

Explaining non-compliance in the Norwegian coastal cod fishery: an application of the multinomial logit

Jensen, Carsten Lyng; Aarset, Bernt

Postprint / Postprint

Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:

www.peerproject.eu

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Jensen, C. L., & Aarset, B. (2008). Explaining non-compliance in the Norwegian coastal cod fishery: an application of the multinomial logit. *Applied Economics*, 40(4), 505-513. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00036840600606245>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter dem "PEER Licence Agreement zur Verfügung" gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zum PEER-Projekt finden Sie hier: <http://www.peerproject.eu> Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

Terms of use:

This document is made available under the "PEER Licence Agreement". For more information regarding the PEER-project see: <http://www.peerproject.eu> This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. All of the copies of this documents must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public.

By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.



Explaining non-compliance in the Norwegian coastal cod fishery: an application of the multinomial logit

| | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Journal: | <i>Applied Economics</i> |
| Manuscript ID: | APE-04-0203.R1 |
| Journal Selection: | Applied Economics |
| Date Submitted by the Author: | 30-Nov-2005 |
| JEL Code: | B23 - Econometrics Quantitative Studies < |
| Keywords: | Multinomial logit, fishery regulation, non-compliance |
| | |

powered by ScholarOne
Manuscript Central™

1
2
3 Full title: **Explaining non-compliance in the Norwegian coastal cod**
4
5
6 **fishery: an application of the multinomial logit¹**
7

8 Running Title: **Explaining non-compliance in the Norwegian coastal cod**
9
10
11 **fishery**
12

13
14
15
16 ABSTRACT
17

18
19 Establishing motive is central to the analysis of criminal behaviour. This paper
20 analyses the range of motives for non-compliant behaviour among coastal cod
21 fishermen. A multinomial logit model is employed to analyse the reasons that
22 underlie various motives. The four motives compared in this study are economic,
23 technological and social, and motives caused by bureaucracy and legitimacy
24 problems. The economic motive is found to be most important for coastal fishermen.
25
26 However, the cross-sectional data indicate that motives vary with fishing gear, vessel
27 length, and fishermen's age. The results indicate that identifying motives for non-
28 compliant behaviour is not straightforward but is important for reducing the extent of
29 infringements of the regulations. Fishermen who use gill-net, seine and long line, for
30 example, are more often motivated to non-compliance by technical problems and
31 bureaucracy than hand-jig fishers. The study suggests that in order to prevent non-
32 compliance behaviour, the authorities' management policy should be designed to
33 address the problems encountered by different categories of fishers. For example,
34 offences that are committed because of technical problems should be resolved by
35 increasing the involvement of fishermen in the process of drawing up regulations,
36 whereas offences motivated by economic factors should be reduced by increasing
37 inspections.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

I. INTRODUCTION

Fish resources are managed by the authorities in order to achieve sustainable development of the fish stocks. In the EU, illegal catches have long been a serious management problem (Holden, 1996), and fisheries managers consider ways to improve fishermen's compliance with regulations. Evaluating motivation is important as a step towards preventing illegal behaviour. Non-compliance, for example, might be a result of lack of enforcement and punishment (Becker, 1968; Sutinen and Andersen, 1985). Lack of perceived fairness and appropriateness of the regulations may also play a role in motivating non-compliance (Tyler, 1990; Jentoft, 1989; Nielsen 2003). In any case, it is vital that the authorities should understand the motives that cause illegal behaviour in their search for effective policies to prevent non-compliance.

The literature on compliance in fisheries addresses economic, social behavioural, legitimacy, and moral factors for non-compliance (Sutinen and Kuperan, 1999; Hatcher *et al*, 2000; Nielsen and Mathiesen, 2003; Jentoft, 2000; Hønneland, 1999). A shortcoming of the existing literature is that technological reasons for non-compliance have scarcely been addressed at all. Squires, (1987), Kirkley and Strand (1988), Dupont (1991) Squires and Kirkley (1991, 1996), Jensen (2002) address that constraints of fishing technology have consequences for obtaining successful management in multispecies fishery. In this view the characteristics of fishing gears impose restriction on the fishermen's ability to comply with regulation. Gill net and trawl, for example, are often inappropriate for the selective harvesting of demersal species (Kirkley and Strand, 1988; Alam, Ishak and Squires, 1996, 2002), and the technological ability to harvest selectively has implications for the ability to obey by-

1
2
3 catch regulations. Obeying regulations may thus depend on the technological
4 characteristics of the fishing technology employed.
5
6

7
8
9 The study makes two contributions to the literature. First, competing explanations
10 that have their roots in different paradigms are tested for their contribution for
11 explaining non-compliance among fishermen. Secondly, technological problems that
12 create incentives for infringements are explicitly tested for, which to the best of our
13 knowledge is a topic that has not been addressed before. We perform an empirical
14 analysis of the motives for non-compliance, based on fishermen's choices among
15 alternative explanations of why the regulations are violated. A multinomial logit
16 model is used to analyse the responses of the fishers. The objective is to identify
17 ways for the authorities to reduce non-compliance. The following section reviews a
18 number of theories regarding the motivation of non-compliance behaviour. The
19 empirical model used to analyse the motives for non-compliance is outlined in
20 section III. Data and empirical results are presented in sections IV and V. A
21 discussion of the findings and some policy implications for reducing non-compliance
22 are presented in the final section.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 43 II. MOTIVES FOR NON-COMPLIANCE 44

45
46 Several scholars have carried out empirical analyses of non-compliance among
47 fishermen (e.g. Sutinen, Rieser and Gauvin, 1990; Furlong, 1991; Sutinen and
48 Kuperan, 1999; Kuperan and Sutinen, 1998; Hatcher *et al.*, 2000, 2005; Nielsen and
49 Mathiesen, 2003). A review of the literature shows that several theories are used for
50 explaining non-compliance in fisheries, the theories are founded on different
51 paradigms employed for explaining human behaviour and have origins in research
52 fields of economics (Becker, 1968), psychology (Kohlberg, 1976) and sociology
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 (Tyler, 1990).² A downside of superfluous of theories is that it becomes difficult for
4
5 management authorities to decide which strategy to employ in order to reduce
6
7 infringements of regulations. Motives for non-compliance among fishermen differs
8
9 with backgrounds variables, for example, regional differences, differences between
10
11 fishing gear, vessel size, and attitudes towards regulation, etc. We employ a
12
13 multinomial logit model to reveal distinctions in motives for non-compliance among
14
15 fishers. The procedure systemises information on fishermen's explanations for
16
17 infringement behaviour with backgrounds variables of demography, firm-related
18
19 factors and attitude factors. Another advantage of the procedure is that explanations
20
21 for non-compliance founded on theories from fields of economics, sociology and
22
23 psychology is tested empirically against each other.
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 Different motives for non-compliance behaviour are outlined in a questionnaire
31
32 presented for the fishermen, and the individual respondents are asked to choose the
33
34 motive that is most appropriate for them for explaining non-compliance behaviour
35
36 (Table 1).
37
38
39

40 The first motive outlined is based on the premise that *economic reasoning* is a
41
42 driving force for non-compliance behaviour. Becker (1968) suggests that utility-
43
44 maximizing individuals might find it optimal to commit a criminal offence when the
45
46 expected utility from committing the crime exceeds the utility from engaging in legal
47
48 activity. Economic reasoning is used to explain non-compliance among fishermen
49
50 (Sutinen and Andersen, 1985; Furlong, 1991).
51
52
53

54 The second option build on that *technological conditions* of different types of fishing
55
56 gear have implications for fishermen's ability to comply with the regulations, and
57
58 therefore *technological problems* as such is explaining the non-compliance behaviour
59
60

1
2
3 (Squires, 1987; Kirkley and Strand, 1988). The technology of gill-nets, for example,
4 makes it difficult for the fisherman to comply with by-catch regulations and quota
5 regulations (Alam, Ishak, Squires 1996; Thunberg, Bresnayan, Adams 1995). This is
6 due to the fact that several species are harvested simultaneously, and the gill-net are
7 an inefficient gear for selective harvesting. Non-compliance with by-catch
8 regulations is also a problem for fishermen using trawl (Nielsen and Mathiesen,
9 2003).

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21 The third is option is that *non-compliance by among fellow fishermen* is a main
22 motivator for non-compliance of the individual fishermen. The significance of
23 imitating others behaviour is founded on the theory of social behaviour, which
24 emphasises how individual behaviour is influenced by opinions that are formed
25 within a group. In this perspective the opinions of peers has a key influence via the
26 moral context of the actual decisions taken at sea by fishermen (Sutinen and
27 Kuperan, 1999, Sutinen and Gauvin, 1988).

28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39 Finally, the *bureaucracy of regulations* is a suggested as reason for infringement
40 behaviour. The argument is that fishermen's perceptions of legitimacy and fairness
41 of the regulations have an impact on compliance (Tyler, 1990; Jentoft, 2000;
42 Hønneland, 1999; Nielsen, 2003). In this view, fishermen regard regulations as
43 unfair, bureaucratic, and the law and its institutions as inappropriate, and thus as
44 incentives for non-compliance.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
The questionnaire form, where the respondents have to choose between alternative
explanations for infringement behaviour, has the advantage that it gives the
possibility for performing a systematic empirical analysis. The applied outcome
choices for non-compliance denote an exhaustive representation of motives for

1
2
3 infringement behaviour based on the literature and relevant for the applied case study
4
5 of the Norwegian coastal cod fishery.³ A drawback of questionnaire form applied is
6
7 that it requires a narrowing of definitions of the motives for non-compliance, but this
8
9 is obtained to the benefit of providing sufficient observations to undertake an
10
11 empirical analysis.
12
13

14
15
16 An important part of the analysis of the motives is to find explanatory factors that
17
18 discriminate among motivation groups. Additional information on the respondents
19
20 that can be broken down into demographic factors (age, member of fishery
21
22 association, position in the firm, etc.), firm-related factors (number of fishing days,
23
24 number of fishing permits, region, etc.) and attitude factors are collected. Information
25
26 of value for understanding the underlying mechanisms for non-compliance is
27
28 obtained by combining knowledge of motives and explanatory factors. These
29
30 mechanisms are important as a means of suggesting options to reduce non-
31
32 compliance for different categories of fishermen. Policy instruments that affect
33
34 economic incentives, for example, might be important as a means of motivating
35
36 fishermen to comply with economic conditions, whereas conditions that affect
37
38 legitimacy problems might be the key to reduce non-compliance among fishermen
39
40 that regard the regulatory climate as too bureaucratic.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 III. THE EMPIRICAL MODEL

52

53
54 The respondents' choices of alternative motives are modelled by a multinomial logit
55
56 model. The respondents chose from J alternative motives (outcomes), which are
57
58 indexed $j=0, \dots, J$. The outcomes cannot be ranked in any way, and the multinomial
59
60

logit model is a suitable modelling device.⁴ The model for determining the probability of outcome j is:

$$1) \Pr_{ij}(y = j | x_i) = \frac{\exp(x_i \beta_j)}{1 + \sum_{k=1}^J \exp(\beta_k x_i)},$$

where $\Pr_{ij}(y_i = j | x_i)$ denotes the probability that individual i chooses outcome j . x_i represents exogenous variables, and β_j are the parameters to be estimated. The multinomial logit model is based on the assumption of Independence of Irrelevant Alternatives (IIA) meaning that the odds ratio between any two choices is unaffected by any other alternative choice.⁵ The IIA assumption is tested by determining whether the odds ratio between each pair of alternatives is impacted, when observations of other alternative choice are eliminated from the estimation (Long, 1997). Rejection of the assumption of independence means that biased predictions of probabilities will be obtained by the multinomial logit model.

The impact of individual regressors on the odds ratio is not obtained in (1), but these marginal effects are derived by differentiation:

$$2) \frac{\partial \Pr_{ij}}{\partial x_i} = \Pr_{ij}[\beta_j - \sum_{k=0}^J \Pr_{ik} \beta_k] = \Pr_{ij}[\beta_j - \bar{\beta}]$$

IV. DESCRIPTION OF DATA

A questionnaire is administered to coastal fishermen holding licenses for catching cod, saithe, and haddock in the coastal fishery. Three hundred randomly selected respondents have answered the questionnaire based on telephone interviews. In order to secure a high likelihood an honest responses assurance of individual anonymity and

1
2
3 confidentiality is provided. The questionnaire is designed in a form and wording that
4 should obtain accurate responses, the accuracy is of particular importance with
5 respect to the choice between different motives for non-compliance. In the study
6 none of the 300 respondents have failed to respond on what motivates non-
7 compliance behaviour.
8
9

10
11
12
13
14
15
16 The coastal fishermen in Norway are harvesting several species, and their motives
17 for non-compliance may differ, depending on which species is mainly targeted. For
18 example, the probability that a respondent indicates that regulation is bureaucratic
19 might depend on whether the fisherman is referring to the herring fishery or to the
20 cod fishery. This study focuses on the cod fishery, because this fishery is most
21 valuable in terms of income for the coastal fleet. The 245 respondents analysed are
22 those fishermen indicating that cod is the most important species for them, and that
23 regulation of cod has a larger influence on earnings than any other species.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34
35
36 The summary statistics indicate that the majority of fishermen 63.5% (N=154)
37 identify economic motives for cheating, 18% a technical reason, 6.6% the
38 importance of other fishermen's behaviour, and 12.3% that bureaucracy is their
39 reason for non-compliance (Table 2).
40
41
42
43
44
45

46
47 The demographic information indicates that the mean age of the respondents is 52
48 years, and that they are employed as skippers. The firm-related information reveals
49 that most of the vessels involved operate for about 200 days a year, the average
50 vessel length is 12.8 metres, the average crew size is two, and most companies are
51 individually owned.
52
53
54
55
56
57

58
59 Four types of fishing gear are used in the coastal cod fishery: gill-net, Danish seine,
60 long line, and hand jig. The summary statistics shows that hand jig fishermen are less

1
2
3 likely to identify technical and bureaucratic explanations for non-compliance than
4 fishermen using other types of gear. The long-line fishermen are less likely to point
5 at the influence of others as a motive for cheating. Some coastal fishermen also use
6 purse seine gear, but respondents using this gear type target mainly herring, and they
7 are not included.
8
9

10
11
12
13
14
15
16 Four regions of Norway are surveyed: the counties of Finnmark, Troms, Nordland,
17 and the southern region. An interesting observation is that fishermen from Troms and
18 the southern region seem more likely to refer to the bureaucracy motive as an
19 explanation for non-compliance than fishermen from Finnmark and Nordland.
20
21
22
23
24
25

26
27 Attitude factors are measured by Likert variables, which reveal the opinions of
28 respondents to regulatory issues. The attitude variables are based on responses on
29 multiple-choice answers of the form: “I agree with the statement”, “I partly agree
30 with the statement”, “I am neutral to the statement”, “I partly disagree with the
31 statement”, or “I disagree with the statement”, which are scored on a scale of 1 to 5.⁶
32
33
34
35
36
37
38 The attitude variables are designed to into account the respondents’ perceptions of
39 different aspects of the regulations and control of the fishery. Among the aspects
40 addressed are attitudes towards regulation of the fishery, personal experience of
41 fishery regulations, perceptions of the fisheries authorities, and attitudes towards
42 cheating in the fishery. The attitudes variables are important for a deeper
43 understanding of the motives for non-compliance.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 V. EMPIRICAL RESULTS

54
55
56

57 A multinomial logit model is employed (Table 3). Maximum likelihood estimation is
58 employed for estimating the model. The model is based on demographic and firm-
59
60

1
2
3 related factors and attitude factors. The regressors are exogenous with respect to the
4
5 respondent's decision on what motivates non-compliance behaviour.⁷
6
7

8
9 Factors that are not significant at the $p=0.10$ level are removed. A likelihood ratio
10
11 (LR) test testing the hypothesis, $H_0: \beta_i = 0$ for all β , is performed. The test statistic is
12
13 defined as $2(L_1 - L_0)$, where L_0 is the value of the log-likelihood function when the
14
15 only explanatory variable is the constant term, and L_1 is the log-likelihood value
16
17 when all explanatory variables are included. The test statistics rejects the H_0 -
18
19 hypothesis ($H_0: \beta_i = 0$) in model, indicating that the variables contribute to explaining
20
21 the differences in motives for non-compliance. Moreover, the IIA assumption is
22
23 confirmed, meaning that the odds of any two choices are independent of the other
24
25 choices.
26
27
28
29

30
31 The model includes three demographic and firm-related factors: fishermen older than
32
33 50 years, vessel's length in metres, and fishermen using hand jig fishing gear. The
34
35 age of the fishermen is not statistically significant, but grouping the data between
36
37 fisherman younger and older than 50 years of age is found to be significant. With
38
39 respect to fishing gear, different gear types have been tested, and the data indicate
40
41 that the hand jig differs from the other gear types. Several other demographic firm-
42
43 related factors are tested but none of them contributed to explaining differences in
44
45 motives for non-compliance. To this end it is interesting to observe that regional
46
47 distinctions in motives for non-compliance are not statistically demonstrated in the
48
49 data. Several of the attitude factors are significant in explaining motives for non-
50
51 compliance, and these factors are included.
52
53
54
55
56

57
58 The individual effects of the demographic, firm-related, and attitudes variables are
59
60 obtained by estimating their marginal effects (Table 4). Several interesting findings

1
2
3 are made. The marginal effects indicate that fishermen using hand jig gear are less
4 likely to point to technical and bureaucracy problems as motivations for non-
5 compliance than fishermen using other types of gear. The result is valuable in that it
6 demonstrates that the fishing technology employed influences the motivation for
7 infringement of the regulations. The results indicate that economic incentives should
8 be used to reduce non-compliance among hand jig fishermen. For the fishermen
9 using seine, gill net and long line the authorities should employ means that address
10 economic motivation, but also means that are directed towards motives based on
11 technology and bureaucratic frustration.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25
26 A weak indication is found for that fishermen on larger vessels are less likely to
27 identify bureaucracy as their motive for non-compliance (Table 4). The vessel length
28 is, however, statistically insignificant a result that follows due to multicollinearity in
29 the model. Spearman's rank test justifies the significant correlations between vessel
30 length and the following attitude factors: 1) perceived fairness of regulation, 2)
31 perceived probability of a control of papers being conducted, 3) perceived
32 probability that fishermen in general are cheating. Moreover fishermen older than 50
33 are less likely to identify technical conditions as reason for non-compliance
34 behaviour.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Turning to the attitude factors, the perceived probability that the public managers
conduct paper control is perceived being lower among fishermen that are pointing at
economic motives for non-compliance compared to fishermen pointing at other
motives (Table 4). The result confirms that low risk of being controlled creates an
economic motive for non-compliance. It is also interesting that fishermen that point
at economic motives for non-compliance have a low trust in that regulation is
perceived as fair among fishermen in general. The economic-oriented fishermen also

1
2
3 anticipate the lowest rate of infringement among fishermen in general. The fishermen
4 that are motivated by economic factors also have a low trust in that increased
5 involvement of fishermen in the regulatory process will reduce non-compliance. The
6 analysis reveals that fishermen that point at the economic motive for non-compliance
7 are more likely to be influenced by increased control measures than fishermen that
8 point at other motives for non-compliances.
9

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Fishermen that point at technical reasons for non-compliance are most negative
towards the discard of useful fish. A relatively positive attitude towards regulation is
found among fishermen who emphasise technical motives for non-compliance. They
are more likely to believe that the regulations are perceived as fair by fishermen, and
that there is a higher probability of their papers being inspected than among
fishermen who refer to the economic motive. For the authorities, it is important to
realise that fishermen who mention technical grounds for non-compliance have a
positive attitude to the involvement of fishermen in the regulation process in order to
reduce non-compliance.

The fishermen who identify non-compliance among fellow fishermen as a reason for
non-compliance are relatively negative to the idea that the authorities are managing
the fisheries properly. They believe that non-compliance among fishermen is more
common than is thought by the fishermen who pointing to economic and
bureaucratic motives for non-compliance. Finally, about 12% of the fishermen point
at the regulations as an explanation for non-compliance. These fishermen mainly use
Danish seine, long line and gill net, and have the lowest belief that targeting other
species than cod might help to reduce non-compliance. The reason might be that to
using these types of fishing gear makes it is difficult to catch other species than cod.
One might expect increasing the engagement of fishermen in the regulatory process

1
2
3 to reduce frustration with bureaucracy as a motive for non-compliance, but this does
4
5 not seem to be case.
6
7

8 9 VI. DISCUSSION AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS

10
11
12 The paper addresses the influence of various motives for non-compliance among
13
14 coastal cod fishermen in Norway. The cross-sectional data show that there are
15
16 various motives for non-compliance among coastal fishermen. The economic motive
17
18 for non-compliance is important for most fishermen, a finding that is in line with the
19
20 results of studies performed by Hatcher *et al.* (2000, 2005), Nielsen and Mathiesen
21
22 (2003), and Sutinen, Rieser and Gauvin (1990). Individual economic conditions play
23
24 an important role in determining the motives that lead to infringement of the
25
26 regulations. In particular, we find that fishermen who emphasise economic motives
27
28 believe in a lower likelihood that their papers will be inspected than fishermen who
29
30 explain non-compliance in terms of non-economic motives. However, increasing
31
32 fishery control has often been found to be a relatively costly way to achieve
33
34 compliance (Arnason, Hannesson and Shrank, 2000). For this reason, increasing the
35
36 involvement of fishermen in the regulatory process is often suggested as a means of
37
38 reducing non-compliance. This study indicates that increased involvement of
39
40 fishermen is likely to have a low probability of success among economy-oriented
41
42 fishermen, compared to fishermen who identify technical reasons for non-
43
44 compliance. The result is interesting because scholars have discussed whether means
45
46 that affect economic incentives, legitimacy or technical problems should be
47
48 employed to reduce non-compliance. Our findings suggest that involving fishermen
49
50 in the regulatory process would reduce non-compliance among some fishermen,
51
52 whereas economic conditions might be expected to influence the majority of
53
54 fishermen.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The study is based on the premise that fishermen cannot be regarded as a
4 homogeneous group, since harvesting patterns differ among fishermen, depending on
5 regional differences in fishing fields and abundance of fish, differences in harvesting
6 gears, which means that perceptions of regulation and motives for non-compliance
7 also differ among fishers. The study shows that type of fishing gear plays a
8 significant role in explaining differences in motives for non-compliance among
9 coastal fishermen. Empirical studies by Squires (1987), Kirkley and Strand (1988)
10 show that gear is crucial for determining production conditions and the ability to
11 adjust to regulation. The present study shows that catch technology also plays an
12 important role in explaining differences in motives for infringing the regulations.
13 More specifically, we find that hand jig fishermen are less likely to suggest that
14 bureaucracy and technical problems motivate non-compliance than fishermen who
15 use Danish seine, gill-net and long line. The use of a particular technology influences
16 fishermen's perception of regulations, in that it appears that hand jig fishermen
17 perceive a higher degree of fairness of regulation than fishermen who use other types
18 of gear. Their somewhat positive attitude to regulation explains the lower percentage
19 of hand jig fishermen who use bureaucracy as their explanation for non-compliance
20 compared with fishermen who use other types of gear. If we wish to understand what
21 causes the differences in motives, it is also important to note that hand jig fishermen
22 have fewer problems in avoiding by-catch than fishermen using Danish seine and
23 long line.⁸ Moreover, fishermen who use other gear types than hand jig indicate that
24 periodic (temporal) regulation is the problem, while hand jig fishermen are relatively
25 more concerned with regulation of minimum fish size.⁹

26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59 It is also interesting to note that our data do not allow us to establish regional
60 differences in motives for non-compliance. We anticipated that the differences in

1
2
3 composition of harvested species and differences in fishing fields along the
4 Norwegian coast, a distance of 2000 kilometres, would have produced different
5 motives for non-compliance in different regions. However, the fact that most
6 respondents are operating in the three northernmost counties of Norway (Finnmark,
7 Troms and Nordland) under much the same harvesting conditions might explain the
8 lack of regional differences in the data.¹⁰
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

18 Eighteen percent of the fishermen identify technical problems as the reason for non-
19 compliance. These fishermen mainly use gill net, long line and Danish seine, and
20 regard discard of useful fish as an important regulation issue. Information on how
21 regulative obstacles are perceived by fishermen who use different gears is important
22 if fishermen are to be involved in the regulatory process. The survey indicates that
23 long-line, Danish seine and gill net fishermen suffer from different technical
24 problems; for example, 40% of long-line and 28% of Danish seine fishermen regard
25 bycatch as a major regulation obstacle, whereas mesh size seems to be a problem for
26 gill net fishermen mentioned by 26 % of this group.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 Forty percent of the respondents who mention bureaucracy as an explanation for
42 non-compliance stress that periodical quota regulation is an obstacle. These
43 fishermen mainly use Danish seine, long line and gill net. It seems that regulations
44 are linked to a low faith in the possibility that orienting their catch strategy towards
45 other species might reduce non-compliance. This result might follow because these
46 fishermen have limited possibilities of switching their catch strategy. Periodical
47 regulation is regarded as being unnecessarily restrictive. It is also interesting to note
48 that fishermen who regard the regulations as bureaucratic do not believe that
49 increased involvement of fishermen in the regulatory process would alleviate the
50 situation. This attitude might stem from these fishermen's lack of faith in being heard
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 in the management process (Jentoft, 2000). Finally, it is remarkable that the
4
5 fishermen who are most sceptical about public control of the fishery are the small
6
7 minority who identify non-compliance among fellow fishermen as a motive for the
8
9 non-compliance conducted by them. On second thoughts, however, this result is
10
11 perhaps not so surprising, in that it suggests that these fishermen would probably
12
13 recommend greater government control of their fellow fishermen.
14
15
16
17

18 REFERENCES

- 19
20
21 Amemiya, T. (1981) Qualitative response models. *Journal of Economics Literature*,
22
23 **XIX**, 1483-1536.
24
25
26
27 Alam M.F., Ishak, H.O. and D. Squires (1996) Sustainable resource use, economic
28
29 development, and public regulation: the multiproduct gill net fishery of peninsular
30
31 Malaysia. *Environmental and Resource Economics*, **7**, 117-132.
32
33
34
35 Alam M.F., Ishak H.O. and D. Squires. (2002) Sustainable fisheries development in
36
37 the tropics: trawlers and license limitation in Malaysia. *Applied Economics*, **34**, 325-
38
39 337.
40
41
42
43 Arnason R., R. Hannesson and W.E. Shrank (2000) Costs of fisheries management:
44
45 the cases of Iceland, Norway and Newfoundland. *Marine Policy*, **24**, 233-243.
46
47
48
49 Becker, G.S. (1968) Crime and punishment: an economic approach. *Journal of*
50
51 *Political Economy*, **76**, 169-217.
52
53
54
55 Dupont, D.P. (1991) Testing for input substitution in a regulated fishery. *American*
56
57 *Journal of Agricultural Economics*, **73**, 155-164.
58
59
60

1
2
3 Furlong, W. J. (1991) The deterrent effect of regulatory enforcement in the fishery.
4
5 *Land Economics*, **67**, 116-129.
6

7
8
9 Hatcher, A., D. Gordon (2005) Further investigations into the factors affecting
10
11 compliance with U.K. fishing quotas. *Land Economics*, **81**, 71-86.
12

13
14
15 Hatcher, A, J. Shabbar, O. Thébaud and E. Bennett (2000) Normative and social
16
17 influences affecting compliance with fishery regulations. *Land Economics*, **76**, 448-
18
19 461.
20

21
22
23 Holden, M. (1996) *The Common Fisheries Policy: Origin, Evaluation and Future*.
24
25 Oxford: Fishing News Books.
26

27
28
29 Hønneland, G. (1999) A model of compliance in fisheries: theoretical foundations
30
31 and practical applications. *Ocean Development & International Law*, **42**, 699-716.
32

33
34
35 Jensen, C.L. (2002) Application of the dual theory in fisheries: A survey. *Marine*
36
37 *Resource Economics*, **17**, 309-334.
38

39
40
41 Jentoft, S. (1989) Fisheries co-management. Delegating government responsibility to
42
43 fishermen's organizations. *Marine Policy*, **13**, 137-154.
44

45
46
47 Jentoft, S. (2000) Legitimacy and disappointment in fisheries management. *Marine*
48
49 *Policy*, **24**, 141-148.
50

51
52
53 Kirkley, J. E. and Strand, I. E. (1988) The technology and management of multi-
54
55 species fisheries. *Applied Economics*, **20**, 1279-1292.
56

57
58
59 Kohlberg, L. (1976) Moral stages and moralization, in *Moral Development and*
60
Behaviour. (Ed.) T. Likona, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, New York, Ny, pp. 31-53.

1
2
3 Kuperan. K. and J. G. Sutinen (1998) Blue water crime: deterrence, legitimacy and
4 compliance in fisheries. *Law & Society Review*, **32**, 309-338.

5
6
7
8
9 Likert, R. (1932) *A Technique for the Measurement of Attitudes*. New York:
10 Archives of Psychology.

11
12
13
14
15 Long, J. Scott (1997) *Regression Models for Categorical and Limited Dependent*
16 *Variables*. Sage Publications.

17
18
19
20
21 McFadden, D. (1974) Conditional logit analysis of choice behaviour, in "*Frontier in*
22 *Econometrics*. (Ed.) P. Zarembka. New York: Academic Press, pp. 105-142.

23
24
25
26
27 Nielsen, J. R (2003) An analytical framework for studying: compliance and
28 legitimacy in fisheries management. *Marine Policy*, **27**, 425-432.

29
30
31
32 Nielsen, J. R, and C. Mathiesen (2003) Important factors influencing rule compliance
33 in fisheries: lessons from Denmark. *Marine Policy*, **27**, 409-416.

34
35
36
37
38 Squires, D. (1987) Public regulation and the structure of production in multiproduct
39 industries: an application to the New England otter trawl industry. *RAND Journal of*
40 *Economics*, **18**, 234-247.

41
42
43
44
45
46 Squires, D. and J. Kirkley (1991) Production quotas in multiproduct fisheries.
47 *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, **21**, 109-126.

48
49
50
51
52 Squires, D. and J. Kirkley (1996) Individual transferable quotas in a multiproduct
53 common property industry. *Canadian Journal of Economics*, **29**, 318-342.

54
55
56
57
58 Sutinen, J.G. and P. Andersen (1985) The economics of fisheries law enforcement.
59 *Land Economics*, **61**, 387-397.
60

1
2
3 Sutinen, J.G and J.R Gauvin (1988) Enforcement and compliance in the commercial
4 inshore lobster fishery of Massachusetts, A Report to the Environmental
5 Enforcement Division, State of Massachusetts.
6
7
8

9
10
11 Sutinen, J.G. A. Rieser and J.R. Gauvin (1990) Measuring and explaining
12 noncompliance in federally managed fisheries. *Ocean Development & International*
13 *Law*, **21**, 335-372.
14
15
16

17
18
19 Sutinen, J. and K. Kuperan (1999) A socio-economic theory of regulatory
20 compliance. *International Journal of Social Economics*, **26**, 174-193.
21
22
23

24
25 Thunberg, E. M., E. W. Bresnayan and C. M. Adams (1995) Economic analysis of
26 technical interdependencies and the value of effort in a multi-species fishery. *Marine*
27 *Resource Economics*, **10**, 59-76.
28
29
30
31

32
33 Tyler, T.R. (1990) *Why People Obey the Law*. New Haven and London: Yale
34 University Press.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Table 1. Motives for non-compliance with regulations among fishers

4 Question: In your opinion, what is the most important reason for non-compliance with
5 regulations

- 6
-
- 7 1. One has to disobey the regulations in order to obtaining a reasonable income from fishing
8 2. Technical problems make it difficult to comply with the regulations
9 3. Because other fishermen are cheating
10 4. Because the regulations are bureaucratic
11
-
- 12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review

Table 2. Summary statistics for respondents on the survey for the coastal cod fishery in Norway

| | Economy (N=154) | Technical problem (N=45) | Others cheating (N=16) | Bureaucracy (N=30) | Total (N=245) |
|--------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| <i>Demographic</i> | | | | | |
| Average age | 52 years | 50 years | 48 years | 53 years | 52 years |
| <i>Position in firm</i> | | | | | |
| Skipper | 98 % | 97 % | 100 % | 100 % | 98 % |
| <i>Firm-related</i> | | | | | |
| Mean fishing days | 200 days | 207 days | 201 days | 196 days | 201 days |
| Mean vessel length | 12.6 m | 13.4 m | 15.7 m | 11.5 m | 12.8 m |
| Mean crew size | 1.9 men | 2.3 men | 2.6 men | 1.8 men | 2.0 men |
| <i>Corporate form</i> | | | | | |
| Single ownership | 77 % | 73 % | 50 % | 83 % | 75 % |
| <i>Gear</i> | | | | | |
| | | | % | | |
| Gill-net | 59.1 | 20.0 | 8.2 | 12.7 | = 100 % |
| Danish seine | 55.3 | 18.4 | 10.5 | 15.8 | = 100 % |
| Long line | 60.5 | 25.6 | 0.0 | 14.0 | = 100 % |
| Hand Jig | 77.8 | 9.3 | 5.6 | 7.4 | = 100 % |
| <i>Region</i> | | | | | |
| | | | % | | |
| Finnmark | 64.3 | 19.0 | 7.1 | 9.5 | = 100 % |
| Troms | 55.0 | 20.0 | 8.3 | 16.7 | = 100 % |
| Nordland | 69.0 | 18.0 | 5.0 | 8.0 | = 100 % |
| Southern regions ¹⁾ | 58.1 | 16.3 | 7.0 | 18.6 | = 100 % |

1) Southern regions include the counties: Nord-Trøndelag, Sør-Trøndelag, Møre and Romsdal, Sogn og Fjordane, Hordaland, Rogaland, Vest-Agder.

Table 3. Estimates made using the multinomial logit model

| | Outcome 1 Economy | Outcome 2 Techn. Probl. | Outcome 3 Other cheat | Outcome 4 Bureaucracy |
|--|----------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Constant | | -3.813** (-2.73) | -3.967* (-1.90) | -2.226 (-1.35) |
| Age_50 | | -0.952** (-2.32) | -1.327** (-1.99) | 0.402 (0.85) |
| Meter | | -0.042 (-0.95) | 0.073 (1.21) | -0.084** (-1.51) |
| Hand Jig | | -1.342** (-2.16) | -0.323 (-0.38) | -1.266** (-2.09) |
| 1. Attitude to public control | | 0.136 (0.88) | -0.392 (-1.63) | 0.134 (0.80) |
| 2. Attitude to discard | | -0.294** (-2.10) | -0.138 (-0.51) | 0.299 (1.21) |
| 3. Fishermen perceive regulation as fair | | 0.016** (2.44) | 0.032** (3.07) | 0.010 (1.43) |
| 4. Perceived risk of papers being checked | | 0.019** (2.47) | 0.018 (1.55) | 0.003 (0.37) |
| 5. Attitude towards cheating of fishermen | | 0.090** (3.23) | 0.099** (3.17) | 0.055 (1.69) |
| 6. Attitude towards fishermen's involvement | | 0.572** (2.34) | 0.099 (0.30) | 0.175 (0.82) |
| 7. Harvesting of alternative species | | 0.074 (0.33) | -0.019 (-0.06) | -0.471** (-2.47) |
| LR test on all variables $\chi^2(9)^1 = 97.65^*$ | | | | |
| IIA Test | 14.41* | 9.69* | 11.76* | 11.79* |

Note. Reference outcome 1 (economy). For outcome 1 the economics are used as a comparison group.
 Note. ** indicates significance at 5% level, and * indicates significance at the 10% level. Figures in parenthesis are the t-statistics.

1) A LR test with $H_0: \beta_i = 0$.

Table 4. Marginal effects

| | Outcome 1 Economy | Outcome 2 Technical problem | Outcome 3 Other cheating | Outcome 4 Bureaucracy |
|--|----------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| Age_50 | 0.105 (1.56) | -0.122** (-2.29) | -0.041 (-1.63) | 0.058 (1.41) |
| Meter | 0.009 (1.31) | -0.004 (-0.78) | 0.002 (1.41) | -0.007 (-1.50) |
| Hand Jig | 0.202** (3.30) | -0.114** (-2.61) | -0.001 (-0.07) | -0.086** (-2.30) |
| 1. Attitude to public control | -0.016 (-0.67) | 0.016 (0.88) | -0.012* (-1.74) | 0.012 (0.77) |
| 2. Attitude to discard | 0.008 (0.32) | -0.039** (-2.37) | -0.003 (-0.47) | 0.034 (1.51) |
| 3. Fishermen perceive regulation as fair | -0.003** (-2.67) | 0.001** (2.16) | 0.0008** (2.43) | 0.0006 (0.93) |
| 4. Perceived risk of papers being checked | -0.002** (-3.01) | 0.002** (2.47) | 0.0004 (1.26) | -0.00001 (-0.02) |
| 5. Attitude towards cheating of fishermen | -0.015** (-3.08) | 0.009** (2.92) | 0.002** (1.97) | 0.003 (1.19) |
| 6. Attitude towards fishermen's involvement | -0.074** (-2.19) | 0.066** (2.37) | -0.0001 (0.001) | 0.008 (0.39) |
| 7. Harvesting of alternative species | 0.030 (0.95) | 0.016 (0.63) | 0.0006 (0.07) | -0.048** (-2.60) |

Note. ** indicates significance at 5% level, and * indicates significance at the 10% level. Figures in parenthesis are t-values.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Suggestions by an anonymous referee have substantially improved the paper. Communication with Stein Arne Rånes is greatly appreciated. The authors wish to acknowledge the financial support of the Research Council of Norway. The views expressed herein are those of the authors and are not to be attributed to the Research Council.

² Sutinen and Kuperan (1999), Hønneland (1999) provide an enriched theoretical introduction to the literature applied for explaining non-compliance in fishery.

³ The applied outcomes are designed to cover the most likely explanations for non-compliance behaviour among Norwegian coastal fishers and for securing accuracy in responses, we have formulated the motives in a wording to be well understood by the fishermen. None of the respondents failed to decide on what motivates non-compliance behaviour.

⁴ Choices that cannot be ranked in any way are denoted as unordered (see Amemiya, 1981).

⁵ An example of rejection of the HIA in the literature is obtained in the red bus/blue bus example, where the odds of transportation choice between car and red bus will be affected when transportation with a blue bus is added as an option. The red and blue buses are naturally close substitutes, and therefore the odds between red bus and car will be reduced, when the blue bus is added as an option (McFadden, 1974).

⁶ The Likert variable is used as a device for transforming attitudes with categories like strongly approve, approve, undecided, disapprove, and strongly disapprove into quantitative variable with numeric values between 1 and 5 (Likert, 1932).

⁷ A referee suggests that a Hausman test might provide a suitable device for testing the exogeneity of the regressors. The procedure builds on the use of exogenous instruments that are correlated with the regressors without being correlated with the regressant. Unfortunately, those instruments are not at hand, which prevents us from performing the suggested test.

⁸ 33% of the fishermen using hand jig mention that avoiding bycatch in the cod fishery is not easy, for seine and long line the percentages are 65% and 53% respectively.

⁹ The questionnaire also reveals that periodical regulation is regarded as a problem for 29% of fishermen not using hand jig, but is regarded as a problem by only 9 % of the fishermen using hand jig. On the other hand, while 27% of the hand jig fishermen mention that minimum size is an important regulatory problem, this issue is only mentioned by 7 % of other fishers.

¹⁰ Eighty-two of the respondents operate in the Counties of Finnmark, Troms and Nordland.