



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).

References

- Ahmed, M., & Alghafli, A. (2017). *Relationship between Socio-Demographic of Drivers and Traffic Violations and Crashes Involvements*.
- Akers, R. L. (1994). *Criminological Theories: Introduction and Evaluation*. Roxbury Publishing Company.
- Anderson, L. S., Chiricos, T. G., & Waldo, G. P. (1977). Formal and Informal Sanctions: A Comparison of Deterrent Effects*. *Social Problems*, 25(1), 103-114. <https://doi.org/10.2307/800471>
- Anwar, S., & Loughran, T. (2011). Testing a Bayesian Learning Theory of Deterrence Among Serious Juvenile Offenders. *Criminology*, 49(3), 667-698. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.2011.00233.x>
- Apel, R. (2013). Sanctions, Perceptions, and Crime: Implications for Criminal Deterrence. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 29(1), 67-101. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10940-012-9170-1>
- Apel, R., & Nagin, D. S. (2015). Deterrence. In *Emerging Trends in the Social and Behavioural Sciences*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118900772.etrds0075>
- Augustyn, M. B. (2015). The (Ir)relevance of Procedural Justice in the Pathways to Crime. *Law and Human Behaviour*, 39(4), 388-401. <https://doi.org/10.1037/lhb0000122>
- Babakus, E., Ferguson, C. E., & Jöreskog, K. G. (1987). The Sensitivity of Confirmatory Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis to Violations of Measurement Scale and Distributional Assumptions. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 24(2), 222-228. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224378702400209>
- Bandura, A. (1990). Mechanisms of Moral Disengagement in Terrorism. *Origins of Terrorism: Psychologies, Ideologies, States of Mind*, 161-191.
- Bardach, E., & Kagan, R. A. (1982). *Going by the Book: The Problem of Regulatory Unreasonableness*. Temple University Press.
- Baumeister, R. F., Vohs, K. D., & Funder, D. C. (2007). Psychology as the Science of Self-reports and Finger Movements: Whatever Happened to Actual Behaviour? *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 2(4), 396-403.
- Beccaria, C. marchese di. (1766). *Dei Delitti e Delle Pene*.
- Becker, G. S. (1968). Crime and Punishment: An Economic Approach. *Journal of Political Economy*, 76(2), 169-217. <https://doi.org/10.1086/259394>
- Beetham, D. (1991). *The Legitimation of Power*. Macmillan.
- Bénabou, R., & Tirole, J. (2006). Incentives and Prosocial Behaviour. *American Economic Review*, 96(5), 1652-1678. <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.96.5.1652>
- Bentham, J. (1879). *The Principles of Morals and Legislation*. Clarendon Press.

- Bethlehem, J. (2010). Selection Bias in Web Surveys: Selection Bias in Web Surveys. *International Statistical Review*, 78(2), 161-188. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-5823.2010.00112.x>
- Blader, S. L., & Tyler, T. R. (2003). A Four-Component Model of Procedural Justice: Defining the Meaning of a "Fair" Process. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29(6), 747-758.
- Bottoms, A. E., & Tankebe, J. (2012). Beyond Procedural Justice: A Dialogic Approach to Legitimacy in Criminal Justice. *Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology*, 102, 119.
- Braga, A. A., & Apel, R. (2016). And We Wonder Why Criminology Is Sometimes Considered Irrelevant in Real-World Policy Conversations. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 15(3), 813-829. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9133.12235>
- Buuren, S. van. (2012). *Flexible Imputation of Missing Data*. Chapman and Hall/CRC. <https://doi.org/10.1201/b11826>
- Byrne, B. M. (2013). *Structural Equation Modeling with Mplus: Basic Concepts, Applications, and Programming*. Routledge.
- Chalfin, A., & McCrary, J. (2017). Criminal Deterrence: A Review of the Literature. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 55(1), 5-48. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jel.20141147>
- Cohen, J. M. (1988). *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioural Sciences* (2nd ed.). L. Erlbaum Associates.
- Comrey, A. L., & Lee, H. B. (2013). *A First Course in Factor Analysis*. Psychology Press.
- Cropanzano, R., & Ambrose, M. (2001). Procedural and Distributive Justice are More Similar than You Think: A Monistic Perspective and a Research Agenda. In *Advances in organization justice* (pp. 119-151). Stanford University Press.
- Dai, M., Frank, J., & Sun, I. (2011). Procedural justice During Police-Citizen Encounters: The Effects of Process-Based Policing on Citizen Compliance and Demeanor. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 39(2), 159-168. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2011.01.004>
- Dempster, A. P., Laird, N. M., & Rubin, D. B. (1977). Maximum Likelihood from Incomplete Data Via the EM Algorithm. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)*, 39(1), 1-22. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2517-6161.1977.tb01600.x>
- Dolan, C. V. (1994). Factor Analysis of Variables with 2, 3, 5 and 7 Response Categories: A Comparison of Categorical Variable Estimators Using Simulated Data. *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology*, 47(2), 309-326. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8317.1994.tb01039.x>
- Dong, Y., & Peng, C.-Y. J. (2013). Principled Missing Data Methods for Researchers. *SpringerPlus*, 2(1), 222. <https://doi.org/10.1186/2193-1801-2-222>
- Dormann, C. F., Elith, J., Bacher, S., Buchmann, C., Carl, G., Carré, G., Marquéz, J. R. G., Gruber, B., Lafourcade, B., Leitão, P. J., Münkemüller, T., McClean, C., Osborne, P. E., Reineking, B., Schröder, B., Skidmore, A. K., Zurell, D., & Lautenbach, S. (2013). Collinearity: A Review of Methods to Deal with It and a Simulation Study Evaluating Their Performance. *Ecography*, 36(1), 27-46. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0587.2012.07348.x>

- Durlauf, S. N., & Nagin, D. S. (2010). *The Deterrent Effect of Imprisonment* (pp. 43-94) [NBER Chapters]. National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc. <http://ideas.repec.org/h/nbr/nberch/12078.html>
- Efron, B. (1982). *The Jackknife, the Bootstrap and Other Resampling Plans*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics. <https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611970319>
- Efron, B., & Narasimhan, B. (2020). The Automatic Construction of Bootstrap Confidence Intervals. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10618600.2020.1714633>
- Eisner, M., & Nivette, A. (2013). Does Low Legitimacy Cause Crime? A Review Of The Evidence. In *Legitimacy and Criminal Justice*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198701996.003.0016>
- Enders, C. K. (2001). A Primer on Maximum Likelihood Algorithms Available for Use With Missing Data. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 8(1), 128-141. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15328007SEM0801_7
- Enders, C. K. (2010). *Applied Missing Data Analysis*. Guilford Press.
- Fagan, J., & Piquero, A. R. (2007). Rational Choice and Developmental Influences on Recidivism Among Adolescent Felony Offenders. *Journal of Empirical Legal Studies*, 4(4), 715-748.
- Fagan, J., & Tyler, T. R. (2005). Legal Socialization of Children and Adolescents. *Social Justice Research*, 18(3), 217-241. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11211-005-6823-3>
- Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Buchner, A., & Lang, A.-G. (2009). Statistical Power Analyses Using G*Power 3.1: Tests for Correlation and Regression Analyses. *Behaviour Research Methods*, 41(4), 1149-1160. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BRM.41.4.1149>
- Field, A. (2013). *Discovering Statistics Using IBM SPSS Statistics* (4 edition). SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Friedman, L. M. (1975). *Legal System, The: A Social Science Perspective*. Russell Sage Foundation. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.7758/9781610442282>
- Gao, J., & Zhao, J. (2018). Legitimacy Versus Morality: Why Do the Chinese Obey the Law? *Law and Human Behaviour*, 42(2), 167-180. <https://doi.org/10.1037/lhb0000271>
- Gau, J. M. (2011). The Convergent and Discriminant Validity of Procedural Justice and Police Legitimacy: An Empirical Test of Core Theoretical Propositions. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 39(6), 489-498. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2011.09.004>
- Gau, J. M. (2013). Procedural Justice and Police Legitimacy: A Test of Measurement and Structure. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 39(2), 187-205. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12103-013-9220-8>
- Gomez, R., Burns, G. L., Walsh, J. A., & Hafetz, N. (2005). A Multitrait-Multisource Confirmatory Factor Analytic Approach to the Construct Validity of ADHD and ODD Rating Scales with Malaysian Children. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 33(2), 241-254. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10802-005-1831-1>

- Goodman-Delahunty, J. (2010). Four Ingredients: New Recipes for Procedural Justice in Australian Policing. *Policing*, 4(4), 403-410. <https://doi.org/10.1093/police/paq041>
- Grasmick, H. G., & Bursik, R. J. (1990). Conscience, Significant Others, and Rational Choice: Extending the Deterrence Model. *Law & Society Review*, 24(3), 837. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3053861>
- Hertogh, M. (2015). What Moves Joe Driver? How Perceptions of Legitimacy Shape Regulatory Compliance Among Dutch Traffic Offenders. *International Journal of Law, Crime and Justice*, 43, 214-234.
- Hindelang, M. J., Hirschi, T., & Weis, J. G. (1981). *Measuring Delinquency*. SAGE Publications.
- Hinds, L., & Murphy, K. (2007). Public Satisfaction with Police: Using Procedural Justice to Improve Police Legitimacy. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 40(1), 27-42. <https://doi.org/10.1375/acri.40.1.27>
- Hjalmarsson, R. (2009a). Juvenile Jails: A Path to the Straight and Narrow or to Hardened Criminality? *Journal of Law and Economics*, 52(4), 779-809.
- Hjalmarsson, R. (2009b). Crime and Expected Punishment: Changes in Perceptions at the Age of Criminal Majority. *American Law and Economics Review*, 11(1), 209-248. <https://doi.org/10.1093/aler/ahn016>
- Hough, M., Jackson, J., & Bradford, B. (2013). Legitimacy, Trust and Compliance: An Empirical Test of Procedural Justice Theory Using the European Social Survey. In J. Tankebe & A. Liebling (Eds.), *Legitimacy and Criminal Justice: An International Exploration*. Oxford University Press. <http://ukcatalogue.oup.com/product/9780198701996.do>
- Hsiao, C. (2003). *Analysis of Panel Data* (2nd ed). Cambridge University Press.
- Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff Criteria for Fit Indexes in Covariance Structure Analysis: Conventional Criteria Versus New Alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 6(1), 1-55. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118>
- Huq, A. Z., Tyler, T. R., & Schulhofer, S. J. (2011). Why Does the Public Cooperate with Law Enforcement? The Influence of the Purposes and Targets of Policing. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 17(3), 419-450. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023367>
- Hutchinson, S. R., & Olmos, A. (1998). Behaviour of Descriptive Fit Indexes in Confirmatory Factor Analysis Using Ordered Categorical Data. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 5(4), 344-364. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519809540111>
- Jackson, J. (2018). Norms, Normativity, and the Legitimacy of Justice Institutions: International Perspectives. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*, 14(1), 145-165. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-lawsocsci-110316-113734>
- Jackson, J., Bradford, B., Hough, M., & Murray, K. H. (2012). Compliance with the Law and Policing by Consent: Notes on Police and Legal Legitimacy. In A. Crawford & A. Hucklesby (Eds.), *Legitimacy and compliance in criminal justice* (pp. 29-49). Routledge.

- Jackson, J., Bradford, B., Hough, M., Myhill, A., Quinton, P., & Tyler, T. R. (2012). Why Do People Comply with the Law? Legitimacy and the Influence of Legal Institutions. *British Journal of Criminology*, 52(6), 1051-1071. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azs032>
- Jonathan-Zamir, T., Mastrofski, S. D., & Moyal, S. (2015). Measuring Procedural Justice in Police-Citizen Encounters. *Justice Quarterly*, 32(5), 845-871. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07418825.2013.845677>
- Junger-Tas, J., & Marshall, I. H. (1999). The Self-Report Methodology in Crime Research. *Crime and Justice*, 25, 291-367. <https://doi.org/10.1086/449291>
- Kaina, V. (2008). Legitimacy, Trust and Procedural Fairness: Remarks on Marcia Grimes' Study. *European Journal of Political Research*, 47(4), 510-521. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6765.2008.00773.x>
- Kleck, G., & Barnes, J. C. (2013). Deterrence and Macro-Level Perceptions of Punishment Risks: Is There a "Collective Wisdom"? *Crime & Delinquency*, 59(7), 1006-1035. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128708327569>
- Kleck, G., & Barnes, J. C. (2014). Do More Police Lead to More Crime Deterrence? *Crime & Delinquency*, 60(5), 716-738. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128710382263>
- Kleck, G., & Sever, B. (2018). *Punishment and Crime: The Limits of Punitive Crime Control* (1st edition). Routledge.
- Kleck, G., Sever, B., Li, S., & Gertz, M. (2005). The Missing Link in General Deterrence Research. *Criminology*, 43(3), 623-660. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0011-1348.2005.00019.x>
- Kline, R. B. (2015). *Principles and Practice of Structural Equation Modeling, Fourth Edition*. Guilford Publications.
- Lai, K. (2018). Estimating Standardized SEM Parameters Given Nonnormal Data and Incorrect Model: Methods and Comparison. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 25(4), 600-620. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705511.2017.1392248>
- Lajunen, T., Parker, D., & Summala, H. (2004). The Manchester Driver Behaviour Questionnaire: A cross-cultural study. *Accident Analysis & Prevention*, 36(2), 231-238. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0001-4575\(02\)00152-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0001-4575(02)00152-5)
- Lajunen, T., & Summala, H. (2003). Can We Trust Self-Reports of Driving? Effects of Impression Management on Driver Behaviour Questionnaire Responses. *Transportation Research Part F: Traffic Psychology and Behaviour*, 6(2), 97-107. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1369-8478\(03\)00008-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1369-8478(03)00008-1)
- Lechner, M. (2011). The Estimation of Causal Effects by Difference-in-Difference Methods Estimation of Spatial Panels. *Foundations and Trends® in Econometrics*, 4(3), 165-224. <https://doi.org/10.1561/0800000014>
- Lee, Y. H., & Cho, S. (2019). *The Significance of Instrumental Pathways to Legitimacy and Public Support for Policing in South Korea: Is the Role of Procedural Fairness Too Small?* 29.
- Lind, E. A., & Tyler, T. R. (1988). *The Social Psychology of Procedural Justice*. Springer.

- Lindeman, M., & Verkasalo, M. (1995). Personality, Situation, and Positive-Negative Asymmetry in Socially Desirable Responding. *European Journal of Personality*, 9(2), 125-134. <https://doi.org/10.1002/per.2410090206>
- Lochner, L. (2007). Individual Perceptions of the Criminal Justice System. *American Economic Review*, 97(1), 444-460.
- Lynn, P. (2011). The Problem of Nonresponse. In *International Handbook of Survey Methodology*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203843123.ch3>
- MacCallum, R. C., Zhang, S., Preacher, K. J., & Rucker, D. D. (2002). On the Practice of Dichotomization of Quantitative Variables. *Psychological Methods*, 7(1), 19-40. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1082-989X.7.1.19>
- MacQueen, S., & Bradford, B. (2015). Enhancing Public Trust and Police Legitimacy During Road Traffic Encounters: Results from a Randomised Controlled Trial in Scotland. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 11(3), 419-443. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11292-015-9240-0>
- Maguire, E. R., & Johnson, D. (2010). Measuring Public Perceptions of the Police. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 33(4), 703-730. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13639511011085097>
- Matsueda, R. L., Kreager, D. A., & Huizinga, D. (2006). Deterring Delinquents: A Rational Choice Model of Theft and Violence. *American Sociological Review*, 71(1), 95-122. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000312240607100105>
- Mazerolle, L., Antrobus, E., Bennett, S., & Tyler, T. R. (2013). Shaping citizen perceptions of police legitimacy: A randomized field trial of procedural justice: shaping citizen perceptions of police. *Criminology*, 51(1), 33-63. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.2012.00289.x>
- Mazerolle, L., Bennett, S., Antrobus, E., & Eggins, E. (2012). Procedural Justice, Routine Encounters and Citizen Perceptions of Police: Main Findings from the Queensland Community Engagement Trial (QCET). *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 8(4), 343-367. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11292-012-9160-1>
- Mazerolle, L., Sargeant, E., Cherney, A., Bennett, S., Murphy, K., Antrobus, E., & Martin, P. (2014). *Procedural Justice and Legitimacy in Policing*.
- McCluskey, J. D. (2003). *Police Requests for Compliance: Coercive and Procedurally Just Tactics*. New York: LFB Scholarly Pub. <https://trove.nla.gov.au/version/28450467>
- McDonald, R. P., & Ho, M.-H. R. (2002). Principles and Practice in Reporting Structural Equation Analyses. *Psychological Methods*, 7(1), 64-82. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1082-989X.7.1.64>
- Mulaik, S. A., James, L. R., Van Alstine, J., Bennett, N., Lind, S., & Stilwell, C. D. (1989). Evaluation of Goodness-of-Fit Indices for Structural Equation Models. *Psychological Bulletin*, 105(3), 430-445. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.105.3.430>
- Murphy, K. (2004). The Role of Trust in Nurturing Compliance: A Study of Accused Tax Avoiders. *Law and Human Behaviour*, 28(2), 187-209. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:LAHU.0000022322.94776.ca>
- Murphy, K. (2005). Regulating More Effectively: The Relationship Between Procedural Justice, Legitimacy, and Tax Non-Compliance. *Journal of Law and Society*, 32(4), 562-589. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6478.2005.00338.x>

- Murphy, K. (2008). Procedural Justice and Affect Intensity: Understanding Reactions to Regulatory Authorities. *Social Justice Research, 22*(1), 1-30. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11211-008-0086-8>
- Murphy, K., Bradford, B., & Jackson, J. (2016). Motivating Compliance Behaviour Among Offenders: Procedural Justice or Deterrence? *Criminal Justice and Behaviour, 43*(1), 102-118. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854815611166>
- Murphy, K., Hinds, L., & Fleming, J. (2008). Encouraging Public Cooperation and Support for Police. *Policing and Society, 18*(2), 136-155. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10439460802008660>
- Murphy, K., Mazerolle, L., & Bennett, S. (2014). Promoting Trust in Police: Findings from a Randomised Experimental Field Trial of Procedural Justice Policing. *Policing and Society, 24*(4), 405-424. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10439463.2013.862246>
- Murphy, K., Tyler, T. R., & Curtis, A. (2009). Nurturing Regulatory Compliance: Is Procedural Justice Effective When People Question the Legitimacy of the Law? *Regulation & Governance, 3*(1), 1-26. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-5991.2009.01043.x>
- Muthén, B., & Kaplan, D. (1985). A Comparison of Some Methodologies for the Factor Analysis of Non-Normal Likert Variables. *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology, 38*(2), 171-189. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8317.1985.tb00832.x>
- Nagin, D. S. (1998). Criminal Deterrence Research at the Outset of the Twenty-first Century. *Crime and Justice, 23*, 1-42.
- Nagin, D. S. (2013). Deterrence in the Twenty-first Century. *Crime and Justice, 42*(1), 199-263.
- Nagin, D. S. (2017). Deterrence. In *Reforming Criminal Justice* (Vol. 4).
- Nagin, D. S., & Telep, C. W. (2017). Procedural Justice and Legal Compliance. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science, 13*(1), 5-28. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-lawsocsci-110316-113310>
- Nunnally, J., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory*. (3.edition). McGraw-Hill.
- Paternoster, R., Brame, R., Bachman, R., & Sherman, L. W. (1997). Do Fair Procedures Matter? The Effect of Procedural Justice on Spouse Assault. *Law and Society Review, 163*-204.
- Paulhus, D. L. (1986). Self-Deception and Impression Management in Test Responses. In A. Angleitner & J. S. Wiggins (Eds.), *Personality Assessment via Questionnaires: Current Issues in Theory and Measurement* (pp. 143-165). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-70751-3_8
- Pickett, J. T., Loughran, T. A., & Bushway, S. (2016). Consequences of Legal Risk Communication for Sanction Perception Updating and White-Collar Criminality. *Journal of Experimental Criminology, 12*(1), 75-104. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11292-016-9254-2>
- Piliavin, I., Gartner, R., Thornton, C., & Matsueda, R. L. (1986). Crime, Deterrence, and Rational Choice. *American Sociological Review, 101*-119.

- Piquero, A. R., Gomez-Smith, Z., & Langton, L. (2004). Discerning Unfairness Where Others May Not Low Self-Control and Unfair Sanction Perceptions. *Criminology*, 42(3), 699-734. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.2004.tb00534.x>
- Pogarsky, G., & Loughran, T. (2016). The Policy-to-Perceptions Link in Deterrence: Time to Retire the Clearance Rate. *Criminology and Public Policy*, 15(3), 777-790. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9133.12241>
- Pogarsky, G., Piquero, A. R., & Paternoster, R. (2004). Modeling Change in Perceptions about Sanction Threats: The Neglected Linkage in Deterrence Theory. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 20(4), 343-369. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10940-004-5868-z>
- Reisig, M. D., Bratton, J., & Gertz, M. G. (2007). The Construct Validity and Refinement of Process-Based Policing Measures. *Criminal Justice and Behaviour*, 34(8), 1005-1028. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854807301275>
- Reisig, M. D., & Lloyd, C. (2009). Procedural Justice, Police Legitimacy, and Helping the Police Fight Crime: Results From a Survey of Jamaican Adolescents. *Police Quarterly*, 12(1), 42-62. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1098611108327311>
- Reisig, M. D., Tankebe, J., & Mesko, G. (2014). Compliance with the Law in Slovenia: The Role of Procedural Justice and Police Legitimacy. *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research*, 20(2), 259-276. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10610-013-9211-9>
- Reisig, M. D., Wolfe, S. E., & Holtfreter, K. (2011). Legal Cynicism, Legitimacy and Criminal Offending: The Nonconfounding Effect of Low Self-Control. *Criminal Justice and Behaviour*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854811424707>
- Rhemtulla, M., Brosseau-Liard, P. É., & Savalei, V. (2012). When can Categorical Variables be Treated as Continuous? A Comparison of Robust Continuous and Categorical SEM Estimation Methods Under Suboptimal Conditions. *Psychological Methods*, 17(3), 354-373. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029315>
- Sahin, N., Braga, A. A., Apel, R., & Brunson, R. K. (2017). The Impact of Procedurally-Just Policing on Citizen Perceptions of Police During Traffic Stops: The Adana Randomized Controlled Trial. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 33(4), 701-726. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10940-016-9308-7>
- Saltzman, L., Paternoster, R., Waldo, G. P., & Chiricos, T. G. (1982). Deterrent and Experiential Effects: The Problem of Causal Order in Perceptual Deterrence Research. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 19(2), 172-189. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002242788201900203>
- Sargeant, E., Antrobus, E., Murphy, K., Bennett, S., & Mazerolle, L. (2016). Social Identity and Procedural Justice in Police Encounters with the Public: Results from a Randomised Controlled Trial. *Policing and Society*, 26(7), 789-803. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10439463.2014.989159>
- Satorra, A., & Bentler, P. M. (2001). A Scaled Difference Chi-Square Test Statistic for Moment Structure Analysis. *Psychometrika*, 66(4), 507-514. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02296192>
- Schauer, F. (2015). *The Force of Law*. Harvard University Press. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt21pxkpx>

- Scheffer, J. (2002). Dealing with Missing Data. *Research Letters in the Information and Mathematical Sciences*, 153-160.
- Schulhofer, S. J., Tyler, T. R., & Huq, A. Z. (2012). American Policing at a Crossroads: Unsustainable Policies and the Procedural Justice Alternative. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 35(3). <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/pijpsm.2012.18135caa.003/full/html>
- Sideridis, G., Simos, P., Papanicolaou, A., & Fletcher, J. (2014). Using Structural Equation Modeling to Assess Functional Connectivity in the Brain: Power and Sample Size Considerations. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 74(5), 733-758. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164414525397>
- Skogan, W. G. (2006). Asymmetry in the Impact of Encounters with Police. *Policing and Society*, 16(2), 99-126. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10439460600662098>
- Smith, H. J., Tyler, T. R., Huo, Y. J., Ortiz, D. J., & Lind, E. A. (1998). The Self-Relevant Implications of the Group-Value Model: Group Membership, Self-Worth, and Treatment Quality. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 34(5), 470-493. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jesp.1998.1360>
- Stafford, M. C., & Warr, M. (1993). A Reconceptualization of General and Specific Deterrence. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 30(2), 123-135. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022427893030002001>
- Sunshine, J., & Tyler, T. R. (2003). The Role of Procedural Justice and Legitimacy in Shaping Public Support for Policing. *Law & Society Review*, 37(3), 513-548. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-5893.3703002>
- Sykes, G. M., & Matza, D. (1957). Techniques of Neutralization: A Theory of Delinquency. *American Sociological Review*, 22(6), 664-670. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2089195>
- Tankebe, J. (2009a). Public Cooperation with the Police in Ghana: Does Procedural Fairness Matter? *Criminology*, 47(4), 1265-1293.
- Tankebe, J. (2009b). Policing, Procedural Fairness and Public Behaviour: A Review and Critique. *International Journal of Police Science & Management*, 11(1), 8-19. <https://doi.org/10.1350/ijps.2009.11.1.105>
- Tankebe, J. (2013). Viewing Things Differently: The Dimensions of Public Perceptions of Police Legitimacy: Public Perceptions of Police Legitimacy. *Criminology*, 51(1), 103-135. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.2012.00291.x>
- Tankebe, J., Reisig, M. D., & Wang, X. (2015). *A Multidimensional Model of Police Legitimacy: A Cross-Cultural Assessment*. 13.
- Tankebe, J., Reisig, M. D., & Wang, X. (2016). A Multidimensional Model of Police Legitimacy: A Cross-Cultural Assessment. *Law and Human Behaviour*, 40(1), 11-22. <https://doi.org/10.1037/lhb0000153>
- Thibaut, J., & Walker, L. (1975). *Procedural Justice*. Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Thornberry, T. P., & Krohn, M. D. (2000). The Self-Report Method for Measuring Delinquency and Crime. *Criminal Justice*, 52.
- Tyler, T. R. (1990). *Why People Obey the Law*. Princeton University Press.
- Tyler, T. R. (2003). Procedural Justice, Legitimacy, and the Effective Rule of Law. *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research*, 30, 283.

- Tyler, T. R. (2004). Enhancing Police Legitimacy. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 593(1), 84-99. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716203262627>
- Tyler, T. R. (2006). Psychological Perspectives on Legitimacy and Legitimation. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 57(1), 375-400. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.57.102904.190038>
- Tyler, T. R. (2008). Psychology and Institutional Design. *Review of Law & Economics*, 4(3), 801-887. <https://doi.org/10.2202/1555-5879.1233>
- Tyler, T. R., & Darley, J. M. (2000). Building a Law-Abiding Society: Taking Public Views About Morality and the Legitimacy of Legal Authorities into Account When Formulating Substantive Law. *Hofstra Law Review*, 28, 35.
- Tyler, T. R., & Fagan, J. (2006). Legitimacy and Cooperation: Why do People Help the Police Fight Crime in Their Communities? *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.887737>
- Tyler, T. R., & Fagan, J. (2008). *Legitimacy and Cooperation: Why Do People Help the Police Fight Crime in Their Communities?* 6, 47.
- Tyler, T. R., & Huo, Y. (2002). *Trust in the Law: Encouraging Public Cooperation with the Police and Courts*. Russell Sage Foundation.
- Tyler, T. R., & Jackson, J. (2014). Popular Legitimacy and the Exercise of Legal Authority: Motivating Compliance, Cooperation, and Engagement. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 20(1), 78-95. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0034514>
- Tyler, T. R., Jackson, J., & Mentovich, A. (2015). The Consequences of Being an Object of Suspicion: Potential Pitfalls of Proactive Police Contact: Potential Pitfalls of Proactive Police Contact. *Journal of Empirical Legal Studies*, 12(4), 602-636. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jels.12086>
- Tyler, T. R., & Lind, E. A. (1992). A Relational Model of Authority in Groups. In *Advances in experimental social psychology*, Vol. 25 (pp. 115-191). Academic Press.
- Tyler, T. R., Sherman, L., Strang, H., Barnes, G. C., & Woods, D. (2007). Reintegrative Shaming, Procedural Justice, and Recidivism: The Engagement of Offenders' Psychological Mechanisms in the Canberra RISE Drinking-and-Driving Experiment. *Law & Society Review*, 41(3), 553-586. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5893.2007.00314.x>
- Tyler, T. R., & Wakslak, C. J. (2004). Profiling and Police Legitimacy: Procedural Justice, Attributions of Motive, and Acceptance of Police Authority. *Criminology*, 42(2), 253-282. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.2004.tb00520.x>
- Unnever, J. D., Colvin, M., & Cullen, F. T. (2004). Crime and Coercion: A Test of Core Theoretical Propositions. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 41(3), 244-268. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022427803257251>
- Velicer, W. F., & Jackson, D. N. (1990). Component Analysis versus Common Factor Analysis: Some Further Observations. *Multivariate Behavioural Research*, 25(1), 97-114. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327906mbr2501_12

- Waldo, G. P., & Chiricos, T. G. (1972). Perceived Penal Sanction and Self-Reported Criminality: A Neglected Approach to Deterrence Research*. *Social Problems*, 19(4), 522-540. <https://doi.org/10.2307/799929>
- Watling, C., & Leal, N. (2012). Exploring Perceived Legitimacy of Traffic Law Enforcement. In T. Senserrick (Ed.), *Proceedings of the 2012 Australasian College of Road Safety National Conference* (pp. 1-13). Australasian College of Road Safety. <http://acrs.org.au/?s=Exploring+perceived+legitimacy+of+traffic+law+enforcement>
- Wikström, P.-O. H., Oberwittler, D., Treiber, K., & Hardie, B. (2012). *Breaking Rules: The Social and Situational Dynamics of Young People's Urban Crime: The Social and Situational Dynamics of Young People's Urban Crime*. OUP Oxford.
- Willits, D., Makin, D., & Koslicki, W. (2019). *Procedural Justice and Traffic Stops: Analyzing Police and Community Perspectives Through Survey and Recorded Observational Research* (No. 2018-AG-1906). Department of Criminal Justice and Criminology, Washington State University.
- Wilson, T., Paternoster, R., & Loughran, T. (2017). Direct and Indirect Experiential Effects in an Updating Model of Deterrence: A Research Note. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 54, 63-77. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022427816664119>
- Winter, S. C., & May, P. J. (2001). Motivation for Compliance with Environmental Regulations. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 20(4), 675-698. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pam.1023>
- Wolf, E. J., Harrington, K. M., Clark, S. L., & Miller, M. W. (2013). Sample Size Requirements for Structural Equation Models: An Evaluation of Power, Bias, and Solution Propriety. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 76(6), 913-934. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164413495237>
- Wolfe, S. E. (2011). The Effect of Low Self-Control on Perceived Police Legitimacy. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 39(1), 67-74. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2010.10.006>
- Worden, R. E., & McLean, S. J. (2017). *Mirage of Police Reform: Procedural Justice and Police Legitimacy*. University of California Press.
- Yagil, D. (1998). Instrumental and Normative Motives for Compliance with Traffic Laws among Young and Older Drivers. *Accident Analysis & Prevention*, 30(4), 417-424.

Appendix A – Questionnaire

Vragenlijst handhaving Politie

uniek nummer

datum

locatie

Kenteken



Universiteit Leiden

Afgenomen door

Intro U bent net gecontroleerd door de politie. Wij willen u graag een aantal vragen stellen over deze controle en over uw mening over de politie in het algemeen. Door middel van deze vragenlijst willen wij inzicht krijgen in hoe u het optreden van de politie beleeft en hoe dit verbeterd kan worden. Uw antwoorden komen bij de onderzoekers van de Universiteit Leiden en niet bij de politie. Uw gegevens worden door de onderzoekers vertrouwelijk behandeld en zijn door de politie niet te herleiden naar u persoonlijk. De vragenlijst duurt maximaal 5 minuten. U krijg van ons een vergoeding van € 5,- voor uw tijd.

Heeft u zojuist een boete of een waarschuwing gehad? ja / nee

En mag ik vragen waarvoor (indien ja)?

Was de uitkomst van uw contact met de politie voor u positief of negatief?

- positief
- niet positief maar ook niet negatief
- negatief

Voorbeeld De vragen die we voorleggen zijn voornamelijk stellingen over de politie, uw contact met de politie en over wetten en regels. Wilt u aangeven in hoeverre u het eens of oneens bent met de stellingen – hierbij staat 1 voor helemaal mee oneens en 7 voor helemaal mee eens. Het gaat om uw mening. Er zijn geen goede of foute antwoorden. We vragen bijvoorbeeld:

	helemaal mee oneens (1)	mee oneens (2)	enigszins mee oneens (3)	niet mee eens/ oneens (4)	enigszins mee eens (5)	mee eens (6)	helemaal mee eens (7)
De (meeste) regels van de politie sluiten goed aan bij mijn eigen waarden en normen	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Is alles duidelijk?

Instructie Ik ga u nu de vragen voorleggen. Denk goed na voor u antwoord geeft en neem daarvoor rustig de tijd.

De eerste vragen gaan over **wetten en regels**. Kunt u aangeven in hoeverre u het eens bent met de volgende stellingen?

Hieronder staan vragen **over de controle die de politie net heeft uitgevoerd**. Kunt u aangeven in hoeverre u het eens bent met de volgende stellingen? *(evt benadrukken dat 7 geheel mee eens is en 1 geheel mee oneens)*

	helemaal mee oneens (1)	mee oneens (2)	enigszins mee oneens (3)	niet mee eens/ oneens (4)	enigszins mee eens (5)	mee eens (6)	helemaal mee eens (7)
Ik vind dat ik respectvol ben behandeld door de politie	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ik vind dat ik eerlijk ben behandeld door de politie	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ik vind dat de politie me de kans gaf om mijn kant van het verhaal te vertellen	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ik denk dat de politie mij op dezelfde manier heeft behandeld als anderen	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
De agent heeft zijn/haar besluit gebaseerd op de feiten en niet op zijn/haar eigen persoonlijke mening	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
De agent heeft zijn/haar handelingen en besluiten toegelicht	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ik denk dat de uitkomst van deze controle eerlijk is in verhouding tot andere mensen	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ten opzichte van de wet is deze controle eerlijk	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

(Eventueel aangeven dat je over de helft van de vragenlijst bent)

We zijn nu bijna aan het einde van de vragenlijst gekomen. Er volgen nog wat algemene vragen en vragen over overtredingen. Hoe vaak heeft u het afgelopen jaar een van de volgende overtredingen begaan? (*het gaat ook om overtredingen die niet door de politie zijn geregistreerd*)

	Aantal keer
Overschrijden van de toegestane snelheid	
Rijden zonder geldige verzekering of geldig bromfietserijbewijs	
Rijden onder invloed van alcohol	
Rijden zonder verlichting	
Mobiel bellen tijdens rijden	
Rijden zonder helm	

Hoe vaak bent u het afgelopen jaar (vóór deze controle) staande gehouden door de politie?

Hoeveel waarschuwingen heeft u het afgelopen jaar (vóór deze controle) ontvangen van de politie?

Hoeveel boetes en/of sancties heeft u het afgelopen jaar (vóór deze controle) ontvangen van de politie?

Hoe hoog was de hoogste boete of sanctie?

Hoe hoog was de laagste boete of sanctie?

Hoeveel keer heeft u het afgelopen jaar contact gehad met de politie om andere redenen dan hiervoor genoemd?

En wat was de reden voor dit contact?

U bent net staande gehouden door de politie. Wat is hiervan het effect op uw gedrag?

	helemaal mee oneens (1)	mee oneens (2)	enigszins mee oneens (3)	niet mee eens/ oneens (4)	enigszins mee eens (5)	mee eens (6)	helemaal mee eens (7)
Ik zal nu minder overtredingen begaan dan vóór deze controle	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Deze controle heeft invloed op mijn gedrag	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ik zal in de toekomst nog wel eens verkeersovertredingen begaan	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Tot slot volgen nog wat algemene vragen.

In welk jaar bent u geboren?

Wat is uw geslacht? (evt zelf invullen)

- man
 vrouw

Wat is uw hoogste voltooide opleiding?

- Geen enkele
 basisschool
 VMBO basis beroepsgerichte leerweg, LBO of vergelijkbaar
 VMBO gemengde, theoretische of kader gerichte leerweg, MAVO, MBO niveau 1 of 2, of vergelijkbaar
 HAVO, MBO niveau 3 of 4
 VWO
 HBO, HBO/WO bachelor
 WO, HBO/WO master
 Weet niet

Wat was uw totale bruto inkomen, dus voor belastingen, in 2016?

- 0-10.000
 10.000-15.000
 15.000-20.000
 20.000-30.000
 30.000-50.000
 Meer dan 50.000
 Weet niet
 Wil ik niet zeggen

In welk land bent u geboren?

In welk land is uw vader geboren?

In welk land is uw moeder geboren?

Hiermee zijn we bij het einde van de vragenlijst gekomen. Heeft u nog vragen?

Mogen wij de gegevens van de politie over uw staande houdingen van de afgelopen en de komende 12 maanden gebruiken om beter inzicht te krijgen in de controles van de politie? De gegevens zijn zowel voor de politie als voor ons niet herleidbaar tot u persoonlijk.

Naam:

Handtekening:

Naar welk mailadres kunnen we uw digitale VVV-bon sturen? (blokletters s.v.p.)

En wilt u de uitkomsten van dit onderzoek ontvangen?

ja/nee

Appendix B – Observation protocol

datum
locatie
observator

kenteken

sanctie/waarschuwing/nvt

participatie					
De agent heeft naar informatie/de mening van de bestuurder gevraagd	ja	nee			nvt
De bestuurder heeft informatie/mening gegeven	ja	nee			nvt
De agent heeft interesse getoond in de info/mening van de bestuurder	afwijzend	onaandachtig	passief	actief	nvt
neutraliteit					
De agent heeft aangegeven alle standpunten te willen horen	ja	nee			nvt
De agent heeft aangegeven geen besluit te nemen voordat alle relevante info bekend was	ja	nee			nvt
De agent heeft aangegeven dat besluiten worden bepaald door persoonlijke kenmerken (ras/geslacht/leeftijd)	ja	nee			nvt
De agent heeft aangegeven waarom brommercontroles worden gehouden	ja	nee			nvt
De agent heeft aangegeven waarom hij/zij heeft gekozen voor een sanctie/waarschuwing of geen sanctie	ja	nee			nvt
Waardigheid en respect					
De agent heeft respectvol gedrag getoond naar de bestuurder	respectloos	neutraal	respectvol		
De duur van respectvol gedrag was	kort	gemiddeld	overwegend		
Betrouwbare motieven van de besluitvormer					
De agent heeft de bestuurder of anderen in de omgeving gevraagd naar zijn/haar welzijn	ja	nee			nvt
De agent heeft troost of geruststelling geboden	ja	nee			nvt
De agent heeft aangegeven in te grijpen indien nodig	ja	nee			nvt
De agent heeft een PV opgemaakt of beloofd een PV op te maken	ja	nee			nvt
De agent heeft aangegeven het op te nemen voor de bestuurder bij een andere instantie	ja	nee			nvt
De agent heeft fysieke ondersteuning gegeven of geregeld	ja	nee			nvt
De agent heeft geadviseerd of beloofd om advies te geven hoe om te gaan met de situatie	ja	nee			nvt

opvallende zaken:

--

Appendix C – Correlation coefficients of motivations for compliance per traffic violation

Table C1: Correlation coefficients of motivations for compliance regarding driving a higher top speed than allowed (N=302)

	1)	2)	3)	4)	5)	6)	7)	8)
1) Personal morality	–							
2) Peer disapproval	.43	–						
3) Perceived probability of apprehension	.15	.12	–					
4) Perceived severity of punishment			.23	–				
5) Obligation to obey the law	.53	.29			–			
6) Trust in the police	.25				.48	–		
7) Moral alignment with laws enforced by the police	.17	.16			.38	.39	–	
8) Moral alignment with traffic laws	.33	.18			.47	.38	.36	–

Note. Only coefficients with $p < .05$ are depicted.

Table C2: Correlation coefficients of motivations for compliance regarding operating a mobile phone while driving (N=302)

	1)	2)	3)	4)	5)	6)	7)	8)
1) Personal morality	–							
2) Peer disapproval	.46	–						
3) Perceived probability of apprehension	.19		–					
4) Perceived severity of punishment			.34	–				
5) Obligation to obey the law	.32	.26			–			
6) Trust in the police	.15	.14			.48	–		
7) Moral alignment with laws enforced by the police		.15			.38	.39	–	
8) Moral alignment with traffic laws	.18	.24			.47	.38	.36	–

Note. Only coefficients with $p < .05$ are depicted.

Table C3: Correlation coefficients of motivations for compliance regarding driving under the influence of alcohol (N=302)

	1)	2)	3)	4)	5)	6)	7)	8)
1) Personal morality	–							
2) Peer disapproval	.23	–						
3) Perceived probability of apprehension	.13		–					
4) Perceived severity of punishment			.36	–				
5) Obligation to obey the law	.37				–			
6) Trust in the police	.19	.17			.48	–		
7) Moral alignment with laws enforced by the police	.14	.21			.38	.39	–	
8) Moral alignment with traffic laws	.16	.18	.16		.47	.38	.36	–

Note. Only coefficients with $p < .05$ are depicted.

Table C4: Correlation coefficients of motivations for compliance regarding driving without proper lighting (N=302)

	1)	2)	3)	4)	5)	6)	7)	8)
1) Personal morality	–							
2) Peer disapproval	.56	–						
3) Perceived probability of apprehension	.19	.19	–					
4) Perceived severity of punishment	.27	.15	.37	–				
5) Obligation to obey the law	.32	.24		.12	–			
6) Trust in the police	.13				.48	–		
7) Moral alignment with laws enforced by the police	.13	.15			.38	.39	–	
8) Moral alignment with traffic laws	.31	.27	.14		.47	.38	.36	–

Note. Only coefficients with $p < .05$ are depicted.

Table C5: Correlation coefficients of motivations for compliance regarding driving without a valid license or insurance (N=302)

	1)	2)	3)	4)	5)	6)	7)	8)
1) Personal morality	–							
2) Peer disapproval	.53	–						
3) Perceived probability of apprehension			–					
4) Perceived severity of punishment			.17	–				
5) Obligation to obey the law	.16				–			
6) Trust in the police	.12				.48	–		
7) Moral alignment with laws enforced by the police				–.13	.38	.39	–	
8) Moral alignment with traffic laws			.16		.47	.38	.36	–

Note. Only coefficients with $p < .05$ are depicted.

Table C6: Correlation coefficients of motivations for compliance regarding driving without a helmet when required (N=302)

	1)	2)	3)	4)	5)	6)	7)	8)
1) Personal morality	–							
2) Peer disapproval	.48	–						
3) Perceived probability of apprehension			–					
4) Perceived severity of punishment	.16	.20	.44	–				
5) Obligation to obey the law	.36	.23		.12	–			
6) Trust in the police	.20	.14			.48	–		
7) Moral alignment with laws enforced by the police	.12	.16			.38	.39	–	
8) Moral alignment with traffic laws	.26	.19			.47	.38	.36	–

Note. Only coefficients with $p < .05$ are depicted.

Curriculum Vitae

Bo Terpstra (10-02-1978, Utrecht), is a teacher and researcher in Behavioural Economics at the Department of Economics of Leiden Law School, Leiden University. His research mainly focuses on studying behavioural change and decision-making processes.

His interest in behavioural economics developed during his years at the Utrecht School of Economics where he studied Social and Institutional Economics. During the time of this study, Bo also studied Econometrics at Amsterdam University to broaden his methodological knowledge.

After his graduation in 2005, Bo started as a trainee at the Dutch Central Government where he worked for the Ministry of Justice and the Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment. During this time, he was responsible for developing models and information reports on migration, but also for the preparation of cabinet-level meetings and the cooperation between the Ministry of Justice and organizations such as the Police and the Royal Netherlands Marechaussee.

After attending a two-year education on coaching and training, Bo started a position as a strategic advisor and trainer for works councils and boards of directors in 2009. In 2010 he also started a position at Leiden University as a lecturer on Law and Economics and started a third study; Psychology at Utrecht University. The knowledge acquired during that Bachelor has helped to further understand the interaction between attitudes, motives and behaviour.

Based on the economic, econometric and psychological knowledge acquired in his studies and his experience with governance, Bo started his Ph.D. at the Economics Department of Leiden University in 2016. Under the supervision of prof. dr. K.P. Goudswaard and dr. P.W. van Wijck, he wrote his thesis on *Instrumental and Normative Pathways to Compliance*.

Currently he combines teaching and doing research at Leiden University with being a partner in a small firm that provides strategic advice and training. In addition to his work-achievements, Bo is the loving father of two young children. Together with his wife he enjoys every minute of their time together.

In the range of books published by the Meijers Research Institute and Graduate School of Leiden Law School, Leiden University, the following titles were published in 2021 and 2022

- MI-365 M.P.A. Spanjers, *Belastingbudget. Onderzoek betekenis budgettaire impact belastingen bij parlementaire vaststelling belastingwetgeving* (diss. Leiden), Den Haag: Flosvier 2021, ISBN 978 90 8216 072 7
- MI-366 J. Zhang, *The Rationale of Publicity in the Law of Corporeal Movables and Claims. Meeting the Requirement of Publicity by Registration?* (diss. Leiden), Den Haag: Boom juridisch 2021
- MI-367 B.C.M. van Hazebroek, *Understanding delinquent development from childhood into early adulthood in early onset offenders* (diss. Leiden), Amsterdam: Ipskamp Printing 2021, ISBN 978 94 6421 2723
- MI-368 M.R. Manse, *Promise, Pretence and Pragmatism – Governance and Taxation in Colonial Indonesia, 1870-1940* (diss. Leiden), Amsterdam: Ipskamp Printing 2021
- MI-369 M.E. Stewart, *Freedom of Overflight: – A Study of Coastal State Jurisdiction in International Airspace* (diss. Leiden), Amsterdam: Ipskamp Printing 2021
- MI-370 M.T. Beumers, *De bescherming van immateriële contractuele belangen in het schadevergoedingsrecht* (diss. Leiden), Den Haag: Boom juridisch 2021, ISBN 978 94 6290 962 5
- MI-371 C.M. Sandelowsky-Bosman, T. Liefwaard, S.E. Rap & F.A.N.J. Goudappel, *De rechten van ongedocumenteerde kinderen in Curaçao – een gezamenlijke verantwoordelijkheid*, Den Haag: Boom juridisch 2021, ISBN 978-94-6290-965-6
- MI-372 G.J.A. Geertjes, *Staatsrecht en conventie in Nederland en het Verenigd Koninkrijk*, (diss. Leiden), Zutphen, Uitgeverij Paris bv 2021, ISBN 978 94 6251 270 2
- MI-373 L. Noyon, *Strafrecht en publieke opinie. Een onderzoek naar de relatie tussen de strafrechtspleging en het publiek, met bijzondere aandacht voor het Openbaar Ministerie*, (diss. Leiden), Den Haag: Boom juridisch 2021, ISBN 978 94 6290 978 6
- MI-374 F. Behre, *A European Ministry of Finance? Charting and Testing the National Constitutional Limits to EU Fiscal Integration*, (diss. Leiden), Amsterdam: Ipskamp Printing 2021
- MI-375 R. Spence, *Collateral transactions and shadow banking* (diss. Leiden), Amsterdam: Ipskamp Printing 2021
- MI-376 B.H.M. Custers, F. Dechesne & S. van der Hof (red.), *Meesterlijk. Liber amicorum ter gelegenheid van het emeritaat van prof. dr. Jaap van den Herik*, Amsterdam: Ipskamp Printing 2021
- MI-377 E. Campfens, *Cross-border claims to cultural objects. Property or heritage?*, (diss. Leiden), The Hague: Eleven 2021, ISBN 978 94 6236 250 5
- MI-378 S.R. Bakker, *Uitzonderlijke excepties in het strafrecht. Een zoektocht naar systematiek bij de beslissingen omtrent uitsluiting van strafrechtelijke aansprakelijkheid in bijzondere contexten*, (diss. Rotterdam), Den Haag: Boom juridisch 2021, ISBN 978 94 6290 998 4, ISBN 978 90 5189 194 2 (e-book)
- MI-379 M. Gkliati, *Systemic Accountability of the European Border and Coast Guard. The legal responsibility of Frontex for human rights violations*, (diss. Leiden), Alblasterdam: Ridderprint 2021
- MI-380 C.-I. Grigorieff, *The Regime for International Air Carrier Liability. To what Extent has the Envisaged Uniformity of the 1999 Montreal Convention been Achieved?*, (diss. Leiden), Amsterdam: Ipskamp Printing 2021
- MI-381 M. Stam, *Essays on Welfare Benefits, Employment, and Crime*, (diss. Leiden), Enschede, Gildeprint 2021
- MI-382 C.M.F. Mommers, *Voluntary return and the limits of individual responsibility in the EU Returns Directive*, (diss. Leiden), Amsterdam: Ipskamp Printing 2022, ISBN 978 94 6421 583 0
- MI-383 M.E. Franke, *Over de grens van de onrechtmatige daad. Een onderzoek naar de plaats van de rechtvaardiging in het buitencontractuele aansprakelijkheidsrecht*, (diss. Leiden), Den Haag: Boom juridisch 2022, ISBN 978 94 6290 152 0