

Exploring Legal Socialization in a New Rule-System:
How the Legal Socialization Framework, Coercive Models, and Consensual Models,

Apply to Motocross and Supercross

by

Jessica Melonnie Rosenthal

A Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

Approved April 2023 by the
Graduate Supervisory Committee:

Abigail Henson, Chair
Edward Maguire
Rick Trinkner

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

May 2023

ABSTRACT

Research on legal socialization aims to develop an understanding of how individuals develop their relationship with law and legal actors, as well as how this relationship influences their behavior. One perspective of the legal socialization framework typically considers two models: the coercive model, where behavior is altered by authoritative force, and the consensual model, where behavior is altered by a sense of obligation. Legal socialization is not limited to the actual legal system and can be understood by applying the concepts to other rule-based systems. The current study applied the legal socialization framework to a previously unexplored rule system: motocross and supercross. The goal of this study was to see how formal and informal rule systems of motocross and supercross incorporate aspects of the coercive and consensual models to influence riders' behaviors. To achieve this aim, semi-structured interviews were conducted with 21 professional motocross and supercross riders. Findings demonstrate that, although aspects of both models influenced rider behavior, riders expressed more desire for elements from the consensual model, including a penalty process that was clear, consistent, and allowed for rider voice. Findings also highlighted additional factors that influenced riders' behaviors, including safety, image, relationships, and respect.

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate my dissertation to my mother Melanna Rosenthal and to dedicate it in loving memory to my grandmother, Bonnie Prante, and father, Scott Rosenthal.

Melanna, you have always been there for me supporting me every step of the way and encouraging me to pursue my goals and do the best work possible. Your love and guidance have helped make me the person I am today, and I am eternally grateful. Without you, I would have never made it through this process, and I want you to know that your unwavering support in all that I do means the world to me.

Bonnie always built up my confidence and pushed me to succeed at whatever I put my mind to. Her love, support, and compassion will always be with me. She is the reason I finished my degree and even though she is gone, I know she would be super proud and would be cheering me on every step of the way.

Scott fostered my love of motocross and supercross by introducing me to the sports and taking me to several racing events over the years, for which I will always be grateful. I know he would be proud of the fact that I was able to recruit the professional athletes we looked up to for my project.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to acknowledge my chair Dr. Abigail Henson and my other committee members, Dr. Edward Maguire and Dr. Rick Trinkner for taking the time to provide feedback and guidance through the dissertation process. Under their tutelage, I have developed new skills and grown as a researcher. I appreciate them encouraging me to pursue a project that I was extremely passionate about and helping me to reach my goals.

I would like to acknowledge Dr. Jacob Young for his initial support and early feedback on the project.

I would like to acknowledge Dr. Callie Rennison for her support and encouragement throughout the project.

I would like to acknowledge Dr. Nancy Rios-Contreras for pushing me to do my best, for always being available to give me advice, and for constantly providing me with the encouragement and support I needed to complete the project.

I would especially like to acknowledge the professional motocross and supercross riders who took the time to complete the interviews for my project, without whom none of this would have been possible. They presented a unique perspective providing valuable insight and shed light on several important topics.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vi
CHAPTER	
1 STATEMENT OF PROBLEM	1
2 LITERATURE REVIEW	7
Legal Socialization Framework	7
First Three Pillars: Foundationality, Reciprocity & Continuity.....	8
Special Focus on Ubiquity Pillar.....	10
Elements of Legal Socialization: Legal Values, Legal Attitudes & Legal Reasoning	13
Differences in Values and Experiences Create Limitations for Laws and Authorities	16
Coercive Models and Consensual Models	17
Coercive Model	18
Rational Choice Theory	19
Deterrence.....	20
Limitations of Coercive Approaches in General	23
Limitations of Deterrence	24
Consensual Model.....	27
Three Value Dimensions of Consensual Models.....	28
Group Dynamics and Socialization	30
Additional Factors.....	32

CHAPTER	Page
Summary.....	36
3 METHODS	37
Qualitative Approach.....	40
Sampling.....	40
Inclusion Criteria	40
Sampling Methods.....	41
Sample Description.....	42
Data Collection.....	45
Interviews	45
Data Analysis.....	46
4 RESULTS	49
Development.....	49
Formal Channels.....	50
Informal Channels.....	54
Fusing Formal and Informal Channels	58
Impacts.....	61
Rule Systems and Authority.....	62
Coercive Factors	65
Consensual Factors	69
Additional Factors.....	73
Desires	78
Coercive Aspects	79

CHAPTER	Page
Consensual Aspects	81
Promoting Change	87
5 DISCUSSION	89
Research Questions.....	89
Connections to Actual Rule Violations.....	92
Legal Socialization.....	95
Industry Implications	108
Limitations.....	113
Directions for Future Research	117
Conclusion.....	119
REFERENCES	121
APPENDIX	
A RECRUITMENT FLYER	137
B RECRUITMENT SCRIPT FOR SOCIAL MEDIA	139
C RECRUITMENT SCRIPT FOR EMAILS/DIRECT MESSAGES	141
D DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE.....	143
E INTERVIEW PROTOCOL	145
F CONSENT FORM	151
G IRB APPROVAL DOCUMENT	154
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH.....	157

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Rider Demographic Information	43

CHAPTER 1

STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

The purpose of this dissertation is to apply the legal socialization (L.S.) framework to a previously unexplored rule system, motocross and supercross¹. Researchers argue that using L.S. as a framework for understanding rules and authorities has historically been overlooked by most scholars and as the framework has experienced a resurgence of interest, researchers have encouraged others to look beyond the legal world and to continue to expand L.S. into new disciplines (Granot & Tyler, 2019; Tyler & Trinkner, 2016; Trinkner & Reisig, 2021). L.S. is the development of an individual's relationship with the law and legal authorities shaped by their legal values, legal attitudes, and legal reasoning (Tapp, 1970; Tapp & Levine, 1970). An L.S. analysis addresses both the developmental process of an individual's relationship with the law and legal authorities, as well as legal orientations which are individuals' views of the purpose or function of the law (Trinkner & Tyler, 2016). One perspective of L.S. puts forth two main models for the legal system to explain why individuals adhere to laws and the legal authority: the coercive model and the consensual model. Within the coercive model, it is believed that individuals do things that are in their best interest. Therefore, to control the behavior of the community members, legal authorities use monitoring and force to impact an individual's internal cost-benefit analysis and to deter law-breaking. Consensual models are more relational in nature, where authorities strive to use group dynamics and

¹ Motocross competitions are conducted on outdoor long natural terrain courses featuring a variety of obstacles including a unique blend of jumps, hills, and berms (large, banked corners) navigated by individuals riding dirt bikes. Supercross races are conducted in stadiums where dirt is hauled in for the events and riders on dirt bikes navigate a series of man-made obstacles jumps, turns, and bumps.

group norms, such as those centered on fairness or justice, to maintain cooperation by creating a sense of duty or obligation to obey what they see as legitimate rules or authority. Research concerning the legal system often indicates that consensual models produce better adherence to laws and legal authority than coercive models (Tyler, 2009).

The L.S. pillar of *ubiquity* is the idea that there are common aspects within all rule systems that shape individuals' views and behaviors towards rules or the legal system (Trinkner & Reisig, 2021). The ubiquity pillar emphasizes that, contrary to the framework's name, L.S. does not apply exclusively to the legal system (Trinkner & Reisig, 2021); non-legal contexts provide opportunities to further our understanding of how individuals develop these orientations to rule systems (Tapp & Levine, 1970). Individuals are embedded in numerous hierarchically organized rule systems such as schools or workplaces that are phenomenologically similar to the legal rule system. Essentially, all rule systems convey information that can be used to understand how values, attitudes, and behaviors are influenced by rules and authority.

Since individuals are entrenched in a variety of rule systems, these systems cannot be seen as fully independent from one another and what is learned in one system impacts how people interact with other systems (Tyler & Trinkner, 2018). Indeed, even research situated within different theoretical frameworks and disciplines that examine the rule systems of home, school, or juvenile justice have found L.S. themes where authorities using coercive approaches foster rejection, mistrust, and rule-violating action, while consensual approaches promote legitimacy and voluntary compliance (Trinkner & Cohn, 2014, Tyler & Trinkner, 2018). Expanding L.S. research into new contexts not only

provides an opportunity to identify similarities among rule systems, but also allows for a more complete understanding of the development of legal orientations.

Sports systems are one area where L.S. could be applied as they would qualify as non-legal rule systems since they have rules, penalties, authorities, procedures, and appeals. Most individuals engage in some type of sport usually starting at a young age (Groombridge, 2016), which corresponds with the timeframe when they would be developing legal attitudes and values (Cohn & White, 1990; Hogan & Mills, 1976; Tapp & Levine, 1974). As such, sports rule systems present a suitable context for researchers seeking to explore L.S. in new settings. Expanding the L.S. framework in new contexts allows researchers to develop a more holistic understanding of the impact of rule systems and authorities on the development of legal orientations and the behaviors they produce. Therefore, applying the L.S. framework to sports and considering the relative impact of coercive and consensual models within sports rule systems is a logical next step in the research.

Although researchers have not specifically applied the L.S. framework to sports to understand how sports rule systems are used to regulate athletes' behavior and motivate them to follow the rules and adhere to authority, some research has considered the application of coercive models to sports (Allen, 2002; Heckelman & Yates, 2003; Jewell, 2009; Kitchens et al., 2019; Levitt, 2002; McCormick & Tollison, 1989; Stephenson & Walcott, 2012; VanDerweken et al., 2018). Coercive models are essentially rooted in self-interest or an instrumental view of human behavior where the athletes would be seeking to behave in ways that produce the greatest benefit to themselves. One theory that is consistent with the coercive model articulated by Trinkner and Tyler (2016) is the

rational choice theory, which suggests that individuals engage in cost-benefit analysis and make decisions that maximize benefits and minimize their costs (Cornish & Clark, 1986). Sports research has incorporated rational choice theory, exploring how increasing the cost impacts behavior, such as how increasing the likelihood of players being expelled from a soccer game leads to less rule-violating behavior (Jewell, 2009). Deterrence is another theory that is consistent with the coercive model articulated by Trinkner and Tyler (2016), and it argues that if punishment is certain, severe, and swift, individuals will be more likely to be deterred from committing rule-breaking behavior (Beccaria, 1963[1764]; Bentham, 1988[1789]). Sports research also has explored deterrence concepts such as the impact of adding more referees on players' behaviors (Heckelman & Yates, 2003; Kitchens et al., 2019) or by increasing severity, such as making offenses eligible for red cards instead of yellow cards in soccer (Stephenson & Walcott, 2012). Research has produced mixed results, with some studies finding sports that increased the cost/severity of penalties or certainty of getting caught can make athletes behave in the desired ways (Heckelman & Yates, 2003; Jewell, 2009; Kitchens et al., 2019) while others find no effect (Levitt, 2002; Heckleman & Yates, 2003).

Motocross and supercross provide a new context where L.S. concepts can be explored and applied. Motocross and supercross are non-legal systems structured by both formal and informal rule systems. The goal of the systems is to promote rule-following behavior for all riders. Some aspects of the rule systems embrace coercive concepts to promote rule following such as closely monitoring or surveilling riders during racing events and creating and enforcing harsh penalties for rule-breaking. The idea is that if it is known that riders' rule violations will be detected and punished swiftly and severely, then

riders will be deterred from committing violations. Additionally, rule-following behavior is promoted through aspects of the consensual model where riders seek to be part of the rider group, thus following the group norms to maintain a position in the group and to be respected by other riders. In other words, riders will voluntarily follow rules because they value their group membership and rule violations put that status in jeopardy. Since motocross and supercross rule systems have the same basic characteristics (i.e., rules, penalties, authorities, procedures, appeals) as the legal system under the L.S. framework, it should be possible to apply concepts used to understand interactions with the law and legal authority to the new rule-system. Additionally, any new insights developed from an examination of the motocross and supercross rule system should in turn be applicable to the criminal legal system according to the ubiquity pillar of L.S.

The current study was exploratory in nature and aimed to expand the knowledge of L.S. by embracing the ubiquity pillar and applying the elements of L.S. (values, attitudes, and reasoning) to a previously unexplored rule system, motocross and supercross. The study used motocross and supercross riders' perspectives to gain insight into coercive and consensual models of behavior in a rule system outside of the criminal legal system. The study also sought to determine if any new factors emerged that could be applied in future research to better understand other rule systems. To expand L.S., coercive, and consensual models into a new setting, the study sought to address six main research questions:

1. How do riders develop an understanding of formal and informal rules and penalties?

2. How do coercive models influence riders' techniques and decision-making during racing events?
3. How do consensual models influence riders' techniques and decision-making during racing events?
4. What aspects of coercive models have the most prominent impact on influencing riders' techniques and decision-making during racing events?
5. What aspects of the consensual models have the most prominent impact on influencing riders' techniques and decision-making during racing events?
6. What additional factors influence riders' techniques and decision-making during racing events?

The remaining portion of the dissertation is structured as follows. Chapter 2 provides a more detailed look at the relevant literature, focusing on general knowledge of L.S., coercive models, and consensual models, while also considering relevant information on sports regulations, rules, and penalties. Chapter 2 also presents relevant information on motocross and supercross. Chapter 3 provides details on the methodology, including research questions, sampling, data collection, and data analysis. Chapter 4 details the results of the study covering three broad categories: development, impacts, and desires. Chapter 5 presents the discussion of the findings, policy implications, limitations, directions for future research, and general conclusions. The recruitment materials, interview protocol, informed consent form, and IRB approval can be found in the appendices.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

This section provides a detailed look at the L.S. framework with specific attention given to coercive and consensual models. In addition, it presents findings from relevant sports research. Finally, it provides insight into the specific sport context that will be used in the current study.

Legal Socialization Framework

In the most basic sense, L.S. is the process through which individuals develop their relationship with the law (Trinkner & Reisig, 2021; Tyler & Trinkner, 2016). There are three main elements of L.S.: legal values, legal attitudes, and legal reasoning (Tapp, 1970; Tapp & Levine, 1970; Tapp & Levine, 1974; Trinkner & Tyler, 2016). The development of these elements allows individuals to form beliefs about laws, the institutions that create them, and the individuals that enforce them (Finckenauer, 1998; Trinkner & Cohn, 2014). L.S. is concerned with understanding both how this socialization process occurs, as well as how variations in the process lead to variations in the legal orientations of children and adults (Trinkner & Tyler, 2016). These legal orientations consist of individuals' views of both the purpose and the function of law within society (Tapp, 1991). Individuals can experience L.S. in the context of multiple rules systems and, as such, the ideas behind L.S. are often explored by scholars of different disciplines (Trinkner & Reisig, 2021; Trinkner & Tyler, 2016). To create a basic framework that can be used by these different scholars to help order the field, L.S. is typically characterized by four pillars: foundationality, reciprocity, continuity, and

ubiquity (Trinkner & Reisig, 2021). These four pillars are essentially the assumptions that hold the field together and will therefore be explored in more detail in the next sections.

First Three Pillars: Foundationality, Reciprocity & Continuity

The foundationality pillar focuses on the notion that law is an important social institution that plays a vital role in shaping human behavior, particularly by regulating interactions between individuals (Cohn & White, 1990; Tapp & Levine, 1974; Trinkner & Reisig, 2021; Tyler & Trinkner, 2016). According to the L.S. perspective, the law can be seen as a socializing agent that reflects values, norms, and beliefs about being a member of society and the obligations that come with group membership (Trinkner & Reisig, 2021). An individual is thus socialized to understand the duties and purpose of the law as a form of social control (Tyler & Trinkner, 2016). Socialization from the legal system also helps individuals to understand their obligations and responsibilities as a member of the socially controlled group (Tyler & Trinkner, 2016). In essence, individuals are socialized by the law to understand what behaviors will be accepted by members of society and individuals in authority (Andenaes, 1971) and how the authority will use its power to control human behavior (Murphy, 2021). The idea is that when individuals are socialized to trust and accept the law, they will defer to legal rules and authority (Tyler & Huo, 2002) with the understanding that the legal system controls behavior and will resolve any conflicts that arise (Hardin, 2006). Therefore, the law is just as important as any other social institution for creating order in society and facilitating interaction among members (Fine & Trinkner, In Press).

The reciprocity pillar captures the idea that the relationship between law and society is bidirectional (Trinkner & Reisig, 2021). In other words, both law and

community are active and equal participants who are constantly interacting to shape and change the legal system, as well as what is learned during the L.S. process (Buss, 2021; Barak-Corren & Perry-Hazan, 2021). There are two forms of reciprocity in L.S. (Trinkner & Reisig, 2021); the first focuses on how individuals learn the roles and obligations of the law itself, while also internalizing the personal roles and duties of community members (Trinkner & Reisig, 2021). Learning about the roles and obligations of the law itself includes discerning the purpose and function of the law, what can be regulated, and the mechanisms the authority has deemed appropriate for controlling behavior (Trinkner & Reisig, 2021). On the other hand, internalizing the personal roles and duties of community members includes knowing when one should obey the law, understanding what the community has deemed to be an appropriate relationship between individuals and authority (i.e., essentially how they can interact with one another), and when authority can use force for control (Trinkner & Reisig, 2021). The second concept of reciprocity focuses on the idea that people influence the law and the law influences people (Trinkner & Reisig, 2021). In other words, the law shapes what values and attitudes are adopted by the community (Trinkner & Reisig, 2021), such as the desire to follow rules for their own sake (Lind & Tyler, 1988), respect for civil liberties (Tyler, 2021), importance of legitimacy (Tyler, 2009), and trust and confidence (Sunshine & Tyler, 2003). The community can also influence what laws are in place and how they are enforced (Trinkner & Reisig, 2021), through traditional political activities such as activism, peaceful protests, or voting (Tapp, 1971; Tyler 2021) or non-traditional actions such as riots or rebellions (Murphy, 2021; Tyler, 2021).

The continuity pillar captures the idea that L.S. is a continuous process that unfolds over the life course (Fine & Cauffman, 2015; Hogan & Mills, 1976; Tapp, 1976; Tapp, 1991; Trinkner & Reisig, 2021; Trinkner & Tyler, 2016). Although values and attitudes about the law and justice are developed in early life through interactions with the rule systems of home, school, and community (Piaget, 1932; Piaget 1972; Kohlberg, 1969; Schrader, 1990; Tapp, 1991), L.S. is a lifelong experience where people learn and relearn new codes of conduct as they interact with new rule-systems, such as governments and the legal system (Tapp, 1991). As they interact with new rule systems or experience changes in old rule systems, they begin to incorporate the written or unwritten codes of conduct into their legal framework or schema (Tapp, 1991). The legal frameworks that have been developed then guide individuals' behavior toward compliance with the new group norms (Tapp, 1991).

Special Focus on Ubiquity Pillar

Although the field is called L.S., the ubiquity pillar emphasizes the fact that the framework covers aspects beyond the legal system (Fine & Trinkner, In Press; Trinkner & Cohn, 2014; Trinkner & Tyler, 2016) and is driven by both legal and non-legal systems and experiences (Tapp & Levine, 1974; Trinkner & Reisig, 2021; Tyler & Trinkner, 2018). Individuals are embedded in a variety of phenomenologically similar hierarchically organized rule systems, which shape their basic understanding of regulations, compliance, and cooperation, as well as their relationship with rules and authorities (Fine & Trinkner, In Press; Trinkner & Reisig, 2021; Trinkner & Tyler, 2016). All institutions are intricately related and come together to form a network of rule systems that can be thought of as extra-legal in nature; therefore, L.S. is applicable in any

instance where people are experiencing rule systems and authorities (Tapp, 1991; Tapp & Levine, 1974). Thus, the internalization of legal values, legal attitudes, and reasoning capacities can be facilitated by experience in either legal (Fagan & Piquero, 2007; Fagan & Tyler, 2005) or non-legal contexts (Trinkner & Cohn, 2014) such as home (Thomas et al., 2021) or school (Cardwell et al., 2021), and can include either formal or informal rules that aim to manage behavior and prevent conflicts (Tapp, 1991; Tapp & Levine, 1974; Tapp & Levine, 1977).

Interaction with non-legal sources occurs throughout the life course, beginning during childhood (Fine & Trinkner, In Press), and although children eventually learn to differentiate legal authorities from interactions with parents and teachers (Amemiya et al., 2019; Fine et al., 2019; Tyler & Trinkner, 2018), these early experiences inform their expectations and views towards future interactions with legal authorities (Trinkner & Reising, 2021). The non-legal experiences teach individuals how to interact with authority figures, develop ideas on how law and legal systems should use power, and demonstrate how authority figures can use social control (Rios, 2011; Tapp, 1987) and variation across systems serve to either reinforce or challenge internalized legal values and attitudes (Buss, 2021; Tyler & Trinkner, 2016). Therefore, a complete understanding of L.S. requires examination of rule-based systems outside the scope of formal law, and thus the understanding of L.S. could be broadened by including more disciplines and perspectives (Trinkner & Tyler, 2016). Sports are contexts where L.S. concepts could be explored due to the popularity of sports and the likelihood that sports have rule systems enforced by authorities.

For instance, in motocross and supercross, riders are subject to a system with rules, penalties, and procedures that are enforced by authority figures. Even though they are different sports, both Lucas Oil Pro-Motocross and AMA Supercross are sanctioned by the America Motorcycle Association (AMA), therefore, their rulebooks are very similar. The rulebooks are designed to provide riders with information to prepare themselves and their machines for competition. The rulebooks are very detailed, ranging from 62-77 pages in length, and cover a wide variety of topics. The aspects of the rulebooks that are of main concern for the current study are offenses, penalties, protests, and appeals for penalties.

In motocross, the rulebook highlights 22 different general offenses and two equipment offenses (AMA Pro Racing, 2022c), whereas in supercross there are two equipment offenses and 23 general offenses. Some examples include refusing to submit a bike for inspection, failing to attend a post-race podium interview, riding in a manner that endangers other riders, failing or refusing to submit to a drug test, engaging in a fight, not reentering the track at the first safe location without gaining an advantage, failure to comply or respond immediately to flags or warnings, and any deliberate overly aggressive riding (AMA, 2022a; AMA Pro Racing, 2022c). These offenses are subject to 14 possible penalties in motocross and seven possible penalties in supercross (AMA, 2022a; AMA Pro Racing, 2022c). Examples of possible penalties include warnings, finishing position or points deduction, time penalty, total or partial loss of prize money, fines, probation, and forfeiture of license (AMA, 2022a; AMA Pro Racing, 2022c). A three-person AMA official team makes a penalty determination by reviewing the infraction evidence and rulebook to determine if a penalty is necessary (Kendra, 2022).

All riders who are affected by dangerous, unfair, or fraudulent behavior have the right to protest the act (AMA, 2022a; AMA Pro Racing, 2022c). Any rider penalized by the AMA has the right to an appeal, which will be heard by a three-member panel. The panel will be composed of three individuals who have no “material interest” in the matter at hand, in other words, three individuals who were not involved in the initial decision² (AMA, 2022a; AMA Pro Racing, 2022c).

Elements of Legal Socialization: Legal Values, Legal Attitudes, & Legal Reasoning

The legal value element of L.S. focuses on the development of normative standards of how both the law and its agents should behave when using formal social control (Fine & Trinkner, In Press; Trinkner & Cohn, 2014). These legal values are developed early in life and are vital because they become the foundation individuals use to inform their beliefs about justice, social control, and legitimacy (Cohn & White, 1990; Fagan & Tyler, 2005; Hogan & Mills, 1976; Tapp & Levine, 1974; Tyler & Trinkner, 2016). Ultimately the congruence between an individual’s legal values and what they experience from agents of the rule system determines if they feel it is appropriate to defer to authority and obey laws (Jackson et al., 2012; Jackson et al., 2013; Trinkner et al., 2018; Tyler 2006a; Tyler 2006b; Tyler & Trinkner, 2016). These legal values are developed and understood through interactions and communications with other individuals (Mills, 1967), essentially the situations they experience and the environments they are in help formulate these values (Trinkner & Tyler, 2016). Older members of the

² The rulebook does not provide additional information on who the three individuals would be beyond the statement that they would not have a material interest in the matter and the AMA would do its best to secure a fair and impartial hearing. Therefore, it is unknown what the qualifications are for appellate committee members. It is also unknown what background appellate members have with the sport.

community share the values that are then internalized by the younger members (Lind & Tyler, 1988). The children develop social bonds, specifically the attachment bond, and the bond becomes an important basis for acceptance of the legal values (Fine & van Rooij, 2021; Lind & Tyler, 1988; Tyler, 2021). Through these attachments, individuals develop an understanding of what ought to happen under the law (Trinkner & Tyler, 2016).

The second element of L.S. is the formation of legal attitudes (Trinkner & Tyler, 2016). Legal attitudes are essentially expressions of an individual's support or opposition towards laws and their enforcement policies (Cohn & White, 1990), their confidence or mistrust in legal authorities (Sunshine & Tyler, 2003), and their support for or against legal institutions and the idea of law itself (Piquero et al., 2005; Piquero et al., 2014). Essentially an individual's legal attitudes reflect congruence between their legal values and their lived experiences (Trinkner & Tyler, 2016). In this part of the process, individuals evaluate what they perceive to be the positives and negatives of laws and legal authorities including both the actual representation of law and the ideals of the legal system (Fine & Trinkner, In Press), and use these evaluations to develop their general attitudes (Trinkner & Tyler, 2016). Legal attitudes can be shaped both by direct and vicarious experiences with laws, regulations, policies, or authorities, which taken together are known as the *legal environment*. (Fine & Trinkner, In Press). Essentially the legal attitudes reflect an evaluation of what is actually happening with the law and legal authorities (Tyler & Trinkner, 2016). Like legal values, it is typical for legal attitudes to form early in life (Tyler & Trinkner, 2016).

The final element of the L.S. process is the formation of an individual's legal reasoning (Cohn & White, 1990; Finkenauer, 1995; Tapp & Kohlberg, 1971; Trinkner & Tyler, 2016; Tyler & Trinkner, 2016). During the legal reasoning process, individuals develop a framework or cognitive schema about laws, rights, and legal responsibilities that have been formed as a response to either direct or indirect experiences with the enforcement authorities (Trinkner & Tyler, 2016). This framework or schema allows the individual to use their legal values and legal attitudes to make sense of the legal environment (Trinkner & Tyler, 2016). Essentially, legal reasoning is the element of L.S. that creates meaning to help the individual understand the world around them (Cohn & White, 1990; Tapp, 1991; White 2001). Legal reasoning is also the mechanism that allows individuals to critically evaluate how the law aligns with their perceptions of the law's purpose and how the law should function (Tapp, 1991).

However, it is important to note that L.S. is not about creating blind obedience to or unthinking acceptance of rules, decisions, or authorities, but rather the legal reasoning aspect allows individuals to recognize when legal systems should be obeyed and when they should not be obeyed (Tyler & Trinkner, 2018; Trinkner & Tyler, 2016). Essentially, L.S. provides a framework for not only understanding why individuals obey laws, but also why they may reject or resist the laws and legal authorities (Cohn & White, 1990; Hogan & Mills, 1976; Tapp & Levine, 1974). Individuals do not view all rules as equally appropriate and recognize that there are situations where they have an obligation to not accept or obey unjust rules, decisions, or authorities (Bocchiaro & Zimbardo, 2010; Kelman & Hamilton, 1989). In these instances, individuals will reject the legal authority or laws and refuse to comply if their critical evaluation leads them to believe the system

is contradicting the values, which they feel it should be based upon (Jackson et al., 2013). Therefore, critical evaluation may lead individuals to engage in critical noncompliance where they speak out against or disobey the laws they feel are unjust (Fine & Trinkner, In Press). For instance, during the civil rights movement, individuals engaged in critical noncompliance because they felt the criminal legal system was not representing the values of equality and liberty upon which it was supposed to be based (Robins & Darley, 1995; Trinkner & Tyler, 2018). Thus, critical noncompliance is necessary to ensure the legal system is upholding the norms of society and to demand change when it is not (Tyler & Trinkner, 2018). L.S. should, therefore, allow individuals to (1) understand the assumptions upon which the law is based and to critically evaluate the law, and (2) apply this information to determine when it is appropriate to comply or not comply with the law (Tyler & Trinkner, 2018).

Differences in Values and Experiences Create Limitations for Laws and Authorities

How individuals are socialized impacts their views of the legal system and authorities, (Trinkner & Tyler, 2016), and the socialization of these values can vary from group to group, from person to person, and from time to time (Fine & Trinkner, In Press; Lind & Tyler 1988). As a result, the law does not always reflect everyone's values, and when the law is inconsistent with an individual's moral values or is seen as unfair or oppressive, the individual will have little motivation to cooperate with the authority or obey laws (Rattner et al., 2003; Robinson & Darley, 1995). L.S. assumes that the laws will reflect the will of the community and, as such, everyone benefits from the legal system and social order it creates (Tyler, 2021); however, in addition to possessing different values, it is likely that not all subgroups will experience or relate to legal

authority in similar ways (Cardwell et al., 2021; Cavanagh et al., 2021; Piccirillo et al., 2021; Shook et al., 2021). As such, the benefits or burdens of the legal system are not always fairly distributed, which can create feelings of injustice and cynicism among some community members (Myers, 2021; Tyler, 2021). When individuals experience feelings of cynicism towards the laws because of these differential experiences, they critically evaluate the law as unjust, leading to rejection of the law even if the law is accepted or supported by most community members and authority figures (Fine & Trinkner, In Press). When individuals reject the law in these instances, they are also rejecting the values of those in power (Kapsis, 1978), thus the law creates conflict between the authority figures and the community member. When this happens, community members will view the law as non-binding in their lives (Kapsis, 1978), which may lead to withdrawing from the community, speaking out against the law, and disobeying the law or authority (Fine & Trinkner, In Press; Murphy, 2021; Piquero et al., 2005). Cases where many community members have been ostracized by law or legal authority, where procedural justice has not been implemented, when the legal system has repeatedly failed to solve conflicts, or when the legal authority has consistently not produced positive outcomes, can result in a loss of widespread support for the legal system, loss of legitimacy, and thus loss of voluntary compliance with law and authority (Easton, 1975; Justice & Mears, 2014; Tyler 2009).

Coercive Models and Consensual Models

The coercive model and the consensual model are two models that have been given attention under the L.S. framework. Both models are used to explain individuals' orientations toward the law and legal authority (Trinkner & Tyler, 2016). The coercive

model embraces the notion that individuals' actions are driven by their self-interest and instrumentality, where they see following rules and authorities as appropriate when it benefits them or provides a means to their desired end goals. (Lind & Tyler, 1988; Trinkner & Tyler, 2016). The consensual model is more relational in nature, focusing on how the connections between group members shape behavior and are driven by group dynamics and group norms. This model recognizes that humans are motivated, at the most basic level, by the need to belong (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). Therefore, in the consensual model, individuals learn what the group views as acceptable behavior and follow these expectations based on feelings of duty and legitimacy (Tyler, 1997; Tyler & Blader, 2003; Tyler & Lind, 1992). Although the two models developed in response to the differing approaches to social control (Trinkner & Tyler, 2016), aspects of both models are typically present within the same rule system. As a result, in L.S. literature, whenever one model is considered, it is often juxtaposed against the other (see for example Trinkner & Tyler, 2016; Tyler 2009). Therefore, consideration will be given to each of these models in turn.

Coercive Model

The coercive model draws upon theories of rational choice and deterrence and suggests that individuals are concerned with their own outcomes and seek out opportunities that will provide them with the most benefit (Lind & Tyler, 1988; Trinkner & Tyler, 2016). Under a coercive orientation, individuals' behaviors are driven by an assessment of risks and rewards; they are more likely to obey or cooperate with legal authorities when doing so benefits their self-interest (Tyler, 2004). Authorities often use threats and fear of punishment to alter individuals' risk calculations to achieve

compliance (Collins, 2007; Pratt et al., 2006; Trinkner & Tyler, 2016). Compliance can also be achieved by reducing the potential rewards associated with rule violation (Brezina, 2002). For instance, rewards for car thefts can be reduced by making the cars undrivable through the installation of ignition cutoff devices (Viscusi, 1986) or, for drugs sales, the rewards can be diminished by reducing the demand for illegal goods which will in turn reduce prices (Belenko & Spohn, 2015). These coercive strategies tend to result in motivation to follow the law only to the extent that individuals feel they will be caught and punished if they disobey (Tyler, 2004).

Rational Choice Theory

Rational choice theory (RCT) stems from economic models of human behavior and suggests that all individuals will make decisions that maximize benefits and minimize costs (Allen, 2002; Cornish & Clark, 1986). Under this model, individuals engage either initially or continuously in rule-violating behavior because they have assessed that they will receive greater benefits relative to potential costs from the illegal activity than from legal activity (Allen, 2002). Under RCT models, individuals engage in a cost-benefit analysis before deciding on actions, such as rule violation or engagement in activities that are deemed criminal (Easton & Rockerbie, 2005). However, just because an individual engages in a calculation does not mean it will be done in a slow, complete, or accurate manner (Cornish & Clark, 1986). Decisions to engage in rule violations or behavior deemed criminal are shaped by the individuals' skill, the availability of alternative legal options, personal preferences for taking risks, the likelihood of detection, and the possibility of sanctions for the act (Allen, 2005). From this perspective, the function of law and legal authorities is to ensure the rewards of illegal behavior never

outweigh the costs (Trinkner & Tyler, 2016). This is achieved by either minimizing rewards or by increasing the potential cost of rule-violating or criminal behavior (Becker, 1968). The most common approach is to increase the cost by increasing sanctions (Cornish & Clarke, 1986). In motocross and supercross, officials increase the cost of rule-violating behavior by increasing the penalty a rider receives when they repeat an offense or by deciding to increase the penalty given for an offense that riders are consistently violating.

Sports research has found support for the idea that increasing the costs decreases rule-violating behavior. In hockey, high costs of rule-violating behavior, such as having to play with fewer players during a power play penalty period which makes goal-scoring easier, in general were associated with fewer rule violations (Allen, 2002). Thus, according to Allen (2002) and Jewell (2009), when non-rule-violating behavior provides greater benefits, such as keeping the maximum number of players allowed on the ice, players were less likely to engage in rule-violating behavior. The decrease in rule violations for hockey players was found both when the referees were enforcing violations and when they were not, so the threat of a violation alone was effective in deterring the behavior (Allen, 2002). Similarly, in soccer, when rule-violating behavior was more likely to result in expulsion from the game, players were more likely to follow the rules and referees were less likely to have to discipline players (Jewell, 2009).

Deterrence

Deterrence theory is often discussed in conjunction with RCT because it plays an important role in influencing the cost side of the RCT assessment (Witt, 2005). There are three main components of deterrence theory: severity, celerity, and certainty (Beccaria,

1963[1764] & Bentham, [1988[1789]). The severity component states the punishment must be severe enough to overcome the gain caused by the rule-breaking or criminal act. Multiple studies on severity and soccer found that increasing the severity of a possible sanction for soccer players led to a decrease in their rule-violating behavior (Heckelman & Yates, 2003; Stephenson & Walcott, 2012; VanDerwerken et al., 2018). Although the lightest penalty in motocross and supercross is a warning, most penalties are seen as severe because they impact riders monetarily (fines and points deductions), they impact race and ultimately championship standing (time penalty, points, or position deductions), or in extreme cases, they can impact riders' ability to compete if a rider is given a forfeiture of license penalty (AMA, 2022a; AMA Pro Racing, 2022c).

The celerity component indicates punishment must be swift because when the punishment is immediate, it creates a stronger and longer-lasting association between crime and punishment. The celerity component is present in sports, as most sports punishments are delivered either immediately or within a short timeframe after the offense takes place (Groombridge, 2016). In motocross and supercross, most rule violations are reviewed immediately, and penalties are typically handed out right after the stage of the event in which the rule violation occurs and are published by the AMA online, where they can be accessed by anyone after the race (Kendra, 2022).

The certainty component refers to the probability of apprehension and punishment for rule-breaking or criminal acts (Beccaria, 1963[1764]; Bentham, 1988[1789]). Researchers have studied the concept of increasing certainty in sports by looking at incidents where the number of referees had been increased and found mixed results. For hockey, increasing the number of referees had no impact on rule-violating behavior

(Levitt, 2002; Heckelman & Yates, 2003), yet for basketball (Heckelman & Yates, 2003; McCormick & Tollison, 1989) and football (Kitchens et al., 2019), increasing the number of referees decreased rule violating behavior. In motocross and supercross, riders' actions are closely monitored by trackside officials who are on the lookout for rule violators as well as by the multitude of cameras present, such as network broadcast cameras, zipline cameras, drone cameras, and small personal recording devices mounted on riders' helmets or bikes. All of this leads to a higher certainty that riders will be caught if they choose to violate rules.

Scholars have differentiated between specific and general deterrence (Zimring & Hawkins, 1973), recognizing that both experiences with punishment and punishment avoidance shape individuals' perceptions of these concepts (Stafford & Warr, 1993). Essentially, every time an individual violates a rule, they can either be punished for the act or have no consequence for their behavior and their experience shapes their perceptions of the probability of being apprehended and punished for a crime (Stafford & Warr, 1993). Under this framing, specific deterrence consists of any deterrent effect related to the direct experience of either punishment or punishment avoidance (Stafford & Warr, 1993). General deterrence occurs when individuals are deterred from committing an action based on their indirect experiences with punishment or punishment avoidance (Stafford & Warr, 1993).

It is argued that if punishment is severe, swift, and certain, the individual will rationally calculate that there is more to be lost than gained by committing the rule-breaking or illegal act and will therefore be deterred from committing it. In addition, the proposed punishment should be tied to the specific offense and made proportional to the

offense (Beccaria, 1963[1764]; Bentham, 1988[1789]). Deterrence-based approaches are dominant within the criminal legal system (Trinkner & Tyler, 2016) and include practices such as hot spots policing (Braga, 2009), mandatory minimum sentences (Schulhofer, 1993), and three strikes laws (Tyler & Boeckman, 1997).

Limitations of Coercive Approaches in General

Coercive approaches are the dominant model in the criminal legal system and include police militarization (Moule et al., 2019), scared straight programs (Lundman, 1993; Petrosino et al., 2006), boot camps (MaKenzie & Piquero, 1994; Zhang, 2000), the death penalty (Bedau, 1964; Radelet & Akers, 1996; Sellin, 1959), and widespread use of mass surveillance technology through access to CCTV and personal security cameras (Aguilar, 2018; Byers, 2018; Friedman, 2017; La Vinge et al., 2011). Although coercive approaches are dominant, there are limitations and drawbacks to the model. Coercive authorities are unable to eliminate private disobedience (disobedience occurring in non-public settings) and cannot assure compliance when mechanisms of control, such as surveillance, are removed (Tyler & Lind, 1992). The coercive model fails to encourage individuals to self-regulate and disregards the importance of fostering personal obligations to the community, therefore it does not promote voluntary compliance with laws and legal authority (Tyler, 2004; Tyler, 2009). When dominance and force are used by authority figures to control the community's behavior, individuals may develop cynical attitudes leading to feelings that the laws and authority are illegitimate (Carr et al., 2007; Gau & Bruson, 2010), which in turn can lead to increases in behavior deemed criminal (Fagan & Tyler, 2005; Jackson et al., 2013; Kirk & Papachristos, 2011; Kirk et al., 2012; Tyler, 2006a; Tyler & Jackson 2013; Tyler et al., 2014). Furthermore, when

individuals consider the law in only rational terms, they focus on personal gains and losses, choosing the option that provides the greatest benefit, therefore ignoring social or personal norms that would otherwise serve to control their behavior through a sense of obligation to obey the law or cooperate with authority (Tyler, 2004; Tyler, 2009).

Another argument is that, even when individuals choose not to engage in illegal behavior under coercive models, they may develop negative feelings about the legal system and its authority figures (Sampson & Bartusch, 1998). The lack of compliance with the coercive system from other individuals in the community can make them doubt the ability of the legal system or authority to control behavior and may thus create cynical feelings about the authority (Sampson & Bartusch, 1998). This may lead to alienation and resentment between the public and the authority or enforcement figures (Delgado, 2008). The ill effects of coercive models are not limited to the criminal legal system; research with youths and adults in both legal and non-legal contexts has shown that a reliance on sanctions and force can encourage rule-violating behavior (Hoeve et al., 2009; Huizinga et al., 2004; Petrosino et al., 2010; Piquero & Porgarsky, 2002; Trinkner et al., 2012), particularly when the authority in the system is viewed as illegitimate or the group members hold cynical attitudes to authority or rules (Fagan & Tyler, 2005; Kirk et al., 2012; Tyler et al., 2014). Additionally, this rule-breaking effect is stronger when the punishments are harsh, disrespectful, or seen as unfair (Sherman, 1993).

Limitations of Deterrence

Although some research has shown that deterrence can be effective in shaping law-abiding behavior (Chalfin & McCrary, 2014; Nagin, 1998), these effects are typically small or weak (D'Alessio & Scolzenberg, 1998; Nagin & Pogarsky, 2001; Pratt &

Cullen, 2005; Pratt et al., 2006; Tonry, 2008; Weisburd et al., 1995). In their meta-analysis, Pratt & Cullen (2005), found the effects of deterrence variables on engagement in illegal activities were either modest or negligible. When considering the specific components of deterrence, research has noted the certainty of punishment may have a small effect (D'Alessio & Stolzenberg, 1998; Tonry, 2008), but generally, it is not related to future crime reduction (Agnew, 2001). The effect of severity of punishment is generally smaller than the effect of certainty (Nagin & Pogarsky, 2001; Pratt et al., 2006), and is typically not related to future reductions in crime (Agnew, 2001; Paternoster, 2010). Increases in severity typically have little or no effects on engagement in illegal activity (Klepper & Nagin, 1989; Nagin, 1998). Likewise, the swiftness of punishment is generally found to not be related to future engagement in acts deemed criminal (Nagin & Pogarsky, 2001). Studies that have found support for deterrence theories are typically methodologically weak and fail to control for other variables (Paternoster, 1987; Pratt & Cullen, 2005; Pratt et al., 2006).

It has been argued that deterrence theory is simple-minded as it does not consider the complexities of the human environment and behaviors (Henson et al., 2022; Von Hentig, 1938). Often when additional factors are taken into consideration, the predictive power of deterrence variables decreases (Pratt et al., 2006). For example, research consistently finds that deterrence variables are outweighed by other nonlegal or extralegal factors such as indicators of concentrated disadvantage, peer effects, or self-control (Bauchman et al., 1992; Grasmick & Bursik, 1990; MacCoun, 1993; Nagin, 1998; Paternoster, 2006; Pratt & Cullen, 2005; Pratt et al., 2006; Williams & Hawkins, 1986). Similarly, research consistently finds that legal values and attitudes are better predictors

of behavior than sanction-driven processes (Cohn & White, 1990; Fagan & Tyler, 2005; Huq et al., 2011; Sunshine & Tyler, 2003; Tyler & Fagan, 2008; Tyler & Jackson, 2014). Essentially, individuals are more likely to follow the law or consent to legal authorities because of the values, attitudes, and beliefs they hold about the legal system than their fear of being punished by the authorities (Meares et al., 2004; Sampson & Bartusch, 1998; Tapp, 1991; Trinkner & Tyler, 2016; Tyler, 2004; Tyler, 2009).

For deterrence to be effective, certain assumptions must be met. For instance, individuals must know both laws and punishments (Ball, 1955) and there must be mechanisms in place to ensure individuals are caught when they violate laws (Appel & Peterson, 1965). The overwhelming number of laws on the books makes it nearly impossible for individuals to know all laws and punishments (Van Rooij & Fine, 2021). Additionally, the public does not know much about the maximum and minimum punishments for offenses and is often unaware of when these punishments change (Paternoster, 2010; Zimring & Hawkins, 1973). Many ethnographic accounts have found that not only is the severity of punishment unknown, but also individuals are unaware of the probability of being caught, arrested, or convicted (Shover, 1996; Tunnell, 1992; Viscusi, 1986; Wright & Decker, 1994; Wright & Decker, 1997). To meet the certainty component of deterrence, there would need to be constant surveillance to ensure the threat is ever present, which would require significant resources (Appel & Peterson, 1965; Mears, 2000; Tyler, 2004). Thus, having mechanisms in place to ensure individuals are caught is expensive, difficult to carry out, and time-consuming (Raven & French, 1958).

Finally, using deterrence to control individuals may undermine trust within the community (Mooijman et al., 2017). When authorities use deterrence as their main mechanism of control, they are signaling to community members that they feel these sanctions are needed because people would break the laws without the sanctions (Mooijman et al., 2017). This indicates that they feel all individuals are likely to break the law even when they have not done so, thus indicating that they do not trust their community members, making community members less supportive of and less likely to obey the authority (Mooijman et al., 2017). Mooijman and colleagues (2017) found across multiple samples, contexts, and sanctions that people felt more distrustful if the sanctions were justified as attempts to deter individuals from breaking the rules, and this distrust in turn decreased their willingness to comply with the rules.

Consensual Model

As mentioned previously, the consensual model is more relational in nature in that it focuses on the importance of connection and belonging for group members and uses these human desires to promote rule-following. Consensual models, therefore, are based primarily on internalized group norms, or what the group feels is acceptable and unacceptable behavior, and group dynamics, or how the group functions. When individuals feel the law and authority represent justice and fair play, they perceive the system as legitimate, understand the necessity of its rules, and thus deem this form of social control acceptable (Jackson et al., 2012; Jackson et al., 2013). Under the consensual model, a positive relationship with authority and the legal system is built on shared norms and values, as well as feelings of mutual respect, which promotes support for the system, compliance with its laws, and cooperation with the authorities (Fagan &

Tyler, 2005; Jackson et al., 2013; Piquero et al., 2014; Trinkner & Cohn, 2014; Tyler & Fagan, 2008). Therefore, laws are most effective when they are in line with the existing customs or conventions of a group (Ball, 1955). On the other hand, when laws conflict with the values or norms of the community, the laws may become problematic, as the community may no longer see the authority as pursuing their collective interests, undermining the relationship with authority (Ball, 1955; Mooijman et al., 2017).

Although socialization occurs in both models, it plays an especially important role in consensual models, since consent-based approaches require a society or group that has acquired appropriate norms about the law and authority to be effective (Tyler, 2006b). Individuals in consensual models should then view society as most effective when the rule systems are fair and community members are following the rules (Trinkner & Tyler, 2016). When the system meets these norms and expectations, people voluntarily recognize the authority and are accepting of its power (Beetham, 1991; Huq et al., 2016; Tyler & Jackson, 2014). Essentially, here the internalized values and norms match with the kind of relationship individuals want and expect to have with their authority figures (Tyler & Trinkner, 2016).

Three Value Dimensions of Consensual Models

In a consensual model, three value dimensions are working together to shape an individual's relationship with the law (Tyler & Trinkner, 2016). The first dimension focuses on values related to how authorities should make decisions (Trinkner & Tyler, 2016). Individuals are more likely to accept decisions when they are administered neutrally, consistently, clearly, and transparently (Tyler, 2006a). On the other hand, if the authorities are making biased decisions that are based on their self-interest rather than the

interest of the community, then the community members will be dissatisfied with the authorities and less likely to accept their decisions (De Cremer & Van Kippenberg 2002; Mooijman et al., 2017; Tyler 2006a). Additionally, in any decision-making process where authorities are making or applying rules, individuals feel better when they have the opportunity to participate (Anderson & Otto, 2003; Cohn et al., 2000; Thibaut & Walker, 1975).

The second value dimension focuses on concerns about how legal authorities treat individuals (Trinkner & Tyler, 2016). Consensual models support relationships where authority figures treat individuals with respect and dignity, are open and honest, and show interest or concern for individuals and their circumstances (Mulder & Nelissen, 2010; Tyler, 1997; Tyler & Blader, 2003; Trinkner & Tyler, 2016). When authority figures treat group members fairly, the authority signals to the member that they have positive status within the group (Justice & Meares, 2014).

The third dimension of values captures individuals' beliefs about the boundaries of legal authority (Trinkner & Tyler, 2016). Legal authorities do not have control over all situations or all behaviors (Smetana, 2002; Tyler & Trinkner, 2016). Therefore, authority figures must understand which situations and behaviors are acceptable for them to have control over and in which instances they need to recognize the autonomy and privacy of individuals under their control (Trinkner & Tyler, 2016; Tyler & Trinkner, 2016). For instance, in motocross and supercross, it is appropriate for the officials to have authority over riders during racing events and while they are in the pits; however, it would be inappropriate for them to have authority over riders at their practice or test tracks or their

personal residence. This dimension is still being developed so it is currently the weakest of the three (Tyler & Trinkner, 2016).

Group Dynamics and Socialization

Social behavior and norms of individuals do not exist in a vacuum and are often influenced or shaped by the groups that individuals belong to, thus consensual models are viewed as relational models. When thinking about groups, it is necessary to consider the role of group procedures, identities, and attachments. Group procedures specify formal or informal social processes used to regulate group activity (Lind & Tyler, 1988). The more an individual is attached or involved in a group, the more procedural fairness will matter to them (Leventhal, 1980). These procedures are important for developing group harmony and loyalty (Lind & Tyler, 1988). For instance, if a group lacks uniformity and does not strictly adhere to consistent rules, the group will likely experience discord, leading to questions surrounding procedural fairness (Leventhal, 1980). When individuals feel group decisions are made fairly, they are more likely to establish long-term commitments to the group (Lind & Tyler, 1988). Essentially, having fair procedures within the group reassures members that their interests will be protected and advanced by the group (Lind & Tyler, 1988).

The identity of the group itself focuses on factors that distinguish the group in question from other groups (Lind & Tyler, 1988). However, groups also can impact the identity of their members, as one important function of groups is to provide individuals with a way of shaping their social identities (Tyler & Blader, 2003). Essentially, individuals choose to be a part of a group because the group provides feedback to the individual, which the individual uses to create and maintain their identity (Tyler &

Blader, 2003). Groups, therefore, can shape individuals' views of themselves and can inform their sense of well-being or worth (Hogg & Abrams, 1988; Sedikides & Brewer, 2001). This identity is composed of three aspects: identification, pride, and respect (Tyler & Blader, 2003). The identification component focuses on the extent to which an individual merges their sense of self and their judgments about the group (Tyler & Blader, 2003). One sports study examining football players found that those who identified weakly with the group were more likely to disengage from the group if they committed an act contrary to group norms (Täuber & Sassenberg, 2012). The pride component reflects the individual's assessment of the status of their group, whereas the respect component deals with the individual's evaluation of their personal status within the group. How strongly an individual identifies with the group impacts how much they will ultimately cooperate with that group (Tyler & Blader, 2003).

The development of attachments between group members is necessary for members to internalize, accept, and comply with group values (Lind & Tyler, 1988; Tyler & McGraw, 1986). If individuals see themselves as belonging to a group and this group attachment is meaningful to them, they will want to preserve this attachment by bringing their behavior in line with group norms and standards (Van Rooij & Fine, 2021). Thus, identification with the group is one of the strongest determinants of an individual's adherence to group norms (Täuber & Sassenberg, 2012; Terry & Hogg, 1996; Terry et al, 1999; Turner et al., 1987) and prevents most deviant behavior (Toby, 1964).

In sports, group norms are established for competition, as well as practice and the off-season (Colman & Carron, 2001; Munroe et al., 1999). In motocross and supercross, group norms are established through the creation of what is known as appropriate rider

etiquette, which riders are exposed to at a very young age (MX Sports, 2022). Research finds that females in team sports have stronger perceptions of group norms than males (Bruner et al., 2014). For example, females indicated that a greater percentage of their teammates would be critical of them if they were lacking in productivity, concentration, and attendance, were unsupportive of teammates, and did not interact with others, than males did (Bruner et al., 2014). Members of individual sports groups compete on their own, but all belong to one sport; therefore, they have limited interaction and communication with each other and were found to have weak normative expectations (Colman & Carron, 2001). When individuals identify with the group and value the group membership, they will fear the peer disapproval, embarrassment, or social stigma that may be associated with deviant behavior and thus are discouraged from engaging in it (Andenas, 1974; Nagin & Paternoster, 1994; Tittle, 1980; Zimring & Hawkins, 1973). For motocross and supercross riders, the fear of disapproval or stigma is very prevalent because they are often switching teams when contracts are up, and they cannot afford to have a bad reputation, as this might affect their career opportunities. Valuing and adhering to group rules are important, for both the individual as well as for the group, since group well-being is influenced by the well-being of the individual and vice versa. The more people comply with group rules, the better the group functions and the more satisfied individuals are (Deutsch, 1975).

Additional Factors

Although the coercive and the consensual models typically receive much of the attention under the L.S. framework, when scholars are seeking to determine why individuals follow rules and defer to authority figures, it has been acknowledged that

additional factors may influence this behavior. For instance, recent research on L.S. has considered the impact of emotionality (Cole et al., 2021), individual characteristics (Fine & van Rooij, 2021), national identity (Wolfe & McLean, 2021), and intimate relationships (Forrest, 2021) on behavior. Therefore, any time L.S. is being applied to a new context, it is important to consider what context-specific factors may play a role in shaping individuals' rule-following behavior.

In the context of motocross and supercross, it is anticipated that rule-following behavior will be influenced by stage, timing, and rider identity. Both the motocross nationals and the supercross rounds have several different stages at each event in the series. The stakes are different for each stage and the informal rider rules system/rider etiquette takes this into account, thus riders' views on what is acceptable riding behavior change based on the stage of the event. Specifically, in stages where the stakes are perceived to be higher, the informal rule system supports riders engaging in different behaviors, including more aggressive maneuvers. In both sports, riders participate in free practice, timed qualifying sessions, and last chance qualifiers (LCQs). Free practice allows riders to get familiar with the track and is thus seen as very low stakes. Timed qualifying sessions determine both entry into the main races as well as gate pick³ and are, therefore, more crucial as riders need to make it to the main races to earn points and purse money. LCQs are for riders who did not qualify out of the other necessary stages (timed

³ The start of a motocross or supercross race occurs behind a metal barrier known as a starting gate. The starting gate is composed of individual gates for each rider that are controlled by a central system. There are 22 gates for a supercross race and 40 gates for a motocross race. Riders get to select which gate they would like to start behind. The process where riders' chooses a gate and where they ultimately line up is known as gate pick. The order in which riders get to choose their gate is based on their position in qualifying.

qualifying in motocross and heat races in supercross) and are therefore very high stakes because if riders do not make it out of this race, they lose all hopes of earning points and money for the day (AMA, 2022b; AMA Pro Racing, 2022a). In motocross, after the LCQs, riders participate in two motos or points-delivering races (AMA Pro Racing, 2022a). The points for each moto are combined to generate an overall score for the day, with the rider who has the most points winning, and in the event of a tie, the rider with the better second moto finish wins the tiebreaker (AMA Pro Racing, 2022a). In supercross, after the timed-qualifying riders participate in timed heat races where the top nine finishers advance to the main event, which is a points-delivering race (AMA, 2022b). Those who do not make it out of the heat races are sent to the LCQs, where only the top four riders advance (AMA, 2022b). Riders then participate in the one-timed main event and earn points based on their finish, which counts for the championship (AMA, 2022b). Positions for motocross overall, supercross main event, and final championship standings, are often tied to large bonus checks for riders, again creating a high-stakes environment.

The stakes for riders are also influenced by the timing during each stage. Motocross and supercross stages are formatted to be certain lengths of time plus an additional lap (supercross) or two laps (motocross). Riders are aware of how much time is left in a race, as this information can be communicated to them by their mechanic on the pit board every lap. Riders are also given special signals by an official to indicate when they are halfway through a stage (crossed flags) and when they are on the last lap (white flag) (AMA Pro Racing, 2022c; AMA 2022a). During a race, the stakes are seen as higher towards the end of the race when riders are running out of opportunities to

improve their track position. As with the stages, when the stakes are higher, riders acknowledge that individuals will be more desperate to improve their results, and thus the informal rule system/rider etiquette has been formulated to consider the different stakes. As such, riders are more willing to condone aggressive riding behavior from other racers during the latter part of a race than riders would be at the beginning of a race. Therefore, what is acceptable is likely to change based on the timing during the stage.

Finally, each rider has a unique rider identity composed of several different factors, which can influence how other riders race them. The first aspect of rider identity is their actual riding style. Some riders are known to have an aggressive riding style and, therefore, if someone is trying to make a pass on them, it is more likely that they will either attempt to push the rider off track or will make contact with the rider. As a result, this aggressive riding style impacts how the other riders approach decisions when racing near them. The second component of the rider's identity is their standing in the championship. Riders are more likely to race individuals who are close to them in the championship standings harder than they are riders who are much higher in the standing than they are. In fact, in some instances, riders may be specifically told to not interfere with riders who are in a tight battle for first place in the championship (Lucas Oil Pro Motocross Championship, 2022). The last component of rider identity is the rider type. There are three main types of riders: privateers (riders who race mostly on their own dime with limited sponsorship), satellite riders (members of a team that receive some support from the manufacturer), and factory riders (who receive full support from the manufacturer). This part of rider identity impacts the amount of support a rider has and thus, can influence not only the type of equipment the rider has, but also how other riders

respond to them. Riders who have more prestige, such as those on factory teams, may be treated/raced differently than those who are on the lower ends of the rider hierarchy.

Summary

In summation, L.S. scholars have called for the expansion of L.S. into new contexts and one area ripe for this expansion is sporting contexts. Sports, including motocross and supercross, have the necessary characteristics of a non-legal rule system, such as rules, penalties, authorities, procedures, and appeals. According to L.S., legal values and attitudes are developed at a young age as individuals engage in different rule systems. Motocross and supercross riders often start in the sport and are first exposed to the rule system around the age of four (MX Sports, 2022), so it is one of the first rule systems they are exposed to. Additionally, in the motocross and supercross rule systems, riders are subject to aspects of the coercive model, such as the swift application of punishments and penalties that are designed to be severe enough to prevent rule violation. At the same time, riders are subject to aspects of the consensual model, through the development of rider group values and norms around what is acceptable and unacceptable behavior and the creation of riding etiquette, which prompts voluntarily obeying rules and authority figures. The current study heeded the call for the expansion of L.S. by applying the L.S. framework to motocross and supercross. L.S. researchers often juxtapose coercive and consensual models within their rule system. Keeping with this tradition, the current research considered both the impact of coercive models and consensual models on rider adherence to formal and informal rules. The research also captured any additional factors that influence rider behavior and decision-making.

CHAPTER 3

METHODS

This study sought to gain a holistic understanding of L.S., coercive models, and consensual models in the context of motocross and supercross by using in-depth, semi-structured interviews. L.S. focuses on the process by which individuals develop values, attitudes, and legal reasoning about rule systems. However, for individuals to develop these legal elements, they must first know about the rule systems. Therefore, the first research question was: how do riders develop an understanding of formal and informal rules and penalties? To address this research question, participants were asked questions about how they learned about official rules and penalties, as well as changes to these rules and penalties. Riders also created informal rules and penalties as a group; therefore, participants were asked to explain how they learned about unofficial or unspoken rider rules.

Coercive models are used to promote adherence to law and legal authorities through a process that increases the cost of engaging in rule-violating behavior. This aspect was assessed through the research question: how do coercive models influence riders' techniques and decision-making during racing events? To capture information about the coercive model, the interviewer asked questions on how rules impact their riding behavior, how penalties impact their rider behavior, whether knowledge of a penalty alone impacts behavior, and whether riders have time to think about rules and penalties while racing.

Consensual models promote adherence to the law and legal authorities through more relational methods, centered on norms of fairness, justice, and group dynamics. To

capture this aspect, the researcher asked: how do consensual models influence riders' techniques and decision-making during racing events? To capture different norms of fairness and justice, participants were asked to explain if rules and penalties are applied equally to all riders, if the penalties fit with rule violations, and whether opinions about the penalty process would be affected if rules were always applied consistently, equally, and in a fair manner to all riders. Riders were also asked to provide their views on protest procedures. To capture group effects, riders were asked to discuss how group members develop and enforce unofficial or unspoken group behavior rules.

Research on L.S. typically juxtaposes coercive and consensual models and finds consensual factors to be most prominent in explanations of behavior. However, aspects of each model may influence behavior to some degree. Promoting rule-following behavior and deference to authority is important, as this allows the sport to run smoothly. Having rules in general protects rights, helps ensure safety, reduces or provides a way to handle conflict, and creates order, predictability, and consistency. Since rule-following and deference to authority are important for the sport to function, it is helpful to develop an approach that best promotes these behaviors. To do this, it is necessary to know which aspects have the strongest effect on behavior. To determine this in the current context, the researcher asked two research questions: what aspects of coercive models have the most prominent impact on influencing riders' techniques and decision-making during racing events, and what aspects of the consensual model have the most prominent impact on influencing riders' techniques and decision-making during racing events. To get at these research questions, riders were asked to explain their motives for following rules they

agree with, as well as motivations for following rules they do not agree with. Riders were also asked to explain what they think has the biggest impact on their riding behavior.

Although coercive and consensual models are the primary focus for understanding why individuals follow the laws and defer to authorities under the L.S. framework, researchers have acknowledged that these are not the only factors that influence behavior. Understanding what these additional factors are in each rule system can provide insight into future directions of exploration in other rule systems. This is addressed through the research question: what additional factors influence riders' techniques and decision-making during racing events? This part of the research is meant to be exploratory in nature since it is the first time this rule system has been explored, so it is not known what all the additional factors may be. The researcher has been exposed to the sport for over 20 years through attending racing events, reading motocross and supercross publications, following riders and other relevant social media pages, and engaging with members of the motorcycle industry. As a result of this background knowledge, the researcher anticipated that stage, timing, and identity might be relevant factors in this context. Therefore, riders were asked how the timing during events and stages of an event impact their behaviors, as well as how the identity of the other rider impacts their behavior. For identity, this incorporates aspects of who the other rider is beyond just their name, such as their riding style, standing in the championship, and rider type (privateer, satellite, and factory). Riders were also asked to describe any additional factors that come into play when making decisions during racing events.

At the start of the interview, riders were asked to explain how they first got into the sport, which often illuminated any family involvement with the sport. Riders were

asked to describe their racing career, with specific attention given to the age they started riding/racing, the age they turned pro, and whether they race both motocross and supercross. To capture potential differences that they may experience throughout their riding career, riders were asked to discuss the different brands/teams they have ridden for including if it was a privateer, satellite, or factory team, as well as any differences in team expectations, interactions, or experiences.

Qualitative Approach

Qualitative methods are typically employed in situations where the researcher seeks to develop an in-depth understanding of complex topics or to gain extensive detail about a particular issue (Creswell, 2013). This methodology fits with the current study, as the L.S. framework is composed of multiple models, elements, and pillars that must be considered. Qualitative methods also allow for the analysis of individuals' values, motivations, behaviors, and backgrounds by considering explanations from participants' perspectives (Saldaña, 2015). This is especially relevant to the current study since the L.S. framework itself is based on developing an understanding of how values, attitudes, and behaviors are shaped by an individual's unique background and experience with different rules systems and authorities.

Sampling

Inclusion Criteria

To best understand the impact of social control on rider behavior, it is necessary to gain a first-hand perspective; therefore, participants were limited to motocross or supercross riders. However, some riders only attend open track or practice days and are not subject to the official rules or sanctions that are in place for motocross or supercross

events. Thus, to be included, participants must have competed in at least one AMA-sanctioned motocross or supercross event in any season prior to the interview. After speaking with some amateur riders who engage in a limited number of local races, it was determined that these individuals did not have enough knowledge to answer many of the study questions. Therefore, the study sample was limited to only include riders who have their professional license for either Lucas Oil Pro Motocross or AMA Supercross and had raced in at least one of these events. All riders had to be 18 years or older to participate in the study. This resulted in a final sample of 21 professional motocross and supercross riders.

Sampling Methods

Two main forms of sampling were used in the study: purposive convenience sampling and snowball sampling. At professional races, the researcher discussed the study with 43 riders and provided them with flyers about the project. Of the 43 who were approached, three declined to participate, 28 expressed interest but never followed through, and 12 completed the interview. The researcher also left flyers at locations that riders frequent, such as tracks and dealerships; however, no riders responded to this recruitment tactic. The researcher used social media to recruit by posting study information on relevant Facebook group pages and sending direct messages to current riders' Facebook or Instagram accounts. The researcher contacted 169 riders through social media and received a response from 13. Of those 13 riders, one declined due to a lack of knowledge about the AMA since he had just moved to the United States, four expressed interest but never followed through, and eight completed the interview. Recruitment material for each of these methods can be found in Appendices A, B, and C.

The second research method used was snowball sampling. At the end of every interview, the researcher asked riders to pass along information about the study to any other riders that they felt would be willing to participate. Only one rider was obtained from the snowball sampling. Participants were recruited until theoretical saturation was achieved. Theoretical saturation was achieved when the patterns emerging in the data no longer produced new properties or essentially when the repetitions in interviews formed a complete theoretical model (Glaser, 2001; Low, 2019). To assess if the sampling methods resulted in a representative sample of riders, the sample was compared to publicly available rider profiles.

Sample Description

The researcher collected the select demographic information to provide context for participants' responses and allow for comparison between the sample and the population. Each participant was asked to provide information on their race/ethnicity, age, and gender. All participants were given a case number, which allowed the questionnaires to be matched up with the interviews and memos. It took riders less than five minutes to respond to the demographic questionnaire (see Appendix D). Information from the demographic questionnaires was entered into a database and basic summary statistics, such as frequencies and averages, were computed, generating the statistics presented below. To assess if the sampling methods resulted in a representative sample of riders, the sample was compared to publicly available rider profiles. Demographic information for both sample riders and all current professional motocross and supercross riders is presented in Table 1.

Table 1*Rider Demographic Information*

Demographics	Motocross	Motocross/Supercross	Sample Riders	Population ^a
Average Age				
Age Started	8.4	4.8	5.8	-
Age Turned Pro	19.8	17.9	18.5	18.5
Current Age	24.8	25.5	25.3	25.8
Race (%)				
White	83.3	93.3	90.5	96.3
Non-White	16.6	6.6	9.5	3.7
Gender (%)				
Male	83.3	93.3	90.5	98.7
Female	16.6	6.6	9.5	1.3
Rider Type (%)				
Privateer	83.3	26.6	42.8	-
Privateer/Satellite	-	46.6	33.3	-
Privateer/Factory	16.7	6.7	9.5	-
Privateer/Satellite/Factory	-	6.7	4.8	-
Satellite	-	6.7	4.8	-
Satellite/Factory	-	6.7	4.8	-

Note. Some demographic categories had additional response options but only those with data were included.

^a Population statistics were obtained from AMA Pro Racing (2022b), AMA Supercross (2022b), and RacerX (2022).

The majority of the riders in the study were White (90.5%) with 9.5% of riders identifying as Non-White.⁴ This is in line with the population where 96.3% of riders are identified as White and 3.7% are Non-White (AMA Pro Racing, 2022b; AMA Supercross 2022b; RacerX, 2022). Most riders in the study were male (90.5%), whereas only 9.5% of riders were female. This is similar to the population where 98.7% of riders are male and 1.3% of riders are female (AMA Pro Racing, 2022b; AMA Supercross 2022b;

⁴ The reason the riders' racial identities were presented as non-white instead of breaking them down into specific categories is doing so would inadvertently create a situation where participants could be identified, which would go against the promised confidentiality.

RacerX, 2022). The average age of both the study riders and the population riders when they turned professional was 18.5 years old (AMA Pro Racing, 2022b; AMA Supercross 2022b; RacerX, 2022). The average current age of study riders was 25.3 years old, which was close to the population's average current age of 25.8 years old (AMA Pro Racing, 2022b; AMA Supercross 2022b; RacerX, 2022

Additional demographic and background information was gathered from the riders in the study during the interviews. Riders in the study started riding on average at 5.8 years old. Riders in the study had been riding for an average of 19.5 years and racing at the professional level for an average of 6.6 years. Most of the riders (71.4%) participated in both motocross and supercross, with 28.6% of riders racing motocross only. Riders often changed teams and thus had the opportunity to be involved in different team formats. Most riders reported that they had only been on privateer teams (42.8%), followed by the privateer/satellite combination (33.3%), privateer/factory (9.5%), privateer/satellite/factory (4.8%), satellite (4.8%), and satellite/factory (4.8%). In addition, riders typically switched bike manufacturers. In fact, all but one rider in the study had ridden on at least two different motorcycle brands. The most common brand ridden was Honda (15), followed by Yamaha (14), Kawasaki (10), KTM (10), Husqvarna (8), Suzuki (8), and Gas Gas (6). The majority of riders (18) reported that one of the factors that got them into the sport was family, while five riders reported that seeing it on TV or in person was a factor that got them involved.⁵

⁵ The total adds up to more than 21 because some riders reported more than one factor for how they got started in the sport.

Data Collection

Interviews

After collecting the demographic data, semi-structured, in-depth interviews were conducted using open-ended questions, related to L.S. concepts. A copy of the interview protocol used in this study can be found in Appendix E. Participants were provided with a consent form before the interview began (see Appendix F) and verbal consent was obtained at the start of the interview. Eleven of the interviews were conducted over the phone and ten interviews were conducted over Zoom. The researcher obtained consent for the interviews to be recorded, as this allowed the researcher to pay better attention to the participants and for the conversation to flow more naturally. All riders consented to have their interviews recorded. Conducting remote interviews enabled participation from individuals who reside in other states, as well as from those who felt uncomfortable meeting in person due to the current Covid pandemic. The average length of the interview was 53.6 minutes. In addition to being assigned a case number, at the start of the interview, riders were asked to select a pseudonym which is employed below when discussing interview data.

Once interviews were transcribed verbatim, the recordings were deleted for privacy purposes. At the end of every interview, the researcher wrote a short memo about the interview, detailing information about the setting and participant, a broad summary of the interview and main takeaways, as well as thoughts on how to improve in the next interview. Information about the interview setting and length was input into the database containing the demographic information. All digital transcripts are stored on an ASU secure cloud, which requires two-factor authentication to access. Any hard copy notes

from the interviews are kept in a locked file cabinet in a locked office. All data will be kept for five years and will then be destroyed either by deleting digital files or by shredding hard copies⁶.

Data Analysis

In analyzing the interviews, the goal was to reduce the large volume of information into smaller manageable pieces that can be used to assess meaning (Saldaña, 2015). This was done by considering patterns in the text which were then used to create codes, categories, and themes (Saldaña, 2015). The first stage of the analysis was manual coding, which took place in three phases: open coding, axial coding, and selective coding (Strauss, 1987). In the open coding phase, the researcher began by broadly considering two types of codes: in-vivo codes and sociological constructs (Bernard & Ryan, 2010; Strauss, 1987). In-vivo codes are essentially literal words or phrases used by the riders themselves such as *money talks*, *rubbings racing*, *above the law*, and *we're all professionals* (Berg, 2004). Whereas sociological constructs are codes the researcher developed based on their knowledge of the current framework including *transparency*, *voice*, *celerity*, and *neutrality* (Berg, 2004). The goal in this stage was for the researcher to consider the data closely and ensure important categories were not missed in the analysis (Strauss, 1987).

The researcher then moved to the second stage, axial coding, where the researcher identified relationships between codes. For example, the researcher carefully considered the relationship between the codes, *money talks*, *factory bias*, *favoritism*, and *frustration*.

⁶ This study was approved by the Arizona State University Institutional Review Board. See Appendix G for the approval letter.

The researcher determined that riders who felt money talks also felt there was a bias towards factory riders, which in turn produced a system based on favoritism, leading these riders to feel frustrated about the system.

In the final stage, selective coding, the researcher developed core or main code categories (Strauss, 1987). After the new main codes were created, the researcher considered how the original codes could be nested within these new main codes. For instance, the researcher developed the new main code, *unclear information*, and then determined that the original codes, *gray area*, *vagueness*, *limited information*, *unclear rules*, and *unclear penalties*, could all be nested within this new main code.

The researcher developed an in-depth codebook to organize all the information obtained during the manual coding process. The codebook consisted of three main sections: environment, codes, and notes (Bernard & Ryan, 2010). The environment section consisted of details on the setting for the data collection. The code section embraced the typical codebook structure by including a list of all codes, the frequency in which the code arose across the transcripts, a definition of the code, and an example of the code. The notes section contained additional important information about the coding process (Bernard & Ryan, 2010).

After the coding was completed, the researcher moved into the second stage of analysis, theme development. Themes are essentially broader units of information developed through the aggregation of several similar codes to create a larger common idea (Creswell, 2013). The goal of this stage is to move beyond the actual information in the data and instead focus on the broader implications (Saldaña, 2015). For example, the researcher took the previously discussed core code, *unclear information*, and combined it

with two other core codes, *unclear procedures*, and *confusing process*, to create the theme, *lack of clarity*. Once the themes were created, the researcher pulled specific quotes from the interviews that illustrated each theme. Including specific quotes allowed the riders' voices to be heard and provided a deeper understanding of their reality (Strauss, 1987). To ensure the confidentiality of the participants, the pseudonyms the riders chose were attached to the quotes. Finally, the researcher drew connections between the themes and the L.S. framework.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

This section provides participants' perspectives on three broad topics: development, impacts, and desires. The development section covers how riders develop their legal orientations, including their values and attitudes toward rules and authorities. The impact section discusses the factors from L.S., the coercive model, and the consensual model that impact rider decision-making and behavior. The desire section addresses riders' desires for aspects of the coercive model and consensual model that are currently missing, as well as how riders can promote change.

Development

As discussed previously, L.S. explains that perspectives about rule systems and authority figures start forming at a young age and continue to develop throughout the life course, as individuals establish and refine their values and attitudes. This development process occurs in formal and informal channels and is influenced by both direct and vicarious experiences. Eventually, individuals build a framework or schema that they can easily reference to make sense of the world around them, also known as the legal reasoning process. This section uncovers the impactful experiences throughout riders' lives that have informed their perspectives of the rule system and authority within motocross and supercross.

The continuity pillar of L.S. addresses the fact that L.S. is a process that unfolds continuously over the life course, starting at a young age, where individuals learn and relearn codes of conduct based on their interactions with rules systems and authorities. Most racers started riding at a very young age and were quick to emphasize the

importance of extensive experience in developing their knowledge of the rules and expectations of racing officials. For example, Steve Little began riding at the age of five, had 19 years of personal experience racing, and ran a rider training program. Throughout his interview, Steve Little emphasized several times how the long developmental process was necessary for developing a perspective on rules and authority. He explained, “like I said, nobody gets on a dirt bike and becomes pro overnight, it takes years of experience and guidance to get to that point, so I think it just takes time to learn those things.” This sentiment was echoed by Joe Motocross, who also started riding at the age of five, and had 17 years of racing experience. Joe Motocross discussed how rules and rider etiquette are, “Something that you just grow up learning. Like there’s nobody that’s just gonna hop on a bike and then in one or within the next year turn pro, so it’s kind of something that you learn over the years.” Aligned with research on L.S., both riders describe how the development of values and attitudes about rules systems and authority figures is something that occurs over a long period of time and begins at a young age. Riders noted that this development process occurs within both formal and informal channels that they are exposed to during their time engaging in the sport.

Formal Channels

Under the L.S. framework, one way that individuals develop their values and attitudes is through exposure to formal rules aimed at managing behavior and preventing conflict. There are three main formal channels of knowledge for riders: rider’s meetings, the rulebook, and official emails. Although all riders have access to these materials, their impact on a rider’s perspective was determined by the rider’s desire to interact with the source, and the time they were willing to contribute to gain insight from these sources.

The riders acknowledged that these formal channels helped shape their perspective, but not as deeply as other informal channels.

Riders' meetings are held at the start of each race day and are designed to provide updates, discuss issues, and cover important information about the race day. Riders have participated in riders' meetings at all stages of their career. Tom Says discussed, "every race, when you go to an amateur race or a professional race, there's always a riders' meeting, and they go through like the most common rules and dos and don'ts. If anything pops up that we're doing wrong they'll say." When asked how he learned initially about the rules of the sport, Paul Small stated, "mostly from the riders' meetings... they're pretty informative at the riders' meetings." Mike Bender, on the other hand, noted how the information presented was redundant and boring, "it feels like every time you go to a rider's meeting, it's the same thing, you're just like, 'okay I know yeah, yeah,' you know you kind of drift off and no one listens."

The lack of a desire to engage with formal channels of information was perhaps best seen when considering riders' interactions with the motocross and supercross rulebooks. All riders have access to the rulebooks, as Jason Lawrence explained, "you can go to the AMA rulebook or on the AMA website and so when you're buying your yearly credentials, we do have the rulebook right there and you can click on it and look at it." However, most riders did not find the rulebook to be critical for developing an understanding of the rules of the sport or the expectations of the officials, nor did they deem reading it necessary for success in the sport. As John Smith explained, "I don't think anybody necessarily is reading every letter of the rulebook." Dale Whoop, a rider with eight years of experience at the professional level, supported John Smith's

hypothesis, “I never read an AMA rulebook in my life.” Another rider, Dawson Reed, who had been riding at the professional level for three years, similarly stated, “I never read a rulebook in my life.” Paul Small, who has engaged in the sport at the professional level for seven years, “I’ve never actually read the rulebook.”

Riders were deterred from reading the rulebook for two reasons. First, riders felt the book was too long. Second, riders found the book to be less useful than the informal knowledge they had gained over time. Considering the length of the rulebook, Ace Extreme explained, “the book is like half an inch thick!” The off-putting nature of the lengthy rulebook was also lamented by Hannah Montana,

I don’t even really know where to start just because the handbook is like 75 pages long. I mean I don’t even know how long it is just super long. It’s just too much for me to process. I feel like a lot of it is just irrelevant and you know I don’t think a lot of it is enforced so I didn’t waste my time really educating myself on it.

Many riders felt they already had a firm grasp of rules from their amateur careers and did not need to consult formal sources to know what to do as a professional. For example, Steve Little stated, “I turned pro last year, and when I turned pro, I didn’t go read the rulebook and like okay how do I know how to go racing at the pro level or anything like that.” Rather, Steve Little felt he already possessed that knowledge because of his 19 years in the sport. Riders noted that they felt most racers would have a solid enough background with the rules and the sport’s expectations by the time they turned professional. Tom Lap discussed, “it’s not very common, I think, riders are blindsided by a rule or such because they don’t read the rulebook.” In other words, the riders have enough experience and know the basic expectations of the sport so it is unlikely that they would be caught completely off guard by a specific rule.

Although riders felt they had a solid understanding of the sport's expectations by the time they turned professional, motocross and supercross are still subject to rule changes, which are communicated to riders typically through emails. As a result of the perception that emails communicating changes provide new and useful information, they were the formal source of information that riders were most likely to engage with. As Mike Bender explained, “when things change, they're usually pretty good about sending like all the riders’ emails and keeping on top of that.” This viewpoint was restated by Joe Motocross, “I mean if there’s anything important that they change, they usually send it in an email.” Riders were more likely to pay attention to and absorb these changes because they felt the email was more manageable than the formal rulebook. As Tom Lap discussed,

It’s easier to learn about a rule change than it is to learn about an actual rule that was in place because like I said most guys don’t want to parse through the rulebook but if you get an email like, ‘hey there’s a new change or an update,’ they're like okay, I’ll read that paragraph.

In addition to being shorter, riders also noted that email communications made it easy to see specific changes. Max Speed explained, “any revisions or updates, they notate in red.” Max Speed noted this made it easy to quickly look at an email and identify a change. Even with the ease of understanding the email communication, it was still ultimately up to the rider to take responsibility for accessing the information. Mike Bender noted, “they have emails, if you don’t pay attention to that, you’re not in the loop,” stressing that the riders must take initiative to read the emails.

Informal Channels

According to the L.S. framework, individuals may also develop their legal values and legal attitudes through direct and vicarious experiences with both formal and informal rule systems. As such for riders, being immersed in the sport was one of the ways riders most commonly learned about formal rules and penalties. When asked how he learned about rules and penalties, Chase McDonald explained, “just by like racing, I think, you know, like the more races you do, the more you kind of learn, like you know what you can and can’t do and what you can get away with.” Love Power provided a complementary response to the same question stating, “I think it was just being out every weekend and just learning the way of the racing world.” Similarly, Cody Berm discussed, “I’ve done it long enough. I know most everything you know been in the sport since like I said I was four, so I got a lot of time and experience with it.”

Specifically, riders learned “right” and “wrong” through their direct experiences. Steve Little noted, “I feel like a lot of it is trial and error, along with, you know, just learning the flow of how things go over the years.” As such, riders expect amateurs or those with less experience to be more likely to get in trouble. Justin explained, “typically you see younger kids getting penalized or making more mistakes because they just don’t know.” Therefore, lack of experience translated to incomplete development. In other words, riders who are early in their careers have not had an opportunity to fully learn expectations, and thus are continuing to develop their knowledge base with each run-in with authority. However, once a rider was further in their career, it was anticipated that they would be able to use direct experiences to inform and refine their perspectives. This is clearly seen in Trent Bernard’s statement,

I think most riders are pretty intuitive as far as they all know what they want to achieve and they are aware of what will keep them from achieving, so they have pretty good memories and are pretty skilled at adapting experiences, so if there's been some experience either personally or just in the community, I think that they're all very adaptive as far as kind of imprinting that into their ideology when they're racing and being able to pull from those experiences.

According to L.S., one-way individuals' legal values and legal attitudes are developed is through vicarious experiences. For riders, watching and hearing about other riders' experiences with rules and penalties shaped their own knowledge base. In explaining how he learned about the rules and penalties, Carlton Thomas stated, "I feel like growing up around the sport and around professional racing watching it all these years...I just kind of learned the rules from just observing and watching and understanding." This perspective was shared by Ryder, who explained, "we have watched racing so long that we just know. A lot of times just seeing it on TV we know kind of what not to do based on other riders' mistakes." This point was expanded by John, who noted that he learned the rules by, "kind of just watching the others. Like when other riders get a penalty, like I kind of learn it."

Riders may learn about rules or penalties that they did not even know existed by hearing what happens to other racers, as can be seen in Paul Small's discussion of a penalty event that occurred in the 2022 supercross season,

There was one race where two guys got penalized for peeing by the starting gate, not using a port-a-potty and it was like a big fine and that was like, I had no idea about any of that. I would just assume not to go to the bathroom there but, I didn't like, I wouldn't know what the punishment is and now you see it.

Situations like Paul Small's example bring to light formally unpublicized or known rules, while simultaneously teaching riders the subsequent punishments to expect if they repeat the violation.

Under the L.S. framework, individuals can develop legal values and legal attitudes from vicarious experiences stemming from interactions with informal rules systems as well. Hence, knowledge from indirect experiences in the rider community was not limited to the formal rule system, riders also developed their perspectives on rules based on indirect experiences with the unofficial rider rule system/rider etiquette. Trent Bernard captured the importance of rider etiquette and experiences for gaining knowledge as a collective rider group in his statement,

Just over the years racing, understanding what is proper, what is not. There are you know rules that you would know simply because you've been in the culture, but as far as the letter of the rule, I would say there's more it's probably an etiquacy that has adopted the spirit of the rule.

As discussed previously, riders do not know the letter of the law/the exact wording of the rules as defined in the rulebook. Instead, as part of the racing culture, riders were familiar with the informal rider etiquette, which typically adapted the official rules into something informal that captured the main ideas or embraced the goals of the formal rules. Riders evaluate the reactions others have to an incident and use those reactions to shape their perspectives about what is acceptable and unacceptable etiquette. For instance, when discussing how riders learn about unspoken rules/rider etiquette, Justin explained, "sometimes like you can watch it on TV or something and you can judge based on people's reactions."

Riders have the benefit of being able to observe the reactions of other riders who are tired of having someone constantly violate rider etiquette, which shows both what is deemed unacceptable by the rider community, as well as the potential consequences for

continuing this behavior. John Smith provided an example of one such incident where a rider finally had enough of another rider violating aggressive riding etiquette, explaining,

You see the backlash that certain people get when they do certain moves. Like when Weston Peick beat up Friese after he took him out for the third time. You realize 'hey, if I do this, you know, eventually someone's gonna have enough of this and I'm gonna get some consequences,' so you learn watching other experiences.

John emphasized how riders pick up on what happens to those who violate rider etiquette and take note to ensure that they do not end up in similar situations.

According to L.S., individuals develop their legal values through interactions and communication with other members of the community where the situations, norms, and environments that they are exposed to formulate their values. Therefore, riders' values can also be developed from their own direct experiences with the unspoken rules/rider etiquette. One way that riders learn appropriate riding etiquette is by experiencing behavior from others that they do not like, noting that this is something that should not be done and refraining from engaging in the behavior themselves. Ace Extreme explained how this learning process takes place,

Riding over the years and like what you would appreciate, not appreciate. Like, basically like, all right how would you feel? All right you don't like being cross-jumped? All right then I'm not gonna cross-jump people because I don't like it.

Therefore, the direct experiences riders have with riding etiquette can be thought of as dynamic in nature, as a rider is constantly updating their values and attitudes with knowledge gained from unpleasant experiences. In essence, through this process, riders embraced the age-old philosophy, "do unto others as you would have them do unto you."

The second way that riders learn appropriate rider etiquette is by violating an unspoken rule and then directly experiencing the consequences. At some point in their

career, all riders likely have this direct experience as Cody Berm explained, “Like most things, you just kind of experience it. I’m sure all of us have done something against rider etiquette: somebody else has either yelled at us or let us know like ‘hey you can’t do that.’” This idea that someone will let you know if you violate etiquette was further noted by Mike Bender,

Most times the veteran rider will tell you, you messed up, a majority of the time they’ll tell you what you messed up, and then they explain how you were wrong, and you better figure that out or it’s going to be a bad day.

Mike Bender stressed how important it was for riders to quickly integrate the information into their perspectives so that they can continue racing without consequences and enjoy the event. If riders do not integrate the information into their perspectives, they may be subject to more aggressive or retaliatory actions on the track. If riders continuously engage in problematic behavior throughout their career, depending on the severity of the violations they may ultimately be ostracized from the rider group.

Riders' direct experiences with informal rider etiquette are not limited to receiving corrections for mistakes. Riders also had direct experiences where they would be considered the enforcer of rider etiquette because they interacted with a rider who they felt was violating the unspoken rules and addressed this inappropriate behavior. Paul Small explained the dual nature of the direct correction, “if you’re being overly aggressive with someone, they’re gonna let you know about it, like, I would let someone know, make sure they know I am not happy about it.”

Fusing Formal and Informal Channels

The ubiquity pillar of L.S. emphasizes the fact that individuals are embedded within multiple rule systems, both formal and informal, which work together as a

network of rule systems to shape individuals understanding of rules and authorities. In line with expectations of this pillar, riders asserted that the formal and informal rule systems generally worked together to accomplish either similar or complementary goals. When asked to describe how he felt the rider etiquette fit with the formal rule system, Cody Berm stated that they, “kind of play hand in hand.” This feeling was echoed by Trent Bernard who stated, “I think they work hand in hand because you don’t, I don’t think that you’ll really, you know, kind of violate any offense if you stay within the etiquette.” Jason Lawrence similarly stated, “it’s pretty equivalent, as long as your rider etiquette is nice, then the AMA will be nice to you.”

In some cases, riders felt like the official rules and etiquette served different yet complementary roles. For instance, Steve Little explained, “I think the regular rules keep things fair, and the unspoken rules, kind of keep it just safer and keep people from doing anything that’s just stupid and could get people hurt,” thus highlighting the function of each system. It is important to note that both aspects, fairness and safety, are important for successful racing. When the system is deemed fair by riders, they are more likely to view the authority and system as legitimate and will feel an obligation to obey the rules. Safety was one of the biggest concerns for riders, as unsafe rider actions could cause delays, prevent riders from achievements like a fast lap time in qualifying, take riders out of championship contention, and even result in career-ending injuries. Both fairness and safety were deemed vital for the racing community; therefore, even though the formal system promoted fairness and the informal system/rider etiquette promoted safety, they were viewed as complementary. To that end, an understanding of each system, driven by

direct or vicarious experiences, was necessary for a rider to complete the development process and form a holistic perspective about the rule systems and authorities.

Once individuals have developed their legal values and legal attitudes through interaction with formal and informal rule systems, they progress to the legal reasoning stage where they develop a framework or schema that can be referenced to understand or make decisions about rules and authorities. After riders have been exposed to knowledge about the official rule system and the rider etiquette through both formal and informal channels for an extended period of time, they progress to the developmental stage where the information becomes ingrained and informs actions and reactions. Max Speed explained, “it comes almost instinctually that you don’t really have to think about it.” Riders noted they felt everyone eventually reached this final development stage, as explained by Chase McDonald, “everybody kind of knows in the back of their head while they’re racing like you know where the lines are, so I think really, you know, they don’t really think about it.”

Riders consider this stage of development, where the boundaries of the sport have been internalized, as the culmination of their “race craft,” which is honed from years of experience. Some riders felt once they reached this development stage, they were unlikely to change how they acted and instead would just rely on their ingrained behavior. For instance, Tom Says felt, “as soon as we develop our race craft and our style of racing, I don’t think that changes.”

Throughout this section, it has been revealed that, as with the legal system, riders begin the development of their values and attitudes at a young age and this is a dynamic process occurring throughout riders’ life course, where riders continually update their

perspective. As with the legal system, one way that riders develop their perspective is through exposure to official rules in formal channels, such as meetings, rulebooks, and emails, although riders acknowledge formal channels have a limited impact. Similar to the legal system, riders also developed their values and attitudes from exposure to informal channels, such as direct and vicarious experiences with both the formal rule systems and the informal system/rider etiquette. L.S. argues that individuals can be exposed to multiple rules systems at the same time and that all systems play a role in shaping perspectives and behaviors which was true for riders who felt both systems had an impact on their development. Although the formal rule system and informal rule system/rider etiquette may not perfectly match up, riders felt the two systems were complementary in nature and argued that an understanding of both was deemed vital for the formation of a complete perspective. Similar to the legal reasoning stage of L.S. where an individual uses the schema they have developed to make sense of their legal environment, riders eventually progress to a developmental stage where they have built an internal framework that they unconsciously reference to direct their racing actions.

Impacts

As discussed in the literature review section, L.S. is concerned not only with how individuals develop their relationships with rules and authorities, but also with how this relationship ultimately impacts their behavior. Within the L.S. framework, the coercive model and the consensual model are both used to explain individuals' orientation towards rules and authority. Under the coercive model, an individual's behavior is impacted by their desire to engage in actions that produce the best outcomes and thus, they are more likely to obey or cooperate when this produces a positive benefit and minimizes risk.

Conversely, the consensual model is more relational in nature and focuses on how the use of fair or just procedures impacts cooperation by fostering a sense of duty or obligation to obey rule systems or authorities deemed legitimate. Researchers have also noted that additional factors beyond the coercive and consensual models are likely to impact individuals' decisions to follow rules and defer to authority. This section reveals factors that riders felt impacted their decision-making and ultimately their behavior while racing in motocross and supercross events.

Rule Systems and Authority

Under the L.S. framework, interactions with rule systems and authority figures impact individuals' perspectives and influence their behavior. Riders felt that the motocross and supercross rules systems and the sanctioning organizations played a role in rider decision-making. Riders expressed that the motocross and supercross rule systems had a positive impact on behavior, as they create a sense of fairness and provide organization, and thus riders felt rule systems were necessary for the sport to run effectively. In terms of fairness, riders felt that the rule system prevented riders from engaging in any behavior that they desired or stopped them from modifying their bikes to gain an advantage. For instance, Steve Little commented,

If there was no repercussion of people doing wrong stuff then it would, you know, kind of give a free for all...you could do whatever, so I think it kind of again gives guidance to keep a more even playing field.

Riders felt that the rule system promoted organization, provided a structure to follow, and outlined expectations. Tom Says explained, "you know it's good to have the structure and the rules and everything obviously we need that." This point was echoed by Love Power, "the system was there for a purpose, and it served that purpose, and it kept

things in order for sure.” Other riders took this position further by speculating on what would happen if the rule system did not exist, painting a bleak picture for the sport. John Smith noted,

I think generally it’s a good thing to have, it’s good to have rules and it’s good to have penalties for breaking the rules. Otherwise, it’s just anarchy out there and then it’s chaos. So, I definitely think there’s a place for the rulebook for sure.

Authority figures create the rule systems and procedures used to enforce the rules, which means their actions directly impact community members' perspectives. Although riders were only sanctioned by the AMA during the 2022 motocross and supercross season, they were previously also subjected to sanctions by the Fédération Internationale de Motocyclisme (FIM) in supercross; therefore, riders were asked to provide insight into the impact of both organizations. Riders had very different views about the two organizations. Riders felt the AMA was both fair to riders and doing the best it could to support riders. This ultimately led to the view that the AMA had a positive impact on riders and the sport. Jason Lawrence noted, “I love the AMA! I’ve been a part of it now for over 25 years...they’ve always treated me fairly racing as an amateur all the way to the professional level.” Similarly, Mike Bender commented, “I really do like the AMA people, they’ve always treated me well.” Some riders also noted the positive impact that the AMA had on the larger rider community. Love Power, who has now retired from the sport, explained, “The AMA was great. They were always kind of that solid body that needed to be there...and they did a lot of advocating for us which was huge and definitely kind of stood up for us when we were racing.” Hence, being deemed a fair organization that looked out for its members led riders to have positive feelings about the AMA. In terms of the AMA’s positive impact on the sport, John Smith explained, “I think the

AMA's got their heart in the right place and they're trying hard to provide a good race series and fair rulebooks." This view was reiterated by Joe Motocross who commented, "I think that they try their best and without them we wouldn't have a lot of racing." Riders felt the AMA tried to do right by them, created a good racing environment, and provided many opportunities for riders, which further contributed to their positive outlook about the AMA.

On the other hand, riders felt that the FIM was unjust, particularly when it came to their stance on drug testing. Riders also felt the FIM was inaccessible. If the FIM decided to sanction a rider, that rider had no way of getting in contact with the FIM to understand what was happening or to provide a defense for their actions. This created the perspective that the FIM had a negative impact on the sport and ruined riders' careers, as such riders were glad when the FIM was removed as a sanctioning body. Riders who believed the FIM was unjust provided examples of how their fellow riders were subject to ridiculous sanctions for questionable drug violations. Carlton Thomas explained,

There were a lot of crazy things with the FIM drug testing. Like you hear all this stuff about how like James Stewart was out for two years because of what they claim was an Adderall thing, which you know if that's the case like it really should not have been that harsh of a penalty.

This view was rehashed by Tom Lap, "I know there's rider docked that weren't necessarily taking something performance enhancing." When riders were accused of these questionable drug violations, they were left with no recourse to defend themselves. For instance, Hannah Montana noted, "The appeal process is a joke because you cannot even talk to the FIM. You cannot even get in contact with them." All of this created the

impression that the FIM did not care about riders and how they made their living. As Max Speed exclaimed,

I feel like the removal of the FIM is a big step in the right direction... I feel like they were unfair and ruined a lot of guys' careers, such as Stewart, Tickle, and Clason. When you do stuff like that, you are taking away a person's livelihood.

According to L.S., when individuals feel that an authority is not taking appropriate action, is unjust, and has no concern for their wellbeing, then they will not view the authority as legitimate which is what happened with the FIM and riders.

Coercive Factors

Literature on L.S. has found that factors from the coercive model influence individuals' decision-making and drive their behavior. Specifically, research focuses on how individuals can be deterred from engaging in rule-violating behavior if punishments are severe, swift, and certain. Individuals experience general deterrence when they are deterred from violating rules based on indirect experiences with punishment or punishment avoidance. This general deterrent effect was evident for riders who expressed that just knowing a penalty existed was enough to influence their behavior and to keep them from engaging in rule-violating behavior. For example, Max Speed stated, "I think just knowing it has an effect. Like knowing if you do this, you know, like the penalty that could happen, so I think you kind of base your action off of that." Likewise, John Smith explained, "I think for most of us knowing it exists is enough to deter us." Carlton Thomas tied this in with his personal experience, as he declared, "just knowing it exists because like me for example, I've never been penalized but I know it exists and I don't want to be."

Knowledge of punishments can deter individuals from engaging in rule-violating behavior if the proposed punishment is severe enough to make the risk of getting caught greater than the benefit obtained from violating rules. For many riders, the potential risks associated with violating the rules outweighed any potential rewards. When asked to provide their main motivation for following the rules, several riders expressed that their behavior was driven by a desire to avoid the consequences of rule violations. Carlton Thomas stated, “my main motivation is not to get docked any positions⁷.” This sentiment was echoed by Cody Berm, “if you don’t follow rules, you get points docked, positions docked, possibly a fine.” For other riders, the risk for rule violations was not tied to the specific penalties, but rather a desire to avoid the difficulties and stress that arise when dealing with the penalty process. Max Speed commented, “my main motivation for following the rules, honestly it’s a lot easier...it’s not worth the headache.”

Although riders recognized that it was possible to gain a small advantage when violating rules, many noted the potential long-term effects and severity of the penalties prevented them from having any desire to violate the rules. Rule violations can have long-term effects if the resulting penalty lands the rider on probation, suspension, or license revocation, which is a risk most riders are not willing to take. For instance, Ryder explained, “I wouldn’t want to do anything on purpose to provoke the AMA...because they can take our right to race away.” In other instances, the riders felt the severity of the

⁷ Officials can punish riders by giving a penalty that changes the overall results in term of finishing order. Essentially here the official issues a penalty where a rider is credited with finishing in a lower place than where they actually finished, also known as being docked positions. For example, if a rider finished in 3rd place in the race but received a penalty where they were docked two position the results sheet for the evening would then be updated to reflect that they finished in 5th place instead of 3rd.

potential financial risk associated with rule violations kept them in line. John Smith discussed,

If you're over sound then you lose your fastest lap time, so, being a privateer, that can be the difference between making the night show or not. That's a difference of between, you know, a couple thousand bucks or nothing, going home losing money, so you definitely don't want to get that fast lap taken away.

Even though financial risks are relevant to all riders, severe financial risks play an especially important role in influencing privateers' risk-reward calculation, as the fines also impacted the rider's ability to afford to attend the next race. Jason Lawrence explained, "if it was three grand for a privateer, that would hurt them torrentially where they probably couldn't race for the next two races...so it's definitely the money motivation to make you follow the rules as a privateer."

Individuals can also be deterred from engaging in rule-violating behavior through specific deterrence, where they have a direct experience with either receiving or avoiding a punishment. For riders, this specific deterrent effect was evident in the fact that they felt a rider needed to receive a penalty for it to change their future behavior. Trent Bernard noted, "I think just knowing it is probably difficult, usually the consequences are what kind of takes your mind to that type of thinking." Riders stressed that experiencing the direct consequences of their actions was what made riders take a step back and think about their actions, causing them to refrain from subsequent rule-violating behavior. Ace Extreme stated, "the only real way, at least in my opinion for people to learn from their mistakes, is to go through the mistake and get punished for it." A similar view was expressed by Justin, "I think the more you're penalized, and the severity of the penalty definitely makes you think about it more."

However, there are instances where specific deterrence does not take place and individuals continue to engage in rule-violating behavior. One factor that drives this phenomenon is the fact that both receiving and avoiding punishment impact the rider's decision-making. Essentially, when riders do not receive a penalty, it teaches them that they can take risks and not face consequences, promoting more rule-violating behavior. Mike Bender discussed this phenomenon, "You have to receive it 100%. I think if they don't have it, they're just going to be like I got away with in their mind."

In other instances, individuals are not deterred from engaging in future rule-violating behavior because the penalty was not severe enough to produce a risk-reward calculation that favors rule-following. When this occurs, individuals are likely to persist in their offending and thus become what is known as a repeat offender. For riders, the feeling that penalties did not have an impact was most pronounced when it came to repeat offenders. Riders explained that it is common to see the same person receiving penalties week after week. For instance, Mike Bender commented,

If you see a name over and over every weekend, it's like okay well, I think at that point now they clearly don't care. They're paying fines⁸, they have the money to pay the fines, so they're just going to overlook 'like whatever I'll pay the fine, I'll deal with it' they don't care.

Likewise, Ryder explained, "Justin Barica he's been known for taking people out consistently... he hasn't really stopped because the penalties I guess, haven't been bad enough to keep him from doing it."

⁸ Officials can sanction riders by issuing a monetary punishment for an action known as a fine. Fines can be taken directly out of a rider's purse money (the money they earned based on their race finish) or in some instance the fines are paid by the rider's team (usually factory teams) instead of being taken from the riders' payout which in turn makes them less effective. Riders can also earn bonuses from their teams or from their sponsors based their position and these bonuses are also usually large enough to offset the cost of a fine for the action.

Consensual Factors

Findings from the L.S. literature suggest that individuals' behavior will be impacted by factors present in the consensual model. Riders' comments suggested that their behavior is also impacted by aspects of the consensual model. In the consensual model, the first dimension considers how values such as neutrality (decisions made without bias), consistency (decisions applied the same over time), clarity (decisions that are easy to understand), and voice (decisions that allow individuals to participate), play an important role in the decision-making process for authorities. How decisions are made by authorities in turn influences community member satisfaction and acceptance. Riders noted the removal of some bias, lack of voice, lack of clarity, and inconsistent penalty application impacted their behavior.

According to the consensual model, individuals are more likely to accept authorities' decisions if they feel the decisions are free of bias. Before the 2022 supercross season, penalty decisions were made by one individual; however, at the start of the 2022 season, a penalty committee was created, where three individuals collaborate to make penalty decisions. Riders expressed that the new penalty committee eliminated some of the potential for biased decision-making, which caused them to feel more confident about the outcomes produced. Dawson Reed asserted, "It's kind of like our government checks and balances. You know, one person making all decisions can be super biased. If you have three people with three points of view, it's more likely to be fair." Although riders noted committee decisions could still be driven by personal opinions, they felt having more opinions made it more likely that officials would consider

a variety of viewpoints including one that was similar to their own perspectives. Ryder explained,

One person could be stuck in their ways and not really be open-minded to seeing a situation differently. So, I think making a decision amongst three people instead of one can work out some in the rider's favor, shedding light on something that might have been misunderstood.

The consensual model also suggests that individuals are more likely to accept decisions made by authority figures if they are allowed to have a say or participate in the process. Riders discussed that they felt they do not have a voice when it comes to the penalty process, as they are typically not allowed to share their viewpoint on the situation or provide any type of defense. Ryder noted, when he received a penalty, "they made the decision before they even walked to tell me... they didn't give me an opportunity to talk about it." As a result of this lack of voice, riders felt as though they were forced to accept the decision, leaving riders feeling bitter about the process. John Smith expressed, "You get your penalty, there's not much negotiations taking place. Pretty much that's your penalty and that's what you get... so a lot of time it's not necessarily fair."

Even if riders did take steps to appeal the penalty decision, they still felt unheard and that their arguments did not have any impact. Mike Bender commented, "They're going to give you what they see fit. You can try to fight some of it, but it rarely goes the way of the rider." As a result, many riders, especially privateers, do not even bother voicing concerns because they know they will not be heard.

Under the consensual model, when the expectations and the decision-making process are clear, individuals are more likely to accept outcomes and defer to authority. Riders explained that there was a lack of clarity surrounding the rules and penalties. In

some instances, the rules are written in a way that leaves room for interpretation. Ryder noted, “there are some rules that are sometimes not very black and white.” A similar dilemma occurs with the penalties, the rulebook often does not make the penalties clear, leaving room for the officials to use discretion. Dale Whoop commented that this leaves riders wondering, “like what are we going to end up with.” Riders are aware that the lack of clarity in the rules opens the door for them to ride however they like. Max Speed expressed, “there actually is a lot of gray areas in the rulebook like you are allowed to get away with certain things.” Although riders may not be reading the rulebook themselves, they may learn about the vagueness of the rulebook from others who are more knowledgeable, such as family members who have worked as referees at local races. The lack of clarity also creates situations where riders accidentally violate rules because they are unaware of the subtle nuances in the rules. Carlton Thomas explained a situation where this occurred,

I heard there was an issue at one of the most recent races with like how you pack your gate before you take off. I heard people were making more of like a ramp before the gate to like launch them over the gate. That was kind of a drama issue because people were doing that, and people weren’t sure if it was a rule or not.

Perhaps the area where riders were most impacted was from the lack of clarity in the connection between the rules and the penalties. Steve Little voiced, “it doesn’t always seem like there’s something written in stone, like if you do this, this is what is going to happen.” Likewise, Trent Bernard pointed out, “everyone’s just waiting to hear what will happen rather than knowing if I do this, this is the definite outcome.”

The lack of clarity on how the rules and penalties are connected leads to another problematic situation, inconsistent penalty application. The consensual model notes that

individuals are more likely to accept decisions and obey rules when punishment decisions are consistent both across individuals and across time. Unfortunately, in the motocross and supercross rule systems, penalty decisions are neither consistent across riders nor are they consistent from race to race or season to season. Dale Whoop mentioned, “I feel like I’ve seen so many situations on track handled in so many different ways.” As such, riders may be subject to a variety of different penalties for the same offense. Paul Small discussed, “they’re very inconsistent with penalties...sometimes a guy will get points taken away or he’ll get positions taken away it’s never like this is what you’re getting and that’s for everyone.” Similarly, Max Speed noted, “I know there were quite a few riders on probation last year in supercross for overly aggressive riding and they would not fine the rider the same thing.”

This inconsistent application can leave riders confused about expectations, especially when individuals do not get penalized for something most would think was a rule violation. Ace Extreme observed, “I saw a lot more dirty riding this year... I’m just like, they got nothing for that?” In other cases, the inconsistent application may actually promote rule-violating behavior. When riders start to see that rules are not always enforced, they may believe they can get away with breaking rules and thus they engage in more inappropriate behavior. Justin disclosed, “a lot of riders just don’t care if they jump on a yellow because they know they’re probably not gonna get penalized for it.” The riders perceived that the inconsistent application typically favored elite factory riders and as such, it was known that these riders could get away with more rule-violating behavior. Chase McDonald shared, “if you’re winning and you’re on a factory team I think you can get away with a lot more.” Moreover, Dawson Reed asserted, “I think when you’re on a

factory team you get away with a whole lot more because the factory teams are kind of in bed with the AMA.”

Additional Factors

Researchers have noted, although the primary focus of L.S. is often centered on the coercive and consensual models, there are several other factors that can impact behavior. Therefore, L.S. scholars note it is important to identify these additional factors to obtain a holistic understanding of what shapes individuals' relationships with rule systems and authorities ultimately impacting their behavior. Riders commented on many additional factors including stage, timing, riding style, safety, image, relationships, and respect, that they felt influenced their behavior and decision-making during racing events.

Based on background knowledge of motocross and supercross, the researcher anticipated that stage, timing, and identity would all impact rider behavior. The riders supported this hypothesis, noting that all three of these factors influenced the decisions they made while racing. Different behaviors were deemed acceptable during each stage of racing. Specifically, in the stage with the greatest stakes, the LCQ, the rider etiquette not only promoted acceptance of more aggressive behavior but also taught riders to expect it. Mike Bender noted, “LCQ that’s your last chance that’s the one where the rules get shady and that’s another unspoken rule, really like if you hit someone dirt as can be in an LCQ that’s okay you kind of accept it.”

Likewise, the rider etiquette acknowledged that as the timing in the stage changed, the behavior deemed acceptable also changed. Particularly, more aggressive behavior was acceptable when the stakes were higher. The stakes increase as the time in

the stage goes by, with the last lap being seen as the timeframe with the highest stake.

Trent Bernard's comment captured this sentiment,

It's the last turn of the LCQ, you know, you pretty much just gotta expect that, you know, etiquacy is going to be a very low percentage as opposed to the very first lap of an LCQ...so timing plays a factor. I would say a very big part of decision-making.

In a similar vein, how a rider decided to act in a situation was determined based on the identity of the other rider. The specific aspect of the other rider's identity that had the greatest influence on decision-making was their known riding style. Actions riders took around a racer with an aggressive riding style differed from behaviors they would engage in when riding around an individual who was known to ride clean. Ryder stated,

If I had Barcia behind me, I would be really scared and would probably just let him by because I don't want to deal with him, but if it was someone, I've never seen take somebody out, I guess I would just ride normally and not have any worry or doubt.

The main goal of any rule system, but especially the criminal legal system, is to get individuals to follow rules and obey authority figures to reduce potential harm.

Therefore, it makes sense that the most prominent additional factor that impacted riders' decision-making was safety. Riders expressed great concern for both their safety, as well as the safety of their fellow competitors. Justin expressed, "I, myself, don't want to get hurt and I also don't want to hurt anybody else that's not a fun feeling." Similarly, John Smith commented, "safety is huge obviously motocross and supercross is dangerous... I think that's the most important thing." Likewise, Carlton Thomas declared, "if I was crashed on the backside of a jump and people were coming at me, I would really want to make sure that they're not jumping onto me."

This drive to ensure safety caused riders to feel that the sport needed a rule system to create a safe environment. Cody Berm suggested, “if they didn’t have the rules they have now or the penalties it’d definitely make the sport more dangerous.” Riders also felt that safety rules were very important. Trent Bernard noted, “I think safety rules are extremely important.” An attitude shared by Mike Bender, who mentioned, “I think the safety rule of like when a rider is overly aggressive is a rule, I think that’s very important.” Riders not only felt that safety rules were important, but also stressed it was critical for riders to know these rules. Chase McDonald brought up that, “the caution flags, it’s definitely good to know those... you don’t want to get yourself or get somebody else hurt because you didn’t know what the flags meant.”

Another factor that riders felt impacted their decision-making was the desire to have a good image in the eyes of the fans, the industry, and the other riders. For instance, Tom Says commented, “I want to set a good example for other people. I teach riding lessons and I want to be a good you know ambassador for the sport. I want to be a good role model.” Riders were especially concerned with maintaining a positive image with industry members, as they are usually on short-term contracts. Therefore, riders are always trying to impress team managers to either get re-signed by their current team or switch to a team that is further up in the hierarchy. John Smith affirmed this impact, “when you’re leaving from one team to another...or you’re trying to ask another team for help or whatever it might be, all that affects the way you ride for sure.”

On the flip side, riders expressed concern that violating either official or unofficial rules could tarnish their image, leading to a bad reputation. Steve Little explained,

We want to be known, be famous, and all that cool stuff that goes along with being a professional athlete. So, I think the perception people have will definitely change if you're one of those guys that just doesn't follow the rules and you're making things dangerous for others.

Similarly, Ace Extreme noted, "I don't want to be that guy. I want to build my name and if like I'm an asshole on the track I'm not going to be as much a fan pick." Although most riders discussed the impact of a bad image in terms of the effect on their reputation with the public, some riders expressed concern that other riders would view them in a negative light. John Smith discussed,

You get a bad reputation amongst other people in the pits. Like Friese is a good example, there's not many people in the pits who have much good to say about Vince Friese because of the way he handles himself over and over. Obviously, actions speak louder than words.

Riders were anxious about having a bad reputation because they knew this could lead to more negative on-track treatment from the other riders. Tom Lap expressed, "you do obtain a certain stigma if you take people out all the time and everyone starts to get sick of it and makes your life kind of a living hell."

Although L.S. does consider the impact of relationships, it is focused on the relationships between community members and rules systems, or community members and authority figures. However, riders tended to focus on how relationships between different members of the rider community impacted rider behavior. Therefore, relationships between community members are considered as an additional factor. Riders felt that the relationship they had with one another was the most important since other riders are the individuals they deal with during racing events. Mike Bender specified,

I care what my peers think of me more than the AMA just because I have to deal with them, you know, same with everyone like you have to deal with each other on the track. I'm not dealing with an AMA guy racing against me.

Riders take this further, explaining that the type of relationship they have with another rider impacts what type of behavior they will engage in while racing that rider. Love Power brought up, “they’re your competition and there are grudges and enemies out there... that definitely can impact how you act on the track.” If the other rider is someone they do not like or have a bad relationship with, then riders viewed it as acceptable to race that rider harder or more aggressively than if the person was a friend. Chase McDonald explained,

If there’s a guy out there that’s in front of you and you know you don’t like him off the track, I think that’s when some of the decisions with racing seem to go wrong... if they’re friends with them, they might race them differently than they would if they didn’t like them.

This sentiment was echoed by Steve Little,

It’s more like do you like the guy or not? If there’s a rider you really like, you really respect that guy...then you may not ride him near as hard as if you’re like this guy's kind of a punk I don’t really care for this guy.

Similar to the situation with relationships, L.S. tends to focus on the importance of receiving respect from authority figures, whereas riders focus on the impact of respect they receive from other riders. As such, the impact of respect among community members is considered as an additional factor. John Smith communicated, “there’s an unspoken respect between all riders.” A viewpoint shared by Hannah Montana, “so you have, you know, a bit of respect for each other.” Riders perceived that the shared respect for one another was a driving factor in decisions to follow the rules. Justin suggested, “It’s just kind of respect. If you have respect for who you’re racing with your gonna follow those rules.” This respect for one another has led riders to refrain from taking actions that could put other riders in danger. Paul Small mentioned, “especially when you

go to the 450's⁹ you kind of respect each other more and don't try to kill each other in the corners and stuff." Ace Extreme voiced a similar viewpoint,

A lot of us have respect for each other. I respect other riders enough to not like want to jump on a medic flag cause I would want the same respect because I do know what it's like, so I would want them to give me the same respect back.

This section uncovered the wide variety of factors that impact riders' decision-making and their subsequent behavior. Riders felt both rule systems and the sanctioning organizations had an impact on their behavior. Riders noted that coercive factors had an impact on their behavior. Some riders were deterred just by knowing a penalty existed whereas others felt riders need to receive a penalty for it to have an impact. Riders noted that they engage in a risk-reward calculation when making decisions. Riders also identified factors from the consensual model that impacted their behavior. Riders expressed positive feelings about the new penalty committee, noting this change reduced bias in decision-making. Riders felt they were impacted by a lack of voice in the penalty process; a lack of clarity on rules, penalties, and the rule penalty connection; and inconsistent penalty application. Riders expressed that several additional factors such as timing, stage, identity, image, relationships among community members, and respect among community members, impacted their racing decisions.

Desires

The coercive and the consensual models both discuss several components that are necessary for rule systems and authorities to be effective in controlling individuals' behaviors. Coercive models highlight the importance of severity, celerity, and certainty

⁹ Both motocross and supercross are composed of two different classes of riders. There is a 250 class where riders participant on motorcycles with 250cc or less engines, and a 450 class where riders participant on motorcycles with 450cc engines (AMA, 2022b; AMA Pro Racing, 2021a).

for punishments to be effective at deterring rule-violating behavior by making the risks of violating rules greater than the rewards. Consensual models allude to the importance of decision-makers embracing the values of clarity, consistency, voice, neutrality, and transparency when making decisions, as doing so increases the likelihood that individuals will accept the ultimate outcomes.

However, rule systems may not embrace or include all of these factors, leaving their community members wanting or unhappy with the system. Thus, the lack of these aspects may negatively impact individuals and when this occurs, individuals express a desire for these missing aspects. When considering the possibility of a system that embraces these desires, individuals may often speculate on what their situation would be like under the hypothetical system. If individuals want to bring about their desires, they must engage in actions that can promote change. Under the L.S. framework, when individuals are not happy with the rules or authority, they may engage in critical noncompliance where they speak out against or disobey the laws to promote change. This section uncovers the changes riders desired for the motocross and supercross rule systems and authority and provides riders' perspectives on how to promote change.

Coercive Aspects

According to deterrence theory, severity and celerity are two of the main components necessary for a punishment to deter individuals from engaging in rule-violating behavior. Riders expressed a desire for change in both the severity and celerity aspects of their rule system. Riders felt punishments were not harsh enough. John stated, "I think the rules are almost too easy right now." A perspective shared by Hannah Montana, "I don't think they're near harsh enough in a lot of instances." Riders expressed

that these more lenient punishments are not enough to outweigh the benefits of breaking the rules. Justin explained,

At least in the front pack, I feel like they're not enough of a punishment¹⁰...for an aggressive pass they got like a \$10,000 fine and like a three-point dock for championship points...it should be a bigger penalty than that, especially if it's top five in the 450 class their getting a \$50,000 bonus for getting in the top 5, so what is \$10,000 less mean, yeah not much.

As a result, riders felt that punishments needed to be stricter to impact rider behavior.

Mike Bender noted, "I mean the only way I think they're going to get that across is be way more strict about stuff." When asked if any changes were needed to penalties, John commented, "just more strict." Riders felt that this increase in penalty severity was especially needed for repeat offenders. Trent Bernard asserted, "I think an accumulation of offenses should be met with an accumulation of penalties."

Typically, when discussing celerity, the argument is that punishment needs to be administered more swiftly. However, riders felt that penalty decisions in motocross and supercross occurred too quickly, as many decisions were made immediately after a violation was observed. In some cases, penalties were given out before the race was even over. Jason Lawrence observed, "it can go as far as him seeing something like a track-cutting penalty and him driving straight over to the team manager and handing out the penalty right there before the race is even over."

Riders suggested that making decisions so quickly did not allow time for evidence to be gathered or presented, which they felt should happen before decisions are rendered.

¹⁰ Riders noted that the type of team an individual was on had an impact on their financial resources and thus influenced how a particular penalty would affect the riders with factory riders/front pack riders having a lot more resources at their disposal. To rectify this situation riders suggested implementing either a sliding scale for fines that would be based on resources or using penalties that affected riders equally across the board such as taking away championship points.

Joe Motocross commented, “I think that they need to not make rash decisions on stuff, they need to sit down and wait till all the facts are released before they make a harsh penalty.” Riders believed that this quick process prevented officials from really analyzing the situation, leading to inappropriate or unjust decisions. Therefore, riders wanted the officials to take more time before releasing the official penalty decisions. Jason Lawrence discussed a situation from the 2022 motocross season that may have had a different outcome if the decision process was longer and used this as his justification for wanting a slower process. Jason Lawrence explained,

Justin Barcia got suspended for roughhousing with Dylan Ferrandis this year and then when you saw Justin Barcia’s helmet cam video it kind of changed a lot of people’s minds and opinions on whether he should have been so harshly penalized. So maybe a change of how quickly the penalty’s handed out, not making such a fast decision on the penalty, give it some time, maybe 48 hours, and let everyone plead their case a little bit instead of handing it out so fast.

Consensual Aspects

Consensual models suggest that individuals are more likely to accept decisions when the decision-making process is clear, consistent, transparent, and neutral. Individuals also are more satisfied if the process allows them to participate. However as discussed in the impact section, most of these aspects are not present in the motocross or supercross penalty process. The lack of these aspects in the current system creates a negative impact on riders' behavior and fuels their desire for change in those areas. Therefore, riders' desires for a better rule system are directly connected to the missing consensual aspects that have a negative impact on behavior. As such, riders expressed a desire for clarity, consistency, voice, communication, neutrality, and transparency. In addition to expressing desires for these consensual factors, riders speculated on what this

system would look like or how they would react to situations if their desires were fulfilled.

Riders wanted the rulebook to not only explain some of the rules better but also to establish a firm connection between rules and penalties. Riders felt the rules often had little detail, leaving them wondering what was actually expected of them and wishing they had more information. Mike Bender pointed out, “with a lot of the rules when they do make changes, I wish it would be a little more in-depth with it right away for riders because they can be kind of vague.” Hannah Montana echoed this perspective, “I think it could be spelled out a bit easier for athletes to understand.” Riders explained in some situations the rules do not provide a clear picture of where the lines are drawn, this was particularly true for aggressive riding rules. Ace Extreme commented, “I feel like there just needs to be like more of a hard standpoint on what is considered too dirty of riding and what is considered okay aggressive riding...like a clear boundary on that.” Riders felt having a clear boundary would make it easier to handle negative outcomes because they could at least know what to expect. Trent Bernard explained,

If there’s a clear boundary set and you cross that...you have some sort of understanding as to what is happening, why it’s happening, as opposed to the line being very vague and maybe you didn’t fully cross it, or you weren’t trying to cross it and then you still get a penalty that you feel you’re not deserving of.

Riders most commonly expressed frustration and a desire for change in the lack of clarity surrounding the rule penalty connection. Tom Lap noted, “the only thing I wish it was more at least documented so it’s like okay if I break this rule this is gonna happen and I know exactly what to expect.” Similarly, Paul Small mentioned, “I feel like they could put them together like if you do this, this is what you get...cut and dry.” Riders felt

a better connection would help prevent issues related to the use of discretion by authority.

John Smith reported,

Maybe have some sort of outline in the rulebook or something on how each potential rule violation would be handled because a lot of it is just up to the mood the person is in that day which is not exactly a good way to do things.

Some riders took a darker stance on the lack of clarity on penalties purporting that rulebooks were designed to promote this disparate application. Max Speed expressed, “they do not make the penalties super clear in the rulebook...I feel like they keep it vague so they can make it work in their favor.” Essentially here, Max Speed felt the flexibility of the rules provided room for authorities’ subjective bias when issuing penalties, which could be influenced by their connections with other members of the industry.

As some riders hinted at above, the lack of clarity in the rulebooks led to another issue, inconsistent penalty applications. Riders conveyed frustration with the inconsistent application and made known their desire for a system that embraced consistent penalty application. Joe Motocross divulged, “I think they need to change. There’s, it almost seems like two different rulebooks, like one for factory and then one for privateer teams. I think they need to enforce the rules more evenly across teams.” Likewise, Ryder criticized, “I think money can talk in those situations, which I don’t think is right. I feel like it should be the same for factory riders as it is for privateers.” Riders felt it was important for the system to hold everyone accountable for their actions, regardless of who they were. John presented an example, “cutting track markers...if 20 of them are doing it they should penalize 20 of them.”

In the eyes of riders, a system that embraced consistent accountability would be considered legitimate; once consistency is lost, riders no longer view the process as credible or the system as legitimate. Mike Bender specifies,

Keep everyone accountable and not just the guy who's winning the championship, all the way to last place everyone should follow the exact rules to the tea or not at all. Once we start overlooking rules for anybody, then all credibility goes out the window.

In addition to promoting legitimacy, riders described how they would have better reactions to penalty decisions if the penalties were always applied consistently. Justin reflected, "I think if it was a little bit more consistent...it would be easier for other riders getting penalized." Trent Bernard took this further explaining, "if you see a level of consistency...riders become familiar with these types of things, so you're not quite as shocked to the system when things happen, which I think helps the emotions stay in check." Therefore, when the process is inconsistent, riders are unable to learn what penalty to expect for a rule violation. Thus, if a decision is made to enact a particularly harsh penalty in a situation where this has not been done before, it can anger riders and make them feel the system is unfair. Whereas, if the penalties are consistent riders learn what can be expected in a particular situation and may be more willing to accept the negative outcome while still viewing the system in a positive light.

It was clear that riders desired to have better communication with authorities during the penalty process and wanted their voices to be heard. In many cases, riders had no direct communication with officials and instead found out about their penalty by looking at the results. Dawson Reed commented, "you'd find out when you went to check your lap time, or your results and you see if you were docked positions or if your time

was not counted¹¹.” As a result, many riders called for a process that would promote better communication and would allow riders to voice their perspective. Ryder commented, “I think there should be at least like a meeting with AMA to go over the issue and you know explain our side of the story before they make a call... it would solve a lot of problems.” Similarly, Joe Motocross expressed, “I think they need to maybe allow more discussion...and hear the rider’s point of view a little bit instead of just kind of well this is what we saw, and this is what we’re doing and your SOL.” In some cases, riders tried to communicate with the officials, but felt their voices went unheard. Dale Whoop declared,

I tried to clear it up with them right then and there when I pulled off the track and I was like ‘am I in trouble or what?’ and they didn’t say nothing then I go to get my money and I was docked a position. Like I know that’s not how things are supposed to go.

Riders were concerned about not having their voice heard by officials because officials have different perspectives from riders and thus may not be on the same wavelength when it comes to understanding situations. Trent Bernard noted, “there’s a bit of a disconnect between you know racers' point of view and you know the race directors.” Riders were afraid this disconnect would lead to inappropriate decisions. Hannah Montana explained, “there could be situations where things get led in the wrong direction because you don’t have a voice a lot of times.”

In addition to focusing on how the penalty procedure should work, riders also discussed their desires for the qualities officials should possess. Riders wanted officials

¹¹ During the qualifying sessions riders are attempting to get the fastest lap time possible to obtain the highest position in the qualifying standings. Officials can issue a penalty where they decided to not count a rider’s fastest lap time or essentially they use the riders second fastest lap to determine their position within qualifying.

who were neutral and transparent. Riders valued officials who were deemed neutral because they felt they would be less likely to be influenced by the politics of the sport and would thus make less biased decisions. To truly be a neutral party, riders felt the authority figure would have to come from outside of the industry. Dawson Reed explained,

I think they need to be regulated by somebody who is outside of the AMA party and someone who's not tied to the factory teams, somebody who is totally independent and is just getting paid to do their job, that's it.

This perspective is echoed by John Smith who reported,

I do think that if there would be a way to get an outside person to be in charge of you know, applying rules and just enforcing them. I think that would be a step in the right direction because like I said there's a lot of politics and all the people that are in charge of those decisions have a lot of connections and a lot of relationships within the industry that sometimes can get in the way of, you know, making the right ruling.

Riders also wanted officials who would be transparent. Riders' desires for increased transparency typically stemmed from concerns surrounding money. Riders did not know what happened to the money they gave the AMA for their membership dues, racing fees, or payment of fines and wanted more insight. Hannah Montana proclaimed,

I'd just be interested to know where the membership fees go to because there's a lot of, I mean there's got to be close to you know hundreds of thousands of people who are, maybe even millions of people in the AMA, so you know that's a \$60 membership, that's a lot of money. For me being a professional, my professional card is \$375 so it's probably a few thousand dollars with us, so I'm not really sure where those funds go.

The lack of transparency surrounding monetary matters made riders feel uneasy and suspicious of the AMA, but they acknowledged they would not have a problem if the AMA would instead be open about what they were doing. Max Speed remarked,

If you have to pay a fine I do not know where the money ends up actually going like I feel like it does not go back into the pay for other riders, so someone is lining their pockets... if they were open I probably would not have any problems with what they were doing ...if they were actually super clear about it and said where it was going.

Promoting Change

When individuals are unhappy with rules or authority, they will naturally look for ways to promote change. L.S. addresses this notion by stressing individuals critically evaluate laws and authorities and can speak out against injustice. Riders acknowledge that for change to occur, they will have to take some type of action. Riders felt the first stepping-stone for this process would be the formation of a rider organization that could advocate for the larger rider community. John Smith commented, "I really think there needs to be some sort of input from the rider. Whether it's a rider's union or just some sort of organization that has riders' best interest." Riders felt that the individuals who would be in the best position to advocate for rider interests are those who have previously been involved in the sport. Former riders are in a unique position where they possess the necessary perspective and knowledge on rider issues, yet they are not constrained by the need to have a position on a team and thus are freer to speak their mind. Trent Bernard commented, "the thing that can be the real difference maker is past riders, past champions being more involved." Though riders felt it is possible to promote change through advocacy, they stressed this change would not occur through boycotting or protests, as these methods would be undermined by the competitive nature of the sport. Specifically, the draw of prestige and money prevents riders from being a completely united front. Mike Bender explained,

If like say 30 guys said I'm not racing this weekend, I gonna boycott, protest, there's about 50 other guys who would easily do it because they never made the night show and never even made top 40 so like this is my time to do it, so they'll fill the gate.

This section shed light on what riders felt was amiss with their rule systems and authorities and contained their desires for righting these wrongs. Riders felt that in order for punishments to be more effective, they should be harsher. However, riders noted officials should take more time in making penalty decisions. Riders commented on the need for clear rules, penalties, and rule penalty connections and expressed a need for consistent application of penalties. Riders wanted to have a process that promoted communication and voice and preferred to have officials who were neutral and would be transparent. To bring about changes, riders acknowledged that they needed to have an organization that could advocate for their desires.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

This section starts by presenting a general discussion of the study results including how they address the research questions and connections between riders' views and the actual rule violations and penalties. This is followed by a discussion of the implications of the study, both for the legal socialization framework and for the motocross and supercross industry. Limitations of the research are described and suggested directions for future research are presented. Finally, the conclusion section provides a recap and final thoughts on the study.

Research Questions

The first research question asked: how do riders develop an understanding of formal and informal rules and penalties? Based on the study results, it is apparent that the primary way that riders gain this knowledge is through experience. Riders learn over time through their own trial and error as well as through seeing and hearing from other riders. Although riders gain knowledge through formal channels, such as emails and riders' meetings, they are more likely to gain knowledge about changes through official communication rather than gaining their initial knowledge from these sources. Riders do not spend time reading the rulebook and knowledge gained from other official sources is obtained only if riders pay attention to the communications or devote time to going to the meetings.

The second research question asked: how do coercive models influence riders' techniques and decision-making during racing events? There are several ways in which riders are influenced by coercive models. Riders are motivated to follow the rules as they

felt the risks associated with violating rules were greater than the rewards. Some riders were discouraged from violating all rules because they have seen other riders penalized and do not wish to receive penalties themselves. Other riders were discouraged from offending again after having received a penalty for a rule violation.

The third research question asked: how do consensual models influence riders' techniques and decision-making during racing events? Consensual models had a limited influence on riders' techniques and decision-making because most of the aspects of the consensual model such as voice, clarity, and consistency are currently missing in the official motocross and supercross rule systems. Riders expressed a desire for many aspects of the consensual model such as clarity, consistency, voice, communication, neutrality, and transparency, and felt if these factors were in place, they would be more likely to follow the rules.

The fourth research question asked: what aspects of coercive models have the most prominent impact on influencing riders' techniques and decision-making during racing events? There were two main aspects of the coercive model that impacted riders during racing events. Riders expressed that the severity of the punishment had a prominent impact on them. For instance, riders explained that as punishment severity increased, so too did their desire to abide by the rules. Similarly, riders were greatly impacted by the risk-reward calculation. Riders discussed how although they might be able to gain a small short-term advantage by violating rules, the potential long-term effects from the consequences were not worth the risk.

The fifth research question asked: what aspects of consensual models have the most prominent impact on influencing riders' techniques and decision-making during

racing events? Riders' behavior was not impacted by having aspects of the consensual model present, rather they were most prominently impacted by three aspects of the consensual model that were missing. The first aspect that impacts riders is voice. The lack of voice that riders have means that they are more likely to just accept whatever penalty they receive because they feel their side of the story will not be heard anyways. Second, riders are impacted by clarity. The lack of clarity both in what the rules and penalties are, and how the two are connected, makes riders more likely to just go out and ride in any manner they want. This may include engaging in inappropriate behavior since they do not know where the lines are. The final aspect that impacts riders is consistency. The inconsistent application of penalties makes riders feel that others would be more likely to take a chance at breaking the rules, especially if they have done so before without receiving a penalty because they know the rules are not always enforced.

The sixth research question asked: what additional factors influence riders' techniques and decision-making during racing events? There were four additional factors that influenced rider decision-making. The most prominent factor was safety, as the majority of the riders stressed that keeping both themselves and other riders safe was a major motivating force in their decision-making. Riders were concerned about maintaining a positive image both amongst their peers and for the fans. The relationships riders have with one another greatly impacts the decisions they make on track. Similarly, riders expressed that respect for one another was a driving force behind the actions they would engage in.

Connections to Actual Rule Violations/Penalties

Penalty reports for the 2022 motocross and supercross season are publicly available online. These reports list the rule violation, the penalty, the rider, and the stage in which the penalty occurs. This makes it possible to compare riders' views about the penalties to what is occurring within the sport. For riders, one of the most important factors that influenced their decision-making and motivated them to follow the rules was safety. This concern for safety was echoed by the officials as the vast majority of penalties (70%) issued during the 2022 motocross and supercross seasons were for violations of safety rules, with 60 penalties issued for jumping on a red cross flag/wheels on the ground light¹², nine penalties for overly aggressive riding, seven penalties for fighting, and three penalties for stopping on the track during qualifying (AMA Supercross 2022a; MX Sports Pro Racing, 2022).

The other main factor riders are concerned about is fairness and again the penalty reports make it clear that this was also a main concern for officials. Twenty-two percent of the penalties issued during the 2022 motocross and supercross season were for violations of fairness rules. Fairness penalties included 16 penalties for track cutting, two for gaining an advantage while off course, and one for not slowing down when off the track (AMA Supercross 2022a; MX Sports Pro Racing, 2022).

Many riders expressed concern about inconsistency in the specific punishments being doled out. However, this inconsistency was not reflected in the 2022 penalty

¹² The red cross flag/wheel on the ground lights are signals that are provided to riders when another rider is down on the ground out of sight typically behind a jump on the track. When these signals are present riders are required to roll over obstacles instead of jumping them to create a safer environment for the down rider and medics.

reports. In most incidents, riders were given consistent penalties for rule violations. For example, all riders who jumped on a red cross flag/wheels on the ground light during qualifying sessions (46 penalties) were docked their fastest lap time, all riders who failed the sound check (6 penalties) lost their fastest lap time, and all riders who stopped on the track during qualifying (3 penalties) lost their fastest lap time (AMA Supercross 2022a; MX Sports Pro Racing, 2022). Additionally, riders expressed frustration that factory riders typically experienced more lenient penalties; however, penalties for loss of fastest lap time for jumping on the red cross flag/wheels on the ground lights or losing one position for track cutting were applied the same to all riders.

Penalties were, however, less consistent when it came to situations that are typically more subjective. For example, nine penalties were handed out for overly aggressive riding; however, the specific punishments varied with violations resulting in different combinations, such as a warning and six-month probation, disqualification and fine, or loss of championship points and a fine (AMA Supercross 2022a; MX Sports Pro Racing, 2022). Similarly, seven penalties were issued for actions detrimental to the sport (this means riders engaged in a fight), yet there were three different punishments doled out for this offense where some riders were issued a written warning (2 riders), others received a warning and six-month probation (2 riders) and others were disqualified from the event (3 riders) (AMA Supercross 2022a; MX Sports Pro Racing, 2022). Aggressive riding and fighting are incidents that often receive a lot of attention in the media and thus may be more prominent in riders' minds.

This disconnect between what the riders are discussing in their interviews and what is occurring in the penalty reports could be due to several reasons. First, in the 2022

motocross and supercross season, officials attempted to address past issues with the penalty system by implementing a new three-person penalty panel in supercross and making a conscious effort to make penalties fairer (Matthes, 2022). It is very likely that riders' views are reflective of the injustices that have been occurring for many years and have not adjusted to reflect the changes that occurred this year. Additionally, if riders are not reading the penalty reports, they may not even be aware of the improvements in 2022. As with the other information presented in formal channels, riders varied in their engagement with the penalty reports with some expressing that they read the reports as they wanted to know what the other riders were getting penalized for, some noted they knew of the existence of the reports but did not read them, and others were unaware that they had access to this information.

Furthermore, it is also possible that the actual application of the penalties has remained inconsistent because the reports do not reflect situations where rules were violated and officials chose to not impose a penalty. Therefore, this could very likely still be occurring and thus causing riders to notice the inconsistency. Additionally, the penalty reports indicate when riders are given a fine as a penalty; however, the reports do not list the dollar amount for the fine, so it is possible that there is an inconsistency in the fines which could also be driving riders' views.

The disconnect between riders' views and the information provided in the penalty reports also illustrates why gathering detailed information from participants is so important. Without the unique rider viewpoints, the understanding of what is occurring in the rule system would inaccurately represent the process and experience. The riders' viewpoints highlighted problems with the system that are not readily apparent when only

considering the quantitative data on rule violations and penalties. Thus, to have a complete picture of the issues and to fully understand how the motocross and supercross rule systems operate, it becomes necessary to supplement the statistics with more in-depth information obtained from the rider qualitative interviews. Therefore, to gain a true understanding of the actual experience with a rule system, it is vital to speak with the individuals who are subject to the system to identify concerns and perspectives that cannot be seen by just considering statistics.

Legal Socialization

As the ubiquity pillar explains, individuals can be exposed to and can develop their legal orientations through interactions not only with the criminal legal system but also with non-legal rule systems (Fine & Trinkner, In Press; Trinkner & Reisig, 2021; Tyler & Trinkner, 2018). As such, findings from the current research add additional support to the main elements of the L.S. framework and further demonstrate that L.S. can effectively be applied to rule systems beyond the criminal legal system. Research findings from the motocross and supercross rule system are in line with findings from both the legal system and other non-legal contexts, such as home, school, and the juvenile justice system, specifically in terms of the finding that consensual models have a greater impact on behavior than coercive models. Consequently, the current research supports the notion that the type of model, coercive model or consensual model, implemented by the authority will influence the impact the model has on its community members. Thus, knowing if the authority is embracing the coercive model or the consensual model, is vital for determining how best to analyze the behavior of community members.

Although L.S. scholars acknowledge that both coercive and consensual models are present within legal systems and consider both in their research, criminal justice scholars have written off deterrence to some degree, as the more recent deterrence literature often does not find deterrence to have a large impact on behavior. However, this study highlights that although deterrence may not come out as statistically significant in advanced statistical models, when a qualitative approach to understanding behavior is taken, individuals still feel deterrence concepts impact their behavior. This study shed light on two nuances of the deterrence literature that became apparent through the qualitative interviews.

First, the deterrent effect was seen as conditional based on the rider's team type. The more privileged factory riders who had more access to resources and money were less deterred by punishments than privateers who were at the bottom of the hierarchy. Based on this perspective, the criminal legal system needs to consider the varying resources accessible to individuals when creating punishments, recognizing that punishment cannot be one size fits all. Likewise, criminologists need to incorporate measures for differing resource levels into their studies on deterrence to better understand how this plays out within the legal system.

Second, the findings in the current study directly contrasted the deterrence notion of celerity, which argues that punishment is more effective when it is immediate (Becarria, 1963[1763]; Bentham, 1988[1789]). Riders conveyed concern that the penalty process was occurring too quickly, undermining its effectiveness. Explicitly, riders felt like there was no time for evidence to be gathered or for situations to be properly analyzed, leading to unjust decisions. Therefore, it appears that there needs to be a

balance between a quick application of punishment, designed to produce a connection between the action and punishment, and a timeframe that allows for the analysis of evidence. This challenge of managing the delicate balance between the need for quick punishment and the need for time to gather evidence manifests in the court system, where speedy trial rules require that hearings and trials take place within a certain timeframe, yet attorneys also need enough time to sufficiently prepare for trials. Therefore, it is apparent that criminologists should delve deeper into how deterrence is impacted by the timing aspects of punishment. Accordingly, criminologists should not be so quick to write off deterrence and should instead seek to engage in more qualitative studies that may provide deeper insight into both the nuances of deterrence presented here, as well as other potential deterrent effects.

The current study also provides several insights into the implications of the consensual model, which are relevant to understanding the criminal legal system. The current research highlights that many problems can occur when aspects of the consensual model are missing within a rule system. When aspects of the consensual model are missing, individuals will be less accepting of the outcome, viewing the outcome as unfair, and will be disenchanted with the procedures. When individuals are unhappy with the outcomes and procedures, individuals will be less likely to view authority as legitimate, which in turn will make individuals less likely to voluntarily comply and obey the authority. This further reiterates the importance of ensuring that all values of the decision-making dimension of the consensual model (neutrality, consistency, clarity, transparency, and participation) are embraced by criminal justice authority figures, such

as police officers, lawyers, judges, and correctional officers when they are making decisions.

Looking at the discovery process in criminal cases can provide insight into how a better outcome is obtained when authority figures embrace all values of the decision-making dimension of the consensual model. Specifically, the open-file discovery process incorporates these values, whereas the closed-file discovery process does not. In the open-file discovery process, the prosecutor provides the defense with everything in their file regardless of whether the prosecutor plans to use the information (Fox, 2013). Closed-file discovery creates biased situations, where the prosecutor gets to decide what information they think should be shared with the defense (Beety, 2017). On the other hand, open-file discovery allows for neutrality, as the prosecutor is not making any judgments about the value of the evidence. Open-file discovery imposed blanket rules of disclosure, which means that prosecutors will consistently be providing the defense with the same types of information, thus all defendants benefit from additional information (Mosteller, 2008). Open-file discovery also promotes clarity on discovery expectations, as prosecutors know they need to produce all information within their files, instead of the vague guideline under closed-file discovery where prosecutors are required to provide evidence pertinent to the defense (Ramseur, 2016). The open-file discovery process provides transparency of the prosecutor's case, which allows the defense to decide what information is of material value, prepare better for cross-examining witnesses, and may shed light on exculpatory evidence overlooked by the prosecutor (Brown, 2017; Eads, 1989; Ramseur, 2016). Finally, open-file discovery allows defendants to play a greater

role in their case, as defendants are in a better position to make more informed decisions on how to proceed when they know the evidence against them (Fox, 2013).

The current research highlights that in some rule systems, the treatment dimension may have a limited impact on behavior. The treatment dimension centers on how authority treats individuals, expressing that when individuals are treated with respect and dignity, when authority figures are open and honest, and when concern is shown for individuals or their circumstances, the individuals will report a more positive relationship with authority (Tyler & Blader, 2003; Trinkner & Tyler, 2016). However, individuals may not always have direct contact with authority figures in their rule systems, and thus they may not have treatment experiences to shape their perspectives. Riders in the study explained that they often did not have direct contact with authority and instead learned about their penalties from written sources, such as timing and scoring reports.

The treatment dimension impacts how individuals feel about authority. Specifically, when individuals feel they are treated fairly by authority, then individuals see this as confirmation of positive status within the group, feel they are a valued part of the group, and are more likely to follow the group norms and obey authority (Justice & Mears, 2014). The expectation is that individuals will be in direct contact with authority figures throughout the process, and thus treatment will shape overall perspectives.

However, the current research sheds light on the notion that individuals may have limited contact with authority. Hence, to truly understand this dimension of the consensual model, researchers should also seek to develop an understanding of how limited or no direct contact with authority figures influences feelings about the treatment. This is especially relevant for criminal justice scholars because individuals who are

processed through the criminal legal system do not always have extensive contact with the authority figures who are making important decisions about their future. For example, in the court system judges have the final say on sentencing decisions, yet, due to the overwhelming use of plea bargaining, individuals may have limited interactions with judges. When individuals have limited interactions with the judge, this could impact their feelings about the treatment from the judge. The individual may view the limited interaction as a sign that the judge does not have concern for the individual or may see the limited interaction as a sign of disrespect. When the individual has negative feelings about treatment from one authority figure within the criminal legal system, it may negatively influence their perspective on other actors within the system or create negative views of the entire criminal legal system.

The boundary dimension of the consensual model focuses on the boundaries of authority stressing that authority should not have control over all situations or all behaviors (Smentana, 2002; Trinkner & Tyler, 2016). Importantly, there are some instances in rule systems where authority needs to recognize the autonomy and privacy of community members (Trinkner & Tyler, 2016; Tyler & Trinkner, 2016) The boundary dimension of the consensual model is the dimension that legal socialization scholars have least developed. Thus, the findings from this study have direct implications for the future development of this concept.

This study highlighted the fact that boundary issues may not be present in all rule systems. Pointedly, riders did not express that they felt the AMA was ever overstepping their boundary or creating rules that violated autonomy or privacy. Riders were asked if they felt there were any rules that were unnecessary for the sport or if there were any

instances where they did not agree with the existence of a rule. Many riders could not think of rules that fell into those categories. Riders that did discuss a rule expressed that their negative feelings stem from the perception that the rule in question created an uneven playing field. Therefore, there was no evidence of boundary-related issues with the motocross and supercross rule systems. It is quite possible that there are other rule systems or even parts of a rule system where boundary issues may not be prevalent, and thus are not influencing individuals' perspectives about systems and authorities. To that end, as researchers continue to explore the impact of the consensual model on the criminal legal system, they should be cognizant of both when boundary concerns are relevant to individuals, as well as noting any areas of the criminal legal system where individuals do not express concerns related to boundaries.

The current research also identified four additional factors: safety, image, community relationships, and community respect, each of which impacted decision-making and behavior. The current models in the legal socialization literature do not specifically take these factors into account; however, changes could be made to the models to incorporate these factors. The safety aspects could be incorporated into aspects of either model or even within both models. In terms of the coercive model, when seeking to understand the risk-reward calculation individuals engage in, researchers could incorporate questions to understand how the safety of the individual making the decision, as well as the safety of others in their community, impacts their calculations. It is anticipated based on the current research, that when an action threatens either the individual's personal safety or the safety of others in their community, individuals will

rate the risk associated with the action as higher and will more likely be deterred from engaging in the behavior.

In terms of the consensual model, it is recommended that a fourth value dimension, called community impact, should be added to capture the influences of interactions with members of the community. Within rule systems, individuals are not only exposed to the authority who run the system but also to other members of the community. Research has shown that the behavior of community members is impacted by their desire to belong with the group and their desire to avoid losing attachment to or acceptance from the group (Andenas, 1974; Nagin & Paternoster, 1994; Tittle, 1980; Zimring & Hawkins, 1973). Thus, a community impact dimension would shed light on how interactions with community members shape individuals' desire to obey rules and cooperate with authority. Although the original three dimensions are specific to authority, it would make sense to have the community dimension integrated within the consensual model, since this model is influenced by the incorporation of group norms and the need to belong.

The new dimension would include all four additional factors from the current study: safety, image, relationships, and respect. The dimensions would first consider the component safety, focusing on how the safety of the community impacts behavior. The safety component could be operationalized by asking individuals questions like, what role safety plays within their community, how often community members discuss safety, and if their actions are shaped by considerations of personal or community safety. The second component of the community impact dimension is image, specifically how maintaining a good image with different members of the community impacts behavior. The image

component could be operationalized by asking individuals questions, such as on a scale from one to ten how much do you care about what others in your community think about you, what would give someone a bad image in your community, and what are the consequences of having a bad image within your community. The third component of the community impact dimension, relationships, considers how relationships between individuals in the community impact behavior. The relationship component could be operationalized by probing individuals on topics, such as how good relationships with others impact their interactions with them, how bad relationships with others drive their behavior, and what relationships they feel have the largest impact on their behavior. The final component of the community impact dimension, respect, focuses on how respect for members of the community impacts behavior. This could be operationalized by gathering insight into how individuals develop respect within the community, when individuals feel respect influences their behavior, and if there are particular individuals or situations where it is deemed most important to have respect.

The ubiquity pillar not only highlights that individuals can develop their legal orientation through a variety of different rule systems, but it also notes that individuals can engage with multiple non-legal rule systems simultaneously (Fine & Trinkner, In Press, Trinkner & Reisig, 2021; Trinkner & Tyler, 2018). Riders discussed how their behavior was impacted by two rule systems simultaneously, the formal rule systems put forth by the AMA and the informal rule system created by riders themselves known as rider etiquette. Consideration of how systems work together is important for the criminal legal system, as all individuals within society will be part of subgroups that have informal rule systems and at the same time all individuals are subject to the criminal legal system.

In the context of the current study, riders felt that the official rules went hand in hand with their rider etiquette, and thus if riders were following the rider etiquette, they did not have to worry about violating formal rules.

Therefore, the current research spotlighted the notion that in some instances following informal group rules can lead to automatically following formal rules. The implication of this finding is that, if legislatures are enacting rules that are in line with the informal group rules of their community members, they will not have to engage in any extra effort to control behavior. Typically, laws are more effective when they are in line with the existing group norms (Ball, 1955). The informal rule system is already encouraging individuals to engage in behavior that falls within the acceptable group norms. Therefore, when rules enacted match the community values, individuals are more likely to comply with laws and cooperate with authority (Jackson et al., 2013; Piquero et al., 2014; Trinkner & Cohn, 2014).

Continuing with the focus on the importance of informal rule systems, the current study also highlighted the fact that informal rule systems may be designed to acknowledge situational differences, especially differences that stem from changes in the stakes. Riders explained that the informal rule system, also known as rider etiquette, condoned a wider range of behaviors when the stakes were perceived to be higher. In other words, riders accepted more aggressive behavior when the stakes were seen as higher. Therefore, the behavior deemed acceptable was conditional on the setting and time in which the behavior occurred. Interestingly, this informal acceptance of conditional aggressive behavior was not limited to the riders themselves. The acceptance was also shared by officials who typically would not issue a penalty during a stage or

timeframe when the rider etiquette would allow for the behavior. This nuance surrounding the impact of conditionality and stakes on behavior should be explored within other rule systems.

There are instances in the formal criminal legal system where acceptance of behavior is conditional based on stakes. Although murder is typically not viewed as acceptable, exceptions are built into the system to consider factors, such as self-defense, where the stakes are typically higher, and broader social norms would support a more lenient penalty. Similarly, another high-stakes situation is when a domestic violence victim or a victim of child abuse commits a violent act against an abuser to prevent further abuse. Again, this behavior is typically deemed more acceptable and receives a more lenient penalty. However, it is important to remember that individuals who are subject to the formal criminal legal system are also subject to informal rule systems. Based on the findings from the current study, it is likely all informal rule systems have rules/norms that vary based on the stakes or conditions. Developing a better understanding of why these variations in acceptability occur within the informal rule systems can help shed light on when it might be appropriate within the formal legal system to make exceptions for certain behaviors. Essentially, knowledge of the differing acceptability can highlight potential changes needed within the criminal legal system to ensure that punishment is in line with the expectations of community members.

Participants in the current study explained that they felt once their framework for understanding and evaluating rules and authority was developed, it was not likely to change and thus, they felt there would be little change in their behavior. This produces two important implications for the criminal legal system. The first implication centers on

the idea that authority figures seek ways to increase rule-following behavior by obtaining voluntary compliance and cooperation. To increase voluntary rule-following behavior, it becomes necessary to ensure that children and young adults develop legal values and legal attitudes that favor trust in authority and support for rule systems. Individuals are less likely to change their perspective and behavior later in life when their framework/schema has been developed. Consequently, every effort should be made to ensure early interactions promote the development of a framework that will favor compliance with laws and cooperation with authority. However, it is important to note that individuals should recognize not all authority figures or rules are just and ethical. Therefore, consideration should be given to the ethical and just nature of the system before encouraging individuals to develop values and attitudes favorable to these systems.

Authority figures seeking to promote voluntary compliance should be trying to promote positive direct experiences with youth who develop attitudes and values through judgments on their own positive and negative experiences with authority (Fine & Trinkner, In Press). Authority figures should also seek to promote positive experiences with members of the community, as these interactions also shape individuals' legal orientations. Specifically, individuals weigh the positives and negatives of vicarious experiences along with their direct experiences. As such, authority members who want to promote voluntary compliance must be conscientious of their interactions with all individuals within a community. Although the focus here is on interactions between authority figures and individuals, it is important to remember that these individuals do not live in a vacuum and will communicate with other members of their communities.

Therefore, it is important to note that how authority figures treat community members also shapes the information that is shared among community members. So, if the authority wants to shape perceptions in a way that views authority in a positive light, the authority needs to ensure the original stories are also positive.

Second, in a similar vein, if criminal justice actors are seeking to improve community relationships, such as recent efforts to improve police-community relationships, special attention needs to be given to developing positive relationships with individuals who are in the early developmental stages. These individuals are most likely to be influenced by the authority's efforts. Additionally, promoting positive relationships with older community members, or treating these individuals with respect, can have a profound effect on the younger generation (Lind & Tyler, 1988). Promoting positive relationships with older community members can have a profound impact because young individuals develop their values based on attachments to older members of their communities (Lind & Tyler, 1988; Tyler, 2021). Specifically, through attachments with older community members, individuals develop an understanding of what ought to happen under the law (Trinkner & Tyler, 2016). Riders noted that learning from older riders helped them to develop an understanding of what was expected of them in racing situations. Individuals come to value these attachments and will thus bring their behavior in line to preserve the attachment (Van Rooij & Fine, 2021). In the context of the current study, riders expressed that they embraced the values conveyed in the rider etiquette because they wanted to have good relationships with other riders.

Finally, the current study provides two broad implications for the legal socialization field. Legal socialization researchers should engage in more qualitative

research studies instead of relying heavily on general surveys or vignette studies. The current study illustrated that research on rule systems that only considers statistics can lead to incomplete or misguided research findings. Explicitly, the study demonstrated that an analysis focused solely on the official rule violation/penalty reports would lead to the belief that the rule system is applying penalties consistently and is operating effectively. However, when considering the qualitative interviews, it becomes apparent that this is not an accurate picture of what riders perceive to be occurring within their rule system. Hence, to develop a deeper understanding of L.S., coercive models, and consensual models in any rule system, researchers should consider incorporating qualitative aspects into their studies.

Additionally, the current study identified several additional factors that influence behavior that are relevant for all rule systems. Thus, the implication is that, by continuing to expand L.S. into new rule systems, researchers can develop better insight into what drives rule-following behavior, as additional factors are discovered or further developed. Ultimately, providing a more holistic understanding through exploring new rules systems allows researchers to better understand how individuals develop their legal orientations and why they obey authority, which in turn can produce a better system with more rule-following, leading to a decrease in potential harm.

Industry Implications

The study also produced specific implications for the motocross and supercross industries. First, rulebooks should be updated to include more details on rules and penalties. As the rulebooks stand now, one section lists all the rules and a second section lists the possible penalties; however, there is no information explaining which penalties

are appropriate for each rule violation. Therefore, the rulebooks should be updated to provide a clearer connection between the rule violations and subsequent penalties. This way, riders know exactly what is expected of them and what the specific consequence is if they violate a rule.

Even if riders do not take the time to read the rulebook, having more detailed explanations and better connections in the rulebook also makes the standards clearer for officials, which in turn can reduce the use of discretion. There are some instances where the use of discretion is helpful, specifically when discretion allows for consideration of factors beyond the rule, such as if the incident was the result of a mistake rather than a blatant rule violation. However, in other instances, the use of discretion is directly connected to inconsistent penalty application. Therefore, without clear guidelines, riders are more likely to feel a decision is unjust, leading to negative feelings about the rules and the authority. Although the subjectivity of authority decision-making cannot be eliminated, clear boundaries can promote more consistent application. For example, considering vague aggressive riding rules, the informal rider etiquette already acknowledges that the acceptability of a move/pass, which results in a collision, can be determined by the angle of impact (i.e., 90-degree collision/T-bone verse running into the back of the other rider's bike) and thus the formal rules could incorporate this information to make the specific rule clearer.

Rule and penalty clarity is not only important for the officials' making calls, but it is also important for riders. Knowledge of rules and penalties can impact the rider's decision-making process because if rules and penalties are not connected then riders have no way of knowing the full consequences of their actions. Riders may have a sense of

some of the consequences behind their actions, such as the potential impacts on safety or fairness, but without knowing the specific penalty associated with the rule violation, riders do not have a complete picture of the full consequences of their actions. When riders do not know all the consequences for engaging in rule-violating behavior, they cannot engage in a complete risk-reward calculation and thus may be less likely to be deterred from engaging in rule-violating behavior. This limited deterrent effect is expected to be greatest in situations where consequences related to safety and fairness are not readily apparent, and there is no clear penalty for the rule-violating behavior because riders may inappropriately calculate low risk for rule-violating behavior.

The penalty procedure should be applied consistently, transparently, and in a timeframe that allows all evidence to be considered. Riders expressed during their interviews that they are more likely to accept a penalty decision if they feel the process behind making the decision is fair. For the process to be deemed fair, riders need to first know what the process is, which is why there should be more transparency around how penalty decisions are made by officials. Second, riders expressed that for the process to be perceived as fair, riders would need to understand how evidence is obtained and considered. The timeframe for the evidence-gathering process should be long enough to allow time for riders to present their evidence, such as video footage, before a decision is made. During the interviews, riders also commented that they would be more likely to accept a penalty decision if they know everyone who commits the offense will be punished and receive the same punishment.

There also needs to be direct communication with the rider throughout the penalty process, so that the rider understands what is taking place and feels they have a voice. In

many cases, riders do not receive any communication from officials notifying them that have received a penalty. Rather, riders learned they received a penalty when they saw the scoresheet and noted that their fastest lap time was not counted, or they were credited with a lower position than how they finished in the race. Therefore, riders may not even be aware of what rule they violated, which limits their ability to change future behaviors. Direct communication would thus allow riders to better understand behavior expectations. In other instances, communication about the penalty decision is with members of the rider's team, perhaps because a penalty has been handed out before a race is completed or because the team managers are seen as a source of authority within the team. When communication is with the team rather than with the rider, it prevents riders from asking questions to clarify their understanding of the situation and misses out on a valuable teaching moment that could have resulted in improved rider behavior. Additionally, if the communication is not with the rider, then the rider cannot explain their point of view or share facts that may have been overlooked by the officials. When riders are participating in the process, they are more likely to see it as fair and will be more accepting of the outcome even if it is not in their favor.

There should be better education on the rules, penalties, and procedures, especially for amateur riders in the earlier stages of their careers. Riders expressed a desire for more education on the rules, penalties, and procedures, as they felt this would make the sport safer and help riders to understand expectations and the related consequences for violating expectations. Riders develop most of their knowledge about behavior expectations during their amateur careers. If riders are expected to adhere to the rule system, then there should be a formal effort to teach riders the expectations.

Although riders participate in riders' meetings at all levels of the sport, these are short meetings (usually less than 30 minutes in length) that serve to cover expectations that are specific to that day's event and to cover any recent rule changes or issues that have been occurring and they are not designed to cover the rules, penalties, or procedures in-depth. At the amateur scouting moto combine events, riders attend longer classroom sessions and work with mentors to help educate them on proper fitness and nutrition, as well as provide tips on how to handle competitions and the media, so sessions could easily be added to cover information on the rules and penalties.

It would be desirable for the rules and penalties to be consistent across both motocross and supercross and from the amateur ranks to the professional ranks. Riders are less likely to take the time to educate themselves on rules in the professional ranks, as they often feel they have all the knowledge they need from their amateur careers. As a result, the differences between the rule systems can lead riders to unknowingly violate rules. For instance, riders explained the flag rules of what is allowed when a yellow flag is out differ from the amateur ranks to the professional ranks, which can cause confusion on what riders are supposed to do in these instances. Similarly, there are rule differences between motocross and supercross which can cause riders to be unsure of what is acceptable and what is not, leading some to accidentally violate a rule, as they did not understand it was applicable to that sport. For instance, riders noted that they were allowed to use starting blocks¹³ in supercross, but it was unclear originally if they were

¹³ At the start of the race when riders are preparing for the gate to drop their body is in a position where both feet are on the ground. Some riders are shorter and have a harder time reaching the ground or feel this position is uncomfortable. To rectify this there are mental blocks that can be placed on the ground for riders to place their feet on which are known as starting blocks.

allowed to use them in motocross as well¹⁴. Riders expressed that they were overwhelmed by the magnitude of information in the rulebook, so if they are required to learn two sets of rules, one for motocross and one for supercross, they will be less likely to take time to really understand the information. Motocross and supercross racing at all levels in the United States are typically sanctioned by the AMA, so if the same sanctioning body oversees all racing, it would be relatively easy to create consistent rules.

Finally, there needs to be more outreach to the entire rider community to gather input and feedback from those who are directly affected by the systems. When big changes are being considered for motocross and supercross, discussions typically only take place with the manufacturers and the factory team managers. However, these changes directly impact riders and thus their viewpoints should be considered. Likewise, if the officials and promoters want to know how to improve the sport or address current issues, they would be best suited to gather this information from the riders. Riders on all types of teams should be consulted to provide a clear picture of the entire rider experience, not just the experience of the top-tier riders.

Limitations

The first limitation was the sample size, which was relatively small due to recruiting challenges. The challenges in rider recruitment were a result of the difficulty of both getting riders to respond to requests for interviews, as well as having difficulty getting riders to follow through once they agreed to participate. Riders may have not followed through with the interviews because of the busy nature of their schedules. Many

¹⁴ Part way through the 2022 motocross season officials recognized that this difference was confusing and unnecessary, so they issued a rule change allowing starting blocks in motocross to match the supercross rule.

riders' schedules are full of not only training and riding but also regular jobs, which makes carving out time for a free one-hour interview difficult. This is further reiterated by the fact that several riders had to reschedule their interviews multiple times due to scheduling changes or conflicts.

The challenge of reaching riders on social media could be because they are professional athletes and as such, may have other individuals running their accounts. Additionally, the researcher encountered difficulty with obtaining a snowball sample, even though all riders commented that they knew others who they thought would be willing to participate. Again, it is likely that this was due to riders' hectic schedules. Riders are typically focused on their training, jobs, racing, or team obligations and thus it is possible that they simply forgot about asking others, as some riders even forget they were supposed to show up for their own interviews.

As a result of the sampling challenges, the sample was not split evenly among riders from all team types and consisted of a greater percentage of privateer riders. Although on this surface this would appear to create an issue with selection effects as the privateer subset has a greater representation within the sample, this actually matches with the composition of the rider population, where there are a limited number of spots available on factory or satellite teams, leading to a greater percentage of riders on privateer teams. However, it is acknowledged that the inclusion of more privateer riders does mean that the findings may be more representative of privateer views rather than capturing a balanced perspective from all rider types and prevents a detailed comparison of experiences along team lines. These factors limit the generalizability of the results. Despite the limited generalizability, this study is still important as it provides a first look

at the application of L.S. into a new rule system and bolsters previous L.S. research. Additionally, privateer riders are the group who typically are the least heard within the industry, so this research gives a voice to the most suppressed group within motocross and supercross.

The second limitation centers on the notion that riders were required to retroactively think about the process by which they developed knowledge, values, and attitudes about the formal and informal rule systems of motocross and supercross. Although the developmental process occurs throughout an individual's life course, the majority of their attitudes and values are typically developed at a young age. On average, riders got their start with the sport at the age of 5.8 years old, yet the average age for riders in the study was 25.3 years old, which means that riders on average were reflecting back on a process spanning the last twenty years of their lives. As such, it is possible that the riders incorrectly remembered how they developed their initial knowledge about the formal and informal motocross and supercross rules systems. However, the fact that most riders had a similar perspective on how the developmental process occurred leads to the credence of the findings.

The third limitation of the study also deals with the age of the participants included in the study. The age restriction requiring participants over the age of eighteen may have precluded the newest members of the professional racing community from participating in the research. Specifically, both motocross and supercross allow riders to obtain a professional license at the age of sixteen. As such, these young professionals are the riders who are more likely to still be, at least to some degree, developing their perspectives of racing at the professional level. However, on average, both riders in the

study sample, as well as the general rider population, turned professional at the age of eighteen. Therefore, it is likely that the viewpoints of new professional riders were still addressed within the study.

The fourth limitation of the study centers on the limited ability to either provide or connect rider demographics/descriptions. All individuals included in the study were professional athletes who are often in the limelight. Races are broadcast on television and streaming platforms weekly worldwide, and riders are also featured in magazines and articles. As such, they are easily recognizable and in order to maintain the promised confidentiality, the researcher had to be careful to not provide too many descriptors on each participant which would make them identifiable. For instance, the researcher could not provide information on the position riders held in the 2022 championships, which would have provided interesting insights into how rider perspectives differ based on where they fell within the championship standings. In a similar vein, the researcher was not able to connect demographic information such as race, gender, or team type to the rider pseudonyms. Doing so would have allowed the researcher to discuss more nuances in findings between the different groups of riders, such as illustrating if the different types of teams impacted views about the rule systems or authorities. Although additional knowledge could be gained from providing this information, the researcher felt upholding the promised rider confidentiality took precedence and thus erred on the side of caution to ensure the information provided could not give away a rider's identity.

Although it was a methodological choice on the part of the researcher to focus solely on qualitative interviews, the researcher acknowledges using only one qualitative data collection method can be a limitation. Ideally, the researcher would use multiple

qualitative methods to collaborate the findings through a method known as triangulation (Creswell & Miller, 2000). In this case, the researcher was only able to conduct open-ended qualitative interviews due to time constraints. The researcher engaged in a limited collaboration attempt by including documentation of the actual rule violations and penalties administered during the same motocross and supercross season in which the interviews were conducted and compared this information to the data in the interviews. If the project timeline would have allowed, the researcher would have expanded the collaboration efforts to include a more complete document analysis, as well as participant observation. The expanded document analysis would have included examining social media and broadcast events. The researcher would have engaged in participant observation by completing the certification required to become a referee for motocross events and would have refereed a few local races.

Directions for Future Research

The directions for future research developed from the current study can be divided into two main categories. First, there are suggestions for future research studies that focus on the motocross and supercross rule system. Although riders are the main group most directly affected by the formal rule system and the informal rule system/rider etiquette, future research would benefit from including viewpoints from other members of the motocross and supercross community. Specifically, future researchers could consider the views of rider mechanics who are also subject to rules in terms of how they build the bikes, team managers who often act as a go-between for officials and riders, referees who make specific penalties calls, and AMA officials/promoters who create the rules and penalties. Researchers should also interview younger amateur riders who are in the early

stages of their careers and thus are more likely to still be developing their legal orientations and can provide better data related to how this developmental process occurs, as they would not be required to retroactively consider how the process unfolds.

Conducting qualitative interviews with the preceding groups would allow for a more holistic understanding of the rule system, authorities, and the developmental process.

Researchers should also attempt to support the interview findings through other qualitative methods and to that end future researchers could also conduct a content analysis of media related to the rule system, such as rider social media responses to penalties, articles about rules and penalties, industry podcasts, and broadcasts covering penalty incidents. This would allow the researcher to see if the findings from the content analysis match the riders' perspectives and could uncover nuances about the rule system. Some riders mentioned that the governing bodies of motocross and supercross in other countries operate in a completely different way than the AMA. Therefore, future research could consider a more global rider population by interviewing riders who participate in international motocross and supercross events and who are subject to different governing bodies.

Second, the current research lends itself to suggestions for future research studies within the criminal legal system. Researchers should conduct more studies on the boundaries of legal authority within all aspects of the criminal legal system, such as policing, courts, and corrections to identify when boundary considerations arise and how their presence or absence impacts relationships and behavior. Researchers should develop studies to consider how the community impact dimension of the consensual model

outlined in the implication section of this paper impacts the development processes, behavior, and relationships within the criminal legal system.

Studies should be conducted with adults who have interactions with authority figures from the criminal legal system to determine if and how their legal frameworks/schema and their legal orientation change as a result of these experiences. Researchers should conduct studies with several subgroups of the population who are subject to informal group rule systems, as well as the formal legal system. By conducting this research, a better understanding of both the connections between the two and what leads to the alignment of values can be obtained. Finally, researchers should develop qualitative studies designed to interview both individuals who go through or are subject to the control of the criminal legal system, as well as the authority figures who develop it (legislators) and those who enforce its standards (police officers, prosecutors, judges, and correctional officers) to ensure that a complete and accurate understanding of the rule system is obtained.

Conclusion

The L.S. framework is designed to provide insight into how individuals develop their relationships with laws and legal authority and how this ultimately leads to different legal orientations. One strain of L.S. research considers the coercive and consensual models to understand why individuals obey the law and defer to legal authorities. These insights allow for the creation of better rule systems and more effective authority models, which in turn promote more appropriate behavior and ultimately reduce harm. Recently, L.S. scholars have called for the expansion of L.S. to additional rule systems. The current study sought to answer this call by expanding L.S. to previously unexplored rule systems,

motocross and supercross. This was accomplished by interviewing 21 professional motocross and supercross riders. The results were presented to encompass three broad categories: development, impacts, and desires. The results provided support for L.S. concepts and stressed the importance of having aspects of the consensual model to promote rule-following behavior. The research also identified additional factors that impact rule-following behavior that are likely to play a role in other rule systems. Thus, reiterating the fact that exploring new rules systems not only further confirms what is already known about L.S., but can also lead to a more holistic understanding of the framework.

REFERENCES

- Agnew, R. (2001). *Juvenile delinquency: Causes and control*. Roxbury.
- Allen, W. D. (2002). Crime, punishment, and recidivism: Lessons from the National Hockey League. *Journal of Sports Economics*, 3(1), 39-60.
- Amemiya, J., Fine, A., & Wang, M. T. (2019). Trust and discipline: Adolescents' institutional and teacher trust predict classroom behavioral engagement following teacher discipline. *Child Development*, 91(2), 661-678.
- American Motorcycle Association (2022a). *Supercross championship 2022 Rulebook*. <https://www.amasupercross.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/2022-AMA-Supercross-Rulebook-FinalC.pdf>
- American Motorcycle Association (2022b). *Supercross 2022 series guide*. <https://www.amasupercross.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/2022-SX-Media-Guide.pdf>
- American Motorcycle Association Pro Racing (2022a). *Lucas Oil Pro Motocross Championship 2022 Media Guide*. <https://promotocross.com/page/media-guide>
- American Motorcycle Association Pro Racing (2022b). *Lucas Oil Pro Motocross Championship 2022 Souvenir Yearbook*.
- American Motorcycle Association Pro Racing (2022c). *2022 Rules for professional motocross competition*. https://mxsp.iscdn.net/2022/06/2590_2022_pro_mx_rules_v5.pdf
- American Motorcycle Association Supercross (2022a). *Penalty Reports*. <https://amasupercross.com/penalty-reports/>
- American Motorcycle Association Supercross (2022b). *Riders*. <https://www.supercrosslive.com/riders/450sx>
- Andenaes, J. (1974). *Punishment and deterrence*. University of Michigan Press.
- Andenaes, J. (1971). The moral or educative influence of criminal law. *Journal of Social Issues*, 27(2), 17-31.
- Anderson, R. A., & Otto, A. L. (2003). Perceptions of fairness in the justice system: A cross-cultural comparison. *Social behavior and personality*, 31(6), 557-563.
- Appel, J. B., & Peterson, N. J. (1965). What's wrong with punishment? *The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science*, 56(4), 450-453.

- Aguilar, J. (2018, October 2). Why Colorado police want to know about your home security camera: Castle Rock, Brighton latest to ask residents to register their outdoor security cameras with the police. *Denver Post*.
<https://www.denverpost.com/2018/10/02/colorado-police-home-security-cameras/>
- Ball, J. C. (1955). The deterrence concept in criminology and law. *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, & Police Science*, 46(3), 347-354.
- Barak-Corren, N., & Perry-Hazan, L. (2021). Bidirectional legal socialization and the boundaries of the law: The case of enclave communities' compliance with COVID-19 regulations. *Journal of Social Issues*, 77(2), 631-662.
- Bauchman, R., Paternoster, R., & Ward, S. (1992). The rationality of sexual offending: Testing deterrence/rational choice conception of sexual assault. *Law and Society Review*, 26, 343-372.
- Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M.R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychology Bulletin*, 117(3), 497-529.
- Beccaria, C. (1963[1764]). *An essay on crimes and punishments* (H. Paolucci, Trans.). Bobbs-Marrill.
- Becker, G. S. (1968). Crime and punishment and economic approach. *Journal of Political Economy*, 76(2), 169-217.
- Beetham, D. (1991). *Legitimation of power*. Macmillan.
- Beety, V. (2017). Changing the culture of disclosure and forensics. *Washington and Lee Law Review*, 73, 580-594.
- Belenko, S., & Spohn, C. (2015). *Drugs, crime, and justice*. Sage.
- Bentham, J. (1988[1789]) *The principles of morals and legislation*. Prometheus Books.
- Berg, B.L. (2004). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences (5th ed.)*. Boston, MA: Pearson Education.
- Bernard, H.R., & Ryan, G.W. (2010). *Analyzing qualitative data systematic approaches*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.
- Bocchiaro, P., & Zimbardo, P. G. (2010). Defying unjust authority: An exploratory study. *Current Psychology*, 29, 155-170.

- Braga, A. A. (2005). Hot spots policing and crime prevention: A systematic review of randomized control trials. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 1, 317-342.
- Brezina, T., (2002). Assessing the rationality of criminal and delinquent behavior: A four on actual utility. In A. R. Piquero, & S. G. Tibbetts. *Rational choice and criminal behavior: Recent research and future challenges* (pp. 241-264). Routledge.
- Brown, D. K. (2017). Discovery. In E. Luna (Ed.) *Reforming criminal justice* (vol 3, pp. 147-167. Academy for Justice.
- Bruner, M. W., Carreau, J. M., Wilson, K. S., & Penney, M. (2014). Group norms in youth sports: Role of personal and social factors. *The Sports Psychologist*, 28(4), 323-333.
- Buss, E. (2021). The Milwaukee youth engagement study: Evidence of reciprocal legal socialization in juvenile court. *Journal of Social Issues*, 77(2), 528-546.
- Byers, C. (2018, October 4). Your home surveillance system is changing how police work across the St. Louis region. *St. Louis Post*.
https://www.stltoday.com/news/local/crime-and-courts/your-home-surveillance-system-is-changing-how-police-work-across-st-louis-region/article_59f8f9d0-cb53-59e0-91ab-04f391d7b6a1.html
- Cardwell, S. M., Mazerolle, L., Piquero, A., & Luengen, K. (2021). Perceiving teachers as procedurally just limits the negative effects of delinquent peer associations: An analysis of male and female Australian adolescent perceptions of school authority. *Journal of Social Issues*, 77(2), 547-576.
- Carr, P.J., Napolitano, L., & Keating, J. (2007). We never call the cops and here is why: A Qualitative examination of legal cynicism in three Philadelphia neighborhoods. *Criminology*, 45, 445-480.
- Cavanagh, C., LaBerge, A., & Cauffman, E. (2021). Attitudes toward legal actors among dual system youth. *Journal of Social Issues*, 77(2), 504-527.
- Chalfin, A., & McCrary, J. (2014). Criminal deterrence: A review of the literature. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 55(1), 5-48.
- Cohn, E.S., & White, S. O. (1990). *Legal socialization: A study of norms and rules*. Springer-Verlag.
- Cohn, E. S., White, S. O., & Sanders, J. (2000). Distributive and procedural justice in seven nations. *Psychology, Crime, and the Law*, 20(8), 722-740.

- Cole, L., Kelly, D., Hennigan, P., Rebellon, C., Van Gundy, K., & Cohn, E. (2021). Emotion: The forgotten component of legalization socialization. *Journal of Social Issues*, 77(2), 291-313.
- Colman, M. M., & Carron, A. V. (2001). The nature of norms in individual sports teams. *Small Group Research*, 32(2), 206-222.
- Collins, R. (2007). Strolling while poor: How broken windows policing created a new crime in Baltimore. *Georgetown Journal of Poverty, Law, and Policy*, 14(3), 419-440.
- Cornish, D. B., & Clarke, R. V. (1986). *The reasoning criminal: Rational choice perspective of offending*. Springer
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among the five approaches*. Sage Publications.
- Creswell, J. W. & Miller, D. L. (2000). Determining validity in qualitative inquiry. *Theory into Practice*, 39(3), 124-130.
- D'Allessio, S., & Stolzenberg, L. (1998). Crime, arrests, and pretrial jail incarceration: An examination of the deterrence thesis. *Criminology*, 36(4), 735-762.
- De Cremer, D., & Van Knippenberg, D. (2002). How do leaders promote cooperation? The effects of charisma and procedural fairness. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 858-866.
- Delgado, R. (2008). Law enforcement in subordinated communities: Innovation and response. *Michigan Law Review*, 106, 1193-1212.
- Deutsch, M. (1975). Equity, equality, and need: What determines which value will be used as the basis of distributive justice? *Journal of Social Issues*, 31(3), 137-149.
- Eads, L. S. (1989). Adjudication by ambush: Federal prosecutors' use of nonscientific experts in a system of limited criminal discovery. *North Carolina Law Review*, 67, 577- 626.
- Easton, D. (1975). A reassessment of the concept of political support. *British Journal of Political Science*, 5, 435-457.
- Easton, S. T., & Rockerbie, D. W. (2005). Overtime! Rules and incentives in the National Hockey League. *Journal of Sports Economics*, 6(2), 178-202.

- 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), 217-242.
- Fine, A., & Cauffman, E. (2015). Race and justice system attitude formation during the transition to adulthood. *Journal of Developmental and Life-Course Criminology*, 1(4), 325-349.
- Fine, A., Kan, E. & Cauffman, E. (2019). Adolescents' confidence in institutions: Do America's youth differentiate between legal and social institutions? *Developmental Psychology*, 55(8), 1758-1767.
- Fine, A. D., & Trinkner, R. (In Press). Legal socialization. In R. Gurung (Ed.), *Routledge encyclopedia of psychology in the real world*. Routledge.
- Fine, A. D., & van Rooij, B. (2021). Legal socialization: Understanding the obligation to obey the law. *Journal of Social Issues*, 77(2), 367-391.
- Finkenauer, J. O. (1998). Legal socialization: Concepts and practices. *Trends in Organized Crime*, 4(2), 30-40.
- Finkenauer, J. O. (1995). *Russian youth: Law, deviance, and the pursuit of freedom*. Transaction.
- Forrest, W. (2021). The contribution of intimate relationships to legal socialization: Legitimacy, legal cynicism, and relationship characteristics. *Journal of Social Issues*, 77(2), 600-630.
- Fox, B. P. (2013). An argument against open-file discovery in criminal cases. *Notre Dame Law Review*, 89(1), 425-450.
- Friedman, B. (2017). *Unwarranted: Policing without permission*. Farrar, Straus, and Giroux.
- Gau, J. M., & Brunson, R. K. (2010). Procedural justice and order maintenance policing: A study of inner-city men's perceptions of police legitimacy. *Justice Quarterly*, 27(2), 255-279.
- Glaser, B. G. (2001). *The grounded theory perspective: Conceptualization contrasted with description*. The Sociology Press.

- Granot, Y., & Tyler, T. (2019). Adolescent cognition and procedural justice: Broadening the impact of research findings on policy and practice. *Social & Personal Psychology Compass*, 13 (10), 1-15.
- Grasmick, H. G., & Bursik Jr., R. J. (1990). Conscience, significant others, and rational choice: Extending the deterrence model. *Law and Society Review*, 24, 837-861.
- Greenberg, D. S. (1975). Peer review under fire. *Science Digest*, 78, 77-78.
- Groombridge, N. (2016). *Sports criminology: A critical criminology of sport and games*. Policy Press.
- Hardin, L. (2006). *Trust*. Polity.
- Heckelman, J. C., & Yates, A. C. (2003). And a hockey game broke out: Crime and punishment in the NHL. *Economic Inquiry*, 41(4), 705-712.
- Henson, A., Nguyen, T T. & Olaghere, A. (2022). Revising the critical gaze: An inversion of criminological theories to center race, racism, and resistance. *Critical Criminology*, 31(1), 17-33.
- Hoeve, M., Dubas, J. S., Eichelsheim VI, van der Lann, P. H., Smeenk, W., & Gerris, J. R. M. (2009). The relationship between parenting and delinquency: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 37(6), 749-775.
- Hogan, R. & Mills, C. (1976). Legal socialization. *Human Development*, 19, 261-276.
- Hogg, M. A., & Abrams, D. (1988). *Social identifications*. Routledge.
- Huizinga, D., Schumann, K., Ehret, B., & Elliot, A. (2004). *The effect of juvenile justice system processing on subsequent delinquent and criminal behavior: A cross-national study*. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Justice.
- Huq, A. Z., Jackson, J. P., & Trinkner, R. (2016). Legitimizing practices: Revisiting the predicated of police legitimacy. *British Journal of Criminology*, 57(5), 1101-1122.
- Huq, A. Z., Tyler, T. R., & Schulhofer, S. J. (2011). Mechanisms for eliciting cooperation in counterterrorism policing: Evidence from the United Kingdom. *Journal of Empirical Legal Studies*, 8(4), 728-761.
- 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. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 52, 1051-1071.

- Jackson, J. Bradford, B., Stanko, B. & Hohl, K. (2013). *Just authority? Trust in the police in England and Wales*. Routledge.
- Jewell, R. T. (2009). Estimating demand for aggressive play: The case of English Premier League Football. *International Journal of Sport Finance*, 4(3), 192-210.
- Justice, B., & Meares, T. (2014). How the criminal justice system educates citizens. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 651(1), 159-177.
- Kapsis, R. E. (1978). Black ghetto diversity and anomie: A sociopolitical view. *Journal of Sociology*, 83, 1132-1153.
- Kelman, H. C., & Hamilton, V. L. (1989). *Crimes of obedience*. Yale University Press.
- Kendra, M. (2022, February 10). The list: Penalties in Supercross. *Racer X*.
<https://racerxonline.com/2022/02/10/the-list-penalties-in-supercross>
- Kirk, D. S., & Papachristos, A. V. (2011). Cultural mechanisms and persistence of neighborhood violence. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 116(4), 1190-1233.
- Kirk, D. S., Papachristos, A. V., Fagan, J., & Tyler, T. R. (2012). The paradox of law enforcement in immigrant communities: Does tough immigration enforcement undermine public safety? *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social science*, 651(1), 1190-1233.
- Kitchens, C., Makofske, M. P., & Wang, L. (2019). Crime on the field. *Southern Economic Journal*, 85(3), 821-864.
- Klepper, S. & Nagin, D. S. (1989). Certainty and severity of punishment revisited. *Criminology*, 27, 721-746.
- Kohlberg, L. (1969). Stage and sequence: The cognitive development approach to socialization. In D. A. Goslin (Ed.), *Handbook of socialization theory and research* (pp.347-480). Rand McNally.
- La Vigne, N. G., Lowry, S. S., Dwyer, A. M., & Markman, J. A. (2011). *Using public surveillance systems for crime control and prevention: A practical guide for law enforcement and their municipal partners*. Urban Institute.
- Leventhal, G. S. (1980). What should be done with equity: New approaches to the study of fairness in social relationship. In K. J. Gergen, M. S. Greenberg, & R. H. Willis (Eds.), *Social exchange: Advances in theory and research* (pp. 27-55). Plenum Press.

- Levitt, S. (1998). Why do increased arrest rates appear to reduce crime: Deterrence, incapacitation, or measurement error? *Economic Inquiry*, 36(3), 353-372.
- Lind, E. A., & Tyler, T. R. (1988). Two models of procedural justice. In E. A. Lind & T. R. Tyler. *The social psychology of procedural justice* (pp. 221-242). Plenum Press.
- Low, J. (2019). A pragmatic definition of the concept of theoretical saturation. *Sociological Focus*, 52(2), 131-139.
- Lucas Oil Pro Motocross Championship (2022, August 27). Tucker Freight Line Ironman National [Video] <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BXTGiJqn2SA>
- Lundman, R. J. (1993). *Prevention and control of juvenile delinquency* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- MacCoun, R. (1993). Drugs and the law: A psychological analysis of drug prohibition. *Psychology Bulletin*, 113(3), 497-512.
- MacKenzie, D. L., & Piquero, A. (1994). The impact of shock incarceration programs on prison crowding. *Crime and Delinquency*, 40, 222-249.
- Matthes, S. (2022, May). The bar bang theory. *RacerX*, 25(5). 57-65.
- McCormick, R., & Tollison, R. (1984). Crime on the court. *Journal of Political Economy*, 92(2) 223-235.
- Mears, T. L. (2000). Norms, legitimacy, and law enforcement. *Oregon Law Review*, 79(2), 391-416.
- Meares, T.L., Katyalm N., & Kahn, D. M. (2004). Updating the study of punishment. *Stanford Law Review*, 56, 1171-1210.
- Mills, T. M. (1967). *The sociology of small groups*. Prentice Hall.
- Mooijman, M., van Dijk, W. W., van Dijk, E., & Ellemers, N. (2017). On sanction-goal justification: How and why deterrence justifications undermine rule compliance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 112(4), 577-588.
- Mosteller, R. P. (2008). Exculpatory evidence, ethics, and the road to the disbarment of Mike Nifong: The critical importance of full open-file discovery. *George Mason Law Review*, 15, 257- 318.
- Motorcycle Safety Foundation (2020). *Basic Rider Course: Rider Handbook*. Motorcycle Safety Foundation.

- Moule Jr., K., Fox, B. H., & Parry, M. M. (2019). The long shadow of Ferguson: Legitimacy, legal cynicism, and public perceptions of police militarization. *Crime & Delinquency*, 65(2), 151-182.
- Mulder, L. B., & Nelson, R (2010). When rules really make a difference: The effect of cooperation rules and self-sacrificing leadership on moral norms in social dilemmas. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 95, 57-72.
- Munroe, K., Estabrooks, P. Dennis, P., & Carron, A. V. (1999). A phenomenological analysis of group norms in sports teams. *The Sport Psychologist*, 13(2), 171-182.
- Murphy, K. (2021). Scrutiny, legal socialization, and defiance: Understanding how procedural justice and bounded authority concerns shape Muslims' defiance towards police. *Journal of Social Issues*, 77(2), 392-413.
- MX Sports (2022, January 11). 2022 National Classes. Amateur National Motocross Championship at Loretta Lynn's. <https://mxsports.com/classes>
- MX Sports Pro Racing (2022). *Penalty Reports*. <https://mxsportsproracing.com/page/penalty-reports#>
- Nagin, D. S. (1998). Criminal deterrence research at the outset of the twenty-first century. In M. Tonry. *Crime and justice: An annual review* (Vol.23, pp. 1-42). University of Chicago Press.
- Nagin, D. S. & Paternoster, R. (1994). Personal capital and social control: The deterrence implications of individual difference in criminal offending. *Criminology*, 32, 581-606.
- Nagin, D. S., & Pogarsky, G. (2001). Integrating celerity, impulsivity, and extralegal sanction threats into a model of general deterrence: Theory and evidence. *Criminology*, 39(4), 865-892.
- Paternoster, R. (2010). How much do we really know about criminal deterrence? *Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology*, 100(3), 765-823.
- Paternoster, R. (2006). How much do we really know about criminal deterrence? *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 100(3), 765-824.
- Paternoster, R. (1987). The deterrent effect of the perceived certainty and severity of punishment: A review of the evidence and issues. *Justice Quarterly*, 4, 173-217.

- Petrosino, A., Pestrosino, C. T., & Buehler, J. (2006). Scared straight and other juvenile awareness programs. In B. C. Welsh & D. P. Farrington (eds.) *Preventing crime: What works for children, offenders, victims, and places*. (pp.87-101). Springer.
- Petrosino, A., Turpin-Petrosino, C., & Guckenburg, S. (2010). Formal systems processing of juveniles: Effects on delinquency. *Campbell Systematic Review*, 6(1), 1-88.
- Piaget, J. (1972). Intellectual evolution from adolescence to adulthood. *Human Development*, 15, 1-12.
- Piaget, J. (1932). *The moral judgment of the child*. Harcourt, Brace
- Piccirillo, D., Carcia-Sanchez, E., Chies-Santos, M., & Gomes, A. M. (2021). The role of police contact and neighborhood experiences on legal socialization: Longitudinal evidence from adolescents in Brazil. *Journal of Social Issues*, 77(2), 437-461.
- Piquero, A. R., Bersanie, B. E., Loughran, T. A., & Fagan, J. (2014). Longitudinal patterns of legal socialization in first-generation immigrants, second-generation immigrants, and native born serious youthful offenders. *Crime and Delinquency*, 62(11), 1403-1425.
- Piquero, A. R., Fagan, J., Mulvey, E.P., Steinberg, L., & Odgers, C. (2005). Developmental trajectories of legal socialization among serious adolescent offenders, *Journal of Criminal Law, and Criminology*, 96(1), 267-298.
- Piquero, A. R., & Pogarsky, G. (2002). Beyond Stafford and Warr's reconceptualization of deterrence: Personal and vicarious experiences, impulsivity, and offending behavior. *The Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 39(2), 153-186.
- Pratt, T. C. & Cullen, F. T. (2005). Assessing macro-level predictors and theories of crime: A meta-analysis. *Crime and Justice Review of Research*, 32, 373-450.
- Pratt, T.C., Cullen, F. T., Blevins, K. R., Daigle, L. E., & Madensen, T. D. (2006). The empirical status of deterrence theory: A meta-analysis. In F. T. Cullen, J. P. Wright, & K. R. Belvins (Eds.), *Taking Stock: The status of criminology theory: Advances in criminological theory* (Vol. 15, pp. 367-395). Transaction.
- RacerX (2022). *2022 AMA supercross and motocross numbers*.
<https://racerxonline.com/page/ama-supercross-and-motocross-numbers>
- Radelet, M., & Akers, R. L. (1996). Deterrence and the death penalty: The views of the experts. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 87, 1-16.

- Ramseur, D. A. (2016). A call for justice: Virginia's need for criminal discovery reform. *Richmond Public Interest Law Review*, 19, 247-253.
- Rattner, A., Yagil, D., & Sherman-Sega, C. (2003). The sense of entitlement to violate the law: Legal disobedience as a public versus private reaction. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 31(6), 545-556.
- Raven, B. H., & French, J. R. P. (1958). Group support, legitimate power, and social influence. *Journal of Personality*, 21, 400-409.
- Rios, V. M. (2011). *Punished: Policing the lives of Black and Latino boys*. NYU Press.
- Robinson, P. H., & Darley, J. M. (1995). *Justice, liability, and blame: Community views and the criminal law*. Westview Press.
- Saldaña, J. (2015). *Thinking Qualitatively: Methods of Mind*. Sage Publications.
- Sampson, R. J., & Bartusch, D. J. (1998). Legal cynicism and (subculture?) tolerance of deviance: The neighborhood context of racial difference. *Law & Society Review*, 32(4), 777-804.
- Schrader, D. (1990). *The legacy of Lawrence Kohlberg: New directions for child development* (No. 47). Jossey Bass Inc.
- Schulhofer, S. J. (1993). Rethinking mandatory minimums. *Wake Forest Law Review*, 28(2), 199-222.
- Sedikides, C., & Brewer, M. B. (2001). *Individual self, relational self, and collective self*. Psychology Press.
- Sellin, T. (1959). *The death penalty*. American Law Institute.
- Sherman, L. (1993). Defiance, deterrence, and irrelevance: A theory of the criminal sanction. *The Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 30(4), 445-473.
- Shook, J. J., Goodkind, S., Kolivoski, K. M., Ballentine, K. L. (2021). Procedural justice and legal socialization among juvenile offenders: The role of defense attorneys. *Journal of Social Issues*, 77(2), 484-503.
- Shover, N. (1996). *Great pretenders: Pursuits and careers of persistent thieves*. Routledge.
- Small, M. L. (2009). How many cases do I need? On science and the logic of case selection in field-based research. *Ethnography*, 10(1), 5-38.

- Smetana, J. C. (2002). Culture, autonomy, and personal jurisdiction in adolescent-parent relationships. *Advances in Child Development and Behavior*, 29, 51-87.
- Strauss, A.L. (1987). *Qualitative analysis for social scientists*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Stephenson, E. F., & Walcott, S. M. (2012). The deterrent effect of accumulated yellow cards. *Atlantic Economic Journal*, 40(4), 445-446.
- Sunshine, J. & Tyler, T. R. (2003). The role of procedural justice and legitimacy in shaping public support for policing. *Law and Society Review*, 37(3), 513-538.
- Tapp, J. L. (1991). The geography of legal socialization: Scientific and social markers. *Droit et Societe*, 19, 331-358.
- Tapp, J. L. (1987). The jury as a socialization experience: A socio-cognitive view. In R. W. Riber. *Advance in Forensic Psychology and Psychiatry* (Vol 2, pp. 1-32). Ablex.
- Tapp, J. L. (1976). Psychology and the law: An overture. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 27(1), 359-404.
- Tapp, J. L. (1970). A child's garden of law and order. *Psychology Today*, 4(29-31), 62-64.
- Tapp, J. L., & Kohlberg, L. (1971). Developing senses of law and legal justice. *Journal of Social Issues*, 27, 65-91.
- Tapp, J. L. & Levine, F. J. (1977). *Law, justice, and the individual in society*. Rinehart & Winston.
- Tapp, J. L. & Levine, F. J. (1974). Legal socialization: Strategies for an ethical legality. *Stanford Law Review*, 27, 1-72.
- Tapp, J. L., & Levine, F. J. (1970). Persuasion to virtue: A preliminary statement. *Law and Society Review*, 4(4), 565-582.
- Täuber, S., & Sassenberg, K. (2012). The impact of identification on adherence to group norms in team sports: Who is going the extra mile *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 16(4), 231-240.
- Terry, D. J., & Hogg, M. A. (1996). Group norms and the attitude-behavior relationship: A role for group identification. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22(8), 776-793.

- Terry, D. J., Hogg, M. A., & White, K. M. (1999). The theory of planned behavior: Self-identity, social identity, and group norms. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 38(3), 225-244.
- Thibaut, J., & Walker, L. (1975). *Procedural justice: Psychological analysis*. Erlbaum.
- Thomas, K., Theodoro, R., & Komatsu, A. (2021). Socializing justice: The interface of just world beliefs and legal socialization. *Journal of Social Issues*, 77(2), 314-335.
- Tittle, C. R. (1980). *Sanctions and social deviance: The question of deterrence*. Praeger.
- Toby, J. (1964). Is punishment necessary? *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, & Police Science*, 55(3), 332-337.
- Tonry, M. (2008). Learning from the limitations of deterrence research. *Crime and Justice*, 37(1), 329-3111.
- Trinkner, R., & Cohn, E. S. (2014). Putting the “social” back in legal socialization: Procedural justice, legitimacy, and cynicism in legal and nonlegal authorities. *Law and Human Behavior*, 38(6), 602-617.
- Trinkner, R., Cohn, E. S., Rebellon, C. J., & Van Gundy, K. (2012). Don’t trust anyone over 30: Parental legitimacy as a mediator between parenting style and changes in delinquent behavior over time. *Journal of Adolescence*, 35(1), 119-132.
- Trinkner, R., Jackson, J., Tyler, T. R., McAuliff, B. D., & Kovera, M. B. (2018). Bounded authority: Expanding “appropriate” police behavior beyond procedural justice. *Law and Human Behavior*, 42(3), 280-293.
- Trinkner, R., & Reisig, M. D. (2021). Celebrating 50 years of legal socialization. *Journal of Social Issues*, 77, 281-290.
- Trinkner, R., & Tyler, T. R. (2016). Legal socialization: Coercion versus consent in an era of mistrust. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*, 12, 417-439.
- Tunnell, K. D. (1992). *Choosing crime, the criminal calculus of property offenders*. Nelson-Hall Publisher.
- Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., Oaks, P. J., Reicher, S. D., & Wetherell, M. S. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory*. Basil.
- Tyler, T. R. (1997). The psychology of legitimacy: A relational perspective on voluntary deference to authorities. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 1(4), 323-345.

- Tyler, T. R. (2004). Enhancing police legitimacy. *Annals of American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 593(1), 84-99.
- Tyler, T. R. (2006a). *Why people obey the law*. Princeton University Press.
- Tyler, T. R. (2006b). Legitimacy and legitimation. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 57, 375-400.
- Tyler, T. R. (2009). Legitimacy and criminal justice: The benefits of self-regulation, *Ohio State Journal of Criminal Law*, 7, 307-359.
- Tyler, T. R. (2021). Legal socialization: Back to the future. *Journal of Social Issues*, 77(2), 663-676.
- Tyler, T. R., & Blader, S. L. (2003). The group engagement model: Procedural justice, social identity, and cooperative behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 7(4), 349-361.
- Tyler, T. R., & Boeckmann, R. J. (1997). Three strikes and you are out, but why? The psychology of public support for punishing rule breakers. *Law and Society Review*, 31(2), 237-265.
- Tyler, T. R., & Fagan, J. (2008). Why do people cooperate with the police? *Ohio State Journal of Criminal Law*, 6, 231-275.
- Tyler, T. R., Fagan, J., & Geller, A. (2014). Street stops and police legitimacy: Teachable moments in young urban men's legal socialization. *Journal of Empirical Legal Studies*, 11(4), 751-785.
- Tyler, T. R., & Huo, Y. J. (2002). *Trust in the Law*. Russel 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 the Law*, 20, 78-95.
- Tyler, T. R., & Jackson, J. (2013). Future challenges in the study of legitimacy and criminal justice. In J. Tankebe, & A. Liebling (Eds.), *Legitimacy and criminal justice: An international exploration* (pp. 83-194). Oxford University Press.
- Tyler, T. R., & Lind, E. A. (1992). A relational model of authority in groups. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 25, 115-191.
- Tyler, T. R., & McGraw, K. M. (1986). Ideology and interpretation of personal experience: Procedural justice and political quiescence. *Journal of Social Issues*, 42(2), 115-128.

- Tyler, T. R., & Trinkner, R. (2018). *Why children follow rules: Legal socialization and the development of legitimacy*. Oxford University Press.
- Tyler, T. R., & Trinkner, R. (2016). *Legal socialization in an era of mistrust: Fostering popular legitimacy of the law*. Oxford University Press.
- VanDerwerken, D. N., Rothert, J., & Nguelifack, B. M. (2018). Does the threat of suspension curb dangerous behavior in soccer? A case study from the Premier League. *Journal of Sports Economics*, 19(6), 759-785.
- Van Rooij, B. & Fine, A. (2021). *The behavioral code: The hidden ways the law makes us better... or worse*. Beacon Press.
- Von Hentig, H. (1938). Limits of deterrence. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 29(4), 555-561.
- Viscusi, W. K. (1986). The risks and rewards of criminal activity: A comprehensive test of criminal deterrence. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 4(3), 317-340.
- Weisburd, D., Waring, E., & Chayet, E. (1995). Specific deterrence in a sample of offenders convicted of white-collar crimes. *Criminology*, 33(4), 587-607.
- White, S. O. (2001). Reasoning and justice. In S. O. White (Ed.), *Handbook of youth and justice* (pp. 307-327). Plenum.
- Williams, K., & Hawkins, R. (1986). Perceptual research on general deterrence: A critical overview. *Law and Society Review*, 20, 545-572.
- Witt, R. (2005). Do players react to sanction changes? Evidence from the English Premier League. *Scottish Journal of Political Economy*, 52(4), 623-640.
- Wolfe, S., & McLean, K. (2021). Is it un-American to view the police as illegitimate? The role of national identity in the legal socialization process. *Journal of Social Issues*, 77(2), 577-599.
- Wright, R. T., & Decker, S. H. (1994). *Burglars on the job: Street life and residential break ins*. Northeastern University Press.
- Wright, R. T., & Decker, S. H. (1997). *Armed robberies in action: Stickups and street culture*. Northeastern University Press.
- Zhang, S. X. (2000). *An evaluation of Los Angeles County probation juvenile drug treatment boot camp*. California State University.

Zimring, F. E., & Hawkins, G. J. (1973). *Deterrence: The legal threat in crime control*.
The University of Chicago Press.

APPENDIX A
RECRUITMENT FLYER



Seeking Riders Over Age 18 for Research Study

Are you a rider that has competed in AMA sanctioned Supercross or Motocross events?

Would you like to share your perspective on rules, penalties, and rider behavior?

If so I want to talk to you!

Study Details

Requirements of Participant

- Complete a short demographic questionnaire
- Complete an approximately 60 minute interview

Additional Information

- Participation is voluntary
- Your identity will remain confidential
- Interviews will initially be recorded but recordings will be deleted as soon as interviews are transcribed

Research is conducted by a Graduate Student in the School of Criminology and Criminal Justice at Arizona State University

For More Information Contact:

Jessica Rosenthal

303-946-3122

jmrosent@asu.edu



APPENDIX B
RECRUITMENT SCRIPT FOR SOCIAL MEDIA

Are you a motocross or supercross rider? Have you competed in an AMA-sanctioned supercross or motocross event? Are you at least 18 years old? If you answered “yes” to all these questions, you are invited to participate in a research study conducted by a graduate student at Arizona State University! You will be asked to participate in an in-depth interview lasting approximately 60 minutes where you will provide your perspective on rules, penalties, and unofficial standards of group behavior. Interviews will initially be recorded but will be deleted as soon as they have been transcribed and any information you provide will not be connected with your name. Participation is voluntary. For more information send a direct message to Jessica Rosenthal or reach out to me at jmrosent@asu.edu or (303)946-3122.

APPENDIX C

RECRUITMENT SCRIPT FOR EMAILS/DIRECT MESSAGES

Hello _____,

I am a graduate student working on my doctorate at Arizona State University. I am conducting a research study to understand riders' perspectives on formal rules/penalties, and unofficial group standards of behavior as well as their opinions on how this impacts rider behaviors. I am recruiting riders who are 18 years or older who have competed in at least one AMA-sanctioned motocross or supercross event to participate in my study. Participation in the study is voluntary. The study will involve an in-depth interview lasting approximately 60 minutes. Interviews will be audio recorded to allow the researcher to better focus on what you have to say; however, the recordings will only be kept until the interviews can be transcribed and will then immediately be deleted. Demographic information gathered will only be presented in aggregate form and no information will be tied to an individual's actual name. If this sounds like an opportunity you would be interested in, see the attached flyer for more details. Please feel free to also respond to the message, email at jmrosent@asu.edu, or call or text at (303)946-3122.

Sincerely,

Jessica Rosenthal
School of Criminology and Criminal Justice
Arizona State University

APPENDIX D
DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What best describes your race?
 - a. American Indian or Alaska Native
 - b. Asian or Asia American
 - c. Black or African American
 - d. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
 - e. White
 - f. Alternative of multiple categories, please specify:

2. Are you Hispanic, Chicano/a, Mexican/a, Latino/a, Cuban, Puerto Rican, South American, or Spanish origin?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No

3. What is your age in years?

4. Gender identity; choose all that apply.
 - a. Agender
 - b. Androgyne
 - c. Demingender
 - d. Genderqueer or gender-fluid
 - e. Man
 - f. Questioning or unsure
 - g. Trans man
 - h. Trans Woman
 - i. Woman
 - j. Additional gender category/identity please specify:

 - k. Prefer not to disclose

APPENDIX E
INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

To maintain confidentiality as we discussed with the consent form, I will not be using your real name in my work. Therefore, I would like you to pick a fake name for me to use when presenting any quotes or information from this conversation.

Rider Fake Name

This first set of questions is designed to get a better understanding of your background in motocross and supercross.

Background

1. Can you tell me about how you first got into racing motocross or supercross?
2. Can you describe your racing career? For example, the age you started, the age you turned pro if you race motocross or supercross, and anything else you would like to share.
3. Can you tell me about the different motorcycle brands you have ridden and/or the different teams you have ridden for? (i.e., Privateer, Satellite, or Factory)
 - a. Can you describe any cultural differences among brands/teams either from personal experience or what you have heard from others?
 - i. Can you provide examples of how these differences might impact what happens to a rider when they violate a rule?

The AMA has official rules in place that riders must follow when racing motocross or supercross. I am going to start by asking you some questions about the rules and your opinions about them.

Perceptions of Rules

1. How familiar would you say you are with the rules, around the general offenses or equipment offenses that are subject to penalties?
 - a. How did you learn about the rules initially?
 - b. How do you learn about changes to the rules?
2. How familiar would you say other riders are with the rules?
 - a. What information informs your opinion about other riders' knowledge?
3. What are your thoughts on the rules around the general offenses or equipment offenses that are subject to penalties?

- a. Can you provide some examples of rules that you feel are really important? Why do you think these are really important?
 - i. Can you explain your motivation for following these rules?
 - b. Can you provide some examples of rules you think are not necessary? Why are they unnecessary?
 - i. Can you explain why you would follow rules that you do not feel are necessary or do not agree with?
 - c. Are there any rules that you think need to be changed?
 - i. If so, what rules specifically do you think need to be changed?
 - ii. Explain why you feel the changes are necessary.
4. Can you explain to me how rule violations are typically discovered and reported?
 5. Do you think the rules are applied equally to all riders?
 - a. How so?
 - b. Are there changes needed in how the rules are applied?
 - i. What would you recommend for these changes?
 - ii. Explain why you feel the changes are necessary.
 - c. If the penalties were applied equally, consistently, and in a fair manner would that have an impact on your feelings about the process?
 - i. How so?
 - ii. Would this be true even if the outcome was not in your favor? Explain?
 6. Can you describe how you feel about the organization that creates the rules (AMA)?

When riders do not follow the AMA rules, they are subject to a variety of different penalties. The next set of questions will focus on these penalties and your opinions about them.

Prescriptions of Penalties

1. How familiar are you with the penalties associated with rule violations?
 - a. How did you learn about the penalties initially?
 - b. Can you describe to me how the penalty process works?
2. How familiar would you say other riders are with the penalties?
 - a. What information informs your opinion about other riders' knowledge?
3. What are your thoughts on the penalties in general?
 - a. What are some positives about the penalties?
 - b. What are some negatives about the penalties?
 - c. Do you feel like the penalties typically fit with the rule violation?
 - i. Why or Why Not?

- ii. Can you provide an example of something where you feel the penalty is appropriate for the rule violation?
 - iii. Can you provide an example of something where you feel the penalty does not fit with the rule violation?
 - iv. Can you explain any situations where you feel the penalty is inappropriate because you do not agree with the rule it is tied to?
 - d. Are there any penalties that you think need to be changed?
 - i. If so, what penalties specifically do you think need to be changed?
 - ii. Explain why you feel the changes are necessary.

- 4. Do you think the penalties are applied equally to all riders?
 - a. How so?
 - b. Are there changes needed in how the penalties are applied?
 - i. What would you recommend for these changes?
 - ii. Explain why you feel the changes are necessary.

- 5. How do you feel about the role of the organizations (AMA & FIM) that create the penalties?
 - a. What are your thoughts about the removal of the FIM as a sanctioning organization?
 - b. What are your thoughts about the removal of drug testing?
 - c. What are your thoughts about having 3 officials making decisions on penalties and rule violations instead of 1?

- 6. What are your thoughts about the protest procedures?
 - a. Can you explain if you feel riders' or their teams' voices are heard when they express that another rider should be issued a penalty?
 - b. Can you explain if you feel the rider who is being protested has their voice heard?
 - c. Who do you think is most likely to protest and why?

Rules and penalties are designed to influence rider behavior. The next group of questions is going to ask about your opinions on the impact rules and penalties have on behavior.

Impact of Rules and Penalties on Behavior

- 1. Can you explain how you feel the rules impact your behavior when riding?
 - a. Can you discuss if you have time to think about the rules during the race and when you typically realize you have violated a rule?

- 2. Can you explain how you feel like the penalties impact your behavior?
 - a. Does just knowing that the penalty exists have an effect?
 - b. How would receiving a penalty impact your behavior?

- c. Do you have time to think about the potential penalties when making decisions during the race?

Often different behaviors are accepted by a group as being either okay or not okay, but these behaviors or standards are not part of an official set of rules. These group standards may also be used to judge a behavior when there is a gray area in the rules. For example, a group's understanding of what is acceptable and what is not acceptable in terms of an aggressive pass. In this next section, I am going to be asking you to think about these unofficial standards and how they come into play in the racing context.

Perceptions about Group Norms

1. What are some examples of acceptable and unacceptable unofficial standards, unspoken rules, or rider etiquette during racing?
 - a. Can you discuss how the standard is applied to different types of riders (i.e., rookies, privateers, factory riders)?
2. How do you learn about what is acceptable and what is not acceptable concerning these unofficial standards during racing?
 - a. Can you discuss if you think all riders learn about them in the same way?
 - b. Is there a change over time in what is acceptable and what is not?
 - i. If so, how do riders become aware of the changes?
 - ii. If so, what is an example of something that has changed?
 - iii. Does this change as you move to a different class?

Unofficial standards can have an impact on behavior. In the next set of questions, I am going to ask you about how these standards might influence rider behaviors.

Impact of Group Norms on Behavior

1. Can you describe the ways you feel these unofficial standards impact rider behavior?
2. Can you tell me what happens if someone engages in a behavior that violates these standards?

During the race, there may be other factors beyond the rules/ penalties that influence the decision that you make. This section will be discussing these factors.

Factors Influencing Behavior Decisions

1. What are your thoughts about how either the stage or the racing program (Heat Race, LCQ, etc.) or the timing during each stage (First Lap, Last Lap) impacts your decisions?

- a. Can you provide some examples of what might be acceptable at one stage/time during the stage but not during another?
2. Can you explain how the identity of the other rider impacts your riding decisions? (i.e., riding style, standing in the championship, and rider type (privateer, satellite, factory)).
3. Can you describe any additional factors that come into play when making decisions when riding?

Although we have discussed each of these topics separately, they may work together to shape your decisions, or not all apply to the same degree. The questions in this next section are to help understand how all the topics fit together.

Interaction Between Rules, Penalties, and Group Norms

1. Can you describe how you feel unofficial standards work with or against the official rules and penalties as outlined and enforced by the AMA?
2. What do you think has the biggest impact on your riding behavior?
 - a. Can you explain why this is the case?

Final Thoughts

1. Is there anything else you want to share or think I should know?

APPENDIX F
CONSENT FORM

You are being asked to be a member of a research study. This form provides you with information about the study. The co-investigator will answer all of your questions about the study. Please read the information below and ask questions about anything you do not understand before deciding whether or not to take part in the study.

About the Study

I am a graduate student under the direction of Professor Abigail Henson in the School of Criminology and Criminal Justice at Arizona State University. I am conducting a research study to explore the role rules/penalties and informal group standards play on individual behavior. The study seeks to gather the perspectives of motocross and supercross riders to provide insights into their thoughts about these topics in general as well as their opinions on how both their behavior as well as the behavior of other riders is impacted. I am inviting your participation, which will involve a demographic questionnaire inquiring about race/ethnicity, age, and gender which will take less than 5 minutes to complete, and an in-depth interview lasting approximately 60 minutes. You have the right not to answer any question, and to stop participation at any time.

Voluntary Participation

To participate in the study, you must be 18 or older. Your participation in this study is voluntary. If you decide to participate in the study, you have the right to withdraw your consent or discontinue participation at any time. You also have the right to refuse to answer any question you do not wish to answer. If you choose not to participate or to withdraw from the study at any time, there will be no penalty. You will not be paid to be in the study, and it will not cost you anything to be in the study.

Benefits and Risks

Although you may not directly benefit from completing this interview, this research will provide you with the opportunity to present your perspectives and opinions about the formal rules/penalties and unofficial group standards of behavior. The minimum risks to you as a participant may include feelings of discomfort regarding any particular interview question; however, if you feel uncomfortable with a question you can choose not to answer it.

Confidentiality

To protect confidentiality, you will be asked to choose a pseudonym that will be attached to your responses rather than your actual name. Your responses will be confidential. Your responses to interview questions will be protected according to the professional standards established by the Institutional Review Board at Arizona State University. The results of this study may be used in reports, presentations, or publications but your actual name will not be used. Any demographic data gathered will be presented in aggregate form to prevent individuals from being identified. Access to the raw data is limited to the researchers and the graduate student working on this project.

Recording

I would like to audio record the interviews to allow me to better focus on what you have to say. The recordings will only be kept until the interviews can be transcribed and will then immediately be deleted. The interviews will not be recorded without your permission. Please let me know if you do not want the interview to be recorded; you also can change your mind after the interview starts, just let me know.

Researcher Contact Information

If you have questions concerning the research study, please contact the research team: Jessica Rosenthal by phone at (303)946-3122 or email jmrosent@asu.edu or Dr. Abigail Henson email Abigail.Henson@asu.edu If you have any questions about your rights as a subject/participant in this research or if you feel you have been placed at risk you can contact the Chair of the Human Subject Institutional Review Board, through the ASU Office of Research Integrity and Assurance, at (480)965-6788.

Thank you for your support!

Jessica Rosenthal, M.S.

Abigail Henson, Ph.D.

Please let me know now if you wish to be a part of this study.

APPENDIX G
IRB APPROVAL DOCUMENT

EXEMPTION GRANTED

[Abigail Henson](#)
[WATTS: Criminology and Criminal Justice, School of](#)

-
Abigail.Henson@asu.edu

Dear [Abigail Henson](#):

On 6/5/2022 the ASU IRB reviewed the following protocol:

Type of Review:	Initial Study
Title:	The Complex Nature of Social Control: Examining both the Individual Roles and the Interplay between Formal and Informal Social Control using Motocross and Supercross Riders as a Case Study
Investigator:	Abigail Henson
IRB ID:	STUDY00016055
Funding:	None
Grant Title:	None
Grant ID:	None
Documents Reviewed:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consent Form, Category: Consent Form; • Demographic Questionnaire & Interview Protocol, Category: Measures (Survey questions/Interview questions /interview guides/focus group questions); • Emails, Category: Recruitment Materials; • Flyer, Category: Recruitment Materials; • Jessica Rosenthal CITI Certificate, Category: Other; • Social Behavioral Protocol, Category: IRB Protocol; • Social Media Script, Category: Recruitment Materials;

EXEMPTION GRANTED

[Abigail Henson](#)
[WATTS: Criminology and Criminal Justice, School of](#)

-
Abigail.Henson@asu.edu

Dear [Abigail Henson](#):

On 6/5/2022 the ASU IRB reviewed the following protocol:

Type of Review:	Initial Study
Title:	The Complex Nature of Social Control: Examining both the Individual Roles and the Interplay between Formal and Informal Social Control using Motocross and Supercross Riders as a Case Study
Investigator:	Abigail Henson
IRB ID:	STUDY00016055
Funding:	None
Grant Title:	None
Grant ID:	None
Documents Reviewed:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consent Form, Category: Consent Form; • Demographic Questionnaire & Interview Protocol, Category: Measures (Survey questions/Interview questions /interview guides/focus group questions); • Emails, Category: Recruitment Materials; • Flyer, Category: Recruitment Materials; • Jessica Rosenthal CITI Certificate, Category: Other; • Social Behavioral Protocol, Category: IRB Protocol; • Social Media Script, Category: Recruitment Materials;

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Jessica Melonnie Rosenthal was born in Wheatridge Colorado on January 19, 1993. She received her bachelor's degree in Criminology and Criminal Justice with a minor in German from the Metropolitan State University of Denver in 2014. Upon graduation, she pursued a master's degree in Criminal Justice from the University of Colorado Denver. During her time there, she served as the School of Public Affairs representative to the Graduate Student Advisory Group and won the award for Outstanding Master of Criminal Justice Graduate Student. She then decided to continue her educational career, seeking a doctoral degree in Criminology and Criminal Justice from Arizona State University. She was a member of the CCJ Graduate Student Committee and served as the co-chair for the organization for the 2021-2022 academic year.