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What is Policy Analysis?

> It is the field in political science that does not deal with:

- Elections and electoral behavior
- Social movements
- Political systems and institutions
- Democracy studies
- Political philosophy and theory
- Policy advice
What is Policy Analysis?

• It is the field in political science that deals with

  – The question how social (and environmental) problems get on the political agenda

  – What policy solutions are produced and how processes (politics) and institutions (polity) impact outputs (policy)

  – It is about the content and design of policy making and implementation and the impact policy instruments and measures have on target groups and affected actors
Policy Analysis and Environmental Governance – the PEGO Team
Why the Environment?

> Environmental problems often ask for an immediate action
> but also a long term perspective

→ Both components constitute a challenge for the political system

> Current environmental problems are complex
> Global drivers but local impacts

→ How to integrate actors from the international to the local scale?
→ And why does the local scale matter?
The beauty of Swiss federalism

> Subsidiarity principle
  — Water supply?
  — Flood prevention?

> Direct democracy and citizens as the sovereign
  — Their vote counts

> Ease in implementation
  — Accepted instruments are important for reaching defined targets
Acceptance

> Acceptance studies: numerous in new climate and energy policies; transitions (Borras & Edler 2015; Tabi & Wüstenhagen 2015; Wüstenhagen et al. 2007)

> But a passive concept; value action gap

> Difference between acceptance, action, opposition and support (Batel et al. 2013)

> Procedural aspects of political decision-making (Knill & Tosun 2012)

> Survey studies
Three illustrations

> Acceptance as
  — Pre-condition for policy success
  — Understanding voter behaviour
  — Bringing policy studies and behavioral politics together
  — Ease in implementation

> Flood prevention in the canton of Solothurn (MA thesis by A. Glaus)
> Flood prevention between Thun and Bern (SNF funded Sinergia project; PhD thesis by A. Glaus, ongoing)
> Alternative energy promotion (SNF funded NRP71 project, PhD thesis by L. Kammermann, ongoing)

→ Elite surveys and citizens/household questionnaire
ILLUSTRATIONS
1. IWRM and flood prevention in Solothurn

> Context: «Integrale Wasserwirtschaft im Einzugsgebiet der Dünner»

— Flood prevention going hand in hand with river restoration
— Other sectors involved
— Research question: what impacts the acceptance of new, and cross-sectoral policy instruments?
— Survey: 95 actors, 75% response rate

Quelle (links): Wasserkommission Einzugsgebiet Dünner (2014)
Quelle (rechts): www.panoramio.com
Policy Instruments or Measures
(Output, Policy, DV)

Policy Instruments

> **Sermons**: Persuasive instruments
  — Information, labels
  — Voluntary measures

> **Carrots 1**: Infrastructure
  — Positive incentives (Service)
  — Negative incentives (Barriers)

> **Carrots 2**: Financial incentives
  — Positive economic incentives
  — Negative economic incentives

> **Sticks**: Regulative instruments
  — Regulation
  — Bans

Coerciveness
Low

High
Results and first conclusions

> Survey study and multiple regression analysis

> What impacted actors acceptance of cross-sectoral policy instruments

— Information by decision-makers
— Being affected by the problem/issue
— Negative: experiences with other integrated projects and measures
2. Flood prevention between Thun and Bern

Aims
- Bringing **problem perception and policy preferences** together
Empirical Analysis: Survey

- Data collection: December 2016 – February 2017
  - Questionnaire (80 actors; 80% response rate)
  - Expert interviews with municipal actors
First Results: Problem Perception

Figure 3  Flood exposition of buildings in local municipalities
Source: Markus Mosimann, MobiLab

Figure 4  Problem perception of flood prevention of local municipalities
Source: Survey Anik Glaus
Data: Policy Preferences

- Policy preferences for flood prevention measures
  - Evaluating preference between two opposing policy measures
  - 4 categories of policy instruments:
    - Infrastructure/construction → hard measures
    - Spatial planning
    - Ecological compensation → alternative measures
    - Information/Research

Figure 5 Question about policy preferences for flood prevention measures
First Results: Policy Preferences

Figure 6  Policy preferences for flood prevention measures by actor groups
Intermediary conclusions about Swiss flood prevention

> Introducing new policies and cross-sectoral policy initiatives is difficult

> The acceptance of new policy measures seems dependent upon the problem perception and affectedness of actors

> What about citizens in contrast to the political elite?
What about climate change mitigation and the promotion of renewable energies?

> NIMBY: not in my backyard

> Too simplistic!

> Complex new arrangements:
  — Replacing the conventional consumer-producer relationships with multipronged relationships (Wolsink 2012).
  — Pro-sumer
  — These new relationships not supported by existing institutions, infrastructure, common knowledge etc.
  — Larger legitimacy context matters (Markard et al. 2016; Dewald and Truffer 2012)
The acceptance of new instruments in policy mix situations - the application of a new framework focusing on path-dependency, legitimacy and citizens’ roles
Household survey

> 8’287 answers from a representative sample of the Swiss permanent resident population (i.e., including non-citizens) provided by the Federal Office of Statistics

> The response rate after three invites was at 41.7%.

— The demographic and structural composition of the final sample corresponds quite closely to the Swiss resident population
— This is particularly true with respect to gender, civic status, and education.
— Foreigners living in Switzerland as well as citizens older than 75 years had a lower response rate, which is likely caused by the exclusive use of an online survey.
Overall policy preferences I

Note: Share of respondents (in %) indicating that the canton should use the respective instrument to promote renewable energy.
Table 1: Correlations between policy instruments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Subsidy</th>
<th>Tax release</th>
<th>Ban</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidy</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax release</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ban</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Correlations between individual responses per instrument. Grey = p-value is below 0.05 (significant at the 95% level).
Drivers for new instruments

Figure 4: Cantonal policy context and policy mix preferences

Note: Hierarchical, logistic multi-response, Bayesian estimation using MCMCglmm in R. The mean and the 90% credible interval of the log odds are presented.
Conclusion

> Results show that there is no general acceptance trend observable from less to more coercive policy instruments.

> But overall reluctance to new or cross-sectoral policy instruments

> Does problem perception and affectedness also matter at the citizens’ level?

   — Yes for pro-summers
   — Yes for left-wing supporters
   — Yes for those being strongly in favor of CC mitigation and nuclear phasing out
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