
Contents

<i>List of figures</i>	<i>page</i> x
<i>List of tables</i>	xi
<i>Preface</i>	xiii

Part I Background

1 Environmental pollution as a problem of collective action	3
1.1 Can something be done?	3
1.2 Environmental dilemmas and the logic of collective action	5
1.3 Surveying environmental dilemmas from the actor's perspective: rational choice	10
1.4 How motives speak to preferences	14
1.5 Non-equivalent dilemmas and reported behaviour	17
1.6 Policies of self-regulation in the Netherlands	18
1.7 Moral commitment in environmental dilemmas: conditional or unconditional?	20
1.8 Determinants of cooperation in environmental dilemmas and policy design	24
2 A Dutch approach: self-regulation as a policy concept	28
2.1 Introduction	28
2.2 Dutch environmental policy and the idea of self-regulation	29
2.3 The social instruments	35
2.4 An environmental ethos and the social dilemma	40
2.5 Self-regulation: compliance-oriented or virtue-based?	42
3 The actor's perspective on collective action	47
3.1 The subjectivity of the actor in rational choice theory	47

3.2	Problems of collective action	49
3.3	Social dilemmas	55
3.4	The actor's perspective	59
Part II The survey		
4	Preference orderings and measurement	67
4.1	Three potential social dilemmas	67
4.2	Measuring preference orderings	71
4.3	Three different environmental problems	78
4.4	Avoiding response effects	82
5	Rational choice	84
5.1	Conditions of rational choice	84
5.2	The dominance rule of rational choice	87
5.3	Choice of strategy	91
5.4	The robustness of the dominance rule	95
5.5	Conclusion	98
6	Consistency of motives and preferences	101
6.1	A model of reasoned choice	101
6.2	The motives of Valuation and Willingness	103
6.3	The test of consistent preferences	108
6.4	Consistent preferences in the three cases	116
6.5	Does motive-preference consistency matter?	118
6.6	Conclusion	121
7	The non-equivalence of the cases	124
7.1	Hard and easy cases of the dilemma	124
7.2	The model of the hardest case	125
7.3	The scalability of the cases	131
7.4	The non-equivalence of social dilemmas	133
8	Reported behaviour	136
8.1	Determinants of behaviour	136
8.2	The sociocultural model	138
8.3	An alternative model	142
8.4	From motives to behaviour	146
Part III Conclusions: theory and policy		
9	Do people accept self-regulation policy?	151
9.1	Introduction to part III	151
9.2	Acceptance and agreement	153
9.3	The acceptance of legal regulation and self-regulation	155
9.4	Conclusion	160

10	Do people agree with the environmental ethos?	161
10.1	Introduction	161
10.2	The two stages of the environmental ethos	162
10.3	Knaves, pawns or knights?	167
10.4	The ethical interpretation of motives and preferences	169
10.5	The agreement response	174
10.6	Acceptance and agreement: overview	176
11	Moral commitment and rational cooperation	178
11.1	Ranking preference orderings	178
11.2	The meta-ranking approach	179
11.3	Enlightened self-interest and moral commitment	183
11.4	Consistent preferences in the meta-ranking	187
11.5	An environmental meta-ranking	193
12	Reciprocity and cooperation in environmental dilemmas	197
12.1	The puzzle of unconditional cooperation	197
12.2	The reciprocity thesis	198
12.3	Cost of cooperation and conditionalities in environmental dilemmas	205
13	Assessing self-regulation policies	210
13.1	The context of environmental dilemmas	210
13.2	Consistent ethical cooperation	211
13.3	Background features of hard and easy cases	213
13.4	Mapping problems and the salience of the environmental ethos	216
13.5	Individual cost and collective gain	219
13.6	Comparing motives in the polar cases	225
13.7	The dimension of private significance	227
13.8	Self-regulation policy: symbolic or real?	228
13.9	A non-moralistic approach to environmental responsibility	230
13.10	Self-regulation in proportion to facilitation	233
	<i>References</i>	235
	<i>Index</i>	239

Figures

3.1	Individual vs. The Others	<i>page</i> 53
3.2	The Prisoner's Dilemma game	54
3.3	The Potential Contributor's Dilemma	61
3.4	The Potential Contributor's Dilemma in the actor's perspective	62
4.1	The pay-off of the row player with ordering RPQS	75
4.2	Valid orderings	79
4.3	Identical orderings	81
5.1	RPQS: dominant Defect	88
5.2	QSPR: <i>dominant Cooperate</i>	89
5.3	QRPS: no maximizing rule	89
6.1	Model of practical reasoning	102
6.2	The Potential Contributor's Dilemma of Chemical Waste	109
6.3	Constraints and consistent sets of Valuation motives	112
6.4	Constraints and consistent sets of Willingness motives	113
6.5	Consistency between preference orderings and motives	114
7.1	The hardest case x and case y	127
7.2	The hardest case x and case z	128
7.3	Cognitive process and intensity structure	134
8.1	The extended sociocultural model	143
8.2	The actor's perspective model	147
10.1	Motives and preferences interpreted in terms of the ethos	173
11.1	The game form of the Prisoner's Dilemma	181
11.2	Sen's meta-ranking in the Prisoner's Dilemma	183
11.3	The reconstructed meta-ranking in the Prisoner's Dilemma	192
13.1	Preference orderings and motive structures of the environmental ethos	213

Tables

4.1	Ranking the four outcomes	<i>page</i> 74
4.2	Preference orderings	76
4.3	Valid orderings related with Age	80
5.1	Choice of strategy	92
5.2	Rational choice	93
5.3	Dominance rule and choice of strategy	97
6.1	Motives on the Valuation scale	105
6.2	Motives on the Willingness scale	106
6.3	Motive structures of Valuation and Willingness	107
6.4	Consistent preferences compared to the motive-preference response	116
6.5	Consistent preferences as control variable	120
7.1	Chemical Waste vs. Holiday Destination	129
7.2	Chemical Waste vs. Energy Saving	130
7.3	Holiday Destination vs. Energy Saving	130
7.4	Results of the hardest case analysis	131
7.5	Coefficients of scalability	132
8.1	Six cases of reported behaviour	139
8.2	<i>Determinants of behaviour</i>	141
8.3	A new determinant 'Choice'	145
9.1	Acceptance and rejection of three regulation types	158
10.1	Full and partial agreement with the ethos: motives	175
10.2	Full and partial agreement with the ethos: preferences	175
12.1	Expectation of the choices of the others	208
13.1	Cooperation and consistent ethical cooperation in the three cases	212

13.2	Consistent ethical cooperation, degree of ethical consistency, and share of ethical motives	214
13.3	Belief in the effectiveness of collective action	224
13.4	Motive response in <i>Holiday Destination</i> of respondents with ethical motives in Chemical Waste	225
13.5	Motive response in <i>Holiday Destination</i> of respondents with ethical motives in Chemical Waste, controlled for belief in effectiveness	226