

**Merit goods determined by society value judgments –  
Political implications for public participation  
Support from an empirical analysis concerning environmental goods**

**Table of Contents**

<b>1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>9</b>
1.1	Subject matter and objective .....	9
1.2	Novel field of research .....	13
1.3	Dissertation outline .....	16
<b>2</b>	<b>SOCIETY VALUES AND THE MERIT GOOD CONCEPT .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>2.1</b>	<b>Discussing actor models and behavioral views with respect to society value judgments... 19</b>	
2.1.1	General definition of society value judgments .....	19
2.1.2	Integration of society value judgments in different actor models.....	22
2.1.2.1	Traditional <i>homo economicus</i> model .....	22
2.1.2.2	Becker’s approach.....	27
2.1.2.3	Multiple preference levels.....	32
2.1.2.4	Sen’s approach .....	35
2.1.2.5	Citizens’ versus consumers’ decisions.....	38
2.1.2.6	Political Economic Person according to Söderbaum .....	40
2.1.3	Discussion and concluding definition of society value judgments .....	44
<b>2.2</b>	<b>Merit goods and their impact within economics .....</b>	<b>51</b>
2.2.1	Development of the subject and the definition of merit goods .....	51
2.2.2	Justifying the merit good argument .....	53
2.2.3	Merit goods and the norm of consumer sovereignty.....	58
2.2.4	Distinguishing between merit goods and other concepts in economics.....	61
2.2.4.1	Misunderstandings about and reproaches against merit goods.....	61
2.2.4.2	Related definitions of governmental intervention.....	63
2.2.4.2.1	Public goods .....	63
2.2.4.2.2	External effects .....	69
2.2.4.2.3	Transaction costs.....	70
2.2.4.2.4	Lack of information, uncertainty and information asymmetry .....	71
2.2.4.2.5	Myopia .....	73
2.2.4.3	Comparing the rationale for governmental intervention.....	74
<b>2.3</b>	<b>Summary and conclusion .....</b>	<b>76</b>

<b>3 OCCURRENCE AND IMPLICATIONS OF SOCIETY VALUE JUDGMENTS IN AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS .....</b>	<b>78</b>
<b>3.1 Analyzing preferences for ecological goods .....</b>	<b>78</b>
3.1.1 Ecological goods as merit goods.....	78
3.1.2 Original research objective and survey background .....	81
3.1.3 Choice of stated-preference methods .....	86
3.1.4 Survey Design .....	91
<b>3.2 Survey results and conclusions .....</b>	<b>96</b>
3.2.1 Response .....	96
3.2.2 Stated preferences .....	99
3.2.3 Subjectively felt incompetence .....	104
3.2.4 Stating society values for ecological goods .....	109
<b>3.3 Effects on politics .....</b>	<b>115</b>
3.3.1 Effects on agricultural politics .....	115
3.3.2 Effects on environmental politics .....	118
<b>3.4 Summary and discussion.....</b>	<b>119</b>
<b>4 IMPLICATIONS FOR POLITICAL PRACTICE: DESIGN OF PARTICIPATION.....</b>	<b>122</b>
<b>4.1 Reasons for dealing with society’s participation.....</b>	<b>122</b>
4.1.1 Consumer sovereignty and welfare-enhancing potential .....	122
4.1.2 Participation as legal postulation .....	126
<b>4.2 Participation in the provision process of ecological goods.....</b>	<b>129</b>
4.2.1 The “Regional Advisory Board” and its functions .....	130
4.2.2 Integrating the regional population .....	131
4.2.2.1 Objectives.....	131
4.2.2.2 Survey concerning preferred parameters of participation.....	133
4.2.2.3 Discussion-based approach of integrating the population .....	138
4.2.2.3.1 Objectives.....	138
4.2.2.3.2 Survey design .....	141
4.2.2.3.3 Survey results and conclusion.....	143
4.2.3 Deduction of possible impact for merit goods in general .....	147
<b>4.3 Critical analysis of efficient participation concerning merit goods.....</b>	<b>148</b>
4.3.1 Current political administration .....	148
4.3.2 Objectives of efficient participation when merit goods are regarded .....	151
4.3.3 Discussion of possible design features for participation.....	156
4.3.3.1 Discussing participation processes.....	156
4.3.3.2 Discussing participants and representatives.....	160
4.3.3.3 Discussing decentralization.....	162
4.3.3.4 Discussing decision delegation .....	166
4.3.4 Modelling decision delegation in the provision process of merit goods.....	169
<b>4.4 Summary and recommendations.....</b>	<b>174</b>
<b>5 CONCLUSIONS AND FURTHER RESEARCH PERSPECTIVES .....</b>	<b>178</b>

**REFERENCES.....I**

**REGISTER OF LEGAL FOUNDATIONS.....XIV**

**APPENDIX.....XVI**