to Nagel’s article.*).

This change can probably be explained by the fact that Scotland understood the benefits associated with the EU for its own sake. Since then, Scotland has remained attached to the EU.

Where does the UK stand regarding the EU? Actually, the UK has a position diametrically opposite to Scotland on that matter. Indeed, the UK has always been against the European integration despite the fact that British politicians claim to be open-minded

regarding the European project. This “openness” presents its limits: the European construction is acceptable as long as the British Nation-State is not threatened. As specified by Cassagnau,

Au Royaume-Uni, c'est le courant souverainiste qui domine au sein de l'opinion publique. Les souverainistes, présents à des degrés divers dans la plupart des États-membres, proclament que les nations du continent ont acquis au fil des âges une identité et une âme qui les rendent insolubles dans une hypothétique “nation européenne” qui, selon eux, ne pourra jamais exister. C'est donc l'attachement fervent aux attributs de la souveraineté britannique qui constitue le frein le plus important à la participation de ce pays aux grands projets européens (Cassagnau, 2004, p. 94).

In order to illustrate this souverainist trend in the UK, it is relevant to specify that the 2000 Eurobarometer revealed that only one quarter of British people believes in the EU's contribution for the UK. This is the worst result for an European country (Cassagnau, 2004, p. 94).

The fact that Scotland is caught between the hammer and the anvil, which refers to the UK and the EU, implies that it does not have the full control of its public policies. In other words, there is an ongoing balancing act between the British and the European influences when it comes the time to elaborate and implement public policies in Scotland. Even if we can not reduce the scope of the British extent over Scotland, it remains that the European influence challenges the territorial boundaries of nations and, by extension, may have more weight in the equation than the UK. This path deserves to be deepened here.

We have not mentioned so far the notion, but, when we talk about the “European influences”, the concept of “Europeanization” is actually underlined. Defining the notion of Europeanization is not an easy task. The chapter 2 discusses more in details this concept. For now, we just have to understand what this notion means without presenting the debates that characterize this field of specialization. For Gerard Delanty, Europeanization must be

analysed in light of a “cosmopolitan perspective” (2007, p. 416). In other words, Europeanization faces “the transformation of cultural and political subjectivities in the context of the encounter of the local or national with the global” (Delanty, 2007, p. 417). Of course, a critical mind can bring up that this quotation does not clarify the meaning of the term “Europeanization”. Trine Flockhart (2010) states that “Europeanization can be characterized as different forms of diffusion processes of European ideas and practices across time and space” (p. 788). According to this definition, Europeanization implies the diffusion of processes, ideas or practices. By extension, we understand that there are some tensions between Europeanization and nationalism (Delanty, 2007, p. 417) because the notion of frontiers is seriously challenged. Indeed, the idea of “diffusion” implies that processes, ideas or practices cross national frontiers without restrictions.

Europeanization interferes on numerous dimensions like public policies. However, the cultural field is rarely studied by authors who are interested by Europeanization. In order to fill this gap, our thesis focuses on Scottish cultural heritage policies. In Scotland, the responsibilities for the cultural heritage sector are divided between the local government cultural services and the Government. These two authorities must conduct the development of cultural heritage activities on the whole Scottish territory (“*Our Next Major Enterprise...*”, June 2005, p. 12-18). Cultural heritage activities are mainly concentrated in some 340 museums and galleries in Scotland (*Scottish Budget Draft*, 2014-2015). The field of cultural heritage is particularly interesting because of the fact that it openly carries the notion of identity. When we know that Scotland is stuck between a rock and a hard place in terms of political dynamic, the connection between the field of cultural heritage and the notion of identity is particularly relevant.

Our thesis studies the issue of “Europeanization” in light of Scottish cultural heritage

policies. We wanted to determine the impact of this phenomenon on this specific sectoral public policy. In particular, it is important to insist on the idea that this thesis raises the questions of identity in the field of cultural heritage. Indeed, this thesis tries to clarify the forces that interact in the construction of the “new” Scotland. Does this construction become possible by joining the EU or by standing out of the UK? This question is complex when we know the political situation in which Scotland stands, a situation where the European dynamic interferes on a daily basis with the British influences. It is true that Scotland has been able to keep its own identity despite the unforeseen turn of events throughout its history. Nevertheless, we supposed in our thesis that Scotland is receptive to the diverse influences involve in the political dynamic.

In order to determine to what extent the Scottish cultural heritage field is concerned by Europeanization, this work is divided in 9 chapters. The first three chapters frame the project. The first chapter formulates the statement of the research problem and presents the literature review relevant to our project. In this chapter, it is question of culture and cultural heritage, regionalization, the notion of identity and cultural public policies. All of these four literatures are essential for our discourse. Effectively, Scotland, as a region that is part of the UK, uses cultural heritage public policies as an effective tool to assert its identity. The chapter 2 defines our conceptual and methodological frameworks. The notions of Europeanization and referential are two important topics of this chapter. However, we also discussed the concept of convergence, which might be confusing when it is question of Europeanization. Following these considerations, we presented our methodology and sources. Our thesis fits in a qualitative research where the single-case design, which is Scotland, turns around the sources of three major Scottish institutions. However, it is in the third chapter that we fully operationalized the notion of referential for our project. Six

variables are identified as being part of the European referential.

Chapters 4 to 9 are the chapters that present the result of our data analysis. These chapters try to determine if the variables identified as being part of the European referential are present in Scottish cultural heritage policies since devolution. The variables analysed are the economic and social justifications of cultural heritage policies, the struggle between the democratization of culture and cultural democracy, the importance given to cultural regional development, the focus placed on partnerships, the ambivalence of the notion of identity and the EU policy and decision-making process. Our analysis reveals that each of these dimensions is present in Scottish cultural heritage policies. If we look beyond this observation, we observed that Scotland tends to assert its identity by marking its difference from the UK. When we know that the UK is essentially against the European integration, the fact to share several characteristics with the EU is really significant for Scotland.

Chapter 1: Research Problem and Literature Review

1.1. The Statement of the Research Problem

In 1957, the EEC was created by six state members (France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg) under economic considerations. In the path of the political construction of the European project, *“l'idée d'un projet culturel commun a souvent été fortement contestée par crainte d'effacer la diversité culturelle et de perdre, ainsi, les références des cultures spécifiques et nationales”* (Sticht, 2000, p. 46). In other words, the European construction is a process articulated around the production of new cultural references towards the establishment of new (and common) references for cultural and political identity building. By extension, we understand that this process sometimes involves conflicts between the traditional and the new references (Sassatelli, 2009).

In the 1970s, there was a clear intent to build a common cultural reality in Europe. For instance, in 1973, the first declaration on European identity was signed by the CEE members. According to this declaration, the statement that a “cultural identity” coexists alongside “national cultures” is made (Sticht, 2000, p. 47). Despite the fact that some attempts have been made to set up cultural projects in the 1970 and the 1980s, culture remains a marginal preoccupation for the EEC (Autissier, 2005; Sticht, 2000).

Further, in 1992, with the Maastricht Treaty, the European Union was created. At that moment, twelve members were part of the EU (Germany, Belgium, France, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Denmark, Ireland, United Kingdom, Greece, Spain and Portugal). This treaty is interesting for us because of the article 128, which concerns the cultural dimension. In this treaty, the EU states its commitment towards the protection and

the promotion of cultural heritage. In 1997, the article 128 is also part of the Amsterdam Treaty's article 151. In the 1990s, some cultural projects were developed (Kaleidoscope, Ariane, Raphaël, etc.). Nevertheless, the EU has still not drawn any cultural policy for its members so far. As specified by Anne-Marie Autissier, "*une juxtaposition de programmes ne fait pas une politique*" (Autissier, 2005, p. 284). Now that 28 members are part of the EU, the cultural dimension appears as the best way to make possible the building of a tightly woven community (Perrin, 2012, p. 469). Of course, it is legitimate to ask who is in charge of cultural policies in Europe? Culture remains the responsibility of State members and their institutions: in other words, cultural policy in Europe is a national reality (Sticht, 2000, p. 62). However, EU has developed over the years some policy instruments to intervene in the cultural sector, and as such its intervention is additional to the member states' interventions. While culture is still a national reality – and arguably still a local government priority in many cases – culture is an area over which the EU is expanding its influence.

In our project, we studied one specific case study, which is Scotland in the UK. Scotland is an interesting case for many reasons. First and foremost, Scotland has legitimate claims to a distinct national identity. With a nationalist party at the top of the Scottish government since 2007, we understand that the will to obtain sovereignty becomes more and more strong. For instance, in September 2014, Scotland's Independence Referendum will take place in order to give the opportunity to Scottish people to decide on their future.

Second, the evolution of the British State has led to many important re-organizations over the years. The UK is made up of four nations, which are England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland. The level of autonomy differs in Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland. In Scotland, the decentralization or, if we prefer the devolution, was accentuated in 1998 with the Scotland Act. Thanks to the devolution, which is "the delegation of governmental powers

from the centre without the relinquishment of sovereignty” (Munro, 1999, p. 99), Scotland now manages several matters such as cultural affairs. This also includes the creation of a distinct cultural agency in 2010 entitled “Creative Scotland” – equivalent to a ministry of culture and to its British counterpart the Department for Culture, Media & Sport (DCMS) – in order to develop a distinctive cultural policy regarding the performing arts.

Third, the decision to choose Scotland is also particularly interesting because of its specificities regarding the composition of the population, the linguistic component and the level of historic statehood (Nagel, 2004). At first, it is important to note the homogeneous composition of the Scottish population. Indeed, to the opposite of Wales, most people who live in Scotland are born there. Regarding the linguistic question, despite the fact that the Gaelic language is becoming more and more important for political authorities (i.e. the Gaelic language is now taught at elementary schools), it remains that the linguistic question is not really a major concern in Scotland because most people speak English. Moreover, the notion of state as a historic reality is really strong in Scotland thanks to “the survival of its institutions in the Union (1707)” that contributes to maintain the Scottish historic statehood (Nagel, 2004, p. 58). Concerning the role of the central state, it is interesting to note that, in the case of the Scottish Parliament, “these parliaments operate in a constitutional framework that recognizes the legal personality of the region and guarantees the constitutional protection of the regional government” (Keating, 1998, p. 226 cited by Perrin, 2012, p. 37).

If it is true that this region has a really strong identity, the last reason why Scotland is an interesting case is related to the fact that it also wants to fill the gap with Europe (Roller and Sloat, 2002; Moreno, 2006; Nagel, 2004). This dynamic implies that we see the Europeanization of the political discourse in this region. In other words, since the late 1980s, but especially since devolution, Scotland has become pro-Europe.

Our research project tries to fill the gap regarding the last trends in cultural policies. Instead of just focusing on regional cultural policies like so many works, we tried to join the global and the local perspectives in our project. Indeed, we wanted to study the impact of Europeanization on Scottish cultural heritage policy-making since devolution. When we looked beyond this guideline, we found the notion of identity: confronting to the “new Europe” and the national dynamic, Scottish policy makers try to determine public policies that reflect the Scottish identity in some ways. So this thesis focuses on the identity construction in Scotland in light of the heritage issues and the political dynamic that faces the region. This political dynamic is torn between the national ambition, the British heritage and the increasing European influence. Our project wants to determine what it implies for Scotland since devolution.

1.2. Review of the literature

The statement of research problem gave us the four parts on which we should focus on in our review of the literature. So, this section concentrates its attention on four distinct yet complementary literatures: which include the research about cultural heritage, regionalization, the notion of identity and cultural policy.

Our thesis directly interacts with these four literatures. Indeed, cultural heritage policies, defined as a specific domain in cultural policy, represent for a region, immersed in a national and European reality, an effective way to express its identity. This said, the relevance of these four literatures is clearly understood when we read between the lines and try to establish connections between them. All of these corpuses have moving boundaries at the conceptual level and, then, it becomes complicated to define them. Moreover, these four literatures take a different hue depending on the country or the region studied. Finally, the Europeanization crystallizes the scope of these literatures by questioning the initial tags. The

relevance of this theoretical amalgam is now clear. It is the time to deepen it in order to justify our path.

1.2.1. Culture and Cultural Heritage

Because our project studies cultural heritage policies, it is essential to understand what we mean by “culture” and “cultural heritage”. However, the literature presents some challenges when it comes the time to look for a clear definition.

Regarding the word “culture”, a few intellectuals clearly state the difficulties related to the definition of this concept (Mulcahy, 2006). Depending on our point of reference, this word is defined as a “process” in which the main goal is to develop a sensibility to appreciate aesthetic production, a cultural achievement of a given society or a way of life. The idea of “process” is quite challenging because it does not give the possibility to understand all the subtleties surrounding the cultural reality depending on the region or the people involved. It is not the case of Mulcahy, but many intellectuals even say that the notion of culture is “arbitrary” (Bennett, 1997, p. 68). Olivier Bennett (1997) thinks that it is rather the product of mix intellectual traditions. This idea of mix is also part of Clive Gray’s rhetoric (2010). Partisan of a comparing approach, he thinks that the notion of culture could only be defined with the contribution of several disciplines. Because it is a complex notion, how could we pretend to define it with only one perspective? His position is interesting considering the fact that our project lies at the crossroad of several literatures. As a result, Gray refers to the definition given by cultural studies, political science, sociology and economics. He concludes by saying that these four disciplines share a similar view about culture because they present it “as a form of social glue that provides a common framework of understandings for the members of society to organize and interact around them” (Gray, 2010, p. 221).

This “social glue” makes sense and, considering Gray’s position, it is relevant to add that this “social glue” takes on a different hue depending on the discipline to which we refer. In light of our project, the notion of “culture” must be understood at the junction of cultural studies and sociology, two disciplines that give enough flexibility to appreciate all the possibilities of the notion of “culture”. In the field of cultural studies, which interacts quite often with semiotics, culture is defined as “the production and circulation of symbolic meanings” (McGuigan, 1996, p. 1). This “symbolic” dimension is also present with sociology, but, in that field, the notion of culture is also understood as “particular arenas of action associated with particular goods and/or activities” limited to specific sectors such as museums or heritage building (Gray, 2010, p. 220). These specific sectors can take a symbolic meaning when the notion of identity is added to the equation.

If it is true that the word “culture” is a complex one, one way to simplify the discussion is to refer to one specific cultural dimension. In the current case, we focused on “cultural heritage” in our project. This sector is also challenging because it lies at the junction of two sub-fields in culture, which are cultural history and heritage studies. Urfalino (2004), Pearce (1998) and Harvey (2001) insist on the idea that cultural history and heritage studies are heterogeneous and, by extension, hard to define.

Regarding cultural history, Urfalino (2004) states the difficulty to make the difference between the identity and the specificity of this subfield of study. For this author, cultural history “*est définie moins par un domaine ou un regard qu’un ajout*” (Urfalino, 2004, p. 118). Urfalino thinks that the usual objects of study in cultural history or, if we prefer “*les rivages sûrs*” (J.-P. Rioux’s concept 117), are not clearly defined. These are the “*rivages sûrs*”: cultural policies and institutions, mediations, cultural practices as well as signs and symbols. In addition, concerning the perspective, cultural history is said to be an observer of

the “*dimension representative de la vie sociale*” (Urfalino, 2004, p. 117). However, this perspective is not enough for understanding cultural history according to Urfalino. When we know the criticisms against history of representation, we fully understand Urfalino’s position. Actually, the author thinks that cultural history is “*un ajout*” because it is a new step in the historical methods. Because nothing is really clear concerning cultural history, the author has difficulty to say if it is a “*programme de recherche ou un grand chantier*” (Urfalino, 2004, p. 115)! He concludes by saying that it is probably the second option in the sense that it is always a work in progress. We agree with Urfalino because almost everything can be defined as “cultural history”. For instance, the field of cultural history studies different topics such as ghosts (Cantin, 2009), sacred violence (Crouzet, 1990), blasphemy (Cabantous, 1998) or laughing (de Baecque, 2000). If the subjects covered by the field of cultural history are numerous, it is legitimate to ask if the boundaries of cultural heritage, which is also part of cultural history, are as porous as the ones of cultural history. In order to answer this question, the notion of heritage studies needs to be overviewed.

In the case of heritage studies, the conceptual ambiguity surrounding it implies that the same oscillation can apply. Graham Fairclough (2009) states that, for some scholars, the notion of “heritage” is retrograde because “it commodifies the past, it over-simplifies, it fossilizes and constrains or it appropriates history to the nation state” (Fairclough, 2009, p. 29). However, when the “new heritage” is taken into account, this notion can have an “active meaning” (Fairclough, 2009, p. 29). Indeed, the “new heritage”, which involves interactions between people and their environment, broadens the traditional frontiers of this notion. In other words, the “new heritage” does not imply temporal boundaries and points out the importance of understanding heritage in an holistic way (i.e. military buildings, recent infrastructure, etc.) (Fairclough, 2009, p. 29-30; 39). In some ways, Fairclough shares

Harvey's point of view regarding the fact that heritage can be thought as a "contemporary process" that we can find in "whatever period of time" (Harvey, 2001, p. 327). This definition that presents the notion of heritage as a dynamic field composed of several representations that have been constantly renewed across history is interesting because it goes beyond the usual static character attributed to the notion of heritage.

Now that the notion of "heritage" has been clarified, how we can define "cultural heritage"? Previously, we mentioned that culture is like a "social glue" for Clive Gray (2010). This idea is underlined in the definition of cultural heritage given by the FARO Convention (The Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society):

...a group of resources inherited from the past which people identify, independently of ownership, as a reflection and expression of their constantly evolving values, beliefs, knowledge and traditions. It includes all aspects of the environment resulting from the interaction between people and places through time" (Fairclough, 2009, p. 36).

The values, beliefs, knowledge and traditions that come up from this "group of resources inherited from the past" help to forge the "social glue" in some ways. However, it is important to keep in mind the fact that this "group of resources inherited from the past" is not "static". In other words, some components have been added to this group of resources across history and, by extension, it implies that it is a "work in progress". In addition, referring to our definition of culture, we would like to point out that this "group of resources" has the power to get a symbolic meaning depending on the links that are established. For instance, cultural heritage can take a symbolic dimension if we link it with the notion of identity. Gabi Dolff-Bonekämper (2009) clearly states the close ties between the notion of heritage and identity: "Movable and immovable heritages have been – and continue to be – used as tools of societal homogenisation, with a view to affirming the unity characteristic of the territory, ethnic group and culture in a given state" (Dolff-Bonekämper, 2009, p. 70).

1.2.2. Regionalization

Traditionally, Scotland is defined as a region. This is the reason why we talked about Scotland as a region in our statement of the research question. However, in the context of Europeanization, we can ask if the literature on regionalization is relevant for our purpose.

At first, we have to insist on the idea that defining the notion of region is not an easy task as specified by many scholars (Harvey, 2002; Bassand, 1991; Hardill, 2006). Harvey defines the notion of region as “*un espace intermédiaire entre le palier local et le palier national*” (Harvey, 2002, p. 135), but this territory varies depending on some variables (geographical scale, country analyzed, historical period). For instance, in the province of Quebec, a region might be a regional county municipality or an administrative area (Harvey, 2002). Hardill insists on the idea that a region should present a relative homogeneity and is an economic, socio-cultural and political unit. Unfortunately, Hardill (2006) does not really insist on the socio-cultural dimension of his definition. Moreover, the idea of homogeneity is a bit unrealistic when we look closely some regions.

No matter Harvey and Hardill’s assertions, Bassand claims that regions make no sense without an identity, which takes form in cultural activities. For understanding the notion of regional identity, it is necessary to take into consideration three types of identities: historical identity, lived identity and projective identity (Bassand, 1991). In other words, it is no longer relevant to reduce the definition of regional identity to the notion of “collective memory”. The notion of identity is rather “*une création collective, culturelle, toujours en devenir*” (Bassand, 1991, p. 11) where the past, the present and the future are put in relation (Bassand, 1991). It is interesting to mention that, despite the fact that the existence of a local/regional culture justifies the territorial community’s legitimacy (Pongy, 2004), it would be inappropriate to suggest that this local/regional culture is in opposition to the national

identity (Poirrier, 1998).

In light of these contributions, we would like to clarify our position regarding the notion of region. We agree with Harvey on the idea that the notion of region is an intermediate stage between the local and the national. For instance, Scotland (region) is located between Glasgow and its surroundings (local) and the UK (national). By extension, an essential component of this intermediate stage is the presence of an identity. Nevertheless, to the opposite of Hardill, we do not think that homogeneity is possible in any region. In the case of Scotland, we saw that the region is quite homogeneous in terms of the composition of the population or the linguistic component. This said, this homogeneity struggles with the heterogeneity of the different identities (the Scottish, the British and the European identity) that meet each other on a daily basis (Roller and Sloat, 2002; Moreno, 2006; Nagel, 2004). Despite this struggling, we believe that the notion of identity represents an essential dimension when it comes the time to understand the notion of region.

When we make an overview of the literature about regionalization, it is clear that, until recently, the study of regions has been a marginal field of research in England because nationhood had prominence over everything. Centralism hid the fact that regions represented a huge potential for the nation (Hardill, 2006; Keating, 1995). Since the end of the 1990s in England, a political reconfiguration has taken place. Cities and regions are now important players in the political game. It is no longer appropriate to frame the political arena in terms of opposition between national and local/regional politics. The State should now be thought as a structure with different political scales (Dannestam, 2008). Following this shift, it is now possible to identify two trends that come up from the literature. However, these two trends are quite limited for the purpose of our project.

First, regions are thought as economic entities. These days, thanks to dynamic local

networks, international connections and industrial particularities (Chapman et al., 2004; Bathelt, 2005), it is the theoretical framework that considers the region as “an innovative building-block of a competitive modern economy” (Hardill, 2006, p. 7) that predominates. Hardill is not quite sure about the relevance of this framework. He points out some aspects that challenge the economic framework such as the fact that many regions have not been developed because of industries. Moreover, the importance given to the economic dimension often hides the political character of the regional development (Hardill, 2006). For our part, the most important limitation related to this trend is the fact that the notion of identity is completely ruled out of the equation.

Second, the literature also focuses on the idea of regional regeneration, which comes from after the “urban regeneration” actually. The term “regeneration” was first used in 1975 and it implies that, after a period of decline or low growth that provokes a depopulation, there is a “regeneration” that takes place (Couch, Sykes and Börstinghaus, 2011). Hardill formulates the concept of regeneration in other terms: “the key features of the new regionalism were that it identified the region as the optimum space or scaled for the kind of mobilisations and activities which could improve the position of less successful regions” (Hardill, 2006, p. 55). In the case of Henderson, Bowlby and Raco (2006), through the case study of Salford, they show that the local authority has a major role in order to make possible any kind of regeneration projects. Some authors point out that the usual regeneration scheme involves not only the local authority, but rather a partnership between the community, the local authorities and others actors such as the private sector (Coaffee, 2004). In some works, authors have pushed further the debate by saying that the regeneration is the result of the cultural dimension and, by extension, this regeneration leads to a transformation of the notion of local/regional identity (Bailey, Miles and Stark, 2004). One of the problems linked

to this literature is the fact that the authors just focus their attention on the “exceptional” and forget the subtle movements that may occur on the long term. For instance, our project is interested by the post-devolution period, which refers to the period between 1999 and now.

In light of the two trends in the literature on regionalization, it is relevant to ask if this literature is appropriate for a project like ours. Considering the complex nature of Europeanization, the literature on regionalization is the only one that is equivalent. However, this literature is problematic because of its incapacity to explain phenomenon that goes beyond the local environment. Indeed, when we analyzed the studies done on regionalization, we understood right away that the link between regions and the global dimension is almost absent in the literature. Of course, when it is question of major regional cities, some works show the international dimension of their cultural policies. It is interesting to note that this dimension has kept growing since 1945, especially since the 1980s (Taliano-des Garets, 2009). Nevertheless, generally speaking, the study of regions seems to be cut off from the world. In other words, scholars analyze one or two regions without paying attention to its international connection. For instance, Poirrier clearly shows that regional studies in France are sufficient in themselves because they just focus on regional cultural development (Poirrier, 1999). In British publications, the same trend is usually present despite the fact that we should recognize that British scholars tend to put more emphasis on comparative analysis. For instance, O’Brien and Miles (2010) as well as Brown, O’Connor and Cohen (2000) focus their attention on the peripheral North of England. This said, we recognize that the literature on regionalization is particularly challenging for us because our project addresses another form of regionalization. The kind of “regionalization” that interacts with its national and global environment. By extension, because of its national ambition, can we really talk of regionalization in the case of Scotland? No matter the relevance of this

question, we have to admit that it is the only literature that exists at the conceptual level. As a result, our project refers to it on several occasions in order to place in perspective our analysis.

1.2.3. Identity: National Identity, Cultural Identity and the European Dimension

We previously mentioned the fact that Scotland is torn between its national ambition, the British influence and the European dynamic. In this context, it seems essential to discuss the notion of identity. Despite the fact that we acknowledged the limitations of the literature on regionalization, all academics have to admit that there is usually a kind of oscillation between the pole “region” and the pole “Europe”. Scotland does not represent an exception at this level except the fact that the national ambition and the will to mark its opposition to the UK interfere in this oscillation.

Be that as it may, this discussion must start with a clarification of the word “identity”. Ignasi Terradas points out that there are three types of identity. Whereas the first type of identity “is considered lived rather than thought” (Terradas, 1990, p. 39), the second type is “an identity formally declared ethnic or national, based on language and culture” (Terradas, 1990, p. 39). The last type is an identity that has political or economic roots (Terradas 1990 - 39). Terradas insists on the idea that these identities are not mutually exclusive; they all interact between each other.

We agree with Terradas regarding the idea that the notion of “identity” is like an intersection where different roads meet. In the case of Scotland, its identity, which is thought as well as lived, has essentially political and historical roots. We already knew that Scotland does not base its identity on language because the common spoken language is English as the rest of the UK. This said, its identity is rooted in its distinct culture, which is determined by its political and historical variable. Here, we must not forget the definition given to the

notion of culture: radiation rooted in symbolism, culture is also a scope limited to specific areas.

1.2.3.1. The National Identity

The notion of “cultural identity” and the European variable are also put on the agenda in this section. But for now, the notion of “national identity” must be discussed in order to fully understand the dynamic in which Scotland is.

When we talk about the identity of a region, it becomes difficult to ignore the notion of “national identity”. In 1983, Benedict Anderson stated in his famous book *Imagined Communities* that “*la ‘fin de l’âge du nationalisme’, si longtemps prophétisée, est loin d’être en vue. Dans la vie politique de notre temps, il n’est en vérité de valeur plus universellement légitime que la nation*” (Anderson, 2000, p. 16). It is important to note that this assertion has been challenging since then: several authors have mentioned the necessity to redefine the parts of the equation. For instance, if nations remain part of the game, their traditional competences are put into question by the new international, European and regional dynamics (Keating, 2007). By extension, the fact that Nations or States are challenged implies that national identities are also called into question:

While being corroded by the forces of globalization they are also subject to fragmentation, competition and overlapping elements of a multiple and diverse nature. In parallel, there is a noticeable strengthening of sub- and supra-state identities. The revival of ethnoterritorial identities has coincided with an increasing challenge to the centralist model of the unitary state. (Moreno, 2006, p. 1)

We agree on the idea that the new global dynamic fosters the bursting of conventional boundaries both territorial and conceptual.

By extension, it is clear that the definition of “national identity” represents a problem. According to David Miller and Sundas Ali (2013), national identity can take four dimensions: national attachment, national pride, patriotism or civic/cultural conceptions of

identity. For his part, Toine Minnaert insists more on the discursive component of the notion of national identity. For this author, five variables take part in the framing of national identity, which are the nation's narrative, "the emphasis on origin, continuity, tradition and timelessness", invented tradition, the myth of origin and, finally, the characteristics of the "pure original population" who lived on the territory (Minnaert, 2012, p. 4). Minnaert's five dimensions remind us Anderson's anthropological definition of nation; for him, the nation is "*une communauté politique imaginaire, et imaginée comme intrinsèquement limitée et souveraine*" (Anderson, 2002, p. 19). However, Minnaert's position seems inadequate for us in light of our case study. For instance, how can we determine the official version of the nation's narrative? In addition, the "myth of origin" or the "invented tradition" seems rather irrelevant in the case of Scotland. Does that mean that Miller and Ali's guidelines are more accurate for the Scottish case? Actually, the four dimensions presented by these two authors are more appropriate, but the problem is that they seem to force us to pick up only one of the four dimensions. We tend to believe that the national identity lies at the crossroad of all of these dimensions depending on the circumstances.

Despite the fact that we took position on how to define the notion of "national identity", this notion represents a problem in the case of Scotland. Indeed, we are not sure if we talk about the Scottish national identity in the making or the British identity considering the fact that Scotland is one of the «regions» that are part of the UK. So, here we understand that this notion is not only challenged by the global dynamic. Nevertheless, perhaps we have to broaden our horizons to other forms of identity such as the one of "cultural identity" in order to really understand all the complexities of this reality.

1.2.3.2. The Cultural Identity

If it is true that we can not give up the notion of "national identity" despite the

challenges linked to it, it remains that the notion of “cultural identity” may prove very useful to get a better appreciation of the situation for a “region” like Scotland.

The notion of “cultural identity” was introduced by Albert Salon in *Vocabulaire critique des relations culturelles internationales* (1978). As a powerful tool that gives the opportunity to struggle against the dangers of cultural homogenization, the notion of cultural identity “*peut être utilisé par des minorités quand l’identité culturelle est conçue comme survie à l’intérieur d’un espace national, ou comme lien au-delà de cet espace*” (Salon cited by Brossat, 1999, p. 149). So, here we understand that Salon considers that the notions of “cultural identity” and “national identity” are opposed to each other. However, we tend to believe that these two identities can live together. Brossat agrees with us because she states that “*L’identité culturelle peut (...) être conçue comme un double de l’identité nationale, mais un double qui souligne la pluralité et la variété alors que la nation met l’accent sur l’unité*” (Brossat, 2009, p. 191).

This said, this notion can help us to frame the understanding of our subject. As a region, Scotland, Catalonia, Provence or Wales, is part of a national entity like the UK, Spain or France, but, if we really want to understand their particularity, it is essential to take into consideration the fact that there is a specific identity linked to each of these regions. So, we understand that it is appropriate to talk about a “compound nationality” (Moreno, 2006) in the case of these European regions.

1.2.3.3. The European Dimension

The discussion so far has showed that the European dimension or, if we prefer, the crystallization of the European dynamic symbolized by the process of Europeanization challenges the notions of regions and identity as well as the cultural field. In the current section, the aim is to clarify what we mean by “Europe” and to determine the forces involved

in the European dynamic.

How can we define “Europe”? For Caroline Brossat (1999), the European space shares a common culture thanks to a common past. As Pamela Sticht (2000), Brossat asserts that the notion of European culture is essentially rooted, at first, in the Greco-Latin and Christian traditions, and subsequently, in the periods of history crossed by all European countries after the Middle Ages (Renaissance, the Enlightenment and the industrial revolution). By extension to their common history, Brossat points out that Europe also shares common values such as individualism, liberty and democracy as well as rationalism (Brossat 1999).

However, if the past defines how the European culture is framed today, this conceptualization of the notion of European culture implies two problems. First, because the local and the regional levels have been interacting with the national level on an extensive way since the 1970s, it is inappropriate to understand the European culture as a singular reality. For Brossat, there is “*un glissement de culture européenne à cultures européennes*” (Brossat, 1999, p. 40). Regions are the best illustration of the affirmation of ‘sub-cultures’ in the European game. It is interesting to note that this change is visible in the vocabulary used by European institutions. For instance, whereas the Council of Europe and the European Union share a vocabulary that places an emphasis on the plural form of European culture, the Council of Europe’s Parliamentary Assembly rather prefers to promote the idea of unity (Brossat, 1999). Be that as it may, scholars usually prefer to promote a third view: instead of talking about “unity” or “diversity”, they promote the idea that the expression “unity in diversity” is the best one to understand the European context (Sassatelli, 2002). According to the Maastricht Treaty’s article 128, which became in 1998 the Amsterdam Treaty’s article 151, “the Community shall contribute to the flowering of the cultures of the Member States,

while respecting their national and regional diversity and at the same time bringing the common cultural heritage to the fore”. Here, we understand that these treaties promote the idea of “unity in diversity” mentioned before (Sassatelli, 2002). By extension, it is clear that the scholars share the Maastricht and Amsterdam Treaties’ view regarding the European culture.

Second, the multiplication of cultural voices that are heard in Europe means that it becomes harder and harder to define the European culture in the present especially when we take into consideration that there is a cultural crisis that is taking place right now in Europe as mentioned before. This cultural crisis is challenging the traditional definition of European culture, which is the one that refers to a common history and common values. So, “*en réaction, le thème de l’identité culturelle européenne se développera en témoignant du désir commun des organisations européennes et des intellectuels d’ancrer la culture européenne dans le présent pour échapper au poids du passé*” (Brossat, 1999, p. 17).

For our part, we firmly believe that the solution to this conceptual dead-end lies in what we previously said regarding the notion of heritage. We defined this notion as a dynamic field composed of several representations that have been constantly renewed across history. This equation has to be used for the notion of Europe. Europe is a cultural, geographical, political and economical space that has been redefined in several occasions across history and, by extension, this redefinition confirms the active character of the notion as the one of heritage.

Now that the definition of “Europe” has been settled, the forces involved in the European dynamic need to be discussed, which also has an impact on the Scottish nation. Two dimensions deserve to be mentioned here.

First, the affirmation of the regions is taking place in Europe. For authors who assert

the decline of the nation-state, they like to focus on the idea that a “Europe of the regions” is taking place, but is it really the case? Klaus-Jürgen Nagel (2004) states that

Europe’s institutional design only opens new chances for regional governments, and only if they accept certain rules of the game. The role of the regions in Europe has increased since the late eighties, and they have won more access points to the EU institutions, but these possibilities are still strictly controlled by the state (Nagel, 2004, p. 59).

Because of the specific European dynamic, Nagel thinks that it is more appropriate to frame the reality as a “Europe ‘with’ and not ‘of’, the regions” (Nagel, 2004, p. 60). Nagel’s point of view is nuanced. Nevertheless, there are usually two opposite views that are struggling between each other regarding the impact of the European integration and regionalism on the State: one group of authors thinks that the European integration and regionalism are working together to weak the State; the other group of scholars rather considers that the State is fostered by this dynamic (Keating, 1995). These opposite hypotheses are in some ways compatible. Keating asserts that

Although the processes of European integration and regionalism have in general advanced only as far as fast as national governments have wished, the latter do not have complete control over events. Territorial pressures have forced governments to concede more than they might have wished, while continental integration is also driven by economic and strategic interests which nations do not entirely control (Keating, 1995, p. 10-11).

Nagel said earlier that the process of regional affirmation on the European scene is controlled by the State. If Keating (1995) adopts a nuanced position as Nagel (2004) regarding that matter, he gives us more details regarding the real power of the State in the process. Be that as it may, Keating shares Nagel’s point of view regarding the irrelevance of a “Europe of the Regions”.

Perhaps the notion of “Europe of the Regions” is inappropriate to understand the complexity of the European reality, but one thing that we can assert with certainty is that

there are several regions that are proactive in Europe. One example that illustrates this assertion is the creation of what we call “euroregions”. Euroregions refer to cross-border initiatives that are directed by supra-national and national entities in Europe. It is interesting to note that the majority of euroregions are created as part of a cultural project. By extension, the existence of these regions challenges the “myth of a ‘European cultural community’” because the relationships between euroregions’ members can be as convivial as conflictual (Bassand et al., 1997, p. 25–27 cited by Perrin, 2010).

Second, it is essential to acknowledge the conceptual existence of this “European cultural community”. For Monica Sassatelli (2002), this concept is an “instrument” used to give an identity to European countries. In order to frame this identity, the author refers to Anderson’s “imagined community” (1983), which is a notion that conceptualize the community as “a reality of mind” (Sassatelli, 2002) shared by the members. The reason why Sassatelli refers to a “virtual” community can be explained by the fact that she considers that “‘Europe’ (...) is becoming more and more like an icon, if not a totem, whose ambiguous content seems to reinforce the possibilities of identification with it” (Sassatelli, 2002, p. 436). In order to set up this “community”, “symbolic initiatives” are taken to create a bond between community members. For instance, we can mention the ‘European City of Culture’ initiative, flags or anthems (Sassatelli, 2002). Considering the fact that we previously referred to the symbolic dimension to define the notion of culture, these “symbolic initiatives” are particularly interesting for us because they establish conceptual bonds between our notion of culture and European community.

1.2.4. Cultural Public Policies

In the previous section, it was question of the notion of identity. If we remember, Dolff-Bonekämper (2009) firmly believes in the existence of a strong bond between heritage

and identity. The best way to analyze these close ties is through cultural public policies, which are like the mirror of identity.

For the ones who are not familiar with public policies, Mulcahy (2006) mentions that they are usually defined as the result of value choices by governments in function of their social outcomes. More specifically, this author thinks that the practical level should be considered if we really want to understand the notion of cultural public policy. At that level, the author simply understands the notion of public culture as “governmental strategies and activities that promote ‘the production, dissemination, marketing, and consumption of the arts’” (Mulcahy, 2006, p. 320). Mulcahy insists on the idea of “value choices”, but he forgets an important dimension in his definition, which is the one of norms. In other words, public policies are determined by values, but also by norms. We had to keep this in mind for our data analysis.

The literature regarding cultural policy is related to four trends. The first one is that scholars, particularly French scholars, tend to analyze cultural policies as a historical object. Indeed, Pascal Ory was the one who started to work on the history of cultural public policies in the 1970s and the 1980s. Even if his work was initially focused on the cultural action of the *Front populaire*, he tended to broaden his horizons to cultural policies at large (Ory, 1974; 1981; 1983; 1984; 1989; 1990).

In the 1990s, the interest of historians kept growing. On one side, some historians analyzed the history of cultural institutions. Many works explore the world of theatres (Abirached, 1992-1995), museums (Poulot, 1992) or libraries (Varry, 1993). Regarding the field of musical institutions, some works focus on musical life, symphony orchestras or musical policies (Veitl and Duchemin, 1999; Lehman, 1995; Brown, O’Connor and Cohen, 2000).

On the other side, many historians focus their attention on the history of cultural policies in local/regional collectivities. Here, it is important to insist on the idea that this field of interest among scholars may be divided in two sections. The first one insists on the seminal moment of local/regional cultural policies. To the opposite of national cultural policies, it is complicated to identify the moment where local/regional cultural policies started (Poirrier, 1998; Urfalino, 2004). The second section tends to study cultural policies in local/regional collectivities regarding specific periods of time. This focus on local/regional cultural policies implies that scholars broaden their horizons to other public agents in the cultural field instead of putting an emphasis on the role of the State in cultural policy. As a result, we inventory works on the municipality of Dijon (Poirrier, 1995), Rouen (Vadelorge, 1996) or even the municipalities of the Seine (Rab, 1994) during the 20th century.

Other cultural policy research focuses not so much on the historical dimension of cultural policy, but rather try to grasp the policy rationales. This is the second trend that might be identified when we make a quick overview of the literature about cultural policy. Research on the “democratization of culture” reassesses the first cultural policy model that took place in the 20th century. Indeed, after the Second World War, three conceptions of cultural policies have emerged, which are democratization of culture (it implies a cultural elitism), cultural democracy (a more participatory approach) and cultural utilitarianism (the economic aspect is the main argument). For Mulcahy as well as Llado and Maso, these models are all present these days in cultural policies and it is sometimes difficult to make a clear distinction (Mulcahy, 2006; Llado and Maso 2011). For their part, Gattinger and Saint-Pierre claim that these conceptions have succeeded over the last 60 years and conceptualize these models in another way. Between 1950 and 1980, the democratization of culture was replaced by cultural democracy. Between 1980 and 1990, there was the professionalization

of the cultural sector that took place. Finally, we are currently in the period where the private sector, local governments and international organizations are important players (Gattinger and Saint-Pierre, 2010). In our project, we tried to identify the policy rationale in Scottish cultural heritage policies after devolution. Nevertheless, this policy rationale is clearly framed by two dimensions, which are the process of Europeanization and the assertion of the national ambitions.

Previously, we pointed out that there are many works done in France on the history of cultural policies in local/regional collectivities. Broadly speaking, the third trend in literature is in relation to current regional cultural policies. Indeed, no matter the way countries divide their territory (for instance, regional county municipalities in the province of Quebec, departments in France or regions in England), there is an abundant literature on that topic. Nevertheless, it is important to insist on the idea that scholars interested by cultural policy tend to focus their attention on the biggest cities in regions, which are dynamic centers of cultural activities (Saint-Pierre, 2002). Of course, some works concern areas located at the periphery (O'Brien and Miles, 2010) or even in the countryside (Bell and Jayne, 2010). However, most of the time, these areas are ignored. For our part, we followed a singular path because we established a link between a "region" and the global dimension. As a result, our thesis celebrates the bursting of boundaries.

The last trend in the literature insists on the notion of cultural region in the construction of the new Europe. Our research project fits precisely in this trend. By presenting the main lines of this trend, we thereby understand the context that Scotland has faced since devolution. At the beginning of the 1990s, Michel Bassand (1991) stated that the cultural dynamism and regional development should walk hand in hand in order to give the opportunity to regions to be partners in the construction of the new Europe. These days,

following Bassand's thesis, the European project seems only realistic if culture is used as cement to operationalize the marriage of several actors. However, it is difficult to establish standards at the cultural level that meet all European actors' needs especially when we take into consideration that the states have a prerogative in cultural issues in front of the European Union. According to Hamid Kaddouri, "*la construction européenne est, et restera, inachevée tant que l'intégration sociale et culturelle n'est pas réalisée*" (2009, p. 78). The integration is inextricably linked to the establishment of a cultural policy for the entire European Union. We should not be surprised about that assertion when we refer to the idea that, generally speaking, the notion of identity has always been an important topic in cultural policy theory at large. Indeed, if we follow Michel de Certeau's point of view concerning the idea that the political institution is a structuring agent for its "strategic identity" (Ahearne, 2004), cultural policy becomes a tool for modeling the identity especially when we know that Pierre Bourdieu claims that culture is "a prime generator of illusion" as well as "a preeminent instrument of mental emancipation" (cited by Ahearne, 2004). By extension, we understand that the link previously made between the notions of culture and identity is particularly relevant.

Scotland is taking part in the definition of this "new Europe". As a proactive region, Scotland has the possibility to make its voice heard. Nevertheless, we have to focus on the idea that, above all, this context underlies that a region like Scotland does not have all the power to decide by itself its public policies no matter the sector concerned. Indeed, the European dynamic as well as the national imperative have a great impact on Scotland. When it comes the time to make a distinction between the effects of the European impact vs the impact of other variables such as the national one, it is important to note that this distinction is probably blurred because of the fact that Europe can not be defined as a singular reality.

1.3. The Purpose of our Project

Following this review of the literature, it is important to focus on the idea that the purpose of our research project is double. First, our goal is to explore the radiation field of Europeanization in the Scottish space in order to determine to what extent the field of cultural heritage is under the influence of this phenomenon. Second, our aim is to study the power of the field of cultural heritage to catalyze a Scottish identity that is facing a complex political dynamic where the European influence meets on a daily basis the British influence, which is essentially against the European integration (Cassagnau, 2004, p. 93-101). The four literatures on cultural heritage, regionalization, identity and cultural policy are essential to successfully reach our two aims.

Chapter 2: Conceptual and Methodological Frameworks

Our object of study concerns the Scottish cultural heritage policies since devolution in 1999. As mentioned previously, thanks to devolution, Scotland has the power to determine its own cultural policies. Because there has been a progressive positive inclination towards the EU since the late 1980s among the Scottish political elites, it seems particularly interesting to analyze our object of study in light of Europeanization.

2.1. The concept of Europeanization

The concept of “Europeanization” in public policies has a recent history. Indeed, before 1980, the study of European public policies was “marginal” (Eppie, 2007). Between the 1980s and the 1990s, we see the emergence of European public policies analysis. It is during the same period that Ladrech formulated his famous definition of Europeanization (1994). For several researchers, Ladrech’s definition marks the official beginning of the research in Europeanization. Since 2000, we have observed “*la normalisation de la recherche*” (Eppie, 2007, p. 27 cited Hassenteufel, Surel, 2000) in the field of Europeanization. In other words, the UE (and its impacts) has become an object of study by itself. If this “new” approach to Europeanization implies a “more theory-oriented approach” according to Kevin Featherstone and Claudio M. Radaelli (2003), Maarten P. Vink and Paolo Graziano (2007), without contesting the importance of theory in the field, add a nuance to this assertion. For these authors, the current research in Europeanization is marked by an “empirical turn” (Vink and Graziano, 2007, p. 7), which means that researchers place more attention on the methodological dimension than before. This said, a question remains: how can we define Europeanization?

In order to properly circumscribe the concept of Europeanization, it is relevant to start by Ladrech's pioneering definition. This author defines Europeanization like an "incremental process re-orienting the direction and shape of politics to the degree that EC political and economic dynamics become part of the organizational logic of national politics and policy-making" (Ladrech, 1994, p. 69). According to Radaelli (2007), this definition gives too much importance to the organizational dimension at the cost of actors. We can also point out the fact that this definition sees Europeanization as a "top-down" phenomenon as Caporaso, Cowles and Risse's definition (2001, 3). Indeed, they define Europeanization as

(...) the emergence and development at the European level of distinct structures of governance, that is, of political, legal, and social institutions associated with political problem-solving that formalize interactions among the actors, and of policy networks specializing in the creation of authoritative European rules.

Instead of a "top-down" definition, it is perhaps more appropriate to propose a definition that place emphasis on the notion of "process" (Eppie, 2007). For instance, Radaelli (2001, p. 110) defines Europeanization as

Processes of (a) construction, (b) diffusion, and (c) institutionalization of formal and informal rules, procedures, policy paradigms, styles, 'ways of doing things', and shared beliefs and norms which are first defined and consolidated in the making of EU public policy and politics and then incorporated in the logic of domestic discourse, identities, political structures, and public policies.

This definition is particularly interesting because of the fact that it takes into consideration the informal dimension of Europeanization. In other words, even if there is no European cultural policy, or if we prefer no formal policy, it does not mean that there is no impact at the domestic level (Radaelli, 2010, p. 248). The European "ways of doing things" can affect the domestic discourse in the cultural field. The fact of taken into consideration the informal dimension of Europeanization goes in the same direction that Maarten P. Vink and Paolo Graziano's assertion. According to them, researchers should go beyond the study of "direct

effects” and include the “indirect effects” in their analysis. By extension, by taking into consideration the “indirect effects” of Europeanization, researchers take position for “a differential impact of European integration” (Vink and Graziano, 2007, p. 8).

Börzel and Risse (2012) claim that the field of Europeanization is characterized by a top-down approach. In other words, scholars usually tend to study how the EU has an impact on the domestic policies and institutions of the member states and candidates. Here, we can mention that the common explanation model “states that European integration leads to pressures to adjust (godness of fit) which are then mediated by domestic-level factors, and finally to outcomes” (Caporaso, 2007, p. 27). However, it is important to insist on the fact that there is also the bottom-up analysis:

The idea is to start from actors, problems, resources, policy style, and discourses at the domestic level. By using time and temporal causal sequences, a bottom-up approach checks if, when, and how the EU provides a change in any of the main components of the system of interaction. Finally, « bottom-uppers » try to measure the consequences of all this in terms of change at the domestic level (Radaelli and Pasquier, 2007, p. 41).

This approach presents the advantage of being neutral according to Radaelli because European politics are not the starting point of the analysis to the opposite of the top-down approach (Radaelli, 2010, p. 252). Previously, we mentioned that Radaelli’s definition of Europeanization is interesting because of the importance placed on the informal dimension. Here, we must focus on the idea that this definition given in 2001 is not clear regarding where he stands about the “top-down” or the “bottom-up” analysis. The duality of Europeanization, or if we prefer the possibility to study the “top” or the “bottom”, is perhaps more clear in James Caporaso’s definition:

Europeanization serves a dual (definitional) function. First it highlights the role of European politics and institutions as an independent variable in domestic politics. It turns the causal arrows around and asks how European integration and everyday policy making affect domestic structures. Second, Europeanization refers to the

processes by which domestic structures adapt to European integration (Caporaso, 2007, p. 27).

Some authors like Börzel go further by saying that Europeanization must be understood “as a two-way process” (Börzel, 2002b, p. 193). Be that as it may, we believe in the duality of Europeanization. Nevertheless, for our project, we focused our attention on the “bottom”, which are the Scottish cultural heritage policies. By doing that, our project fits in the new research agenda (Vink and Graziano, 2007).

No matter that a study follows the “top-down” or the “bottom-up” approach, it is important to insist on the fact that Europeanization research has “reverted almost without exception to the broad spectrum of theories that fall under the umbrella of the so-called ‘new institutionalism’” (Vink and Graziano, 2007, p. 13). For the institutional approach, the main point that must be kept in mind is that “institution matter” (Pierson, 1996). If the classical way to define institutions insist on the formal rules, procedures and organizational parameters, “in its ‘new’ understanding, however, institutions may also encompass informal rules, routines and conventions” (Vink and Graziano, 2007, p. 13). Because there is no formal cultural policy introduced by the European Union, the importance given to the informal character of institutions in new institutionalism is particularly relevant for us.

This said, it is interesting to note that most scholars agree when it comes the time to explain changes that are caused by Europeanization. There are two main “logics of change” (Vink and Graziano, 2007, p. 13), which are the rationalist explanation and the sociological (or constructivist) explanation (Vink and Graziano, 2007; Jacquot and Woll, 2008; Börzel and Risse, 2003). The rationalist logic believes in actors’ ability to pick up the best option whereas the constructivist logic firmly believes in the social construction of interests. In the next section, it is question of the cognitive approach of public policies, which is an approach

that falls between the rationalist and constructivist logics actually.

2.2. The notion of referential

Now that we have defined the notion of Europeanization, it is relevant to add another component, which is really helpful to analyze our object of study. In order to understand the nature of Scottish cultural heritage policies and to narrow down a bit further the operationalization of our project, the notion of “referential” needs to be taken into consideration. Henri Oberdorff’s statement on this notion is the perfect starting point. This author states that

Il existe donc bien un référentiel européen distinct du référentiel national qui influence les politiques publiques nationales. Il s’agit de savoir quelle est la nature de ce référentiel pour saisir l’étendue et la profondeur de l’influence de l’UE sur les politiques publiques nationales (Oberdorff, 2008, p. 22).

Perhaps this notion of referential is not clear. Actually, Pierre Muller’s thoughts (2000) might be a good reference to get a better understanding of this notion. Indeed, for this author, who studies public policies in light of the cognitive approach, the notion of “referential” is like “*des cadres d’interprétation du monde*” (p. 189). The role of public policies is to build these frameworks in order to give a sense to the social order. In other words, we understand here that, for Muller (2000), the cognitive approach of public policies is like “*une sociologie politique de l’action publique*” (p. 190). However, it is important to note that a point of junction should be established between actors’ strategies (the local dimension) and the global dimension (p. 190) if we want to analyze properly public policies and, by extension, understand the referential component.

Muller (2000, p. 193-194) insists on the idea that there is an important distinction to make between the notion of referential and the one of paradigm primarily associated to the work of Thomas Kuhn. If it is true that both notions involve “*des phases normales*” (the

interpretative framework is commonly accepted) and “*des phases de crise*” (there is a rupture between the reality and the interpretative framework), it remains that there is a big difference between both notions regarding their invalidation. Indeed, as Muller mentions “*alors qu’un paradigme se verra invalidé, in fine, à travers l’épreuve de la vérification expérimentale, il n’en est évidemment pas de même pour ce qui concerne l’invalidation d’un référentiel qui reposera sur une transformation des croyances des acteurs concernés*” (p. 194). In other words, it is a bit complicated to put into question the notion of referential because of the fact that actors’ beliefs are involved in the process.

The complexity of the process is accentuated when we know that Muller (2000) firmly believes in the necessity to take into consideration the “global” in the process. When there is a rupture in the “*rapport global-sectoriel*” - also called RGS in French - (p. 196), it means that the referential of a public policy must adapt itself to the new reality. If not, actors would not be able to give a sense to their actions and to act in accordance with a coherent framework. By extension, Muller (2000) points out that actors have a role to play in the definition and redefinition of these interpretative frameworks (p. 199). More precisely, Muller states in one of his articles written in 1985 that

Les médiateurs sont les agents qui élaborent le référentiel normatif des politiques publiques. En réalité cette fonction est double car elle consiste à décoder le RGS, c’est-à-dire le rendre intelligible aux acteurs en présence à travers l’élaboration une philosophie de l’action ; à re-coder ce RGS en des termes susceptibles d’agir sur le réel, c’est-à-dire en normes et en critères d’intervention politiques (p. 175).

Nevertheless, because the global is no longer within the Nation-State, it implies that the redefinition of interpretative frameworks might be a difficult process for actors (p. 204-205). Previously, it was question of the European Union, but, here, it is important to point out that this political entity is at the front row of the redefinition of the “*rapport global-sectoriel*”.

2.3. Sectoral Policies

In the two previous sections, the notions of Europeanization and referential were defined in order to conceptualize our research project. For narrowing down a bit further our project, it is interesting to insist more on “sectoral policies”. We mentioned that there is a dialogue between the “global” and the “sectoral” level. This dialogue frames the referential. This said, it is important to understand the notion of “sectoral policies”. As mentioned by Muller (1985), sectors are like “*des entités abstraites parce qu’ils ne regroupent par construction qu’une dimension de l’activité des individus*” (p. 167). As a result, sectors are inseparable from the State. In other words, sectors do not have the capacity to exist by themselves. Public policies are the extension of the State in order to introduce coherence in the society (p. 168-169). Cultural policies are one among others of the sectoral policies.

Of course, it is relevant to ask how we can analyze sectoral policies? Muller (1985) gives three parameters to guide us in the process (p. 170-182). First, it is essential to understand how the normative referential is built. Muller describes the normative referential of a politics as “*la représentation que l’on se fait du secteur concerné, ainsi que de sa place et de son rôle dans la société*” (p. 170). In order to fully circumscribe the normative referential of a politics, the global referential (the social image of the global), the sectoral referential (the social image of a specific sector) as well as the conditions under which the two referentials interact between each other have to be identified. Second, the work implies to identify the mediators or the actors who modify the referential in order to elaborate new public policies. By extension, it is important to determine the concepts or frameworks used to “build” this new referential. Third, it is the time to analyze the relations between the global and the sectoral referentials. Muller (1985) clarifies this last step by saying that

Le RGS est en effet la variable clef de toute analyse du changement des politiques, et

cela pour deux raisons : d'abord, parce que ce sont les changements dans le rapport global/sectoriel qui provoquent la mise en place de nouvelles interventions politiques destinées à gérer les tensions qui en résultent ; mais aussi parce que ces changements sont la conséquence de intervention publique, puisque celle-ci a principalement pour objet l'ajustement de la reproduction sectorielle au regard de la reproduction sociétale (p. 180).

With this quotation, we understand that there is a bidirectional relationship between public policies and the “*rapport global-sectoriel*”. In other words, public policies and the RGS can be both the independent or the dependent variables in the dynamic of changes (p. 181). However, it is not really important to know the direction where changes come from according to Muller (p. 181).

2.4. Europeanization or Convergence?

Our thesis addresses the issue of Europeanization, but the line is thin between the notions of “Europeanization” and “convergence”. Effectively, Andrew Jordan states that scholars of the EU do not show a great excitement regarding policy convergence. Actually, this field of research is mostly limited to American scholars. Perhaps this situation can be explained by the fact that policy convergence is a “rather heterogeneous research field” (Jordan, 2005, p. 945). Christoph Knill defines policy convergence as

... any increase in the similarity between one or more characteristics of a certain policy (e.g. policy objectives, policy instruments, policy settings) across a given set of political jurisdictions (supranational, institutions, states, regions, local authorities) over a given period of time. Policy convergence thus describes the end result of a process of policy change over time towards some common point, regardless of the causal processes (Knill, 2005, p. 768).

Following the reading of this definition, we understand why the line is thin between Europeanization and convergence. In other words, Europeanization is a form of convergence in some ways: Europeanization takes place when there is one or more dimensions of EU policies that spread across states, regions or local authorities. How can we take position regarding these two concepts? Even if our thesis directly addresses the issue of

Europeanization, the concept of convergence is relevant for anyone who wants to be careful in his/her final remarks.

In this section, we defined the notion of Europeanization, referential, sectoral policies as well as policy convergence. Thanks to this discussion, we got all the theoretical tools to conceptual our object of study and to qualify our discourse. The next section concerns the methodological dimension of our project.

2.5. Methodology and Sources

The research design, which is defined by Robert Yin (1994) as the “logic that links the data to be collected to the initial questions of a study” (Yin, 1994, p. 19), is essential in order to guarantee the relevance of research projects. When we know that Valérie Janesick (2000) compares the research design to a choreography, we fully understand the difficulty to define it. Indeed, for this author, a good choreography is a middle point between a minuet (rigid dance) and improvisation (flexible dance). As the choreography, the research design is involved in the same kind of situation. For proving her assertion, Janesick shows that both the choreographer and the researcher follow the same steps.

2.5.1. Types of research

As everybody knows, there are two main types of research (qualitative and quantitative) and our research project follows the qualitative approach. A researcher chooses the qualitative path when he wants to seize a phenomenon in its specificity through the eyes of individuals in order to get thorough descriptions (Denzin and Lincoln, 1998). Within the qualitative dimension, several strategies of inquiry are possible (surveys, experiments, archival analysis or historical analysis). The one on which we want to focus on is the case study strategy. We may ask how a researcher decides to choose the case study strategy. Actually, Robert Yin (1994) mentions that the decision is related to three dimensions, which

are the way that the research question is formulated, the degree of control the researcher has in the process as well as the character of the object of study (contemporary vs historical phenomenon). When a research project tries to understand the “how” and “why”, the researcher is dependant of the process and the object of study focuses on contemporary matter, the case study strategy is the best option. Because we wanted to study if Europeanization has an impact on the way that Scottish cultural heritage policies are formulated since devolution, the case study strategy makes sense especially when we know that we were looking for “the particular more than the ordinary” (Stake, 1998, p. 125).

2.5.2. Our research design

Yin (1994) insists on the idea that the research design is composed of five components, which are the research question, the propositions, the case selection and the units of analysis, the logic linking data as well as criteria for giving sense to our findings. We would like to insist in particular on the third component. However, before doing so, we want to highlight the fact that the theoretical background is essential in the process. Effectively, in case study, the theory, as an anchor point, is a distinctive feature comparing to other research strategies. Theory gives the opportunity not only to define properly our concepts and facilitate the collecting of data, but also to make possible generalizations at the end of the research process (Yin, 1994). This is the reason why our conceptual framework precedes this current section.

In order to follow Yin’s logic, we present here our research question and our hypotheses at first. In our project, we tried to answer the following question: to what extent does Europeanization have an impact on Scottish policy-making regarding the way that cultural heritage policies are formulated since devolution? As mentioned by Radaelli, “*les différents domaines de politiques publiques montrent divers degrés d’eupéanisation*” –

Henri Oberdorff (2008) shares Radaelli's point of view - and, in the case of cultural policy, the degree of Europeanization is considered as low (Radaelli, 2010, p. 255). This is the reason why it was particularly interesting to study our object of study. Despite Radaelli's assertion, our first hypothesis was that Europeanization affects Scottish cultural heritage policies since 1999. Here, it is appropriate to refer to the previous section where it was question of the notion of referential. Thanks to this notion, we understood that our first task was to identify the forms under which this referential can be perceived. According to Oberdorff (2008), these forms are multiple: public policies' objectives, public policies' strategies, theoretical tools used by public policies, etc. Once it was done, it was possible to observe Scottish cultural heritage policies in light of these criteria. Because the notion of cultural heritage is clearly linked with the notion of identity, our second hypothesis was that the Scottish cultural heritage field has the power to stimulate the expression of a Scottish identity.

Regarding the case selection and units of analysis, Yin (1994) states that there are two types of design, which are single-case design and multiple-case design. For each type of design, it is possible to choose between the holistic or the embedded option. In other words, a researcher can decide to study just one (holistic) or several units of analysis (embedded). Stake (1998) gives an interesting precision regarding the two types of design mentioned before when he says that a researcher can have an intrinsic or instrumental interest in cases selected. No matter the option chosen by the researcher or the reason of his interest, one thing is sure for Stake (1998): a case study must be viewed as a "system" because of the fact that each part is interrelated with other parts. However, it is important to insist on the idea that "certain features are within the system, within the boundaries of the case, and other

features outside” (Stake, 1998, p. 120). This reality implies that it is sometimes hard for the researcher to know exactly where he should end his analysis.

For our part, we say “single-case design” because our attention focused on one case, which was the Scottish cultural heritage policy. We observed three institutions, which are the Scottish Executive or Government – it is important to make a distinction between the Scottish Executive (1999-2007) and the Scottish Government (2007 onwards) (Cairney, 2011) - the Museums Galleries Scotland and, finally, the Scottish National Museums. The Museums Galleries Scotland “is the National Development Body for the museum sector in Scotland” (Museums Galleries Scotland’s Website). Those are the main institutions devoted to the development of a heritage policy.

Because we wanted to understand the impact of Europeanization in Scottish cultural heritage policies, it seemed relevant to observe these institutions. Here, it is important to insist on the fact that the Scottish National Museums is not a member of the Museums Galleries Scotland. As a result, the Scottish National Museums, which refers to five museums - the National Museum of Scotland (Edinburgh), the National War Museum (Edinburgh Castle), the National Museum of Flight (East Fortune Airfield, East Lothian), the National Museum of Rural Life (Wester Kitchside, East Kilbride) and the National Museums Collection Centre (Granton, Edinburgh), represents the third institution that we studied. It is important to note that museums, even in their own projects, take part in the management of the heritage field as the government or the national institutions. In the Scottish case, the specific model that makes a distinction between the national museums and the other museums is a particularity that comes from the British cultural policy.

In order to judge the relevance of our research design, Yin (1994) states four criteria to which the researcher must refer throughout the research process, which are construct

validity, internal validity, external validity and reliability. Here, we understand that those criteria are as important as the five components of the research design. We would like to add that we kept in mind the word “flexibility” throughout the process. In other words, if some problems would happen with the initial research design, we had to be ready to make the right modifications as soon as possible.

2.5.3. Data collection

For Stake, “case study is defined by interest in an individual case, not by the methods of inquiry used” (Stake, 1998, p. 119). We fully understand the second part of his quotation when we refer to Denzin and Lincoln’s (1998) expression “researcher as *bricoleur* and quilt maker” (Denzin and Lincoln’s, 1998, p. 5). For these authors, there are different types of *bricoleur*. However, generally speaking, this expression means that the qualitative researcher is forced to use several methods in his work. Of course, the fact that each case study is part of a complex context where “interactivity” (Stake, 1998, p. 131) is the key word implies that the combination of several methods is a way to seize a part of this complexity.

When Stake as well as Denzin and Lincoln talk about the triangulation strategy, they refer in some ways to this necessity to combine several methods. However, even if this section is not directly concerned about the analysis, it is important to mention that triangulation does not only concern methodology; triangulation may also refer to the use of several data sources as well as theoretical perspectives. For her part, Janesick rather prefers to use the term “crystallization” (Janesick, 2000, p. 391).

Of course, it is legitimate to ask which options are possible for researchers. This is a brief overview: interviews (Fontana and Frey, 2000; Yin, 1994), observations (Tedlock, 2008; Yin, 1994; Angrosino and Mays de Pérez, 2000), documentary and archival research

(Yin, 1994; Holder, 2000), focus groups (Madriz, 2000) and so on. We chose the documentary research option. Here is a quick overview of our 42 primary sources:

Institutions	Number of Sources	Types of Sources
Scottish Government (including the Scottish Executive and the Scottish Government)	19	Literature Reviews Audits Drafts Consultation or Progress Reports Policy Statements Action, Performance or Evaluation Frameworks Programmes or Strategic Plans Online Statements
National Museums Scotland	13	Annual Reviews Frameworks Strategic Plans
Museums Galleries Scotland	6	Audits Consultation Reports Delivery Plans Reports
European Commission ¹	4	Reports Policy Statements
		Total of Sources: 42

Previously, we mentioned that our research project focuses on three areas. For the first institution, which is the Scottish Government, several sources are available such as documents that are related to the national cultural strategy (i.e. consultation reports, drafts, the national cultural strategy itself and progress reports) and official documents that talk about cultural heritage (i.e. national performance framework, the Government's Program for Scotland, online statements). Regarding the National Museums Scotland, it was observed through the annual reviews, strategic plans and international framework. Finally, Museums Galleries Scotland is the last institution included in our project; we analyzed consultation reports and official documents such as audit and delivery plan. Yin (1994) insists on three

¹ Regarding the European Commission's documents, they were used in chapter 3 in order to circumscribe the global referential. As a result, they do not count in the sources used to study the Scottish cultural heritage policies.

principles of data collection, which are using several sources of evidences, building a database as well as establishing a chain of evidences. We followed these three principles in our research project.

2.5.4 Limitations

We met two major limitations when we did research for this thesis. In order to clarify our methodology, it is important to mention these limitations:

- **Clarity of the Scottish Government's Website:** Most of our primary sources were found in the Scottish Government's Website. Despite the fact that a searching engine is available, it remained difficult to find all the publications on cultural policies. Indeed, depending on the keywords used, several documents were added to our list each time that we consulted it.
- **Availability of Recent Documents:** The Scottish Government has a policy to make public all its official documents. In other words, all its documents are put online at some point. However, the delay of treatment is quite long. As a result, it becomes difficult to get access to documents recently published by the Scottish Government compared to the Scottish Executive. This is the reason why the number of documents published by the Scottish Executive was higher than the ones published by the Scottish Government in our corpus.

2.6. The Last Word

To conclude, in our research project, we tried to understand the impact of Europeanization in the field of cultural heritage for a minority society like Scotland since devolution. The notion of identity was at the centre of our analysis. In order to realize this project, we focused our attention on three institutions, which were the Scottish Executive and the Scottish Government, the Museums Galleries Scotland and, finally, the Scottish National

Museums. This chapter drew the conceptual and methodological frameworks required for our research project.

Chapter 3: The Referential or How to Use this Concept in Our Analysis

The aim of this chapter is to start the data analysis by operationalizing the notion of “referential” for our project. For doing so, we analyzed secondary documents as well as public documents in order to identify cross-cutting issues in European policies. The identification of these issues is essential because they guide or influence the process of Europeanization. By extension, the relevance of the analysis of the Scottish public documents is correlated with the ability to properly circumscribe these issues. In other words, for determining the extent where Europeanization has an impact on Scottish cultural heritage policy-making since devolution, it is essential to take into consideration the bigger picture in order to understand the framework from which the local or sectoral dimension refers to.

Bernhard Peters and al. (2005, p. 142) state that the Europeanization of public discourse can happen in several ways. There is the “Europeanization of communication flows”, but also the “Europeanization of public identities” as well as the “Europeanization of contents” (Peters and al., 2005, p. 142). For our project, we were particularly interested by the “Europeanization of contents”:

This dimension includes all ways in which the topics addressed in public discourse, and the manner in which they are discussed, can become more European (or more transnational in other ways). Indicators for a Europeanization of contents would be growing numbers of references to the EU as such and to EU institutions and policies, but also to the affairs of other EU member states, as well as an increasing similarity of public agendas and frames of reference within the public spheres of EU countries. (Peters and al., 2005, p. 142)

In terms of global referential, our goal was not to count the references to the EU, but rather to identify some theoretical tools, patterns, objectives or strategies used by EU public policies. This said, our aim referred to the last part of the previous quotation because we wanted to identify the “public agendas and frames of reference” that prevail in the EU when

it comes the time to talk about public policies.

A quick overview of the literature gave us the possibility to identify six dimensions that frame the EU “public agendas and frames of reference”: the tendency to justify cultural policies by its economic or social benefits, the democratisation of culture, the importance given to regions’ cultural development, the policy process, which is characterized by a three-step decision making-process (consultation, codecision and cooperation), the emphasis placed on the development of partnerships and the ambivalence of the EU identity.

3.1. The economic and social justifications of public policies

The tendency to link public policies to economic justification is a predominant dimension since the 1970s and the EU is also under similar influences. Indeed, in opposition to state intervention in the path of an economic crisis, the 1970s saw the “revival of doctrines of the free market” (McGuigan, 2005, p. 230). The keywords of this phenomenon are free trade, privatization as well as deregulation. For David Osborne and Ted Gaebler (1992, p. 19-20 cited by McGuigan 2005, p. 237), the notions of competition and “customer choice” as well as the importance of “earning money” can be added to this list. The neoliberal period continued in the 1980s and reached “a new impetus and intensification” in the 1990s (Rothschild, 2009, p. 215). It is important to insist on the idea that the EU embodies the neoliberal system.

The cultural dimension is not spared by this neoliberal trend. Of course, we may ask what the impacts of neoliberalism are on cultural policies. McGuigan insists on the idea that neoliberalism puts into question the public investment in culture. The State as the main actor of subsidies is no longer a certainty. Tyler Cowen even believes that the role of government in culture should be one of a “customer” (Cowen, 1998, p. 235). This idea of “customer” follows the logic of the “new public management” (Cowen, 1998, p. 236), which insists on

the necessity to manage public institutions as banks. Here, we understand that the instrumental dimension of culture is prioritized over the intrinsic one (Orr, 2008). The instrumental dimension refers to the fact that the value of culture is correlated with its success, its results.

This view has been prioritized in many European countries in the recent years and, especially with the European Capital of Culture since the selection of Glasgow in 1990. In other words, this selection meant that “no longer was it merely about honouring what already existed; it had become about something new, about regeneration” (McGuigan, 2005, p. 237). Thanks to the designation of Glasgow as the European Capital of Culture in 1990, the government put in action a revitalization plan for the city: the success of the 1990’s European Capital of Culture is measured by the degree of regeneration of Glasgow (Orr, 2008, p. 311). McGuigan states that “a distinctive yet seldom mentioned feature of neoliberal development is to translate issues of social policy into question of cultural policy. And in turn cultural policy ceases to be specifically about culture at all” (McGuigan, 2005, p. 238). The case of the European Capital of Culture since the designation of Glasgow in 1990 is a good example for illustrating this assertion.

For her part Cécile Doustaly agrees with McGuigan in some ways when she talks about the “*politisation des politiques culturelles*” in Europe (Doustaly, 2004, p. X). According to this author, “*la culture est devenue ‘une affaire d’État’*” (Doustaly, 2004, p. 109) because of budgetary considerations. The best example comes with the brand new Creative Europe programme (approved by the European Parliament and the Council of Europe in December 2013). Indeed, this cultural programme is justified by its economic and social impacts: “Europe needs to invest more in its cultural and creative sectors because they significantly contribute to economic growth, employment, innovation and social cohesion”

(see Creative Europe's Website).

3.2. The democratization of culture or cultural democracy?

In the first chapter, it was question of the different models that characterize the cultural field over the last decades. We said that, between 1950 and 1980, the democratization of culture was replaced by cultural democracy. These days, the cultural field is challenged by several players such as the private sector, local governments and international organizations (Saint-Pierre and Gattinger, 2010). However, it is important to insist on the idea that the “democratization of culture” and the notion of “cultural democracy” are still a topical subject for the EU (Doustaly, 2004, p. 116).

How can we distinguish “the democratization of culture” from the “cultural democracy”? Gattinger states that the democratization of culture, which places an emphasis on the diffusion of information from the centre to the periphery, “*met l’accent sur la ‘valeur civilisatrice des arts’ et accorde la priorité à l’accès du grand public aux formes principalement européennes de haute culture*” (Gattinger, 2011, p. 3). For its part, the “cultural democracy” challenges this elitist conception in order to give space to cultural expressions and practices that go beyond the high culture (Gattinger, 2011, p. 3; Santerre, 2000, p. 48). Indeed, the cultural democracy focuses on discussions between the different levels of culture and believes in the operationalization of the creative power of a given society where “the consumer plays a more active role” (Evrard, 1997, p. 171). Through the notion of cultural democracy, we also find an important dimension of the European referential, which is the support to cultural diversity (Doustaly, 2004, p. 116). By extension, it is important to note that the notion of cultural democracy is at the middle of the European Agenda for Culture, a cultural initiative promoted by the European Commission since 2007. Indeed, the aim of this programme is to insist on cooperation, cultural diversity and dialogue

as well as the idea that culture must be used “as a catalyst for creativity and innovation” (see European Agenda for Culture’s section on the European Commission’s website).

3.3. The cultural development of regions

The importance given to regions’ cultural development is another important feature to the EU. Previously, we discussed the fact that there is a convergence between the cultural field and the economic justification. Olivier Charnoz states that this economic discourse implies that a bigger importance is given to the regional development (Charnoz, 1999, p. 92) and especially on regional development projects that focus on exchanges or dialogues between different cultural spaces (Doustaly, 2004, p. 116). Doustaly adds a nuance to Charnoz’s assertion because she says that, even if the regional and local institutions are given increasingly more responsibilities, it remains that large institutions maintain a privileged position (Doustaly, 2004, p. 107-110). So there is always a swinging between centralization and decentralization in the EU (Bugeaud, 2010-2011).

If we want to have a representative picture of the situation, it is essential to take into consideration two other aspects. First, when we know that the Maastricht Treaty (1992) promoted a “common culture” (Evans and Ford, 1999, p. 55) in Europe while respecting diversity, we fully understand the tensions between the two poles. Second, the complexity of this situation is enhanced by the fact that a mixed-funding regime has been applied in Europe since the 1970s. Indeed, whereas several structural funds have supported regional initiatives, other initiatives have rather focused on ‘European’ projects (Evans and Ford, 1999). For instance, Interreg, a programme initiated in 1990 and now a part of FEDER, falls into the second category. This programme’s goal is to place an emphasis on cooperation (cross-border, transnational and interregional) in order to promote a development in harmony with the rest of the European territory. So, despite the fact that we note the emergence of regional

identities, we should admit that this progression has not been realized according to a linear path.

3.4. The EU policy process and the decision-making process

As any other political entities in the democratic world, the policy cycle stages in the EU can be divided in five main steps, which are the definition of the agenda setting, the shaping of public policies, the process of taking decisions regarding those policies, the implementation of policies and, finally, the evaluation of public policies' efficiency (Versluis, Van Keulen and Stephenson, 2011, p. 238). However, it is important to insist on the fact that

A key feature of the EU policy process is its ability to evolve by incremental, step-by-step, gradual shifts through the often highly technical nature of regulatory policy making. It can be complex, often unpredictable, often highly emotional, but rarely is there sudden rupture. Policy-making is largely about maintaining an acceptable and workable status quo. In most policy areas, the process is all about fine-tuning or 'tweaking' what has already been in place for several years. (Versluis, Van Keulen and Stephenson, 2011, p. 230-231).

This step-by-step process means that there are rarely surprises regarding the EU policy process. In other words, they build on what is already in place. This process is the first dimension discussed in Chapter 9.

Despite the fact that the five steps are important, this thesis addresses only two of them. A whole section focuses on the evaluation of public policies, which is the last step in the process. Versluis, Van Keulen and Stephenson insist on the idea that "evaluation is fundamental to the EU, given the need for accountability [...] and measurement of performance" (Versluis, Van Keulen and Stephenson, 2011, p. 207). The main aim of this evaluation process is to learn something from the successes and failures in order to improve the performances regarding the coming initiative.

3.4.1. The Decision-Making Process

Previously, we mentioned that the third step in the policy cycle stages in the EU is the process of taking decisions regarding public policies. This is the second step discussed in chapter 9. Oberdorff (2008, p. 27) mentions that this step is characterized by a three-step decision making-process (consultation, codecision – or if we prefer collegiality - and cooperation). However, in light of the *European Governance: A White Paper* (2001), we understand that there are more aspects to take into consideration in order to fully circumscribe the European governance. Of course, the notions of “consultation”, “codecision” and “cooperation” (or “partnership”) can be found everywhere in the *White Paper*.

If we look a bit further, we see that the *White Paper* mentions other keywords such as the one of “dialogues”. Indeed, the idea is to place an emphasis on dialogues between different levels of government and civil society in the process of policy-making (*White Paper*, 2001, p. 4-5; 14). Here, we must understand that it is important for the EU to build a communication channel with the civil society in order to encourage everybody to get involved in the policy-making process. In that way, the EU sets up the conditions that allow for a real participation of all actors.

By extension, it is important to mention that the notion of “participation” is part of the five principles enumerate in the *White Paper* to establish “good governance” (*White Paper*, 2001, p. 10). The establishment of “good governance” is also correlated with “openness” (a good communication strategy must be developed in order to give the possibility to the public to be concerned about the EU activities), “accountability”, “effectiveness” (this principle implies, among others, to evaluate the past experiences as well as the anticipated results in order to get a better understanding of what must be done in terms

of public policies) as well as “coherence” (this principle involves the necessity to determine the long-term objectives) (*White Paper*, 2001, p. 10; 13; 28).

Until so far, we have not insisted on the notion of “cooperation” despite the fact that we specified its mention throughout the *White Paper*. If we really want to understand its importance, it is relevant to refer to Oberdorff’s explanations. He states that “*Le principe de ‘loyauté communautaire’, peu éloigné de la loyauté fédérale pratiquée dans les États fédéraux, découle actuellement directement de l’article 10 (TCE). Il impose aux États de ne pas entraver l’effet du droit communautaire et de prendre toutes les mesures nécessaires à son application*” (Oberdorff, 2004, p. 18). The States’ collaboration can be understood by the fact that the EU previously succeeded in identifying the community’s common interest (Oberdorff, 2004, p. 23). In some ways, the EU is constantly swinging between community compromise and negotiation (Oberdorff, 2004, p. 27).

3.5. The emphasis placed on the development of partnerships

Here, we want to focus more on the collaborative dimension of the EU at large. For Michael W. Bauer, when it is question of the EU, we have to take into consideration the “partnership principle”, which has a big importance in the EU because “it organizes actor relationships across administrative arena in EU policy-making” (Bauer, 2002, p. 769). This principle came from the 1988 reform of the structural funds. It was defined at first as collaborations between the Commission, a Member State and a specific authority depending on the project (it might be national, regional or local). Over the years, interest groups have been invited to take part in those collaborations (Bauer, 2002, p. 772-773). We just have to look over the Horizon 2020 project to understand that keywords such as “partnerships” or “collaboration” are still commonly used in the EU projects (see the Horizon 2020 project’s website).

It is important to note that more and more European partnerships have a transnational or intercultural dimension. If we remember, in the first chapter, we introduced Nagel, an author who thinks that it is more appropriate to frame the reality as a “Europe ‘with’ and not ‘of’, the regions” (Nagel, 2004, p. 60). In order to illustrate this assertion, we referred in that chapter to what we called “euroregions”, these cross-border initiatives that are conducted by supra-national and national entities in Europe. The “Four Motors” region, which designated the interregional partnership between four prosperous regions (Stuttgart, Barcelona, Lyon and Milan), is a good example of this kind of entity (Russell Martin, 2011, p. 42). The transnational or intercultural collaborations are also really present in the cultural field as mentioned before when it was a question of the regions’ cultural development. Interreg programs, even if they were not designed for the cultural field at first, support this assertion. Indeed, Interreg programs, which are defined as “*(des) Programmes d’Initiative Communautaires*” (Guerin, 2008, p. 235), focus on the “*production patrimoniale transfrontalière*” (Guerin, 2008, p. 231) in order to build a cultural community that lives in harmony.

3.6. The ambivalence on the notion of the EU identity

In order to understand the struggle faced by the EU regarding the notion of identity, we just have to refer to the article 151 of the Amsterdam Treaty (or Article 128/Maastricht Treaty), an article that we have already stated in the first chapter. The first point of this article states that “The Community shall contribute to the flowering of the cultures of the Member States, while respecting their national and regional diversity and at the same time bringing the common cultural heritage to the fore” (The Amsterdam Treaty, article 151). So, there is a clear tension between two identity discourses according to Olivier Charnoz. The first discourse focuses on the region: the challenges turn around the notion of

decentralization, affirmation and “subsidiary”. The other discourse focuses on the Union and the importance of building a commune entity in the name of integration (Charnoz, 1999, p. 93).

For achieving this dual goal, the EU places an emphasis on the same tools. It encourages the dissemination of the culture of the peoples of Europe, works for the safeguarding of the cultural heritage, focuses on cultural exchanges and encourages creativity in all its forms (see Amsterdam Treaty, article 151). For Charnoz, the tension between the discourse on the EU common identity and the discourse on cultural diversity *“reflète à sa façon celle qui existe, au sein même du référentiel global de l’Union, entre la ‘norme de subsidiarité’ et la ‘norme de communauté politique’”* (Charnoz, 1999, p. 179).

3.7. The global referential

Our goal in this chapter was to define the notion of “global referential” in light of the European Union. We pointed out six aspects that define the EU framework, which are the tendency to justify cultural policies by economic and social considerations, the importance given to the democratization of culture, the focus on the regional development, the policy process marked by a three-step decision making process, the emphasis placed on collaborative projects and the tensions related to the EU identity.

It is important to insist on the idea that these six dimensions were the variables on which we focused for our data analysis. However, throughout the analysis, we kept in mind the notion of “convergence”, which underlies that what is called “Europeanization” may actually be a case of “convergence”. This ongoing reminder was important because it gave us the possibility to not jump to conclusions too quickly.

Chapter 4: The economic and social justifications of heritage policies

In the previous chapter, we pointed out the fact that the instrumental dimension of culture is now prioritized over the intrinsic one in the European Union. The European Capital of Culture since the selection of Glasgow in 1990 and the new Creative Europe programme are good examples of the victory of the instrumental dimension in European public policies. In order to justify investments in culture, governments must prove at first that there is a direct link between investments in culture and tangible results. In order to determine if this dimension is part of the Scottish cultural heritage policies since devolution, we analyzed several documents published by the Scottish Executive and Government, the Museums Galleries Scotland (MGS) and the National Museums Scotland (NMS).

4.1. The Scotland's position regarding the instrumental dimension of culture

An important change happened in the allocation of funds to Scotland after 1999. Indeed, as mentioned by Michael Keating, "The UK system of devolved public finance is unique in combining tight central control over expenditure totals, with total freedom of allocation within the assigned budget" (Keating, 2010, p. 188). This quotation means that the UK has absolutely no control on the allocated funds once it is transferred to Scotland. Scotland decides to manage these funds according to its own budgetary procedures (Keating, 2010, p. 189). Because cultural affairs have become a domain managed by Scotland after devolution, it implies that the Scottish government can now decide how much money it spends in culture and, by extension, which place it wants to attribute to culture in the society. This new responsibility is not so easy to manage when we know that Scotland's leitmotiv after devolution is doing things differently to the UK (Keating, 2010, p. 29). We can suppose

that this leitmotiv can be explained by Scotland's will to build a strong identity clearly distinct from the UK (Hamilton & Scullion, 2002, p. 12).

When we read the various documents published by the Scottish Executive and Government, the Museums Galleries Scotland (MGS) and the National Museums Scotland (NMS), we clearly saw the Scotland's will to make culture a priority in their policies. However, this will comes with the emphasis placed on the importance of showing the economic and social benefits of culture in society. In *A Partnership for a Better Scotland*, we can read that "culture and the arts have a key role in today's diverse Scotland" (*A Partnership for a Better Scotland*, May, 2003, p. 42) and, after, that "culture and the arts are integral to healthy communities and to developing self-confident individuals" (p. 42). There is a direct link between culture and its instrumental dimension here. Ten years later, in *Empowering Scotland – The Government's Programme for Scotland 2013-2014*, the government follows the same track:

The Scottish Government believes that culture and heritage are fundamental to our quality of life. They are central to shaping our sense of place and making our communities attractive places to live, work, invest and visit. Culture and heritage are powerful forces for renewal and regeneration. They underpin our journey towards better health, individual well-being, strong communities and enriched lives (*Empowering Scotland – The Government's Programme for Scotland 2013-2014*, p. 78).

In light of this quotation, it is clear that, no matters that we are talking about the Scottish Executive or the Scottish Government, they share the same point of view regarding the importance of culture and heritage in terms of social and economic impacts.

This instrumental character is enforced in the document entitled *A Literature Review of the Evidence Base for Culture, the Arts and Sport Policy* (Scottish Executive, February 2004). This review ordered by the Scottish Executive presents an overview of national and international research evidence regarding the social and economic benefits of culture.

Among the social impacts, the review states that participation in cultural activities has benefits on personal and community development by gaining new knowledge and self-confidence, extending the social network and improving the quality of life. Cultural participation also brings benefits in terms of social justice and health. Indeed, not only cultural participation reduces the proportion of offending behaviors, but it also improves mental and physical health by reducing stress or anxiety. Regarding the economic benefits associated to cultural activities, the review mentions the fact that culture improves the employment rates, brings tourists and regenerates local communities (*A Literature Review*, February 2004, p. 1-6). If we continue reading this document, we fully grasp the aim of the Scottish government with this literature review. Finding “robust evidence” of the benefits of culture “is particularly important in light of further investment to be made in these areas, ensuring that good value for money is obtained in supporting the government’s key objectives” (*A Literature Review*, February 2004, p. 7).

Until so far, we have presented the Scottish government’s aim to attribute a privileged place to culture in society and the positive impacts associated to culture. However, there is an interesting dimension in Scottish initiative that must be brought to lights, which is the fact that the national strategy tries to link cultural objectives to other policy areas such as education, economic development, business, major events or tourism (*Scotland’s National Cultural Strategy – Creating our Future... Minding our Past*, August 2000; *Cultural Policy Statement*, April 2004; “*Our Next Major Enterprise...*” – *Final Report of the Cultural Commission*, June 2005; *Cross-Portfolio Cultural Initiatives for 2006*; *Scottish Executive Response on the Cultural Review*, January 2006; *Culture Delivers*, 2008). The reason for this is simple: the government firmly believes that cultural activity can help to meet the aims of all its departments (“*Our Next Major Enterprise...*” – *Final Report of the Cultural*

Commission, June 2005, p. 5). In the Regeneration Policy Statement, the National Transport Strategy, the National Planning Framework and the Strategy for a Scotland with an Ageing Population, we can find several examples where the cultural dimension has been integrated to several strategies (*Cross-Portfolio Cultural Initiatives for 2006*, p. 2).

4.2. Do we find the instrumental dimension in museum policies?

In the previous section, we presented where Scotland stands regarding the social and economic benefits of cultural participation at large. It is now the time to focus on museum policies in order to determine if the same kind of link is made between social and economic benefits and cultural participation.

In *An Action Framework for Museums – Consultation and Response* (August 2003), the social and economic contribution of museums is clearly recognized by the Scottish Executive. Indeed, it is mentioned that museums have an important impact on community identity, education, social justice, equality, economic growth and sustainability (*An Action Framework for Museums – Consultation and Response*, August 2003, p. 5-6). Of course, it is legitimate to ask how this impact can be described. In order to give a strong overview of this contribution, it is essential to make a distinction between the social and the economic dimension.

4.2.1. The Social Dimension

The social impact of museums can be related to two major dimensions, which are the fact that museums are considered as an important resource for “educating, inspiring and nurturing talent” (*Report by the Museums Think Tank – Scotland’s Museums & Galleries*, December 2010, p. 7) and are a variable that influence communities’ vitality.

Regarding the first dimension, there is a positive correlation between museums and the deployment of a nation’s talent. In other words, museums are like a catalyst for the

building of the Scottish identity. Indeed, as cited in the *Report by the Museums Think Tank – Scotland’s Museums & Galleries*, “museums are active centres for promoting learning across many disciplines, across all ages, and across diverse communities, thereby contributing significantly to social inclusion” (*Report by the Museums Think Tank – Scotland’s Museums & Galleries*, December 2010, p. 7). This idea of social inclusion underlies that individuals become part of a “whole” (Mason 2010, p. 857) or, if we prefer, develop a sense of belonging to the Scottish society to the point of sharing its identity. By extension, thanks to museums, it is possible to catalyze the potential and the creativity of the nation. A good example to illustrate this assertion is with the project “Creating the Past” (2002) initiated by the National Museums of Scotland. This project, which was part of their Social Justice Action Plan, wanted to encourage young people who usually stand away from museums to take part in cultural activities (*A Literature Review*, February 2004, p. 34). With their life-long learning program, museums are also a source of opportunities for adults and seniors (*Report by the Museums Think Tank – Scotland’s Museums & Galleries*, December 2010, p. 8).

Another social impact associated with museums is the idea that these institutions are like focal points around which communities are prospering. Museums bring a lot to communities: “Museums and galleries in Scotland generate community-focused projects contributing to local pride, a sense of empowerment and greater commitment to the local area. Outreach projects often engage with prisons, hospitals and ethnic minorities, helping to promote social engagement and confidence” (*Report by the Museums Think Tank – Scotland’s Museums & Galleries*, December 2010, p. 8). It is interesting to note that the ideas of “local pride”, a “sense of empowerment” and “greater commitment to the local area” are closely related to Miller and Ali’s dimensions of national identity. Indeed, if we

remember, these authors state that the national identity expresses itself through a sense of pride, patriotism or a proof of attachment. More than that, museums enhance the cultural environment and create a space where dialogue is welcome. Of course, volunteering is a precious tool through which bridges are built between people, generations and communities (*Scottish Budget Draft – Budget 2014-2015; Scotland’s National Audit – Summary Report*, July 2012, p. 8). These dialogues and bridges are variables that feed a dynamic process of identity construction.

4.2.2. The Economic Dimension

If we want to circumscribe properly the economic benefit associated with museums, we have to take into consideration the revenues generated by museums, the jobs created and the touristic industry.

Regarding the revenues generated by museums, it is interesting to note at first that there is an important progression in terms of visitors since 1999. In 2003, 986 visitor attractions were listed in Scotland; from this number, 437 were listed in the category “museums” (*Realising the True Impact of Museums and Galleries in Scottish Tourism: Full Report*, 2005, p. 1). The sample reveals that, in 2003, museums represented 37% of visits to attractions in Scotland (*Realising the True Impact of Museums and Galleries in Scottish Tourism: Full Report*, 2005, p. 31). In the 2010 report, we note an increase: museums represented now 39% of all visits to visitor attractions in Scotland. For the total number of museums and galleries, the estimated number of visitation turns around 23.54 million (*Realising the True Impact of Museums and Galleries in Scottish Tourism 2010 Data*, p. 3).

When the number of visitors in Scottish museums is translated in terms of revenues, the results are quite impressive. In the *Report by the Museums Think Tank*, we read that “At national level the total worth of museums and galleries to the Scottish economy has been

calculated by MGS at over £800m. Museums and galleries generate £78.9m in direct and £44.18m in indirect revenues per annum” (*Report by the Museums Think Tank*, December 2010 p. 7). By extension, a study on all National Museums Scotland’s sites conducted by independent consultants in 2010 shows that, for every £1 invested by the Scottish Government, this investment represents £3.19 to the Scottish economy (*Strategic Plan 2011-2015*, p. 2). In rural areas, the place of museums is “disproportionately important in maintaining viable local economies” especially because primary and secondary industries are declining (*Report by the Museums Think Tank*, December 2010, p. 7).

In terms of employment, the museum sector has an important impact. As mentioned in the *Final Report of the Cultural Commission* in 2005, “the Scottish museum and galleries sector is currently estimated to support 3,285 people in full-time employment with 1,282 being in associated industries. Museums and galleries spent £29.5m with £11.6m going on goods and services and £17.9m on staff. Again, it is estimated that around 90% of this expenditure is spent locally in Scotland” (“*Our Next Major Enterprise...*” – *Final Report of the Cultural Commission*, June 2005, p. 27). This number increases at 4,000 people in 2014-2015 (*Scottish Budget Draft – Budget 2014-2015*, online). If we look at the National Museums of Scotland, this cultural institution employs by itself 2,600 full-time jobs (*Annual Review*, 2010, p. 9).

When it comes the time to talk about the impact of museums on the touristic industry, this contribution was fully recognized in 2005 with the report *Realising the True Impact of Museums and Galleries in Scottish Tourism*. Effectively, this report states that

Museums and Galleries are central to tourism destination marketing and provide a foundation for the iconic representation of the nation and its people. This vital but disparate set of cultural resources are for the first time recognised as a key cultural resource that lies at the heart of visitor experiences in urban, rural and coastal region.

(*Realising the True Impact of Museums and Galleries in Scottish Tourism*, 2005, p. 13)

Moreover, the museum sector represents more than 3,000 tourism related jobs - here, it is important to make a distinction with the previous statistics that are rather museum focus jobs (*Realising the True Impact of Museums and Galleries in Scottish Tourism*, 2005, p. 10). Among the 23,54 million of visitation in museums and galleries in 2010, overseas visitors represent 22.2%, domestic visitors 40.4% and local visitors 37.4%. In other words, we understand with these statistics that Scottish museums and galleries have a real power of attraction (*Realising the True Impact of Museums and Galleries in Scottish Tourism 2010 Data*, p. 13) especially the five National Museums of Scotland (*Annual Review*, 2010, p. 10).

4.2.3. The Instrumental Dimension in Scottish Cultural Heritage Policies

To conclude, it is difficult to determine if Scotland's intent to make culture the focal point of its public strategy justifies the necessity to refer to the economic and social explanation or if, to the opposite, the economic and social benefits of culture motivate Scotland to initiate a "cultural turn" in its public policies. Be that as it may, this chapter showed that the economic and social justification of cultural heritage policies is greatly applied in Scotland as the EU (see chapter 3) or even the UK (Doustaly, 2004, p. 107).

However, we have to focus on the idea that our analysis reveals that Scotland has more an "encompassing vision" than the UK because it gives as much importance on economic as social benefits. In the case of the UK, there is a clear focus on economic variables. As stated by Robert Hewison (2011), "culture (is) economically most successful in terms of urban regeneration, and attracting European Community funds" (p. 327). As a result, the economic argument seems to be predominant in the UK when it is question of culture.

Moreover, Scotland asserts its difference over the UK by the importance given to cultural heritage in its national strategy. Indeed, it makes culture, and especially the cultural heritage field with museums, a priority in its public policies. For its part, the UK has a different perspective on the question. For instance, the “heritage” dimension was occulted in the new name of the department of culture. Instead of “Department of National Heritage” (DNH), the new department, founded in 1997 and still known under that name today, was entitled “Department for Culture, Media and Sport” (DCMS). In addition, during the reign of Blair (1997-2007) and Brown (2007-2010), “heritage organizations – notably English heritage – felt unfairly treated” (Hewison, 2011, p. 236).

In light of these differences between Scotland and the UK, Scotland tries to build an identity distinct from its neighbors. The relevance of this statement is accentuated by the fact that several social or economic benefits contribute to the activation of identity processes in Scotland. For instance, museums stimulate nation’s talent or work for the social inclusion of minorities, which creates a sense of belonging toward the Scottish society.

Chapter 5: The Cultural Supremacy

In chapter 3, we discussed the differences between the “democratization of culture” and the “cultural democracy”. Whereas the first notion refers to the diffusion of high culture, the second one places an emphasis on the dialogue between the different levels of culture. Today, the European countries are still concerned by the debate between these two notions despite the fact that the cultural democracy has become more and more important since the 1950s. When we read over the documents published by the Scottish Executive and Government, the Museums Galleries Scotland (MGS) and the National Museums Scotland (NMS), we discovered that the Scottish cultural heritage policies tend to promote cultural democracy in their initiatives.

5.1. Cultural Rights

For Scotland, the importance of culture is such that it implies to introduce cultural rights for each citizen. These rights make culture the focal point of the Scottish society and, by extension, they become part of the Scottish identity. If we go a bit further, we can say that the idea of cultural rights is the expression of cultural democracy. Indeed, it means that everyone in Scotland must have the right to get easily access to cultural activities no matters his/her social background (*Cultural Policy Statement*, April 2004, p. 3-4). In other words, we understand here that the Scottish Executive focuses on the idea of “equality of access” (“*Our Next Major Enterprise...*” - *Final Report of the Cultural Commission*, June 2005, p. 1). It is important to insist on the idea that these cultural activities do not only concern high culture, but all forms of culture.

Four cultural rights were prepared by the Scottish Executive in order to introduce a new system or, strictly speaking, “a new national approach” (“*Our Next Major Enterprise...*” - *Final Report of the Cultural Commission*, June 2005, p. 49). In “*Our Next Major Enterprise...*”, it is specified that “all citizens of Scotland have the right to fulfill their creative potential, take part in cultural life, an enriching communal life in a satisfying environment and participate in designing and implementing cultural policy” (“*Our Next Major Enterprise...*” – *Final Report of the Cultural Commission*, June 2005, p. 50). This strategy concerns different cultural sectors including heritage, galleries and museums. The reasons that justify this initiative are double: referring to what we said previously, nobody would be surprised to know that reducing the inequality when it comes the time to get access to cultural activities represents the first reason. The second justification concerns the will “to empower the citizen with informed choice” (“*Our Next Major Enterprise...*” – *Final Report of the Cultural Commission*, June 2005, p. 49). So, these cultural rights give the possibility to each citizen to take part in the construction of the new Scotland, the Scotland post-devolution, which comes with the construction of the Scottish identity.

Following the cultural commission’s conclusions in June 2005, the Executive had discussions with the Parliament, the Convention of Scottish Local Authorities and national cultural agencies in order to make possible a new cultural dynamic in Scotland (*Scottish Executive Response on the Cultural Review*, January 2006, p. 8). Thanks to the participation of everyone in Scotland, this new dynamic was born according to a “high inclusive approach” (*Scottish Executive Response on the Cultural Review*, January 2006, p. 8). Because all the Scottish society is engaged in the process, it implies that everyone in Scotland develops strong ties with the Scottish culture. When we know that the line between culture and identity is really thin as we saw in the review of the literature, this engagement

leads to an attachment to the Scottish identity. In order to introduce these new national standards, the Commission stated that “local cultural entitlements” should be established in each area (*Scottish Executive Response on the Cultural Review*, January 2006, p. 19). They would be part of the “Local Cultural Strategy” (“*Our Next Major Enterprise...*” – *Final Report of the Cultural Commission*, June 2005, p. 49).

Of course, it is legitimate to ask what the Commission had in mind regarding these “local cultural entitlements”. In the *Draft Culture (Scotland) Bill* (2006), it is specified that local cultural activities are widely represented in all Scottish areas and most of these activities are funded by local authorities. The Executive wants “to build on this success and encourage more people from different communities to enjoy and get involved in cultural activities in their area” (*Draft Culture (Scotland) Bill – Consultation Document*, 2006, p. 4). In other words, with this kind of strategy, it is not only people who are living in major urban areas like Edinburgh or Glasgow who would take part in cultural activities. By extension, if we remember our statement on the direct link between culture and identity, it means that the sense of belonging towards the Scottish identity would not be not limited to people living in major cities. In order to implement this strategy, it is proposed to increase the local provision of cultural activities and guide local authorities in the process to enlarge the programming of cultural activities. The goal is to make available to everyone who wants to be involved in cultural activities the possibility to get access to these activities in his/her local community. In order to determine the kind of cultural activities that have to be implemented in each local community, the cultural Commission wants to circumscribe the cultural needs with the help of people (*Draft Culture (Scotland) Bill – Consultation Document*, 2006, p. 4-5). Three variables must frame these entitlements, which are affordability, “citizen focus” and

accessibility (physical access and wider participation) (*Draft Culture (Scotland) Bill – Guidance Document*, 2006, p. 17).

By promoting the notion of cultural rights, Scotland shows its attachment to cultural democracy, which is an important component in European public policies. However, there is an important distinction between Scotland and the European Union regarding these cultural rights. It is true that, in the “*Our Next Major Enterprise...*”, it is mentioned that

The European Union recognizes the ‘universality, indivisibility, interrelation and interdependence’ of all human rights. Civil and political rights and economic, social and cultural rights are seen as mutually reinforcing, based on common basic assumptions and principles (“*Our Next Major Enterprise...*” – *Final Report of the Cultural Commission*, June 2005, p. 29-30).

Even if cultural rights are recognized by the European Union, their implementation in member states remains a difficult process (“*Our Next Major Enterprise...*” – *Final Report of the Cultural Commission*, June 2005, p. 42).

5.2. Increasing accessibility to all forms of culture by using different strategies

With the cultural rights, we understand that Scotland wants to make culture a national priority. This aim is also really clear when we take into consideration the government and cultural institutions’ discourse on accessibility. The keywords are “audience development” (*A Literature Review*, February 2004, p. 3), “equality of access” (“*Our Next Major Enterprise...*”, June 2005, p. 1) and “cultural engagement” (*Empowering Scotland*, 2013-2014, p. 78). If we read between the lines, we understand that an increase in the number of people who are engaged in cultural activities actually means an increase in the number of people who feel that are part of the Scottish society and, obviously, share its identity. Engagement is clearly a priority in the *Delivery Plan for Scotland’s Museums and Galleries* (2013-2015, p. 25-26). The aim to increase accessibility takes different forms in official documents. The first one is related to the physical visits to museums. However, the initiatives

to attract young people, the investment in digital projects and the programmes that try to reduce the gap between disadvantaged social groups and cultural institutions are several strategies to increase accessibility to all forms of culture such as museums. All these variables are part of the “corporate targets” of the National Museums Scotland (*Annual Review*, 2003-2004, p. 30). Behind these variables, we find the idea to facilitate access to cultural institutions “for all groups” (*Achievement Audit – Scotland’s National Cultural Strategy*, 2000-2004, July 2005, p. 48). In other words, the Executive wants to reduce “cultural exclusion because of disability, location, age or economic or educational factors” (*Achievement Audit – Scotland’s National Cultural Strategy*, 2000-2004, July 2005, p. 50).

5.2.1. Facilitating access to cultural institutions: visits to museums

The *Scottish Household Survey* (2011) states that 31% of Scottish people in the sample visited a museum or a gallery over the last year (*From Strategy to Action*, 2013-2015, p. 3) and then, Scotland considers that a lot of work still has to be done in order to make culture widely accessible to everyone. The first parameter to measure this objective is by increasing the number of visits to museums or, if we prefer, by increasing the audience development. This is early stated in the official post-devolution documents. It is important to note that this objective can be reached by combining two variables: improving infrastructures and abolishing barriers that restrict access to museums. What are the key audiences? According to several official documents, the key audiences identified include the disabled, the rural disadvantaged areas, the young and the old (*Annual Review*, 2003, p. 20).

Regarding the infrastructures, several options can be implemented to encourage people to visit museums. The idea is that an appropriate setting is a convincing variable for potential visitors. Among the measures proposed to improve the infrastructures, some of them concern the transport to get access to cultural institutions, the physical access to people

with disabilities and the exhibits' displays. By extension, in "*Our Next Major Enterprise...*" (June 2005), we read that a planned infrastructural development must be enforced in order to facilitate the management of all the Scotland's museums located in historic buildings. In that way, the financial obligations would be reduced for the concerned museums, which would be able to use their budget for better purposes ("*Our Next Major Enterprise...*" – *Final Report of the Cultural Commission*, June 2005, p. 104).

Among the barriers that restrict access to museums, we can mention admission charges and geographic distance. In the *National Cultural Strategy – Creating our Future... Minding our Past* (August 2000, p. 24), we read that the Executive approved funding to the National Museums of Scotland in order to eliminate admission charges starting in 2001. Since that time, the number of visitors at the NMS has progressively increased. In 2002-2003, the NMS attracted 1.33 million visitors at its different sites (*Annual Review*, 2003, p. 5). Ten years later, this number reached 2.3 million visits (*Annual Review*, 2012, p. 5). This outstanding increase is mostly linked to the opening of the new NMS, which is "now the most-visited attraction outside London, with the largest year-on-year growth by a significant margin" (*Annual Review*, 2012, p. 5). The audience development is also tangible through the frequentation of special exhibitions – some of them even travel around Scotland. Special exhibitions are often considered as the best way to attract visitors who do not usually visit museums because of variables such as their location (*Annual Review*, 2007, p. 15). For instance, the tour of "The Lewis Chessmen: Unmasked Exhibition" in Edinburgh, Aberdeen, Lerwick and Stornoway attracted more than 122,000 visitors in 2011 (*Annual Review*, 2011, p. 17-19). People in Aberdeen are not necessarily open to visit an exhibition in Glasgow or Edinburgh and traveling exhibitions are an interesting alternative for them.

5.2.2. Facilitating access to young people

Attracting the attention of young people regarding museums is a key concern for Scotland. Is it not true that young people are the future of a Nation? By attracting young people in museums, which are like the tank where lies the Scottish identity, it is a clever way to develop their sense of belonging to the Scottish Nation in the making. Several strategies are implemented to develop education and learning for the young audiences at museums or in schools. The National Priorities in Education focuses on the idea that young people must be exposed to different sources of learning in order to broaden their horizons; culture is one of these sources of learning (“*Creating our Future... Minding our Past*”, 2003, p. 44-46; “*Our Next Major Enterprise...*”, June 2005, p. 53). As a result, there is a clear focus on fostering the educative experience of young people in and about museums in the Scottish Executive and Government, the MGS and the NMS’ documents.

In order to clearly understand this focus, it is relevant to cite the *Final Report of the Cultural Commission* published in June 2005:

Museums and galleries can provide an inspirational learning environment where students of all ages can learn. The Commission is convinced of the effectiveness of ‘object-centered learning’ and is determined to promote the widest possible role for Scotland’s museums and galleries in education. (...) In addition, they could support teachers in the delivery of most, if not all, of the National Curriculum. We believe all school pupils should be able to visit museums and galleries of assured quality and within a reasonable distance, as part of their curriculum based school activities (“*Our Next Major Enterprise...*” - *Final Report of the Cultural Commission*, 2005, p. 103).

A major issue regarding the promotion of education activities in museums is related to the fact that very few museums invest in educational services because of a lack of funding. The NMS, for instance, is almost an exception in the field. Then, the possibility for teachers to get access to museums as part of their curriculum is disproportional depending on their location in Scotland (“*Our Next Major Enterprise...*” - *Final Report of the Cultural*

Commission, 2005, p. 103). For solving this problem, it is recommended to build more bridges between museums and the educational community for the sake of the young generation (“Our Next Major Enterprise...” - *Final Report of the Cultural Commission*, 2005, p. 103; *Scotland’s National Audit – Summary Report*, July 2012, p. 8).

This said, it remains that several initiatives are implemented to attract the young audience. For instance, school coordinators for heritage, arts and culture have been introduced in some academic institutions to stimulate the interest of young people. In 2003, the SMC even published a guide for these coordinators and teachers to “promote better use of Scotland’s heritage as a powerful tool for effective learning” (*Scotland’s National Audit – Summary Report*, July 2012, p. 41). Moreover, national cultural institutions are encouraged to set up junior boards of young people in order to incite them to be part of the development of the cultural life. There is one of these boards at the NMS; the NMS’ junior board is involved in the elaboration of displays and services (*Achievement Audit – Scotland’s National Cultural Strategy*, 2000-2004, p. 53).

When we read over the NMS annual reviews, we discovered that the outreach department has reached its objective every year since 2002. In 2002, 45,000 pupils visited one of the museums part of the NMS network. The learning programmes were even extended to secondary history students (*Annual Review*, 2003, p. 8). In order to continue this progression, the NMS introduced a couple of years later more innovative learning programmes at some of its sites such as the Museum of Flight or the Museum of Scottish Country Life. Ten years later, 50,000 school visits took place at the NMS sites. It is even possible to young people to curate their own exhibition through “Scotland Creates: A Sense of Place”, a youth engagement programme or to be engaged with the Viking history through

pilots sessions on Education Scotland's GLOW TV where interactivity is at the midst of the program (*Annual Review*, 2013, p. 7).

5.2.3. In the name of social inclusion

As early as the year 2000, the *National Cultural Strategy* expressed a clear concern to promote "inclusion" (*The National Cultural Strategy – Creating our Future... Minding our Past*, First Report, August 2000, p. 1). In *Partnership for a Better Scotland* (2003), there is also a will to integrate under-represented groups in the cultural life. In that way, everyone in Scotland without exception would feel that he/she is part of the Scottish public space. Of course, it is legitimate to ask who are the under-represented groups. Most of the studies reveal that common under-represented groups are "low socio-economic groups, young people with low educational attainment, disabled and mobility impaired people (...) and ethnic minority groups" (*A Literature Review*, February 2004, p. 2-3). Several reasons explain their cultural exclusion such as lack of public transport to get access to cultural institutions, the cost of cultural activities, lack of information, "perception that the activity is 'not for them'" (*A Literature Review*, February 2004, p. 3).

In order to break the exclusion pattern for under-represented groups in museums, several initiatives have been implemented since devolution. At first, it is important to keep in minds that, through the SMC's guidelines for the promotion of social justice, the Deputy Minister for Sports, the Arts and Culture at the end of 2000 promoted "active involvement to make all people feel welcome to museums and galleries (both national and local)" (*Creating our Future... Minding our Past*, First Report, August 2000, p. 24). In the same line, the SMC's guidelines, entitled "Museums and Social Justice", want to challenge the usual obstacles to inclusion (*Creating our Future... Minding our Past*, First Report, August 2000, p. 24). One of the strategies to achieve this goal is by offering trainings to museum staff and

volunteers in order to give them the tools to promote socially inclusive practices in their daily work (*Achievement Audit – Scotland’s National Cultural Strategy 2000-2004*, p. 49). Also, between 2000 and 2004, the NMS delivered several learning programmes aligned with the Social Inclusion Partnerships (*Achievement Audit – Scotland’s National Cultural Strategy 2000-2004*, p. 48). One of them is the “Paradise Garden Carpet” project, which is a collaboration between the NMS and Glasgow Museums. This project uses Islamic artifacts from the two museums as a source of inspiration for textile creations made by 780 people from the Scottish Islamic communities, schoolchildren, and other marginalized groups (ex: asylum seekers). Another similar project took place with 600 Asian participants living in Edinburgh and Glasgow (*Achievement Audit – Scotland’s National Cultural Strategy 2000-2004*, p. 58). Finally, it is interesting to know that some initiatives have been proposed to attract categories of visitors who do not tend to visit museums. For instance, the NMS was particularly interested by young people who are not part of the formal school system: they were invited to make research in the NMS collections regarding the British motorcycle industry as part of a restoration project (*Annual Review*, 2008, p. 22).

5.2.4. The power of digital initiatives

When we know that the Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation reveals that only 23% of people living in “deprived areas” visited a museum or a gallery in 2011; a proportion that turns at 42% for the privileged people, it becomes clear that it is not so easy to overcome social inclusion (*From Strategy to Action*, May 2013, p. 3) despite all the previous initiatives mentioned. However, digital initiatives present the advantage to challenge the usual barriers to cultural exclusion. As a result, several documents clearly state the idea that Scottish cultural institutions want to use digital resources as a mean to reach a wider audience and engage more visitors in their activities (*Scotland’s National Cultural Strategy*, 2000-2004, p.

25; *Creating our Future... Minding our Past*, Annual Report 2003, p. 37; “*Our Next Major Enterprise...*”, June 2005, p. 1; *Scottish Executive Response on the Cultural Review*, January 2006, p. 40). In *Going Further, The National Strategy for Scotland’s Museums and Galleries* (2012, p. 18), digital technologies are part of the six objectives identified to guarantee the development of the museum field.

Several digital initiatives have been implemented over the past years in the Scottish cultural heritage field and we will point out the most meaningful here. For instance, the NMS has been the leader behind the Heritage Education Forum, a national forum that “works closely with members of the Cultural Coordinators in Scottish Schools Scheme to develop online and other resources” related to the natural and built heritage (*Scotland’s National Cultural Strategy*, 2000-2004, p. 25). Regarding the Scottish Museums Council, it launched a National ICT Strategy for Scotland’s Museums in 2004 in which 27 goals were identified. The main goal was to increase the access to collections through the help of technologies (*Scotland’s National Cultural Strategy*, 2000-2004, p. 26). Another impressive digital project is The Scottish Cultural Resources Access Network (SCRAN). This network, mainly designed for educative purposes, proposes to give online access to cultural material. We can find on the SCRAN more than 300,000 images, movies and sounds from museums, galleries and archive centres (*Final Report of the Cultural Commission*, June 2005, p. 108).

Thanks to the NMS digital innovation, positive quantitative results have been observed over the past years. Indeed, in 2002-2003, the NMS had 2 million page visits on its website, which represents an increase of 30% from 2001-2002 (*Annual Review*, 2002-2003, p. 5). With its new website, which is like an online museum, the NMS broke records in 2006: 4.5 million visits were recorded (*Annual Review*, 2012, p. 18). It is important to understand

that the NMS is “increasingly using digital media to complement visiting and as a tool to engage audiences who might never come to (its) physical sites” (*Annual Review*, 2013, p. 9).

Despite all these initiatives previously mentioned and the positive results on a statistical point of view, it remains that, in the *Scotland’s National Audit* published in July 2012, there is a clear statement regarding the importance for museums to continue opening up to digital possibilities:

...museums are increasingly required to make their collections accessible as digital resources. The Audit reveals that museums face substantial challenges in the area of ICT application, which it is critical that they overcome if they are to meet public and government expectations. The commitment required to create and ensure public access to digital resources is at least equal to that required to ensure public access to the real objects. The potential for promotion of museums through the Internet is considerable, with 67% of organisations currently using a website for publicity purposes (*Scotland’s National Audit*, July 2012, p. 10).

In order to reinforce the digital pathway that has to be followed by cultural institutions and, more specifically, by museums, several roles are suggested for the future National Development Body (previously known as Museums Galleries Scotland) such as using social media to facilitate communication with cultural institutions, building bridges to encourage digital collaborations, creating “a central hub for digital media in museums to signpost quality information”, etc (*Scotland’s Museums and Galleries – Activities, Needs & Support – Consultation Report, MGS*, February 2013, p. 23).

5.3. Scotland’s Cultural Democracy

The notion of cultural democracy implies that the elitist conception of culture is challenged in order to introduce a dialogue between the different levels of culture and give an active role to every citizen. In this chapter, we clearly understood that Scotland is ruled by a cultural democracy. Indeed, the introduction of cultural rights and the strategies to increase

accessibility and to facilitate access to cultural institutions illustrate the reign of cultural democracy in Scotland.

When we established a point of junction with the UK, we clearly saw that Scotland takes a unique approach. Indeed, under the cover of cultural democracy, the British cultural policy is governed by the concept of “excellence”. John Street (2011) analyzed two important New Labour’s statements on cultural policy from Teresa Jowell and Brian McMaster. Both of them firmly believe that the primary goal of the UK cultural policy lies in the promotion of excellence (p. 385), which is rooted in the notion of high culture. When he looks a bit further, Street discovered that “the popular and policy are thereby reconciled, not in terms of populist democracy, but through the political discrimination and judgment that invests art...” (Street, 2011, p. 392-393). No matter that “the popular and policy are reconciled” in some ways, it remains that Scotland considerably differs from the UK: in the documents analyzed, the keyword is not “excellence”, but rather “accessibility” or “engagement”.

How can we explain this distinction? Scotland has actually understood that accessibility to cultural activities or institutions as well as cultural engagement are the best way to promote “a strong, fair and inclusive national identity” (The Scottish Government, “National Outcomes”, Sept. 2013). Indeed, we can read that “Scotland’s national and cultural identity is defined by our sense of place, our sense of history and our sense of self” (The Scottish Government, “National Outcomes”, Sept. 2013). As a result, the democratization of cultural heritage institutions or activities is considered as a national priority by the Scottish Government in order to reach their aim regarding the promotion of national identity.

Chapter 6: The Cultural Regional Development

When we talked about cultural rights in chapter 5, it was also question of the notion of cultural regional development in some ways. By introducing cultural rights in Scotland, the idea was to give the possibility to everyone in Scotland to get access to cultural activities no matter his/her profile. In other words, the Executive wanted that cultural activities be distributed across Scotland and not only in urban areas like Edinburgh and Glasgow. This aim is clearly expressed with the implementation of local cultural entitlements in each area. In the previous chapter, we did not really discuss the planning of cultural regional development. It might be a good idea to focus more on this aspect in this chapter in order to clearly understand the implications of cultural regional development in Scotland.

6.1. Cultural Regional Planning

At first, it is important to point out that the Executive firmly believed that the impulsion to implement local cultural provision must come to the local authorities:

Local government has a key role to ensure cultural provision in their respective areas. The Executive proposes to promote the development of this responsibility by local authorities, building on their substantial current contribution to achieve more consistent delivery approaches and standards across Scotland (*Scottish Executive Response on the Cultural Review*, January 2006, p. 17).

This importance given to the local governments can be explained by the fact that three key roles are reserved to them: they are considered as “providers of cultural services and activities (...), partners and supporters of cultural activity in the voluntary and private sectors (and) representatives of the communities they serve” (*Creating our Future... Minding our Past*, p. 57). For ensuring that local authorities work effectively, the Executive wanted to frame their actions by promoting the virtues of cultural planning. Cultural planning, which

presents the benefits to identify “the nature of demand by means of inviting, and responding to, local aspirations” (*Scottish Executive Response on the Cultural Review*, January 2006, p. 18), is tightly linked to community planning. In other words, the development of a given community is dependant to its cultural provision. This thesis is at the middle of the *Implementation of the National Cultural Strategy: Guidance for Scottish Local Authorities* (2003, p. 12; 27). By extension, we recognize here the instrumental value that is again given to culture as discussed in chapter 4.

This said, it is now the time to clarify how local authorities can satisfy their citizens’ cultural needs. In *Implementation of the National Cultural Strategy: Guidance for Scottish Local Authorities*, a kind of “to-do list” is presented in order to help each local authority to achieve its mission:

- prepare a single authority-wide cultural strategy and consider service-specific plans relating to key areas of provision;
- ensure that its strategy and plans reflect the particular cultural needs of its area and communities, including those who have special needs arising from disability, age, language, race and religion;
- create a supportive infrastructure, providing adequate facilities for cultural, sporting, recreational and social activities, and libraries, in line with its statutory responsibilities;
- stimulate activity, e.g. demonstrating how culture contributes to other relevant policies including health, education, social justice, economic development and planning;
- provide services, whether this is done directly, or by commissioning them from voluntary or private sector bodies, or from individuals (e.g. creative artists);
- contribute to the strategies and plans of other bodies, acting in partnership. (*Implementation of the National Cultural Strategy: Guidance for Scottish Local Authorities*, 2003, p. 13)

More specifically, we have to point out that a “single authority-wide cultural strategy” (first prescription) means the necessity to clearly identify the cultural goals and the best way to achieve them. In addition to these six prescriptions, the success of the planning is also indissociable to the local authorities’ ability to take into consideration strategic issues in the

reflection. For instance, they must think their leadership role in relation to their role in their community and the local cultural strategy's objectives must be in the right line of the Scottish Executive's policy (*Implementation of the National Cultural Strategy: Guidance for Scottish Local Authorities*, 2003, p. 35). If local authorities follow the six prescriptions while taking into consideration the strategic issues, they would be able to implement an effective cultural planning.

In terms of local cultural provision, local authorities cover several areas and one of them is heritage, museums and historical records. As mentioned at the beginning of this paper, Scotland has around 400 museums and galleries; a considerable part of this number is under the authority of local authorities. Local museums have a fundamental role that must be emphasized by the action of local authorities:

Local museums and galleries have a special role to play in showing and interpreting local history and identity. Their contribution to education both through contacts with schools and to lifelong learning is significant and local authorities should seek to maximize that contribution. Local museums can also be significant visitor attractions and part of an area's tourist profile (*Implementation of the National Cultural Strategy: Guidance for Scottish Local Authorities*, 2003, p. 48-49).

This quotation shows that local and regional museums are an important educational resource, a site of touristic value and an identity key point around which local communities must be developed. In that way, the Scottish Executive, and later the Scottish Government, in collaboration with the local authorities, have the power to anchor the Scottish identity in institutions that are present on the entire territory.

Since the publication of the *Implementation of the National Cultural Strategy: Guidance for Scottish Local Authorities* in 2003, it has become clear that more guidance would be essential to help local authorities to implement the National Cultural Strategy in local areas. This guidance should be provided by a joint collaboration between local

authorities bodies and cultural agencies. Through this guidance, it would be possible to develop holistic cultural policies that guarantee that “culture’s contribution is harnessed in all departments of local government” (*Scottish Executive Response on the Cultural Review*, January 2006, p. 18). This idea of collaboration brings us to the second dimension of this chapter.

6.2. The importance of partnerships in cultural regional development

Because cultural regional planning is rooted in community planning, partnerships are fundamental in the process:

A partnership is where there is a shared agenda between two or more bodies, to achieve an agreed goal or goals. Partnerships are crucial to the successful provision of culture because of the number of agencies that have a role to play in cultural provision. (...) Some partnerships involve individual local authorities, whereas some are collective (e.g. regional ones involving several local authorities, or a national one involving CoSLA). The partnerships will vary in nature and purpose (e.g. funding, planning, service delivery) (*Implementation of the National Cultural Strategy: Guidance for Scottish Local Authorities*, 2003, p. 28).

This quotation gives some reasons that explain why partnerships are formed. In addition to funding, planning and service delivery, partnerships can also be explained by the desire to create a space for collaboration and discussion, develop facilities, share experience and practices, enhance service quality, maximize their outreach or transfer funds between partners (*Report by the Museums Think Thank – Scotland’s Museums and Galleries*, December 2010, p. 14-15; *Implementation of the National Cultural Strategy: Guidance for Scottish Local Authorities*, 2003, p. 29-30).

The previous quotation points out the existence of different types of partnerships. There are “individual” and “collective” partnerships. As a result, local authorities can establish a partnership with several types of partners: the Scottish Executive, the Executive’s agencies (i.e. Historic Scotland), public bodies (i.e. tourist boards or economic development

agencies), local organizations, local authorities or other community planning partner organizations (*Implementation of the National Cultural Strategy: Guidance for Scottish Local Authorities*, 2003, p. 30). In this section, we are more interested by the local or regional partnerships. National (the type of partnerships where an institution like the NMS is the investigator of the collaborative projects for instance) and international partnerships are discussed in the next section.

In *An Action Framework for Museums – Consultation and Response* published in 2003, the Executive expressed its intention to implement a regional development framework:

The purpose of the framework is to develop the capacity and sustainability of the cultural heritage sector through active partnerships: across local authority boundaries; between local authority and independent museums; enabling a new level of productive interaction with the Nationals and providing opportunities for museums to link into, and be part of, other initiatives within developing regional partnerships (*An Action Framework for Museums – Consultation and Response*, 2003, p. 8).

In order to give the means to this network to develop its full potential, it is proposed to implement a network of regional museum development officers. The mandate of these officers would be to establish points of junction across local areas and, by extension, to guarantee the effectiveness of partnerships. Moreover, their role would be to build the “local presence of museums” on an educational and touristic point of view as well as offer guidance to local museums in order to give them the tools to be part of the community planning process (*An Action Framework for Museums – Consultation and Response*, 2003, p. 8). Through these partnerships, several projects are developed that give the possibility to everyone living in local communities across Scotland to interact on a regular basis with these identity markers represented by the local museums.

There are some areas of predilection for these partnerships that are part of the

regional development network. Indeed, initiatives that want to maximize the potential of regional cultural tourism, invest in regional workforce development or develop the regional educational potential are more than welcome. The importance given to this network is fully understood when we know that the Scottish Executive Regional Development Challenge Fund is ready to offer £100,000 per annum over three years to regional partnerships that are in conjunction with the aim of the regional development network (*An Action Framework for Museums – Consultation and Response*, 2003, p. 9).

Several regional partnerships have been developed in the cultural field since the publication of *An Action Framework for Museums* (2003) and *Implementation of the National Cultural Strategy: Guidance for Scottish Local Authorities* (2003). Two of the best examples are the VOCAL (Voice of Chief Officers for Cultural, Community and Leisure Services in Scotland) and the SOLACE (The Society of Local Authority Chief Executives and Senior Managers), two initiatives that plan to work with CoSLA (Convention of Scottish Local Authorities) in order to promote local cultural activities in conjunction with local priorities (*Achievement Audit – Scotland’s National Cultural Strategy, 2000-2004*, July 2005, p. 64).

However, a serious statement is done in the *Final Report of the Cultural Commission* (2005) that force us to look a bit further these local or regional partnerships: “there is more that could be done” (*Final Report of the Cultural Commission*, 2005, p. 106). This statement wants to challenge the nature of regional partnerships actually. Indeed, as specified in this same publication:

Support for museums and galleries across Scotland could become more regionally or city-region focused, with a reduced requirement for central intervention. Advice and support for local museums could be focused on regional or city-region groupings, with partnerships sought with local government and community/voluntary groups (*Final Report of the Cultural Commission*, 2005, p. 106).

According to the Commission, the fact to insist more on a regional focus would be more beneficial to everyone. In that way, the collaboration would really reflect the needs of local museums and, by extension, local communities (*Final Report of the Cultural Commission*, 2005, p. 106).

6.3. The Cultural Regional Development in Scotland: A Final Word

To conclude, it is clear that the cultural regional development in Scotland is a priority. Through the cultural regional planning, the authorities have the power to extent culture across Scotland and, by extension, the Scottish identity. At the middle of this process, we found local museums and the development of partnerships, which are powerful tools around which the Scottish identity is crystallized.

The focus placed on cultural regional development in Scotland is not unique. Indeed, it is also a priority for the UK, as the rest of the EU. However, in the UK, there is an important divide between the North (where Scotland is located) and the South because of the way that regional development is framed. Despite the fact that several regional development projects are funded by Westminster, the divide, which is cultural and economical in nature, remains. According to the author, it can be explained by the fact that the cultural argument is not used as a key variable in regional development. In the UK, the economic variable is rather the one that justifies the regional development (Griffiths & Williams, 2010, p. 105-107).

To the opposite, in Scotland, culture is at the front row of the regional strategy. This difference in the strategy can probably be explained by the fact that, as mentioned before, Scotland has included the promotion of “a strong, fair and inclusive national identity” (The Scottish Government, “National Outcomes”, Sept. 2013) in its National Outcomes. In other

words, Scotland places a clear focus on cultural regional development in order to accentuate the vividness of the Scottish culture and, by extension, the Scottish identity all across Scotland.

Chapter 7: Partnerships in the Scottish Cultural Heritage Field

In the previous chapter, we discussed the importance of partnerships in cultural regional development. The current chapter insists on two other types of partnerships, which are the national and international partnerships. As the regional partnerships, the national and international partnerships are an efficient way to make possible projects that would not be implemented without these initiatives.

7.1. National Partnerships

Following the Cultural Commission (June 2005), the Executive expressed its views and published *The Scottish Executive Response on the Cultural Review* (January 2006). The Executive's position in the cultural field is clear: "Government is just one player – where our responsibilities stop, other cultural providers must play their part" (*The Scottish Executive Response on the Cultural Review*, January 2006, p. 11). The Executive's speech continues by focusing on the importance of the partnerships in the field:

All those with a role in the provision of culture need to work together – across the public, private and voluntary sectors. There will be a need to increase the commitment of these sectors to partnership working and joined-up delivery. Equally, the Scottish Government cannot, and should not, extend its ambit to areas best served by others, whose expertise and knowledge is better suited to the task (*The Scottish Executive Response on the Cultural Review*, January 2006, p. 11).

In other words, we understand here that the Scottish Government wants to encourage collaboration between the different actors because it firmly believes that it is not its role to be fully involved in the cultural field.

Of course, it is legitimate to ask what the government's role is. In regard to our main point of interest, which is cultural heritage, the government has the mission to "promote the best of Scotland's rich cultural treasure-store, maintaining and presenting, as openly and

accessibly as possible, Scotland's superb national galleries', museums' and library collections" (*The Scottish Executive Response on the Cultural Review*, January 2006, p. 14). One of the dimensions previously discussed in the chapter 5 is clearly present in this quotation. Indeed, the accessibility of culture as a political priority reminds us the focus on the cultural democracy. The importance given to the promotion of the national heritage treasures is the second important aspect here. It is difficult to ignore the identity variable. Indeed, through the promotion of the national heritage treasures, the Scottish Executive has the power to strengthen the Scottish peoples' pride in their culture and identity. If we remember, Dolff-Bonekämper (2009) firmly believes in the existence of a strong bond between heritage and identity. The Scottish Executive actually illustrates Dolff-Bonekämper's statement.

The focus placed on collaborations at the time where the Executive was in power has continued under the Scottish government. Indeed, in 2010, Fiona Hyslop, Minister for Culture and External Affairs, stated the importance for the museums to "work more efficiently and effectively both within their own organizations, but more importantly with others in the sector and beyond" (*Scottish Government Response to the Report by the Museums Think Tank*, 2010).

In the National Strategy for Scotland's Museums and Galleries published in 2012, which represents the first strategy implemented for the whole sector in the name of unity, there is an obvious call to promote partnerships because "by working together the sector can achieve more than purely the sum of its parts" (*The National Strategy for Scotland's Museums and Galleries*, 2012, p. 10). The development of partnerships at the national and international levels is part of the Strategy in 6 points and, then, it proves the importance given to partnerships. Thanks to better connections between museums (aim 2), it would be

possible to increase public participation, possibilities of learning and well-being. In addition (aim 5), collaborations are an effective way to promote the collections and make the Scottish museums and galleries competitive (*The National Strategy for Scotland's Museums and Galleries*, 2012, p. 22-23; 34-35). In order to illustrate the relevance of partnerships, an example that refers to the Musselburgh Museum is given by the SMG. With the collaboration of the East Lothian Council and the Musselburgh Museum and Heritage Group, the Musselburgh Museum opened in 2011. In that way, it has been possible to develop museums education and exhibitions programmes (*The National Strategy for Scotland's Museums and Galleries*, 2012, p. 11).

It is relevant to ask what the museum organizations think about the idea of collaborating with their peers. According to a report published in 2013, 92% of Scottish museums that are part of the sample said that they are ready to support their colleagues. Five areas are mentioned regarding where the collaboration can be established: expertise and best practices, curatorial work, partnerships and networking, venues and loans of artifacts (*Scotland's Museums and Galleries: Activities, Needs & Support – Consultation Report*, February 2013, p. 2).

Among the “other cultural providers (that) must play their part”, we also have the National Museums Scotland (NMS). Soon after the devolution, this institution has expressed its intention to confirm its national role by developing strategic partnerships with local and regional cultural institutions. Through these partnerships, the NMS would share its expertise and gives access to its collections (*Achievement Audit – Scotland's National Cultural Strategy, 2000-2004*, July 2005, p. 24). In the *Draft Culture (Scotland) Bill*, the Executive places an emphasis on the mission of the “National Collections”, which refer among others to the National Museums of Scotland (NMS). The NMS' role is to collect, preserve and

exhibit artifacts of “national importance”. The Executive wants that the NMS continues its work, but it also wants “to ensure there are no barriers to joint-working between the bodies and to encourage increasing co-ordination of strategy and exhibitions. We also want the Collections to continue and enhance their leadership and support of local collections” (*Draft Culture (Scotland) Bill – Consultation Document*, 2006, p. 9). Here, we clearly see the emphasis places on the establishment of partnerships between national and local cultural organizations. By extension, because of the NMS’ role and the connection between the notion of “heritage” and “identity”, the NMS’ partnerships with local organizations are an effective way to extent the reach of the National Collections, which symbolize the Scottish identity.

It is interesting to note that this support is not a new phenomenon: many years before the devolution, the NMS tried to help the development of local cultural organizations. However, after 1999, the NMS has been significantly increasing its influence in the cultural field (*A Museum Action Framework – The Scottish Executive Response*, 2003, p. 10) because of the incentive of the Executive to do so. This new focus was clearly exposed in the NMS’ 2003-2007 Corporate Plan. The NMS’ success in this role is confirmed in the 2011-2015 Corporate Plan where we can read that “we increased our national role through formal partnerships, and the provision of training and support to the Scottish museum sector” (*Strategic Plan 2011-2015 – National Museums Scotland*, 2013-2014 update, p. 3).

In order to understand the NMS’ national role, it is a good idea to give some examples. The NMS has established several partnerships with local communities or cultural organizations. For instance, the NMS shares material for the exhibition “Hugh Miller: Local Hero” that took place at Groam House Museum in Rosemarkie and, then, the NMS assisted “a local community to access its heritage” (*Annual Review*, 2002-2003, p. 5). Another good

example refers to the case of the support provided by the NMS to the Tarbat Discovery Centre (Portmahomack in Easter Ross), a centre that makes the past being part of the community's present. The NMS supports the project by offering the possibility to display the discoveries and loaning material for exhibitions (*Annual Review*, 2003-2004, p. 18). It is interesting to note that a new position (a National Partnerships Manager) opened at the NMS in order to develop more national partnerships (*Annual Review*, 2003-2004, p. 18). In the *2006-2007 Annual Review*, we learnt that the NMS

worked in 29 out of 32 Scottish local authority regions in 2006–07, delivering outreach projects, fieldwork, loans to museums and visitor attractions, touring exhibitions, talks and lectures, and contributing to national events. (They) have also worked with council, university and independent museums across Scotland to provide better collections care and increased access. This support takes many forms, from advising local museums on Scotland's new Significance Scheme to providing training workshops (*Annual Review*, 2007, p. 19).

In light of this quotation, we see that the NMS is fully involved in many projects at the national level. In addition, this dimension is not mentioned in the previous quotation, but the NMS also takes part in projects where its employees share their knowledge and expertise with others. For example, in 2008, through workshops or "behind the scenes" visits, the NMS' staff helps other organizations (i.e. local museums or universities) to develop their expertise (*Annual Review*, 2008, p. 8).

It is interesting to note that the NMS' community involvement has increased over the years: in 2007, the NMS worked with 29 out of 32 Scottish local authority regions; in 2009, the NMS was involved with 30 of Scotland's 32 local authority regions (*Annual Review*, 2009, p. 3). A part of this involvement with the local authority regions concerns the loan of artifacts: the NMS supported 125 individual collection loans to 28 local authority areas in 2009. The new Culloden Visitor Centre, Summerlee Industrial Museum in North Lanarkshire and the Shetland Amenity Trust are among the partners (*Annual Review*, 2009,

p. 22). In 2012, the NMS was involved with all 32 local authority areas. The best example is the successful touring exhibition *The Lewis Chessmen: Unmasked*. This tour traveled at the Aberdeen Art Gallery, Shetland Museum & Archives, Museum nan Eilean in Stornoway and the NMS. More than 122,000 visitors visited this traveling exhibition (*Annual Review*, 2012, p. 11). By extension, through its community involvement, the NMS reaches a wider audience. Here, it is possible to establish a point of junction with the chapter 5 regarding cultural democracy.

In the *2010 Annual Review*, we learnt that the NMS administered the National Fund for Acquisitions, a Scottish Government scheme. This institution gives the possibility to regional museums and other regional cultural organizations to make new acquisitions. In 2009-2010, 83 grants were made to 32 organizations among which there are the Burrell Collection in Glasgow (*Annual Review*, 2010, p. 23). In the *2013 Annual Review*, it is specified that “81 grants were made to 33 organizations enabling the purchase of objects worth just under £500,000” (*Annual Review*, 2013, p. 7).

In this section, the NMS’ national role was illustrated by giving examples related to partnerships with local or regional cultural organizations in Scotland. Nevertheless, the NMS’ national role also implies that it is involved with high-standing institutions in the UK such as the Barbican Centre in London, the British Museum and the Victoria and Albert Museum. Thanks to its collaboration with the Barbican Centre, the NMS brought the exhibition *Game-On: The History, Culture and Future of Videogames* to Edinburgh (*Annual Review*, 2002-2003, p. 5). Previously, we discussed the successful touring exhibition *The Lewis Chessmen: Unmasked*. Actually, this exhibition in Scotland was possible because of a “UK-wide partnership” (*Annual Review*, 2010, p. 21). Finally, the partnership with the Victoria and Albert Museums gave the possibility to save a pair of 17th century Italian

Baroque tables by Lucio de Lucci (*Annual Review*, 2012, p. 9).

7.2. International Partnerships

If national partnerships are a priority in Scotland, a great focus is also placed on international partnerships. In the First Annual Report of the Scotland's National Cultural Strategy, the second strategic objective states the importance of celebrating Scotland's cultural heritage (*Creating our Past... Minding our Past*, August 2000, p. 10). This celebration is closely linked to the expansion of the Scottish presence on the international scene. Indeed, one of the "key priority" of this second strategy implies to "promote international cultural exchange and dialogue" (*Creating our Past... Minding our Past*, August 2000, p. 17). Some of the strategies mentioned included looking for opportunities to promote Scotland's culture abroad by working with partners such as the British Council or the Brussels Office or taking part in joint cultural projects with other European actors. The best example of joint cultural projects that we can give is the EU Culture 2000 (*Creating our Past... Minding our Past*, August 2000, p. 17). Between 2000 and 2004, Scotland was part of 10 collaborative projects with other EU members (*Achievement Audit, Scotland's National Cultural Strategy, 2000-2004*, p. 37).

The focus placed on international collaboration in the Scottish Executive and the Scottish Government is also tangible in the NMS' official documents. In order to reach another level on the international scene, the NMS worked on an international framework, which was published in 2008. We can read that

We want to make our international work more focused, and more productive. Our intention is to create a framework that encourages deeper engagement, maximizes the productivity of external partnerships and demonstrates the added value which international museum programmes can bring to international relations. While we are already engaged internationally, too much of our activity is currently adhoc or reactive (*National Museums Scotland, International Framework*, 2008, p. 1).

Thanks to this quotation, it is clear that the NMS wants to give an orientation to its international commitment based on its collections of international scope and its curatorial expertise. As the Scottish Government, the NMS wants to focus on specific areas for international partnerships. While it plans to renew the dynamic of its relationships with Europe and the EU, China, India and North America, the NMS has specific projects in mind for the Arc of Prosperity (Norway, Finland, Iceland and Denmark), the Commonwealth (India, Pakistan, Canada, Australia and New Zealand), Celtic Nations (Wales, Ireland and Northern Ireland) and developing countries (African countries and specifically Malawi) (*International Framework*, 2008, p. 2). The International Framework has probably had a great impact because the NMS' Strategic Plan states that great success has been achieved so far regarding the development of international links (*Strategic Plan 2011-2015 – National Museums Scotland*, 2013-2014 update, p. 14). Indeed, the successes can be measured by the fact that the NMS collections has traveled around the world, the NMS has shared its expertise with international colleagues and it has established several partnerships that bring international exhibitions in Scotland.

Regarding the first variable, which is the traveling of the NMS collections around the world, several successes have been recorded since devolution. Indeed, in the *2002-2003 Annual Review*, it is mentioned that the NMS collections were part of exhibitions in 177 venues in the UK and overseas. We can also read that “a major international loan, which included some of the Lewis chesspieces, was made to the Smithsonian Museum of Natural History for the touring exhibition Vikings!, seen in Los Angeles, Ottawa and Minneapolis” (*Annual Review*, 2002-2003, p. 15). In the *2003-2004 Annual Review*, we learnt that several NMS' artifacts have been loaned to cultural institutions such as the Victoria & Albert Museum, the Hayward Gallery and the National Maritime Museum in the UK, but also to

the Louvre in Paris, the MET in New York and the Prado Textile Museum in Madrid (*Annual Review*, 2003-2004, p. 12). The NMS' international loans programme continued to be a success in 2007 because 109 artifacts were loaned to 9 countries across 5 continents (*Annual Review*, 2007, p. 20). This number increased to more than 130 in 2008 (*Annual Review*, 2008, p. 10). In 2009 and 2010, the NMS contributed in three major exhibitions. Indeed, in 2009, the NMS provided more than a quarter of the artifacts in an exhibition on Celts and Scandinavians at the *Musée de Cluny*, in Paris (*Annual Review*, 2009, p. 15). In 2010, the NMS shared artifacts for another exhibition entitled *The Art of the Celts* held at the Historisches Museum in Berne, Switzerland. The same year, the NMS was also involved in the exhibition *James Cook and the Exploration of the Pacific*. This exhibition toured in the Germanic countries (Germany, Austria and Switzerland) (*Annual Review*, 2010, p. 19). In light of these examples, we understand that the NMS enjoyed a great exposure abroad thanks to its loans that traveled in several exhibitions.

The international exposure of the NMS also embodies in the sharing of its expertise with international colleagues or involvement in international projects. Since devolution, the NMS has been involved in several projects. In the *2003-2004 Annual Review*, we learnt about the NMS' key role in an international UE-funded project:

NMS is playing a key role in an international EU-funded project which will help conserve historic tapestries. In this project, worth 1.3 million Euros over three years, NMS is working with Historic Royal Palaces, the Royal Institution of Cultural Heritage (Belgium), the University of Manchester Institute of Science and Technology, Birbeck College, the University of Edinburgh and Spanish Royal Palaces to investigate methods of monitoring changes in historic tapestries (*Annual Review*, 2003-2004, p. 22).

In this project, the NMS worked with many partners and, by extension, enlarged its network. This kind of collaboration allows the NMS to share its expertise, but also to learn from others (*Annual Review*, 2004-2005, p. 18). A similar configuration took place with the

Museum with No Frontiers, a project in which the NMS was involved with 17 other museums from Europe, North Africa and the Middle East. This museum, launched in 2006, is actually a “virtual museum of Islamic art” (*Annual Review*, 2004-2005, p. 18). In the NMS’ 2011 Annual Review, we read that the NMS has “active collaborations across six continents” (*Annual Review*, 2011, p. 3), which is quite impressive. However, it is important to note that the NMS does not establish arbitrary connections as previously mentioned at the beginning of this section. The NMS “focuses on countries where (it has) strong collections links and opportunities to increase knowledge” (*Annual Review*, 2011, p. 17).

The last mean through which we can measure the success of the NMS’ action on the international scene is the number of international exhibitions that take place in Scotland. The goal of the NMS is clearly to “bring the world to Scotland” (*Annual Review*, 2004-2005, p. 18). As a result, in the sole year of 2004-2005, the NMS collaborated with the *Museo Nazionale* in Florence, the Louvre in Paris and the State Hermitage Museum in St. Petersburg in order to display major exhibitions in Scotland. This last partnership brought the 2005 summer exhibition *Nicholas and Alexandra: The Last Tsar and Tsarina* in Scotland (*Annual Review*, 2004-2005, p. 4). This exhibition, qualified as a real “blockbuster”, saw “curators from Scotland and Russia worked side by side, sharing their individual expertise” (*Annual Review*, 2006, p. 4). In 2011, the NMS pursued its development because

A five-year programme has been developed to deliver a vibrant range of special exhibitions in collaboration with UK and international partners. The first major shows scheduled in 2012 will be *Fascinating Mummies* developed with the National Museum of Antiquities in Leiden, the Netherlands, and *Catherine the Great*, a new exhibition which we are co-developing with the State Hermitage Museum in St Petersburg, Russia with sponsorship from Baillie Gifford. This prestigious programme is expected to attract audiences from far and wide, especially as the museum will be the only UK venue for *Fascinating Mummies*, and *Catherine the Great* will show uniquely in Edinburgh (*Annual Review*, 2011, p. 29).

The scope of these two exhibitions is such that the NMS' goal is clearly to assert itself as a leader in the field. In other words, by holding exhibitions that just take place in one spot in the UK or Scotland, the NMS wants to prove its international standing. This standing is also confirmed by the importance of the displayed artifacts. Regarding the exhibition *Fascinating Mummies*, the artifacts were from "one of the world's leading Ancient Egyptian collections", which is held by the National Museum of Antiquities in the Netherlands. The second exhibition displayed "the greatest collection of Russian treasures ever seen in the UK" (*Annual Review*, 2012, p. 6). In 2013, another international exhibition took place at the NMS, *Mary, Queen of Scots*. This time, the Scottish history was honored and more than 60,000 visitors enjoyed the treasures displayed at the NMS. This exhibition was possible thanks to UK and international loans (*Annual Review*, 2013, p. 4).

We mostly focused on the evidences of Scotland's international connections in this section. Nevertheless, it is important to insist on the idea that the traveling of Scottish exhibitions around the world, the sharing of Scottish expertise with worldwide colleagues and the welcoming of international exhibitions in Scotland are effective ways to make Scottish peoples proud of the Scottish cultural accomplishments and, by extension, proud of being Scots. Indeed, as shown by Joachim Blatter et al. (2008), the international activities of European regions are often a way to express or defend their cultural identities (p. 467; 484 and 486).

7.3. Conclusion

In chapter 3, we mentioned that the EU is ruled by the "partnership principle" (Bauer, 2002, p. 769). In light of the two last chapters, it is clear that partnerships are greatly encouraged in Scotland. Indeed, we discussed the establishment of regional, national, and international partnerships.

In the UK, partnerships are also commonly widespread (Nelson, 2009, p. 488), but they do not follow the same guidelines than Scotland. For instance, regarding local or regional partnerships, Stephen Osborne, Arthur Williamson & Rona Beattie (2010) insist on the idea that the UK give more importance to economic regeneration projects compared to Scotland where projects initiated must rather focus on community vitality (p. 1089). In terms of national partnerships, the State does not have the same role in the UK and Scotland. Doustaly (2004) states that “*L’analyse des actions gouvernementales au Royaume-Uni ne suffit pas à rendre compte de la vie culturelle, nombre d’activités fonctionnant sans aucune subvention publique ou soutien privé organisé, mais sur un mode uniquement volontaire ou commercial, preuve de la pérennité des valeurs victoriennes du self-help*” (p. 105). In Scotland, if it is true that the “Government is just one player” (*The Scottish Executive Response on the Cultural Review*, January 2006, p. 11), the State remains involved in culture in some ways by encouraging the different actors to develop joint projects.

Again, Scotland marks its difference from the UK. Of course, it is not without reason: Scotland has understood that national partnerships between an institution like the NMS and local/regional centres across Scotland or international connections are a great way to extent the reach of the Scottish realizations. By doing so, Scottish peoples become proud of their national treasures and their Scot identity.

Chapter 8: The Ambivalence on the Notion of Identity

In chapter 3, we discussed the fact that Europe struggles between the notion of cultural unity and cultural diversity. Indeed, even if the European Union wants to create a coherent political community, it remains that the cultural identity of every Member State must be respected. When we read the Scottish official documents, we realized that Scotland faces the same struggle in the field of cultural heritage. The previous chapters already gave us the opportunity to discuss the notion of Scottish identity in light of other variables. In this chapter, the notion of identity is at the centre of our discussion.

8.1. The Scottish Identity: Cultural Unity

The National Cultural Strategy states right away Scotland's position on that matter. The second strategic objective concerns the intention to "celebrate Scotland's cultural heritage in its full diversity" ("*Creating our Future... Minding our Past*" – *First Report*, August 2000, p. 1). This idea of "diversity" should be mainly understood as the Executive's plan to preserve the heritage of linguistic communities that have been part of the Scottish history such as the Gaelic-speaking people and the Scots-speaking people. This is the reason why the first key priority for the second objective is to "promote Scotland's languages as cultural expressions and as a means of accessing Scotland's culture" ("*Creating our Past... Minding our Past*" – *First Report*, August 2000, p. 10)². In other words, by protecting the Gaelic and Scots languages, it is actually a way to promote Scotland's unity, which relies on

² Because it is not the focus of our work, we will not insist on the Executive's linguistic initiatives. Nevertheless, it is relevant to mention that the government wants to explore the possibility to build a centre for the languages of Scotland, establish a structure to support the Gaelic and Scots languages and propose ways to promote minority linguistic communities (*Achievement Audit – Scotland's National Cultural Strategy, 2000-2004*, p. 19; "*Creating our Future... Minding our Past*" – *Scotland's National Cultural Strategy, Annual Report*, 2003, p. 40-41).

a common cultural heritage. The second key priority of this strategic objective states the importance to “conserve, present and promote interest in, and knowledge of, Scotland’s history and cultural heritage” (“*Creating our Past... Minding our Past*” – *First Report*, August 2000, p. 13). Here, we also understand the intention to focus on the unity, which comes from the Scotland’s history and cultural heritage. It is interesting to note that the first and second key priorities intertwine in several occasions. For instance, the NMS worked on an exhibition of poetry at Kitchside in which works in Scots language can be found (“*Creating our Future... Minding our Past*” – *First Report*, August 2000, p. 10).

The promotion of cultural unity also comes from the intention to achieve cultural excellence and develop Scottish people’s pride regarding their homeland. In order to create this cultural unity, the Scottish Executive and Government have highlighted anniversaries that shape the Scottish cultural heritage. For instance, both the Scottish Year of Highland Culture in 2007 and the celebration of the 250th anniversary of Burns’ birth in 2009 were great opportunities used by the government to develop among Scottish people a sense of belonging towards Scotland (*A Partnership for a Better Scotland*, 2003, p. 43). It is probably the same logic that explains the Scottish Government’s investment in 2014 for the site where the Battle of Bannockburn took place 700 years ago (*Empowering Scotland, The Government’s Programme for Scotland, 2013-2014*, p. 78).

Nevertheless, the best way to reach these objectives is through the National Collections. As “centres of excellence”, “the National Collections have a crucial role to celebrate and showcase the talent of Scots” both at the national and international levels (*Scottish Executive Response on the Cultural Review*, January 2006, p. 36; *A Partnership for a Better Scotland*, 2003, p. 42-44). How do the National Collections succeed in celebrating and showcasing the Scottish ingenuity? Actually, part of the answer can be found in the

previous chapters. Indeed, if we remember, the focus on cultural democracy in Scotland gives the possibility to an important part of the Scottish population to get access to the National Collections. Moreover, it is important to note that the development of partnerships at the national and international levels is also a convincing way to make Scottish people proud of their homeland. In that way, the wonders of the National Collections are showcased at home and abroad (*Draft Culture (Scotland) Bill – Consultation Document*, 2006, p. 2; 10). So, partnerships between national institutions and regional museums represent an effective way to contribute to the regional cultural development in Scotland.

If the previous chapters gave us a part of the answer regarding how the National Collections celebrate and showcase the Scottish wonders, other dimensions can be added to this discussion. The documents reveal that a National Audit of museum collections was initiated by the SMC in April 2001 on behalf of the Executive (*Achievement Audit – Scotland’s National Cultural Strategy, 2000-2004*, p. 23). This National Audit, which was the first initiative of that kind in Scotland and the largest ever conducted in Europe, gives many reasons to Scottish people to be proud of their cultural heritage (*Scotland’s National Audit – Summary Report*, 2002, p. 1):

- There are over 12 million items in Scotland’s museum collections, of which 46% are in the collections of the national organisations.
- The National Audit has for the first time identified the significance of museums collections in five categories: international, UK-wide, national, regional and local significance.
- 78% of organisations have collections which are, in whole or in part, of national significance, although the size of the collections varies considerably.
- Collections of ‘national significance’ are by no means confined to the national organisations (*Scotland’s National Audit – Summary Report*, 2002, p. 4).

If almost half of the 12 million artifacts in Scotland can be found in the national organizations’ collections, it is interesting to note that the NMS, for its part, has one third of these 12 million artifacts in its collection (*Strategic Plan 2011-2015 – National Museums*

Scotland (2013-2014 update), p. 1). The NMS is fully conscious of the importance of its collections, describe as having “an astonishing breadth and depth” (*Annual Review*, 2002-2003, p. 20), for the Scottish nation. Indeed, the NMS’ collections preserve the Scotland’s cultural heritage in order to give the possibility to Scottish people to connect with their history, which is the key to build the present and the future (*Strategic Plan 2011-2015 – National Museums Scotland (2013-2014 update)*, p. 2).

Acquiring significant artifacts for the Scottish nation and showcasing exhibitions related to the Scottish culture are other means to cultivate the national pride (*Annual Review*, 2004-2005, p. 12-16). For instance, in its *2002-2003 Annual Review*, we learn that the NMS acquired objects of “two of Scotland’s most distinguished soldiers of the Napoleonic Wars” (*Annual Review*, 2002-2003, p. 21). The following year, the NMS lent its national piping collections for an exhibition at the National Piping Centre in Glasgow. The importance of this loan is fully understood by the fact that “the bagpipe is Scotland’s national instrument and the most powerful and evocative voice of Scottish music and culture” (*Annual Review*, 2003-2004, p. 18). In addition, as part of Highland 2007, the NMS, in collaboration with the NGS and the NLS, worked on the special touring exhibition “Fonn ’s Duthchas: Land and Legacy”. This exhibition, which offered interpretation in English and Gaelic, honored Highland cultural vitality (*Annual Review*, 2007, p. 8) and, by extension, celebrated the Scottish identity. Nevertheless, the permanent gallery at the NMS entitled “Scotland: A Changing Nation” is undoubtedly the permanent exhibition that strengthens the national pride: “The gallery offers a thought-provoking insight into our recent past, from the First World War to the present day, through personal accounts, familiar objects and evocative films. From heavy to hi-tech industries and humour, a nation is put under the spotlight” (*Annual Review*, 2009, p. 25). This national pride was accentuated with the temporary

exhibition *Mary, Queen of Scots*. Indeed, Mary, which is an emblematic figure of the Scottish history, attracted more than 60,000 visitors at the NMS (*Annual Review*, 2013, p. 3).

The last variable that needs to be mentioned is the NMS' transformation that was finalized in 2011. This transformation implies that this institution has become "a treasure house for the nation" (*Annual Review*, 2009, p. 7). Thanks to the support of the Heritage Lottery Fund, the Scottish Government and more than 1,000 private donors, the £47m project became possible (*Annual Review*, 2012, p. 5). The NMS' transformation involves the establishment of 16 new galleries and the display of artifacts for the first time. Indeed, 80% of the artifacts have never been part of an exhibition (*Annual Review*, 2009 and 2011, p. 5). The reopening of the museum was a great success with 2.3 million visits in only 12 months (*Annual Review*, 2012, p. 5). For understanding the importance of this transformation, it is essential to focus our attention on the expressions used to describe it. For instance, the new NMS has become "a new cultural focal point for Edinburgh and Scotland", "a 21st-century museum" and a "museum of international importance" (*Annual Review*, 2010, p. 13-14 and 2011, p. 7). In the same logic, with the reopening of the NMS, it means actually "the liberation of the potential of [a] great national collections" (*Annual Review*, 2011, p. 2).

8.2. The Scottish Identity: Beyond Cultural Unity

If the National Outcome 13 states "we take pride in a strong, fair and inclusive national identity" (*Scottish Budget, Draft Budget 2014-2015*), which was clearly demonstrated in the previous section, it is important to insist on the fact that there is a clear will to open Scotland to cultural diversity.

Indeed, despite the fact that there is an obvious intent to promote cultural unity in Scotland, it remains that black and minority ethnic groups are taken into consideration in Scottish museums' programming. In order to illustrate this assertion, it is relevant to give

some examples that took place in Scotland over the past years. For instance, the SMC is working in collaboration with the Black Environment Network on the “Equal” project and the “HEAP” project. These two projects want to encourage cultural diversity at work, in the cultural heritage field, and invite minority groups to visit museums and galleries. Another good example refers to the fact that the Museum of Scotland Discovery Centre gives the possibility to young visitors to start the exploration of world religions (Islam, Hinduism, Judaism, Buddhism and Christianity) and, by extension, to get introduced to the religious diversity (*Creating our Future... Minding our Past*, Annual Report 2003, p. 104).

As mentioned in the NMS’ Strategic Plan 2011-2015, “connecting Scotland to the world and the world to Scotland” (p. 5) is a priority. Here, we will give several proofs that this objective is strictly followed. Of course, the UK represents Scotland’s first partner and source of influence. Previously, it was question of UK-partnerships such as the touring exhibition *The Lewis Chessmen: Unmasked*. This successful exhibition was the result of a collaboration between the NMS and the British Museum (*Annual Review*, 2010, p. 21). The partnership with the Victoria and Albert Museums, which gave the possibility to save a pair of 17th century Italian Baroque tables by Lucio de Lucci (*Annual Review*, 2012, p. 9), is also a good example of UK-partnership. In addition, the UK is a great source of inspiration for Scotland regarding cultural diplomacy. Effectively, the UK sees museums as a powerful tool in cultural diplomacy, which is described as “soft diplomacy”. Following this trend, the NMS firmly believes that “cultural diplomacy can be part of the articulation of the national identity to a global audience” (*International Framework*, August 2008, p. 1).

We would not be surprised to know that Europe is the second most important partner for Scotland. In *Creating our Future... Minding our Past (First Report)*, we learnt that Scotland took part in 10 joint cultural projects in 2003-2004 with other European states or

regions in order to get access to EU Culture 2000 funding and have the possibility to have an impact on EU cultural orientations (August 2000, p. 17). By doing so, Scotland shows the importance that it gives to the establishment of European links. Getting closer with Europe has remained a priority for Scotland 10 years later:

The Scottish Government's key international priority for 2013 and 2014 is to increase the level of engagement with the European Union and its member countries, particularly through developing enhanced links with priority countries, especially France, Germany, Ireland and the Nordic and Baltic countries. We will also seek opportunities to promote Scottish Government priorities, both with visitors in Scotland, in Brussels and in priority countries (*Scottish Budget, Draft Budget 2014-2015*, p. 1).

This quotation reveals that Scotland has identified some European targets and these targets are mainly located in the north of Europe. For instance, we previously mentioned an exhibition on the Celts and the Scandinavians that took place at the *Musée de Cluny* in Paris. This exhibition falls in line with the priorities of Scotland (*Annual Review, 2009*, p. 15).

However, it is important to note that Scotland also develops projects with other European countries that are not part of their priority list. Indeed, if we remember, we discussed earlier the exhibition *Catherine the Great: An Enlightened Empress*, an exhibition that was possible thanks to a partnerships with the State Hermitage Museum in St Petersburg (*Annual Review, 2012*, p. 6). The same pattern happened with the exhibition *Fascinating Mummies*, an exhibition that was possible thanks to the support of the National Museum of Antiquities in the Netherlands. As Russia, the Netherlands is not part of Scotland's priorities, but this does not prevent Scotland to develop projects with these countries (*Annual Review, 2012*, p. 6).

Scotland also has partners beyond Europe. On the international scene, Scotland has developed relationships with China, India, Australia and North America (*Annual Review, 2011*, p. 3). It is important to note that the "International Framework focuses on countries

where (Scotland has) strong collection links combined with opportunities for enhanced profile or increased knowledge” (*Annual Review*, 2010, p. 17). In other words, Scotland does not develop links with specific countries without reason. Indeed, Scotland has a particular interests for India, China, North America and Australia because these countries “offer potent future prospects both to extend our knowledge and collections” (*Annual Review*, 2011, p. 3). This is the same reason why Scotland is interested to work in collaboration with Malawi: the NMS works with the Museum of Malawi in order to highlight the bicentenary of the birth of David Livingstone, a Scottish missionary and explorer that went to Malawi in the 19th century (*Annual Review*, 2012, p. 10).

In light of these examples, we fully understood what *The National Strategy for Scotland’s Museums and Galleries* wanted to do by developing a “global perspective” in the field of cultural heritage (*Going Further*, 2012, p. 38). However, the first section of this chapter clarified the idea that the development of a global perspective in the field of cultural heritage should not be done at the expense of Scottish cultural unity.

8.3. The Scottish Case: Unity vs Diversity

In Chapter 3, we discussed the fact that the EU faces a struggle between the notion of cultural unity and cultural diversity. According to Charnoz, this struggle is representative of the tension that is part of the EU. The current chapter showed us that Scotland faces also an identity struggle. However, a precision must be done. When it is question of the European unity, it is actually question of the existence of common values shared by the European community. In terms of European diversity, it implies that the EU has to respect the State members’ identities. In the case of Scotland, the notion of “unity” refers to the Scottish identity whereas the notion of “diversity” means that Scotland broadens its horizons to other realities like the European community. In other words, Scotland faces the same variables

(“unity” vs “diversity”) that the EU, but the equation is inverted.

Scotland’s position regarding the notion of “identity” differs from the UK. The UK has not taken position so far on the definition of a national identity:

...avec la dévolution de pouvoirs à l’Écosse et au Pays de Galles en 1997, aucune définition nationale de la culture ou de l’art n’a été arrêtée par le gouvernement, en reconnaissance d’une diversité culturelle marquée par des spécificités linguistiques et régionales (...). Le gouvernement soutient également la culture des minorités ethniques d’origine étrangère. La politique travailliste est en ce sens véritablement multiculturelle...” (Doustaly, 2004, p. 105)³

So, the UK as a pluralist position on the notion of national identity. With the National Outcome 13, which states that “we take pride in a strong, fair and inclusive national identity”, Scotland proves, for its part, the importance given to a national identity. For instance, in this chapter, we saw that Scotland tends to stimulate the national pride by using different strategies. The focus that Scotland places on the notion of national identity comes with the desire to be connected with the UK and the rest of the world. Indeed, several projects that try to integrate minority ethnic groups in the Scottish society have been implemented so far and Scotland or Scottish cultural institutions work to establish, maintain or increase the number of connections with the UK, Europe or the international scene. In brief, we can resume the differences between the UK and Scotland by the fact that the UK has a pluralist position whereas Scotland advocates a “strong, fair and inclusive national identity” that is open to the world in order to asserts its position.

This initial difference is accentuated by the fact that the UK and Scotland do not have the same position on the European community. Effectively, the UK is clearly opposed to the European integration: *“Que ce soit dans la presse britannique ou dans les discours des hommes politiques, on parle rarement de la machine institutionnelle européenne en termes*

³ The Labour Party ruled the UK from 1997 to 2010.

optimistes ou élogieux” (Cassagnau, 2004, p. 95). Regarding Scotland, as mentioned before, it has become a supporter of the EU and wants to “play the game of a powerful region in Europe” (Nagel, 2004, p. 69). By doing so, Scotland marks again its difference over the UK.

Chapter 9: The EU Policy and Decision-Making Process

In chapter 3, we briefly overviewed the policy cycle stages in the EU before focusing on the idea that the EU policy process follows a step-by-step process. In other words, we can say that the EU policy process is built up from what has already been done in the past. This aspect is the first dimension discussed here. The notions of evaluation and measurement as well as the focus on the three-step decision making-process (consultation, collegiality and cooperation) are also on the agenda.

9.1. A Step-by-Step Process

If it is true that a step-by-step process is commonly used in the EU policy, we did not find several examples throughout the Scottish primary sources that illustrate this process. However, it does not mean that Scotland's cultural field ignores this pattern. Indeed, if we refer to *Achievement Audit – Scotland's National Cultural Strategy, 2000-2004*, we learnt that the Executive would like to establish a new national framework for museums and galleries in light of the previous statutory framework (p. 24). In other words, the intention is to use what it has already been done in order to include “exemplification of standards”, “illustrations of good practices” or “advices” in the new framework (*Achievement Audit – Scotland's National Cultural Strategy, 2000-2004*, p. 73). Moreover, it is interesting to note that the MGS “has carried out research into existing information available on museums and galleries from key sources”. This information would be part of a “statistical baseline and a set of Key Performance Indicators” (*From Strategy to Action – A Delivery Plan for Scotland's Museums and Galleries, 2013-2015*, p. 30). So, the MGS did not start from scratch to build this new framework. Eventually, it would be appropriate to study more in

details this step-by-step process in Scottish cultural policies.

9.2. Evaluation and Measurement

The notions of evaluation and measurement are now our focus of interest. The evaluation and measurement of the Scottish museums' performance is done in light of some criteria. These criteria are mentioned throughout our primary sources. Indeed, the notion of "efficiency", "sustainability", "accountability" and "rationalization" are omnipresent in the Scottish official documents.

9.2.1. The Importance of Objectives, Indicators and Standards

When we read all of our sources, we understood that the Scottish cultural heritage field gives a great importance to evaluation and measurement. At first, the value of these notions is implicitly revealed by the fact that the Scottish cultural institutions or the Government insist on the definition of objectives, indicators or standards.

In the *National Cultural Strategy – Creating our Future... Minding our Past (First Report)*, four objectives are defined for the cultural field as a whole. One of them concerned the policy process, which is assuring "an effective national support Framework for culture" (August 2000, p. 1). In *Going Further – The National Strategy for Scotland's Museums and Galleries* published in 2012 (p. 17), six objectives are circumscribed in order to indicate the direction that has to be followed by Scotland's Museums and Galleries. These objectives concern, among others, the potential of the collections, the public participation, the professional development of the museums' workforce and the sustainability of the sector. We have to understand that "this National Strategy represents a crucial milestone for Scotland's museums and galleries. It is the first time that there has been a single strategy for the whole sector, to unite it in purpose and to work towards a shared vision to achieve a more sustainable future" (p. 6).

As objectives, indicators and standards fill out the same role: to give indications regarding the direction that has to be followed. For instance, in the National Performance Framework, there are several indicators such as “Increasing cultural engagement” (*National Performance Framework: Changes to the National Indicator Set*, 2012). It is also question of the importance for the NMS to respect the “highest international standards” in the field of museum in order to confirm their distinctive position (“*Our Next Major Enterprise...*” – *First Report of the Cultural Commission*, June 2005, p. 108). By extension, the Accreditation Standard and the Quality Improvement System are other rules that frame the Scottish museums. These standards are clearly aligned with the National Performance Framework (*Going Further – The National Strategy for Scotland’s Museums and Galleries*, 2012, p. 42). So, these objectives, standards and indicators are essential to evaluate and measure the Scottish museums’ performance.

9.2.2. Different Strategies to Evaluate and Measure the Performance of the Museums

If we go further in the analysis, different strategies are used to evaluate and measure the performance of the museum field. The first one is the definition of a “set of instruments” that includes “exemplification of standards, illustrations of good practice and advice on measuring the social benefits of cultural activity” (*National Cultural Strategy – Creating our Future... Minding our Past (First Report)*, August 2000, p. 32).

Research is another strategy used in the Scottish cultural field that tries to give the adequate tools to better evaluate and measure the museums’ performance. This is the reason why the first national audit of collections in museums and galleries was initiated. The same logic applies with the Executive’s *Literature Review of the Evidence Base for Culture, The Arts and Sport Policy* (August 2004). The evidences gathered by the national audit and the literature review gave essential information to determine the direction that has to be taken

regarding the policy initiatives (*Achievement Audit – Scotland’s National Cultural Strategy, 2000-2004*, p. 24). In order to establish a strong system to gather and disseminate information and statistics, the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA), the Executive, the cultural institutions, university representatives and authorities worked together in the name of further national outcomes (*Achievement Audit – Scotland’s National Cultural Strategy, 2000-2004*, p. 71).

The identification of “clear targets for monitoring progress” (*An Action Framework for Museums – Consultation and Response*, August 2003, p. 9) is the last mean that has to be mentioned here. The definition of objectives, standards and indicators in the previous paragraph refers in fact to the importance of clarifying the targets and outcomes that the field wants to reach.

9.2.3. A Timeline for the Introduction of the Evaluation and Measurement Policy in Scotland

Of course, it is relevant to ask what is the timeline regarding the establishment of the evaluation and measurement policy in Scotland. Was this policy already in place before devolution? Actually, this policy has started to be implemented in the post-devolution epoch. Following the Cultural Commission’s work, it came to the conclusion in its final report in 2005 that “the sector needs reform. The national framework to regulate standards and align strategy needs to be established and robustly managed. The national collection needs to move from concept to operational and strategic reality” (*“Our Next Major Enterprise...” – Final Report of the Cultural Commission*, June 2005, p. 109). So, we understand here that the national collection was mainly a conceptual reality at the beginning of the 2000s. The Cultural Commission firmly believed that a “reconfigured infrastructure” had to be introduced in order to help the development of the cultural field in Scotland (*“Our Next Major Enterprise...” – Final Report of the Cultural Commission*, June 2005, p. 255).

Shortly after, in 2008, A Quality Improvement Framework, *How Good is Our Culture and Sport?*, was developed in order to help local authorities and other cultural institutions that need indications regarding the quality of their cultural provision (*Culture Delivers*, 2008). The idea behind this Framework is to give the tools to local authorities that want to self-evaluate their cultural provision. The keyword in the middle of this evaluation is the notion of improvement. Local authorities have to answer four questions: “how good is our culture?”, “how are we doing?”, “how do we know?”, “what are we going to do now?”. The answers to these questions are supposed to lead to the planning for improvement (*How Good is our Culture and Sport?*, 2012, p. 8).

For its part, the MGS tried to translate its strategy into action starting in 2011. At first, the aims and objectives of the sector were stated in *Going Further: The National Strategy for Scotland’s Museums and Galleries*. If we remember, we previously said that six objectives were circumscribed in this publication. The Delivery Plan’s objective is mainly to propose a “structured approach” to reach these six aims and objectives (*From Strategy to Action – A Delivery Plan for Scotland’s Museums and Galleries, 2013-2015*, 2013, p. 1). For each of the six aims, the Delivery Plan identifies the MGS role, the sector role, the timescale, the way to measure the priority and the National Strategy aims to which it refers (*From Strategy to Action – A Delivery Plan for Scotland’s Museums and Galleries, 2013-2015*, 2013, p. 11-28). We have to understand that “the purpose of this Delivery Plan is to ensure that museums and galleries are working towards a more secure, robust and fit-for-purpose sector, with the goal of sustainability firmly underpinning all activity” (*From Strategy to Action*, p. 9).

The NMS also has its own strategic plan for the years 2011-2015. It is important to note that it is not the first time that the NMS has a strategic plan. Its last strategic plan was in

2006-2011. However, at that time, the strategic plan was not closely aligned with a national strategy. The current strategic plan involves a revised Strategic Framework that will last for 10 years. That Framework includes a vision, strategic themes (collections, audiences, connections and people & resources), strategic priorities and strategic actions. In order to give a clear direction regarding the path that has to be followed, we also find the “intended outcomes” in this Framework (*Strategic Plan 2011-2015 – National Museums Scotland, 2013-2014 update*, p. 5). These outcomes are measured through the “Key Performance Indicators”, which are closely linked with the strategic themes. For instance, for the first theme (Collections), the key performance indicators are the number of loans, the number of academic publications or the number of objects records online (*Strategic Plan 2011-2015 – National Museums Scotland, 2013-2014 update*, p. 6). Each of the four themes is linked with the relevant National Outcomes defined by the Government. Of course, the “National Museums Scotland makes a contribution towards all 16 National Outcomes” (*Strategic Plan 2011-2015 – National Museums Scotland, 2013-2014 update*, p. 12). However, the NMS has more impact on five specific Outcomes: National Outcome 1, 4, 13, 14 and 16.

9.3. The Three-Step Decision Making-Process

We mentioned previously that the third step in the public policy cycle stages in the EU is the process of taking decisions. This process is composed of three steps, which are consultation, collegiality and cooperation. In this section, the attention is focused on consultation and cooperation because our sources did not give us the possibility to appreciate the collegiality between the different actors.

9.3.1. Consultation

In light of the reading of our sources, “consultation” was a word that constantly recurred in the field of Scottish cultural heritage. Actually, since devolution, every cultural

initiative seems to have started with a consultation.

Just after the publication of the National Audit of museums and galleries' report, the Executive launched a consultation that took place between September and December 2002 in order to draft an Action Plan for Scotland's museums and galleries (*Achievement Audit – Scotland's National Cultural Strategy, 2000-2004*, p. 24). The answer was positive because the Executive received 92 submissions. A part of these responses stated that the Executive should support the non-national museums sector, the local authorities should be more involved in the development of their museums located in their area, the roles of NMS, NGS and SMC need to be clarified and a new agency that has a clear orientation for the whole sector needs to be created (*An Action Framework for Museums – Consultation and Response*, August 2003, p. 4). Thanks to this consultation, the “NMS has proposed a more clearly defined national role for itself as a source of advice and expertise and also as a key player in the creation of strategic partnerships which build capacity” (*An Action Framework for Museums – Consultation and Response*, August 2003, p. 10).

Consultation was also an important dimension of the Cultural Commission's work. Indeed, in order to be informed of the sector's point of view, the Cultural Commission used several sources of information during the consultation process such as meetings, thinking groups, international observation and written submissions (“*Our Next Major Enterprise...*” – *Final Report of the Cultural Commission*, June 2005, p. 31). The Commission conducted consultations for different dimensions: rights and entitlements, education, cross-cutting initiatives, national assets, planning and partnerships, organizational infrastructure and investment (“*Our Next Major Enterprise...*”, June 2005, p. 31; 52; 78; 122; 168; 211; 222; 257). Following the consultations, the Cultural Commission came with many recommendations such as the introduction of a Culture Bill by 2007, which implies the

definition of national cultural standards for heritage centres, galleries and museums as well as architecture and built environment (*“Our Next Major Enterprise...”*, June 2005, p. 275).

Finally, the National Strategy for Scotland’s Museums and Galleries published in 2012 was also the product of consultations:

This National Strategy for Scotland’s Museums and Galleries has been developed through an extensive process of consultation and engagement with individuals and organisations in the sector and with external partners. The many thoughtful and insightful contributions received have informed the Strategy and helped to determine the future direction of the whole sector (*Going Further – The National Strategy for Scotland’s Museums and Galleries*, 2012, p. 8).

Through the consultation process, it has been possible to point out the challenges that are part of the reality of the Scottish museums such as the relevance of the collections, the importance of being competitive in a challenging economy or the sustainability of the sector. These challenges represent the starting point for the development of the National Strategy. The consultation process was also useful to determine how the sector was able to reach the National Strategy aims and to what could be the responsibilities of the new National Development Body (*Scotland’s Museums and Galleries – Activities, Needs & Support – Consultation Report, Museums Galleries Scotland*, February 2013, p. 1-5).

9.3.2. Cooperation

The notions of cooperation, partnerships or dialogues are also omnipresent in our Scottish sources. The first mean by which this cooperation takes place is through a call for a better collaboration between the National institutions (*Achievement Audit – Scotland’s National Cultural Strategy, 2000-2004*, p. 6). Following this collaborative dynamic, the National Institutions Collaboration Exercise (NICE), which regroups the three national institutions (NGS, NMS and NLS), tries to “identify where they can work together to mutual benefit” (*Creating our Future... Minding our Past (First Report)*, August 2000, p. 5). The

potential avenues are related to the development of more joint exhibitions, the rationalisation of common functions (ex: human resources, estates and communications technology) and the introduction of a better coordination of strategies and policies especially regarding the national collections (*Scottish Executive Response on the Cultural Review*, January 2006, p. 36; *Draft Culture (Scotland) Bill – Consultation Document*, 2006, p. 9).

There is also a clear intent to encourage the National Institutions to become more involved with the non-national sector (*An Action Framework for Museums – Consultation and Response*, August 2003, p. 1). For instance, the “NMS has made a major strategic commitment to enhance its national role to provide advice and expertise, and to work in partnership to improve access to its own and other collections” (*Achievement Audit – Scotland’s National Cultural Strategy, 2000-2004*, p. 24). The Commission firmly believes that the national collections should travel more around Scotland through a permanent and temporary loans program. However, according to this Commission (June 2005), the National institutions’ contribution is not limited to the sharing of their expertise and resources: in addition, they “must lead the sector by example” (p. 108).

The MGS, in which the NMS is not included, is also invited by the Government to foster its collaborative approach. At first, it is important to remember that the MGS is currently in a transition process; the MGS will become the National Development Body for the whole museums sector. In the National Strategy for Scotland’s Museums and Galleries published in 2012, the notions of “connections”, “collaboration” and sharing are widely used. The National Strategy’s objectives imply, among others, to “strengthen connections between museums, people and places to inspire greater public participation, learning and well-being” and “foster a culture of collaboration” (*Going Further – The National Strategy for Scotland’s Museums and Galleries*, 2012, p. 22). By extension, the new National Development Body is

invited to focus on the development of partnership, networking and collaboration with the heritage sector, key partners, peer organisations and the Scottish Government (*Scotland's Museums and Galleries – Activities, Needs & Support – Consultation Report, Museums Galleries Scotland*, February 2013, p. 2). One strategy to maintain collaboration and dialogues within the heritage sector is to establish a Forum where all players will be invited to take part in (*Report by the Museums Think Thank – Scotland's Museums and Galleries*, December 2010, p. 10).

Until so far, the national institutions and the MGS have been the focus of interest. Nevertheless, it is important to insist on the idea that the collaborative approach is required from all levels of the society. Effectively, all departments of the government, the whole cultural sector, the private and the voluntary sectors, the Scottish universities and colleges as well as local authorities are invited to be part of the game (*Creating our Future... Minding our Past*, August 2000, p. 31; *An Action Framework for Museums – Consultation and Response*, August 2003, p. 3; 5 & 10; *Cultural Policy Statement*, April 2004, p. 4; “*Our Next Major Enterprise...*”, June 2005, p. 105).

9.4. The Policy Cycle Stages and the Decision-Making Process in Scotland

To conclude, this chapter illustrated the similarities between Scotland and the EU regarding the policy cycle stage and the decision-making process. Nevertheless, to the opposite of the other variables studied in this thesis, there is no significant difference between Scotland and the UK for this dimension. For instance, we illustrated the idea that Scotland follows a step-by-step process instead of reinventing the wheel when it comes the time to introduce new cultural policies. In the case of the UK, authors also recognized that the country is dealing with “a pattern of gradual adaptation” (John et al., 2013, p. 24). In addition, in terms of evaluation, as Scotland, the authors assert that the UK commonly

applied evaluation and measurement in order to properly track the efficiency of its public policies (Jacob, 2000). Finally, the publication *Public Engagement in Policy-Making* (House of Commons, Public Administration Select Committee, May 2013) clearly shows the importance of consultations in the UK, which is also an important dimension in Scotland.

If it is true that Scotland and the UK share the same key features in terms of the policy cycle stages and the decision-making process, Scotland gives a great importance to evaluation and measurement because the Government and cultural institutions know that it is an effective tool to frame Scotland's performance regarding the objectives and, by extension, to change directives if necessary. A positive correlation exists between these objectives and the Scottish pride.

Conclusion

The aim of our project was to determine to what extent Europeanization has an impact on the Scottish cultural field since devolution. According to Radaelli, the degree of Europeanization regarding cultural policies is generally considered as low (Radaelli, 2010, p. 255), but, in other fields like agricultural policies, the degree is high (Versluis, Van Keulen and Stephenson, 2011, p. 74). Our project tried to shed lights on the influence of Europeanization in the Scottish cultural heritage field.

To the opposite of Radaelli's statement, our hypothesis was that Europeanization is clearly affecting Scottish cultural heritage policies. In order to build a framework that gave us the possibility to analyse our object of study, we referred to the notion of "referential" in light of the process of Europeanization. We identified six dimensions that frame the European community, which are the economic and social justifications of public policies, the importance of cultural democracy, the cultural development of regions, the EU policy process and the decision-making process, the emphasis placed on the development of partnerships and the ambivalence of the notion of the EU identity.

Our analysis gave us the possibility to observe that all the variables previously identified as being part of the European referential roam the Scottish cultural heritage policies. Regarding the first dimension, which is the economic and social justifications of public policies, both the Executive and the Scottish Government give credits to the social and economic benefits related to cultural investments. This instrumental dimension is also widely present in Scottish museum policies. On a social point of view, museums are considered as having the power to inspire and nurture talent and to contribute to the vitality of

communities. On an economic point of view, museums generate revenues, create jobs and stimulate the tourism industry.

The importance given to cultural democracy in Scotland is illustrated by the fact that cultural rights were introduced for all citizens. Moreover, the aim to increase accessibility takes different forms in official documents. The first obvious one is related to the physical visits to museums. The initiatives to attract young people, the investment in digital projects and the programmes that try to reduce the gap between disadvantaged social groups and cultural institutions are other strategies to increase accessibility to all forms of culture such as museums.

In terms of regional development, it is important to point out that the Executive firmly believed that the impulsion to implement local cultural provision must come to the local authorities. For ensuring that they work effectively, the Executive wanted to frame their actions by promoting the virtues of cultural planning, which is tightly linked to community planning. In this dynamic, local museums have a fundamental role that must be emphasized by the action of local authorities.

The emphasis placed on the development of partnerships is really clear in the case of Scotland. The national and international partnerships are considered as an efficient way to make possible projects that would not be implemented without these initiatives. In terms of national partnerships, these collaborations have the power to increase public participation, promote the collections and make the Scottish museums and galleries competitive. Regarding international partnerships, they make possible the traveling of Scottish collections around the world, the sharing of expertise and the holding of international exhibitions in Scotland.

Scotland struggles between the notion of cultural unity and cultural diversity as the European Union. By preserving the Gaelic and Scots languages, promoting interest in Scotland's history, working to achieve cultural excellence and developing Scottish people's pride regarding their homeland, the Government works in the name of cultural unity. To the opposite, there is a clear will to open Scotland to cultural diversity. Indeed, despite the fact that there is an obvious intent to promote cultural unity in Scotland, it remains that black and minority ethnic groups are taken into consideration in Scottish museums' programming. In addition, several collaborations are established in order to connect Scotland to the global world.

Concerning the last dimension, which is the EU policy process and the decision-making process, the analysis of our sources showed that the Scottish cultural heritage field gives a great importance to evaluation and measurement. The evaluation and measurement of the Scottish museums' performance is done in light of some criteria such as "efficiency", "sustainability", "accountability" and "rationalization". The value of these notions is implicitly revealed by the fact that the Scottish cultural institutions or the Government insist on the definition of objectives, indicators or standards. Also, the word "consultation" constantly recurs in the field of Scottish cultural heritage. Actually, since devolution, every cultural initiative seems to have started with a consultation. By extension, the notions of cooperation, partnerships or dialogues are also omnipresent in our Scottish sources.

If all the six variables identified as being part of the European referential are present in Scottish cultural heritage policies, it is important to insist on the idea that each of these variables alone does not have the power to determine the degree of Europeanization of cultural policies. However, the omnipresence of all these variables is significant. This said, our thesis was based on a limited number of variables and, then, is it possible to conclude

that Europeanization is clearly affecting the Scottish cultural heritage policies? Indeed, because of the scope of a master's thesis, it was not possible to take into consideration all the dimensions that refer to Europeanization. As a result, it becomes difficult to take a firm stand regarding the Scottish cultural heritage policies. Our thesis was like an introduction in the field of Scottish cultural heritage policies. This introduction would require to dig a bit further before concluding to the Europeanization of Scottish cultural heritage policies.

We firmly believe that it is wiser to say for now that policy convergence is taking place in Scotland instead of concluding that Scottish cultural heritage policies are Europeanized. If we remember, we mentioned that Europeanization is a form of convergence. By saying that the Scottish cultural heritage policies are clearly part of a policy convergence dynamic, this statement is not so far from our initial hypothesis.

Be that as it may, our thesis also showed that the presence of these variables in Scottish cultural heritage policies since devolution is an efficient way to catalyze the notion of Scottish identity. Indeed, for almost all of these variables (in the case of the last dimension studied, we did not see a significant difference between Scotland and the UK), Scotland's position tends to differ from the UK.

Marking his difference has always been a great tool to assert his identity. This equation also works for a region like Scotland. For instance, by focusing on the democratization of cultural heritage institutions or activities, we saw in chapter 5 that everyone who wishes it has the possibility to be part of the cultural field in Scotland. By extension, being part of the Scottish cultural field actually means that it becomes easier to feel connected with the Scottish society and, then, to share the national identity. In the case of the UK, the cultural field is governed by the notion of "excellence". In addition, in

chapters 6 and 7, our analysis showed that the Scotland uses cultural regional development and the establishment of partnerships as a springboard to anchor its identity.

According to Keating, Scotland has tried hard to do things differently than the UK after devolution (Keating, 2010, p. 29). Now we know that part of this attitude has its roots in Scotland's will to prove its distinctiveness from the UK. This distinct character makes fully sense with the notion of "Scottish identity". By extension, our work showed that cultural heritage policies have the power to stimulate the identity factor. Actually, we can say that cultural heritage is like a nation-building officer. Scotland finds its way to construct its own identity by sharing several characteristics with the EU. When we know that the UK is openly against the European integration, Scotland's position regarding the EU makes sense. In other words, by sharing several characteristics with the EU, Scotland seeks to establish its credibility in the political chessboard.

To conclude, our thesis gave us the opportunity to explore Scottish cultural policies in light of the notions of Europeanization and identity. The limited framework of a master's thesis implied that it was not possible for us to conclude categorically that the Scottish cultural heritage policies were Europeanized. A future study could push further our approach by expanding the number of variables taken into account to assess the level of Europeanization. Once that this study is done, a comparative study between Scotland, Catalonia and Bavaria could be interesting if we want to feed the discussion on the level of Europeanization of regions with a strong cultural identity.

Bibliography

1. Primary Sources

1.1. Scottish Executive

Scottish Executive. *Creating our Future... Minding Our Past, Scotland's National Cultural Strategy. First Annual Report*. August 2000.

Scottish Executive. *An Action Framework for Museums – Consultation and Response*. August 2003.

Scottish Executive. *A Partnership for a Better Scotland*. May 2003.

Scottish Executive. *Creating our Future... Minding Our Past, Scotland's National Cultural Strategy*. Annual Report 2003.

Scottish Executive. *Implementation of the National Cultural Strategy: Guidance for Scottish Local Authorities*, 2003.

Scottish Executive. *A Literature Review of the Evidence Base for Culture, The Arts and Sport Policy*. February 2004.

Scottish Executive. *Cultural Policy Statement*. April 2004.

Scottish Executive. *Progress Report of Initiatives Promoting Cultural Provision and a Wide Range of Other Policies*. January 2005.

Scottish Executive. *“Our Next Major Enterprise...”*. *Final Report of the Cultural Commission*. June 2005.

Scottish Executive. *Achievement Audit. Scotland's National Cultural Strategy, 2000-2004*. July 2005.

Scottish Executive. *Scottish Executive Response on the Cultural Review*. January 2006.

Scottish Executive. *Draft Culture (Scotland) Bill. Consultation Document*. December 2006.

Scottish Executive. *Draft Culture (Scotland) Bill – Guidance Document*. December 2006,

Scottish Executive. *Cross-Portfolio Cultural Initiatives for 2006*. 2006.

1.2. Scottish Government

Scottish Government. *Culture Delivers*. 2008.

Scottish Government. *Report by the Museums Think Tank – Scotland’s Museums and Galleries*. December 2010.

Scottish Government. *Scottish Government Response by Fiona Hyslop, Minister for Culture and External Affairs to the Report by the Museums Think Tank*. 2010.

Scottish Government. *Empowering Scotland: The Government’s Programme for Scotland 2013-2014*. September 2013.

Scottish Government. *How Good is our Culture and Sport? A Quality Improvement Framework for Culture and Sport Provision*. 2012.

Scottish Government. *National Performance Framework: Changes to the National Indicator Set*. Page updated on June 19, 2012. www.scotland.gov.uk

Scottish Government. *Scottish Budget Draft – Budget 2014-2015 (Chapter 8: Culture and External Affairs)*. Page updated on September 11, 2013. www.scotland.gov.uk

Scottish Government. *Future for Scotland’s Museums*. Page updated on September 16, 2011. www.scotland.gov.uk

Scottish Government. “National Identity”. *National Outcomes*. Page updated on June 21, 2012. www.scotland.gov.uk

1.3. Museums Galleries Scotland (formerly the Scottish Museums Council)

Museums Galleries Scotland. *Realising the True Impact of Museums and Galleries in Scottish Tourism*. 2010 Data.

Museums Galleries Scotland. *Scotland’s National Audit. Summary Report. The Main Findings and Conclusions from the National Audit of Scotland’s Museums and Galleries*. July 2012.

Museums Galleries Scotland. *Going Further. The National Strategy for Scotland’s Museums and Galleries*. March 2012.

Museums Galleries Scotland. *Scotland’s Museums and Galleries: Activities, Needs & Support. Consultation Report*. February 2013.

Museums Galleries Scotland. *From Strategy to Action. A Delivery Plan for Scotland’s Museums and Galleries 2013-2015*. May 2013.

Scottish Museums Council. *Realising the True Impact of Museums and Galleries in Scottish Tourism: Full Report*. 2005.

1.4. National Museums Scotland

National Museums Scotland. *Annual Review*. 2002-2003.

National Museums Scotland. *Annual Review*. 2003-2004.

National Museums Scotland. *Annual Review*. 2005.

National Museums Scotland. *Annual Review*. 2006.

National Museums Scotland. *Annual Review*. 2007.

National Museums Scotland. *Annual Review*. 2008.

National Museums Scotland. *Annual Review*. 2009.

National Museums Scotland. *Annual Review*. 2010.

National Museums Scotland. *Annual Review*. 2011.

National Museums Scotland. *Annual Review*. 2012.

National Museums Scotland. *Annual Review*. 2013.

National Museums Scotland. *International Framework*. August 2008.

National Museums Scotland. *Strategic Plan 2011-2015*. Update 2013-2014.

1.5. Other primary sources

Commission of the European Communities. *European Growth Initiative*, 2003.

European Commission. *European governance: a white paper*, 2001.

European Commission. *i2010 European Digital Libraries Initiative*, May 2008.

European Commission. *Horizon 2020 – The EU Framework Programme for Research and Innovation*. Website consulted on June 5, 2012. Ec.europa.eu/programmes/horizon2020.

2. Secondary Sources

Abirached, Robert (dir.). *La décentralisation théâtrale*. 1. *Le premier âge 1945-1958*, Paris, Actes Sud, 1992 ; *La décentralisation théâtrale*. 2. *Les années Malraux. 1959-1968*, Paris, Actes Sud-Papiers, 1993 ; *La décentralisation théâtrale*. 3. *1968, le tournant*, Paris, Actes Sud, 1994 et *La décentralisation théâtrale*. 4. *Le temps des incertitudes 1969-1981*, Paris, Actes Sud-Papiers, 1995.

- Ahearne, Jeremy. "Between Cultural Theory and Policy: The Cultural Policy Thinking of Pierre Bourdieu, Michel de Certeau and Régis Debray." Centre for Cultural Policy Studies. University of Warwick. *Research Papers*. 2004 (7).
- Ahearne, J. (2009) "Cultural policy explicit and implicit: a distinction and some uses". *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 15(2), pp. 141-153.
- Anderson, Benedict. *L'imaginaire national : réflexions sur l'origine et l'essor du nationalisme*. Paris, La Découverte, 2002.
- Autissier, Anne-Marie. *L'Europe de la culture : histoire(s) et enjeux*, Arles : Actes sud ; Montréal : Leméac ; Paris : Maison des cultures du monde 2005.
- Autissier, Anne-Marie. « Politiques culturelles des États européens : pour une nécessaire refondation ». *Revue Espaces Temps*. Article published in 2006. Page updated on July 2012. <http://espacestemp.net/document1917.html>
- Bailey, Christopher, Steven Miles and Peter Stark. "Culture-Led Urban Regeneration and the Revitalisation of Identities in Newcastle, Gateshead and the North East of England." *International Journal of Cultural Policy*. 2004 (10.1): 48-65.
- Bassand, Michel, éd. *Identité et développement régional*. Projet Culture et région (Conseil de l'Europe). 1991.
- Bathelt, H. "Cluster Relations in the Media Industry: Exploring the 'Distanced Neighbour' Paradox in Leipzig." *Regional Studies*. 2005 (39): 105-128.
- Bauer, Michael W. "The Eu 'Partnership Principle': Still a Sustainable Governance Device across multiple administrative arenas?", *Public Administration*, Vol. 80, No. 4, 2002: 769-789.
- Becker, H. S. (1976). "Arts Worlds and social types", *American Behavioral Scientists*, vol. 19, no. 6, p. 703-718.
- Bell, David and Mark Jayne. « The Creative Countryside : Policy and Practice in the UK Rural Cultural Economy ». *Journal of Rural Studies*. 2010 (26): 209-218.
- Bennett, T. (1998). Cultural Policy – Acting on the social. *Cultural Policy*, 4(2), 271-289.
- Bennett, O. (1997). Cultural policy, cultural pessimism and postmodernity. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 4(1), 67-84.
- Blatter, Joachim et al. "The Foreign Relations of European Regions: Competences and Strategies". *West European Politics*. May 2008 (31:3): 464-490.

- Borneman John and Nick Fowler. "Europeanization". *Annual Review Anthropology*. 1997 (26): 487-514.
- Börzel, Tanja A. and Thomas Risse. "From Europeanisation to Diffusion: Introduction". *West European Politics*, Vol. 35, No. 1, January 2012: 1-19.
- Bovis, Christopher. *Public-Private Partnerships in the European Union*. Routledge, New York and London, 2014.
- Brossat, Caroline. *La culture européenne: définitions et enjeux*. Bruxelles, Bruylant, 1999.
- Brown, Adam, Justin O'Connor and Sara Cohen. "Local Music Policies Within a Global Music Industry: Cultural Quarters in Manchester and Sheffield". *Geoforum*. 2000 (31): 437-451.
- Budina, Nina, Hana Polackova Brixi and Timothy Irwin. *Public-Private Partnership in the New EU Member States: Managing Fiscal Risks*. World Bank, 2007.
- Bugeaud, Marie. *Un local qui s'europeanise : l'exemple de la politique culturelle au sein du Conseil regional de Midi-Pyrénées*. IEP de Toulouse, 2010-2011.
- Cabantous, Alain. *Histoire du blasphème en Occident, fin XVI^e – milieu XIX^e siècle*. Paris, Albin Michel, 1998, 307 p.
- Cairney, Paul. *The Scottish Political System Since Devolution. From New Politics to the New Scottish Government*. Imprint Academic, Exeter, 2011.
- Cantin, Caroline. *Croyance, crédulité et superstitions : étude sur les échanges culturels à travers l'affaire Robert Pons (1757-1758)*. Mémoire. Montréal, Université du Québec à Montréal, 2009.
- Caporaso, James, Maria Green Cowles and Thomas Risse. "Introduction: Europeanization and Domestic Structural Change" in *Europeanization and Domestic Structural Change*. James Caporaso, Maria Green Cowles and Thomas Risse, eds. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 2001: 1-20.
- Cassagnau, Olivier. « Le Royaume-Uni contemporain face aux politiques d'intégration européenne à vocation fédéraliste » in *Identités nationales, identité européenne, visibilité internationale*. Aspects historiques, politiques et économiques de la construction européenne. Sous la dir. de Traian Sandu, Cahiers de la nouvelle Europe, L'Harmattan, 2004.
- Chapman, K., MacKinnon, D. and A. Cumbers. "Adjustment or Renewal in Regional Clusters? A Study of Diversification Amongst SMEs in the Aberdeen Oil Complex." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*. 2004 (29): 382-394.
- Charnoz, Olivier. *La constitution du référentiel de l'action culturelle de l'Union*

Européenne. Comment et au nom de quoi la culture est-elle devenue l'objet d'une politique spécifique de l'Union Européenne?, Maîtrise de sociologie politique, Université de Nanterre - Paris X, Septembre 1999.

- Coaffee, Jon. "Re-scaling Regeneration. Experiences of Merging Area-Based and City-Wide Partnerships in Urban Policy." *The International Journal of Public Sector Management*. 2004 (17.5): 443-461.
- Couch, Chris, Olivier Sykes and Wolfgang Börstinghaus. "Thirty Years of Urban Regeneration in Britain, Germany and France: The Importance of Context and Path Dependency." *Progress in Planning*. 2011 (75): 1-52.
- Crouzet, Denis. *Les guerriers de Dieu : la violence au temps des troubles de religion (vers 1525-1610)*. Seyssel, Champ Vallon, coll. « Époques », 1990, 2 vol.
- Dannestam, Tove. "Rethinking Local Politics: Towards a Cultural Political Economy of Entrepreneurial Cities." *Space and Polity*. December 2008 (12.3): 353-372.
- De Baecque, Antoine. *Les éclats du rire : la culture des rieurs au XVIII^e siècle*. Paris, Calmann-Lévy, 2000.
- Delanty, Gerard. "The Idea of a Cosmopolitan Europe: On the Cultural Significance of Europeanization". *International Review of Sociology*. 2007 (15:3): 405-421.
- Denzin, Norman K. and Yvonna S. Lincoln. "Chapter 1 – Introduction: The Discipline and Practice of Qualitative Research" in Denzin, Norman K. et Yvonna S. Lincoln. (1998). *Strategies of Qualitative Inquiry*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. p. 1-43.
- Denzin, Norman K. et Yvonna S. Lincoln. (1998). *Strategies of Qualitative Inquiry*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Dewey, Patricia. "From Arts Management to Cultural Administration." *International Journal of Arts Management*, 2004 (6.3): 13-22.
- DiMaggio, P. (1983). Cultural policy studies: What they are and why we need them, *Journal of Arts Management and Law*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 241-248.
- Dolff-BoneKämper, Gabi. "The Social and Spatial Frameworks of Heritage – What Is New in the Faro Convention". Council of Europe ed. *Heritage and Beyond*. Strasbourg, Council of Europe, 2009: 69-74.
- Doustaly, Cécile. « La politique culturelle britannique, entre particularisme et européanisation » in *Identités nationales, identité européenne, visibilité internationale*. Aspects historiques, politiques et économiques de la construction

- européenne. Sous la dir. de Traian Sandu, Cahiers de la nouvelle Europe, L'Harmattan, 2004.
- Eppie. "Analyser l'europeanisation des politiques publiques" In *L'Europe en action. L'Europeanisation dans une perspective comparée*. Bruno Palier et Yves Surel, dir. Paris, L'Harmattan, 2007: 13-80.
- Evans, Graeme. "Measure for Measure: Evaluating the Evidence of Culture's Contribution to Regeneration." *Urban Studies*. May 2005 (42.5/6): 959-983.
- Evrard, Y. (1997). "Democratizing culture or cultural democracy?". *The Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society*, 27(3), 167-175.
- Fairclough, Graham. "New Heritage Frontiers. Council of Europe ed. *Heritage and Beyond*. Strasbourg, Council of Europe, 2009: 29-41.
- Featherstone, Kevin et Claudio Radaelli. *The Politics of Europeanization*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Flockhart, Trine. "Europeanization or EU-Ization? The Transfer of European Norms across Time and Space". *Journal of Common Market Studies*. 2010 (48:4): 787-810.
- Flockhart, Trine. "Europeanisation. The Myths and the Facts". *Research Public Policy*, 2006: 86-91.
- Fontana, Andrea and James H. Frey. "Chapter 24 – The Interview: From Structured Questions to Negotiated Text" in *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. (2000). Thousand Oaks: CA, Sage Publications. p. 645-672.
- Fontana, Andrea and James H. Frey. "Chapter 4 – The Interview: From Neutral Stance to Political Involvement" in Denzin, Norman K. et Yvonna S. Lincoln. (2008). *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Material*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. p. 115-159.
- Fontana, Marie-Christine. "Europeanization and Domestic Policy Concertation: How Actors Use Europe to Modify Domestic Patterns of Policy-Making". *Journal of European Public Policy*, 18:5 August 2011: 654-671.
- Gattinger, Monica and Diane Saint-Pierre. "The 'Neoliberal Turn' in Provincial Cultural Policy and Administration in Québec and Ontario: The Emergence of 'Quasi-Neoliberal' Approaches." *Canadian Journal of Communication*. 2010 (35): 279-302.
- Gattinger, Monica. "Démocratisation de la culture, démocratie culturelle et gouvernance", présentation dans le cadre de l'assemblée générale annuelle du réseau des organismes publics de soutien aux du Canada (OPSAC), 16-18 novembre 2011, Whitehorse.
- Gray, C. (2010). Analysing cultural policy: incorrigibly plural or ontologically incompatible?

International Journal of Cultural Policy, vol. 16(2), pp. 215-230.

- Graziano, Paolo and Maarten Peter Vink. "Challenges of a New Research Agenda" in *Europeanization: New Research Agendas*. Graziani P. Vink, ed. Basingstoke: Palgrave. 2007: 3-22.
- Greer, Scott L. *Nationalism and Self-Government: the Politics of Autonomy in Scotland and Catalonia*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2007.
- Griffiths, Andy & Allan M. Williams. "Culture, Regional Image, and Economic Development in the United Kingdom". *World Futures: The Journal of New Paradigm Research*. 1992 (33:1-3): 105-120.
- Guérin, Marie-Anne. "Le patrimoine culturel, instrument de la stratégie de légitimation de l'Union Européenne. L'exemple des programmes Interreg", *Politique européenne*, 2008/2, no. 25: 231-251.
- Hamilton, Christine & Adrienne Scullion. "Cultural Policy and Scotland: A Response to the National Cultural Strategy". *Scottish Affairs*. Spring 2002 (39): 1-18.
- Harvey, D. C. (2001). Heritage pasts and heritage presents: Temporality, meaning and the scope of heritage studies. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 7(4), 319-338.
- Harvey, Fernand. "Chapitre 7: La région culturelle et la culture en région". Dans *Traité de la culture*. Denise Lemieux, dir. Québec: Les éditions de l'IQRC. 2002: 135-161.
- Hardill, Irene, ed. *The rise of the English regions?* New York: Routledge, 2006.
- Henderson, Steven, Sophie Bowlby and Mike Raco. "Refashioning Local Government and Inner-City Regeneration: The Salford Experience." *Urban Studies*. July 2007 (44.8): 1441-1463.
- Hewinson, Robert. "Creative Britain: Myth or Monument?". *Cultural Trends*. September-december 2011 (20:3-4): 235-242.
- Holder, Ian. "Chapter 26 – The Interpretation of Documents and Material Culture" in *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. (2000). Thousand Oaks: CA, Sage Publications. p. 703-732.
- JACOB, Steve. « Approche comparative des politiques d'évaluation », *Pyramides. Revue du Centre d'études et de recherches en administration publique*, p. 85-113.
- Jacquot, Sophie et Cornelia Woll. "Action publique européenne: les acteurs stratégiques face à l'Europe". *Politique européenne*. 2008 (25:2): 161-192.

- Janesick, Valerie. "Chapter 13 – The Choreography of Qualitative Research Design: Minuets, Improvisations, and Crystallization" in *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. (2000). Thousand Oaks: CA, Sage Publications. p. 379-399.
- John, Peter et al. *Policy Agendas in British Politics*. New York, Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.
- Jordan, Andrew. "Policy Convergence: A Passing Fad or a New Integrating Focus in European Union Studies?". *Journal of European Public Policy*. October 2005 (12:5): 944-953.
- Kaddouri, Hamid. "Chapitre 4: Les actions culturelles en Europe: communautarisation ou simple cooperation intergouvernementale?" Dans *Tendances et défis des politiques culturelles*. Claudine Audet et Diane Saint-Pierre, dir. Québec: Presses de l'Université Laval. 2009 : 67-80.
- Keating, Michael, "National and Regional Identities in Europe", *Contemporary European History*, Vol. 16, Issue 03, 2007: 407-412.
- Keating, Michael. *The European Union and the Regions*. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1995.
- Keating, Michael. *Les défis du nationalisme moderne : Québec, Catalogne, Écosse*. Montréal; Bruxelles : Presses de l'Université de Montréal et Presses interuniversitaires européennes, 1997.
- Keating, Michael. *The Government of Scotland. Public Policy Making after Devolution*. Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, 2010.
- Knill, Christoph. "Introduction: Cross-National Policy Convergence: Concepts, Approaches and Explanatory Factors". *Journal of European Public Policy*, October 2005 (12:5): 764-774.
- Lehman, Erin V. *Symphony Orchestra Organizations: Development of the Literature Since 1960*. *Harmony*, October 1995 (1): 37-54.
- Llado, Anna Planas and Pere Soler Maso. "Design and Application of a System of Evaluation Indicators for Municipal Cultural Policies." *Evaluation*. 2011 (17.3): 277-291.
- Madriz, Esther. "Chapter 32 – Focus Groups in Feminist Research" in *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. (2000). Thousand Oaks: CA, Sage Publications. p. 835-850.
- Martin, Aaron Russell. *Analyzing the Effects of Microregions on Macroregions: Can Euroregions Legitimize the European Union?* ProQuest, UMI Dissertation Publishing, 2011.
- McGuigan, J. (2005). "Neo-liberalism, culture and policy", *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, vol. 11, pp. 229–241.

- Mesic, Milan. "Multicultural world and its challenges." *Studia Europaea* (2009): 73+. *Academic OneFile*. Web. 31 July 2014.
- Miller, David and Sundas Ali. "Testing the National Identity Argument". *European Political Science Review*, 2013: 1-23.
- Minnaert, Toine. "Footprint or Fingerprint: International Cultural Policy as Identity Policy". *International Journal of Cultural Policy*. 2012: 1-15.
- Moreno, Luis. "Scotland, Catalonia, Europeanization and the 'Moreno Question'". *Scottish Affairs*, Winter 2006 (54): 1-21.
- Mulcahy, Kevin V. "Cultural Policy: Definitions and Theoretical Approaches." *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*. Winter 2006 (35.4): 319-330.
- Muller, Pierre. « Un schéma d'analyse des politiques sectorielles », *Revue française de science politique*, 35^e année, no 2, 1985 : 165-189.
- Muller, Pierre. « L'analyse cognitive des politiques publiques : vers une sociologie politique de l'action publique », *Revue française de science politique*, 50^e année, no 2, 2000 : 189-208.
- Munro, R. Colin. "Scottish Devolution: Accommodating a Restless Nation". *International Journal on Minority and Group Rights*, 6 (1999): 97-119.
- Nagel, Klaus-Jürgen. "Transcending the National / Asserting the National: How Stateless Nations like Scotland, Wales and Catalonia React to European Integration". *Australian Journal of Politics and History*, 2004 (50.1): 57-74.
- Nelson, Suzy. "The Nature of Partnership in Urban Renewal in Paris and London". *European Planning Studies*. 2009 (9:4): 483-502.
- Oberdorff, Henri. *Les institutions administratives*. Paris, A. Collin, 2004.
- Oberdorff, Henri, dir. *L'eupéanisation des politiques publiques*. Saint-Martin-d'Hères (Isère), PUG , 2008.
- O'Brien, David and Steven Miles. « Cultural Policy as Rhetoric and Reality: A Comparative Analysis of Policy Making in the Peripheral North of England ». *Cultural Trends*. March-June 2010 (19): 3-13.
- Orr, Joanne. (2008). "Instrumental or intrinsic? Cultural policy in Scotland since devolution". *Cultural Trends*, 17(4), pp. 309-316.
- Ory, Pascal. « Front populaire et création artistique », *Bulletin de la Société d'histoire moderne*, 1974, no 8, p. 5-17.

- Ory, Pascal. « Pour une histoire culturelle de la France contemporaine (1870-...). État de la question », *Bulletin du Centre d'histoire de la France contemporaine*, 1981, no 2, p. 5-32.
- Ory, Pascal. « L'action culturelle du Front populaire », *Les Cahiers de l'animation*, 1981, no 32, p. 17-27.
- Ory, Pascal. *L'entre-deux-mai. Histoire culturelle de la France. Mai 1968. Mai 1981*, Paris, Seuil, 1983.
- Ory, Pascal. « La politique du ministère Jack Lang : un premier bilan », *The French Review*, 1984, p. 77-83.
- Ory, Pascal. *L'aventure culturelle française. 1945-1989*, Paris, Flammarion, 1989.
- Ory, Pascal. « La politique culturelle de Vichy : ruptures et continuités » dans J.-P. Rioux (dir.), *La vie culturelle sous Vichy*, Bruxelles, Éditions Complexe, 1990, p. 225-238.
- Osborne D. & Gaebler, T. *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector*, 1992, Plume/Penguin, New York.
- Osborne, Stephen, Arthur Williamson & Rona Beattie. "Community Involvement in Rural Regeneration Partnerships in the UK: Key Issues from a Three Nation Study". *Regional Studies*. 2002 (36:9): 1083-1097.
- Ozel, Isik. "Differential Europe Within a Nation: Europeanization of Regulation Across Policy Areas". *Journal of European Public Policy* (2013), vol. 20, no. 5: 741-759.
- Paquin, Stéphane. *La revanche des petites nationales. Le Québec, l'Écosse et la Catalogne face à la mondialisation*. Montréal, VLB éditeur, 2001.
- Pearce, S. (1998). The construction and analysis of the cultural heritage: Some thoughts. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 4(1), 1-9.
- Perrin, Thomas. "Inter-Territoriality as a New Trend in Cultural Policy? The Case of Euroregions". *Cultural Trends*, June 2010 (19: 1-2): 125-139.
- Perrin, Thomas. "Distinctive and Distinguishing Strategies, from Local to Global". *Journal of Contemporary European Studies*. December 2012 (20:4): 459-475.
- Peters, Bernhard and al. "National and Transnational Public Spheres: The Case of the EU", *European Review*, 2005, vol. 13, supp. No. 1: 139-160.
- Poirrier, Philippe, éd. *Politiques locales et enjeux culturels. Les clochers d'une querelle, XIXe-XXe siècles*, Paris, La Documentation française-Comité d'histoire du ministère de la Culture, 1998.

- Poirrier, Philippe. *Municipalité et culture au XXe siècle : des Beaux-Arts à la politique culturelle. L'intervention de la municipalité de Dijon dans les domaines artistiques et culturels. (1919-1995)*, Dijon, Université de Bourgogne, thèse d'histoire, 1995.
- Poirrier, Philippe. *Bibliographie de l'histoire des politiques culturelles*. Travaux et documents no 9. Comité d'histoire du ministère de la culture. 1999.
- Pongy, Mireille. "La régionalisation change-t-elle la ou les politiques ? La territorialisation de l'action culturelle en Corse." *Politiques et management public*. 2004 (22.1): 23-46.
- Poulot, Dominique. « Bilan et perspectives pour une histoire culturelle des musées », *Publics et musées*. 1992 (2) : 125-149.
- Rab, Sylvie. *Culture et banlieue. Les politiques culturelles dans les municipalités de la Seine (1935-1939)*. Université de Paris VII-Denis Diderot, thèse d'histoire, 1994.
- Radaelli, Claudio. "The Domestic Impact of EU Public Policy: Notes on Concepts, Methods, and the Challenge of Empirical Research". *Politique européenne*. November 2001: 107-142.
- Radaelli, Claudio. "Le perimeter du concept" In *Dictionnaire des politiques publiques*. Laurie Boussaguet, Sophie Jacquot et Pauline Ravinet, dir. Paris, Presses de Sciences Po, 2010: 247-257.
- Radaelli, Claudio and Romain Pasquier. "Conceptual Issues" In *Europeanization: New Research Agendas*. Graziani P. Vink, ed. Basingstoke: Palgrave. 2007: 35-45.
- Roller, Elisa and Amanda Sloat. "The Impact of Europeanisation on Regional Governance: A Study of Catalonia and Scotland". *Public Policy and Administration*. Summer 2002 (17.2): 68-86.
- Saint-Pierre, Diane. *La culture comme facteur de développement de la ville : recension des écrits et des sites Internet*. Québec: Ministère de la Culture et des Communications du Québec (Coll. "Les Écrits"), 2002.
- Santerre, Lise. "De la démocratisation de la culture à la démocratie culturelle". In *Démocratisation de la culture ou démocratie culturelle?*, sous la dir. de Guy Bellavance, Les Éditions de l'IQRC, Presses de l'Université Laval, Sainte-Foy. 2000.
- Sassatelli, Monica. "Imagined Europe. The Shaping of a European Cultural Identity through EU Cultural Policy". *European Journal of Social Theory*, 2002 (5:4): 435-451.
- Sassatelli, Monica. *Becoming Europeans: Cultural Identity and Cultural Policies*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.
- Silverman, David. "Chapter 31 – Analyzing Talk and Text" in *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. (2000). Thousand Oaks: CA, Sage Publications. p. 821-834.

- Stake, Robert E. "Chapter 4 – Qualitative Case Studies" in Denzin, Norman K. et Yvonna S. Lincoln. (1998). *Strategies of Qualitative Inquiry*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. p. 119-149.
- Sticht, Pamela. *Culture européenne ou Europe des cultures? les enjeux actuels de la politique culturelle en Europe*. Paris ; Montréal, L'Harmattan, 2000.
- Stolz, Klaus. *Towards a Regional Political Class? Professional Politicians and Regional Institutions in Catalonia and Scotland*. Manchester; New York: Manchester University Press, 2009.
- Street, John. "The Popular, the Diverse and the Excellent: Political Values and UK Cultural Policy". *International Journal of Cultural Policy*. September 2011 (17:4): 380-393.
- Taliano-des Garets, Françoise. "Chapitre 8: Les politiques culturelles des grandes villes françaises et l'ouverture internationale (1945-2008)." Dans *Tendances et défis des politiques culturelles*. Claudine Audet et Diane Saint-Pierre, dir. Québec: Presses de l'Université Laval. 2009: 131-146.
- Urfalino, Philippe. *L'Invention de la politique culturelle*. Paris, Hachette, 2004.
- Vadelorge, Loïc. *Pour une histoire culturelle du local. Rouen 1919-1939*, Université de Paris IV Sorbonne, thèse d'histoire, 1996.
- Varry, Dominique. « Réflexions autour de la parution de l'*Histoire des bibliothèques françaises* », *Bulletin d'informations de l'Association des Bibliothécaires Français*. 1993 (160) : 43-46.
- Veitl, Anne et Noémi Duchemin. *Une politique musicale démocratique, Maurice Fleuret (1981-1986)*, Paris, Le colloque « La vie musicale en France pendant la Seconde Guerre mondiale », organisé en janvier 1999 par Myriam Chimènes avec la collaboration de l'Institut de recherche sur le patrimoine musical en France (UMR 200) et l'IHTP (CNRS).
- Versluis, Esther, Mendeltje Van Keulen and Paul Stephenson. *Analyzing the European Union Process*. The European Union Series, Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.
- Yin, R. K. (1994). *Case Study Research. Design and Methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.