The emergence of the animal police in the Netherlands according to incrementalism and the stream model

K.R.M. Willems

Wageningen University, Wageningen

The emergence of the animal Police in the Netherlands according to incrementalism and the stream model

K.R.M. Willems Bsc
Registration number: 891112 957 020

Image on the front page: http://www.escobaramsterdam.com/nieuwsItem.php?id=1035

Table of contents

Preface

This thesis was written as part of the Communication and Policy Module of the Master Animal Science.

My thanks goes to my supervisor, who guided me through the process of writing. I also want to thank all the people who supported me during this process, especially those who read my thesis and gave feedback.

Summary

Introduction

During the introduction of the animal police, the media were very negative about the animal police and the opinions of the citizens were divided. This raised the question how the policy was implemented, while so many people were against it. The main question therefore was how the animal police emerged in the Netherlands according to incrementalism and the stream model. In order to answer this question, the following subquestions were answered first; what is the animal police in the Netherlands, what was the influence of the negative public opinion according to the two models and how do the two models explain the emergence of the animal police in the Netherlands?

Theoretical Framework

First, an introduction of the Dutch political system is required. The Netherlands are a constitutional monarchy with a democratic two-housed parliament, namely the House of Representatives, chosen directly by the citizens, and the Senate, chosen indirectly by the citizens. The power to propose and amend law lies with the House, while the Senate only has the power to approve or disapprove proposals (Neelen et al. 2003:24-41)). A many party system is present in the Netherlands and the House contained ten parties after the elections of 2010, indicating that the formation of a coalition was needed to create a government with a majority in the House.

Different models were considered to analyze the emergence of the animal police, like the advocacy coalition network of Sabatier (1998) and the barrier model of Bachrach and Baratz (Nelissen, De Goede and Twist, 2004:191-192).

Incrementalism as described by Lindblom and Woodhouse (1993) was chosen as model, since it is based on a many party system and fits with the Dutch political situation. It takes into account the influence of many participants in- and outside government and assumes negotiation is essential in multiparty systems, which results in gradual change.

Kingdon's (2003) stream model was chosen since it takes into account chance. This model states that policymaking is based on three streams, namely the problem, policy and politic stream. These streams represented the necessary circumstances that need to come together for policy to emerge, namely a recognized problem, a fitting alternative and a political mood to solve this problem, a policy can emerge. These streams constantly change and the content changes rapidly. Participants can influence these streams, although most participants only influence one of the streams. When streams come together, a policy window opens. Entrepreneurs actively try to influence the stream to introduce their pet solution and couple the other streams to their policy.

Methods for data collection and analysis

For this research, national newspaper articles, policy documents and election programs were used. The newspaper articles were found using Lexis Nexis, searching for the Dutch terms 'dierenpolitie' and 'dierenagenten' and the English term animal cops that is also frequently used in the Netherlands. Due to the high number of articles, no other search terms were used. The policy documents were collected using the site www.Rijksoverheid.nl, which contains a database in which all publications of the Ministries since 2007 are collected. A search in the database on the website of the House of Representatives resulted in only two documents. Last, the election programs of 2010 were collected for all parties in office for

analysing the opinions of the parties. Interviews were considered, but extensive interviews were not possible due to time constrictions. An interview with Dion Graus, the possible entrepreneur of the animal police, was not possible.

Results

During the analysis, different meanings of the term animal police came up in the documents. The term referred to the National Inspection for Animal Protection, special detection officers specialized in animal abuse and the specialized police officers as meant in this thesis. Incrementalism does not fit perfectly with the case. Firstly, most participants mentioned by Lindblom and Woodhouse were not relevant in this case. The policy seems to be introduced by the PVV and the policy was negotiated successfully during the coalition formation and that resulted in the acceptance of the animal police in the tolerance agreement. Other political participants tried to influence the final policy without success. The topic was introduced a few years ago and the policy gradually came up in politics. The size of the ultimate policy is surprising, since the original proposal in the election program of the PVV stated 300 agents, while 500 officers made it into the coalition agreement. Since the police were already dealing with underemployment according to the VVD and no other crime areas has so many officers, a pilot project with fewer officers would be more consistent with gradual change.

Next are the results of the stream model. The important events in the political stream were the gain of seats by PVV during the elections in 2010 and the coalition negotiations that followed. The policy stream was favourable since the idea of animal police had been introduced by the actions of the entrepreneur; PVV member of the House of Representatives Dion Graus, and softening up had taken place. In the problem stream, the problem of too mild punishment of animal abuse was coupled to the animal police.

A political policy window opened when the election outcome joined VVD, CDA and PVV at the negotiation table. The two other streams were favourable as well, since all parties recognized the problem and the policy was softened up by the PVV.

When these to outcomes are compared, the two models both conclude that the coalition negotiations were the important event in the emergence of the animal police. Incrementalism states that the PVV negotiated with the VVD and CDA en persuaded them to support the animal police. The steam model concludes that the problem recognition and the softening up resulted in the emergence of the animal police. These two findings are supplementing each other, since the PVV was able to negotiate with the parties, since they recognized the same problem and they were familiar with suggested solution.

Conclusion

Concluding, the animal police are fulltime police officers specialized animal abuse and 500 were promised in the tolerance agreement. The negative public opinion was not considered of influence in this case. Incrementalism states that the PVV negotiated successfully in the coalition negotiations and the stream model strengthens this conclusion. The negotiations opened the political policy window for the animal police, while the entrepreneur had softened up the politicians for this policy and the shared wish for increased severe punishment of animal abuse provided the problem for which the animal police offered the solution.

Discussion and reflection

For future research, I would replace incrementalism with another model to check if this results in a different conclusion than the stream model. The negotiations were not discussed in detail in the data collected. An addition search on cabinet formation or interviews with the negotiators could fill in these knowledge gaps. Due to time limitations this was not done. The data collection was relative narrow and an extra search on punishment of animal abuse could provide more insight in the problem stream. Although the media are not objective, this did not result in a biased conclusion. In future policy research, I would always include interviews to provide more insight in the participants. Overall, this research provides an insight in how the animal police emerged according to incrementalism and the stream model.

1 Introduction

In 2010, the animal police has been introduced in the Netherlands. With this, the Netherlands was the first country where animal police were introduced by the government. A special telephone number was introduced (144), so that the general public could report 'animals in need' directly to specialized agents. Incidents for which they can be called are accidents, abuse or neglect among others (Postbus 51 Rijksoverheid, unknown). Especially the animal police was received with scepticism by the general public.

In the media this new police department got the name "cavia politie" (guinea-pig police), which illustrates the sceptic attitude towards this new organization. The chief constable for Amsterdam, who came with this term for the new police department, feared that the creation of the animal police would reduce the capacity to deal with other crimes *(1)*.The general public was not enthusiastic for the new policy either. According to poll in the Telegraaf, the opinions were divided although a small minority was against the animal police. Arguments were that the regular police force can handle animal related crimes as well and that there are many other organisations working to guarantee the welfare of animals; like the animal ambulance *(2)*. However, the other half of respondents supported the animal police.

The question arises why this new police department was introduced when the support for it by the general public seemed low. Apparently, the government saw a higher value than its citizens and the media in introducing the animal police. This made me wonder who came up with the idea of animal police and how this lead to the introduction of animal police. It is very interesting to see how this idea became reality, while the value of this police department was debatable. Did politicians see a real problem with animal related crimes for which the animal police are the solution? Or could it be that the introduction of the animal police was only symbolic politics?

The goal of this research was to find an explanation for the emergence and implementation of a policy that is not broadly supported by the general public. To do this, the purpose of the animal police according to the politicians needs to become clear. It is also interesting to see how the policy could be implemented when so many people were sceptic about the introduction. In order to find these answers I looked at the process of policymaking. Different theories exist about policymaking and these can be used to answer the research question: How did the animal police emerge in the Netherlands?

Since many theories exist and I do not have the possibility to look at all of them, I selected incrementalism and the stream model to analyse the emergence of the animal police. Special attention will be given to the role of the public on policymaking. This will give an insight in how policy can be created in the Netherlands, when there seems to be little support from the general public. To reach the research objective, subquestions were formulated:

- What is the animal police in the Netherlands? How are they organized, what is their jurisdiction and how many specialized agents are appointed?
- According to the two models, how did the negative public opinion influence the emergence of the animal police?
- According to the models, what was the motivation for introducing the animal police?
- How did the animal police emerge in the Netherlands according to incrementalism?

- How did the animal police emerge in the Netherlands according to the stream model?

I will focus on how this policy came into being. This means that the functioning of the organisation is not part of the research.

Due to time restrictions, only written sources were used, although taking an interview was considered as well. The documents used for the analysis are, firstly party election programs, which contain the aims and goals of the political parties. In addition, national newspaper articles were used to provide a broader view on the emergence of the animal police through time. Finally, policy documents were used to get broader understanding in the process of the House of Representatives and the activities of the members of the House.

The method that was used in this research is qualitative content analysis. This means that not the quantity of data, but the core content of the data was used for analysis. Labels were created for the elements of the models to structure the information and the analysis.

A short overview of the structure of the thesis illustrates the research process. First, I start with the theoretical framework in which the choice for the two models, the stream model and incrementalism, will be explained. In this chapter, the models are presented and, where needed, translated to the Dutch political system. Next, the methods for data collection and analysis will be shortly described. The case description contains a short overview of the events around the emergence of the animal police. The animal police will be described in more detail in this chapter as well. This will provide the basis for the analysis. First incrementalism will be applied to the case, after which the stream model is discussed. The conclusions of the two models will be compared. In the conclusion, the research question will be answered. The research process will be evaluated at the end and recommendations for future research are given.

Please note that the newspaper articles are added in a separate reference list. Therefore, the newspaper articles are referred to in-text with numbers, for example (1), to distinguish them from other sources.

2   Theoretical framework

In this chapter, the theoretical background on which the research is founded, will be presented. First a short introduction of the Dutch political system is given. This is necessary to motivate the choice of model, since the type of political system influences the process of policymaking. Next an explanation for the choice of the incremental and the stream model will be given. Then these two models are discussed in more detail and are adapted to the Dutch political system.

2.1 Dutch political system[1]

The Netherlands is a constitutional monarchy. This means that the Netherlands has a monarchy, which is based on a constitution.

The cabinet is formed by the prime minister and other ministers, the state secretaries and the monarch. The monarch has less power compared with the past. The ministers are responsible for the actions of the monarch and the monarch is untouchable. Some say the monarch has a symbolic function. However, in government formation this is not true. The king is involved in appointing the informant[2]. The informant is responsible for researching the possible coalitions between parties to form a government. Normally, the government has a majority in the House of Representatives (in Dutch called the Second Chamber) and the party with the most seats almost always delivers the prime minister. Next to the influence on the government formation, the monarch has a weekly meeting with the prime minister. The content of these meetings is secret.

The government that was formed under Prime Minster Rutte in 2010 was a minority government, which is unusual for the Netherlands. VVD and CDA formed a coalition, but these two parties did not have a majority in the House of Representatives. To get the required majority, they needed the support from the Party for Freedom (PVV). During the formation, this party promised support to the government, but did not wish to become part of the government. They were so to speak a 'party of tolerance'. This meant that for some policies the government needed cooperation of the opposition, which made governing more complicated.

The ministers, chosen from the parties in office, are appointed to run a ministry and are aided in this by the state secretaries. Although the state secretary operates independent from his minister, he does need to follow the commands of his minister. If the minister is absent, not the state secretary, but another minister functions as the head of the department during the minister's absence.

Parliament (Staten-Generaal in Dutch) consists of two houses, the Senate (the First Chamber) and the House of Representatives (the Second Chamber). The Senate is elected indirectly, the House of Representatives is chosen directly.
The role of the House of Representatives includes the right of initiative (the right to make law proposals) and the right of amendment (the right to change the law proposals). The House of Representatives also has the right to determine the budget for all ministries. Chamber members also have the right to discuss topics, which are not on the agenda during the weekly question hour.

The role of the Senate is to make sure that the law is not in contradiction with other laws and is juridically sound. For law to be approved both Chambers need to pass the bill to make it an official law. The Senate has fewer rights than the House of Representatives. They are

---

[1] This paragraph is based one Neelen et al. 2003:(pp. 24-41).
[2] This has changed. Since 2012 the House of Representatives appoint the informant (House of Representatives,
[2] This has changed. Since 2012 the House of Representatives appoint the informant (House of Representatives, 2012a).

not allowed to make amendments to the law, but can force the House of Representatives to change the proposal by voting (or threatening to vote) against the current proposal. They also have no right of oral questioning. Compared to the members of the House of Representatives, which are fulltime employed with this task, the members of the Senate are only part-time politicians and have a stronger connection to society.

Many other political institutions exist, but they will not be discussed here, since they have played no role in this case.

2.2 The political parties in the Netherlands

The Netherlands has many political parties, although not all parties make it into the House of Representatives. Since only the chosen parties can vote for or against policies, the political parties seated in the House have a strong influence on policymaking. Therefore, the composition of the House plays an important role in policymaking. In addition, this illustrates the diversity of political parties within the Netherlands.

The political parties in the House of Representatives after the elections of 2010 were the following in order of number of seats (House of Representatives, 2012b):

- VVD, Volkspartij voor Vrijheid en Democratie (Peoples' Party for Freedom and Democracy)
- PvdA, Partij van de Arbeid (Labour Party)
- PVV, Partij voor de Vrijheid (Party for Freedom)
- CDA, Christen Democratisch Appel (Christian Democratic Party)
- SP, Socialistische Partij (Socialist Party)
- D66, Democraten 66 (Democrats 66)
- GL, GroenLinks (Green Party)
- CU, Christen Unie (Christian Union)
- SGP, Staatkundig Gereformeerde Partij (Reformed Party)
- PvdD, Partij voor de Dieren (Party for Animals)

2.3 Choice of models

For the analysis, incrementalism by Lindblom and Woodhouse (1993) and the stream model of Kingdon (2003) were chosen. First, other models considered, will be described. Next, incrementalism and the stream model will be described in detail, together with the motivation for the choice for these models.

Many models exist for analyzing policies. All these models put emphasis on a different aspect of policymaking. No model is perfect for all cases and each model has its own strengthens and weaknesses.

One of the simplest models is the policymaking cycle. This model assumes that policymaking has different stages and policy is formed and changed as it flows through the different stages of the cycle. The real life situation is not as structured and policymaking does not follow the stages orderly or skips stages altogether (Howlett and Ramesh, 2003:11-15). This model is useful for understanding which processes are important for policymaking, but do not reflect the real situation and therefore cannot be used to explain how the animal police emerged.

Other models focus more on the way decisions are made. One of these models is the rational model. This model assumes that policy makers consider all options and choose the option that maximizes the desired result at the lowest cost. It assumes that politicians know all the options, evaluate all consequences and based on this evaluation, come to a rational decision. This, in reality, would be time consuming and thus policy makers do not look at all alternatives in their considerations (Howlett and Ramesh, 2003:167-170; Lindblom, 1959). Next to that, not all consequences of a new policy can be known beforehand, leaving decision makers with incomplete knowledge. Rationalism is therefore not likely to resemble the real situation and is unfit to analyse the emergence of animal police in the Netherlands.

The barrier model by Bachrach and Baratz (Nelissen, De Goede and Twist, 2004:191-192) also assumes that policymaking is a structured process in which several hurdles need to be overcome before policy can change (Nelissen et al., 2004:191-192; Woerdman, 2000).

The first hurdle is that the wishes of the general public need to be transformed in demands to the political system. Next, the topic should be noticed by politicians and enter the political agenda. The next barrier is decision making, which means that politicians have to agree on a course of action consistent with the wishes of the public. The last barrier is implementation. Although the decision is made, neither enactment nor the results of implementation are guaranteed (Nelissen et al., 2004:191-192).

The barrier model is interesting, since I assumes that a policy needs to overcome several hurdles to enter the political agenda and eventual become an accepted policy. However, I believe that the stream model of Kingdon has aspects that incorporate the same barriers, although not in the same way. For example, one barrier is getting the topic on the agenda. Kingdon does recognize this problem as well and this barrier is incorporated in the problem stream. I prefer the stream model, since it assumes that hurdles can be taken in different order and sees policymaking as a more dynamic process.

The advocacy coalition network by Sabatier (Howlett and Ramesh, 2003:151-152, Sabatier; 1998) focuses on the complex system of networks for policy areas. Policy subsystems exist for specific problems or issues in which a variety of participants, including governmental actors, participates in order to influence the policies related to the problem or issue. These subsystems are influenced by changes in society, politics and other policy subsystems.

Within the subsystem, coalitions are formed that share the same beliefs and values and cooperate to change policies. When believes of two different coalitions clash, another group of actors in the subsystem acts to find a compromise between the clashing advocacy coalitions.

Although this system would incorporate many different actors, the subsystems are hard to define since it would include the interest of animal welfare as well as those related to the police force. Indentifying the subsystem and the actors would be a complex task. The way the participants interact, forming coalitions and finding compromises, are important in politics and can be found in the House of Representatives too.

The characteristics of the advocacy coalition network, compromise and diverse participants in- and outside government, are present in incrementalism as well. Since for this model it is not required to structure the network, I have chosen for incrementalism.

2.4 Incrementalism

In this chapter, incrementalism as described by Lindblom and Woodhouse (1993) will be presented in more detail. They describe incrementalism in the book: *The policy-making process*. The original idea of incrementalism comes from Lindblom (Howlett and Ramesh, 2003:170; Lindblom, 1959), but in time, this model has been refined. First, the choice for incrementalism will be motivated. Next, the participants recognized by Lindblom and Woodhouse (1993) will be discussed.

2.4.1 Motivation model choice

Incrementalism is based on a political system, which resembles the Dutch situation. According to this model, decision making is done by negotiating and compromise of self-interested participants. Policy therefore reflects what was "*political feasible*" and not the policy with the most benefits according to the rational model (Howlett and Ramesh, 2003:170). Multiparty systems require a large amount of negotiation and persuasion, since no political party is big enough to pass a bill in parliament on its own. In the Dutch system, the first thing that is done after elections is the formation of a coalition that has the majority in the House of Representatives. During this formation, negotiation already starts. Negotiation was especially difficult during the formation of the government at the time of the introduction of the animal police. The PVV only partly cooperated with the plans set out by the coalition. This shows that, although an agreement was made, the differences between the parties were not easy to overcome. As mentioned before, the minority government made the negotiations even more important in the House of Representatives, since the VVD and CDA still had to find support for part of their plans with other parties than the PVV. Negotiation as an important factor in policymaking seems therefore very compatible with the Dutch political system.

This way of creating policy has its benefits, as it takes into account many opinions, values, interests and alternatives. It also means that a lot of information comes together, since each participant contributes information to the process. This leads to policy that makes a deliberate trade-off between all these values (Lindblom and Woodhouse, 1993:25). When not all participants participate, their interest, information and possible alternatives will not be taken into account, which make the outcome not as optimal as it could have been.

Incrementalism also looks at the different participants and their influence on policymaking (Lindblom and Woodhouse, 1993). The model does not only assume that participants are important, but also provides an overview of groups of participants that all have different influence on policymaking. Not only politicians and civil servants, but also business, interest groups and citizens are involved in policymaking. The different participants have different power and influence on the policy-making process. Together these participants make this policy.

2.4.2 Public opinion

The citizens' main influence on the political process is through voting. In the Dutch situation, citizens can choose which parties represent them in parliament. The influence is small, since citizens cannot directly choose for a policy, but have to vote for a party (Lindblom and Woodhouse, 1993:34). This means that they have to choose a 'package' of policies as presented by a party. It is not certain that the party will stick to all these policies after the election (Lindblom and Woodhouse, 1993:55). Parties also aim for minority groups in their

election campaigns, leading to policies that only are important to a small part of the population (Lindblom and Woodhouse, 1993:41). In the period between elections, the power of the citizens is even smaller.

In the case of the animal police, not all people were in favour of the introduction of the new policy. Since the impact of the public opinion is relatively small on the policymaking process, this does not have to hinder politicians to implement the policy. The public did have influence on the parties elected in the House of Representatives. The parties that support the animal police consequently had to be chosen by the public to gain power in the House.

2.4.3 Elected officials

The elected officials in the Dutch political system are in the Second Chamber (House of Representatives) and the First Chamber (Senate). Elected officials are not bound to stand by their election promises and campaigns. Once elected, they can make their own decisions as they like (Lindblom and Woodhouse, 1993:55). This can have consequences for the next elections, but not for the current term. The public has no direct influence on policies.

The number of policies/subjects with which officials have to deal is too high to process all by themselves. Therefore, some sort of labour division exists, for example within a party but also within the Chambers (Lindblom and Woodhouse, 1993:49). This means that elected officials do not research each topic for themselves, but act upon information from others.

A majority is needed in both Chambers for implementing policy. Blocking a policy is therefore easier then getting a policy accepted (Lindblom and Woodhouse, 1993:47).

Elected officials have power in policymaking, especially the House of Representatives, since they have the right to propose and amend laws and the cabinet had the executive power. First, the topic needs to be brought onto the political agenda by members of the House of Representatives, for example by questions to the ministers. During the elections, the topic can also be brought up by the parties in their election program and in debates. In the end, the members of the House of Representatives play an important role, since the majority has to vote in favour of the policy.

2.4.4 Civil servants

Civil servants are important for the implementation and with that, the ultimate form of policy. Politicians cannot oversee all possible problems with the implementation. Civil servants are closer to the real situation and can accordingly adapt the policy to the situation (Lindblom and Woodhouse, 1993:59-60).

However, civil servants can have other goals than implementing policy. They can focus on retaining power, budget or political turf. They can also loose sight of the problem and focus on the policy itself. Civil servants can also focus on their own domain, without taking other domains into account (Lindblom and Woodhouse, 1993:63). It may also be that policy becomes too much fragmented by specialized agencies dealing with the same topic. Some sort of coordination and cooperation between the agencies is necessary, but not always functions in practice (Lindblom and Woodhouse, 1993:66). Elected officials do not often check the work of civil servants due to a lack of time. A risk of bureaucrats is that they focus on the limitations of policies instead of the goals of the policy (Lindblom and Woodhouse, 1993:71).

For successfully creating animal police civil servants are important. However, the main task of civil servants is working out policy plans and therefore it is not likely that the initiative for

this policy came from them. It is expected that animal related problems were already known at the Ministry of Security and Justice.

2.4.5 Business

Business is very powerful in policymaking, since the government depends on them for the many basic needs of their citizens. Think about work, housing, production and food. The government needs to stimulated business in order to provide jobs, production and growth. As a result, business has a high influence on policies, as they know the government needs them. They want influence on policymaking or ask help to 'create' the needs they provide (Lindblom and Woodhouse, 1993:91-92). They have the asset of high funding (Lindblom and Woodhouse, 1993:100).

In the case of animal police business has very little to do with this policy, since no benefits or harm is to be expected from the animal police.

2.4.6 Labour unions

Labour unions have less power then business, due to the abundant resources of business, especially in time of economic crisis. Labour unions can go on strike, but the employees need to go back on their job at some point (Lindblom and Woodhouse, 1993:95-96). Since government depends on business, they tend to have more influence than the labour unions (Lindblom and Woodhouse, 1993:102). In the Dutch situation, labour unions are not powerless against business and often have negotiations with the companies when problems arise.

The only labour union that might have an interest in this policy is the police force labour union. If the policy would be negative for the police officers, this union will take action. The labour union for the police might have something to say in this case, although this would be more related to the implementation than the emergence.

2.4.7 Interest groups

Interest groups often play an important role in information exchange between elected officials and the general public. Interest groups can promote a particular policy and win support for this policy with the general public, which makes introduction more likely (Lindblom and Woodhouse, 1993:75). They monitor government (Lindblom and Woodhouse, 1993:77) and can help to build coalitions for policies (Lindblom and Woodhouse, 1993:78). In a multi party system like the Netherlands, the parties take over part of this function as well.

Persuasion is an important tool used by interest groups (Lindblom and Woodhouse, 1993:83). They have no power in government themselves, but they need to convince officials of their ideas. Interest groups also help legislators by informing them about policy and their opinion, which saves the official the time of reading through all material about the subject (Lindblom and Woodhouse, 1993:83).

The downside of interest groups is that they are not a direct representation of the general public. Different social classes have different resources; which results in power differences. The higher classes have for example more money to fund campaigns and research. Next to that, social classes can differ in their ability and skills to voice their opinion. Another risk is that interest groups often represent self-interest, although this is not always the case (Lindblom and Woodhouse, 1993:85-86).

Interest groups related to animals might have played an important role in the emergence of the animal police. Especially interest groups aiming for better animal welfare and

more/heavier punishment for animal crimes are likely to have promoted the introduction of the animal police, for example Animal Protection. It could also be that the idea comes from these interest groups.

2.4.8 External influences on policy

The Netherlands are part of the European Union, which means that European laws and agreements also apply. Lindblom and Woodhouse do not mention this participant, since the focus on the federal government of the United States. It does mean that Dutch politics have to take into account the EU laws and agreements while making policy. This might have a strong influence on policy choices and possible alternatives.

Since the animal police is part of the police force and are in principal agents that received an extra training, I do not expect that European laws or other European countries will interfere with the emergences of the animal police.

2.4.9 Negotiations and gradual change

Policy is formed by interaction between participants, although not all participants interact directly with each other and not all participants are active on every topic. Negotiation plays an important role during this process. Participants try to win support for their policy by persuading other participants. In parliament, politicians need to persuade one another as well. No party is big enough in the Dutch system to have the majority in the House of Representatives, and therefore relies on the support of other political parties. This is also the reason for the coalition formation after elections, since the biggest party cannot govern on its own.

Next to that, incrementalism assumes that policy is formed in small steps. This is done as radical plans are not likely to win enough support (Lindblom and Woodhouse, 1993:27). A benefit of implementation in small steps is that policy can be formed by trial and error. Politicians therefore do not have to know the full consequences and possible flaws of their policy as their errors are easy to correct (Lindblom and Woodhouse, 1993:29-30). In this case, it means that the animal police should be a small alteration to the previous situation. A first step for incremental change would be a pilot project with a few animal police officers. This would give politicians the change to evaluate the efficiency and impact of this new policy after which they can decide how they will proceed.

2.4.10 Conclusions

To analyse the emergence of the animal police, first all participants have to be identified and their interests and influence must be determined. The most important participants in this case seem to be elected officials (mainly House of Representatives) and interest groups like the Animal Protection. Civil servants and public opinion could have influenced policymaking, but this is not what I expect. The power differences between participants are an important aspect. The elected officials will have the upper hand compared to the interest groups. Since business is not likely to interfere with this policy, I expect to see most interaction between the parties seated in the House of Representatives. Although members of the party can have a different opinion than the party on a specific topic, this is not often the case. Therefore, the parties are seen as the participants. The differences in seize of the parties also represents a difference in power, as bigger parties have more influence when it comes to voting in the House of Representatives.

The opinions and motives for supporting or not supporting the introduction of the animal police needs to be known for all political parties and the interest groups to be able to see how this influence everybody's role in the emergence of the animal cops.

2.5 Stream model of Kingdon

The second model that will be used to analyse the case of the animal police is the stream model of Kingdon (2003) as presented in his book *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies*. In this chapter, the stream model of Kingdon will be introduced.

2.5.1 Motivation model choice

In contrast to incrementalism, Kingdon does not assume that policy is formed in small steps, although incrementalism is a strategy (Kingdon, 2003:80). His model is built on the garbage can model of Cohen, March and Olsen. The garbage can does not assume a structured process in which policy is formed. It assumes "organized anarchies". These organized anarchies are defined as organisations that have problematic preferences, unclear technology and fluid participation. This means that goals are not clearly defined, members of the organization do not understand how the organization works and participants in the decision making process vary constantly (Kingdon, 2003:84). These characteristics can also be found in government, since government is an organisation that has to deal with the wicked demands of citizens and participants, and the government is regularly changed at elections. Kingdon adapted the garbage can model to the situation of the United States federal government (Kingdon, 2003:85).

The stream model assumes three streams; problems, policies and politics. These form the base of policymaking (Kingdon, 2003:87). The streams can change rapidly and are *"largely separated from one another"* (Kingdon, 2003:88). For policy to emerge, all streams need to be coupled by an entrepreneur or come together on their own. This means that policy can only emerge if all three streams are favourable. If there is a problem that is recognized, a fitting alternative is found and there is the political mood to solve this (and there are no constraints prohibiting action), a policy can emerge (Kingdon, 2003:88).

From the above it becomes clear that this model takes into account chance. The streams are constantly changing and the opening of a policy window is based on the chance that two streams come together. Although an entrepreneur can steer the streams, the opening of a policy window is not in total control of the entrepreneur. It means that politicians have to act on what comes along in the streams. The strength of this model is that it takes into account the ever-changing world around and describes how this can influence policies.

Participants are important in policymaking, but they are depending on the development in the streams (Kingdon, 2003:18). First, the participants will be shortly discussed and then the streams will be introduced.

2.5.2 Participants

Like Lindblom and Woodhouse (1993), Kingdon makes a distinction between different participants. The influence of a participant depends on his resources, importance and function (Kingdon, 2003:21-70). The function indicates which streams the participant can influence. Kingdon puts emphasis on other participants than Lindblom. He also makes the distinction between inside and outside government, although this is somewhat artificial. The participants recognized by Kingdon (2003:21-70) are presented in Table 1.

Table 1 Participants in policymaking recognized by Kingdon (2003:21-70)

Inside Government	Outside Government
Administration (The president and his staff)	Academics, researchers and consultants
Civil servants	Media
Capitol hill (Congress, comparable with the Dutch parliament)	Campaigners
	Interest groups
	Political parties
	Public opinion

The distinction of participants inside government is not comparable with the Dutch situation. It is good to take into account the different types of, as Lindblom and Woodhouse (1993) call them, elected officials. The Dutch government and parliamentarians have different influence on policies, thus this distinction is important for the analysis.

Kingdon recognizes many participants outside government and comes with different participants than Lindblom. Interest groups are the most important ones and they can affect the agenda and the alternatives considered by politicians. They are often busy with protecting existing benefits and blocking new policies (Kingdon, 2003:49-50). As mentioned before, Animal Protection is one of the interest groups important in Dutch animal welfare.

Academics, researchers and consultants are important in the policy stream, coming up with new solutions for existing problems (Kingdon, 2003:55). The idea for animal police could originated from these participants.

Election related participants, campaigners, political parties and public opinion have an effect on the agenda (Kingdon, 2003:63, 65). Campaigners are important in America, since parties and presidents make promises during the election campaigns. If the campaigners end up as elected officials, others will keep them to their promises. In the Netherlands, this means that the political parties are hold to their promises from their election campaign, making the campaigners as participants unnecessary in the Dutch situation.

Public opinion often forms a restraint on policymaking (Kingdon, 2003:65). Currently, government plans to change the health insurances premiums in the Netherlands, in which the premium is based on income, which means that higher incomes pay more insurance contribution than lower incomes, is a good example of the restrained that the public opinion has on policymaking. Part of the general public is furious about the introduction of income dependant insurance contributions, as the new system is not in line with the promises of one of the major parties in office, the VVD. Although the plan is not abolished, politicians are actively working to inform people and win back support, while others already threaten that the new policy will not pass the Senate. This shows the importance of campaign promises and the influence of the negative public opinion on the policies.

The media has a function in setting the agenda. By reporting on issues, they give a problem attention, magnifying small movements and/or influencing the public opinion (Kingdon, 2003:57-60). In the case of the animal police, this could mean that the media show an increased interest in animal welfare or give attention to other participants that aim for animal police, thereby helping the topic appear on the political agenda.

Participants in policymaking have restricted influence on the process and often their influence is focussed on one stream, although this does not mean participants cannot

influence multiple streams (Kingdon, 2003:87). It is important that different participants influence different streams. It is therefore likely that multiple participants played a role in the emergence of the animal police. In the analysis, all participants should be taking into account. It is important to know who was influencing which stream and how they were influencing this stream to determine the role of the participants in the emergence of the animal police.

2.5.3 Problem stream

Different indicators can signify a problem. These are called focus events, which can be a crisis, personal experiences, symbols or feedback (Kingdon, 2003:113). Crises have different intensity: some are so big, like nuclear disasters, that the topic immediately appears on the political agenda. Other crises can be less direct and could just be an incident. Further prove for the urgency of the problem is then needed (Kingdon, 2003: 90-115). Symbols are a small part of the problem or an event related to the problem. Symbols are often used to keep attention for a problem (Kingdon, 2003:97-98), for example the use of the panda bear by the WWF as a symbol for nature degradation. Feedback on implemented policies can conclude that the current policy is not effective in dealing with the problem or that the policy itself creates a new problem. It can also be that a policy is implemented differently than intended by policy makers (Kingdon, 2003:100-101).

The problem stream is changing rapidly. What was a hot topic today can be forgotten tomorrow. A new crisis can take away the attention for the previous crisis or the attention falls away when no solution can be found for the problem. It may also be that people get used to the problem, like noise disturbance, and therefore no longer see it as a problem (Kingdon, 2003:103-105).

The way a problem is framed determines what kind of solutions can be considered (Kingdon, 2003:109-110). As an example, take many unemployed women. It could be that their position in the job market is bad. It could also be that no childcare is available and therefore women have no choice but to stay at home. Depending on the definition of the problem, a solution is chosen to reduce unemployment among women.

2.5.4 Policy stream

In this stream, all solutions and alternatives are presented. They can be introduced into the stream by entrepreneurs or policy communities which hope to find a problem to attach to their 'pet' solution. Entrepreneurs try to convince others to support their policies. Policies that are worked out in detail, which are technically feasible and can be implemented have a higher chance of survival. In times of crisis the policy needs to be implemented quickly, thus a solution, which is already worked out, is more likely to survive in the policy stream (Kingdon, 2003:143).

Policy entrepreneurs use their resources, like time and money, to win support for their policy. This can be done by rational arguments and persuasion. It is important that entrepreneurs fit their policies to the values of the members of the policy community (Kingdon, 2003:143).

The following processes can get alternatives into the policy stream: softening up, the bandwagon-effect and the tipping point.

Entrepreneurs try to bring up their pet solution as often as possible. This way, other people get used to their solution as they have already been introduced to it. They also get used to the idea, which can take away some resistance against the solution. Especially for radical

policies, softening-up is important. When the time comes for a solution to be linked to a problem, participants are familiar with the solution and are more likely to support the policy. (Kingdon, 2003:126-131).

The bandwagon-effect is a mechanism for increased support for a policy. This happens when support for the policy is already rising by softening-up or persuasion and opponents start to fear that the policy will be implemented even without their support. In order not to miss the benefits from supporting the policy, they join as well (Kingdon, 2003:140-141).

The tipping-point states that at some point, enough people are convinced to make the alternative the new standard (Kingdon, 2003:140-141). An example is working mothers. In the past mothers stayed home to take care of the children while the husband generated the income. At some point in time, women started to take up work again after childbirth. First, this was uncommon, but when more and more mothers started working, it became the new standard.

Politicians can use different mechanism to make their alternative attractive to other politicians as mentioned above. In addition, different motives exist for supporting a policy. For the analysis, this means that possible entrepreneurs of animal police had different ways to promote their plans. The reason for supporting the animal police also plays a role and can explain why, even if not all politicians do believe in the benefits of the animal police themselves, they did support the policy. Even if a politician does not see the merits of the animal police directly, he might gains something else by giving his support, for example support for another policy of his own. As a result some participants supported the policy as they believed in the merit of the animal police, while others only give support as they believed they gained another advantage with supporting the policy.

2.5.5 Political stream

The political stream contains *"electoral, partisan and pressure group factors"* (Kingdon, 2003:145). Some important factors are the national mood, organized political factors (like interest groups and labour unions) and changes in the political staff (for example elections).

The national mood is a difficult concept. The first point is how to define the national mood and how to measure it. The media are not a reliable reflection of the national mood, although politicians use it as such. Interest groups and social movements are just the active part of the general public and therefore cannot represent the national mood either (Kingdon, 2003:146-149). Opinion polls are common in the Netherlands, but they do not take into account the strength of an opinion. Next to that, no argumentation for the opinion is presented, so it is not clear what the reason for opposing a policy is. Although the definition for the national mood is not clear, politicians think they can sense changes in the national mood. The national mood can act both as a promoter and a restraint (Kingdon, 2003:147). This means that the national mood is taken into account in decision making.

Organized interest groups have clear opinions, but these opinions can be conflicting. Often politicians try to find some balance between the conflicting opinions. When organized forces are strong and have different opinions, this can stall the development of a new policy (Kingdon, 2003:150-151). This is well known in the Netherlands and is called: "Polderen". The result is a government that tries to please everyone involved and thus follows a moderate course in which all parties find something to their liking.

Changes in the political staff are common during elections. When other political parties come into office, policies can change drastically as new people bring new topics to the agenda and make other policies impossible, which first were feasible (Kingdon, 2003:153). In

the Dutch situation, this does not imply as much as in the American situation. Civil servants are not replaced after each election. Only the ministers and the state secretaries are replaced, while the staff does not change. Elections do bring the opportunity of different political parties in office and thus for a new political mood.

Negotiations are an important process in the political stream. Different motivations for supporting a policy exist (see 2.5.4). Persuasion and diffusion are important. If a possible solution survives all criticism, it will diffuse into the political community (Kingdon, 2003:159). Negotiations are especially important during the government formation, in which several parties have to agree upon a plan for the coming four years. Trade-offs between parties are made to come up with a common plan, the coalition agreement, which will have majority support in the House of Representatives.

2.5.6 Policy window

When streams come together, for example a policy and a problem are linked, this is called a policy window. Windows are only open for a short period and do not open frequently (Kingdon, 165-166). Two types of openings exist: a political and a problem window. In the political window a change in the political stream opens the window. The problem window is opened by a problem that comes up in the problem stream by one of the mechanisms mentioned before. (Kingdon, 2003:174). The deliberated action of bringing streams together is called coupling. This is done often by policy entrepreneurs, who couple their 'pet solution' to all kinds of problems (Kingdon, 2003:172-173, 179).

The spill over effect comes from policies, which have something in common, which leads to implementation of similar policies for different problems (Kingdon, 2003:190-191). It could be that, for example, other specialisations in the police force had been very successful. This could have been an argument for specialist animal police officers as well.

It is expected that an entrepreneur for the animal police has actively coupled the animal police to problems and political changes that came along. Since the policy was implemented, this entrepreneur did this successfully. Other related policies might have opened the window for the animal police.

2.5.7 Conclusions

When analysing the emergence of the animal police, all three streams must have been favourable and next to that, at least one participant had to notice this and act upon it. For the analysis, the three streams must be described and the participants influencing these streams must be determined. The changes in the streams and the participant actively taking action on these changes should be the core of the analysis. At least one entrepreneur is expected to have used the favourable stream to his advantage. From the analysis, it should become clear if a change in the problem stream or political stream opened the policy window. If a political window opened, the elections for the House of Representatives in 2010, causing a change is staff, is the most likely cause. If a problem window opened up, it is expected that an increase in animal related crimes was the explanation.

The stream model and incrementalism assume different ways of policymaking. Lindblom sees negotiating as the most important process, while Kingdon sees his three streams as the most important elements of policymaking. In the analysis I will look at the role the different participants played .For incrementalism I will look at the negotiations and how they developed. As for the stream model, I will look at the developments in the different streams and try to find the policy window for animal police. I will also search for an entrepreneur.

When this is done, it can be concluded if negotiations were the mayor force behind the introduction of the animal police or if an entrepreneur used a favourable development in the streams to bring the animal police to the Netherlands.

3   Methods for collecting data and analysis

In this chapter, the methods for data collection and analysis will be presented. First, the type of data used will be described and why this type of data was chosen. Then the data collection and analysis will be described.

For this research, the following sources were used for analysing the policymaking process:

- – Dutch national newspapers (found via Lexis Nexis)
- – Party election programs
- – Policy documents from the ministries (Rijksoverheid.nl and tweedekamer.nl)
- – Interview with entrepreneur(s)

The type of analysis that was used is called qualitative content analysis. Qualitative analysis means that not the number of documents about the subject, but the core meaning of the document is of interest (Kohlbacher, 2005). Therefore the focus will not be on the number of documents about the animal police, but the focus will be on what is said about the animal police in those documents. The research questions deal with what happened to make the animal police emerge. This cannot be explained by the number of times the topic is mentioned. As a result qualitative analysis will be applied to the data.

3.1.1   Newspaper articles

Newspapers can be useful to find out the existing opinions about the animal police. Not only do political parties publish their views, citizens and other organisations get attention too. Next to that, newspapers present the perception of the new policy. Is the policy considered positive or negative and why.

Lexis Nexis was used to scan all Dutch newspapers. The first search, using the search string animal cops and/or dierenpolitie, since these two terms are used for the animal police in the Netherlands, resulted in more than 3000 results. To limit the amount of results only national newspapers were used, which resulted in 857 newspaper articles. These were sorted by newspaper.

Other possible search terms popped up during the analyses. One of these terms was 'dierenagenten'. An extra search in the national newspapers, excluding articles that contained the term 'dierenpolitie' or animal cops, resulted in 16 new articles. Since not many articles came up, the search term was dismissed for use in this paper.

In addition, an extra search for documents dealing with the national telephone number 144, which is used for reporting animals in need, was made. Various trials with different key words (again excluding documents containing the words animal cops and/or dierenpolitie) resulted in 18 articles. A scan of titles and publishing dates resulted in dismissing these articles for use, since they were duplicate articles, which where already found during the analysis of previous articles. The high number of articles found was also the motivation for not using more general search terms like animal welfare or animal abuse. It is possible that, due to this limited search, information about the subject was missed.

From the national newspapers, the AD, NRC Handelsblad, Volkskrant and Boerderij Vandaag and the press agency ANP were analysed (see Table 2). These newspapers were selected based on their quality and their focus on politics. Boerderij Vandaag was included since it is focussed on farmers, thus having another reader base than the other newspapers. Firstly, analysis was done on all data available for AD and ANP, but it turned out analyses only needed to be done till 2012, since the animal police was installed in December 2011,

marking the end for analyses of documents. Since many articles overlapped between the newspapers in terms of information, analyses were limited to these five newspapers.

Table 2 Newspaper articles used in the analysis
*Only used articles dated before 2012

Title	Number of articles analysed	Database extent
AD	104	4 November 1991 through present
ANP	145	1 January 1993 through present
NRC Handelsblad	72*	8 January 1990 through present
Volkskrant	63*	2 January, 1995 through present
Boerderij Vandaag	18*	March 2, 1999 through present

For qualitative content analysis, it is important to work systematically. These three things are important: summary, explanation and structuring (Mayring, 2002; cited in Kohlbacher, 2005).
According to Silverman (2003:83-84), the research has to start with a small selection of the documents to created categories or labels.

Therefore, a system for analysing the data had to be created. In this process, I started with the oldest articles working my way towards the present. The AD was used as trial for creating the correct labels for the data. All participants from both incrementalism and the three streams were given a label as well. This included all political parties in the House of Representatives after the elections of 2010, civil servants and the ministers of related areas. Interest groups that were important are Animal Protection and the Animal Ambulance. During the analyses, the National Inspection Animals Protection (LID) and the General Inspection Service (AID) were added to the participants, since these organisations are related to the animal police, as some of their tasks overlap. Next to that, labels were created for articles containing details about what the animal police is and for articles related to the special telephone number. For each article, the interesting facts were briefly noted.

The data analyses were done using Excel in which the rows represent articles and the columns their labels. The key words were marked in the articles, which was very useful when analysing all the data. Firstly, the sentences in which search words were present were read to determine what possible information could be in the article and if the rest of the paragraph contained more details about the animal police or the policy process.
Some articles appeared more than once in the same newspaper or even across newspapers. Some turned out to be updated during the day, but all versions remained in the dataset. Some documents appeared multiple times in the data or the content of the article (published on the same day in the same newspaper) was highly overlapping. These articles were highlighted in the same colour to indicating they had the same content.

3.1.2 Party election programs

Party election programs for the elections of 2010 were used in which the political parties present their plans for the coming four years. Only the programs of parties represented in the House of Representatives after the elections of 2010 were considered. Firstly, a search for animal cops and dierenpolitie was done to indentify political parties that wanted to

introduce the animal police or were against the introduction of animal police. When the term animal police was not present, a search for related topics was done, namely animal welfare and police. This might be useful for determining the likelihood that the political party would support the animal police or not. If, for example, animal welfare is an issue for the party, they are more likely to support the idea of animal police, compared to parties that do not even mention animal welfare in their election program. The election programs already show that a political party sees improving animal welfare as a goal for which the animal police can be a tool to reach this.

However, installing 500 special agents is less directly connected to a general interest in animal welfare, although it could be linked to plans to reorganize the police. It could also be that some parties aim for more specialized agents without specifically mentioning animal police. Other parties might want to cut the budget for the police, making animal police less likely as this would most likely mean an investment in the police force.

3.1.3 Policy documents

First thing to mention is that political documents are very diverse, including policy proposals and questions for ministers and the prime minister. In these documents, the activity of members of the House of Representatives concerning the animal police becomes clear. Among the policy documents, questions to the ministers are present. This can show which parties are actively promoting the subject in the parliament. It also shows what the political parties did with the points presented in the party election program.

On www.rijksoverheid.nl all ministries publish their documents since 2007. This site is used to find political documents dealing with the animal police. Another source for political documents is www.tweedekamer.nl, although only two documents came up in the database on this website of the House of Representatives.

The policy documents were analyzed in the same way as the newspaper articles using the same labels.

3.1.4 Interviews

News articles and policy documents might not contain all information that is needed to analyze the emergence of the animal police. Interviews with policy entrepreneurs and other key persons can help to fill in these gaps. Due to the time limit in which this research was done, extensive interviews were not possible. An interview with one or two key players was a possibility. Therefore, Dion Graus, member in the House of Representatives for the PVV since 2006, who seemed strongly related to the topic from the start, was contacted by email with the request for an interview. After a first reaction, in which Mister Graus briefly talked about his connection to the animal police, no further reaction was received. The timing of the research might explain this. The start was just before the summer recess of the House of Representatives. In September 2012, elections for the House of Representatives were held. This meant that directly after the recess the campaign period started. This is why an interview was not possible.

4 Case description

In this chapter, an overview of the important events connected to the animal police is presented. In order to do this, first a definition of the term animal police will be given. In addition, the time of the establishment of the animal police is defined.

4.1 Definition of the animal police in the Netherlands

Firstly, it is important to have a definition of the animal police in the Netherlands. During the data analyses, it became clear the Dutch word 'dierenpolitie' (Dutch term for animal police) and the term animal cops, as this the English term used for animal police in the Netherlands, could refer to more than the policy for introducing police officers by the government, which will act against animal abuse.

First of all, the term can refer to the American television program Animal Cops in which volunteers are battling animal cruelty. In addition, a Dutch program called Dierenpolitie was broadcasted as well. In this documentary, the officers of the LID (National Inspection for Animals Protection) were followed during their work *(3)*. These were not the animal police officers as meant for this research, but they are civil servants. It does created confusion, since the LID is referred to as ´dierenpolitie´ as well in a lot of newspaper articles.

Next to that, the Dutch municipality Capelle aan den IJssel installed their own 'animal cops' in 2010 with permission of the minister of agriculture *(4)*. These are not police officers either, but they are special detection officers (BOAs) and are civil servants of the municipality Capelle aan den IJsel. They are allowed to investigate suspected cases of animal abuse. In addition, the animal police of Capelle received the power to confiscate animals (which first only the LID could do) and they are allowed to fine people in cases of animal abuse *(4)*. Although these special detection officers are part of the debates about the animal police, they themselves are not considered animal police in this thesis.

In short, the term is used for the American volunteers, the civil servants of the LID and the civil servants of Capelle aan den IJssel. In this thesis, the interest lies with the specific police officers. This explains why Dion Graus wanted that these agents were only referred to by the Dutch term dierenpolitie to prevent confusion with the American television program *(5)*.

The animal police meant in this thesis are the fulltime police officers who are specialized in animal abuse. They are allowed to deal with all crimes they come across, while battling animal abuse (Ministry of Security and Justice, 2011a). These agents receive a special training of 12 days in which they are prepared for the job by learning the laws about animal abuse, to recognize animal abuse, their authorizations, how to cease animals and how the report animal abuse (Ministry of Security and Justice, 2012).

In addition, the moment at which the animal police came into existence needs to be defined. In this case, the animal police are considered officially established when both the first agents and the telephone number 144 became active. This was chosen, since although the motion for a special telephone number was passed by the House of Representatives in 2006 *(6)*, the number only was truly installed in 2011. The animal police are part of the coalition agreement, but details about the implementation are not presented and simply a statement will not guarantee the true establishment. The telephone number was being taken into account as well, as part of the duties of the animal police was answering the calls on this special number. They are responsible for taking the proper kind of action and sending the correct organisation, namely either animal police themselves, the National Inspection for Animal Protection, the General Inspection Service (previous AID, now nVWA) or the Animal Ambulance (Ministry of Security and Justice, 2011b).

4.2   Development of the animal police

An overview of the most important developments during the emergence of the animal police is presented in Table 3.

The first time the animal police was mentioned in an election campaign was in 2006 when Geert Wilders, previous in the House of Representatives for the VVD, started his own party, the PVV. In his election pamphlet, he stated that he wanted animal police (Party of Freedom, 2006). After the elections, the PVV got nine seats in the House of Representatives (Kiesraad, unknown). One member of this party, Dion Graus, was already promoting the animal police with the police in Heerlen *(7)*.

In the same year, the PvdD was elected into the House of Representatives, which also had taken up the idea for the animal police in their election program (Party for Animals, 2006). This party was established in 2002, but only then got enough votes to enter the House of Representatives, which is extraordinary for a one-issue party aiming on animals only.

At the end of 2006, a motion from Graus for the introduction of a special number for the animal police was passed, but a second motion, also from Graus, for the introduction of animal police was declined *(6)*. No details about the special number were given nor how it would be taken up.

In 2007, the animal police were proposed in questions for the Minister of Agriculture, Verburg by PVV members Graus and De Roon, but she answered that the existing organisations were capable of dealing with animal abuse and that the animal police was not necessary. In addition, more money and staff (in the future the equivalent of 15 fulltime employees) was planned for the LID (Ministry of Economic affairs, Agriculture and Innovation, 2007a). Another two times the animal police are mentioned in questions by the House of Representatives.

In 2008 and 2009 the topic almost disappeared in the policy documents and the newspaper. It was only mentioned ones in the newspaper Boerderij Vandaag during this period. In this article, the idea of the PVV to install the animal police at the cost of 20 million euro was discussed *(8)*. In 2009, no reference to the animal cops was found. Therefore, no data in 2009 was analyzed.

The next appearance of the topic was in the election program of the PVV and the PvdD for the 2010 elections (Party of Freedom, 2010 and Party for Animals, 2010). After these elections, a coalition was formed between VVD and CDA, but these two parties formed a minority government with support from the PVV in a so-called tolerance agreement. The animal police and a special number for reporting animals in need were part of the coalition and tolerance agreement, presented on 30 September 2010. It is interesting to see that the tolerance agreement only stated that 500 animal police officers would be active and no specifics were given (VVD, PVV and CDA, 2010: 12 and 13). This meant that the form of the animal police was not defined and thus still open for discussion. After the publication of these documents, the discussion in the House of Representatives and the newspapers began about the animal police.

The municipality of Capelle aan den IJssel started a pilot project with two special detection officers for animal welfare with permission from the minister. Although they were already planned and agreed upon in 2010 and the goal was to start in May 2010 *(4)*, they were appointed on 15 February 2011 *(9)*. The initiative taker of this project, Alderman Eerdmans, thought that the special detection officers were cheaper than police officers *(10)*. Counting special detection agents as animal police officers was proposed by Marcouch of the PvdA and declined by the Minister of Security and Justice Opstelten, since the agreement clearly stated policy officers and not special detection officers (Ministry of Security and Justice, 2011i).

Another point brought up by politicians is the balance between animal abuse and other crimes. Member Arid, also of the PvdA, ask the Minister of Security and Justice how the police capacity for the new animal police was balanced with the police capacity to deal with child porn (Ministry of Security and Justice, 2011i).

At the start of 2011, the chief constable for Amsterdam nicknamed the animal police "guinea-pig police" during a speech and voiced his disapproval of the new police. However, if this is what politicians wanted, the police will have to execute this plan *(11)*. During the year, voices came up claiming that the animal police were not recruited on a voluntary basis, although the Minister of Security and Justice assures that all animal police officers had willingly applied for this role *(12)*.

The costs of the new policy are an interesting detail, which is not yet mentioned. The policy documents do not present much detail, but 300 million euro was reserved for the 3000 extra police officers in the coalition agreement, but no specific budget was reserved for the 500 animal police that were part of these 3000 extra officers (Ministry of Security and Justice, 2011c). For the special number 144 354.000,- euro was reserved as special contribution (Ministry of Security and Justice, 2011d). In the newspapers, a clearer number is mentioned, namely 70 million euro per year *(2)*. If I assume this number is correct, it does not seem to be a mayor expense for the government.

In the end, the special telephone number to report animals in need was opened on 15 November 2011 (Ministry of Security and Justice, 2011e). The first animal police officers received their qualifications from the Minister of Security and Justice Opstelten on 2 December 2011 (Ministry of Security and Justice, 2011f), making the animal police a fact.

Due to the economic crisis and EU regulations on the budget of its member states, new cuts were necessary in 2012. VVD, PVV and CDA went into negotiations, but in the end they could not come to an agreement. This resulted in the fall of the cabinet and elections were necessary. A new coalition was formed that agreed on new cuts, so that the Dutch budget was in line with the regulations from the EU. In this budget, the animal police was abolished and the animal police officers, who were already installed, went quickly back to normal police work *(13)*.

Table 3 Timeline

In this timeline an overview is presented of the mayor events related to the emergence of the animal police.

2006	**Jan**	Animal police is in the election program of the PVV and PvdD
	Nov	Elections, PVV 9 seats, PvdD 2 seats
	Dec	Motion national telephone number approve, motion animal police declined
2007	**Jan**	15 extra officers for the LID
	April	Start television program Dierenpolitie Number of reports of animal abuse to the LID go up
2008	**Sep**	PVV wants to invest 20 million to install 250 animal police officers
2009		
2010	**Jan**	Chief of police of Amsterdam nicknames the animal police guinea-pig police Pilot project special detection officers Capelle aan den IJssel approved
	Jun	Elections House of Representatives, PVV 24 seats, PvdD 2 seats
	Sep	Presentation tolerance agreement VVD, CDA and PVV, includes the appointment of 500 animal police officers
2011	**Feb**	Introduction special detection officers for animal abuse in Capelle aan den IJssel
	Jun	Police officers forced to join the animal police department SP claimed police do not want the animal police Debate about the animal police with Minster of Security and Justice Opstelten
	Nov	National telephone number '144 red een dier' opens
	Dec	First animal police officers appointed
2012	**April**	Animal police are abolished

5 Results

In this chapter, the analyses on this case will be done using the two models, incrementalism and the stream model, to analyze what happened around the introduction of the animal police.

First, incrementalism will be discussed and conclusions about the emergence of the animal police according to this model will be given. Next, the same will be done for the stream model. At the end if this chapter, the conclusions of the two models will be compared.

5.1 Incrementalism

The most important points of incrementalism are participants, negotiations and gradual change of policy. These aspects of the model will be discussed separately, after which the fit of incrementalism to the case is evaluated.

5.1.1 Participants

The first thing that becomes clear from the data is that many *political participants* were not active in the introduction of the animal police. The only active participants during the elections were the PVV and the PvdD. These two parties mentioned the introduction of the animal police as a goal in their election programs, both in 2006 and 2010 (Party of Freedom, 2010 and Party for Animals, 2010). While the PvdD does not mention the number of animal police officers, the PVV aims for 300 officers. Their motivation is that animals should be treated with *"decorum and respect"*.

Although the *PvdD* had the animal police in their election campaign for at least two elections (2006 and 2010), they did not seem to have played an important role in getting the animal police accepted by the House of Representatives. This might be related to the small size of the party. With only two seats of the total of a 150, the influence of this party on voting is relatively small. However, they are able to bring up the subject in politics by asking questions. Their argument for the installation of the animal police is to give animal abuse priority.

The other parties seem not to had a strong opinion about the topic and the policy does only appear in the election programs of PvdD and PVV. However, Rutte, party leader of the VVD, said during the campaign period in the Children News (a news bulletin especially for children) that he was in favour of the national animal police as well *(14)*. The animal police is discussed more after their introduction then before. Only then other political parties get involved. However, the animal police was supported in the coalition agreement of three parties, namely the VVD, PVV and CDA. From these three parties, the *PVV* had the most influence, since the other two parties depended on this party to become the new government. Most likely, the point is brought up by the PVV and thus the animal police ended up in the coalition agreement. The support from the PvdD was no longer needed, since these three parties already had the majority in the House.

Dion Graus, a member of the House of Representatives since 2006 for the PVV, had brought up the subject of the animal police in a motion and in parliamentary questions for the Minister of Security and Justice. This was not successful in getting the animal police accepted by parliament. A motion for the introduction of a national telephone number for reporting animals in need was accepted in 2006 *(6).* However, this number was implemented in 2011 together with the introduction of the animal police. This meant that, although the policy for a telephone number was accepted, no action seems to have been taken to implement the policy.

Civil servants are also not referred to in the data. It could be that these participants work more in the background, thus with the implementation of the animal police, but this is not dealt with in the newspapers or the policy documents. Their job was to work out the

proposal for the animal police into a plan of action. They did not seem to have been the source that brought the policy on the agenda.

The *semi-governmental organisations LID* (National Inspection for Animal Protection) and the governmental organisation *AID* (General Inspection Service, now called the nVWA) are important participants in dealing with animal welfare. In principle, the LID had already the authority to deal with animal abuse in a more general way *(15)*. The AID dealt with animal welfare of production animals. The inspectors of the LID are special detection officers. One member of the LID stated that although she is not against the introduction of the animal police, the problem lies in the non-severe punishment of animal abusers. Judges did not dare to punish severely and that is what should change. Possible the number of cases brought forward by the animal police could help to change this attitude *(15)*. This however is only the opinion of one of the employees. No official statement of the LID or AID was found in the data.

These organisations apparently did not have had influence on the emergence of the animal police, but they were incorporated in the plans for the national telephone number.

Interest groups were not active on the topic before it appeared in the coalition agreement. Organisations like Animal Protection and the Animal Ambulance were asked for their opinion after the formation of the coalition. These organisations were not aiming for the animal police in particular and had other problems that they deemed more important. Animal Protection argues that the signal form the cabinet is good, but maybe they should have had more attention for prevention and aftercare for the animals *(16)*. Animal Protection also expected more calls were made upon them to help animals in need, but wondered who was going to pay for the rise in costs? The organisation depends on donations and does not receive funding from the government *(17)*.

This means that, although the organisations are not against the introduction of the animal police, they had no active role in the emergence of them. They were critical on the implementation of the animal police and had some point of concern.

These organisations, which all deal with animal welfare, did play a role with the number 144. In official governmental covenants, they made agreements on who was responsible for dealing with different calls to this number (Ministry of Security and Justice, 2011b).

As expected, *business* is not active on this topic. No reference to this group of participants can be found. This could mean that they have no interest in the introduction of the animal police as no loss or gain was expected from the introduction of this policy. Business will more likely intervene with policies that deal with the market in some way or another.

Next to that, the *police* are an important actor in this case as well. In the first reaction, the *police labour union* indicates that the animal police will reduce the universal employability and wonders where the money will come from for these agents *(16)*. In an email questionnaire among 3000 police officers, the SP asked police officers what they thought about the new animal police. From the 492 answers, most officers were not in favour of the animal police *(18)*.

During the first training of animal police officers it seemed that not all participants volunteered for this role and many dog handlers and police on horse were forced to take the training, although the Minister of Security and Justice (Opstelten) claimed they all started

voluntarily *(12)*. Next to that, the chief constable for Amsterdam was not very positive about the animal police, he deemed them useless, and gave them the nickname "guinea pig police". In addition, according to him, giving priority to animal abuse will result in losing many hours which could be spend on other cases. In addition, other crime needed extra officers as well, while in effect, they would only lose current staff to the animal police. The chief constable could do nothing else than accept the political choice and the police would have to execute the plans of the government *(11)*.

Other police officers left after training to become an animal police officers since they did not want to do the work fulltime *(19)* (Ministry of Security and Justice, 2011a) and from the dog handlers who followed the training, 72 out of 80 refused the job of animal police officer when they heard it was a full time position*(20)*. The following day a discussion about the animal police in the House of Representatives took place and the criticism by the police officers could have been a useful argument for the opponents of the animal police, like the SP.

Based on this information, it can be concluded that overall the police force did not seem to be overflowing with enthusiasm for the animal police. Among the ***animal police***, there seemed to be more enthusiastic officers. As one cop in an interview described, she is happy to do her job, but feels that confiscating animals takes to long, which means that they cannot directly help the animal *(21) (20)*. Within the police force, there were willing agents, although the organisation as a whole had a problem with financing the animal police and the lack of time for other crimes. However, the influence of the police on policy is limited; they just have to do as politicians and the minister demands. The labour union comes up for the interests of the police officers, but the influence of the labour union is not directly clear, since the minister seems to share their opinions. There is not indication that the labour union influenced the minister.

Based on the reactions of readers in the different newspapers *(2)*, the ***public opinion*** is divided on the subject. It is not apparent that this was the driving force behind introduction of the animal police. No actions of the public, like demonstrations, were reported. Most likely, other more prominent problems, like the economic crisis, took up the attention from the general public. It can also be that, although many people had an opinion about the animal police, the strength of the opinion was not strong enough to result in action. Overall, the influence of the public apparently did to have an influence on the emergence of animal police in the Netherlands.

In conclusion, the only groups of participants that were active were the political parties (mainly PVV and PvdD) and the police. Other groups of participants had no interest in the subject, because it did not influence them (business)., or it was focussed on more severe problems (public opinion). The police did vent their opinion, but had not enough power to change the demands of the government and as the chief constable for Amsterdam said, the police will execute the plans of government. From this it can be concluded that the police did not influence the emergence of the animal police. The labour union of the police, the LID, the AID and interest groups did have influence on the exact formation of the policy, but not on the fact that the animal police would be introduced.

This is not what the model assumes. The model assumed that policy is formed by the interplay between many different participants. In this case, it seems that only the three parties in the agreement were dealing with this topic. No other actors outside government

were active on the subject. They were only shortly active after the agreement was announced. Most organisations did not aim for the animal police, but aimed for better after care and more severe punishment. This means that the assumption of interplay between many different participants in and outside government was not present during the emergence of the animal police.

5.1.2 Negotiations

The main time for negotiations was during the coalition formation in which all parties had to come to one common plan for the coming four years. Already early in the process, on 30 July, the parties agreed that they would form a minority government with the support of the PVV (VVD, PVV and CDA, 2010: Appendix). The introduction of 500 animal police officers most likely came from the PVV, based on the election programs of 2010. VVD and CDA both agreed with the introduction of 500 animal police officers, but this was never mentioned in their election programs. The animal police is mentioned as a tool for more severe punishment of animal abuse and more general to improve animal welfare (VVD and CDA, 2010:14, 40 and 41, VVD, PVV and CDA, 2010:12 and 13), although it is clearly a point brought up by the PVV. One of the few references to the negotiation process is the one comment from Rutte *'you must do something'* (Dutch: *'Je moet wat' (22).* This is strengthened by an article in which a journalist argued that the animal police could not continue. The following arguments were used: *"The cabinet had to promise the PVV that they would be introduced"* (they referring to the animal police) and *"The parties in office: VVD and CDA, did not like the proposal a lot" (23)*. These statements are simply the opinion or perception of the journalist, but indicate that this is how the situation was perceived by some people from outside politics. In addition, the PVV stood by the original 500 fulltime police officers, which were agreed on during the formation of the government, giving those officers no room to work on other crimes *(23).* These few hints together give the impression that the PVV had pushed through their policy. However, no clear evidence is found to prove this hypothesis. The analyses did not bring up any inside information about the formation of the cabinet. The negotiations between the parties are not public and only small parts reach the media. In the newspaper articles that discussed the coalition agreement, only the fact that the animal police is in the agreement is mentioned.

When I looked at the election program of the coalition partners, I saw that neither mentions the animal police. CDA is critical about intensive farming and mentioned animal welfare only as aspect of agriculture, trade and animal health without elaboration on the topic (CDA, 2010: 57, 58 and 88). They want to change the structure of the police force, but nothing relates to the specialization of officers (CDA, 2010: 21). The VVD thinks that pet owners will take care of their own pet and government should not interfere with this. Animal abuse may be punished severely according to this party (VVD, 2010:29). The police force needs to be increased and needs to be made more efficient (VVD, 2010:31 and 32). However, the statement of Rutte that he is in favour for the animal police changes this perspective *(14)*. Although this statement is not repeated anywhere else, the VVD seems more approving of the policy than stated in their election program.

This means that, especially the program of CDA has no elements that can be linked to the animal police. The VVD is in favour of severe punishments and sees that the police force is underemployed, but does not hint at special officers for animal abuse. If we look at the previous arguments from the police, specialized officers would reduce the number of police

officers that can work on other crimes. If this was true, than the animal police would go against the wishes of the VVD.

In the tolerance agreement, the animal police officers are surplus to the present police force and are presented together with the promise for 3000 extra police officers. The PVV also aimed for more officers and greater efficiency, which this could be agreed on without much difficulty. How 500 of the extra officers ended up as animal police is less clear. Although the VVD seems favourable towards the policy, 500 specialized officers seems a lot.

The election programs of the VVD and CDA would support severe punishment for animal abuse, but not the appointment of 500 specialized officers in an already underemployed police force that does not seem to be capable of handling all other incoming reports. This fits with the presentation of the animal police in the coalition agreement, since they are presented as a tool for severe punishment of animal abuse and they are presented as extra officers. The number of officers is most likely the doing of the PVV alone and the other parties might have conceded to this high number in exchange for the support of the PVV on other issues.

The final plan for the animal police was drafted up after the animal police were mentioned in the coalition/tolerance agreement (Ministry of Security and Justice, 2011g). This gave other parties, most notably the SP and PvdA, the opportunity to try to influence the outcome. Without success can be said, as neither were they able to influence the number of officers assigned fulltime to the animal police (Ministry of Security and Justice, 2011h). Some tried to make task of the animal police less important, other considered using special detections officers instead of police officers (Ministry of Security and Justice, 2011i). None succeeded in changing the plans and especially the PVV stuck to the agreed 500 animal police officers *(23)*.

What I missed in this case is that there is no attempt to reach **consensus**, which is typical for the Netherlands. The point of the animal police had been accepted without any challenge, so it seems. In the election program of the PVV, 300 animal police officers were suggested while in the agreements 500 officers were presented. This seems a lot. This also becomes clear in the reactions of the opposition in the House of Representatives. Some try to relocate some of the 500 officers to other police tasks, which they deem need a higher priority as well, without success. No room was given and the coalition and the partner of tolerance sticked to the original 500 officers. The main force behind this policy seems to be have been the PVV according to the articles, which claim that VVD and CDA do not truly want the animal police *(23).* This is strengthened by the fact that from these three parties, only the PVV had the animal police in their election program. The process in which the coalition and tolerance agreement was made is not discussed in the newspapers. Therefore, little is known about the negotiation process that took place. Only the negotiators know how the VVD and CDA were convinced to take up the animal police in the coalition agreement.

Overall, it can be concluded that negotiation has been an important factor for the emergence of the animal police. Although both VVD and CDA want severe punishments for animal abuse, the shortage of police officers does not fit with the high number of animal police officers and without the coalition, these parties would most likely have been opposed to the policy because of this. This means that the strategy of the PVV during the negotiations for the new coalition was successful.

5.1.3 Gradual change

The topic already came up in 2006 during the elections in the election programs of PVV and PvdD. When both parties entered the House of Representatives, the topic was frequently brought up in questions by the House. These proposals for an animal police force did not find the support they needed and gradually the topic was not discussed in parliament anymore. In 2009, the topic had disappeared, but it re-enter during the campaigns for the elections in 2010.

After these elections, the PVV has significantly grown compared to the previous elections, from 9 to 24 seats (Kiesraad, unknown). This made the party a likely coalition partner for the VVD and CDA, since at least 75 seats are needed to create a majority government. This resulted in the coalition and the tolerance agreement in which the animal police was presented.

After these agreements, a discussion took place between the members of the House of Representatives about the introduction of the animal police. Not the animal police themselves were the main point of discussion, but the number of officers needed was debated. Many other parties thought that 500 officers were too many and other areas, like child porn, had to less officers assigned to them *(24)*. The number of officers is indeed surprising, since the PVV only speaks of 300 officers in their election program (PVV, 2010:53). However, these arguments were all put aside and the coalition parties and the party of tolerance stuck to their original plan. The many questions that arose, indicated that resistance against the animal police was still strong. The animal police was not a surprising new idea that suddenly made an appearance in the coalition agreement, as the policy had been proposed by the PVV for several years. The size of the project is surprising. From the reactions of other parliamentarians, it became clear that the size was the main point for objections. The officers were needed elsewhere as other cases already could not be investigated due to lack of personal. No other specific task force was as big as this one, which made it very questionable if these numbers were reasonable. Why would animal abuse suddenly need so many agents, especially since other organisations like the LID are already dealing with animal abuse?
If gradual change was the reality, I expected a pilot project first with a lot less agents.

5.1.4 Conclusions

The model is not fitting perfectly with this case. Firstly, most participants mentioned by Lindblom and Woodhouse were not relevant in this case. The policy seems to originate in the PVV and the policy was negotiated successfully during the coalition formation. Other political participants tried to influence the final policy without success.
The topic was introduced a few years earlier and the policy gradually came up in politics. The size of the ultimate policy is surprising, since the original proposal in the election program of the PVV stated 300 officers, while 500 made it into the coalition agreement.
Since the police were already dealing with underemployment and no other crime areas has so many cops, the dedication of 500 police officers to animal abuse seems sudden. A pilot project with fewer officers would be more consistent with gradual change.

5.2 Stream model

The stream model is based on three streams, namely the problem, policy and political stream. These will first be analyzed for this case separately. Then the policy window will be dealt with after which conclusions will be given on how the animal police appeared as a Dutch policy. Finally, a comparison of the conclusions of both models will be made.

5.2.1 Problem stream

In 2006, the topic of the animal police made its appearance in the election programs of the PVV and PvdD. During the period after these elections, problems like the economic crisis and all the related cuts proposed by the government were most likely more prominent. These problems might have been the reason for the disappearance of the topic around 2009. Income, work and pension were likely more important to the general public than animal welfare. On the other hand, animal welfare had become more and more prominent. The introduction of the Party for Animals is an indicator for this. Next to that, bio-industry, animal transport and animal welfare appeared in the election programs of 2010 of all parties, although the amount of attention and the solutions offered for the problems differ.

The first time the animal police was mentioned in parliament was related to the increase in reports of animal abuse. This was the **event or feedback** (if you deal with it as a report from the existing organisation), which provided the opportunity to suggest the possibility of the animal police as an alternative to deal with animal abuse to the minister (Ministry of Economic Affairs, Agriculture and Innovation, 2007a). However, the problem is not recognized and the Minister of Agriculture deems the existing organisations (AID and LID) capable of handling all cases. After that, an incident with killing rabbits was the next event that led to the suggestion of an animal police force, but again the suggestion was brushed aside (Ministry of Economic Affairs, Agriculture and Innovation, 2007b).

Another argument used, is the possible connection between animal abuse and other crimes like domestic violence **(25) (26)** (Party of Animals, 2010). No evidence for this relationship s presented, but as the animal police will deal with all crimes they come across during their work, also this type of crimes would be dealt with. The PvdD therefore also wanted more research done to find the connection between these two types of crime. Since no prove for the relationship was given, the argument is not very strong.

The PvdD wants '*more priority for finding, prosecuting and punishing animal abuse'* (Party of Freedom, 2012). They also want more attention for the possible relationship between animal abuse and domestic violence (Party for Animals, 2010). Also they state that animal abusers can go on with the abuse for years and that the punishment for abuse is very low, if it is even given. The PVV wants *"Decorum and respect for defenceless living creatures"* and *"three-hundred animal police officers would be a beautiful instrument"* (Party of Freedom, 2010).
However not a change in the situation is the reason for the shift in attention towards the problem. What happens is that apparently animal welfare has a higher value then before and thus deserves more attention. This becomes clear in the establishment of a party specifically aiming for animals and the mentioning of animal welfare in all election programs. This means that the problem came into focus due to a shift in priorities in society.

If we look at the coalition agreement, it is stated that the animal police would be introduced to punish animal abuse more severely and to improve animal welfare (VVD and CDA, 2010:14, 40 and 41). This indicates that the coalition had chosen to introduce the animal police based on the values of animal welfare. No increase of animal welfare was mentioned, thus it seems that the value of animal welfare had indeed increased and therefore action was needed to improve animal welfare.

Another problem that comes up, are the **budget cuts** by the government due to the economic crisis. The investment in animal police officers does not fit with reducing expenses. These cuts also made the introduction of the animal police questionable. Why spent money on specializing officers in a time of crisis? The cost for the animal police is not very clear in the policy documents. For the special number 144, 354.000 euro was spent as special contribution (Ministry of Security and Justice, 2011d). All the extra 3000 officers that were promised in the coalition agreement would cost 300 million euro, but special distinction towards the animal police was made (Ministry of Security and Justice, 2011c). The Telegraaf mentioned 70 million euro as the cost per year for the animal police **(2)**. If I assume this number is correct, and I compare this to the total cuts of 2.9 billion in 2011 to 18 billion in 2015 (VVD and CDA, 2010:15), 0.07 billion is a relatively small amount of money. Therefore, the conflict between cutting expenses and introducing the animal police is minimal.

In conclusion, the problems mentioned for the introduction of the animal police were the increasing reports of animal abuse and the relation between animal abuse and domestic violence. The economic crisis was not relative, since the costs for the animal police was relatively low. The problem that was linked to the animal police was animal welfare and the wish for more severe punishment of animal abuse.

5.2.2 Political stream

In this stream, the changes in government, negotiations, the national mood, the interest groups and the politicians are important.

One important factor in the political stream is the **change of staff in government**. After the **elections of 2006**, both the PVV and PvdD made it into the House of Representatives for the first time. That was how the topic made its appearance in the House of Representatives, although with little success in the beginning. The animal police made their first appearance in the policy documents in 2007, although no documents before 2007 were available in the database. Dion Graus, member of the House of Representatives for the PVV, proposed the introduction of the animal police in a question to the Minister of Agriculture (Verburg) with the argument the increase in reports of animal abuse by the National Inspection for Animal Protection (Ministry of Economic Affairs, Agriculture and Innovation, 2007a). The suggestion was declined, but still Graus brought the animal police up twice after that without winning the approval of the minister.

The **elections of 2010,** after which the PVV gained seats, were the crucial event in the political stream that provided the opportunity for the introduction of the animal police. The change of seat division in the House of Representatives and the growth of the PVV made the PVV a favourable coalition partner.

The PVV entered the negations with the VVD and CDA for the formation of a new coalition. Instead of becoming part of government, they became a partner of tolerance. This means that on many points, they supported the minority government, but for some policies, the government would have to find the support elsewhere. By this construction, the PVV had influence on the tolerance agreement, and so for the policy of the coming four years, without giving in on all subjects. In addition, points from their election program were brought into the tolerance agreement as well. The opportunity for the animal police arose and the PVV brought this subject up in the negotiations. The exact process is not clear, however I know that the VVD, PVV and CDA negotiated and came to the agreement, but neither policy documents nor the newspapers gave an insight in this process and the arguments for introducing the animal police.

Another important factor in the political stream is winning support for a policy. **Negotiating** is an important process, which played a role in this. Finding and creating consensus is common in Dutch politics when negotiating, as no party can get a policy through the House and the Senate without support from at least one other party. During the formation of the coalition and tolerance agreement, all parties had to come together, which always results in a form of consensus, since neither party can afford to stick to their election program without change. It can be said that the whole agreement therefore represents consensus.

The animal police was only presented in the election program of the PVV. Only 300 cops were suggested by the party, but this was increased to 500 in the agreements. This does not hint at consensus, since I would have expected a reduction of the number of officers instead of an increase. Rutte is mentioned ones as favourable towards the animal police *(14)*. Although, as previous described in chapter **Fout! Verwijzingsbron niet gevonden.**, the animal police were presented as a tool for increased severe punishment for animal abuse. However, the VVD wanted more police officers, and officers working only on animal cases cannot contribute to other police areas. It looks like the PVV forced the 500 animal police officers into the agreement.

Another factor that influences the political stream is the ***national mood*** or public opinion as Lindblom and Woodhouse call it. As mentioned before in the chapter 5.1.1, the national mood is divided as illustrated by the reaction of readers in the newspapers *(2)*. Some were optimistic about the animal police; others thought it is a waste of time and money. Other problems, like the economic crisis and the cuts were likely more prominent for the general public. Therefore, the national mood did not influence the political stream.

The interest groups, or ***pressure groups*** in Kingdon's terms, were as said before not active on the subject of the introduction of the animal police. When the animal police appeared in the coalition and tolerance agreements, they reacted reserved. They believed that increased severe punishment by judges was also needed to reduce animal abuse *(16)*. The ***political parties*** are pressure group as well. As said before, only the PVV and PvdD were promoting the animal police beforehand. VVD and CDA gave their support for the animal police by adding them to the coalition agreement. The difference between the politicians and the political parties is hardly noticeable in this case, since in coalition formation the individual members act together in the interest of the party.

To conclude, the elections of 2010 and following change of government resulted in a favourable political stream for the introduction of the animal police. Negotiations and consensus were important mechanisms that brought the animal police in the coalition and the tolerance agreement. The elements described in the political stream have a lot in common with incrementalism. Negotiations, the national mood and the influence of the pressure groups are overlapping elements. This was expected, as Kingdon sees incrementalism as a mechanism for getting policy accepted.

5.2.3 Policy stream

In the theoretical framework three processes were described that can get an alternative into the policy stream, namely softening up, bandwagon effect and tipping point. Softening up is mostly done by a policy entrepreneur. Therefore, I first have to determine if I can identify a possible entrepreneur.

Dion Graus is a likely candidate for an entrepreneur. First, he proclaims himself as an animal ambassador and he is active for animals in various ways. He was lobbing for the animal police with the police in Heerlen as well *(7)*. Graus was also the one who proposes the motion to introduce a special telephone number for reporting animal abuse and the motion to introduce the animal police *(6)*. When his motion for the animal police was not accepted, he still was actively trying to bring them up by questions in the House of Representatives. The PVV states again in 2008 that they want to invest 20 million euro in the instalment of 230 animal police officers *(8)*. These are all activities that can be seen as softening up. Graus used every opportunity to bring up the animal police, linking it to all kinds of misuse of animals. He used the increased number of reports of animal abuse to bring up the animal police and suggested the animal police when the existing organisations, the LID and AID were discussed. This makes Graus the likely entrepreneur for the introduction of the animal police.

However, the animal police was accepted in the tolerance agreement. This made me wonder if Graus was present during the negotiations. If not, he could not have persuaded VVD and CDA to agree with the introduction of the animal police. The question arises if Wilders would have gotten the animal police in the tolerance agreement without the efforts of Graus. According to Kingdon, softening up is needed, since politicians are not likely to favour a brand new policy proposal.

The bandwagon effect and the tipping point do not seem appropriate in this case. No growth in support by different parties can be found, although stated to be in favour of the animal police *(14)*. The PVV and the PvdD seemed the only supporters. Since the animal police was passed as a policy by the coalition agreement, only the acceptance of VVD and CDA were necessary. The bandwagon effect and the tipping point could have played a role if the policy was debated in the House and all parties were free to act on their own will. However, the primary goal was to form a government. The animal police was not strongly supported in the election campaigns of the VVD and CDA, thus another motive for their support seems more likely. These two parties might have given in on this policy, in order to gain the support of the PVV on another point in the tolerance agreement. The words spoken by Rutte when asked about the animal police, *'you must do something'* (In Dutch: "je moet wat") *(22)*, seem to support this theory, although this is not enough to prove it.

The policy was accepted, but no clear plan was prepared. Therefore, this was discussed in the House of Representatives, as the plan still needed to be transferred into law. Mainly the number of officers was discussed. The 500 officers assigned were seen as excessive. Other police departments, like the department dealing with child porn, had far less people and some wanted to use the budget for the animal police to handle child porn cases *(24)*. When it became clear that these officers would work fulltime on animal cases, some were afraid these cops would spend most of their time doing nothing *(11).* All these arguments were of no use and the 500 animal police officers would work on animal cases fulltime.

The special detection officers are also proposed as an alternative to the animal police officers according to Alderman Eerdmans, the initiative taker of the trial of the 'animal cops' in Capelle aan den IJsel. Using special detection officers was proposed as cheaper than using police officers and the police officers could focus on real police work *(10)*. The possibility of counting these officers as animal police officers was proposed, but declined since the coalition agreement clearly states animal police officers and not special detection officers (Ministry of Security and Justice, 2011i).

Another option remained, namely not to introduce the animal police at all. There was already an organisation dealing with animal welfare, namely the National Inspection for Animal Protection. This option was the chosen alternative when Graus proposed the animal police in the beginning (Ministry of Economic Affairs, Agriculture and Innovation, 2007a). The alternative seemed to be preferred by some of the opponents of the animal police.

In short, the idea of the animal cops was introduced by the PVV. Dion Graus seemed to act as entrepreneur for this policy and softened up the politicians for the idea of the animal police. However, the necessity of the entrepreneur in this case is unclear. It seems that the animal police was hardly surviving in the policy streams. Only the support of the PVV and the softening up by Graus was keeping this policy in the stream, but apparently, this was enough.

5.2.4 Policy window

A political policy window seems to have been opened in the case of the animal police by the coalition negotiations for the House of Representatives between VVD, CDA and PVV. More specifically, the window was opened by the presence of the PVV in these negotiations, since they brought up the policy to introduce animal police. Without the support of the PVV, the coalition of VVD and CDA would lack a majority in the House of Representatives. The reason for including the PVV in the negotiations was likely based on the growth of the party compared with the previous elections. The PVV took this opportunity and made the most of it. The influence of the PVV showed in fact that the other parties accepted the party as tolerance party and took the risk of forming a minority government. This means that no other option was open for the VVD to form a government and the PVV used this knowledge to get as much as possible in return for their cooperation. If we translate this to the stream model again, the policy stream and the political stream came together.

However, another explanation for the situation is possible. The policy stream seemed weakest in supporting the emergence of the animal police. It could have been that the position of the PVV and the overlapping wish of the politicians to punish animal abuse more severely opened the policy window. This would mean that the policy stream was added last

to the streams, although one would still speak of a political window, as the opportunity was created by the election outcome that brought the three parties together.

Arguments for a problem policy window can be found as well. The policy did exist already, as the PVV had it as a proposed policy in their election program. The animal police was not strongly maintained in the policy stream, but it did 'keep its head above the water'. The policy was already linked to increased severe punishment of animal abuse by the PVV and possibly the VVD *(14)*. This would already have been a problem in the policy window, but this window would have been open for years, which windows, according to Kingdon, do not ought to be.

More information about the negotiations could add details about how and in which order the streams came together. Overall, the arguments for a political policy window are stronger compared to those for the problem policy window. Therefore, I conclude that a political policy window was opened by the negotiations. At the same time, I assume that all streams came together at the same time. The problem stream and policy stream were favourable as well at the moment of the negotiations, although the PVV still needed to convince VVD and CDA to implement the large number of officers.

5.2.5 Conclusions

Overall, the important events in the political stream were the gain of seats by PVV during the elections in 2010 and the coalition negotiations that followed. The policy stream was favourable since the idea of the animal police had been around and by the actions of the entrepreneur, PVV member of the House of Representatives Dion Graus, who had softened up this policy. In the problem stream, the problem of too mild punishment of animal abuse was coupled to the animal police policy.

A political policy window opened when the election outcome joined VVD, CDA and PVV at the negotiation table. The two other streams were favourable as well, since all parties recognized the problem and the policy was softened up by the PVV.

5.3 Comparing the two models

When comparing the incremental and the stream model it becomes clear that incrementalism emphases the role of the participants, while the stream models states that these participants are dependent on the three streams. With this, Kingdon emphasizes the different elements needed to successfully implement policy, while incrementalism only looks at the interaction between the participants. Incrementalism also looks at the different influence and skills, which different participants have that influences their chance of successfully implementing their policies.

Incrementalism does describe the elements that are important in policymaking. Who is dealing with the subject and the influence on politics are important aspects of policymaking. In addition, negotiations, which often results in gradual change since this will only work with enough support, is an important element in policymaking. However, incrementalism only describes the important elements, not why a policy is accepted.

The stream model does, since it takes into account more elements. It also describes three essential parts for a policy to be accepted, political acceptance, problem recognition and an available policy. The elements brought up in incrementalism can be found back in the political stream. Kingdon's model provides more structure to present why the policy could have been accepted. Incrementalism does this too, but to a lesser extent. The model of Kingdon illustrates the fluctuations in policy better, which could also explain why the policy was terminated shortly after it was implemented. Incrementalism still presents the situation as a lot more rigid, while Kingdon puts more emphasis on the movements in his streams on which both existing policies and policy ideas are moving along the waves.

Incrementalism therefore concludes that negotiation between VVD, CDA and PVV during the coalition negotiations was the reason for the emergence of the animal police. The stream model comes to the same conclusion, since it indicates that the negotiations opened the policy window for the animal police.

The difference lies in how the models explain how this event resulted in the appearance of the animal police in the tolerance agreement. Incrementalism states that the PVV negotiated with the VVD and CDA and convinced these parties in some way to support the introduction of the animal police. The stream model concludes that the parties already agreed on the problem of to mild punishment for animal abuse, for which the animal police was a solution proposed by the PVV and already known to the other participants due to softening up by entrepreneur Graus. The election and the resulting coalition negotiations provided the political opportunity to change the policy into law.

The two models do not exclude each other, but strengthen the conclusion that the coalition negotiations were the essential event for the emergence of the animal police.

6 Conclusions

The goal of this thesis was to see which model better explained the emergence of the animal police in the Netherlands. Firstly, the subquestions will be answered and then the overall research question will be answered.

The first question was **what the animal police was in the Netherlands**. During the research, it turned out the term was used for several organisations, namely the National Inspection for Animal Protection and the special detection officers in Capelle aan den IJssel. The animal police meant in this thesis are the fulltime police officers who are specialized in animal abuse. The animal police officers were regular officers that receive a special training of 12 days in which they were prepared for the job by learning the laws considering animal abuse, to recognize animal abuse, their authorizations, how to confiscate animals and how to report animal abuse.

The next question was how the negative **public opinion** influenced the emergence of the animal police. Both models consider the influence of the public opinion, or national mood as Kingdon calls it. Incrementalism considers the impact of public opinion as minimal, as the public only has influence during elections and even this influence is marginal. Ones elected, politicians do not have to keep to their election promises. The stream model considers public opinion as a participant which influences the political stream. Public opinion often is a restraint on policymaking and can affect the political agenda. However, other problems like the economic crisis demanded the attention of the general public. Both models concluded in the case of animal police, the negative public opinion had almost no influence on the outcome.

The **motivation** for introducing the animal police was also one of the subquestion. There are clues that the need to create a new government gave the PVV room to demand for the animal police in return for their support for the government formed by VVD and CDA. The motivation of the PVV was respect for all living creatures and the wish for increased severe punishment for animal abuse, a problem the VVD and CDA recognize as well. In the coalition and tolerance agreement, the motives for the animal police attached to the animal police are the wish for more severe punishment of animal abuse and improving welfare.

Now it is time to look at the explanation of the **emergence of the animal police in the Netherlands according to incrementalism**. From the many participants that can influence policymaking, only the political participants were actively influencing the emergence of the animal police. Most likely the PVV brought up the animal police in politics. During the coalition negotiations, VVD, CDA and PVV negotiated to form a new minority cabinet with tolerance support of the PVV. During these negotiations, the PVV managed to negotiate for the introduction of the animal police and even succeeded in getting 500 officers instead of the initial 300 in their election program as accepted policy.

The explanation of the stream model is that a political policy window opened when the election outcome of 2010 for the House of Representatives joined VVD, CDA and PVV at the negotiation table. The two other streams were favourable as well. In the problem stream, all parties recognized the need for increased severe punishment for animal abuse. In the policy

stream, softening up for the animal police had taken place by entrepreneur Graus. These circumstances resulted in the law that introduced the animal police to the Netherlands.

Both models contribute the emergence of the animal police; the coalition negotiations were the event that resulted in the emergence of the animal police. Incrementalism contributes the introduction on successful negotiation of the PVV. The stream model adds to that the favourable condition common problem recognising and the softening up by entrepreneur Graus. In comparing the outcomes, both models come with the same answer to how the animal police emerged.

7 Discussion and reflection

Since the models come to the same conclusion, it would be interesting to use another model to compare the results. Personally, I prefer the stream model, since it does contain the elements used by incrementalism, but the three elements, problem, policy and politics proved very helpful in understanding the development of the animal police.

During the research, it turned out that the data did not contain all information needed about the negotiation process to make firm conclusions. Interviews with the negotiators would have been ideal for filling in this knowledge gap. However, due to time constrictions, this was not possible. For future research, I would always include interviews, since the media do not publish everything and information was missing that is of importance to analyze policymaking. Not only an interview with the entrepreneur, but also interviews with the negotiators would have made the data collection complete. The national newspapers, policy documents and the election programs did provide enough information to make the start, but it was not enough to come to solid conclusions.

An additional search on cabinet formation in the national newspapers with Lexis Nexis might have resulted in more details about this process. Some articles in the dataset discussed the coalition agreement, but the subject of the introduction of the animal police is not discussed in detail and often only mentioned as part of the coalition agreement. Also, the process of the formation is behind closed doors and the media are almost completely excluded from this. Even after the agreement was presented, the details of the negotiations were not made public. Therefore, I expect that not a lot of information would have been discovered with the extra search, while it would have cost a lot of time to analyze all this extra data. This was the reason for not including an extra data analysis on national newspaper articles.

This also brings the attention to the relatively narrow search on animal police, containing only the terms animal cops and the Dutch variants Dierenpolitie and Dierenagenten. When I look at the conclusion, an addition search on punishment of animal abuse could have resulted in a more in-depth analysis of the problem related to the animal police.
In addition, the media are not objective, thus the media might have influenced my perception of the policy. However, my conclusions are not the same as those in the media. They often claim that the PVV forced the animal police upon the VVD and CDA, while I found elements that showed that the wish for increased severe punishment of animal abuse could have accounted for the support of VVD and CDA.

While writing the thesis, some more practical lessons were learned as well. Lexis Nexis has an option to select articles that show a high similarity with one another. Since I had many overlapping articles in my database, this function would have been useful, as it would reduce the amount of articles that needed to be analyzed without losing information. In addition, using a program that manages the references saves time spend on correctly including the references.

Overall, this thesis provides an insight in the emergence of the animal police in the Netherlands and some details that future interviews might be able to reveal, this research shows that the stream model and incrementalism help to analyze policymaking in the Netherlands.

8 References

Christian Democratic Party (2010) Verkiezingsprogramma 2010-2015 Slagvaardig en samen, Election program House of Representatives 2010, source: http://www.cda.nl/Upload/2010_docs/Verkiezingsprogram2010/CDA_VKPnieuw.pdf, accessed; 25 July 2012

Howlett, M., and Ramesh, M., (2003) *Studying public policy; policy cycles and policy subsystems*, second edition, Oxford University press, Don Mills

Kiesraad (unknown) Databank verkiezingsuitslagen, source: http://www.verkiezingsuitslagen.nl/Na1918/Verkiezingsuitslagen.aspx?VerkiezingsTypeId=1,accessed: 03 Oktober 2012

Kingdon, J. W. (2003) *Agendas, alternatives, and public policies*, second edition, Longman, New York

Kohlbacher, F. (2005). 'The Use of Qualitative Content Analysis in Case Study Research'. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*. 7, 1: Art. 21.

Lindblom, C.E. (1959) 'The science of "muddling through"', *Public administration review*, Vol. 16, (2):79-88

Lindblom, C.E. and Woodhouse, E.J. (1993) *The policy-making process*, third edition, Prentice Hall, New Jersey

Mayring, 2002; cited in: Kohlbacher, F. (2005). 'The Use of Qualitative Content Analysis in Case Study Research'. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*. 7, 1: Art. 21.

Ministry of Economic Affairs, Agriculture and Innovation (2007a) Kamervragen meldingen dierenmishandeling: Letter Minister of Agriculture, Nature and Food quality G. Verbrug to the House of Representatives, source: http://www.rijksoverheid.nl/documenten-en-publicaties/kamerstukken/2007/06/14/kamervragen-meldingen-dierenmishandeling.html, accessed: 26 July 2012

Ministry of Economic Affairs, Agriculture and Innovation (2007b). Doodknuppelen van konijnen door allochtonen: Letter Minister of Agriculture, Nature and Food quality G. Verbrug to the House of Representatives, Source: http://www.rijksoverheid.nl/documenten-en-publicaties/kamerstukken/2007/08/20/doodknuppelen-van-konijnen-door-allochtonen.html, accessed: 26 July 2012

Ministry of Security and Justice (2011a) Brief Tweede Kamer: Dierenpolitie: Lettter of the Minister of Agriculture, Nature and Innovation to the House of Representatives, source: http://www.rijksoverheid.nl/documenten-en-publicaties/kamerstukken/2011/10/24/brief-tweede-kamer-dierenpolitie.html, accessed: 25 July 2012

Ministry of Security and Justice (2011b) Convenant Samenwerking dierenhandhaving: Convenant, source: http://www.rijksoverheid.nl/documenten-en-publicaties/kamerstukken/2011/10/24/convenant-samenwerking-dierenhandhaving.html, accessed: 25 July 2012

Ministry of Security and Justice (2011c) Maartcirculaire: Circular, source: http://www.rijksoverheid.nl/documenten-en-publicaties/circulaires/2011/04/15/maartcirculaire-2011.html, accessed: 25 July 2012

Ministry of Security and Justice (2011d) Decembercirculair 2011: Circular, source: http://www.rijksoverheid.nl/documenten-en-publicaties/circulaires/2011/12/01/decembercirculaire-2011.html, accessed: 25 July 2012

Ministry of Security and Justice (2011e) Meldnummer '144, red een dier' open op 15 november: Press release, source: http://www.rijksoverheid.nl/documenten-en-publicaties/persberichten/2011/10/24/meldnummer-144-red-een-dier-open-op-15-november.html, accessed: 25 July 2012

Ministry of Security and Justice (2011f) Minister Opstelten reikt certificaten uit aan eerste dierenagenten: Press release, source: http://www.rijksoverheid.nl/documenten-en-publicaties/persberichten/2011/12/02/minister-opstelten-reikt-certificaten-uit-aan-eerste-dierenagenten.html, accessed: 25 July 2012

Ministry of Security and Justice (2011g) 5684097 Beleidsbrief voor de bijzondere opsporingdiensten: Letter of Minister of Security and Justice (Opstelten) to the House of Representatives, source: http://www.rijksoverheid.nl/documenten-en-publicaties/kamerstukken/2011/03/22/5684097-beleidsbrief-voor-de-bijzondere-opsporingdiensten.html, accessed: 25 July 2012

Ministry of Security and Justice (2011h) 2011-2000086605 Antwoorden kamervragen over extra rechercheurs voor de opsporing van kinderporno: Letter of the Minster of Security and Justice (Opstelten) to the House of Representatives, source: http://www.rijksoverheid.nl/documenten-en-publicaties/kamerstukken/2011/03/22/2011-2000086605-antwoorden-kamervragen-over-extra-rechercheurs-voor-de-opsporing-van-kinderporno.html, accessed: 25 July 2012

Ministry of Security and Justice (2011i) 174940 Antwoorden kamervragen over de oproep van de voorzitter van het College van procureurs generaal om winkelbeveiligers te bewapenen: Letter of the Minister of Security and Justice (Opstelten) to the House of Representatives, source: http://www.rijksoverheid.nl/documenten-en-publicaties/kamerstukken/2011/03/15/174940-antwoorden-kamervragen-over-de-oproep-van-de-voorzitter-van-het-college-van-procureurs-generaal-om-winkelbeveiligers-te-bewapenen.html, accessed: 25 July 2012

Ministry of Security and Justice (2012). Vraag en antwoord: Wat doet de dierenpolitie? Rijksoverheid.. source: http://www.rijksoverheid.nl/onderwerpen/dieren/vraag-en-antwoord/wat-doet-de-dierenpolitie.html, accessed: 17-05-2012

Neelen, G.H.J.M., Rutgers, M.R., Tuurenhout, M.E. (2003) *De bestuurlijke kaart van Nederland Het openbaar bestuur en zijn omgeving in nationaal en internationaal perspectief*, second revised edition, uitgeverij Coutinho, Bussum

Nelissen, N., Goede, P. de, Twist, M. van (2004) *Oog voor openbaar bestuur: Een beknopte geschiedenis*, Elsevier Overheid, 's-Gravenhage

Party of Freedom/groep Wilders (2006) Verkiezingspamflet, Election pamphlet, source: http://www.verkiezingsprogramma.info/component/option,com_weblinks/catid,19/Itemid,72/, accessed: 25 July 2012

Party of Freedom (2010) De agenda van hoop en optimisme Een tijd om te kiezen: PVV 2010-2015, Election program House of Representatives 2010, source: http://www.verkiezingsprogramma.info/component/option,com_weblinks/catid,50/Itemid,72/, accessed: 25 July 2012

Party for Animals (2006) 220x liever voor mens, dier, natuur en milieu, Election program House of Representatives 2006, Source: http://www.parlement.com/9353000/1f/j9vvhy5i95k8zxl/vhnnmt7mr5zw, accessed: 25 July 2012

Party for Animals (2010) Recepten voor mededogen en duurzaamheid, Verkiezingsprogramma Partij voor de Dieren tweede Kamerverkiezingen 2010, Election program House of Representatives 2010, source: http://www.verkiezingsprogramma.info/component/option,com_weblinks/catid,50/Itemid,72/, accessed: 25 July 2012

Peoples' Party for Freedom and Democracy (2010) Orde op zaken verkiezingsprogramma 2010-2014, Election program House of Representatives 2010, source: http://site.vvd.nl/pers/persberichten/detail/854/orde-op-zaken-vvd-verkiezingsprogramma, accessed: 25 July 2012

Postbus 51 rijksoverheid. (unknown). *144redeendier*. Postbus 51 rijksoverheid. source: http://144redeendier.nl/, accessed 17 May 2012

Sabatier, P.A. (1998) The advocacy coalition framework: revisions and relevance for Europe, *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol. 5 (1):98-130

Silverman, D. (2011) Interpreting qualitative data: a guide to the principles of qualitative research, fourth edition, Sage, Londen

House of Representatives (2012a) *Taken informateur*, Tweede kamer der Staten Generaal, source: http://www.tweedekamer.nl/hoe_werkt_het/verkiezingen_en_kabinetsformatie/taken_informateur/index.jsp, accessed: 9 November 2012

House of Representtives (2012b) *Fracties*, Tweede Kamer der Staten Generaal, source: http://www.tweedekamer.nl/kamerleden/index.jsp, accessed: 04-07-2012

VVD, PVV and CDA (2010) Gedoogakkoord VVD-PVV-CDA: Report tolerance agreement, source: http://www.rijksoverheid.nl/documenten-en-publicaties/rapporten/2010/09/30/gedoogakkoord-vvd-pvv-cda.html, accessed: 26 July 2012

VVD and CDA (2010) Regeerakkoord VVD-CDA 'Vrijheid en verantwoordelijkheid: Report coalition agreement, source: http://www.rijksoverheid.nl/documenten-en-publicaties/rapporten/2010/09/30/regeerakkoord-vvd-cda.html, accessed: 26 July 2012

Woerdman, E. (2000) Organizing emissions trading: the barrier of domestic permit allocation, *Energy Policy,* Vol 26, (9):613-623

9 References newspaper articles

1. Blansjaar, V. (2011). *Animal cop hoeft niet bij de politie*. Algemeen Nederlands Persbureau (ANP). 12 January. Unknown

2. Jansen. J. (2012). *Caviapolitie splijt volk*. Telegraaf. 26 April. Unknown

3. Volkskrant (2007) Dierenpolitie, 24 April, p. 20

4. AD (2010) Dierenkwellers mogen hun straf niet ontlopen - Capelle krijgt dierenpolitie, 26 January, p. 5

5. Volkskrant (2011) Even is ieder Kamerlid regionaal, 12 Februari, p. 8

6. Misérus, M (2006), Dierenliefde bindt links en rechts; Diervriendelijk blok in Tweede Kamer laat zich in moties duidelijk horen, *Volkskrant*, 13 December, p. 2

7. Beekman, B. (2006) 'Ridder Dion, dat ben ik', *Volkskrant*, 9 September, magazine p. 16

8. Severt, S. (2008) PVV wil 20 miljoen euro voor dierenpolitie, *Boerderij Vandaag*, 16 September, p. 3

9. Schreuder, A (2011) Dierenbeul? Let dan op de kinderen; Capelle aan den IJssel loopt vooruit op kabinetsplannen voor 'animal cops'*, NRC Handelsblad*, 15 February, p. 1

10. Wanders, W. (2011) 'Animal cops' nog niet erg druk met dierenleed, *Volkskrant*, 30 April, p. 12

11. AD (2011) Ergernis cavia- politie terecht, 4 January, p. 2

12. Den Hartog, T, and Voskuil, K. (2011) Agenten gedwongen naar de dierenpolitie, *AD*, 2 July, p.1

13. AD (2012) Stokpaardjes van PVV razendsnel van tafel, 26 April, p. 6

14. Dirks, B. and Van Keken, K. (2010) Heus, zó moeilijk is die formatiepuzzel niet Week 25 waarin informateur Rosenthal verder puzzelt; BINNENSKAMERS, *Volkskrant*, 26 June, page unknown

15. Schildkamp, V. (2010) Rechters hebben niet de ballen om strenger te straffen, *AD*, 5 Oktober, p. 5

16. Van Bemmel, N. (2010) Dierenpolitie krijgt lauw onthaal, *Volkskrant*, 5 Oktober, page unknown

17. Deligt (2011) Dierenbescherming vreest drukte door '1 4 4' (2), *ANP*, 29 April, page unknown

18. NRC Handelsblad (2011) Agenten zijn tegen de dierenpolitie, zegt SP, 15 June, page unknown

19. AD (2011) Cursisten dierenpolitie haken af, 29 November, p. 6

20. Stoker, E (2011) 'Caviapolitie? Wij zijn pioniers'; Reportage Eerste animal cops krijgen hun diploma, *Volkskrant*, 3 December, p. 13

21. Stoker, E. (2011) Animal Cop speurt naar dierenhel; Reportage in Noord-Brabant op stap met een van de eerste dierenagenten, *Volkskrant,* 22 December, p. 6

22. Savelkouls J. and Severt S. (2010) Rutte-I: mooie voornemens, maar weinig middelen, *Boerderij Vandaag*, 8 Oktober, p. 14

23. Van Soest, H. (2011b) Plan voor dierenpolitie is niet vol te houden, *AD*, 2 July, p. 2

24. AD (2010) Dierenpolitie inzetten tegen kinderporno, 3 December, p. 13

25. AD (2011) Wie aan de dieren komt, komt aan Dion, 18 November, p. 9

26. Schildkamp, V. (2010) Dierenbeulen loopt het straks dun door de broek, *AD*, 2 Oktober, p. 2