

# The Multiple Dilemmas of Environmental Protection

---

The Effects of Generalized and Political Trust on the Acceptance of Environmental Policy Instruments

Niklas Harring  
Göteborg Studies in Politics 137

2014



UNIVERSITY OF GOTHENBURG  
DEPT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

Avhandlingen baseras på följande delstudier:

Harring, Niklas. 2013. "Understanding the Effects of Corruption and Political Trust on Willingness to Make Economic Sacrifices for Environmental Protection in a Cross-National Perspective." *Social Science Quarterly* 94 (3): 660–671.

Harring, Niklas & Jagers, Sverker C. 2013. "Should We Trust in Values? Explaining Public Support for Pro-Environmental Taxes." *Sustainability* 5 (1): 210–227.

Harring, Niklas. 2014. "Corruption, Inequalities and the Perceived Effectiveness of Economic Pro-Environmental Policy Instruments: A European Cross-National Study." *Environmental Science & Policy* 39: 119–128.

Harring, Niklas. n.d. "Reward or Punish? Understanding Preferences Toward Pro-Environmental Policy Instruments in a Cross-National Perspective." Forthcoming.

Akademisk avhandling för filosofie doktorsexamen i statsvetenskap som med tillstånd av samhällsvetenskapliga fakultetsnämnden vid Göteborgs universitet framlägges till offentlig granskning fredagen den 3 oktober 2014, kl 13.15 i Torgny Segerstedtsalen, universitetsbyggnaden, Vasaparken, Göteborg.

Harring, Niklas. 2014 *The Multiple Dilemmas of Environmental Protection. The Effects of Generalized and Political Trust on the Acceptance of Environmental Policy Instruments*. Göteborg Studies in Politics 137, edited by Bo Rothstein, Department of Political Science, University of Gothenburg, Box 711, 405 30 Göteborg, Sweden. ISBN: 978-91-628-9148 ISSN: 0346-5942

## **Abstract**

With different environmental policy instruments (EPIs) that target individual citizens, the state can change activities or behaviors that have negative environmental consequences. However, EPIs are not likely to be implemented or have the intended effects unless people support these policies since a lack of support may affect willingness to comply, and politicians may not even introduce them due to the risk of loss in electoral support. Previous studies have suggested that political and generalized trust are important explanatory factors in EPI support. On an individual level and at least in some contexts, investigations have found that political and generalized trust generate more positive attitudes and higher acceptance of EPIs. There is, however, a lack of comparative studies.

The effects of political and generalized trust on EPI support are investigated in this thesis by studying cross-national differences in EPI preference. By using a comparative design, it is possible to study not only perceptions of whether public institutions are trustworthy and whether we find those effects in different countries, but also the effects of living in a society with more or less effective or corrupt public institutions.

It is suggested that people support different kinds of EPIs in different contexts. The data used are three international surveys and a Swedish mail survey. The results suggest several effects of trust on preferences for policies. One could be described as the coercion effect, where people with low trust choose more coercive policies in order to punish defectors; the second is the bureaucratic discretion effect, where people accept certain kinds of policies (typically economic instruments) only when the bureaucracy has a potential to deliver; third is an effect of trust in others, for people who do not trust others are not likely to choose certain policies when the risk of free-riding is high; and fourth is an indirect effect, for trust affects people's willingness to perform environmental action, which in turn affects policy preferences. In conclusion, as political and generalized trust are important explanatory factors in EPI support, we should expect the potential for such policy instruments to vary quite significantly across countries.

**Key words:** Social dilemmas, Generalized trust, Political trust, Environmental policy instruments, Environmental attitudes, Quality of Government