Policy Analysis in the German-Speaking Countries: common traditions - different cultures in Germany, Austria, and Switzerland

Bandelow, Nils C.; Sager, Fritz; Biegelbauer, Peter

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version
Sammelwerksbeitrag / collection article

Chapter 6

Policy Analysis in the German-speaking Countries: Common traditions, different cultures in Germany, Austria, and Switzerland

Nils C. Bandelow, Fritz Sager and Peter Biegelbauer

1.   Introduction

Policy research has developed several perspectives. Scholars are influenced by both international developments of the discipline and their respective political environment. To cover the global view, it is common practice to trace back recent research to the founding fathers of the discipline with their competing ontological, epistemological, normative and political views (Schubert, 2009; Bandelow and Schubert, 2009). National traditions can be classified within the different types of global perspectives. They depend on national constellations often discussed at the beginning of national textbooks (for example von Beyme, 2009). The notion of intellectual traditions, however, does not mean that they are not hybrid and interacting and consequently open to and often influenced by external ideas (Sager et al, 2012). Beyond these global and national traditions there are also regional schools of the discipline. For example there is a 'European perspective' on policy analysis that has been developed in periodicals like the *Journal of European Public Policy*, *West European Politics*, and the *Journal of Common Market Studies*. Beside the national and European traditions, however, there are clusters of regional traditions that have gained less attention by state of the art reviews so far. This article aims at filling this gap by focusing on the peculiarities of policy analysis in the three German-speaking countries Germany, Austria and Switzerland.

Policy analysis in the German-speaking countries shares scientific and political traditions and has established common journals like *German Policy Studies* and regular joint conferences.

There is an extensive exchange of researchers between Germany, Austria and Switzerland. The language contributes to the use of similar analytical frameworks and methods in the three countries. Nonetheless, each of the three countries has established a substantial uniqueness that relates to the respective political and higher education environment. This leads to the question in what way policy analysis in these countries differs from the Anglo-Saxon models and moreover what the similarities and differences of the three cases are and how they can be explained.

This chapter starts by highlighting shared traditions and peculiarities of policy analysis in German-speaking countries. Afterwards the institutional environment and specialties of policy analysis in each of the countries is analysed separately to contribute to a general understanding of influences on national styles of policy analysis.

2.   Shared traditions

German-speaking countries have adopted the terms and models of Anglo-Saxon policy analysis since the 1970s. The new discipline, however, was confronted with an environment that differed from the situation in the US. There are several peculiarities of German-speaking countries that have contributed to the development of a German-speaking tradition. These peculiarities include the scientific traditions, the political environment, and the language itself.

First of all, the systems of higher education in German-speaking countries differ from the US. German-speaking countries developed highly specialised faculties that oriented themselves to the Humboldt legacy. Publicly founded universities characterised these systems neither using extensive tuition fees nor having large private third party founds. Research and higher education are bound together and concentrated on basic research. Only a small share of young

people got the chance to study at universities. The universities themselves have not been part of the economic system in a way comparable to the Anglo-Saxon world.

The systems of higher education made it difficult to establish a discipline that was explicitly application oriented. So policy research in German-speaking countries started with a broad interest in basic theoretical questions that were not necessarily taken directly from political applications. Within the system of specialised faculties policy analysis has been interpreted as a part of political science. Contrary to other countries like France, political science usually is not combined with law, but is seen as a social science. Political science in German-speaking countries has its own normative and theoretical roots. After World War II the goal to transfer theories of democracy has been of great importance.

The political systems of all three countries also differ from the United States, even though this applies more to Germany and Austria than to Switzerland which shares various institutional idiosyncrasies with the US such as an extensive federalism and a limited central government. While the parliaments lack professional service at a level typical for the US Congress, the executive branch of government, political parties and corporatist associations dominate the political process. Therefore the system of policy advice is embedded in formal, institutionalised pillars that do not always lend themselves to external academic advice. This environment made it difficult to establish new forms of policy advice as postulated by the ideas of self-reflective application and democracy oriented policy sciences (Lasswell, 1970; Hajer and Wagenaar, 2003).

Germany, Austria and Switzerland all have multiparty systems based on variants of election systems with proportional representation. In all German-speaking countries green parties have gained large shares of parliamentary seats since the 1980s and environmental policies became

quite important. Environmental policy therefore became one of the most prominent fields of policy analysis at that time (for example Knill, 2008). Common political beliefs in all three countries contributed to other similarities of research interests. Some normative questions concerning biotechnology, gender, higher-education policies and others have reached high levels of conflict in all countries. Many scholars in the German-speaking countries tested and discussed theoretical models of policy analysis against the background of these areas. Most of this research, however, has only been on a theoretical level and did not gain political influence. Methodologically there is a European tradition to apply 'small-N' comparative designs, using countries, regions, or states as cases. Due to the prevalence of federalism in the three German-speaking countries this tradition is quite prominent in the three countries.

The German language does not only link Germany, Austria and Switzerland. It also influences the perspective on policy analysis. The German language does not only lack proper terms for translating 'policy', 'polity' and 'politics', but also transports own meaning with its terms. For example *Regierung* (government) does refer exclusively to the executive branch of government from an institutional definition. *Macht* (power) or *Herrschaft* (control) transport explicit definitions produced by German-speaking classics like Max Weber or Karl Marx and are used extensively by political scientists. However, there are national peculiarities related to the respective traditions and institutional environments. The following parts analyse these country perspectives starting with Germany.

3.   Policy analysis in Germany

Germany as the largest of the three cases and the largest country within the European Union fulfils the prerequisites to establish internal scientific and political discourses that are not necessarily oriented towards the Anglo-Saxon world. Germany has been quite successful in developing a unique scientific culture. Especially the technical sciences have established their

own degrees ('Dipl.-Ing.') that benefited from the success of German mechanical and automotive engineering. Within German universities there is a tradition of national orientation convinced of own strengths. Political science has never reached a leading role in the German scientific and political systems though. Within the scientific system, the political and ontological conflicts made it difficult to establish large faculties of political science.

The political system does not provide major access for policy research to engage in political advice either. Like Austria and Switzerland, Germany is a federal state. Contrary to other federal states like Austria the *Länder* have gained most responsibilities for education and research. However, political decision-making is rather centralised, especially since the federal government transferred most of its ministries from the provincial town Bonn to the largest city Berlin in 1994. The centralised political system can use a broad range of sources for policy advice: Traditionally, the federal and regional civil services, the parties and associations are much more influential than academic advisors. These traditional pillars are dominated by jurists and economists while policy analysis started as a field of academic political science in Germany. The interdisciplinary tradition of policy research is only mirrored by a small part of researchers.

German politics always involve a vast number of different actors that are bound together in joint institutions (Katzenstein, 1987; Paterson and Green, 2005). Against this background policy analysis in Germany became dominated by institutionalist perspectives. The high number of veto players of the political system contributed to a very special interest in *politische Steuerung* (Luhmann, 1989; Scharpf, 1989; Mayntz and Scharpf, 1995). The term has been translated in different ways like 'governability' (Mayntz, 1993), 'political guidance or steering' (Mayntz, 2003, p 27), 'public governance' (Klenk and Nullmeier, 2003), 'government' (Benz and Dose, 2010, pp 26-27), or 'control' (Willke, 2005). These terms give

an impression of both the original top-down understanding of German-speaking policy analysis (following prescriptive and empirical views on *planning*) and the modern understanding of *cooperation* within policy networks (Mayntz, 2008, p 45). Early German policy research started in the late 1970s by applying the stage heuristics to the question of *politische Steuerung*. First research programs concentrated on implementation research, highlighting the influence of non-governmental actors on policy outcomes (Mayntz, 1977, 1980; Windhoff-Héritier, 1987).

In the following, some few networks of scientists adopted policy analysis to develop their own understanding of this discipline. A leading role was taken by the University of Constance that integrated policy analysis in its research and teaching programs on public administration. Based on several personal links the Social Science Research Center Berlin (*Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin*, WZB) and especially the Max Planck Institute for the Study of Social Sciences in Cologne (*Max-Planck-Institut für Gesellschaftsforschung*, MPIfG) contributed to a German view on policy analysis. The directors of the MPIfG developed the analytical framework of actor-centred research combining different theoretical perspectives (Mayntz and Scharpf, 1995; Scharpf, 1997). Scharpf himself had presented a seminal study on labour market policy earlier, that contributed to the framework and belongs to the most influential German contributions to policy analysis (Scharpf, 1987). Contrary to most other German policy researchers, the leading scientists of the MPIfG and the WZB have gained some impact, not only on policy-making but also on the polity-questions regarding ministerial organisation and features of the German federalism.

Another influential school of policy research has been founded by Manfred G. Schmidt. Based on his own research on welfare state policy (Schmidt, 1982) he presented the *Staatstätigkeitsforschung* (research on governmental action) as an ordered combination of

several theoretical perspectives. Schmidt's research is primarily theoretically oriented and aims at developing models to assess the respective contribution of different variables for variations of policy outcomes in different cases (Schmidt, 1988). The perspective has been used by several scholars, not only from his recent university in Heidelberg but also in Bremen and other universities. Most of the work within this school is focused on international comparisons of OECD countries with a focus on social, research and education policies.

The large schools of policy research in Germany both adopt a scientist ontology and epistemology. Contrary to the qualitative orientation of most of Mayntz' and Scharpf's-work, the Schmidt school prefers quantitative methods based on macro data. However, there are a lot of single policy researchers or smaller networks of scholars that differ from large schools. Some critical perspectives have been presented in a special issue of the *Politische Vierteljahresschrift* (PVS; Héritier, 1993). A major argument of the contributions to this issue is the relevance of norms, ideas and perceptions for the policy process. German research refers to Anglo-Saxon lenses like the 'Advocacy Coalition Framework' or 'Multiple Streams' (for example Bandelow, 2006; Augustin-Dittmann, 2011; Rüb, 2011). However, German scholars do not necessarily share the scientific ontology and epistemology of their founding fathers. Especially in the 1990s, some younger German policy researchers discussed theoretical lenses on the policy process that combined critical perspectives of discourse analysis (Fischer, 1993) with micro-political methods. A lot of these scholars have reached senior positions on German universities in the meantime. Therefore these views are still present in the academic discussions.

Policy research from smaller institutes did only get influence on regional policy or on single issues on the federal level though. The political influence of policy analysis in Germany is not only hampered for institutional reasons but also by the competition with other disciplines.

Advice on economic policy has been dominated by economists, at least under right wing governments. Social democrats tend to include social scientists into their programmatic and political work though. However, the latest generation of 'third way' social democrats has been closer to sociologists subsequent to Anthony Giddens, Ulrich Beck and others than to policy analysis. Other areas are also dominated by scientists from traditional disciplines in German-speaking countries. Even though health policy is a major area for policy analysis in German-speaking countries – and some researchers have managed to become influential policy advisers - the area is still dominated by physicians, pharmaceutics and traditional economics.

The range of policies covered by German researchers is still limited. There is a lot of research on environmental and welfare issues. Other areas like health, police, culture and even employment have been studied deeply by a small number of policy analysts. Education and research is about to become a major field of study for German policy research, after having been neglected for a long time. Other areas – like transport, consumer protection or banking policy – have only led to a very small number of German publications (see Schubert, 1989; Beyme, 2007; Strünck, 2008; Bandelow and Kundolf, 2011). External policies are still somehow within the competence of international relations, usually ignoring theories and methods of policy research.

After German unification, the 'Berlin Republic' has widened its sources to large firms, professional agencies and think tanks. Policy analysis became more pluralistic at the same time. So the traditional separation of academic research and applied policy analysis decreased. The participation of the social democratic party within the federal government (1998-2009) also contributed to a change of political advice and gave access to policy analysts as political advisors at least in some fields. At the same time the relevance of policy research within the scientific community in Germany slowly increased. While traditional fields of political

science like political theory lost posts at the universities, private universities like the Hertie School of Governance in Berlin and the Zeppelin University in Friedrichshafen provided new posts for policy analysts. Within the largest association of German political scientists (DVPW) the increased importance led to a new section for policy analysis that also focused on public administration ('Policy Analyse und Verwaltungswissenschaft', see https://www.dvpw.de/gliederung/sektionen/spv.html; 2012-07-26). By combining the policy perspective with the juridical lens of administration research, the institutional perspective might even gain more importance in Germany. At the same time, policy analysis might profit from the dominance of jurists in German politics by integrating their views. The relationship between the two disciplines in Germany remains delicate though (Jann, 2007, p 478).

4.   Policy analysis in Austria

By having some 8.5 million inhabitants, Austria accounts for no more than 10 per cent of the German population and is only slightly larger than Switzerland. The Austrian political system differs even more from the US federal presidential democracy than Germany. Austrian Federalism in comparison to the other two German-speaking states is relatively weaker. The political system rests on a unique form of consociationalism based on both political parties and associations (Pelinka, 2009). Austrian politics and policy advice is related to the macro-corporatist tradition of the country. The two pillars of the system – Social Democrats with employee representatives on the one hand and Christian Democrats with employer representatives on the other – enable different perspectives to gain access to the policy process. However, this system has been established before policy analysis has evolved. Both pillars already have had close networks of advisors within the parties, the administration and the large associations when policy research started to offer its service in the 1970s (Tálos and Kittel, 2001).

In the 1990s the consociationalist system became more pluralistic by changes within the party system (Karlhofer and Tálos, 2005). Even though political input beside the traditional pillars has been enabled, this did not directly lead to more openness for policy research in politics. The most important actors beside the old system are populist right wing parties that have only very little points of contact with academic policy research.

Similarly to Germany and Switzerland policy analysis, informed by international academic debates on issues and methods in Austria, began to play a role with the 1960s. Of paramount importance was the founding of the *Institut für Höhere Studien* (Institute for Advanced Studies, IHS) in Vienna in 1963, which was based on contemporary US models of empirically oriented social science upon the initiative of Paul Lazarsfeld, a Jewish pre-WWII émigré from Austria. In the 1970s and 1980s policy problem oriented studies became an important product of the IHS in a number of fields, from gender, science and technology, public administration, environment to economy. The IHS also - from begin on under heavy involvement of international scholars - has educated young social scientists in two-year postgraduate courses, thus laying the groundwork for the establishment of political science in Austria (Fleck, 2000; Kramer; 2002; König, 2010).

It is also until the present day one of the few institutions in which university and non-university scholarship intersects in the area of policy analysis: IHS staff members regularly teach at Austrian universities, IHS students are enrolled in the programs of Austrian universities, scholars from IHS and universities are cooperating in research projects. Similar cooperations exist at the Department for Foresight and Policy Development of the Austrian Institute of Technology (AIT, formerly Austrian Research Centre Seibersdorf), which offers stipends for students mostly working on policy analysis and who are advised jointly by university and AIT staff. Policy analysis related research projects are carried out in

cooperation with both extra university research institutions and university institutes.

There are further research institutions such as the Centre for Social Innovation (ZSI), the Institute for Social Research and Consulting (SORA), the Austrian Institute for International Politics (OIIP, since 2011 part of the University of Vienna) or the Interdisciplinary Centre For Comparative Research in the Social Sciences (ICCR), which are all specialised in policy analysis. An important factor for the choice of issues and methods of all of these extra university social science research institutions is the fact that they have to finance themselves through numerous sources, including - to varying degrees - contract research from public and private organisations. In this respect the EU Framework Programs have played an important role. The full availability of external project funding with the EU accession of Austria in 1995 led to a clear rise in policy analysis oriented research, first in the extra-university sector and later also at the universities.

This is also the case for the most important research group for policy analysis in the Austrian university system, the interdisciplinary research platform 'life science governance', founded and led by Herbert Gottweis, professor at the institute of political science at the University of Vienna. The platform is highly internationalised, cooperates with natural and social science institutions alike and finances its personnel primarily through external founding.

Most research-based policy analysis in Austria is interdisciplinary in nature, regardless if it takes place at university or extra university research institutions. An important area of research work, not part of political science, is performed by economists, for example at the Institute for Economic Research (Wifo). All of this is dwarfed, however, by the non-research based and highly application oriented policy analysis work in the civil service and in the associations which are part of the social partnership structure. Similar to the situation in

Germany and Switzerland most of this work is not done under the name of policy analysis and often lacks the respective methodological background. Fittingly, public management curricula in Austria usually do not feature policy analysis units.

In general, there exists an only rudimentary disciplinary understanding of policy analysis in Austria, much less than in Germany and Switzerland. This is an effect of several factors, mainly a small political science community which is barely able to cover the traditional main fields of the discipline (König, 2010) and could not (even if it wanted to do so) fulfil the needs of politics and civil service regarding external expertise. In addition the demand for purely political science oriented studies is rather limited in Austria, due to policy-makers' ongoing "trust into numbers" (Porter, 1995; Felt and Fochler, 2010). As a consequence external expertise to policy-making is provided by extra-university research institutions, which are mostly interdisciplinary in nature with respect to their fields of expertise, but also the qualifications of their staff and methodologies utilised.

The international debates on new public management, good governance, better regulation, regulatory impact assessment and evidence-based policy-making are mirrored in Austria, if often with some time delays. They have led to some innovations in public administration regarding policy-making processes, but have not systematically strengthened the role of research based policy analysis until now (Hammerschmid and Meyer, 2005; Biegelbauer, 2009). An important reason for the meagre effects of these international discussions is that related policy innovations such as Regulatory Impact Assessment often are in conflict with the neo-corporatist social partnership system, which rests on the early processing of organised interests (Biegelbauer and Mayer, 2008).

Austrian policy analysis nevertheless has contributed to some newer theoretical debates of

policy analysis. Firstly, Austrian policy analysis has contributed significantly to the argumentative turn in policy analysis (starting with Gottweis, 1998; Prainsack et al, 2008; Durnová, 2011; cf also Pülzl and Wydra, 2011). Herbert Gottweis (University of Vienna) belongs to the leading scholars within a transnational network that argues for 'Critical Policy Analysis' (as they named their journal), using amongst others Jürgen Habermas' critical theory as the basis for a unique perspective of policy analysis (Gottweis and Fischer, 2012). Secondly, Austrian policy analysts joined the networks of critical German scholars interested in policy perception and learning as means to understand different policy beliefs empirically without starting with assumptions of narrow rationality (Biegelbauer, 2007; Griessler, 2007; Pregernig, 2007).

5. Policy analysis in Switzerland

The system context for policy analysis in Switzerland differs from the one in Germany and Austria. First, while being a small state, Switzerland also is a multiethnic state with four official languages three of which connect to large linguistic cultures. It thus was not possible for a unique scientific culture to develop. Second and also due to its rather small size, Swiss academia is rather international. The country simply is not big enough to produce sufficient scientific offspring to meet the demand of a land without natural resources and hence living of service and knowledge-based industries. The consequence is a more international orientation of academic research than in larger countries. Third, the political system differs. The main characteristics of the Swiss polity are the semi-direct democracy, strong federalism and the system of concordance, and this polity has strongly influenced the policy process.

The main characteristic of the Swiss consensus democracy is the involvement of all relevant political actors in both the pre-parliamentary and the parliamentary decision-making

processes. This in turn led to a system of power sharing where decisions are based on cooperation and consensus between the political elites. This system acknowledged the strong position of the cantons and allowed their preferences to be taken into account, which is a precondition for an effective and efficient implementation of federal policies by the latter. However, the strong federalism and direct democracy lead to a limited policy capacity of the federation, which in turn had implications for the content of economic and social policies in Switzerland. Furthermore, the system of consociationalism reinforced the low capacity for rapid change of Swiss policies, as well as the Swiss political system and led to a strong status quo bias. Policy-making requires negotiations between all players with veto powers, which take some considerable time (Sager and Zollinger, 2011). As Linder (1994, p 128) puts it, 'the pattern of consociationalism, despite its shortcomings, seems to have provided important advantages. In the absence of electoral change, there are no abrupt discontinuities in federal policy. The sobering effect of negotiation cools down ideological exaggeration and promotes pragmatic solutions. Cooperation in commissions, in government and in parliament leads to mutual adjustments where learning processes occur over the substantive issues of legislation. Reaching a satisfactory compromise may take several years, but once the agreement becomes law most actors are prepared for it. This context increases the chances of new laws and policy programmes being implemented.' To put it in a nutshell, Swiss policy may not be the best designed, but it is pretty well accepted. This institutional environment has consequences for policy research. Widmer and Neuenschwander (2004, p 391) correctly state that 'policy making in Switzerland is oriented toward gathering support more than toward gathering evidence'.

However, the notion of policy analysis also in Switzerland stems from the need of modern society for knowledge and expertise in order to develop and legitimate new policy programs. Such expertise was first supplied by academic institutions such as the IUHEI (*Institut*

univérsitaire des hautes études intérnationales) at the University of Geneva for foreign policy and diplomacy, various research institutes of the two Federal Polytechnicums in Zurich and Lausanne or the IDHEAP (*Institut des hautes études en administration publique*) in Lausanne. While these institutions provided policy advice, social scientific policy analysis in a modern understanding started in Switzerland as in Germany in the late 1960s with the opening of political science to process views of decision-making that differed from classic institutionalism. The discovery of public administration as a political actor that significantly modified policies during implementation played a crucial role in this development. This reconsideration of the political role to the bureaucracy can be found in Urio's (1972) seminal study on the procurement of new fighter-jets in the 1960s, one of the major political scandals in post-war Switzerland (the so-called 'Mirage-scandal'). Subsequently, Swiss political science witnessed an actual heyday of analyses of the policy process culminating in a national research program on policy formulation and implementation initiated by the Swiss National Science Foundation (Linder, 1987). The 1980s at the same marked a shift in Swiss policy analysis more and more abandoning the institutionalist perspective on policy-making (government) and focusing on the processes of political steering and coordination including societal self-regulation (governance). This change of perspectives was influenced by international debates as well as changing political realities (Sager and Hurni, 2012). However, it was accompanied by a certain loss of interest in administrative structures. Academic policy analysis shifted its focus to more quantitative comparative and methodologically sophisticated approaches not least due the international orientation of Swiss political science in general. The resulting void regarding field work close to the political praxis was filled by a growing Public Management community gaining epistemological dominance in the course of neoliberal ideas and New Public Management reforms (Schedler, 1995). However, also policy analysis found its role in this development with the establishment of a strong evaluation research (Widmer and De Rocchi, 2012).

The NPM claim for outcome-oriented steering fostered a need for corresponding information. Answering a need from the federal administration, the national research program 'Effectiveness of Public Policies' was launched that eventually led to strong institutionalisation and professionalisation of policy evaluation research in Switzerland. In 1996, the Swiss Evaluation Society (SEVAL) was founded which quickly became a major pillar of the evaluation community. Mainly with the so-called SEVAL standards for good evaluation practice, it fostered the professionalisation of the discipline. In the revised Federal Constitution of 1999, a provision for evaluation was included in Article 170 which states: 'The Federal Parliament shall ensure that the efficacy of measures taken by the Confederation is evaluated.' This provision led to an institutionalised demand for policy evaluation which further expanded the evaluation activities also and especially by private providers of such expertise. The SEVAL currently counts about 400 members private and public which is comparable to international societies and societies in much larger countries.

As for use, Bussmann (2008) states that evidence finds its way into decision-making by way of ex-post evaluations of policy programmes. Stakeholders are very flexible to handle and use this knowledge in a way that serves their interests for the reformulation of a policy.

> In this political system, so heavily influenced by various political actors, evaluation cannot play a decisive role. It must serve as a resource for all partners (or rather opponents). Evaluation, at its best, can help to illuminate the stakes at hand and to improve the quality of argumentation within the legislative process. Often, it is used as ammunition in the political process by different interests involved. At its worst, it is distorted or completely ignored (Bussmann, 2008, p 502).

A more recent development in Switzerland is the establishment of so-called advocacy tanks, that is private research institutes affiliated to specific ideological ideas. The most prominent

example in Switzerland is Avenir Suisse, founded in 1999 by fourteen Swiss enterprises with a budget of seven million franks per year (about 5 mio euro). As pointed out by Steffen and Linder (2006, p 340; also Sager and Stadelmann-Steffen, 2008), these advocacy tanks established political agenda-setting as a new function of policy analysis, which means 'last but not least the production of studies that are detached from the feasible'. After a short heyday in the early 2000s, their political influence has decreased in recent times. At the university level, policy analysis profited from the establishment of the Swiss Public Administration Network (SPAN) in 2007 mandated by the federal administration. The SPAN connects four university institutes in order to foster a professional public service education and training.

6.   Conclusions

This article started by assuming a common perspective of policy analysis in German-speaking countries which could be proven partly by focusing on similarities. Germany, Austria and Switzerland all refer to a tradition of qualitative studies with a comparative focus. In all German-speaking countries policy analysis has developed as a new field of political science in the 1970s. Policy analysis in German-speaking countries has a tradition of applying and developing theoretical approaches and methods that have originated in the Anglo-Saxon community.

There are several reasons for this common tradition: Not only the language but also single researchers have contributed to this tradition. Leading universities have developed strong ties with partners in other German-speaking countries. This is not only true for universities in neighbouring cities such as Constance (Germany), Innsbruck (Austria) and Zurich (Switzerland). Leading policy researchers have been part of the scientific community in all

German-speaking countries (see for example Pelinka, 2003). The different size of the three countries also has contributed to this common perspective. Germany as the largest of these countries receives a lot of attention for its politics and policies in the media and scientific discussion of its smaller neighbours.

However, this chapter has also pointed out peculiarities of policy analysis in the three countries. While policy analysis in Switzerland focuses mostly on the mainstream of international scientific debates, Austria has developed its own constructivist perspectives. Germany as the largest of the three German-speaking countries combines both perspectives.

The comparison of the three cases can be used to conduct some hypotheses about variables that influence national varieties of policy analysis. Firstly, size matters, as one can trace back some of the national peculiarities to the respective country size. Secondly, political systems influence policy research in several ways. As policy analysis is often intended to produce political advice the national rules of decision-making do matter for both the success and the national variety of policy analysis. Thirdly, the systems of higher education are important for the interpretation of policy analysis. As policy research aims at developing interdisciplinary perspectives, it is influenced by the relationship, status and institutional integration of different sciences and arts. The three cases give some evidence that there are a lot of independent variables, and that their influence on policy research seldom is linear. For example the two smaller countries, Switzerland and Austria, contrast each other while Germany seems to be somewhere in between. Future research on the establishment of policy analysis beyond the German-speaking countries could be successful by using qualitative comparative analysis assuming figurative causalities (Ragin, 1987; 2000).

Contrary to the national and regional peculiarities highlighted in this chapter, in general the

adaptation of Anglo-American perspectives on policy analysis has increased during the last decade. International journals force German-speaking scholars to use elaborated methods. Most leading international journals are either within a clear scientist tradition or are primarily interested in political problems and applications within the Anglo-American world. Therefore these journals produce incentives for German-speaking scholars to supplement or even replace their traditional German perspective with a scientist view.

While universities are forced to focus on scientific methods on the one hand, there is a contrary demand by political actors on the other hand. Economics and other competitors of policy analysis have failed to avoid, predict or at least explain the recent economic, financial, ecological, social and political crises. Against this background, public and political actors are looking for more realistic explanations and more promising advice that might be produced by policy analysts (Sager and Andereggen, 2012). Therefore one might expect some further pluralisation of policy analysis in German-speaking countries. Leading universities and basic research institutes will focus on international discussions using new methods and empirical results. Other research might strengthen the interdisciplinary of its perspectives. German-speaking policy analysts thereby might get both more national political influence and more international scientific impact.

References

Augustin-Dittmann, S. (2010) 'The Development of All-Day Schooling in Germany: How was it possible in this Conservative Welfare State?', *German Policy Studies*, vol 6, no 3, pp 49-81.

Bandelow, N. C. and Kundolf, S. (eds) (2011) 'Governance of Transport Policy', *Special issue of German Policy Studies*, vol 7, no 2.

Bandelow, N. C. and Schubert, K. (2009) 'Perspektiven der Politikfeldanalyse zwischen Grundlagen und Anwendungen, Szientismus und Kritik', in K. Schubert and N. C. Bandelow (eds) *Lehrbuch der Politikfeldanalyse 2.0*, München: Oldenbourg, pp 475-86.

Bandelow, N.C. (2006) 'Advocacy Coalitions, Policy-Oriented Learning and Long-Term Change in Genetic Engineering Policy', in *German Policy Studies*, vol 3, no 4, pp 743-95.

Benz, A. and Dose, N. (2010) 'Governance – Modebegriff oder nützliches sozialwissenschaftliches Konzept?', in A. Benz and N. Dose (eds) *Governance – Regieren in komplexen Regelsystemen*, Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, pp 13-36.

Biegelbauer, P. (2009) 'Erfahrungsorientiertes Lernen in der österreichischen Forschungs-, Technologie- und Innovationspolitik. Innovationsforschung und Technologiepolitik in Österreich', in J. Fröhlich, K. H. Leitner and M. Weber (eds) *Neue Perspektiven und Gestaltungsmöglichkeiten*, Innsbruck, Studienverlag: pp 197-214.

Biegelbauer, P. and Mayer, S. (2008) 'Regulatory Impact Assessment in Austria: Promising

Regulations, Disappointing Practices', *Critical Policy Analysis*, vol 2, no 2, pp 118-42.

Biegelbauer, P. (2007) 'Ein neuer Blick auf politisches Handeln: Politik-Lernansätze im Vergleich', *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Politikwissenschaft*, vol 36, no 3, pp 231-47.

Bussmann, W. (2008) 'The Emergence of Evaluation in Switzerland', *Evaluation*, vol 14, no 4, pp 499 –506.

Durnová, A. (2011) 'Feldforschung "intim": Von Erlebnissen, Bedeutungen und Interpretationspraxis in der Politikfeldanalyse', *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Politikwissenschaft*, vol 40, no 4, pp 417-32.

Felt, U. and Fochler M. (2010) 'Riskante Verwicklungen des Epistemischen, Strukturellen und Biographischen: Governance-Strukturen und deren mikropolitische Implikationen für das akademische Leben', in P. Biegelbauer (ed) *Steuerung von Wissenschaft? Die Governance des österreichischen Innovationssystems*, Innsbruck/Bozen/Wien: Studienverlag, pp 297-328.

Fleck, C. (2000) 'Wie Neues nicht entsteht. Die Gründung des Instituts für Höhere Studien in Wien durch Ex-Österreicher und die Ford Foundation', *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft*, vol 11, no 1, pp 129-78.

Fischer, F. (1993) 'Bürger, Experten und Politik nach dem 'Nimby-Prinzip: Ein Plädoyer für die partizipatorische Policy-Analyse', in A. Héritier (ed) *Policy-Analyse. Kritik und Neuorientierung* (PVS-Sonderheft 24), Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, pp 451-70.

Gottweis, H. and Fischer, F. (2012) *The Argumentative Turn Revisited. Public Policy as*

Communicative Practice, Duke: Duke UP.

Gottweis, H. (1998) *Governing Molecules: The Discursive Politics of Genetic Engineering in Europe and the United States*, Cambridge, MA.

Green, S. and Paterson, W. E. (eds) (2005) *Governance in Contemporary Germany. The Semisovereign State Revisited*, Cambridge.

Grießler, E. (2007) '"Policy Learning" in der SPÖ: Innerparteiliche Dynamiken bei der Entscheidungsfindung zur Fristenregelung', *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Politikwissenschaft*, vol 36, no 3, pp 267-84.

Grießler, E. and Hadolt, B. (2006) 'Policy Learning in Policy Domains with Value Conflicts: The Austrian Cases of Abortion and Assisted Reproductive Technologies', *German Policy Studies*, vol 3, no 4, pp 693-742.

Hajer, M. and Wagenaar, H. (eds) (2003) *Introduction. Deliberative Policy Analysis. Understanding Governance in the Network Society*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp 1-32.

Hammerschmid, G. and Meyer, R. (2005) 'New Public Management in Austria: Local Variation on a Global Theme?', *Public Administration*, vol 83, no 3, pp 709-33.

Hegelich, S. (2010) 'Diskurskoalitionen in der Finanzmarktrettung – Das Finanzmarktstabilisierungsgesetz', *dms – der moderne staat – Zeitschrift für Public Policy,*

Recht und Management, vol 3, no 2, pp 339-59.

Héritier, A., Mingers, S., Knill, C., Becka, M. (1994) *Die Veränderung von Staatlichkeit in Europa. Ein regulativer Wettbewerb: Deutschland, Großbritannien und Frankreich in der Europäischen Union*, Opladen: Leske+Buderich.

Héritier, A. (ed) (1993) *Policy-Analyse. Kritik und Neuorientierung* (PVS-Sonderheft 24), Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Jann, W. (2009) 'Praktische Fragen und theoretische Antworten: 50 Jahre Policy-Analyse und Verwaltungsforschung', *Politische Vierteljahresschrift*, vol 50, no 3, pp 476-505.

Karlhofer, F. and Tálos, E. (eds) (2005) 'Sozialpartnerschaft. Österreichische und Europäische Perspektiven', Wien: Lit Verlag.

Katzenstein, P. J. (1987) *Policy and Politics in West Germany: The Growth of a semi-sovereign State*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Klenk, T. and Nullmeier, F. (2003) *Public Governance als Reformstrategie*, Düsseldorf: Edition Hans Böckler,

Knill, C. (2008) *Europäische Umweltpolitik. Steuerungsprobleme und Regulierungsmuster im Mehrebenensystem*, Opladen: Leske+Buderich.

König, T. (2010) 'Die Geschichte der Disziplin Politikwissenschaft im Verhältnis zu österreichischer Forschungspolitik und gesellschaftlichen Rahmenbedingungen. Steuerung

von Wissenschaft?', in P. Biegelbauer (ed) *Die Governance des österreichischen Innovationssystems*, Innsbruck/Bozen/Wien: Studienverlag, pp 223-57.

Kramer, H. (2002) 'Wie Neues doch entstanden ist. Zur Gründung und zu den ersten Jahren des Instituts für Höhere Studien in Wien', *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Politikwissenschaft*, vol 13, no 3, pp 110-32.

Lasswell, H. D. (1970) 'The Emerging Conception of the Policy Sciences', *Policy Sciences*, vol 1, no 1, pp 3-14.

Linder, W. (1994) *Swiss Democracy – Possible Solutions to Conflict in Multicultural Societies*, London/New York: Macmillan Press Ltd./St. Martins Press Inc.

Linder, W. (1987) *Politische Entscheidung und Gesetzesvollzug*, Bern: Haupt.

Luhmann, N. (1989) 'Politische Steuerung. Ein Diskussionsbeitrag', *Politische Vierteljahresschrift*, vol 30, no 1, pp 4-9.

Mayntz, R. (2008) 'Von der Steuerungstheorie zu Global Governance', in G. F. Schuppert and M. Zürn (eds) *Governance in einer sich wandelnden Welt* (PVS Sonderheft 41), pp 43-60.

Mayntz, R. and Scharpf, F. W. (2005) 'Politische Steuerung – Heute?', *Zeitschrift für Soziologie*, vol 34, no 3, pp 236-43.

Mayntz, R. (2003) 'New challenges to governance theory', in H. P. Bang (ed) *Governance as social and political communication*, Manchester, New York: Manchester University Press, pp

27-40.

Mayntz, R (1993) 'Governing Failures and the Problem of Governability: Some Comments on a Theoretical Paradigm', in J. Kooiman (ed) *Modern Governance*, London: Sage, pp 9-20.

Mayntz, R. (1980) (ed) *Implementation politischer Programme. Empirische Forschungsberichte*, Königstein/Ts.: Athenäum.

Mayntz, R. (1977) 'Die Implementation politischer Programme − Theoretische Überlegungen zu einem neuen Forschungsgebiet',*Die Verwaltung*, vol 10, pp 51-66.

Obinger, H. (2009) 'Vergleichende Policyanalyse: Eine Einführung in makro-quantitative und makro-qualitative Methoden', in K. Schubert and N. C. Bandelow (eds) *Lehrbuch der Politikfeldanalyse 2.0*, München, pp 221-44.

Pelinka, A. (2003) 'Gerhard Lehmbruch und die österreichische Politikwissenschaft',*Österreichische Zeitschrift für Politikwissenschaft*, vol 32, no 2, pp 213-16.

Pelinka, A. (2009) 'Das politische System Österreichs', in W. Ismayr (ed*) Die politischen Systeme Westeuropas,* Wiesbaden: VS Verlag, pp 607 - 641.

Porter, T. M. (1995) 'Trust in Numbers: The Pursuit of Objectivity in Science and Public Life', Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Pülzl, H. and Wydra, D. (2011) 'Editorial − *Public Policy Analysis* und die interpretative

Wende: 'Zur Erklärung von Politikwandel', *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Politikwissenschaft*, vol 40, no 4, pp 395-99.

Ragin, C. C. (2000) *Fuzzy-Set Social Science*, Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press.

Ragin, C. C. (1987) *The Comparative Method*, Berkeley: The University of Chicago Press.

Rüb, F. (2011) 'Politisches Entscheiden. Ein prozess-analytischer Versuch', in N. C. Bandelow and S. Hegelich (eds) *Pluralismus - Strategien - Entscheidungen*, Wiesbaden, pp 17-45.

Sager, F. and Andereggen, C. (2012) 'Dealing with Complex Causality in Realist Synthesis: The Promise of Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA)', *American Journal of Evaluation*, vol 33, no 1, pp 60-78.

Sager, F. and Hurni, P. Y. (2012) 'Die Geschichte der Verwaltungswissenschaften in der Schweiz', in A. Ladner, J.-L. Chappelet, Y. Emery, P. Knoepfel, L. Mader, N. Soguel and F. Varone (eds) *Handbuch der öffentlichen Verwaltung in der Schweiz*, Zürich: NZZ, in print.

Sager, F., Rosser, C., Hurni, P. Y. and Mavrot, C. (2012) 'How Traditional Are the American, the French, and the German Traditions of Public Administration? A Research Agenda', *Public Administration*, vol 90, no 1, pp 129–43.

Sager, F. and Zollinger, C. (2011) 'The Swiss Political System in a Comparative Perspective', in C. Trampusch and A. Mach (eds) *Switzerland in Europe*, London and New York:

Routledge, pp 27-42.

Sager, F. and Stadelmann-Steffen, I. (2008) 'Politikberatung in der Schweiz', in S. Bröchler and R. Schützeichel (eds) *Politikberatung*, Stuttgart, Lucius&Lucius/UTB, pp 465-79.

Scharpf, F. W. (1997) *Games Real Actors Play. Actor-Centered Institutionalism in Policy Research*, Boulder, CO/Oxford.

Scharpf, F. W. (1989) 'Politische Steuerung und politische Institutionen', in *PVS*, vol 30, no 1, pp 10-21.

Scharpf, F. W. (1987) *Sozialdemokratische Krisenpolitik in Europa*, Frankfurt a. M./New York: Campus.

Schedler, K. (1995) *Ansätze einer wirkungsorientierten Verwaltungsführung. Von der Idee des New Public Management (NPM) zum konkreten Gestaltungsmodell. Fallbeispiel Schweiz*, Bern/Stuttgart/Wien: Haupt.

Schmidt, M. G. (ed) (1988) *Staatstätigkeit. International und historisch vergleichende Analyse* (PVS-Sonderheft 19), Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Schmidt, M. G. (2002) 'The Impact of Political Parties, Constitutional Structures and Veto Players on Public Policy', in H. Keman (ed) *Comparative Democratic Politics. A Guide to Contemporary Theory and Research*, London: Sage, pp 166-84.

Schmidt, M. G. (1993) 'Theorien in der international vergleichenden

Staatstätigkeitsforschung', in A. Héritier (ed) *Policy-Analyse. Kritik und Neuorientierung* (Politische Vierteljahresschrift Sonderheft 24). Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, pp 371-93.

Schmidt, M. G. (1982) *Wohlfahrtsstaatliche Politik unter bürgerlichen und sozialdemokratischen Regierungen. Ein internationaler Vergleich*, Frankfurt a. M./New York: Campus.

Schneider, V. (2009) 'Akteurkonstellationen und Netzwerke in der Politikentwicklung', in K. Schubert and N. C. Bandelow (eds) *Lehrbuch der Politikfeldanalyse 2.0*, München, pp 191-219.

Schubert, K. (2009) 'Pragmatismus, Pluralismus und Politikfeldanalyse: Ursprünge und theoretische Verankerung', in K. Schubert and N. C. Bandelow (eds) *Lehrbuch der Politikfeldanalyse 2.0*, München, pp 39-71.

Schubert, K. (2002) *Innovation und Ordnung – Grundlagen einer pragmatistischen Theorie der Politik, gleichzeitig ein Beitrag über die ideengeschichtliche Basis einer erweiterten Theorie der Politikfeldanalyse*, Münster: LIT.

Schubert, K. (1989) *Interessenvermittlung und staatliche Regulation*, Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Steffen, I. and Linder, W. (2006) 'Switzerland: Think Tanks and Vested Interests in Swiss Policy Making', *German Policy Studies*, vol 3, no 2, pp 310-46.

Strünck, C. (ed) (2008) 'Re-shaping Consumer Policy in Europe', *Special issue of German*

Policy Studies, vol 4, no 1.

Tálos, E. and Kittel B. (2001) 'Gesetzgebung in Österreich. Netzwerke, Akteure und Interaktionen in politischen Entscheidungsprozesse', Wien: WUV.

Urio, P. (1972) *L'affaire de Mirage: décision administrative et contrôle parlementaire*, Genève: Ed. Médecine et Hygiène.

von Beyme, K. (2009) 'Vorläufer der Politikfeldanalyse auf dem europäischen Kontinent' in K. Schubert and N. C. Bandelow (eds) *Lehrbuch der Politikfeldanalyse 2.0*, München: Oldenbourg, pp 25-37.

von Beyme, K. (2007) 'Verkehrspolitik als Feld der Staatstätigkeit – Ein Aufriss', in O. Schöller, W. Canzler and A. Knie (eds) *Handbuch Verkehrspolitik*, Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, pp 125-37.

Widmer, T. and De Rocchi, T. (2012) *Evaluation. Grundlagen, Ansätze und Anwendungen*, Zürich/Chur: Rüegger.

Widmer, T. and Neuenschwander, P. (2004) 'Embedding Evaluation in the Swiss Federal Administration: Purpose, Institutional Design, and Utilization', *Evaluation*, vol 10, no 4, pp 388-409.

Willke, H. (2005) 'Atopia, the Plus ultra of the nation-states self-encirclement', in S. Bidner and T. Feuerstein (eds) *Plus Ultra. Beyond Modernity?*, Frankfurt a. M.: Revolver, pp 219-36.

Windhoff-Héritier, A. (1987) *Policy-Analyse. Eine Einführung*, Frankfurt a. M./New York: Campus.