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Abstract

In this paper, we first provide a brief outline of the creation of a mass higher education system across the UK in the post-war period. This is followed by an overview of the impact of administrative devolution from 1992, followed by political devolution from 1997 onwards. We focus on the nature and impact of policy in two distinctive but interconnected areas, tuition fees and widening access. In relation to tuition fees policy, there has been growing divergence across the UK, with the Scottish Government paying tuition fees for Scottish domiciled students studying in Scotland and those from the EU, whilst charging fees of up to £9,000 per annum to students from the rest of the UK. By way of contrast, all students, including those from other EU countries, are charged fees of up to £9,000 into study in English universities. We consider the impact of these policies in relation to (i) overall participation rates and (ii) the social class background of students in different types of institutions in the two countries. It is argued that whilst different principles underpin the Scottish and English approaches to tuition fees, policy outcomes are broadly similar, both in terms of university participation rates and the social selectivity of different institutions. We then consider approaches to widening access, a policy arena characterised by convergence rather than divergence, with similar strategies being used in England and Scotland giving rise to a common set of problems in relation to regulation and the use of performance indicators. We conclude that the ‘fragile divergence machine’ (Greer, 2007) created by devolution has resulted in growing divergence in UK higher education systems, particularly at the level of political discourse. However, the countervailing pressures of globalisation have ensured the continuation of a recognisably common system across the UK, with all four jurisdictions experiencing a shared set of problems in relation to the reproduction of social inequality in university participation, particularly in high tariff institutions.

Introduction

Since the Second World War in western democracies, there has been a strong belief that achieving equality of educational opportunity is essential to the maintenance of social and political cohesion (David, 2008; Trench, 2009). More recently, the Child Poverty and Social Mobility Commission (2014) has emphasised the role of universities in supporting social mobility. In the post-war years, a relatively low proportion of the age group (about 4 per cent) gained a university place. The Robbins Report, published in 1963, reflected the belief that all who are qualified by ability and attainment should be entitled to a place in higher education, supported by a national system of grants. The recommendations for university expansion were accepted by the UK Government and a wave of new universities was established, leading to an increased participation rate of about 12 per cent by 1980. The next spike in university participation took place in the 1990s following the abolition of the binary divide between the universities and polytechnics/central institutions. By the
mid-1990s, about 32 per cent of 17–30 year olds across the UK had experienced some form of higher education. By 2005, 42 per cent of 17–30 year olds across the UK were entering some form of higher education, although it should be noted that this figure includes those studying sub-degree programmes, only some of whom go on to complete a degree. The advent of administrative and political devolution during the 1990s has led to the emergence of increasingly divergent higher education policies in different UK jurisdictions. Focusing on two key areas, tuition fees and widening access, this paper questions the extent to which a common UK higher education system continues to exist.

Higher education and devolution
Between 1919 and 1989, UK universities were funded directly by the University Grants Committee, which also allocated student numbers. Policy differences began to emerge in different parts of the UK following administrative devolution in 1992, when the funding councils established in each jurisdiction adopted responsibility for resource distribution. During the 1990s, despite emerging differences in the allocation of research funds and the use of colleges as higher education providers in Scotland, there continued to be strong similarities across the systems, with the Dearing report of 1997 recommending that the rapid expansion of higher education should be funded in part by students themselves, with the state continuing to play a major role in university funding. Both the Dearing and Garrick reports (which dealt with Scotland) reflected a view of higher education as both a public and a private good, thus warranting a cost-sharing approach.

As argued by Riddell et al (2015 forthcoming) and Gallacher and Raffe (2012), following political devolution in the late 1990s, far greater differences in approaches to student funding have emerged between the four nations, summarised in Table 1. In Wales and Scotland, these have emerged as flagship policies of the devolved governments, signifying different beliefs about the role of the state in relation to higher education funding. Since 2012, the contrasting arrangements to student funding have been particularly marked. In 2012, variable fees of up to £9,000 with a dedicated income contingent loan were introduced in England following the publication of the Browne review. The devolved nations felt obliged to follow suit, offering different types of financial support to home students. In Wales, variable fees of £9,000 were introduced, but with a dedicated fee grant covering all fee costs over £3,465 for Welsh students studying in any part of the UK, effectively capping fees at that level. At the same time, the maximum grant was raised to £5,161. New loan rules were adopted, as in England. In Scotland, variable fees with no legal maximum were introduced for students from rest of the UK and tuition fee loan was increased to £9,000 for Scottish students studying in the rest of the UK. Free tuition was retained for Scots in Scotland. In Northern Ireland, fees were capped at £3,465 for Northern Irish students in Northern Ireland, and the maximum fee loan increased to £9,000 for Northern Irish students in the rest of UK. Variable fees of up to £9,000 were introduced for students from rest of the UK. Wales was thus unique in providing portable support for its young people, the implications of which are discussed below.
**Table 1: Student support in the United Kingdom before and after devolution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1945–7</td>
<td>First national legislation empowering local authorities and Ministers to support students in higher education. Greater provision of national and local state scholarships ensured many students received grants and had full fees paid, but no absolute entitlement. Separate primary legislation for Scotland and Northern Ireland, both showing some variation in the detailed approach, including more emphasis in Scotland on studying locally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961–2</td>
<td>Following the Anderson Committee report, the introduction of full payment of fees (partially subject to means-testing until 1977) and means-tested grants, as an automatic entitlement on the award of a university place for the first time in any part of the UK. Separate primary legislation, regulations and administrative arrangements for Scotland and for Northern Ireland, but student entitlements essentially the same as for England and Wales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Introduction of student loans to supplement living cost grants across the UK. ‘Mortgage-style’ repayment with only link to earnings the ability to seek 12 months’ suspension of repayments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998–9</td>
<td>Means-tested fee payment of up to £1,000 introduced across the UK. No liability below £23,000; full liability from £30,000. Grants reduced, loan entitlements increased and extended at higher incomes. Loans become ‘income-contingent’, payable at 9% of all earnings over a threshold, initially £10,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999–00</td>
<td>Grants abolished completely across all of UK and replaced with higher loans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000–1</td>
<td>Fee payments abolished for Scottish students studying in Scotland. £1,000 fee continues for all other students in the UK.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001–2</td>
<td>Introduction in Scotland of post-graduation payment (the ‘graduate endowment’) of £2,000, supported by income-contingent loan. National means-tested grants reintroduced for young Scottish students, up to £2,000. Institutionally-administered grants introduced for Scottish mature students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002–3</td>
<td>In Wales and Northern Ireland, means-tested grants re-introduced (for young and mature students) of up to £1,500.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004–5</td>
<td>In England, means-tested grants re-introduced (for young and mature students) of up to £1,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006–7</td>
<td>In England and Northern Ireland, variable fees of up to £3,000 introduced, with dedicated income-contingent fee loan. Grant maximum increased to £2,765. No change to fee arrangements in Wales. Income-contingent fee loan made available for Scottish and Welsh students studying in rest of UK. Annual fee payable by students from rest of UK in Scotland increased to £1,700 (£2,700 for medicine).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007–8</td>
<td>Graduate endowment abolished in Scotland. In Wales, £3,000 fee introduced backed by income contingent loan, but with an additional non-means-tested grant towards fees of £1,845 to all Welsh students studying in Wales, reducing de facto fee liability. Grants increased to a maximum of £2,700.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010–1</td>
<td>Fee grant abolished in Wales and means-tested maintenance grant increased to £5,000. National means tested grant re-introduced in Scotland for mature students, up to £1,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012–3</td>
<td>In England, variable fees of up £9,000 introduced, as before with dedicated income-contingent loan. Loan repayment threshold increased to £21,000 and loan interest rates increased. Grants increased to £3,250. In Wales, variable fees of £9,000 also introduced, but with a dedicated fee grant covering all fee costs over £3,465 for Welsh students studying in any part of the UK, effectively capping fees at that level. Maximum grant raised to £5,161. New loan rules adopted, as for England. In Scotland, variable fees with no legal maximum introduced for students from rest of the UK; loan increased to £9,000 for Scottish students in rest of UK; free tuition retained for Scots in Scotland. In Northern Ireland, fees capped at £3,465 for Northern Irish students in Northern Ireland, maximum fee loan increased to £9,000 for NI students in rest of UK. Variable fees of up to £9,000 introduced for students from rest of the UK.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013–4</td>
<td>Maximum grant for young students reduced from £2,640 to £1,750 in Scotland and mature student grant reduced to £750 and income threshold for grant reduced; tapered system replaced with steps. Minimum loan increased from £940 to £4,500.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tuition fees and political discourse**

Since the first Scottish Parliamentary elections in 1999, tuition fees policy has continued to be an extremely thorny issue. In negotiations between Labour and the Liberal Democrats following the 1999 Holyrood elections, differences in this area threatened to derail the fledgling coalition administration. To maintain political unity, the Cubie Committee was set up to review student funding. This led to the removal of up-front fees in Scotland, which were initially replaced by a one-off graduate endowment (set at £2,289 in 2006-07) which was to be repaid after the student left university and was in employment, with exemptions for disabled students and those from
poorer backgrounds. In 2007, following the election of a minority SNP administration, all graduate contributions were abolished. Since that point, the absence of tuition fees north of the border has been presented as one of the defining features of the Scottish education system and wider polity, exemplifying the principles of universalism rather than marketisation (see chapter 2 for further discussion. In the Scottish Government White Paper on independence (Scottish Government, 2013) and during the course of the referendum debate, frequent reference was made to the distinctiveness of Scottish higher education as based on ‘the ability to learn rather than the ability to pay’. In November 2014, a memorial stone to Alex Salmond’s tenure at the Scottish political helm was unveiled at Heriot Watt University, engraved with the First Minister’s pronouncement that: ‘The rocks will melt in the sun before I allow tuition fees to be imposed on Scotland’s students’. This throws down the gauntlet to political parties and universities who might regard some form of student contribution as both socially just (given the social composition of the student body) and economically prudent.

Has Scotland’s approach produced a more egalitarian system as assumed in the political discourse surrounding tuition fees? This issue is addressed in the following section.

Rates of participation in Scotland, the rest of the UK and Europe

In this section, we briefly summarise data on rates of university participation by jurisdiction. As noted by Iannelli (2011), rising higher education entry rates are likely to promote participation by students from poorer backgrounds, particularly when there is already very high participation by young people from middle class backgrounds.

Northern Ireland has the highest 18 year old university entry rate (36.2%), followed by England (30.3%), Wales (26.6%) and Scotland (24.2%). It should be noted that a high proportion of Scottish young people from deprived areas undertake higher national courses in colleges before transferring to university for the final two years of a degree, so the relatively low university entry rate in this jurisdiction does not convey the full picture of higher education participation. Between 2010 and 2013, entry rates increased in all countries apart from Scotland, with a particularly marked growth in Northern Ireland. In England, Wales and Northern Ireland (but not Scotland), there was a slight fall in participation in 2012 following the introduction of higher fees, followed by an increase in 2013. The cap on student numbers in England will be lifted in 2016, and it will be interesting to see whether this further boosts participation in this jurisdiction.

Table 2: Number of acceptances and entry rates of 18 year olds to end of cycle, by country of domicile. (Source: Universities and Colleges Admissions Service, 2014.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2013 v 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>England</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptances</td>
<td>359,005</td>
<td>367,150</td>
<td>342,755</td>
<td>367,900</td>
<td>2.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 year-old entry rate</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scotland</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptances</td>
<td>32,250</td>
<td>30,800</td>
<td>30,900</td>
<td>31,495</td>
<td>-2.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 year-old entry rate</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wales</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptances</td>
<td>18,670</td>
<td>18,325</td>
<td>19,305</td>
<td>19,665</td>
<td>5.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 year-old entry rate</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northern Ireland</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptances</td>
<td>13,505</td>
<td>13,790</td>
<td>13,285</td>
<td>14,555</td>
<td>7.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 year-old entry rate</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As part of the Bologna process, the EU is committed to harmonising higher education systems across Europe, ensuring that at least 40% of the population aged 30–34 in EU member states has tertiary level qualifications. The EU is also encouraging member states to promote widening access measures and student mobility. As shown in the figure below, the UK has already overtaken the 40% target. However, some countries like Germany appear to have low participation rates because only university degree courses are counted, whereas in other countries higher level vocational courses have tertiary status.

Figure 1: Changes in the proportion of 30–34 year olds with tertiary education in EU28 countries between 2005 and 2013. (Source: Eurostat 2014.)

Note: a) break in data series in 2005

University participation and social class background
Despite the creation of a mass higher education system, and an increase in the proportion of university students from disadvantaged backgrounds, there are still very marked differences in participation by different social groups. In Scotland, 55% of independent school entrants attend an ancient university, compared with 25% of state school entrants. By way of contrast, in Wales just over 40% of university entrants from the independent school sector attend a Russell Group university, compared with 15% of state school entrants. Differences in institution attended by social class background are illustrated below, with students educated in the independent sector much more likely to gain a place in a Russell Group University compared with state school students, who are more likely to attend a post-92 institution.
Figure 2: University attended by student background: Scotland

Higher Education Institutions attended by student background: young Scottish-domiciled students entering HEIs in Scotland (Source: HESA record 2012/13)
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Figure 3: University attended by student background: England

Higher Education Institution attended by student background: young English-domiciled students entering HEIs in England (Source: HESA Student record 2012/13)
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Student funding in Scotland and the rest of the UK: links with widening access
The perceived and actual cost of higher education is likely to have an impact on higher education participation rates, particularly in relation to students from less advantaged social backgrounds. However, as shown in table 2, the negative impact of the trebling of tuition fees for English students in 2012 was offset by the availability of income contingent low interest loans and non-repayable grants. Of the four home nations, despite the absence of tuition fees, only Scotland experienced a drop in the number of university entrants between 2010 and 2013, due to a number of factors including the decline in the 18 year old population, the tight control of university numbers by the Scottish Government and encouragement of students from non-traditional backgrounds to undertake higher education at college rather than university. Based on interviews with young people in Scotland and the north of England, Minty (2015, forthcoming) found that young people in England were resigned to incurring debt, whilst young people in Scotland were highly debt averse. In both jurisdictions, young people from less advantaged backgrounds were more likely to apply to a university close to home in order to avoid debt. Those from more affluent backgrounds were more likely to apply academic criteria to their choice of institution and subject, regarding this an investment in their future even if it resulted in higher debt. Irrespective of students’ perceptions, Lucy Hunter Blackburn (2014) argues that there are important social justice issues embedded in the social distribution of debt which students will carry forward into later life. She has analysed the distribution of tuition fee and living cost debt by jurisdiction and income group
http://www.docs.hss.ed.ac.uk/education/creid/Projects/34ii_d_ESRCF_WP3.pdf. Whilst there has been a major focus on tuition fees, far less attention has been paid to debt incurred to cover living costs. The figure below compares spending power for students across the UK, excluding London. In all parts of the UK, the majority of full-time undergraduate students live away from the parental home. For this group, which faces the highest living costs, the greatest spending power is provided by the English or the Welsh systems. Higher-income Scots studying in Scotland emerge as the group expected to borrow least, relative to all other UK students, underlining the non-redistributive nature of the Scottish system.

Despite marked divergence in the funding of higher education, all jurisdictions have expressed commitment to the principles of widening access for under-represented groups and each nation has claimed that its approach is designed to support this goal.

Approaches to and effectiveness of widening access initiatives
Riddell et al. (2013) were commissioned by Universities Scotland to review the UK literature on the effectiveness of widening access initiatives and analyse the first round of Scottish widening outcome agreements. This section draws on this review in which the following central points were highlighted:
• Policy reasons for promoting wider access have varied over the years, but whether those reasons are based on the desire for social justice, the desire to meet the needs of employers and the UK economy for well-qualified, skilled graduates, or the desire to promote social mobility, there is a broad consensus on the need to give everyone with the potential to succeed the opportunity to enter higher education.
• In England, the Office for Fair Access was established under the terms of the Higher Education Act 2004, ostensibly to ensure that all universities focused on widening access and that the introduction of higher tuition fees did not deter people from entering higher education for financial reasons. The regulation of widening access happened at a later date in Scotland, becoming mandatory under the terms of the Post-16 Education (Scotland) Act 2013.
• The range of under-represented groups is wider than the current focus on disadvantaged neighbourhoods might suggest. It includes: pupils from schools identified as having a record of low progression of its pupils to higher education; students with lower socio-economic status (NS-SEC 4-7); residents in a deprived postcode (not only the most deprived); students in receipt of EMA (Scotland only); those entering from FE college; adult returners; care-leavers; people whose education has been disrupted by health problems or a disability; first generation entrants to HE; students with refugee or asylum seeker status. The inter-section of variables is also important – for example, boys from working class backgrounds and boys of Afro-Caribbean heritage are particularly under-represented in higher education (Hills et al., 2010).

• Across the UK the widening access activities and the performance indicators used in fee plans, outcome agreement and widening access strategies have focused on measures of neighbourhood deprivation. Whilst there is a strong association between neighbourhood deprivation and low rates of university participation, not everyone who lives in a deprived area is socially and economically disadvantaged, and many of those who lack social and economic resources live in less deprived neighbourhoods. This point is reinforced by Evans (2014) and Croxford (2014).

• There has been a much greater focus on recruitment than retention measures. In addition, although most universities claim to use contextualised admissions policies, in ‘high tariff’ institutions the adjustments made for students from low participation school and neighbourhoods is very small. As a result, the vast majority of students from poorer backgrounds are rejected on the grounds of not having the appropriate grades in a limited range of subjects.

The role of colleges in widening access

Whilst there are many similarities in approaches to widening access across the UK, a central difference between Scotland and Northern Ireland on the one hand and Wales and England on the other is the greater role assigned to colleges. In 2009–10, just over 18 per cent of higher education students in Scotland and Northern Ireland were studying sub-degree programmes at a college, compared with 5 per cent in England and 1 per cent in Wales (Bruce, 2012), although the Welsh Government is attempting to promote the role of colleges in widening access (Higher Education Funding Council Wales, 2014). Colleges have traditionally been effective in recruiting students from lower socioeconomic backgrounds and offering more flexible routes, including articulation into the last two years of a university degree programme (Gallacher, 2009). Following the allocation of additional funds by the Scottish Government, there has been an increase in the number of students moving from college into the last two years of a university programme, increasing from 3,019 in 2011–12 to 3,469 in 2012–13 (Universities Scotland, 2014).

Although colleges have succeeded in recruiting young people from low-income backgrounds, Gallacher (2014) has drawn attention to the downsides of such provision. As is the case in the US community college system, there is a danger that young people from lower socioeconomic backgrounds are diverted into low-status programmes which disadvantage them in the labour market. Articulation routes are typically from college to post-92 institutions, limiting access to high-status courses and routes into certain professions such as law and medicine. In addition, the type of teaching and learning which takes place in some college sub-degree programmes is based on demonstrating practical skills, and students may be ill-equipped to complete the last two years of a university degree. In Scotland, higher education statistics often include students on degree and sub-degree programmes and there is a hidden assumption of parity between such programmes. Whilst different types of higher education may be of value to participants, programmes do not provide equal labour market returns and there is a danger that these differences are glossed over.
School attainment
As noted by Rees and Taylor (2014), much – although not all – of the relationship between socio-economic background and HE participation is accounted for by previous educational attainment, which is the most important factor when all others are taken into account. Whilst the existence of different education systems across the UK makes comparison difficult, Wyness (2013) has attempted to draw some contrasts.

http://www.docs.hss.ed.ac.uk/education/creid/Projects/34ivc_ESRCF_Seminar_Briefing.pdf - see table 3 below. Widening access measures adopted by universities can make only a marginal difference in terms of equalising rates of HE participation by different social groups. A programme of major investment in early years and school level education, with a particular focus on improving the attainment of lower achieving groups, would appear to be the most effective way of increasing HE participation by young people from less advantaged backgrounds.

Table 3: Indicators of educational attainment in the home nations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>England</th>
<th>Wales</th>
<th>Scotland</th>
<th>Northern Ireland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Five or more GCSEs A*-C or equivalent</td>
<td>GCSE exams or equivalent, 2010/11</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>75.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A*-C GCSE in Maths</td>
<td>GCSE exams or equivalent, 2006/07</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>54.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A*-C GCSE in English or equivalent</td>
<td>GCSE exams or equivalent, 2006/07</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>62.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of 17-18 year olds at school or in further and higher education</td>
<td>Labour Force Survey</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of 17-24 year olds with no qualifications</td>
<td>Labour Force Survey, 2009</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of 18 year olds with two or more A-levels or equivalent</td>
<td>A-level results, 2011/12; Higher results 2011/12</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>50.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusion
This paper has argued that social inequalities in access to university are entrenched in both England and Scotland. Scotland’s policy of abolishing tuition fees has not made a perceptible difference to widening access – indeed, the latest HESA statistics show that Scottish universities have a lower proportion of students from social classes 4, 5, 6 and 7 than their English counterparts. In assessing the most effective means of widening access, it is necessary to pay attention not only to the role of universities, but also to that of schools and colleges. Pupils from less socially advantaged backgrounds are much more likely to be undertaking a sub-degree programme at college rather than a degree level course at university, raising the questions as to whether the college route should be seen as a form of diversion rather than inclusion. The Scottish Government has committed itself to eliminating the association between social class background and both school attainment and university participation. This is an extremely ambitious goal and will probably require redistribution of funding across different education sectors, with a higher proportion of overall spend directed towards schools and colleges. There are strong vested interests in Scotland which are likely to oppose such resource distribution, and only time will tell whether the government is able to follow through on its promise.
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