



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Instrumental and normative pathways to compliance: results from field research on moped drivers

Terpstra, B.L.

Citation

Terpstra, B. L. (2022, March 31). *Instrumental and normative pathways to compliance: results from field research on moped drivers*. Meijers-reeks. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3281271>

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3281271>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Instrumental and normative pathways to compliance

Instrumental and normative
pathways to compliance
Results from field research on moped drivers

PROEFSCHRIFT

ter verkrijging van
de graad van Doctor aan de Universiteit Leiden,
op gezag van rector magnificus prof.dr.ir. H. Bijl,
volgens besluit van het college voor promoties
te verdedigen op donderdag 31 maart 2022
klokke 16.15 uur.

door

Bo Lammert Terpstra

geboren te Utrecht

in 1978

Promotoren: prof. dr. K.P. Goudswaard
Co-promotor: dr. P.W. van Wijck

Promotiecommissie: prof. dr. J.P. van der Leun
prof. dr. K. van den Bos (Universiteit Utrecht)
prof. dr. M.G. Knoef
prof. dr. P. Nieuwbeerta
prof. dr. mr. S. Zouridis (Tilburg University)

Lay-out: AlphaZet prepress, Bodegraven
Printwerk: Ipskamp Printing

© 2022 B.L. Terpstra

Behoudens de in of krachtens de Auteurswet van 1912 gestelde uitzonderingen mag niets uit deze uitgave worden vervoelvoudigd, opgeslagen in een geautomatiseerd gegevensbestand of openbaar gemaakt, in enige vorm of op enige wijze, hetzij elektronisch, mechanisch, door fotokopieën, opnamen of enig andere manier, zonder voorafgaande schriftelijke toestemming van de auteur.

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm or any other means without written permission of the author.

For Karen, Thijs and Linde

Acknowledgements

I can safely say that the past years have been the busiest time of my entire life. That I managed to write a dissertation while also managing a small firm, raising two beautiful human beings and trying to instill a love of learning into students can be characterized as a small miracle. A miracle that would not have been possible without the help and support of a number of people. I would like to take this opportunity to express my gratitude.

I am grateful for the support of my supervisors. Kees, your support gave me the opportunity to write this dissertation. Your trust in me made it an enjoyable journey from the beginning till the end. Peter, ever since we first met at the Ministry of Justice, I have enjoyed our nuanced discussions. They have contributed to both my happiness and the quality of this dissertation. May many discussions follow.

Ben, this dissertation would not exist if it were not for you. Thank you for starting this journey with me.

Many thanks to everyone from the Traffic department of the unit The Hague of the Dutch National Police. You are the backbone of my research. I have the upmost respect for the way you do your work and you are amongst the kindest people I know.

I thank all student-assistants that helped me conduct the field work. Aster, Frouka, Hanane, Jeanine, Lennaerd, Naomi, Wies and Wouter, you were the best team I could have wished for. Let's keep in touch.

Members of the Committee, thank you for reading and assessing my thesis. Joanne, Kees, Marike, Paul and Stavros, it is an honor to have you on the committee. I look forward to working with you in the future.

To all my colleagues and friends from the Department of Economics of Leiden University; You make solitary work a little less solitary.

A special thank you goes out to my friends. In many different ways, you have contributed to this dissertation. I value your perspectives on life. You broaden my view. Angelique, Ben, Ed, Edward and Sabrina, you were my introduction to governance. Thank you for shaping my view on policy.

Bas, Grietje, Hilde, Marieke, Pascal, Ralph, Robert and Vivien. I am so glad that our paths have crossed. I appreciate you for your sincerity and I am proud to call you my friends.

Jelle, Michiel, Mondli, Patrick and Willem. Thank you for being a part of my life for over twenty-five years. There is no point in having an opinion when you cannot share it with the ones you love.

Alwin, Geert and Okke; gentle souls. Our paths have been aligned for so long. I cannot express how much you mean to me. Let's continue to make memories and pay it forward to our children.

Floor, writing a dissertation and running a business was only possible with a great partner like you.

Boudewijn, Erica, Hairo, Mariette, Nadia, Roderick, Roelant, Sander, Seb and Suzanne, you are the reason that we don't want to move.

I also want to thank my family. Your support is indispensable.

Joke and Hans, thank you for raising a beautiful daughter and for being the caring people you are.

Sofie, thank you for sharing your cheerful presence, your thoughts and your home in times when they were most needed.

Ludo, Marjolein and Rick, thank you for being my family.

Freke-Annemei and Freya, my sisters. Thank you for your wisdom and strength. You are an example to me.

Dear mom and dad, thank you for being loving parents. Because of you, I can confidently look out into the world and pursue my dreams. I am most grateful that you have shown me at an early age that nothing is ever black-and-white. A principle that has guided me throughout my life.

Karen, you are the most beautiful person I know. Thank you for making me a better person. Without you, life would not be.

Thijs and Linde, every day starts and ends with you. You are the world, my world.

Bo Terpstra, Utrecht, December 2021

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----|
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | VII |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS | IX |
| 1 GENERAL INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW | 1 |
| 1.1 Introduction | 1 |
| 1.2 Pathways to compliance | 1 |
| 1.3 Instrumental and normative pathways to compliance | 4 |
| 1.4 Gaps and limitations in a large body of knowledge | 5 |
| 1.4.1 Limited evidence on actual police action | 5 |
| 1.4.2 Omissions of potentially relevant motivations | 6 |
| 1.4.3 Limitations in research settings | 7 |
| 1.4.4 Diversity in concepts used | 8 |
| 1.4.5 Limited results on actual offending behaviour | 9 |
| 1.4.6 Difficulties in determining causal order | 10 |
| 1.5 Design of this study | 11 |
| 1.5.1 Set-up | 12 |
| 1.5.2 Data | 12 |
| 1.6 Overview | 14 |
| 1.6.1 Do Intensified Police Controls Change Perceptions of Apprehension Probability? | 15 |
| 1.6.2 The Influence of Police Treatment and Decision- making on Perceptions of Procedural Justice | 15 |
| 1.6.3 Instrumental and Normative Motivations for Compliance with Traffic Laws | 16 |
| 1.7 Contributions | 17 |
| 1.7.1 Academic contributions | 17 |
| 1.7.2 Contributions to crime control policy | 17 |
| 1.8 Discussion | 19 |

| | | |
|-------|--|----|
| 2 | DO INTENSIFIED POLICE CONTROLS CHANGE PERCEPTIONS OF APPREHENSION PROBABILITY: A FIELD EXPERIMENT | 21 |
| | Abstract | 21 |
| 2.1 | Introduction | 22 |
| 2.2 | Prior research | 23 |
| 2.3 | The current study | 27 |
| 2.3.1 | Set-up of the experiment | 27 |
| 2.3.2 | Survey instrument | 29 |
| 2.4 | Description of the data | 30 |
| 2.5 | Plan of analysis | 32 |
| 2.6 | Results | 36 |
| 2.6.1 | Robustness check | 38 |
| 2.7 | Discussion and conclusion | 41 |
| 3 | THE INFLUENCE OF POLICE TREATMENT AND DECISION-MAKING ON PERCEPTIONS OF PROCEDURAL JUSTICE: A FIELD STUDY | 43 |
| | Abstract | 43 |
| 3.1 | Introduction | 44 |
| 3.2 | Prior research | 45 |
| 3.2.1 | The role of procedural justice | 46 |
| 3.2.2 | Procedural justice ingredients | 47 |
| 3.2.3 | Police behaviour and perceived procedural justice | 48 |
| 3.3 | The current study | 51 |
| 3.3.1 | Set-up | 52 |
| 3.3.2 | Perceived procedural justice | 53 |
| 3.3.3 | Police treatment and decision-making | 53 |
| 3.4 | Description of the data | 57 |
| 3.4.1 | Perceived procedural justice | 59 |
| 3.4.2 | Police treatment and decision-making | 61 |
| 3.5 | Plan of analysis | 64 |
| 3.6 | Results | 66 |
| 3.7 | Discussion and conclusion | 68 |

| | | |
|-------|--|-----|
| 4 | INSTRUMENTAL AND NORMATIVE MOTIVATIONS FOR COMPLIANCE WITH TRAFFIC LAWS: A CLOSER LOOK AT SPECIFIC VIOLATIONS | 71 |
| | Abstract | 71 |
| 4.1 | Introduction | 72 |
| 4.2 | Prior research on motivations for compliance | 73 |
| 4.3 | The current study | 77 |
| 4.4 | Methodology | 78 |
| 4.4.1 | Set-up | 78 |
| 4.4.2 | Survey instrument | 79 |
| 4.4.3 | Participants | 80 |
| 4.4.4 | Variables | 81 |
| 4.5 | Analytical strategy | 91 |
| 4.6 | Results | 93 |
| 4.6.1 | Overall model | 93 |
| 4.6.2 | Different traffic violations | 94 |
| 4.7 | Discussion and conclusion | 98 |
| 4.7.1 | Interpretation of results | 98 |
| 4.7.2 | Contributions to the field | 100 |
| 4.7.3 | Limitations | 101 |
| | SAMENVATTING (SUMMARY IN DUTCH) | 103 |
| | REFERENCES | 109 |
| | APPENDIX A – QUESTIONNAIRE | 121 |
| | APPENDIX B – OBSERVATION PROTOCOL | 131 |
| | APPENDIX C – CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS OF MOTIVATIONS FOR COMPLIANCE PER TRAFFIC VIOLATION | 133 |
| | CURRIULUM VITAE | 135 |

