

Index

- Abbink, K 63, 76, 77
Abbott, A 188
Abeler, J 70
administrative law 23–56
 see also constitutional and
 administrative law
 administrative justice concept 24
 background 177–178
 case studies 19, 174–193
 complex causality 182–188
 decision making 24–25
 future research questions
 159–163
 incident disclosure rules, business
 regulation 177–178
 lack of research on administrative
 justice 24–25, 50
 limitations 188–191
 methodological choices, making
 sense of 179–182
 quantitative research 24, 28–29,
 138
 and random assignment 38
 and regulations 137
 research design 26–31
 United Kingdom 175, 176, 180,
 181, 183, 184, 187, 188
adversary procedure, common law
 countries 39, 50
Akkermans, AJ 117
Albania 75
Alexander, CS 141
Anderson, AB 144
anthropological research 57, 58, 62
antitrust games 83
Aquinis, H 164
Armentier, O 77
artefactual field experiments 38, 39
artificiality 60
Australia 78, 126
Austria 81
Ayres, I 151
Azand 77
Becker, HJ 141
behavioural economics 2–3
Bellé, N 40
Belot, M 68–69
Bennett, A 191
Bentham, J 88
Berk, RA 152
bias 14, 146
Blumer, H 200, 201
Boppre, B 19, 241
Bouwman, R 41
Braithwaite, J 151
bribery 76, 77, 78, 83
 collusive 79, 84
bricolage 184
Bush v. Gore 50
Bushway, SD 65
Caldeira, GA 50
Campbell, A 152
Carson, R 156
case studies 9–10, 15–17
 abundance of writing 211–214
 access to court 203–204
 actor network approaches 216
 administrative law 19, 174–193
 case of what 219–221
 case-making as a distributed work
 practice 215–217
 cases and narratives 209–211
 cases under construction
 194–226
 criminal law 251–253
 defining the field 201–203

- description goals 10
- hanging on to sensitizing concepts 200–201
- how to choose a case 199–204
- idiographic explanation 15
- internal point of view (Hart) 217–219
- interviews 207–209
- judicial decision making 199–200
- legal case making 196–199
- “making the case talk” 204–214
- methods, performativities 206–207
- multiple 16, 194
 - and objectivity 221–224
 - ‘pure’ single 19, 194
 - silence 211–214
 - situatedness of researcher 205–206
 - theoretically informed research question 199–200
 - unexpected, encounters with 214–217
 - uses of 153
 - visualization practices vs. internal point of view 217–219
 - where appropriate 15
 - whole-case narratives 209–210
 - work practices 199–200
 - case making as a distributed work practice 215–217
 - observations of work practices/in-court interactions 209–211
- Castillo, M 68
- causality 14, 15, 37, 66
 - complex 182–188
- cheating 70–71
- chemical and oil sectors 187
- citizen-authority interactions 42
- citizens’ attitudes 66
- civilian systems, administrative justice 24
- Coglianesse, C 166–167
- cognitive behavioural treatment, UK 91, 92
- cognitive overload 146
- collusive bribery 79, 84
- Columbia 81
- Commonwealth countries,
 - administrative justice 24
- complex causality 182–188
- constitutional and administrative law
 - comparative constitutional law, data and patterns 246–250
 - legal comparisons/transplants 243–250
 - moral-centred tradition 244–246
 - outsourcing of theory and research 241–243
 - possibilities of ELS in 240–250
- constitutional missionaries 247
- constitutionalism 247
- construct validity 48
- contrast effects 146
- control, in research 10–11, 14, 15
- corporate malfeasance 138
- correlational methods
 - cross-sectional 36
 - vs. experimental 35–38, 51
 - plausibility 36
 - realism 49
 - surveys 24
- corruption 63, 64, 76–79, 83–84
- cover stories 49–50
- Craig, P 240
- Crijns, J 20
- criminal law
 - case studies 19–20, 251–253
 - corporate crime 138, 140
 - corruption 63, 64, 76–79, 83–84
 - crimes 67–79
 - crossfertilization of experiments 93–95
 - deterrence 80–89, 150
 - drug offenses 65
 - effects of sanctions 89–93
 - ELS in 251–257
 - state of the art 253–255
 - whether the way forward 256–257
 - environmental crime 160
 - experimental 18, 57–107, 251–253
 - naturalistic conditions 68, 71
 - reasons for experiments 57–62

- variety of methods 62–67
 - fraud 69–71, 190
 - imprisonment 80, 90
 - increases in certainty vs.
 - increases in severity of punishment 81
 - institutionalizing intervention 87
 - intervention 79–93
 - punishment 64, 81–82, 84
 - tax evasion 72–75, 82, 84, 92
 - theft 67–69, 81, 82
 - theory 87
 - United Kingdom 70, 78, 91
 - white-collar crime 140
- cross-sectional research 14, 36
- culture 58
- cycle, empirical 8, 9
- data collection 139, 246–250
- decision making
 - administrative justice 24–25, 51
 - individual experiments 41
 - judicial 199–200
- deduction/deductive reasoning 8–9, 29
- Denmark 90
- dependent variables 10, 11, 12, 13, 62
- descriptive studies 10, 14
- design, research 18
 - comparisons 15
 - cross-sectional studies 14, 36
 - longitudinal studies 36, 37
 - plan 28
 - questions and hypotheses 28–31
 - starting points 26–31
 - surveys 14
- Desmet, PTM 121
- detection game 83
- deterrence 80–89, 150
- dictator game 64
- Diefenbach, T 117
- dispute resolution 39, 51
- doctrinal legal research
 - and empirical legal research 4–8
 - teaching role 5–6
 - traditional 20
- Drago, F 80
- drug offenses 65
- effect sizes 31
- Eifler, S 145
- empirical legal research/empirical
 - legal studies (ELS) 227–262
 - case for increasing the empirical study of the law 231–233
 - choice 3, 17, 31–41
 - in constitutional and administrative law 240–250
 - outsourcing of theory and research 241–243
 - in criminal law 251–257
 - state of the art 253–255
 - whether the way forward 256–257
- definitions 233–234
- and doctrinal legal research 4–8
- evaluation 257–260
- history 2
- inclusive description 7–8
- ‘is’ and ‘ought’ 6
- legal comparisons/transplants 243–250
- legal scholarship and empirical research 229–234
- legitimacy concept 26–27, 28
- methods 8–17
- and private law 234–240
- qualitative research 8
- research goal 10–11
- scientific shift in looking at the law 2, 3
- state of the art, in private law 238–239
- steps in cycle 8, 9
- terrain of 1–22
- ‘value freedom’ 6
- Engel, C 18, 81–82, 251, 252, 256, 258
- environmental crime 160
- Environmental Protection Agency 138
- environmental regulation
 - see also* factorial surveys
 - factorial surveys 19, 137–173

- capacity to provide unique information 153–155
- informing environmental regulatory policy 156–158
- future research questions/future development of method 159–166
- physical harm, potential of environmental offending for 161
- previous research on environmental compliance 147–158
- “regulatory shopping” 165–166
- Epstein, L 233
- ‘*erklärendes Verstehen*’ 10
- ethnicity 42
- ethnography 202
- Etienne, J 19
- evasion of tax 72–75, 82, 84
- experimental criminology 57
- experimental realism 49
- experiments, research
 - see also* empirical legal research; research methods
 - carrying out 41–50
 - causality 14, 15, 37, 66, 182–188
 - correlational vs. experimental methods 35–38, 51
 - criminal law 18, 57–107
 - experimental study 9
 - field experiments *see* field experiments
 - “lab in the field” 64
 - laboratory 9, 12–13
 - manipulation 17, 142
 - natural 65
 - personal injury 128–132
 - private law 109–136
 - quasiexperiments 38
 - randomized 37
 - realism 49–50
 - reliability 46–47
 - research instruments 43–46, 47
 - types 38–41
 - use of in legal research 234–240
 - validity 47–49
 - vignettes 66, 69, 120–122, 141
 - explanatory research 10, 13, 14
 - external validity 11, 12, 13, 48
 - criminal law, experimental 60, 61–62
 - extraneous variables 11, 15, 48
 - factorial surveys 9, 137–173
 - applications of 140
 - benefits of design 141–145
 - description of method 140–141
 - environmental regulation 19, 137–173
 - capacity to provide unique information 153–155
 - informing environmental regulatory policy 156–158
 - experimental manipulation 142
 - future research questions 163–166
 - informing environmental regulatory policy 156–158
 - limitations 145–147
 - managerial decision making 148–151
 - public perceptions of legal instruments 152–153
 - randomization 140–141, 142, 147
 - regulatory actors/roles 151
 - review of in environmental regulatory domain 147–158
 - unique information, provision of 153–155
 - use of in regulatory research 140–147
- fairness/fair process effect 73
 - administrative law 30, 36, 38
- “fear of falling hypothesis” 160
- Federal Trade Commission 138
- Feldman, Y 152–153
- field, research 13, 41–43
 - defining the field 201–203
 - personal injury litigation 115–119
- field experiments 9, 13, 18
 - private law 126–128
 - validity considerations 47, 48
- Fischbacher, U 69
- Fortin, B 74

- framed field experiments 38, 39–40
- France 19, 89, 180
 bricolage 184
 and United Kingdom 182, 183,
 184, 187–188
- fraud 69–71, 190
- Friesen, L 82
- Garner, J 149
- gender factors, and corruption 78
- generalizability 11, 13, 16
- George, AL 191
- Gerring, J 174, 191
- Gërxfhani, K 75
- Gibbs, C 149
- Gibson, JL 27, 50
- Giesen, I 20
- Ginsburg, T 244
- goal, research 10–11
- Goertz, G 191
- Golden, PM 11
- governance 5, 25, 26, 28, 29, 52
 regulatory 162–163
- government audits 83–84
- Gravert, C 68
- Grimmelikhuijsen, SG 29, 30, 33–34,
 41, 43
- Grootelaar, H 18, 34, 36, 241
- grounded theory 181
- Gunningham, N 176
- Güth, W 73
- Hamilton, A 241
- Harari, YN 230
- Harbaugh, WT 81
- Hardy, W 69
- Harrison, GWG 38
- Hart, HLA 217–219
- Hasisi, B 42
- Hawkins, K 175, 176
- Henrich, J 64
- hermeneutics 5
- Hirschauer, S 213
- historical institutionalism 185
- Hobbes, T 87
- Hugh-Jones, David 70
- Hulst, L 40, 43, 48, 51, 117, 127
- Hutter, BM 175, 176
- hypothesis-testing 28–31, 39
 deterrence 80
- idiographic explanation 15
- imprisonment 80, 90
- incident disclosure rules, business
 regulation 177–178
- independent variables 10, 12, 13,
 37
- India 78
- Indonesia 78, 80, 83
- induction/inductive reasoning 8,
 29
- inquisitorial procedure, civil law
 countries 39, 50
- instruments, research 43–46, 47
- integrated theories 148
- internal validity 11, 12, 47
- intervention, criminal law 79–93
 deterrence 80–89
 effects of sanctions 89–93
- interviews 207–209
- Introduction to Empirical Legal
 Research, An* (Epstein and
 Martin) 233
- Japan 115
- Jay, J 241
- Jehle, A 124
- Journal of Experimental Criminology*
 57
- judicial decision making 199–200
- Kagan, RA 176
- Khadjavi, M 81
- Klijn, A 43
- laboratory experiments 9, 12–13, 18,
 38
 conventional 39
 criminal law 63, 81–82
 “lab in the field” 64
 private law 122–126
 realism 49
 validity considerations 47–48
- large-N methods 180, 191, 192

- legal case making 196–199
 legal scholarship and empirical research 229–234
Legal Transplants (Watson) 243
 legitimacy concept 26–27, 28, 42
 Levy, JS 181
 List, JAJ 38
 longitudinal research 36, 37, 144
- McKnight, DH 33
 Macondo 160
 Madison, J 241
 Mahoney, J 191
 managerial decision making 148–151
 manipulation, experimental 17, 142
 Martin, AD 233
 Mascini, P 19–20, 251, 252, 253
 Mayer, RC 44
 Meadowcroft, J 158
 Meijer, AJ 33–34
 mere description 181
 Meyer, JW 188
 Mill, JS 174, 186
 Minnesota 80, 91–92
 Molina, M 156
 Montag, J 66
 most dissimilar system design (MDS) 174
 most similar system design (MSSD) 174
 mundane realism 50
 Murphy, K 36–37
- Nagin, D 81
 natural field experiments 38, 40
 naturalistic conditions 68, 71, 78
 Netherlands, the 20, 40, 195
 criminal law 75, 89
 Research and Documentation Centre, Ministry of Security and Justice 255
 and traditional lawyer's perspective 238, 239
 New Public Management (NPM) 25
 nomothetic theories 15
 “nuisance” variables 37
- objectivity, and case study 221–224
 observations 8, 9, 12, 14
 online platforms, users of 69
 operationalization 31–35, 47
 organizational theory 148
Oxford Handbook of Comparative Constitutional Law (Rosenfeld) 245
- panel studies 14
 participants of research, getting into minds of 45
 Pascual-Ezama, D 70
 Pate, AM 84
 Paternoster, R 159
 Pautz, M 151
 peer punishment 86
 Perez, O 152–153
 Perez-Truglia, R 84
 personal injury
 apologies, provision of 113–114, 118, 119, 129
 current designs of litigation 111–112, 118
 doctrinal vs. comparative research 114–115
 experimental approaches 128–132
 extant designs of litigation 110
 extant legal approaches 114–119
 field research 115–119
 litigation 18, 19, 110–119
 paucity of empirical support 118
 post-traumatic stress 127
 relational restoration 111
- phronesis 194
 Pierce, CA 164
 Piquero, NL 149
 Posner, RA 229–230
 private law 109–136
 empirical legal studies (ELS) 234–240
 state of the art 238–239
 experimental approaches 119–128
 experimental vignettes 120–122
 field experiments 126–128

- laboratory experiments 122–126
- personal injury litigation *see*
 - personal injury litigation United Kingdom 126
 - way forward for 236–238
- probation 90
- procedural justice 28, 32, 34
 - and ethnicity 42
 - Israeli airport example 42
 - new scales of 35
 - perceived 30, 31, 35, 36, 40, 41, 43, 51
 - research field 41–42
 - and trust 36, 37, 40, 48
- process tracing 185
- prototypical lab experiments 12
- psychological realism 49
- psychology 66
- public administration, changes in
 - nature of 25
- punishment 64, 84
 - advantage of legalizing 88
 - antisocial 88
 - increases in, vs. increases in certainty 81–82
 - legalizing 88
 - peer 86
- qualitative research 8, 9, 61
 - personal injury litigation 116
 - Qualitative Comparative Analysis 192
- quantitative research 8, 9, 17
 - administrative law 24, 28–29, 138
 - large-N methods 192
- quasiexperiments 38
- questionnaires
 - items 45
 - testing among acquaintances and relatives 45–46
- questions, research 28–31
- Rachlinski, JJ 125
- random assignment/randomized
 - experiments 11, 17, 48
 - and administrative law 38
 - cases 219
 - correlational vs. experimental methods 37, 38
 - criminal law 60, 65
 - experiment types 41
 - factorial surveys 140–141, 142, 147
 - field experiments 13
 - impossibility of 65
 - laboratory experiments 12
 - randomized field trial 62
 - rational choice theory 148
- Ready, JT 62
- Reagan, R 156
- realism, research 49–50
- recidivism, reducing 80, 89, 90, 91
- Reinders Folmer, CP 18, 121, 234–240
- reliability, research 46–47
- Relis, T 113, 116
- representativeness 11
- research goal 10–11
- research instruments 43–46, 47
- research methods 8–17
 - see also* empirical legal research; empirical legal studies (ELS)
 - administrative law 26–31
 - case studies *see* case studies
 - choice 3, 17, 31–41
 - control 10–11, 14, 15
 - descriptive studies 10, 14
 - experiments *see* experiments
 - explanatory research 10, 13
 - instruments 43–46
 - methodological choices, making sense of 179–182
 - observations, utilising 8, 9
 - operationalization 31–35, 47
 - surveys *see* factorial surveys; survey research
 - variety 62–67
- response biases 146
- response scales, questionnaires 45
- restorative justice conferences 126–127
- retribution 64
- Riccucci, NM 41, 43

- rigour, methodological 18
 Rinfret, S 151
 Robbenolt, Jennifer 121
 Rorie, M 19, 151, 241
 Rosenfeld, M 245
 Rossi, PH 140, 144, 152
 Rowan, B 188
 Rowland, F 156
- Saltzman, L 144
 sample size 17, 49
 saturation point 9
 Saulnier, A 122, 123
 Saunders, C 246
 Schildberg-Hörisch, H 67, 81
 secondary data 154–155
 Securities and Exchange Commission
 137–138
 self-control theory 148
Shades of Green (Gunningham,
 Kagan and Thornton) 176
 Sherman, LW 126, 127
Silent Spring (Carson) 156
 Simpson, SS 19, 149, 157, 159,
 241
 Singapore 78
 situatedness of researcher 205–206
 Sivasubramaniam, D 122, 123
 small-N comparisons 174, 179, 185,
 186, 190, 191
 Sobek, T 66
 social desirability bias 14
 social norms 74, 84, 111
 Spain 82–83, 84
 Spence, LK 50
 statistical generalization 16
 stealing 67–69
 Steurer, R 158
 stimulus materials 45, 46
 Stolker, C 229
 survey research 13–14
 choice of method 17
 correlational surveys 24
 criticisms 14
 descriptive studies 14
 design 14
 explanatory research 14
 factorial surveys 9, 137–173
 longitudinal studies 144
 traditional 153, 154
 verification of homogeneity of
 questions in 47
- tax evasion 72–75, 82, 84, 92
 Taylor, MS 38
 test–retest method 47
 theft 67–69, 81, 82
 theoretical generalization 16
 Thibaut, J 39, 50
 Thornton, D 176
 time series analysis 14, 81
 Toxic Release Inventory data 161
 transparency 29–30
 triangulation 60, 62
 tribes 58
 trust/trustworthiness 30, 34
 concepts/distinctions 32–33, 44
 and procedural justice 36, 37, 40,
 48
 Tyler, T 27–28, 31
- United Kingdom
 administrative law 175, 176, 180,
 181, 183, 184, 187, 188
 criminal law 70, 78, 91
 and France 182, 183, 184,
 187–188
 restorative justice conferences
 126
 United States 24, 70, 84, 124, 163,
 238
 regulatory agencies 137–138
 Sentencing Commission guidelines
 152
 unreliability of research instrument,
 potential 47
- validity, research 47–49
 construct 48
 external 11, 12, 13, 48, 60,
 61–62
 internal 11, 12, 47, 48
 intrinsic 14
 Van Boom, WH 121

- Van den Bos, K 18, 34, 36, 51, 241
- Van Oorschot, I 19–20, 251, 252, 253
- variables
- dependent 10, 11, 12, 13, 62
 - extraneous 11, 15, 48
 - focal 119
 - independent 10, 12, 13, 37
 - laboratory experiments 12, 13
 - “nuisance” 37
 - survey research 13
- vignettes, experimental 66, 69, 120–122, 141
- Voermans, W 20
- Walker, L 39, 50
- Watson, A 243
- Weber, M 10, 27
- Weisburd, D 42
- whistle-blowing 83–84
- White, BT 113, 116
- whole-case narratives 209–210

